

# Nūtimaḍugu plates of Vikramāditya II

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA\_INSVengiCalukya00064

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA\_INSVengiCalukya00064.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

## Edition

<Page 2r> <1> [...] tat-putro jayasimha-vallabhas trayastrimśad va(rṣāṇi)| tad-anu<2>[jendra-rā]jasya priya-tana(yo) viṣṇuvarddhano nava (vatsa)rāN| tat-suto maṅgi-yu<3>[varājaḥ pa]ñcaviṁśati<m>| tat-putro jayasimhas trayodaśa vat-sarāN<|> tad-dvaimāturānujaḥ<4> [kokki]liḥ ṣaṇ māsāN| tasya (jyeṣṭho) bhrātā viṣṇuvarddha(naḥ) svānujam ājā(v u)<5>[ccā]ṭya saptatrimśaT| tat-tanujo vijayāditya-bhaṭṭārakaḥ Aṣṭā(daśa)<6> [varṣāṇi]| tad-auraso viṣṇurājaḥ ṣaṭtrimśad abdāN|

### 1. Anuṣṭubh

tat-suto vijayādityaś

catvāriṁśata<7>[~]

[a]ṣṭottara-śata-śrīman-

-narendreśvara-kārakaḥ

tad-ātmajaḥ (ka)li-viṣṇuvarddhanas sārddha<8>[samām| tat-suto] vijayāditya(h)  
catuṣcatvāriṁśad varṣāṇi| tad-bhrātūr yuvarājaḥ vi<Page 2v><9>[kramādityasya]  
[tanayaḥ cā](lukya-bhīmas trimśad v)arṣ{v}ā[(ṣa?)ṇa]||<ni>>

### 2. Anuṣṭubh

<<ta>>t-(su)to vijayādi<10>[tyaḥ]

[~~~~~v~]

[sapta saṁvatsarā]<sub>i</sub>[n]!<ms> [tasya]

[sū](nur amma)-mahīpatiḥ

### 3. Śārdūlavikriḍita

yāte ga(ṇḍaragaṇḍa-bhūbhu)<11>[ji?] [v-] (prāptābhi)[ṣekas tatas]

[sūnum] [v-] (vaśāt) sa (tasya) vijayā(di)tya(m) punas tālapa(ḥ)

<12> [---](ra?)○-[gataṁ vidhāya ba] [v-][bhū?](ya bhū)mī(śvaro)

bhūmi(m) pālayati<13> [sma?] [v-]la○[v-][taṁ śrutvā vaco] [v~]

### 4. Śārdūlavikriḍita

[Āgat](ya) (dru?)ta(m ā?)yato <'>pratimukha<14>[---]n uddha[tān]

[hatvā tad-rudhirā][v-][bhīma-ba](la)[v-][nistr](i)mśa-bhā(s)va(d-bhujah)

tan dagdhvā<15> [v~v~v~] [śrīmad-vikramāditya]-(bhū)-

[pālas t](ā)la(pa)m eṣa pa(tṭa)m a(va)hac (ch)ū<16>[v~v~v~]

[viśālāvākāśam imam] [...] [kṣiti-pa]y(o)-rāśi(ṣu?) kūla-śālī<Page 3r> <17> [...] [ca. 5×](t  
pra)(bh?)(u)(r adhipa?)t(er) yyasya (saro)ruhā(sanaḥ||)

### 5. Hariṇī

yad-asi<18>[v~v~v~]t(v)āgā(dha)m mahad ri(pur a)(mbu?)dh(er?)

v(vi)śa(t)i vimukho vārā(m) rāśi(m) sphurad ra(ṇa)-raṁgata(ḥ)

ya<19>[v~]-(va?)(ni)(tā?)○-cakṣur-vv(ā)ri-prasikta-tanus satīn

asakṛ(d a)khilā jaj(ñe) [v~v~v~]<20> [v~v~v~]○

### 6. Anuṣṭubh

(v)ikramaika-sahāyo <'>ṣṭau

yu<d>dhvā yuddha-śata(m samāḥ)

[yuddhe] (lab)dha<21>[v~] (rā)jyam

yaḥ kīrttyā samam agrahīT||

### 7. Indravajrā

yat-kānt(i)-vikrānti-(k?)ṛ(t)ā(bh)ibhūta

la<22>[v~v~v~]-citta-(v)ṛ<rti?><ttir>

candro mṛgārāti-rucā(v a)pīm(au?)

(jā?)t(au?) [v~](kā?)(ka)-guhā<Page 3v><23>[v~v~]

### 8. Mālinī

(A)panudati pareṣāṁ rāga-mo(hau ya)dīyo  
 (di)śati ca karavāla<24>-[-----]||  
 cirayati samagraṁ bhūri-sāmsāra-mohan  
 nara Iva<25> (bhu?)vi siddho loka-vikhyāta-kīrttiḥ||

sa samasta-bhuvanāśraya-śrī<26>-(vi)kramāditya-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-  
 parama-bhaṭṭāra<27>(ka-pa)rama-brahmaṇyaḥ kaṇḍervvāḍi-viśaya-nivāsino  
 rāṣṭrakūṭa-pramukhā<28>(n kuṭimbinas sa)rvvān ittham ājñāpayati

viditam astu [...] mādityā [...]

## Apparatus

<4> svānujam ājā(v u)<5>[ccā]ṭya • The reading is plausible, but compare line 12 of the Bezvāḍa plates of Bhīma I, which have *svānujam {adam} uccāṭya*.

<7> catvāriṁśata<7>[~] • NLR only observes that the text from *aṣṭottara* is half an *anuṣṭubh* stanza. I prefer to assume that we are dealing with a full stanza here, though it is possible that the first hemistich has indeed been converted into prose. The Bezvāḍa plates of Bhīma I, which contains a practically identical genealogy, has corrupt prose here: *tat-suto vijayādityaḥ catvāriṁśat samaḥ*. Other grants of the dynasty describe the length of Vijayāditya II's reign in *anuṣṭubh* (though not juxtaposed to the extant hemistich here) as *catvāriṁśat samāṣṭabhiḥ* or *catvāriṁśat samās samaḥ*. There is no way to determine whether a reign of forty or forty-eight years was assigned here. The last character in line 7 may perhaps be *T* or *tṣa* rather than *ta*.

<8> [-samāṁ| tat-suto] NLR • The meaning of the lost text was certainly as restored by NLR, but the words may have been different. The Bezvāḍa plates of Bhīma I have *samaḥ tan-nandano* here. — <8> vi<Page 2v><9>[kramādityasya] NLR • I assume that NLR could read the text he prints as clear and could estimate the number of lost characters with some precision, in which case his restoration is perfectly plausible. But if he was guessing where he admits no doubt, then the text could have run somewhat differently. The Bezvāḍa plates of Bhīma I read *tad-bhrātur yuvarājasya vikramāditya-bhūpateḥ putro bhīmaḥ*. The phrase *tad-bhrātur yuvarājasya* may also be the beginning of an *anuṣṭubh* stanza.

<9> (triṁśad v)arṣ{v}ā[(śa?)ṇa]<<ṇi>> ◇ *triṁśad varṣāṇi[(ṇa)]<<(>>* NLR • The scope of correction may be somewhat larger; possibly, *triṁśataṁ vvarṣāṇi* was first engraved, then *taṁ* was overwritten with *dva* and the subsequent characters corrected accordingly. I am quite certain that the following *ta* is also the result of correction, but cannot establish the pre-correction character. — <9> <<ta>>t-(su)to vijayādi<10>[tyaḥ] • I feel

quite certain that an *anuṣṭubh* stanza must have begun here, since we subsequently have a partly extant half-stanza followed by a different metre. NLR shows this passage as prose.

<10> [~~~~~] ◇ [*ṣaṇ māsā*]N NLR • NLR shows this passage as prose. I am far from sure that a full quarter stanza could have fit in the lacuna here, but compare the previous note. — <10> (-bhūbhu)<11>[ji?] [~] ◇ -*bhū(bhu)*<11>[~] NLR • At the end of line 10 I see nothing recognisable beyond *bhū*, but I assume that NLR's *bhu* is based on vestiges. He does not make the restoration I suggest, but surely had the same in mind. Unless the vestigial *bhu* is quite clear in the original, *bhūbhṛti* is also possible.

<11> prāptābhiṣekas NLR • I would expect this word to be in the accusative but must accept NLR's reading because nothing is legible in the visuals available to me. — <11> [~] (vaśāt) NLR • Perhaps restore *kāla-vaśāt* or *daiva-vaśāt*. — <11> (tasya) ◇ [~] NLR • I do not understand why NLR did not read this word, which is quite visible even in the ASI photo.

<12> [---](ra?)○-[gataṁ] ◇ [---]*ru-gataṁ* NLR • Very tentatively, I suggest restoring *kārāgāra-gataṁ*. — <12> [sma?] [~]la○[~][taṁ] ◇ [~~~~]taṁ NLR.

<13> (dru?)ta(m ā?)yato <'>pratimukha ◇ *drutam āyata-pratimukha* NLR • I hesitantly accept NLR's reading for the first part of this segment, because I have nothing better to offer. I see no vowel marker in *dru*, and the character may also be *pra*, since its bottom seems to be joined to the vertical stroke NLR reads as the tail of the following *ta*. The body of *mā* is partly obliterated but it is certainly wider than expected, with an extra stroke that looks like a greater-than sign between the body and the vowel marker. At the end of this segment, *to* seems quite certain, so an *avagraha* probably needs to be supplied after it.

<14> [-rudhirā][~]- NLR • Perhaps restore -*rudhirākta*-?

<15> [śrīmad-] NLR • If NLR's reading is correct, then the poet availed of licence whereby the syllable preceding *śr* is scanned as short. — <15> a(va)hac (ch)ū° ◇ *avahac cū*° NLR.

<16> [viśālāvakaśam] ...<Page 3r> <17> ... (saro)ruhā(sanaḥ||) NLR • This was probably a stanza in the original. NLR suggests that its metre may have been *āryā*, but if his reading is largely correct, then this is prosodically impossible. Given the lengths of adjacent lines (29 characters each in lines 14 and 15; 31 in line 18), the total length of the stanza would have been about 40 characters, with about 2 in the first lacuna and about 13 in the second. It may perhaps have been in *viyoginī* (42 characters total), but this too is only possible if NLR's reading (which I am unable to improve) is substantially incorrect.

⟨18⟩ (a)(mbu?)dh(er?) ◇ *ambugair* NLR. — ⟨18⟩ ya⟨19⟩[~]-(va?)(ni)(tā?)- NLR • If NLR’s reading (which he shows as clear) is correct, perhaps restore *yad-ari-vanitā*.

⟨20⟩ labdha⟨21⟩-[~] NLR • Perhaps restore *labdha-jayo*?

⟨21⟩ -(k?)ṛ(t)ā(bh)ibhūta ◇ *-kṛtābhībhūti* NLR • In the character NLR reads as *kṛ*, the vowel marker is not attached to the body as it is in l19 *asakṛd* and as subscript *r* is attached two characters earlier in this line. Reading the partly obliterated body as *k* is still plausible, but *v*, *bh* or *dh* may also be possible. The end of this word may require emendation to *ā*. The *ī* printed in NLR’s edition is not present and not interpretable to me. After this word, it is tempting to restore *lakṣmī*, in compound or with a nominative ending. — ⟨21⟩ -(v)ṛṛti?⟨ttir⟩ ◇ *-vrṛti?⟨tti⟩* NLR.

⟨22⟩ -rucā(v a)pīm(au?) (jā?)t(au?) [~](kā?)(ka)-guhā ◇ *-rucāv apīmau jātau [~] guhā* NLR.

⟨24⟩ samagraṁ NLR • I do not know whether the hypometrical prosody is a misprint in NLR’s edition or an omission in the original. The intended text may have been *ca samagraṁ*, *susamagraṁ*, etc. — ⟨24⟩ [...] mādityā [...] NLR • NLR prints eight dots for the first lacuna and two for the second. It is not clear to me whether he intends the number of dots to represent the length of lacunae; elsewhere in the text, some of his lacunae seem to correspond to my estimates of lacuna length at two dots per *akṣara*, but elsewhere at one dot per *akṣara*.

## Translation

### Plates

⟨1–6⟩ His son Jayasimha Vallabha (I), for thirty-three years. His younger brother Indrarāja’s (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka’s) dear son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine years. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasimha (II), for thirteen years. His younger brother by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning his younger brother in battle, his eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven <years>. His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen years. His son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana IV), for thirty-six years.

1.

His son Vijayāditya (II), who erected a hundred and eight majestic Narendreśvara <temples>, for forty [...]<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The short lost segment was probably just “years,” but it is also possible that it was a number (e.g. eight) to be added to 40.

⟨7–10⟩ His son Kali Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His son Vijayāditya (III), for forty-four years. The son of his brother the heir-apparent (*yuvarāja*) Vikramāditya, Cālukya-Bhīma (I), for thirty years.

2.

His son Vijayāditya (IV) [reigned for six months]. His son King Amma (I), for seven years.

3.

When King Gaṇḍaragaṇḍa (Amma I) had gone [to heaven], then through the power of ⟨fate?⟩ Tālapa made [prisoner] his (Amma I's) son Vijayāditya, who had been anointed (as king). ⟨Tālapa⟩ protected the earth as king, having heard the voice [...]²

4.

Arriving in haste, ... killing haughty ⟨enemies?⟩, his arms glowing with a sword of fearsome might which was ⟨smeared?⟩ with the blood of that ⟨enemy⟩, scorching that [...] Tālapa, His Majesty, this King Vikramāditya (II) took up the [...] turban (of royalty).

⟨16–17⟩ [...] ;this great opportunity? [...] ;endowed with banks among masses of land and water? [...] ;the overlord (*adhipati*) whose Lord is the Lotus-throned (Brahmā)?³

5.

;From the theatre of battle? ⟨he?⟩ enters, ;with face averted?, the ocean's great, unfathomable mass of seething waters [...] sword [...] his body sprinkled with water from the eyes of the women [of his enemies?] [...] the entire [...] ;was born repeatedly?⁴

6.

Having fought a hundred battles over eight years with none but his valour for company, attaining ⟨victory?⟩ in battle, he grasped the kingdom together with fame.⁵

7.

---

²My translation follows the suggestions I make in the apparatus for lines 11 and 12. The second hemistich is more problematic and may have a quite different meaning.

³This stretch of text, probably a stanza, is badly preserved and may have been incorrectly read even where extant; I cannot grasp a coherent idea that would connect the available fragments.

⁴Here too, the preserved segments are not sufficient to make a coherent whole, and some of the readings are suspect. The stanza, or at least the first hemistich, may have been a simile likening a battle to an ocean.

⁵If the reading is correct (which is somewhat doubtful), then this stanza says that Vikramāditya II spent eight years fighting a war. This means either that Vikramāditya II fought his wars during the reign of Amma I, or that he remained alive and active throughout the reign of Yuddhamalla II and issued this charter very shortly before the coronation of Bhīma II

[...] ¿a state of mind overwhelmed by? his comeliness and valour [...] the moon [...]  
¿these two, though they resemble a lion, have become? [...] cave [...] <sup>6</sup>

8.

His [...] pushes away the passion and delusion of others, and <his> sword indicates [...]; ¿<he> entirely delays copious worldly delusion?, renowned ¿on earth? like Nara (Arjuna), with a reputation spread wide among the people.

<25–28> That shelter of the entire universe (*samasta-bhuvanāśraya*), His Majesty the supremely pious Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*), the Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*) Vikramāditya (II), commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Kaṇḍervvāḍi district (*viṣaya*) as follows:

<29> Let it be known <to you that> [...]

## Commentary

This set of plates is a palimpsest, with two plates of an Eastern Cālukya grant re-utilised for a Vijayanagar grant (edited in the same article). Moreover, the Cālukya grant itself seems to have been written, at least in part, over an erased earlier text, as indicated by vestiges of characters e.g. above line 9. Only plates 2 and 3 of the original grant are preserved, with the genealogy extant from Jayasimha I onward. The pages of the original grant are not in the same order as those of the later one, so that EC page 2r is Vijayanagar 2r; EC 2v = V 2v; EC 3r = V 1r and EC 3v = V 1v. At least one, probably two additional plates at the end of the EC grant are also lost. The two remaining plates have been re-cut into the shape of a typical Vijayanagar grant, causing the loss of some characters at the corners. The plates, when found, were bound by a ring without a seal.

Stanza 3 (*śārdūlavikrīḍita*) has a caesura in the middle of a word in *pāda* b. If NLR reads the text correctly, then *pāda* c of stanza 4 (*śārdūlavikrīḍita*) has *muta cum liquida* licence, a caesura in the middle of a word (before a suffix), and enjambement (at a compound boundary) from this *pāda* to the next.

---

<sup>6</sup>Again, the stanza is too fragmentarily preserved to find a coherent thread, and some readings may be incorrect.

## Bibliography

Edited from the original by N. Lakshminarayan Rao ([1956] 1939–1940, N<sup>o</sup> A), with photographs of 2v and 3r, without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Lakshminarayan Rao’s edition with photographs kept at the ASI (Mysore). The set of ASI photos likewise records only 2v and 3r, but they are somewhat better legible than the published ones. I assume that Lakshminarayan Rao was able to make out more from the original than I can from the photos, and thus accept his readings unless counterindicated. Where photos are available, I indicate unclear and tentative readings accordingly, and show restored text visible to a previous editor where Lakshminarayan Rao prints a reading even though I cannot make anything out in the pictures. For the parts without visual documentation, I follow his edition verbatim unless otherwise noted. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

### Primary

[NLR] Lakshminarayan Rao, N. [1956] 1939–1940. “Two inscriptions on copper-plates from Nutimadugu.” EI 25, pp. 186–194. Item A.

### Secondary

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