CHAPTER VI

SETBACK AND RECOVERY

*****

The disappearance of the powerful ruler Madhavavarman II naturally led to some confusion in the Vishnukundī dominions in the subsequent period and the fissiparous forces had their time. However, in the next generation the dynasty produced a person who could rise equal to the situation and restore the prestige of the family.

(i) Vikramendra varman I

The highest known regnal year of Madhavavarman II is 37. It is not likely that he ruled much longer. So, we may assume that he ruled for about 40 years and his reign probably ended sometime between 500 and 505 A.D. say c. 502 A.D. He was succeeded to the throne by his beloved, good son Vikramendravarman, also called Vikramendra Bhaṭṭārakavarman in one place.

No charter issued by this prince has come to light so far. On that ground as well as on the ground that in the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham charters no regal title is prefixed to his name, scholars once thought that just like his brothers, Vikramendra varman, too, never ruled. But mere absence of charters itself need not be an argument for such a conclusion. It should also be noted that in the Valpuru record even those monarchs who actually ruled, are found...
Furthermore, the recently found Tummalagudem (II) and the Kendulapalem charters prefix the royal title Mahārāja to the name of Vikramendravārman. Therefore it may be concluded that Vikramendravārman did rule since about 502 A.D.

Scholars have allotted a very short period of reign for this king. Some are of the opinion that he ruled probably five or ten years while others have gone to the extent of assigning him only two years of rule. While discussing the chronology of the Viṣṇukundis we have, however, suggested that Vikramendravārman I might have ruled for a period of 25 years. The reason is this: in the sequel we are going to see that Vikramendravārman's son Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakavārman vanquished his cousin Mādhavavarman III soon after 542 A.D., which most probably corresponded to his own 16th or 16th regnal year. This means that Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakavarnan started his reign c. 526-27 A.D. At the same time the rule of Mādhavavarman II ended as we saw earlier in c. 502 A.D. Thus the reign of Vikramendravārman I that intervened the reigns of Mādhavavarman II and Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakavārman might have comprised about 25 years (502-27 A.D.)

Though no charter of Vikramendravārman I himself has come to light all the records of his successors including the Polamuru set I speak of this king. The reasons why Vikramendravārman of the Polamuru charter must have been identical with Vikramendravārman I of the Ramatirtham,
Chikkulla and other charters have already been studied.

Incidentally the following may also be added here: In the Polamuru Set I Govindavarman II and his son Madhavavarman IV are endowed with the birudas like Vikramāśraya and Janāśraya respectively. Therefore it is reasonable to expect a similar biruda in the description of Vikramendravarman also in that record, in case he had had one. But we find none there, though it is known from the Tummalāgudem set II that Vikramendravarman II did have the title Uttamāśraya. So, it may be concluded that Vikramendravarman of the Polamuru set I must have been different from Uttamāśraya Vikramendravarman II, and identical with Vikramendravarman I. For, the latter is not known to have any such title, and there was no third king of that name known in the family.

But some scholars have argued as follows to prove that Vikramendravarman of the Polamuru set I was different from his namesake of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates: The former, unlike the latter, is not described as ubhayavāṃśa-ālankārabhūta or Vishnukundī-vaśa-āśa-dvayālankāra-janman. Secondly, while the former is styled as svā-pratā∼p-ananda-sāmanta-mannis-pati-mandala, the latter bears no such title. However it must be borne in mind that in the Polamuru record the description of the Vishnukundī genealogy begins only with Vikramendravarman and it is not concerned with his parentage. Again the above argument may carry little weight when one notices that while Madhavavarman II is stated to be the son of Govindavarman in the Tummala-
gudem set II, the same king is not described so in the Ramatirtham, Chikkulla and other charters of the family. Similarly the discovery of the Kandulapalem plates has nullified the second argument as Vikramendravarman I is endowed with the epithet pratap-āpanata-sakala-sāmanta-makuta-mañiari-piñiarita-charan-yugala in that record.

These titles quoted above together with his description as a king of irresistible sway, prowess, might etc., attainable only by the leader of gods (i.e., Indra) go against the view, once held by scholars, that Vikramendravarman I had no other merit than that of his birth. His epithet ubhaya-vamsa-ālankārabhūta reminds us of ubhaya-kul-ālankāra-bhūta, a title borne by Prabhāvatīgupta who, was perhaps his great grandmother on his mother's side. In one record he is praised as a great poet (mahākavi). Though no poetic work of his is known to the extent now, the above epithet probably indicates that he had in him some poetic talents inherited from his maternal grandfather Pravarasena II, the reputed author of the Sātananda otherwise known as Rāvandana.

While a majority of the records are silent about Vikramendravarman's religion, in one instance he is described as the meditator on the feet of the Lord of the Śrīparvata. But in a Buddhist record he is painted as a great devotee of Sugata, i.e., the Buddha. These may indicate that just like his paternal grandfather (viz. Gōvindavarman I), he too was well disposed towards both Hinduism and Buddhism.
and encouraged both the religions.

But one thing must be admitted. All the epithets of this king are very general in nature and none of them credit him with any particular political achievement. This fact, if viewed along with the total absence of his records, may suggest that there was perhaps an eclipse of Vishnukundil power during the period of Vikramendraavarman I. What was the power which could have over-shadowed the Vishnukundis? It is known that the Vishnukundis had a rival in the Pallavas. But after the set-back they suffered at the hands of Mādhavavarman II, they do not appear to have recovered their original strength till Simhavarman of that dynasty took an offensive in about 566 A.D. during the reign of Vikramendraavarman II.

However, fortunately an inscription from an Ajanta Cave seems to give us a clue. For, in that record the Vākāṭaka king Harishēna of the Vatsagulma branch claims to have conquered the powerful rulers of Andhra, Kuntala, Avanti etc. We have already traced the circumstances under which the Vishnukundis, though originally feudatories of the Vākāṭaka rulers of Vatsagulma, came subsequently under the influence of the rulers of the main branch of the Vākāṭaka, joined with the Rāṣṭrakaṭas of Manapura, rebelled against the overlords, and declared independence during the weak rule of Devasēna in Vatsagulma. So there is no wonder if Harishēna (475-510 A.D.), the powerful son and successor of Devasēna chalked out a plan of punitive wars against the rebels. As there is
no proof to the contrary, one is to give full credit to the above claims of Harishēṇa. So, he must have been successful in executing the above plan of reducing the power of the rulers of Andhra etc.

The date of the Vākāṭaka expedition cannot be determined at present. It might have happened either about the end of the reign of Madhavavarman II, or more probably in the beginning of the reign of Vikramēndravarman I, who was perhaps not strong enough to meet the crisis. The shock of the Vākāṭaka expedition must have been so severe and so stunning that the Vishṇukūṇḍi seems to have continued to be not able to rise up for a considerable time at least, if not throughout his reign. It was during this period that Madhavavarman III of the collateral branch and Vishṇukūṇḍa-dhirāja Gunabhartrī joined together and invaded the Veṅgi country. Again, taking advantage of weakness and confusion in the centre, the feudatories too became independent. An epithet of Vikramēndravarman I probably indicates that he tried hard to put down the rebellious chiefs.

Thus the reign of Vikramēndravarman I, the son and successor of the mighty Madhavavarman II, the performer of the Rājasūya and eleven Āśvamedhas seems to have been a period of weakness in the central authority and of foreign aggression resulting in the internal strife and civil war. It was left to his able son Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman to restore the glory of the Vishṇukūṇḍi power once again.
(ii) Madhavavarman III

Madhavavarman III was the son of Devavarman. We shall see later that he was ruling over some region of the Guntur District at the time when Vikramendravarman I was ruling over the main land of the Andhra country. The only available source of information regarding this prince is his own Ipur charter set II.

Ipur Plates Set II: The engraving of this charter is bold, but very shallow. Hence, in many places the letters are worn out and lost. While discussing the genealogy and chronology of the Vishnukundis we have, with reason, concluded that the characters of this charter could have been later than that of the Ipur set I.

This charter has been issued by Madhavavarman III from Kudirapura. The prince is described as the beloved son of Devavarman and as the beloved grandson of Maharaja Madhavavarman, the performer of eleven Aśvamedhas and the Agnishţomasahasra. He is also credited with the title Trikuţa-Malay-ādhivatī.

The formal portion of the charter is very much damaged. Yet there is no doubt that it records the royal gift of the village Murudyaṅkāliki to two Brahmāṇas by name Agniśarman and Indraśarman. A certain Gupabhartṛi designated as Vishnukundyaadhīṛīṇa acted as the executor of the grant.

The record is dated in the 7th day of the 7th fortnight
of the rainy season of the 47th regnal year evidently of Madhavavarman III, who issued the charter.

We have already seen how scholars once thought that Madhavavarman the elder of this epigraph might have been the great-great-grandfather of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and how all the scholars now concur in taking him only to be the grandfather of that ruler. Again, as no inscription of the successors of Vikramendravarman I mentions Devavarman and his son Madhavavarman, the issuer of the present charter, there cannot be any doubt now that they formed a collateral branch of the Vishṇukundī family. Therefore there is no difficulty in placing the issuer of this charter in the genealogical scheme of the Vishṇukundīs. He would be Madhavavarman III, a grandson of Madhavavarman II.

The name of the place from which this charter was issued had been usually read as Amarapura. Some have proposed to identify this Amarapura with the modern Amaravati on the bank of the Krishna and this identification has been endorsed by others also. However, this identification has been rightly questioned on the ground that Amaravati was known only by the name Dhānyakṣāṭaka as late as the 6th-7th century and it was never called as Amarapura. In point of fact, the facsimiles and the impressions of the record show that the reading of the name of the place under question is possibly Kudūrapura only. This place was obviously no other than that Kudūranagara from where
Jayavarman of the Brihatphalayana family issued his Kondamuḍi plates. Dubreuil has correctly identified that place with the modern village Kūgūru or Gūgūru four miles west-north-west of Masūlipatnam. The grant village Muṇḍyakaḻuku cannot be satisfactorily identified.

It has been suggested by some writers that the donee Agniśarman of the record may be identified with his namesake who figures as the donee in the Ipur set I. However as we shall see subsequently, it is a fact that the present record was issued about 40 years after Ipur set I. So it is more probable that, if at all the donees of these two charters were related to one another, the donee Agniśarman of the Ipur set II, issued by the grandson Mādhavavarman, was the grandson of his namesake, the donee of the Ipur set I, issued by the grand-father Mādhavavarman.

The sentence mentioning the executor of the grant is believed to read as asya śasanasy-ānā Viṣṇukundya-ādhiśā-dhyāṇa-ādatta and it is taken to mean "The command (ānā) of this edict was ennobled by the meditation of the overlord of the Viṣṇukundaás". But it may be pointed out that the passage so read and interpreted does not suit the context; and that a sentence of such or similar type, with such or similar meaning, is not met with anywhere else in epigraphs, let alone in the Viṣṇukundā charts. A scholar was inclined to read Viṣṇukundya-Ādhiśā-Guṇavanta in the portion under question and he viewed it to contain a reference to two
executors of the grant namely Adhirāja and Guṇavanta supposed to be two princes of the Vishṇukundī family. But Adhirāja as a personal name sounds rather unusual.

In fact, with reasonable certainty the passage under question can be read as asya śāsanasyāīna Vishṇukundīadhiraīa-Guṇabhartī. So the āīna or the executor of the grant was one Guṇabhartī designated as Vishṇukundīadhiraīa, evidently meaning "a prince of the Vishṇukundī family". It is immaterial for us whether Guṇabhartī was the personal name of the prince like Guṇamudita of a Telugu Chōḍa prince or it was his birada like Guṇabhara of the Pallava Mahendravarman I— all belonging to subsequent ages.

The first symbol in the date portion denoting the year is damaged. So Dr. Hultzsch read it as [4]7 doubtfully. There has been some difference of opinion among the scholars regarding the date of the grant. But those who took the donor of this record, viz. Madhavavarman III or his uncle Vikramendravarman to be the Vishṇukundī opponent of the Chālukya Pulakēśi II, and those who thought that the rule of Madhavavarman of the Ipur set II as well as that of his father Devavarman were in between the reigns of the former's grandfather Madhavavarman and the latter's son Vikramendravarman I found it difficult to accommodate in their respective chronological schemes the long rule of 47 years of this prince. Therefore they have made attempts to read the year of the record, as 17 or 27. However it must be accepted that the reading 47 is much nearer to the original. So, these
scholars have assumed subsequently, obviously to avoid the above chronological difficulty, that the year 47 was not of the donor of the record but of his grand-father Madhavavarman. In support of this theory the following arguments are brought forward: Madhavavarman, the donor, is not endowed any regal title. Again it has also been presumed that what Hultsch read in connection with the rāga of the record cannot but indicate that the charter was issued at the command of the Vishpukundadhiraja "Vishpukundā overlord", identical with Madhavavarman, the grandfather of the donor.

We have already seen that Vikramendravarman I succeeded his father Madhavavarman II to the throne and that Madhavavarman III belonged to a collateral line of the Vishrūkunḍis. As the latter was ruling over his own principality, the problem of accommodating the his rule of 47 years in the chronology of the reigns of the rulers of main branch may not arise at all. Moreover, in the Velpuru record even the ruling monarch is found bearing no regal title. So one may have to revise the opinion generally held regarding the absence of such titles in the descriptions of the Vishpukundā kings. Again Madhavavarman, the younger, of the record did not bear any regal title because, as we shall see in the sequel, he started his career as a governor of a province under his grandfather. And it is also probable that he became a vassal of Harishena. The untenability of the reading Vishpukundadhirāja-dhvanodatta has already been
seen. Of course, according to the lexicons adhīraṭa means "supreme king". But in inscriptions the word is often used also to refer to a subordinate or even an official. For example in the Godavari plate (I) Ṛṣṭhivīśūla refers to his subordinate ally as Indrādhīraṭa; and in the Kasankudi plates, Nandivarman Pallavamalla speaks of his military commander as Brahmādhīraṭa. Another Pallava monarch Paramēśvaravarman I made a land grant at the request of one Vidyāvīniṭa Pallavādhīraṭa, who was perhaps the king's relative, but certainly not an overlord. Therefore the year 47, cited, may be of the donor himself (i.e. Madhavavarman III) as in the case of the respective years of all the other records of the family.

We shall now see the part played by Madhavavarman III in the history of the Vishnukulās. He is endowed in his charter with the title Trikūṭa-Malavādhīpatī. The circumstances under which Madhavavarman II might have helped the Vaṅgaṭaka Narendrāsena against the Traikūṭakas or the rulers of the Trikūṭa had already been traced. The above title may indicate that as a viceroy or commander of his grandfather, Madhavavarman III probably joined the Vaṅgaṭaka in their expedition against that foe. His conquest of Malaya too was perhaps connected with that expedition or more probably with his conquest of the eastern coast of the Vengi country. In this connection, the following points are also worth considering. The Ananda king Kandara II is also
known to claim to be the lord of the Trikūṭa. That king was the maternal grandfather of Prithiviyuvāraja or Oduvāraja of the Kopparam plates of Pulakāśi I dated in 631 A.D. and therefore seems to be a later contemporary of Madhavavarman III. But none of the early rulers of the Ānanda family is known to bear that title. The Ānandas, though once independent, had been reduced to vassalage subsequently by the powerful Pālava. The Velpuru record indicates, as we saw earlier, that the Vishṇukūṭi Madhavavarman II had been at war with the Pālava and was victorious. He probably brought under his rule the region of Sattanapalle-Narasaraopet, the home of the Ānandas. All these facts together with the more or less similar titles of Madhavavarman III and Kandara II tend to indicate that the former was probably appointed by his grandfather as a governor of the newly conquered territory, and that the Ānanda subsequently drove the Vishṇukūṭi out of his country and appropriated the title for himself. Again, it is a fact that while both the above chiefs claimed to be the lords of the Trikūṭa, none of the other Vishṇukūṭi kings of the main line had a similar claim. This contrast is conspicuous enough to suggest that Madhavavarman III and Kandara II might have ruled over one and the same territory, obviously the latter after the former; and that the rulers of the main branch, who were ruling over the main land of the Andhra country had no hold on that territory.

As the Velpuru inscription is dated in the 33rd year
of Madhavavarman II, we may believe that round about that year the Kandara country was conquered and Madhavavarman III was appointed as a governor of it.

But the place of issue of the charter of Madhavavarman III would show that by the date of the Ipur set II he was in possession of the Masulipatnam region. Similarly his claim to be the lord of Malaya also perhaps indicates that he probably conquered the Malayavani territory adjacent to the above region. Moreover, as we shall see later, his cousin brother Indrabhattarakaavarman is credited with the success in driving out his dayadas or kinsmen. These may make it clear that though Madhavavarman III, remained as a provincial governor of the Kandarapura region (i.e. the Ananda territory) under his grandfather became independent after the latter's death, and that taking advantage of the weakness of Vikramendravarman I in the centre and the confusion that followed Harishena's expedition in Andhra, Madhavavarman III might have invaded and occupied the coastal part of Andhra from where he was driven out later by Indrabhattarakaavarman.

In this connection one more significant point deserves our attention. The Ajanta inscription of Varahadeva credits the VakaPAYaka king Harishena with the conquest of some mountains and countries, the list of which is unfortunately not fully preserved. Though one may not be sure whether that list originally included the Malaya, there is no doubt that the extant part of the list includes the Trivikrama and Andhra. It
is not unlikely that Mādhavavarman III joined Harishēṇa's expedition to the Trikuṭa and also probably the Malaya and assumed the title Trikuṭa-Malay-ādhipati to commemorate his success there. In that case the invasion and occupation of the Masulipatnam area of the Andhra country by Mādhavavarman III was only a part of a big military scheme of the Vākāṭaka. Probably Mādhavavarman III joined Harishēṇa's fold and revived the traditional Vishṇukundī policy of the Vākāṭaka vassalage. His action was no doubt amply rewarded by the Vākāṭaka emperor by helping him to occupy the main land. The absence of regal titles in his description in the Ipur charter II, if it is significant, perhaps indicates a sort of his feudal status under the Vākāṭaka.

Mādhavavarman's original principality was probably the same Kandarapura-vāra-janapada to be identified tentatively with the region around the modern Chezerla in the Narsaraopet taluk. To the north of that was the Vēlpurudēsa or the province of Vēlpuru (i.e. roughly the modern Sattenapalle Taluk) of which his brother or cousin brother or uncle the Vishṇukundīādhirāja Guṇabhartṛi was the governor. In the conquest of the main land of Andhra, Mādhavavarman III appears to have got the support and co-operation of that prince also, as evidenced by the Ipur set II.

(1) Did Mādhavavarman conquer and occupy the whole of the central Andhra or only a part of it? (2) When did he occupy? (3) How long did he continue to occupy it? All these questions cannot have precise answers. However the
inscriptions of the rulers of the main branch do not indicate any break in the rule of their line. Hence it is likely that Vikramendravarman I and his son were also ruling over some part i.e. the western part, in that region even during the period under consideration.

Coming to the next question it may be pointed out that the date of the record is his 47th regnal year of Madhavavarman III. It seems that the above year corresponded to the 15th year of the reign of Indrabhāṭārakavarman who started ruling c. 526 A.D. Therefore the date of the Ipur set II may be c. 527 + 15 = 542 A.D. So, Madhavavarman III must have occupied the Masulipatnam area earlier than that date. In case, in his adventure, Madhavavarman III got the help of Harishēna, as has been earlier suggested, then it is likely that he occupied that region earlier than c. 510 A.D. the last date accepted for that mighty Vākāṭaka conqueror. If so, the answer to the third question would naturally be that he was occupying the area for about 32 years till c. 542 A.D. (542 minus 510). At any rate, it is certain that he could not have continued to occupy the area much longer. For, soon after the date of the Ipur set II, as we have already seen and also shall see later, Vikramendravarman's son Indrabhāṭārakavarman succeeded in driving out of his territory his dāyādas i.e. Madhavavarman III and his coadjutor Gupabhārti.

It is not known whether the last mentioned princes had sons, and whether they continued to rule over the
principality the Kandarapuravarajanapada for some time more. The theory that Harishēpa helped a son of Mādhavavarman III against Vikramēndravarman I and slain the latter may not hold good on account of its manifest chronological difficulties. The circumstances indicate that soon afterwards the Ananda power started to assert itself under Kandra II once again in the area perhaps with the assistance of the Pallava. Thus the province of Kandarapuravara-janapada, seems to have been lost by the Vishṇukundis. The same was probably the case with the Vālpurudēśa also, the province governed by Gupabhārtṛi who was an accomplice in the military adventure of Mādhavavarman III.

Some writers have built up the following thesis: At the time of the death of his grandfather Mādhavavarman III was too young to take the throne; hence his uncle became the king; Mādhavavarman, after he grew up, fought with his cousin Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in an attempt to get back the kingdom into his own hand; the quarrel ended in a compromise and consequently Mādhavavarman, the lord of the Trikūta-Malaya and the issuer of Ipur set II, was allowed to rule over a part of the western mountainous region of the kingdom from "Amarapura" owing a nominal allegiance to Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. But we have already seen that even during the time of his grandfather, Mādhavavarman III must have been old enough to be appointed as a viceroy or governor and to take part in the wars fought by Mādhavavarman, the elder. Again the Ipur set II was issued not from Amarapura in the
western part of the kingdom, but from Kudurapura in the eastern part. Lastly the above thesis would drive one to the belief that the reign period of Madhavavarman III perhaps started after the alleged compromise or a little earlier. Then it would naturally follow that his 47th regnal year, in which the Ipur set II was issued, fell sometime after the date of the Ramatirtham plates. It is needless to point out that to take such a position may hardly be justified by the characters of those two charters.

(iii) Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān

The son and successor of Vikramendravarman I was Indravarman II, invariably referred to as Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān in the grants of his successor. Only one record of this king has come to us and it was found in the village Ramatirtham.

Ramatirtham Plates: This charter was issued by the Indravarman from his camp at what is called Puranisangama. Here the king styles himself as Rājan and as the son of the Rājan Vikramendra, who was the son of the Maharāja Madhavavarman, the performer of eleven Āśvamedhas and the Kṛtsnasahasra. The formal part of the grant records the royal gift of the village Pernvāṭaka, also called Pernvāṭaka, situated in the Plakirāśṭra, in favour of a Brahmāṇa, by name Nagnasārman, belonging to the Māṇḍīragōtra and
Taittirīyaṇākha. The king himself was the executor of the grant. The record is dated in the seventh lunar day of the bright fortnight of the month Jyēṣṭha, in the 27th regnal year of the king.

The territorial division Pākirāshṭra in which the gift village was included has been identified with the region of the modern Srikakulam District. Sometimes it is also called as Pākki-viśaya or Paḷakki-viśaya in inscriptions. Probably this division had its headquarters at the modern Pakki (18°35' N and 83°25' E) in the Bobbili Taluk, Srikakulam District. Similarly the gift village Peruvāṭaka or Peruvāṭaka may be tentatively identified with the modern village Perumāli (18°25' N, 83°30' E) in Bobbili Taluk, only about 10 miles to the south-east of Pakki and about 20 miles to the north of Rāmatīrtham, the findspot of the record.

Regarding the place of issue of the charter, some scholars like Sri H. Krishna Sastri and Dr. Hultzsch have taken the whole expression Puranisangama as a single unit. But Sri K.R. Subramanian took it to be a compound expression consisting of two units viz. Purani and Sangama, and Dr. Sircar interpreted it as "the confluence of the river Purani." But, both Puranisangama nor the river Purani still remain to be identified. However, it is reasonable to think that the above expression contains two units i.e. Purani and Sangama or Pur and Nisangama. If the first alternative is accepted, then the river Purani may be identified with either of the two following rivers which bear the name Purāṇa.
One of them waters the Parbhani District and mingle with the Godavari near Parbhani town. This sangama or confluence of the Purna and the Godavari might have been well within the Vishnukundhi dominions, which, as we have already seen, included the northern part of the former Hyderabad State. The second Purna waters the Berar area and enters the Tapti almost on the Berar-East-Khandesh border. This confluence was within the erstwhile Vasataka dominions. Yet it is not unlikely, as we shall see subsequently in detail, that that locality served as a camping place of Indrabhattaraka on the given date. On the other hand, if the second alternative is accepted and the expression Pura-Nisangama is taken to signify "a town named Nisangama", then the place Nisangama may be identified with the modern Sangam (18.35 N, 83.35 E) in the Palkonda taluk of the Srikakulam District. It is on the confluence of the Suvarnamukhi and Nagavali rivers and is about four miles to the east of Pakki and 12 miles to the north-east of Perumali mentioned above.

Having thus discussed the contents of the charter, let us turn to the political history of the Vishnukundhis during the reign of Indrabhattaraka Varman. From his time onwards our study of the history of the dynasty is based on much surer chronology, thanks to the recent discovery. The year 555 A.D. is fixed as the lower limit of his reign by the Tummalagudem set II. It is said in epigraphs that when his first son Vikramendravarman II was enthroned by the council of ministers, the latter was still a boy. Therefore it is quite reasonable to conclude that Indrabhattaraka Varman was not very much aged at the time of his death and
that therefore he did not rule much longer after his 27th
year, the date of the Ramatirtham charter. Possibly he ruled
for a year or two after that date. Then it would follow
that he must have started his reign in c. 526 A.D. (555 minus
29 = 526).

In the earlier sections of this chapter we saw how
at the time of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's accession a part
of his territory was already under occupation of his aggressive
cousin Mādhavavarman III; and how taking advantage of the
weakness of Vikramendravarman I, some of the feudatories like
Prithivīmāla and others managed to throw off the Vishṇukūṇḍi
yoke and became independent. Yet, the Vishṇukūṇḍi kingdom
was lucky enough to find in Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, a right
leader in the right place and in the right time.

Though the internal conditions of the kingdom were
far from being satisfactory, fortunately for Indrabhaṭṭāraka-
varman, there was no foreign power strong enough to intervene
in his home affairs in favour of the rebellious elements.
Harishena, the last great Vākāṭaka, who perhaps instigated
Mādhavavarman III to occupy the main Andhra country, was
no more, and after him the Vākāṭaka power is unheard of.
In the south, the days of the Pallava Simhavarman who could
think of an invasion into the Vishṇukūṇḍi territory, were
yet to come. So, with these advantages Indrabhaṭṭāraka-
varman seems to have tried measures to restore the Vishṇu-
kūṇḍi kingdom to its original glory.
The records of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman himself and of his successor unanimously credit him with repeated victories in the innumerable battles of elephants. It seems, therefore, that he organised a huge and formidable army of elephants to achieve his objectives. Perhaps to begin with, he turned his attention to curb the rebellious feudatories. The power and strength of his army were so much that the rebels, having got no strong foreign power to support them, had no other go but to organise a confederacy among themselves again their adversary. At the head of that confederacy was perhaps Prithivimula to whose family belonged the great grandmother of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman (i.e. the mother of Mādhavavarman II). His Godavari plates (I) graphically describe how a number of chieftains, evidently in utter panic, joined together with the sole common objective of uprooting Indrabhaṭṭāraka. In a pitched battle that followed, one of the confederates by name Indrādhīrāja seems to have played a very important role. The allies won the battle and the head of the confederacy viz., Prithivimula greatly appreciated the heroism of Indrādhīrāja, and, presumably as a mark of his appreciation, granted at his request, four villages to the Brāhmaṇas.

The scholars who have dealt with the Godavari plates (I) entertain difference of opinion regarding (1) the identity of Indrabhaṭṭāraka and (2) Indrādhīrāja both mentioned in the record. There is also disagreement concerning (3) who could have been the members of the coalition and (4) what
might have been the result of the battle.

(1) At the time when Dr. Fleet edited the Godavari set I, only one king of the name Indrabhaṭṭāraka was known and he was an Eastern Chālukya prince, who was the younger son of Kuba Viśṇuvardhana and who succeeded his elder brother Jayasimha and ruled for seven days in 663 A.D. or 673 A.D. Naturally, therefore Fleet took Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari record to be identical with his Eastern Chālukya namesake. However, the discovery of the Chikkulla plates brought to light one more Indrabhaṭṭāraka, viz. the Viśṇukunḍi, and Prof. Kielhorn, the editor of that record, suggested that that Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari plates may better be identified with the Viśṇukunḍi of that name. Scholars in general have accepted the above suggestion of Prof. Kielhorn, though in some quarters the earlier view of Dr. Fleet still lingers on. Now the Tummalagudem set II tells us that Prthivīmūla or a successor of him was a feudatory of the Viśṇukunḍi Viḥrāmendravarman II, and testifies the correctness of Kielhorn’s above suggestion.

(2) Indradhīrāja of the Godavari set I is usually identified with the one or the other Indravarman of the Eastern Gaṅga family. A detailed discussion may be reserved to a more appropriate later occasion, in order to ascertain whether this Indradhīrāja could have been an Eastern Gaṅga and, if so, with which Gaṅga ruler of that name he could have been identical. However, if one takes into considera-
tion the period and the area, to which the Godavari set I belongs, one cannot think of any Indra other than the first
known Eastern Ganga king Indravarman, who issued the Jir-
ingi plates of the Ganga year 39 (= c. 535 A.D.)

Regarding the part played by Indradhirāja it may be
said that there is no evidence in support of the contention
that Indradhirāja placed himself at the head of the coali-
tion and Prithivīmūla was his vassal. On the other hand
the Godavari set I itself bears a good witness to the fact
which seems to be diametrically opposite to the above con-
tention. Evidently it was Prithivīmūla, the issuer of the
charter who perhaps headed the coalition while Indradhirāja
at whose request the charter was issued was only his ally,
or rather a subordinate ally.

What follows as a natural corollary from the above
discussion is the date of the Godavari set I and the date
of Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman's ill success in his conflict with
Prithivīmūla and others. The Ganga era is believed to have
started in 496 (or c. 496-98) A.D. Indravarman I, the
Ganga, figures as an independent monarch - as indicated by
his epithet Mahārāja in his Jirjīngi plates of the year 39
of the era or c. 535 A.D. At the same time that epithet is
conspicuous by its absence in the Godavari set I. On the
basis of these one may assign the last mentioned charter
and the defeat of the Vishnukunḍi in the conflict recorded
in the Godavari plates to a date sometime before 535 A.D. i.e.
sometime in the first decade of Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman's
reign.
In the Godavari set I, Indrabhaṭṭāraka's elephant is named as Kumuda while that of his opponent as Supratika. From the Purāṇas etc. we learn that Kumuda is the name of the elephant of the south-west and Supratika is of the north-east. So Dr. Fleet suggested that Indrādhīrāja, the opponent of Indrabhaṭṭāraka must have advanced from the north-east. In other words he must have been a Ganga king from the Kalinga country. Proceeding on the same line, Prof. Kielhorn interpreted Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān's epithet which credits him with victories in the chāṭurdanta-battles. The scholar took chāṭurdanta to be properly an epithet of Airavata, the elephant of the east. Then it would follow that the above epithet refers to the Vishnukuṇḍi's victory over his foe from the east i.e. a Ganga of Kalinga. Other scholars also have underlined the above statement of Kielhorn.

Of course, these views support the identification of Indrādhīrāja with a Ganga ruler. However, one cannot but hesitate to accept the contention that chāṭurdanta in the title of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān denotes Airavata of the eastern direction. Firstly, there is nothing in that title to show that the chāṭurdanta was the elephant only of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān's foe and not of himself. The title as interpreted and translated by Kielhorn to that effect cannot be properly dissolved, as that scholar himself had magnanimously admitted. Secondly, it has been agreed on
all hands that, in the epithet anēka-chātrdanta, etc. the word anēka is an adjective of the immediately following chātrdanta, and the Karmadārāvya thus formed means "many chātrdantas". But at the same time it is well known that there is only one Airāvata and not many. Thirdly, the Sanskrit poets and writers are at times found describing the huge and fierce elephants of their respective heroes as chātrdantas.

Above all, the days are gone when the scholars were of the opinion that the title anēka-chātrdanta etc. was a monopoly of Indrabhaṭṭārakavaraṇa. The subsequent discoveries and researches show that, during the period under question, there were other chiefs too, besides Indrabhaṭṭārakavaraṇa, to bear the same or similar title, claiming victories in the chātrdanta battles. To the list of those chiefs, belonged Mitavarman, the father of Indrāḍhirāja of the Godavari set I, the Eastern Gaṅga Indravarman I himself, Prithivāmūla, and others. Certainly it is futile to search for an elephant of the east in all these cases. True, the above title of the Vishṇukuni was appropriated with or without modification, by the victorious members of the said coalition. But to suggest that the victors assumed the title denoting a military victory over themselves may land us in a sort of reductio ad absurdum. Therefore chātrdanta-samara may simply mean "a battle of elephants" just like ghotaka-vigraha (of the Rewa stone Inscription of Karpa of the Kalachuri year 812 or 1061 A.D.), simply signifies "a battle of horses."
(3) The third point is in regard to the other members of the coalition. If the time and area, to which the Godavari set I belongs, are to be taken into consideration, then it may be suggested that the confederacy of all the chiefs (aśesa-arpita) probably included the members of the Rāmakāśyanagotra family, the Pitribhaktas, the Mātharas and Vāsishṭha gotras also. For, all of them perhaps had been reduced to vassalage by Madhavavarman II, as we saw earlier. Assigning Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman to a period between 430-515 A.D., some would concur with Dubreuil and suggest that among the many kings of the coalition there was perhaps the Vākaṭaka king Harishēya too. But this theory is to be dropped in view of the Vishnukundī chronology accepted here. For, while Harishēya's reign cannot be extended beyond 510 A.D., Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman could not have ascended the throne earlier than c. 526 A.D., as has been already concluded.

(4) Coming to the fourth and the last point, viz. the result of the battle, there is no denying that the confederates were victorious to begin with, as amply evidenced by the Godavari set I itself. The victors asserted themselves against the aggressive overlord. They issued charters in their own names. They seem to have been irresistibly enchanted by the high sounding title of Indrabhaṭṭaraka crediting him with the victory in the chāturdanta-samaras. So, being victorious they appear to have thought it quite becoming of them to appropriate that
But it is also to be particularly noted that neither the Godavari set I, nor any other evidence, supports the conclusion that Indrabhattaraka varman was slain in the battle by Indrādhirāja. In fact Prithvimūla issued the charter only because Indrādhirāja knocked down the elephant Kumuda that confronted the other elephant Supratīka, presumably of the allies. Nor does the record indicate that the Vishnu-puttra was on the back of the elephant Kumuda. On the other hand, Indrabhattaraka varman's complete victory over the members of the coalition is well testified by the Ramatirtham charter from which one may deduce that nearly two decades after the said conflict, the Vishnu-puttra was in full control over the Plakirāshṭra which was in the north far beyond the territories ruled by Prithvimūla and some other members of the coalition. The charter also indicates that by c. 553 A.D. (i.e. the date of the Ramatirtham charter) he had already encroached well into the Kalinga country of the Gaṇgas. Therefore the following might have been the result of the battle under question.

The Godavari set I is clear enough to indicate how hastily (sarabhāsam) the anti-Indrabhattaraka coalition was constituted by the disparate but over enthusiastic chiefs motivated by the sole desire of putting down Indrabhaṭṭaraka. There is little wonder that a coalition, so hastily formed, proved to be fragile enough to break
itself after the flush of its first victory disappeared. Thus, circumstances show that, though defeated at first, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman subsequently found a more opportune time and broke the already loose hotch-potch coalition and brought under his control its members one by one. So, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's claim, in the Ramatirtham plates, of victories won in many battles of the chāturdantasa may also refer to the later part of the struggle between Indrabhaṭṭāraka on one hand and the confederates on the other.

The result was that many families like the Māṭharas, Vāśishṭhas who were perhaps members of the coalition were totally wiped out and they were unheard of any more. The chiefs of the family of Prithivimūla turned to be loyal chieftains of the Vishpukunḍi and went to the extent of standing by the side of that monarch's son during the time of a great crisis as we shall see in the next chapter. Similarly the family of Rāmakāśyapa-gōtrins too became so attached to the overlord that a member of that family thought it fit to name his own son after the overlord's son Vikramāṇendravarman II. In the history of the Eastern Gāṇgas there is a dark period of about 25 years after c. 535 A.D. i.e. the date of the Jirjingi plates. Again between the Gāṇga Indravarman I and his son Hastivarman, some rulers are known to have been ruling. These facts do indicate a sort of political instability, and may support
Dubreuil's contention that in the war with Indravarman of Kalinga it is certain that ultimately Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman was the victor. Therefore it may be justifiably concluded that in his struggle with the rebellious feudatories, Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman might have lost a few battles to begin with, but won the war at the end.

The second and perhaps more important achievement of Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman was his success in forcing all his kinsmen to vacate their aggression of the main land of the Andhra country. In the last section we have traced how Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman's cousin Madhavavarman III joined with the Vishnukundirāja Gupabhatṛi and followed a policy of aggression towards Vikramendravarman I and had occupied the Māsūlipatnā area. Soon after, perhaps after winning over the feudatories, Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman at an appropriate time crossed swords with his cousin. It seems that his superiority in arms, in guts and skill over that of his opponents gave him a decisive victory. The records of his son are unanimous in declaring that he drove out all his kinsmen and, nowhere is it recorded that he killed any of his cousins. The expressions aśēna (or sāmeśra)-dāyāda "all kinsmen" probably includes, besides Madhavavarman III, his accomplice Gupabhatṛi also. We do not know whether Maṇḍhayāṇa-bhāṭṭāraka had sons and if so whether they were in good terms with Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman. The theory of compromise between Indrabhāṭṭāraka-varman and his cousin Madhavavarman has already been dealt with in the last section.
The victory of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman over his cousins has already been placed after c. 542 A.D. i.e. the approximate date of the Ipur set II. It may also be assigned to a date earlier - probably much earlier - date than c. 553 A.D. i.e. the 27th regnal year when Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman issued his Ramaṭīrtham charter (526 + 27 = 553). Some writers are of the view that as the Ramaṭīrtham plates do not speak of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's victory over his cousin, the said achievement is to be placed after the date of that charter. But the same charter clearly indicates that Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman had already extended his dominions at least as far as the Srikakulam District and that he was camping somewhere in the north as we shall see later. This would have been possible provided he had cleared off completely the aggression from his home-land. Moreover Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's repeated victories in the innumerable chāturdanta-samaras referred to in the Ramaṭīrtham charter itself may as well include his victory in one such war against his dāvādas.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to bear in mind two important landmarks in the history of the Deccan of the age. Firstly the rise of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the Eastern Deccan almost coincided with the rise of a new power viz. the Chālukyas, under Pulakēśi I in the western part of the peninsula. In this Badami inscription
of Śaka 465 or 543 A.D., Vallabhaśvara, i.e. Pulakesi I, is represented to have already performed the Āşvamedha and other āstānta sacrifices and to have laid the foundation of the fort Vatāpi (modern Bādami in Bijapur District) in that year, viz. 543 A.D., i.e. almost the same year when Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakaravarman finally succeeded in clearing off all aggressions from his dominions.

Similarly the emergence of Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakaravarman coincided more or less with the fast sinking and final disappearance of the Vākaṭaka empire in the Deccan. The former might have been the effect, or cause, or more probably both, of the latter. The above study of the political career of Indrabhaṭṭāraṇakaravarman would suffice to show how in crushing down ruthlessly the rebellious chiefs, in driving out the aggressors from his kingdom and in bringing under him the Kalinga country, the Vishnukumāḍi made best use of the political instability that followed the death of Harishēṇa, the vanquisher of the rulers of the Andhra, Kalinga etc.

The causes of the sudden collapse of the mighty Vākaṭaka power are not known. The contention that the struggle between the two houses of the Vākaṭakas lead them to their decline may be only partially true as we are still in the dark regarding how the Vatsagulma house, after asserting itself, by the spectacular military achievements of the great warrior Harishēṇa should disappear all on a sudden
following the death of that king. Depending on the romance Dāsakumāracharita of the subsequent age some would attribute the above phenomenon to the incompetence of Harishēna’s successor and to the treacherous defection of his feudatories. In this connection it is worthwhile remember the following points:

The Vishṇuṇaṅgis were, to begin with, feudatories of the Vākāṭakas of Vatsagulma and became subsequently independent with the support of the members of the main branch of the Vākāṭakas, to which Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman’s grandfather belonged. It was Harishēna of the other branch who eclipsed the power of the main line, punished the Vishṇuṇaṅgi severely by waging a punitive war. He probably also instigated Mādhavavarman III to occupy the main land of the Andhra country. These led to a bloody revolt of the feudatories of the Vishṇuṇaṅgi kingdom. To undo all the damages made by Harishēna must have been a stupendous task. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, however, as we have seen just now, rose equal to the occasion. He not only cleared his territory of the external aggression and internal strifes, but also grew strong enough to conduct aggressive wars in far off lands with his army and to wrest the territory from their rulers, like the Ganga who had sinned against him once by leading an army with other bellicose chiefs. Considering all these, one may not be on the erring side in conjecturing
that, given an opportunity, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmāṇa would not have hesitated, in a spirit of vengeance, to contribute his mite to the down-fall of the Vatsagulma house that had doubly sinned against him by its aggression in Vidarbha and in Andhra.

In this context the recent discoveries of some copper coins attributed to the Vishṇukundi in the Vidarbha region seems to be quite significant. A few of them have been found actually at Pavner, i.e. the ancient Prāvaradura, the capital of the main line of the Vākalas. Basing scholars have conjectured that at one time in its history Vidarbha or a portion of it was included within the dominions of the Vishṇukundis. If this is correct, then, subject to the confirmation by future researches, it may be further suggested that being a Vākalas of the main line through his grandmother, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmāṇa might have felt that he too had some claim—distant at least—over the Vidarbha kingdom perhaps as there was no member in the main branch to claim it. After all, Pavner is hardly 150 miles to the north from the Karimnagar District, which, as indicated by the numerous coins found there, lay well within the Vishṇukundī dominions. So, it is likely that he tried to fill up the political vacuum in the Vidarbha region and then probably struck the final blow at the root of the already falling Vatsagulma house. Therefore there may be some truth, even in his tall claim, of having obtained the lordship of the
whole of the chakravartikshētra by his victories in many a
caturdanta battle. Here chakravartikshētra obviously
signifies the South India bounded by the waters of the three
seas and of the Reva river. Against this background
and against the background of his clash with the Maukhari
in the Vindhyan region, as we shall see presently, the
identification of the place of issue of the Ramatirtham
plates, viz. the sangama of the Purani with some place near
the confluence of the Purṇa and the Tapti may not be
altogether ruled out:

The active participation of Indrabhāṭṭarākavarman in
the politics of the Vākāṭaka empire seems to have compelled
him to come in conflict with the Nalas. Probably taking
advantage of the political confusion that ensued the decline
of the Vākāṭaka power, the king Bhavadattavarman of the Nala
family of the Bastar-Jeypore region had already started
penetrating well into the Vidarbha area. It is evidenced
by his own grant of the village Kadambagiri, whose identi-
fication with the modern Kalsamba (Yeotmal District in Berar)
is generally accepted. Most probably it was Indrabhāṭṭarā-
karvarman who drove the Nala out of the Vidarbha country and
crippled his power by conducting raids into his home pro-
vince. However, it seems that the Vishṇukūṇḍi was subse-
quently vanquished by the successors of Bhavadattavarman.
For, we find that the latter's son Skandavarman asserting
himself, not long after, in the Jeypore region as proved
by his podghadh inscription that records the repopulating
of the area earlier depopulated and the renewal of some earlier grants. Similarly Arthapatibhaṭṭāraka, a son, or grandson of Bhavadatta-varman managed to occupy the city Nandivardhana, the earlier capital of the Vākaṭakas of the main line and issued his Riddhapur plates, most probably confirming, or rather renewing, Bhavadatta-varman’s earlier grant of Kadambagiri, which perhaps had fallen in disuse subsequently. In the meanwhile.

Probably by the end of his reign, Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman came into conflict with Īśānavarman, the Maukhari king of the north. As the Vishṇukundis, once feudatories of the Vākaṭakas were thriving on the ruins of the latter’s empire in the Deccan, so also the Maukharis, an ancient family who had been feudatories of the Gupta were flourishing at the ruins of the empire of their masters in the northern India and were ruling over the South Bihar and U.P. No Gupta ruler is referred to in any record after 543 A.D., i.e. the year when the Vishṇukundis and the Chālukyas rose strong in the south as we saw earlier. Īśānavarman, was the first Maukhari king to assume the imperial title Maharāja-ādhirāja. The Haraha (Barabanki District, U.P.) inscription of the time of that monarch dated in V.S. 661 (554 A.D.), credits him with a victory, in a war with one Andhrādhīpati described as the master of thousands of rutting elephants. The relevant passage of the inscription under question runs:
The Jaunpur (Jaunpur District, U.P.) fragmentary inscription of one of the successors of Ḫsānavarman seems to inform us that the above battle was fought somewhere in the Vindhya region. The seventh line of that inscription reads:

\[
VINDHYADRÉH PRATI-RANDHRAÉ=ANDHRAPATINÉ
\]

The identification of Andhrāhipati, the opponent of Ḫsānavarman has been a problem for scholars. Long ago Prof. Raychaudhuri proposed to identify him with Madhavavarman Janaśraya of the Polamuru set I, and this view continues to enjoy the favour of other scholars also. Connecting Madhavavarman Janaśraya's march to conquer the east with Ḫsānavarman's claim of victory over the Andhra king; and taking the Paṇḍuvaṁśis (also called Sāmavēśis) of South Kosala to be feudatories and helpers of the Maukharis in vanquishing the Andhra; some writers have propounded a theory of Maukhari-Paṇḍuvaṁsi marriage alliance of political importance. They also believe that Madhavavarman Janaśraya conquered and occupied the city of Tīvra of South Kosala. In support of this contention our attention is drawn to that Vishṇukūṭī's title Trivaranagarabhavaṇa etc. But one should not forget that Ḫsānavarman's defeat of the Andhrāhipati is to be placed before the date of the
Harappa inscription viz. 554 A.D. while Madhavavarman Janapa-dravya's march to conquer the east took place more than half a century later, i.e. by 612 A.D. At the same time, the Vishnukunji chronology adopted here would show that the Andhradhipati under question could have been only Indrabhattarakavarman and not anybody else. This identification seems to be supported also by the description of the Andhradhipati as a master of a sizeable army of elephants with rutting juice flowing in three parts. For, as has already been shown, Indrabhattarakavarman had an exceptionally strong army of elephants.

It is hard indeed to guess the reason for a war between Indrabhattarakavarman of the south and Isanavarman of the north. We are totally in the dark also about what could have brought them to the Vindhya mountain, where they confronted one another. So, one has to be content with probabilities.

The Asirghad (Khandwa, East Nimar) District about 12 miles to the north-east of Burhanpur, Madhya Pradesh] seal of Sarvavarman, the son of Isanavarman has been considered by some as a compelling evidence showing that the Vindhya mountain of the area fell into the hands of the Maukhari. It may be tempting to concur with this view. For, it would greatly reduce the difficulty of finding out the avenue of the Maukhari-Vishnukunji war. We have already seen that the active involvement of Indrabhattarakavarman
in the Vākaṭaka politics probably brought him as far as the confluence of the Pūrpā and Tāptī which was only about 30 miles to the south of Asirgadh itself. The aggressive Vishnuukuppi could have found easily one reason or other to collide with the equally, if not more, aggressive Maukhari, so near.

But the main difficulty with this view in this: As Dr. Fleet had promptly reminded us, it is not the original of the so-called Asirgadh seal, but only an impression of it was found in Asirgadh in the box containing the property of the Maharāja Scindia. It is also not clear whether the original was ever found there at all. Even assuming that the original was actually found in Asirgadh, one cannot rule out the probability of its being carried to the locality from a far offfplace. Yet, fortunately there is another clue to decide the presence of the Maukhari in the Vindhyan region. The Later Gupta king Dāmodara Gupta and his son Mahīśēna Gupta, who was a brother of the grandmother of the Pushyabhūti emperor Harshavardhana (acc. 606 A.D.) are to be assigned to the period under question. The Later Guptas was the king of Mālava, according to the Harsha-charita. It is known that he and the Maukhari Īśānavarman were fighting with one another, and that the Maukhari killed the above Dāmodaravarma. At the same time, as we have already seen, the Balaghat plates refer to the Vākaṭaka suzerainty over Mālava. Taking all these
points into consideration, one cannot totally rule out a probability of a confrontation of the Maukhari in the Vindhyan region with the Vishpukundī interested in the Vakataka affairs.

One more thing to be remembered in this connection is this. The above Haraha inscription refers to the Śūlikas, as being vanquished by the above Isānavarman along with the Andhradhipati. Prof. Raychaudhuri had identified the above Śūlikas with the Chālukyas of Badami. Some scholars have accepted this view, though some would disagree. If this identification is accepted, then it may be suggested that the Chālukya Pulakesī I, or his son Kīrttivarman I who acted probably as his father’s commander-in-chief, perhaps joined the Vishpukundī against the Maukhari. Then it would seem that the inclusion of the king of Magadha in the list of rulers over whom Kīrttivarman claims to have won victory in the Mahākūta (Badami) pillar inscription, may not be totally without substance. For, the Maukhari kingdom, in fact, included portions of Magadha.

Another, and perhaps, more plausible explanation of the Maukhari-Vishpukundī confrontation in the Vindhyā range seems to lie in the aggressive policy followed by Indrabhaṭṭarakavarman in the east. As we have already seen, it is likely that the Ramatirtham plates were issued from the place called Nisangama or the modern Sangam almost on the Andhra-Orissa border. It has also been suggested that Indrabhaṭṭarakavarman probably had vanquished the Ganga...
Indravarman I and this created a political instability in Kalinga. Perhaps, on his way there was none to block his raid further north. Again the accession of Īśānavarman is placed c. 550 A.D., and the Haraha inscription, the earliest reporter of the Andhra-Maukharī's conflict is dated in 554 A.D. Therefore it is reasonable to think that the above conflict actually took place not long before, but in c. 552 or 553 A.D. itself, which seems to have corresponded to the 27th year of Indrabhaṭṭarakavarma when that monarch was on the Andhra-Orissa border. Moreover the Sūlikas and the Gaṅgas of the sea-shore over whom Īśānavarman claims to have won victories besides the Andhrādhipati, may be identified, as suggested by Prof. R.C. Majumdar, respectively with the Sulkis of Orissa and some powers in Bengal. Therefore, it is very likely that the Maukharī was conducting raids in the south-eastern direction. It is natural that the two aggressive monarchs viz. Indrabhaṭṭarakavarma and Īśānavarman inevitably found themselves confronted with one another somewhere in Orissa.

Another thing one is to keep in mind in this connection is this: The Nagarjunī Hill (Gaya District) cave inscription of the Maukharī Anantavarman calls that hill by the name Vindya. Dr. Fleet correctly remarked that it is a part of the Vindhya mountains which though most conspicuous in Western and Central India do extend right across the peninsula until, passing through the neighbourhood of Gaya, their easternmost spurs reach and disappear in the
valley of the Ganges at Rājmahāl. Most probably it is to this or some other wing of the Vindhyas in the east within the dominions of the Maukharis, that Rājyaśrī, Harshavardhana's sister, the Maukharī Grahavarman's widow, and the captive of the unnamed Mālava king, might have escaped, as graphically narrated by Bāpa, from the prison at Kanauj and taken refuge there without the least apprehension of any trouble. Now, it may be pointed out that another wing of the same Vindhyas bends down southward about Chōtanāgpur and its spurs reach and disappear somewhere in the former Keonjar State of Orissa. This wing too, just like the other wing at Gayā has every right to be justifiably referred to by the name Vindhya in the Maukharī inscription from Haraha. The cumulative effect of all these seems to point to a probability of a confrontation between Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman and Īṣānavarman somewhere in that range.

Whatever might have been the avenue of the war, it is certain that Īṣānavarman was the victor. There is no reason to discredit the claim of the Maukharī especially when there is no record on the Vishṇukunḍi side giving evidence to the contrary. As may be gathered from the Maukharī records, the reason for Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's defeat seems to be his over dependence on his elephant-force, which, though a source of strength in the plains, is only a source of nuisance in the hilly terrain. In this aspect the Vishṇukunḍi stands in a good comparison
to Harshavardhana. For, in the succeeding century, that
knight, Pushyabhūti, because of his use of an enormous army of
elephants, lost his battle against the Chālukya Pulakesī
II in the Vindhyā region, where the very absence of that
army was an additional strength as realised by the Chālukyan
conqueror, as well as the Maukha king.

But one should not forget the fact that even the
elegance of the Maukha inscriptions does not allow us
to conclude that the Andhrāhipati and others were all
compelled to accept the Maukha suzerainty and that
their territories must have come under the sway of the
Maukha occupation. On the other hand, the fact that
it was the Andhrāhipati who had collected his army to
meet the Maukha in the Vindhyā region, far away from
his home perhaps suggests that the Vishnu-kunḍi had already
been conducting aggressive wars. But he failed miserably
when he confronted the Maukha. In this context the name
Indrabhaṭṭārika of the queen of Sarvavarman, the son of
Īśanavarman seems to attract our attention. For, it
strongly suggests a probability that she might have been
a daughter (or at least a close relative) of the Vishnu-
kunḍi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. In that case, it would
appear that the rivals of the conflict probably found it
more expedient to wave olive branches in the Vindhyā
forest and concluded a peace-treaty which resulted in the
marriage of a Vishnu-kunḍi princess with the Maukha prince
Sarvavarman.
After his conflict with the Maukhari, Indrabhaṭṭāräkavarman does not seem to have lived long. He died probably within a year or two. It is not known whether he died a natural death or fell in one of the battles he fought. Yet the fact that his son Vikramāndravarman II, though a boy was to be enthroned by the council of ministers (prakṛiti-maṇḍala) seems to imply that Indrabhaṭṭāräkavarman died perhaps in a battle (with a Nala king?) and that with a view to avert a probable confusion, his ministers might have enthroned the boy prince.

Indrabhaṭṭāräkavarman was not only a warrior and conqueror interested in the bloody wars alone. He was equally interested in the institutions of peace also. He is said to have gifted away plenty of lands, cows, girls, gold/etc. He maintained and supported ghaṭikās i.e. education institutions. His ghaṭikās were probably of the type of the one at Kāṇchī to which the Kadamba Mayūraśarman went sometime in the 4th century to get proficiency in all precepts. As no earlier monarchs of the Andhra region claims to have set up ghaṭikās, Indrabhaṭṭāräkavarman may be considered, perhaps, as the first king to establish ghaṭikās there.

There is nothing to indicate the exact place where the ghaṭikās of Indrabhaṭṭāräkavarman might have been situated. Asanapura is known to have a ghaṭikā in the subsequent age and the Eastern Chalukya king Jayasimha granted lands to the Brāhmaṇa member of that ghaṭikā.
Though Asanapura still remains to be satisfactorily identified, there is no doubt that it was within the Vishnukundī kingdom was a place of importance as indicated by the fact that the said Chālukya king issued some of his charters from that place. The donee of the Polamuru set II is said to be an inmate of the sātāna (i.e., ghatikā-sātāna) at Asanapura. As none of the Eastern Chālukyas is known to have set up any ghatikā, the one at Asanapura was the ghatikā, or one of the ghatikās, established by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. In this connection it is interesting to observe that Appayya Dīkṣita, the celebrated author of the 17th century, speaks of the famous ghatikās on the banks of the Gōḍaṇavī (i.e., in the Vishnukundī kingdom of ancient days) in which the Atharvavādī was also taught. The significance of the term ghatikā and the meaning of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's title have been dealt with separately (Appendix V).

Regarding the religion of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman it may be stated that he was the first Vishnukundī member to style himself as Paramāmāhēśāvara and Paramabrahmanaya though the earlier-rulers of the dynasty called themselves as devotees of the lord of the Śriparyata (i.e., Śiva) and followed the Brahmnic religion by performing innumerable Vedic scarifices. Similarly Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman was perhaps the first known ruler to bear the bīruda, Satyaśāraya. Another Satyaśāraya, viz. Pulakeśī I was probably his younger contemporary, as we saw earlier. The other
Satyārāyas viz. Pulakēśi II Satyārāya Dhruvaśrāja Indravarmān of the Goa plates and others belonged to subsequent times.
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