Kalidiṇḍi grant of Rājarāja I Narendra

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00079

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00079.xml

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

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final T (line 10) seems to be a ta without a headmark, perhaps slightly reduced in size; it may have a tail; the specimen in line 14 (employed to avoid the ligature tkṛ) definitely has one, looking much like a repha, while that in line 64 appears to be full-sized and may or may not have a tail. Final N (line 35) is a slightly reduced na with a short slanting tail in place of (or, in the second instance, perhaps in addition to) a headmark. Final Ṭ, used in line 36 to avoid the conjunct *ṭtr*, looks rather like ṭa, but the right-hand stroke of the headmark is straighter and longer than normal, so I believe it is a tail rather than part of a headmark.

Original punctuation marks are plain vertical strokes, usually short (sometimes barely more than a dot) and placed at a varying height, but occasionally, and without any apparent system, of the regular length (i.e. as tall, or nearly as tall, as character bodies), especially when doubled. The double bar in line 9 may have some ornamentation.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāras are placed after the character to which they belong, often at median height. They can be moved to the next line as at the beginning of line 13. Visarga is also moved to the next line in l52. There may be an editorial deletion mark in line 33, for which see the apparatus. Jihvāmūlīya occurs in line 42, shaped like a figure-8 (not an hourglass) that is placed inline like a separate

character (or like a visarga), not conjoined in a ligature to the following character (see also the apparatus). There is a probable initial ṝ in line 89, but the character is indistinct in the estampage and the reading is determined by the context. It may resemble ḷa in shape.

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 ✤

1. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

śrī-dh(āmnaḥ) p(uruṣo)t(ta)masya mahato nārāyaṇasya prabho(r)
nn(ā)bhī-paṁkaruhā(d babhū)va (jagatas sraṣṭā svayaṁ)〈2〉(bh)ūs tata(ḥ)
jajñ(e) mā(na)sa-sūnur atrir iti yas tasmān (mu)n(e)r atritas
s(o)mo vaṁśa-ka(ras su)dhā(ṁśu)r udita(ś śrīka)ṇṭha-cū〈3〉ḍāmaṇiḥ|

2. Anuṣṭubh

tasmād (a)bhūt s(u)dhā-s¿u?〈ū〉ter
bbudho budha-nutas tataḥ
jātaḥ purūra(vā) nāma
ca(kra)va(rt)t(ī sa-v)ikra〈4〉maḥ

tasmād āyus〈.〉 tato nahu(ṣa)ḥ〈.〉 tato yayātiḥ cakrava(r)ttī vaṁśa-ka(r)ttā〈.〉 tataḥ purur iti cakra(varttī)〈.〉 tato ja〈5〉name(ja)yo 〈’〉śvamedha-tritayasya ka(r)ttā〈.〉 tataḥ prācīśaḥ〈.〉 tasm¿a?〈ā〉t sainyayātiḥ〈.〉 tato hayapatiḥ〈.〉 tatas sārvvab-hau〈6〉maḥ〈.〉 tato jayasenaḥ〈.〉 tato mahābhaumaḥ〈.〉 tasmād aiśānakaḥ〈.〉 tataḥ krodhānanaḥ〈.〉 tato devakiḥ〈.〉 tasmād ṛbhu〈7〉kaḥ〈.〉 tasmād ṛ◯kṣakaḥ〈.〉 tato mativaraḥ satra-yāga-yājī sarasvatī-nadī-nā(thaḥ)〈.〉 tataḥ kātyāyanaḥ〈.〉〈8〉 tato (nīlaḥ)〈.〉 ◯ tato duṣyantaḥ〈.〉 tat-sutaḥ،

3. Anuṣṭubh

cakrava(r)ttī mahā-tejā
bharato yūpa-kānanaṁ,
kṛtvāśvamedh(ā)<9>n akarod
gaṁgā◯-yamunayos taṭe(||)

tato bharatād bhūmanyuḥ(,) tatas suhotraḥ, tato hastī, tato virocanaḥ<.><10> tasmād ajamīlaḥ, tatas saṁvaraṇaḥ, saṁvaraṇasya tapana-sutāyās tapatyāś ca sudhanvā, tataḥ parikṣiT,<11> tato bhīmasenaḥ, tataḥ pradīpanaḥ, tataḥ śantanuḥ, tato vicitravīryyaḥ, tataḥ pāṇḍ(u)-rājaḥ,,

4. Upagīti

putrās tasya yu<12>dh¡asth!<iṣṭh>ira-bhīmā(r)j(u)na-nakula-sahadevāḥ,
paṁceṁdriyavat paṁca s(y)u(r) vvi¿s?<ṣ>aya-grāhiṇas tatra,,

5. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

jitvā yena p¿ya?<u>ra<13>ṁdaraṁ h(u)ta¿n?<v>ah(e) havyī-kṛtaṁ ¿k?<kh>āṇḍavaṁ yaś śaṁbhor lla(bha)te sma saṁyati ba(hū)n(y) astr(ā)ṇi divyāni ca,
yenādhyāsita<14>m ā(sa)naṁ maghavataś cārddhaṁ sura-dveṣiṇaḥ
saṁpiṣyāgamayaT kṛtānta-nagarīṁ yaḥ k(au)ravān vidviṣaḥ,

tato <'>rjunā<15>d abhimanyuḥ, tataḥ par¡i!<ī>kṣiT, tato janamejayaḥ, tataḥ kṣemukaḥ, tato naravāhanaḥ, tataḥ śatānīkaḥ, tasmā<16>d (u)dayanaḥ, tataḥ paraṁ tat-(p)rabhṛtiṣv avicchinna-santāneṣv ayodhyā-siṁhāsanāsīneṣ(v) ekān(n)a-ṣaṣ(ṭ)i-cakravar(tt)i<Page 2r><17>(ṣu) gate¿s?<ṣ>u ta(d-vaṁśyo) vijayādityo nāma rājā (v)ijigī(ṣa)yā dakṣi(ṇā)pathaṁ gatvā tri(lo)ca(na)-pa(lla)<18>vam adh¿a?<i>kṣipya kāla-vaśāl lokāntaram agamaT

tasmin saṁkule (ta)sya mahādevī gar¡bhbh!a-bhārālasāntaḥpurādhi(k)ṛ<19>ta-vanitā-(k)aṁc¿ṛ?<u>ki{,}bhis sā(r)ddha(ṁ) vṛddhāmāt(yai)ḥ purohitena ca nīyamānā kathaṁcin m(u?)ḍivemu-nāmāgrāhāram upaga<20>mya tad-vāstavyena viṣṇubhaṭṭa-somayājinā duhitṛ-ni<r>¿n?<v>viśeṣam abhi¿g?<r>akṣitā satī naṁdanaṁ viṣṇuvard-dhanam as(ū)ta<.><21> sā tasya ca kumārasya mānavya-sagotra-hārīti-putrādi-sva-kṣatra-gotra-kramocitāni ka(r)mm(ā)¿n?<ṇ>i kārayitvā ta<22>m avarddhayaT,, sa ca mātrā vidita-vṛttāntas san nirggatya calukya-girau naṁdāṁ bhagavat¿i?<ī>ṁ gaur¿i?<ī>m ārādhya kumāra-nārāya<23>ṇa-mātṛ-gaṇāṁś ca saṁtarpya śvetāta-patr¿e?<ai>ka-¿g?<ś>aṁkha-paṁca-mahāśabda-pāliketana-pratiḍhakkā-varāha-lāṁcchana-piṁ<24>ccha-kuṁta-siṁhā◯sana-makara-toraṇa-kanaka-daṇḍa-gaṁgā-yamunādīni sva-k(u)la-kramāgatāni nikṣiptān¿i?<ī><25>va sāmrājya◯-cihnāni s¿ā?<a>māsādya trilocana-pallavaṁ jitvā tat-sutām uttamadānīm upaya<26>mya

kadaṁba◯-gaṁgādi-bhūmipān ni(r)jjitya setu-narmmadā-madhyaṁ sārddha-sapta-lakṣaṁ dakṣiṇāpathaṁ pāla〈27〉yām āsa,,

6. Anuṣṭubh

tasyāsīd vijayādityo
viṣṇuva(r)ddhana-bhūpateḥ,
pallavānvaya-jātāyā
mahādevyāś ca naṁdanaḥ,

ta〈28〉t-sūnuḥ pulakeśī vallabhaḥ, tat-(p)utraḥ kīrttivarmmā, tasya tanayaḥ,

śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstū(ya)māna-mā〈29〉navya-sagotrāṇāṁ hārīti-putr¿a?〈ā〉ṇāṁ kauś¿ī?〈i〉kī-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyānāṁ mātṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ svāmi-(ma)〈30〉hāsena-pādānudhyātānāṁ bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-varāha-lāṁccha(n)e(kṣ)aṇa-kṣaṇa-〈va〉(ś)ī(kṛ)〈31〉tārāti-maṇḍalānām aś-vamedhāvabhṛ¿t?〈th〉a-snāna-pavitrīkṛta-vapuṣā¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉 cālukyānāṁ ku(lam alaṁkar)i(ṣṇo)s sa(tyā)〈32〉śraya-va(llabheṁ)drasya bhrātā ku¿j?〈b〉ja-viṣṇ¿a?〈u〉vard-dhano 〈’〉ṣṭādaśa varṣāṇi ve(ṁ)gī-deśam apālaya(T,) (tat-sūnuḥ?) (jaya)[siṁ]〈33〉(ha-valla)bha(s traya)striṁśataṁ, tad-anujeṁdrarāja[[naṁdana]]s sapta dināni〈.〉 tat-putro (viṣṇuvarddha)(no na?)(va va)〈Page 2v〉〈34〉(r)ṣāṇ(i), tat-sūnu(r) mmaṁgi-yuvarājaḥ paṁcaviṁśatiṁ, tat-tanayo jayasiṁhas trayodaśa(,) tad-a(nuja)ḥ (k)o〈35〉kiliḥ ṣaṇ māsāN, tasya jyeṣṭho ¿s?〈bh〉rātā viṣṇuvarddhanas tam uccāṭya saptatriṁśatam abdāN, tat-suto (vijayādi)〈36〉tya-bhaṭṭārako 〈’〉ṣṭā-daśa, tat-putro viṣṇuvarddhanaḥ ṣaṬtriṁśataṁ, tat-sūnur nnareṁdra-mṛgarāj(o) 〈’〉(ṣṭācatvāriṁ)śata(ṁ)〈.〉〈37〉 tat-sutaḥ kali-viṣṇuvarddhano 〈’〉dhya(r)ddha-varṣaṁ, tat-(t)anayo guṇaga-vijayādi〈tya〉ś catuścatvāri(ṁśa)taṁ, (tad-bhrātu)〈38〉r vvikramāditya-bhūpates sutaś cālukya-bhīmas triṁśataṁ, tat-putro vijayāditya¡ṣ! ṣaṇ mā(sāN,) tat-s(ūnur a)〈39〉mmarājas sapta varṣāṇi, tat-sutaṁ vijayādityaṁ bālam uccā(ṭya) tāḍapa-rājo māsam e(kaṁ, taṁ jitvā)〈40〉cālukya-bhīma-tanayo vikramāditya Ekādaśa māsāN, tat-tāḍapa-rāja-suto yuddhamallas sapta (varṣāṇi)(, ta?)〈41〉taḥ||

7. Anuṣṭubh

Ammarā◯jānujo rāja-
-bhīmo bhīma-parākramaḥ,
vijitya yuddhamallaṁ taṁ
dvādaśābdā(n dha)(rā?)[m aśāT]

8. Vasantatilakā

〈42〉 sat-putrayo◯r ddaśaratha-pratimasya tasya

(bh)īmasya rāma-bharatopamayoḻ kanīyā(N›)
dānārṇ(ṇavāmma)〈43〉-nṛpayoḥ kha◯lu paṁcaviṁśaty
abdān arakṣad avanī-talam ammarājaḥ„

9. Mandākrāntā

tasya jy(e)ṣ(ṭh)o (nṛpa)tiṣu (catuṣṣa)〈44〉ṣṭi-vidyā-pravīṇo_
yaḥ ka(r)ṇṇād¿i?〈ī〉n sura-taru-nibho bhūri-dānena jitvā‚
(lo)ke 〈’〉nva(r)ttthaṁ sucira(m adadhān nāma?) (dānārṇṇa)〈45〉vākhyas
sa trīn abdān avahad avanīm arṇṇava-kṣauma-kāntāṁ„

10. Anuṣṭubh

ta(ta)ḥ paraṁ patiṁ labdhum
anurūpam an(āy)¿(i)?〈a〉kā
(sa)〈46〉ptaviṁśati varṣāṇi
¿v?〈c〉acāreva tapaḥ kṣamā„

11. Anuṣṭubh

Atha dānārṇṇav¿a?〈ā〉j j(ātaḥ)
kalāvāN dviṭ-tamo-haraḥ‚
rāja-cā(lukya-caṁ)〈47〉dro yaḥ
kṣamā-tāpam apā⟦(ro)⟧karoT„

12. Upajāti

balād (gṛ)hītvā balito (dha)r(i)¿śrīḥ?〈trīṁ〉
gīrvvāṇa-śatror iva śatru-v(arg)g(āT)
(śrī)〈48〉-śa¿d?〈k〉tivarmm(ā) sa samāś calukya-
-nārāyaṇo dvādaśa rakṣati sma„

13. Mālinī

tad-anu tad-anujanmā rājamārttaṇḍa-(bhū)〈49〉po
viśada-rucir arāti-dhvānta-vidhvaṁsa-dakṣaḥ‚
sma vahati bhuvam abdān sapta saptāśva-tejās
sa(kala-va?)〈Page 3r〉〈50〉sumatī-bhṛn-mastaka-nyasta-pādaḥ‖

14. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

lakṣmī-bha⟦[1×]⟧(r)tṛ{i}-nibhasya tasya vimalādityasya ¿bh?〈c〉oḍānvaya-
-kṣīrāṁbhonidhi〈51〉-janmanaḥ śriya Iva śrī-rājarājādhipaḥ|
devyāś cā¿b?〈j〉ani rājarāja-duhituḥ kuṁdāṁbikāyās suto
ya〈52〉ḥ kaṁdarppa Ivāparaḥ prativasaN loka-traye strī-hṛdi‖

15. Āryā

bālye bhūṣaṇam abhavad ratnamayī yasya ka<53>ṁṭhikā kaṁṭhe,
guṇa-lub¿d?<dh>ayeva mālā dharayā dattā patiṁ(va)[ra]yā,,

16. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

vedāṁbhodhi-nidhi-pramāṇa-ga¿n?<ṇ>ite (ś)ā<54>kābda-saṁghe ravau
siṁha-sthe bahula-dvitīya-divase vāre gu(roś śī)tagau,
(yu)kte ¿bh?<c>ottara-bhadrayodyati vaṇi<55>¡j!<g>-yāme tu <sarvva>-kṣamāṁ
trātuṁ paṭṭam adhatta yo guṇa-nidhiḥ śrī-rājarājo nṛpaḥ,,

17. Anuṣṭubh

yasyottamāṁgam ābaddha<56>m
ābhāt ¿v?<p>aṭṭena (bhū)yasā||
bharttuṁ viśvaṁbharā-bhāraṁ
janai¿ś?<r> ā(r?)o(pi?)(ta)(ṁ ya)¿t?<th>ā,,

Api ca,,

18. Vasantatilakā

khyātas samasta-nara<57>-nātha-¿r?<k>irīṭa◯-koṭi-
-ratna-prabhā-pa<<ṭala-pāṭala-pāda-pīṭhaḥ(,)>>
yas tyāga-varṣa-pariharṣita-sat-samājo
rājeṁ<58>dra-coḍa I◯ti coḍa-kulaika-ratnaṁ,,

19. Mandākrāntā

Ekasyāsīd api sa himavān īśva(r)asyāpatadbhi(r)
mmūrddh(n)o gaṁg(ā)<59>-vimala-sa◯lilais si(c)yamānaḥ pavitraḥ,
rājeṁdro <'>ya¿ḥ?<ṁ> kim uta namatām īśvarāṇā(ṁ) bahūnā<60>ṁ
ratnāloka-prakaṭita-jagat-prāṁgaṇ¿o?<e>bhyaś śirobhyaḥ,,

20. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

sa-dvīpā(ṁ ca)tur-aṁbu-¿ś?<r>āśi-parikhāṁ vi(śvaṁbha)rāṁ (lī)<61>layā
daṇḍenaiva vijitya yo diś¿a?<i> diśi prātiṣṭhipat sa(rvvataḥ,)
svairodbhrānti-nivāraṇāya vijaya-(sta)<62>ṁbhān sva-nāmāṁ¿r?<k>itān
ālānān iva ba(ddhu)m a<ṁ>dha-ma(naso) darppeṇa dig-dantinaḥ||

21. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

sa śr¿a?<u>tvā paritu(ṣy)¿(ā)?<a> (vaṁśa)-vinaya<63>-tyāgābhimānonnati(ṁ)
praj(ñ)ā-vikrama-satya-śau(ca)-paṭutā-śauryya-kṣamādīn guṇā<<(N,,)>>

co(ḍe)śo (madhu)rā(nta)<64>kaḥ sva-ta(na)yām ammaṁga-nāmāṁ satīṁ
cā(ḷ)ukyābharaṇasya cāgra-ma(h)iṣīṁ s(n)ehena yasyākaroT‚(‚)

22. Gīti

<65>yasmin rājani rakṣati bhū-cakram avakram ucita-mā<r>ggeṇa|
Abhavad abādham akalma(ṣam a)d(ūṣi)tam a<Page 3v><66>(matsaraṁ prajā-caritaṁ)„

23. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

(rājño rāja-ca)lukya-vaṁśa-latikālaṁbasya yasya svayaṁ
śaśvat-(kīrttir alaṁka)<67>roti (ni)ta(r)ā(ṁ loka-t)r(ayī)-k¿a?<ā>minīṁ|
hār¿a?<ā>līva sugandhi-candana-ma(yī) (loleva lālāma?)kī
(mā)l(e)vā(ma)(la-jā?)<68>ti-(jā)la-(kali)tā dau(kū)la-lakṣmīr iva(„)

24. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

yasya śrī-paragaṇḍa-bhairava-vibho(r) ddor-dda(ṇḍa-kaukṣeyaka)-
-(prodbhinnā)hita-(ha)<69>st(i)-mast(a)ka-galan-masti(ṣka-kh)ā(d)āśayā
gṛdhrāḥ pakṣa-puṭ¿a?<ā>n visāryya (v)iyati (vyābaddha-cakrāś ca)la(t)-
-(piṁcchā-pa)<70>tra-(caya)-śr¿ī?<i>yaṁ vidadhate vīr¿i?<a>-śr¿ī?<i>yas saṁyati||

25. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

Ekenaiva hayī haye(na bahu)śo (vāhā)(s saha?)(sran) ta<71>thā
ko vā (vīra-bha)ṭo jayeT pratibhaṭa(ṁ) cāstrābhiva(r)ṣ(ai)s tathā‚
kas siṁced iti vidr(u)tā ra(ṇa-mukheṣv āśca)<72>(r)yya-(paryyā)◯kulā
yasyārātaya Eva śauryyam aniśaṁ stunvanti ta(nvanti ca„)

(svasti)<.> <sa>(rvalokā)<73>(śraya-śrī-vi)◯ṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāj¿a?<ā>dhirāja-
parameśvara-parama-bhaṭṭ(ā)ra(ka)ḥ parama-(māhe)<74>(śvaraḥ para)◯ma-
brahmaṇyaḥ māt⟦o⟧<<ā>>-pitṛ-pādānudhyātaḥ tyāga-siṁhāsan(āsī)naḥ g(āḍevalu-
nā?)<75>ma-viṣaya-sahit(a)-palla(p)u-gudravāra-viṣayam adhivasataḥ rāṣṭrakūṭa-
pramukh(ān kuṭuṁbina)ḥ (sarvvān sa)<76>māh¿u?<ū>ya (ma)ntri-purohita-senāpati-
yuvarāja-dauvārika-pra¿v?<dh>ānādi-sam¿e?<a>kṣa(m ittham ājñā)<77>pa{ha}yati|
ya¿dh?<th>ā|

26. Āryāgīti

khyāto <’>sti rājarāja-brahma-mahārā(ja I)ti mahā-daṇḍa-patiḥ
yo ma(dhu)rā<78>ntaka-bhūbhṛt-karuṇā-rasa-sikta-varddhita-yaśo-latikaḥ‚

27. Anuṣṭubh

rājendra-coḍa-bhūpāla-
-rāj(y)a-la(kṣm)ī-ma(hā)<79>-(n)idhe(ḥ)

(r)akṣaṇa-kṣama-dakṣ(o)gra-
-mahā-(bhu)ja-bhuja(ṁ)gamaḥ

28. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

(d)ikto dakṣi(ṇa)taḥ (pu)ra(skṛ)ta-bṛhad-daṇḍaḥ pracaṇḍa<80>s sa yo
vidvi¡(ncho?)!<ṭ-śo>ṇita-pāna-gṛdhnur aparaḥ kālo na vetīkṣitaḥ
rājen(dr)a-kṣitipālaka(sya) mahato man-(mā)t(u)<Page 4r><81>(la)syā<tu>lasy-
āde<<śa>><ṁ> pra(t)ipa(d)ya ta(T-kṣa)ṇata Evāṁdhra-kṣa(māṁ) prāgama(T),,

29. Lalitā

Anyo <'>pi daṇḍa-nātho bhakti-kleśa-(pra)¿(ru)?<hṛ><82>(ṣ)ṭa-nija-nā¿dh?<th>aḥ
Amunaivāgatavān uttama-śoḍa-ccoḍagon iti vy¿e?<a>padiṣṭaḥ|

30. Lalitā

Uttama-coḍa-milāḍuḍa(yā)<83>n ity anyo <'>pi c¿o?<ā>gataḥ puruṣaḥ
yaḥ patir atha senāyāḥ pati-vratāyāḥ par(e)kṣaṇāsahanāyāḥ(,?)

31. Anuṣṭubh

(ka)<84>(r)¡nn!<ṇṇ>(ā)ṭika-balāraṇy¿ā?<a>ṁ
¿(t)ā?<da>gdhu-k(ā)mam a(śeṣa)ta(ḥ|)
daṇḍa-nātha-tray¿e?<a>ṁ dṛṣṭam
agni-trayam ivo(j)vala(M,),

32. Anuṣṭubh

ka(r)¡nn!<ṇṇ>(ā)<85>ṭa-dramilādhī(śa)-
-daṇḍeśām a¿c?<bh>avad raṇa(ṁ)
paraspa(ra)-caturddanta-
-pratighaṭṭana-bhīkaraṁ,

33. Anuṣṭubh

muṣṭāmuṣṭi kvaci(d dṛ)<86>ṣṭaṁ
ke(śā)ke(śy abha)vat (kṣ)aṇaṁ
daṇḍādaṇḍi kvacit proktaṁ
kuntākunti-<<nirantara>><ṁ>

34. Svāgatā

<<ja>>ghnire nija-śarair api kecid
dhanvino _<87> yudhi sa(marddhita-śau)ryy(ā)ḥ

senayor api paraspara-bāṇā-
pāta-(jā)ta-java-vāta-vivṛ(ttaiḥ?)

35. Svāgatā

khaḍgi-khaḍga-dṛ<88>ḍha-gha(ṭṭana)◯-jāte
visphuliṁga-nivahe ¿su?<śa>labhā<ḥ> syuḥ,
sad-bhaṭ¿a?<ā> bhaya-bhṛta¿ḥ la<<ca>>?<ś cala>-c¿ī?<i>ttāḥ
paṁca-(ṣa?)<89>[⏑⏑–⏑]◯-padātyoḥ||

36. Āryāgīti

nṛtya<<(nti ga?)(ja)>>-kaba¿ṇ?<n>dhās turaga-kaba¿ṇ?<n>dhāś ca nara-kabandha-pramukh(ā)ḥ(,)
Ṛ<90>ṇam adyaiva vi¿y?<m>ukta(ṁ) nija-nāthāvaṁdhya-poṣaṇasy(e)ti mudā(,)

37. Vaṁśastha

gajair g(g)ajā vājibhir eva vāj(i)no
nar(ai)<91>(r) nnarās tatra samaṁ vinā¿kṛ?<śi>tāḥ
dvi-pakṣayoḥ kāla-vaśena saṁyuge
samāna-yuddhaṁ samam e(va)<92> naśyat¿i?<oḥ>|

38. Puṣpitāgrā

(bh)ṛśam avasara Eṣa naḥ praganturṁ
divam anuciṁtya padāti-yugma-mukhyāḥ
divi(ja)<93>-yuvati-saṁga-kāṁkṣayeyuḥ
s{s}amam a(tha dai)va-durīhayā (ca bhū)me<<(ḥ)>>

Eta(d-d)ramila-daṇḍanāthān(ā)<94>ṁ rājarāja{rāja}-brahma-mahārāja-nāmadheyo me mātulasya madhurāntaka-(de)vasyā<95>tul¿ā?<a>syādeśa(ṁ) (prā)pya kar¿vn?<ṇṇ>āṭaka-daṇḍanā¿dh?<th>air yyud(dhv)ā t(ai)r eva sā(r)ddhaṁ divaṁ gatavān ¿a?<ā>(śvike)<96>na h¿a?<ā>sti(kena ca bale)na (pādā)<ta>-balena ca sama-bala(tvāc ca), tam (u)ddiś(y)a ka(l)idiṇ(ḍi-grāme)<Page 4v> <97> rā-jarāj(e)śvaram (i)t(i ś)ivāyatanam akaravaṁ, (U)ttama-śoḍa-(ccoḍagon) i(ty utta)ma-(coḍa-mi)<98>lāḍuḍayān it(i) prasiddh(ā)v anyāv api (coddi)ś(ya śivā)yatana-dva(yaṁ karo)(m?)i (y?)[eṣā?](ṁ?) (maṁga)<99>lotturṁgga-saṁgītaka-kha(ṇḍa)-sphuṭita-navaka(rmma-ba)ly-upahārādy-a(rttha)ṁ (paṁcāśac-chātrāṇāṁ?)<100> śāstrasya śrot¿ṛ?<ṝ>ṇāṁ satr(ār)ttharṁ ca dvayādhika-paṁcāśad-veś(y)ā(bh)i(ḥ) brāhmaṇa-(śatena brahma-ve)<101>dinā huta-jātavedas¿a?<ā> vai(ś)ya-śatena ca dhana(do)pamena śūdra-śatena (brah)m(a-pāda-ka)(mala?)<102>-saṁbhūte<na> ca

sārddhaṁ madhurāntaka-nallūri-nāmnā prasiddhaḥ k(a)lidiṇḍi-nāma grām¿(e)?〈aḥ〉 (mā)(gaḍavaṟu?)〈103〉-grāmaṭika◯(yā) dattaḥ

tasy(ā)vadha(ya)ḥ〈.〉 pūrvvataḥ konneki-sīmai(va sī)mā〈.〉 Āgn(eyataḥ) [1×](li)do(ṟṟu-sī)〈104〉maiva sīmā(,)◯ dakṣi(ṇa)taḥ koṇṭhama sīmā, nairṛtyataḥ (v)e(vāka-sī)maiva (sī)mā, (paścimata)ḥ (kaḍa?)[paṟṟu]〈105〉-sīmaiva sīmā, vā(yavya)ta(ḥ d)āḍināṇṭi sīmaiva sīmā, Uttarataḥ| (potuṁbaṟti)-sīm(ai)va (sī)mā, ¡(Ī)!〈Ai〉(śānata)〈106〉(ḥ) potuṁbaṟti-s¿i?〈ī〉maiva sīmā,

pallapu-gudravāre kaḍapaṟ(ṟ)u nāma grāma(ḥ du?)ggiy(ap)ū(ṇḍi) (cet?)i(, gr?)(ā)(masyā?)〈107〉sya pūrvvataḥ, kal(u)diṇḍi-sīmaiva s(ī)mā(,) Āgn(e)yataḥ, ¿ve?〈E〉ṣaiva, dakṣi¿n?〈ṇ〉a{,}ta(ḥ,) ve(vāka-sī)maiva sīmā, n¿a?〈ai〉rṛ〈108〉ty-ataḥ Eṣaiva, paścimataḥ, Āvakūri sīmaiva sīmā, vāyavyataḥ *t(ā)ma(ra-ko)lani krovvi(ṇḍḍe)ṭaṁbāsi〈109〉na tallikroyya* nāma nadī, (U)t(t)a(r)a(t)aḥ, kal(v?)asaṇḍa-sīmaiva sīmā, ¡Ī!〈Ai〉(ś)ānataḥ(,) tā(ḍ)ināṇṭ(i) sīmaiva〈Page 5r〉 〈110〉 sīmā(,)

pallapu-gudravāre Āvakū [...] [pūrvva]〈111〉taḥ kaḍapaṟti (s)īmaiva sīmā, Āgne(y)[yāṁ] [...] [paści]〈112〉mataḥ koṇḍika-muṁjalūra-sīmai(va) [sīmā] [...]〈113〉ṟti-sīm¿e?〈ai〉va sīmā, Īśānataḥ kaḍa[...]〈114〉sa paṁca-mahāpātakair yyukto bha[vati] [...]

39. Anuṣṭubh

[sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ]〈115〉 vā
yo hare◯ta vasundha[rāṁ]
[ṣaṣṭi-varṣa-sahasrāṇi]
[viṣṭhāyāṁ jāyate kṛmiḥ]

40. Anuṣṭubh

[bahubhir vvasudhā dattā]
〈116〉 bahubhiś cā◯nupāli[tā]
[yasya yasya yadā bhūmis]
[tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ]

41. Śālinī

[sāmānyo yaṁ dha]〈117〉rmma-setur nṛ◯pāṇāṁ
k(ā)[le kāle pālanīyo bhavadbhiḥ]
[sarvvān etān bhāvinaḥ pārtthivendrān]
[bhūyo]〈118〉bhūyo yācate rāmabhad(ra)[ḥ]

42. Vasantatilakā

[mad-vaṁśa-jāḥ para-mahīpati-vaṁśa-jā vā]

[pāpād apeta-manaso bhuvi bhāvi]〈119〉-bhūpā
ye pālayanti mama [dharmmam imaṁ samastaṁ]
[teṣāṁ mayā viracito ṁjalir eṣa mūrdhni]

43. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

[–––⏑]〈120〉p(a)m(o?) 〈’〉dhikatva-vidhinā śrī-rāja(r)[āja] [⏑–]
[––––⏑–⏑⏑⏑––––⏑––⏑–]
[A?]〈121〉stādrer aparāt sadāsta-vidhinā [––⏑––⏑–]
[––––⏑–⏑⏑⏑––––⏑––⏑–]

44. Āryāgīti

[Ājñaptiḥ kaṭake?]〈122〉śo rāciya-pedderi-(bh?)ī[bhīmana-nāma-tanūjaḥ?]
[ca. 20+]

〈Page 5v〉

Apparatus

Plates

〈3〉 s¿u?〈ū〉ter ◇ *sūter* V.

〈5〉 tasm¿a?〈ā〉t ◇ *tasmāt* V.

〈6〉 tasm¿a?〈ā〉d ◇ *tasmād* V. — 〈6〉 ṛbhu〈7〉kaḥ ◇ *ṛ¿bh?〈c〉u〈7〉kaḥ* V • In the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya, its first editor V. Venkayya emends *ṛcuka* to *ṛbhuka*, while here V emends the other way round. I cannot yet form an opinion as to which variant is more correct or typical.

〈11〉 pāṇḍ(u)rājaḥ ◇ *pāṇḍ¿a?〈u〉rājaḥ* V.

〈12〉 s(y)u(r) ◇ *sūr-* V • V’s editor in EI suggests that the intent may have been *svar-*. This is a very plausible suggestion, but the character on the plate is definitely *syu*, and not *sva* or *sū*. Although the loop of the ostensible subscript y (as e.g. in line 15, *nyu*) is not visible here, compare *vyā* in the next line, where the subscript *y* is clear and hardly loops at all to the left. (And with that in turn, compare *pyara* for *pura* at the end of the present line: the engraver clearly had an issue with subscript *y* and dependent *u*.) The reading is confirmed by the parallel stanza IV of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya and stanza IV of the Korumelli grant of Rājarāja I. Nonetheless, *syur viṣaya-grāhiṇas* is quite awkward and insipid, so the stanza as originally composed may well have had *svar-viṣaya-grāhiṇas*. — 〈12〉 p¿ya?〈u〉ra〈13〉ṁdaraṁ ◇ *pura〈13〉ṁdaraṁ* V.

〈14〉 sura- • As also observed by V, the body of *ra* is bisected by a horizontal line. It does not look like *ka*, but may perhaps have been corrected from *śa*.

〈15〉 par¡i!〈ī〉kṣiT ◇ *parīkṣiT* V.

〈18〉 gar¡bhbh!a- ◇ *garbha-* V.

〈19〉 -(k)aṁc¿ˌr?〈u〉ki{,}bhis ◇ *-kaṁcukibhis* V.

〈20〉 ca nīyamānā ◇ *cānīyamānā* V. — 〈20〉 naṁdanaṁ ◇ *nandanaṁ* V. — 〈20〉 as(ū)ta • *sū* was probably corrected from *sā*.

〈21〉 -hārīti- ◇ *-hāriti-* V. — 〈21〉 -putrādi-sva-kṣatra- • The reading is clear, but the same locus reads *-putra-dvipakṣa-* in line 21 of the Kolāṟu grant (Hultzsch 1890, pp. 49–62, № 39) and line 24 of the Korumelli grant. The Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya has the same reading as the present text.

〈22〉 calukya- ◇ *cālukya-* V. — 〈22〉 bhagavat¿i?〈ī〉ṁ gaur¿i?〈ī〉m ◇ *bhagavatīṁ gaurīm* V.

〈23〉 °ātapatr¿e?〈ai〉ka- ◇ *°ātapatraika-* V.

〈24〉 nikṣiptān¿i?〈ī〉〈25〉va ◇ *nikṣiptānī〈25〉va* V.

〈29〉 -putr¿a?〈ā〉ṇāṁ kauś¿ī?〈i〉kī- ◇ *-putrāṇāṁ kauśikī-* V. — 〈29〉 mātṛ ◇ *mātṛ{ṁ}* V.

〈30〉 -pādānudhyātānāṁ ◇ *-pādānuddhyātānāṁ* V.

〈32〉 ve(ṁ)gī- ◇ *veṅgī-* V. — 〈32〉 apālaya(T›) (tat-sūnuḥ?) ◇ *apālayat tat-sū(nuḥ)* V • V prints *nuḥ* in round parentheses, which is used in EI for emendation (and is used appropriately in the name *kujja-viṣṇavarddhano* earlier in this line), while printing *siṁ* at the end of the line in square brackets. The plate is badly corroded after *ya*, but I feel quite certain that this is followed by a final *T* and a punctuation mark, not by the conjunct *tta*. After that, two characters are wholly indistinct. I find V's *tat-sūnuḥ* doubtful and believe that *tad-anu* may be more likely, but accept his reading since he had the actual estampage in hand.

〈33〉 -anujeṁdrarāja⟦naṁdana⟧s ◇ *-anujendrarāja-naṁdana{ḥ}s* V • V's discussion explicitly notes that the text, like in the Korumelli grant, has *indrarāja-nandana* instead of the expected *indrarāja*. It seems to me that the sign V read here as a superfluous *visarga* must have indicated in some way, perhaps paired with another sign that is not visible in the estampage, that *naṁdana* is to be deleted. The sign, in the estampage, resembles a Latin capital G with a gap in the middle of the semicircle on the left, or perhaps a capital C with a gap in the middle and a dot inside it.

〈35〉 ¿s?〈bh〉rātā ◇ *bhrātā* V • Throughout the plates, *bh* looks very similar to *sa*, but in this case the scribe definitely used the latter instead of the former.

〈38〉 triṁśataṁ ◇ *triṁśataM* V.

〈41〉 rāja- ◇ *rāj¿a?〈ā〉* V • Since the name is often used in the form *rāja-bhīma*, I think the same was intended here, with enjambement into the next line and an anceps at the end of the first quarter. — 〈41〉 (dha)(rā?)[m aśāT] ◇ *dha[2+]* V • The restoration *dharām aśāT* was suggested by V's editor in a footnote. It is very plausible in the context, and *rā* is possible. However, there seem to be only two illegible characters after it. I also have some doubts about *dh*. Since V prints it as clear, I accept it, but the subscript attached to the previous word's final *n* appears to be more complex (restore *ksamā* here?). The instance of this stanza in the Maṇḍa grant of Rājarāja I Narendra reads *dvādaśābdān apād bhuvaṁ*.

〈42〉 -bharatopamayoḫ ◇ *-bharatopamayoḥ* V • The final glyph is a figure-8, definitely not a regular *visarga*. I interpret it to be a *jihvāmūlīya* that is written inline rather than in a conjunct with the following character. V may have had the same interpretation in mind. Theoretically, the glyph might represent *ri*, but that would be out of place here, and *ri* is normally narrower at the neck.

〈44〉 °ād¿i?〈ī〉n ◇ *°ādīn* V. — 〈44〉 (adadhān nāma?) • The reading *adadhān*, which V too prints as unclear, is rather doubtful, but I cannot offer a better one.

〈45〉 -kāntāṁ ◇ *-kāntāM* V.

〈46〉 dānārṇṇav¿a?〈ā〉j ◇ *dānārṇṇavāj* V. — 〈46〉 rāja- ◇ *rāj¿a?〈ā〉* V • As in line 41 above, V's emendation does not seem necessary; it may nonetheless correspond to the composer's intent, compare stanza 10 of the Korumelli grant. — 〈46〉 (dha)r(i)¿śrīḫ?〈trīṁ〉 V • I accept V's emendation, since the reading (which he prints as clear throughout) is quite secure.

〈50〉 -bha⟦[1×]⟧(r)tṛ{i}- • The deleted character probably had a subscript *y* or *ṛ*. The following *rtṛ* also has an *i* marker and mnay have been corrected from *rtri*.

〈53〉 -lub¿d?〈dh〉ayeva ◇ *-lubdhayeva* V.

〈54〉 ¿bh?〈c〉ottara-bhadrayodyati ◇ *bhottara-bhadrayā¿d?〈p〉y ati-* V.

〈55〉 〈sarvva〉- V • V may have supplied this word on the basis of a parallel stanza of which I am not yet aware. Even without a parallel, the word omitted here must have been similarly generic.

〈56〉 ¿v?〈p〉aṭṭena ◇ *paṭṭena* V. — 〈56〉 janai¿ś?〈r〉 ā(r?)o(pi?)(ta)(ṁ) V • V's reading,

which he prints as clear throughout, is rather awkward. Nothing is visible in the estampage of the characters shown here as tentatively read. Having no better suggestion, I assume that V could make this out better and accept his reading and emendation.

〈57〉 -¿r?〈k〉irīṭa- ◇ *-kirīṭa-* V. — 〈57〉 -pa〈〈ṭala-pāṭala-pāda-pīṭhaḥ(ˌ)〉〉 • In the facsimile, the first *ṭa* of this sequence does not appear to be a correction, but I accept V's opinion that it is one. The remainder of the string has clearly been re-inscribed, and the pre-correction text must have been one or two characters shorter. None of the latter can be made out with any certainty, but the *ṭa* of *pāṭala* may have been struck over a *ba* or perhaps *ja*.

〈58〉 īśva(r)asyāpatadbhi(r) ◇ *īśva¿ś?〈r〉asyāpatadbhir* V • V's edition actually reads *īśvasasyā°*, but he must have meant *śa*, which the character in question does resemble.

〈60〉 ratnāloka-prakaṭita-jagat-prāṁgaṇ¿o?〈e〉bhyaś • See the note to the translation of stanza XIX for a possible further emendation of this phrase.

〈61〉 diś¿a?〈i〉 diśi ◇ *d¿i?〈a〉śa-diśi* V • V's emendation is also plausible, but mine is perhaps a little more likely in the context.

〈62〉 -nāmāṁ¿r?〈k〉itān ◇ *-nāmāṁkitān* V. — 〈62〉 ba(ddhu)m a〈ṁ〉dha-ma(naso) • As far as I can tell from the facsimile, this sequence is probably a correction written over slightly shorter struck-out text; but V does not mention correction here, as he does in line 57 above. — 〈62〉 guṇā〈〈(N„)〉〉 ◇ *guṇā(N)ˌ* V • It seems to me that two very short punctuation bars have been added below the vowel marker of *ṇā*, and perhaps also a very small final *N* squeezed in above the bars, to the right of the vowel marker.

〈66〉 (prajā-caritaṁ) ◇ *(prajā-bharitaṁ)* V • I adopt the reading suggested by V's editor in a footnote, since it fits the context better and is just as possible from the unclear estampage.

〈67〉 (loleva lālāma?)kī ◇ *[--˘](lālāmakī)-* V • My reading of the characters not read by V is a rather desperate guess. The reading *lālāmakī* is quite plausible from the estampage but difficult to interpret. I do not know why V connects this word with a hyphen to the next one.

〈68〉 -(jā)la- ◇ *-j¿a?〈ā〉la-* V.

〈69〉 -mast(a)ka- ◇ *-mast¿i?〈a〉ka-* V • I see no discernible *i* marker; if one is present as read by V, then it may be accepted as a legitimate variant of the word. — 〈69〉 -puṭ¿a?〈ā〉n ◇ *-puṭān* V. — 〈69〉 -(piṁcchā)- ◇ *-picchā-* V. — 〈69〉 -śr¿ī?〈i〉yaṁ ◇ *-śriyaṁ* V. — 〈69〉 vīr¿i?〈a〉- ◇ *vīra-* V. — 〈69〉 -śr¿ī?〈i〉yas ◇ *-śriyas* V.

〈70〉 (vāhā)(s saha?)(sran) ◇ *vāhā-sahasran* V.

〈71〉 -(mukheṣv) ◇ *-(mukhāsv)* V • V's reading seems uninterpretable. His editor notes that "the sense requires" *-mukhād*. I see no *e*, but *ṣ* appears plausible from the estampage.

〈73〉 -mahārāj¿a?〈ā〉dhirāja- ◇ *-mahārājādhirāja-* V.

〈74〉 māt⟦o⟧〈〈ā〉〉- ◇ *māt¿o?〈ā〉-* V • An *o* and an *ā* marker are both present without apparent deletion, but the former must have been corrected to the latter. — 〈74〉 -siṁhāsan(āsī)naḥ ◇ *-siṁh¿a?〈ā〉sanāsīnaḥ* V • An *ā* marker is definitely present here, but instead of bending downward on the right of the body, it bends down right next to the head, into the cavity of the body. This suggests it may be a subsequent addition. — 〈74〉 g(āḍevalu-nā?) • V prints only the last *nā* as unclear. In the estampage, the second character is indiscernible, the next two look rather like *vula* than *valu* to me, and the last is again indiscernible but could well be *ga*.

〈75〉 -sahit(a)- ◇ *-sahitāṁ* V • There is no clear *ā* and I would not expect one. A large dot above *ta* is probably not an *anusvāra*, since that would be placed to the right of the character. — 〈75〉 (kuṭuṁbina)ḥ ◇ *kuṭuṁbinaḥ* V • I accept V's reading, which he prints as clear throughout. To my eye, the second character could well be *ṭi*, as is quite common in related inscriptions.

〈76〉 °āh¿u?〈ū〉ya ◇ *°āhūya* V. — 〈76〉 sam¿e?〈a〉kṣa(m) ◇ *samakṣam* V.

〈77〉 -mahārā(ja I)ti • The characters *ja I* are small and crowded together. They may be a correction.

〈80〉 vidvi¡(ncho?)!〈ṭ-śo〉ṇita- ◇ *vidvi(ṭ-cho)oṇita-* V • The subscript component of the problematic conjunct is quite certainly a slightly damaged *ch*. Although *ṭ* would be expected for the upper component, the facsimile does not indicate this; compare *ṭo* in line 71.

〈81〉 ā〈tu〉lasyāde〈〈śa〉〉〈ṁ〉 • It seems likely that this entire sequence is a correction. At the beginning, *la* is awkwardly formed, small, and has a horizontal line below it. Next, the *s* of *syā* is also malformed. The following *de* is faint, while *śa* is very small and is lowered so that its headmark is at median height. Probably, *ādeśaṁ* was first engraved (eyeskip), then *de* was changed into *la*, utilising the head, shoulder and perhaps part of the vowel mark to create the new character (the horizontal stroke below *la* being the bottom of the original *de*). The shape of the original *śa* is perhaps discernible in the following malformed *s*, and the original *anusvāra* may be there after *syā*. I have no suggestion for the text previously engraved where we now see *deśa*, and do not see the still-missing *tu* added anywhere. — 〈81〉 pra(t)ipa(d)ya ta(T-kṣa)ṇa° • This segment

too may be a correction over deleted earlier text; there appear to be several strokes not belonging to the intended characters.

〈84〉 ¿(t)ā?〈da〉gdhu- • The incorrect character may perhaps be (dhā) instead of (tā).

〈85〉 -daṇḍeśām ◇ *-daṇḍeś¿ām?〈air〉* V • I find V's emendation unnecessary, assuming that *īś*, not *īśa* is used here. — 〈85〉 a¿c?〈bh〉avad ◇ *abhavad* V.

〈86〉 -〈〈nirantara〉〉〈ṁ〉 〈〈ja〉〉° • This string, perhaps including the preceding *nti* or *kunti*, appears to be a correction written over shorter text. I wonder if perhaps *kuntākuntirantaraṁ* was originally inscribed — 〈86〉 dhanvino _ • There may be a dot, used as a space filler, at the end of the line here.

〈87〉 -vivṛ(ttaiḥ?) • I accept V's reading, which he prints as clear. To me, the estampage does not look like *ttaiḥ*; perhaps *tyā* (for *ttyā*) is more likely.

〈88〉 ¿su?〈śa〉labhā〈ḥ〉 V • V's ingenious emendation is probably spot on. — 〈88〉 -bhṛta¿ḥ la〈〈ca〉〉?〈ś cala〉-c¿ī?〈i〉ttāḥ ◇ *bhṛt¿aḥ?〈āś〉 cala-cittāḥ* V • There is no *ca* before *la*, but a small *ca* is inserted above and to the right of *la*, probably with a corresponding insertion mark (though perhaps just a spot of damage) below and to the right of *la*. *bhṛtaḥ* needs no emendation to *bhṛtāḥ*. — 〈88〉 -(ṣa?)〈89〉[◡◡◡–◡] • I accept V's reading of the last character in line 88, which he prints as clear. Howeve, I'm inclined to think that what seems to be a vertical stroke on the right is rather the crease at the raised edge, and if so, then the character is probably not *ṣa*. Most likely, it might be *ra*, but *dha* and *ka* also seem possible, and an *ā* may be attached. In the next line, the plate is cracked from the hole to the edge. The lower parts of characters can to some extent be made out below the crack. The first character in line 89 seems to have a smaller tight curve and a large semicircle below it, the combination suggestive of *kṣa*, but far from decisive. (Something with a subscript *r* may also be possible, but I would expect a more angular stroke there.) I recognise nothing in the next two characters, but what remains of the fourth looks much like the body of *sa*, possibly *na* or *ṇa*. The remnants of the fifth character strongly imply a subscript *t*. Given the dual ending of *padātyoḥ*, I expect a word meaning "horseman" or "cavalry" before that. Thus, *sapti* is a feasible restoration; alternatively, the fifth character may perhaps be *śva* or *śvi*. If V is correct to read *ṣa* at the end of line 88, then *pañcaṣaṣṭi* is the most plausible restoration from that end, but the vestiges counterindicate this, and such a precise (and small) number would be strange in the context. The lost chunk may have included a unit (such as "regiments") which the numeral and the compound with *-padātyoḥ* would have qualified, but if *sapti* is correct, then no plural nominal ending would fit the metre. All in all, I cannot venture any restoration other than something meaning "cavalry" in the lacuna.

〈89〉 nṛtya<<(nti ga?)(ja)>>- ◇ *nṛtya¿m?〈n〉ti {va}gaja* V • The two characters after *nṛtya* are illegible in the estampage; the many strokes here are probably not all damage, so I assume that the text has been corrected here. The third is plausibly *ja*, damaged but perhaps not written over earlier text. The chaos after *nṛtya* does have a plausible *m* at the beginning, but I do not think *mti* would have been inscribed; more likely is that something with *m* was corrected to *nti*. I certainly see nothing recognisable as a *va*, and the number of unclear characters is definitely three, not four. The *va* may be a typo in V's edition, since the footnote that says it is superfluous is editorial.

〈90〉 vi¿y?〈m〉ukta(ṁ) • The emendation I adopt from V is not strictly necessary, but since *ṛṇa* typically goes with *vi-muc*, this was probably the composer's intent. — 〈90〉 vāj(i)no • There seems to be both *o* and *i* attached to *j*; perhaps the former has been corrected to the latter.

〈91〉 vinā¿kṛ?〈śi〉tāḥ ◇ *vināk̤ṛtāḥ* V • I emend with some hesitation, not being able to produce a coherent interpretation of the stanza without emending here and at the next locus. The character *kṛ* is unambiguous, but it is raised higher than the surrounding characters, and there is a slight chance that it has been corrected from *śi*, but correction the other way round certainly did not take place.

〈92〉 naśyat¿i?〈oḥ〉 ◇ *naśyati* V • Here too I emend with some hesitation, not being able to produce a coherent interpretation of the stanza without emending here and at the previous locus. The vowel mark in the character *ti* is incomplete or damaged; just possibly, it might be a malformed *o*.

〈94〉 rājarāja{rāja}- • I agree with V that one iteration of *rāja* is superfluous here. Compare the name in line 77. — 〈94〉 me mātulasya ◇ *sva-mātulasya* V • There seems to be some damage above *me* that looks vaguely like the strokes for *s*, so I am not certain *sva-* is a typo in V's edition.

〈95〉 ādeśa(ṁ) ◇ *ādeśa¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉* V. — 〈95〉 (pādā)〈ta〉- ◇ *bā(hā)-* V.

〈98〉 °uḍayān ◇ *°uḍaiyān* V. — 〈98〉 (y?)[eṣā?](ṁ?) ◇ *[3×]* V • I restore conjecturally based on very uncertain vestiges.

〈99〉 °ottuṁgga- ◇ *°ottuṁga-* V.

〈102〉 grām¿(e)?〈aḥ〉 ◇ *grāma(ḥ)* V • The intent was probably *grāmaḥ*, which agrees well with the rest of the sentence. The inscribed text, however, certainly seems to be *grāme*. See also the next note.

〈103〉 -grāmaṭika◯(yā) • Given *grāme* earlier in the sentence (see the previous note), I wonder if the composer's intent here was *grāmaṭikā mayā* or *grāmaṭikeyaṁ*. But if

so, then *dattaḥ* needs emendation to *dattā*. — 〈103〉 konneki- ◇ *konnekī-* V. — 〈103〉 [1×](li)do(r̤r̤u-) • I accept V's reading. In the estampage, the first character of the name (as well as the preceding taḥ) is only a blotch with nothing discernible whatsoever, and *li* is only the merest hint. According to V's editor, the name may be *Ālidor̤r̤u* or *pulidor̤r̤u*. I do not know if this is based on anything positive that he could discern in the physical estampage, or merely conjecture based on the fact that the illegible character consists only of a compact body (nothing ascending or descending), and informed by a knowledge of what words may make sense in the name. — 〈103〉 (kaḍa?)[paṟṟu] ◇ *kaḍa[2×]* V • V's edition seems to imply that there are four illegible characters, but there are definitely two. Given that in line 107 below, Kaludiṇḍi (sic) is said to form the eastern border of Kaḍapaṟṟu, it seems likely that here, Kaḍapaṟṟu was said to form the western border of Kalidiṇḍi.

〈106〉 potuṁbaṛti s¿i?〈ī〉maiva ◇ *potūṁbaṛti sīmaiva* V. — 〈106〉 (cet?)i(, gr?)(ā)(masyā?) ◇ *[3×](grāma)* V • I do not see how the last two characters in this line could be *grāma*, but the third from the end may well be *grā*. My own reading is very uncertain. The text may be *Iti* instead of *ceti*, and something quite different cannot be excluded.

〈107〉 ¿ve?〈E〉ṣaiva, ◇ *Eṣaiva* V • Compare the proper *Eṣaiva* in the next line. — 〈107〉 dakṣi¿n?〈ṇ〉a{,}ta(ḥ,) ◇ *dakṣi(ṇa)taḥ,* V.

〈108〉 Āvakūri ◇ *Āvakūru-* V. — 〈108〉 krovvi(ṇḍḍe)ṭaṁbāsi〈109〉na ◇ *krovviṇḍleṭaṁbāsi〈109〉na* V • I cannot offer a certain reading of the problematic conjunct. There may be damage to the body, or correction may be involved. There is certainly no *l* in it. It looks most like *ṇḍḍe*, with some damage in the body of *ṇ*. The first *ḍ* is attached to the bottom of the body as well as to the descending right wing of *ṇ*, and the second is attached at the bottom left of the first. It is possible that V read the lowest component as *ḷ* (misprinted as *l* in his edition), but for this to be possible, we must read *°nāṇṭa* instead of *°nāṇṭi* in the next line, taking the curved stroke above that *ṇṭ* to be the distinctive end of *ḷ* here, rather than an *i* marker.

〈109〉 tā(ḍ)ināṇṭ(i) • V prints this word as clear, and he is in all probability correct. Still, *ḍ* looks much like *bh*, and what looks like a partly effaced *i* above *ṇṭ* may perhaps belong the the line above (see the previous note).

〈110〉 [pūrvva]〈111〉taḥ • Throughout this last, broken plate, V does not restore the words that are partially extant or implied by the context.

〈119〉 [–––◡]〈120〉p(a)m(o?) 〈’〉dhikatva- ◇ *[...]〈120〉pāmādhikatva-* V • Given the extant fragments, I am reasonably certain that we have a *śārdūlavikrīḍita* stanza here, but I cannot establish this beyond doubt. The required number of syllables is only a hair

more than that required in the preceding lines for the known *anuṣṭubh* stanzas, and the last five lines of the plate do appear to be written in smaller and tighter script than the rest. The first character in line 120 does not seem to be *pā*. It may perhaps be *pe* or *po*, but if I am correct that the text is metrical, then these are inappropriate. The next one does look like *mā* marker, but there may be a second stroke to the left of the headmark, making the vowel *o*. The reading *mā* is feasible and plausible, but I believe *mo* is slightly more likely, because I cannot think of a relevant word with *°pamādhikatva*.

〈121〉 [Ājñaptiḥ kaṭake?]〈122〉śo rāciya-pedderi-(bh?)ī[bhīmana-nāma-tanūjaḥ?] ◇ *[...]〈122〉śo rāciya-pedderi (bh?)ī[...]* V • I restore conjecturally on the basis of the concluding stanza of the Korumelli grant. The present one may have been composed in a different moraic metre, but the meaning was quite certainly identical to that restored here. Compare also stanza XXXVII, also *āryāgīti*, of the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya, where the composer is the same person. See also the note to the translation.

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.

〈4–8〉 From him 〈was born〉 Āyus. From him, 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 him, Ṛbhuka. From him, Ṛkṣaka. From him, Mativara, performer

of a Sattra sacrifice and Lord of the River Sarasvatī. From him, Kātyāyana. From him, Nīla. From him, Duṣyanta. His son—

3.

the immensely powerful universal sovereign Bharata erected a forest of sacrificial posts (*yūpa*) and performed Aśvamedha sacrifices on the banks of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā.

9–11.

From that Bharata ⟨was born⟩ Bhūmanyu. From him, Suhotra. From him, Hastin. From him, Virocana. From him, Ajamīla. From him, Saṁvaraṇa. ⟨The son⟩ of Saṁvaraṇa 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.

4.

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

5.

That one who, after defeating (Indra) the Crusher of Forts, made an offering of the Khāṇḍava (forest) to fire; who also obtained many divine weapons from Śambhu (Śiva) in combat; who seated himself on half the throne of Maghavat (Indra) when he had pulverised the enemies of the gods; who sent his (own) enemies, the Kauravas, to the city of Death—

⟨14–18⟩ —from that Arjuna ⟨was born⟩ Abhimanyu. From him, Parikṣit. From him, Janamejaya. From him, Kṣemuka. From him, Naravāhana. From him, Śatānīka. From 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 the power of fate, passed to the otherworld.

⟨18–27⟩ In the midst of that tribulation, his chief queen, heavy with the burden of a foetus, went together with the overseer of the harem, the women and the chamberlain, guided by the aged ministers and the chaplain (*purohita*), at long last came to a Brahmanical settlement (*agrahāra*) named Muḍivemu, and ⟨there⟩ gave birth to a son ⟨named⟩ 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 boy,

arranging for the performance of the ceremonies traditionally applicable to his particular *kṣatriya gotra*, 〈namely〉 being of the Mānavya *gotra*, a son of Hārīti, and so on.[1] 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〉 obtained 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[2], the pennant garland (*pāli-ketana*), the ¿inverted drum? (*pratiḍhakkā*)[3], 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—having vanquished Trilocana Pallava and taken his daughter Uttamadāni (for his wife), and having conquered the kings of the Kadambas, 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?).

6.

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

〈28〉 His son was Pulakeśī Vallabha. His son was Kīrtivarman. His son—

〈28–41〉 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 Hārīti, 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. His younger brother Indrarāja (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka),[4] for seven days. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine years. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five.

[1] In some parallel versions (see the apparatus to line 21), the ceremonies are described as being applicable to a member of a double *gotra*, namely Mānavya and Hārītaputra.

[2] 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.

[3] 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.

[4] See the apparatus to line 33 about an error in the text that has, in my opinion, been corrected in the original.

His son Jayasiṁha (II), for thirteen. His younger brother, 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 Vijayāditya (IV Kollabigaṇḍa), for six months. His son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. After dethroning his son the child Vijayāditya (V), King (*rājan*) 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. Then—

7.

Having defeated that Yuddhamalla, Ammarāja's younger brother, Rāja-Bhīma (II) of fearsome (*bhīma*) prowess [ruled] the earth for twelve years.

8.

That Bhīma, comparable to Daśaratha, had two worthy sons like Rāma and Bharata, specifically Kings (*nṛpa*) Dānārṇava and Amma. The younger ⟨of these two⟩, Ammarāja (II), protected (*rakṣ-*) the surface of the earth for twenty-five years.

9.

Learned in the sixty-four sciences ⟨prescribed⟩ for kings, his eldest ⟨brother⟩ called Dānārṇava, being comparable to a (wish-granting) divine tree, surpassed Karṇa and his like with his copious giving and thereby made his name ("Ocean of Gifts") forever literally true among the populace. He married the earth, gorgeous in her dress of forests, for ⟨a span of⟩ three years.[5]

10.

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

11.

Then there was a king (*rājan*), a ⟨veritable⟩ Moon of the Cālukyas (*cālukya-candra*)—born of Dānārṇava, endowed with the arts {possessing digits}, a disperser of the darkness of enemies—who dispelled the suffering of the earth.

[5]Since the earth is spoken of as a woman here and in the next stanza, I assume that the verb *vah-*, literally "carry," means "take for wife" in this sentence. However, related inscriptions do not normally speak of the king as married to the land, so perhaps the composer's intent was simply that he "bore" the earth. The same verb is apparently used in this latter sense in stanza XIII below.

12.

He, His Majesty Śaktivarman, seizing the earth by force from the forceful host of his enemies as if ⟨seizing it⟩ {from Bali}, the enemy of the gods, ruled it for twelve years as Cālukya-Nārāyaṇa.

13.

After him, the one born after him (i.e. his younger brother), King (*bhūpa*) Rājamārtaṇḍa (Vimalāditya), {a Sun among kings} blazingly brilliant and adept at dispersing the darkness of foes, bore ⟨the burden of⟩ the earth for seven years, glorious as the seven-horsed (sun), with his foot planted on the heads of all rulers of the earth.

14.

Of that Vimalāditya, comparable to (Viṣṇu) the husband of Lakṣmī, and of Rājarāja's daughter born of the Milk Ocean of the Coḍa Dynasty, Queen Kuṁdāṁbikā ⟨herself⟩ comparable to Śrī (i.e. Lakṣmī, born of the Milk Ocean), was born a son, His Majesty King (*adhipa*) Rājarāja, who dwelt[6] in the hearts of women all over the three worlds, like another Kandarpa (Kāma).

15.

⟨Already⟩ in childhood, the jewelled locket (of the heir-apparent) became the ornament of his neck, like a garland conferred on him by the earth ⟨itself⟩ in her choice of a husband, smitten with his virtues.

16.

He, King (*nṛpa*) Rājarāja, the repository of virtue, donned the (royal) turban in order to save ⟨the entire⟩ earth upon a multitude of Śaka years enumerated by the measure of the Vedas (4), oceans (4), treasures (9) (i.e. Śaka 944), when the Sun was positioned in Leo (*siṁha*), on the dark (*bahula*) ⟨fortnight's⟩ second day, a Thursday, when the moon was conjoined with ⟨the asterism⟩ Uttara-Bhadrā, and the watch (*yāma*) of Libra (*vaṇij*) was ascendant.

17.

His head, bound with the turban (of royalty), shone all the more, as if it had been raised by the populace in order to bear the burden of the earth.[7]

[6]The participle *prativasan* is evidently used in place of a finite verb here.

[7]The simile in this stanza is opaque to me. The reading may be incorrect; see the apparatus to line 56 and compare the slightly different version in stanza 22 of the Korumelli 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?

〈56〉 On the other hand,

18.

The sole jewel of the Coḍa family, called Rājendra Coḍa, who delights the company of the truthful by a rain of generosity, is renowned as one whose footstool is tinted with a halo of luminescence 〈cast〉 by the gems atop the diadems of all lords of men.

19.

That 〈Mount〉 Himavat was rendered holy, sprinkled by the pure waters of the Gaṅgā dripping onto him from the head of just one Lord (Śiva). How much more so is this Rājendra, 〈with light spilling on him〉 from the heads of many bowing lords, which illumine the expanse of the world with the brilliance of gems?[8]

20.

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,[9] erected, all over every quarter, 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.

21.

Having learned to his satisfaction of the Cālukyan Jewel's (Rājarāja's) excellence in birth, discipline, generosity and renown, and his virtues such as intelligence, bravery, honesty, purity, craftiness, valour and forbearance, that Coḍa Lord Madhurāntaka (Rājendra) gave his own chaste daughter named Ammaṁga to be his prime queen.

22.

While this king (Rājarāja)[10] has been protecting the circle of the earth impartially and

[8] I find this stanza awkward. The text is quite clear and requires only minor and straightforward emendation, but instead of the irrelevant and repetitive mention of illumining the expanse of the world, I would expect something in the second part of the simile to correspond to the water of the Gaṅges in the first part. Perhaps the composer had intended *ratnālokaiḥ* instead of *ratnāloka-*, which would eliminate the need to supply "with light", but in that case it would be the heads themselves that illumine the world. Going further with emendation, *-prāṁgaṇair yaś* would solve this new problem, but would still result in rather awkward syntax, so I refrain from emending so far. Venkataramanayya (1951–1952, p. 60) sees in this stanza a reference to Rājendra Coḷa's Gangetic campaign, but since the Ganges does not seem to be involved in the second part of the simile, the reference, if intended, is just a slight hint.

[9] Venkataramanayya (1951–1952, p. 60) opines that this stanza refers to Rājendra Coḷa's overseas conquests. This is probably indeed correct.

[10] The stanza does not make the subject change entirely clear, but the relative pronouns in stanzas 18 to

in the proper way, the conduct of the subjects has become rid of obstacles, free from sin, unspoiled and without envy.

23.

The eternal fame of this king—who is himself dependent on the liana that is the royal Calukya lineage—decorates the fair lady who is the trinity of worlds as conspicuously as a row of necklaces of scented sandalwood, as ¿a swaying brow ornament?,[11] as a garland laced with strands of immaculate jasmine, as the ¿allure of a gossamer shawl?.[12]

24.

For this lord, His Majesty Paraganḍa Bhairava, whose majesty is heroism, it is the vultures—weaving circles in the firmament with pinions spread wide as they hanker to devour the brains spilling from the skulls of his foes' elephants split asunder by the sword in his massive arms—that provide the splendour of a mass of waving feather fans (*piṁcchā*).

25.

His very enemies extol and propagate his valour unceasingly as they run from the battle fronts willy-nilly with perplexity, (saying), "what martial hero could, mounted on just a single horse, again and again overcome ¿a thousand steeds?,[13] and who could rain showers of arrows on the soldiers facing him?"

〈72–77〉 Greetings. That shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), the supremely pious Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*), Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*) and supreme devotee of Maheśvara, His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana (Rājarāja I), who was deliberately appointed (as heir) by his mother and father, seated on his throne of generosity, convokes all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Pallapu-Gudravāra district (*viṣaya*) together with the district named Gāḍevalu and, in the presence of the counsellor

20 correspond to a demonstrative pronoun in stanza 21, and the relative pronouns in stanzas 22 to 25 are logically picked up by the demonstrative in line 72.

[11]The text is uncertainly read here, see the apparatus to line 67. I assume that *lālāmakī*, not attested to my knowledge but derivable from *lalāma*, means a flower or jewel worn on the forehead or in the parting of the hair (as a modern-day *māṁg tīkā*), but this word may have been misread. The preceding *loleva* is a conjectural reading; if it is wrong, then it is also possible that *lālāmakī* qualifies the garland in the next quarter, making it a head wreath.

[12]Here too, I am uncertain of the interpretation, though the reading is quite secure. The other object of comparison are all physical, but in this case I see no other way but to understand *lakṣmī*, "beauty" as the object, and *daukūla* as "of something made of *dukūla* cloth."

[13]Here too the reading is uncertain (see the apparatus to line 70), but the meaning must be something much like that translated here.

(*mantrin*), the chaplain (*purohita*), the general (*senāpati*), the crown prince (*yuvarāja*), the commander of the guard (*dauvārika*), the chief minister (*pradhāna*) and so on, commands ⟨them⟩ as follows. To wit:

26.

There is a great general renowned as Rājarāja Brahma-mahārāja, the liana of whose reputation has been watered and nourished by the liquor that is the sympathy of King Madhurāntaka (Rājendra Coḻa).

27.

With his mighty, adroit and terrible arms, he is a serpent capable of protecting the great treasure that is the royal majesty of King Rājendra Coḍa.

28.

When he received the command of the great King Rājendra, my (Rājarāja's) incomparable maternal uncle, he forthwith proceeded from the southern direction to the land of Āndhra, accompanied by a great army, so fearsome that ⟨people⟩ looked on ⟨wondering⟩, "Is ⟨this⟩ perchance another Death, greedy to drink the blood of enemies?"

29.

Right along with him came another general, called Uttama-Śoḍa Coḍagon, who had pleased his lord with his devotion and efforts.

30.

And there came yet another man, Uttama-Coḍa Milāḍuḍayān, the lord {husband} of an army devoted to its commander {faithful to her husband}, whose sight could not be borne by enemies {who could not bear the sight of another man}.

31.

The three generals looked like three blazing fires lusting to burn to cinders the forest that was the army of Karṇāṭa.

32.

Between the generals of Karṇāṭa and the Tamil lords there ensued a battle, frightful with the clash of elephants into one another.

33.

Now it came to fisticuffs, then in a moment to hair-tearing; now staff upon staff, it is said, then immediately spear upon spear.

34.

Some valiant bowmen, their wrath burgeoning in battle, were even slain by their own arrows, turned around by a wind whose force was generated by the volleys sent by both armies against one another.

35.

Stalwart soldiers, 〈as if〉 they were moths to the torrent of sparks struck by the mighty clash of the swords of swordsmen, 〈became〉 filled with fear, their minds wavering, [...] five [...] [cavalry and] infantry.[14]

36.

Headless torsos of elephants and torsos of horses led by torsos of men dance with joy: "on this day we have paid our debt, so our lord has not been feeding us in vain."

37.

Elephants by elephants, horses by horses and men by men alike were ¿annihilated? as the two forces, matched in combat, perished simultaneously in that battle at the compulsion of fate.[15]

38.

"Surely this is our opportunity to go to heaven," reflected the finest footmen and riders and, longing for union with the divine damsels, they departed (all) together from the earth because of fate's ill will.[16]

〈99–103〉 Of these Tamil generals, the one named Rājarāja Brahma-mahārāja, having received the command of my maternal uncle the incomparable Madhurāntaka-deva and engaged in battle with the generals of Karṇāṭa, went to heaven together with those same (generals), because the strength of their cavalry, elephant and infantry troops was matched. I (the Cālukya Rājarāja I) have founded at the village Kalidiṇḍi a Śiva temple (*āyatana*) dedicated to him, named Rājarājeśvara. I shall also found two further Śiva temples dedicated to the other two (generals) known as Uttama-śoḍa Coḍagon and Uttama-coḍa Milāḍuḍayān. In order to provide for auspicious and exalted music, for

[14] See the apparatus to line 88–89 about the lacuna here.

[15] See the apparatus to lines 91 and 92 for two emendations that may be unwarranted, but without which I cannot interpret this stanza in a coherent way.

[16] I assume that *yugma* (normally, "pair") is used in this stanza for *yugya*, "draught animal," which in turn is used metonymically for elephant and horse soldiery.

the renovation of what is broken and cracked (*khaṇḍa-sphuṭita*), and for sacrifices (*bali*), offerings (*upahāra*) and so forth ¿at these?[17] (three temples), and to provide for the feeding of fifty pupils (*chātra*) studying the treatises (*śāstra*), I have granted the village named Kalidiṇḍi, (henceforth to be) renowned by the name Madhurāntaka-nallūru, along with the hamlet Māgaḍavaṟu,[18] together with fifty and two courtesans (*veśyā*), a hundred Brahmins knowledgeable of the Brahman and offering oblations in fire, a hundred Vaiśyas comparable to Dhanada (Kubera), and a hundred Śūdras arisen from the lotus foot of Brahman.

〈103–106〉 Its boundaries (are as follows). To the east, the border is none other than the border of Konneki. To the southeast, the border is none other than the border of [1×]lidoṟṟu. To the south, the border is Koṇṭhama.[19] To the southwest, the border is none other than the border of Vevāka. To the west, the border is none other than the border of Kaḍapaṟṟu. To the northwest, the border is none other than the border of Dāḍināṇḍu. To the north, the border is none other than the border of Potuṁbaṟṟu. To the northeast, the border is none other than the border of Potuṁbaṟṟu.

〈106–110〉 Also, in Pallapu-Gudravāra 〈district〉, the village named Kaḍapaṟṟu and (the hamlet) Duggiyapūṇḍi. Of this village, the border on the east is none other than the border of Kaludiṇḍi. To the southeast, the same. To the south, the border is none other than the border of Vevāka. To the southwest, the same. To the west, the border is none other than the border of Āvakūru. To the northwest, the river named Tallikroyya … (*tāmara-kolani krovviṇḍḍeṭaṁbāsina*). To the north, the border is none other than the border of Kalvasaṇḍa. To the northeast the border is none other than the border of Tāḍināṇḍu.

〈110–114〉 [Also,] in Pallapu-Gudravāra 〈district〉, [the village named] Āvakūru. […] The border on the [east] is none other than the border of Kaḍapaṟṟu. To the southeast, […] To the [west], the border is none other than the border of Koṇḍika-Muṁjalūra. […] the border is none other than the border of […]ṟṟu. To the northeast, [the border is none other than the border of] Kaḍa[paṟṟu]. […] shall be conjoined with the five great sins. […]

39.

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

[17]See the apparatus to line 98 about a conjectural restoration here.

[18]The syntax is a little problematic here; see the apparatus to lines 102 and 103. It is possible that the donation is only the hamlet Māgaḍavaṟu, located near the village Kalidiṇḍi.

[19]Koṇṭhama is probably another village name, in which case there is probably a scribal omission here, and the intended text was “the border is none other than the border of Koṇṭhama.”

40.

[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.]

41.

"[Each in your own time, you shall respect this] bulwark of legality [that is universally applicable] to kings!"—〈thus〉 Rāmabhadra begs all these future rulers over [and over again.]

42.

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

43.

His Majesty Rājarāja, ¿comparable to? [...], ¿by the convention of superiority? [...] from the western Sunset Mountain, ¿always by the convention of setting?[20]

〈121–122〉 [The executor (*ājñapti*) is the Castellan (*kaṭakeśa*)], Rāciya Pedderi['s son named Bhīmana]. [...][21]

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1937–38, p. 6, appendix A/1937-38, № 5 with description at ARIE 1937–38, p. 82, § 14. Summarised by N. Venkataramanayya in Telugu (1943). Edited from inked impressions by N. Venkataramanayya (1951–1952), without translation, with facsimiles. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Venkataramanayya's edition with his facsimiles.[22] Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

[20]This stanza is too fragmentarily preserved for any coherent interpretation, and I know of no parallels. The translations of the surviving fragments are offered as suggestions, but depending on the context, their meaning may have been quite different.

[21]Most of this stanza is lost, and my restoration is conjectural; see also the apparatus to line 121.

[22]Venkataramanayya shows much of the text as clear even though it cannot be made out in the published estampage, and some of what he shows in unclear is much clearer than some of what he shows as clear. I accept his readings unless otherwise noted, but indicate unclear readings according to the published estampage.

Primary

[V] Venkataramanayya, N. 1951–1952. “Kalidindi grant of Eastern Chalukya Rajaraja I.” EI 29, pp. 57–71.

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.

Venkataramanayya, N. 1943. “□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ (Rājarājanarēndruni Kalidiṇḍi tāmraśāsanamu).” *Bhārati* 20 (3), pp. 269–277.

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