PART ONE

HISTORY
The centuries that followed the fall of the mighty power of the Sātavāhanas in the third century and preceded the rise of the equally mighty power of the Chālukyas in the sixth century witnessed the rise and fall of many royal houses — both great and small — in the Deccan. Among them the house of the Vishṇukundīs occupied a unique position. For, in point of power and influence on the contemporary politics of the Deccan, the Vishṇukundīs came next to the Vākāṭakas. Again their house represented an offshoot of the Chuṭu Sātakarṇīs who served directly under the Sātavāhanas. And at the same time its later members were the contemporaries of the early members of the Chālukya family and for all practical purposes they may be regarded as the immediate predecessors of the Chālukyas in the Eastern Deccan. Thus in a way the house of the Vishṇukundīs may be viewed as a link between the Sātavāhanas and the Chālukyas in the Eastern Deccan. Hence the importance of the study of the history of the family. Therefore an attempt is made here for a full study of the history of the Vishṇukundī dynasty.
(1) Name of the Dynasty

As a preliminary to our study it may be worthwhile to decide the correct spelling of the name of the dynasty. In the epigraphs of the family, the dynastic name occurs altogether not less than fifteen times. Out of them in eight cases it is found within compound expressions, and in one place its reading is doubtful. In all the other six instances the name occurs in the plural form of the genitive case. In the Chikkulla plates, the first among the records of the family to be discovered and edited, it occurs as Vishnukundinam. Dr. Kielhorn the editor of that record naturally took the name of the family to be Vishnukundin, with n-ending. But in all other records of the family, subsequently discovered and published, the name reads Ondinam only and it occurs in that fashion not once, but five times indicating the i-ending of the name.

Dr. Hultzsch who edited the Ipur charter I was obviously influenced by the Chikkulla text published earlier. Therefore he read the name under question as Ondinam, but with a prompt remark that the sign for the medial i in what was read as uñi appeared to be for the medial i. Again the correct reading of the name in the Polamuru plates seems to be Ondinam, though some have read it as Ondin. In the Kandulapalem plates the reading is only Ondinam but the editor of that record corrected it into Ondinam, evidently thinking that it should fall in line with the Chikkulla text. Besides in both the
sets of the Tummalagudem plates recently discovered, the reading Ündīnam is beyond doubt. Thus the ī-ending of the name is denoted by five records while ī-ending is favoured only by the solitary Chikkulla charter whose language, at the same time, is “very incorrect” as Prof. Kielhorn has remarked. Hence it would be logical to correct the reading of the Chikkulla plates into Ündīnam instead of correcting the readings of all the other plates. Therefore the name of the dynasty hereinafter may be spelt as VISHNUKUNDI and not VISHNUKUNDJIN as has been hitherto done. In the next chapter there will be occasion to see that the forms Vishpukundi and Vishpukundin are not tweedledum and tweedledesd and that they make all the difference.

(ii) Genealogy and Chronology

The genealogy and chronology form the bed-rock of the history of any given dynasty. The interesting point regarding the problems of the Vishpukundi genealogy and chronology is that they have evaded a satisfactory solution in spite of the repeated attempts of scholars for more than half a century past. Consequently one is apt to conclude that the problems are by no means definitely settled. Therefore here the various important views of the scholars on these problems are studied first and then an attempt is made to arrive at a possible, satisfactory solution.

There are four major theories offered by scholars who
have dealt with the problem. They may be referred to here as Theory I, Theory II, Theory III and Theory IV respectively. All these theories centre around the following genealogies furnished by the copper-plate charters of the family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHIKKULLA PLATES</strong></td>
<td><strong>RAMATIRTHAM PLATES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Madhavavarman  
(Performer of 11 Asvamedhas, Kratusahasra and other sacrifices) | 1. Madhavavarman  
(Performer of 11 Asvamedhas, Kratusahasra and other sacrifices) |
| 2. Vikramendravarman I | 2. Vikramendravarman |
| 3. Indrabhattarakavarman | 3. Indravarman |
| 4. Vikramendravarman II | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLAMURI PLATES: (Set I)</strong></td>
<td><strong>IPTIR PLATES: (Set I)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Vikramendravarman</td>
<td>1. Govindavarman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Govindavarman  
Vikramārava  
Vikramārava | 2. Madhavavarman  
(Performer of 11 Asvamedhas, Agnishtomasahasra etc.) |
| 3. Madhavavarman Janaprava  
(Performer of 11 Asvamedhas  
Kratusahasra and other sacrifices) | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPTIR PLATES: (Set II)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Madhavavarman I  
(Performer of 11 Asvamedhas,  
1000 Agnishtomas etc.) | 2. Devavarman |
| 3. Madhavavarman II | |
The Theory I was proposed by Sri H. Krishna Sastri in 1914 and it was finalised in 1920. Taking into account the palaeography alone, this Theory arranged the above five charters in the following chronological order:

1. Ipur plates, set II;
2. Ipur plates, set I;
3. Ramatirtham plates;
4. Chikkulla plates; and
5. Polamuru plates, set I.

So this Theory believes as follows: (i) Madhavavarman II of the Ipur set II might have been the grandfather of Madhavavarman of the Ipur set I (ii) The latter was identical with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates (iii) And Vikramahendravarman of the Polamuru plates I may perhaps be identical with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla charter. In this connection it is also promptly pointed out that the later nature of the characters of the Polamuru plates and the titles Vikramāśraya and Janaśraya borne respectively by Govindavarman and Madhavavarman in that charter establish that those kings were different respectively from their namesake of the Ipur set I and were probably successors of Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla record. Thus the genealogical scheme in Theory I would be like this:

1. Madhavavarman I
   |   |
2. Devarman
3. Madhavavarman II  
   (issued the Ipur set II)

4. Govindavarman I

5. Madhavavarman II  
   (issued the Ipur set I)

6. Vikramendravarman I

7. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman  
   (issued the Ramatirtham plates)

8. Vikramendravarman II  
   (issued the Chikkulla plates)

9. Govindavarman II Vikramāśraya

10. Madhavavarman Janāśraya  
    (issued the Polamuru plates)

Later while editing the two sets of the Ipur plates
in 1924, Dr. Hultzsch did not utter a word about the rulers
Nos. 9 and 10 of the above genealogy. Yet he underlined the
above genealogical scheme up to Vikramendravarman II of the
Chikkulla plates. He added the following two important
and unequivocal statements in this connection:

(i) The characters of the Ipur set I are decidedly
   earlier than that of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates.

(ii) The characters of the Ipur set II resemble those
    of the British Museum Prakrit charter of the Pallava queen
    Charudevi, (i.e., of about the middle of the 4th century
    A.D.), and therefore Madhavavarman of the Ipur set I might
have been the grandson of Madhavavarman II of the Ipur II, the grandson being named after the grandfather.

While writing in 1920 itself, G. Jouveau-Dubreuil was obviously not aware of the two Ipur sets. Yet, he endorsed the Theory I and identified Vikramendravarman of the Polamuru plates with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla charter.

The Theory II was propounded by K.V. Lakshman Rao in 1924. This scholar suggested two corrections in the above Theory I. He identified (i) Madhavavarman II of Ipur set II with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates, and (ii) Govindavarman and Madhavavarman of the Ipur set I with their respective namesake of the Polamuru record. Thus the genealogical scheme in this Theory II is as follows:

1. Madhavavarman I
   (Performer of 11 Asvamedhas and other sacrifices)

2. Devavarman

3. Madhavavarman II - issued the Ipur set II
   (Performer of 11 Asvamedhas and other sacrifices)

4. Vikramendravarman I

5. Indrabbhattarakavarman - issued the Ramatirtham plates
6. Vikramendravarman II - issued the Chikkulla plates

7. Govindavarman

8. Madhavarman III - issued the Ipur set I and the Polamuru set I (Performer of 11 Āśvamedhas and other sacrifices)

9. Mañchyanabhatṭāraka (the anānti of the Ipur set I)

Later in 1933 Dr. D.C. Sircar offered the Theory III. His arguments are as follows: The first Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set II and all his namesake of all the other charters of the family claim to have performed exactly an equal number of the same sacrifices viz., 11 Āśvamedhas, 1000 Agniṣṭōmas etc. Therefore all of them must have been one and the same and must have been identical with that Mādhavavarman who was the great grandfather of Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. So the scholar stressed that it is "almost impossible that there can be more than one Mādhavavarman the performer of eleven Āśvamedhas and thousand Agniṣṭōmas in the same period."

Therefore the conclusions of this theory are: (i) Both the Ipur (set I) and Polamuru (set I) charters were issued by that Mādhavavarman who was the great grandfather (and not grandson as in the scheme of the Theory II) of Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla charter; (ii) Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur set II and Indravarman of the Ramatirtham plates were two grandsons of that Mādhavavarman through different
sons; (iii) Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates was the last known ruler of the dynasty. Hence this Theory III proposes the following genealogical tree of the family.

Vikramendravarman
(i.e., Vikramendravarman I)

| Govindavarman Vikramaśraya

| Madhavavarman Janaśraya
performed 11 Áśvamedhas and 1000 Agnishtomas - issued the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates

| Devavaran Vikramendravarman II Mañchyappa-bhattaraka

| Madhavavarman II Indrabhattarakavarman issued the Ipur set II
| issued the Ramatirtham plates

| Vikramendravarman III issued the Chikkulla plates

Now the question of the later nature of the characters of the Polamuru set I comes up. By way of answering that question it is said that the record may be later copy of an earlier original. Regarding the two statements of Hultzsch on the relative positions of the two sets of the Ipur charters in point of time, it is affirmed that the difference is due to different scribes.

As against the above Theory III, the Theory IV came in 1936. The arguments of the authors of this theory viz. Sri R.S. Panchamukhi and Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri etc.,
are as follows: While stressing too much on the common epithets (i.e. śamānya-dharma) referring to 11 Aśvanādhas and 1000 Agnīśṭomas etc., of Mādhavavarman I of the Ipur set II and Mādhavavarmans of other Vishṇukundī records, the Theory III has failed to give due weight to the new and distinguishing epithets (vyāvarttaka-dharmas) like Hirāpyagarbha-prasūta, and Trivaranaagare-bhavana-gata-yuvati-hridaya-nandana borne only by Mādhavavarmans of the Ipur set I and the Polamuru set I. These latter epithets, beyond doubt, indicate (i) that these two Mādhavavarmans, who assumed these titles, and who were the sons of Gōvinda-varman, must have been identical; and (ii) that he must have been different from his namesake of all the other Vishṇukundī charters.

Secondly, a comparative study of the respective grant portions of the Polamuru set I of Mādhavavarman and the Polamuru set II of the Eastern Chālukya Jayasimha would reveal that the donee of the latter charter was the son of the donee of the former one; that therefore the interval between the dates of these two charters could not have been much longer than one generation. And consequently that Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I and the Ipur set I is to be placed slightly before the Chālukyan conquest, and after Vikramāndravarman II of the Chikkulla charter, who therefore may 29 be identical with Vikramaḥendravarman of the Polamuru set I.

30 Again the Theory IV questions the Theory II also that
identifies Madhavavarman the younger of the Ipur set II with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates. In this context it is pointed out that while the former Madhavavarman was a Trīkūṭa-Malayādhinatī, but not a performer of 11 Aśvamedhas and other sacrifices, the case was quite the reverse with the other Madhavavarman. Therefore Madhavavarman the elder of the Ipur set II has to be identified with his namesake of the Chikkulla and Ramatirtham plates.

On the basis of the above reasoning the following genealogical table is constructed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madhavavarman (Performed 11 Aśvamedhas and other sacrifices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Đōvavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhavavarman II (Issued the Ipur set II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrabhattaraksavarman (issued the Ramatirtham plates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman II (issued the Chikkulla plates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govindavarman Vikramaśraya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhavavarman Janāśraya (Performed 11 Aśvamedhas and other sacrifices and issued the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mañchyappabhattāraka the ājñapti of the Ipur set I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now arises a problem, viz: How to account for (i) the palaeographical discrepancy and (ii) the duplication of Madhavavarmans who claim to have performed an equal number of
the same sacrifices? Regarding the first question it is remarked that it is not easy to fix up, within a century or so, or even more, on simply palaeographical grounds, the time of an undated record. And the second question is explained away by saying that the epithets like śakāsāsvāmedha etc., agnīshyomasahasra etc., seem to be mostly rhetoric and conventional attributes; and that these epithets, originally of the earlier Madhayavavarman, must have been appropriated by his later namesake who had also his own distinguishing titles.

Of the four Theories studied so far, the first two have become obsolete. Consequently the last two theories alone hold the field at present. Hence, now among the students of the Indian History some hold to the Theory III while some others adhere to the Theory IV. Now before examining the relative strength and weakness of these theories, we shall study the next part of our problem viz., the chronology of the Vishnukundis.

Dr. Hultzsch suggested that the Ipur set II is the earliest of the known charters of the family and compared its characters with that of the British Museum Prakrit charter of the Pallava queen Chārudevi. Thus he indicated implicitly the upper limit of the age of the Vishnukundis i.e., the second half of the 4th century A.D. Similarly Dubreuil assigned the Polamuru set I to a period shortly before the Chālukyan conquest of the Coastal Andhra and had thus suggested a sort of working hypothesis for the construction
of a chronological scheme for the family.

Evidently taking both these clues and perhaps by tagging Dubreuil’s above suggestion with the statement that Madhavavarman of the Polamuru “was the latest of the Vishnu-kuṇḍi kings”, the upholders of the Theory II had worked out a detailed chronological scheme in the following ways:

- Madhavavarman I . . 357-382 A.D. (25 years)
- Devavarman . . 382-407 A.D. (25 years)
- Madhavavarman II . . 407-444 A.D. (37 years)
- Vikramendravarman I . . 444-469 A.D. (25 years)
- Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman . . 469-496 A.D. (27 years)
- Vikramendravarman II . . 496-521 A.D. (25 years)
- Govindavarman Vikramāśraya . . 521-546 A.D. (25 years)
- Madhavavarman III Janāśraya . . 546-610 A.D. (65 years)
- Maṇḍhyanābhaṭṭāraka . . 610- A.D.

Basing on the genealogical scheme of this Theory, Vishnu-kuṇḍi chronology comprising of 250 years from c. 400 A.D. to 650 A.D. has also been worked out by other scholars.

The Theory III has made the necessary correction to the above schemes by pointing out that at least up to the middle of the 5th century A.D., the Vēṇgi country was under the rule of the Śaṅkāyanaśa and not of the Vishṇu-kuṇḍis. However this Theory III assumes as follows: (i) The difference between
the Polamuru set I and Polamuru set II was "about half a
century".(ii) The fifth year of the Eastern Chalukya Jaya-
simha (i.e. the date of the latter record) corresponded to
637 A.D. (iii) The details of the date of the Polamuru set I
might have fallen in 556 A.D., or 565 A.D., or 574 A.D., or
575 A.D. On the basis of these assumptions this theory assigns
the accession of that king to a period sometime between 516
and 535 A.D. So an "approximate chronology" of the Vishųkūṇḍi
kings has been built up in the following manner:

1. Rise of the Vishųkūṇḍi power . . in the 5th century
   A.D.

2. Vikramendravarman I . . c. 500-520 A.D.
3. Gōvindavarman Vikramāśrava . . c. 520-535 A.D.
4. Madhavavarman I Janaśrava . . c. 535-585 A.D.
5. Madhavavarman II . . c. 585-615 A.D.
6. Vikramendravarman II . . c. 615-625 A.D.
7. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman . . c. 625-655 A.D.
8. Vikramendravarman II . . c. 655-670 A.D.
9. End of the dynasty about the end of the 7th cen-
tury A.D. or somewhere in the 8th century A.D.

It is natural that the above scheme has led the author
of the Theory III to assume further that it was either
Madhavavarman II or Vikramendravarman II who was defeated by
the Chalukyan conqueror. So a series of explanations and
elucidations had to be offered to show that there was a
prolonged continuance of the Vishųkūṇḍi rule in the Vēṅgī
area even after his conquest by the Chalukyas. Evidently to ward off the sharp criticism on this untenable position the author of this Theory has subsequently revised the scheme as follows:

Vikramahendra (Okramendra)varman I c. 500 A.D.
|        |
| Goindavarman Vikramārava        |
|        |
| Madhavavarman Janāśraya I c. 535-585 A.D. |
|        |
| Devavarman                      |
| Vikramendravarman II 585-631 A.D. |
| Manchyanabhātṭāraka             |
| Madhavavarman II Indrabaṭṭārakavarman c. 590-620 A.D. |
| Vikramendravarman III c. 620-631 A.D. |

Now the author of this Theory also holds that on the authority of the Kopparam plates, the Chalukyan conquest of the Andhra country must be assigned to about 631 A.D.; and that it was Vikramendravarman III (not any of the earlier kings) who was conquered by the Chalukya. So when the Kandulapalem plates dated in the 14th regnal year of that Vīṣṇukūṇḍi monarch came to be published he has to further revise the above revised scheme also, without however, changing the last date, as follows:
On the other hand the Theory IV worked out the following chronological scheme to suit its genealogical table:

As in the case of the Vishnuḍi genealogy so in the case of the Vishnuḍi chronology too these two uncompromising views of the Theory III and the Theory IV are now in the field. And their arguments and counter-arguments go on. The views of other scholars, in spite of their respective differences may be grouped under these two schemes.

From what has been studied so far it is clear that the problem of the Vishnuḍi genealogy and chronology is the
problem of identification of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I and that it is closely related to the date of the Chālukyan conquest and to the date of the Polamuru set II.

The source of strength of the genealogical scheme, propounded by the Theory III is its very convincing arguments nailed on the common epithets like Ekadesā-Āśvamedha etc., which seem to point to the identity of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I with Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates. But its weakness is that it widens too much the gap between the two sets of the Polamuru plates—50 years or even more. This gap has to be justified only by means of long arguments based on some assumption and presumptions. And in fact the said gap may be still wider. For, if Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I was succeeded by the other kings of the Chikkulla list, then the Vishnukundī rule must have continued for at least some 43 years more, after the date of the Polamuru set I. Similarly before the date of the Polamuru set II, some 22 or 23 years of Eastern Chālukyan rule also must have elapsed. Thus the above gap would actually become 43 + 23 = 66 years. So this has to be once again explained away by suggesting that Kubja Vishnuvardhana’s regnal years were counted from about 614 A.D., long before 631 A.D., which, according to the Theory III, was the date of the Chālukyan conquest of the Andhra country. But if the other views according to which the counting of Vishnuvardhana’s regnal years started only from
624 A.D. or even as late as 631 A.D. are proved to be correct, then the above stand may not be tenable at all. Thus the arrangements of the Theory III seem to suffer from chronological difficulty.

At the same time, the scheme of the Theory IV seems to have the capacity to stand the chronological test. As the 48th year of Madhavavarman Janāśraya is equated in this scheme with 616 A.D., the gap between the two sets of the Polamuru plates would be only 38 years even if one takes 631 A.D. to be the starting point of Kubja Vishnurindhana's regnal year. But it does suffer from lack of arguments to establish the probability and possibility of the existence of two Madhavavarmans claiming 11 Aśvamedhas and other sacrifices. It is futile to explain it away as a case of conventional appropriation of the earlier Madhavavarman's purely hyperbolic and rhetorical titles, by the later king of his namesake. The question is this: Why among the later members of the family, Madhavavarman alone, and not any one else should appropriate such titles for himself. Until a logical answer to this pertinent question is suggested, the Theory IV is bound to be characterised as "not completely convincing."

On the other hand, if it is possible to work out a scheme in which Madhavavarman Janāśraya of the Polamuru set I, though claiming 11 Aśvamedhas and Aṣṇishtōmaśabasa is to be accommodated necessarily in between the date of Vikramendra-varman II of the Chikkulla plates and that of the Chālukyan
conquest; and if that scheme itself could help one in finding out an answer to the question why the later Madhavavarman alone, and not any other king, claimed such sacrifices; then such a scheme should be acceptable to all including the authors of the Theories III and IV. Luckily, such a scheme seems to be possible with the help of two more Vishnukundī records recently unearthed in Tummalagudem village in Mahbubnagar District. Their contents may be summarised as follows:

The Tummalagudem set II is the charter issued by the Vishnukundī king Vikramendravarman II in his eleventh regnal year and Śaka 488 (= A.D. 566-67) granting a village in favour of the Buddhist clergy of a vihāra referred to as Paramabhaṭṭārika-mahāvihāra and stated to have been built by a certain Paramabhaṭṭārikāmahādevī. She was the queen of one Govindaraja, a staunch Buddhist king of the Vishnukundī family of Śrīparvata and was the builder of many vihāras. Her son was Madhavarāja noted for his aggressive wars. The introductory part of the charter furnishes the following genealogy of the Vishnukundī kings:

1. Govindavarman: a staunch Buddhist and builder of many vihāras
2. Mādhavavarman: performer of 11 Āśvamedhas and other sacrifices
3. Vikramendravarman I
4. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarm Śatyaśráva
5. Vikramendravarman II Uttaṃśráva: the issuer of the charter
The above genealogy clearly indicates that the issuer of the charter was no other than his namesake who issued the Chikkulla plates. Again the identity of the description of Govindarāja in the grant portion with that of Govindavarman in the genealogical account indicates that both the persons were one and the same. Then it will follow that Madhavārāja of the grant portion was identical with Madhavavarman of the introductory part.

The Tummalagudem set I was issued by a Vishnukundī king called Govindavarman in his 37th regnal year, granting a village in favour of the Buddhist monks of the vihāra built by his queen Paramamahādevī. It offers the following genealogy of the king’s family:

1. Indravarman

2. Madhavavarman

3. Govindavarman
   the issuer of the charter a staunch Buddhist and a builder of many vihāras etc.

From this account it is sufficiently clear that the vihāra, its builder, the queen Paramamahādevī and her husband Govindavarman, the issuer of this charter are identical with their respective counterparts of the Tummalagudem set II seen above. Thus these two charters are complementary to one another in supplying the genealogy of the Vishnukundis down
to Vikramendra-varman II. So the combined genealogy supplied by these two charters together may be tabulated as follows:-

1. Indravarman
2. Madhavavarman I
3. Govinda-varman, issuer of the Tummalagudem set I
4. Madhavavarman II, performer of 11 Áśvamedhas etc.
5. Vikramendra-varman I
6. Indrabhattaraka-varman
7. Vikramendra-bhattaraka-varman

It may be seen now that the king No. 4, viz. Madhavavarman, the performer of 11 Áśvamedhas etc., who was the grandfather of No. 6, Indrabhattaraka-varman (of the Ramatirtham plates) and the great-grandfather of No. 7 Vikramendra-bhattaraka-varman (of the Chikkulla and Tummalagudem plates) had his grandfather in No. 2 by name Madhavavarman. But according to the list of kings given by the Polamuru set I, the king Madhavavarman Janāśraya, the performer of 11 Áśvamedhas etc., had his grandfather whose name was not Madhavavarman but Vikramahendra-varman. Therefore it is obvious that Madhavavarman of the Chikkulla list and the other Madhavavarman of the Polamuru (I) list were different and that there did exist, not only one, but Madhavavarman claiming 11 Áśvamedhas. Now one need not be afraid of
the argument of the Theory III against such conclusion. Nobody can question even if a series of Mādhavavarmans is accepted with sufficient proof. *(Pramāṇavat ātāh pravāhāḥ kēṇā vaṃyataḥ)*.

Now it remains to find out the place of the kings of the Polamuru (I) list. It has already been seen that on the basis of its palaeography and its contents this record has been assigned after the date of the Chikkulla plates and just immediately before the Chālukyan conquest of Andhra. The later event took place about 616 A.D. as indicated by the Marutra grant of Pulakesi II. The details of the date of the actual grant of the Polamuru set I viz., lunar eclipse, Phālguna su. 15 seems to correspond to the 22nd February, 612 A.D. Therefore the 48th year of Mādhavavarman Janāśrava quoted in the Polamuru set I may be equated with 611-12 A.D. or 612-13 A.D. Consequently the year of accession of that king has to be fixed in 562-63 or 563-64 A.D. In this context the following three crucial points may be borne in mind.

(i) The period 562-64 A.D. fixed for the accession of Mādhavavarman Janāśrava was earlier by 3 or 4 years to the date of the Tummalagudem plates II of Vikramāndravarman II viz., Śaka 498 or 566-67 A.D. Thus the earlier regnal years of Mādhavavarman Janāśrava seem to overlap with the reign period of Vikramāndravarman II.

(ii) From the last mentioned inscription, dated also
in the 11th regnal year of Vikramendravarman II, one may have to fix up the accession of that king in 555-56 A.D. or 556-57 A.D.

(iii) Moreover the inscriptions of that king assert that the monarch was enthroned by the prakriti-mandala or the council of ministers when he was still in his boyhood (śaiśaveśa) — say about 16 years old. Therefore this king, who was only about 16 years old in 555-56 A.D., would have been about only 22 or 23 years old in 562-64 A.D., viz., the date of accession of Madhavavarman Janāśraya arrived at above.

These factors are strong enough to indicate that Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla and Tummalagudem plates could not have been that Vikramendravarman, the grandfather of Madhavavarman Janāśraya who ascended the throne as early as 562-63 A.D. Thus the genealogical arrangements of the Theory IV also seems to require a modification. As the identification of Vikramendravarman of the Polemuru set I with Vikramendravarman II is out of question, the former may be identified with Vikramendravarman I in as much as there was no third king of that name among the Vishṇukundi monarchs. In that case both Vikramendravarman II and Madhavavarman Janāśraya would be cousin brothers and hence would be more or less of the same age in 562-63 A.D., the year from which the latter's regnal years seem to have been counted.

Moreover from the fact that Madhavavarman Janāśraya
started ruling earlier than the end of the rule of Vikramēndravarmān II it is logical to deduce that the former started his career as a viceroy or a feudatory of the latter or perhaps even as an independent ruler over some principality since about 562 A.D. and on some opportune time after the 14th regnal year of Vikramēndravarmān II (i.e., the date of the Kandulapalem plates) viz., after Śaka 491 or 569-70 A.D. — say in 571 A.D. or near about — he overthrew that ruler and occupied the imperial throne. That he got the empire not from his father Gōvindavarman but from Vikramēndravarmān himself seems to be hinted at by his own Polamuru charter. Evidently to commemorate his victory and independence, this Mādhavavarman the son of Gōvindavarman II, performed horse sacrifices etc., imitating his illustrious namesake who was his great grand­father and was also the son of one Gōvindavarman. No other Vishpukundī king who ruled in between these two Mādhavavarmans had any such occasion to perform those sacrifices. That is why among the successors of the earlier Mādhavavarman no king excepting Mādhavavarman Janāśraya is found claiming Āsvamādhas.

Now it is incumbent on us to identify those Mādhavavarmans who are mentioned in the two sets of Ipur plates. For in these plates too there figure Mādhavavarmans with 11 Āsvamādhas etc.

(1) We have already seen that Mādhavavarmans of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) charters bore the two titles viz.,
Trivaranagara etc., and Hiramragarbha etc., and that on that basis the Theory IV takes those two to be identical and differentiates him from the earlier Madhavaverman I of the Ipur set II. At the same time that Theory believes in the possibility of appropriation of the titles of the earlier kings by the later ones. But in fact, it will be seen later that in the title like Trivaranagara etc., there is nothing to distinguish one Madhavaverman from the other. Moreover if the later Madhavaverman was really capable of appropriating form himself the high sounding titles of his earlier namesake, was he incapable of doing the same in the case of the titles under question? Therefore one may take into account the following facts:

(i) The characters of the Ipur charter I, as declared by Dr. Hultzsch, are doubtlessly earlier than that of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates.

(ii) The language and titles found in the Ipur set I are much simpler than that in the Polamuru set I.

(iii) And the general appearance of the Ipur set I is much earlier than that of the Polamuru set I.

On these grounds the king Madhavaverman of Ipur I may be identified with his namesake of the Chikkulla list.

(2) Similarly on the very same grounds the king Madhavaverman I of the Ipur set II may also be identified with the same monarch. Of course this identification had already
been accepted by both the opposite schools of the Theories III and IV. But this, if combined with the identification of Ādhavavarman of the Ipur set I, as has been just suggested, goes against the second statement of Dr. Hultzsch assigning the Ipur set II to a period earlier than that of the Ipur set I. Therefore though the founder of the Theory III may approve the above suggestion, the upholders of the Theory IV would oppose it. Even the line of defence of the former Theory, set up by some, is considered to be not decisive by the other school.

However it must be pointed out that even those who, on the authority of Dr. Hultzsch assign the Ipur set II to a period earlier than that of the Ipur set I, do not follow the statement of that epigraphist in its true spirit. For they assign the Ipur set II to c. 500 A.D. or still later, whereas Dr. Hultzsch's statement would implicitly assign the record to c. 400 A.D. Moreover by believing that Ādhavavarman II of the Ipur set II was a contemporary of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman, the scholars of the Theory IV assign, in effect, that charter to the period of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman. On the other hand by believing that the Ipur set II is dated in the regnal year, not of Ādhavavarman II, the issuer of the grant, but of his grandfather Ādhavavarman, the upholders of the Theory III assign the charter to the period of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's grandfather. Thus the earlier date approved by the Theory IV for the Ipur set II is rather apparent than real.
As a matter of fact the angularity and the boldness of the characters of the Ipur charter II seem to have given it an older look than what it actually is. A comparative study of the angular characters of the Kandulapalem plates with the roundish letters in the Chikkulla plates, dated respectively in the 14th and 10th years of Vikramendravarman II may make the point clear. This older look of the Ipur II is further enhanced by the careless and shallow engraving and by the too much of damages the charter has suffered. Therefore the Ipur set II could have been later than the Ipur set I, and Mādhavavarman I of the charter could have been identical with Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates. Consequently his son and grandson viz., Devavarmān and Mādhavavarman II must have formed a collateral branch of the family.

There are two more records of Mādhavavarman and both of them are fragmentary. The first is the stone inscription from Vēlpuru and the second is the copper-plate charter from Khānāpur. They seem to belong to Mādhavavarman of the Chikkulla plates rather than to any other king of that name.

On the basis of the reasons given so far and on the basis of the known regnal years of the kings of the family, the genealogy and chronology of the Vishṇukūṇḍi kings may be tabulated as follows:-
1. Indravarman c. 375-400 A.D.
2. Madhavavarman I c. 400-82 A.D.
3. Govinda Varman Ic. 422-62 A.D. (40 years)
4. Madhavavarman c. 462-502 A.D. (40 years)
5. Govinda Varman II Vikramaditya
6. Indrabhatarkavarman c. 502-27 A.D.
7. Vikramadityavarman II
   (c. 555 to 572 A.D. (about 17 years) (of the Chikkulla plates, year 10; Tummalagudem Set II, year 11 = Saka 488; and Kandulapalem plates, year 14).
8. Madhavavarman IV Janashraya c. 564-612 A.D. (48 years)
   (of the Polamuru set I year 48) performer of 11 Asvamedhas and other sacrifices
The above scheme based on the facts supplied by the old and new source materials is free from unnecessary assumptions. It minimizes the gap between the two sets of the Polasamuru plates, and hence free from the difficulty of explaining the continued existence of the Vishṇukūpī rule even after the Chāluṇyav conquest. The total period allotted to the eight ruling monarchs is only 225 years — in average about 28 years for each monarch — and it is not unreasonable. The fact that the dynasty, though it became an independent power, as it will be seen later, under Gōvindavarman I, had its previous history at least for two generations, gives us an opportunity to reconstruct its history on a wider basis.

The reign period (564-613 A.D.) allotted to Mādhavavarman Janāsrava finds support from the Janāsravī Chhandōvīchiti of the period. For, it quotes from the poet Bharavi, generally assigned to about 550 A.D. It is also corroborated by the Vizianagaram tradition that gives the date Śaka 514 (=592 A.D.) for a certain Mādhavavarman of the Andhra dynasty.

Moreover the total number of regnal years from the great king Mādhavavarman II down to the end of the fourth reputed king of that name is 40 + 25 + 29 + 18 + 48 = 160. This seems to explain a tradition recorded in the later age according to which there was a Mādhavavarman in Andhra ruling for 160 years. Probably these traditions have mixed up the respective account of Mādhavavarman II and Mādhavavarman IV.
and have attributed from their own imagination so many deeds to that king, thus rendering his history beyond all points of recognition. A parallel example may be found in the Tibetan and Chinese traditions that have hopelessly mixed up the two respective accounts of Nāgārjuna, the Madhyamika of about the middle of the second century A.D. and the other Nāgārjuna, the Tantrika of about the seventh century A.D. These traditions speak of a single Nāgārjuna living for 529 or 571 years and have added to the story so much from their imagination that it may lead the critics to doubt the very existence of a writer named Nāgārjuna.

Even after the recent discovery of the two sets of Tummalagudem plates some new theories have been published by scholars. One such scholar presupposes the posteriority of the group of kings of the Tummalagudem set I to that of the Tummalagudem set II and tries to accommodate the first group in between the dates of the last mentioned charter and of the Chālukyan conquest. But this thesis feels helpless to decide the relationship between the first and the second groups of kings.

Believing in the anteriority of the first group of kings to that of the second group of the two sets of the Tummalagudem plates, two suggestions have been made by another scholar. The first one identifies Mādhavavarman and Gōvindavarman of the Tummalagudem set I respectively with
Vikramahendravarman and Govindavarman of the Polamuru set I while the second one views Govinda varman of the former record to be the father of Vikramahendravarman of the later one.

92 A third scholar has identified Indravarman of the Tummalagudem set I with Indrabhaṭṭaraka varman of the Ramatirtham and Chikkulla plates.

These writers are evidently under the strong spell of the doctrine of single Madhavavarman with 11 Āśvameṭhes, advocated by the Theory III, which, as shown above seems to suffer too much from chronological difficulties even if one does not take into account the new discoveries. Now the newly discovered records have created such a position where it is not given to anyone to adhere to that doctrine and at the same time to be logical in answering the different chronological questions. Moreover these schemes would assign the Polamuru set I to a period of about 520 A.D. and consequently widen up the hiatus between the date of that record and the date of the Polamuru set II (i.e., 633, 651 or 668 A.D.) by more than a century, a result which no one is likely to approve. Besides, these new theories are based on somewhat defective reading and interpretation of the text of the Tummalagudem sets.

In the light of the Theory IV some attempts have also been made to give different genealogical and chronological schemes, ignoring the fact that Vikramahendra varman of the Polamuru set I could not have been identical with Vikramendra varman II of the Chikkulla plates.
NOTES

(i) Name of the Dynasty

1. The name occurs in all the records of the family excepting the Khanapur plates. In Inscriptions VII, VIII and IX it occurs more than once.

2. I.e., in Inscriptions II, VI, VII, VIII and IX.

3. Inscription V.

4. Inscriptions I, III, VII, IX and X.

5. EI, XVII, p. 335.

6. In fact the reading here is °konāinyām.


8. EI, XXXVI, p. 11.

9. A similar error has crept in the name of the Western Chālukya king Pulakēśivallabha. The name occurs within compounds often. But in the Aihole inscription (v. 7) it is found in the Nominative singular. Dr. Fleet who first edited this inscription read the portion as Pulakēśi ya and corrected it into °kēṣi yaḥ to honour grammar (IA, VIII, p. 241). Dr. Kielhorn too read the portion containing the name as °kēṣī(śī) yaḥ[p*] (EI, VI, p. 4). Consequently now the name of the monarch is spelt by all as Pulakēśin with n-ending. However an examination of
the facsimiles of the record furnished by the above scholars and the impressions of it (No. B 219 of ARE, 1957-58) shows that the reading of the passage is Polakēśīr-ya[ḥṣ] which is correct both metrically and grammatically and which therefore indicates that the spelling of the name is only Pulakēśi with i- ending. Similarly the Chālukya family is called Chulukikīnāṁ-anvaya in the Lohner plates of Pulakēśi II of Śaka 552 (EI, XXVII, p. 39, line 6). This indicates that according to the author of the record, the dynastic name was only Chulukiki with i- ending. But the writers are inclined to spell it as Chulukikin with u- ending (See CA, p. 227).

(ii) Genealogy and Chronology


11 These five plates are enumerated here in the order in which they have been discovered and edited one by one. The Kandulapalem plates, discovered later, furnishes a genealogy which is identical with that of the Chikkulla plates.

12 ARE, 1914, p. 102.

13 Ibid., 1920, pp. 97 ff.

14 This identification suggested by Krishna Sastri with
much hesitation and reservation (ARE, 1914, p. 102) was approved by Dubreuil (The Pallavas, p. 34; AHD, pp. 90-92).

15 EI, XVII, p. 335.

16 Ibid., VIII, pp. 143 ff.

17 Portion within brackets is mine.

18 EI, XVII, p. 338. These two statements of Hultzsch will be subsequently referred to respectively as statement 1 and 2 of Hultzsch.

19 AHD, p. 90.


21 This scheme had been approved by M.S. Sarma (JAHRS, V, pp. 180-85), Robert Sewell (The Historical Inscriptions of Southern India, Ed. by S.K. Aiyanger, Madras, p. 404), R. Subba Rao, (JAHRS, VI, p. 19) and others. However some scholars (BRA & HA, pp. 114-15) continued to stick on to the earlier Theory.

22 IHQ, IX, pp. 273 ff; JDL, XXVI, pp. 84 ff; SS, pp. 98 ff.
23 SS, p. 102.
24 Ibid., p. 104; CA, p. 207.
25 SS, p. 131 n.
26 Ibid., p. 57.
27 EI, XXIII, pp. 19 ff; IC, XV, pp. 15 ff; etc.
28 IC, XV, p. 15-16; EI, XXIII, p. 91 and n.
29 I.e., as has been suggested by Dubreuil earlier (AHD, p. 92).
30 I.e., as has been suggested by the Theory I.
31 EI, XXIII, p. 95; IC, XV, p. 17; etc.
32 Ibid.
33 CA, p. 224.
34 QJMS, XXV, pp. 82 ff; XXVI, pp. 142 ff; Ibid., XXV, pp. 299 ff; XXVII, pp. 231 ff.
35 E.g., K.S. Vaidyanathan, QJMS, XXX, pp. 62-63; Dr. M. Rama Rao, APGAS, No. 10; etc. See below.
36 E.g., Dr. R. Subrahmanyan, APGAS, No. 8, pp. 11 ff; Shri B.N. Sastri, Bharati, 1965, June, pp. 27 ff; etc.
37 EI, XVII, p. 338.
A reign of 65 years for this Madhavavarma has been justified by equating the details of the date of the Polamuru set I viz., Phalgunasa 15, lunar eclipse, 48th year with 594 A.D., February 10, and by taking that king to be the Vishnuvardha enemy of the Chalukyan conqueror in 610 A.D. (ibid.)

Sri K.S. Vaidyanathan, QJMS, XXV, pp. 85-86.

SS, p. 102 fn; QJMS, XXV, pp. 300-01.

SS, pp. 110-12. It has also been pointed out that if Madhavavarma the younger issued his charter only as a viceroy of his grandfather, his reign should be omitted and the succeeding reigns closed up. (Ibid., pp. 392 and 398).

Ibid., p. 116.

Ibid., pp. 116 ff.

IC, XV, pp. 17-18, p. 224 n.

It is why some scholars though concurring (QJMS, XXX, pp. 62-63) with Theory III in the genealogical scheme, had worked out another chronological scheme of their own
starting from 457-87 A.D. (for Vikramendraavarman I),
passing through 517-65 A.D. (for Madhavavarman Janasrava)
and ending in 605-15 A.D. (for Vikramendraavarman III). 
Ibid., pp. 70-71.

49 CA, 1962, p. 207. In the copy of this book printed in 
1964 the years are not marked.

50 Published in EI, XVIII, pp. 257-60.

51 EI, XXXVI, p. 8.

52 IC, XV, p. 17; CA, p. 223. The arrangement proposed by
some comprises of a period beginning in 420-55 A.D. (for 
Madhavavarman Janasrava). No regnal period is allotted
to the latter's son Manchyaapabhattarakaka. Again reading
the regnal year in the Ipur set II as 27, these scholars
have assigned the younger Madhavavarman's reign to c.
458-88 A.D. in between the reign periods of Devavarman
(c. 455-58 A.D.) and Vikramendraavarman I (c. 488-93 A.D.)
(ED, pp. 418-21). According to the chronological
arrangement suggested earlier by others, Madhavavarman I
ruled round about 500 A.D. and Madhavavarman Janasrava
ruled until c. 621 A.D., i.e. his 48th regnal year. (See
EI, XXIII, p. 95). Some have accepted the genealogical
arrangement, of the Theory IV but allot about 200 years
for the Vishvakupiji rule from c. 400 A.D. to c. 600 A.D.
(APGAS, No. 8, p. 12-13).

54 SS, p. 110 and n.

55 Ibid., pp. 108-10.

56 I.e., 2 years of Madhavavarman's son Vikramendravarman + 27 years of his son Indrabhattarakavarman + 14 years of his son Vikramendravarman II = 43 years according to the latest arrangement (El, XXXVI, p. 8).

57 I.e., 18 years of Kubja Vishnuvardhana + 5 years of his successor Jayasimha.

58 CA, pp. 251-52.

59 Ibid., p. 211.

60 JAHRS, IX, pt. iv., pp. 1 ff; ECV, p. 55.

61 JOR, IX, pp. 17 ff.

62 I.e., 631 A.D. + Kubja Vishnuvardhana's reign period of 18 years + Jayasimha's regnal years (recorded in the Polamuru set II) viz., 5 years minus 616 A.D. (date of Polamuru set I) = 654 A.D., minus 616 A.D. = 38 years.

63 See QJMS, XXVII, 1936-37, p. 232; CA, p. 207 n.


65 The difference between the names ending in varman and those ending in raja makes in fact no difference at
all. For, the father of the Chālukya king Pulakeśi II is generally called Kīrttivarman in inscriptions. But his name appears in the form of Kīrttirāja also in the Nerur grant of his son (IA, VIII, pp. 43 ff.). Similarly both the Vakāṭaka Dēvasena and the Gupta king Dēvagupta (i.e. Chandragupta II) are referred to as Dēvarāja alike in the inscriptions (CII, V, p. 117, line 13; III, p. 32, line 7).

66 For other views on this point see below.

67 In fact the author of the Theory III himself may be ready to believe in the existence of two such Madhavavarmans provided there is "evidence of an exceptionally positive character". See JAHRS, XI, p. 129.

68 See below Ch. IX, sect. i.

69 See below Ch. VII, sect. ii.

70 This date certainly relieves one of the unnecessary assumption that the Polamuru set I may be a later copy of an earlier inscription.

71 Even accepting the theory that the date of the Chālukyan conquest was 631 A.D., and assuming that the 48th regnal year of Madhavavaran Janārāja coincided with that year one cannot identify now Vikramahendravarman of the Polamuru set I with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates and Tummelagudem (II) plates. For if 631 A.D.
was his 48th year, then Madhavavarman’s accession may have to be placed in 631 minus 48, i.e. 583 A.D. As we have nothing to suggest that Madhavavarman IV came to the throne as a minor, we may have to believe that he must have been at least 18 years old at the time of his accession. Accordingly he must have been born at least about (583 minus 18) 565 A.D., i.e., when Vikramendravarman II was only about 24 years old and was too young to have a grandson by that date.

72 See also below.
73 See below Ch. VII, sect. ii.
74 See Ch. IV; Ch. VII, sect. ii.
75 EHAC, pp. 206-07.
76 IC, XV, p. 15.
77 Ibid., p. 13; CA, p. 224.
78 See EI, XXIII, p. 95; ED, p. 421; CA, p. 223 etc.
79 CA, p. 209.
80 See below Ch. IV, sect. i.
81 For the probable period of this ruler see below Ch. VI, sect. ii.
82 See below Ch. IV, sect. iii.
83 See below Ch. VII, sect. ii.
84 See ibid; CA, p. 311.


86 JDL, XI, p. 56.


88 Nalinaksha Dutt, IHQ, VII (1931), p. 637.

89 M. Walleser, The Life of Nagarjuna from Tibetan and Chinese Sources (Reprint from the Asia Major, Introductory Volume, Leipzig) p. 6.


91 Dr. A.M. Sastri, JIH, XLIV, 1966, pp. 683-91.

92 Sri K. Syama Sundaram, JAERS, XXXI, pp. 39 ff.