Pulivar̲r̲u (spurious?) grant of Amma I

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00087

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00087.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 T (e.g. line 8) resembles ta without a headmark. Final N (a fairly clear instance in l36) is probably a minuscule simplified na, raised and with a sinuous vertical tail.

Original punctuation marks are single or double vertical bars. Some, especially on the first plate, have a small triangular serif on top; others are plain, while yet others are slightly sinuous and may have a small hook toward the right at the top.

Other palaeographic observations. The script is very elegant and ornate. Anusvāra is sometimes a dot, at other times a conspicuous circle at headline height after the character to which it belongs.PS notes that dependent ā is sometimes indicated by a vertical line on top of the character (e.g. l2, l4), while dependent ī is distinguished by a dot in the centre of the circle.

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-tribhuvanāṁkuśa

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 ✤ svasti〈.〉 śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstū(ya)māna-(mā)navya-sa〈2〉gotrāṇāṁ hārīti-putrāṇāṁ kauśikī-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyān(āṁ)〈3〉 mātṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānāṁ svāmi-mahā(se)na-pādānudhyā(t)ā〈4〉nāṁ bhaga◯[[(rāya?)]]〈〈van-nā〉〉rāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-va〈5〉rāha-l(āṁ)◯¿c?〈ch〉anekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārā(t)i-maṇḍalānā{ṁ}m a〈6〉śvame(dhāvabhṛtha-sn)āna-pavitrīkṛta-vapuṣā(ṁ cālu)kyānāṁ kula〈7〉m alaṁkari(ṣṇoḥ) satyāśraya-va(lla)bhendrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇuva〈Page 2r〉〈8〉(rddha)no 〈’〉ṣ(ṭādaśa) varṣ(ā)ṇi veṁgī-deśam apālayaT|| tad-(ātmajo)〈9〉 (jaya)[siṁha](s) trayastriṁśataṁ| ta(d-a)nuja (Indra)rā(jaḥ) sa(pta dināni|)〈10〉 (ta)n-〈n〉anda(no vi)ṣṇuvarddhano nava| tat-sūnur mma(ṁ)gi-yuvarā(ja)(ḥ?)〈11〉 pa(ṁca)vi◯ṁśatiṁ| tat-putro jaya(siṁhas tra)yo(da)śa(|)〈12〉 ta(d-a)va◯ra-jaḥ kokkiliḥ ṣaṇ māsā(N|) tasya (jyeṣṭho bhrā)〈13〉(tā) viṣṇuvarddhanas tam uccāṭya saptatriṁśataṁ| ta(t-pu)tro vi〈14〉(jayā)ditya-bhaṭṭārako 〈’〉ṣṭādaśa| tat-suto viṣṇuvarddhanaḥ ṣa〈Page 2v〉〈15〉ṭtriṁśataṁ| tat-suto (v)i(ja)yāditya-[[bha]]〈〈(na)〉〉(re)ndra-mṛgarājaś cāṣṭa〈16〉catvāriṁśataṁ| (tat-su)ta(ḥ ka)li-viṣṇuvarddhano 〈’〉ddhyarddha-varṣaṁ| ta〈17〉t-suto 〈gu〉ṇagā(ṁka-vijayādi)tyaś catu〈ś〉catvāriṁśataṁ(| tad-a)nu〈18〉ja-yuva◯rā(ja)-v{r}ikramāditya-bhūpate〈ḥ〉 sūnu〈ḥ〉 cālukya-bhī〈19〉ma-bhūpā◯las triṁśataṁ||

1. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tat-putraḥ sva-bhujāsi-khaṇḍita-ripu〈20〉-kṣmābh¿i?〈ṛ〉d balād vā¿ś?〈s〉avī〈ṁ〉 jitvā¿sa?〈śāṁ〉 viraje pratiṣ¿ṭ?〈ṭh〉ita-jaya-stambha〈ḥ〉〈21〉 paṭiṣṭho raṇ¿o?〈e〉| svarṇṇārūḍha-tulo 〈’〉tra bāḍha(m a)〈tu〉l(o) dhātrī-tale〈Page 3r〉 〈22〉 〈kṣatriyair〉 〈mitrābhaḥ parira〉kṣati sma vijayāditya〈ḥ〉 samārddha(ṁ) dharāṁ||

2. Āryā

tasya śaśi-mauli-m(ū)〈23〉rt(te)r (u)mā-samānākṛteḥ kumārābhaḥ
pallava-mahādevyāḥ〈24〉 khalu yas samabhavad ammarājākhyaḥ||

3. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

kecid bhūdhara-go<25>care (va?)◯ra-guhās¿t?<th>ānepsitān bhūdharā(N?)
kecid <d>urgga(ma-va)<26>kra-saṁka◯ṭa-mahā-du<r>(j)ñeya-mārggāṭavīṁ|
¿A?<Ā>¿(s)?<ś>ān t¿ā?<a>n a<27>pi kecid a¿s?<ś>ruta<ta?>ra-(dvī?)(p)āntarāntā-vadh¿ī?<i>
yasmā<d> gaṇḍaraga(ṇḍa-bhū)<28>tala-pate<r> bh¿i?<ī>tā<ḥ> pra(yā)tā dviṣaḥ

4. Āryāgīti

yo rūpeṇa manoja(ṁ?)<Page 3v> <29> vibhavena mahendram ahimakaram u<ru>-mahasā|
haram ari-pu<30>ra-dahanen⟦dr⟧a nyak<k>urvvan bhāti vidita-dig-ava(n)i-(k)īrtti(ḥ)‖

sa sa(r)vva<31>lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddha(na-ma)hārā(jādhirāja)-parameśva<32>raḥ para◯(ma-bha)ṭṭārakaḥ (vela)nā(ṇḍu)-vi(ṣa)ya-(n)i(vā)sin(o)<33> rāṣṭrakū◯(ṭa)-pram(u)khā(n kuṭuṁbinaḥ) samāhūyet(th)am (ā)<34>jñāpayati‖

śrī-m(ā)nyak(e)ṭādhipatir

5. Vallarī(?)

indapa-rā(ja)-n(ā)mā<35> vidita-mahā-raṭṭa-vaṁśa-jaḥ pra(ka)ṭa-guṇaḥ|
vīrāvatāra-m(ū)<Page 4r><36>rtti<ḥ> śaṁkara-pada-ka<ma>la-ṣaṭpado (mat)imāN‖

6. Āryāgīti(?)

tat-<t>anayo naya<37>-ved¿i?<ī> vṛt<t>ā(yata-bhu)ja-gatāsi-jita-para-<nara>paḥ|
raṭṭiya-nṛ<38>pati-mṛgapatir amita-guṇa-gaṇ¿o?r j(j)i(ta-śatru)<ḥ>‖

7. Anuṣṭubh

tat-patnī go<39>Indakā◯(ṁ)beti
v¿ī?<i>khyātā putra[–◡◡]
(pa?)ti-vrata-gu<40>ṇopetā◯
dharmma-jñā satya(-vādinī‖)

8. Indravajrā

[U](me)śayo<ḥ> ṣa¿n?<ṇ>mukha<41>vaj jayanta<ḥ>
¿s?<ś>ac¿i?<ī>ndrayo ¡bh¿ya?<ū>d! yad u(pe)ndra-(la)kṣm<y>¿ai?<o><ḥ>|
Anaṁgaval lo<42>ka-janābhipūjya{ṁ}n
tayos sut¡o I!ndapa-rāja-nāmā‖

9. Lalitā

naku<la><Page 4v><43>-sahadeva-mūrtt¿e?<i><r> ⟦(ka)⟧<<dha>>(rmmā)nugatau ca bhārata-khyātau
sarvvā<yu>dha<44>-prav¿i?<ī>¿n?<ṇ>o nirjjita-du(r)yyodhanār(i)-sainika-mukhyaḥ‖

tasmai Indapa<45>-rājākhy¿a?<ā>ya bhavad-viṣaye pulivaṟṟu nāma grāmo mānyīkṛtya<46> śāsanā◯r¿u?<ū>ḍho sa(r)vva-kara-parihāra<ṁ> datta Iti vidi-tam a<47>stu vaḥ‖◯

Asyāvadhayaḥ‖ pūrvvataḥ māvaluru sī<48>mā| dakṣ¿a?<i>ṇa<ta>ḥ kaṁcekavvapūṇḍi sīmā| paścimataḥ goravapū<49>ṇḍi sīmā| Uttarataḥ velaṇṭhuru sīmā‖ Asyopari na ke<Page 5r><50>nacid bā<dhā> karttavyā<.> yaḥ karo(t)i sa paṁca-mahā-pā(ta)[ko bha?]<51>vati| tathā coktaṁ vyāsena‖

10. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā
bahu<52>bhiś cānupālitā
(yasya) yasya yadā bhūmis
ta(sya) tasya<53>tadā pha◯laṁ‖

11. Anuṣṭubh

(sva-da)ttāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hareta va<54>sundharā◯ṁ
ṣaṣ¿ṭh?<ṭ>iṁ va(r)ṣa-(saha)srāṇi
viṣ¿ṭ?<ṭh>āyāṁ jāyate k¡ri!<ṛ><55>miḥ‖

Ājñaptiḥ kaṭṭa-rā(jaḥ)<.> mahā(kā)la-bhaṭṭa-kāvyaṁ<.> j(o)ntācāryya<56>-likhita(ṁ✤)

<Page 5v>

Apparatus

Plates

<4> bhaga◯⟦(rāya?)⟧<<van-nā>>rāyaṇa- ◇ *bhagav¿ā?<a>n-nārāyaṇa-* PS • The two characters after the hole have defintely been corrected, but the pre-correction text is largely a guess. If correct, then only the first half of *ya* was engraved. That the superfluous *ā* on the first character is probably not a scribal mistake but a remnant of the pre-correction text.

〈6〉 alaṁ(ka)ri(ṣṇoḥ) ◇ *alaṁkāriṣ(ṇoḥ)* PS • Although *ka* is damaged, it does not seem to have an *ā*. PS does not emend, so this is probably a typo in his edition.

〈15〉 -[[bha]]<<(na)>>(re)ndra- ◇ *-narendra-* PS • Possibly *re* has also been corrected, presumably from a partially written *ṭṭā*.

〈17〉 (tad-a)nu〈18〉ja- ◇ *tad-anu〈18〉j¿a?〈o〉* PS • The character *da* may be a correction. PS's emendation is incorrect.

〈18〉 v{r}ikramāditya- • The first character may perhaps be *vi* inscribed as a correction over *kra*, rather than an erroneously inscribed *vri*.

〈21〉 paṭiṣṭho ◇ *pratiṣṭho* PS • In spite of some noise, the reading is entirely clear and provides the solution to this problematic locus, found in two other grants that I am aware of, the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava and the Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman. For some slight additional support in favour of this reading, compare *mahāhava-raṁga-paṭutara-naipuṇya* in line 8 of the Tāṇḍivāḍa grant of Vijayāditya II. — 〈21〉 dhātrī-tale〈Page 3r〉 〈22〉 〈kṣatriyair mitrābhaḥ parira〉(kṣa)ti ◇ *dhātrī-tale 〈kṣatriye mitrābhaḥ parira〉〈Page 3r〉〈22〉kṣati* PS • PS notes that he restores the omission from the Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman. I am confident of my own restoration and prefer to place it at the beginning of the next page. It is clear that a major eyeskip happened as the scribe moved to the next place and picked up at *kṣa*, but as it happens, at the next *kṣa*.

〈22〉 samārddha(ṁ) dharāṁ ◇ *samārddhāṁ dharāṁ* PS • The character *dha* is probably a correction, possibly from *ndha*; if so, the *anusvāra* is probably a subsequent addition too.

〈23〉 -mahādevyāḥ ◇ *-mahādevyāṁ* PS • The two dots at the edge may perhaps be just spots near the rim, but there are definitely two of them, and all variants of this stanza that I am aware of have *mahādevyāḥ* here.

〈24〉 -go〈25〉care (va?)◯ra- PS • I accept PS's reading, which he prints as clear throughout. However, I have some doubts about *va*. Perhaps read *-gocaretara-*?

〈25〉 °ās¿t?〈th〉āne° ◇ *°ā-sthāne°* PS. — 〈25〉 bhūdharā(N?) ◇ *bhūdharāṁ* PS.

〈26〉 -du〈r〉(j)ñeya- ◇ *-durjñeya-* PS. — 〈26〉 ¿A?〈Ā〉¿(s)?〈ś〉ān t¿ā?〈a〉n ◇ *¿A?〈Ā〉¿s?〈śr〉ānt¿a?〈ā〉n* PS.

〈27〉 a¿s?〈ś〉ruta〈ta?〉ra-(dvī?)(p)āntarānt(ā)vadh¿ī?〈i〉 ◇ *a¿s?〈ś〉ruta-ra-pāntarāntā vadhī* PS • PS notes that he does not understand this quarter of the stanza, and simply ignores both the effaced character after *ra* and the fact that the metre requires one more syllable. For the problematic character, *dvī* is the most plausible (compare *dvi*

in the next line) and would fit the context very well, but a different reading cannot be ruled out. The string *asrutara*, requiring one more syllable, is open to alternative restorations, perhaps involving *āśrita* or *āsruta* (though these would be somewhat redundant with *prayātā* in the next line).

〈28〉 -pate〈r〉 ◇ *-pate* PS. — 〈28〉 bh¿i?〈ī〉tā〈ḥ〉 ◇ *bhītā* PS.

〈30〉 -dahanen⟦dr⟧a ◇ *-dahanendraṁ* PS • Probably, *dr* has been deleted to obtain the correct text *dahanena*, found in parallel attestations of this stanza. In the following line, the top of *ya* overlaps with the bottom of the subscript *r* here, and this would probably not have been done if that *r* had not been already deleted. A short vertical stroke to the right of *ndra* may be a *kākapada* indicating correction. I do not think that an *anusvāra* was present here. A slightly similar vertical line next to the following *nya* is probably damage rather than a deliberate stroke. — 〈30〉 nyak〈k〉urvvan ◇ *nyakkurvvan* PS.

〈33〉 (kuṭuṁbinaḥ) ◇ *kuṭuṁbina〈ḥ〉* PS • This entire stretch is effaced, but I am quite certain a *visarga* is present.

〈34〉 indapa- • This passage is definitely a stanza in a metre of the *āryā* family, but the first hemistich is much longer than it ought to be. Splitting it at this point and assuming that the bit before was meant to be introductory prose, we obtain a correct 32-mora line. However, if this was also the composer's idea, I would expect a more noticeable break at this point.

〈37〉 vṛt〈t〉ā(yata)- ◇ *vṛtāyata-* PS • I find *vṛta* inappropriate to the context, while *vṛtta* is often associated with *āyata*. With PS's *nṛpaḥ* (see below), the hemistich has 30 morae as in the first half of an *āryā*, but the pattern of the sixth foot is not permissible. With my restoration, we obtain a correct 32-mora line as suggested for the previous stanza. — 〈37〉 〈nara〉paḥ ◇ *〈nṛ〉paḥ* PS • See the previous note about the metre of the hemistich. Further support for my emendation may be found in the fact that this way, the omission can be explained by eyeskip. — 〈37〉 raṭṭiya … • More than one locus probably needs emendation in this stanza in order to achieve correct prosody. Reading *śatru-gaṇaḥ* at the end (instead of *śatruḥ*) would bring the mora count up to 27, so I classify the stanza as a *sugīti*, but the pattern of the fifth foot is not permissible. Emending *nṛpati* to *nṛpatir* or *narapati* would yield a cleaner caesura after the third foot, but break the metre further on. Further on, the received reading *guṇa-gaṇorjjita* suggests eyeskip involving *jita* and *°orjita*. Restoring *raṭṭiya-narapati-mṛgapatir amita-guṇa-gaṇa-jitorjjita-śatru-gaṇaḥ* would produce a correct 32-mora line and thus an *āryāgīti* stanza, but I prefer not to emend so heavy-handedly in the text itself.

〈38〉 -gaṇ¿o?r j(j)i(ta)- ◇ *-gaṇ¿o?〈ai〉r jjita-* PS • See the note to the previous entry. — 〈38〉 tat-patnī … • The metre is again problematic. PS suggests that the sequence *go I*

was treated by the composer as a single syllable for the sake of the metre. This seems unlikely to me, but it does remedy the problem. Alternatively, one might assume that instead of *tat-*, *tasya* was intended as an introductory word preceding the stanza, like *śrī-mānyaketādhipatir* in line 34 above.

〈39〉 putra[–⏑⏒] • The first character of the lacuna appears quite compact, with a headmark and a rounded body. No vetiges of the next two characters can be made out. Possible restorations include *-dāyinī* or *-vatsalā*.

〈41〉 ¿s?〈ś〉ac¿i?〈ī〉ndrayo ¡bh¿ya?〈ū〉d! ◇ *¿s?〈ś〉ac¿i?〈ī〉ndrayo〈ḥ〉 bhūd* PS • I agree with PS that *bhūd* was intended here (though *bhyad* was clearly written), but I do not know if the weird grammar/sandhi involves a scribal mistake for **śacīndrayor bhūd* (with *bhūd* standing for *abhūd*), or was meant to represent **śacīndrayo 'bhūd* (with *śacīndrayoḥ* first losing the *visarga* and then participating in o-sandhi). — 〈41〉 (la)kṣm〈y〉¿ai?〈o〉〈ḥ〉 ◇ *-(la)kṣm¿(e)?〈yo〉(ḥ)* PS.

〈42〉 -janābhip(ū)jya{ṁ}n • The expected form is *-janābhipūjyas*, but the presence of pre-nasalisation implies that this is not a scribal mistake, so I prefer not to make this emendation in the text.

〈43〉 dha(rmmā)nugatau • PS proposes emending to *dharmmarājānugatau* "for the sake of the metre". The emendation would in fact break the metre (resulting in an invalid pattern in the fourth foot), though it would bring the total mora count of the hemistich to the same as that of the second hemistich. The stanza is in fact a completely correct *lalitā* with 30 morae in the first hemistich and 32 in the second, assuming that I am right in emending to *sarvvāyudha* at the end of the line (see below). — 〈43〉 sarvvā〈yu〉dha ◇ *sarvva-dha〈rmma〉* PS • The emendation suggested by PS sounds rather flat, and is also unmetrical (resulting in syncopation from the first to the second foot). I am pretty certain that the vowel of *rvv* is *ā* rather than *a*, in which case my proposal is quite straightforward and fits much better into a comparison to Nakula and Sahadeva.

〈44〉 -prav¿i?〈ī〉¿n?〈ṇ〉o ◇ *-pravīṇo* PS. — 〈44〉 -sainika- ◇ *-s¿e?〈ai〉nika-* PS.

〈45〉 °ākhy¿a?〈ā〉ya ◇ *°ākhyāya* PS. — 〈45〉 pulivaṟṟu ◇ *pulivaṟṟa* PS • Probably a typo in PS's edition.

〈46〉 -parihāra〈ṁ〉 ◇ *-parihār¿a?〈o〉* PS.

〈47〉 pūrvvataḥ ◇ *pūrvvattaḥ* PS • Probably a typo in PS. — 〈47〉 māvaluru ◇ *māvalūru* PS.

〈49〉 velaṇṭhuru ◇ *velaṇṭhūru* PS.

〈50〉 -(pāta)[ko bha?]〈51〉vati| ◇ *-pāta[ka-yukto bha]〈51〉vati|* PS • The broken-off corner

is much too small to have accommodated PS's restoration, much less the customary *pātaka-saṁyukto*. The formula occurs with *pātako* in the Eḍeru plates of Amma I and the Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II.

〈54〉 sundharā◯ṁ ◇ *sum¿d?〈dh〉arā〈ṁ〉* PS. — 〈54〉 ṣaṣ¿ṭh?〈ṭ〉iṁ ◇ *ṣaṣṭiṁ* PS.

〈55〉 j(o)ntācāryya ◇ *jāntācāryya* PS • The spelling of this name is *jontācāryya* in multiple related grants, and I am quite certain that a second stroke atop the character is present, making the vowel an *o*.

Translation

Plates

〈1–19〉 Greetings. Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Cālukyas—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 (I), for thirty-three. His younger brother Indrarāja (Indra Bhaṭṭāraka), for seven days. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for nine (years). His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasiṁha (II), for thirteen. His 〈brother〉 of inferior birth, Kokkili, for six months. After dethroning him, his eldest brother Viṣṇuvardhana (III), for thirty-seven. 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 Vijayāditya (III) with the byname Guṇaga, for forty-four. The son of his younger brother the heir-apparent (*yuvarāja*) Prince (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya, King (*bhūpāla*) Cālukya-Bhīma, for thirty.

1.

His son—who with the sword 〈held in〉 his arm crushed enemy rulers; who, having forcibly conquered the eastern (*vāsavī*) region, established a victory pillar in Viraja; the craftiest one in battle who ascended a balance scale with gold; who is surely

incomparable to 〈any other〉 *kṣatriya*s on the surface of this earth—protected (*rakṣ-*) the earth for half a year as Vijayāditya (IV, Kollabigaṇḍa), brilliant as the sun (*mitra*).[1]

2.

To him (Vijayāditya IV)[2], who was 〈like〉 the Moon-crested (Śiva) in form, a 〈son〉 named Ammarāja (I), who verily resembled Kumāra, was born from none other than (his queen) Pallava Mahādevī,[3] who was like Umā in appearance.

3.

From this Gaṇḍaragaṇḍa, lord of the (entire) surface of the earth, enemies have fled in terror—some, (being) in mountainous territory, to mountains that were attractive (to them) on account of having good caves (for use) as a base; some to the jungle where the paths are greatly unfathomable, being hard to traverse, crooked and narrow; yet others to the ends of the horizon, as far as the ends of highly obscure foreign continents.

4.

Surmounting the Mind-Born (Kāma) in physical beauty, the great Indra in opulence, the sun in widespread splendour and Hara (Śiva) in the burning of enemy fortresses, he shines with a reputation that is known in 〈all〉 quarters of the earth.

〈30–34〉 that shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana (Amma I), the Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*) and Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*), convokes and commands all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Velanāṇḍu district (*viṣaya*) as follows:

〈34〉 The overlord of majestic Mānyaketa—

5.

named Indapa-rāja (I), he of manifest qualities was born of the famous Mahāraṭṭa dynasty.[4] In form like heroism incarnate,[5] this intelligent man was a bee to the lotus that is the foot of Śaṅkara.

6.

[1] Vijayāditya IV's ascension of a balance scale is also mentioned in close proximity to his erection of a victory pillar in Viraja in stanza 32 of the Diggubaṟṟu grant of Bhīma II.

[2] See the commentary about the attribution of these plates.

[3] Or: a queen of the Pallava house.

[4] Or, "of the famous and great Raṭṭa dynasty."

[5] The term *vīrāvatāra* may also refer to the deity Vīrabhadra.

His son, a lion among the Raṭṭiya kings,[6] was knowledgeable in politics (*naya*), defeated other kings with the sword held in his brawny and long arm and defeated his enemies with his immeasurable host of virtues.

7.

His wife, known as Goindakāmbā, [bore?] sons, and was endowed with the virtue of marital faith, knowledgeable of *dharma* and truthful in speech.

8.

As the Six-faced (Skanda) (was born) of Umā and Īśa, as Jayanta was born of Śacī and Indra, and as Anaṅga (was born) of Upendra and Lakṣmī,[7] (so) a son ⟨was born⟩ of these two, named Indapa-rāja (II) and worshipped by the common populace.[8]

9.

An image of Nakula and Sahadeva in the way he follows *dharma* {as they followed Dharma (Yudhiṣṭhira)} and in being famous among actors[9] {as they were famed in the Mahābhārata}, (in being) skilled in all weapons (and in being) a leader of soldiers whose enemies are hard to defeat {as they were leaders of the soldiers of Duryodhana's enemy (Yudhiṣṭhira)}.[10]

⟨44–47⟩ To that one named Indapa-rāja (II), the village named Pulivaṟṟu in your district has been given (by us), converted into a rent-free holding (*mānya*) with a remission of all taxes and consolidated[11] as a (copperplate) charter. Let this be known to you.

⟨47–51⟩ Its boundaries ⟨are as follows⟩. To the east, the border is Māvaluru. To the south, the border is Kaṁcekavvapūṇḍi. To the west, the border is Goravapūṇḍi. To

[6] The stanza is metrically problematic, probably because there are several mistakes in its text. See the apparatus to line 37. PS takes Raṭṭiya to be the personal name of this son. This is not very plausible on the basis of the syntax, but would be acceptable with the emendation *nṛpatir*. I prefer to see it simply as the dynastic name, though indeed, in this case the son remains nameless.

[7] The reference is to Kāma (Anaṅga) reincarnated as the son of Kṛṣṇa (Upendra) and Rukmiṇī (equated to Lakṣmī).

[8] See the apparatus to lines 41 and 42 for grammatical problems with this stanza. The meaning is clear in despite.

[9] Or the meaning applied to Indapa may be that he was famous throughout India (Bhārata), as understood by PS.

[10] PS seems to understand that the second hemistich likens Indapa to Dharmarāja. The emendations he proposes are noted in the apparatus to line 43, but even with these (in my opinion incorrect) emendations, the meaning he desires does not obtain.

[11] The expression *śāsanārūḍha* is not familiar to me. It is interpretable in the context as meaning "consolidated as" or "raised to the status of" a copperplate charter, but I wonder if *siṁhāsanārūḍha* was rather intended (though the case ending would also need to be different in that case).

the north, the border is Velaṇṭhūru. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to the enjoyment of rights) over it. He who does so shall have the five great sins. So too Vyāsa has said:

10.

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.

11.

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

〈55–56〉 The executor (*ājñapti*) is the castellan (*kaṭṭa-rāja*). The poetry is Mahākāla Bhaṭṭa's. Written (*likhita*) 〈by〉 Jontācārya.

Commentary

Assigning this grant to Amma I is highly problematic. Stanza I is attested in the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava and the Andhra Sahitya Parishad plates of Śaktivarman, but not in any earlier plates. Stanza II is very similar to one found (with some variance) in many grants of Amma II, but the name of Amma I's mother in the present version happens to break the metre, whereas Amma II's mother's name fits it.[12] This very strongly implies that the stanza was composed about Amma II and was clumsily adapted to describe Amma I. Stanza IV, too, occurs verbatim in multiple grants of Amma II and nowhere else. The deplorable quality of the verses describing the donee may also indicate that there is something fishy with this grant. The prose genealogy mentions Indrarāja as reigning for seven days (rather than only as the father of Viṣṇuvardhana II). This occurs in grants issued by Dānārṇava and his descendants,[13] but nowhere else. The genealogy simply lists Vijayāditya II Narendramṛgarāja and his reign, whereas all known grants of Amma I that contain a full king list include a reference to Narendramṛgarāja's 108 battles and corresponding number of temples, which is omitted from most later grants. Vijayāditya III is described here by the term

[12]Incidentally, the mother's name is recorded as Pallava Mahādevī. The Velaṁbaṟṟu (spurious?) grant of Amma I records Amma I's mother's name as Lokamahādevī, which is also Amma II's mother's name. The Velaṁbaṟṟu grant may belong to Amma II (omitting several kings from the genealogy); or, if both Ammas had mothers named Lokamahādevī, then the present Pallava Mahādevī may be a family name rather than a personal one. However, if Amma I's mother was really called Lokamahādevī, there would have been no reason for the composer of the present grant to change the name to Pallava and thereby ruin the metre.

[13]The Māṁgallu grant of Dānārṇava, the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya; in garbled text, the Korumelli grant of Rājarāja I; in garbled and probably corrected text, the Kalidiṇḍi grant of Rājarāja I.

guṇagāṁka, which is found in several grants of Amma II and one of Bādapa;[14] earlier charters, conversely, either omit this epithet or use it (or its fuller form *guṇakkenalla*) without *aṁka*.

Given the anomalies so far and given that Dānārṇava was supported by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, it seems probable that the current grant was created in or shortly after his time, with royal approval, but set up as if it were an earlier grant issued by Amma I.[15]

The name of the composer Mahākāla Bhaṭṭa is known as that of the composer of the Vemalūrpāḍu plates of Amma II. He may or may not be identical to Bhaṭṭa Mahākāla, composer of the Cevuru plates of Amma I. The latter may or may not be identical to Mahākāla, who is said in the Drujjūru grant of Amma I to have been a general of Bhīma I, and is granted a village by Amma I. The engraver Jontācārya is the engraver of no fewer than five grants of Amma II (called Jayantācārya in one of the five) as well as of the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava and the Raṇastipūṇḍi grant of Vimalāditya. The latter may be the same person at a venerable age or a successor, perhaps a grandson of Amma II's and Dānārṇava's "primary" Jontācārya. The possibility that a predecessor, perhaps a grandfather, of that Jontācārya was active in the reign of Amma I cannot be excluded, but it is more parsimonious to assume that the plates are in fact the work of the "primary" Jontācārya, who signed his name even though the plates were supposed to have been engraved before his time. The composition may be that of Mahākāla Bhaṭṭa, still active at a time; or it may belong to an anonymous author, with Mahākāla Bhaṭṭa's name featured in order to lend authenticity to the grant's being of Amma I's time.

Continuing the speculative line further, once Dānārṇava was established as ruler of Veṅgī after Amma II's death, he would not have needed such subterfuge to reward someone who had helped him. The same stands for Dānārṇava's descendants. However, Dānārṇava first occupied the throne at the time when Amma II had fled to Kaliṅga from Kṛṣṇa II's wrath after having reigned for eleven years (Māṁgallu grant of Dānārṇava), i.e. around 955 CE. At this time, as the Māṁgallu grant shows, he ruled in Amma II's name (as Vijayāditya, whereas he was Viṣṇuvardhana in his Kaṇḍyam plates issued after Amma II's death) and had to beat around the bush explaining why he rewarded Kākatya Guṇḍyana. Backdating a grant to Amma I's time sounds like a strategy he may well have employed at this time.

[14] the Elavaṟṟu, Paḷaṁkalūru, Pāṁbaṟṟu and Tāṇḍikoṇḍa grants and the Vandram plates of Amma II, and the Āruṁbāka grant of Bādapa.

[15] In spite of the stanzas adopted from descriptions of Amma II, the ostensible issuer cannot be Amma II, since stanza III uses Amma I's epithet Gaṇḍaragaṇḍa, and lines 30-31 give his styles Sarvalokāśraya Viṣṇuvardhana.

As to the identity of the donee, the question certainly needs more research. PS cites and dismisses D. C. Ganguly's opinion that he is a son of Amoghavarṣa II, and thus a grandson of Indra III (identified with Indapa I of our grant). According to PS, Amoghavarṣa II cannot have taken shelter with Amma I after being ousted by Govinda IV, because he lost his throne only in 930 CE, while Amma I's reign ended in 927. Instead, PS suggests, the donee is Amoghavarṣa III, for which his evidence is that Amoghavarṣa III's mother was named Govindāmbā. However, neither Amoghavarṣa III, nor his grandfather Kr̥ṣṇa II are known to have borne the name Indapa or Indra.

Keeping in mind that according to our grant Indapa I was in fact the ruler of Mānyaketa (i.e. Mānyakheta), it is certainly tempting to identify him with Indra III. However, according to Altekar in Yazdani 1960, vol. 1, p. 286, Indra III was no more than thirty years old at the time of his accession in 914 CE. That he could have had a grandson who reached adulthood[16] before the end of Amma I's reign in 927 is unlikely. Altekar (Yazdani 1960, vol. 1, p. 286, n. 4) adds to this that since Indra III remained in power up to 927, there would have been no reason for a grandson of his to flee to Veṅgī. Then again, if our grant was actually issued by Dānārṇava, the drafters may not have bothered too much with historical accuracy. Also, there is no need to assume that flight was involved and the present grant was given in the way of alms; more likely, it is a reward for some service rendered by the donee or one of his predecessors. Given that Dānārṇava was practically a puppet of Kr̥ṣṇa III, he may well have been allied to either Amoghavarṣa III (who was Kr̥ṣṇa III's father) or to Amoghavarṣa II (who was Kr̥ṣṇa III's rival's rival, ousted by Govinda IV, who was in turn ousted by Amoghavarṣa III). As pointed out above, the male names do not fit Amoghavarṣa III, while they do permit the assumption that our Indapa I was Indra III. If this is the case, then his son (not named in the grant which does, however, imply that he was a king of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas) was either Amoghavarṣa II or an unknown brother of his, and his grandson, Indapa II of the grant, is not known from other sources.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1923–24, p. 10, appendix A/1923-24, № 3 with description at ARIE 1923–24, p. 93, § 3. Edited from inked impressions by C. A. Padmanabha Sastry ([1989] 1975–1976) with facsimiles but without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on a collation of Padmanabha Sastry's edition with his facsimiles and with estampages preserved at the ASI (Mysore). No image of the seal is available.

[16] The grant describes him as a skilled general, which is hardly applicable to an infant or a young boy.

Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[PS] Padmanabha Sastry, C. A. [1989] 1975–1976. “Pulivaṟṟu grant of Ammarāja (I).” EI 41, pp. 140–147.

Secondary

ARIE 1923–24. *Annual report on South-Indian epigraphy for the year ending 31st March 1924*. Edited by G. Venkoba Rao. Madras: Government Press, 1925.

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