

Sātalūru plates of Vijayāditya III

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00069

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00069.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas.

KR does not describe the original punctuation marks. This edition prints | and || as shown in KR's edition.

Other palaeographic observations, summarised from Krishna Rao. The writing is very neat and beautiful, but with innumerable mistakes. Anusvāra is frequently omitted or added superfluously. There are two forms of ja, an open square form (l5, 10) and a later cursive form (l6, 7, 8, 9, 10). The scribe makes a distinction between da and ḍa, notable in l45 where the two are side by side.

Edition

Seal

⟨1⟩ śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> svasti| śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-mānavya-sagotrā_in?<n>ā<m> harīti-putrā_in?<n>ām kau<2>śikī-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājya_ia?<ā>nām mātr-ga_in?<n>a-paripāl_ii?<i>tānām svāmi-mahāsena-pādā<3>nudhyātānām bhagava_in-n?<n-n>ārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-var_ia?<ā>halā_in!<n̄>chanekṣa_in?<n>a-kṣa<4>ṇa-vaś_ii?<i>kṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-sa_ia?<ā>na-pavit_ir?<ri>kṛta-vapuṣām cālu<5>kyānām kulam ala_in!<m>kariṣṇoḥ satyāśraya-vallabhendrasya bhrātā{D} kubja-viṣṇuvarddhana Aṣṭā<6><da>śa varṣa_ia?<ā>_in?<n>i<.> tasya sūnuḥ sakala-lokāśrayo jayasimha-vallabhaḥ trayast_ir?<ri><m>śad varṣā_in?<n>i<.><7> tasyānujasya Indra-bhaṭṭāarakasya p_ir?<ri>ya-tanayaḥ viṣṇurājaḥ nava varṣā_in?<n>i<.> tasya suta_im?<h><Page 2r> <8> māṁgi-dau(ga?)rājaḥ pañcaviṁśati varṣā_in?<n>i<.> tasya putraḥ jayasi<m>ha-vallabhaḥ trayodaśa va<9>_iśa?<rṣā>_in?<i><.> tasyānujaḥ dvaimātura<h> kokkiliḥ ṣaṇ māsā_iT?<N><.> tasyāgrajaḥ viṣṇur_ia?<ā>jaḥ sv_ia?<ā>nujam uccā<10>tya pañcat_ir?<ri>mśad va<r>ṣān_ii?<i><.> tasyātmajaḥ vijayāditya-mahārāja Aṣṭāda<śa> va<r>ṣā_in?<n>i<.> tasya ta<11>nayaḥ viṣṇuvarddhanāḥ pañcat_ir?<ri>mśad varṣāṇi dvādaśa-sahasra-pramāṇa<m> ve_i(n)?<n>gī-maṇḍala{m}<12>m anvapālaya_iN?<T> tasya jyeṣṭhaḥ vijayādityaḥ Āditya Iva satatodaya-kar_ii?<i> vindhyāta<13>v_ii?<i>va su-vaṁśa-śatādhāraḥ merur iva su<va>r_inn?<n̄>a-va<r>_inn?<n̄>ikṛta-tanuḥ hara-jaṭ(ā)-makuṭa I(va gaṁ)gā<14>rava-pratibandhana-samart_it?<th>a<h> surapati-gaja Iva satata-dāna-(karo) viṣṇur i<va> ba<Page 2v><15>li-ripu-ma_it?<th>a_in?<n>aḥ śeṣa-mahānāga Iva bhū-dharaṇa-kṣama-bhujāḥ mahā-vrat_ii?<i>va mahā-śamkha<16>-dhvani-virājaṇaḥ sa<m>kula-garjjaj-jalada-ghaṭa-koṭi-vitrāsana-viśiṣṭa-mā<17>rutaḥ Api ca

1. Sragdharā

śrī(mad-dharmma)sya mū<r>tt_ii?<i>s subha<ṭa>-madhupa-sad-bodhanā<m>bhoruhābha<h> śauryāgny-u<18>tpat<t>i-bīja<h> p_ir?<ri>ya-vacana-ma_in?<n>er ākaraḥ sarvva-santo kī<r>tti-str_ii?<i>-vallabhas sat-kula-g_ira?<r>ham a<19>malaṁ satya-vā_in?<n>ī-kumāryyā vidvad-vṛndasya dhāma prakāṣam avanipo gotra-nist_ia?<ā>rakāmkaḥ

<20> Aṣṭottara-śata-na<re>ndreśvara-dev_ia?<ā>layānām karttā dvādaśa-varṣa-yuddhaṁ vallabhendra-daṇḍa<21>-nāyakaiḥ saha bhīma-saḥuke-n(ā)māna<m>

sv(ā)nujaṁ nirjjitya gr̥<hi>ta-veṁgi-maṇḍala(h) catvāri<m>śa<Page 3r><22>d
varṣāṇi

tasya sutah|

2. Campakamālā

Ari-nṛpa-vāji-vāraṇa-padāti-mahābhra-virāma-mārutaḥ
para<23>-kari{kari}-sa<m>s̥t?<th>itāsiḥbh?<t>aruci-pravināśana-bhānu-sannibhaḥ
gurutara-d̥i?<i>na-bhāḥgava?<va-ga>ta<24>-m(ā)nava-m(ā)nita-kalpa-pādapah
vara-karigalla-bhūmipa-bhujāsir ihāj̥i?<i>-bhuvi praḥh?<bh>ā<25>sate

kali-viṭṭa-nāmā varṣārdhah<.> tasya sūnuḥ vijayādityaḥ Aneka-tulā-dhṛta-
suvar̥nn?<n̄>a<26>-dāna-dhārā-santa<rppa>ṇāni kuḥrmmaḥ?<rvvaN> guṇakke-
nallan iti jaya-gīyamāna-kīrtti(h) sa<27>N dakṣiṇāpatha<m> sa-trikaliṅga-
deśam anvapālayā(m āsa)<.> Eva<m> pañca viṣṇuvarddha(na)-nāmānaḥ dvau
ja<28>yasi<m>ha-nāmānau Eko ma<m>gi-y̥ū?<u>varāja<h> tray(o) vijayāditya-
nāmānaḥ<.>

tatra t̥ri?<r>tīya-vi<Page 3v><29>jayāditya<h> dvāri pratiṣṭhāpita-gaṁgā-
yamun̥a?<ā>-candrāditya-pāl̥i!-ketana-samadhigataḥ<30> pañca-mahāśabda-
śravaṇa-vitrāsita-ḥm?<c>aturāśaś̥cake? varāha-lāñchana<h> vīra-makaradhvajah

3. Āryā

<31> satyena dharmma-putraḥ kar̥nn?<n̄>a<s> tyāgena vikrameḥn?<n̄>a hariḥ
nṛpakāma<h> svāmy-anujo viprebhyo <'>di<32>di(śa)d grāma<M>

4. Anuṣṭubh

Adād bhuvana-kandarppaḥ
grāma<m> dvija-śatāya tam(|)
prerita<h> svānujenātha
nṛpa<33>kāmena sūraye

5. Anuṣṭubh

śāntagrāmam amuṁ r(ā)j̥a?<ā>
sopagrāma<m> vinā karaM
nāti-kunṭhena sākam<34> hi
dattavān̥matta!-bhūsurah
punar api tasyai<va> rājña<h> viśeṣaṇa<m>||

6. ~~~~~

satya-vacano ya(ma)-suro<35> na sa surādhipa-bhayād bhavati satya-vacanaḥ
 śauryya-guṇavān mṛ(gapati)r nna sa viveka-ma<Page 4r><36>tito bhavati śauryya-
 guṇavāN
 dāna-vibhavo ravi-suto na sa pati-sva-balato bhava<37>ti dāna-vibhavaḥ
 satya-vara-śauryya-para-dāna-vibhavas tu nṛpakāma-nṛpatiḥ prakṛtitaḥ||

<38> vijayāditya-bhūpati-svānujena nṛpakāmena prerita<h> sūryya-grahaṇa-
 nimitt{y}a<m> sa vija<39>yāditya<h> rāṣṭrakūṭa-pramukhān kuṭṣil<i><m>bina<h>
 sarvvān ittham ājñāpayati

viditam astu v<ā?<o> <'>smā<40>bhiḥ gudravāra-viṣaye śantagrām<e?<o>
 nāti-kunṭha-sahitam dvija-śatā(ya) dattavāN<.> veda-vedā<m><41>getihāsa-
 purāṇādi-catu<ṣṣa>ṣṭi-kalā-niśāka<?<r>ebhya<h> parama-brahmavidbhyaḥ
 par<?<i>tāgni<42>hotrādy-anuṣṭhāna-parebhyaḥ śama-dama-yama-niyamāśr<?<i>ta-
 śaucācāra-śīla-guṇa-ga<n?<n>ā<Page 4v><43>lamkṛta-śarīra-padbhyaḥ dhātr-<ā?<a>ryyamādi-
 dvādaśāditya-samāna-bhrājita-kī<r>tt<?<i>bhyaḥ

tathā hi prati<44>grāhakāḥ<.> svasti<.> śrīmaT-varṅgipaṛ-vāstavyāya yajñaśarm-
 maṇe trayo bhāgāḥ guṇḍaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgāḥ<45> vidadīśarmmaṇe Eko bhā-
 gaḥ droṇaśarmmaṇe A<r>ddh<a?<ā><m>śaḥ karamiceḍu-vāstavyāya parāśara-
 go<46>trāya droṇaśarmmaṇe Adhyarddhako bhāgaḥ kañciśarmmaṇe dvau bhāgau
 droṇaśarmmaṇe dvau bhāgau ba<47>dīśarmmaṇe pañca(mo?) bhāgāḥ kaṛṇora-
 vāstavyāya bhāradvāja-gotrāya śivanaśarmmaṇe trayo bhā<48>gāḥ revaśarm-
 maṇe Eko bhāg<ā?<a>ḥ śivikuṛṇaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāg<ā?<a><h> śāṇḍilya-gotrāya
 petaśarmmaṇe<49> Eko bhāgaḥ Ayyappaśarmmaṇ<?<o><e> Addhyarddhako bhāgaḥ
 devarata-gotrāya vakaśarmmaṇe Eko bhā(gaḥ)<Page 5r><50> savvaśarmmaṇe Eko
 bhāg<ā?<a>ḥ kuṇḍīśarmmaṇe Eko bhāg<ā?<a><h> va<m>gipaṛ-vāstavyāya kata-
 gotrāya bu<51>daḍīśarmmaṇe dvau bhāgau vennaśarmmaṇe arddh<a?<ā><m>śaḥ
 harita-gotrāya revaśarmmaṇe dvau bhāgau droṇa<52>śarmmaṇe Addhyarddhako
 bhāgaḥ <konḍinda!<kaunḍinya>-gotrāya śrīdharaśarmmaṇe trayo bhāgāḥ damaśarm-
 maṇe Eko (bhā)<53>g<ā?<a><h> keśavaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ trivikramaśarmmaṇe
 Arddh<a?<ā><m>śa<h> Upūtūru-v(ā)stavyāya kau<54>śika-gotrāya kuṇḍīśarm-
 maṇe dvau bhāgau kāsya-gotrāya rūdvaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ go<55>laśar-
 maṇe Arddhāmśaḥ rūdvaśarmmaṇe Addhyarddhako bhāgaḥ goḷaśarmmaṇe
 Eko bhāgaḥ Eṛaśarmmaṇe E<56>ko bhāgaḥ kramja-vāstavyāya kāsya-gotrāya
 mahākāla-śarmmaṇe dvau bhāgau (droṇa)maśa(rmma)<Page 5v><57>ne Arddhāmśaḥ
 nārāyaṇaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ kauśik<il<a>-gotrāya piṭṭamaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ
 <konḍinda!<kaunḍinya><58>-gotrāya droṇaśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ karamiceḍu-
 vāstavyāya kaṇva-gotr(ā)ya sarvvaśarmmaṇe dvau<59> bhāgau cāmiśarmmaṇe Eko
 bhāgaḥ harita-gotr(ā)ya kañciśarmmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ mah<il<dharaśarmmaṇe<60>

Eko bhāgaḥ divja!karaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ śamkaraśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ krovaśrī-
vāstavyā<61>ya radhītara-gotrāya nārāyaṇaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ bhāradvāja-gotrāya
Āgyapaśarmaṇe<62> Eko bhāgaḥ vennaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ guṇḍaśarmaṇe Eko
bhāgaḥ kutsa-gotrāya turkaśarmaṇe<63> dvau bhāgau boppanaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ
kauśika-gotrāya raviṇaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ kāra<Page 6r><64>ñceḍu-v(ā)stavyāya
lohita-gotr(ā)ya goyindaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ jkonḍinda!<kaunḍinya>-gotrāya Iruga-
maśa<65>rmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ bhīmaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ madhuvaṇaśarmaṇe Eko
bhāgaḥ Uppuṭūru-vā<66>stavyāya bhāradvāja-gotrāya keśavaśarmaṇe Eko bhā-
gaḥ guṇḍaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ nāgaśa<67>rmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ Ātreya-gotrāya
jnarāya!śarmaṇe trayo bhāgāḥ rāyūru-vāstavyā<68>ya Agniveśya-gotrāyā?<a>
mayindamaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ kaśyapa-gotrāya bopaśarmaṇe<69> Eko bhāgaḥ
kuṇḍuru-vāstavy(ā)ya gautama-gotrāya droṇaśarmaṇe dvau bhāgau bhāradvāja-
gotrāya ka<70>ndaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ Uppuṭūru-vāstavyā?<a>ya parāśara-gotrāya
vīraśarmaṇe Addhyarddhak?<e><o> bhāgaḥ<71> cāmiśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ trivikra-
maśarmaṇe Eko<Page 6v> <72> bhāgaḥ bavvaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ dugaśarmaṇe
Arddh(ā)mśaḥ jblīmaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ (varṇ)gipaṇ-vā<73>(sta)vyāya gautama-
gotr(ā)ya baṭaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ jkonḍinda!<kaunḍinya>-gotrāya somaśarmaṇe
Addhyarddha(ko)<74> bhāgaḥ droṇaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ mādhaśarmaṇe Eko bhā-
gaḥ droṇaśarmaṇe Eko bhā(gaḥ) kuṇṭuru<75>-vāstavyāya kauśika-gotrāya droṇaśar-
maṇe Eko bhāgaḥ kārañceḍu-vāstavyāya {(bhā)radvā}<76> bhāradvāja-gotrāya
Eraśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ droṇaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ śiva(śarmaṇe) A<77>rddhāmśaḥ
vallana(yya)śarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ revaśarmaṇe Eko bhāgaḥ śrīpura-vāstavy(ā)ya
harjī!ta-gotrā<78>ya sabadiśarma(ṇe Addhyarddhakau) dvau bhāgau||

7. Anuṣṭubh

bhaṭṭ(ā)nāṁ vimśatis c(ā)pi
Eka-vedā<ś> ca vimśati<ḥ>
t?<ri>mśaT-trivedina<79>s tadvaT
catu(rvedav)(idā I?)ti

8. Anuṣṭubh

tatrānuṣṭhiyam(ā)n(ā)s te
Āśir dda;t!vā sva-bhūbhṛte
sadā sa(ghuṣṭa)<Page 7r><80>-vedās ca
sukhaṁ jīvantu bhūsurāḥ

Asyāvadhayaḥ<.> pūrvata<ḥ> penubūṇḍi-sīmai<va><.> dakṣi?<n><ḥ>ataḥ
Aṛuta<81>guru-s?<i>mai<va><.> nair?<a><ḥ>tita<ḥ> m{m}uñjalūru-sīmai<va><.>
paścimataḥ Urivi-sīmai<va><.> Ut<t>arataḥ tumburuballi-s?<i><82>mai<va><.>

ḥ(ī)!<ī>śḥa?<ā>nataḥ muluḍupendoru-sīmai<va><.> catur-avadhi-kṣetra<in> dat-
tavāN||

9. Anuṣṭubh

Ājñaptir asya dharmasya
pā<83>ṇḍaramgo mahā-guṇaḥ
s(ā)si-dhārā-samucchinna-
-vidviḥd?<d>-vṛndopavandita<h>

10. Anuṣṭubh

kṛtavān bhaṭṭa-kālasya
<84> ḥputro pautre! mahḥi?<ī>-tale
ḥgagaṇādi-garbhābha-sad-buddhi!-
-śāsanam karma-nḥa?<ā>ḥs?<ś>anaM

11. Anuṣṭubh

lekhako<85> lekhakāditya<h>
śāsanasyāsyā paṇḍitaḥ
viśvakarmḥa?<e>va yo bhāti
ghaṇṭā-śḥa?<ā>lā-sva-kārakaM

12. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhi<86>r vvasudhā datt(ā)
bahubhiś c(ā)nupālītā
yasya yasya yadā bhḥa?<ū>mi<s>
tasya tasya taḥta?<dā> phalaḥh?<M>

13. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattḥa?<ā><in><87> para-dattā<in> vā
yo haretḥu?<a> vasundharḥaḥ?<ām>
ṣaṣṭi-varṣa-sahasrḥa?<ā>ḥn?<n>i
viḥṣa?<ṣṭhā>yā<in> jāyate kḥri!<r>mi<h>

<Page 7v> <88> ḥdattaharayatābhūmi?

Apparatus

Seal

<1> śrī-tribhuvanāmkuśa ◇ tribhuvanāmkuśa KR.

Plates

<3> lāṇ!<n̄>chanekṣaṇ?<n>a- • KR does not normalise the dental *n*, which may be a typo in his edition.

<5> alaṇ!<n̄>kariṣṇoḥ • KR does not normalise the dental *n*, which may be a typo in his edition. — <5> bhrātā{D} • KR does not emend the superfluous *D*, which may well be a typo in his edition. — <5> -viṣṇuvarddhana • According to KR's note, Lakshmana Rao interpreted some dots above *na* as a subsequently inserted *visarga*. KR asserts that the dots are only corrosion, though I do not know how he can be so sure if he edited the plates from impressions while LR had the originals. — <5> Aṣṭā<6><da>śa • KR does not supply *da*, which thus may be omitted in his edition by mistake.

<7> Indra- • KR in fact prints *ḍandra*, clearly a typo in the Devanagari edition.

<8> -dau(ga?)rājah ◇ -*dauśarājah* KR • According to KR's note, *śa* is not clear and looks like *ga*. I do not know why then he thinks it is *śa*, and not *ga*. In his discussion he uses the word as *dogarāja* and equates it to *yugarāja*.

<10> Aṣṭāda<śa va>rṣāṇ?<n>i • KR prints the supplied characters in round parentheses with an asterisk. This may represent illegible and supplied text, since above he uses square brackets and an asterisk for omitted and supplied.

<11> veṇ(n)?<n>gī- • KR's Devanagari edition has □□[□□]□□, emending to *veṇigī* in a footnote. I assume, but am not sure, that the upper consonant is unclear but resembles *n*.

<13> -tanuḥ • After this word, KR prints an asterisk in round parentheses. He may perhaps have wished to indicate that the *visarga* is supplied.

<14> i<va> • KR uses round parentheses with an asterisk here.

<16> sa<n̄>kula- ◇ *sa<kala-gaṇga>kula-* KR • KR prints the supplied characters in square brackets with an asterisk. If I am correct in assuming that no characters are present here in the original, then I have strong reservations about supplying all this and prefer the much simpler emendation I propose here. However, I am not sure of my understanding of the text (see the translation). Given that KR's summary speaks about Vijayāditya II “destroying the Gāṇḍa race root and branch like a fierce wind,” probably referring to this locus, I believe KR too did not understand this passage clearly. Ideally, I would expect another comparison with *iva* here; given *māruta*, the object of such a comparison might be Indra; but this also presupposes a major scribal omission. Unless perhaps we have a single long comparison here, and *mahā-vratī* above means Rudra.

<17> subha<ṭa>- • KR shows *ṭa* in round parentheses with an asterisk, probably indi-

catating a scribal omission. I provisionally accept his restoration because I do not have a clearly better solution, but I cannot make good sense of the word in context and other restorations may well be possible, including supplying a syllable before *bha*.

<18> sarvva-santo • Though printed as clear by KR, this reading seems unintelligible and doubtful to me. Note also the unexpected sandhi at the end of the second *pāda*. Perhaps read/emend *sarvva-śaktaḥ* or *sarvva-śaktiḥ*? See also the note to the translation. — <18> -str*i?*<*i*>- • I provisionally accept KR's reading, but if the first consonant is to any degree unclear, then *śrī* is also distinctly possible.

<20> -na<re>ndreśvara- • Round parentheses and asterisk in KR. — <20> -yuddharī • This should perhaps be read as, or emended to, *yuddhe*.

<21> -n(ā)māna<ṛ> sv(ā)nujam • The characters shown as unclear are in round parentheses in KR's edition. He does not supply *anusvāra*, printing this stretch of text without spaces, but I assume he must have interpreted it as I do.

<23> -kari{kari}- ◇ -*kari-kari**i?*<*a*>- KR • The second *kari* is hypermetrical and so, if it is present at all in the original, is probably dittography. But KR emends it to *kara* in his edition. He cites this stanza in full in his discussion, there printing *karikari* without emendation. See also the next note. — <23> -sa<ṛ>*s**t?*<*th*>itāsi*i**bh?*<*t*>aruci- ◇ -*s**i**a?*<*u*>*s**i**t?*<*th*>itāsi*bharuci*- KR • I cannot make sense of KR's emendation, which is identical in his edition and in the citation of this stanza in his discussion, except that in the edition the emendation is *susthī*, which is unmetrical and thus evidently a typo. See also the previous note. My own emendation is tenuous and may well be wrong; see the translation for my interpretation. — <23> -bhā*i**gava?*<*va-ga*>ta ◇ *bhāgavata* KR • I have some doubt that *bhāgavata* is present in the text. KR prints it both in his edition and in the stanza cited in his discussion; he moreover emends it in the edition to *Bhāgavata* (the only difference from the text being that the text is in Devanagari, and the emendation in the footnote is in transliteration, with a capital initial). I emend on the assumption that the reported reading is correct. Venturing further from the edition's text, I could imagine *nagna-naṭa* here; compare *dīnānātha-nagna-naṭa-gāyaka-dharmma-dhvaja-vṛttinām* in line 31 of the Eḍeru plates of Amma I and *dīnānātha-naṭāndha-nagna-kavi*- in line 39 of the Ārumbāka grant of Bādapa.

<24> -m(ā)nava-m(ā)nita- • The characters shown as unclear are in square brackets in KR's edition. — <24> -bhujāsir ihā° • If the reading is correct, then this is probably the parsing intended by the composer. KR prints a space after *bhujā* and nowhere else in this segment. Even with the words resolved, I am unable to interpret the line as a whole. — <24> pra*i**h?*<*bh*>ā<25>sate ◇ *prahā*<25>*sate* KR • I emend tentatively, being unable to interpret the reading shown by KR. — <24> kali-viṭṭa- • The form of this

epithet in the Cheruvu Madhavaram plates of Kali Viṣṇuvardhana V is *kali-viṭṭara*, and this is the form KR uses in his discussion of the present inscription. The absence of *ra* here may be a typo in his edition.

⟨26⟩ -santa⟨rppa⟩ṇāni ◇ -santa⟨rppita-brāhma⟩ṇāni KR • KR prints the restored text in round parentheses with an asterisk. If this is an omission, and not illegible and restored text, then I prefer my simpler restoration to KR's heavier (and grammatically problematic) one. — ⟨26⟩ kuṛmmaḥ?⟨rvvaN⟩ • KR does not emend his reading *kur-maḥ*, which may thus be a typo. I emend tentatively to what I believe may be either the actual reading or at least the composer's intent. — ⟨26⟩ anvapālayā(m āsa) • The form read by KR is grammatically incorrect; *anvapālayat* or *anupālayām āsa* would be expected.

⟨29⟩ -pālṛil-ketana- • KR's edition in fact prints □□□(□)□□□□. Since in his discussion of this passage he mentions *pālī-ketana*, I assume that this is a compound typo, with the received reading *pālī-ketana* and emendation to *pālī-ketana*. This is confirmed by Narasimhaswami 1967–1968, p. 44, n. 1 who in his edition of the Cheruvu Madhavaram plates of Kali Viṣṇuvardhana cites this section of text from the *Bhāratī* edition of the present inscription. — ⟨29⟩ -samadhigataḥ • As cited from the earlier edition in *Bhāratī* (see the previous note), the *visarga* was considered by that editor. I agree with KR that in the present context a nominative is expected here, even though *samadhigata-pañca-mahāśabda* is a frequent collocation.

⟨30⟩ -ṛm?⟨c⟩aturāśāś ṛcake? • I adopt KR's emendation. I cannot interpret *cake*, which KR leaves without comment. Perhaps emend to *catur-āśā-cakraḥ*? — ⟨30⟩ -lāñchana • KR prints *-lāñchana*, probably a typo.

⟨33⟩ r(ā)jṛa?⟨ā⟩ ◇ (ā)ja KR • Since KR does not emend the ending, the final *a* may be a typo in his edition and the plate may have the expected *ā*.

⟨34⟩ ṛmatta!- • KR emends this word to *nata*. While *matta* is in all probability wrong, I find this emendation vapid and the underlying scribal error unlikely. I have no better suggestion. — ⟨34⟩ ya(ma)-suro • This string may also be parsed as *'yam asuro*. KR prints □ (□)□□□□, perhaps implying that he parsed it in this way. I am not certain of my interpretation (see the translation).

⟨38⟩ -bhūpati- ◇ -bhūpati⟨h⟩ KR • As Vijayāditya appears again shortly afterward, I prefer not to emend to a nominative here. The construction is still awkward, but less so than with the subject coming twice. — ⟨38⟩ -nimitt{y}a⟨m⟩ • Or perhaps the composer had *nimitte* in mind.

⟨40⟩ dattavāN • The grammatically correct verb would be *dattam*.

⟨41⟩ parṛi?⟨i⟩tāgni° • Or perhaps emend to *parito 'gni?* Neither appears very good in the context.

⟨43⟩ dhātr-ṛā?⟨a⟩ryyamādi- ◇ *dhātrāryyamādi*- KR • KR does not emend, so he may have construed *dhātrā* here, or the *ā* may be a typo in his edition.

⟨44⟩ -vaṅgipar-vāstavyāya • So in KR's edition, printed with the Telugu conjunct □□□□.

⟨45⟩ A⟨r⟩ddhṛa?⟨ā⟩⟨m⟩śaḥ • KR's emendation is *arthāṁśaḥ*, which I assume to be a typo.

⟨47⟩ pañca(mo?) bhāgāḥ • The character read here as *mo* is probably clear in the original, but damaged in both my scans of the published edition. KR emends to *pañcamo bhāgaḥ*, and the fact that his emendation includes the word *pañcamo* may indicate that the questionable character is not *mo* but, perhaps, *no*. One fifth of a share seems to be very meagre, so perhaps the intent was rather *pañca bhāgāḥ*, but this in turn would be very large.

⟨49⟩ Ayyappaśarmmaṇṛo?⟨e⟩ • KR does not emend the ending, which may thus be a typo in his edition. — ⟨49⟩ Addhyarddhako • The spelling of this word is with *dhya* in line 46 above. Both may be original, or one of the spellings may be a typo in KR.

⟨50⟩ savvaśarmmaṇe • The intended name may be *śarvvaśarmman* or perhaps *sarvvaśarmman*. Compare line 58. — ⟨50⟩ -vaṅgipar-vāstavyāya • As in line 44 above, the spelling is with the Telugu conjunct □□□□ in KR's edition.

⟨53⟩ Upūṭūru- • KR emends the name to Uppuṭūru. The form is Uppuṭūru in the Masulipatam plates of Vijayāditya III.

⟨58⟩ sarvvaśarmmaṇe • Perhaps intended for *śarvvaśarmman*? Compare line 50.

⟨66⟩ bhāgaḥ • KR's edition has an asterisk over the *visarga*. This may be a printing error, or it may signify that the *visarga* is editorial; that it is a scribal addition; or that there is a scribal mark in the original here. — ⟨66⟩ ṇarāyaśarmaṇe • KR emends to *narāyaṇa°*, leaving the *a* uncorrected. If this is a typo and the plate has *nārāya*, then the emendation is certainly warranted; otherwise, the intent is not so clear.

⟨69⟩ bhāgaḥ • Instead of (or perhaps in addition) to the *visarga*, KR's edition has two large squares (positioned like an enlarged *visarga*). This may be a printing error, or it may represent that the *visarga* is a scribal addition. — ⟨69⟩ kuṇḍuru- • KR's edition reads *kunḍuru-*. Since he does not emend, I assume this is a typo.

<70> Addhyarddhak^{ḥe?}<o> • KR does not make this emendation, so the *e* may be a typo in his edition.

<72> (vaṁ)gipar- • As above, the spelling is with the Telugu conjunct □□□□ in KR's edition.

<74> kuṇṭuru- • The spelling in KR's edition is *kuṇṭuru*-, presumably a typo.

<75> -vāstavyāya • KR's edition has spaces before and after the *ā* marker, which may be a typo for brackets or parentheses signifying an unclear reading.

<78> (Addhyarddhakau) • KR's edition has *Addhyarddhako*, but since the text is unclear, I give the engraver the benefit of the doubt. However, there is a chance that the text is not unclear. KR prints it in square brackets, perhaps in this instance meaning text deleted by the scribe? Since the last character of the preceding word is in the same set of brackets, this is not very likely.

<79> catu(rvedav)(idā I?)ti ◇ ^ḥcatu(rvedavadāśa)ti?<aturvedāś ca trimśati> KR • Lacking a facsimile, my suggested reading is tentative and it assumes non-standard morphology (*vedavid* declined as if the stem were *vedavida*). Checking the original may suggest a better solution, but KR's emendation is also non-standard and it is a very heavy alteration of his reading. — <79> sa(ghuṣṭa)- • KR's footnote suggests the emendation *saṁdhuṣṭa*, which is presumably a typo for *saṁghuṣṭa* based on a Devanagari manuscript for which the footnotes have been rendered into transliteration. The emendation *saṁghuṣṭa* is plausible, though *sughuṣṭa* is also a possibility, and even *saghuṣṭa* may be acceptable.

<80> -vedāś • KR's edition does not indicate the beginning of page 7r. I assume that line 80 is the first line on this page, yielding 8 lines each on 6v and 7r.

<81> m{m}uñjalūru- • KR's edition prints this name with *nja*, presumably a typo.

<82> ^ḥ(ī)l<ī>^ḥś^{a?}<ā>nataḥ • KR's edition prints *raśanataḥ* emended to *īśānataḥ*. I assume that the original had an initial *ī* resembling *ra* with a dot on each side. These dots may have been omitted by the scribe, but the intent was definitely *īśānataḥ*.

<83> s(ā)si- • It may be better to emend this to *svāsi*-.

<84> ^ḥputro pautre! • KR's commentary says Pāṇḍaramāṅga was the great-grandson of Bhaṭṭa-kāla, and *putra-pautro* would be somewhat plausible here. KR does not emend the text, so the plates may in fact read *putra-pautro*. But I hesitate to accept this as the original intent, since I see no reason why this great-grandfather should be important enough to name here. A later descendant of Niravadya was named Bhaṭṭa-mahākāla (Cevuru plates of Amma I), so the name does occur in the family. Another Mahākāla

was the milk-brother and general of Bhīma I (Maliyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II), who was probably not of this family. — <84> *ḡgagaṇādi-garbbha-sad-buddhi!* • The reading is unmetrical and, to me, uninterpretable. KR emends the first word to *gaganādi*, but this does little to improve the line. The intended text (or even the actual reading) may perhaps be *guṇādi-*, but this is still awkward (see the translation). For a wilder conjecture, I offer *guṇagāgarbbha-sad-buddhi*.

<85> *viśvakarmḡa?<e>va yo* ◇ *viśvakarma-vayo* KR • Since KR’s commentary, absurdly, says the scribe is “described as being very old, as old as the Viśvakarma (sic) himself,” the absence of emendation is not a typo in his edition. The composer’s intent was clearly as emended here; I wonder if the *e* is in fact present in the original. — <85> *-śḡa?<ā>lā-* • I cite the reading as printed in KR, but since KR does not emend, the original may in fact be correct. — <85> *-sva-kārakaM* • I suspect another typo or misreading in KR’s edition here, but I do not have a better conjecture. See also the note to the translation. — <85> *ḡdattaharayitābhūmi?* • Could this be the beginning of an aborted *anuṣṭubh* stanza, *dattvā harati yo bhūmim?* No such stanza is, however, listed in Sircar 1965, appendix II.

Translation

Plates

<1–12> Greetings! Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Cālukyas—who are of the Mānavya *gotra* which is praised by the entire world, who are sons of Harīti, 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 Mahāsenā, 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 Jayasimha Vallabha (I), the shelter of the complete world (*sakala-lokāśraya*), for thirty-three years. His younger brother Indra Bhaṭṭāraka’s dear son Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana II), for nine years. His son Maṅgi Daugarāja,¹ for twenty-five years. His son Jayasimha Vallabha (II), for thirteen years. His younger brother by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning his younger brother, his elder brother Viṣṇurāja (Viṣṇuvardhana III), for thirty-five years. His son King (*mahārāja*) Vijayāditya (I), for eighteen years. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV),

¹The reading *daugarāja* is slightly problematic (see the apparatus to line 8), but the word *dugarāja* or *dogarāja* is a legitimate form in Andhra.

protected the country (*maṇḍala*) of Veṅgī, twelve thousand in extent,² for thirty-five years.

<12–17> His eldest <son> Vijayāditya (II) always effected prosperity like the sun (*āditya*) {whose rays are always on the rise}; he was the supporter of hundreds of good (noble) lineages like the wilderness of the Vindhya {which is the ground for hundreds of nice bamboos}; he had a body painted with gold like Meru {whose body is coloured golden}; he was able to suppress the grumbling of the Gaṅgas like Hara's (Śiva's) crown of matted locks {which is able to hem in the roaring of the Gaṅgā river}; he always made donations like the elephant of (Indra) the Lord of the Gods {whose trunk always has rut fluid on it}; he crushed powerful enemies like Viṣṇu {who crushed his enemy Bali}; he had arms capable of supporting the earth, like the great serpent Śeṣa {whose coils are capable of upholding the earth}; he was resplendent with great conch shells (and the five great?) sounds like a great (*pāśupata*?) ascetic {who is resplendent with a great sound of the conch shell}; he was ḥa wind deity distinguished by routing a myriad of teeming, rumbling, rut-dripping elephant battalions {as opposed to the actual wind deities, which dispel a myriad elephant battalions consisting of moiling, booming clouds}?³. Moreover:

1.

Manifestly, the king with the byname “Rescuer of his Family” (*gotra-nistāraka*) is an embodiment of majestic Righteousness (*dharma*); he resembles ḥa lotus brought to bloom by truth (*sat*) and <surrounded by> bees that are good soldiers?⁴; he is the spark from which the fire of heroism arises; a mine of the gem that is kindly speech; ḥbountiful to all?⁵ beloved of the Lady Fame; the noble house in which the girlchild True Speech <is born>; the abode of a flock of scholars.

<20–22> He erected a hundred and eight Narendreśvara <temples>. He seized the country of Veṅgī after defeating his own younger brother named Bhīma Saḷuke along with the generals of the Vallabha (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) Lord in a twelve-year war. <He reigned> for forty years.

²Twelve thousand may be the number of villages encompassed in the country. KR (pp. 107-108) dismisses this prevailing interpretation, but his reason for doing so is not clear and his alternatives are not convincing.

³I am not certain of the double entendre intended with the phrase involving conch shells, and my translation after that point is a desperate attempt to make sense of a text that appears quite incoherent. KR makes a major emendation here (see the apparatus to line 16), but this does not seem to improve the text to any great degree. If the interpretation I propose here is anywhere close to correct, then *ghaṭa* is to be understood as a non-standard in-compound form of the feminine noun *ghaṭā*, or as a scribal error for *ghaṭā*.

⁴The reading and emendation of this phrase is problematic; see the apparatus to line 17.

⁵This is another phrase that does not appear intelligible as read by KR. I provisionally assume that *sarva-santa* means *sarva-santya*, but *santya* itself is rare and Vedic usage. See also the apparatus to line 18.

⟨22⟩ His son—

2.

A wind that ⟨brings about⟩ the cessation of the great clouds that are the cavalry, elephants and infantry of hostile kings; like a sun that is the destruction of the √moonless night? comprised of enemy elephants; a wish-fulfilling tree honoured by people who have ended up in a seriously wretched situation; the sword in the arm of the excellent King Karigalla shines here on the battleground.⁶

⟨25–27⟩ —named Kali-Viṭṭa, ⟨reigned⟩ for a year and a half. His son Vijayāditya (III) has been protecting the Southern Region (*dakṣiṇāpatha*) together with the country of Trikalīṅga, making a series of many offerings (*santarpaṇa*) of gold weighed (against his body) in the balance and with his reputation of victory being sung as Guṇakkenallan. Thus, ⟨there have been⟩ five ⟨kings⟩ named Viṣṇuvardhana, two named Jayasīmha, one Maṅgi Yuvarāja, three named Vijayāditya.

⟨29–30⟩ The third Vijayāditya among these attained the Gaṅgā and Yamunā stationed at his door, the Moon and the Sun, and the pennant garland (*pāli-ketana*); intimidated the four quarters by the ⟨mere⟩ hearing of ⟨his⟩ five great sounds (*pañca-mahāśabda*); has the boar as his insignia;⁷ and is a crocodile-bannered ⟨god of love⟩ among heroes.

3.

Nṛpakāma, the lord's (Vijayāditya III's) younger brother—who is (Yudhiṣṭhira) the Son of Dharma in truthfulness, Karṇa in selflessness, Hari (Viṣṇu) in valour—has consigned a village to Brahmins.

4.

Then the Earthly Kandarpa (Vijayāditya III), at the urging of his own brother Nṛpakāma, granted that village to a learned hundred of Brahmins.

5.

The king, √devoted to?⁸ Brahmins, gave away this ⟨village of⟩ Śāntagrāma together with its hamlets (*upagrāma*) and free of taxes, and even including the √Nāti pond?⁹

⟨34⟩ Once again, a description of that same prince (*rājan*) (Nṛpakāma):

⁶The entire stanza is awkward and may have been read incorrectly at several points by KR. See the apparatus to lines 23–24. Since *sita-ruci* means the moon, I assume that *a-sitaruci* has been used in the second quarter in the sense of a moonless night. My interpretation of the third quarter relies on emendation.

⁷See the apparatus to line 30 about the uninterpretable word *cake* here.

⁸See the apparatus to line 34 about the word *matta*.

⁹The compound *nāti-kunṭha* is opaque. KR speculates that it may be a combination of a Sanskrit and Telugu word, but does not say what Sanskrit word he has in mind; he suggests the meaning “with all the

6.

Truthful in speech the God Yama (*Dharma*) is not: it is for fear of the overlord of gods that he becomes truthful in speech. Possessed of the virtue of valour the lion is not: it is for considered purpose that he becomes possessed of the virtue of valour. Bountiful in generosity the Son of the Sun (*Karṇa*) is not: it is for the inherent power of his lord that he becomes bountiful in generosity. King Nṛpakāma, however, is by nature bountiful in truthfulness, outstanding valour and generosity to others.¹⁰

⟨38–39⟩ Urged by King Vijayāditya's own younger brother Nṛpakāma, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun that Vijayāditya (III) commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—as follows:

⟨40–43⟩ Let it be known to you that we have given Śāntagrāma in Gudravāra district (*viśaya*), together with the Ānāti pond?,¹¹ to a hundred Brahmins, who are moons of the sixty-four arts beginning with the Veda, the Vedāṅgas, the Itihāsas and the Purāṇas;¹² supremely knowledgeable about Brahman, thoroughly engaged in the performance of the *agnihotra* and so on, whose bodies and ⟨even⟩ feet are adorned by a host of virtues of conduct (*ācāra*) and morality (*śīla*) founded on tranquility (*śama*), self-control (*dama*), restraint (*yama*) and observance (*niyama*), and whose reputation blazes equally to the twelve Ādityas beginning with Dhātṛ and Aryaman.

⟨43–78⟩ And thus ⟨follow⟩ the recipients. Blessings!

- To Yajñaśarman, resident of majestic Varṅgiparu, three shares.
- To Guṇḍaśarman, one share.
- To Vidadīśarman, one share.

tanks adjoining the village". I wonder if perhaps the composer's intent was *nāṭi*, meaning "ponds of the countryside." But since the word is in the singular, it is perhaps most likely to be a name.

¹⁰The somewhat awkward arrangement of the English is intended to reflect the original's repetitiveness. The Sanskrit is almost as hard to parse as the translation, but I am certain it is to be understood along these lines. The term *yama-sura* is unusual, but given the context, it must in my opinion mean the god Dharma. In the third quarter, the Son of the Sun is in all probability Karṇa, famed for his selflessness. I do not, however, know how he could be selfless through his lord's power. The poet's implication may be that Karṇa could afford to be magnanimous because Duryodhana gave him lordship over Aṅga, but Karṇa's famous act of generosity is giving away his innate armour and ear pendants, which has nothing to do with this lordship. Could the text perhaps read *pituh* instead of *pati*-, or should it be emended to that? In that case the implication would be that it is only because of his miraculous birth as the son of the sun god that he could make that great gift.

¹¹See the note on this term in stanza 5 above.

¹²Moons in the sense that they shine brightly. The composer may have chosen this rather unusual phrasing in order to pun on the word *kalā* ("art" and "digit of the moon"), implying that these Brahmins are moons with sixty-four digits where the real moon has only sixteen.

- To Droṇaśarman, a half share.
- To Droṇaśarman of the Parāśara *gotra*, resident of Karamiceḍu, a share and a half.
- To Kañciśarman, two shares.
- To Droṇaśarman, two shares.
- To Baddiśarman, five shares.¹³
- To Śivanaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, resident of Kaṛṛora, three shares.
- To Revaśarman, one share.
- To Śivikuṛraśarman, one share.
- To Petaśarman of the Śāṇḍilya *gotra*, one share.
- To Ayyappaśarman, a share and a half.
- To Vakaśarman of the Devarata *gotra*, one share.
- To Savvaśarman, one share.
- To Kuṇḍiśarman, one share.
- To Budāḍiśarman of the Kata *gotra*, resident of Vaṃgiparu, two shares.
- To Vennaśarman, a half share.
- To Revaśarman of the Harīta *gotra*, two shares.
- To Droṇaśarman, a share and a half.
- To Śrīdharaśarman of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra*, three shares.
- To Damaśarman, one share.
- To Keśavaśarman, one share.
- To Trivikramaśarman, a half share.
- To Koṇḍiśarman of the Kauśika *gotra*, resident of Upuṭūru, two shares.
- To Rudvaśarman of the Kāśyapa *gotra*, one share.
- To Goḷaśarman, a half share.
- To Rudvaśarman, a share and a half.

¹³Or perhaps one fifth share; see the apparatus to line 47.

- To Goḷaśarman, one share.
- To Eṛaśarman, one share.
- To Mahākālāśarman of the Kāśyapa *gotra*, resident of Krañja, two shares.
- To Droṇamaśarman, a half share.
- To Nārāyaṇaśarman, one share.
- To Piṭṭamaśarman of the Kauśika *gotra*, one share.
- To Droṇaśarman of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra*, one share.
- To Sarvaśarman of the Kaṇva *gotra*, resident of Kāramiceḍu, two shares.
- To Cāmiśarman, one share.
- To Kañciśarman of the Harita *gotra*, one share.
- To Mahidharaśarman, one share.
- To Divakaraśarman, one share.
- To Śaṃkaraśarman, one share.
- To Nārāyaṇaśarman of the Radhītara *gotra*, resident of Krovaśrī, one share.
- To Āgyapaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, one share.
- To Vennaśarman, one share.
- To Guṇḍaśarman, one share.
- To Turkaśarman of the Kutsa *gotra*, two shares.
- To Boppanaśarman, one share.
- To Raviṇaśarman of the Kauśika *gotra*, one share.
- To Goyindaśarman of the Lohita *gotra*, resident of Kārañceḍu, one share.
- To Irugamaśarman of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra*, one share.
- To Bhīmaśarman, one share.
- To Madhuvaṇaśarman, one share.
- To Keśavaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, resident of Uppuṭūru, one share.
- To Guṇḍaśarman, one share.
- To Nāgaśarman, one share.

- To Narāyaśarman of the Ātreya *gotra*, three shares.
- To Mayindamaśarman of the Agniveśya *gotra*, resident of Rāyūru, one share.
- To Bopaśarman of the Kaśyapa *gotra*, one share.
- To Droṇaśarman of the Gautama *gotra*, resident of Kuṇḍuru, two shares.
- To Kandaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, one share.
- To Vīraśarman of the Parāśara *gotra*, resident of Uppuṭṭūru, a share and a half.
- To Cāmiśarman, one share.
- To Trivikramaśarman, one share.
- To Bavvaśarman, one share.
- To Dugaśarman, a half share.
- To Bīmaśarman, one share.
- To Baṭaśarman of the Gautama *gotra*, resident of Vaṅgipaṛu, one share.
- To Somaśarman of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra*, a share and a half.
- To Droṇaśarman, one share.
- To Mādhavaśarman, one share.
- To Droṇaśarman, one share.
- To Droṇaśarman of the Kauśika *gotra*, resident of Kuṇṭuru, one share.
- To Eṛaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, resident of Kārañceḍu, one share.
- To Droṇaśarman, one share.
- To Śivaśarman, a half share.
- To Vallanayyaśarman, one share.
- To Revaśarman, one share.
- To Sabaḍiśarman of the Harīta *gotra*, resident of Śrīpura, two shares and a half.

7.

Thus <there are> twenty of masters (*bhaṭṭa*); likewise twenty of knowers of one Veda; thirty knowers of three Vedas; and as many knowers of four Vedas.¹⁴

¹⁴I translate the reading I suggest in the edition; see the apparatus to line 79.

8.

Being relocated there (to that village), let these gods-on-earth, after giving their blessing to their own king, live happily ever after, reciting the Veda.¹⁵

<80–82> Its boundaries <are as follows>. To the east, exactly the border of Penubūṇḍi. To the south, exactly the border of Arutagūru. To the southwest, exactly the border of Muñjalūru. To the west, exactly the border of Urivi. To the north, exactly the border of Tumburuballi. To the northeast, exactly the border of Muluḍupendoṛu. <The king> has donated the land <thus delineated by> four boundaries.

9.

The executor (*ājñapti*) of this provision (*dharma*) is Pāṇḍaramga of great virtue, to whom a host of enemies uprooted by his sword pays obeisance.

10.

<He,> the ¿great-grandson? of Bhaṭṭa Kāla has made (composed?) this decree ¿of good sense arising from virtue and so on?, the destructor of <the consequences of> deeds (*karman*) upon the earth, which is a destructor of the consequences of deeds.¹⁶

11.

The writer (*lekha*) of this decree is the learned Lekhakāditya, who is as brilliant as Viśvakarman ¹⁷

12.

¹⁵I am not sure what the composer had in mind with the passive participle *anuṣṭhiyamānāḥ*. Instead of the donees' relocation, it may have been intended mean that they were to line up one after another to give their blessing or (with incorrect use of the passive) that they were to carry on with their sacrificial duties. I am also not sure whether the "own" in "their own king" indicates Nṛpakāma, who is presumably the ruler of the territory where the village is located, or whether *sva* is employed in a weak sense and the king meant is Vijayāditya.

¹⁶There are several problems with the text of this stanza as read by RK; see the apparatus to line 84. Assuming that the gist is as translated here, it still remains uncertain whether the person described in this stanza is Pāṇḍaramga or someone else, and whether he was also the composer of the text or "made" means "executed." KR explicitly says in his commentary that the name of the composer is not mentioned, but I am not sure he is right. With the wilder conjecture offered in the apparatus, the stanza might mean "He, the great-grandson of Bhaṭṭa Kāla has executed upon the earth the ruling of the innate good sense of Guṇaga."

¹⁷See the apparatus to line 85 for my overriding of KR's reading in the third *pāda*, and about the uninterpretable fourth quarter. According to KR's commentary, the scribe had built a *ghantaśālā* (sic), which he interprets as "a factory to manufacture bells or styles (*ghaṇṭa*)", but this seems unlikely in the context and is syntactically impossible (also, *ghaṇṭā* or *ghaṇṭa* does not, to my knowledge mean a stylus). I wonder if the historic site of Ghaṇṭaśālā may be referred to here; or if *ghaṇṭā-śālā* means a foundry where, among other things, copper plates are manufactured. The word *kārakaM*, if correctly read, does not fit into the syntax in any way I can imagine.

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.

13.

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

<88> ¿He who seizes land after giving it?¹⁸

Commentary

KR's editorial notation is inconsistent. He appears to use both square brackets and round parentheses for unclear, and brackets or parentheses with an asterisk for text supplied by the editor. But collation with a facsimile would be essential to improve the fidelity of the edition.

2.

Stanza 2 is rather awkwardly composed. It is in a metre that is uncommon in Sanskrit, and it uses conspicuous Telugu-style *prāsa* in the second syllable of each quarter. The longer assonances near the beginning of each line, in particular those of the even quarters, may also be a feature of Telugu versification.

6.

Stanza 6 is in a metre that I could not trace to any established Sanskrit or Telugu metre. The prosodic pattern, identical for each quarter, is six repetitions of ~~~ (first paeon), followed by a long syllable. Divided into trisyllabic *gaṇas*, the pattern is bha-ja-sa-ma-bha-ja-sa-ma-ga. There may be a caesura after the tenth syllable, accentuated by *prāsa*. In each of the first three lines, five syllables at the end of the line are identical to the beginning.

<71> From the shortness of line 71 I assume that this was written in insufficient space at the bottom of the plate.

KR's discussion says that Nṛpakāma, the donor or initiator of the grant, is a brother of Vijayāditya III born of a Haihaya princess. I see no indication of his mother in the text here. However, in the Korraparṇu grant of Vijayāditya II, also a grant to many Brahmins, the executor is Nṛparudra, a brother of the king born of a Haihaya princess.

¹⁸The text ends abruptly, with only these few words on the verso of plate 7. See the apparatus to line 88 for a possible interpretation of the unintelligible text.

KR observes that although the text mentions a donation to a hundred Brahmins, only 79 donees are mentioned by name. I count 78 (KR apparently counts three Bhīmaśarmans in his list, of whom Bhīmaśarman (perhaps of the Kauṇḍinya *gotra*, perhaps resident of Kārañceḍu) and Bīmaśarman (perhaps of the Parāśara *gotra*, perhaps resident of Uppuṭṭūru) are actually present on the list, but the latter appears to be counted twice by KR. He assumes that the rest of the recipients were omitted by the scribe's or composer's mistake, but the total number of shares allotted is exactly 100. Although the text clearly talks of a hundred Brahmins, it is nonetheless likely that a hundred shares were in fact meant.

KR may be correct to assume that *gotra* names and places of residence are to be supplied from above where they are not specified. This, however, leaves the first four donees without a *gotra* name. Moreover, both the list of *gotras* and that of names contain items that reappear one or more times in the document, so neither *gotra* nor residence is an exclusive top-level sorting factor. (Spelling differences aside, Bhāradvāja *gotra* is mentioned 5 times; Kauṇḍinya and Kauśika 4 times; Kāśyapa 3 times; Gautama, Harita and Parāśara twice. As a place of residence, Kārañceḍu, Uppuṭṭūru and Vaṅgiparu are mentioned 3 times and Kuṇḍuru twice). There are, on the other hand, no cases where the same *gotra* is explicitly mentioned twice for one presumable residence, nor any cases where the same residence is mentioned twice for one presumable *gotra*. If such cases occurred, that would be a strong indication against supplying the missing information from above, but lacking such cases, supplying remains possible. Perhaps the list is sorted primarily by the qualifications of the donees, which would explain why certain residences and *gotra* names recur. The lack of a *gotra* for the first four donees is, however, a problem and may be due to scribal error.

Bibliography

The inscription may have been first reported and edited by K. V. Lakshmana Rao in a posthumous publication curated by M. Somasekhara Sarma.¹⁹ Edited by B. V. Krishna Rao (1930–1931) from inked impressions, without facsimiles and without translation. Photographs of the seal have been published in ARIE 1937–38, p. 80, plate II. The present edition by Dániel Balogh follows Krishna Rao unless otherwise noted. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

¹⁹Reportedly in Bhāratī, Vol. I, No. 1 or No. 11, pp. 90ff. or 91ff, not traced. Volume I No. 1 cannot be located; volume 10 No. 11. does not contain such an article.

Primary

[KR] Krishna Rao, Bhavaraju Venkata. 1930–1931. “Sataluru copper plate grant of Gunaga Vijayaditya III.” JAHRS 5, pp. 101–116.

Secondary

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