Korumelli grant of Rājarāja I Narendra

Dániel Balogh

Alternative titles: Korumelli grant of Rājarāja I Narendra – Korumilli grant of Rājarāja I Narendra – Korumelli plates of Rājarāja I Narendra – Korumilli plates of Rājarāja I Narendra

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00078

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00078.xml

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

Commit: 2026-10-28 17:37 (06a61a7), last modified 2026-10-28 17:37 (0b464e1)

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final T (e.g. l13, l18) is a regular ta with just a wiggly tail (upward and to the right) instead of a V-shaped headmark. Final N (e.g. l16, l43) is a much reduced and simplified na without a headmark, while in l46 it is an extremely simplified and reduced na with a wiggly tail. In l46, ka is erroneously inscribed instead of final K, and l47 has ta instead of final T.

Original punctuation marks are simple straight vertical, generally slightly shorter than a character body is tall; occasionally very short. The opening symbol consists of two concentric circles; the outer circle has four wavy appendages in the cardinal directions, and four dots spaced in the intercardinals.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāras are placed at median height after the character to which they belong. They may be moved to the next line (l27) or across a binding hole (l37). Vowel markers are generally just small extensions, outward and down, on the left, right or both sides, of the V-shaped headmark, when such a headmark

exists in a consonant. Dependent au, when distinguished from o, has a taller right hump (e.g. lines 25, 26, 32; see also o corrected to au in line 7). Subscript consonants are as a rule simplified, and are often ambiguous outside context, e.g. ṣṣa looks like ṣva. Repeatedly (lines 77, 78, 92, 96, 103), a combination of short *u* and *ā* (attached to the headmark, not to the end of the *u* marker) is used to represent long *ū*. (But compare the properly written *kūṁdavā* in line 61.) Since this double *uā* marker is not a plausible scribal mistake, it is probably a deliberately employed alternate notation; nonetheless, I mark it up as erroneous usage.

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 ⁜

1. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

śrī-dhāmnaḥ puruṣottamasya mahato nārāyaṇasya prabho〈r〉
nnābhī-paṁkaruhād babhū〈2〉va jagatas sraṣṭā svayaṁbhūs tataḥ
jajñe mānasa-sūnur atrir iti ya〈ḥ〉 tasmān muner atritas
somo〈3〉 vaṁśa-karas sudhāṁśur udita〈ḥ〉 śrīkaṇ(ṭh)a-cūḍāmaṇiḥ|

2. Anuṣṭubh

tasmād āsīt sudhā-sūter
bbudho budha-nutas ta〈4〉taḥ
j¿a?〈ā〉taḥ purūravā nāma
cakrava〈r〉ttī sa-vikramaḥ|

tasmād āyur〈.〉 Āyuṣo nahuṣaḥ〈.〉 tato y¿ā?〈a〉〈5〉yātiś cakravarttī vaṁśaka〈r〉ttā〈.〉 tataḥ purur iti cakravarttī〈.〉 tato janamejayo 〈'〉śvamedhatrita〈6〉yasya kartt¿a?〈ā〉〈.〉 tataḥ ◯ prācīśaḥ〈.〉 tasmāt sainyayātiḥ〈.〉 tato hayapati¿ṁ?〈ḥ〉〈.〉 tatas sā〈r〉vva〈7〉bh¿o?〈au〉maḥ〈.〉 tato jaya◯senaḥ〈.〉 tato mahābh⟦o⟧〈〈au〉〉maḥ〈.〉 tasmād (ai)śānakaḥ| tataḥ krodhānanaḥ〈.〉〈8〉 tato devakiḥ〈.〉 ¡devake!〈devaker〉 ◯ ¡ri!〈r̥〉bhukaḥ〈.〉 tasmād r̥kṣakaḥ, tato mativaras

satra-yāga-yājī sara〈9〉svatī-nadī-nāthaḥ〈.〉 tataḥ kātyāyanaḥ〈.〉 kātyāyanān nīlaḥ〈.〉 tato duṣyantaḥ〈.〉 tata

Āryyā

3. Āryāgīti

gaṁ〈10〉gā-yamunā-tīre yad avi¿chc?〈cch〉innan nikhāya yūpān kramaśaḥ
kṛtvā tathāśvamedhān nāma mahā-ka〈11〉rmma-bharata Iti yo 〈'〉labhata,

tato ⟦ta⟧〈〈bha〉〉〈〈ra〉〉tād bhūmanyuḥ〈.〉 tasmāt suhotraḥ〈.〉 tato hastī| tato viro〈12〉canaḥ〈.〉 tasmād ajamīlaḥ〈.〉 tatas saṁvaraṇaḥ〈.〉 tasya ca tapana-sutāyās tapatyāś ca sudhanvā, ta〈13〉taḥ parikṣiT, tato bhīmasenaḥ, tataḥ pradīpanaḥ〈.〉 tasmā¿chc?〈c ch〉antanuḥ〈.〉 tato vicitravīryyaḥ|〈Page 2r〉 〈14〉 tataḥ pāṇḍu-rājaḥ〈.〉 tataḥ

Āryyā

4. Upagīti

putrās tasya ca dharmmaja-bh¿i?〈ī〉mārjjuna-nakula-sahadevāḥ
paṁ〈15〉ce(n)driyava(T) paṁca syur vviṣ¿i?〈a〉ya-grāhiṇas tatra|

5. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

yenādāhi vijitya ¿k?〈kh〉āṇḍavam atho gāṇḍīvinā〈16〉 ¿m?〈v〉ajriṇaṁ
yuddhe ¿dh?〈p〉āśupatāstram a〈〈ṁ〉〉dhaka-ripoś cālābhi d(ai)tyāN bah¿u?〈ū〉n
i(n)drārddhāsanam adhyarohi j¿i?〈a〉yi〈17〉nā yat kālikeyādikān
hatvā svairam akāri vaṁśa-vipina-cchedaḥ kur¿u?〈ū〉ṇāṁ vibhoḥ,

tato 〈'〉rjj¿a?〈u〉nād abhimanyuḥ〈.〉〈18〉 tataḥ parikṣiT〈.〉 tato janame〈ja〉yaḥ〈.〉 tataḥ kṣemukaḥ〈.〉 tato naravāhanaḥ〈.〉 tata⟦(ś c)⟧〈〈ś ś〉〉atānīkaḥ〈.〉 tasmād udayanaḥ〈.〉〈19〉 tataḥ paraṁ tat-p(r)abhṛtiṣv avicchinna-〈sa〉ntāneṣv ayodhyā-siṁhāsanāsīneṣv ekā¿d?〈n〉na-ṣaṣṭi-cakravarttiṣu 〈gateṣu〉 tad-vaṁśyo vi〈20〉jayādityo nāma rāj(ā) ¿ṣa?〈vi〉jigīṣayā dakṣiṇāpathaṁ gatvā trilocana-pallavam adhikṣipya daiva〈21〉-durīhayā l¿e?〈o〉kānta◯ram agamaT

tasmin sa(ṁ)kule purohitena sārddham antarvvatnī tasya mahādevī〈22〉 muḍivemu nāmā◯grahāraṁ katipayābhir antaḥpura-kāntābhiḥ kaṁcukibhiś ca sahopagamya〈23〉 tad-vāstavyena viṣṇubhaṭṭa-somayājinā duhitṛ-ni〈r〉vviśeṣam abhirakṣitā satī viṣṇuvarddhanan na〈24〉ndanam asūta〈〈|〉〉 sā tasya ca kumārakasya mānavya-sagotra-hārīti-putra-dvipakṣa-gotra-¿v?〈k〉ramocitā〈25〉ni karmmāṇi kārayitvā tam ava〈r〉ddhayaT〈.〉 sa ca mātrā vidita-vṛttāntas san nirggatya calukya-girau na〈26〉(n)dāṁ bhagavatīṁ gaurīm ārādhya kumāra-nārāyaṇa-mātṛ-

gaṇāṁś ca saṁta<r>pya śvetātapatr¿e?<ai>ka-śaṁkha-pa<27>ṁca-mahāś¿ā?<a>bda-pāliketana-prati¿ḍ?<ḍh>akkā-varāha-lāṁcchana-piṁcha-kun¿th?<t>a-siṁhāsana-makara-toraṇa<28>-kanaka-daṇḍa-gaṁgā-yamunādīni sva-kula-kramāgatāni nikṣiptān(ī)va sā¡ṁb!<m>rājya-cihnān¿ī?<i> samā<29>dāya kaḍaṁba-gaṁgādi-bhūmipān nirjj(i)tya setu-narmmadā-madhyaṁ sārddha-sapta-lakṣaṁ dakṣiṇāpa<Page 2v><30>¿dh?<th>aṁ pālayām āsa,

ś¿y?<l>okaḥ,

6. Anuṣṭubh

tasyāsīd vijayādityo
viṣṇuvarddhana-bhūpateḥ
pallavānvaya-jātā<31>yā
mahādevyāś ca nandanaḥ

tat-sutaḥ polakeśi-vallabhaḥ<.> tat-putra<ḥ> kīrttivarmmā, tasya tanayaḥ

svasti<.><32> śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-m¿a?<ā>navya-sagotrāṇāṁ hārītī-putrāṇāṁ kauśikī-vara-pra<33>sāda-labdha-rājyānā{ṁ}m m¿a?<ā>tṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ svāmi-mahāsena-pādānudhyātānāṁ bhagavan-nār(ā)<34>yaṇa-pr¿ā?<a>sāda-sam¿a?<ā>sādita-vara-varāha-lāṁcchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām aśva<35>medhāvabhṛ¿t?<th>a-snāna-pavitrīkṛta-vapuṣāṁ cālukyānāṁ kulam alaṁkariṣṇos satyāśraya-vallabhe<36>ndrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇ(u)varddhano <'>ṣṭādaśa varṣāṇi veṅgī-deśam ap¿a?<ā>layaT<.> tad-ātmajo jayasiṁ<37>ha-vallabhas trayastri◯ṁśataṁ| tad-anujendrarāja-nandanas sapta dinān¿ī?<i><.> tat-suto viṣṇuvarddhano<38> nava varṣāṇi, tat-sūnur ¡mmāṁgī!-yuvarājaḥ paṁcaviṁśatiṁ| tat-putro jayasiṁhas tra(yo)<39>daśa<.> tad-avarajaḥ kokkiliṣ ṣa¿n?<ṇ> māsā<N>, tasya jyeṣṭho bhrātā viṣṇuvarddhanas tam uc¿v?<c>āṭya sap-tatriṁśata<40>m abdā¿|?<N>| tat-putro vijayāditya-bhaṭṭ¿a?<ā>rako <'>ṣṭādaśa| tat-tanujo viṣṇuvarddhanaṣ ṣaṭtriṁśataṁ| tat-sūnu<41>r vvijayāditya-nare(n)dra-mṛgarājaś cāṣṭācatvāriṁśataṁ, tat-sutaḥ kali-viṣṇuvarddha¿ṇ?<n>(o) <'>dhyarddha-varṣaṁ| ta<42>t-suto guṇaga-vijayādityaś catuśc¿ā?<a><tvā>riṁśataṁ| tad-bhrātur vvikramāditya-bhūpates tanayaś cāl¿ū?<u><43>ky¿ā?<a>-bhīmas triṁśataṁ<.> tat-sutaḥ kollabigaṇḍa-vijayādityaṣ ṣa¿n?<ṇ> māsāN<.> tat-sūnur ¿ā?<a>mmarājas sapta<44> varṣ¿a?<ā>ṇi| tat-sutaṁ vijayādityaṁ bālam uccāṭya tāḍapo m¿a?<ā>sam ekaṁ<.> taṁ jitvā cālukya-bh¿i?<ī>(ma)<45>-tanayo vikramāditya Ekādaśa māsāN<.> tat-tāḍapa-rāj¿ā?<a>-suto yuddham¿ā?<a>llas ¿t?<s>apta varṣ¿a?<ā><Page 3r><46>(ṇi),

7. Anuṣṭubh

Amma-rāj(ā)nujo rāja-
-bhīmo <’>¿db?<bd>ā(N) dvādaśābhuna¿ka?<K>
yuddhe yuddhamallan taṁ
dhāṭyā nir¿g?<d>dhāṭya dha<47>r¿u?<a>ṇ¿i?<ī>(M)

<ta?>(t)-sut(o) <’>mma-bhūpa<<ḷ>> kṣmāṁ paṁc¿i?<a>-viṁś¿i?<a>ti-varṣ⟦a⟧<<(ā)>>ṇy
(a)pā¿ta?<T>|

8. Anuṣṭubh

dv¿e?<ai>māturo <’>m(m)a-rājasya
dānār¿nn?<ṇṇ>av¿ā?<a> Iti sm¿a?<ṛ>taḥ
catu<48>ṣṣaṣṭi-kalābhijñas
samās tisro <’>bhunag bhuvaṁ

9. Anuṣṭubh

tataḥ paraṁ patiṁ lab(dhu){i}m
anurūpam anāy¿i?<a>kā{(ḷ)}
saptaviṁśati<49> varṣāṇi
cacā¿v?<r>eva tapaḥ kṣamā|

10. Anuṣṭubh

Atha dānārṇṇavāj jātaḥ
kalāvāN mṛdubhiḥ karaiḥ
rājā cāluky¿ā?<a>-candro<50> yaḥ
kṣamā-tāpam apākaroT|

11. Anuṣṭubh

satye pratiṣṭhitā lokā
Iti satyaṁ vaco yataḥ,
sarvva-lokāśraye yasmi<51>¡|n!<N|>
saty(a)-rāj(e) sthitaṁ jagaT|

12. Anuṣṭubh

nirvvakraṁ vasudhā-cakram
arakṣaT kṣapitāhitaḥ,
nyāyye pathi (nṛ)pair ādyais
sa dvā<52>daśa samās samaḥ|

13. Anuṣṭubh

vimalāditya-devākhyas
tata⟦(syā?)⟧<<(s tasyā)>>nujo <'>da¿th?<dh>āT,
mahi-maṇḍala-sā¡<ṁ>b!<m>rājya(ṁ)
vijitya vi(j)¿(ā)?<a><53>y¿i?<ī> ripūN|

14. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

yasya pra◯jvalita-pratāpa-dahanaṁ so¿ḍ?<ḍh>un na ¿s?<ś>aktā bhayād
gatvā kānanam aṁbudhiṁ ca<54> taras(ā) vidveṣiṇo vi◯hvalāḥ
dāv¿o?<au><r>vv¿a?<ā>gni-padena tatra ca punas tenaiva saṁtāpitāḥ
śrī-pād(ā)<55>ma(ra)-pādapasya ◯ mahatīṁ chāyāṁ samā(śi)śriyaN

Api ca||

15. Vasantatilakā

sūryyānvaye sura-pa<56>ti-pratimaḥ prabhāvaiḥ
śrī-rājarāja Iti yo jagati vyarāja¿ta?<T>
nāthas samasta-nara-nātha-k(i)rīṭa-koṭi-
-ratna<57>-prabhā-paṭal¿(ā)?<a>-pāṭala-pāda-pīṭhaḥ|

16. Vasantatilakā

jātas tatas tata-yaśo-jita-rāja-tejā
rājeṁdra-coḍa-nṛpatir nnṛpa-ca<58>kravartt¿i?<ī>
da{ṁ}<r>(pī?){ṁ} pra{ṁ}caṁḍa-mada-danti-kapola-niryyad-
-dānāvilāmara-sarit-salila-pravāhaḥ|

17. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

sa-⟦p⟧<<d>>vīpāṁ catu<59>r-aṁbu-rāśi-parikhāṁ viśvaṁbharāṁ l¿i?<ī>layā
daṇḍenaiva vijitya ca pratidiśaṁ yo <'>tiṣṭhipat sarvvataḥ
svairodbhrāṁti-ni<60>vāraṇāya vij¿ā?<a>ya-staṁbhān sva-nāmāṁkitān
ālānān iva baddhum andha-manaso darppeṇa dig-(d)antinaḥ|

18. Āryā

tasyānu<61>jāṁ surūpām anurūpāṁ kūṁdavām mahādevīṁ
sa Upāyata kṛta-kṛtyo vimalādityo jana-stutyaḥ|

19. Anuṣṭubh

samu<62>dra-raśanāṁ pṛthvīṁ
pṛthvīṁ sa bh¿ū?<u>ja-vikramā(T)
samarakṣat samās sapta
saptasapti-samas s¿ā?<a>maḥ|

20. Sragdharā

〈Page 3v〉〈63〉tasmāc cālukya-cūḍāmaṇir atha vimalāditya-devān mahīśāc
coḍa-kṣmāpāla-lakṣmyā Iva〈64〉 racita-tanoḥ kuṁdavāyāś ca devyāḥ
jātaś śrī-rāj¿ā?〈a〉rāj(o) rajanikara-kula-śrīmad-aṁbhodhi-rājo
rā〈65〉jad-rājanya-sevyām abhṛta bhuja-balād rāja-lakṣmī(ṁ?) pṛthivyāḥ||

21. Vasantatilakā

yo rakṣituṁ vasumatīṁ śaka-vatsareṣu
〈66〉 vedāṁburāśi-nidhi-va(r)tt(i)ṣu siṁha-ge 〈'〉rkke
kṛṣṇa-¿p?〈d〉vitīya-di{va}vasottara-bhadrikāyāṁ
vāre guror vvaṇiji〈67〉 lagna-vare 〈'〉bhiṣiktaḥ||

22. Anuṣṭubh

yasy(o)ttamāṁgaṁ paṭṭena
samābaṁdhi mahīyasā
bharttuṁ viśvaṁbharā-bhāra〈68〉ṁ
janair āro¿s?〈p〉itaṁ ¿v?〈c〉iraṁ||

23. Upajāti

pṛthvīm imāṁ yatra pṛ¿dhya?〈thu〉-prabhāve
rakṣat{r}y avarggaṁ kṣapitāri-va(r)gg(e)
dūrīkṛ〈69〉tāvagraha-cora◯-rogāḥ
praj¿a?〈ā〉 labhaṁte sa¿p?〈ph〉alaṁ trivarggaṁ||

24. Sragdharā

ś¿o?〈au〉ryy¿o?〈au〉dāryyābhimānā〈70〉¿p?〈d〉y-agaṇita-guṇa◯-janmānuraktā
mahimnā
prakhyātenāti-kṛṣṇā śaśadhara-dhavalā saj-janā〈71〉nāṁ gaṇena
pītā ◯ prītena karṇṇāṁjalibhir abhinavā (bh)āti dig-devatānān
nānā-varṇṇ¿a?〈ā〉ṁ vi〈72〉tāna-śriyam ata◯nutarā tanvatī yasya kīrttiḥ||

25. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

pitror vvaṁśa-gurū babhūvatur alaṁ〈73〉 yasya s¿p?〈ph〉urat-tejasau
sūryy¿a?〈ā〉-caṁdramas¿o?〈au〉 nirasta-tamas¿o?〈au〉 dev¿o?〈au〉 ¿b?〈j〉agac-
cakṣuṣī
daṁṣṭrā-koṭi-sa〈74〉muddhṛtākhila-mahī-cakram maha¿ta?〈T〉 krīḍayā
viṣṇor ādi-varāha-rūpam abhavad yac-chāsane lāṁcha〈75〉naṁ||

sa sarvva-lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāj¿a?⟨ā⟩dhirāja-parameśvara-parama-bhaṭṭ¿a?⟨ā⟩raka(ḥ)⟨76⟩ parama-brahmaṇyaḥ mātā-pitṛ-¿h?⟨p⟩ādānudhyātaḥ tyāga-siṁhāsanāsīnaḥ caṇḍikā-prasā⟨77⟩da-parilabdha-sā¡¿ḥ?⟨ṁ⟩b!⟨m⟩rājya-cihnaḥ guddavādi-vi¿vi?⟨ṣa⟩ya-nivāsino rāṣṭrak¿uā?⟨ū⟩ṭa-pramukh¿a?⟨ā⟩N ku⟨Page 4r⟩⟨78⟩ṭ¡i!⟨i⟩ṁbina(s sa)rvv¿a?⟨ā⟩⟨N⟩ samāh¿uā?⟨ū⟩ya maṁtri-purohita-senāpati-yuvarāja-d¿o?⟨au⟩vārika-pradhānā⟨79⟩dhyak(ṣ)am it⟨y⟩ ādiśati‖

26. Sragdharā

Ādy-aṁtātyaṁta-dūrāt samajani jagatā(ṁ) jyotiṣo janma-het¿a?⟨u⟩r
brahmā dhāma pra⟨80⟩jānām abhavad atha tataḥ kaśyapo nāma ve¿th?⟨dh⟩āḥ
bhāradvājas tato ⟨’⟩bhūn (mu)nir adh(i)ka-tapās tasya gotre pa⟨81⟩vitre
tatrāp¿ā?⟨a⟩staṁba-sūtre śruti-nidhir udagāc c(ī)ḍamā¿yu?⟨ryya⟩ḥ krameṇa‖

27. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

rājñām arccita-varccasas sa⟨82⟩muditai⟨r⟩ yyajñair vvi{dh(ū)}(dhau)tāṁ¡gh!⟨h⟩aso
yajño nāma sutas tataḥ kṛta-dhiyo jajñe kṛta-jñaḥ kṛtī
⟨83⟩ vijñātākhila-veda-śāstra-samayaḥ prāj¿j?⟨ñ⟩as sadā poṣita-
-jñ¿a?⟨ā⟩ti⟨r⟩ jñāna-nidhir guru-jña-sa¿r?⟨d⟩ṛśo nīti-jña⟨84⟩tāyāṁ bh¿ū?⟨u⟩vi‖

28. Upendravajrā

ya◯thā vasiṣṭho viduṣāṁ variṣṭho
nirundhatīṁ ¿p?⟨d⟩o¿p?⟨ṣ⟩am arundhatīṁ saḥ
tathā⟨85⟩nurūpām a¿b?⟨bh⟩irū◯pa-rūpas
satīm upāyac¿c?⟨ch⟩ata mākavākhyāṁ‖

29. Vasantatilakā

putras tayor adi⟨86⟩ti-kaśyapayor i◯vābhū¿p?⟨d⟩
bhāsvān apākṛta-tamāḥ khalu cī{ṁ}ḍamāryyaḥ
y¿e?⟨o⟩ veda-śā⟨87⟩stra-sakala-śruti-raśmi-j(ā)taiś
śiṣyānanāṁburuha-bodha-karo garīyāN‖

30. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

nityābh(ī)ṣṭa-¿ṣ?⟨ph⟩ala-pra⟨88⟩dāna-ruciraṁ lakṣmī-nivāsās¿v?⟨p⟩adaṁ
bibhrāṇaṁ gurutāṁ prabuddha-sumanaḥ-saṁpūr¿nn?⟨ṇṇ⟩a-śākhānvi⟨89⟩taṁ
chāyā-saṁtatim āśrit¿e?⟨ai⟩ś ca vibu¿v?⟨dh⟩ai⟨ḥ⟩ saṁstūyamānaṁ sadā
s¿o?⟨e⟩vitvā sukham āsyate⟨90⟩ dvija-varair yyaṁ vipra-kalpadr¿a?⟨u⟩maṁ|

31. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

yad-ge{hā}haṁ suciraṁ vibhāti paṭhatāṁ puṇyair vvaṭ¿u?⟨ū⟩nāṁ pa⟨91⟩ṭu-

-vyāv¿a?<ṛ>ttyāviratamṁ kramāt krama-pade sāmarthya-ju¡¿gh-g?<g-gh>!<ḍ-gh>oṣaṇais
sāy¿o?<a>ṁ-prātar upāhitamṁ hu<92>ti-hṛta-s(v)āhā-priya-proccalad-
-<d>ām(ai)ś cāpi samantataḥ kali-malamṁ protsārayad <d>¿(u)ā?<ū>rataḥ|

<Page 4v> <93> tasm¿e?<ai>

32. Free verse

samasta-janatā-viśeṣa-guṇā{ṁ}ya,
rai-suta(r)ppita-mahīdeva-deva-gaṇāya,
viprānva<94>yābdhi-śaśabhṛt-pr¿e?<a>ti¡(cha)!<ccha>ndāya<,>
vidvaj-janā<ṁ>gīkṛta-viśrutānandāya,
janm¿i?<a>-prabhṛti-gīta-vedārttha-ta<95>¡tv!āya,
san-mano-vasati-vāstavyātma-sa¡tv!āya,
laṁbhita-gurutva-parilālita-(c)aritrāya,
śuṁbhita-ma<96>ti-s(th)a(g)ita-jīva-bhṛ(gu)-putrāya,
siddha-nija-nātha-kṛti-sevita-manīṣāya|
śud¿th?<dh>a-mati-d¿uā?<ū>ṣita-sama<97>sta-jana-doṣāya<,>
santat-ārādhita-nija-svāmi-pādāya,
cintita-mana<ḥ>stha-su(kha)dābhūta-supādāya,
ho<98>ma-(dhū)ma-vinirggatāmita-kalaṁkāya,
dhīmat-pragīta-rucira-sthira-guṇāṁkāya|
sakala-m[[ā]]<<u>>ni-gaṇa-nutāpa<99>staṁba-sūtrāya|
ta◯tra saṁgīta-bhāradvāja-gotrāya,
sapta-tantu-kṛta-yūpa-staṁbha-śobhāya,
<100> saptāśva-rūpa-sa◯dṛśātma-tanu-lābhāya,
nitya-janatocita-susatya-guṇa-yuktāya,
paty-a<101>bhi<<la>>ṣita-kā¿yū?<ryya>-ni◯¡ḥ!<ṣ>patti-saktāya,
parama-puruṣārttha-saṁpādana-paṭiṣṭhāya,
parame(ś)vara-sma<102>raṇa-pālana-variṣṭhāya,
sakalārttha-ś¿o?<ā>stra-pariniścita-vi¿ṇ?<n>odāy¿e?<a>,
sukumāratā¿v?<dh>ika-saroja-nibha<103>-pādāya,

33. Vidhvaṅkamālā

dhār¿a?<ā>-kareṇāgrahārīkṛtaḥ ko-
rumelli-nāmā grāma Iṁd¿uā?<ū>parāge
datto mayācandra-tāra<ṁ><104> hi tiṣ¿(p)?<ṭh>et
tasyāvadhi-vyaktir eṣocyate <'>dya,

pūrvvataḥ *kūḍakuniyyūri kimaṭṭi-kāliya*<105> sīmā, Āgneyataḥ *muṇḍa-kāliya* sīmā,

dakṣiṇataḥ *vānapalliyu saṁppa*〈106〉*(tan)iyayu māvuṇḍeṭiyu* sīmaiva sīmā, nairṛtyataḥ godāvariya sīmā, pa〈107〉(ści)mataḥ *būruvu-ḍo¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉g(la)* sīmā, vāyavyataḥ *ve(n)eṭiyu māsarayu* sīmaiva〈Page 5r〉 〈108〉 sīmā, Uttarataḥ *māsara-ponbeḍuva(mu?) (kha?)lmeṇḍi-kāliyu* sīmā, ¡Ī!〈Ai〉śānataḥ *E〈109〉ṟuvaṁkay-uttaramuna kaḍali(bh/c)āṭi* sīmā, Asyopari na kenacid bādhā karaṇīyā〈.〉〈110〉 yaḥ karoti sa paṁ(c)a-mahāpātak¿e?〈ai〉r yyukto bhavati〈.〉 tathā (c)oktaṁ bhagavatā vyās¿a?〈ā〉〈111〉di-maharṣi-prakareṇāpi,

34. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hareta vasundharāṁ
ṣaṣṭiṁ va(r)ṣa〈112〉sahasrāṇi
viṣṭhāyāṁ j¿a?〈ā〉yate k¡ri!〈ṛ〉miḥ,

35. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānup¿o?〈ā〉〈113〉litā
yasya ◯ 〈yasya〉 yadā bhūmis
tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ,

36. Āryāgīti

Ājñaptiḥ kaṭ¿i?〈a〉keśo〈114〉 rāciya-pedde◯ri-bhīma〈na〉-nāma-tanūjaḥ
karttā ¿be?〈po〉tanabha¿j?〈ṭṭ〉aḥ kāvyānāṁ〈115〉 lekhako 〈’〉sya gaṇḍācāryyaḥ|

(Asm)in (g)rāme prativarṣaṁ bhūpa-siddh¿a?〈ā〉ya-grahaṇa(ṁ pa)ṁcavi(ṁ)〈116〉śati niṣkāṇi śata-dvaya-sahitāni paṁcāśad dhānya-khaṇḍakāni ca‖꣸

〈Page 5v〉

Apparatus

Plates

〈1〉 prabho〈r〉 ◇ *prabhor* JFF.

〈3〉 śrīkaṇ(ṭh)a- ◇ *śrīkaṇ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉a-* JFF.

〈5〉 -ka〈r〉ttā ◇ *-karttā* JFF. — 〈5〉 cakravarttī〈.〉 ◇ *cakravarttī|* JFF • The faint and short vertical here does not seem to be a punctuation mark.

〈7〉 sā〈r〉vva〈7〉bh¿o?〈au〉maḥ ◇ *sārvva〈7〉bh¿o?〈au〉maḥ* JFF. — 〈7〉 mahābh⟦o⟧〈〈au〉〉maḥ ◇ *mahābhaumaḥ* JFF. — 〈7〉 tasmād (ai)śānakaḥ ◇ *tasmād deśānakaḥ* JFF • The stroke

below *de* must have been intended for the lower stroke of *ai*, not for a subscript *d*. Compare *daityān* in line 16 below. — 〈7〉 krodhānanaḥ〈.〉 ◇ *krodhānanaḥ|* JFF.

〈9〉 Āryyā ◇ *Āryy¿ā?〈o〉* JFF.

〈10〉 avi¿chc?〈cch〉innan ◇ *avi¿chc?〈cch〉inn¿a?〈ā〉n* JFF • The text is acceptable without Fleet's emendation, and corroborated by stanza 3 of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya. — 〈10〉 tathāśvamedhān ◇ *tathāśvamedh¿ā?〈a〉n* JFF • I disagree with Fleet's emendation, who may have wished to construe *aśvamedhaṁ nāma mahā-karma* as one phrase. The reading is reportedly *tathāśvamedhan* in the Kolāṟu grant (Hultzsch 1890, pp. 49–62, № 39, line 9), but probably *tathāśvamedhān* in the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya. See also the note to the translation.

〈11〉 ⟦ta⟧〈〈bha〉〉〈〈ra〉〉tād • According to Fleet's note, an originally inscribed *tā* has been corrected into *bhara* here. I think the pre-correction character was rather *ta*; *ra* is added in small size and slightly raised between the corrected *bha* and the following *tā*, and this *tā* may also be a correction from *to* (i.e. *tato tato* may have been inscribed first, then the second iteration corrected to *bharatā*. — 〈11〉 hastī| • This original punctuation mark is not visible in Fleet's estampage, but it has been read by him and is present in the Elliot estampages.

〈12〉 sudhanvā, • Again, the punctuation mark is not visible in Fleet's estampage, but it has been read by him and is present in the Elliot estampages.

〈13〉 pradīpanaḥ〈.〉 ◇ *pradīpanaḥ|* JFF • There is perhaps an original punctuation mark here, but none is visible in Fleet's estampage, and the Elliot estampages are unclear.

〈14〉 Āryyā ◇ *Āryyā-* JFF. — 〈14〉 -bh¿i?〈ī〉mārjjuna- ◇ *-bhīmārjjuna-* JFF.

〈15〉 °e(n)driya° • The body part may have been mistaken for *d* by the scribe, but reading *ndri* is possible with some goodwill. Compare *ekādna* in line 19 with a definite *d*, and an unambiguous *nd* conjunct in line 26. — 〈15〉 -grāhiṇas ◇ *-gr¿a?〈ā〉h¿ī?〈i〉ṇas* JFF. — 〈15〉 ¿k?〈kh〉āṇḍavam atho ◇ *¿k?〈kh〉āṇḍava-maṭhe* JFF.

〈16〉 ¿dh?〈p〉āśupatāstram ◇ *pāśupatāstram* JFF. — 〈16〉 a〈〈ṁ〉〉dhaka- ◇ *a¿dhaṁ?〈ṁdha〉ka-* JFF • I think what Fleet saw as an *anusvāra* after *dha* is just a hook on the tail of *hi* above; however, there seems to be an *anusvāra* above the left shoulder of *dha*, which must have been added subsequently. This is clearest in the Edinburgh specimen of Elliot's rubbing; in Fleet's estampage, neither of the possible *anusvāra*s is visible. — 〈16〉 d(ai)tyān ◇ *d{d}¿e?〈ai〉tyān* JFF • The stroke below *de* must have been intended for the lower stroke of *ai*, not for a subscript *d*. Compare *aiśānakaḥ* in line 7 above. — 〈16〉 bah¿u?〈ū〉n ◇ *bahūn* JFF. — 〈16〉 °i(n)drā° • The body part may have been mistaken for *d* by the scribe, but reading *ndrā* is possible with some

goodwill. Compare *ekādna* in line 19 with a definite *d*, and an unambiguous *nd* conjunct in line 26.

〈18〉 tataś ⟦(c)⟧〈〈ś〉〉atānīkaḥ ◇ *tataś śatānīkaḥ* JFF.

〈19〉 ekā¿d?〈n〉na- • The body part of the unusual conjunct may have been intended for *n*; compare the conjunct *ndr* in lines 15 and 16. There, however, the shape of *n* is recognisable in the upper part of the *d*-like body, while the lower part of what looks like *d* is in fact the upper part of the subscript *d*. — 〈19〉 〈gateṣu〉 • The supplied word is present in other versions of this origin story, so this is probably a scribal omission, not a redactorial alteration. — 〈19〉 vi〈20〉jayādityo ◇ *vi〈20〉j¿ā?〈a〉yādityo* JFF.

〈20〉 ¿ṣa?〈vi〉jigīṣayā ◇ *¿pa?〈vi〉jigīṣayā* JFF.

〈21〉 sa(ṁ)kule ◇ *sa〈ṁ〉kule* JFF • The *anusvāra* is directly adjacent to the ascending limb of the subscript *s*. It may be a subsequent addition.

〈24〉 -dvipakṣa- • There is a short horizontal stroke above *kṣa*, which seems to have been deliberately engraved, but its function is uncertain. Could it be an editorial mark for something to be done about the deviation from the standard text *-putrādi-sva-kṣatra-gotra-*?

〈25〉 ava〈r〉ddhayaT〈.〉 ◇ *ava〈r〉ddhayaT|* JFF. — 〈25〉 na〈26〉(n)dāṁ • The body part may have been mistaken for *d* by the scribe, but reading *ndā* is possible with some goodwill. Compare *ekādna* in line 19 with a definite *d*, and an unambiguous *nd* conjunct in line 26.

〈26〉 °¿e?〈ai〉ka- ◇ *°aika-* JFF.

〈27〉 -piṁcha- ◇ *-pi{ṁ}〈c〉cha-* JFF.

〈28〉 cihnān¿ī?〈i〉 ◇ *cihnāni* JFF.

〈29〉 dakṣiṇāpa〈Page 2v〉〈30〉¿dh?〈th〉aṁ ◇ *dakṣiṇāpa〈Page 2v〉〈30〉thaṁ* JFF.

〈33〉 -rājyānā{ṁ}m ◇ *-rājyānām* JFF.

〈37〉 tad-anujendrarāja-nandanas • The text is incorrect here; see the note to the translation. The parallel in line 30 of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya correctly reads *tad-anujendrarājas*, while that in line 33 of the Kalidiṇḍi grant includes the characters *nandana*, but they are probably marked for deletion with an editorial mark. — 〈37〉 dinān¿ī?〈i〉 ◇ *dināni* JFF.

〈39〉 uc¿v?〈c〉āṭya ◇ *uccāṭya* JFF.

〈41〉 -nare(n)dra- • The body part may have been mistaken for *d* by the scribe, but reading *ndra* is easily possible. Compare *ekādna* in line 19 with a definite *d*, and an unambiguous *nd* conjunct in line 26. — 〈41〉 -viṣṇuvarddha¿ṇ?〈n〉(o) ◇ *-viṣṇuvarddhano* JFF. — 〈41〉 〈'〉dhyarddha- ◇ *'dhya-arddha-* JFF • Probably a typo in Fleet.

〈42〉 cāl¿ū?〈u〉〈43〉ky¿ā?〈a〉- ◇ *cālu〈43〉ky¿ā?〈a〉-* JFF.

〈45〉 ¿t?〈s〉apta ◇ *sapta* JFF.

〈46〉 〈'〉¿db?〈bd〉āN ◇ *bdā(N)* JFF. — 〈46〉 nir¿g?〈d〉dhāṭya ◇ *nirg¿v?〈gh〉ātya* JFF • The dental *t* in Fleet's reading is probably a typo. The word *nirddhāṭya* is attested in a similar context in line 30 of the Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman. — 〈46〉 dha〈47〉r¿u?〈a〉ṇ¿i?〈ī〉(M) ◇ *dha〈47〉¿ruṇira?* JFF • Fleet offers no solution for this problematic locus. I emend tentatively, but I think the character Fleet read as *ra* can pass for a final *M*, providing an object to the verb *abhunak*. I assume that this sentence was meant to be in *anuṣṭubh*; it certainly belongs semantically with the preceding half-stanza in that metre. The loose parallel Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman, in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre, has *sannaddhaṁ yudhi yuddhamallam avaner nnirddhāṭya dhāṭyāharat*, so it is also possible that *dharaṇeḥ* or *dhāriṇeḥ* was meant here in parallel to *avaner*; but this seems less likely since we have no verb parallelling *aharat* here.

〈47〉 〈ta?〉(t)-sut(o) 〈'〉mma- ◇ *sutāmma-* JFF • I am quite certain that the first character of this sequence is *tsu*, not *su*. If so, then given the preceding scribal blunders (for which see the previous note), an omitted character is not unlikely, and the restoration *tat-suto* is very plausible. It is also possible that more than one character was omitted, and the composer's intent had been *atha tat-suto*, which would perhaps explain the *ra* at the end of the previous locus. Further on, I am also uncertain about *to*, but there seems to be a faint indication of *o* rather than *ā* in the BnF specimen of Elliot's rubbing. If this is incorrect, I still prefer emendation to *-suto 'mma-*, though *-sutāmma-* is also acceptable. — 〈47〉 kṣmāṁ paṁc¿i?〈a〉-viṁś¿i?〈a〉ti- ◇ *kṣmāṁ paṁca-viṁśatiṁ* JFF • In addition to the erroneous *i* markers, which Fleet does not note, all the *anusvāras* in this string may be subsequent additions. They are above the consonants rather than occupying horizontal space to the right. I do not see an *anusvāra* at the end of this segment. — 〈47〉 -varṣ⟦a⟧〈〈(ā)〉〉ṇy (a)pā¿ta?〈T〉 ◇ *varṣ¿a?〈ā〉ṇy ¿ā?〈a〉pā¿ta?〈T〉* JFF • I think what Fleet sees as a superfluous vowel marker in *ṇyā* is in fact a subsequently added *ā* attached to the end of the repha of the preceding *rṣa*.

〈48〉 〈'〉bhunag bhuvaṁ • According to Fleet, *g* was at first omitted, and later added on top of the following *bhu*. The arrangement of the glyph is indeed strange, with *g* rather resembling an *i* marker, but I am not at all sure this is a subsequent correction; instead, it is probably just a way to conserve vertical space. Compare line 71 below. The *anusvāra*,

if that is what it is, is placed almost as low as the baseline. — 〈48〉 lab(dhu){i}m ◇ *labnim* JFF • According to Fleet, a word such as *vinā* is expected here. We now know from parallels that the expected word is *labdhum*, and I think the subscript component of this character was in fact meant for *dhu*, not a subscript *n* (compare *baddhum* in line 60). It is also possible that a less ambiguous pre-drawn *dhu* has been mistakenly engraved as *n*. However, a superfluous *i* is definitely present and does not at all seem to have been deleted. Nonetheless, *dhu* may perhaps be a subsequent addition. In addition, there seems to be a short stroke cancelled by a series of hatches below the *ma* at the end of this word. This is clear in Fleet's estampage, but not in Elliot's BnF rubbing. — 〈48〉 anāyikā{(ḷ)} ◇ *anāyikāṁ* JFF • The superfluous (visarga) (or *anusvāra* according to Fleet) may be a scribal mistake for a punctuation mark.

〈49〉 cacā¿v?〈r〉eva ◇ *cac〈ch〉āveva* JFF. — 〈49〉 kṣamā ◇ *kṣamā〈ṁ〉* JFF. — 〈49〉 dānārṇṇavāj ◇ *dānār¿nn?〈ṇṇ〉avāj* JFF. — 〈49〉 cāluky¿ā?〈a〉- ◇ *cālukya-* JFF • The *ā* marker is clear in Fleet's estampage, though it isn't in Elliot's BnF rubbing. Given its narrowness, it may be an incorrect correction in the original.

〈50〉 satye pratiṣṭhitā lokā • Possibly citing the *Mahābhārata* 13,150.009d@020_0379, *satye pratiṣṭhitā lokā dharmaḥ satye pratiṣṭhitaḥ* or 05,043.019d*0266_09, *satyātmā bhava rājendra satye lokāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ*; or *Rāmāyaṇa* 2.101.010c, *tasmāt satyātmakaṁ rājyaṁ satye lokaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ*. Compare also *Aṅgirasasmṛti*, 2.3.2, *bhūr bhuvaḥ svas trayo lokās te 'pi satye pratiṣṭhitāḥ*

〈51〉 saty(a)-rāj(e) • I accept Fleet's reading because I see no other way to make sense of the text. Fleet prints the vowels as clear, but the estampages look rather like *satye rājo*, with some damage at the possible vowel mark of *je*.

〈52〉 tata⟦(syā?)⟧〈〈(s tasyā)〉〉nujo ◇ *tatas tasyānujo* JFF • Again, Fleet's reading probably matches the composer's intention. The text itself appears to have been corrected and there are several superfluous strokes and others that are strangely placed. The subscript *y* of the post-correction *syā* is a tiny closed loop, and its *ā* is to the left of the right limb of *s*. These two characters are narrow and closely spaced. Most probably, an initial *syā* has been corrected to *stasyā*. — 〈52〉 vi(j)¿(ā)?〈a〉〈53〉y¿i?〈ī〉 ◇ *vija〈53〉y¿i?〈ī〉* JFF.

〈53〉 ripūN ◇ *ripū〈N〉* JFF.

〈55〉 ma(ra) • This *ra* may perhaps be *va*, or corrected from *va*. — 〈55〉 samā(śi)śriyaN ◇ *samaśiśriyaN* JFF • Fleet's unmetrical *a* is probably a typo. *śi* has been probably corrected from something else; in Elliot's BnF estampage it looks like *śī* with noise to the right and below, while in Fleet's estampage it resembles *ś* with both *i* and *u*.

〈57〉 -paṭal¿(ā)?〈a〉- ◇ *-paṭala-* JFF • There is either an *ā* marker or a superfluous punctuation mark here. — 〈57〉 -nr̥patir nnr̥pa- ◇ *-nr̥patir nr̥pa-* JFF • Fleet's omission of the second *n* is probably a typo. The superscript *r* is discernible in Elliot's BnF estampage, but not in Fleet's.

〈58〉 da{ṁ}〈r〉(pī?){ṁ} ◇ *daṁbaṁ* JFF • Fleet offers no comment for his reading, which I am unable to interpret. The character he reads as *ba* may be *pī* (compare *Api* in line 55 above and a probable pre-correction *pvī* at the end of the present line), and there is at least one superfluous *anusvāra* in the next word (which Fleet does not read). Nonetheless, my reading is tentative and my emendation is quite invasive; the composer may have had something different in mind. The *p* is doubled in *darppeṇa* in line 60. — 〈58〉 pra{ṁ}caṁḍa- ◇ *pracaṁḍa-* JFF. — 〈58〉 catu〈59〉r-aṁbu- ◇ *ca pa〈59〉¿ra?〈yo〉ṁbu-* JFF • The reading is quite clear in both estampages, and confirmed by the parallel stanza 20 of the Kalidiṇḍi grant.

〈61〉 kūṁdavām ◇ *kūṁdavāṁ* JFF. — 〈61〉 Upāyata kr̥ta-kr̥° • These characters are small and densely written. Probably a correction over shorter text, but there are no discernible traces of the pre-correction text.

〈62〉 -vikramā(T) ◇ *-vikramā¿ta?〈T〉* JFF • The last character may be *ta* corrected to *T*; it has the left-hand part of the headmark, but the right-hand part is definitely extented as for *T*.

〈63〉 Iva • The last character looks rather like *vā*, especially in Fleet's estampage. I assume the apparent vowel marker is just the fold at the edge of the plate.

〈64〉 kuṁdavāyāś ◇ *kūṁdavāyāś* JFF • The spelling of the name is *kūṁdavā* in line 61 above, but *kuṁdavā* here. — 〈64〉 -rāj¿ā?〈a〉rāj(o) ◇ *-rājarājo* JFF • The final *jo* may be a correction from something else, or just distorted so as not to interfere with the descender of *nma* in the previous line. — 〈64〉 -aṁbhodhi- ◇ *-aṁbodhi-* JFF • Typo in Fleet.

〈65〉 -lakṣmī(ṁ?) • Fleet prints the expected *anusvāra* as clear, but there is nothing here in his estampage. There are several faint dots, one below the other, in Elliot's BnF rubbing, any or none of which may be an *anusvāra*.

〈66〉 -¿p?〈d〉vitīya- ◇ *-dvitīya-* JFF. — 〈66〉 -di{va}vasottara- • The first *va* is stunted, squeezed in below *vyāḥ* in the previous line. The engraver probably decided it was not good enough (perhaps because it looks like *ra*) and re-engraved it, but there is no visible indication that the first has been deleted.

〈67〉 samābaṁdhi ◇ *sam¿ā?〈a〉baṁdhi* JFF • I do not think Fleet's emendation is neces-

sary. — 〈67〉 -bhāra〈68〉ṁ • The *anusvāra* at the beginning of line 68 is not visible in Fleet's estampage, but quite clear in Elliot's BnF rubbing.

〈68〉 rakṣat{r}y avarggaṁ ◇ *rakṣaty avarggaṁ* JFF • Fleet's reading/interpretation is probably correct, but it requires emending a clearly present superfluous *r*.

〈71〉 (bh)āti • Fleet prints *bh* as clear, but it is far from unambiguous. It may have been corrected from something else, perhaps *ś*. — 〈71〉 dig-devatānān • As in line 48 above (but not noted here by Fleet), *g* is inscribed on top of *d*, so that it looks like an *i* marker except that there is an additional *e* marker above. The *g* does not seem to be a subsequent addition, but perhaps *di* was initially engraved and then re-conceived into *gde*.

〈75〉 -mahārāj¿a?〈ā〉dhirāja- ◇ *-mahārājādhirāja-* JFF. — 〈75〉 -bhaṭṭ¿a?〈ā〉raka(ḥ) ◇ *-bhaṭṭ¿a?〈ā〉raka-* JFF.

〈77〉 guddavādi- ◇ *guddavā¿d?〈ḍ〉i-* JFF.

〈78〉 ā〈79〉dhyak(ṣ)am ◇ *ā〈79〉dhyakṣ¿am?〈ān〉* JFF • Fleet's emendation is probably unwarranted.

〈79〉 it〈y〉 ādiśati • Fleet is probably correct in not reading an original *y* here. None is visible in his estampage, but in Elliot's rubbings, there is something below *t* that may be a subscript *y*. However, if this were so, the *ā* ought to be attached to the ascender of that stroke, which is not the case. Below and slightly to the left of *śa*, there is a curved stroke resembling the lower component of *ai* or an *e* attached at the bottom. Fleet does not remark on it and I cannot interpret it as anything other than an accidental stroke that is not relevant to this line or the next (where it is above the characters *bhava*). — 〈79〉 Ādy-aṁtātyaṁta- • I wonder if perhaps the composer intended *Ādyo 'ṁtātyaṁta-* here; the text as received is hard to interpret sensibly. See the note to the translation.

〈80〉 ve¿th?〈dh〉āḥ • In Fleet's estampage, this word looks like the expected *vedhāḥ*, but in Elliot's rubbings the second character is clearly *thā*. — 〈80〉 tasya ◇ *tasyā* JFF • Probably a typo in Fleet.

〈82〉 vvi{dh(ū)}(dhau)tāṁghaso ◇ *vvidh¿ūṣo?〈au〉tāṁghaso* JFF • The first problematic character may be *dhyā* or *dhyā* corrected to *dhū*. I believe this character was meant to be deleted (though there is no sign of this), and *dhau* was re-engraved to its right, though it does look rather like *ṣo*, as read by Fleet.

〈84〉 saḥ ◇ *sa{ṁ}* JFF.

〈85〉 upāyac¿c?〈ch〉ata mākavākhyāṁ ◇ *upāyac catamākavākhyāṁ* JFF • I cannot inter-

pret Fleet's segmentation, but his capitalisation shows that he took Catamākavā to be the name.

〈86〉 cī{ṁ}ḍamāryyaḥ ◇ *cīḍamāryyaḥ* JFF.

〈87〉 -¿ṣ?〈ph〉ala- ◇ *-¿p?〈ph〉ala-* JFF.

〈88〉 ās¿v?〈p〉adaṁ ◇ *āspadaṁ* JFF.

〈89〉 s¿o?〈e〉vitvā ◇ *sovitvā* JFF. — 〈89〉 paṭhatāṁ ◇ *paratāṁ* JFF.

〈91〉 -vyāv¿a?〈ṛ〉ttyā ◇ *-vyav¿a?〈ṛ〉ttyā* JFF • Probably a typo in Fleet. — 〈91〉 krama- ◇ *kṣama-* JFF. — 〈91〉 -ju¡¿gh-g?〈g-gh〉!〈ḍ-gh〉oṣaṇais • Fleet does not comment on this word. The reading is clear. I assume that *gh-g* erroneously stands for *g-gh*, which in turn is non-standard sandhi for *ḍ-gh*.

〈92〉 -〈d〉ām(ai)ś ◇ *-dāmaiś* JFF • I see no subscript *d* (compare *dūrataḥ* later in the line), and find the word very difficult to interpret (see the translation). I am unable to suggest a better restoration or emendation. If the lower component of *ai* is present, it is mostly lost in the crease at the rim of the plate. — 〈92〉 〈d〉¿(u)ā?〈ū〉rataḥ • Fleet is probably correct in reading a combined *u* and *ā* here (compare lines 77 and 78), but the *u* marker is not visible at all in his estampage and very uncertain in Elliot's rubbings.

〈93〉 tasm¿e?〈ai〉 ◇ *tasmai* JFF. — 〈93〉 samasta- • Fleet comments that "This passage is *Gadya*, or rhythmical and alliterative prose." It seems to me that with end-rhymes and initial or second-syllable alliteration for every pair of lines, coupled with almost fully consistent punctuation, the passage must be some kind of verse. I am not sure whether *tasmai* is part of the verse, but my intuition is that it is not. — 〈93〉 -viśeṣa-guṇā{ṁ}ya ◇ *-viśeṣa{sa}ṇāya* JFF • Here and several more times in the following lines, *gu* looks almost identical to *sa*. Apart from the fact that the text is hard to interpret with *sa*, it seems to me that instances of *gu* do have a small notch in the line where the right leg of *g* joins the *u* marker, whereas the upward bend of the right leg of *sa* is normally a smooth curve (though a similar notch is occasionally present).

〈94〉 -pr¿e?〈a〉ti¡(cha)!〈ccha〉ndāya ◇ *-pr¿e?〈a〉ticand〈r〉āya* JFF • The character Fleet reads as *ca* is markedly different from *ca* earlier on, as well as from that in line 95 (which, too, is different from earlier *ca*-s, as its headmark is attached to the right-hand component of the body and thus looks much like *bha*). I am quite certain it was intended for *cha*, which in turn is non-standard spelling for *ccha*, yielding without emendation a word that fits the context better than Fleet's emended reading and rhymes better with *ānandāya*.

〈95〉 -gurutva- ◇ *-sara〈la〉tva-* JFF • The second character is definitely *ru*, not *ra*, so the first must be *gu*. See also line 93 above.

〈96〉 -s(th)a(g)ita- ◇ *-svasita-* JFF • There is an extra stroke on the right-hand side of *gi* that makes it resemble *si*, but since the subscript *th* of *stha* is quite clear in Elliot's BnF rubbing (though not in Fleet's estampage), I am confident of my reading. — 〈96〉 -bhṛ(gu)- ◇ *-bhṛ¿s?〈ś〉a-* JFF • See also lines 93 and 95 above. — 〈96〉 -su(kha)dābhūta- • The character read as *kha* has a horizontal stroke attached to its top, but it is not *khā*, which should have the vowel marker attached to the right limb (compare line 88). It could be a slightly misshapen *mo*, but there too the right-hand stroke of the vowel marker should be attached to the right limb.

〈98〉 -guṇāṁkāya ◇ *s〈v〉a¿ṇ?〈n〉ā〈mā〉ṁkāya* JFF • See also lines 93, 95 and 96 above. — 〈98〉 -m⟦ā⟧〈〈u〉〉ni- ◇ *-muni-* JFF • The text looks like *māni*, but has probably been corrected to *muni*, as read by Fleet. — 〈98〉 -bhāradvāja- ◇ *-bhāra{ṁ}dvāja-* JFF • There is definitely a dot next to *ra*, but it is smaller and closer to the character than an *anusvāra* would be, so I assume it is random noise.

〈100〉 -guṇa- ◇ *-saṇa-* JFF • See also lines 93, 95, 96 and 98 above.

〈102〉 vi¿ṇ?〈n〉odāy¿e?〈a〉 ◇ *vinodāy¿e?〈a〉* JFF.

〈103〉 -tāra〈ṁ〉 ◇ *-tāra〈kaṁ〉* JFF.

〈105〉 *saṁppa〈106〉(tan)iyayu* ◇ *saṁp{p}a〈106〉taniyayu* JFF • I do not know if Fleet is right to emend *pp* to *p*. He is probably correct in reading the second character of line 106 as *ni*, but *di* or *ṭi* may also be possible. The first character in line 107 is faint and poorly visible in the estampage. Given that this village is probably identical to Saṁpaniya listed in the Māviṇḍēṟu grant of Vijayāditya VII, this character may have been deleted.

〈106〉 *māvuṇḍeṭiyu* ◇ *māmaṇḍeṭiyu* JFF.

〈107〉 *-ḍo¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉g(la)* ◇ *°ḍo{ḥ}ggu* JFF • Not understanding the words, I emend tentatively. I think a superfluous *visarga* is less likely than one inscribed instead of *anusvāra*, and the last character looks like *gla* to me, though I cannot exclude *ggu* with the lower components flattened at the bottom edge of the plate. — 〈107〉 *ve(n)eṭiyu* JFF • I accept Fleet's reading, which he prints as clear, but there may be a subscript component to the character read as *ne*; it may perhaps be *nne* or *nde*.

〈108〉 *-ponbeḍuva(mu?) (kha?)lmeṇḍikāliyu* ◇ *-ponbaḍuvayu khalmeṇḍikāliyu* JFF • The characters from *nbe* to *lme* are narrow and crowded (barely in the case of *nbe*, increasingly so afterward, and again barely in *lme*); some or all of these may be a correction

written over something else. The vowel of *nbe* is certain. There may be an *anusvāra* after *ḍu*, or that dot, at head height, may be a remnant of the pre-correction text. Fleet's *yu* is impossible; that character's body is probably *m*. The stroke below it may be *u* with a superfluous mark (left over from the pre-correction text?), but it looks rather like a subscript consonant (*p*? *v*?), and if it is, then the body may perhaps be *v*. I provisionally accept Fleet's *kha*, but if it is correct, then it is an earlier form of *kha* without the double neck normally drawn in late Eastern Cālukya plates including this one (e.g. lines 97 and 115). The character may perhaps be initial *E* (though it is different from the one at the end of this line) or *Ai*, or a poorly drawn *ve* or *le*.

〈109〉 *kaḍali(bh/c)āṭi* • As Fleet notes, *bhā* may be read as *cā*. The glyph is the form expected for *bh*, with a headmark on the right-hand leg where *c* should have its headmark on the left; however, *c* does look like this in l95, *caritrāya* and twice in line 110. — 〈109〉 vyās*¿a?*〈ā〉〈111〉di- ◇ *vyāsā*〈*111*〉*di-* JFF.

〈113〉 Ājñaptiḥ ◇ *Ājña{ṁ}ptiḥ* JFF • A small dot, visible in Elliot's rubbings though not in Fleet's estampage, is more likely to be noise than an *anusvāra*.

〈114〉 -bhīma〈na〉- ◇ *-bhīma-* JFF • The emendation restores the verse (which Fleet saw as prose) and aligns the name with that found in the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya (and probably also in the Kalidiṇḍi grant of Rājarāja I). — 〈114〉 *¿be?*〈po〉tan-abha*¿j?*〈ṭṭ〉aḥ ◇ *cetanabha¿j?*〈*ṭṭ*〉*aḥ* JFF.

Translation

Plates

1.

From the lotus in the navel of the great Lord Nārāyaṇa, the supreme person and the abode of Śrī, there arose (Brahmā,) the self-born creator of the world. From him was born a son of the mind called Atri, and from that sage Atri 〈was born〉 the founder of a dynasty: the Moon (*soma*) whose rays are nectar and who is the turban jewel of Śrīkaṇṭha (Śiva).

2.

From that nectar-yielding one there came into being Mercury (*budha*), praised by the wise (*budha*), 〈and〉 from him was born the valiant universal sovereign (*cakravartin*) named Purūravas.

〈4–9〉 From him 〈was born〉 Āyus. From Āyus, Nahuṣa. From him, the universal

sovereign and dynastic father Yayāti. From him, the universal sovereign called Puru. From him, Janamejaya, performer of three Aśvamedha (sacrifices). From him, Prācīśa. From him, Sainyayāti. From him, Hayapati. From him, Sārvabhauma. From him, Jayasena. From him, Mahābhauma. From him, Aiśānaka. From him, Krodhānana. From him, Devaki. From Devaki, Ṛbhuka. From him, Ṛkṣaka. From him, Mativara, performer of a Sattra sacrifice and Lord of the River Sarasvatī. From him, Kātyāyana. From Kātyāyana, Nīla. From him, Duṣyanta. From him—

〈9〉 〈What follows is〉 moraic verse.

3.

—〈the one〉 who, because he unceasingly dug down one sacrificial post (*yūpa*) after another on the banks of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā and also performed Aśvamedhas, obtained the name "Bharata of the Great Sacrifices."[1]

〈11–14〉 From that Bharata 〈was born〉 Bhūmanyu. From him, Suhotra. From him, Hastin. From him, Virocana. From him, Ajamīla. From him, Saṁvaraṇa. 〈The son〉 of him and of Tapatī, the daughter of Tapana, 〈was〉 Sudhanvan. From him 〈was born〉 Parikṣit. From him, Bhīmasena. From him, Pradīpana. From him, Śantanu. From him, Vicitravīrya. From him, King Pāṇḍu. Then—

〈14〉 〈What follows is〉 moraic verse.

4.

He in turn had five sons—(Yudhiṣṭhira) the son of Dharma, Bhīma, Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadeva—who were to obtain the kingdom (*viṣaya*) like the five senses {which grasp the sense-objects (*viṣaya*)}.

5.

The masterful wielder of the Gāṇḍīva (bow) who, after vanquishing (Indra) the thunderbolt-bearer, burned the Khāṇḍava (forest); who obtained the Pāśupata weapon in combat from (Śiva) the enemy of Andhaka; who, after slaying many Daityas such as Kālikeya, victoriously ascended to share a throne with Indra; who with abandon cut down the forest that was the dynasty of the Kurus—

〈17–21〉 —from that Arjuna 〈was born〉 Abhimanyu. From him, Parikṣit. From him, Janamejaya. From him, Kṣemuka. From him, Naravāhana. From him, Śatānīka. From

[1]The stanza without emendation (see the apparatus entry on line 10) does not permit the interpretation that he performed the great sacrifice Aśvamedha and obtained the name Bharata, which seems to have been the interpretation preferred by Fleet as well as by Hultzsch's translation of the parallel cited in the apparatus. In my opinion the word *nāma* must in any case be construed as the object of *alabhata*.

him, Udayana. Thereafter, when sixty-less-one universal sovereigns beginning with him (Udayana) ⟨had passed⟩ in uninterrupted succession, ⟨each⟩ seated on the throne of Ayodhyā, a king of their dynasty named Vijayāditya marched to Dakṣiṇāpatha ⟨driven⟩ by a desire to conquer. He challenged Trilocana Pallava and, by an ill turn of fate, passed to the otherworld.

⟨21–30⟩ In the midst of that tribulation, his pregnant chief queen, along with several ladies of the harem (*antaḥpura*) and the chamberlains (*kañcukin*), went with their chaplain (*purohita*) to a Brahmanical settlement (*agrahāra*) named Muḍivemu, and ⟨there⟩ gave birth to her son Viṣṇuvardhana while under the protection of its resident the soma-sacrificer Viṣṇubhaṭṭa, ⟨who cherished her⟩ as if she were his own daughter. She raised that boychild, arranging for the performance of the ceremonies traditionally applicable to his bilateral *gotra*, ⟨namely⟩ being of the Mānavya *gotra* and a son of Hārīti.[2] He in turn, when her mother had told him the story, went forth to Mount Calukya and worshipped Nandā, ⟨who is⟩ the goddess Gaurī, and also appeased Kumāra, Nārāyaṇa and the band of Mothers. Having ⟨thereby⟩ recovered the hereditary paraphernalia of sovereignty belonging to his family, as though they had been deposited (with these deities for safekeeping)—⟨namely,⟩ the white parasol, the one conch shell, the five great sounds[3], the pennant garland (*pāli-ketana*), the ¿inverted drum? (*pratiḍhakkā*)[4], the Boar emblem, the peacock fan (*piṁcha*), the lance (*kunta*), the lion throne, the *makara* archway, the golden sceptre, the Gaṅgā and Yamunā and so forth—and having conquered the kings of the Kaḍambas, Gaṅgas and so on, he reigned over Dakṣiṇāpatha (extending) from (Rāma's) bridge to the Narmadā (and comprising) seven and a half lakhs (of villages?).

⟨30⟩ ⟨What follows is a⟩ *śloka*.

6.

The son of that King Viṣṇuvardhana and his chief queen born of the Pallava dynasty was Vijayāditya.

⟨31⟩ His son was Polakeśi Vallabha. His son was Kīrtivarman. His son—

[2]In some parallel versions of this story (the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya and the Kalidiṇḍi grant of Rājarāja I), the ceremonies are described differently, without the claim of a double *gotra*. The two text versions are very close as far as the sequence of letters is concerned, so one is clearly derived from the other; but it is not clear which is the earlier.

[3]The expression *pañca-mahāśabda* probably refers to being honoured by the sound of five musical instruments, but may also mean five titles beginning with "great". See Fleet 1888, pp. 296–298, n. 9 for a discussion.

[4]Some Cālukya grants use the words *paḍa-ḍhakkā* and *daḍakkā* in similar contexts. See the Cheruvu Madhavaram plates of Kali Viṣṇuvardhana V and the commentary thereto.

〈31–46〉 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 Hārītī, 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 enemy territories 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 protected (*pāl-*) the country of Veṅgī for eighteen years. His son Jayasiṁha Vallabha (I), for thirty-three. The son of his younger brother Indrarāja (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka), for seven days.[5] His son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine years. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasiṁha (II), for thirteen. His 〈brother〉 of inferior birth, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning him, his eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven years. His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), for thirty-six. His son Vijayāditya (II) Narendramṛgarāja, for eight and forty. His son Kali-Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His son Guṇaga Vijayāditya (III), for forty-four. The son of his younger brother King (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya, Cālukya-Bhīma, for thirty. His son Kollabigaṇḍa Vijayāditya (IV), for six months. His son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. After dethroning his son the child Vijayāditya (V), Tāḍapa, for one month. After defeating him, Cālukya-Bhīma's son Vikramāditya (II), for eleven months. 〈Then〉 that King (*rājan*) Tāḍapa's son Yuddhamalla, for seven years.

7.

Ammarāja's younger brother, Rāja-Bhīma (II), ruled the earth for twelve years after dislodging that Yuddhamalla by a raid in battle.

〈47〉 His son King Amma (II) protected the earth for twenty-five years.

8.

King Amma's brother by a different mother, known as Dānārṇava and versed in the sixty-four arts, ruled the earth for three years.

9.

Thereafter the earth, 〈left〉 without a leader, seemed for twenty-seven years to be performing austerities to obtain a suitable husband.

10.

[5]The text errs here; Indrarāja was Jayasiṁha's younger brother and not the younger brother's son. The error probably crept in from versions of the king list that do not mention Indrarāja's brief reign and introduce him only as the father of Viṣṇuvardhana II. See also the apparatus to 37.

Then there was a king (*rājan*), a ⟨veritable⟩ Moon of the Cālukyas (*cālukya-candra*) (Śaktivarman)—born of Dānārṇava, endowed with the arts {possessing digits}—who dispelled the suffering of the earth with his soft hands {with his pleasant rays}.

11.

"The worlds are upheld by Truth"—this dictum ⟨was proven⟩ true because he, the King of Truth, the shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), upheld the universe.

12.

Having destroyed his antagonists, he protected the circle of the earth fairly for twelve years, ⟨following⟩ the just path ⟨along⟩ with the kings of old.

13.

Then his younger brother named Vimalāditya took up sovereignty over the circle of the earth after he, the conqueror, conquered his enemies.

14.

Unable to bear the burning of his blazing valour, his enemies hurriedly fled willy-nilly in fear into the jungle and the ocean. Being scorched even there by him—the same ⟨though appearing⟩ in the role of wildfire and the (submarine) Fire of Aurva—they ⟨finally⟩ took shelter in the copious shade of the celestial tree of ⟨his⟩ auspicious feet.

⟨55⟩ On the other hand,

15.

In the (Coḻa) lineage of the Sun ⟨was born one⟩ comparable in puissance to (Indra) the Lord of the Gods, who shone in this world as His Majesty Rājarāja: a lord whose footstool was incarnadined by a veil of light from the gems atop the diadems of all rulers of men.

16.

From him was born King Rājendra Coḍa, a proud universal sovereign among kings who with his expansive reputation surmounted the glory of ⟨other⟩ kings, and who infused the flood of the Immortal River (Ganges) with the rut fluid seeping from the cheeks of his elephants, terrifying in their rage.

17.

He who, after effortlessly conquering, with a mere stick {with no other means than his army}, the all-supporting earth whose moats are the four oceans, along with the

islands,[6] erected in every direction victory pillars marked with his name to dispel the illusion of independent supremacy (of other rulers), as if (erecting) pickets to bind the elephants of the quarters, their minds blinded by pride.

18.

That Vimalāditya, having accomplished his aims and being worthy of people's praise, married his (Rājendra Coḻa's) younger sister, the beautiful Great Queen Kūṁdavā, who was appropriate (for him).

19.

Thanks to the valour of his arms, he, the equal of the seven-horsed (sun), protected the wide earth, girt by oceans, fairly for seven years.

20.

Now from that illustrious King Vimalāditya and from Queen Kuṁdavā, whose body was fashioned as if she were the Royal Fortune of the Coḍa kings, was born the crest jewel of the Cālukyas: His Majesty Rājarāja (I), the king ⟨produced from⟩ the majestic ocean that is the Dynasty of the Moon who seized the Royal Fortune of the Earth, whom ⟨only the most⟩ resplendent warriors (*rājanya*) may approach.

21.

He was anointed to protect the earth when the Śaka years were positioned as the Vedas (4), oceans (4) and treasures (9) (i.e. Śaka 944), when the Sun was in Leo (*siṁha*), in the Uttara-Bhadrikā ⟨lunar asterism⟩ on the dark (*kṛṣṇa*) ⟨fortnight's⟩ second day, on Thursday, under the excellent ascendant of Libra (*vaṇij*).

22.

His head was bound by the great turban (of royalty), raised by the populace in order to bear the burden of the earth for a long time.[7]

23.

While he of extensive power, who has annihilated the host of enemies, protects the earth ¿without partiality?, his subjects—rid of droughts, bandits and disease—attain the group of three (aims) (*trivarga*) along with its fruits.

[6] Venkataramanayya (1951–1952, p. 60) opines that the almost identical stanza 20 of the Kalidiṇḍi grant refers to Rājendra Coḻa's overseas conquests. This is probably indeed correct.

[7] I do not understand the implication of this stanza. Compare the slightly different version in stanza 17 of the Kalidiṇḍi grant. Could the point of both (or at least of a hypothetical model from which both are distorted) be a comparison of the royal turban to the head padding worn by labourers who carry loads on their heads?

24.

His {verdant} youthful, ⟨but⟩ by no means frail, reputation seems to spread the grandeur of a canopy of varied colours over the deities of the directions, being since birth {reddened by} fond of countless virtues such as heroism, munificence and honour; being {exceedingly black} greater than Kṛṣṇa through ⟨his⟩ famous greatness; being {white} bright as the moon; being {yellow} imbibed happily by a host of good men through their ears resembling hands held to receive alms.[8]

25.

The founders of his parents' dynasties were verily the Sun and the Moon: the two Eyes of the World, the gods who dispel darkness with their scintillating brilliance. The emblem of his reign became the Original Boar form of Viṣṇu, which could playfully lift the great circle of the entire earth on the tip of its tusk.

⟨75–79⟩ That shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), the supremely pious Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*), Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*), His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana (Rājarāja I), who was deliberately appointed (as heir) by his mother and father, who acquired the insignia of sovereignty from the grace of Caṇḍikā, seated on his throne of generosity, convokes all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Guddavādi district (*viṣaya*) and, witnessed by those ⟨officials⟩ headed by the minister (*mantrin*), the chaplain (*purohita*), the general (*senāpati*), the crown prince (*yuvarāja*) and the gate guard (*dauvārika*), commands ⟨them⟩ as follows.

26.

¿From ⟨the one who is⟩ infinitely far from beginning and end? was born Brahmā,[9] the cause of the birth of the light of the worlds and the substrate (*dhāman*) of ⟨all⟩ creatures. Then from him came into being the demiurge (*vedhas*) named Kaśyapa. From him came into being Bhāradvāja, a sage of great austerity. In his sacred lineage (*gotra*),

[8]The central idea of this stanza is certainly that Rājarāja's reputation is of many colours, which are expressed in bitextual understandings of words that the reader would first understand in a different sense. Since reputation (*kīrti*) is often compared to a creeper, I believe the simile also involves a plant. This is perhaps implied by the word *abhinavā* (youthful, verdant); also compare stanza 6 of the Māṁgallu grant of Dānārṇava for a similar idea. However, the vegetable connection may not have been present in the composer's mind, and Rājarāja's reputation may be pictured as an actual canopy or awning spread over all quarters of the horizon. This latter image is expressed in much simpler terms in line 9 of the Cipḷūṇ plates of Pulakeśin II.

[9]Since Brahmā himself should not be infinitely far from beginning and end, the only way I can make sense of the received text is to assume that *ādy-antātyanta-dūra* refers to Viṣṇu as transcending the duality of beginning and end. Compare stanza 1. Alternatively, the text may need emendation (see the apparatus to line 79) to mean, "Infinitely far from the end, there was born the original cause..."

and within that in the school (*sūtra*) of Āpastaṁba, in due course arose Cīḍamārya, a storehouse of Vedic learning.

27.

Of that prudent one, whose brilliance was praised by kings and whose sin had been washed off by well-endowed sacrifices, was born a son named Yajña: correct in conduct, accomplished, familiar with the conclusions of all Vedas and *śāstra*s, intelligent, always nourishing his relatives, a repository of knowledge, and in his knowledge of polity (*nīti*) an earthly peer of Bṛhaspati and Śukra.[10]

28.

As Vasiṣṭha, that most excellent of the wise, 〈married〉 Arundhatī, the warder-off of faults, so did he 〈Yajña〉, comparable in appearance 〈to Vasiṣṭha?〉, marry the suitable virtuous lady named Amākavā.

29.

The son of these two, as the Sun 〈is the son of〉 Aditi and Kaśyapa, is the {bright} and most venerable Cīḍamārya, who literally dispels darkness and with his multitude of rays—〈which were in fact〉 all the sacred texts of the Vedas and *śāstra*s—awakens the lotuses that were the faces of his disciples.

30.

Distinguished Brahmins {excellent birds} abide happily attending {perching} on this wishing-tree among priests, who is attractive on account of always providing the desired outcome {which is pleasant and always provides the desired fruits}; who is the dwelling place of riches {which is the dwelling place of Lakṣmī}; who bears the office of teacherhood {which bears dignity}; who is endowed with the branches 〈of Vedic learning〉 and is full of excellent, awakened intellect {which possesses branches full of blooming flowers}; who is ever praised by the learned who rely on his series of commentaries {by the gods who resort to the expanse of its shade}.

31.

His house shines permanently, driving far away the foulness of the Kali 〈age〉 all around, since it is furnished day and night with the auspicious chants of reciting pupils which display adeptness, never deviating from the 〈proper〉 sequence in the *krama* and

[10] *Guru* is a common appellation of Bṛhaspati, while the word *jña* is attested as a name of the planet Venus, i.e. Śukra. Bṛhaspati and Śukra are authorities on *nīti*, often conceived of as the political advisors of the gods and demons respectively.

pada ⟨recitation⟩ thanks to their sharp discernment, as well as with ¿the pleasantly emanating garlands of? *svāhā* ⟨cries⟩ uttered in the course of sacrifice.[11]

⟨93–103⟩ To him—

- who surpasses the entire populace in virtue,
- who thoroughly pleases the host of kings and gods with riches
- who is a very likeness of the moon to the ocean of his priestly lineage,
- who delights in a celebrity acknowledged by the learned society,
- who has since his birth proclaimed the essence of the Vedas' purport,
- whose inherent character resides in the dwelling of a true mind,
- whose conduct is held dear on account of his accumulated dignity,
- whose rarefied intellect stuns Bṛhaspati and Śukra,[12]
- whose accomplished wisdom serves the purposes of his patron,
- whose pure mind censures all human failings,
- who continuously praises the feet of his lord,
- ¿whose excellent feet are themselves grantors of the joy of ⟨any⟩ conceived desire?,[13]
- from whom uncounted stains have departed with the smoke of oblations,
- whose hallmark is steadfast and brilliant virtue praised by the wise,
- who belongs to the Āpastamba *sūtra* praised by the entire host of sages,
- ¿⟨and⟩ within that?, to the celebrated Bhāradvāja *gotra*,[14]

[11] I find the entire stanza extremely awkward and hard to interpret. In general, I do not understand why the imagery of light is applied to sounds. The syntax is messy throughout; the composer may have had something slightly different in mind from what I make of it. Most particularly, I cannot make good sense of the words *-proccalad-dāmaiś-*, which is already an emended reading (see the apparatus to line 92) but may be in need of further emendation.

[12] *Jīva* is a name of Bṛhaspati in several astronomical works, and *bhṛguputra* means the planet Venus, i.e. Śukra, said to be a son of Bhṛgu.

[13] The reading of this item is quite certain, but I am far from sure what the composer had meant by it. I assume that *sukhadā-bhūta* is used for *sukhadī-bhūta* in accordance with the author's tendency to show off his knowledge of rare forms, and that the intended meaning is simply that he grants the wishes of those who seek his favours.

[14] I find the word *tatra* suspect here. The reading is entirely clear, but I find it strange that the *gotra* should be specified as a subset of the *sūtra*, and I see no other way to understanding *tatra* in the context. Also, this pair of lines (*sakala* and *tatra*) is one of only two pairs without alliteration (*prāsa*) at the beginning of the

- whose grandeur consists of pillar posts (*yūpa*) erected in sacrifices,
- who has attained a soul and body resembling the form of the sun,
- who is endowed with the good quality of truth ever beneficial to the populace,
- who is capable of implementing the aims desired by his lord,
- who is most clever in accomplishing the supreme human purpose (*puruṣārtha*),
- who is most excellent in observing meditation on the supreme lord,
- who with complete deliberateness amuses himself with all treatises on statecraft (*artha-śāstra*),
- whose feet resemble lotuses of outstanding tenderness—

32.

I (Rājarāja I), with water in the hand (for sanctification), have given the village named Korumelli, converted into a rent-free holding (*agrahāra*) at an eclipse of the moon. May it remain as long as the moon and stars. The nature of its boundaries shall now be told.

〈104–111〉 To the east, the border is the *kimaṭṭi-kāliya* of Kūḍakuniyyūru. To the south, the border is none other than the border of ¿(the villages) Vānapalli, Saṁppataniya and Māvuṇḍeṭi?. To the southwest, the border is that of Godāvari. To the west, the border is *būruvu-doṁgla*.[15] To the northwest, the border is none other than the border of ¿(the villages) Veneṭi and Māsara?. To the north, the border is *māsara-ponbeḍuvamu khalmeṇḍi-kāliyu*. To the northeast, the border is the *kaḍali-cāṭi* to the north of Eṟuvaṁka. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to his enjoyment of his rights) over it. He who does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins. So too has a multitude of great sages beginning with the reverend Vyāsa said:

33.

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

34.

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.

---

line (the other being the first pair in the poem). It is thus possible that a word has been omitted or gravely corrupted here.

[15] Could this mean a hollow silk-cotton tree?

35.

The executor (*ājñapti*) is the Castellan (*kaṭakeśa*), Rāciya Pedderi's son named Bhīmana. The author of the verses is Potana Bhaṭṭa. The writer (*lekhaka*) of this 〈provision〉 is Gaṇḍācārya.

〈115–116〉 The annual income collectible from this village has been set by the king at twenty-five *niṣka*s 〈in coinage〉 and two hundred and fifty *khaṇḍaka*s of grain.

Commentary

The first plate is a palimpsest showing traces of 12 lines in a "somewhat older and squarer form of the same alphabet" (Fleet 1885, p. 49). None of this can be read. The first plate has raised rims on both sides, showing that it was recycled from an inner plate of an earlier set.

Bibliography

Reported only in ARIE 1962–63, p. 50, appendix A/1962-63, № 23 without further discussion. Edited from the original by J. F. Fleet (1885), with facsimiles but without translation (though with some parts translated in his discussion of the contents). According to Fleet, the text has been transcribed by Sir Walter Elliot in his *Telugu Sasanams*, vol. 1, p. 73ff (not traced). The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Fleet's edition with his facsimiles with inked rubbings in Sir Walter Elliot's collection.[16]. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[JFF] Fleet, John Faithfull. 1885. "Sanskrit and Old Canarese inscriptions, no. CLIII: Korumelli plates of Rajaraja II, after Saka 944." IA 14, pp. 48–55.

[16] Scans of these impressions were obtained by Emmanuel Francis from the Edinburgh University Library and the Bibliothèque nationale de France. Fleet's rubbing appears to have been taken after a cleaning of the plates, and is much better legible than the earlier Elliot rubbings. None of the three sets of facsimiles includes the seal, the text of which is given in Fleet's introduction to the edition. A drawing of the seal is published in *The Indian Antiquary*, volume 7 (1878), between pages 256 and 257.

Secondary

ARIE 1962–63. *Annual report on Indian epigraphy for 1962-63*. By G. S. Gai. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1967. Page 50, appendixes A/1962-63, item 23.

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

Gaur 1975, pp. 9–10, № Ind. Ch. 15