Ciṁbuluru plates of Vijayāditya III

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00062

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00062.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-28 17:37 (06a61a7), last modified 2026-09-18 17:45 (0273b8a)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final N (l9) looks like a reduced and slightly lowered na with a long and straight vertical stem, no headmark. Final T (l13) is likewise a reduced and lowered ta with a (not so long) vertical stem, no headmark.

Original punctuation marks.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is normally to the right of the character to which it belongs, at or slightly above headline height; quite often atop the next character (e.g. l7 maṁgi, l18 kuṭuṁbina); at least once atop the character to which it belongs (l14 śibiṁ). Jihvāmūlīya, identical in shape to m, occurs in line 28. Long initial Ī occurs in line 33. Short and long dependent i are indistinguishable most of the time, and are read as expected unless there is reason to read otherwise.

Edition

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 svas(t)i〈.〉 śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-mānavya-sagotrāṇāṁ hāriti-putrā(ṇāṁ)〈2〉 kauśik(ī)-va(r)¿(u)?〈a〉-pra(sā)da-labdha-rā(j)yā(n)ā(ṁ) mātṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ sv¿a?〈ā〉mi-mahāse¿(ṇa/nā)?〈na〉-pā〈3〉d¿a?〈ā〉nudhy(ā)tā¿ṁna?〈nāṁ〉 bhagavan-nārā(yaṇa)-prasāda-sa(mā)sā(d)ita-vara-varāha-lāñchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa〈4〉-vaśī◯(k)ṛtārāti-maṇḍalānāṁ Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna-pavitrīkṛta-vapuṣ¿a?〈āṁ〉〈5〉 calukyānāṁ kulam alaṁkariṣṇoḥ satyāśraya-vallabhendrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇuvarddhana〈ḥ〉 A〈6〉ṣṭādaśa varṣ¿a?〈ā〉ṇi〈.〉 tasya sūnu〈ḥ〉 jayas(ī)ha-vallabha〈ḥ〉 trayastri(ṁ)śad varṣ¿(a)?〈ā〉(ṇi)〈.〉 ta(s)yānujasya I〈7〉(ndra-bha)ṭṭārakasya priya-tanaya(ḥ) viṣ(ṇ)u-rā(ja)〈ḥ〉 nava varṣ¿(a)?〈ā〉(ṇ)i〈.〉 tasyāt(m)aja〈ḥ〉 maṁgi-(y)uvarāja(ḥ?) pañca〈Page 2r〉〈8〉v(iṁ)śat(i) va(r)ṣ(ā)ṇ(i)〈.〉 tasya suta〈ḥ〉 sakala-lokāśraya-jayasiṁha-vallabhas trayodaśa va(r)ṣ(ā)ṇ(i)〈.〉 tasy(ā)〈9〉nuja-dvaimāturaḥ kokkili〈ḥ〉 ṣaṇ mās¿a?〈ā〉N〈.〉 tasyāgraja〈ḥ〉 viṣṇuvard-dhanaḥ saptatriṁśad varṣāṇi〈.〉 tasya putra〈ḥ〉 vija〈10〉yādityaḥ Ek¿u?〈o〉naviṁśad varṣ(ā)ṇi〈.〉 tasya s(ū)nu〈ḥ〉 viṣṇurāja〈ḥ〉 ṣaṭtr(i)ṁśa¿ṣ?〈d〉 varṣ¿a?〈ā〉ṇi〈.〉 tasya priya-tanaya〈ḥ〉 vijayā〈11〉dity〈ḥ〉 ◯

1. Anuṣṭubh

Ekacatvāriṁśat samā
rājya〈ṁ〉 kṛtvā surālaya〈ṁ〉
gate 〈'〉smi¡(N)!〈ṁ〉s tat-sut(o) viṣṇu-
rāja〈ḥ〉 kṛta-śa〈12〉rad-〈d〉vaya〈ḥ〉

2. Anuṣṭubh

tasya jyeṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉a-sutaḥ praṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉a-
-śūro goṣṭheṣ¿ṭ?〈v〉 adhiṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉itā
yena vallabha-lakṣmīr apy
¿a?〈ā〉tma-ve¿(ṣ?)?〈d〉ī vidhe〈13〉ya-kṛT

3. Anuṣṭubh

sva-¿vaśyāraśśratāviṣṭ(ā)?
yena pratyanta-bhūmaya〈ḥ〉
chit〈t〉vā tar¿u?〈ū〉n gir¿i?〈ī〉n khātv¿a?〈ā〉
kṛtāś ¿c(e?)ṇḍuka-?vedi〈14〉kāḥ

4. Anuṣṭubh

dadhīca-kānīna-śib¿iṁ?〈īn〉
gupt¿(ā)?〈a〉-bhūriśravo-b¿i?〈a〉līN
yo jayaty ā〈śri〉t¿o?〈au〉¿dha?〈dā〉ryy¿a?〈ā〉d
ambhodhi-kṣamayā〈Page 2v〉 〈15〉 (kṣa)m(āṁ)

5. Anuṣṭubh

gu(ṇa)k(ke)nalla-nāmno <’>sya
vijayāditya-bhūpateḥ
priya-<patnī> cellakākhyā
mahā-devī śubhānva<16>yā

6. Anuṣṭubh

vallabhendra-sutā<ṁ> helā-
-hasitāmara-kanyakā<ṁ>
kanyakātva<ṁ> samāpannā<ṁ>
kāma-mū(r)ttir iv¿(e)?<o>dva<17>¿yā?<ha>T

7. Anuṣṭubh

vijayāditya-bhūpālo
grāma<ṁ> puṇya-samṛ<ddha>y¿a?<e>

gudrah¿a?<ā>ra-viṣ¿ā?<a>ya-niv¿a?<ā>sin¿ā?<a>ḥ rāṣṭrak(ū)<18>ṭa-pra◯mukhān
kuṭuṁbina<ḥ> sarvv(ā)n itth¿ā?<a>m ¿a?<ā>jñāpayati

viditam astu vo <’>smābhiḥ nandiyala-vā<19>s(t)avy¡a!<āya> murggali-gotr¿a?<ā>ya
madhuvayyaśarmmaṇ¡e!<aḥ> pautr¿a?<ā>ya viṣṇuśarmmaṇ¡e!<aḥ> putr¿a?<ā>ya
veda<20>yyaśarmmaṇe callak(ā)ryyay¿a?<ā> ciṁbuluru nāma grāmo may¿a?<ā>
datta<ḥ>

vedayya-śarmm(ā) ca sama<21>stam eva grāma(ṁ) vidita-sakala-mīm¿a?<ā><ṁ>sādi-
ś¿a?<ā>strebhya<ḥ> satata-vita¿(bh)?<n>yamāna-sapta-tantu-sa<Page 3r><22>nta(r)pp(i)ta-
sakala-g(īr)vv(ā)ṇa-¡n(i)kumbhebhyaḥ!<nikurumbebhyaḥ> catu(r)vvedib-
hya<ḥ> samadhigata-samasta-vedāṁga-tat<t>v¿a?<e>bhya<ḥ><23> vaśiṣṭha-
jamadagn¡a!<i>-bharadv(ā)ja-par¿a?<ā>śara-durvv¿a?<ā>so-<’>nukāribhyaḥ
ṣaṭ-karmma-niratebhya<ḥ> br¿a?<ā>hmaṇebhya<ḥ> pa<24>¿th?<ṭh>ita-
paṭhanīyebhya<ḥ> vidita-veditavy¿ā?<e>bhya<ḥ> kṛ<ta-ka>(r)ttavy¿ā?<e>bhya(ḥ)
soma-gr¿ā?<a>haṇa-nimitt¿a?<e> Udaka-pū<25>rvva<ṁ> sa◯rvva-kara-parihāraḥ
ciṁbuluru-nāmā grāmo dattaḥ

tasyāvadhayaḥ<.> pūrvvataḥ daṭṭi<26>yava◯r̥ru-nāmā gr¿a?<ā>maḥ<.> dakṣiṇataḥ
golavadyapūṇḍi nāma grāma<ḥ><.> paścimataḥ Indula<27>maddavallī nāma
grāmaḥ<.> Uttar¿ā?<a>taḥ kel̥(i)pūṇḍi-nāmā grāmaḥ<.> Eteṣām madhya<28>-
va(r)tt¡iḥ!<ī><.> Asyopari na kenacid bādhā karaṇīy(ā)<.> ya{ḥ}ḥ karoti s¿ā?<a>
pañca-mah¿a?<ā><Page 3v><29>-pātaka-sa<ṁ>yukto bhavati

8. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānupālitā
ya〈30〉sya (ya)sya yada bhūmis
tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ

9. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattā〈ṁ〉 para-dattā〈ṁ〉 vā
yo〈31〉ha◯reta vasundhar¿a?〈ā〉ṁ
ṣaṣṭi-varṣa-saha¿ś?〈s〉r¿a?〈ā〉ṇi
viṣṭhāyā〈ṁ〉 jāya(te) kṛmiḥ

10. Anuṣṭubh

ta(ṭā)〈32〉kānā〈ṁ〉 sahasreṇa
Aśvamedha-śatena ca
gavāṁ koṭi-pradānena
bhūmi-hartt¿a?〈ā〉 n¿ā?〈a〉〈33〉(śu){(d)}(dhyat)i

11. Anuṣṭubh

br¿(a)?〈ā〉hmaṇo jāyamā¿ṇ?〈n〉o vai
p¡ri!〈ṛ〉¿dh?〈th〉ivyām adhijāyate
Īśvara〈ḥ〉 sarvva-bhū(tā)〈Page 4r〉〈34〉nā(ṁ)
brahma-kośasya guptaye

12. Anuṣṭubh

tasya sva〈ṁ〉 harate yas tu
tasya pā〈pa〉-phala〈ṁ〉 ś¡ri!〈ṛ〉ṇu
〈35〉 brahma-haty¿a?〈ā〉-sahasrebhya〈ḥ〉
go-〈ha〉ty¿a?〈ā〉bhy¿ā?〈o〉 viśiṣyate

13. Anuṣṭubh

dehi deh¿i?〈ī〉ti v¿a?〈ā〉dat¿ā?〈o〉
dehi〈36〉 {dehi} ◯ deh¿i?〈ī〉ti yo vadeT
na sa vakṣy¿i?〈a〉ti deh¿i?〈ī〉ti
deh¿i?〈ī〉{ti} deh¿i?〈ā〉{ve}ntara¿gaṁ?〈ṁ ga〉taḥ

14. Śālinī

〈37〉 sarvv(ā)n itth¿ā?〈aṁ〉 bhāvina〈ḥ〉 pā〈r〉tthivendrā〈n〉
bhūyo bhūyo yācate rāmabhadra〈ḥ〉

sāmānyo〈38〉 〈’〉ya〈ṁ〉 dharmma-setur nṛpāṇāṁ
kāle kāle pālanīyo bhavadbhiḥ

15. Vasantatilakā

mad-va〈ṁ〉śa-j¿a?〈āḥ〉 para-mah¿i?〈ī〉〈Page 4v〉〈39〉-pati-vaṁśa-jāś c¿ā?〈a〉
pāpād apeta-manaso bhuvi bhāvi-bhūpā〈ḥ〉
ye pālay¿ā?〈a〉nti〈40〉 mama dharmmam ima〈ṁ〉 samasta〈ṁ〉
teṣā〈ṁ〉 mayā viracito 〈’〉ṁjalir eṣa mūrdhn¿aḥ?〈i〉

16. Puṣpitāgrā

cala〈41〉ka(ma)◯la-dalāṁbu-¿bh?〈b〉indu-lol¿a?〈ā〉ṁ
śriyam ¿ā?〈a〉nucintya manu¿s?〈ṣ〉ya-jīvitañ ca
Iti sa〈42〉kalam u¿dh?〈d〉āhṛ¿dā?〈ta〉ñ ca bu〈d〉dh¿na?〈vā〉
n¿ai?〈a〉 ¿hi?〈mati〉matā para-kīrtta〈yo〉 vilopy¿a?〈ā〉ḥ

17. Anuṣṭubh

na viṣa〈ṁ〉 viṣam ity ¿a?〈ā〉〈43〉huḥ
brahma-sva〈ṁ〉 viṣam ucyate
viṣam ekākina〈ṁ〉 hanti
brahma-sva〈ṁ〉 putra-pautrika¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉

18. Anuṣṭubh

Ā〈Page 5r〉〈44〉dhi-vyādhi-parītāyev-
ādya śvo vā vināśin¿a?〈e〉
ko hi nāma ¿g?〈ś〉arīrāya
dharmm¿a?〈ā〉(pe)taḥ〈45〉 sam¿a?〈ā〉careT

19. Anuṣṭubh

para-cakreṇa yu〈d〉dhvāj(au)
(da)tt¿ā?〈a〉-pr¿a?〈ā〉ṇasya bhūbhṛte
sūnuḥ kaṭeya-rāja〈46〉sya ◯
paṇḍarāṁgo mahā-balaḥ

20. Anuṣṭubh

Ājñaptir asya dharmmasya
gṛhītaika-pati-vra〈47〉ta〈ḥ〉
sv¿a?〈ā〉minā saha-yogena
hema-bhār¡ā! tulā-dhṛtaḥ

bhaṭṭ¿ā?〈a〉-nir¿ā?〈a〉vadya-n¿a?〈ā〉mna〈ḥ〉 kolle〈48〉-niv¿a?〈ā〉sinaḥ〈.〉 ¡vijavaḍa!-vāstavya-¿Akṣalalitā?〈Akṣaralalita〉-sutena śrīvi(ja)yācāryyeṇālile(kh)¿(ā)?〈(a)〉 ¿saśāna?〈śāsanaM〉

〈Page 5v〉

Apparatus

〈3〉 -lāñchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa- ◇ *-lāñchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-* NV • Typo in NV.

〈5〉 calukyānāṁ ◇ *cālukyānāṁ* NV.

〈6〉 jayas(ī)ha ◇ *jayasiṁha* NV.

〈9〉 °ja-dvai° • These two characaters are crowded very close together. The vowel markers on *dvai* may have been added subsequently. — 〈9〉 tasya putra〈ḥ〉 • The first word has probably been corrected from *tasyā*; the next two characters may also be a correction, e.g. from *nuja*.

〈11〉 Ekacatvāriṁśat • See the commentary about this stanza in addition to the apparatus. — 〈11〉 〈’〉smi¡(N)!〈ṁ〉s ◇ *smi〈n〉s* NV • The character I tentatively read as a final *N* may instead be a punctuation *daṇḍa*, but would then be out of place. I cannot interpret NV’s editorial markup; he too may have read a final *N* here and intended to mark it as superfluous, but is also possible that he ignored this character and wished to supply an *anusvāra*. — 〈11〉 -sut(o) • The ending *o* (also read by NV) fits my interpretation of the text and my assumption that it is in *anuṣṭubh* (not shared by NV), but if a vowel marker is present, it has no downward extensions and may have been added subsequently. — 〈11〉 viṣṇurāja〈ḥ〉 • At the end of this word, where a *visarga* is expected, there seems to be a single small circle or dot at median height. NV ignores this and it may be just damage, but it does seem to be part of the writing. — 〈11〉 -śa〈12〉rad-〈d〉vaya〈ḥ〉 ◇ *-śa〈12〉rad-〈d〉vaya〈ṁ〉* NV.

〈12〉 -śūro ◇ *-śūrā* NV. — 〈12〉 goṣṭheṣ¿ṭ?〈v〉 ◇ *goṣṭheṣv* NV • If I am wrong in my interpretation of the second hemistich, then it is also conceivable that the intended text was *goṣṭheṣṭy-* or *goṣṭhīṣṭy-*. — 〈12〉 adhiṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉itā • If I am wrong in my interpretation of the second hemistich, then this word may require further emendation to *adhiṣṭhito*. — 〈12〉 apy ¿a?〈ā〉tma- ◇ *a¿p?〈s〉yātma-* NV • I do not understand the purpose of NV’s emendation. — 〈12〉 -ve¿(ṣ?)?〈d〉ī ◇ *-vedī* NV • I find NV’s reading acceptable in the context, but the problematic consonant does not look like *d*; the additional strokes on the right-hand side of the lower part appear to be a deliberate part of the writing.

I assume that *d* had been intended, and the scribe mistook the draft for a different character, probably *ṣ*.

〈13〉 sva-¿vaśyāraśśratāviṣṭ(ā)? • NV's edition gives this chunk of text literally as "sva-vaśyār=aś=śrat=āviṣṭā". This implies that he analysed the segment in a particular way, but I cannot understand his analysis. The last character probably does indeed have a small *ā* marker attached to it, and what resembles an *i* marker distorted by the overhanging descender of *pra* above is nothing but an oversized headmark. As for the meaning of this segment, the best I can propose is to emend to *sva-vaṁśyair āśritāviṣṭā*, with hypersandhi applied to *āśritāḥ* (or *viṣṭā* used instead of *āviṣṭā*). This is a tentative suggestion and therefore I choose not to include the emendation in the edition itself. See also my translation. — 〈13〉 ¿c(e?)ṇḍuka-? ◇ *caṇḍuka-* NV • The vertical stroke on the left of *śc* that I take to be an *e* marker may be just a slip of the chisel in the engraving of the subscript part of *tma* above. There is, moreover, a slight chance that a further vowel marker is attached on the top right; if this is a deliberate stroke, then it is probably a subsequent addition, since it mingles with the upper part of the following *ṇ*. The intended vowel might thus be *a*, *ā* or *o* in addition to *e*, which I deem to be most likely. I cannot interpret any of these readings and cannot offer a convincing emendation. If *caṇḍuka* is correct, this may mean a ball or a conglomerate (Schmidt's addenda to the PW: "Ball, zusammengeballte Masse"), which does not seem appropriate but may have been used in the sense of a mass or multitude. If the correct reading is *coṇḍuka*, then the composer may have used the word *uṇḍuka* in the sense of "a lot of." Emending to *caiḍuka*, the word may have been *eḍuka*, for Buddhist (or Jain?) *stūpa*s. Emending to *candraka*, this might be a technical term for a particular kind of *vedikā*; emending to *cendraka* may likewise result in *indraka* as a technical term. All of these words are, however, rare and barely or not at all attested in meanings that may be appropriate here. For want of a better reading/emendation, I provisionally believe *cendraka* to be the most likely, since this emendation presupposes a relatively minor graphical modification (*ṇḍu* engraved instead of *ndra*), and *indraka* can mean an audience chamber (as an asterisked entry in the PWG).

〈14〉 ā〈śri〉t¿o?〈au〉¿dha?〈dā〉ryy¿a?〈ā〉d ◇ *¿ā?〈a〉to dh¿a?〈ai〉ryyād* NV • NV's emendation is unmetrical and not very meaningful. My own emendation is offered tentatively, but seems to make good sense in the context, since most of the personages listed in the first hemistich are noted for their generosity to people who were *āśrita* to them (see my translation). — 〈14〉 ambhodhi- • This word may need emendation to *ambhodhiṁ*, but if this was the composer's intent, then I do not know the quality in which Vijayāditya surpasses the ocean. In other Eastern Cālukya inscriptions, kings are said to rival the ocean in profundity (*agādhatā* in the Pedda-Vegi plates of Jayasiṁha

I and *gambhīra-satva* in the Pṛthivipallavapaṭṭana grant of Viṣṇuvardhana IV) or in having great character (*mahā-satvatā* in the Masulipatam plates of Vijayāditya III, punningly in the case of the ocean); this latter stands right next to a claim of rivalling the earth in forbearance (*kṣamāyāḥ kṣitir*). The composer may have clumsily adopted a slightly different stanza that mentioned the ocean in such a connection, or–somewhat awkwardly–*ambhodhi* can be understood in compound with *kṣamayā* in the sense of "inexhaustable".

〈15〉 priya-〈patnī〉 NV • I endorse NV's emendation of the otherwise hypometrical line. The ending of the quarter follows the *ra-vipulā* pattern, which would also permit other restorations such as *bhāryā* or *kāntā* instead of *patnī*; also, *priyā* may have been intended instead of *priya-*, and if so, then one of the above substantives may have been meant to come before, rather than after this word.

〈16〉 -sutā〈ṁ〉 ◇ *-sutā* NV. — 〈16〉 -kanyakā〈ṁ〉 ◇ *-kanyakā* NV. — 〈16〉 samāpannā〈ṁ〉 ◇ *samāpannā* NV. — 〈16〉 iv¿(e)?〈o〉dva〈17〉¿yā?〈ha〉T ◇ *iv¿a?〈ā〉dva〈17〉y¿ā?〈a〉T* NV • I do not understand NV's emendation; he may have meant to emend to *ivādvayāt*, but this does not make sense in the context. Since *kāma-mūrttir* is in the masculine, I expect something in this stanza to be about the king. In the script of the plates, the *akṣaras yā* and *ha* are very similar. In this locus, we definitely have the former, but I assume this to be a scribal mistake for a pre-drawn *ha*. The form *udvahat* is still problematic; it may have been used for the sake of the metre in place of *udavahat*, or may be a non-standard form for correct *udvahan*. Given my understanding of the narrative context, I consider the latter more likely; see also my translation.

〈17〉 grāma〈ṁ〉 ◇ *grāma-* NV • I believe that the second half of this stanza must have been omitted by mistake (rather than never being composed), and this second half would have contained a verb stating that a village has been granted. — 〈17〉 -samṛ〈ddha〉y¿a?〈e〉 ◇ *-samṛ〈ddha〉ye* NV • I second NV's emendation, though it requires emending the ending too, since no *e* is visible in the plate. — 〈17〉 gudrah¿a?〈ā〉ra- ◇ *g¿ṛ?〈r〉udr¿ā?〈a〉h¿a?〈ā〉ra-* NV • I am not sure if NV saw a subscript *ṛ* here that he emended to *r*, or saw an *r* to begin with, which was misprinted in his edition. Whichever the case, the reading is mistaken, and the semblance of an *r* or *ṛ* only appears because the descender of *u* touches the *i* of *ājñāpayati* in the following line. — 〈17〉 -niv¿a?〈ā〉sin¿ā?〈a〉ḥ ◇ *-nivāsino{ḥ}* NV.

〈20〉 ciṁbuluru ◇ *ciṁbul¿u?〈ū〉ru* NV • While it makes good sense that a long *ū* had been intended here, I prefer not to interfere with the original spelling both here and in line 25.

〈22〉 ¡n(i)kumbhebhyaḥ!〈nikurumbebhyaḥ〉 ◇ *¡nikumbhābhyaḥ!〈nikurambibhyaḥ〉* NV • I do not understand NV's reading of *ā* and emendation to *i* where I read and retain *e*; both may be typos, and we are in agreement about the essence of the emendation.

〈23〉 -durvv*¿a?〈ā〉*so-〈'〉nukāribhyaḥ ◇ *-¿durvvāsonukārrbhya?〈durvvāsa-śaunakādibhyaḥ〉* NV • NV's reading was probably identical to mine aside from typos in his edition. His emendation is unnecessary; the text as received is perfectly intelligible and much better than his emendation.

〈24〉 -veditavy*¿ā?〈e〉*bhya〈ḷ〉 ◇ *-veditayebhya〈ḷ〉* NV. — 〈24〉 kṛ〈ta-ka〉(r)ttavy*¿ā?〈e〉*bhya(ḷ) ◇ *kṛvyebhyoḥ* NV • NV offers no emendation and ignores the character *rtta*, which to my mind clearly determines how the text must be emended. — 〈24〉 -nimitt*¿a?〈e〉* ◇ *-nimitta〈ṁ〉* NV.

〈25〉 ciṁbuluru- ◇ *ciṁbulūru-* NV • See also the note to line 20. — 〈25〉 -nāmā ◇ *nāma* NV • While elsewhere in the text, *nāma* has been used in the neuter accusative and the same may have been intended here, there is nothing against construing it in compound, as a masculine nominative.

〈26〉 -nāmā ◇ *nāma* NV • See the previous note.

〈27〉 -nāmā ◇ *n¿a?〈ā〉m¿ā?〈a〉* NV • See note to line 25.

〈28〉 ya{ḥ}ḫ ◇ *yaḥ{m}* NV. — 〈28〉 s*¿ā?〈a〉* • The superfluous *ā* was probably the scribe's misunderstanding of a *visarga*. — 〈28〉 Īśvara〈ḷ〉 sarvva- • There are two dots, resembling *anusvāra*s, at (or slightly below) head level on the two sides of *sa*. They may be an editorial mark to correct *sa* into *ssa*. — 〈28〉 br*¿(a)?〈ā〉*hmaṇo jāyamā*¿ṇ?〈n〉*o • The text is acceptable as it is, but I would find it smoother with *brāhmaṇe jāyamāne*.

〈36〉 na sa ◇ *nanu* NV • Since I am not sure of the intended meaning of the stanza, I cannot rule out the possibility that the second character was intended for *nu*, but its right limb does not extend below the baseline, and the character as a whole is a nearly perfect *sa*. — 〈36〉 deh*¿i?〈ī〉*{ti} deh*¿i?〈ā〉*{ve}ntara*¿gaṁ?〈ṁ ga〉*taḥ ◇ *{dehīti} deh¿i?〈ī〉vāntara〈tā〉¿gaṁ?〈ṁ ga〉taḥ* NV • NV's emendation does not seem very coherent. I offer my own conjecturally; see the translation for my interpretation of the text.

〈37〉 itth*¿ā?〈aṁ〉* ◇ *¿itthā?〈etān〉* NV.

〈40〉 mūrdhn*¿aḥ?〈i〉* ◇ *mūrdh¿naḥ?〈ani〉* NV • Emendation is not strictly necessary, but the stanza normally has *mūrdhni*, and an *añjali* "of the head" does not sound very plausible, so I assume this is not an intentional variation.

〈41〉 -jīvitañ ◇ *-¿jīartāñ?〈jīvitañ〉* NV • This is probably a compound typo in NV, and he emends only because this word is part if his lemma for the preceding *manusya*.

〈42〉 u¿dh?〈d〉āhṛ¿dā?〈ta〉ñ ◇ *udāhṛ¿dhā?〈ta〉ñ* NV. — 〈42〉 bu〈d〉dh¿na?〈vā〉 ◇ *budhvā* NV. — 〈42〉 n¿ai?〈a〉 ¿hi?〈mati〉matā ◇ *nali n¿ai?〈a〉 hi 〈mati〉matā* NV • NV's *nali* must be a typo. His emendation to *na hi* is hypermetrical even though this is suggested by the received reading *naihi*. I can only save the metre by more heavy-handed emendation, but perhaps the original composer had a less rigorous grasp of the metre and did indeed intend the text to be *na hi matimatā*. A variant of this stanza (not known to me to occur in the Eastern Cālukya corpus) has *na hi puruṣaiḥ*. — 〈42〉 para-kīrtta〈yo〉 vilopy¿a?〈ā〉ḥ ◇ *para-kīrtt¿a?〈ir〉 vilopya{ḥ}* NV • NV's emendation is unmetrical and grammatically incorrect.

〈44〉 -parītāyevādya • The received reading is acceptable, but *iva* is not very appropriate; *-parītāyaivādya* would be better as far as the sense is concerned. Both are metrically risqué. Versions of this stanza found elsewhere have *parītāya Adya* (e.g. *Kāvyādarśa* 3.160) or *-parītāpād adya* (e.g. *Hitopadeśa* 4.136). — 〈44〉 dharmm¿a?〈ā〉(pe)taḥ • The received reading is acceptable, but other occurrences of this stanza have *dharmmāpetaṁ*, which is better.

〈45〉 (da)tt¿ā?〈a〉-pr¿a?〈ā〉ṇasya ◇ *datt¿a?〈vā〉 prāṇ¿asya?〈āṁś ca〉* NV • NV's emendation is unnecessary and only makes the syntax more awkward. — 〈45〉 kaṭeya- ◇ *kaḍeya-* NV • Although the form *kaḍeya* is repeatedly attested, the present plate clearly has *kaṭeya*.

〈46〉 -vra〈47〉ta〈ḥ〉 ◇ *-vra〈47〉t¿ā?〈a〉〈ḥ〉* NV. — 〈46〉 saha-yogena ◇ *saha yogen¿ā?〈a〉* NV • Note that in addition to reading a superfluous *ā* where I see none, NV construes *saha* as a separate word, as is evident from his discussion where he says Paṇḍarāṁga was weighed together with his lord. I think this is unlikely, because *yogena* would then not be meaningful in the context.

〈47〉 -bhār¡ā! • This ending is not grammatically correct. The intended meaning is clear, but I cannot tell whether it is a scribal mistake for *-bhāra-* in compound, or whether the composer used *-bhārā* as a non-standard instrumental (or ablative). — 〈47〉 -n¿a?〈ā〉mna〈ḥ〉 ◇ *-nāmnā* NV • I am not certain how to parse the text of the colophon; different emendations may lead to different senses. See my translation and note there for my interpretation.

〈48〉 -niv¿a?〈ā〉sinaḥ〈.〉 ◇ *-nivāsin¿aḥ?〈ā〉* NV • I am not certain how to parse the text of the colophon; different emendations may lead to different senses. See my translation and note there for my interpretation. — 〈48〉 ¡vijavaḍa!- • As NV also observes, this is clearly Vijayavāḍa; it is, however, impossible to tell whether the

ya was omitted by mistake or whether this is a legitimate variant of the name. — 〈48〉 ¿Akṣalalitā?〈Akṣaralalita〉- • Akṣaralalitācārya of Vijayavāḍa was the writer of the Koṟṟapaṟṟu grant of Vijayāditya II. The *ā* at the end of the present name may indicate that *cāryya* was omitted by the scribe, or it may simply be an incorrect way of writing the name without the title. — 〈48〉 śrīvi(ja)yācāryyeṇālile(kh)¿(ā)?〈(a)〉¿saśāna?〈śāsanaM〉 ◇ *vijayācāryyeṇ¿ā?〈a〉 lilekha śasanaṁ* NV • NV omits *śrī* both in his edition and in his discussion. I prefer to construe *śrī* as part of the writer's name because I doubt that clerical staff would have had *śrī* as an honorary epithet, but the latter is of course also possible. The active verb *lilekha* is syntactically incorrect with the agent in the instrumental. The composer may have conceived of the verb as passive, or may have meant the name to be in the nominative. The Uṟuvuṭūru grant of Vijayāditya III, also inscribed by Śrīvijayācārya, spells this phrase in the same way, but there this is followed by *likhita vidyadhara*. Therefore, I assume that the action performed by Śrīvijayācārya is in both texts reported with the verb *ālikh-* (see also my commentary there), and do not emend to *śrīvijayācāryyeṇa*.

Translation

〈1–11〉 Greetings! Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Calukyas—who are of the Mānavya *gotra* which is praised by the entire world, who are sons of Hāriti, who attained kingship by the grace of Kauśikī's boon, who are protected by the band of Mothers, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāsena, to whom the realms of adversaries 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. His brother Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana 〈reigned〉 for eighteen years. His son Jayasiṁha Vallabha (I), for thirty-three years. His younger brother Indra Bhaṭṭāraka's dear son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana II), for nine years. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five years. His son Jayasiṁha Vallabha (II), the shelter of the complete world (*sakala-lokāśraya*), for thirteen years. His younger brother by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. His elder brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven years. His son Vijayāditya (I), for nineteen years. His son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana IV), for thirty-six years. His dear son was Vijayāditya (II).

1.

After he (Vijayāditya II), having reigned for forty-one years, passed on to heaven, his son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana V) completed two autumns 〈as king〉.[1]

[1] See the commentary for some thoughts on this awkward stanza. The original stanza that I hypothesise

2.

His eldest son, a pre-eminent hero, ¿knows his own nature and does his duty. He has even presided over? the royal might (*lakṣmī*) of the Vallabha (the Rāṣṭrakūṭas) in negotiations (*goṣṭha*).[2]

3.

He ¿penetrated into? the peripheral lands ¿to where his dynastic relatives (cognates) had retreated?. Felling trees and digging up mountains, he built ¿halls and altars?.[3]

4.

By his generosity to those who seek his protection, he surmounts Dadhīca, the Maid's Son (Karṇa), Śibi, Gupta, Bhūriśravas and Bali; and by his ocean-like patience, (he surmounts) the earth.[4]

5.

The beloved 〈wife〉 of this King Vijayāditya (III) named Guṇakkenalla is a great queen of illustrious lineage, called Cellakā.

---

there would have much the same meaning except that it would claim forty years as Vijayāditya II's reign, and would set up the completion of Viṣṇuvardhana V's reign as an adverb of time for the following stanza rather than completing the sentence here.

[2]This is another extremely awkward stanza in the original. I translate the text with the fairly straightforward emendations noted in the apparatus for line 12. To make sense of the tortuous sentence, I assume from the historical context that the claim being made is that Vijayāditya III was authorised to dispose of some funds and/or troops of his Rāṣṭrakūṭa suzerain. However, my intuition is that the first hemistich was meant to be intelligible in itself (calling Vijayāditya an eminent hero who presided over assembly meetings), while the second hemistich was meant to claim that he made the *lakṣmī* of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas subject to his own will (implying a victory over the Rāṣṭrakūṭas). But to obtain this purport from the stanza as received and emendable in good conscience, grammar would have to be twisted far beyond the conventions of non-standard Sanskrit.

[3]This stanza is even less intelligible than the previous one. See the apparatus to line 13. My translation reflects the tentative suggestions made in the apparatus notes. I assume that the stanza refers to Vijayāditya III rooting out his own rivals to the throne and simultaneously civilising the peripheries conquered in the course of this. It also seems possible that the first hemistich was intended simply to say that he conquered those peripheries, but I cannot suggest an emendation by which this purport could be obtained.

[4]Another problematic stanza; see the apparatus to line 14. I am confident in my emendation of the third *pāda* and my interpretation of the first three, but retain doubts about the intended meaning of the fourth quarter (for which see the apparatus note on *ambhodhi-*). The sage Dadhīca gave up his own bones when requested by Indra, so that a weapon could be fashioned from them. The Maid's Son Karṇa (also called Kānīna in the Kalucuṁbaṟṟu grant of Amma II) cut off the breastplate that was fused to his body from birth at the request of Indra disguised as a Brahmin. Śibi fed his own flesh to Indra in the guise of a hawk to save Agni who in the guise of a pigeon asked for his protection. Bali's generosity is probably his giving up of the world (or of his body) to Viṣṇu in his Vāmana incarnation. I do not know of any relevant notable act by Bhūriśravas, but he is said to have been generous to Brahmins. I have not the faintest idea who the Gupta mentioned here may have been.

6–7.

When upon her attainment of young womanhood he, like Kāma embodied, married this daughter of the Vallabha (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) king, who was like a divine damsel with her coquettish smile, King Vijayāditya ⟨donated⟩ a village in order to accumulate merit.[5]

⟨17–18⟩ ⟨He, Vijayāditya III⟩ commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Gudrahāra district (*viṣaya*) as follows:

⟨18–20⟩ Let it be known that we, ⟨together⟩ with Callakāryā,[6] have given the village named Ciṁbuluru to Vedayyaśarman, resident of Nandiyala, of the Murggali *gotra*,[7] grandson of Madhuvayyaśarman and son of Viṣṇuśarman.

⟨20–25⟩ Vedayyaśarman, in turn, ⟨has given⟩ the entire village to Brahmins engaged in the the six duties (of a Brahmin), who know all the treatises (*śāstra*) such as Mimāṁsā, who gratify the complete coterie of gods by the ceaseless offering of sacrifices, who are learned in the four Vedas, who have completely mastered the truths of all the Vedāṅgas, who take after Vaśiṣṭha, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Parāśara and Durvāsas, who have studied what there is to be studied, learned what there is to be learned, performed what ⟨ritual⟩ there is to be performed. The village named Ciṁbuluru has been given, exempt from all taxes, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, ⟨the donation being⟩ sanctified by (a libation of) water.[8]

[5]Stanza 7 consists only of one hemistich and lacks the expected finite verb "donated". I believe this lack is a scribal omission and the composer's original text would have included a second hemistich with that verb, along with some additional details (such as for whose merit the donation was made). NV interprets the text differently, seeing a finite verb in stanza 6 ("He married her" instead of my "When he married her"), and joins the single hemistich of stanza 7 to the following prose. Although that prose sentence does lack a subject, I find this interpretation unsatisfactory because it results in confused syntax in the metrical text, leaving the accusative *grāmaṁ* floating free without any context.

[6]The agent of giving is apparently expressed at least twice, once as *asmābhiḥ* in line 18 and once as *mayā* in line 20. This is probably a simple oversight of the drafter of the text (compare the negligent composition of the next passage about the passing on of the donation). But it is also possible that in the legalese of the period, the stock phrase *viditam astu vo 'smābhiḥ* was understood to mean "let it be known to you from us", i.e. that *asmābhiḥ* was not perceived to be the agent of the donation, but that of the proclamation. (On this point, see especially the Pṛthivipallavapaṭṭana grant of Viṣṇuvardhana IV, whose Sanskrit text breaks off after these words, and the text then switches to Telugu and begins anew with *svasti*.) To complicate matters, the instrumental *callakāryayā* may also have been meant to express the agent, perhaps in apposition to *mayā*. NV in fact interprets the text to say that the donor is the wife, while I prefer to understand that the formal donor is the king, but since the grant is being made on the occasion of his marriage, his newly wed wife is mentioned as co-donor. A further detail relevant to this difference of opinion is that by NV's interpretation of stanzas 6 and 7 (with which I disagree), there is no indication that the grant was made on the occasion of the marriage.

[7]As NV observes, Murggali may perhaps be a corruption of the name Maudgalya.

[8]This passage is awkwardly phrased. I translate by dividing it up into two sentences, in which case

〈25–29〉 Its boundaries 〈are as follows〉. To the east, the village named Daṭṭiyavar̲r̲u. To the south, the village named Golavadyapūṇḍi. To the west, the village named Indulamaddavallī. To the north, the village named Ke̲l̲ipūṇḍi. 〈The donated village is〉 situated in between these. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to the enjoyment of rights) over it. He who does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins.

8.

Many (kings) have granted land, and many have preserved it (as formerly granted). Whosoever at any time owns the land, the fruit {reward (accrued of granting it)} belongs to him at that time.

9.

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

10.

A seizer of (granted) land cannot be cleansed by (commissioning) a thousand ponds, nor by a hundred Aśvamedhas, nor by donating ten million cows.

11.

It is the Lord of All Beings who, in order to preserve Brahmanic wealth, takes birth on earth as a Brahmin being born.

12.

Hear the fruit of the sin of that man who seizes His property: it exceeds thousands of Brahmin-murders and cow-slaughters.

13.

---

a verb must be supplied for the first. If we are to understand it as a single sentence, then the donated object is specified twice, once correctly in the nominative right before the passive verb, and another time, redundantly and incorrectly in the accusative, at the beginning after the subject expressed by a nominative. The drafter of the text probably did not pause to consider such niceties, but simply took the standard text of a grant and carelessly inserted in it a new bit about the passing on of the donation. The remission of all taxes appears at the end, whereas I would expect this to be mentioned where the king's gift is spoken of (remission of taxes being the king's prerogative). I also find the reference to an eclipse slightly problematic. Was the grant made on the occasion of the king's marriage or that of an eclipse? The eclipse may have happened so close to the marriage that a need was felt to avert its inauspicious influence by making a grant. But if so, the eclipse too ought to be mentioned next to the king's gift, and not after describing the passing on of the donation. Or was there no eclipse at all, and was this word simply retained from a previous grant that an inattentive composer used as a template for the present one?

He who would would say "〈No, you〉 give 〈me〉, give" to one who says "Give 〈me〉, give" (i.e. to a Brahmin)—that embodied being will not 〈be able to〉 say "Give" when he takes birth in another body.[9]

14.

Over and over again, Rāmabhadra begs all future rulers thus: "Each in your own time, you shall respect this bulwark of legality that is universally applicable to kings!"

15.

Hereby I offer my respectful obeisance (*añjali*) to 〈all〉 future kings on earth, 〈whether〉 born in my lineage or a different royal lineage, who with minds averted from sin observe this provision (*dharma*) of mine in its integrity.

16.

Considering that fortune (*śrī*), and indeed, the human life, is as unsteady as a drop of water on a fluttering lotus petal, and keeping in mind all adages of this kind, a sensible man ought not to expropriate the reputation of others.

17.

It is not 〈actual〉 poison that is 〈properly〉 called poison: it is the property of a Brahmin that is said to be poison. Poison kills just the one man, while 〈seizing〉 the property of a Brahmin 〈destroys〉 his progeny.

18.

Who indeed would act in breach of moral duty (*dharma*) for the sake of the body, which seems to be full of pain and malady, and which will decay today or tomorrow?

19–20.

The executor (*ājñapti*) of this provision (*dharma*) is the mighty Paṇḍarāṁga, who has undertaken a vow of 〈serving〉 a single lord and whom, as a consequence of being an associate in 〈his lord's〉 affairs, his lord has weighed in the balance against a mass of gold; son of the castellan (*kaṭeya-rāja*) who gave up his life for the king while fighting in a battle against an enemy army.

[9]This stanza is badly garbled on the plate. I am quite confident of my reconstruction, even though it involves a fair amount of emendation. The verse plays on the words *dehi*, "give" and *dehī* "embodied being". I understand its essence to be that one with the temerity to ask (and, by extension, take by force) something from a Brahmin (whose nature is to ask for, and receive, donations), will be reborn as an animal and will thus not be able to speak at all.

〈46–47〉 Of the one named Bhaṭṭa Niravadya, residing in Kolle.[10] The decree has been written (*ālikh-*) by Śrīvijayācārya, son of Akṣaralalita residing in Vijavaḍa.

Commentary

1.

As indicated in the apparatus for lines 11-12, the received text is problematic here. In the edition, I emend and hyphenate in the way that seems most straightforward, by and large in agreement with NV's emendations. However, with these straightforward emendations the grammar is poor and the meaning is intelligible only with a deal of goodwill. See the translation for my understanding of how the syntax was meant to work out and to connect to the preceding prose. The first quarter of this stanza is moreover unmetrical, though the composer may have thought of it as a "*ta-vipulā*" *anuṣṭubh* variant. I believe that at least part of the reason for the metrical and syntactical awkwardness is that a pre-existing stanza that stated Vijayāditya II's reign to have lasted forty years has been clumsily modified to a reign of forty-one years. The length of this king's reign is variously recorded as 40, 44 or 48 years in later grants, but apparently the earliest grants that mention lengths of reigns (mostly unpublished, but summarised by Venkataramanayya 1974, p. 9)) state his reign as either 40 or 41 years. The hypothetical original stanza may have run something like this: *catvāriṁśat samā rājyaṁ kṛtvā sura-padaṁ gate| 'smiṁs tat-sute viṣṇurāje kṛtvā śarad-dvayaṁ tathā||*[11] or, with a different take on the second hemistich, *asmiṁs tasya sute viṣṇurāje kṛta-śarad-dvaye*. Further alternatives with much the same meaning can be found with similarly small emendations, resulting in a stanza with correct syntax and seamless embedding in the context.

1.

A further interesting detail of this stanza or passage is that while NV interprets *śarad-*

[10] By my interpretation, this sentence is tagged on to the preceding pair of verses as an explanatory "footnote", giving further information about the *kaṭeya-rāja* mentioned in stanza 19. NV says in his discussion that the text was composed by Bhaṭṭa Niravadya of Kolle, but the text contains no indication that the composer is being named here. A similar "footnote" is appended after stanza 15 of the Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman. Pāṇḍaraṅga's father is normally referred to simply as *kaṭaka-rāja* (or a variant of that term), but this is almost certainly a designation of office rather than a name. We do know that Pāṇḍaraṅga's son (and heir in office) was named Niravadya, and if I am correct in interpreting this colophon, then we now have evidence that Pāṇḍaraṅga's father had the same name.

[11] The prosodic pattern ⏑– (the first two syllables of the word *surālayaṁ*) is not acceptable for the third to fourth syllables of the second *pāda*, so I assume that the original stanza had a different word here, such as *sura-padaṁ*.

dvayam to mean "two years," the reign of Viṣṇuvardhana V is recorded as either 18 or 20 months not only in later grants, but also in all grants of Vijayāditya III from which NV extracted the relevant data (loc. cit.), with the present grant being the sole exception. It thus seems likely that *śarad* was used deliberately by the composer to imply that although his reign incorporated two autumns, it did not last two full years.

18.

Sandhi-obscured break at enjambement from first to second quarter; see also apparatus to line 43.

The admonitory stanzas 10 to 13, 16 and 18 do not occur in any Eastern Cālukya grant I have yet seen; moreover, only number 11 among these is included in Sircar's list of stanzas on *bhūmidāna*. It may be interesting to see whether any of these occur in Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants, or if not, then where else they may have been adopted from.

Bibliography

Edited by N. Venkataramanayya (1974), perhaps from the original, with estampages of the plates; without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Venkataramanayya's edition with his visual aids. Only significant typographic mistakes are shown in the apparatus here, and others are silently assumed to have been correctly read by the original editor. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[NV] Venkataramanayya, N. 1974. "Chiṁbulūru grant of Guṇakanalla Vijayāditya III." In: *Epigraphia Āndhrica vol. III*. By N. Venkataramanayya. Edited by P. V. Parabrahma Sastry. Epigraphical series 7. Hyderabad: Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 8–15.

Secondary

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