Musinikuṇḍa grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III

Dániel Balogh

Alternative titles: Mushinikuṇḍa grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III – Musinikoṇḍa grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00080

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00080.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final D in line 39 is a da with a sinuous tail resembling a repha.

Original punctuation marks are plain vertical bars.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is above or, mostly when constrained by space, to the right of the character to which it belongs, but it may also be at median height to the right (l14, saṁghānvaye). Dependent au is clearly distinguished from o (e.g. l2 kauśikī), but o is also used in place of au (e.g. l6 potraḥ). Long and short i are usually not clearly distinguished, and I usually read with the benefit of doubt. Fairly explicit instances of long ī may be found in l11 māggaśīrṣa and l12 dvādaśī. Among several idiosyncrasies of the writing, the ā marker is sometimes attached to s at the right leg, not at the headmark (as in l2, prasāda; see also two instances of sāda in l41, of which the first is written regularly and the second in this alternative form).

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-viṣamasiddhi

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 svasti〈.〉 śr¿i?〈ī〉matāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-〈māna〉vya-sago〈2〉tr(ā)ṇāṁ hārīti-putrāṇāṁ kauśik¿i?〈ī〉-vara-pras(ā)da-labdha-rājyānā〈ṁ〉〈3〉 svāmi-mahāsena-pādānudhy¿a?〈ā〉t(ā)〈〈nāṁ〉〉 m¿a?〈ā〉t¿ra?〈ṛ〉-gaṇa-paripālit¿a?〈ā〉nāṁ〈4〉 bhagavan-nā◯rāya¿n?〈ṇ〉a-prasāda-sam¿a?〈ā〉sādita-vara-var¿a?〈ā〉ha-l¿a?〈ā〉〈5〉ñchanānāṁ {m}aśvamedha-y¿a?〈ā〉jināṁ calukyānāṁ kulam ala〈ṁ〉karisṇoḥ〈6〉 śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājasya p¿o?〈au〉traḥ śrī-maṅgi-yuva〈7〉rājasya priya-tanayaḥ svāsi-dhārā-namita-ripu-nṛpati〈Page 2r〉〈8〉-makuṭa-ghaṭita-maṇi-kiraṇa-rāga-rañjita-caraṇa〈9〉-yugalaḥ parama-brahmaṇya〈ḥ〉 mātā-pitṛ-p¿a?〈ā〉dānudhy¿a?〈ā〉ta(ḥ)〈10〉 śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārāj{y}aḥ sarvv¿a?〈ā〉〈n ā〉jñ(ā)payati

vidita〈11〉m astu vo ◯ 〈'〉¿svādita?〈smābhiḥ〉 mā〈r〉ggaśīrṣa-māsa-bahula〈12〉-dvādaśī-pūrvāhn¿a?〈e〉 p¿a?〈ā〉ram¿a?〈e〉śva(ra)ś (c)a pad¿a?〈o〉 〈'〉nvayā¿laplya?〈l labhya〉〈13〉ta (I)ty avitatha-¿p?〈ph〉al¿a?〈ā〉deśa-tuṣṭ{y}a-hṛda¿yadai?〈yaiḥ〉 śrī-kavu〈14〉ṟūri gaṇa-saṁghānvaye sūrasta-gaṇe śrī-c¿ā?〈a〉ndr¿ā?〈a〉prabhā〈Page 2v〉〈15〉cāryya-praśiṣya-ravicandrācāryya-praśiṣya-rāvinandy-ā〈16〉cāryya-kamalabhadrācāryya-praśiṣya-devanandy-ācā〈17〉ryyā¡yāṁ!〈ya〉 Aṣṭāṁga-divya-jñāna-vaśīkṛtāśeṣa-nṛpa〈18〉ti-maṇḍa◯la-śr¿i?〈ī〉mat-kālibhadrācāryyā¡yāṁ!〈ya〉 śr¿i?〈ī〉ma〈19〉d-¿ā?〈a〉rhat¿a?〈ā〉m anavarata-pūj¿a?〈ā〉-prava¿rṇṇatayā?〈rttanāya〉 śr¿i?〈ī〉-toṁka〈20〉-n¿a?〈ā〉tav¿a?〈ā〉ḍi-viṣaye _ musinikuṇḍākhya-nāma grā〈21〉m¿e?〈aṁ〉 śr¿i?〈ī〉-kubja-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājasya tasya〈Page 3r〉〈22〉 priya-vallabha-Ayyana-mahādev¡i!〈ī〉-bijavaḍa-na〈23〉ḍuṁbi-vasatyai śrīmat-kālibhadrācāryyeṇa Udaka-pūrvvaṁ〈24〉 kṛtvā sarva-kara-va¿ṁrja?〈rjaṁ〉 Asmad-āyur-ārogya-dharmma-yaśo〈25〉-〈'〉bhivṛddha◯ye dattaṁ Asmābhi(ḥ)

⟦Asya (kṣetrasya?)⟧〈〈Asya grāma-sīmaḥ〉〉〈26〉 s¿i?〈ī〉māni〈.〉 p¿u?〈ū〉rvvataḥ Aruvalapallama-gataḥ〈.〉 da〈27〉kṣiṇataḥ kusuma-guṇṭa-p¡ri!〈ṛ〉ṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉ata〈ḥ〉 cintak¿o?〈ā〉d ṟāyi-rā〈28〉vi-guṇṭa-sīmāvadhi-gataḥ〈.〉 paścimataḥ mroṁgu-ṟā〈Page 3v〉〈29〉yi-sīmāvadhi-gataḥ〈.〉 Uttarataḥ rāceṟuvula-〈30〉 cilloḷkapallamu-¿śi?〈sī〉māvadhi-gataḥ〈.〉 Evaṁ catu〈31〉r-avadhi-paryyantaṁ

⟦Asya kṣetrasya⟧<<Asya grāma-sīmāni>> vi¡dd!<d>i⟦di⟧kṣu<32> s¿i?<ī>māni<.> ◯ ¿A?<Ā>gneyataḥ viriguṇṭa cemromu<33>la-taṭ¿a?<ā>ka◯s ¿tūbhāmogaḍlanūyi? Uñca-panna<34>sa-s¿i?<ī>māvadhi-gataḥ<.> nair¡i!<ṛ>ti-di{ṁ}kṣu rāvadhi rāvi<35>-guṇṭa-paścima-cāṭṛayi Elamañci-kuṭṛu-kallu-sī<Page 4r><36>māvadh¿ī?<i>-gataḥ<.> ¡vāya<<va>>!<vāyavya>-dikṣu rāvadhi ṭiggi-ṛaI<37>-s¿i?<ī>m¿a?<ā>vadhi-gataḥ<.> Īśāna-dikṣu rāvadhi muvvuṁ<38>-doṁka-podalu-s¿i?<ī>māvadhi-gataḥ<.> Evaṁ vi¡dd!<d>ikṣu<39> catur-¿ā?<a>◯vadhi-pa<r>yyantaṁ

A<<(syo)>>pari na ka⟦ci⟧<<ści>>D<40> bādhāṁ karoti sa pañca-ma<hā>-pātaka-saṁyukt(o) bhavati<41> Asya grāmaṁ pra{yi}ti sāda-Ari-sāda-dv¿e?<ai>pakṣo<42> nāsti<.> vyāse¿ṇa?<no>kta¿ḥ?<ṁ>

1. Anuṣṭubh

sva-datt¿a?<ā>ṁ para-datt¿a?<ā>ṁ vā
yo haret¿i?<a><Page 4v> <43> vasundharā<ṁ>
ṣaṣṭiṁ va<r>ṣa-sahasrāṇi
vis¿ṭ?<ṭh>āyāṁ<44> jāyate k¡ri!<ṛ>miḥ

2. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhi<r> vvasudhā <<bhu>>kt{v}ā
bahubhiś cā<45>nupālitā
yasya yasya yadā bh⟦ā⟧<<ū>>mi¿ṁ?<ḥ>
ta<46>sya tasya ◯ tadā phalaṁ

Asya grāme sarvva<47>-kṣetra-pramāṇaṁ pañc¿a?<ā>⟦(śri)⟧ś⟦r⟧ottara-saha(sra)<48>-kodrava-bījāvāpa-mātraḥ

3. Anuṣṭubh

bhadr¿ā?<a>ṁ bhūyā{ṁ}j <j>ine<49>ndrāṇāṁ
śāsanāyāgha-nā¿s?<ś>ine
kutīrttha-dhvā<Page 5r><50>nta-saṁgh¿a?<ā>ta{ṁ}-
-prabhinna-ghana-bhānave

Ā<51>jñapti Ayyaṇa-mahādevī| śāsanāṁkitaṁ<52> kubja-vi◯ṣṇ(u)va<r>ddhana-mahārājasya

<53> g¡ri!<ṛ>ha-pari◯sūtra-pramāṇaṁ<.> pūrvvataḥ panthāḥ<.> (da)kṣi<54>ṇataḥ nāgula-paṭṭu<.> ¿ph?<p>aścimataḥ layaṇaṁ<.> Uttarataḥ<55> koṇḍaloya| (p)e(sa)ledu

<Page 5v>

Apparatus

Plates

〈3〉 -pādānudhy(ā)t(ā)〈〈nāṁ〉〉 • It seems that the original *ā* of *tā* has been remodelled into *nāṁ*, so that the text now actually looks like *°tanāṁ*, but the corrector's intent is clear.

〈5〉 -y¿a?〈ā〉jināṁ • These characters are very narrow. No correction has taken place here, but perhaps an attempt was made to squeeze *ya* down so that the vowel of *ji* can be fitted before the descender of *pra* above.

〈8〉 -ghaṭita- ◇ *padita* R.

〈11〉 〈'〉¿svādita?〈smābhiḥ〉 ◇ *svādita* R • I am fairly sure that previous scholars were mistaken in believing these characters to be a chronogram. See the translation and the commentary.

〈12〉 p¿a?〈ā〉ram¿a?〈e〉śva(ra)ś (c)a pad¿a?〈o〉 〈'〉nvayā¿laplya?〈l labhya〉〈13〉ta ◇ *paramaśwa iśva padānvayāla〈13〉 ta* R • There is a small dot to the left of the second *ra*, which gives it a very superficial resemblance to *ī* (though not *ɪ*). This dot is much shallower than the dots at the ends of headmarks, and I am certain it is irrelevant. See line 37 for a definite *ī*. The subscript component of the second conjunct with *ś* is subtly different from that of the first, so I believe the first was meant for *v*, and the second for *c*. R completely ignores *plya*, the last character in the line. All my emendations here are only tentative suggestions. My thanks to Jens Thomas, who suggested (personal communication) that the superfluous subscript *l* of *plya* might have been inscribed instead of a subscript *l* on the preceding character.

〈13〉 (I)ty avitatha-¿p?〈ph〉al¿a?〈ā〉deśa-tuṣṭ{y}a-hṛda¿yadai?〈yaiḥ〉 ◇ *na tvavitha dhapaladesa thu hridaya da* R • The first character looks like a figure 3 rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise, while I would expect initial *ɪ* to be this shape with two dots below (compare line 36). It is patently not *na*; Ramesam may have intended *ṇa* for his reading, but that is also out of the question. My reading of the rest of the characters is certain, but my emendations throughout this sequence are tentative. Compare the phrase *yasya dvija-gaṇa-varasyādbhutādeśa-tuṣṭaḥ* in stanza V of the Masulipatam plates of Vijayāditya III.

〈14〉 sūrasta- ◇ *surastu* R • The reading is clear, although *sta* looks as if the upper part was first engraved as *g*, then corrected to *s*, though this may just be a peculiarity of the scribe (compare si in line 20 below). There is no *u* attached to it.

〈16〉 -ācā〈17〉ryyā¡yāṁ!〈ya〉 ◇ *-ācā〈17〉rya yā* R • I emend the declensional ending tentatively; see my commentary and translation.

〈18〉 -kālibhadrācāryyā¡yāṁ!〈ya〉 ◇ *-kalibhadrācāryayā* R • The first part of the name may have been intended for *kali*, but *ā* is used in line 23 too. I emend the declensional ending tentatively; see my commentary and translation.

〈19〉 -prava¿rṇṇatayā?〈rttanāya〉 ◇ *pravannotayā* R.

〈20〉 -n¿a?〈ā〉tav¿a?〈ā〉ḍi- ◇ *natavadi* R • My emendation may be unnecessary, but other attestations of this name have long *ā*-s. — 〈20〉 grā〈21〉m¿e?〈aṁ〉 ◇ *grā〈21〉me* R • While *grāma* is normally a masculine word, it may be neuter when meaning "village" and is often treated so in related grants.

〈22〉 -Ayyana- • The spelling may need emendation to *ṇ*, compare line 51. — 〈22〉 -mahādev¡i!〈ī〉- • While *i* is frequently written in place of *ī*, if I am correct to interpret this word as standing in compound to the next one, then the use of a short *i* here may not be a scribal error but simply the convention of using *i* for feminine nouns ending in *ī* when in compound. See also the commentary.

〈23〉 -kālibhadrācāryyeṇa ◇ *kalibhadrācāryana* R.

〈25〉 Asmābhi(ḥ) ⟦Asya (kṣetrasya?)⟧〈〈Asya grāma-sīmaḥ〉〉〈26〉 s¿i?〈ī〉māni〈.〉 ◇ *asmabhih asya grāme sima〈26〉 simāni* R • The text from *Asya* to the end of line 25 is certainly a correction. The earlier text has been deleted quite thoroughly, but it is still mostly discernible as very thin lines. It seems to me that originally *Asya kṣetrasya simāni* had been inscribed, presumably through following a standard grant text mechanically. After deleting this, *Asya* was re-engraved a little to the left (in the process obscuring the *visarga* of *Asmābhiḥ*, which is now within the perimeter of the post-correction *A*), and instead of correcting to *grāmasya*, *grāma-sīmaḥ* was inscribed (with the *visarga* squeezed in at the very edge of the plate), apparently without noticing or caring that *simāni* was already present in the next line. Compare the correction in line 31. — 〈25〉 grāma- ◇ *grāme* R.

〈27〉 kusuma- ... ṟāyirā〈28〉vi-guṇṭa • This stretch of text is blank in R's edition. It is not clear whether R did not bother to offer a reading, or if his manuscript was illegible and it was the typesetter who did not bother. — 〈27〉 -guṇṭa- • Reading *-guṇḍa-* is equally possible, but *guṇṭa* seems to be a more likely word, and the subscript component is identical to that in *priṣṭa* further on. — 〈27〉 cintak¿o?〈ā〉d • Since *ṟāyi* recurs in the next line as an apparently unitary term or name (and possibly also in line 36, as *ṟaI*), I assume that *cintaka* is a Sanskritisation of Telugu *cinta* and was meant to be in the ablative here.

〈28〉 mroṁgu-ṟā〈Page 3v〉〈29〉yi- ◇ *vraungura〈Page 3v〉〈29〉i* R.

〈30〉 cilloḻkapallamu ◇ *cillarā pallavu* R.

〈31〉 ⟦Asya kṣetrasya⟧<<Asya grāma-sīmāni>> ◇ *Asya grāma simāni* R • As in line 25 above, it seems that *kṣetrasya* has been corrected to *grāma-sīmāni* without minding the presence of *simāni* in the next line. — 〈31〉 vi¡dd!〈d〉i⟦di⟧kṣu • There is a short horizontal line above *di*. Given that *viddikṣu* recurs in line 38, I assume that this is the spelling intended by the composer, and that the line above *di* is a deletion marker.

〈32〉 cemromu〈33〉la- • R's edition is again blank for this word and the whole of line 33.

〈33〉 °s ¿tūbhāmogaḍlanūyi? • The characters *stū* and *nū* are rather awkwardly shaped, but there is hardly any uncertainty about this string, which is unintelligible to me. Possibly, *ḍla* may be *dla*, and *nū* may be a badly misshapen *ka*.

〈34〉 -di{ṁ}kṣu rāvadhi • This may be non-standard (or plain bad) language for *dikṣu Avadhi*, understand *diśi Avadhi*. Compare line 36 below. The vowel marker of *dhi* is not fully formed, consisting only of a pair of horns atop the body. I see no reason why this was done, but an *i* marker was certainly intended. — 〈34〉 rāvi • The final character may perhaps be *di* or *ḍi*, or may have been corrected to one of these from *vi*, or the other way round. The line closing it into a *v* is much shallower and fainter.

〈35〉 -paścima ... kallu- • This chunk is again blank in R's edition.

〈36〉 ¡vāya<<va>>!〈vāyavya〉- • Here, *va* (for *vya*) is added in the space between *ya* and *di*, at and below baseline and in small size. Interestingly, the right limb of *ya* is itself raised (branching out from the stem at median level), as if to create space for this *va*. There is, however, no sign that a limb at the regular baseline level was deleted, and elsewhere on the plates, *ya* is often similarly formed without any correction. — 〈36〉 -dikṣu rāvadhi • This may be non-standard (or plain bad) language for *dikṣu Avadhi*, understand *diśi Avadhi*. Compare line 33 above. — 〈36〉 ṭiggi-ṟaI ◇ *diggi rana* R • The first character may be *di* or *ḍi* (compare *dikṣu* in the next line), but in my opinion *ṭi* is the most likely reading. The last character in the line is an unambiguous initial *I* (compare line 13).

〈37〉 -dikṣu rāvadhi • This may be non-standard (or plain bad) language for *dikṣu Avadhi*, understand *diśi Avadhi*. Compare line 33 above. — 〈37〉 muvvuṁ ◇ *mulla* R.

〈38〉 vi¡dd!〈d〉ikṣu ◇ *ciddikṣu* R • Ramesam is correct that the first consonant looks like *c*, but it was evidently intended for *v*, so I read with the benefit of doubt. For the

spelling, see also line 31. The character *ddhi* in fact looks like *dḍhi*, but this is because a small *i* marker overlaps its tail; see also the note to line 39.

〈39〉 A<<(syo)>>pari na ka⟦ci⟧<<ści>>D〈40〉 bādhāṁ karoti ◇ *asya parinaka〈40〉 bādhām karoti* R • R's edition ignores the last two characters in line 39. This string is evidently a garbled version of *asyopari na kaiścid bādhā karttavyā yaḥ karoti*. Both the vowel marker strokes as well as the subscript *y* in *syo* are subsequent additions, but I am not sure what the pre-correction character was (perhaps *pa*?). The initial *A* may also have been corrected. For *ści*, I am certain that originally only *ci* was engraved, which was then corrected by changing the original *i* marker to *ś* and adding a new minuscule *i* marker on top of that, overlapping the tail of *ddi* in the previous line.

〈41〉 ṁ pra{yi}ti ... dv¿e?〈ai〉pakṣo • R's edition is blank here. — 〈41〉 pra{yi}ti • I emend tentatively. It is also possible that *prayiti* is a legitimate word (or a corruption of some other word) forming a compound with the following *sāda*.

〈44〉 <<bhu>>kt{v}ā ◇ *dattā* R.

〈47〉 pañc¿a?〈ā〉⟦(śri)⟧ś⟦r⟧ottara- ◇ *pañca thrim śrottara* R • I feel certain that the intended text is *pañcāśottara* and not *pañcatriṁśottara*. The second character has obviously been deleted by paring down some of the copper around most of its outline and inside its body. The vowel mark has not been gouged out, but there are two vertical lines above it and some further vertical scratches lower down. The body is consequently indistinct, but I believe it was *śri* rather than *tri*. The next character was originally engraved as *śro*, but the ascending part of the subscript r has a short but distinct horizontal line across it, which is evidently not accidental. This must be a deletion marker. The received post-correction text is thus *pañcaśottara*, and *ā* markers are frequently dropped in the inscription. — 〈47〉 -saha(sra) • The body of *sra* is mostly effaced. I cannot tell if this is due to a fault in the copper or if it has been deleted.

〈48〉 bhadr¿ā?〈a〉ṁ bhūyā{ṁ}j <j>ine〈49〉ndrāṇāṁ ◇ *candrānvayā〈49〉ndrānām* R.

〈49〉 śāsanāyāgha-nā¿s?〈ś〉ine kutīrttha-dhvā ◇ *śāsanāya* R • R's edition is blank for the rest of this line.

〈50〉 -saṁgh¿a?〈ā〉ta{ṁ} ◇ *sambhūtham* R • The character I read as *gha* is perfectly identical to that in *ghana* further on in this line, and is absolutely not *bhū*. It might possibly be read as *pu*, in which case the intent may have been *saṁpāta*, *saṁpūta* or even *saṁbhūta*, but this form of u marker seems to occur only in *ṣu*, and in all other instances of *pu* (l2 and l7), the vowel marker descends below the body rather than being placed next to it. — 〈50〉 prabhinna-ghana-bhānave • R's edition is blank for this string.

〈51〉 Ayyaṇa- • The spelling is definitely with *ṇ*, while it is *n* in line 22.

〈53〉 g¡r!〈r̥〉ha-pari • R's edition is blank for this string. — 〈53〉 panthāḥ ◇ *bandhah* R.

〈54〉 nāgula-paṭṭu ◇ *nasala bandhah* R. — 〈54〉 layaṇaṁ ◇ *Ayanah* R.

〈55〉 koṇḍaloya| ◇ *kondilāya* R. — 〈55〉 (p)e(sa)ledu ◇ *desa ledu* R • There may be a deleted character after this string, but if this is not just a fault of the metal or corrosion, then it is only from midline to headline. Final *M* is a possibility.

Translation

Plates

〈1–10〉 Greetings. The grandson of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (II), who was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Chaḷukyas—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 were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāsena, who are protected by the band of Mothers, who acquired the superior Boar emblem by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, and who perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice—the dear son of His Majesty Maṅgi Yuvarāja: His Majesty the supremely pious King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (III), whose pair of feet are tinted by the hues of the rays from the gems fitted to the crowns of enemy kings bowed down by the blade of his own sword, who was deliberately appointed (as heir) by his mother and father, commands everyone 〈as follows〉.

〈10–25〉 Let it be known to you that, ¿being pleased in 〈our〉 heart with 〈their〉 correctly fulfilled prediction (*ādeśa*) 〈according to which〉 "we shall attain even the position of supreme sovereign through succession on the morning of the dark 〈fortnight's〉 twelfth 〈day〉 of the month Mārgaśīrṣa,"? we 〈Viṣṇuvardhana III〉 have—in order to augment our vitality, health, virtue (*dharma*) and glory—given the village called by the name Musinikuṇḍa in the prosperous Toṁka-Nātavāḍi district (*viṣaya*), exempt from all taxes, to the Reverend Master Kālibhadra—who has, through his eightfold divine knowledge subjugated the entire circle of kings—¿and? to the Master (*ācārya*) Devanandi, ¿who is the disciple of? the Master Rāvinandi ¿and? the Master Kamalabhadra, ¿who were the disciples of? the Master Ravicandra, ¿who was the disciple of? the Reverend Master Candraprabha in the monastic lineage of the venerable *gaṇa* of Kavuṟūr in the Sūrasta *gaṇa*, 〈making the donation in fact〉 to the Naḍuṁbi monastery (*vasati*) of Bijavaḍa (Vijayavāṭa)—〈which was commissioned by?〉 the Great Queen Ayyana, the dear beloved of His Majesty the King (*mahārāja*) Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana

(I)—¿for facilitating the? uninterrupted worship (*pūjā*) of the Reverend Arhats, ⟨the donation being⟩ sanctified by a libation of water ¿⟨performed⟩ with (i.e. into the hands of)? the Reverend Master Kālibhadra.[1]

⟨25–31⟩ The borders[2] of this village ⟨are as follows⟩.[3] To the east, it is up to Aruvalapallama. To the south, it is up to ¿⟨the line extending⟩ from the back of the Kusuma-guṇṭa ⟨passing⟩ a tamarind tree to the border between R̲āyi and Rāvi-guṇṭa?. To the west, ¿it is up to the border between Mroṁgu and R̲āyi?. To the north, it is up to the border between Rāceṟuvula and Cilloḷkapallamu. Thus it is demarcated by four boundaries.

⟨31–39⟩ The borders[4] of this village in the intercardinal directions ⟨are as follows⟩. To the southeast, ¿it is up to ⟨the line extending⟩ from the Cemromula tank in Viriguṇṭa to the *uñca pannasa* of *tūbhāmogaḍlanūyi*?. In the southwestern direction, ¿the boundary is up to ⟨the line extending⟩ from the western *cāṭṟayi* of Rāvi-guṇṭa to the border of Elamañci and Kuṭṟu-kallu?. In the northwestern direction, ¿the boundary is up to the border of Ṭiggi and R̲aï?. In the northeastern direction, ¿the boundary is up to the border of Muvvuṁ-ḍoṁka and Podalu?. Thus it is demarcated by four boundaries in the intercardinal directions.

⟨39–42⟩ ⟨Let⟩ no-one ⟨pose⟩ an obstacle (to the enjoyment of rights) over it. ⟨He who⟩ does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins. ¿There is no conflict of interest concerning the *sāda* and *ari-sāda* (taxes) applicable to this village.?[5] Vyāsa has said:

1.

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

2.

[1]My interpretation of this passage is tentative and radically different from that of the ARIE report and its previous editor, as well as all scholars that I am aware of who cited this grant in secondary literature before its publication. The passage is a single, exceedingly complex sentence with numerous scribal mistakes and thoroughly garbled case endings. See the apparatus to lines 11 to 23 for the textual problems, and the commentary for a discussion of the interpretation.

[2]The word for borders appears twice, probably due to inattentive correction in the text. See the apparatus to line 25. Throughout this passage, my segmentation into names is conjectural and may be off in several places.

[3]Most of my translations in this passage and, particularly, the next one, are desperate attempts to make sense of an incoherent mixture of Telugu and bad Sanskrit, and may well be off in many places.

[4]The word for borders appears twice, probably due to inattentive correction in the text. See the apparatus to line 31. Throughout this passage, my segmentation into names and words is conjectural and may be off in several places.

[5]This sentence may mean something entirely different. A tax named *sāda* appears in Sircar's *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, attested in an inscription of the Kalyāṇī Cālukya *yuvarāja* Mallikārjuna.

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.

〈46–48〉 The extent of all the fields at this village amounts to that sowable with a thousand and fifty 〈measures of?〉 *kodrava* seed.

3.

May there be blessing for the sin-destroying teaching of the Kings of Victors (*jinendra*): the sun that splits the clouds asunder when it clashes with the darkness of unworthy authorities {unpleasant fords}.

〈50–52〉 The executor (*ājñapti*) is the Great Queen Ayyaṇa.[6] ¿〈The land has been〉 designated by the charter of King (*mahārāja*) Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana.?

〈53–55〉 The extent of the circumference of the homestead 〈plot〉 〈is as follows〉. To the east, the road. To the south, ¿a termite mound inhabited by a snake? (*nāgula-paṭṭu*). To the west, ¿a rock-cut shelter? (*layaṇa*). To the north, *koṇḍaloya*. *pesaledu*.

Commentary

Ramesam incorrectly reports that the set consists of four plates strung on a ring. His facsimiles labelled from 1 recto to 4 verso are in fact from 1 verso to 5 recto.

To the best of my knowledge, all previous scholars who have written about this grant regarded the string *svādita* in line 11 to be a chronogram expressed in the *kaṭapayādi* notation. While the word does precede the specification of a day of the year (with month, *pakṣa* and *tithi*), and may thus be expected to identify a year, identifying it as a chronogram is problematic on several levels.

First, this interpretation (read right to left) yields the number 684, which, if taken as a Śaka year, would be equivalent to ca. 761 CE, later than the end of Viṣṇuvardhana III's reign. To eliminate this difficulty, B. V. Krishna Rao (1934–1935, p. 22, 1973, p. 35) suggested emending the text to *svāḍhita*, yielding 644 Śaka or 721 CE, which falls within Viṣṇuvardhana III's reign. However, the reading is clear, and Krishna Rao did not address the issue that such a chronogram is expected to be an intelligible word that is in some way relevant to the context. This could be argued for the received reading *svādita*, but is absolutely not the case with his propsed *svāḍhita*. Ramesam (1945–1946, pp. 45–47) argued for a date in the Vikrama era, yielding 627 CE, a date that falls in the reign of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana. This is consistent with his claim that the grant is

[6] See the commentary.

a re-issue of a grant from Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana's time, but as I shall show, this is not very likely. Moreover, his arguments for the plausibility of a Vikrama date at this time and place are unconvincing.

Second, even if the discrepancy of the date could somehow be eliminated, it is not likely that a chronogram of this kind would have been used without making it explicit that it refers to the year (e.g. by adding *saṁvatsare* or *śakābde*). According to Burnell (1878, p. 79), the *kaṭapayādi* system is used "almost exclusively in Malabar, Travancore and the southern Tamil country", and moreover, it "was commonly in use in the fifteenth century, but, apparently, not long before then". Burnell may not be entirely correct in the light of evidence recovered since his time, but recent scholarship (Rajeswara Sarma 2012, pp. 41, 47–48) still shows that the first positive and dateable attestation of the system is from late 7th-century Kerala. Moreover, epigraphic instances of its use are very scarce and no earlier than the 14th century; the only one known from the Telugu area was inscribed in the 16th century and is accompanied by a Telugu gloss explaining the numerical meaning. Had such a chronogram been employed in 8th-century Veṅgī, which is unlikely in itself, it would surely have been accompanied at the very least by some sort of hint to the prospective audience.

It may be added that not only *kaṭapayādi* chronograms, but, as acknowledged by Ramesam, dates in any established era, are altogether absent from all known early Eastern Cālukya grants. Charters that record a month, *pakṣa* and *tithi* (or the month and a new or full moon) either refer to a regnal year (the Reyūru and Koṇeki grants and the Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 2) Viṣṇuvardhana II, and the Cendalūr plates of Maṅgi Yuvarāja), or refrain from stating the year at all (the Sātārā plates of Viṣṇuvardhana I, the Niḍupaṟu grant of Jayasiṁha I, and the Peṇukapaṟu grant of Jayasiṁha II).

In the light of these considerations, the chronogram theory should in my opinion be discarded as nothing but fancy. What then could this string mean? The word *svādita*, though meaningful, does not seem to fit the context. Given the abundance of scribal mistakes throughout the charter, emendation is warranted. Emending to *sthāpita* would assume a minimum of scribal error, but this word also does not fit the context. Entering the realm of conjecture, I believe the word we want here is most likely to be *smābhiḥ*. Although phonetically very different from *svādita*, the graphemes involved still have an overall similarity, so it is not implausible that a scribe could have engraved one instead of the other. This reconstruction would also explain the preceding *vo* which should by normal sandhi rules be *vaḥ* before a word beginning with *s*. While absence of sandhi and the dropping of a *visarga* are common in Eastern Cālukya grants, the use of the sandhi-form *-o* in place of the default *-aḥ* is not. The proposed *vo 'smābhiḥ* is, however, standard sandhi for *vaḥ + asmābhiḥ*.

The phrase *viditam astu vo 'smābhiḥ* (or *viditam astu vo yathāsmābhiḥ*) is the stock beginning of the executive part of many related grants and is especially common in this earlier period of the Eastern Cālukya dynasty. In my opinion the original function of *asmābhiḥ* in this phrase must have been to identify the agent of the act of donation at the end of the executive section. Thus, the framework of the executive part is *viditam astu vaḥ*, "let it be known to you" that *asmābhiḥ*, "by us" (the king speaking in the first person and the majestic plural) something *dattaḥ*, "has been given". However, in the legalese of copper plate charters, the syntax of the executive section does not always conform to the above pattern and may, for example, use an active rather than passive participle or even an active finite verb to express the action (which in turn would require the first person pronoun in the nominative case, not the instrumental *asmābhiḥ*). It also happens in some grants (the Cimbuluru plates of Vijayāditya III and the Śrīpūṇḍi grant of Tāḷa II) that the agent is expressed by a second pronoun in the instrumental case, near the verbal form expressing the action. In such cases, it seems that the drafter misconstrued *viditam astu vo 'smābhiḥ*, perhaps as "let you be informed by us," or simply did not understand or care about the function of the first *asmābhiḥ* and used it merely because he knew it was conventional to put that word in that place.

In the present case too, we have a second *asmābhiḥ* at the very end of the executive section, just after the predicate *dattam* (line 25). Since the person who composed the charter was clearly not a proficient Sanskrit writer, he too may well have used the first *asmābhiḥ* just for convention's sake or in a mistaken sense. However, if I am correct in reconstructing and interpreting the executive section, there may be another solution to the issue, discussed below.

Ramesam (p47) simply announces that in this executive section, expressed as a single sentence, the agent is Queen Ayyaṇa. While the composer did have something of a swashbuckler approach to syntax and Sanskrit declension, I find it hard to believe that the agent of a passive participle (line 25, *dattam*) should be expressed by an apparent nominative (line 22, *ayyana-mahādevi*),[7] when the above-mentioned second *asmābhiḥ* stands right next to that participle. It is in my opinion much more likely that *asmābhiḥ* (either the second instance of this word or both) expresses the agent, meaning the reigning king Viṣṇuvardhana III who is making this address. The name of Ayyaṇa *mahādevī* is then to be construed not as a nominative but as in compound, joined to the following compound describing the Naḍumbi *vasati* (with a dative ending), signifying the recipient of the grant. The "*vasati* of the queen" is probably to be understood as an establishment commissioned by that queen.

Thus, contrary to the prevailing opinion that the present grant is a re-issue or confirma-

[7] In my discussion I use the spelling of the name with a retroflex *ṇ* as found in line 51.

tion of the original endowment of the *vasati* made in the time of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana, I adduce that this is a later and additional grant made in the time of Viṣṇuvardhana III, to a temple established by Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana's queen. I may be mistaken in this interpretation, since the colophon (lines 51-52) names Ayyaṇa *mahādevī* as *ājñapti* and (probably) says that the charter is authorised with Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana's seal. Nonetheless, in my opinion the executive section does not at all imply the existence of an earlier grant. The discrepancy of the colophon may be explained by assuming that the less than gifted composer of this text used the founding charter as a model for the present one (compare the colophon of the 00010, which is apparently modelled on that of a Viṣṇukuṇḍin grant at the same locality). Moreover, the name Ayyaṇa is masculine. It is thus probably not the personal name of the queen concerned, but a family name.[8] If so, then both Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana and Viṣṇuvardhana III may have had wives of this lineage. The intended meaning of the garbled phrase *śāsanāṁkitaṁ kubja-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājasya* may also be something other than that the present grant is sealed with Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana's seal.

Proceeding to the details of the grant, Ramesam altogether ignores most of lines 12-13. Indeed, much of this text is gibberish as received. However, copious but plausible emendation (for which see the apparatus to these lines) can render it meaningful and appropriate to the context. If my conjectural restoration is correct, then we have a compound in the plural instrumental agreeing with *asmābhiḥ*, telling us that the donor was pleased by an instruction (*ādeśa*), presumably of one or both of the *ācārya*s named below. We also have a phrase ending in *iti*, revealing the essence of this instruction, which seems to be a prediction to the effect that the position of supreme ruler will be attained. Since Jains had a reputation for divination, it is likely that the *ācārya* in question had foretold Viṣṇuvardhana III's rise to kingship and is now being rewarded. This king was preceded on the throne by two of his brothers, his senior Jayasiṁha II and his junior Kokkili. He must have been quite concerned over whether he would ever become king, especially during the brief reign of Kokkili. If this interpretation involving a foretelling is accepted, then the charter is unlikely to be a reissue of a grant made in Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana's time.

The passage introducing the recipients is also difficult to understand. The principal donee seems to be Kālibhadrācārya, whose name is mentioned twice. I believe that his second mention means that he was the person to receive the king's ritual libation representing this donation. Devanandi seems to be a second donee, and he is associated

[8] The executor of the Cendalūr plates of Maṅgi Yuvarāja belongs to the *ayyaṇānvaya* and bears royal titles. In the Īnteṟu grant of Bādapa, the mother of a royal favourite comes from the *jyeṣṭhāyāṇa-kula*, which may be the same family. Less certainly, the *āryāhū* (understand *āryāhva*?) lineage of a subordinate ruler (*mahārāja*) mentioned in the Koṇḍaṇagūru grant of Indra Bhaṭṭāraka may also be the same family.

with a teacher lineage in which I interpret *praśiṣya* to mean simply "disciple". Kālibhadra is not syntactically connected to this lineage, but it may be implied that he belongs to the same line of teachers; or he may have had only miraculous knowledge and no great teachers to speak of. I believe that the ending of these two names was meant to be in the dative. Further on, the name of the monastery is actually in the dative case, so I understand the text to mean that the grant was de facto made to the monastery. My translation reflects this understanding. Speculating further, it seems likely that Devanandi was the head of the monastery, while Kālibhadra was the person who made the prediction that pleased the king, and possibly an itinerant who was only temporarily associated with the monastery. Be that as it may, the passage's syntax is garbled and the declensional endings non-standard, so different scenarios cannot be excluded.

The phrase expressing the date comes directly at the beginning of the executive section and may thus be part of the *iti* quotation summarising the prediction, in which case the *ācārya* has foretold not only Viṣṇuvardhana III's accession to kingship, but also the day on which it would happen. Moreover, if the date is included in the quoted text, then going a step further would also include the first instance of *asmābhiḥ*. This results in a complete sentence expressing a prediction complete in itself, so I prefer this version in my translation. In this reading of the text, the minor syntactic problem of the iteration of *asmābhiḥ* is eliminated, since the first instance is in the quoted sentence. Simultaneously, the introductory phrase is reduced to *viditam astu vo*, which does occur in cognate grants without *asmābhiḥ*. As a corollary of this interpretation, our charter lacks not only a year, but also a day on which it was issued. This is uncommon among early Eastern Cālukya charters, but not unique and thus not a cause for concern. Read in this way, the text implies that the grant was made at, or shortly after, Viṣṇuvardhana III's coronation, and this implicit date may be why it was not deemed necessary to record an explicit date, or the occasion on which the grant was made. That said, lacking clearer hints either way, I cannot establish whether the syntactical position of the date is as given in my translation, or whether it should be understood that the donation took place on the specified day and the prediction was simply that Viṣṇuvardhana III would become king in due course (*anvayād*).

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1916–17, p. 7, appendix A/1916-17, № 9 with discussion at ARIE 1916–17, p. 114, § 21. Edited from estampages by Vepa Ramesam (1945–1946, № C), with facsimiles, with a rather desultory summary of the contents. The present edition by Dániel

Balogh is based on photographs of the original taken by myself in February 2023 at the Government Museum, Chennai, collated with Ramesam's edition and estampages. The published edition is replete with typographic errors and inconsistent and idiosyncratic transliteration and spelling. As a rule, this is silently ignored here, and only substantial differences from my reading are registered in the apparatus. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[R] Ramesam, Vepa. 1945–1946. "The Mushinikunda grant of the Eastern Chalukya king Vishnuvardhana III." JAHRS 16, pp. 42–49.

Secondary

ARIE 1916–17. *Annual report on epigraphy 1916-1917. Recording, with remarks, the progress report of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for epigraphy, Southern Circle, for the year 1916-1917*. Edited by H. Krishna Sastri. No place, 1917.

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