

Koṇḍakalip̣lola grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00061

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00061.xml

Languages: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)], Telugu [Script (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-16 17:02 (a1bf930), last modified 2026-09-18 17:45 (0273b8a)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final M is reduced in size and simplified to a tick mark.

Original punctuation marks.

Other palaeographic observations. Short and long dependent i are barely distinguished (the long vowel is open at the bottom left) and have been read with the benefit of doubt where applicable.

Edition

Seal

⟨1⟩ śrī-viṣamasiddhi

Plates

⟨Page 1r⟩

<Page 1v> <1> svasti<.> śrīmḷa?<a>tā<m> sakala-bhuvana-sarṇstḷu?<ū>yamāna-
mānavya-sagotrḷa?<ā><2>ṇā<m> hāriti-putrḷa?<ā>ṇā<m> mātḷri!<ṛ>-gaṇa-
paripālītḷa?<ā>ḷṇa?<nā>M svḷa?<ā>mi-ma<3>hḷa?<ā>sena-pḷa?<ā>dḷa?<ā>nud-
dhyḷa?<ā>tānāM bhagavan-nārḷa?<ā>ya<ṇa>-prasāda-samāsādita<4>○-vara-
<varāha>-lḷa?<ā>ñchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśikṛtḷaṇaM śeṣa!-maṇḍa<5>lānāM
ḷma?<A>śvamedhḷa?<ā>vabhṛḷt?<th>a-snḷa?<ā>na-pavitrḷi?<i>kṛta-vapuṣā<6>M
caḷukyānḷa?<ā>M kulam ala<m>kariṣṇo<h> śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahḷa?<ā>rāj{y}asya
A<7>nanya-nṛpati-sāḷth?<dh>ḷa?<ā>raṇa-guṇa-traya-sampādi<ta>-sḷa?<ā>mḷṛ?<rā>jya<Page
2r><8>sya pautraḷya?<h> tad-anuśayita-ḷpitṛguṇavva-sampannasya? śrī-sa<9>rvva-
lokāśraya-mahḷa?<ā>rḷa?<ā>jasya putraḷya?<h> śakra Ivḷa?<ā>pratihatā-
śā<10>san(o) ravir iva tejasvḷi?<i> ḷma(thapa)? Iva manḷe?<o>-nandana-ka(ra)<h>
(nārā)yaṇa<11> ○Iva śrīmḷa?<ā>N śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahḷa?<ā>rāja<h>
parama<12>-brahḷv?<m>aṇya<h> <ājñāpayati>

yathḷa?<ā> viditam astu vo <'>smā(bh)i<h> vaṇḷgipura-va<13>stavyḷa!<āya>
ḷkhaṇva!<kāṇva>-ḷgh?<g>otrḷa?<ā>ya ḷtahitri![(na?)]<ya>>!<taittirīyāya>
![(ndiśa)]<<naḷṇḍ?<nd>iśa>>(r)mma(ṇa?)<h> (putr)ḷi(a)?<ā>ya (d)u<14>(rgganā-
disarmma?)ṇa<h> ḷpauvutraya!<pautṛāya> nandiḷs?<ś>a<r>mmanḷa?<e>
<'>smḷa?<ā>bhḷe?<i><r> nṇḷa?<ā>tavḷa?<ā><Page 2v><15>ḷi-viṣaye koṇḍakaliplo(la)
<<n(ā?)>>ma{ma} grām(e grāmasya)<16> ḷAkneyantisi?<Āgneyyān diśi>
pḷu?<ū><r>vvaḷd?<t>a<h> kurikiyuru kaṛuru panta sḷi?<i><17>mḷa?<ā><.>
dakṣiṇata<h> ḷsila!<śilā> sḷi?<i>mḷa?<ā><.> paḷc?<ś>cimata<h> ḷsila?<śilā>
sḷi?<i>mḷa?<ā><.> Ut<t>arata<h><18>○ koṇḍakaliplo(la) pa<<ḷa>>kaṇ(lu)ru
panta sḷi?<i>mḷaḷ?<ā><.> Et(e)<19>sḷa?<ām> madhye ḷtva?<dvā>daśa-kodrava-
khaṇḍikḷa?<ā>vḷa?<ā>pa-kṣetra<m> prava(r)ddhamā<20>na-vijaya-rājya-
sarṇvatsare pañca ḷvaruṣel<varṣe> (pra)(varttamā?)<21>ne candra-grahaṇa-nimitte
sḷe?<o>[da](ka-pū?)[rvvaṇ mātā-pi]tr(o)<Page 3r><22>r ā(t)manāś ca ḷś?<s>va-
puṇyḷa?<ā>vḷa?<ā>ptaye {ta} dattaḷh!<m><.> Uktañ ca bhaga<va>tā vy(ā)s(e)<23>na

1. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā bhuktḷa?<ā>
bahubhiś cānupālītā
yasya yasya<24> yadḷa?<ā> bhūmi<h>
tasya <tasya> tadā ḷp?<ph>alaM

2. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattām <para-dattām> vḷa?<ā>
yo haretḷi?<a> vasundharā<m>

<25> ○ṣaṣṭi-vaṛuṣ?<rs>a-sahasrāṇi
viṣṭ?<th>āyā<m> jā<ya>te kṛmiḥ

3. Anuṣṭubh

<26> svaḍdandā?<n dāturiṃ> sumahaḍT> śa!<c cha>ḍkh?<k>yaṛiṃ
duḥḍk?<kh>am anyasya pālana<m>
dḍa?<ā>naṛiṃ vā pāla<27>na<m> veti
dḍa?<ā><nā>ḍchre!<c chre>yo <'>nḍa?<u>pḍa?<ā>la<na>M

<Page 3v>

Apparatus

Plates

<4> -vaśīkṛtḍjaṇaM śeṣa!-maṇḍa<5>lānām • NR suggests the emendation -
vaśīkṛtāśeṣārāti-maṇḍalānām. However, this form does not seem to occur in related
grants. In later grants of the dynasty, -vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām is standard, while sev-
eral grants issued by the first few generations of rulers have -vaśīkṛtāśeṣa-mahībhṛtām
or -vaśīkṛtāśeṣa-mahīkṣitām. The two phrases seem to be confounded here.

<7> -sāthḍa?<ā>raṇa- ◇ -sāḍya?<dhā>raṇa- NR • This must be an error of the Devanagari
typesetter in NR's edition. — <7> guṇa-traya • It may be better to emend this to guṇasya
śakti-traya; see note to the translation.

<8> pauṭraḍya?<aḥ> ◇ pauṭrāya NR. — <8> -anuśapita- ◇ -anuśapita- NR • A Devana-
gari typesetting error. — <8> ḍpitṛguṇavva-sampannasya? ◇ pitṛguṇḍavva?<aiś ca>
samppannasya NR • NR's emendation (in fact pitṛguṇaiśca, clearly a typographic mistake)
renders the text intelligible, but has no parallel in related grants. Several of these (e.g.
the Nutulapaṛu grant and London plates of Maṛṅgi Yuvarāja) describe Maṛṅgi with
the words samatiśayita-pitṛ-guṇa-śakti-sampanna, where I prefer to emend to -guṇaḥ,
separating this phrase from the next. It is very likely that something much the same
was intended here.

<9> putra<ḥ> ya<ḥ> ◇ putra<ḥ>ḍya NR • I do not find ya superfluous; assuming that
yaḥ was intended, this is a perfectly normal way to connect to the subsequent string
of qualifiers for the reigning king. However, if the received reading is indeed pauṭraya
in the previous line, then it is also possible that the dative forms pauṭrāya and putrāya
had been intended here, incorrectly, to describe the king.

<10> ḍma(thapa)? ◇ ḍmataya?<manmatha> NR • NR's tentative emendation (printed

manmadha, a Devanagari typo) does not seem satisfactory. In the received text, the second character may be *ta* but looks more like *tha*. The third character is definitely not *ya*; in addition to a misshapen *pa*, it could be a misshapen *ca*. Related grants sometimes compare the king to the moon in similar phrase, compare *śaśalāñchanasyeva sakala-jagan-mano-nayanānandana-karasya* (of Viṣṇuvardhana I in the Niḍuparu grant of Jayasimha I) and *candra Iva sarvva-jana-mano-nayana-nandanaḥ* (of Jayasimha II in the Cendara grant of Jayasimha II). Being immediately subsequent to a comparison to the sun (as in the second parallel cited here) also makes the moon likely here, and the word *kara* could well have been used punningly if the object of the comparison were indeed the moon. My best guess at the composer's intent is therefore *mṛgāṅka*, but since this presumes an egregious scribal mistake, I do not make the emendation in the text. Emending to *mādhava* would be less invasive, but inferior in the context.

<12> <ājñāpayati> • The text omitted here may well have been longer. NR only notes that “some portion seems to be missing” at this point. — <12> yath_ḥa?<ā> ◇ ya_ḥdhe?<thā> NR.

<13> <khaṇva!<kāṇva>-> • The ARIE reporter reads the *gotra* as *khaṇḍi* and emends to *kaṇḍinya*. I concur with NR that it is *khaṇva*. — <13> <tahitri![(na?)]<ya>>!<tait-tirīyāya> [(ndīśa)]<<na_ḥṇḍ?<nd>īśa>>(r)mma(ṇa?)<ḥ> (putr)_ḥ(a)?<ā>ya ◇ <tahitriya?<taittirīya>-naṇḍīśarmmaṇa<ḥ>putr_ḥa?<ā>ya NR • In addition to the anomalies, this locus is confusing because of the descenders of *stu* and *smā* in the line above, the presence of scribal correction, and the faintness of the estampage. I am fairly certain that originally, *tahitri* was followed by *nandi* and a now illegible character that may have been *śa*, but also *ṣa* or *ma*. The first two of these were probably beaten out and replaced, lower down, by *yana*. The third, at the same height (and extending above and below the pre-correction character) was replaced by *ṇḍi* instead of the expected *ndi*. The *śa* after this is very faint and may also have been deleted or re-inscribed shallowly. After that, *mma* is positioned higher. Of the following *ṇa*, only the faintest trace is discernible in the estampage, and most of *pu* is also indistinct. — <13> (d)u<14>(rgganandisarmma?)ṇa<ḥ> ◇ (du)<14>[q*]ṇa<ḥ> NR • My reading of the name is extremely tentative and partly conjectural, see also the commentary. The name may have been deleted in the original. Of the first character in line 14, only a headmark and part of an arc from the top of the body remain. These are consistent with reading *g*, and since the headmark is raised, a subscript consonant is likely. Of the following character, the headmark is distinct and the vestiges of the body imply *na*. Next, part of a headmark and a dependent *i* remain, but nothing of the body. Of the following character, there is again a largely discernible headmark and some vestiges of the body, from which *sa* is slightly more likely than *śa* (cf. the spelling of the next name in the

line), but many other readings could be possible. The vestiges of the next character strongly suggest *rm*, and in any case, *śarmma* or *sarmma* is certainly expected here in the context. The following *ṇa* is pristine.

<14> *jpauvutraya!*<*pautrāya*> • I wonder if *putrāya* was in fact intended here and *pautrāya* in the previous line. In that case, the sequence of grandfather and father would be more standard, and we would have (partly) identical names for the grandfather and grandson rather than, unusually, for the father and son. — <14> <'>*smṛa?<ā>bhṛe?<i><r>nnṛa?<ā>tavṛa?<ā>*<Page 2v><15>*ḍi-* ◇ <'>*smṛa?<ai>ṛbh?<p>ennṛa?<ā>tavṛa?<ā>*<Page 2v><15>*ḍdh?<d>i-* NR • The ARIE reporter gives the name of the district as (*penn*)*atavāḍi*. Although my emendation results in two iterations of *asmābhiḥ* in the sentence, given the typical formulation of related grants I am certain that NR's emendation is inappropriate. No related charters use *asmai* in such a context, while many put *asmābhiḥ* here. The district names *Nātavāḍi* and *Pennātavāḍi* are both attested and may be identical or the latter may be an extension of the former.

<15> *koṇḍakaḷipḷola* • NR's accompanying text uses “*Koṇḍakaripḷola*” in transliteration, while his edition in a mixture of Devanagari and Telugu script shows “□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□”, which I take to be a typographic approximation of *koṇḍakaripḷola*. See also the second instance of the name in line 18. The actual reading begins beyond doubt with *koṇḍakaḷipḷo*. The last character's body is shaped like that of *la*, but it completely lacks the tail curving back and down above the body. The tail is present in all instances of *la* except for the two occurrences of this name here and in line 18 below. As it is, the received character could be read as *ba* in related inscriptions of a slightly later time, but again, all instances of *ba* in the present inscription differ from it in that they have a closed box for a body. — <15> <<n(ā?)>>*ma{ma}* ◇ *nṛa?<ā>ma{ma}* NR • The narrow *nā* (or perhaps *na*) is almost certainly a subsequent insertion; if the vowel marker is present, it is close to the stem and faint. The second *ma* may have been deleted in the original or redundant as judged by NR. It also seems possible that *mahā-* had been intended. — <15> *grām(e grāmasya)* ◇ *grāma[3*]* NR • The locus is damaged, but my reading is reasonably confident.

<16> *pṛu?<ū><r>vvaḍd?<t>a<ḥ>* • In the character *da*, there are two dots placed to the left and right of the stem, just above the body. They may be a scribal mark indicating an error (though why this one error out of dozens?), or possibly a very strange manner of inserting a *visarga* subsequently. — <16> *kuṛikiyuru* ◇ *kuṛikiyūru* NR • NR's article uses “*Krokiyuru*”, but his edition's text is correct. — <16> *kaṛuru* ◇ *kaṛūru* NR.

<18> *koṇḍakaḷipḷola* • See the note on this word in line 15 above. For this instance, NR's mixture of Devanagari and Telugu characters seems to read *koṇḍakaripoṭiḷa*. — <18>

pa<<ḍa>>kaṁ(ḷu)ru ◇ *padakaṁkūru* NR • The last character is rather awkward, but I am fairly confident of its reading. Compare also the village Paḷaṁkalūru granted in the Paḷaṁkalūru grant of Amma II and located near Nandigāma, the findspot of the present plates.

<20> (pra)(varttamā?)<21>ne ◇ *prava(rddhamā)<21>ne* NR • I am very unhappy with this word and guess tentatively. Interestingly, the previous (and expected) instance of *pravarddhamāna* is right above this one. After the unclear but fairly certain *pra* (below and slightly to the right of the *pra* above), we have a plausible *va* (alternatively: *ca*, *bha*, below and a hair to the left of the *rddha* of the previous line), and at the end, a very likely *ma* (though probably not *mā*, below and a hair to the right of the *mā* above). There is nothing discernible between the possible *va* and the possible *ma*, and NR's *rddha* would have to have been much compressed to fit here. My alternative *rtta* would also have to have been compressed, but a faint stroke to the left of *tro* in the next line may be the remnant of a subscript *t*. Reading *pravarttamāne* would also eliminate the redundancy with the earlier *pravarddhamāna*, but the usage is strange.

<21> s_ḷe?<o>[da](ka-pū?)[rvvaṁ mātā-pi]tr(o)° ◇ *sodaka-pūrvvaṁ (mātā-pitro)°* NR • The characters marked here as lost and supplied are completely invisible in the estampage.

<22> bhaga<va>tā ◇ *bhagavatā* NR.

<23> bhukt_ḷa?<ā> • Although this word occurs in grants of Pulakeśin II, all Eastern Cālukya grants except the pre-royal Sātārā plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I use this stanza with *dattā*.

<25> jā<ya>te ◇ *jāyate* NR.

<27> d_ḷa?<ā><nā>_ḷchre!<c chre>yo ◇ *ḷda?<dānāT>dhke yo* NR • I assume that *dhke* in NR's edition must be a typo for *cchre* or *chre*.

Translation

Plates

<1–12> The grandson of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (II), who attained sovereignty through his triad of virtues in which he was quite beyond other kings¹ and

¹I do not know what triad of virtues (*guṇa-traya*) may have been intended here. Finding no similar phrase in related grants, I suspect that this may be a scribal omission (see the apparatus to line 7). With the emendation I suggest there, the meaning would be “whose virtues were quite beyond other kings and who attained sovereignty through the triad of his powers.”

who was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Caḷukyas—who are of the Mānavya gotra which is praised by the entire world, who are sons of Hārīti,² who are protected by the band of Mothers, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāsena, to whom <all kings>³ instantaneously submit at the <mere> sight of the superior Boar emblem they have acquired by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, and whose bodies have been hallowed through washing in the purificatory ablutions (avabhṛtha) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice; the son of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Vijayasiddhi (Maṅgi Yuvarāja), ḷwho surpasses the virtues of his father, and who is endowed with <the three> power<s>?:⁴ His Majesty the supremely pious King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (III)—whose command is as incontrovertible as that of Śakra, who blazes like the sun, who gladdens the mind like ḷthe moon {with its rays}?⁵ and who is as majestic as Nārāyaṇa {possesses Śrī}—<commands as follows>

<12–23> To wit: let it be known to you that to Nandiśarman, a resident of Vaṅgipura of the ḷKāṇva?⁶ gotra and the Taittirīya <school>, son of Nandiśarman and grandson of Duṛḡanandiśarma?⁷ we have given, at the village named Koṇḍakaḷiplōla in Nā-tavāḍi district (viṣaya), in the southeastern direction of the village—To the east, the border is ḷthe road between? Kuṛikiyuru and Kaṛuru.⁸ To the south, the border is ḷa (demarcation) stone?. To the west, the border is ḷa (demarcation) stone?. To the north, the border is ḷthe road between? Koṇḍakaḷiplōla and Padakaṁkūru—in the midst of these <boundaries>, a field (sufficient) for sowing twelve *khaṇḍikās* of *kodrava* seed in order to acquire merit (*puṇya*) for our mother and father and ourselves, in ḷthe course of?⁹ the year that is the fifth year of our progressive victorious reign, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water. The reverend Vyāsa too has said:

1.

Many (kings) have enjoyed the land, and many have preserved it (as formerly granted).

²The phrase “who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī’s boon” is practically universal at this point and was probably omitted here out of neglect.

³See the apparatus to line 4 for the tentative restoration that I translate here.

⁴See the apparatus to line 8 for the tentative restoration that I translate here.

⁵See the apparatus to line 10.

⁶See the apparatus to line 13.

⁷The name is mostly lost. The father and grandfather may have been mixed up by the scribe. See also the commentary and the apparatus to lines 13 and 14.

⁸Here and below in connection to Koṇḍakaḷiplōla and Padakaṁkūru, I assume without complete confidence that *panta* is a form of Sanskrit *patha* or *pathin*. The same form occurs in the Nutulapaṛu grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja in association of a (probable) village name. The form *panthaḷ* is used with a village name (explicitly specified as a village) in the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 2) of Viṣṇuvardhana II and the Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 3) of Viṣṇuvardhana II, where it is distinguished from a *rathyā-mārgaḷ*.

⁹See the apparatus to line 20 for my doubts concerning the reading of this phrase.

Whosoever at any time owns the land, the fruit {reward (accrued of granting it)} belongs to him at that time.

2.

He who would seize land, whether given by himself or by another, shall be born as a worm in faeces for sixty thousand years.

3.

It is possible (i.e. easy) to give away what is yours, <even if it is> a great thing; <but> it is hard to preserve that <given away> by another. <When it comes to> the question, “donation or preservation <of previous grants>?”—<the answer is that> preservation is superior to donation.

Commentary

<13–14> The name partly lost here may have been *durgganandiśarmmaṇaḥ*. This name occurs in the Uccāti grant of Jayasimha I found together with the present grant (and perhaps originally issued to members of a single family), and the name Dugamaḍiśarman in the Cendāra grant of Jayasimha II (also found together) may be a variant or corruption of the same name, as also observed by NR. The donee of the latter grant is Dugamaḍiśarman of Vaṅgiparu and of the Kāṇva *gotra* (though an Āpastamba), son of Maḍiśarman and grandson of Dugamaḍiśarman. Assuming that the present donee is Nandiśarman, son of Durganandiśarman and grandson of Nandiśarman (see also the apparatus note to *putraya* in this line), it is tempting to speculate that the present donee is the son of the donee of the Cendāra grant.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1997–98, p. 18, appendix A/1997–98, N° 4 without discussion of details. Edited from the original plates by N. Ramesan (1988, N° C), without facsimiles and without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on estampages preserved at the ASI, Mysore, collated with Ramesan’s edition. Minor errors in the printed edition are not shown in the apparatus. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[NR] Ramesan, N. 1988. “Three Eastern Chālukyan copper plate grants from Nandigāma.” In: *Epigraphia Āndhrīca* vol. V. Edited by N. Mukunda Rao. Epigraphical series 19. Hyderabad: Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 18–29.

Secondary

ARIE 1997–98. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1997-98*. Edited by T. S. Ravishankar. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 2011. Page 18, appendixes A/1997-98, item 4.

Balogh, Dániel. 2026. “Metadata for the DHARMA editions of Veṅgī Cālukya copper plates.” Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22827003. [URL].