Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 2) of Viṣṇuvardhana II

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00089

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00089.xml

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

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final N (l3 bhagavaN) is a simplified but full-sized na with a slightly elongated vertical stem and no headmark.

Original punctuation marks. The opening symbol is a circle slightly smaller than a character body, with a slightly curved vertical line (resembling an opening parenthesis) placed in it, extending from a point slightly below the circle's centre to a point slightly above the circle's top.

Other palaeographic observations. Anusvāra is typically omitted, but where used (l5 and l12 jayasiṁga), it may be atop the next character. The writing is on the whole extremely untidy, but the use of many cursive forms suggests a scribe familiar with the script in a handwritten form.

Edition

Seal

〈1〉 śrī-viṣamasiddh(i)

Plates

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 O svasti〈.〉 śrīmatā〈ṁ〉 sakala-bhuvana-sa〈ṁ〉stūyamāna-mānavya-sago〈2〉tr¿a?〈ā〉ṇ¿a?〈ā〉ṁ hāriti-putr¿a?〈ā〉ṇā〈ṁ〉 sapta-loka-māt¿ri?〈ṛ〉bhir mm¿a?〈ā〉〈tṛ〉bhiḥ parip(ā)li〈3〉t¿a?〈ā〉◯n¿a?〈ā〉〈ṁ〉 svāmi-〈ma〉hāsena-pād¿a?〈ā〉nudhyātānā〈ṁ〉 bhagavaN-nār⟦i⟧〈〈ā〉〉yaṇa-vara〈4〉-pra◯sāda-sam¿a?〈ā〉s¿a?〈ā〉dita-varāha-lāñcchanānā〈ṁ〉 〈Aśvamedhāvabhṛtha-〉sn¿a?〈ā〉na-pavitr¿a?〈ī〉k¿ri?〈ṛ〉〈5〉t¿i?〈a〉-vapuṣā〈ṁ〉 caḷukyānā〈ṁ〉 ku-lam alaṁkariṣṇo〈ḥ〉 śrī-jayasiṁ¡g!〈h〉a-val〈l〉a〈6〉bha-mah¿a?〈ā〉r¿a?〈ā〉jasya priya-tanaya〈ḥ〉 śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mah¿a?〈ā〉r¿a?〈ā〉j¿asya?〈aḥ〉〈Page 2r〉 〈7〉 prat¿a?〈ā〉popanata-samasta-sāmanta-maṇḍalo viṣamasiddhi〈8〉r iti c¿a?〈ā〉ru-bhūri-k¿i?〈ī〉rtti〈ḥ〉 ¿karigaḍapelimarājaraja?-maṇi-〈ma〉y¿u?〈ū〉kha-ma〈ṁ〉ja〈9〉r¿i?〈ī〉◯-pu〈ṁ〉ja-pi〈ṁ〉jarita-p¿a?〈ā〉da-padma-yuga¡l!〈l〉aḥ Ari-timira-nikar¿āpa?(v)i〈10〉ś¿a?〈ā〉〈ta〉◯¿nodyāditi?〈noddyotita〉-pra¡l!〈l〉ayādityaḥ〈ḥ〉 sakala-guṇa-gaṇo¡j!〈j〉vala¿śasa?〈11〉¿mya?samācita-viṣama-siddhi〈ḥ〉 merur iva bhuvan¿a?〈ā〉la〈ṁ〉bana〈ḥ〉 ¿A?〈Ā〉kha〈12〉ṇḍala ¿Ivaiyya? vaiśravaṇa

śrī-ja〈ya〉siṁ¡g!〈h〉a-val〈l〉a¿b?〈bh〉a-mah¿a?〈ā〉r¿a?〈ā〉ja-putra-viṣa〈Page 2v〉〈13〉ma-siddhi〈ḥ〉 Okādu-vastavy¿a?〈ā〉ya Āśvalāyani-gotr¿a?〈ā〉ya doṇaśa〈14〉〈r〉mmaṇ¿i?〈a〉〈ḥ〉 putr¿a?〈ā〉ya ku(dg?)iśa〈r〉mmaṇ¿a?〈e〉 veda-ved¿a?〈ā〉〈ṁ〉ga-vide ṣaḍ-a〈ṁ〉ga-vi〈de〉 ṣa(ṭ)-ka〈r〉mma〈15〉-ni◯ratāya k¿a?〈ā〉〈r〉ttika-m¿a?〈ā〉se candra-grahaṇa-ni〈mi〉tte dattaṁ vara(nā)ṇḍu-viṣa〈16〉ye ◯ paṇḍimu〈〈ku〉〉 nāma gr¿a?〈ā〉me paścimata〈ḥ〉

p(ū)rvva-diśi {(M?)} Akula-(v)ṛ(kṣa)〈ḥ〉〈.〉〈17〉 dakṣiṇataḥ meḻuru nāma grāme pan(th)¿a?〈ā〉ḥ〈.〉 paścimata〈ḥ〉 meḻuru-s¿i?〈ī〉〈18〉ma〈ṁ〉ta(ḥ?) s¿i?〈ī〉m¿a?〈ā〉{ma}〈.〉 Ut〈t〉arataḥ valm¿i?〈ī〉ka〈ḥ〉〈.〉 Ete〈ṣāṁ〉 madhye dv¿a?〈ā〉daśa-khaṇḍika-ko〈Page 3r〉〈19〉drava-b¿i?〈ī〉ja-mātra-kṣetra〈ḥ〉 dat-taḥ r¿a?〈ā〉ja-m¿a?〈ā〉nena daṇḍena sarvva-kara-pari〈20〉h¿a?〈ā〉ra〈ṁ〉〈.〉 grāma-madhye gṛha-s¿t?〈th〉āna〈ṁ〉 ¿paścitatoṇḍa(M?)?

¡A(ṇa)ti!〈ājñaptiḥ〉 ¡samu(kha)!〈sva-mukhaṁ〉〈21〉 U◯ktañ ca bhaga〈va〉t¿a?〈ā〉 vy¿a?〈ā〉sena

1. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā datt(ā)
bahu(bh)iś cā(nupā)〈22〉li◯tā
yasya yasya yad¿a?〈ā〉 bh(ū)mis
tasya tasya tad¿a?〈ā〉 ¿(p)?〈ph〉alaṁ __

〈23〉 cuvvuru-vastavy¿a?〈ā〉ya bhāradvāja-gotrāya maṇaśa〈r〉mmaṇ¿i?〈aḥ〉 gaṇayaśa〈r〉mma〈24〉_ṇa〈ḥ〉 vṛddhaśa〈r〉maṇa〈ḥ〉

Imuvvur(u/a) Okā(ḍ)u-boḷa (v?)etaśa(v?)aṇa goṇiri〈Page 3v〉〈25〉Iṟlakāveṟugu varusamati-boḷumu visa-boḷumu paṇḍ(i)〈26〉mukuna raṭṭoṟnu puṇya sāṟnu vanṟi-boḷumu Iṇḍāṟu diniki sa〈27〉kṣmi◯ Aḷugarālandhāru viṣaya be(ḷa?) (ko)(ṇḍi?)

sida(M) lakṣmaṇa〈28〉 śaraṇalaya likhitaM

Apparatus

Plates

〈8〉 ¿karigaḍapelimarājaraja? • The reading is clear; possibly ambiguous characters are *ga*, which may perhaps be *śa*, and *ḍa*, which may perhaps be *da*. The phrase expected here would be along the lines of *samasta-sāmanta-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭita*. I could imagine emending *karigaḍa* to *kari-ghaṭā*, *pelima* to *pelava*, or *marājaraja* to *saroja-rajaḥ*, but none of these fit the context. Assuming that the beginning of this string was meant to be *karigaḷa*, this may be an early attestation of the name recorded as Karigalla for Viṣṇuvardhana V in the Sātalūru plates of Vijayāditya III and as Karigaḷḷa for a (probably royal) deity in the Pṛthivipallavapaṭṭana grant of Viṣṇuvardhana IV.

〈9〉 -nikar¿āpa?(v)i〈10〉ś¿a?〈ā〉〈ta〉◯¿nodyāditi?〈noddyotita〉- • The reading is clear apart from *vi*, which may perhaps be *ti* or *ṭhi*. I emend on the basis of the partial parallels in the Peddāpurappāḍu plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II and the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II (line 11), where the phrase (with minor orthographic emendations) is *kali-timira-nirasanoddyotita-śrī-pralayāditya*. I have no confident solution for *āpa*. It may be the verbal prefix *apa-* (whose combination with *vi-* looks rather awkward to me), or perhaps the word *āpad* (which I find unnecessary in the context) or *°augha* (which would be redundant next to *nikara*).

〈10〉 sakala-guṇa-gaṇo¡j!〈j〉vala¿śasa?〈11〉¿mya?samācita-viṣama-siddhi〈ḥ〉 • The reading is again clear, but I am unable to interpret the string straddling the line break. In cognate grants, the epithet *viṣamasiddhi* is invariably explained as martial victory in difficult circumstances. It is in my opinion likely that a *visarga* is to be supplied

after *°ojvala*, and that a new phrase or compound starts at this point. Possibly, *mya* may be scribal error for *ṣu*, but the only relevant emendation I can conceive of without completely altering the received text is *śastreṣu*, which I do not find satisfactory.

〈12〉 ¿Ivaiyya? • The reading is clear. I am fairly certain that *Ivaiśvaryya* was intended, but we still need another word after this, e.g. *Ivaiśvaryya-yuktaḥ*. — 〈12〉 vaiśravaṇa • The composer or scribe seems to have omitted a comparison here, e.g. *vaiśravaṇa Iva dhana-daḥ*.

〈13〉 ku(dg?)iśa〈r〉mmaṇ¿a?〈e〉 • The problematic character may perhaps be *ṅgi* or possibly *ṭṛi*, but none of the readings looks like a plausible name to me. I wonder if *kuṇḍiśarman* was intended, which is a common name in the corpus. The character in the plate does not, however, resemble *ṇḍi* at all..

〈16〉 paṇḍimu〈〈ku〉〉 • According to the ARIE report, the village is named Paṇṭimuku. While *ṇṭi* cannot be excluded, the consonant component is exactly identical to other instances of *ṇḍ*. — 〈16〉 {(M?)} Akula- • The superfluous character looks like a minuscule figure 6 at headline height. It may be a punctuation mark, but one would be out of place here. I cannot interpret *akula* as a tree name, nor find a relevant emendation other than *bakula*, but I do not think the clear initial *A* could be a scribal error.

〈17〉 pan(th)¿a?〈ā〉ḥ • The subscript part of the problematic character looks like *ḍ* or a clumsy *ḷ*. Given the context, I believe it must have been intended as *th*.

〈20〉 ¿paścitatoṇḍa(M?)? • The text is clear except for the last character, which resembles a pair of parentheses "()". It looks similar to the final *M*s in lines 27 and 28 except that no arms are discernible here. It may conceivably be a clumsy double *daṇḍa* or a very poorly inscribed *ra*, *ka* or final *N*. I believe the composer's intent involved *paścimataḥ* and probably the word *toṭa*, meaning garden. Cf. *paścimatayatā puṣpakatoṭā* in the same context in line 19 of Set 1, and see its translation for references on *toṭa*. The present text may be a corrupt imitation of the already corrupt text in Set 1.

〈23〉 maṇaśa〈r〉mmaṇ¿i?〈aḥ〉 • The name was probably meant to be Maṇḍaśarman.

Translation

Plates

〈1–12〉 Greetings. His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Jayasiṁha (I) Vallabha 〈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 Hāriti, who are protected by the Mothers who are the mothers of the seven worlds, who were deliberately appointed (to kingship)

by Lord Mahāsena, who acquired the Boar emblem as a boon by the grace of the divine Nārāyaṇa, and whose bodies have been hallowed through washing 〈in the purificatory ablutions of the Aśvamedha sacrifice〉[1]. His son is His Majesty (*mahārāja*) King Viṣṇuvardhana (II),[2] whose valour forces the entire circle of subordinate rulers (*sāmanta*) to bow, who has a great good reputation as Viṣamasiddhi, whose pair of lotus feet are engilded by a mass of beam clusters from gems ...,[3] a doomsday sun (*pralayāditya*) luminous through his obliteration of the darkness of the Kali age, luminous with the host of all virtues, ...[4] prevailing over adversity (*viṣama-siddhi*), like 〈Mount〉 Meru the support of the world, like Indra ...,[5] Vaiśravaṇa.[6]

〈12–16〉 〈This〉 Viṣamasiddhi, the son of His Majesty Jayasiṁha Vallabha, has, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month of Kārttika, given to the son of Doṇaśarman, 〈namely〉 Ku¿dg?iśarman—a resident of Okādu belonging to the Āśvalāyani *gotra*, learned in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas, learned in the six auxiliary sciences (*ṣaḍ-aṅga*), devoted to the six duties (of a Brahmin)—〈land〉 in Varanāṇḍu district, at the village named Paṇḍimuku, to the west 〈of that village〉.

〈16–20〉 In the eastern direction is an ¿*akula*? tree. To the south is the road 〈leading to〉 the village named Meḻuru. To the west the border is the border of Meḻuru. To the north is a termite mound. In the midst of these, a field to the extent 〈sowable with〉 twelve *khaṇḍika*s of *kodrava* seed has been given, 〈to be measured〉 with a rod according to the royal measure, exempt from all taxes. Within the village, a homestead plot, ¿〈and〉 a garden on the west?.[7]

〈20〉 The authority (*ājñapti*) is 〈the word of the king's〉 own mouth. The reverend Vyāsa too has said:

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.

[1]Omitted in the original

[2]Viṣṇuvardhana II was in fact the son of Indra Bhaṭṭāraka and nephew of Jayasiṁha I. See also the commentary.

[3]The inscription is unintelligible here. The expected text would be something like "fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of subordinates/enemies". See the apparatus to line 8.

[4]The inscription is unintelligible here. See the apparatus to line 10.

[5]The inscription is unintelligible here. The intent may have been "possessing authority". See the apparatus to line 12.

[6]Several words are missing here. The intent was probably "rich" or "a giver of wealth" like Vaiśravaṇa, i.e. Kubera.

[7]See the apparatus to line 20.

〈23–27〉 To Maṇaśarman, Gaṇayaśarman 〈and〉 Vṛddhaśarman, residents of Cuvvuru belonging to the Bhāradvāja *gotra*, ...[8]

〈27–28〉 Completed. Written 〈by〉 Lakṣmaṇa Śaraṇalaya.

Commentary

There is some confusion in the ARIE report as to the numbering of the two Pamidimukkala plate sets. According to the reported contents (ARIE 1916–17, pp. 113–114, § 20), the issuer's father is Jayasiṁha in No. 14 and Indra Bhaṭṭāraka in No. 15; and No. 14 is not dated while No. 15 is dated to the year 3. On the basis of this information, the plates I call Set 1, year 3 correspond to No. 15, and those I call Set 2 correspond to No. 14. However, according to the same report, the seal of No. 15 has a preserved lotus flower, while that of No. 14 does not. This is the opposite of the above, as a lotus flower is visible only on the seal of Set 2. A Devanagari transcript of Set 1 in the ASI headquarters in Mysore bears the title "CP No XV of 1916-17", where "XV" has been corrected from "XIV". The post-correction number is thus consistent with how the contents of the plates are reported, and thus I have equated Set 1 to No. 15 and Set 2 to No. 14. The fact that the transcript's title has been corrected indicates that there was already some confusion about the numbering of these sets in the ASI office. The discrepancy about the reported seals may be a mistake of the ARIE report, or the seals (with the ring now cut) may have been swapped between the sets.

Like the Pamiḍimukkala plates (set 1) of Viṣṇuvardhana II, the authenticity and attribution of this grant is questionable. The number of omissions and other scribal mistakes in the text is beyond preposterous, and the genealogy is seriously out of step, introducing the ostensible issuer Viṣṇuvardhana as the son of Jayasiṁha I not once but on two separate occasions, while failing to mention any other predecessor including the real father of Viṣṇuvardhana II, Indra Bhaṭṭāraka. Nonetheless, my gut feeling is that this is probably a genuine grant that was seriously botched by the chancellery. I cannot support this with evidence other than to say that no sane forger would have done such a poor job. The two grants are written in very different hands, and although there are common points in their composition, neither seems to be a specimen on which the other may have been modelled (although see the apparatus to line 20).

[8] I am unable to translate the Telugu passage.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1916–17, p. 7, appendix A/1916-17, № 14[9] with description at ARIE 1916–17, pp. 113–114, § 20. I am not aware of a previous published edition. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs taken by myself in 2023 at the Telangana State Archaeology Museum, Hyderabad. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

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].

[9] See the commentary about a possible mistake in this numbering.