

Koḷūru (spurious?) grant of Bhīma II

Dániel Balogh

Alternative title: Amalapuram plates of Bhīma II

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00102

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00102.xml

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

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

Palaeographic description

Halantas. Final M is a very small circle at headline height with a sinuous tail. Its circle part is barely or not at all larger than an anusvāra, but the latter is normally a solid circle (except e.g. l5 viṃśati), while final M is an outline. Padmanabha Sastry's edition reads all final M-s as anusvāras; this is not indicated in my apparatus. Final N may be the same size as the regular na, but with no headmark and a slightly sinuous stem (e.g. l5 vatsarāN). Or it may be a reduced and raised form (e.g. l7 māsāN). Final T is a full-sized ta with a sinuous tail instead of a headmark.

Original punctuation marks are straight vertical bars with a nail head at the top. The opening symbol is a flower with a central circle and eight petals, each shaped like a letter S or a Devanagari numeral 9 (the two facing W and SW are mirror images of the other 6).

Other palaeographic observations. Long ī is written in two forms, one with curl inside the circle, e.g. l1 śrīmatām, and one with a dot inside the circle, e.g. l1 hārītī. There is no clear distinction between dependent o and au, which have been read as applicable

to the context. (However, dependent o may also be composed of two separate strokes at top right and bottom left, e.g. l9 ākhyo.)

Edition

Seal

<1> [śrī-tribhu]vanāmkūśa

Plates

<Page 1r>

<Page 1v> <1> ॐ svasti<.> śrīmatārṇ sakala-bhuvana-sarṇstūyamāna-mānavya-sagotrāṇām hārītī-putrāṇām kauśikī-vara<2>-prasāda-labdha-rājyānām {m}mātrgaṇa-paripālītānām svāmi-mahāsenā-pādānudhyātānām bhagavā?<a>n-nārāya<3>ṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-vara-varāha-lāmcchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍalānām āma?<A>śvamedhāvabhṛtha-snāna<4>-pavitrā?<i>kṛta○-vapuṣām cālukyānām kulam alamkariṣṇoḥ satyāśraya-vallabhendrasya bhrātā kubja<5>-viṣṇuvarddhana<h> A○ṣṭādaśa-varṣā?<ā>ṇi| tat-putraḥ jayasimha-vallabhah trayastrimśata(M)| tad-bhrātā Indra<6>-bhaṭṭāraka<h> sapta dināni| tat-sūnu<r> viṣṇuvarddhana<h> nava vatsarāN<|> tat-tanayo maṇgi-yuvarājā?<a>ḥ paṇcavimśati<|><7> tad-ātmajo jayasimhas trayodaśa?<s ta?<| ta>d-dvaimāturānujaḥ kok(k)ili<h> ṣaṇ māsāN| tasya jyeṣṭho bhrātā sv(ānu)<8>jam uccātya viṣṇuvarddhanas saptatrimśataṇ| tad-auraso vijayāditya-bhaṭṭārako <'>ṣṭādaśa vatsarāN| tat-to<Page 2r><9>kaṇ viṣṇuvarddhana?ṣa!ṭtrimśataM|

1. Anuṣṭubh

nare(n)dra-mṛgarājākhyo
(m)ṛgarāja-parākramaḥ
vijayā(d)itya-bhūpāla(h)
(ca)<10>(tvā)rimśat samā<s> samaḥ

tat-putraḥ kali-viṣṇuvarddhano <'>dhyarddha-varṣaṇ| tat-putro guṇakke(na)lla-vijayādi<11>tyaḥ catuṣcatvārimśataṇ|

2. Anuṣṭubh

śaṁkilasya purā?<i>dagdhā
rakṣito yādaveśvaraḥ

sphoṭitaṁ gaṁgakṛu?<ū>ṭ(arṁ ca)
yena maṁgi-bhaṭ(o)<12> hataḥ|

3. Anuṣṭubh

tad-bhrā○tur yyuvarājasya
vikramāditya-bhūpate<ḥ>
cālukya-bhīma-bhūpālas
tana(ya)<13><s> trīmśataṁ sa○mṛa?<ā>ḥ|

4. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

tat-putras tad-anantareṇa vijayādityo vijityāhave
svenaikena gajena (vā)<14>raṇa-ghaṭṛa?<ā>ṛu?<ū>ḍhān kṛā?<a>liṁgādhīpāN|
Āruhyojv!<jv>ala-hema-kalpita-tulṛa?<ā>-koṭim vadānyṛā?<o> jaya-
-stambha<m> kī<15><r>tīmāyan nidhāya vṛi?<i>raje ṣaṇ-māsam āsṛi?<i>n <n>ṛpaḥ|
tat-toka{m}m ammarājas sapta vatsarāN| tat-sūnur arbhaka<16>-(vija)yāditya<ḥ>
pakṣam| tatas tālapa-rājo māsam| tad-anu vikramāditya<ḥ> saṁvatsaram veṁgī-
ma(ṇḍa)la<Page 2v><17>m apālayaT|

5. Anuṣṭubh

tatas tu tammu-bhīmākhyā(h/m)
hatvā proddhṛ(ā)?<a>(ta)m āhave
varṣāṇi sapta rakṣanta<m>
yuddhama<18>llādhīpaṁ kṣitiM|

6. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

ni<r>jityārjjuna-sannibho janapadāt tan nirggamayyoddhatān
dāyādān ina-bhānu-līna-bha-ga<19>ṇākārān vidhāyetaṛM?<N>
vajrīvo<r>jita-nākam amma-nṛpate<r> bhrātā kaniyān bhuvan
bhṛi?<i>mo bhīma<20>-parākrama(h) ○ [~~~~~] |

7. Sragdharā

śṛi?<i>mat-kālirṅga-gaṁgānvaya-mahita-maho meḷabāmbo<21>ditodya○l-
-lakṣmī-cālukya-vaṁśonnati-yuta-vijayāditya-vīrāgra<22>sūnuḥ

8. Āryāgīti

jalajātapatra-cāmara-kalaśāmkuśa-lakṣaṇāmka-kara-caraṇa-talaḥ
lasad-ājā<23>(nv-a)valāmbita-bhuja-yuga-parigho gṛi?<i>rīndra-sānūraskah||

9. Āryāgīti

vidita-dh_iā?<a>rādhīpa-vidyo vivi(dh)ā<24>yudh_iā?<a>-kovido vilīnāri-kulaḥ
kari-turagāgama-kuśalo hara-caraṇāmbhoja-yuga[la]<Page 3r><25>-madhupaś
śrīmāN|

10. Lalitā

kavi-gāyaka-kalpa-taru<r> dvija-muni-d_ii?<i>nāndha-bandhu-jana-surabhiḥ
yā<26>caka-gaṇa-cintāmaṇir avaniśa-maṇir mmahogra-mahasā dyumaṇiḥ||

11. Āryāgīti

yasmin <ś>āsati nṛ<27>patau paripakvāneka-sasya-sampac-chāl_ii?<i>|
satata-payo-dhenur abhīr nnir_ii?<i>tir aparū<28>ig! nirasta-co○ro deśaḥ||

12. Āryāgīti

yasmin vrajati dhareśe bahir udyānāvaloka<29>nārttham bhītā(h)| ○
ta(d-d)ig-deśādhiśā diśanti maṇi-kanaka-haya-gajendra-p(ra)<30>tatiM||

13. Āryāgīti

yo rūpeṇa ma(no)jaṁ vibhavana mahendram ahimakaram uru-mahasā
<31> haram ari-pura-dahanena nyakkurvvan bhāti vitata-dig-avani-kī(r)ttiḥ||

sa sakala-ripu<32>-nṛpati-makuṭa-taṭa-ghaṭita-maṇi-gaṇa-madhukara-(n)ikara-
pari(cu)mbita<Page 3v><33>-caraṇa-sarasiruha-yugalo <yugalo>cana-pada-kamala-
vilasad-<d>vire_ip?<ph>āyamāno<34> mānonnato natoddhata-sarvva-lokaḥ
sarvva-lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājā<35>dhirāja-parameśvara-parama-
bhaṭṭ_ia?<a>rakaḥ parama-vīrāgraganyaḥ paṁcūrikurru-viṣa<36>ya-nivā○sino
rāṣṭrakūṭa-pramukhān k_iū?<u>ṭumbina<<h>> sarvvān samāhūye<37>ttham
ājñāpa○yati<.> viditam astu vaḥ|

yo

14. Anuṣṭubh

narendra-mṛgarājasya
vallabhaḥ<38>kuppayāhvayas
tat-sutābhūd revakāmbā
paṭṭavarddhana-vaṁśa-pā|

15. Anuṣṭubh

tat-tokā (p/b)olla<39>kāmbākhyā
jātā vaṁśa-vivarddhanā

tasyā<ḥ sū>nur abhḥu?<ū>d bhḥi?<i>mo
dhanurvveda-vicakṣaṇa|s!<naḥ|>

16. Anuṣṭubh

ta<40>to <'>bhūtām sutḥā?<au> kyhātau
vijayā(d)itya-daṇḍinḥo?<au>
dhanuṣmatām ca vḥi?<i>rāṇām
sa(m̐yu)<Page 4r><41>ge cāgra-gāminau|

17. Triṣṭubh

Ete trayah śḥu?<ū>ra-janāgraganyā
dhanur-ddharā (ghora-mahā)<42>haveṣu
gajam samāruhya mayāgra-samsthitā
hy akhaṇḍaya<n> krūra-ripū(n aja)<43>sram|

tasmād iṣṭa-bhr̥tya-vargga Iti tebhyaḥ tribhya<ḥ> bhīmana-vijayāditya-daṇḍibhya<ḥ>
śā<44>sanikṛ̥tya sarvva-kara-parihāreṇa mayā koḷūru nāma grām(o)<45> dattaḥ

A○syḥa?<ā>vadhayah pūrvvataḥ gūlamu|| dakṣiṇataḥ|| deva<46>buddamu|| paści-
mataḥ kontekurru|| Uttarataḥ Impalli|| Asyopari na kena<47>cid bādhā karttavyā<.>
yah karoti sa pañca-mahāpātakḥo?<aiḥ> samyukto bhavati||

<48> koḷūri pūrvva-sīmambu tūrppuna kālīya polamera|| dakṣiṇataḥ ko(ru)<Page
4v><49>ceru||ṣu||<<vu>>|| paścimataḥ kālīya polamera|| Uttarataḥ Eru||

Ājñapti<ḥ> ka<50>ṭakarājah| jontḥa?<ā>cāryyeṇa likhitaM||

ceṁbroli kayāmuna toḷu yenuṁ(gek)i<51> paḍasinadi| dīniki vajje rāju kari|| jamu-
daṇḍamu yekinadi||

<Page 5r> <Page 5v>

Apparatus

Plates

<1> śrīmatām ◇ *śrī matḥa?<ā>m* PS.

<2> bhagavḥā?<a>n- ◇ *bhagavan-* PS • The ASI transcript correctly has the incorrect ā here.

<3> -lāmcchanekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa- ◇ *-lāmcchanekṣṇa-* PS • The ASI transcript does not omit -kṣaṇa-.

⟨7⟩ kok(k)ili⟨h⟩ ◇ *kokili* PS • The ASI transcript also reads *kokili*. I am quite certain that the extra horizontal stroke for *kk* is present. The first vowel may be *au*, as it is definitely asymmetrical.

⟨8⟩ bhrātā sv(ānu)⟨8⟩jam ◇ *bhrātasv ānu⟨8⟩jam* PS • The ASI transcript shows *bhrātā sva/jam* in the original hand, corrected in red to *bhrātā svānu/jam*.

⟨9⟩ bhūpāla(h ca)⟨10⟩(tvā)rimśat ◇ *bhūpāla⟨kaś⟩ ca⟨10⟩tvārimśat* PS • Instead of supplying *kaś* (unmetrical), PS may have intended to emend to *laś*. PS does not recognise this passage as verse. The ASI transcript shows *bhūpāla(śca)/tvārimśat*. The last character is barely visible, but almost certainly *ca*. The *visarga* before it is quite certain.

⟨10⟩ guṇakke(na)lla- ◇ *guṇakenalla-* PS • The ASI transcript shows *guṇakāṅga* (sic), corrected to *guṇakkenalla*. The double *k* is certain.

⟨11⟩ śamkilasya ◇ *samlīlasya* PS • The ASI transcript has the correct reading. PS recognises this passage as verse. — ⟨11⟩ yādaveśvaraḥ ◇ *yao-veśvaraḥ* PS • The ASI transcript has the correct reading. — ⟨11⟩ sphoṭitaṁ ◇ *svoditaṁ* PS • The ASI transcript has the correct reading. — ⟨11⟩ maṅgi-bhaṭ(o)⟨12⟩ hataḥ ◇ *maṅgi-bhaṭopa⟨12⟩hataḥ* PS • The ASI transcript has *maṅgi-bhaṭṭā /hataḥ* corrected to *maṅgi-bhaṭo /hataḥ*. The last character actually seems to be *ṭe* with a vowel marker attached to the bottom left of the body, but *ṭo* must surely have been meant, and there may be an effaced second marker attached to the rising stem of the *ṭ*.

⟨12⟩ tana(ya)⟨13⟩⟨s⟩ trimśataṁ ◇ *tana(yo)⟨13⟩ trimśataṁ* PS • The ASI transcript has the correct reading and suggests no emendation.

⟨13⟩ sa○mṛa?⟨ā⟩ḥ ◇ *samaḥ* PS.

⟨15⟩ āsṛi?⟨i⟩n ⟨n⟩ṛpaḥ ◇ *asi nṛpaḥ* PS.

⟨17⟩ tammu-bhīmākhyā(h/rn) ◇ *tam{ma} bhīmākhyam* PS • The ASI transcript *tamma bhīmākhyam* corrected to *tammu bhīmākhyā* (or perhaps the corrector wished to emphasise, rather than delete, the final *anusvāra*?). PS's emendation to *tam* is unmetrical and can be ruled out. The sign after *ākhyā* definitely involves a second dot in addition to the one placed at head height. The lower dot is, however, smaller, does not appear to be as deeply incised, and takes up no horizontal space, being located to the left of the upper dot rather than straight below it. An originally engraved *anusvāra* may have been corrected to *visarga*. The parallel locus in the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king definitely has a *visarga*, but that too is probably a subsequent insertion. See also the commentary. — ⟨17⟩ proddhṛi(ā)?⟨a⟩(ta)m ◇ *proddama* PS • The ASI transcript has *pro..māhave* corrected to *proddhātāmāhave*. Instead of *dhā*, it is possible that the upper component was first engraved as *pa*. — ⟨17⟩ rakṣanta⟨m⟩ ◇ *rakṣanta*

PS • The ASI transcript also has *rakṣanta*, which is clear and certain. Emendation to *rakṣantam* is the only way I can make sense of the reading; see also the commentary.

<18> nirggamayyoddhatān ◇ *nirggamayy;a?<o>ddhātan* PS • PS probably read *nirggamayyāddhatān* and wished to emend correctly. The ASI transcript also first has *nirggamayyādvaton*, corrected by the hand in red ink to *nirggamayyoddhaton* (the last vowel is not corrected). The second vowel stroke on *yy* is faint and largely horizontal, attached to the loop of the subscript *y*.

<20> [~~~~~] • The end of the stanza has been omitted. Parallel instances of the stanza have *samabhunak saṁvatsarān dvādaśa* here, which PS restores to the text. See also the commentary. — <20> -mahita-maho ◇ *-mahitam aho* PS.

<24> -yuga[la] ◇ *-yugaḷa* PS • The ASI transcript omits the last letter at first, then *la* was added in red. There are no discernible vestiges, but perhaps *la* is slightly more likely than *ḷa*.

<29> -p(ra)<30>tatiM ◇ *-pra<30>tat;i?<i>M* PS • The ASI transcript simply reads *patatim*. I am not certain the subscript *r* is present at the end of the line but I think part of it can be made out below the *p*.

<32> -maṇi-gaṇa- ◇ *-maṇi-<ki>raṇa-* PS • The ASI transcript simply reads *patatim*. I am not certain the subscript *r* is present at the end of the line but I think part of it can be made out below the *p*.

<38> (p/b)olla<39>kāmbākhyā ◇ *bolla<39>kāmbākhyā* PS • The ASI transcript has *bolakāmbā* corrected in red to *pollakāmbā*. I think *p* is more likely (there seems to be a second headmark on the right-hand side of the consonant component), but *b* cannot be excluded.

<39> tasyā<h sū>nur ◇ *tasyānur* PS • The ASI transcript has *tasyānur* and suggests emending to *tat-sūnur* (unmetrical). — <39> -vicakṣaṇa|s|<naḥ|> ta<40>to ◇ *vicakṣaṇ;aśi?<aḥ||> ta<40>to* PS • PS may have read just as I do. Note that there is no real problem with the text, except for the somewhat confusing practice of inserting a punctuation mark before a conjunct consonant, part of which belongs before the punctuation mark.

<40> <'>bhūtām ◇ *bhūta-* PS • The ASI transcript has *bhūtau* corrected to *bhūtā*. — <40> dhanuṣmatām ◇ *dhanuṣṭha tam* PS • The ASI transcript seems to have *dhanuṣṭha*, corrected to *dhanuṣmatām*. — <40> sa(rīyu)<Page 4r><41>ge ◇ *sa(rīyu)<Page 4r><41>go* PS.

⟨42⟩ akhaṇḍaya⟨n⟩ ◇ *akhaṇḍaya* PS • The ASI transcript also reads *akhaṇḍaya*. — ⟨42⟩
-ripū(n aja)⟨43⟩sraṁ ◇ *-ripum ja⟨43⟩sram* PS.

⟨43⟩ tebhyaḥ ◇ *tebhyaḥ?āṁ?⟨aḥ⟩* PS.

⟨45⟩ gūḷamu ◇ *gūḷnamu* PS. — ⟨45⟩ deva⟨46⟩buddamu ◇ *deva⟨46⟩buddhamu* PS • The
ASI transcript has *devapuddamu* corrected to *devabuddamu*; there is also correction in
the character *dda*, but the black and red seem to differ only in execution. The reading
is clear.

⟨48⟩ tūrppuna ◇ *turppunaka* PS. — ⟨48⟩ polamera ◇ *polamera* PS.

⟨49⟩ polamera ◇ *polimera* PS.

⟨50⟩ kayāmuna ◇ *kayyamuna* PS. — ⟨50⟩ yenuṁ(gek)i ◇ *yenuṁgu eki* PS.

⟨51⟩ paḍasinadi ◇ *paḍasiṇadi* PS • The ASI transcript has *baḍasinadi*. The initial *pa* is
clear.

Translation

Plates

⟨1–9⟩ 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 Hārītī, 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 Mahāsenā, 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
the country of Veṅgi⟩ for eighteen years. His son Jayasīṁha Vallabha (I), for thirty-
three. His brother Indra Bhaṭṭāraka, for seven days. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (II), for
nine years. His son Maṅgi Yuvarāja, for twenty-five. His son Jayasīṁha (II), for thirteen.
His younger brother by a different mother, Kokkili, for six months. His eldest brother
Viṣṇuvardhana (III), having dethroned his own younger brother, for thirty-seven years.
His son Vijayāditya (I) Bhaṭṭāraka, for eighteen years. His son Viṣṇuvardhana (IV), for
thirty-six.

1.

King (*bhūpāla*) Vijayāditya (II) who was called Narendramṛgarāja and who had the
courage of a lion (*mṛgarāja*), ⟨reigned⟩ fairly for forty years.

⟨10–11⟩ His son Kali-Viṣṇuvardhana (V), for a year and a half. His son Guṇakkenalla Vijayāditya (III), for forty-four.

2.

He who burnt Śaṁkila's town, defended the Yādava lord, rent asunder the Gaṅga hilltop, ⟨and⟩ slew the warlord (*bhaṭa*) Maṅgi.¹

3.

The son of his brother, the heir-apparent (*yuvarāja*) Prince (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya, ⟨named⟩ King (*bhūpāla*) Cālukya-Bhīma, ⟨reigned⟩ for thirty years.

4.

After him his son Vijayāditya (IV) was king for six months, defeating in battle with ⟨just⟩ one elephant of his own the overlords of Kaliṅga mounted on hosts of elephants, generously ascending the beam of a balance scale furnished with bright gold,² and commissioning a victory pillar representing his reputation in Viraja.

⟨14–15⟩ His son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. His son Vijayāditya the Kid (*arbhaka*), for a fortnight. Then King (*rājan*) Tālāpa, for a month. After him, Vikramāditya (II) protected (*pāl-*) the country of Veṅgi for a year.

5.

Then the one named Tammu-Bhīma, having defeated in battle the pretentious King Yuddhamalla, who had protected the earth for seven years—³

6.

having vanquished him and expelled him from the country, having made ⟨other⟩ haughty rivals (*dāyāda*) resemble clusters of stars vanishing in the rays of the sun, the younger brother of King (*nṛpati*) Amma (I), ⟨namely⟩ Bhīma (II) of fearsome (*bhīma*) prowess, who takes after Arjuna, ⟨rules now⟩ as the Thunderbolt-wielder (Indra) ⟨rules⟩ the high heaven.

7.

His might is revered by the majestic Gaṅga dynasty of Kaliṅga. ⟨He is⟩ the valiant

¹The intended meaning may be that he defended the Yādava lord by burning Śaṁkila's town, but emendation would be needed for this to be explicit in the text. No Yādava lord is mentioned in any related grant that I know of, but other accounts refer to protecting or saving someone named Baddega, mentioning this in the same breath as the defeat of Śaṁkila and Maṅgi.

²That is, donating his own weight in gold.

³The interpretation of stanza V is problematic. See the commentary.

foremost son, borne by Meḷabāmbā, of Vijayāditya (IV), who was linked to the exaltation of the Cālukya dynasty whose fortune is <constantly> on the rise.⁴

8.

The palms of his hands and the soles of his feet are marked with the omens of the conch,⁵ the parasol, the chowrie, the jar and the elephant goad. His two playfully moving arms are like iron bars and extend to his knees. His chest is like a cliff of a majestic mountain.

9.

<He is> majestic, familiar with the sciences (appropriate) for kings, expert with various weapons, skilled in the lore of elephants and horses and a bee to the lotus that is the foot of Hara (Śiva). The families of his enemies have melted away.

10.

<He is> a wish-granting tree to poets and singers, a cow of plenty (*surabhi*) to Brahmins (*dvija*), ascetics (*muni*), the afflicted, the blind and his kinsfolk, a wish-fulfilling jewel to supplicants, a jewel among kings, and the jewel of the sky (the sun) by his great and fierce glory.

11.

While this king rules, the land is replete with the bounty of many a ripe harvest, exempt from fear, free from disasters (*īti*), devoid of pestilence and rid of bandits, and its cows lactate continuously.

12.

When this king goes out with the <only> purpose of admiring a park, the rulers of the countries in that direction fearfully offer up a train of gems, gold, horses and excellent elephants.

⁴"Foremost son" (*agra-sūnuḥ*) may be figurative, or it may mean that he was in fact older than his deceased brother Amma I. Since their mothers were different, Amma I may have succeeded their father in spite of being a junior son. Bhīma II's mother is called Meḷāmbā in other records; this variant of her name may have been invented for the sake of the metre. PS, in his discussion of this text, says she was a Kālīṅga Gaṅga princess, but this does not seem to be said here. It is in principle possible to read the entire stanza as a compound where the might of Meḷabāmbā would be revered by the Gaṅgas, but I find this implausible (and it would still not explicitly mean that she was a princess of that family) and think that the text up to *-maho* applies to Bhīma II. Nonetheless, if I am correct in believing that Ūrjapā is another name of Meḷāmbā in the Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava, then she was indeed the daughter of a Kālīṅga king.

⁵In the text, I construe *jalaja+ātapatra*, not *jalajāta+patra*. Instead of a conch, *jalaja* may perhaps mean a fish or a lotus..

13.

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 encompasses <all> the quarters of the earth.

<31–37> The pair of lotuses, which are his feet, are kissed all around by swarms of bees, which are the clusters of jewels fitted to the surfaces of the crowns of all enemy kings, <while> he himself plays the part of a bee flitting at the lotus that is the foot of the <god> with an odd number of eyes (Śiva). He rises high with pride <while> all the puffed-up world bows down. That shelter of all the world (*sarvva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty Viṣṇuvardhana (Bhīma II) the Supreme Lord (*parameśvara*), the Emperor (*mahārājādhirāja*), Supreme Sovereign (*parama-bhaṭṭāraka*) and supreme paragon of heroes,⁶ convokes and commands the householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—who reside in Paṃcūrikurū district (*viṣaya*) as follows: let <the following> be known to you.

<37> <He> who <was>

14.

Narendra-Mṛgarāja's (Vijayāditya II's) favourite named Kuppaya, had a daughter Revakāmbā, the matron of the Paṭṭavardhana lineage.⁷

15.

To her was born a daughter named Pollakāmbā, the enricher of her lineage. Her son was Bhīma, skilled in the discipline of archery (*dhanurveda*).

16.

From him arose two famous sons, Vijayāditya and Daṇḍin, foremost among archers and fighters, and {taking point} in battle.

17.

These three, paragons of heroes that they are, have always stationed themselves in front of me (Bhīma II) in horrendous, great battles and, mounted on an elephant and wielding bows, destroyed (our) fierce enemies.

<43–45> Therefore I have given the village named Kolūru, with a remission of all taxes and substantiated as a (copperplate) charter, to these three, <namely> Bhīmana,

⁶This epithet, *parama-vīrāgraganya*, seems to be used in lieu of a religious epithet such as *parama-māheśvara*.

⁷See the commentary.

Vijayāditya and Daṇḍin, <formally recognised as belonging to the> “class of favoured of retainers” (*iṣṭa-bhṛtya-varga*).

<45–47> Its boundaries (are as follows). To the east, Gūlamu. To the south, Devabud-damu. To the west, Kontekurru. To the north, Impalli. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to their enjoyment of rights) over it. He who does so shall be conjoined with the five great sins.

<48–49> ¿On the eastern border of Kolūru is the eastern Kāliya *polamera*?. To the south is the Koru tank (*ceṛuvu*). To the west is ¿the Kāliya *polamera*?. To the north is ¿the river?.⁸

<49–50> The executor (*ājñapti*) is the castellan (*kaṭaka-rāja*). Written (*likhita*) by Jontācārya.

<50–51> ...⁹

Commentary

Many stanzas of the royal *praśasti* are attested several times in the grants of Amma II, but not before him. The same is true of some of the prose *praśasti* at the beginning of the executive section. The writer Jontācārya is also featured in several grants of Amma II as well as Dānārṇava. It is possible that Jontācārya first rose to prominence in the chancellery late in the reign of Bhīma II and composed these stanzas and phrases (or inserted them into the standard template) originally with reference to Bhīma, then repurposed them to describe Amma II. The phrase *mānonnato natoddhata-sarvva-lokaḥ sarvva-lokāśraya* seems to imply this, as Amma II’s *āśraya* epithet is *samasta-bhuvanāśraya*, which is rather awkwardly omitted or distorted from the parallel titulature in his grants (00035 Elavaṛṇu grant of Amma II: *mānonnato natoddhata-samasta-lokaḥ samasta-bhuvanāśraya*; 00045 Tāṇḍikoṇḍa grant of Amma II: *mānonnato natoddhataḥ samasta-bhuvanāśraya*; 00046 Vandram plates of Amma II : *mānonnatoddhataḥ samasta-lokaḥ samasta-bhuvanāśraya*). However, stanza VI of this charter describes the reign of Bhīma II, and also states its length in several later grants.¹⁰ Here, the part about his reign’s

⁸I do not fully understand this passage containing Telugu words and phrases. I believe that while the previous passage described the location of the village Kolūru in terms of the neighbouring villages, the present sentence describes the exact borders where the fields belonging to this village end and those beginning to the adjacent village begin. The word *polamera* may mean a field.

⁹I do not understand the Telugu passage. According to PS, *ceṁbroli kayāmuna* (in his discussion, *cēmbroḷu kayyambuna* means a war fought at Cembrolu. He identifies a village of this name near Veṅḡī, in Elurā taluk of West Godavari District and believes it was the site of a major battle in Bhīma II’s struggle for the throne.)

¹⁰Nāgiyapūṇḍi grant of Amma II, Paḷaṁkalūru grant of Amma II, Pāṁbarṇu grant of Amma II, Tāṇḍikoṇḍa grant of Amma II, Kaṇḍyam plates of Dānārṇava, Masulipatam plates of Amma II.

duration is omitted, which renders the verse grossly defective both in metre (lacking 11 syllables) and in syntax (lacking a verb and an object to that verb to parallel *nākam*). This does not seem to be accidental and may rather suggest that the charter was written during the reign of Amma II or Dānārṇava, and predated for some reason to the time of Bhīma II. (The Pulivaṛru (spurious?) grant of Amma I is a similar case, also hallmarked by Jontācārya.) The plates, however, have all appearance of proper royal charters, so if they are spurious, they were nonetheless in all likelihood engraved in the royal chancellery. Since several small details fit the notion that the grant does indeed belong to Bhīma II, the most likely explanation of the anomalies is that the grant had been made by Bhīma II, but the official copper plates were only issued during the reign of one of his successors, most likely Amma II.

The closely connected stanza V is unique in the corpus aside from a partial attestation in the incomplete Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king. Due to inconsistent case endings, the syntax of this stanza is not clear. What one would expect at this point in the narrative is an introduction of Yuddhamalla as the next king after Vikramāditya II. However, reading V as such an introduction not only requires a minor emendation (*yuddhamallādhīpaṃ* to *yuddhamallādhīpaḥ*) but also faces a major difficulty: the word *raṣanta* must then somehow be a verb in the third person singular. I see no way to emend it appropriately and preserve the metre. The only plausible way of dealing with *raṣanta* that I can conceive of is to emend it to *raṣantaṃ*, in which case it stands in apposition to *yuddhamallādhīpaṃ* in the accusative. This, however, leaves stanza V bereft of a finite verb (and possibly of a subject too, see below). I think it is acceptable to find this in the following stanza. That, in turn, has only a pronoun for an object of the absolutes in the first quarter, whose signification must be supplied from the preceding prose in the other attestations of this stanza, and from V in the present context. Read in this way, we do have the expected narrative where Yuddhamalla (II) rules Veṅgi for seven years, and is ousted by Bhīma II. The only deviation from the standard king list is that Yuddhamalla is not presented as a proper member of that list, but rather as a parenthetical item who had to be disposed of—which would be understandable in a charter of Bhīma II even if other charters of the same ruler do recognise Yuddhamalla as a legitimate predecessor.

I am thus quite certain that I interpret V and VI correctly in this respect. The first hemistich of V, however, remains to be understood. It refers, beyond reasonable doubt, to a person named Tammu-Bhīma. The second glyph in this name has been read as *mma* by Padmanabha Sastry, as well as by Subba Rao in his edition of the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king, but the glyph (both here and in the other instance) clearly sports an extra “ear” attached to the subscript *m* on the right-hand side. This

stroke looks like it could be the right wing of the subscript *m*, but it does not occur in any glyph for *mma* that I am aware of (cf. e.g. l15), while being identical to the form of dependent *u* associated with certain consonants with a rounded bottom (cf. in particular *dyu* in l26). The glyph was also read as *mmu* by the person who made corrections in red in the ASI transcript. The same glyph occurs (and is read as *mmu*) in line 34 of the Varāṇaveṇḍi grant of Bhīma II. Tammu-Bhīma is thus quite certain, but this name is not attested anywhere else that I know of. The name may be either in the accusative or the nominative in the present charter (see the apparatus to line 17), and both can be interpreted sensibly in the context. Given the parallel locus, I consider the nominative more likely and translate accordingly. If the word *tammu* is connected to Telugu *tammuḍu* “younger brother”, then this name (in the nominative) might well denote Bhīma II, the younger brother of Amma I. If, however, the accusative is correct, then Tammu-Bhīma may be an otherwise unknown epithet of Yuddhamalla II, or it may refer to a third person whom Yuddhamalla had killed in order to establish his own reign of seven years. The use of a name plus *ākhyā* as a substantive (rather than adjective) has parallels elsewhere in the corpus (e.g. Kolaveṇṇu plates of Bhīma II, stanza III; Pedda-Gāḷidipaṛṛu grant of Amma II, stanza V). Subba Rao in his edition of the Single Bhimavaram plate of a late Eastern Cālukya king sees this as a reference to Bhīma III, a putative son of Amma I, and the same may have occurred to the person who wrote the ASI transcript of the present plates, who pencilled “Amba’s[?] son” here, with a reference to Fleet’s edition of the Diggubārṛu grant of Bhīma II where the existence of Bhīma III is proposed. While such a son might also plausibly bear an epithet meaning “younger brother Bhīma”, I see no evidence anywhere that Amma I had a child named Bhīma (to be discussed elsewhere; see also my edition of the Diggubārṛu grant of Bhīma II). Also, since Amma I’s certain child, Vijayāditya V, is consistently described as being of a tender age when he was displaced by Yuddhamalla (e.g. *arbhaka* in the present grant), it is very unlikely that a younger brother of that child would have been slain in battle at much the same time. If Tammu-Bhīma is someone whom Yuddhamalla killed, then it is most likely Vikramāditya II, who was also the younger brother of a previously reigning king.

For stanza XIV, both the ASI transcript and Padmanabha Sastry’s edition 1990, p. 65 comment that Revakāmbā “married into Paṭṭavardhana family” or “married a person belonging to the Paṭṭavardhini family” (respectively). The text, however, says unequivocally that Revakāmbā was herself the head of the Paṭṭavardhana family. Given the indications in other grants that there was a strong matrilineal tradition in this family, I am certain it is mistaken to posit that she gained membership in that family through marriage.

Bibliography

Reported in ARIE 1939–43, p. 20, appendix A/1939–40, № 3 with description at ARIE 1939–43, pp. 233–234, § 17. Edited from inked impressions by C. A. Padmanabha Sastry (1990) with facsimiles but without translation. The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs of the estampages kept at ASI Mysore, collated with Padmanabha Sastry’s edition. Innumerable typos and transliteration errors have been ignored in Padmanabha Sastry’s edition; readings shown by him are indicated in the apparatus only when they imply a different interpretation or when a lemma merits a note for another reason. I have also consulted an unsigned Devanagari transcript (with some corrections, probably by a different hand, in red ink) included with the ASI estampage. This transcript is much more accurate than Padmanabha Sastry’s Romanised edition. No visual documentation of the seal is available. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[PS] Padmanabha Sastry, C. A. 1990. “Amalapuram plates of Eastern Chālukya Bhīma II.” In: *Indian History and Epigraphy. Dr. G. S. Gai Felicitation Volume*. Edited by K. V. Ramesh, S. P. Tewari & M. J. Sharma. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, pp. 64–69.

Secondary

ARIE 1939–43. *Annual reports on South Indian epigraphy for the years 1939–40 to 1942–43*. Edited by C. R. Krishnamacharlu & N. Laksminarayan Rao. Delhi: Government of India, 1952.

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