Pāmulavāka plates of Vijayāditya VII

Dániel Balogh

Author of digital edition: Dániel Balogh

Identifier: DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00107

Repository: Eastern Cālukya (tfb-vengicalukya-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSVengiCalukya00107.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Southern Brāhmī (unspecified)]

Commit: 2026-10-28 17:37 (06a61a7), last modified 2026-10-27 16:44 (1c8d045)

Palaeographic description

Anusvāras are small dots usually at median height after the character to which they belong. Original punctuation marks are straight verticals with a small serif at the top. Rare initial Ai occurs in line 7 and would not be distinguishable from ṣo if deprived of context. When a superscript repha is combined with a dependent ā, this often differs only very slightly or not at all from the superscript repha without ā, and has been read with the benefit of doubt unless very clearly incorrect. When a superscript repha is combined with a dependent i, the repha is occasionally added on the right of the vowel marker, but more commonly integrated into it as a slight jaggedness to the lower right portion. In this latter form it is not always clearly perceptible and has, again, been read with benefit of the doubt where expected.

Edition

〈Page 1r〉

〈Page 1v〉 〈1〉 ⁜

1. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

śrī-dhāmnaḥ puruṣottamasya mahato nārāyaṇasya prabhor
nnābhī-paṁkaruhād ba<2>bhūva jagatas sraṣṭā svayaṁbhūs tataḥ|
jajñe mānasa-sūnur atrir iti yas tasmān muner atri<3>tas
somo vaṁśa-karas sudhāṁ¿s?<ś>ur udita<ḥ> śrīkaṁṭha-cūḍāmaṇiḥ|

2. Anuṣṭubh

tasmād āsīt sudhā-sū<ter>
bbu<4>dho budha-nutas tataḥ
j¿a?<ā>taḥ purūravā nāma
cakravarttī sa-vikramaḥ|

tasmād āyur<.> Āyuṣo<5> nahuṣaḥ| nahu◯ṣād yayātiś cakravartti-vaṁśa-karttā| tataḥ prācīśaḥ<.> pr¿a?<ā>cī<6>śāt (sai?)nyayā◯ti<ḥ><.> sai<<n<y>a>>yāter hayapatiḥ| hayapates sā<r>vvabhaumaḥ<.> sārvvabhau<7>māj jayasenaḥ<.> ◯ jayas¿a?<e>nān mahābhaumaḥ<.> mahābhaumād aiśānakaḥ| Aiśāna<8>kāt krodhānanaḥ<.> krodhānanād devakiḥ|¡devake| ricukaḥ!<devaker ṛbhukaḥ><.> ¡ricukād!<ṛbhukād> ṛkṣakaḥ| ¿ri?<Ṛ>kṣakān ma<9>ti¿n?<v>araḥ satra-yāga-yājī sarasvatī-nadī-nāthaḥ| tataḥ kā{r}tyāyanaḥ| kā{r}tyā<10>yanān nīlaḥ<.> nīlād duṣyantaḥ<.> tat-sutaḥ|

Āryyā|

3. Āryāgiti

gaṁg¿o?<ā>-y¿u?<a>munā-t¿i?<ī>re ya<Page 2r><11>d avicchi{ṁ}nnaṁ nikhāya yūpān kramaśaḥ|
kṛtvā ta¿dh?<th>āśvamedhān nāma mahā-karmma-bharata I<12>ti yo <'>labhata{ḥ}

tato bharatād bhūmanyuḥ| bhūmanyos suhotraḥ<.> suhotrād dhastī<.> hasti<13>no virocanaḥ| vi<ro>canād ajamīlaḥ<.> Ajamīlā{|}t saṁvaraṇaḥ| saṁvaraṇasya tapanasu<14>tāyās tapa{na}◯tyāś ca sudhanvā| sudhanvanaḥ{|} parikṣiT<.> parikṣito bhīmasenaḥ<.><15> bhīmasenāt pra◯dīpanaḥ<.> pradīpanā¡ś c!<c ch>aṁtanuḥ<.> śaṁtano<r> vvicitravīryyaḥ| vvicitra<16>vīryyāt pāṇḍu◯-rājaḥ|

Āryyā|

4. Upagīti

putrās tasya ca dharmmaja-bhīmārjjuna-nakula<17>-sahadevāḥ
paṁcendriyavaT paṁca syu<r> vviṣaya-grāhiṇas tatra|

vṛttaṁ|

5. Śārdūlavikrīḍita

yenād¿a?〈ā〉hi viji〈18〉tya ¿k?〈kh〉āṇḍavam atho gāṇḍīvinā vajriṇa¿ḥ?〈ṁ〉
yuddhe pāśupatāstram aṁdhaka-ripoś cālābhi dai〈19〉tyān bahūn
indrārddhāsanam adhyarohi jayinā| yat kālikeyādikān
hatvā svairam akāri〈Page 2v〉 〈20〉 vaṁśa-vipina-(c?)chedaḥ kurūṇāṁ vibhoḥ|

tato 〈'〉rjjunād abhimanyuḥ| 〈Abhima〉nyoḥ parikṣiT| parikṣito〈21〉 janame-jayaḥ| janamejayāt kṣemukaḥ〈.〉 kṣemukān naravāhanaḥ| naravāhanā¡ś c!〈c ch〉atānīkaḥ〈.〉〈22〉 śatānīkād udaya¿ṇ?〈n〉aḥ| tataḥ paraṁ tat-prabhṛti¿s?〈ṣ〉v avicchinna-santāneṣv ayodhyā-siṁhāsanāsī〈23〉neṣv ekānna-ṣaṣṭi◯-cakrava(r)ttiṣu gateṣu tad-vaṁśyo vijayādityo ⟦bhī⟧〈〈nā〉〉ma rāj¿a?〈ā〉 vi〈24〉jigīṣayā da◯kṣiṇā-pathaṁ gatvā trilocana-pallavam adhikṣipya daiva-durīh¿ā?〈a〉〈25〉yā lokāntara◯m a(ga)maT|

tasmin saṁkule purohitena sārddham antarvvatnī tasya〈26〉 mahādevī muḍivemu nāmāgrahāraṁ upagamya tad-vāstavyena viṣṇubhaṭṭa-somayājinā duhi〈27〉t¿ta?〈ṛ〉-ni〈r〉vviśeṣam abhirakṣitā satī nandana〈ṁ〉 viṣṇuvarddhanan nāma prasūya| tasya ca kumārakasya m¿a?〈ā〉〈28〉navya-sagotra-hārīti-putra-dvipakṣa-gotra-kramocitāni karmmāṇi kārayitvā tam avarddhaya〈29〉T〈.〉 sa ca mātrā vidita-vṛttāntas san nirggatya calukya-girau nandāṁ bhagavatīṁ gaurīm ārādhya ku〈Page 3r〉〈30〉māra-nārāyaṇa-māṭṛ-gaṇān saṁt{t}arppya śvetātapatraika-śaṁkha-paṁca-mahāśabda-pā〈31〉li-k¿a?〈e〉tana-prati¿ḍ?〈ḍh〉akkā-varāha-lāṁ¿c?〈ch〉ana-piṁ¿c?〈ch〉a-kunta-siṁhāsana-makara-toraṇa-kanaka-da〈32〉ṇḍa-gaṁgā-yamunādīni sva-kula-kramāgatāni 〈ni〉kṣiptānīva tat-sā¡ṁb!〈m〉rājya-cihnāni sa〈33〉mādāya kaḍaṁba-gaṁgādi-bhūmipān ni〈r〉jitya setu-narmmadā-madhyaṁ sārddha-sapta-lakṣ¿ā?〈a〉ṁ〈34〉 dakṣiṇāpathaṁ ◯ pālayām āsa|

ślokaṁ|

6. Anuṣṭubh

tasyāsīd vijayādityo
viṣṇuv¿i?〈a〉〈35〉rddhana-bhūpateḥ ◯
pallavānvaya-jātāyā
mahādevyāś ca nandanaḥ|

tat-sutaḥ po〈36〉lakeśi-vallabhaḥ| tat-putraḥ kī(r)ttivarmmā〈.〉 tasya tanayaḥ|

svasti〈.〉 śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuva〈37〉na-saṁstūyamāna-mānavya-sagotrāṇāṁ hārīti-putrāṇāṁ kauśikī-vara-prasāda-labdha〈38〉-rājyānāṁ māṭṛ-gaṇa-paripālitānā〈ṁ〉 sv¿a?〈ā〉mi-〈〈ma〉〉hāsena-pādānudhyātānāṁ bhagavan-nārā〈39〉yaṇa-prasāda-samās¿a?〈ā〉dita-vara-v¿ā?〈a〉rāha-lāṁ¿c?〈ch〉anekṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśīkṛtārāti-maṇḍa〈Page 3v〉〈40〉lānām aśvamedhāvabhṛ¿t?〈th〉a-snāna-pavitrī〈〈kṛ〉〉ta-

vapuṣāṁ cālukyānāṁ kulam alaṁka〈41〉〈ri〉ṣṇos satyāśraya-vallabhendrasya bhrātā kubja-viṣṇuvarddhano 〈’〉ṣṭādaśa varṣāṇi veṁgi-deśam a〈42〉pālayaT| tad-ātmajo jayasiṁ¡gh!〈h〉a-vallabhaḥ trayastriṁśataṁ| tad-anujendrarājas sa〈43〉pta dināni| tat-suto viṣṇuvarddhano ¿v?〈n〉ava| tat-sū〈nu〉r mmaṁgi-yuvarājaḥ paṁ-cavi〈ṁ〉śatiṁ| tat-putro〈44〉 jayasiṁ¡gh!〈h〉a◯-vallabhas trayodaśa| tad-avarajaḥ kokkiliṣ ¿v?〈ṣ〉a¿n?〈ṇ〉 māsāN| tasya jyeṣṭho〈45〉 bhrātā viṣṇuva◯rddhanas tam uccāṭya saptatriṁśataṁ| tat-putro vijayāditya-bhaṭṭ¿a?〈ā〉〈46〉rako 〈’〉ṣṭ¿a?〈ā〉daśa| ta¿d-a?〈t-ta〉nujo viṣṇuvarddhanaṣ (ṣ)a〈ṭ〉triṁśataṁ| tat-sūnur vvijayāditya-narendra-mṛgarāja〈47〉ś cāṣṭacatvāriṁśataṁ| tat-sutaḥ kali-viṣṇuvarddhano 〈’〉{r}ddhya〈r〉ddha-varṣaṁ| tat-suto guṇaga-vijayādityaś catu〈48〉ścatvāriṁśataṁ| tad-bhrātur vvikramāditya-bhūpates tanayaś cālukya-bhīmas triṁśataṁ| tat-sutaḥ〈49〉 koll¡e!biganḍa-vijayāditya〈ḥ〉 ṣaṇ māsāN〈.〉 tat-sūnur ammarājas sapta varṣāṇi| tat-sutaṁ vija〈Page 4r〉〈50〉yādityaṁ bālam uccāṭya tāḍapo māsam ekaṁ| taṁ jitvā yudhi cālukya-bhīma-tana〈51〉yo vikramāditya Ekādaśa māsāN| tat-tāḍapa-rāja-suto yuddhamalla{ḥ}s sapta varṣāṇi

7. Indravajrā

〈52〉 taṁ Yuddhamalla〈ṁ〉 pa{ṁ}rihṛtya deśāt
piṣṭvetareṣām api śātravā¿n?〈ṇ〉āṁ
kṣmām ammarājānuja-rā〈53〉ja-bhīmo
bhīmas samā dvādaśa rakṣati sma|

8. Anuṣṭubh

t¿i?〈a〉t-sūnu〈r〉 vvinatārātir
ammarājo nṛpāgraṇīḥ
〈54〉 paṁcaviṁśati ◯ varṣāṇi
veṁgī-bhuvam apālayaT|

9. Gīti

dvaimāturo 〈’〉mma-nṛpater ddā〈55〉na-nṛpo rāja◯-bhīma-nṛpa-tanayaḥ
vidyā-kalāpa-caturaḥ ca〈tu〉ranta-dharām a〈56〉pāt samās tisraḥ|

10. Anuṣṭubh

Anu dānārn¿n?〈ṇ〉ṇavād āsīd
〈d〉aiva-duśceṣṭayā tataḥ
saptaviṁśati varṣā〈57〉ṇi
veṁg¡i!-mahir anāy¿i?〈a〉kā|

11. Indravajrā

Atrāntare dāna-narendra-sūnu<ḥ>
śrī-śaktivarmmā sura-rāṭ-sadharmm¿a?<ā>
<58> yaś śauryya-śaktyā vinihatya śatrūn
sa dvādaśābdān samarakṣad urvvīM|

12. Upendravajrā

tasyānujanmā <ji>ta-śa<59>trur urvvīṁ
saṁvatsarān pālayati sma sapta
nirasta-sapta-vyasanaḥ pratāpī
bhūpā<Page 4v><60>graṇ(īr) mmummadi-bhīma-bhūpa<ḥ>|

13. Anuṣṭubh

tasya mummadi-bhīmasya
sutaḥ kṛta-matir mmahā¿|?<N>|
<61> rājarājāhvayo rājā
dv¿a?<ā>daśābdān dh¿ā?<a>rām apāT|

14. Āryāgīti

taṁ rājarāja{ṁ}-¿d?<n>ṛpatiṁ nirddhāṭya<62> bhuvaḥ prasahya vijayādityaḥ|
vimalāditya-<ta>nūja<ḥ> <<ta>>sya dvaimāturo <'>grahīd y¿a?<o> rājyaṁ

15. Sragdharā

<63> śrīmān śāke samaughe dṛg-iṣu-nidhi-mite karkk¿i?<a>-ge karkkaśāṁśau
śuddhātmā śuddha-paṁcamy-aditi<64>-suta-dine sū◯ryya-bhe śauryya-śālī|
kanyā-lagne <'>ti-⟦(nya?)⟧<<dha>>nya<ḥ> śaśi-kula-tilako rā<65>ja-m¿a?<ā>rttaṇḍa-
sū◯nur
vveṁgī-sā¡ṁb!<m>rājya-paṭṭaṁ sma vahati vijayāditya-bhūpaḥ pratā<66>pī|

16. Praharṣiṇī

putrīya◯nn api śaraṇā¿tti?<rtthi>naṁ jighāṁsuM
jñā¿tir?<trī>y{y}an bhaṭa-vi¿bh?<b>udhāṁś ca sat-k¿ṛ?<ri>yā<67>bhiḥ|
mā¿tkṛ?<trī>yan para-yuvatīr ajihma-vṛttir
yyo dhātrīm avati n{d}ṛpo yathā sva-dharmmaM|

17. Upajāti

vilaṁghaya<68>ntī himavantam uccair
ume<śva>rāṁga¡(M)!<ṁ> dviṣatī vicitraM|
gaurīti siddhāpi vibhāti kīrttiś
cālukya-⟦rā⟧<<bhī>>ma<69>-kṣitipasya yasya|

sa śrī-sarvva-lokāśraya-śrī-viṣṇuvarddhana-mahārājo rājādhirājaḥ〈70〉śrī-vijayāditya-devo rāṣṭrakūṭa-pramukhān kuṭ¡i!〈u〉ṁbinas sarvvān sam⟦va⟧〈〈ā〉〉h¿u?〈ū〉ya samasta-pradhā〈Page 5r〉〈71〉na-samakṣam ittham ā〈jñā〉payati|

18. Upajāti

nihatya vairi-kṣitipān a¿r?〈ś〉eṣāN
¿ś?〈s〉vīkāray¿ā?〈a〉n bhūpatinā dhar¿a?〈i〉〈72〉trīṁ
kucamma-rājena nijeśvareṇa
labdha-prasādo bhavati sma tasmā¿ta?〈T〉|

19. Upajāti

śrī-cāme-rājasya bhart(u)〈73〉ś ca
kāmāṁbikāyāś ca pati-vratāyāḥ
yo bhīma-bhūp⟦o⟧〈〈a〉〉s tanayo 〈’〉janiṣṭa|

tasmai dīnā(r)t¿t?〈th〉i-dvija〈74〉-bandhu-budha-surabhūruhāyamānāya| nā〈〈ga〉〉-kula-bhūṣa¿n?〈ṇ〉āya| meghagiri-nātha-melpa-kandarppa〈75〉malaya-bhāska◯rāya| sam¿u?〈u〉pārjjita-dharmma-ka〈r〉mmaṇe b¿ra?〈ṛ〉haspati-kalpāmātya-śrīya〈76〉pa-cāmena-be◯nn¿a?〈ā〉ya bu¡dh!〈d〉dhi-pau¿rṣa?〈ruṣa〉-samupā(r)jjita-rājya-mahimne{ṁ}| kṛta-kleś¿ī?〈a〉-ni〈77〉mitte koṁpo◯loṁgu nāma grāmo dvādaśa-grāmaś ca śāsanīkṛtya dhārā-pū〈78〉rvvakaṁ mayā ◯ datta Iti viditam astu vaḥ| Asyopari na kenacid bādhā kartta〈79〉vyā〈.〉 yaḥ karoti sa paṁca-mahāpātako bhavati〈.〉

20. Anuṣṭubh

bahubhir vvasudhā dattā
bahubhiś cānupā〈80〉litā
yasya yasya yadā bhūmis
tasya tasya tadā phalaṁ|

21. Anuṣṭubh

sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā
yo hare〈81〉t¿u?〈a〉 vasundharāṁ
ṣaṣṭi-varṣa-sahasrāṇi
viṣṭhāyāṁ j¿a?〈ā〉yate k¡ri!〈ṛ〉miḥ|

Asya dvitī〈〈ya〉〉-varṣa-varddha〈82〉ne dattasy¿ā?〈a〉 ś¿a?〈ā〉sanasya Ājñapti〈ḥ〉 kaṭakādhīśaḥ〈.〉 ś(ā)sana-le¿k?〈kh〉akaś ca gokācāryyaḥ꣓

〈Page 5v〉

Apparatus

〈3〉 sudhā-sū<ter> bbu〈4〉dho ◇ *sudhāṁ¿sū?〈śo〉 ¿bh?〈bb〉u〈4〉dho* SR • I assume that *bhu* in SR's edition is a typo and that his intended emendation was *sudhāṁśor*, but this is unmetrical and does not correspond to other attestations of this stanza.

〈4〉 cakravartti-vaṁśa-karttā • Other attestations of this stanza read *cakravarttī vaṁśa-karttā*, which may have been intended here too, but the text is intelligible and appropriate as received. — 〈4〉 °t (sai?)nyayā◯ti〈ḥ〉 ◇ *°t syinyayati* SR • The problematic character read here as *tsyai* has been corrected rather awkwardly, and it is not evident which strokes are earlier and which later. SR's reading was probably meant to be *°t syainyayāti*. In fact the character, as received, best matches the shape expected for *tsyo*, but I am willing to believe that the corrector's intent had been *tsai*. The pre-correction character may have been *tsya*, *tsyā*, *tsye*, *tsyo*, *tsu* or *tsū*.

〈11〉 nikhāya ◇ *ni¿kh?〈dh〉āya* SR. — 〈11〉 ta¿dh?〈th〉āśvamedhān ◇ *tadāśvamedhān* SR.

〈20〉 -vipina-(c?)chedaḥ ◇ *-vipinaś cedaḥ* SR • SR may be correct in reading *ś* for the damaged body (compare *pradīpanāś caṁtanuḥ* in line 15 and *naravāhanāś catānīkaḥ* in line 21), but the subscript component is quite certainly *ch* here. — 〈20〉 -〈〈ma〉〉hāsena- • The scribal addition is written at the expected spot below the line and also marked by a horizontal obelus sign (resembling ÷ or a dash crossed by a shorter vertical line) above the line.

〈50〉 tana〈51〉yo ◇ *tamna〈51〉yo* SR • SR's intent was probably *taṁnayo*, reading a dot (which I deem to be random) as an *anusvāra*.

〈55〉 -caturaḥ ◇ *-¿bh?〈c〉aturaḥ* SR.

〈58〉 〈ji〉ta-śa〈59〉trur ◇ *¿taśa?〈talasa〉〈59〉ṭṛrurvvīṁ* SR • SR probably reads the received text correctly, with only a typo in line 59. I am, however, unable to interpret his emendation.

〈62〉 vimalāditya-〈ta〉nūja〈ḥ〉 〈〈ta〉〉sya dvaimāturo 〈'〉grahīd y¿a?〈o〉 rājyaṁ ◇ *vimalāditya-〈〈ta〉〉nūjasya dvaimāturo grahīd{ya} rājyaṁ* SR • The scribal addition is written below and to the left of sya and also marked by a horizontal obelus sign above this spot, as in line 20. In spite of this, SR's footnote suggests reading the inserted *ta* after *vimalāditya* (instead of supplying another *ta* there), so his emended text is *vimalāditya-tanūjasya dvaimāturo grahīd rājyaṁ*, which is prosodically inappropriate. My emendation results in a metrically correct 32-mora hemistich, making the stanza an *āryāgīti*. Suppressing *yo* in combination with my first emendation would result

in a prosodically correct 30-mora line (and thus the rare but attested *vallarī* metre), but I find that emendation too invasive, since it involves reading a single *akṣara*, *drā*, instead of two inscribed *akṣaras*, *dyo rā*. By retaining *yo*, the stanza as a whole becomes a subordinate clause to the next verse. I am thus confident that my emendations reflect the composer's intent. In addition to that noted in the edition, there are two further indications of possible scribal correction here. First, the top of the subscript *y* in *tya* is extended to the right, which may be a subsequent correction to *tyā*. (Although the *ā* marker would be expected to bend downward, as for instance in l. 64 *nyā*, the absence of the downward component could be explained here by the proximity of the already engraved following character.) If this is indeed scribal correction and not just a slip of the chisel, then one redactor had probably wanted *vimalādityānuja* rather than *vimalāditya-tanūja* here. This, however, would be a correction to make things worse, since on the one hand no younger brother of Vimalāditya is known, and on the other hand it would render the text unmetrical. Second, there is a slightly sinuous horizontal line below the left-hand side of *nū* (this was apparently misinterpreted by SR as part of an *ī* marker on *rkka* in the next line). It is possible that this is a second *kākapada* signifying that the interlinear *ta* should be inserted here as well as at the point where it is engraved, although it is below the locus and is not crossed by a vertical stroke. Alternatively, it may be a mark of secondary correction intended to cancel the earlier correction of *tya* to *tyā*.

〈63〉 karkk¿i?〈a〉-ge karkkaśāṁśau ◇ *karkkige karkīśaṁ sau* SR • See also the commentary about this date. — 〈63〉 -paṁcamy-aditi〈64〉-suta-dine sū◯ryya-bhe ◇ *-paṁcamyāditi〈64〉-suta-diner sūryyābhe* SR.

〈64〉 -⟦(nya?)⟧〈〈dha〉〉nya〈ḥ〉 • Emending to *-dhanye* would be just as plausible as emending to *-dhanyaḥ*. However, two other words echoing the astronomical details (*śuddhātmā*, *śauryya-śālī*) qualify Vijayāditya while the third such assonance (*karkka-ge karkkaśāṁśau*) is an integral part of the astronomical information, so I feel that here too the composer probably intended to describe the king rather than the ascendant.

〈66〉 jighāṁsuM ◇ *jighāṁsur* SR.

〈67〉 mā¿tkṛ?〈trī〉yan ◇ *mātkrayan* SR. — 〈67〉 yyo dhātrīm avati n{d}r̥po ◇ *yyodhā trīmavatin drupo* SR.

〈68〉 ume〈śva〉rāṁga¡(M)!〈ṁ〉 ◇ *°u meraṁgam* SR • My emendation is not entirely confident, but it is my only metrically correct idea that results in meaningful and contextually passable text. Even so, the poetic image is awkward and difficult to interpret (see the translation), so the composer may have had something different in mind. The final *M* at the end of this word is quite different from other instances

(compare the one in *vicitraM* shortly afterward in this line), with a larger and rounder body and a simple, short vertical stroke for a stem. It is even less like a final *N* (cf. l. 71) and is certainly nothing like an *anusvāra*, so I assume it was intended for *M*. — 〈68〉 ⟦rā⟧《bhī》ma • SR also sees a correction of *rā* to *bhī* here, but the reverse is not out of the question as none of the strokes have been visibly erased. I assume that the limb of *bha* was attached to the left side of an already inscribed *ra*, so that the left half of the original *ra* now forms the slightly misshapen stem of *bha*. With the reverse, the original *bha* would have had to be misshapen to begin with.

〈70〉 sam⟦va⟧《ā》h¿u?〈ū〉ya • I assume, with SR, that *mva* has been corrected to *mā* here. If so, then the body of the subscript *v* has been joined to the subsequently added *ā* marker to become its ornamental extension. Alternatively, the originally inscribed character may perhaps have been *mya*.

〈72〉 kucamma-rājena ◇ *¿ku?〈śrī〉-camma-rājena* SR • The text is somewhat opaque here (see the translation), but I do not feel SR's emendation to be warranted. Engraving a completely different character in place of *śrī* would be a very unlikely scribal mistake. — 〈72〉 bhart(u)〈73〉ś ca ◇ *bharata〈73〉ś ca* SR • The stroke below the body of *t* may be a subscript *t* as well as a squat and misshapen *u*. Given the immediate context, *u* was in all probability intended, although the stanza as a whole is seriously corrupt.

〈73〉 -bhūp⟦o⟧《a》s ◇ *-bhūpos* SR • The *o* is much fainter than surrounding strokes and has probably been beaten out.

〈76〉 -be◯nn¿a?〈ā〉ya ◇ *bannaya* SR • I emend tentatively, assuming that *benna* is part of the recipient's name. Alternatively, perhaps some other correction is needed at the beginning of this locus, and *naya-* belongs with the following compound.

Translation

1.

From the lotus in the navel of the great Lord Nārāyaṇa, the supreme person and the abode of Śrī, there arose (Brahmā,) the self-born creator of the world. From him was born a son of the mind called Atri, and from that sage Atri 〈was born〉 the founder of a dynasty: the Moon (*soma*) whose rays are nectar and who is the turban jewel of Śrīkaṇṭha (Śiva).

2.

From that nectar-yielding one there came into being Mercury (*budha*), praised by the

wise (*budha*), 〈and〉 from him was born the valiant universal sovereign (*cakravartin*) named Purūravas.

〈4–10〉 From him 〈was born〉 Āyus. From Āyus, Nahuṣa. From Nahuṣa, Yayāti, progenitor of a dynasty of universal sovereigns. From him, Prācīśa. From Prācīśa, Sainyayāti. From Sainyayāti, Hayapati. From Hayapati, Sārvabhauma. From Sārvabhauma, Jayasena. From Jayasena, Mahābhauma. From Mahābhauma, Aiśānaka. From Aiśānaka, Krodhānana. From Krodhānana, Devaki. From Devaki, Ṛbhuka. From Ṛbhuka, Ṛkṣaka. From Ṛkṣaka, Mativara, performer of a Sattra sacrifice and Lord of the River Sarasvatī. From him, Kātyāyana. From Kātyāyana, Nīla. From Nīla, Duṣyanta. His son 〈was the one〉—

〈10〉 〈What follows is〉 moraic verse.

3.

—who, because he unceasingly dug down one sacrificial post (*yūpa*) after another on the banks of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā and also performed Aśvamedhas, obtained the name "Bharata of the Great Sacrifices."

〈12–16〉 From that Bharata 〈was born〉 Bhūmanyu. From Bhūmanyu, Suhotra. From Suhotra, Hastin. From Hastin, Virocana. From Virocana, Ajamīla. From Ajamīla, Saṁvaraṇa. 〈The son〉 of Saṁvaraṇa and of Tapatī, the daughter of Tapana, 〈was〉 Sudhanvan. From Sudhanvan 〈was born〉 Parikṣit. From Parikṣit, Bhīmasena. From Bhīmasena, Pradīpana. From Pradīpana, Śantanu. From Śantanu, Vicitravīrya. From Vicitravīrya, King Pāṇḍu.

〈16〉 〈What follows is〉 moraic verse.

4.

He in turn had five sons—(Yudhiṣṭhira) the son of Dharma, Bhīma, Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadeva—who were to obtain the kingdom (*viṣaya*) like the five senses {which grasp the sense-objects (*viṣaya*)}.

〈17〉 〈What follows is〉 syllabic verse.

5.

The masterful wielder of the Gāṇḍīva (bow) who, after vanquishing (Indra) the thunderbolt-bearer, burned the Khāṇḍava (forest); who obtained the Pāśupata weapon in combat from (Śiva) the enemy of Andhaka; who, after slaying many Daityas such as Kālikeya, victoriously ascended to share a throne with Indra; who with abandon cut down the forest that was the dynasty of the Kurus—

〈20–25〉 —from that Arjuna 〈was born〉 Abhimanyu. From Abhimanyu, Parikṣit. From

Parikṣit, Janamejaya. From Janamejaya, Kṣemuka. From Kṣemuka, Naravāhana. From Naravāhana, Śatānīka. From Śatānīka, Udayana. Thereafter, when sixty-less-one universal sovereigns beginning with him (Udayana) had passed in uninterrupted succession, ⟨each⟩ seated on the throne of Ayodhyā, a king of their dynasty named Vijayāditya marched to Dakṣiṇāpatha ⟨driven⟩ by a desire to conquer. He challenged Trilocana Pallava and, by an ill turn of fate, passed to the otherworld.

⟨25–34⟩ In the midst of that tribulation, his pregnant chief queen went with their chaplain (*purohita*) to a Brahmanical settlement (*agrahāra*) named Muḍivemu, and—under the protection of its resident the soma-sacrificer Viṣṇubhaṭṭa, ⟨who cherished her⟩ as if she were his own daughter—having given birth to a son named Viṣṇuvardhana, she raised that boychild, arranging for the performance of the ceremonies traditionally applicable to his bilateral *gotra*, ⟨namely⟩ being of the Mānavya *gotra*, a son of Hārita, and so on. He in turn, when her mother had told him the story, went forth to Mount Calukya and worshipped Nandā, ⟨who is⟩ the goddess Gaurī, and also appeased Kumāra, Nārāyaṇa and the band of Mothers. Having ⟨thereby⟩ recovered the hereditary paraphernalia of sovereignty belonging to his family, as though they had been deposited (with these deities for safekeeping)—⟨namely,⟩ the white parasol, the one conch shell, the five great sounds[1], the pennant garland (*pāli-ketana*), the ¿inverted drum? (*pratiḍhakkā*)[2], the Boar emblem, the peacock fan (*piṁcha*), the lance (*kunta*), the lion throne, the *makara* archway, the golden sceptre, the Gaṅgā and Yamunā and so forth—and having conquered the kings of the Kaḍambas, Gaṅgas and so on, he reigned over Dakṣiṇāpatha (extending) from (Rāma's) bridge to the Narmadā (and comprising) seven and a half lakhs (of villages?).

⟨34⟩ ⟨What follows is⟩ a *śloka*.

6.

The son of that King Viṣṇuvardhana and his chief queen born of the Pallava dynasty was Vijayāditya.

⟨35–36⟩ His son was Polakeśi Vallabha. His son was Kīrtivarman. His son—

⟨36–51⟩ Greetings. Satyāśraya Vallabhendra (Pulakeśin II) was eager to adorn the lineage of the majestic Calukyas—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

[1]The expression *pañca-mahāśabda* probably refers to being honoured by the sound of five musical instruments, but may also mean five titles beginning with "great". See Fleet 1888, pp. 296–298, n. 9 for a discussion.

[2]Some Cālukya grants use the words *paḍa-ḍhakkā* and *daḍakkā* in similar contexts. See the Ceruvu Mādhavaram plates of Kali Viṣṇuvardhana V and the commentary thereto.

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 Vallabha (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 ⟨years⟩. 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 Guṇaga Vijayāditya (III), for forty-four. The son of his younger brother King (*bhūpati*) Vikramāditya, Cālukya-Bhīma, for thirty. His son Kollebigaṇḍa Vijayāditya (IV), for six months. His son Ammarāja (I), for seven years. After dethroning his son the child Vijayāditya (V), Tāḷapa, for one month. After defeating him, Cālukya-Bhīma's son Vikramāditya (II), for eleven months. ⟨Then⟩ that King (*rājan*) Tāḷapa's son Yuddhamalla, for seven years.

7.

Having ousted that Yuddhamalla from the country and having also quashed other enemies, the fearsome King Bhīma (II), younger brother of Ammarāja, protected (*rakṣ-*) the earth for twelve years.

8.

His son Ammarāja (II), the foremost of kings who forced his enemies into submission, protected (*pāl-*) the land of Veṅgī for twenty-five years.

9.

King Dāna (Dānārṇava), the brother of King Amma (II) by a different mother and the son of King Bhīma (II), clever in a whole array of sciences, protected (*pā-*) the earth up to its four ends for three years.

10.

Then, after Dānārṇava, by an ill turn of fate the land of Veṅgī remained leaderless for twenty-seven years.

11.

At this juncture, the son of King Dāna, His Majesty Śaktivarman, who was of the same

nature as (Indra) the king of the gods, struck down his enemies by the power of his valour and protected (*rakṣ*-) the earth for twelve years.

12.

His younger brother, having defeated his enemies and dispelled the seven ⟨kinds of⟩ calamities, protected (*pāl*-) the earth for seven years as the foremost of rulers: the valiant King (*bhūpa*) Mummadi Bhīma (Vimalāditya).

13.

The stalwart son of that Mummadi Bhīma, the great king (*mahān ... rājā*) named Rājarāja, protected (*pā*-) the earth for twelve years.

14.

⟨Then⟩ his brother by a different mother, Vimalāditya's son Vijayāditya, obtained kingship after forcibly expelling that King (*nṛpati*) Rājarāja from the land. He—

15.

—the forehead ornament of the Lunar dynasty, the son of Rājamārtaṇḍa (Vimalāditya), the valiant King (*bhūpa*) Vijayāditya, majestic, endowed with heroism and greatly auspicious—donned the turban (*paṭṭa*) of sovereignty over Veṅgī upon the multitude of Śaka years measured by eyes (2), arrows (5) and treasures (9) (i.e. Śaka 952 expired), when the harsh-rayed ⟨sun⟩ was staying in Cancer (*karka*), on the day of Aditi's son (i.e. of Āditya, hence Sunday) that was the fifth ⟨*tithi*⟩ of a bright ⟨fortnight⟩, in the asterism (*bha*) of the Sun,[3] with Virgo (*kanya*) as ascendant (*lagna*).

16.

Those who seek to harm him, he treats like ⟨his own⟩ sons ⟨provided that they⟩ seek his pardon. Retainers and learned men, he treats like ⟨his own⟩ kinsmen, with gifts of honour. Young women belonging to another, he treats like ⟨his own⟩ mother. Being ⟨thus⟩ free of crookedness in his conduct, he as king safeguards (*av*-) the earth as well as his own moral duty (*dharma*).

17.

The fame of this king (*kṣitipa*) Cālukya-Bhīma shines forth, being evidently ⟨the goddess⟩ Gaurī, ⟨yet⟩—absurdly!—blatantly disobeying Himavat (her father) and shunning the body of Umā's lord (her husband Śiva)... ⟨but in fact⟩ {being proven white, leaping high over the Himalaya, and rivalling the body of Śiva}.[4]

[3]See the commentary about the date.

[4]The stanza is rather difficult to interpret, owing in part to a scribal error, for which the apparatus to

〈69–71〉 That majestic shelter of all the world (*sarva-lokāśraya*), His Majesty King (*mahārāja*) Viṣṇuvardhana, the Emperor (*rājādhirāja*), His Majesty the divine Vijayāditya (VII), convokes all householders (*kuṭumbin*)—including foremost the territorial overseers (*rāṣṭrakūṭa*)—and, witnessed by all dignitaries (*pradhāna*), commands them as follows.

18.

Having defeated all rival rulers (*kṣitipa*), the lord (*rājan*) Kucamma had made it possible for his suzerain the king (*bhūpati*) to take over the earth, and he obtained a reward from him.[5]

19.

The majestic lord (*rājan*) Cāme as husband, and 〈his〉 faithful 〈wife〉 Kāmāmbikā, had a son born 〈to them〉: the lord (*bhūpa*) Bhīma.[6]

〈73–79〉 To him—the one who acts like a divine 〈wish-granting〉 tree to the destitute, to Brahmins, to his kinsmen and to the learned; the ornament of the Nāga family; the lord of the Cloudy Mountain, the Love-God of ¿gentleness? (*melpa*), the sun of Malaya; who has accumulated meritorious acts (*dharma-karman*)—〈namely〉 to ¿Śrīyapa Cāmena Benna?, a minister (*amātya*) comparable to Bṛhaspati, who has accumulated greatness for the kingdom through his intellect and fortitude, on account of the travails he has undertaken 〈on my behalf〉, I have given the village named Koṁpoloṁgu along with 〈its〉 twelve hamlets, substantiated as a 〈copperplate〉 charter and sanctified by the pouring 〈of water〉. Let this be known to you. Let no-one pose an obstacle (to his enjoyment of his rights) over it. He who does so shall have the five great sins.

---

line 68. The crucial poetic device is an apparent contradiction (*virodhābhāsa*) which hinges on the ambiguity of *gaurī*, a name of the goddess Pārvatī and an adjective meaning 'pale, white,' hence 'bright' or 'spotless'. The double entendre is self-evident in the first quarter, but the alternative meaning (applicable to fame) of the second quarter is not so clear. Provided that I have emended the text correctly, the only interpretation I can offer is that in the translation above. The verb *dviṣ-* can, in poetic language, mean 'vie with, rivalise' in addition to the straightforward sense 'be hostile,' and Śiva's body is often conceived of as white (being smeared with ashes), so the king's fame may be understood to rival that whiteness.

[5] I translate what I believe to have been the intended message, but for this translation to be syntactically possible, *kucamma-rāja* ought to be in the nominative rather than the instrumental. The name itself is problematic, see the apparatus to line 72 and the commentary.

[6] The stanza is problematic on several counts. It consists only of three *pāda*s instead of four, and the first of the three is grossly unmetrical. I see no straightforward way to restoring the correct metre. The phrasing of the received text is also awkward and, with two occurrences of *ca*, it would rather suggest that Bhīma had three parents: Cāme, Cāme's lord (*bhartṛ*), and Kāmāmbikā. I wonder if, before being mangled by the scribe, the stanza might have actually said that Kāmāmbikā was the daughter of Cāme's overlord. I also wonder if the missing fourth quarter might have introduced another generation between Bhīma and the donee. See also the commentary.

20.

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.

21.

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

〈81–82〉 Of this charter (*śāsana*) presented in the course of the second year, the executor (*ājñapti*) is the Castellan (*kaṭakādhīśa*). The writer (*lekhaka*) of the charter is Gokācārya.

Commentary

The plates were discovered in Pāmulavāka village, Narasipatam Taluk of Vizag district. The cultivator who found them, along with the Pāmulavāka plates of Amma II, used the ring and seal of both sets to make bangles.

The editor Subba Rao did not provide a complete and correct reading of Vijayāditya IV's coronation date in these plates. B. V. Krishna Rao (1930–1931, p. 84) provided an improved reading and equated it to Thursday, 9 July, 1030 CE. A more convincing calculation was made by K. G. Shankar at the request of N. Venkataramanayya (1951–1952, p. 61, n. 4). According to this, the equivalent date is Sunday, 27 June 1031 CE. This results in the correct weekday in addition to the Sun being in Cancer and the correct *tithi* at sunrise. According to Shankar as cited by Venkataramanayya, the *kanyā lagna* lasted from 10 to 12 AM on that day. At this time, the *nakṣatra* was Uttara-Phālgunī, while later on (with the same *tithi* still current) it was Pūrva-Phālgunī. The presiding deities of these *nakṣatra*s are Bhaga and Aryaman respectively. Since both are Ādityas, *sūryya-bhe* (if not an inconsequential word meaning 'sunlit') might conceivably refer to either.

The parentage of the donee, as presented in stanzas 18-19, is not wholly clear. Read at face value, we learn of the following persons. 1: Kucamma-rāja (l. 70), who is also called Cāme-rāja (l. 87), defeated enemies for his overlord, presumably a onetime Cālukya king of Veṅgī. 2: Kucamma married a lady called Kāmāmbikā (l. 73). 3: Their son Bhīma-bhūpa (l. 73) is the recipient of the present grant, and is also called Śrīyapa Cāmena Bennaya (ll. 75-76) [though some of these may not be names].

Since at least one quarter of stanza 19 is corrupt and another quarter was probably omitted by the scribe, I believe that the donee may have been Bhīma-bhūpa's son rather than Bhīma-bhūpa himself. I have no positive evidence for this, but in this

scenario we would have the usual three generations represented instead of just two; the discrepancy of the donee's names in ll. 75-76 from the name Bhīma would be explained by the fact that they were not the same person; and the similarity of the donee's principal name to that of Kucamma or Cāme would also be explained by the fact that the latter was the former's grandfather.

Interestingly, the Pāmulavāka plates of Amma II record a grant to a dignitary called Kucena, son of Betona and grandson of Cāmena. The similarity of the names (aside from Betona) together with the fact that the two charters were found together makes it reasonable to assume that we are dealing with two grants to members of the same lineage.[7] Continuing the speculation further, if Kucamma/Cāme—rewarded for his service by his overlord according to our text—was the present donee's grandfather, then he may in fact be none other than the Penuṁbulugu grant's Kucena, rewarded by Amma II.

Bibliography

Not reported in ARIE. Edited with estampages and a summary of the contents by R. Subba Rao (1927–1928). The present edition by Dániel Balogh is based on photographs taken by myself at the Rallabandi Subba Rao Archaeological Museum (Rajahmundry) in February 2023, collated with Subba Rao's estampages and edition. The numerous typographic mistakes and confused diacritics in the printed edition are not shown in the apparatus here. Metadata associated with this edition have been published separately in Balogh 2026, available on Zenodo.

Primary

[SR] Subba Rao, R. 1927–1928. "The Pamulavaka copper plate grant of Vijayaditya VII." JAHRS 2, pp. 277–289.

Secondary

Krishna Rao, Bhavaraju Venkata. 1930–1931. "Telugu Academy plates of Saktivarman II." JAHRS 5, pp. 33–49. Page 84.

Venkataramanayya, N. 1951–1952. "Kalidindi grant of Eastern Chalukya Rajaraja I." EI 29, pp. 57–71. Page 61, note 4.

[7] An even earlier charter, the Penuṁbulugu grant of Amma I, rewards a minister named Cāmyaṇa, who may be an ancestor of this lineage. There are, however, no further points of connection, and both the findspot of that charter and the land donated in it are spatially far from the two under discussion here.

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