

Peravali plates of Viṣṇuvardhana IV

Dániel Balogh

Alternative titles: Reṇḍuballī grant of Viṣṇuvardhana V – Raṇḍuballī grant of Viṣṇuvardhana V

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00083

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00083.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final M (l27, l32) is usually a simplified ma, but in l37 (twice) it seems to be the later form, a tiny circle with a single sinuous tail. Final T (l27) is a reduced ta with a short vertical tail instead of a headmark.

Original punctuation marks.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is normally above and to the right of the character to which it belongs. Long dependent ī is barely distinguishable from short (but occasionally conspicuous, e.g. l8 kīrtteḥ); I read most instances with the benefit of doubt. Rare initial Au occurs in line 22; the curved stroke at its top right, distinguishing it from O, is not clear in the estampage, but distinct in the original.

Edition

Seal

<1> (śrī-viṣa?)[masiddhi?]

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> sv[ī]⟨⟨a⟩⟩sti⟨.⟩ śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-
mānavya-sagotrāṇām hāriti-pu⟨2>trāṇām kauśī?⟨i⟩kī?⟨i⟩-vara-prasāda-
labdha-rīa?⟨ā⟩jyānām mātṛ-gaṇa-paripālītānā⟨m⟩⟨3> svāmi○-mahāsena-
pādānudhyātānām bhagavan-nīa?⟨ā⟩rāyaṇa-prasā(da)-sīā?⟨a⟩⟨4>mīa?⟨ā⟩sā○dita-
vara-varāha-lāñīc?⟨ch⟩anekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalā(nām aśvame)⟨5>dhāv-
abhṛt?⟨th⟩a-snīa?⟨ā⟩na-pavitṛī?⟨i⟩kṛta-vapuṣām caḷukyānām kulam alarṁkar-
iṣṇoḥ svāsi-dhārā-prabhīa?⟨ā⟩vā⟨6>varjjitīa?⟨ā⟩śeṣa-bhūpāla-makuṭa-koṭi-
m(ā)ñīk(k)!⟨ky⟩a-śāṇa-kaṣaṇa-masṛṇa-nakha-maṇi-kiraṇa-k(e)⟨7>sarodbhāsita-
pāda-padma-yugaī!⟨l⟩asyānavarata-tulā-dhṛta-śātakumbha-viśr(ā)⟨Page 2r>⟨8>ṇana-
va⟨r>ddhitāvadāta-kīrtteḥ sarvva-lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājasya
pautra⟨ḥ⟩ ni⟨9>ja-bhu⟨⟨ja⟩⟩-niśītāsi-dhārā-pra⟨⟨īs?⟨ś⟩a⟩⟩mita-para-caīkk!ra-
vikramasyāneka-sāmanta-mauli-m(ā)⟨10>lā-ma○karanda-rajah-puñja-piñjarita-
caraṇāravinda-dvayasyāneka-tulā-dhṛta⟨11>-svarṇṇa○-dā⟨⟨na⟩⟩-vidhūta-
pāpmana⟨ḥ⟩ niravadyodāra-guṇa-⟨⟨gaṇā⟩⟩laṁkṛtasya śrī-vijayādi⟨12>tya-
mahārājasya priya-tanayaḥ sva-pratāpa-śravaṇa-tat-kāla-viliya(mā)na-para⟨13>-
narapati-vikramaś cakrava⟨⟨r⟩⟩tti-lakṣaṇopetaś śārīg?⟨n⟩gāyudha Iva
la(kṣ)mīi?⟨i⟩-vallabha⟨ḥ⟩ (kṣi)rā⟨Page 2v>⟨14>rṇṇava Ivātīgīā?⟨ā⟩mbhīra-
saītlvaḥ Anavarata-laī!⟨l⟩ita-mada-mudita-vibhrama-bhramita⟨15>-laṭaha-
kaṭākṣekṣaṇālakṣiteṣu makaradhvajah Ari-timira-nika⟨⟨ra⟩⟩-vidhvamsano⟨16>daye○ṣu
praī!⟨l⟩ayādityaḥ subhaṭa-prakaṭāṭopa-kṣubhita-kolāhalā{ha}⟨17>{la}sa○nna-
yuddheṣu viśamasiddhi⟨ḥ⟩ dīi?⟨i⟩nānātha-suhṛ{r}j-jana-dvija-bandhu⟨18>-īb!⟨v⟩ṛndāraka-
mitra-bhṛtya-kā(m)kṣita-vara-pradāneṣu kāmadh(e)n(u)⟨ḥ⟩ deva-dvija-guru-
caraṇīa?⟨ā⟩⟨19>nudhyīa?⟨ā⟩tas sarvvalokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇ(u)varddhana-mahārāj(ā)dhīrā⟨⟨(ja)⟩⟩-
parameśvara-bhaṭṭā⟨Page 3r>⟨20>rakaḥ♣gudrahāra-viṣaya-nivāsino rāṣ(tr)akīu?⟨ū⟩(ṭa)-
p(ramu)khīa?⟨ān⟩ kuṭī!⟨u⟩mbina⟨ḥ⟩ sarvvīa?⟨ā⟩n ī⟨21>tīt?⟨th⟩(am
ā)īnā?⟨jñā⟩payati

viīdh?⟨d⟩itam astu vo <?>smā(bhi)[h] [ca. 3×]-(vā)stavyīa?⟨ā⟩ya kauśīkhi?⟨ka⟩-
go⟨22>trīa?⟨ā⟩ya ○ tait⟨t⟩irīi?⟨i⟩ya-sa⟨bra⟩hmacāriīn?⟨n⟩e Aulīa?⟨u⟩(p)e[ya]-
(s)ūtr(ā)ya veda-vedīa?⟨ā⟩mṛgeti{(h)iti}⟨23>hāsa○-purāīn?⟨n⟩a-vidīe?⟨o⟩

viṣṇuś{ś}armmaḥ(na)?<ṇaḥ> (pau)trḥaḥ?<āya> (sa)rvva-śāstra-vidḥ(e)?<o>
yaj(ñ)āśa(rm)m(aṇa)<ḥ><24> putrāyḥā?<a> pada-vākya{ta}-ḥpramana?<pramāṇa>-
prabhava-cā(ru)-bhḥu?<ū>ri-kīrttḥe?<aye> ṣaṭ-karmma-nīratāya trḥai?<ayī><25>-
m(ā)rggḥa?<ā>ḥn?<n>uḥś?<s>āriḥn?<n>e Āyuḥ-m!<r>-ārogyḥa?<ā>bhivḥi?<ṛ>ddhaye
bhavvaś{ś}a<r>maḥ(na)?<ṇe>s(o)ma-graha<Page 3v><26>(ṇa)-nimitte<<ra>>nduballī
nāma grāma<ḥ> sarvva-kḥā?<a>ra-parihḥa?<ā>reḥn?<n>a Udaka-pḥu?<ū>rvva<m>
kṛil<ṛ><<tvā>><27> dattaM

tasya Avadhaya<ḥ><.> pḥu?<ū>rvvataḥ kalpaṭṭanabu AvadhiḥT?<ḥ><.>
dakṣiḥn?<n>ata<<ḥ>> tālka<28>ṭuru ○ AvadhiḥT?<ḥ><.> paścimataḥ niḍu(m)gāḍu
AvadhiḥT?<ḥ><.> Uttarat{t}a<ḥ> ja(kka)<29>nace○ruvu AvadhiḥT?<ḥ><.>
jye!<E>tesḥa?<ām> catur-avadhayaḥ<.> Asyopari (bā?)<30>dhā na kenacit
karaṇḥ(i)?<i>y{y}ā<.> karoti yas sa pañca-mahḥa?<ā>-pātaka-saṁy{y}ukto
bhava(ti)<.><31> vyāsenāpy ukta<M>

1. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānupālītā
yasya yasya<Page 4r><32> yadā bhūmi<s>
tasya tasya tadā ḥp?<ph>alaM

2. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattām para-dattām vā
yo haretḥi?<a> vasu<33>ndharā<m>
ṣaṣṭīrṇ varṣa-sahasrāṇi
viṣṭḥt?<ṭh>āyḥa?<ām> jā<y>t{t}e kṛmi<ḥ>

3. Anuṣṭubh

bhūmi-dānāt paraṁ dāna<34>n
na bhū○tan na bhaviṣyati
tasyaiva haraṇāt pāpan
na bhūtan na bhaviṣya<35>ti

4. Anuṣṭubh

bhḥu?<ū>○mirṇ yaḥp?<ḥ> pratiḥdh?<g>ṛṇh!<hṇ>āti
yaś ca bhūmi<m> prayacchati
Ubh(au) tau p(u)<36>ṇya-karmmāṇ(au)
niyatḥau?<am> svargga-vāsiḥ(n)?<n>(au)

5. Anuṣṭubh

svan dātu<ṛ> sumahac chakya<ṛ>
(duḥkha)<37>m anyatra pālanaM
dānaṁ vā pālana<ṛ> veti
dānāc chreyo <'>nupālanaM

6. Anuṣṭubh

ḷA?<ā>jña<Page 4v><38>ptir asya dharmmasya
nirmmalo dha<r>mma-sa<ṛ>graha<ḥ>
Eṇeyamma Iti khyḷa?<ā>ta(ḥ)
ś(ū)<39>ro vinaya-vaḷcha!<tsa>ḷi!<1>aḥ
kautamḷa?<ā>cāryyeṇa likhitaM
<Page 5r> <Page 5v>

Apparatus

Seal

<1> (śrī-ṣiṣa?) [masiddhi?] • The seal is completely effaced. Faint vestiges are compatible with the reading shown here and seem less compatible with the most likely alternative *śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa*, but the reading and restoration are far from confident.

Plates

<5> -prabhḷa?<ā><vā><6>varjjitḷa?<ā>śeṣa- ◇ -pra(bhā)<6>(vā)rjjitḷa?<ā>śeṣa- RM
• RM cites the Pṛthivipallavapaṭṭana grant of Viṣṇuvardhana IV as also reading -*prabhāvārjjitāśeṣa*-, but this may be an oversight. His point is not to corroborate this reading but to indicate that the title is simpler there. It is quite certain on the basis of several cognate plates that the intended expression was *prabhāvāvarjjitāśeṣa*-.
<6> -k(e)<7>sarodbhāsita- ◇ -ka<7>rodbhāsita- RM • The reading is quite clear in the original plate (sa is to the left of the descender of *rjji* in the previous line), and confirmed by the Zulakallu plates of Vijayāditya I.

<6> -k(e)<7>sarodbhāsita- ◇ -ka<7>rodbhāsita- RM • The reading is quite clear in the original plate (sa is to the left of the descender of *rjji* in the previous line), and confirmed by the Zulakallu plates of Vijayāditya I.

<8> -kīrtteḥ • The surface of the plate, elsewhere pristine, is a little uneven around these two characters. They are also a little narrower than usual, and the vowel marker for *e* is squeezed poorly into the scant space between these two characters. They, and perhaps the preceding two and the next one, may be a correction over carefully deleted earlier text.

<13> cakrava<<r>>tti- • The *repha* has been written as a separate stroke (resembling a J in shape) to the right of the *i* marker. It is probably a subsequent addition, though it is also possible that it was written this way in order to avoid having to reduce the size of the *i* marker. — <13> (kṣī)rā<Page 2v><14>(r)ṇṇava Ivātig;ā?<a>mbhīra- ◇ kṣīrā<Page 2v><14>rṇṇavair atig;ā?<a>mbhīra- RM • The reading is clear, so this must be some kind of weird typo in RM.

<15> -nika<<ra>>- • RM's note about the *ra* being added below the line is wrongly anchored next to the preceding word, *timira*.

<16> -kolāhalā{ha}<17>{la}sa○nna- ◇ -kolāhalāha<17>{la} sanna- RM • I do not know why RM considers only *la* to be superfluous. In addition to the dittography, there is yet another *la* inscribed above the first in line 17, and then deleted. It seems that the engraver first started the line too high, then decided to delete the first character and start again lower down.

<19> -mahārāj(ā)dhirā<<(ja)>>- • A *kākapada* in the shape of a small cross is inscribed to the right of the vowel marker of *rā*, and the added *ja* is below this mark, to the right of the lower body of *rā*. — <19> -parameśvara- • The characters *rame* are narrower and more closely spaced than usual, while *śvara* are extremely narrow and close, as well as fainter than the rest of the writing. It seems very likemy that only *parama* had been first inscribed, then *rama* was deleted and *rameśvara* reinscribed in the resulting space..

<20> -p(ramu)kh;ā?<ān> ◇ -p(ra)mu(kha)- RM • My emendation is not essential for the text's intelligibility, but the formula is ubiquitous in the corpus.

<21> -(vā)stavy;ā?<ā>ya • Here, *ya* is very narrow and its left limb is barely present. It is possible that this character is a subsequent insertion, utilising the left-hand stroke of *au* on the next character for its right limb (and re-inscribing the *au* stroke in smaller size) and inserting the rest of *ya* in the space after *vya*.

<23> -purā;n?<n>a-vid;e?<o> ◇ -purāṇa-vide RM • Although the preceding words, in the dative, qualify the donee, I still think this particular compound at least was intended to qualify his grandfather. Note that the specification of residence and affiliation likewise applies to the donee's grandfather, rather than the donee himself, in many related grants. — <23> viṣṇuś{ś}armma;ī(na)?<ṇaḥ> ◇ viṣṇuśarmmaṇaḥ RM. — <23> -śāstra-vid;ī(e)?<o> ◇ -śāstra-vide RM • Here too, I believe this term was meant to apply to the donee's father, not to the donee.

<24> pada-vākya{ta}-;īpramana?<pramāṇa>- RM • I accept RM's emendation because of the strong collocation of these three words and the attestation of their combination in the Uruvūṭuru grant of Vijayāditya III. I do wonder, however, if *vākyata* (possibly

vākyāta, with a minuscule hook at the end of the subscript y stroke) was rather meant for vākyārtha.

<25> Āyuḥ-m!<r>-ārogy(ā) • I believe this *m* is not an unwitting mistake but non-standard sandhi involving an epenthetic *m*.

<26> <<ra>>nduballī ◇ *reṇḍuballī* RM • The name was read as Raṇḍuballī for the ARIE report, while RM asserts that it is correctly Reṇḍuballī. In RM's estampage, the first character does look rather like *re*, but there are also two conspicuous dots placed symmetrically on either side of its body. Because of these, I was inclined to read it as a long initial *ī* when I first edited this text. Having in the meantime had the opportunity to look at and photograph the original plates, I am now certain that *ra* (and nothing else) is inscribed here, but this character is a correction over some earlier writing. What looks like an *e* marker in the estampage is part of the curved outline of the pre-correction character, and what look like two dots are probably the lower ends of its body, which may have been *ga*. I hazard the conjecture (without showing it in my edition) that the engraver may have written *grā* for *grāmahere*, then realised that he had omitted the name of the village. There is, however, no trace of a subscript *r*, and the right limb of *grā* further on in this line continues seamlessly into the subscript *r*, lacking a hook that might have resulted in the dot present at this locus. Thus, *gā* is perhaps more likely for the pre-correction character, and it too is very far from certain. The second character of the name is beyond doubt *ndu*, not *ṇḍu*. The reason why previous editors thought otherwise is probably a small and slightly sinuous horizontal stroke to the left of the headmark, which may have been taken for the left-hand side of the distinctive upper component of *ṇ*. The right-hand side of the headmark, however, shows neither the rest of this component, nor any sign of damage. The sinuous horizontal stroke is in all probability a remnant of the pre-correction character here; indeed, it looks very similar to the *ā* of *grāma* later in this line. The third character, *ba*, is indistinct in the estampage but clear in the original.

<27> tālka<28>ṭuru ◇ *tā(rka)<28>ṭu?<ū>ru* RM.

<28> niḍu(rn)gāḍu ◇ *niḍugāḍu* RM • A dot above *gā*, to the left of its centre, is visible in the estampage and clear in the original. It is in all probability an *anusvāra*.

<29> ḥye!<ye>teṣa?<ām> ◇ *ḥyeteṣa?<ete>* RM • RM's emendation is of course perfectly appropriate to the immediate context, but seems to be an unlikely scribal error, and the formulation *ete catur-avadhayaḥ* does not occur anywhere else in the corpus that I am aware of. I believe the text is garbled from expressions involving *Eteṣām catur-avadhi-madhya-varti* (cf. the Nemmalūru and Dinakādu grants of Vijayāditya I).

⟨32⟩ haret_{ḥi?}⟨a⟩ ◇ _{hḥe?}⟨a⟩ret_{ḥi?}⟨a⟩ RM • What looks like an *e* marker is an ornamental extension to the tail of *ha*.

⟨33⟩ ṣaṣṭim ◇ ṣaṣṭi(r) RM.

⟨35⟩ Ubh(au) tau ◇ tau RM • The vowel marker on *bh* consists only of a humped right-hand stroke; the left-hand stroke completing *au* was omitted by the scribe.

⟨37⟩ anyatra • This word does not fit the context well and is probably a scribal mistake for *anyārtha*. The only other occurrence of this stanza in the Eastern Cālukya corpus that I am aware of is in the Koṇḍaḥaripīḷa grant of Viṣṇuvardhana III, where the variant of this word is *anyasya*.

⟨39⟩ kautam_{ḥa?}⟨ā⟩cāryyeṇa • RM emends the to *gautamācāryyeṇa*, which is probably correct, but I prefer not to interfere.

Translation

Plates

⟨1–21⟩ Greetings. The grandson of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana (III), the shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*) whose pair of feet is illuminated by a nimbus of rays from the jewels that are his toenails, which have been rubbed smooth by the grindstones that are rubies at the tips of the crowns of the totality of kings bowed down by the prowess of the blade of his sword, whose clear reputation was enhanced by the ceaseless distribution of gold weighed on balance scales,¹ and who was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Caḷukyas—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 Mahāseṇa, to whom the realms of adversaries 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 (*avabḥṛtha*) of the Aśvamedha sacrifice—; the dear son of His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Vijayāditya (I), who repressed the onslaught of enemy armies (*para-cakra-vikrama*) by the sharp swordblade ⟨wielded by his⟩ own arm, whose pair of lotus feet were engilded by a mass of stamen dust (i.e. pollen) from the garlands on the brows of many peripheral rulers (*sāmanta*), whose sins were washed off by the donation of gold weighed in many a balance scale and who was adorned by a host of irreproachable (*niravadya*) and noble virtues: ⟨namely⟩ His Majesty the Supreme Lord

¹That is, gold weighed on a scale against his body, the *tulāpuruṣa mahādāna*.

(*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*) and Sovereign (*bhaṭṭāraka*) Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), upon hearing of whose ferocity the bravery of enemy kings (*para-narapati-vikrama*) instantly vanishes, who possesses the bodily marks of a universal sovereign (*cakravartin*), who is the beloved of Royal Fortune (*lakṣmī*) as (Viṣṇu) the Wielder of the Śārṅga (bow) {is the beloved of Lakṣmī}, who is very profound by nature, like the ocean, who is a very Crocodile-bannered (love god) among (men) at whom (women) glance with flirtatious eyes (made all the more) appealing by a flurry of gestures delighting in ceaseless playful desire, who is a doomsday sun inasmuch as his rising dispels the dense darkness of enemies, who prevails over adversity (*viśama-siddhi*) in battles thick with agitated clamour and the swaggering displays of great warriors, who is a cow of plenty (*kāmadhenu*) inasmuch as he grants the boons coveted by the destitute, the helpless, his friends, Brahmins (*dvija*), kinsmen, reputable persons,² allies and underlings (*bhṛtya*), and who defers to³ the honoured presence (*pāda*) of gods, Brahmins and his elders (*guru*)—<this Viṣṇuvardhana> commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Gudrahāra district (*viṣaya*) as follows.

<21–27> Let it be known to you that on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, for the augmentation of <our> vitality and health, we have given the village named Randuballī with an exemption from all taxes, <the donation being> sanctified by (a libation of) water, to Bhavvaśarman, a resident of [ca. 3×] belonging to the Kauśika *gotra* and the Taittiriya school, of the Aulupeya *sūtra*, whose great good reputation arises from (his mastery of) words (grammatics, *pada*), sentences (linguistic analysis, *vākya*) and the means of knowledge (epistemology, *pramāṇa*), who is engaged in the six duties (of a Brahmin) and follows the path of the Veda, the grandson of Viṣṇuśarman, a scholar of the Veda, Vedāṅga, Itihāsa and Purāṇa, and the son of Yajñaśarman, a scholar of all treatises (*śāstra*).

<27–31> Its boundaries <are as follows>. To the east, the boundary is Kalpaṭṭanabu. To the south, the boundary is Tālkaṭuru. To the west, the boundary is Niḍuṅgāḍu. To the north, the boundary is Jakkanaceruvu. <It is located in the midst> of these four boundaries. 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. Vyāsa too has said:

1.

Many (kings) have granted land, and many have preserved it (as formerly granted).

²Or perhaps gods? (*ṇṇdāraka*)

³While I consistently translate the phrase (*pāda*+) *anudhyāta*, occurring in almost all Cālukya plates in the description of kings as “deliberately appointed by,” in this case it seems clear that the expression *caraṇānudhyāta* means that it is the king who pays respectful attention to the persons mentioned.

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 thousand years.

3.

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

4.

He who accepts (granted) land and he who offers land: both of these doers of meritorious deeds are guaranteed to dwell in heaven.

5.

It is possible (i.e. easy) to give away what is yours, <even if it is> a great thing; <but> it is hard to preserve the property of another.⁴ <When it comes to> the question, “donation or preservation <of previous grants>?”—<the answer is that> preservation is superior to donation.

6.

The executor (*ājñapti*) of this provision (*dharma*) is the impeccable (superintendent of justice?) (*dharma-saṅgraha*)⁵ known as Eṇeyamma, who is valiant and fond of discipline.

<39> Written (*likhita*) by Kautamācārya.⁶

Commentary

The name of the donated village was read as Raṇḍuballī for the ARIE report, while RM asserts that it is correctly Reṇḍuballī. The latter seems unlikely; however, the name may perhaps be Īṇḍuballī, which is compatible with RM’s proposed identification with the (or a) modern village Eṇḍapalle. Nonetheless, Raṇḍuballī seems to be most likely.

The grant has usually been attributed to Viṣṇuvardhana V. On the basis of circumstantial evidence (to be discussed elsewhere), I believe Viṣṇuvardhana IV is the most likely

⁴I translate the emendation suggested in the apparatus to line 37, but not included in the body of the edition.

⁵I assume that *dharma-saṅgraha* is synonymous to *dharmaādhyakṣa* or *dharmaādhikaraṇika*, but it may be the title of a different official, or it may be used in a non-technical figurative sense as “storehouse of justice”.

⁶The name may be a mistake for Gautamācārya.

issuer, though Viṣṇuvardhana V cannot be excluded confidently, and the plates may also be a later reissue of an original grant by Viṣṇuvardhana IV.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1914–15, p. 8, appendix A/1914–15, N° 2 with discussion at ARIE 1914–15, p. 90, § 10. Edited from estampages by S. S. Ramachandra Murthy ([1986] 1973–1974, N° A), with facsimiles and a summary of the contents. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs taken by myself in February 2023 at the Government Museum, Chennai, collated with Ramachandra Murthy’s edition and estampages. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[RM] Ramachandra Murthy, S. S. [1986] 1973–1974. “Two copper-plate charters of Eastern Chālukya Vishnuvardhana V.” EI 40, pp. 37–46. Item A.

Secondary

ARIE 1914–15. *G.O. No. 1260, 25th August 1915. Epigraphy. Recording, with remarks, the progress report of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent for epigraphy, Southern Circle, for the year 1914–1915.* Edited by H. Krishna Sastri. No place, 1915.

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