

Elūru grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00072

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00072.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas.

Original punctuation.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is a dot or small circle above headline, usually to the right of, but occasionally above the character to which it belongs and occasionally above the next character, especially when that next character is gha. In l7-8 saṃghaṭṭo° it may be pushed across a line and page break.

Edition

Seal

<1> śrī-vijayasiddhi

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> svast(i)<.> (śrīmatām sakala-bhuvanābhiṣṭū)yamāna-mānavya-
sagotrāṇā(r̥m)<2> k(au)śik(i)-vara-prasā(da)-labdha-rājy(ā)nām sv(ā)mi-mahāsenā-
pādānudhyātānām mātṛ-[ga]<3>ṇa-(pa)riṀpā(litā)nām bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-
prasāda-samāsādita-vara-varā<4>ha-lāṀñchanānām Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna-
pav<5>trikṛta-vapuṣā(r̥m) ca<5>lukyānām kula-jala<dhi>-samudi(t)endo(h) naya-
vinaya-v<6>kr<7>mopārjjita-cāru<6>-bhūri-k<8>rte<h> śrī-jayasīmha-
vallabha-mahā<rā>jasya priy[(a-bhrātu)]<<ānuja>>sya Indra-sa<7>māna-
vik(r)amasya śrī-Ind<r>a-bhaṭṭ<a>rakasya sūn<9>r aneka-samara-
sa<Page 2r><8>(r̥m)ghaṭṭ(o)palabdha-yuddha-vijaya-yaśaḥ-pras<10>ty-āmoda-
gandhādhivāsi<9>ta-sakala-di<10>maṇḍalasya śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājasya
priya-tana<10>yaḥ samatiś<11>ta-pit<12>guṇa<h> śakti-sa<r̥m>panna<h>
Ānv<13>kṣiky-ādi-vidy(ā)-pra<14>yog(e)Ṁṣ(u) śrī-vijayasiddhiḥ svāsi-dhārā-
<namita>ripu-nṛ(i)pati-vara-(ma)<15>kuṭa-ta(ṭa)-ghaṭitāneka-maṇi-kiraṇa-
rāga-ra<16>ita-araṇa-yuga<17>la<18>h<19> śrī-(sarvva)l(okāś)raya-
(ma)hā(rā)jaḥ Evam ā<20>āpayati

Ayyavo(lu?)<14>-v<15>radvāja-sa(g)otr<16>ya <17>tettriya<tait-
tirīya>-<sa>brahmacāriṇe v(iṣṇuśa)<Page 2v><18>rmmaṇa<h> (p)<19>trāya
ven(n?)eśarm(m)aṇa<h> putrāya <20>-ka(r)m(m)a-niratāya śr(i)dharaśar-
mma<21>ṇe ve(r̥m)gh<22>i-viṣaye Elū(ru nāma grā)m(e)<.> pūrvva-diś(āyām)<.>
(vālmī)ka pūrvvata<h><.> v(ā)lmik<23>(d)akṣiṇata<h><.> vālmī<24>ka
paścimata<h><.> [ja]l<25>a-ś<26>ri<27>ma<28>a Uttara(rata)<h><.> (Eta)<29>(t)<30>-
ca)tur-a(vadh)i dvāda<31>(śa)-<32>a(ṇḍikā)Ṁ-(ko)drava-bīja-paripramāṇa<r̥m>
kṣetra<r̥m><.> (Uttara-diśā)<yām><.> m(ū)l(ām?)bu-ta<33><34>āka
(pūr)vata<h><.> ja<35>a-ś<36>ri<37>ma<38>a dakṣiṇata<h><.> colivinthe-
pa(ścima)ta<h><.> (ja?)<39>(a)-<40>ś<41>ri<42>(m)gh<43>a Uttarata<h><.>
Eta(c-cat)ur-avadhi dvādaśa-<44>aṇḍikā-kodrava-bīja-pa<45>ripramāṇa(r̥m)
kṣetra(r̥m) viṣṇu)varddhana-!<46>a-nimitte <47>daka-pūrvva<r̥m>
datta(r̥m)<.><Page 3r> <48>g<49>ha-s<50>ānām puṣ(p)a-(vāt)ik<51>-sa(hitam
sarvva)-kara-parih(ā)re<52> p<53>ava[rddhamāna]<54>-vijaya-rājya-sarīva(tsa)re
daśa (varṣe)

1. Anuṣṭubh

(bh)ūmi-dānāt paraṁ dānaṁ
na bh(ūta)[m̐ na bhavi]<24>ṣya{vi}ti
ta<25>hai<26>va haraṇāt pāpa(r̥m)
(na) bhūta<r̥m> na bhaviṣyati

2. Anuṣṭubh

(sva)-[dattārṁ para-da]<25>ttārṁ vā
yo ○ haretṛi?<a> va

<Page 3v>

Apparatus

Plates

<1> -(bhuvanābhiṣṭū)yamāna- KR2 ◇ *-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-* KR1 • This combination is to my knowledge unique. Most Eastern Cālukya plates use *bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna*. The form *jagad-abhiṣṭūyamāna* occurs in some grants of Maṅgi Yuvarāja and Viṣṇuvardhana II. There are also corrupt hybrids: the Cendaṛa grant of Jayasīrṁha II has *jagada-saṁstuyamāna* (sic), and the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II have *sakala-bhūvana-jāgad-abhiṣṭūyamāna-*. — <1> -sagotrāṇā(rṁ) • The word *hārītī-putrāṇām* is expected after this point, and was almost certainly omitted accidentally by the scribe, not deliberately by the composer.

<5> -samuditendo(h) ◇ *-samuditendṛa?<oh>* KR1; *-samuditendu<h>* KR2. — <5> priy[(a-bhrātu)]<<ānuja>>sya ◇ *priyāṛṇ?<n>ujasya* KR1 KR2 • KR clearly read *ṇu* because of the *ā* marker of the earlier character that was partly hammered out and overstruck.

<7> -Ind<r>a- ◇ *-Indra-* KR1 KR2 • There is no room at the bottom of the place for a subscript *r*. The tail of the subscript *d* seems to be extended somewhat to the right, which may have been meant to indicate that *r*. — <7> -sa<Page 2v><8>(rṁ)ghaṭṭ(o) KR1 KR2 • I accept KR's opinion that the *anusvāra* is above *gha* on the next page. The small circular mark there may, however, be just an artefact created in raising the rim.

<9> priya- • The subscript *r* seems to have been deleted and re-engraved at a shallower depth to make room below for the *i* of *-ādi*.

<10> Ānvṛi?<i>kṣiky- ◇ *Anvīkṣiky-* KR1; *Aṇvṛi?<i>kṣiky-* KR2. — <10> -pra<11>yog(e)○ṣ(u) ◇ *-pra<11>yo<ga>-śeṣaḥ* KR1 KR2.

<11> -dhārā-<namita->ripu- ◇ *-dhārā-ripu-* KR1 KR2.

<12> *ta-ṛch?<c>araṇa- ◇ **tāruṇa-pāda-* KR1; **ta-caraṇa-* KR2.

<14> -<sa>brahmacāriṇe ◇ *-brahmacāriṇe* KR1; *-sabrahmacāriṇe* KR2.

<15> ven(n?)eśarm(m)aṇa<h> ◇ *vennaśarmmaṇa<h>* KR1 KR2 • The ARIE report also reads the name as Venneśarman. The *e* is certainly present on the second character. I am not at all sure that a subscript consonant is present. The plate is badly corroded

there, so there may have been something, but I see nothing that could be identified with confidence as a vestige.

<16> (vālmī)ka • Throughout the two lists of boundaries, I refrain from supplying endings for the names of features. KR does supply (or, in some cases, read) masculine nominative endings here, but my impression is that none are present in the original, and some of the words ought to be neuter rather than masculine. I attribute the lack of endings to non-standard usage of nouns in the stem form, not a scribal error, nor precisely a grammatical error of the composer. It is also possible that the nouns were intended to be in compound, for which see the commentary.

<17> [ja]jī!<l>a-śrī!<r>mīgh!<g>a! ◇ jaḷa-śrī!<r>mīgh!<g>a<h> KR2; [ja]ṭa-śrī!<r>mīgh!<g>a KR1 • KR explicitly mentions this improved reading in his introduction to his revised edition. While ḷa is perfectly clear, the preceding character is entirely lost to corrosion, which KR's second edition does not admit. Given the perfectly clear instance in line 19 and a differently damaged instance in line 19-20, the restoration is nonetheless sound. KR further notes that Sanskrit *jala-śṛṅga* is a mirror translation of Telugu *nīṭi-kommu*, which he explains as a “blind arm of a water course”, elaborating that it is an extension of a tank or a natural body of water, which fills up only in the rainy season, and is a feature often seen at village boundaries in this part of the Andhra country. Although the interpretation assumes two non-standard spellings, writing ḷa for la is quite common in the corpus, and gha for ga occurs occasionally, including *veṃghi* in line 16 of the present inscription. I therefore think KR's reading and interpretation are both correct. — <17> (Eta)jī!<c>(-ca)tur-a(vadh)i ◇ Etet?<aiś> catur-avadhi KR1; Etet?<aiś> catur-udadhi- KR2.

<18> -jī!<kh>a(ṇḍikā)○-(ko)drava- ◇ -jī!<kh>aṇḍi-(ko)drava- KR1 KR2 • The character *kā* is partly eaten by the binding hole but is still recognisable to the left of it. — <18> -(diśā)<yām>mūl(ām?)bu- ◇ -diśā<yā>m kul<y>ābu- KR1; -diśā<m><yām>bu- KR2 • KR's second edition probably has a typo here; his intent may have been to emend to -*diśāyām Ambu*-. I think the character *mū* is reasonably clear. I am not at all certain that an *ā* was present on *la*. The anusvāra is above and to the right of *bu*. — <18> -ta<19>ī(dh)?<t>āka<m> ◇ -ta<19>ī(r)?<t>ākaḥ KR1 KR2 • The first character in line 19 is much too broad to be *r*, but it is a fairly plausible *dh*, which may in turn be the engraver's misrecognition of a pre-drawn *t*.

<19> colivinṭhi- ◇ vālivinṭi KR1; colivinṭi KR2 • KR notes that his reading *colivinṭi* is the Telugu genitive singular of the name Colivṇṇu, and locates a modern village by this name near Eluru. Nonetheless, the correct reading of the last character is beyond doubt *nthi*. I do not know if this is a plausible genitive, perhaps of Colivinṇu. A possible

parallel formation is *muttinthi-boya* in the Reyūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II. — <19> jaḥ!<1>a- KR2 ◇ jaṭa- KR1. — <19> (ja?)ḥ!<1>(a)-<20>śḥ!<ṛ>(m)ḥ!<gh>a KR2 ◇ jaṭa-śṛil<ṛ>mḥ!<g>a KR1 • As in line 17 above, the reading *ja* is problematic. The locus is not as badly damaged, but the extant strokes are difficult to interpret. Correction may have been involved both on this character and on the following *la*. Given the clear instance earlier in this line, I agree with KR that *jaḥa* must have been intended.

<20> Eta(c)-catur- ◇ Etḥe?<ai>ś catur- KR1 KR2. — <20> -ḥk!<kh>aṇḍikā- ◇ -ḥk!<kh>aṇḍi{kā}- KR1 KR2.

<21> -nimitte ḥO?<U>daka- ◇ -nimittam ḥdi?<U>daka- KR1; -nimittam Udaka- KR2.

<22> parih(ā)re<ṇa> p<r>ava[rddhamāna-] ◇ -parihopa va [...] KR1; -parihare pa va [...] KR2 • My restoration is not entirely certain given that it also requires the restitution of an omitted syllable and an omitted subscript *r*. There is, however, no other solution I can come up with that is even remotely plausible in the context. Given the end of the next line, it is quite certain that three characters are lost at the edge of the plate here. — <22> daśa (varṣe) ◇ daśame [pi] KR1 KR2 • From the photos of the original, the reading *varṣe* is certain beyond reasonable doubt in spite of considerable corrosion, except that the superscript *r* and/or the *e* marker may have been omitted in the original. Similare dating formulae with a redundant *varṣe* do occur in the corpus: *pravarddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-savasare trīmśati varṣa* (continuing with month, fortnight and day) in the Koṇeki grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II; *pravaddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-saṁvachare viṁśati-trir varṣeṁ* in the Jaḥayūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III; and *pravarddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-saṁvatsare pañca varṣe* in the Koṇḍakarīḥlola grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III.

<23> bh(ūta)[m na bhavi]<24>śya{vi}ti ◇ na bhū(ta)[...]<24>śyati KR1 KR2.

<24> s(v)a-[dattām para-da]<25>ttām ◇ sva-[...]<25>ttām KR1 KR2.

<25> haretḥi?<a> • The inscribed word looks like *hireti*, but the first *i* marker is very thin and probably belongs to the earlier inscription on this plate (see the commentary). — <25> va • The text ends abruptly here.

Translation

Plates

<1–13> Greetings. From the ocean that is the lineage of the majestic Calukyas—who are of the Mānavya gotra which is praised by the entire world,¹, who attained kingship

¹The standard phrase “who are sons of Hārīti” was probably omitted by the scribe here.

by the grace of Kauṣikī's boon, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāseṇa, who are protected by the band of Mothers, who acquired the superior Boar emblem by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, and whose bodies have been hallowed through washing in the purificatory ablutions (*avabhṛtha*) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice—had arisen a moon <who was> His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Jayasimha Vallabha (I), who earned his great good reputation by his political acumen (*naya*), discipline (*vinaya*) and valour. His dear younger brother <was> Indra Bhaṭṭāraka whose valour equalled Indra's. His son <was> His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (II), who perfumed the complete circle of the quarters with pleasant fragrance from the efflorescence of his glory <achieved by> martial victory attained in the clash of many a battle. His dear son, His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Sarvalokāśraya (Maṅgi Yuvarāja), who surpasses the virtues of his father, who is endowed with <the three> power<s>, who is His Majesty Vijayasiddhi {prevailing in victory} in applications of sciences such as critical investigation (*ānvīkṣikī*) and whose pair of feet are tinted by the hues of the rays from the many gems fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of prominent enemy kings bowed down by the blade of his sword, commands thus.

<13–23> <I have granted land> in the Veṅgi district (*viṣaya*), at the village named Elūru, to Śrīdharaśarman of the Bhāradvāja *gotra* and the Taittirīya school, a resident of Ayyavolu, grandson of Viṣṇuśarman and son of Vennaśarman, engaged in the the six duties (of a Brahmin). <Item,> in the eastern direction <of the village>. A termite mound to the east. A termite mound to the south. A termite mound to the west. An oxbow lake² to the north. A field <demarcated> with these four boundaries, comprising (an area sufficient for sowing) twelve *khaṇḍikās* of *kodrava* seed. <Item,> in the northern direction <of the village>. The Mūlāmbu³ pond to the east. An oxbow lake to the south. The border of (the village) Colivintha⁴ to the west. An oxbow lake to the north. A field <demarcated> with these four boundaries, comprising (an area sufficient for sowing) twelve *khaṇḍikās* of *kodrava* seed. <These have been> given, <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water, on the occasion of the *annaprāśa* <ceremony> of (prince) Viṣṇuvardhana <III>. <Also,> a homestead plot together with a flower garden. <All these were donated> with an exemption from all taxes, in the year that is the tenth year of the progressive triumphant reign.

1.

²See the apparatus to line 17 about this word.

³Or perhaps “the pond in Mūla” if this word ends in a Telugu locative rather than the Sanskrit word *ambu*.

⁴The stem form of this name may be Colivinnu.

There has never been and will never be a gift surpassing the gift of land, nor has there ever been or will ever be a sin <surpassing> the seizing of the same.

2.

He who would seize land, whether given by himself or by another⁵

Commentary

The boundary lists in lines 16-17 and 18-20 are somewhat problematic because of the inconsistent (and mostly missing) case endings. I am quite certain that the demarcation of two separate fields is presented here, both commencing with the location of the field with respect to the village Elūru. In each demarcation, this is followed by four pairs of “landmark” + “direction”, in the conventional order of East–South–West–North. It is therefore most likely that the landmarks are to be construed in the nominative, understood to mean that each landmark is to the specified direction of the field. With this interpretation, however, the syntax of the text is extremely fragmented, with several complete sentences inserted parenthetically as it were into the framing sentence that announces the grant.

Conversely, if the landmark–direction pairs are to be construed as compounds meaning that the field is to the specified direction of each landmark, the resulting sentence is syntactically more or less correct, although highly convoluted and complex. There are some cases in the Eastern Cālukya copperplate corpus where boundary demarcations are (or may be) presented in this manner. In the Jaḷayūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III, the demarcation likewise follows a statement of the field’s location with respect to the village. That grant, incidentally, is the only other Eastern Cālukya charter that I know of to use termite mounds as boundary markers. There, however, the directions come in the order West–North–South–East, whereby the conventional subjective order East–South–West–North obtains if the pairs are interpreted to mean that the field is to the said direction of the landmark. The Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II (but not the other two related sets from Peddāpurappāḍu) also situates the field relative to the landmarks, but there this is made explicit by putting the landmarks in the ablative case, although the actual order is still E–S–W–N, so the subjective order (of the boundaries relative to the field) is reversed. The Nutulapaṇu grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja demarcates three fields in two differently unconventional sequences of directions, one or both of which may also have to be understood as positioning the field relative to each landmark. In the Peñcerekuru grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja, the

⁵The text ends abruptly here.

landmarks are likewise in the ablative, and their sequence is likewise erratic. Finally, the Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II also put the landmarks in the ablative case, but the sequence there is again unconventional (E–W–S–N).

It is thus possible that the demarcations are to be understood as situating the field relative to each landmark, but because the present charter employs the standard sequence of directions and does not use the ablative case for the landmarks, I think this is unlikely, and the demarcations are to be interpreted in the same way as those in the overwhelming majority of related grants, in spite of the syntactical difficulty involved.

Another possible complication in the boundary list is that the word *vālmika* is graphically quite similar to *Elūru*, and it is therefore not impossible that one or more of the many *vālmikas* in the text are scribal mistakes for *Elūru*. This may, in particular, be the case for the *vālmika* to the west of the first field (in line 17, inscribed only as *vālmī*), since this field lies to the east of *Elūru*.

Not noted by Krishna Rao, the recto of plate 3 is a palimpsest. No traces of earlier writing can be made out on any other page. On 3r, there were probably 4 lines of writing in larger characters than the present inscription, so that all of the fourth earlier line is below the last presently inscribed line, but there is still blank space below where there was probably no earlier writing. In this fourth line, the text *varāha-lāñchanānām Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna* can be made out without much difficulty, so this page had once been inscribed with the opening passage of Eastern Cālukya grants. Further legible bits of the earlier writing include (*māna-mānavya-sa*) in line 1 (slightly above the level of the present first line on this page), and (*paripā*)*litānām bhagava* in line 3 (slightly above the level of the present inscription's last line).

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1937–38, p. 7, appendix A/1937–38, N° 6 with description at ARIE 1937–38, pp. 80–81, § 41. Edited from the original by B. V. Krishna Rao (1938–1939), with a summary of the contents, followed immediately by a slight revision (1938–1939) accompanied by facsimiles.⁶ The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs of the original taken by myself in February 2023 at the Rallabandi Subba Rao Archaeological Museum, Rajahmundry, collated with Krishna Rao's editions and his facsimiles. Minor typographic mistakes and oversights in either of the previous

⁶The inscription has also been published in *Bhārati*, Vol. XVI, pp. 613 ff., not traced.

editions are not shown in the apparatus here. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[KR1] Krishna Rao, Bhavaraju Venkata. 1938–1939. “Eluru grant of Sarvalokasraya.” JAHRS 12 (1), pp. 49–53.

[KR2] Krishna Rao, Bhavaraju Venkata. 1938–1939. “A note on the Eluru grant of Sarvalokasraya.” JAHRS 12 (2), pp. 109–110.

Secondary

ARIE 1937–38. *Annual report on South Indian epigraphy for the year ending 31st March 1938*. Edited by C. R. Krishnamacharlu. Delhi: Government of India, 1942.

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