CHAPTER VIII

FEUDATORIES

So far we studied in detail the history of the sovereign family of the Vishnukundis. But, it was only through the feudatories that the paramount sovereigns were able to carry on the activities of their kingdom — both political and administrative. The feudatories were first subdued by a member of the paramount family and slowly they developed a sense of loyalty towards the central authority. However, as in the history of any other part of India, so also in the history of Vengi too, the centrifugal tendencies had always been stronger than the centripetal forces. So whenever the central authority fell into weak and incapable hands, the feudal lords found it convenient to declare independence. They fought against the assertive centripetal forces, sometimes successfully and sometimes otherwise. One of the feudatory families were almost coeval with the paramount dynasty. With the overlords they seem to have risen to power and with them they disappeared once for all. At the same time, another family that was ruling far away from the place of the centre often successfully declared independence and turned to be a great menace that was one of the causes that led to the disappearance of the suzerain family. Still another family tried for a short while to fill up the political vacuum created by the disappearance of the house of the overlords. The history of three such feudal families that was inter-connected with the history of the Vishnukundis, may
be studied briefly in this chapter.

(1) **The Prithivimulas**

From the point of history the family of Prithivimulas was the earliest of the feudatories of the Vishnukundis. We have the following charters for the study of the history of the family.

(1) **The Godavari Plate Set I**. This charter was issued by the Rajan Prithivimula from his victorious camp at Kandali. The chief is described as the son of Prabhakara Maharaja, as a protector of the varnasrama dharma and as a paramamahesvara. The charter records the chief’s order addressed to the officers and others of the Tajupa vishaya informing them of his grant of the village Chuyipaka, surrounded by four localities (names given) in the above vishaya as a tax-free agrahara in favour of 43 Atharvanikas (scholars in the Atharvaveda) of belonging to the Upadyaya-kula. The grant was made at the instance of Indradhiraja, who was the son of Mitavarman, a dvija of the locality called Mapalkudi, who was one among the chieftains, rising to root out Indrabhaṭṭāraka and who overpowered an elephant of the same. In the benedictory portion, the chief requests that the grant may be protected by all, especially by the officers hastikōsa and vīrakōsa.

The grant was made on the 3rd lunar day of the 4th fortnight in the rainy season of the 25th year of the reign
presumably of Prithivimula himself, as we shall see subsequently.

The Tālipāka vishaya of the record may be identified with the region around the modern village Tātipāka in the Nagaram island of the Razzul Taluk of the East Godavari District. For, that island is even now known by the name Taṭipākasīma. The place of issue of the charter, viz. Kāndali, may be identical with the present Kāndali about five miles south-east of the above Tātipāka. The gift village Chūhipaka and the places mentioned as its adjacent localities are difficult to identify.

Viewing the chief's title Ṛalan, as an indication of his subordinate rank, Dr. Fleet entertained a doubt that the regnal year given in the record might be of the reign of Prithivimula's overlord. But it is now known that the overlords of the chief's family were the Vishrūkangis and that Prithivimula's contemporary was Indrabhāṭarakaivarman. At the same time, as we have already seen, the record gives us a graphic description of the overthrow of that Indrabhāṭaraka himself by the confederacy of the chiefs including Prithivimula. And this description testifies the overflowing joy and pride of the chief on the independence which he had newly won, or rather asserted successfully. Therefore it seems to be highly improbable that he could have dated that record of his in the regnal year of the vanquished sovereign, although there were instances of independent
feudatories like the Parivrajas, Maitrakas etc., dating their records in the years of the eras founded by the family of their former overlords, viz. the Guptas. Again, as we have seen more than once, even the sovereign kings like Indrabhattacharakavarman etc., also are found endowed with the simple title raja in their own records. Therefore the 25th year of the record may better be counted from the commencement of the rule of Prithivimula rather than that of an overlord.

(2) The Godavari Plates, set. II: This is a Buddhist record. It is issued from a locality called Guptapasaapura by Prithvi Siddharaja otherwise called Mularaja, the son of Prabhakararaja. In the preamble of the record both the father and the son are endowed with titles which are also found in the Godavari set I. One notable addition here is the epithet that credits Prithivimula with the victory in many chaturdanta battles—a title which is prominent in the description of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman in the Vishpakapūḍi charters.

The formal portion of the charter records the chief's order addressed to the officers etc. of the Talupaka vishaya informing them to the following: The chief gave his beloved son Harivarman the village Kaṭṭučēnuvulu bounded by three villages (names given). The Harivarman, on his part, gave away the village, free of taxes, for the enjoyment of the four necessaries (chatush-pratyaya-paribhoj-ārtham) of
the community of the Buddhist monks, of all quarters, residing in a great monastery. The prince did so, after getting the permission of his father and after informing the navakarma-
vāpār-ādhikrita, an inmate of the monastery. It is said that the above establishment, i.e. monastery, was built by the prince himself at the foot of the hill in Guṇapāśapura. At the end, the charter is said to have been made for the sake of the Tambraparnīyas or those hailing from the place Tambraparni, i.e. Ceylon. And this denotes that the monks of the monastery had hailed from that country. The charter bears no date.

The Tālupāka vishaya has already been identified. It is difficult to identify the place of issue of the charter viz. Guṇapāśapura. Yet, the expression pāsapura reminds us of the present Pāsarlapūdi, a village about 3 or 4 miles to the east of Tātipāka. One may guess that the present name of the above village might have derived from something like Pāsavārupūdi, "a town or village of rope-makers", connected with Pāsapura, "a town of ropes." This place was probably not the capital of the chief as believed by some writers. For, Tālupāka was more probably the headquarters of the vishaya in which Guṇapāśapura also was included. Again, the former place "seems to have been at one time a place of some importance." So one may take that place itself as the capital of the chief. The gift village and its bordering localities are not identifiable.
As we have already seen, this charter was issued by the Vishṇukūpḍī Vikramendravarman II in his eleventh regnal year corresponding to Śaka 488 (566 A.D.) and it records the king's grant of a village to the monastery built at Indrapura by the queen Paramamahādevī, who was the mother of Madhavarāja, and the wife of Govindarāja and who was born of the rājavrāja, or royal family, of Prithivīmūla. As the names of the husband and son of this queen are given, it is not unreasonable to expect the name of her father also given along with — rather than a simple mention of her family — in the portion describing her birth. So, one may tentatively take her father's name to be Prithivīmūla.

The executor of the charter was one Śrī-Mūla who claims to be the foremost among the nīpas, i.e. the feudalatories of the king; to be born of a famous family; and to have restored the sunken fortunes of his master, viz., Vikramendravarman II, the issuer of the charter.

As we have already seen, the above Govindarāja and Madhavavrāja of this charter were no other than Govinda-varman I and his son Madhavavaran II respectively. Therefore we may have to take this Govindavaran's father-in-law Prithivīmūla to be an elder contemporary of his son-in-law. Hence, his reign period may have to be assigned to the second quarter of the fifth century. So, he was evidently much earlier than, and different from, his namesake who fought
against Indrabhaṭṭaraka sometimes before 535 A.D. Similarly we have also seen that the Godavari set I is dated in the issuer's 25th regnal year that fell sometime before 535 A.D. Consequently that chief's accession is to be assigned to a date earlier than 510 A.D. On the other hand, the Tummala-gudem set II is dated in 566 A.D. i.e. more than 56 years after the accession of Prithivīmula of the Godavari plates. If it is permissible to allot 56 years of reign to that chief, then the executor of the Gummalagudem set II i.e. Śrī Mūla, may be identified with the same Prithivīmula of the Godavari plates. If, on the other hand, to allot such a long reign to a ruler without definite grounds is not acceptable, then this Śrī Mūla may have to be viewed as later than, and different from, that Prithivīmula. Having thus studied the necessary records, we may try to connect the facts furnished by them.

The family, whose history is now under study may be called Prithivīmula dynasty as stated in the Tummala-gudem set II. From the above account we come to know of four or five members of the family. (1) Prithivīmula I, the father-in-law of Govindavarman; (2) Prabhākara; (3) his son Prithivīmula II, of the two sets of the Godavari plates; (4) his son Harivarman; and probably (5) Śrī Mūla, the ajāṭhāpāna of the Tummala-gudem set II.

The members of this family were feudatories of the Vishnukundis at least since the time of Govindavarman I;
been assigned to c. 422-62 A.D. Prior to that time, no information about this family has come to us. One cannot be quite sure about the extent of the kingdom of its members. Yet, from their charters it would appear that the kingdom included the region of the modern Razołu Taluk, which was just adjacent to the Vengi kingdom of the Vishnukundis. Again, the official designationsbastikōsa and vīrakōsa seem to be peculiar to the kingdom of Prithivimūla. If so, the reference to the same in the two sets of the Polamuru plates may also indicate that a part of the neighbouring Ramachandrapuram Taluk was also included in the kingdom. As we have seen earlier, the capital of the kingdom was perhaps Tālupāka.

It was very probably Prithivimūla I who achieved some political status and increased the prestige of the family by means of a matrimonial alliance with the Vishnukundīs. He gave in marriage his daughter Paramamahādevī to his overlord Gōvindavarman. As a result of this marriage was born Mādhavavarman II, the greatest of the Vishnukundis. Nothing is known regarding the religion of Prithivimūla I. But, we know that his daughter favoured Buddhism and built a Buddhist vihāra in Indrapura.

In course of time there arose in the family a king called Prabhākara. The relationship between that chief and Prithivimūla I is not known. Yet, it is clear that the latter’s great-great-grandson Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, through his daughter, was vanquished by Prithivimūla of the Godavari
plates. Therefore taking the period and family into account it may be reasonable to guess that the vanquisher Prithi-
vīmūla II too was a great-great-grandson of Prithivīmūla I through the latter's son. If so, Prabhākara was the great-grandson of him. Then it would follow that between them, there might have been two chiefs in the family ruling roughly between 450 and 490 A.D.

Nothing is known about the achievements of Prabhākara. His epithets, only two in number, are identical in both the sets of the Godavari charters. They describe, in general terms, the chief's wide fame and devotion to god, Brahmāpas and elders. His title mahāraja, if it is really significant, may probably indicate that he had enhanced the dignity of his family and raised his status to that of a mahāraja. If this is true, then it would appear that, being encouraged by the weakness of Vikramendravarman I, and by the general confusion prevailing during the period, Prabhākara successfully threw off the Vishṇukūḍa yoke and became independent. This was perhaps the reason why both the sets of the Godavari charters of his son give the genealogical account of the family starting only from this chief, the first independent ruler of the dynasty. Prabhākara's epithets indicate that he was a follower of the Vedic religion.

Prabhākaramahāraja was succeeded by his son Prithi-
vīmūla II sometime in the first decade of the sixth century. His name also appears in the forms of Śrīmūla, and Prithivī-
śrīmūla. This indicates that the name of the chief was only Mūla and the words Prithivī and Śri were added to it evidently with a view to give a dignified look to the nomenclature, just as they were added to the name of the Eastern Chāluṇkya Jayasimha of the subsequent age. During the time of Prithivīmūla II, the independence of the family was in jeopardy. For, Vikramendravarman’s son and successor Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman started his warlike career and tried to bring under him the rebellious chiefs. It has been shown earlier how different chiefs joined together against Indrabhaṭṭāraka and overwhelmed him in a fierce battle of elephants, in which Prithivīmūla’s ally, perhaps a subordinate ally at that time, Indrādhirāja, the Gāṅga, played an important role. The Gopāvari set I narrates how the last mentioned chief overpowered in the battle an elephant called Kamuda, that dashed against another elephant named Suprātika which was mounted by somebody (name not given), and which obviously belonged to the side of the confederates. The circumstances seem to suggest that the elephant Suprātika was probably 15 mounted by Prithivīmūla himself, and that in a sense of gratitude towards Indrādhirāja for saving him in the battle, Prithivīmūla, issued the charter. An almost parallel instance may be found in Nandivarman Pallavamalla (c. 730-96 A.D.) 16 who issued his Udayendiram plates, with a view to reward the heroism of the sword (aśīdhārā-nilakray-ārtham), shown by his brave general Udayachandra in rescuing the monarch in the battle at Mappaikkudi.
The victorious Prithivimula issued the charters in his own regnal years. The combat described in the Godavari set I, has already been assigned to a period sometime earlier than 535 A.D. The vivid description of the rise of the confederates and of the achievement of Indradhiraja on one hand and the grant in appreciation of the latter's help on the other, go to indicate that there might have been not much gap between the date of the battle and that of the grant, i.e. the 25th regnal year of Prithivimula II.

Apart from issuing charters in his own regnal year, Prithivimula appropriated for himself the title of the vanquished Indrabhatjaraka as a mark of his victory. His two epithets viz. aneka-chaturdanta etc., and satata-sambhumi etc., were originally of Indrabhatjaraka. It is significant that the above epithets found in the Godavari set II are conspicuous by their absence in the Godavari set I. On that ground the former charter may be assigned to a period later than that of the latter. However the chief must have issued the former record before he lost his independence. Further, he followed the example of the Vishnukunjis in other respects also. Like them, he styled himself as Paramamahesvara and Paramabrahmapya, and claimed to have gifted away cows, lands etc. in plenty. These claims were not empty boasts. His Godavari charter I testifies that he actually colonised a number of Brahmans well versed in the Atharvaveda. Like the Vishnukunjis he encouraged
the varṇāramadharma and yet, did not hesitate to show favour to the religion of the Buddha. Thus in several respects Prithivimūla II seems to be the greatest of the family. His simple title Raṇan, instead of indicating his subordinate rank, seems to exhibit the influence his contemporary Vishṇuṇandi Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman who, instead of his sovereign status, styled himself only as Raṇan.

The independent status which the family enjoyed was not destined to last much longer. Within a few years, perhaps during the last days of Prithivimūla himself or in the beginning of his son's time, Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman, as we saw earlier, asserted himself by crushing the confederacy successfully and by bring under him the chiefs of the family. Prithivimūla II was probably succeeded by his son Harivarman. It is a matter of interest that for the first time we find now in this family a prince bearing the name ending in varman. Obviously in naming the princes of the family also the practice of the Vishṇuṇanis was copied by Prithivimūla. Regarding Harivarman the only information given by his father's charter is that he fought successfully many fierce battle and that he favoured the Buddhism. From the above it may be guessed that he might have taken a leading part, more than once, in Prithivimūla's battles against the Vishṇuṇandi.

The next known member of the family was Śrīmūla who figures as the adīśōpana of Vikramendravarman II in 566 A.D. As has been pointed out earlier, he may, or may not, be
identical with Prithivīmūla II. In the latter alternative there is nothing to indicate his relationship with Harivarman. Yet, the typical name of his seems to indicate that he was most probably the son of Harivarman and was named after his illustrious grandfather. He stood loyal by the side of his Vishṇukunḍi suzerain Vikramāndravarman II at the critical time of the Pallava peril and helped the Vishṇukunḍi in saving the kingdom from a sudden collapse.

No material is available now to show exactly what happened to the members of this family in subsequent times. However, in view of the very meagre information we have regarding the history of the family and of the area during the period under question, it is worthwhile to venture some tentative suggestions for the convenience of future researches. It is already known that the members of the family played an important role in the Vishṇukunḍi conquest of the Pallavas in the south. It is likely that they might have continued the same policy of help towards their suzerains in the subsequent times too. Therefore until one gets evidence to prove otherwise, one may believe that they might have helped Mādhavavarman IV also in the eastern expeditions which the latter undertook in his 43th regnal year, i.e. 612 A.D.

In this respect the chief of the family of the period probably followed the example of his northern neighbour Prithivīmahārāja of Pishpapura who too owed allegiance to the Vishṇukunḍis. The total absence of any further information about the family
is perhaps suggestive of the fact that the family of Prithivīmūla too disappeared more or less simultaneously with the dynasty of the Vishṇukūḍás after serving them for about seven generations.

(i1) The Gaṅgas

On consideration of chronology, the rise of the Gaṅga of Kaliṅga comes next to that of the Prithivīmūlas. Their rise is marked with an era, known as the Gaṅga era, that seems to have commenced sometime in 496-98 A.D. The dynasty continued to rule nearly nine centuries and a half till about 1435 A.D. when on the death of the last ruler of the family viz. Bhanudeva IV, his minister Kapilēśvara usurped the throne by suppressing the rebellion of the princes of the family. Many scholars have already dealt at length with the history of the Gaṅgas. Therefore it would suffice if the scope of the study here is confined to the period between 496 and 612 A.D. There too it may be better to concentrate on that part of the history of the Gaṅgas that is woven around their inter-relationship with the Vishṇukūḍás and to ignore altogether their probable relationship with the other contemporaneous dynasties.

One more thing that may be borne in mind in this connection is this: The Gaṅgas seem to have been quite reluctant to bear the Vishṇukūḍa yoke almost from the
beginning, and hence none of their records throw any light directly on the subject. Therefore though there are about ten records bearing on the history of the dynasty of the period under consideration it would suffice if one studies in detail here only two of these records, viz. the one that testifies that the founder of the dynasty had been a feudatory of the Vishnukundis and the other that indicates that the Ganga had subsequently managed to throw off successfully the Vishnukundī yoke. They are the following:

(1) The Godavari Plates, set 1: As we saw already, this charter was issued, by Prithivīmūla at the request of Indrādirāja, the son of Mitavarman of a dvija or twice-born family of the place Mapalkuḍi. We have also seen the vivid picture given by the charter of how a number of chiefs formed a confederacy and fought against the Vishnukundī Indrabhaṭṭāraka and how the above Indrādirāja played a vital role by knocking down in the battle the furious elephant Kumuda of the Vishnukundī that charged against another elephant Supratiṣa mounted probably by Prithivīmūla himself. Scholars do not see eye to eye with each other regarding the identity of the above Indrādirāja. Dr. Fleet who proposed to identify Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the record with the Eastern Chālukya king of that name, believed that Indrādirāja might be identical with either of the two Ganga kings
viz., Indravarman of the Achyutāpuraṇa plates of the year 87 and his namesake of the Chicasole plates of the year 128.

The scholars, who accept Kielhorn's identification of Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the charter with the Vishṇukūḍi of that name identify his opponent Indrādhirāja with Indra of the Gaṅga year 128-46. Sticking on to Dr. Fleet's above theory of identification of Indrabhaṭṭāraka and assigning that Eastern Chālukya king to 673 A.D., some scholars feel it "difficult to establish" the identity of his opponent Indrādhirāja mentioned in the record. For, in fact, there was no Indra at that time in any dynasty in the area who can be regarded as the son of Mitavarman.

Recently a few writers have had that the father of Indrādhirāja was a Brāhmaṇa of Māpalkūḍi and probably of non-monarchical rank and that the identification of Indra of the record with any Gaṅga king is therefore extremely improbable. Basing on the fact that no Gaṅga Indravarman of the time under question is known to be the son of Mitavarman, and basing on the assumption that Māpalkūḍi is described in the Godavari plates as Indrādhirāja's capital which had never been the headquarters of the Gaṅgas, a writer has also questioned the identification of Indrādhirāja with any of the Gaṅga kings, and has concluded that he must have been a local chieftain in Kalinga.

But the varman - ending of the name of Mitavarman denotes that he was believed to be a Kshatriya and not a
Brāhmaṇa. Again the title adhirāja of Indra indicates that he enjoyed some political status, at least of a feudatory, if not of a sovereign. The description of the family as the one of the dvija may not be incompatible with the above conclusion. For, dvija "twice-born" includes Kṣhatriya also. Even if dvija is taken to be synonym of Brāhmaṇa, it may not exclude the Gāṅga kings as they are believed to be originally Brāhmaṇas like the Kadambas. Again, now it is known that Indrabhaṭṭaraka varman of the record was none other than the Vīshṇukumāra monarch of that name who ruled during the period 525-55 A.D. Therefore, taking into account the period and the region under question, one may agree with D.R. Bhandarkar who identified Indrādhiraṇa with the Gāṅga Indravarman the issuer of the Jirāngi plates of the year 39, which we shall study next. None of the early Gāṅga charters of the first century of the Gāṅga era gives the name of the father of the respective kings who issued those charters. Therefore nothing prevents one from suggesting that the above Indravarman's father might have been one Mitavarman,

In the Godaveri plates Maṇṭalkudī figures not as the headquarters but only as a place where from the family of Indrādhiraṇa hailed. This place remains yet to be identified. Now it may be provisionally suggested that the above place may be identical with Maṇṭalakudī of the Udayindiram plates of Nandivarman Pallavammal, where his general Udayachandra
is said to have won a battle, and which has been identified recently by a writer with Manypura which was once the capitals of the Gangas in the Gaṅgavāḍī and which had been referred to as Māppai and Māppē. Again, still earlier capital of the Gangas of Mysore is located at Maṇkuḍa west of Channapatna in the Bangalore District. It is not unlikely that both Manvaikkudi and Maṇaikuḍi are identical with the above Maṇkuḍa. At any rate, these identifications will be in tune with the theory that the Early Gangas of Kaliṅga represented a branch of the Gaṅga dynasty of Mysore.

(2) The Jirijjī Plates: This is the earliest known charter of the Gaṅga family. It was issued from Dantapura by the Mahārāja Indravarman of the Gaṅga family who styles himself as the lord of Trikaliṅga. He was a worshipper of god Paramēśvara. His titles credit him with victories in the innumerable chāturdanta battles fought with the neighbouring rulers (gāmentas). The grant records the royal gift of the tax-free village of Jijjika in the division Vōṅkhārabhōga to two Brahmānas viz. Rudrasvāmin's son Agnīsvāmin and the latter's son Rudrasvāmin - half the village each. The writer of the grant was one Devasimhadeva, the king's minister of war and peace. The epigraph is dated in the 21st lunar day of the month Vaiśākha in the 39th year. All scholars concur in attributing the year to the Gaṅga era of 496-98 A.D., and the palaeography of the record suits quite well to the first half of the sixth century A.D.
The place of issue of the charter, viz. Dantapura, is famous in Buddhist literature as a capital of Kalinga. There is a difference of opinion among scholars in locating that city. However, the verdict of the majority of writers is that it is to be located near Srikakulam. The identification of Trikalinga of which Indravarman claims to be the lord, is a bit problematic. But this much is certain: It must have comprised some three broad regions into which the entire Kalinga was perhaps divided. It is not known whether the title Trikalingadhinati of Indravarman was a mere biruda, or it signifies that the king actually held control over the said entire three regions. The gift village Jijjika may be the modern Jirjingi, the findspot of the charter near Tekkali in the Srikakula District. Consequently we may identify the division Vonkhārabhōga with the region around the said Jirjingi.

Having thus examined the necessary records, let us study the history of the Gaṅgas of the period. Before proceeding further, it is worthwhile to find out what might have been the political status of the Gaṅgas to begin with.

We have already seen that Indrādhirāja was an ally of Prithivīmūla. From the Gōḍāvarī plates (I) it is learnt that he was an active member of the confederacy of the feudatories who rose against the Vishnupurāṇi Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. This may suggest that he too, just as his coadjutors, like Prithivīmūla, etc. was probably a
vassal of the Vishṇukumāḍī king. There seems to be another and perhaps stronger, reason for the above suggestion. It has been admitted that the name Vikramendra of the father of Prīthivīmahārāja betrays a feudatory relationship that the latter's family stood to the Vishṇukumāḍī rulers among whom alone the name is met with more than once. It is also accepted that the feudatory Vikramendra was a contemporary of his Vishṇukumāḍī namesake. Now, if the name Indra of Indravarman I of the Gaṅga dynasty is viewed in the same light, it may indicate, not without reason, a feudatory relationship which the early members of the Gaṅga family had with the Vishṇukumāḍīs. For, among the royal families of the Deccan the earliest occurrence of that name is met with in the Vishṇukumāḍī dynasty alone. In earlier period it is not found in other families including that of the Gaṅgas of Mysore.

The general consensus of the opinion of scholars is that the early Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga belonged to some branch of the Gaṅga dynasty of the Gaṅgavāḍī country of Mysore. The family of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga hailed from Maṇḍalkuḍi, i.e. Maṇyapura in Gaṅgavāḍī, and settled in the Kaliṅga area. Like some of the early rulers of the Western Gaṅga dynasty the members of the Gaṅga family of Kaliṅga were the worshippers of Śiva. They seem to have carved out a small principality of their own in the eastern part of the Kaliṅga country i.e. in the Śrīkūṭam region some
time in the last decade of the 5th century A.D. They used in their records an era of their own that began sometime in 496-98 A.D.

Regarding this era it is believed that Indravarman of the Jirjlingi plates dated his records in his own regnal years and this reckoning was continued by his successors and thus the Ganga era came to be. However it seems to be more probable that the era was founded to commemorate the foundation of the above Ganga principality. The founder of it might have been, therefore, either Indravarman himself or an immediate predecessor of his, possibly his father. The date of foundation, i.e., viz. 496-98, falls in the last decade of the reign of Madhavavarman II. It is difficult to be sure whether the foundation of such an epoch making nucleus by the Ganga was due to the weakness of the Vishnukundol authority in the centre and or its special leniency shown towards the chiefs of the border area in the north. It is not altogether unlikely that it might have been also due to the interference by the Vakataka Harishena in the politics of both Andhra and Kalinga. In any case, the first ruler of the family seems to have continued to owe at least some nominal allegiance to the Vishnukundol ruler for sometime.

As we have already seen, the fight between the Ganga Indra and the Vishnukundol Indra was fought earlier than 535 A.D., i.e. sometime in the early period of the thirties
of the sixth century. As the grant of Chāyipāka (i.e.,
in the Godavari set I) was made at the request of Indrādhī-
rāja for the merit of his own father and mother it is not
unreasonable to believe that on the date of the issue of the
Godavari plates the father Mitavarman was no more. Again
it is significant that the latter is praised to have won
victories in the chāturdanta battles. It is likely he fell
in one such battle fought very probably with Indrabhaṭṭāraka-
varman noted for his innumerable battles of chāturdantas.

The way in which both Mitavarman and his son Adhi-
rāja Indra are described in the Godavari set I may be an
indication to the fact that the Gaṅga power had not yet
attained a status of prominence. However the record does
not fail to impress on us that Indrādhīrāja had in him a
powerful conquerer in the high potential. Therefore it
is quite predictable that he would soon emerge as a full-
fledged king and assume the title Mahārāja as he is actually
found in his Jirjini plates of c. 535 A.D. Moreover, like
his ally Prīthivīmūlā, he too appropriated for himself
the high sounding title of the vanquished Vishṇukūṇḍi that
credits him with victories in the chāturdanta battles. It
is noteworthy that such or similar title is not met with
anywhere else in the known Eastern Gaṅga records. Sure,
Indravarman’s skill and guts raised him to a high status.
But, he could not afford to maintain that status for long
without inviting a rebuff from the warlike Vishṇukūṇḍi.
Predictably enough, the powerful Indrabhaṭṭāraka asserted
himself very soon over the Kalinga country. His Ramatirtham plates of 553 A.D. (i.e. nearly two decades after the date of the Jirjingi plates), actually records his grant of a village in Bobbili Taluk which was the north-western neighbourhood of the Dantapura area held by Indravarman.

As we have seen already there is a strong possibility of the Vishnukundii camping at that time somewhere farther north in the Palkonda Taluk. The triumphant Vishnukundii did not stop at that. As shown above, he continued his military campaigns further northward up to an offshoot of the Vindhyas where he was checked by the Maukhari Īśānavarman. All this goes to indicate that the power of the newly risen Ganga dynasty must have been eclipsed considerably.

Perhaps this is the reason why Dantapura in the Śrīkākulan area figures as a Ganga capital in the records of the family only about a century later i.e. in the Parla plates of Indravarman, son of Dēnērpava, dated year 137. There is nothing to reveal who might have been the Ganga enemy of the Vishnukundii Īndrabhaṭṭārakāvarman.

The next known Ganga king is Mahāsāṃtāvarman or Sāṃtāvarman, the issuer of the Ponnatur plates of the Ganga year 64 or c. 560 A.D. It is not known whether he was an immediate successor of the Ganga Indravarman I. His relationship with that monarch and with the next known ruler, viz. Hastivarman, is also not known. The very name of his viz, Sāṃanta, seems to smack of a status of the vassalage or of a military captainship. Whether he was a
protege and vassal kept on the Ganga throne by the Vishnu-
kunḍi is a matter of guess-work only. Even if he was so,
he must have declared independence as soon as he found that
Indrabhūṣṭārakavarman was no more by 555 A.D., and that
the latter's son and successor was too young and weak to
put under control his far off vassal. The above Ponnaturu
plates bear witness to that fact.

The next known Ganga ruler is Maharaja Hastivarman
Rājasimha Rapabūita of the Narasingapallī and Urlam plates
respectively of the Ganga years 79 (c. 575 A.D.) and 80
(c. 576 A.D.). As has been pointed out just now, his
relationship with Śamantavarman is not known. But scholars
hold him to be a son of Indravarman I. In that case, it
may be a bit hard to explain how Śamantavarman came to rule
in between the father and son. Perhaps it may add some
strength to the doubt whether Śamantavarman was an usurper
backed by some other power, perhaps the Vishnu-
kunḍi. Hasti-
varman's first charter itself is a good witness to the fact
that the Ganga power had once again asserted itself in
the Varāhavarttani viśaya corresponding to the coastal
region between Srikakulam and Tekkali. The next Ganga
king known was Maharaja Indravarman II Rājasimha of whom
we get charters dated 87 (c. 583 A.D.) 88 (c. 584 A.D.)
91 (c. 587 A.D.) and 97 (c. 593 A.D.). This monarch
is taken to be the son of Hastivarman. His own charter
testifies that he had encroached well as far as the modern
Narasannapeta region in the Srikakula District.
The next known date in Ganga era is 128 (c. 624 A.D.) supplied by a charter of Mahārāja Indravarman III, considered to be a grandson of Indravarman II and a son of a Ganga prince who probably ruled in between them. Whatever may be the case, one thing is quite clear. After Indrabhaṭṭārakavaram the Gangas enjoyed absolute power. It is likely that they made intrusions into the northeastern part of the Vishṇukunḍi dominions. It is probably to wrest back this occupied area that Mādhavavarman IV undertook his eastern campaign in 612 A.D., as we saw earlier. One may not be sure about who exactly was the Ganga opponent of Mādhavavarman IV. Maybe, he was the one, or one of those who ruled in between c. 587 or 624 A.D.

Mādhavavarman IV seems to have succeeded in his war against the Ganga by conquering the area as far as the Jajpur region. No doubt, as we have already seen in the last chapter, the subsequent events show that the Vishṇukunḍi died soon after. But the conquest of the Kalinga country up to Jajapur must have naturally given a very rude shock to the Ganga power. This is perhaps one of the reasons that may go to account for the dark period in the Ganga history between c. 587 A.D. and c. 624 A.D.

(iii) The Rāmakāśyapa

The third family whose members owed allegiance to
the Vishṇukultra is that of those chiefs who claimed to belong to the Rāmakāśyapa gotra. As they do not supply any dynastic appellation of them in their records, they may be referred to as Rāmakāśyapas just as the chiefs belonging to the Sālanakāyana, Māṭhara, Prināṭphalāyana, Vāsishṭha and Ānanda gotras are generally named after their respective gotras. All these chiefs belonged to the same region. Of the Rāmakāśyapa family we have the following two copper-plate charters.

(1) The Tāṇḍivāda Grant: This charter was issued by the chief Prithivīmahārāja from Pishpapura. The king styles himself as paramabrahmāṇya and claims to belong to the Rāmakāśyapa gotra. He is credited with the victory over his sāmantas (i.e. neighbouring chiefs or feudatories) and is described as the son of Vīkramendra and the grandson of Mahārāja Rāṇadurjaya. The charter records the king's gift of the village Tāṇḍivāda, made tax-free agraḥāra in favour of one Bhavasarma, a member of the Kāmakāyana gotra, a resident of Kondiamanchi village, a master of Trisahasravidvā, a student of Chhendōga, a performer of many sacrifices, a scholar in the Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Nyāya, Upanishads and Yōga, and a writer of twenty commentaries. The donee was the son of Prithivīsarma, who was a scholar and a teacher of Trisahasravidvā and was a son of Vishṇusarma a scholar in the āruti and amṛiti literature. The grant village was situated in the Pāganāra vishaya. The grant is said to have been made for the merit etc. of the donor himself. The aśīṅasti or the executor of the grant was Rāmalēnządura.
The charter is dated in the 15th lunar day of the month Karttika in the 46th regnal year of the chief.

The place of issue of the record, viz. Pishṭapura evidently the capital of the king, is the modern Pithapuram in the East Gōdāvari District. Basing on the Eastern Chālukyan records and on the inscriptions from Juttiga in the Tanuku Taluk, the division Pagupāra vishaya has been identified by some scholars with the region that roughly comprised the modern Tanuku Taluk. Similarly the grant village Taṅgivāḍa has also been identified with the village Taḍiparagū in the same taluk. According to another view, the above division comprised a larger area that included in itself the Bhimavaram Taluk, the southern fringe of the Tanuku Taluk and the eastern edge of the Kaikaluru Taluk - thus the whole area was bounded by the Kolēru lake in the west and the Gōdvārī in the east. Those who hold this view identify the gift village with Taṅināṇu in the Kaikaluru Taluk in the Krishna District, and the donee's residential village Kōḍamaṇchi with Kōḍamaṇchili in the adjacent Narasapuram Taluk.

(2) The Gollavalli grant: This charter was also issued by the same Prithivīmahārāja, but from his victorious camp evidently of his own army, at Virajōnagara. The introductory portion that describes the chief, his father Vikra­mendra and grandfather Maharaja Rapadurjaya is exactly the same that is found in the previous grant. The charter
records the king's gift, made for his own merit and welfare of the village Gollavalli in the Kudravali yishaya a tax-free agrahara in favour of one Padmasarman, a member of Baṣīgu-gōtra, a student of the Teittiriyaśākha, a scholar in the Vedas, Vedāṅga, Purāṇas, Rāmāyaṇa, Dharmāṣṭra and the rest. The donee was a son of Damōdarśarman and grandson of Mātriśarman. As in the previous grant so in the present one also the aśīravī was Rāmaleppurāja only. The record is dated on the 8th lunar day of the bright half of the month Jyēṣṭha in the 49th regnal year of the king.

The city Virajōnagara where from the chief issued the record has been identified with modern Jāipur in the Cuttack District of Orissa. The names Gollavalli of the gift village and Kudravali of the territorial division in which the gift village was included remind us respectively of the modern names of the village Galavilli (also spelt Galavili) in the Bobbili Taluk and Guḍḍavilli in the adjacent Palkonda Taluk - both the taluks being in the Srikakulam District.

Now as the first step to understand a bit of the history of the Rāmakēśyapas, it may be incompatible for us to fix up the period to which the known members of this family belonged. For that purpose there is no evidence other than that of the palaeography of the above two records. The circumstantial evidences gleaned from the contemporary history of the region may also come to our help.
It is quite clear from the language and contents of the above two charters that Prithivimahārāja was an independent sovereign king who had his capital at Pishtāpura and who held his sway over a territory that extended from the Cuttack District in the north to the Koleru lake in the south. Again a comparison of characters of the Gol­lavalli and Tandivada grants on one hand and that of the Timmapuram (Vizagapattam District) plates also issued from Pishtāpura by Kubja Vishpyuvardhana on the other, would convince anyone that they are exactly identical and that the gap in between them could not have been more than 25 years at the most. At the same time, there can be no doubt about that Pishtāpura, captured by Pulakeśi II in 616 A.D., continued to be in the hands of the Chālukyas throughout. Therefore there is no question of assigning Prithivimahārāja of Pishtāpura to a period following the Chālukyan conquest.

Similarly it is also known that Pishtāpura was well within the Vishṇukundī dominions as indicated by the Ramatirtham and Kandalapalem plates. One should not, perhaps, venture to assign the chief either to a period of the successful rebellion of Indrabhaṭṭarakaśvarman's feudatories sometime before 535 A.D., or to a period between the Kandalapalem plates and the rise of Mādhavavarma IV. For in either case it would widen the gap between the charters of the chief and that of Vishpyuvardhana, by about 90 or 60 years—a gap, which, as has been just now pointed out, is not permitted by the palaeography of the charters.
Moreover there is no reason to assume that during either of the above periods the Vishnukundī power had been reduced to such a tragically weak position as to enable Prithivimahārāja to annex even the heart of the Vengi kingdom. Again during both the periods there was the family of Prithivīmūla ruling over the tract in between Pīshāpura and Vengi. Similarly during both these periods, as the study in the last section shows, the Gaṅgas were in complete control of the Srikakula District. Hence it may not be reasonable to imagine a kingdom of Prithivimahārāja extending up to the Cuttack District during those times.

Moreover the Polamuru set I indicates that in 612 A.D. the Vishnukundī kingdom was quite intact at least up to the Ramachandrapuram Taluk. The description in the record that Mādhavavarman IV had just crossed the Godāvari river with a desire to conquer east clearly reveals that he had not yet started fighting. Had Prithivimahārāja earlier occupied the trans-Godāvari region, the Vishnukundī must have already commenced fighting by that date to recover the area. Besides the scholars believe that the aim of Mādhavavarman IV in his eastern campaign was to take back the area occupied by the Eastern Gaṅgas, and not to conquer Pīshāpura. In view of all these, one may have to assign Prithivimahārāja's independent rule over Pīshāpura to a period in between the date of the Polamuru set I, and that of the Marutura grant, i.e. between 612 and 616 A.D. So there appears to be every truth in that the Pīshāpura area
It has been admitted already that the Ramakasyapas stood on a feudal relation to the Vishnukundis. This is propped up by the fact that Prithivimaharaja's father had the name Vikramendra, a name which is met with in the Vishnukund family alone more than once. It may also be supported by the contemporaneity of the Ramakasyapas of Pishapura with the Vishnukund rulers. For, as Prithivimaharaja's 46th regnal year fell about 616 A.D., he must have come to power sometime about 570 A.D. and must have reigned contemporaneously with Madhavavarman IV. Similarly his father Vikramendra might have ruled during 546-70 A.D. as a vassal of the Vishnukund Vikramendravarman II. Then it would follow that Prithivimaharaja's grandfather Ranadurjaya's suzerain was Indrabhatarkavarman.

How the family of the Ramakasyapas came to power we do not know. It has been tentatively suggested earlier that by curbing the power of the Matharas, Pitribhaktas etc. of the area Madhavavarman II might have established on the throne of Pishapura his own protege probably of the Ramakasyapa family. The gotra-name Ramakasyapa reminds us of the Tamrakasyapa gotra to which belonged a line of chiefs who were ruling sometime in the 6th century, over Punnag, i.e. a small territory west of Talakag in Mysore State. These rulers had matrimonial alliance with the Ganges of Talakag, and the king Durvinita Ganga (540-60 A.D.)
is believed to be a product of some such marriage. In that Tamrakasa family as well as in the family of the Western Gaṅgas the name Prithivipati is often met with. Now the name of Prithivimahārāja and the gṛha name Rāmakāśyapa of his give rise to a doubt whether his family represents a branch of the above Punnad family. In that case, one may believe that just like the Eastern Gaṅgas and their Kadamba feudatories of Kalinga represented certain off-shoots of the families of the same names belonging to the area in the present Mysore State, in the same way the family of the Rāmakāśyapas of Piṣṭapura also may be a branch of the said feudal family of Punnad.

It may be stated that the title mahārāja of Panaṇḍurjaya perhaps indicates that he might have proclaimed independence following the defeat of Indrabhaṭṭarakavarman by the confederacy of the chiefs, or earlier during the period of the weak rule of Vikramendravarman I. The records shed no light on any achievement of this king. The name Rāṇadurjaya occurs twice in the list of the early kings of the family of the Valanaṇḍu chiefs who claim to belong to the fourth caste. It is likely that the name Rāṇadurjaya might have borrowed from the Rāmakāśyapas by the Valanaṇḍu family.

Rāṇadurjaya's son and successor was Vikramendra. The latter is not endowed with any title like Mahārāja or even Rājan, though he is said to be a very rich king. Probably it signifies that the family was once again reduced to complete subjugation and the vassalage by Indra-
Vikramendra's son and successor was Prithivimaharaja. As we saw in the last chapter, this chief too remained perhaps as a vassal of the Vishnuvardhas for a long time and probably followed his master Madhavavarman IV in the latter's Kalinga campaigns. When some unknown calamity overtook the suzerain, Prithivimaharaja, as we saw earlier, proclaimed himself as an independent sole monarch of the departed master's vast territory from Jajpur to Kolercu lake. Therefore scholars seem to be on the right side when they observe that "Prithivimaharaja asserted full independence about the end of his career when the Vishnuvardha power declined as a result of many wars."

One can not be sure whether in the process of the take-over of the Vishnuvardha kingdom, Prithivimaharaja had to put down a Vishnuvardha prince who might have been imbecile. It is also not known whether Prithivimaharaja put an end to the feudal family of Prithivimala. At any rate, it is almost clear that it was Prithivimaharaja who was stripped of Pishapura by the Chalukya Pulakesi II. The theory of the Chalukyan take-over of Pishapura from Prithivimala (of the Godavari plates) alleged to be a grandson of Prithivimaharaja is difficult to maintain any further, in the light of the facts examined so far.

When Pulakesi took the kingdom of Pishapura from Prithivimaharaja, automatically the former became the master of the latter's territory that extended down to the
Kolēru lake. That is why in the process of completing his conquest of the east coast the Chālukya was necessitated to fight on the bank of the Kolōru with Prithivīyuvarāja, immediately after the capture of Pishṭapura. This aspect of our study may be taken up in the next chapter. What happened to Prithivīmāhārāja after his defeat at Pishṭapura is beyond what one can now be sure of. Yet his Cola-valli grant may be indicative of one probability: Being driven out from Pishṭapura, the chief continued his activities for sometime in the northern part of the kingdom, he had newly carved out.

Before concluding it may be noted that the names Prithivīmāhārāja and Prithivīyuvarāja of the above mentioned chiefs are strikingly identical. It is also equally striking that both of them tried to make best use of the situation created by the sudden collapse of the Vishṇukūḍi house and both had held their respective regions in the Vēṇgi country perhaps with a common border, viz. the Kolōru lake. It is also noteworthy the Chālukya Pulakēśi had to fight with the one immediately after he vanquished the other. If all these do not go to make a series of mere coincidences, then they may indicate some relationship between the families of the two. Such a relationship between the feudatory of the Vishṇukūḍi with a vassal of the Pāllava may not be incongruous especially in view of the possibility of such a relationship existing between the families of the overlords themselves, as we saw in the last chapter.
NOTES

(1) Prthivīmūlas


2 JBBRĀŚ, XVI, p. 115. Some take it for granted that the record is dated in the regnal year of the suzerain only. See ASVOI, Vol. I, pt. iii, pp. 87 ff.

3 The suggestion that the writer of the Godavari plates (I) has here skillfully indicated a complete failure of the confederacy against Indrabhaṭṭāraka (ibid. p. 90) is far from convincing.

4 The four necessaries of the bhikṣuṇī's daily life are clothing (chīvara), food (pīṇḍa-pīṭa), dwelling (śāya-āśana) and medicine to the sick (glāṇa-bhāishāya). See PED, s.v. pachchaya.

5 In the literature and inscriptions of the Buddhists, this expression as well as its shorter form nava-karmaṇa have a technical import. They denote a Buddhist monk appointed by the community of the bhikṣus as a superintendent of the building operations of a religious establishment. See EI, XX, p. 30; Edgerton, Bud. Byb. Skt. Dict., s.v. Sometimes nava-karmaṇa is said to mean also "an artificer" or "a worker in metal." See IC, XV, p. 232.

6 The expression is sva-pratishthaṇita. Here as the construction shows, the word sva should ordinarily
denote Harivarman. Yet, as the act of erection, dedication etc., of the Buddhist buildings were usually the works of navakarm-ādhikrita, the above word may denote him as well. Cf. thevitaś svasa cha lokasa ime ā navakarmam tithi navakammikeni in a Nagarjunakonda inscription (EI, XX, p. 22, text lines).

7 Cf. the Tamil pāśava "rope-maker". See Tamil Lexicon s.v.

8 Cf. APGAS, No. 6, p. 243.

9 MDG, (op. cit), p. 220.

10 The names Prithivimula, Mula etc. of the family reminds us of the name Chantamula (Skt. Šantamula) of the Ikshvaku dynasty and the names Mahamula, Chulamula, Mulavāṇīja, Mula etc. of the inscriptions of that dynasty (EI, XX, pp. 22-23).

11 Above Ch. VI, Sect. i.

12 Cf. e.g. in the charters of Mādhavavarman II his successors the genealogical account of the Vishṇukundī family starts only with Gōvindavarman I, the first independent ruler of the family, though we know that there were at least two rulers of the dynasty before his time.

13 See Inscr. XII.

14 Inscr. XVII, and the three sets of the Gudivada plates
A good deal of speculation centres around the names Supratīka and Kumuda of the elephants. As they are known to be respectively the names of the elephants of the north-east and south-west corners it has been conjectured that the person on the Kumuda was Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the south-west i.e. Vengi and that the chief on the Supratīka was the north-east i.e. the Gaṅga king of Kalinga (JBRAS, XVI, p. 116); EI, IV, p. 155, f.n. 2; CA, p. 210; etc.). But now it is known that even the kingdom of Prithivīmūla also was on the north-eastern direction of Vengi.

However, one may legitimately hesitate to believe whether by using the said names of the elephants the composer of the text of the grant actually meant the above two quarters. For among the names of the digajas only that of the Supratīka denotes an elephant that has a good shape or good features (su-pratīka). The most important of the features of the war elephants must be the mada or rut. And the elephant Supratīka was probably believed to have a good amount of the same. This seems to be indicated by Vasubandhu in one of his characteristic puns viz. a-tāta-madanaṃ āpi S atīkē a (Vāsava., pp. 127-28). So if that is
to be chosen as the name of an elephant of the confederates to denote its good features then naturally the opponent’s elephant must be referred to as Kumuda alone. For, that name is of the elephant of the just opposite direction and that name with ku in beginning denotes something bad as against su in the beginning of the name Supratika. Therefore there appears to be every likelihood that the author would have chosen the same names, even if the respective opponents had hailed from some other directions.

At the same time it is also to be noted that the interpretation of the passage under question in such a way as to establish that the elephants Supratika and Kumuda belonged respectively to Indrabhaṭṭāraka and his opponent is hardly convincing and justifiable. (Cf. ASVol, Vol. I, pt. iii, p. 90; QJMS, XXX, p. 325).

16 SII, II, pp. 361 ff. and plates.
17 Ibid., p. 368, line 62.
18 As has been pointed earlier (Ch. VII, Sect. i) there is no ground for the assumption that Prithivīmūla was slain by Indrabhaṭṭārakavarm man’s son Vikramendra-varman (Cf. BD, p. 500).
19 Above Ch. VII, Sect. ii.
20 See Sect. iii below.
(ii) The Ganges

There has been a long controversy on the epoch of the Ganga era. For different views on this question, see e.g. El, XXVI, p. 326; XXVII, p. 192; XXXI, pp. 46 ff; XXXIII, pp. 101 ff.

H.C. Ray DHNI, pp. 497.


They are the following:

(i) The Godavari Plates (I) cf. Prithivimula, Inscr. XI.
(ii) The Jirjingi Plates of Indravarman I, Year 39 (c. 535 A.D.) Inscr. XIII.
(iii) The Ponnaturu Plates of Mahāśāmatavarman, Year 64 (c. 560 A.D.), EI, XXVII, p. 216 ff.
(iv) The Narasingapalli Plates of Hastivarman, Year 79 (c. 575 A.D.), EI, XXXII, pp. 62 ff.
(v) The Urulam plates of Hastivarman, year 80 (c. 576 A.D.), EI, XVII, pp. 332 ff.
(vi) The Achyutapuram plates of Indravarman II Rājasimha, year 87 (c. 583 A.D.), EI, III, pp. 128 ff.
(vii) The Šanta Bommali plates of Indravarman II Rājasimha, year 87 (c. 583 A.D.). JAHRS, IV, pp. 21 ff.
(viii) The Tirllingi Fragmentary Copper-plate charter, year 88(?) (c. 584 A.D.), JAHRS, III, pp. 54 ff.
This charter has been attributed to Mitavarman (ibid. VI, p. 71). But in fact it belongs to the time of Indravarman II Rājasimha only. See Bhandarkar's List No. 2047 and f.n.; and p. 597.

(x) The Urjam plates of Indravarman II, Year 97 (c. 593 A.D.), EI, XXXVII, pp. 159 ff.

The next known charter in the chronological order is the Chicacole plates of Indravarman III, Year 128 (c. 624 A.D.) (IA, XIII, pp. 120 ff.) a date that falls beyond our purview.

25 Above Ch. VI, Sect. iii; Ch. VII, Sect. i.
27 See above f.n. 24.
28 SS, p. 114; CA, 216.
29 EHD, p. 473.
30 ASVOI, I, pt. iii, pp. 89-90; CA, p. 216.
31 APGAS, No. 10, p. 17.
32 Yājñā. I, verse 39.

34 Bhandarkar's List, p. 386, f.n. 5.

35 The record does not indicate that Indra, the son of Mitavarman reigned at Maṇḍalkuṭi as believed by some (AHD, p. 93).

36 SII, II, p. 368, lines 60-61

37 TFCO, pp. 123-24. For other conflicting views on the identification of Maṇḍalkuṭi see KESIH, p. 175.

38 MG, II, pt. ii, p. 597.


40 See CHI, I, pp. 172-73; CA, p. 367.

41 For conflicting views on this topic see EI, XXV, pp. 235-36.

42 See EI, XIV, p. 361; JAHRS, VI, 73 f.n. 10, Sylvain Levi etc., Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian India, trans. by P.C. Bagchi, p. 171.

43 For different views on the subject see EI, XXV, p. 236; CA, 215 etc.

44 Above Ch. VI, sect. ii; Ch. VIII, sect. i.

45 Cf. the axiom Tan-madhya-patitas-tad-grhaepena apihvatā.

46 See below, Sect. iii.

47 CA, pp. 215.
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[Ch. VIII, Sect. iii, n

48 See CA, p. 269.

49 Ibid., 215.

50 See above Ch. VI, Sect. iii.

51 See EI, XIV, pp. 361 ff. Here the date of the record has been read as 149. For the reading 137 see EI, XVIII, p. 308; CA, p. 216.

52 See above n. 24.

53 CA, p. 216.

54 See above n. 24.

55 CA, p. 216.

56 EI, XXIII, p. 65.

57 See above n. 24.

58 CA, p. 216.

59 See EI, XXXVII, p. 161.

60 See above n. 24.

61 CA, p. 216

(iii) The Ramakāśyapas

62 EI, XXIII, p. 97.

63 BD, p. 551-52.
65 This village has yielded two Eastern Ganga copper plate charters. See El, XXXI, pp. 187 ff.

66 See El, IX, plate facing pl 318.
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