CHAPTER IV

ZENITH

The Tummalagudem (I) record is dated in the 37th regnal year of Govindavarman. Therefore assuming that he ruled about 40 years, we may suggest that by 462 A.D. his reign came to an end. He was succeeded by his son Madhavavarman II, also called Madhavaraja in one place.

(1) Sources

Of the time of Madhavavarman we have got the following three records:

1) The Velpuru Pillar Inscription: This is the only known stone inscription of the Vishpukuppi dynasty. But unfortunately it is very much mutilated and fragmentary. Its characters are earlier than those of the Ramatirtham plates and assembles those of the Ipur set I.

It is dated in the full-moon day of the month Taisha (i.e. Pausha) of the 33rd regnal year of the king Madhavavarman. Herein the latter is described as the son of Govindavarman, of the family of Vishpukuppi, the meditator on the feet of the Lord of the Śrīparvata. Unlike in all the other records of the family, neither the father nor the son is endowed with any title in the present record. Nor even the honorific śrī is prefixed to their names. It may be noted that both the month Taisha and the Full-moon day are favoured
by the literature for the consecration of idols which seems to be the purport of the record.

The epigraph introduces one Vishnukundvadhirāja as the governor of what is called Velpurudēsa, as a victor of many battles and as a person obeyed by a Pallava ruler. It is really a matter of great pity that neither the personal name of this Vishnukundvadhirāja, nor that of the Pallava ruler is preserved in the available portion of the record. The epigraph further informs us that the above Vishnukundī prince visited the army camp located in the place (iha 'here', i.e. 'at Velpūru') and was ordered there by Madhavavarman to do something, details of which are lost. There seems to be a reference to the setting-up of an ānaka or war-drum probably by the same Vishnukundvadhirāja. The latter appears also to have set up, under the orders of the king (i.e. Madhavavarman), an Elephant-faced Vināyaka and worshipped the same with great care after gifting away gold. A passage, like phalasruti (promise of reward), at the end seems to indicate that all these actions were intended to achieve victory. There is also a reference to the worship of the said Vināyaka by people in general.

The Velpurudēsa of the record must be obviously the region around the modern Velpūru, the findspot of the record.

2) IURR Plates (Set I): The characters of this charter are definitely earlier than those of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates as Dr. Hultsch has pointed out. It is
dated on the 15th day of the seventh fortnight of the summer season of the 37th regnal year of Madhavavarman, son of Govinda- varman. It is issued by the king from his victorious camp at Kudavada and is addressed to the residents of the village Vilembelli in the Guddadi vishaya informing them of his grant of the village, made tax-free, in favour of a Brāhmaṇa by name Agnisarman belonging to the Vatsa gotra. The grant is said to have been made for the prosperity of the royal family. The executor of the grant was Maṅchayapa-bhaṭṭāraka, described as a beloved son, evidently of the king. In this charter Madhavavarman bears a number of titles including those that credit him with the performance of eleven Āsvamādasas, Agnishtoma-sahasra and the Hiranva-garbha-mahādana. Another title describes him to have delighted the heart of the ladies of Trivarsanagar. These titles distinguish him from his namesakes who were his grand- father and grandson. But they do not exclude Madhavavarman IV.

The Guddādi vishaya of this charter may be same as Guddādi-vishaya, that included the gift villages viz. (1) Pulomburu (=modern Polamuru in the Ramachandrapuram taluk of the East Godavari district) of the Polamuru plates; (2) Kolāru (=Kolairo of the map, near Chelluru in the same Ramachandrapuram taluk) of the Chelluru plates of Vi- ra-chōga; and (3) Korumelli (=present Korumelli, Rajahmundry taluk of the same district) of the Korumelli plates of the Eastern Chalukya Rajaraja II. Thus this vishaya seems to
have comprised roughly parts of the East Godavari district. Accordingly, the gift village Vilemballi of the present grant may be identified with Velampalem (16° 48' N and 82° 3' E) very near Drakshārāma in Ramachandrapuram Taluk. The king's camping place Kaṇḍavaḍa may perhaps be identified with the modern Guḍivaḍa (17° 3' N and 82° 9' E) in the Peddapuram Taluk of the East Godavari district. The city Trivaranagara, the hearts of whose young women Mādhava-varman claims to have delighted seems to be the residential headquarters of the monarch as suggested by Dr. Hultzsch. This place may be identified with Tiravuru of (17° 10' N and 80° 35' E), the headquarters of the taluk of that name in the Krishna district.

(3) The Khanapur Plates. The passage of time has been very unkind to this record, with the result that there is now only a fragment of the charter. The characters of it are comparable, as said by Prof. Mirashi, with that of the early Aśhṭrakūṭas of Mānapura. They may also be compared with those of the Benaras Plates of the Sūravaṇi king Harirāja, assignable to the 5th century A.D. But the letters in the present charter are engraved in a very careless manner.

The available portion of the record describes Mādhava-varman as a performer of eleven Paundarikas and eleven Bahusvārṇas and as a protector of the Varnāśramadharma. It also refers to his desire to grant in favour of some two Brāhmaṇa scholars a village named Reṭṭūraka, excluding
one-fourth of it that had been gifted to a Brāhmaṇa earlier. It further seems to record a gift of the same village with its remaining three-fourths, by an individual evidently a royal personage, whose name is not preserved. On the whole the language of the text suggests that by issuing this charter some king had granted Rēṭṭūraka as desired by Mādhasavārman. The grant was made on a Madhāvaisakāhi Pūrṇiṃā.

Prof. Mirashi and others have already satisfactorily identified the gift village of the grant, viz., Rēṭṭūraka with Retare Budrukh (Larger Retare, Karhad Taluk, Satara district) which lies to the South-East of the Krishna-Venna as stated in the inscription. Similarly they have also identified with the nearby places, the villages mentioned as boundaries of Rēṭṭūraka, and the vatikās and the tīrthas it contained.

While studying the genealogy of the Vishpukūṇḍis, it has been concluded that there were four Mādhasavārmans in the family and that the second and the fourth of them claimed to have performed eleven Aśvameṭṭhas and Agnīśṭoma-sahasras and that their respective fathers were also Gōvindavārmans. Hence it becomes necessary to decide the identity of the kings of these three inscriptions, with the one or the other of these two Mādhasavārmans. For, even those scholars who believe in the theory of two Mādhasavārmans with eleven Aśvameṭṭhas, have assigned the first two
of these three inscriptions to Mādhavavarman Janāśrava of
the Polamuru set I.

**Mādhavavarman of the Velpuru inscription:** (1) The
calligraphy of the record; (2) the influence of Prakrit in
the language of the text; (3) the absence of any title of
Mādhavavarman; and (4) the reference to the Vishnukundya-
dhirāja who was probably identical with the one mentioned
in the Ipur set II; all these go to indicate that the
record belongs to a period much earlier than that of the
Polamuru (I) record of Mādhavavarman IV. Again, as we
shall see later, the territory that lies south of the Krishna
seems to have been lost by the Vishnukundis to the Pallavas
sometime before Mādhavavarman IV came to the throne.
Therefore the king of the Velpuru record may better be
identified with Mādhavavarman II, rather than with Mādhava-
varman IV.

**Mādhavavarman of Ipur I:** (1) The characters of the
record; (2) the influence of Prakrit on the language; (3)
the brevity of the text; and (4) the comparatively small
number of epithets of the king may indicate the early nature
of the record and may favour the identification of the king
of this charter with the second Mādhavavarman and not with
the fourth king of that name. This suggestion may well
find support from the fact that in the present record the
distinguishing titles Vikramāśrava and Janāśrava, respectively
of Gōvindavarman II and Mādhavavarman IV are notably absent.

One more point worthy of consideration in this
Iks

[Ch. IV, Sect. 1.

connection is this: Madhavavarman of the Polamuru set I calls himself not only as the son of a Gōvindavarman, but also as the grandson of one Vikramāndravarman. At the same time the reference to the grandfather is conspicuously absent in the Velpuru and Ipur (I) records. On the strength of this, it is logical to presume that Madhavavarman of the Polamuru plates is purposely described as the grandson of Vikramāndravarman in order to distinguish him from his earlier namesake viz. Madhavavarman II, who was also the son of a Gōvindavarman. A sort of parallelism may be found in the case of the Kushāpa king Kanishka II, who, calling himself as the son of Vājeshka (i.e. Vasishka), distinguished himself from Kanishka I; and also in the case of the Eastern Ganga Indravarman IV who marked himself off from his predecessor and namesake by describing himself as the son of Dānārāvha. Therefore those who ascribe the Velpuru and Ipuru (I) records to Madhavavarman of the Polamuru set I have to overlook all the above points.

Madhavavarman of the Khanapur Plates: In deciding the identity of this king some difficulty has been felt by scholars. Some have originally proposed to identify this king with some hitherto unknown king of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of Manapura. However later on they concluded that the monarch must be the Vishṇukunḍi Madhavavarman as he was the only king of that name claiming eleven Āvamādhas during the period under question. This identification and the reason on which it is based hold good, though the extant text
of the Khanapur record contains reference only to the eleven Pampantarikas and eleven Bahusuvvarnas of Madhavavarman and to his eleven Áśvamedhas. For, no other Madhavavarman is known to have performed the above sacrifices as many as eleven times.

However some scholars remained unconvinced of the identification suggested above. The reason adduced in this connection is as follows: This charter of Madhavavarman records his gift of land in the Satara district and therefore the above identification would drive us to assign "a very vast empire to the otherwise unknown dynasty of the Vishūkunḍis". As against this contention it has been stressed by other group of scholars that the kingdom of the Vishūkunḍi Madhavavarman, the performer of eleven Áśvamedhas must have been certainly large enough to include the Satara district. Now, though the identification is upheld the charter has been set aside as spurious, probably on the ground that the charter recording a grant of land in Satara region by Madhavavarman of the Vishūkunḍi dynasty "would suggest that the king had led a successful expedition against the western part of the Deccan".

But, as has been earlier pointed out, the Khanapur charter was issued probably not by Madhavavarman himself but by some other king who granted some lands in the Satara district as the Vishūkunḍi desired. Later it will be seen that the issuer of the charter was perhaps a member of the Rāṣṭra-kūṭa family of Mānapura. Therefore, the Khanapur plates may not indicate that the Western Deccan formed part of the
Vishnukuppedi kingdom, fearing which the record has been characterised as spurious. Nor is it necessary to believe, as done by some, in the Vishnukuppedi occupation of the Western Deccan to explain the epithet Trikutamalavidhipati of Madhavavarman II. Thus this Madhavavarman of the Khanaipur charter may be identified with the Vishnukuppedi monarch of that name.

Again, the description of Madhavavarman of the record as a performer of eleven Pampdarikas and Bahusuvapras points to the fact that king must have been other than Madhavavarman IV who claims only eleven Aśvamādhas and not even a single Pampdarika or Bahusuvapra. Secondly, the way in which Madhavavarman is described in the Khanapur plates, seems to indicate that the issuer of the charter was an ally, probably a subordinate ally, of the Vishnukuppedi monarch. The rulers of the Satara region who were contemporaries of the earlier Madhavavarman II were the members of the Rāṣṭhakūṭa dynasty and they were struggling, as we shall see later, against the Vākaṭakas. Consequently it is likely that a member of that family chose to be an ally or even a subordinate ally of the Vishnukuppedi. On the other hand the contemporaries of Madhavavarman IV (c. 570-613 A.D.) in the area were the mighty kings like the Chāluksya Kṛittivarman I (566-98 A.D.) and his successors and it is unlikely that any of them might have been a subordinate ally of the Vishnukuppedi, though there might have existed some good relationship during that time also as we shall see later.
Thus on the above grounds the Velpuru, Ipur (I) and Khanapur records may be assigned to the time of Mādhava-varman II to whose history we shall turn next.

(ii) Career of Mādhava-varman II

When Mādhava-varman II came to power in the early sixties of the fifth century, the Vākāṭaka Devasena was ruling in Vatsagulma. That the latter came to power, earlier than the Śaka 380 (457-58 A.D.) is evidenced by his own Hisse-Borala inscription of that Śaka year recently discovered. The Ajanta Cave inscription of Varahadeva clearly describes this Vākāṭaka as a pleasure loving king having no interest in the administration of the kingdom. Obviously Mādhava-varman must have taken full advantage of the situation and declared independence. Perhaps as a mark of his newly acquired sovereignty he performed the Aśvamedha. A large number of Vishṇukundī coins have been unearthed in the Karimnagar district. A tradition also speaks of one Mādhava-varman of the fifth century as the progenitor of some Hanumakonda (near Warangal) kings of the pre-Kakatiya period. These obviously indicate that Mādhava-varman II extended his kingdom, presumably at the expense of the Vākāṭakas, as far north as the banks of the Godāvari in the Central Andhra. It is likely that the newly acquired territory was put under the control of some Vishṇukundī prince appointed as a governor.

The Sālankāyana power in the east was already on the
Madhavavarman must have enhanced his prestige by overthrowing the last Salankayana and by annexing the latter's territory of Vengi. Thus the Bay of Bengal came to be the eastern boundary of the Vishnukundī kingdom.

Madhavavarman's ambition did not stop at that. He embarked upon the conquest of his southern neighbour. He appears to have led his army southward across the river Krishna with a view to conquer the Guntur region. His Velpuru record clearly shows that earlier to his 33rd year, the Velpuru āśa in the northern part of the Guntur District had been ruled by a Vishnukundī prince evidently as a governor under Madhavavarman. The record also suggests that the king was actually busy in preparing for a war in the region during that year. For, it speaks of his presence in his military camp at Velpuru and refers to the act of setting up of a war-drum, the gift of gold in large quantity and the worship of Vināyaka — all the three acts were performed obviously for achieving a victory. The Grihyasūtras and Purāṇas prescribe the offer of prayers to the war-drum by the king as a part of a rāṇa-dīkṣā or preparation for a war. Maybe, the ṣaṅka-sthāpanā or the act of setting up of a war-drum by the prince under the orders of Madhavavarman was in connection with a rāṇa-dīkṣā. Again the gift of gold referred to in the record reminds us of the one stated to have been made by the Pāṇḍavas in their army camp on the eve of the Kurukṣetra war. Similarly, the worship of Vināyaka is also prescribed for the rāṇa-dīkṣā. There are many references in literature to the worship of Vināyaka
as a part of preparing for a war. Therefore it is not unlikely that being an ardent follower of the Vedic religion, Mādhavavarman performed the above rituals for achieving victory in his war.

Now arise three questions: (1) Who was this Vishnu-
kundvadhīra in the Velpuru record? (2) From whom did Mādhavavarman wrest the Velpuru area? (3) Who was the king against whom Mādhavavarman was preparing for a war? Being very fragmentary, the said record does not help us in answering these question directly.

Regarding the first question, one may however identify Vishnu-
kundvadhīra in the Velpuru record with Gunabhartī who figures as the aśantī in the Ipur set II and who is also found designated as Vishnu-
kundvadhīra. For, there was no other Vishnu-

kuṇḍa prince known to have borne such a designation. He could have been either another son or a grandson of Mādhavavarman II.

Coming to the second and the third question, it may be suggested that the power from whom the Velpuru deśa had been wrested earlier, was the same against which Mādhavavarman was preparing for a war. After the disappearance of the Satavāhanas the area under question had been under the Ikshvākus in the second and third centuries of the Christian era and later on it was conquered by the Pallavas. The Ānandas succeeded in driving out the Pallavas from the area subsequently and the kings of the dynasty like Kandara,
Damādaravarman and Attivarman ruled over the territory most probably in the fourth century. Yet the Pallavas managed to reconquer the area later, reducing the ānandas to vassalage. There is nothing to show whether the Śālankayana kingdom, which Mādhavavarman II had appropriated for himself recently, had included the Vēḷurū-dēsa. Therefore most probably the area was conquered by Mādhavavarman from the Pallavas. The description of the Vishnukundadhiraja in the record as being bowed by a Pallava seems to vouch for this suggestion. Similarly the war which Mādhavavarman was preparing for in his 33rd year in the southern most part of his kingdom must have been a southerner only viz. a Pallava.

Regarding the identity of the Pallava adversary of Mādhavavarman the following may be suggested: It will be seen later that it was the Pallava Simhavarman of the Māṅgalūru grant who invaded the Vishnukundadhiraja territory, north of the Kṛishṇa, during the reign of Vikramendravarman II, and was subsequently driven out by that Vishnukundadhiraja king. From this, it is reasonable to say that the Pallava contemporary of Mādhavavarman, the great grandfather of Vikramendravarman II must have been very probably the great-grandfather or grandfather of the said Simhavarman, viz. Skandavarman I or his son Vīravarman. In this connection it may be remembered that while there are copper plate charters of the Pallava Kumārevishṇu, the father of the said Skandavarman and of all the successors of the said Vīravarman, no record of the time of either Skandavarman or Vīravarman has come to light. This fact probably indicates a temporary
eclipse of the Pallava rule in the region during the period in question. So it may not be wrong if the Pallava opponent of Madhavavarman is identified with Skandavarman or his son Viravarman.

The cause of the war is not known. The said Kumāra-viṣṇu restored the fallen fortune of the family and performed 55 Áśvamedha. He may be assigned roughly to the middle of the fifth century A.D. His son Skandavarman I is stated to have obtained the country by his own valour while the latter's son Viravarman is pictured as an inimitable hero, victorious in many a battle. It is probable that the latter fell in a battle perhaps with the Vishnukundī. At any rate, the above description of the Pallava princes indicates beyond doubt that the warlike career started by Kumāra-viṣṇu was continued by his successors. There is no wonder that these two rising powers viz. the Pallava and the Vishnukundī confronted one another on the banks of the Krishṇa to test the strength of their respective arms.

In a fray that followed the arms of the Vishnukundī seem to have proved stronger. The battle ended in favour of Madhavavarman, who, as a result, extended his territory further south so as to include the Vēḻpurudēśa sometime before his 33rd year. The second battle for which the Vishnukundī was preparing in that year seems to have yielded to him territory further south. As a measure of guarding the explosive frontiers, he kept the newly acquired area under the governorship of his beloved grandson, Madhavavarman III. Prof. Kielhorn, had suggested a probability of the connection
between the name Vinukopda of a hill-station in the Guntur district on one hand and the dynastic name Vishnukundli on the other. Possibly that hill formed part, or the southern boundary of the new Vishnukundli and was named after the dynastic name of the Conqueror, as it seems to have been the custom with the Andhra Satavahanas in the earlier centuries.

As regards the activities of the Vishnukundis in the territory beyond the Godavari in the eastern Andhra, it has been earlier seen that the sphere of influence of Govindavarman had already included at least the southern part of the present East Godavari district. 

The Madhavavarman's kingdom included the area is confirmed by the Ipur set I recording his own grant of a village in the Ramachandrapuram taluk. In this connection the following facts may be worth considering.

1) The Ipur set I tells us that Madhavavarman was camping with his army at a place in Peddapuram Taluk. This place is not far removed from Pithapuram, i.e. the ancient Pishatapura.

2) The charters of the Mathara and Vasistha kings ruling over the Pishatapura region may have to be assigned to about the 5th century A.D. Nothing is known about their history of the succeeding period.

3) In the subsequent time there was a line of kings of the Rama-Kasyapagota ruling from Pishatapura owing allegiance to the Vishnukundli monarchs, as we shall see later.
The cumulative effect of these evidence tends to suggest that perhaps before his 37th year, i.e. before the end of the fifth century, Mādhavavarman managed to conquer Pishṭapura area from the Maṭharas and others who too had probably exhausted their strength by their mutual wars and fight with other Kālinga rulers. It is likely that Mādhavavarman appointed an early member of the family of the Rāma-Kāṣyapa gotra kings as his own governor to rule over the Pishṭapura region. It is also very likely that the arms of Mādhavavarman penetrated as far as the Śrīkākulem district and that the early members of the Gangā family of Kālinga owed alligiance to him.

There is no direct evidence to show the relationship of Mādhavavarman with his northern neighbours. However in this context the following points are worth considering:

1) In the Tummalagudem set II, Mādhavavarman II is described as a ruler of a territory extending as far north as the Narmāda river - a description, though conventional may not be altogether without some substance during the period under question.

2) The Vākāṭakas continued to be supreme in the Deccan till the end of the fifth century, though they had to struggle hard quite often to maintain that position. Therefore any political move in the north by Mādhavavarman must be in connection with the politics of the Vākāṭakas.

3) As we shall see later, Mādhavavarman II was a
son-in-law of the Vākaṭaka Pravarasena II or—more probably his son Narendrasena of the main branch.

4) In the whole of the Deccan of his time Māduvavarmann was the only king powerful enough to perform Aśvamedhas quite often.

Bearing these points in mind the following may be observed:

The efficient rule of Pravarasena II for more than 63 years ended round about 455 A.D. and he was succeeded by his son Narendrasena. An epithet of the latter in the Balaghat plates seems to praise him to have got his family fortunes brought or offered back to him. This indicates that the fortunes of the Vākaṭaka had been in jeopardy and that in getting it back from an enemy's hold, Narendrasena was helped by somebody, i.e. by some friends. Narendrasena's another epithet that follows the above one in the same record describes him as being obeyed by the kings of Kōsala, Mēkala and Mālava. These countries had been earlier under the Gupta influence. And, as scholars have already suggested, the second of the above epithets may refer to the Vākaṭaka king's success against the vassals of the Guptas.

Now the question is this: Who were the friends that could have helped Narendrasena at this juncture? Obviously the friends cannot be identified with the Guptas though the latter were related to the Vākaṭakas. Firstly because the
Vākaṭaka brought under himself the vassals of the Gupta; it is unthinkable that the latter would have helped the former. Secondly the Guptas might not have been in a position to help the Vākaṭaka as the military might of the Gupta empire had been put continuously to severe test since the days of Skandagupta (456-87 A.D.) and there are indications that in the succeeding periods (viz. upto 500 A.D.) of Parugupta, Kumāra-gupta II and Budhagupta, the central authority of the Gupta empire was torn between rival factions fighting for the throne and that the empire had started to disintegrate due to repeated inroads by the Hūṇas.

Nor could these friends of Narendrasena have been his enemies at Vatsagulma, as the relationship between the two families was far from cordial. One may accept the theory of cordial relationship of Devasena of the Vatsagulma line with the main line on the ground that he had no military ambition. Even then that ruler cannot be thought of in the present context on the same ground, viz. he was a pleasure loving king having no aptitude for military conquest.

On the ground that the Balaghat Plates of Prithvīshēna refers to his mother as a daughter of the Kuntala king, some scholars have suggested the possibility of Narendrasena's getting help from his father-in-law, viz. the Kuntala king, who, according to those scholars was a Kadamba of Banavasi. But one may reasonably doubt whether the ruler of Banavasi in the south would have been in a position to help the Vākaṭaka in conquering an enemy in the north during
this period. This doubt is strengthened when one remembers the fact that during the period under question the Kādamba authority itself was suffering from division of the kingdom following the death of Kākusthavārman (c. 430–50 A.D.) and it had to maintain itself against its nearby powerful enemies, like the Western Ganges and the Pallavas. One may follow the suggestion that the Kuntalādhūnati of the Belaghat plates was a Rāṣṭrakūṭa of Mānapura in the Southern Māhārāṣṭra, and it would solve the question of distance. But the identification of Kuntala with Southern Māhārāṣṭra is not favoured by scholars in general. Moreover, it is still doubtful whether any of the successors of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Devarāja viz. Avidēya, Bhavishya and Abhimanyu - who may have to be assigned to the period we are now concerned with - was strong enough to help the Vākāṭaka against the latter's formidable foe.

When all these possibilities are ruled out one may naturally think of the Vishṇukūṇḍi Mādhavavarman II in this context. He was no doubt powerful and was in a position to help the Vākāṭaka. He had exhibited to the world his might by repeatedly performing Āśvameśāhas. He was also the husband of the Vākāṭaka princess perhaps a sister of Narēndrasēma. Thus it is likely that Mādhavavarman helped his brother-in-law or in regaining the family fortunes of the latter.

The worse days were yet to come to the Vākāṭaka kingdom. The family sank subsequently on two occasions and the burden of elevating it fell on the shoulders of Narēndra-
sena's son Prithivishëna. It is hardly possible to be
definite about the cause, nature and the dates of these two
Vakaṭaka debacles. However it is likely that one of the mis-
fortunes of Prithivishëna's reign may be, as suggested by
Altekar, due to the invasion of his kingdom by Dharaśena
(460-80 A.D.) the ruler of the region of the Trikuṭa mountain
in the west. The Vakaṭakas in the east were neighbours and
perhaps for sometimes overlord of the Traikūṭakas. Dharaśena
started a policy of military conquest, extended his terri-
tory and performed Aśvamedha sacrifice. Earlier, reference
has been made to the similarity of the characters of the
Banaras plates of the king Harirëja of the Sūravamśi dynasty
with that of the Khanapur plates. Moreover representation
of the pūrṇakalāsa on the seal of the former record looks like
the kalaśa on the Vishṇukūṭa coins. Scholars are of opinion
that the kings of the Sura family might have been the governors
under the Traikūṭakas. In this connection it may be borne
in mind that Mādhavavarman III, the grandson of Mādhavavarman
II styles himself as a lord of the Trikuṭa, a claim which
may probably indicate that the Vishṇukūṭa joined those who
defeated the rulers of that mountain. All these tend to
point out a possibility of Mādhavavarman's role in helping
the Vakaṭaka against the Traikūṭaka.

The second misfortune that befell on the Vakaṭaka empire
must have been Prithivishëna's struggle with the rising
Harishëna of the Vatsagulma branch. The interference of
the latter in Andhra politics and the set-back the Vishṇukūṭa
suffered during the subsequent period seem to hint at a
probability that Mādhavavarman might have joined his hands with Prithvīshēna against Harishēna.

(1) Assigning Mādhavavarman II to a period between 500 A.D. and 550 A.D.; (2) viewing him to be a son-in-law of Harishēna; (3) treating the Khanapur charter as a record issued by Mādhavavarman himself; and (4) taking into account of the king's title Trīvaranagara etc., his performance of eleven Āsvamedhas and his grandson's title Trīkuṭanālaḍāḍhipati: some writers have come to a conclusion that Mādhavavarman, by "his relationship with the Vākāṭaka, must have considered himself a rightful, heir to the Vākāṭaka empire (after Harishēna)" and "embarked upon an extensive scheme of disyijaya and soon brought Māharāṣṭra, Vidarbha, Daksinakōsala and Karnāṭaka under his sway." But out of the said four reasons adduced in this connection, the first and the second may not hold good now in the light of the chronology constructed here on the basis of the latest discoveries. The third and the fourth reasons have already been dealt with.

Even those scholars who look upon Mādhavavarman II as a son-in-law of Harishēna of Vatsagulma do not minimise the part played by that Viśpukunda king in the Vākāṭaka politics. They too regard that a boyish prince, perhaps a grandson of Harishēna, might have got the help of Mādhavavarman in driving the allegedly treacherous feudatories out of the country of the Vākāṭakas.
Our knowledge of the history of South Kosala (i.e., the present Raipur-Bilaspur-Sambalpur region) of the period between 400 and 500 A.D. is next to nothing and it is therefore hardly possible to determine Mādhavavarman's political activities in connection with that area. However, from the Balaghat plates of Prithivīśēna it is known that the king of Kōsala (i.e., South Kōsala) was a feudatory of Narendrasēna. Hence, it may tentatively be suggested that the relationship of Mādhavavarman with the king of Kōsala was quite normal. However, it is also likely that Narendrasēna's above claim of the overlordship of South Kosala indicates his military achievement in the area that lay, till very recently, within the sphere of the Gupta influence. In that case here may be a reason to believe that Mādhavavarman might have extended his helping hand to the Vākāṭaka in that connection also. On the other hand, there are scholars who assign the said Vishṇukūṇḍi monarch to the middle of the sixth century, view the Trīvaranagāra of his title to be the city of Tīvara, the Pāṇḍuvamśi king of South Kōsala and believe that Mādhavavarman was the vanquisher of that king. However it must be accepted that the date of Tīvara is yet and to be finally decided that the above Trīvaranagāra was nothing but the Vishṇukūṇḍi capital of the period.

One can not be quite sure about the western boundaries of Mādhavavarman's kingdom. It has already been said that the home province of the Vishṇukūṇḍis comprised roughly the modern districts of Nalgonē and Mahbubnagar. And there is nothing to show that the Mahbubnagar region was under the
rule of any other power during the period we are concerned with. So, it is not unreasonable to think that the western boundary of the Vishṇukūṇḍi kingdom was roughly marked by the Bhīma river if not by anything else in further west.

The Khanapur record gives us some clue to know about the nature of the Madhavavarman's connection with his western neighbour. The facts that the record was issued by some ruler of the area donating land, as desired by Madhavavarman and that the latter is described as a sarvabhāuma "a paramount ruler" seem to indicate a friendly relationship both Madhavavarman II and that donor had. During the period under discussion the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mahārāṣṭra were ruling over the southern Maharāṣṭra where from the Khanapur record comes. For, as the Gokak (Belgaum district) plates of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dejjamahārāja are dated in the Aguptayika year 845 which is equated to 532-33 A.D., the earlier members of the family viz. Avidhāya, the donor of the Paṇḍaraṅgapalī grant, and his brother Bhavishya and the latter's son Abhimanyu, the donor of the Uṇḍivatika grant may be referred to a period between 450 and 525 A.D. If it is right to identify their country with Kuntala conquered by the Vākaṭaka Vindhyaśakti II of the Vatsagūmā line, then it may be believed that the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the area, like the Vishṇukūṇḍis in the east, were feudatories of the Vākaṭakas of the said branch. Even those scholars who would not subscribe to the above identification of Kuntala, are not against the possibility of the said
Rāṣṭrakūṭas being the provincial governors under some rulers, who, as the history of the period shows, could have been only the Vākāṭakas.

The fact that both the Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli and Uṇḍivaṭikā grants do not refer to any overlord indicates that the members of the family of the subsequent period must have declared independence, again like the Vīṣṇuṇakūṭis. Ṭanśaka, the grandfather of Avidhāya is said to have frightened both Vidarbha and Aśmaka, of which one is certainly to be identified with the kingdom of Vatsagulma. This clearly indicates that Ṭanśaka declared independence just like Gṛvindavarman did, during the period of confusion in Vatsagulma following the death of Vindhyāśakti. Ṭanśaka's son Dēvarāja and his successors, therefore, might have ruled contemporaneously with Vindhyāśakti's son Pravarasēna II, the latter's son (name not preserved in the Ajanta inscription) and Dēvasēna in Vatsagulma on one hand and Gṛvindavarman I and Mādhavavarman II in Andhra on the other. Therefore it is likely that the common cause of achieving complete freedom from the Vākāṭaka yoke brought the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Vīṣṇuṇakūṭis together to a single fold, just like a similar cause united many chiefs in the subsequent period against Indrabhaiṭāraka.

Moreover the name Dēvavaran of the Vīṣṇuṇakūṭi prince who was the son of Mādhavavarman is a singular and unique instance among the names met with in the list of the Vīṣṇuṇakūṭi princes. Secondly while Mādhavavarman's another son
Vikramendravarman I is found claiming to be a son of a Vakataka princess, Devavarman had no such claim. Therefore it is certain that the latter's mother did not belong to the family of the Vakåtas. So taking into consideration these two facts along with the contemporaneity of the Rashtračuṭa Dēvarāja and the Vishnukunḍi Gōvindarvarman I, as stated above, and also the common practice of naming the grandsons after their grandfathers, one may provisionally suggest that the above political alliance between the two families was well cemented by the marriage of Dēvarāja's daughter with the Vishnukunḍi Mādhavavarman II and that Devavarman was a product of that marriage. So it may be concluded that the relationship of Mādhavavarman II with the power in the Western Deccan was a cordial one and that one of the successors of Dēvarāja or Avidheya of Mānapura might have issued the Khanapur plates granting lands as desired by Mādhavavarman. Again the description of Mādhavavarman in the Khanapur record as a sārvabhūma "paramount ruler" seems to indicate that the Rashtračuṭa who issued the charter was perhaps a subordinate ally of the Vishnukunḍi, who was perhaps more powerful at that time.

To the south of the kingdom of the Rashtračuṭas of Mānapura lay the kingdom of Banavasi of the Kadambas. There is no direct evidence to indicate the nature of relationship that might have existed between the Kadambas and the Vishnukunḍis. Yet as we saw earlier, on the basis of the lion-crest that was common to both the dynasties, Prof. Dubreuil...
had suggested a family relationship between them. It has been pointed out earlier that the rise of the Kadambas under Mayūrāśarman was probably due to the support that Kadamba warrior received, at least to some extent, from the chieftains at Śrīparvata, the home land of the Vishṇukūḍis. In this connection it may also be remembered that the queen of the Vākāṭaka Narāndrasena viz. Ajjhitabhāṭārikā is said to be a daughter of the ruler of the Kuntala country usually identified with the kingdom of Banavāsi. Therefore there did exist a family connection between them through the said Narāndrasena and his son whom Madhavavarman helped more than once. So, having no proof to the contrary one may suggest that Madhavavarman perhaps continued the traditional friendly policy towards the Kadambas.

To sum up, Madhavavarman extended his kingdom at least up to the middle valley of the Gōdāvari, exterminated the Śāleśkāyana dynasty at Vēṇgi, conquered Pīshṭapura and Śrīkākulam area from the rulers of the region and thus extended his kingdom to the eastern sea. He vanquished the Pallava of the south more than once and wrested from him the area of the Guntur district. He helped the Vākāṭaka rulers of the main line often and tried successfully to avert the destruction of their kingdom by the inroads of their enemies. He maintained scrupulously a cordial and good relationship with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Western Deccan and with the Kadambas of the further south. Thus he did influence the politics
of the whole of the Dakshipanatha or peninsular India (i.e. the Chakravartti-kshētra in the South). What wonder if he is praised to have forcibly seized from other reputed royal families their loyal territories and to be a protector of the earth surrounded by the seas in the east, south and west and by the waters of the Reva i.e. the Narmada in the north?

In this connection it may be pointed out that originally the Sātavahana kings like Sātakarnī I and Vāsishṭhiputra Pulumāvi claimed to be the lords Dakshipanatha or the Deccan. The latter's father Gautamīputra Śrī Sātakarnī's suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan is suggested by his description that his vāhana or horses drank the waters of the three seas. After the Sātavahanas it was only Madhavavarman II who seems to be the first king to claim such a suzerainty. Therefore it may not be justifiable to set aside the above description of the Vishṇukūṇḍī as a totally conventional exaggeration.

Madhavavarman performed many great royal vedic sacrifices to mark his splendid achievements that followed each other in a quick succession. The significance of these sacrifices may be studied later.

(iii) Family of Madhavavarman II

Madhavavarman had at least two queens. One of them, the mother of Devavarman, as we have already suggested, was probably a princess of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of Mānapura...
and was perhaps a daughter of Devarāja of that family. Madhavavarman's another queen was a Vākaṭaka princess, as we learn from the records of his successors.

There is some difference of opinion regarding the family to which this queen belonged. Some believe that she must have been a daughter or a grand daughter of Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma branch of the Vākaṭakas. But the Vishṇukunḍi chronology, accepted here, militates against this view. Another school of thought is that the queen might have been a daughter of Devasēna, if not his sister. But it has already been shown how during the period of Pravarasēṇa II of the main branch, the influence of that line over the Vishṇukunḍi rulers superceded that of the Vatsagulma line of kings, and how the Vishṇukunḍis along with the Rāṣṭrapātas of Mānapura made a common cause against the Vatsagulma rulers. Moreover the Vishṇukunḍis boast themselves of their Vākaṭaka blood-relationship and it probably indicates some material advantage they might have received from the Vākaṭakas at the time of their rise. But at the same time Harishēṇa of the Vatsagulma line is known to have taken a punitive expedition against the ruler of Andhra viz., the Vishṇukunḍi. Therefore it is likely that it was the Vākaṭaka of the main branch from whom the Vishṇukunḍi got such a help. Besides the conversion of Govinda-varman from Buddhism to Saivism, as we saw earlier, was perhaps due to his contact with Pravarasēṇa II of the main line of the
Vākaṭakas. Therefore there appears to be truth in Dr. Dubreuil's suggestion that Madhavavarman's queen must have been a daughter or grand-daughter of the queen Prabhavatī-guptā.

In support of the above suggestion of the Vishnukundī's relationship with the Vākaṭakas of the main line the following may also be added: There is a place called Chandraguptapata on the norther bank of the Krishnā in the area that was included in the Vishnukundī kingdom. Though the antiquity of his geographical name is difficult to ascertain, one may be apt to feel that there must have been some Gupta influence in naming the place after Chandragupta. Secondly, Madhavavarman's son through the Vākaṭaka princess bore the name Vikramendravarman — a name which was introduced for the first time in the Vishnukundī family. Though the name Indravarman was already known in the dynasty, the addition of Vikrama to that name was most probably due to the influence of the name of the Gupta emperor Chandragupta II Vikramaditya. For, Vikrama, we know, is the abbreviated form of Vikramaditya, and hundreds of Chandragupta's coins bear the legends ārī-Vikrama. This influence one may have to trace possibly through the queen Prabhavatī-guptā, who was the daughter of that great Gupta emperor, was the queen of Rudrasena and was the mother of Pravarasena II.

Some scholars believe that Madhavavarman's title Trivaranacarabhavana-gata-śrayati-pridaya-nandana is suggestive
of the king's marriage with a princess of the family of Mahāśīvagupta Tīvaradeva of South Kosala. At the same time there is another school thought that takes the above title as an indication of Mādhavavarman's conquest of that South Kosala ruler or of his city. Reserving to a future occasion a detailed examination of the above title, it may be simply pointed here that the place Trivaranaagara of the title was the Vishṇukūṇḍī capital of the time and it had nothing to do with Tīvara, the king of South Kosala.

Mādhavavarman II is known to have had at least three sons, viz., Deva-varman, Vikramendravarman I and Mañcchāppabhaṭṭāraka. Scholars generally take Deva-varman to be the eldest of the three. The Ipur set II is the only source of information about this prince. Besides endowing him with no royal title like Mahārāja or rājan the said charter describes him as a warrior of renowned valour in annihilating the kshatrivas. On that account it is usually believed that this prince predeceased his father falling in one of the battles of the wars waged by the latter. Vikramendravarman I, born of the Vakāṭaka princess succeeded his father to the throne and we shall study about his history in detail later. The prince Mañcchāppabhaṭṭāraka is known only as an añā or the executor of the Ipur set I of his father. Again his name does not figure in the list of the Vishṇukūṇḍī kings given by the charters of the family. So it may be concluded that he did not rule at all independently at least. It is interesting to note that the name of this prince furnishes the solitary instance of a Telugu name among the Vishṇukūṇḍī
princes whose names are otherwise Sanskrit.

Yet another Vishnukundī prince designated as Vishnukundya-
dhirāja figures in the Velpuru record of Madhavavarman II
and we have suggested a probable identification of this prince
with Gunapbhartrī, the Ādana of the Ipur set II. There is nothing
to indicate his relationship with Madhavavarman II. Yet, one
cannot be far from being right if he is taken to be yet
another son, or more probably another grandson of that monarch.
We know nothing about the mothers of both Mañchyanabhāṭṭāraka
and this Vishnukundya-dhirāja.
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