In the last chapter we saw that Indrabhattacharaka varman's energy restored the Vishnukundī power. But it was only for a short period. In other words, the evil days of the Vishnukundī kingdom were only postponed. During the period of the reigns of Indrabhattacharaka varman's two successors the Vishnukundī power started declining and it finally disappeared about 612 A.D. The disappearance of the Vishnukundīs is as mysterious as, or perhaps more mysterious than, their rise. Some circumstantial evidences alone can explain how their fall came.

(i) Vikramandradvarman II

Indrabhattacharaka varman was succeeded to the throne by his eldest son Vikramandradvarman II, also called sometimes Vikramandradhattacharaka varman. Of the latter we have got the following three epigraphs:

(1) Chikkulla Plates: Issued from his victorious camp at Lendulūra by Vikramandradvarman II, this charter records the royal gift of the village Rēgōṇam to the three-eyed god Sōmagirīsvaranātha (Śiva). The gift village was in the south-eastern direction of the village Rāvirēva on the Kṛishpabegṇā (i.e. Kṛishṇā) in Nātapāti District. The king
is described as the eldest son of Indrabhatārakaverman, as the grandson of Vikramendraverman (I) and as the great-grandson of Madhavaverman, the performer of eleven Āyamādhas and other sacrifices. The record is dated in the 5th lunar day of the 8th fortnight of the summer season of the 10th year of the reign of Vikramendraverman II. Unlike in other Vishnukundī copper-plate grants, no ārāmi or executor is mentioned here in this charter.

The place of issue of the charter viz. Lendulūra has been unanimously identified by scholars with the modern Dendalūra, about five miles north of Ellore (Elūru) in the Ellore taluk of the West Godaveri District. This place is on the ruins of the city of Vengi, the capital of the Salankayanas whom the Vishnukundis succeeded to power in the Coastal Andhra. Consequently, Lendulūra has been taken by scholars to be the Vishnukundī capital. However, Dr. Sircar seems to be right when he argues that the place was specially mentioned in the charter as a place of issue, not because it was the capital, but because it was not the normal residence (i.e. capital) of the Vishnukundī king. As we have already seen, the capital of the Vishnukundis was known by the name Trivaranagara and it is to be located in the modern Tiruvārur, after which a taluk in the Krishna District is named.

The village Rāvireva on the north-west of the gift village has been identified by R. Sewell with the modern Rāvirela (80° 10' E 16° 50' N) near the Krishnā in the
Nandigama taluk and this identification has been endorsed by other scholars also. Consequently the gift village Regongam is also to be located nearby. The territorial division Natapati is same as the Natavadi vishava of the Mangallu grant of Amma II and Nathavadi or Nathavati country mentioned in the inscriptions belonging to the 12th-13th centuries. They all come from the Nandigama taluk and speak of the places of the vishava that are to be located in the said taluk. So the division might have roughly corresponded to the modern Nandigama taluk. Kielborn took Sōmagiriśvaranātha to be the name of a temple. Another scholar believes it to be the name of a Linga established in a temple at Lendulura itself, while a third scholar locates the temple on the bank of the Krishna and concludes that it has been destroyed by the floods of that river. But in either way, it is a bit difficult to explain why the copper-plate grant to a temple in the Krishna or West Godavari District should travel all the way to be discovered at Chikkulla in the Tuni Taluk in the north-eastern most part of the East Godavari District. It seems that the name of the god Sōmagiriśvaranātha probably had some connection with the place Sōmagiri (83° 25' E, 17° 45' N) in the hilly tract of the Narasipatnam Taluk of the Visakhapatnam District, just adjacent of the Tuni Taluk.

(2) Tummalagudem Plates (Set II): This record is Buddhistic in nature. Unlike other records of the family, this charter begins with a verse that introduces the ruling
monarch, viz. Vikramendravarman II. Here he is referred to by his title Uttamārāya and is described as the son of Satyārāya which is apparently a title of Indrabhaṭṭārakaverman, the father of Vikramendravarman II. The record traces the royal genealogy as follows: There was the Mahārāja Gōvindavarman, a believer in the Sadgataśāgana and a builder of many vihāras; his son Mahārāja Mādhavarāman was the performer of eleven Asvamednas and other sacrifices; his son, through a Vākaṭaka princess, was the Mahārāja Vikramendra (I) a great poet and a follower of the Buddhism; his son was Indrabhaṭṭārakaverman, the conqueror of the whole of chakravarttikīrṣhātra and the terror to all his dāvādas; and his son, Vikramendrabhaṭṭārakaverman, who was enthroned by the council of ministers, even when he was a mere boy, was the ruling monarch. It may be pointed out that both Indrabhaṭṭārakaverman and the ruling monarch are not endowed with any title like Mahārāja or Rājan.

The epigraph then proceeds to say that on the Karttika ba. 8th of his eleventh regnal year, while being in the Paramabhaṭṭārikī-mahāvihāra, the ruling monarch Vikramendravarman gifted away the village Irundoga, for the enjoyment of the Buddhist monks evidently of the above vihāra. The said vihāra is stated to have been built by Paramabhaṭṭārikī-mahādēvi, the mother of Mādhavarāja, the princess of the Pṛptivīmūla family and the queen of Gōvindarāja who was a member of the Śrīparvata family and a builder of many Buddhist
stūpas and vihāras throughout the Deccan. The charter further continues to record that the king Uttamāśrāva issued the present edict in Śaka year 488, when he came returning first to Śakrapura after crippling the might of a Pallava king named Simha. A certain Śrīmūlarāja figures as the aśīrāpana or the executor of the charter, and he claims to have restored the fallen fortunes of the family of the overlord, i.e., Vikramēndravarman II.

The gift village Irundōga is difficult to identify. Indrapura, also known as Śakrapura, the place of the Buddhist monastery is the same as the one mentioned in the Tummalagudem set I, and it is to be identified with Indrapālagutta area (near Tummalagudem) where both the sets of the Tummalagudem charters have been discovered.

We have already seen how these two sets together help us to work out a correct genealogical scheme of the Vīshṇukūṇḍi kings. And it is needless to say that by equating the eleventh regnal year of Vikramēndravarman II with the Śaka 488, i.e. 566 A.D., the present charter helps us to solve the vexed problem of the Vīshṇukūṇḍi chronology. The executor of the grant viz. Śrīmūlarāja is to be identified with the chief Prīthivīmūla of the Godavari plates, or probably with a successor of him.

(3) Kandulapalem Plates: Earlier there was an occasion to refer to the angularity of the charters of this record
giving it an older look. The genealogical portion of the record follows the corresponding part of the Chikkulla plates. However, the ruling king Vikramendravarman II styles himself in the present record neither as a Maharaja, nor even as a raja. The charter records the royal gift of the village Tungi adjacent to Chamupura in the territorial division Vaijyarakara in favour of the Brāhma Svamisvarman, son of Rudrasarman, a resident of the locality Aki, a member of Kaundinya-gōtra and a student of the Āpastamba-sūtra. The king himself acted as the āina of the charter. The record is dated on the first lunar day (pratīpad) of the second fortnight of the summer season of the 14th regnal year of Vikramendravarman.

Scholars seem to be right in identifying the gift village Tungi with Tūpi (the head quarter of the taluk of that name in the East Godavari District) and the donee's native village Aki with Akividu (Railway station) in the Bhimavaram Taluk of the West Godavari District. Consequently in the region around Tungi itself we may have to look for the locality Chamupura and the territorial division Vaijetakara.

In spite of the fact that there are three records of Vikramendravarman II, the material for the study of the history of his time is very meager. For all his epithets are very general in nature. However, with the help of the Tummalagudem set II that equates the eleventh regnal year of
Vikramendravarman II with Saka 488 or 566-67 A.D. the date of his accession may confidently be fixed up sometimes in 566-57 A.D. In the last chapter we saw how, on the death of Indrabhattarakavarman the latter's son, the boy prince Vikramendravarman was enthroned by council of ministers. Perhaps he was not more than 16 years, at the time of his accession.

There are reasons for believing that all did not go well with this prince and that the Vishnukundī power must have started declining during his reign. We saw how the Malas, who had been kept at bay earlier by Indrabhattarakavarman, started once again asserting themselves under Bhavadattavarman's son Skandavarman of that family in the Koraput District area, and how Arthapatibhattarakaraka, another member of the family superseded the Vishnukundī in the Vidarbha region. Similarly the Gangas of Kalinga, who had been put down by Indrabhattarakavarman, soon gained their strength and declared independence as evidenced by the Ponmuturu plates of the king Mahāśāmantavarman of that family dated in the Ganga year 64 or c. 560 A.D., i.e., just about four years after Vikramendravarman's accession. Thus, almost all the acquisitions made by Indrabhattarakavarman by his military conquests seem to have been lost by Vikramendravarman.

Still worse misfortune soon befell the Vishnukundī. His home country of Vengi itself was invaded and occupied for a while by the powerful Simhavarman, a Pallava ruler of the
south. On an earlier occasion we saw how Madhavavarman II had crossed the Krishna, vanquished a Pallava ruler, perhaps Skandavarman I or his son Viravarman, of the Nellore-Guntur region and wrested from him the region of the Guntur District that originally belonged to the Anandas. We have also traced the circumstances under which subsequently the Vishpukundis lost that conquest to the Anandas obviously helped by the Pallavas. The latter seem to have been regaining their strength during the time of Viravarman’s son Skandavarman II of the Ongouc grant (Set I) and his son Simhavarman of the Jalapuram plates. Then the Pallava crown passed on to Simhavarman’s brother Vishpugopa’s son Simhavarman II.

The last mentioned Pallava must have been happy to see the weakness of the Vishpukundi boy prince Vikramendravarma II. In an opportune time he invaded and occupied a portion of the Vengi country, the doab between the Krishna and Godavari. In fact, an edict of him, dated in his eighth regnal year, records his gift of the village Mangaluru situated in the Vengorashtra, which is generally held to denote the Vengi country. Even the doubts that have been entertained in some quarters regarding the Pallava occupation of the Vengi country is now removed by the Tummalagudem set II that speaks of an actual encounter of Vikramendravarman II with the Pallava Simhavarman, as we shall see, in the Vengi country itself.

It is certain that Vikramendravarman did not play the part of the aggressor in that war. For, there is no evidence
to show that he ever crossed the Krishna and held any territory in the south of that river. On the other hand, there are the said Mangalaru grant of Simhavarman that records the Pallava's grant in Vengi country, and the Tummalagudem set II, that speaks of the sunken fortune of Vikramendravarman's family and side by side refers to his conflict with Simhavarman. If these charters are studied together, they would show beyond doubt that it was Simhavarman, the Pallava, who was the aggressor by invading the Vengi country and threatened the fortunes of the Vishpukuppi. Because Simhavarman seems to be occupying Vengi country only for a very short period, as we shall see presently, and because the Vishpukuppi seems to have continued to rule over Vengi even during that period, it is reasonable to think that the Pallava did not occupy the whole of the Krishna-Godavari doab. Yet, there is nothing to show which part of the doab the Pallava managed to occupy. In the last chapter it has been seen that the eastern or coastal part of the Krishna District proved to be vulnerable for an invader from the Guntur District viz. Madhavarman III. It is likely that the Pallava Simhavarman too followed the same path and occupied the same area. In that case one may perhaps have to look in the same region for his gift village Mangalur.

However the Tummalagudem set II tells us that after crippling the power of the Pallava, the king Vikramendravarman II returned first to Sakrapura or Indrapura, i.e. Tummalagudem in the Nalgonda District. This seems to indicate
that the avenue of the Pallava-Vishnuvardha encounter was not very much removed from the Tummalagudem area. Therefore it is more likely that Simhavarman crossed the Krishna somewhere in the Sattanapalle-Guntur region and occupied the western part of the Vengi country. Therefore the village Mangalur gifted by Simhavarman may be identified with that Mangallu in the Natvadi vishava which was gifted in favour of a Brahma nearly four centuries later by the Eastern Chalukya Amma II. That village has been correctly identified with the modern Mangallu or Mangallu in the Nandigama Taluk. Both the places are nearer to Tiruvuru or Trivananagara the Vishnuvardha capital since the days of Madhavavarman II.

Thus, it would look as if on account of the Pallava peril so very near, the Vishnuvardha had shifted his headquarters from Trivananagara to the earlier capital of the dynasty viz. Indrapura. That was why after vanquishing the Pallava, the Vishnuvardha first returned to that capital. This suggestion seems to draw further support from Vikramendravarman's successor Madhavavarman's claim to have delighted the heart of womenfolk of Trivananagara. A claim that seems to imply that just like Madhavavarman II, his great-grandson Madhavavarman IV also once again shifted the royal headquarters to Trivananagara presumably from Indrapura.

From the Tummalagudem set II one may also gather that the Pallava-Vishnuvardha war must have been fought sometime before the Karttika ba. 8 of Vikramendravarman's eleventh
regnal year equated with the Śaka year 488, i.e. sometime before October-November of 566 A.D. Vikramendravarman's other charter, viz., the Chikkalla plates, is dated in the eighth fortnight of the summer season of his own tenth regnal year, i.e. sometime in June-July of 565 A.D. But, not even the slightest scent of the Pallava peril is felt in that charter, even though it records a grant of a village in the Nandigama Taluk itself. On these considerations one may reasonably assign the Pallava invasion of the Vengi country to a period that separated the said two charters from one another. This period, viz. 565-66 A.D., perhaps also coincided with the eighth regnal year of the Pallava Simhavarman in which his Mangalur grant is dated. For, the flush his recent victory is betrayed by two of his epithets found in that record characterising him as "to have pervaded the world by his valour" and "to be very ambitious of conquering the whole earth." It is significant that these epithets are conspicuously absent in all the other charters of the king - both earlier and later.

The Tummalagudem set II gives us to understand that in 566 A.D., Vikramendravarman had succeeded in repelling the Pallava perhaps out of the Vengi country itself, with the help of Śrīmūlarāja. It must be observed that in spite of all the repeated set-backs, Vikramendravarman II seems to have been fortunate enough to enjoy the royal support of his feudatories at least during the time of danger. Just now we saw the part played by Śrīmūlarāja or Prithivīmūlarāja in
restoring the fallen fortune of Vikramendravarman. The Kamdulapalem and Chikkulla plates indicate that the monarch had an undisputed hold over the East Godavari and Visakhapatnam Districts. This would have been possible, only if he was able to command the support and obedience of his feudatories of the Rāmakāśyapa gotra ruling from Pīṣṭacūrā. Therefore Vikramendravarman’s claim to have been obeyed by the sāmantrya is not an empty boast.

Vikramendravarman’s last known date is the year 14th or 569-70 A.D. Though he came to power quite young, his reign period does not appear to have been much longer as we shall see in the next section. The theory that would make this monarch an adversary of the Chālukya king Pulkēṣi II has already been dismissed. Vikramendravarman was a staunch devotee of the god of Śrīparvata and, like his father, he styled himself as Pāramamahaśvēra. But it may be noted that his adherence to Śaivism did not prevent him from patronising the Buddhist vihāra at Indravpura.

All the records of Vikramendravarman II are unanimous in picturing him as a highly virtuous king. A record endows him with the title Uttamāśraya “a repository of the best (things)” or “an asylum of the best (men)”. We are completely in the dark regarding the queen and other members of his family.

Identifying Vikramahendravarman of the Polamuru set I
with Vikramendravarman II, and connecting the former name with the name of the Pallava Mahendravarman I (son of Simhayishna of Kâñchi) that occurs for the first time in the genealogical list of that family, J. Dubreuil had suggested that the Pallava Simhayishna might have married a daughter of Vikramendravarman, the Vishṇukūṇḍi, and gave his own son the maternal grandfather's name. By way of substantiating this theory of a Pallava-Vishṇukūṇḍi matrimonial contact, the said French scholar drew our attention to (1) the Telugu epithets of Mahendravarman I found in his inscriptions; (2) the striking similarity of the images of the lions that are found in Mahendravarman's cave at Siyamangalam and in the seal of the Chikkulla plates; and (3) the resemblance of the sculptures in the Pallava caves with those found in the Uḍḍavaḷi caves, which according to Dubreuil, are of the Vishṇukūṇḍi origin.

No doubt, on consideration of some chronological difficulties one has to drop the idea of identifying Vikramendravarman II with Vikramahendravarman of the Polamuru plates. Similarly, one may not completely agree with the theory of the Vishṇukūṇḍi authorship of the Uḍḍavaḷi caves. Yet there is nothing wrong, either chronologically or otherwise, with the above thesis of Dubreuil. For, even as early as 566 A.D. Vikramendravarman II could have got a daughter. And she could have been married to Simhayishna (acc. c. 575 A.D.), either during the time of Vikramendravarman II himself.
or during the time of his successor Madhavavarman IV. In that case the above alliance between the Pallava of Kanchi and Vishvakunji might have been an offset to neutralise the growing power of the Pallava Simhavarman of the Nellore-Guntur region. Such an alliance might have been quite beneficial to both the parties of it. It would have helped Simhavishnu in superseding his kinsmen of the Nellore-Guntur area and in annexing their territory by vanquishing, as he claims, both Simha (i.e. Simhavarman) and (his son) Vishnu (i.e. Vishnugopa II). The above alliance may also explain how Madhavavarman IV could embark upon a military conquest of the east, without the least fear of any armed aggression in his southern frontier by the expansionist Pallava neighbour Mahendravarman I whose presence in the Guntur region is vouchsafed by his inscription at Chezerla. Therefore to reject summarily the above suggestion of Dubreuil does not seem to be quite proper, though one may still wait for some stronger evidence to come up for putting the theory on firmer grounds.

(ii) Madhavavarman IV

The successor of Vikramendravarman II was Madhavavarman IV. The following record is the only source of information about him.

Polemuru Plates set I: Those who would assign this record to a period earlier than that of the Chikkulla and
Ramatirtham plates find its characters quite unsuitable to their theory. Hence they have suggested that the record under question might be a later copy of an earlier record. But, as will be seen subsequently, this record is to be placed in c. 612 A.D. The palaeography of the record is normal for that date and it bears some resemblance to the palaeography of the Hyderabad plates of Pulakesi II dated Saka 536 i.e. 612 or 613 A.D. Similarly the language of the record is more flowery than that of the other records of the family and it contains some śleśālankāras or puns as we find in the Vāsavadatta, Kādambari etc.

Issued by the Maharāja Madhavavarman Janārāya, the son of Govinda varman Vikramārāya and the grandson of Vikramendra, this charter records a royal gift of the village Pulombūru situated on the banks of the Daliyavāvi in the Guddavādi vishaya together with four nivartanas of cultivable land in the village Mayindavatki, in favour of a certain Brāhmaṇa named Śivaśārman, who was the son of Damaśārman, and the grandson of Rudraśārman and who was a resident of Kuṇgūra in Karmarāṣṭra and belonged to the Taittirīya school and to the Gautama ēstra. Madhavavarman is credited with the performance of eleven Āśvamedhas, the Kratusāhasra and the Hīranyagarbha-mahādana. While he is endowed with the title Maharāja, both his father and grandfather bear no such title, not even the title rājan.
The record is dated in the 48th (or 40th) regnal year of the king and the actual occasion, on which the grant was made, is stated to be a lunar eclipse that fell on the full-moon day of the month Phālguna. It is also said that the king made the grant when he was just crossing the river Godāvari with a view to conquer the eastern direction. Two officers, one designated Hastikōsa and the other Virakōsa, acted as the executors of the grant.

All the places mentioned in the record have already been identified by scholars with certainty. Thus, the grant village Pulombūra is the modern Polamuru the findsport of the charter in the Ramachandrapuram taluk, East Godavari District. The Guddavādi Vishaya, which is also mentioned in the Ipur plates (I), comprised as we have already seen, part of the East Godavari district. The Daṃiyavāvi river, on the banks of which the gift village was situated, may be the modern Tulyabhāga, a distributary of the Godāvari and on the northern banks of this, Polamuru is now situated. Mayindavēṭaki where four nivartanas of land were given is nothing but the modern Mahāndravāḍa, just adjacent to Polamuru. Kuppura, the native village of the donee in Karmarāṣṭra may be identified with the present Kondūru in the Sattenapalle taluk of the Guntur District. The Karmarāṣṭra is known to have comprised parts of the Nellore and Guntur Districts.

As in the present grant, so in the Polamuru set II and in the Godavari set I also the officials Hastikōsa and
Virakōśa are mentioned. Fleet held that these two officials "kept the purses and made disbursements on account of, respectively, the establishment of elephants and heroes who were to be rewarded for deeds of valour." However the expressions mahāmātra "drivers or trainers of elephants" and yūdha "warriors" that follow hastikōśa and virakōśa in the present record seem to favour H. Krishna Sastri's contention that by these two designations "perhaps the officers in command of the elephant force and infantry are meant."

To fix up the 48th (or 40th) regnal year of Mādhavavarman IV in which his Polamuru charter is dated, the following three important points may be taken into consideration.

(1) Vikramendravarman II, whom Mādhavavarman IV succeeded, ruled, as we have already seen, at least for 14 years, i.e. upto 670 A.D.

(2) As we shall see later, it is now certain that by 616 A.D. the Chāḷukya Pulakēṣī II, had already set out for subjugating the Andhra country and he was actually camping near Koleru lake in the Godavari District in that year. It is very significant that not a single record of the Western and Eastern Chāḷukyas—including the Aihole Prāṣasti, noted for its vivid and detailed description of Pulakēṣī's campaigns—speaks of the Vishṇukūḍis and the Chāḷukyan
victory over them. In this connection one should not also lose sight of the fact that no Andhra king, or Andhra dynasty—let alone the Vishnukundis for that matter—has been mentioned in the Chalukyan records as being vanquished by Pulakesi II. Therefore it is quite reasonable to conclude that there was no Vishnukundi in the Andhra when Pulakesi II entered the political arena there. This may also probably indicate that the powerful Vishnukundi dynasty had just disappeared and no king or dynasty worth the name had been successful enough to establish itself on the ruins of the Vishnukundi power, when the Chalukya invaded the country. Then it would naturally follow that not much time had passed between the last date of the last Vishnukundi and the date of the Chalukyan conquest of the Andhra country.

(3) The set II of the Polamuru plates is dated in the fifth year of the Eastern Chalukya king Jayasimha I that correspond to c. 638 A.D. A comparative study of the contents of both the sets of Polamuru plates would show beyond any doubt that the donee of the set II was the son of the donee of the set I, of Madhavavarman IV. Therefore without any assumption one should naturally believe that the last mentioned charter must be earlier than the other (i.e. of 638 A.D.) only by a generation i.e. 25 to 30 years.

So taking into consideration these facts the date of the present charter may be fixed. During the period under question the lunar eclipse fell on the following Phalgunī
Pūrṇimā days:

1) 574 A.D. Feb. 21, Wednesday. 6 2\frac{1}{12} of the eclipse
2) 575 A.D. Feb. 10, Sunday. Total eclipse
3) 593 A.D. Feb. 21, Saturday. Total eclipse
4) 594 A.D. Feb. 10, Wednesday. 6 2\frac{1}{12} of eclipse
5) 612 A.D. Feb. 22, Tuesday. 7 2\frac{1}{12} of eclipse
6) 621 A.D. Feb. 12, Thursday. 8 6\frac{1}{12} of eclipse

The last (i.e. the 6th) date, viz. 621 A.D. February 12, may be safely dropped as it fell after the Chālukyan occupation of Andhra. The first two dates, viz. 574 A.D. and 575 A.D., may also be set aside as they are removed from 638 A.D. (i.e. the date of Polamuru set II) by more than two generations, i.e. about 63 years. Moreover they would drive one to the belief that the regnal period of Mādhavavarman IV started 48 (or 40) years earlier, i.e. about 527 A.D. (575 minus 48) when, as we have already seen, Indrabhāṭṭāraka had just started ruling. The third and fourth dates also, viz. 593 and 594 A.D., if accepted, would assign the accession of Mādhavavarman IV, to 545-46 A.D. (593 or 594 minus 48), when Indrabhāṭṭārakavarmarman was still ruling all powerful.

One may argue that the date of Polamuru I is only 40th year and hence Mādhavavarman IV could have ascended the throne in 554 A.D. (i.e. 594 minus 40), i.e. soon after the death of
Indrabhattārakavarman. Even then, the gap between the two sets of the Polamuru plates would be about 44 years (638 minus 594) which certainly requires some special justifications.

On the other hand, the fifth date of the above list, viz. 612 A.D. February 22nd, would satisfy all the requirements. It would reduce the gap between the said two charters to only 26 years (638 minus 612 = 26). It would also reduce to four or less years the period of confusion that followed the fall of the Vīśṇukunḍi and preceded the Chāḷukya occupation of Vēṅgi. Again the above date would assign the beginning of Madhavavarman’s independent rule either to c. 564-65 A.D., (viz. when the weak rule of Vikramendravarman II had already started) or to 572-73 A.D. (i.e. after the date of Kandulapalem plates). Thus on consideration of these facts, the fifth date, viz. 612 A.D. February 22nd, may safely be accepted as the date of the Polamuru set I.

On more occasions than one it has been observed that Vikramendre of Polamuru I was identical not with Vikramendravarman II but with Vikramendravarman I. So, the relationship between Vikramendravarman II and Madhavavarman IV was that of cousin brothers, the latter being the son of the former’s paternal uncle Govindavarman II. The last mentioned chief viz. Govindavarman II obviously was a younger brother Indrabhattārakavarman. Circumstances seem to suggest that he was a governor of some province, or a military commander,
under his elder brother. As his descriptions indicate, he probably took active part in the wars fought by Indrabhutaśarakavarman and deserved the title Vikramaśraya or "repository of valour".

Gövindavarman II probably died about 564-65 A.D. or 572-73 A.D. and was succeeded by his son Màdhavavarman IV to the governorship. We have already seen the weakness of Vikramendravarman II at the centre and his inability to preserve the kingdom intact. No wonder some of his feudatories, slowly turned hostile. It seems that after 572 A.D. Màdhavavarman succeeded Vikramendravarman II to the imperial throne. That Màdhavavarman IV got the vast earth, i.e. the whole of the Vishnukupāi kingdom, not from his father Gövindavarman, but from Vikramendravarman is vouched for by his own record. It is not known whether Vikramendravarman II died without any male issue to succeed him and consequently the throne went to his cousin, or whether Màdhavavarman IV himself managed to usurp the throne. Yet, the performance of the Ásvamedhas by Màdhavavarman IV seems to favour the second alternative. At any rate, he soon vanquished the foes of his own and of the empire and revived the glory of the Vishnukupāi dynasty. By way of celebrating his achievement of the sovereignty, recently acquired, and by way of heightening the prestige of his own and of the dynasty, he performed, more than once, Ásvamedhas and other sacrifices. In doing so he was perhaps influenced by the glorious example
of his illustrious great-grandfather Madhavavarman II. The Janāravī Chandāvichiti joins the Polamuru set I in bearing witness to Janārava Madhavavarman's victory over his enemies and to his performance of different great sacrifices. The passage under question in that work runs as follows:

\[
\text{Sa bhūpatir-udāra-dhīr-īavyātī sampad-śēkārayō}
\]
\[
\text{Janārava tī śrīvya vahati nāma sārtham vibhuh !}
\]
\[
\text{iitā viiita-satrupā iṣagni vēna muḍhā chirām}
\]
\[
\text{mākhāir-urūbhīr-aśhutair-Maghayaḥ jayārāj-apī !}
\]

We have already seen how Madhavavarman IV, once again following the example of Madhavavarman II, transferred the royal headquarters of Trīvaranagara from Indrapura to which Vikramendravarman had been compelled to shift the capital earlier. Thus after Madhavavarman II his great-grandson Madhavavarman IV alone had the occasion to perform the Aśvamedhas, etc. and to bring glory to Trīvaranagara once again. Other achievements of Madhavavarman IV are not known.

Some scholars are of the opinion that the expressions (1) sattvam Kaiśavam, (2) kāntiṃ = Aindavīṃ and (3) Vikrama (in Vikramā-arpas-bhūri-bhūp) of the Polamuru plates (lines 15-16) denote respectively (1) the hill fort Harivatsakotṭa of the Upḍavaṭikā grant, (2) the city Indukānti and (3) the king Rapavikrama Pulakesī I. Therefore it has been believed that Madhavavarman captured the said hill-fort and the above
city from the Chālukya Pulakesī I. In support of this contention our attention is drawn to a certain Jayasimha, who figures as the commander of the said fort in the Upḍavatikā grant and whom Dubreuil had doubtfully identified with the early Chālukya Jayasimha, the grandfather of Pulakesī I. Similarly we are also reminded of the epithet Ārit-endukāntih of Pulakesī I in the Aihole Praśasti (verse 7). For, Dr. Fleet had once taken indukānti of that description as a geographical name of a city believed to be in possession of Pulakesī I.

But it is needless to point out that to interpret sattvam Kaišavam of our inscription in the sense of the Harivatsakōṭṭa fort may be very far fetched. Similarly Kielhorn who edited the Aihole praśasti last has not taken indukānti as a name of a city. Even Fleet, though once held it to contain a reference to a city, had rightly dropped that idea as suggested by Dr. Hultzsch. Above all, as we have already seen, Pulakesī I was a younger contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭarakaravāman. He started ruling c.535 A.D. and continued to be on the throne till 566 A.D. when Vikramendra-varman II was still on the throne. Therefore the theory of a military confrontation between Pulakesī I and Madhavavarman IV may not be easy to maintain. On the other hand, as we are going to see later, some sort of a friendly relationship seems to have prevailed between the Chālukyas and the Vishnuvids.
In the Janäśrayi Chhandövichiti there is a dāndaka running Yena prāchāya etc. in which Mayūradvaja i.e. Skanda-Kartikēya is praised to have split the peak of the Kraunēcha mountain, likened to the kumuda. Believing that the expression Mayūradvaja denotes Janäśraya Mādhavavarman IV also, it has been suggested by some that the above passage contains a reference to Janäśraya's conquest of the South-West region, i.e. the region of the diggaja named Kumuda. But it is to be pointed out that the above dāndaka compares the whiteness of the Kraunēcha mountain with that of the silver, Śiva's bull, moon-light and kumuda. Therefore, the last mentioned word means "water-lily" and not the diggaja of the name. Again it is not known whether Mādhavavarman IV had a title like Mayūradvaja. Moreover the above passage is given in the work as an example of a particular type of composition known as dāndaka. It is very likely that this example also, just like many other ones in that work, is a mere quotation from another earlier work popular at that time. Therefore the passage may not refer to any achievement of Janäśraya at all.

Mādhavavarman IV is endowed with a few interesting titles. They are (1) avasīta-vīvidha-dīva-stri-vara-nagara-bhavana-gata-parama-yuvati-jana-viharapa-ratiḥ and (2) daśā-gata-sakala-dharapī-tala-narapatī. As both these titles are unique and are not met with anywhere else in epigraphs they have puzzled the scholars. The significance of these titles
has been discussed at length individually. The first of the above titles praises Madhavavarman's saintly disposition, his just rule resulting in the disappearance of all the diwās or ordeals; and his change of capital to Trivaramagaram. Similarly the second title praises him as the lord of the entire chakravarttikṣētra i.e. the territory from southern ocean to the Himalayas.

By 612 A.D. Madhavavarman IV must have set right the affairs at home and must have felt strong enough to set out on a military expedition to conquer a country in the east. This eastern country was no doubt the Kalinga kingdom of the Gāṅgas which started asserting itself by throwing off the Vishṇuṇḍi yoke after the days of Indrabhāṭṭārakavarmam. In fact, in Gāṅga year 79 (c. 575 A.D.) the Gāṅga king Hastivarman Rājaśīha Rāpabhīta, perhaps a son of Indradevarman I had already assumed the title Mahārāja and actually issued a charter gifting a village in the Śrīkākulam area which, as the Ramatirtham plates show, had been well within the dominions of the Vishṇuṇḍis. Therefore it is natural that Madhavavarman IV felt it necessary put down the Gāṅga. The Vishṇuṇḍi must have made some arrangement to safeguard his frontiers in the south against the expanding Pallavas under Mahēndravarman I, and in the west against the rising Chālukyas under Pulakēśi II. We have already seen a possibility of some alliance between the Vishṇuṇḍi and the Pallava. Similarly we shall also see a probability of some understanding, in about 610 A.D., between the Chālukyas and Vishṇuṇḍis.
We are totally in the dark regarding the course and fate of Madhavavarman's campaign in the east. All that is known is only that he embarked upon that campaign and had just crossed the Godavari for that purpose in 612 A.D. Mysteriously enough no more information has come to us regarding either Madhavavarman IV or any subsequent members of his family. When Pulakesi II captured Pishṭapura and fought on the banks of the Koleru lake in 616 A.D., there was no Vishṇukundī to resist him. It will be seen later that it was only a certain Prithivīmahārāja who was ruling over Pishṭapura at the time of Pulakesi's invasion. Similarly it was only Prithivīyuva-raja of the Chezerla inscription who gave a stiff fight to the Chālukyan invader on the banks of the Koleru lake. Moreover, some of the later records of the Eastern Chālukyas give us to understand that Kubja Vishṇuvardhana wrested the earth i.e. the Vengi country from certain Durjaya. Thus the end of Madhavavarman IV as well as that of the Vishṇukundī family is completely shrouded in mystery. However basing on the available circumstantial evidences, the following course of events may be suggested subject to future discoveries and researches on this question.

It has been accepted on all hands that the family of Prithivīmahārāja of Pishṭapura stood in a feudatory relationship to the Vishṇukundīs. As will be seen later, the Tandivada and llavalli grants of that Prithivīmahārāja
are to be assigned to a period in between the disappearance of the Vishnukundis on one hand and the advent of the Chalukya on the other. These grants indicate that the above chief had attained independence about the end of his career and that he was ruling over a territory that extended from the Virajōnagara (i.e. Jajpur in the Cuttack District) in the Kalinga country in the north down to the Kolēru lake in the heart of the Vēngi country in the south. There can be scarcely any doubt that this chief could have carved out for himself such a vast kingdom only on the ruins of the Vishnukundis empire. Therefore it may be logical to infer that Mādhavavarman IV, perhaps being followed by his feudatories like Prithivīmahārājā fared very well in executing his ambitious scheme of Kalinga conquest and penetrated victoriously as far north as Virajōnagara or Jajpur. But his victory in that region probably turned to be a great disaster owing to some reason unknown to us now. Probably he died in the battle itself or soon afterwards. Maybe, there was no suitable prince living in the Vishnukundis family to succeed Mādhavavarman IV and to consolidate his conquests. In any case, one may have to believe that the Vishnukundis became the victim of his own ambition of the Kalinga conquest.

Thus seems to have come to an end the glorious epoch of the Vishnukundis quite unexpectedly, creating all on a sudden a sort of political vacuum in the Vēngi country. It is well known that as in atmosphere, so in politics too a vacuum
is always abhorred. Naturally a stormy period of civil war and struggle for supremacy must have ensued. Prithivi- mahārāja, who, as we saw earlier, followed the suzerain to Kalinga, would waste no time. Perhaps he found himself independent and therefore he proclaimed himself as the master of the vast area of his departed master's kingdom. Similarly Prithivyavarāja, who was ruling over the Guntur area owing allegiance to the Pallava Mahēndravarman I, found it very convenient to march across the Krishna with his huge army and occupied the Vengi country as far as the Kolera lake.

Now the political instability and confusion must have made the region quite ripe for a take-over by the Chalukya Pulakūśi II, the master conqueror of the age.

A situation of almost the same nature repeated itself in the history of Vengi country about three centuries later. In 922 A.D. The Eastern Chalukya Vijayaditya IV Kollabigaña undertook his Kalinga campaign, won a spectacular victory in the same Virajāpuri itself (i.e. Jōjur), but died either in the battle or soon afterwards. At that time too there ensued a stormy period of about a decade and a half that witnessed civil wars and struggle for supremacy. Then also the foreign invaders, viz. the Rāṣṭrakūṭas tried, their best to make profit out of the disturbed conditions of the region. The only difference was this: Unlike the Vishnukundī family, the Eastern Chalukya dynasty was fortunate enough to have princess to continue the rule and to revive the glory of the family.
Madhavavarman IV was not only a reviver of his family prestige and a conqueror, he was also a noted patron of letters. A prosodical treatise called Ṣaṅśravī Chandāvīchiti is named after this king. It is written by a scholar named Gaya-svāmin in the form of a commentary on some Śūtras or aphoristic rules. As has been already pointed out, the king Ṣaṅśrava is praised, in the introductory verse of this work, as having put down all his enemies and to have performed many great sacrifices. As accepted by many, this Ṣaṅśrava was none other than Madhavavarman IV Ṣaṅśrava. To think of the Western Chālukya prince Avariṣṭārṣṇa Pulakēśī of Gujarat (739 A.D.) in this context is to ignore totally that the title of that prince was not mere Ṣaṅśrava but Avariṣṭārṣṇa and that he is nowhere known as a performer of great sacrifices. This work on prosody may be assigned to the first decade of the 7th century at the latest. Incidentally this may be pointed out: This work quotes a verse from Kiratarjuniya of Bhāravi. Consequently the composition of the last mentioned work may have to be assigned to the last quarter of the 6th century at the latest.
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