Boṇḍāḍa grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00081

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00081.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.

Original punctuation marks.

Other palaeographic observations.

Edition

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 svasti〈.〉 śrīmatāṁ saka[la-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-mānavya-sagotrāṇāṁ hāritī-pu]〈2〉trāṇāṁ kauśikī-vara-pra[sāda-labdha-rājyānāṁ svāmi-mahāsena-pādānudhyātānāṁ mā]〈3〉tṛ-gaṇa-paripā[litānāṁ bhagavan-nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-varāha-lāñcha]〈4〉nekṣaṇa-kṣa[ṇa-vaśikṛtāśeṣa-][mahībhṛtām?] [Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna-pavitrīkṛta-gā]〈5〉trāṇāṁ cālukyānāṁ [kulam alaṁkariṣṇoḥ] [ca. 18+]〈6〉 svāsi-dhārā-namit¿i?〈a〉[-ripu-nṛpati-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭitāneka-maṇi-kiraṇa-rāga-rañjita-cara?]〈Page 2r〉〈7〉[nāra]vinda-yu〈ga〉la¿ḥ?〈sya〉 Aneka-samara-saṁghaṭṭ(ano)palabdha-vijayina〈ḥ〉 śrī-maṁgi-

dugarāja〈8〉sya putraḥ pravardhamāna-pratāpopanata-samasta-sā(ma)nta-maṁḍala(ḥ) sva-śakt¿ī?〈i〉-{s}traya〈9〉-śūlāvabhinna-para-narapati-sakala-bala-cetana〈ḥ〉 sva-vaṁśodaya-śrī-(gi)ri-śikharāva〈10〉bhāsi-mahodayatvā(n) meṟur iva sthitimān ravir iva tejasvī para¿p?〈m〉a-brahma〈11〉ṇyo mātā-pit¿u?〈ṛ〉-pād¿a?〈ā〉nu{r}ddhyāt¿ā?〈a〉〈ḥ〉 pṛthur iva pra¿dhī?〈thi〉ta-yaśāḥ śrī-viṣṇuvardhana-mahā〈12〉rāja¿sya?〈ḥ〉 Ittham ājñāpa(ya)ti

pasiṇḍipa(ṟu)-v¡a!stavyasya ¡taitrīya!〈taittirīya〉-saha-brahma〈Page 2v〉〈13〉cāriṇe bhāradvāja-gotrasya trivedasya Āpastaṁ¿bh?〈b〉a-sūtrasya devaśarmmaṇ¿e?〈aḥ〉 pauttrā〈14〉(ya) veda-vedāṁ¿dā?〈ga〉-vid¿e?〈o〉 droṇamaṇḍasya putrāya{ḥ} govindaśarmmaṇe Aneka-ka¡l!〈l〉ā-śāstra-jñā〈15〉(ya) candra-grahaṇa-nimitte toya-pūrvvaṁ kṛtvā prāṅgguṇāḷa-viṣaye bo〈16〉ṇḍāḍa nāma grām¿a?〈e〉 kuṭuṁ¿y?〈b〉i(naḥ) samājñāpayati gṛha-s¿t?〈th〉āna〈ṁ〉 *toṭa*-vāṭa-sahitaṁ〈17〉 dattaṁ〈.〉 Ā¿ś?〈g〉neya-digbhāge vrīhi-vīja-triṁśa(t)-khaṇḍika〈ṁ〉 c¿ā?〈a〉 kṣetraṁ *nūṟu 100 maṟuntru* ¿kṣe〈18〉trebhyantaraṁ? dattavāN

Asya kṣetrasya sīma-vibhāgaḥ〈.〉 pūrvvataḥ kāḷasīya-vāṭa〈19〉bhoya-kṣe(tra)-sīm¿aḥ?〈ā〉〈.〉 dakṣiṇataḥ tuṁkhtalapaṟu-bhoya-kṣetra-sīm¿aḥ?〈ā〉〈.〉 paści¿ṇ?〈m〉ata(ḥ) ¿ga k⟦ā⟧〈〈u〉〉lyā?〈.〉〈Page 3r〉 〈20〉 Uttarataḥ kāmadeva-kṣetraḥ kṣetra{ṁ}(m i)ti〈.〉 Asya dharmmasy¿a?〈ā〉harttā paripāla¿I?〈yi〉tā Ā〈21〉gāmi-kāla-rāja¡riṣi!〈ṛṣi〉〈r〉 mayā śirasā prati¿b?〈p〉ūjita Iti〈.〉 vyāsa-¿ś?〈g〉īt¿a?〈au〉 dvau ślokau

1. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhi〈22〉r vvasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānupālitā
yasya yasya yadā bhū¿v?〈m〉i〈ḥ〉
tasya tasya ta¿th?〈d〉ā〈23〉 phalaṁ

2. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hare¿ṣu?〈ta〉 vasundharā〈ṁ〉
ṣ⟦ṭi⟧〈〈a〉〉ṣṭi¿(r vva)?〈ṁ va〉rṣa-sahasrāṇi
(viṣ)¿(ṭ)?〈ṭh〉(ā)〈24〉yāṁ jāyate k¡ri!〈ṛ〉mi〈ḥ〉

Ā¿g?〈j〉ñaptir asya prāguṇāla-viṣaya-¿rāṣṭrakuṭubi kakaṇḍiveḷḷi mu(ṭḷu)?

〈25〉 (svasti)

〈Page 3v〉

Apparatus

〈3〉 [litānāṁ]...[-lāñcha] • The text I supply here is five characters longer than that needed to restore the first two lines, while the extant bit of text at the beginning of the line is only 2 or 3 characters shorter. Perhaps *vara* was omitted from the standard text in the original.

〈4〉 [ṇa-vaśikṛtāśeṣa-]...[-kṛta-gā] • Here too, the text is slightly long. The restoration is probably very close to the original, except for the word *mahībhṛtām*, which may have been a different word meaning king or enemy.

〈6〉 [-ripu-?]...[-cara?] • The restoration is probably very close, but the original may have been slightly shorter, e.g. through lacking the word *taṭa* or *rāga*.

〈7〉 [nāra]vinda-yu〈ga〉la¿ḥ?〈sya〉 • PS prints the two supplied segments in the same editorial markup. I assume that *ga* has been omitted, while *nāra* has been worn to illegibility. PS does not supply the lost text on 1v, so he must have had some reason to supply just these two syllables at the beginning of this line. Further, PS does not emend *-yugalaḥ* to *-yugalasya*. The text is syntactically acceptable without this emendation, but given the structure of the section, I am quite certain that a genitive was intended here. — 〈7〉 saṁghaṭṭ(ano)palabdha ◇ *saṁghaṭṭo(ṇo)palabdha* PS • PS's reading, printed with *ṇo* in square brackets, should in principle mean that *ṇo* is unclear, but he may have wished to indicate something else. I believe the composer's intent was *saṁghaṭṭanopalabdha*, but this may require emendation if PS is correct in printing *ṭṭoṇo*. — 〈7〉 -vijayina〈ḥ〉 • The text is slightly garbled here; it ought to be *-vijayinaḥ* without preceding *upalabdha*, or *-vijayasya* with it. Both occur in similar expressions in related plates.

〈8〉 -{s}traya〈9〉-śūlāvabhinna- • Although the text is intelligible this way, I am quite certain that scribal haplography is involved, and the composer's intent had been *-traya-triśūlāvabhinna-*. Compare e.g. the very similar phrases in the Guḍivāḍa plates (set 2) of Jayasiṁha I.

〈10〉 me̲ru̲r • Lacking the means to verify, I accept PS's reading *me̲ru̲r*, but I doubt the *r̲* here.

〈12〉 pasiṇḍipa(r̲u)- • PS prints *r̲u* in round parentheses, which by his notation should mean that he is emending the preceding *pa* to *r̲u*. I assume that he intended to indicate an unclear character.

〈14〉 -vid¿e?〈o〉 • PS does not make this emendation, and it is not essential for the text to be intelligible, but here too, I feel certain on the basis of the passage's structure that this was the composer's intent. — 〈14〉 Aneka-ka¡ḷ!〈l〉ā-śāstra- • PS prints *aneka kaḷā*

sāstragñāya, noting after *aneka* that "Asterisk sign on the right side of the top of the letter *ka* and a damaged letter *ma* below the line are noticeable. Hence it may be read as *aneka kalā*". I do not understand why he observes the scribal mark and the added letter if he then disregards them. I wonder if the text has been corrected from *dharma-śāstra* to *kalā-śāstra* or the other way round. — 〈14〉 prāṅgguṇāḷa • Given that the spelling is reported as *prāguṇāla* in line 24, I have some doubt about the correctness of *ṅggu* here. — 〈14〉 -jñā〈15〉(ya) ◇ *-gñā〈15〉(ya)* PS • I believe that this is a typo in PS's edition, but cannot be certain; compare *samājñāpayati* in line 16 and *Āgñaptir* in line 24.

〈16〉 samājñāpayati • PS's edition prints *samāñāpayati* with an indiscernible manual addition before *ñ*. Since the diacritical marks in his edition have also been added by hand, I believe this is a correction by PS and the plates have the expected *samājñāpayati*; however, compare the notes to lines 14 and 24.

〈17〉 ¿kṣe〈18〉trebhyantaraṁ? • I cannot interpret this reading. PS's commentary speaks about *ābhyantara-kṣetra* at one point and *abhyantara-kṣetra* at another. If that is correct, then the reading may be printed incorrectly. If the reading is correct, then perhaps it should be interpreted as *kṣetre 'bhyantaraṁ* with *abhyantara* as a substantive (a kind of revenue?). See also the note to the translation.

〈19〉 tuṁkhtalapaṛu- • PS's reading of this name seems doubtful to me. — 〈19〉 ¿ga k⟦ā⟧〈〈u〉〉lyā? • PS observes that the *ā* seems to have been erased and a very faint *u* has been added at the bottom. He opines that *ga* is superfluous, and thus obtains the word *kulyā*, which he says means a canal. Sircar's IEG refers this meaning of *kulyā* to a single publication in EI, which is a copper plate from the far north, deemed spurious by its editor, who announces without any explanation or evidence that *kulyā* means an irrigation canal. I believe both PS's reading and his interpretation may be incorrect.

〈20〉 -kṣetraḥ kṣetra{ṁ}(m i)ti • PS does not comment on the repetition. The intent may have been simply *kṣetram iti*, though *kṣetra-sīmā* is also plausible.

〈24〉 Ā¿g?〈j〉ñaptir • Here, the reading and emendation are both present in PS's edition, so the received reading is apparently correctly reported. Compare the related words in lines 14 and 16. — 〈24〉 ¿rāṣṭrakuṭubi kakaṇḍiveḷḷi mu(ṭḷu)? • I show the received reading as printed in PS's edition. PS emends *kuṭubi* to *kuṭuṁbi* in the body text, but then notes that "The medial *i* on *ti* and the letter *bi* seem to have been erased", so I believe the plates may in fact read *kuṭibi*. PS then proposes reading *rāṣṭrakūṭaka kaṇḍivelli muṭlu*, understanding the latter two words as a name. Without seeing the plates, I cannot offer an opinion on reading *rāṣṭrakūṭa*, but believe that whether or not that word has been corrected by the scribe, the name (or whatever it is) should better be read *kakaṇḍiveḷḷi muṭḷu*.

Translation

〈1–12〉 Greetings. [The grandson of His Majesty King Viṣṇuvardhana II],[1] [who was eager to adorn the lineage of the] majestic Chaḷukyas—[who are of the Mānavya *gotra* which is praised by the] enti[re world, who are s]ons [of Hāritī, who attained kingship by the grace of] Kauśikī's boon, [who were deliberately appointed (to kingship) by Lord Mahāsena, who are pro]tected by the band of Mo[thers, to whom all kings instantaneously submit at the] 〈mere〉 sight [of the Boar emblem they have acquired by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa] and whose limbs have been hallowed through washing in the purificatory ablutions (*avabhṛtha*) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice—[...] the son of His Majesty Maṅgi Dugarāja, whose pair of lo[tus feet were tinted by the hues of the rays from the many gems fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of all the enemy kings] bowed down by the blade of his own sword, who attained victory in the clash of many a battle: His Majesty the supremely pious King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (III), who was deliberately appointed (as heir) by his mother and father, whose ever-increasing valour forces the entire circle of subordinate rulers (*sāmanta*) to bow, who breaks the entire army and 〈even〉 the mind of enemy kings with the trident comprised of his own three powers (*śakti-traya*), who—because of his magnanimity illuminating the summit of the majestic Sunrise Mountain that is his own dynasty—is as sound as (Mount) Meru and as fierce as the sun,[2] who has widespread glory like Pṛthu, commands as follows.

〈12–18〉 Informs the householders.[3] To the grandson of Devaśarman—a resident of Pasiṇḍipaṟu belonging to the Taittirīya school and the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, 〈learned in〉 three Vedas and the Āpastamba *sūtra*—and son of Droṇamaṇḍa learned in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas, 〈namely〉 Govindaśarman, who is familiar with numerous disciplines (*kalā*) and treatises (*śāstra*), on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon 〈I have〉 given, accompanied by (a libation of) water, a homestead plot along with ¿an orchard and? a

[1] According to PS, "It is known from the broken piece that no earlier king is mentioned" than Maṅgi. But I would expect the current king's father and grandfather to be named, and Viṣṇuvardhana II could very well have been mentioned in line 5.

[2] The eulogy is probably a little garbled here: Viṣṇuvardhana's illumination of the mountain of his dynasty should be adjacent to his comparison to the sun. Compare also ll. 14-15 of the Pithapuram plates (set 1) of Jayasiṁha I.

[3] This phrase was probably erroneously added to line 16, where it breaks the sentence completely after the name of the village and the district. In many related grants, the king addresses the householders and overseers of a particular village and its district, so the words were probably inserted here under the influence of that practice.

garden[4] at the village named Boṇḍāḍa in Prāṅgguṇāḷa[5] district (*viṣaya*). 〈I〉 have also given 〈to him〉 a field (sufficient for the sowing) of thirty *khaṇḍika*s of paddy seed in the southeastern direction, ¿the revenue of that field being? a hundred, 〈i.e.〉 100, *maṟuntru*.[6]

〈18–21〉 The disposition of the borders of this field 〈is as follows〉. To the east, the border of the *bhoya* field 〈of the village?〉 Kāḷasīya-vāṭa. To the south, the border of the *bhoya* field 〈of the village?〉 Tuṁkhtalapaṟu. To the west, ¿a canal?.[7] To the north, the field 〈called?〉 the field of Kāmadeva. I worship with 〈bowed〉 head that sagacious king of a future age who does not confiscate this provision (*dharma*) 〈but〉 protects it. 〈There are these〉 two *śloka*s sung by Vyāsa:

1.

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.

2.

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

〈24–25〉 The executor (*ājñapti*) of this 〈provision〉 is ¿Kakaṇḍiveḷḷi Muṭlu, a householder of the province (*rāṣṭra*) that is the district (*viṣaya*) of Prāguṇāla?.[8] Blessings.

[4]According to PS's discussion, the donation includes "garden and *vāta*" or, elsewhere, "gardens and residential locality (*vāta*)"". My assumption, which may be wrong, is that the Telugu word *toṭa* and the Sanskrit word *vāṭa* refer to two related but different things. Flower gardens (*puṣpa-vāṭikā*) are mentioned in association with a homestead plot in the Jaḷayūru grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III, the London plates of Maṅgi Yuvarājaand the Elūru Grant of Maṅgi Yuvarāja, while *toṭa* in the Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 2) of Viṣṇuvardhana II refers to a betelnut orchard, although it is also used in the compound *puṣpaka-toṭa* in the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II, year 3.

[5]The spelling of the name here and at the end of the charter is strange. It is certainly the same district that is called variously called Pāgunavara and Prakuṇora.

[6]I do not understand this part; see the apparatus to line 17 for the textual problem involved. I assume that *abhyantara* means some kind of revenue (cf. Sircar's IEG, s.v. *abhyantarasiddhi*) to which the donee is entitled from this field. PS suggests that the term *abhyantara-kṣetra* means wet land, but does not justify this in any way. In his summary, he calls this a field "of hundred *maṟuntru*s" once and "hundred *maṟtur*s" another time, apparently separate from the paddy field. It is not clear whether the word *maṟuntru* is so straightforward to him that he does not deign to explain it, or if he is as ignorant of the meaning as I am. At any rate, I definitely do not think the text is about two fields.

[7]The reading and interpretation are problematic here; see the apparatus to line 19.

[8]The name may be Kaṇḍiveḷḷi Muṭlu, and he may be a territorial overseer (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*) of Prāguṇāla district. See the apparatus to line 24.

Bibliography

Not reported in ARIE. Edited from the original by P. V. Parabrahma Sastry (1994), without facsimiles, with a summary of the contents. The present edition by Dániel Balogh follows Parabrahma Sastry's edition unless otherwise noted in the apparatus, except for the silent correction of what I deem to be typos and transliteration inconsistencies in PS's edition. The restorations supplied on 1v are also mine. PS mentions that the charter contains many scribal corrections, but explicitly indicates only a very few in his edition. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[PS] Parabrahma Sastry, P. V. 1994. "Boṇḍāḍa grant of Chālukya Vishṇuvardhana." In: *Epigraphia Āndhrica vol. VI*. Edited by N. R. V. Prasad. Hyderabad: Government of Andhra Pradesh, pp. 13–17.

Secondary

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