CHAPTER II

THE BACKGROUND

Not much is known about the background from which the Vishnukundis came to play their role in the political scene of Andhra. Therefore in this chapter an attempt is made to understand something about their origin, original home and other connected matters.

(i), The Origin and the Original Home of the Vishnukundis

The origin of the Vishnukundis is shrouded in mystery. Similarly nothing is definitely known about their homeland also. Conflicting suggestions have been made by scholars on these questions. As both the above problems are inter-related they are studied together here.

Considering the findspot of the Chikkulla plates as well as the slight Telugu influence on the language of that charter; identifying the Śrīvarvata of the record with the Śrīśailam; and connecting the dynastic name Vishnukundī with Vinukonda of to-day, a place of antiquity 60 miles east of the Śrīśailam; Prof. Kielhorn suggested that Vinukonda might have been the capital of the dynasty.

However taking into consideration (i) the matrimonial relation of a member of this family "with the Vākaṭakas of the north"; (ii) and the findspot of Indrābhaṭṭārakavarman's
charter near Vizianagaram and many ancient coins with the
dynasty's royal emblem (viz., the lion) discovered in the
Vizagapatam District; and holding (iii) the said king's war
with Prithvimula to be a war connected with the southward
expansion of the Vishnukundī power; some scholars like
H. Krishna Sastri concluded that the dynasty must have been
distinctly a northern one. Consequently they tried to
locate the Śrīparvata in the Vizagapatam District. They also
identified Trivaranagara of the Ipur set I and the Trikūṭa-
Malaya of the Ipur set II — both considered to be the
earliest of the grants of the family — respectively with
Tewar near Jabalpur and the Trikūṭa of the Vākāṭaka inscrip-
tion.

But it is known that the Satavāhanas and Ikshvākus had
matrimonial connections with the Western Kshatrapas and the
Śakas of Ujjayinī. Perhaps the Kadambas too had similar
relations with the Vākāṭakas and the Guptas. Yet, on that
account no one has embarked upon suggesting a North Indian
origin for all of them. At the same time an Amaravati inscrip-
tion seems to suggest that the Vākāṭaka was not a
foreigner to the Andhra country. Besides, all the places
mentioned in the Vishnukundī charters can be better identi-
fied with places in the Andhra Pradesh itself. Therefore the
theory of the North Indian origin has lost its hold on
scholars who therefore favour Kielhorn's above theory, and
hold that the family was an indigenous one belonging to the
Andhra country. Some have gone a step forward to conclude that the dynasty had its earlier home in the land south of the Krishna, with their capital at Amaravati, identified with "Amarapura" of the Ipur set II. But as will be seen later, the dynastic name Visnukundī may not indicate that Vinukonda was the capital of the dynasty; nor does Ipur set II has anything to do with "Amarapura" or Amaravati. So the solution to this problem seems to lie somewhere else.

At the outset it may be pointed out that the Tummala-gudem set II describes the kings of the dynasty as Śrīparvatāyas meaning "(the kings) of the Śrīparvata". This Śrīparvata must be the same hill whose god the Visnukundīs worshipped. Dr. Kielhorn was perfectly right when he identified this hill with the modern Śrisailam in the Kurnool District, famous for the Mallikarjuna temple. Secondly it will be seen later that a Vishnukundī was referred to as Andhranatī by his Maukhari rival.

These two epithets viz., Śrīparvatāya and Andhranatī indicate a distinct possibility of the Visnukundīs claiming a connection with the Śrīparvatīya Andras who are included in the Puranic list of the successors of the Sātavāhanas i.e., the Andras. Now it becomes imperative that the Puranic passage that speaks of the Śrīparvatīya Andras is examined. The passage under question runs like this:
Jas. Burgess believed that the Andhras, who are called the bhritvas or servants of the Andhras, i.e., the Satavahanas, in the passage may be a petty dynasty either at Srisailam or across the Krishna at Chandraguptapatnam in the vicinity. Rapson went a step further and held that the above servants of the Andhras were perhaps the Chutu Satakarnis. This view however has been rejected later by others on the ground that the Ikshvaku inscriptions discovered later at Nagarijuna-konda associates what is called Sriparvata with the Ikshvaku capital Vijayapurin in the Nagarijuna-konda valley. Therefore it is now generally held that the whole of the Nallamalai range was known by the general name Sriparvata and that it was the Ikshvakus and not the Chutus, who are referred to in the above Puranic passage. It is also stressed that no dynasty other than the Ikshvakus could have ruled in the region after the Satavahanas, and that to this Sriparvata of the Ikshvakus the Tantrika Nagarijuna of the seventh century might have retired as stated by the Tibetan writer Taranatha and as indicated by the Jaggayapat inscription of Chandraprabha, the spiritual grandson of that teacher.
But the evidence of the Nagarjunakonda and Amaravati inscriptions and the arguments based on them both do not appear to be strong enough to go against what Burgess and Rapson had suggested. On the other hand the following reasons are there in support of their contention:

(i) The Chutukula coins from the Anantapur District and from the southern part of the former Hyderabad State indeed go to prove that the Chutukulas held sway in and around the Srisailam area and thus testify that the suggestion of those scholars is not wrong. It seems to get further support from the fact that the Srisailam area was known in medieval times by the name Kannadu, Kannavishaya which were the contracted forms of Satakarni-naḍu and Satakarni-vishaya. It is likely that they were connected with the Sātavāhanahāra of the Mysakadoni inscription of Pulmāvi and Sātavāhanarattra of the Hirahadagalli plates. Further, the Chutus, like their masters, viz., the Sātavahanas, are known to have borne the title Satakarni. Therefore Satakarpinādu may denote the land of the Chuṭu Satakarnis as well. In the next chapter there will be an occasion to see how the Chutus or branches of, into two, branches, one ruling over the Śriparvata region and the other over Vanavāsa.

(ii) The present Srisailam is famous for its temple of the goddess Bhramarambā, who is stated to be one of the eighteen Śaktis. In the Purāṇas the hill is included in
the list of fifty Śrīpūthas of the goddess Lalitā, and is stated to be the seat of the Mother Goddess Madhavī. The Agnipurāṇa goes to say that it is a siddhikṣetra where Śiva and Pārvatī are always present. The Kathāsaritsāgara contains a story of a Kāshmirian, performing penance in this place and receiving boons from the god Śiva there. Subandhu, the famous author of the Vāsavadattā, who was perhaps earlier than Bāpabhaṭṭa, speaks of the Śrīparvata as an abode of god Mallikārjuna. All these tend to prove that the rūḍh-arthā or the popular and conventional meaning of the word Śrīparvata is the “Śrīśailam hills” of to-day. It is also very likely that it was only this place, and not the Śrīparvata of the Nagarjunakonda inscriptions — which has no such claim to be the centre of the worship of the Mother Goddess — that might have been chosen by the said Tantrika teacher Nagarjuna also, for his success (siddhi) in the worship of the Mother Goddess Tārā. The presence of his grand-disciple’s inscription in Jaggayapeta does not go against the above conclusion as both the places are not far removed from one another. (iii) Besides, the Nagarjunakonda records seem to locate the Śrīparvata hill to the east of the city Vijayapuri as Prof. Vogel had correctly held. Again the inscription of the Ābhira Vasuśeṇa from the same place refers to an act of beautifying or painting of the enclosure wall or rampart of the Parvata (Parvatasya cha prakāraṇa chitrāvitaḥ), evidently the same Śrīparvata of other Nagarjunakonda inscrip-
tions. Therefore it is obvious that the Parvata or Śrīparvata of the area that could have an enclosure wall was considered to be only a hill and not a range of hills. Thus it would appear that the term Śrīparvata of the said inscriptions is not used in the traditional or conventional sense (rūdhv-arthā). It may be compared to the term Tirmalai (exactly a Tamil translation of Sanskrit Śrīparvata) of the Tamil inscriptions of the southernmost districts of the Tamil country where it is used in the yeugikārtha (i.e. the etymological sense) only, meaning 'a sacred or holy mountain'. On the other hand one must take Śrīparvata of the Purāṇas only in the conventional meaning i.e., the Śrīsañlam hill as that word was known to the Purāṇikas and poets in that sense only as we have seen earlier. Moreover it is also known that in the case of the names of warrior tribes, which also denote their country, the meaning is generally conventional and not etymological.

(iv) According to the above mentioned inscription of the Ābhīra king Vasushēpa, a certain Śeṣagiri was situated in the Nāgārjunakōṇḍa valley. This Śeṣagiri must be identified with the Seṣagiri, which is included by a Nasik inscription in the list of territories over which Gautemāputra Śrī Sātakarni claims to be ruling. The latter is mentioned along with the Sahya, Siriṇa, Malsya, Mahēndra, etc., in that record. Therefore this Śeṣagiri too, like the Sahya etc., must be a range of hills as has been rightly pointed out by Dr. Sircar. The hill-range in the area contains white
stones, now known as 'Palnad marble' and therefore deserves to be called Seกำหนดir = Setagiri = Skt. Svētagiri "white mountain". Now if one assumes that the whole range of the Nallamalai hills was called Śrīparvata during the period under our study, then it would be hardly possible to think of the Setagiri range in the area as different from the Śrīparvata (i.e. Nallamalai range). Therefore it seems that the range of the Nallamalai hills in the Palnad area in the east was known by the name Seta (or Seta)giri, while the western wing of that range was called Śrīparvata. This view seems to receive another corroboration from the same Nasik inscription in the following way: Its list of Gautamiputra's territories includes, as we have just now seen, both Siriśana and Setagiri, thus showing that they are different from one another. Siriśana has been identified with Srisailam = Śrīparvata by R.G. Bhandarkar and Buhler. If it is so, then it would establish that the Śrīparvata and Seta( or Seta)giri were taken to be different, though they respectively represent the western and eastern wings of the Nallamalais. Thus it would appear that the Ikshvākus were to be called as Seกำหนดiriyas (Skt. Svētagiriyas) and not Śrīparvatiyas.

(v) Even the context in which the Śrīparvatiya Andhras are spoken of in the Puranic passage under question seems to be more suited to the Chutus than to the Ikshvākus. For, they are stated to have risen to power in a particular
period denoted by the expression \textit{Andhrānāṁ samāsthītā raivā}. It has been usually rendered as "when the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end". But the word \textit{saṁsthītā}, like the root from which it is derived (viz. \textit{saṁ} + \textit{sthā}) has many meanings. It may mean "ended" when used as a predicate of rituals etc. As a predicate of personal nouns it may also mean "dead" but not always. But the primary and general meanings of the word are "being", "existing" or "staying". So in our Puranic passage where the subject of \textit{saṁsthītā} is neither a ritual nor a person, the word may better be taken in its general sense only. Besides the Purāṇas themselves are often found using the word \textit{aṭītā}, and not \textit{saṁsthītā}, to denote the end of the royal families. So the passage under discussion may better be understood in the sense of "when the kingdom of the Andhras was (still) remaining". This meaning finds a very strong support from the newly discovered Chutukula coins referred to earlier, which have been assigned by Dr. Sircar to a period when the Satavahana power had not totally disappeared but was fast declining. Perhaps the Chaṭusas started reigning like the Ābhīras (who figure next to them in our Puranic verse) about the end of the second century A.D. On the other hand the rise of the Ikshvākus appears to have taken place only after the total disappearance of the line of the Satavahana kings of the Puranic list. For, the Nagarjunakonda inscription of Vijaya Satakarni, perhaps after whom the Ikshvāku capital was named, and the Kodavali
inscription of his successor Chaṇḍasāti, the penultimate
Andhra king of the Puranic list, show that the Satavahanas
were holding the area up to their end. So the Ikshvākus could
have risen to power after the complete disappearance of the
Satavahanas.

(vi) The dynastic title Andhrāḥ in the above Puranic
passage is more suitable to the Chuṭu kings than to the
Ikshvākus. It is well known that the Satavahanas, otherwise
called Satakarnis, are referred to in the Purāṇas by the name
Andhras. Therefore the Chuṭukula kings who are known to have
borne the surname Satakarni might have been referred to as
Andhras. On the other hand the Puranic writers were quite
familiar with the dynastic name Ikshvāku and in the bhavishya
section we find actually the expression Aikshvākavas
chaturvīnasat etc. So it seems to be rather unlikely that
the southern Ikshvākus are referred to as Andhras in the same
section.

(vii) In the height of all these, the recently dis­
covered Nagarjunakonda inscription dated in the 24th regnal
year of the Ikshvāku king Virapurisadata speaks of a
certain Bapusāmi and endows him with the biruda Siriparvatādhī-
pati (= Skt. Śriparvatādhīpati). It needs hardly any
explanation that the said Bapusāmi, perhaps a chief, was not
at all an Ikshvāku and that the Ikshvākus themselves did not
claim to be the Śriparvatīyas.
Thus all these above reasons go to prove that the Śrīparvata of the Purāṇas is nothing but the modern Śrīśailam of the god Mallikārjuna and that the Śrīparvatiya Andras of the passage were most probably the Chuṭu Sātakarnis. Therefore it may be concluded that the Vishnukundis who were also described as Śrīparvateyas and Andras must have claimed a connection with some stalk of the Chuṭus and that their original home was the Śrīśailam only. In this context it may be noted that the names of the Pīhhāpuram chief, Mahendragiri and the Sālankāyana ruler Hastivarman, though ruling over the Andhra area, were appended not with the title Andhra but only with the adjectives Paishtānāra and Vaṅgēyaka in the inscription of Samudragupta. But at the same time the Vishnukundī is referred to as Andhranati by the Maukhari Iśānavarman as we shall see later. This may also go to show that, as we have already suggested, the Vishnukundis were connected ethnically with the Andras of the Puranic passage under discussion. The above suggestion of the Chuṭu origin of the Vishnukundis seems to gain further support from the meaning of their dynastic appellation Vishnukundī to which let us turn next.

(ii) Meaning of "Vishnukundī"

Scholars hold divergent views on what is indicated by the dynastic name Vishnukundī.

(1) Some have suggested that it may be a gotra-name
just like Vishnuvriddha of the Vākāṭakas. At the same time they confess that the former one is not traceable in the literature on the gotras and pravaras. However the expression Vishpukundī-kula, Vishpukundī-pārthiv-ōdit-ōdit-ānyaya, Vishpukundī-Vākāṭaka-vaṃśa-ānyaya etc., of the charters make it clear that Vishpukundī is a dynastic name like Vākāṭaka and not a gotra-name like Vishnuvriddha. Hence Vishpukundīnām of the records is to be translated as "of the Vishpukundīs" as stated by Prof. Kielhorn. Consequently even the word gotra in Vishpukundī-gotra of the Velpuru record must be taken in the sense of santati or family only (and not in the sense of 'hill') just as in the passage jātēna yēna kamalākaraśyāt, svagotram-unmālitam dīnakṛitr-śva mahādayēna of the Sāilōdbhava inscriptions.

(2) Another suggestion is that the name of the dynasty is from Vishpukunda and it signifies that the family was believed to have been born out of the altar (kunda) of a particular fire, known as Vishpu, mentioned in the Mahābhārata. Of course the Vel chiefs of the Tamil country of the Saṅgam age claimed to have issued from a sacrificial fire-pit. Yet the general practice of claiming fire-pit origin for a dynasty and naming it accordingly in one way or other belong to the later age as we find in the Paramāra records. Again, kunda means generally 'a vessel' or 'a hole' and without āgni preceding, it may not yield the meaning 'fire-pit'. Even the particular fire, Vishpu of the Mahābhārata is only a fire-god for whom — and not in whom — oblations are offered in the fire-pit, on
the New and Full Moon days along with other gods. Therefore just as the fire-pits in which oblations are given to the gods Indra, Soma, Rudra etc., may not be called Indrakunda, Soma-kunda, Rudra-kunda etc., the fire-pit in which oblations are made for god Vishnu may not also be called Vishnu-kunda, even though that god happens to be a fire-god.

Above all the said theory of the fire-pit origin is obviously based on the assumption that the name of the family is Vishnu-kundin, an assumption which is shown to bear no justification.

(3) Another set of scholars connect the name Vishnu-kundin with Vishnukunda and view the latter as a Sanskritised form of Vinukonda referred to above. Some of them derive Vinukonda from Vishnukundin. There is also a theory that would derive the dynastic name from an imaginary name Vishnu-kundin of an alleged tributary of the Brahmakunda, which is another name of the river Gungjakamma in the Guntur district. In this connection it is further presumed that a town by the side of that tributary might have acquired from that river the appellation 'Vishnukundinapura' from which the ruling family adopted its name, and that the name of the town in course of time became Vinukonda.

But it may be pointed out that no tributary by name Vishnukundin is known either from literature, or from inscriptions, or from tradition. Hence such a river may have
to be regarded as a fictitious one and it cannot form the
basis for our enquiry. Moreover it may be borne in mind that
if the dynastic name is to be derived from the name of a
geographical unit — be it a town, or a river, or a fire —
its expected form then would have to be not Vishnukundl, but
something like Vaishnukundika with adi-vriddhi (i.e. the
second modification or increase of the first syllable) just
as Traikuta, Paishtapuraka, Vaiingavaka etc. Thus
the absence of this adi-vriddhi in Vishnukundl seems to
indicate that the name cannot ordinarily be derived from the
name of a place. And at the same time, we have no authority
to dub the form of the name as irregular and ungrammatical.
Moreover the name Vinukonda, i.e. Vishnukonda (?) if viewed
along with Bhairavakonda (a name of the hill which is famous
for its early rock cut shrines and which is not far off from
Vinukonda) seems to give room for a doubt whether the former
had anything to do with the dynastic name Vishnukundl. Above
all, as we have already seen, the original home of the
Vishnukundlis was the Sriparvata itself. They had their dynastic
name Vishnukundl even before they conquered the Vinukonda area,
perhaps during the time of Madhavavaran II. Therefore it
seems that if at all Vinukonda had any connection with Vishnu-
kundl then in all probability it is the place that got its
name from the dynasty and not vice versa. That is why Prof.
Kielhorn guardedly remarked, "the word Vishnukundl(n)
survives in Vinukonda."
It has been argued that the dynasty might have taken its name from its original place Vishnukunda, i.e. Vinukonda, just like the Velanantis and the Koḍapāḍumati chiefs did. True, the ruling classes, like the Pañchālas, Āṅgas, Paṇḍaras, Kambōjas, Chōlas, Śakas, Kōralas, etc., are known to have appropriated for themselves, the names of their respective janapadas or countries. And their names have no adi-vridhi. But no dynasty seems to have taken its name from a city. The examples of Velanantis and Koḍapāḍumatis actually support the view suggested above. For, they are formed only from the names of the janapadas and the Telugu sixth-case ending and therefore they mean 'the chiefs of Velanāṇu' and 'the chiefs of the Koḍapāḍumati-dēṇa.'

So the key that may unlock this problem seems to be this: It is well known that the descendants of the kings Rāghu, Guptā, Vākāṭaka, Pallava, etc., were respectively known as the Rāghus, Guptas, Vākāṭakas, Pallavas, etc. And these have grammatical sanction. We have already seen that Vishnukundinēm of our records means 'of the Vishnukūṇḍis', as in the case of Pallavanēm, Vākāṭakānēm, etc. Thus it would appear that Vishnukūṇḍi was considered to be the name of an individual and that the kings of the dynasty claimed to be the descendants of that person.

If so, who was that person called Vishnukūṇḍi? If this name is viewed against the background of the Chūṭu origin of
the Vishnukundi dynasty it is indeed tempting to connect this Vishnukundi with the family of the kings Viṃukṣaḍa (or Okaḍa) and Viṃukṣaḍa Satakarna of the well-known Banavasi and Malavalli inscriptions. It is not altogether unreasonable to take Viṃukṣaḍa as a Prakritic equivalent of the Sanskrit Vishnukundi. (Viṃukṣaḍa = Viṃukṣaḍa = Viṃukṣaḍa = Vishnukundi). True, while commenting on the above inscriptions Rapson took the three units of the king's name viz., Viṃukṣaḍa, Chuṭukulānanda and Satakarna to be respectively the place name, the title from the clanish name Chuṭukula, and the dynastic name. He believed also that the personal name of the king is not mentioned in the epigraphs.

However luckily for us there is another name of a similar type that occurs in the recently discovered Nagarjunakonda inscription of the Ābhīra Vasuśeṣa and seems to suggest the necessary correction to the above view. The name is Viṃhpu-rudrāśīvalānanda Satakarna. Some have held that the last mentioned name of the Satakarna contains names of gods, Viṃhpu and Rudrāśīva. But in that case, the later part of the name viz., lānanda would be left unexplained. It is suggested that "the third element" lānanda — "popular in some parts of the Deccan" — is added to the name. But even then the syllable lā still remains to be accounted for. It may be argued that Śivala forms the end of the previous part, i.e. personal name proper. But Śivala is known only as a female name connected with the Buddhist religion. Hence it seems unlikely that that name is clubbed along with those of the
male gods, Vishṇu and Rudra of the Hindu pantheon, and that the name so formed was borne by the Sātakarṇī who does not appear to be a Buddhist. Therefore it seems that in the above long name the first unit Vishṇurudra forms the personal name of the Sātakarṇī while Sivalānanda, the second unit is his surname or title derived from the tribal name Śivala as in the case of Munḍānanda, of the coins. That there did exist a tribe named Śivala has already been made known to us by the Bow-and-Arrow-type of coins from the southern Maratha country, which are also assignable to the period of the above Ābhīra inscription. Thus Vishṇurudra-Sivalānanda-Sātakarṇī seems to denote an individual, most probably a chief, named Vishṇurudra who was born of the Sātakarṇī family and belonged to the Śivala tribe or clan.

This analogy may now be applied to the expression Vishṇukāda-Cauṭukulānanda Sātakarṇī. There can hardly be any doubt now that it denotes a king by name Vishṇukāda (i.e. Vishṇukunda) born of the Sātakarṇī family who belonged to the Cauṭu clan. Kunda like Rudra is recognised as a name of god Śiva. Because from the Malavali Kallēśvara temple pillar inscriptions and the Talagunda inscription, the Cauṭu Sātakarṇīs are known to have been fervent worshippers of god Bhava (i.e. Śiva), kunda or kuni as a name of that god seems to fit in well in the name of the king of their family. Thus the above name stands in a good comparison to the name in the above Ābhīra inscription and to the donee's name Rudra-vishṇvārya (Prakrit Rudravampanja) of the Kondamudi plates of
It may be pointed out that the meaning of kundé may not be different from that of kunda. So the name Vishnukundi may now be compared with Skandakundi of a donee in the Hirahadagalli plates. These arguments would suffice to show that Vishnukundi of our records, Vishuka (i.e. Vishnukunda) of the Banavasi and Malavalli inscriptions and Vishnurudra of the Abhira record probably belonged to one ethnical group that perhaps included the clans like Chutukula and Sivalakula.

It may now be asked while the names with kada-ending like Dhutuka, are known to be place-names, why Vishuka should be taken as a personal name. Moreover Rapson too has taken Vishuka as an equivalent to Chutuka "city of the Chutos". But this objection carries little weight in view of the following reasons:

(1) In 1908 Rapson read, on the coins then at his disposal, Dhutukalananda and conjecturally corrected it into Chutukalananda and took Chutu to be a place name. Now subsequent discoveries have yielded numerous Chutu coins on which the reading Chutukula is beyond doubt. And that reading is supported by the Chutu inscriptions referred to above. So what is intended by Dhutukalananda of Rapson's coins may be Chutukulananda only. Chutukula is the name of a clan or tribe and not of a place. Hence the Vishuka = Chutuka equation may not hold good now.
(ii) It is hardly convincing that the kings (or king) of the Banavasi and Malavalli records were not inclined to mention their personal names, although at the same time they were very particular to record their matronymics and the names of the place of their origin, their clan and their dynasty as has been believed. One's natural expectation, under such circumstances, would be to trace the king's proper name also. But as we have seen earlier, no unit in the above name of the king has a better claim to be his personal name than Vishukada does. Such a claim of the latter is further strengthened by the compelling analogy of the name Vishnu-rudra-Sivalananda Satakarni.

(iii) There are instances where both the personal names and the names of geographical units have common endings. For example Upendragiri, Dhanagiri, etc., Garinsukunda, etc., and Harshavardhana, Vishnuvardhana etc., are personal names ending respectively in girī, kunda and vardhana. At the same time we meet the place names with the same endings like Moragiri, etc., Srikunda, etc., Panugavardhana, Bhovagardhana, etc. In fact in the Varupurana there figures a person bearing the name Anadrishtikada.

(iv) Above all it is not proposed to take kada as a name-ending at all. Rather it is treated here as an independent second unit of the Dvandva compound just as in the case of rudra in the name Vishnu-rudra, and Hara in Haribara. Kada itself independently makes the name of an individual in an early inscription from Sanchi according to Buhler. The
only new thing here is that it is believed to stand for the Sanskrit kuṇḍa.

Coming back to the name Vishnukundi it may be pointed out that it is also grammatically possible to take Vishnukundi as a tribal name (instead of a family name) like Ikshvāku, etc. But in that case too we have to search for a person called Vishnukundi as in the case of Ikshvāku. Moreover, as we have already seen, the inscriptions place the names Vishnukundi and Vākaṭaka in the same level and refer to both as kula or vaṃśa. Besides, the fact that the Vishnukundis were unheard of after the Chālukyan conquest can be explained satisfactorily by taking the name to be of a family and not of a tribe. For, it would be too much to assume that by the time of the Chālukyan conquest the whole tribe became extinct.

A probable connection between Vinbukāda and Vishnukundi has already been thought of by other scholars also. But they dropped that idea. The "serious objection", "raised in this connection" is this: While the Chāntu kings claimed Manavasa-gōtra and used the matronymic Haritiputra and the title Satakarni along with their names, the Vishnukundis did not use any of them. But the kings like Aśra Mānasada of the Velpuru inscription, the Vākaṭaka Pravarasena I had the matronymic Haritiputra. The Kadamba kings of Mayūra-śarman's line as well as the kings of the Chālukya family too did use the same matronymic and the gōtra but in a slightly
modified way. On that account nobody had ventured to suggest their blood connection with the Chutus. At the same time there are coins issued by the kings calling themselves Chutukulas, but using different or no matronymic. In fact those apppellations seem to have had some connection with the rulership or overlordship of the Kuntala or Vanavasa country. That is why they were used successively by the Chutus, Kadambas and the Chalukyas who enjoyed in turn the rulership or overlordship of the territory. Having nothing to do with this area the Vishnukundis did not bear any of such apppellations. While the Chutus seem to have taken the dynastic title Satakarni from their overlords, viz., the Satavahanas, the Vishnukundis were under different circumstances and had no such thing to inherit from their masters.

Moreover it may be remembered that while the Chutu king of the Malavaḷḷi inscription is assigned to the first quarter of the fourth century A.D., we have seen above that Indravarman I, the first known king of the Vishnukundis was ruling about the last quarter of the same century. As the gap is only about half a century, the time factor can hardly come in the way of connecting Vishnukundis with the Chutus.

The above suggestion of the Chutu-Vishnukundi connection seems to get further support from the symbol on the seals and coins of the Vishnukundis. For example the central figure on the seal of the Ipur set I, the earliest of the available seals of the dynasty, is exactly what we find above the figure
of horse on the coins of the Chutu found in Anantapur District. The same symbol is found on the Chutu coins also. And it seems to be neither Lakshmi, nor Svastika, nor lion. Its form is almost what Rapson hesitatingly called the Naga symbol. That the Chutu worshipped the Nagas is well indicated by the Naga stone inscription from Banavasi, which records the gift of the very Naga stone by the Chutu king's daughter Sivaskandanagasi. Therefore it is reasonable to expect the representation of the Naga in their coins.

Again a glance at the above symbol and at the five-hooded Nagas found in Banavasi, in Amaravati and also in Kausambi seems to support Rapson's above contention. At any rate there can be no doubt that the central symbol in the Ipur (I) seal is same as what we find on the Chutu coins. It may also be remembered that the same symbol is invariably found along with the representation of the lion in all the coins attributed to the Vishnukundis. Therefore, it is very likely that the Vishnukundis inherited or copied this symbol from their kinsmen, the Chutus. The lion emblem of the Vishnukundis, represented on the seals of their charters from Ramatirtham, Chikkulla etc., resembles those of the Kadambas, Telugu Cholas, Pallavas etc. But the lion along with the above Naga symbol, as on the Vishnukundis coins are found on the obverse of some of the Maharathi coins discovered in the Hyderabad area. It is known that the Maharathis were the viceroys of the Andhras and were intimately connected with Chutus.
(iii) Social Status of the Vishnukundis

Not much has been stated by scholars regarding the status of the Vishnukundis in society in ancient India. Those who propounded the theory of the fire-pit origin of the dynasty viewed the family to be that of the Janhikula-Kshatriyas. As against this view some have suggested that the Vishnukundis were Brahmans. In support of this contention they draw our attention to the epithet of Dēvavārman (in the Ipur set II) viz., Kṣhatriyāvaskanda-pravarttita-pratima-vikhyāta-parakrama, which is believed to indicate that the members of the family claimed to be superior to the Kshatriyas. In this connection it must be borne in mind that the origin and caste of the great warriors who founded dynasties are often quite obscure, and that in ancient India the royal nature or Kshatriyahood of the kings was decided not by their Kshatriya-parentage alone. It was often the result of their valour or their capacity to lead successfully an army. Therefore it is hardly possible to be sure of the social status or caste of any royal family, let alone the Vishnukundis. However, in the context of the Vishnukundī history, let us try to study the problem on the basis of the available material.

For the purpose of our enquiry in this regard there are only two epithets to consider. The first one is the dynastic or tribal or clanish title Andhrapatri with which a Vishnukundī monarch is referred to. The second one is the epithet Brahmakṣhatrābhūtrām applied to Vishnukundis in
The word *Andhra* in the title *Andhranati* may mean either (1) "the Andhra country" or (2) "the people of that country" or (3) "the clan named Andhra". We have already seen that the rulers of Pīśṭapura and of the Gālāṅkāyana family and even of the Iksvākus did not bear that title though they were ruling over the Andhra Country and over the people of that country. Therefore the third meaning appears to be more appropriate to the context than the other two. Perhaps this was the reason why the Purāṇas call the Sātavāhanas only as the Andhras and not as the rulers of the Andhras. Again this seems to be the reason why the Nasik inscription of Puḻumāvi does not include the Andhra country in the list of countries ruled over by his father Siri Sātakarṇi, though there is scarcely any doubt that the Andhra area formed part of his empire. Otherwise the conspicuous omission is difficult to explain.

It is already known that the Bhavishya section of the Purāṇas speak of the Andhras or Sātavāhanas as successors of the Kāṇvāyanas. As the Sātavāhanas, the Chuṭus, and the
Vishnu’s alone seem to have been referred to as Andhras and Andhrapatis in the early age, the problem of determining their social status may be studied together. In this connection it may be observed that the earlier sections of the Purāṇas speak also of a certain king Andhra. This last mentioned king Andhra, we are told in the earlier section, was one of the sons of the Kshatriya king Bali of the family of Anu, or of Puru both being the sons of Yayāti. From the Bhāgavata Purāṇa we learn that this Andhra and his brothers Anga, Vanga, Kalinga, Sumha and Pundra were born in the kṣetra of Bali and they carved out their kingdoms after their respective names. Accordingly this Andhra, the founder of the Andhra kingdom, and his descendants would be Kshatriyas. Most probably the Andhras of the Bhaṭṭavācaka section were deemed to have been the descendants of the said king Andhra. Now comes the next epithet viz. Brahmakṣatratelajobhiritam. What does it mean?

The inscriptions do not help us in understanding the significance of this title. Nor do the Dharmaśastras. But the Purāṇas tell us that in the family of Puru both Rājarṣis (i.e. great Kshatriya rulers) and Brahmaśāśiśtras (i.e. Brahmaśāśiśtras) were born, and that the family was a source of Brahmakṣatras, meaning "Brahmanas and Kshatriyas" or more probably "Kshatriyas with Brahminhood". It may also be noted that a certain Vijaya of the family is described as Brahmakṣatratelajobhiritam "most superior among the Brahmakṣatras.

These indicate that the descendants of Puru including the said Andhra were designated as Brahmakṣatras.
The Purāṇas also explain to us, by means of a story, why the members of the family were so designated. The story goes: The famous emperor Bharata, the son of Dushyanta, of that family had no issue, and therefore performed the Marutsōma sacrifice. Being pleased with it, the gods Maruts transferred to that monarch (i.e. caused him to adopt) one Bharadvāja, a Brāhmaṇa child of Mamata and Brihaspati of the heavens. This Brāhmaṇa Bharadvāja thus became a Kṣatrapīya and therefore he and his descendants were both Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas and were dvāṃśvyāya-kaulīnas, i.e. those who belonged to a family that sprung from two sources viz., the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya. In other words, they were known as Brāhma-ksatras or Brāhmaṇa-Kṣatriyas. Again in the Bhavishya section the Purāṇas appear to record that a few Kṣatriya rulers along with the Seven Sages remain at times as a source of the Brāhma-ksattra progeny. They also go to say that in every age (yuga) whenever the Kṣatriya race is annihilated, a similar contact with the Brāhmaṇas is sanctioned by the traditional law (smritah). Perhaps the above Puranic details furnish the background for Manu's declaration Kṣatrāṃ hi Brahma-sambhavam: "truly the Kṣatriya is born from the Brāhmaṇa".

If this background of the Brahmakṣattra-kula, and the fact that the progenitor of the Andhra race belonged to that kula, are borne in mind, then one may not be surprised to see the members of the Vishnukupāli branch of the Andhras claiming the ṛajas or brilliance of the Brahmakṣattra. Similarly perhaps from the same background one may have to understand the
significance of the epithet \textit{Brahmakshatra-kulôdbhava} of the
Pallava king Dantivarman. Though there were kings bearing
the same or similar epithet the \textit{Vishnukûpâs} appear to be
the first to claim the Brahmakshatra origin among the known
kings of the historical period.

In this context it is also worthwhile to bear in mind the following important point. Dr. P.B. Desai has edited an interesting copper plate grant of the Kadamba king Kâmadéva, dated Śaka 1139. There the king's minister, Mâyideva by name, is described to have been born in the family of the Kashmirian kings, also called Nāgavaḿśa. This family is said to have originated from the union of a Brahmin girl (\textit{Brahmakanya}) and the Nāgarāja of the lower world. Mâyideva is also described as the very sun in the sky of the Brahmakshatra-vamśa. It is likely that the issue of the Brahmakanya-Nāgarāja-union was believed to have been adopted to the family of the Kashmirian kings just as the \textit{Purānic} Bharadvāja, the offspring of Māmaṁ-Brihaspati-union to the Paurava family.

Some scholars have held that the said Nāgavaḿśa was called Brahmakshatra-vamśa because the Nāga king who married the Brâhmaṇa girl was regarded to be a Kshatriya. For all practical purposes this suggestion may not be very much different from the suggestion made above. But technically speaking it should differ, as the issue of such union went by the name sūta and not Brahmakshatra. Again it is extremely doubtful whether in the age under question, a chief,
who was bent upon boasting himself as being born of a high family, would have ever described his line as an outcome of such a pratiloma marriage which was not at all looked upon favourably by the law of the age. The well known story of the hero Karna of the Mahabharata illustrates how a sutaputra was looked down by the kings and warriors of ancient India. Moreover the hero Parasurama of the Epics and Purapās was known to be a product of an inter-caste marriage of Brāhmaṇa and a Kshatriya. He is also described by Kālidāsa as having the quality of both the castes. But he was regarded to be a Brāhmaṇa only. Similarly the families of the Pratihāra Bāuksa and of the Vākaṭaka Harishēpa's minister Varahadeva were the outcomes of similar marriages.

Yet, they were not known by the name Brahmakshatra-vamśa. Likewise the Mahabharata also tells us that as a result of the intercourse between the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriya women many Kshatriyas only were born. Again the Brāhmaṇī Devayānī, the daughter of the Brāhmaṇa Sukrachārya had to marry, due to a curse, the Kshatriya king Yayāti. But her son Yadu's line was not considered to be a Brahmakshatra-vamśa. On the other hand the line of Puru, the son of the same Yayāti and Sarmishṭhā, the Asura princess (not a Brāhmaṇī) was, as we have already seen, known by that name. All these seem to indicate that Brāhmaṇa-Kshatriya matrimonial relationship alone was not enough to produce a Brahmakshatra-vamśa. Above all there is no authority to assume that the Nāga prince of the above Kadamba grant was considered to be Kshatriya.
Because we know of a Naga prince who is stated to be a Brahmana and whose intercourse with a Brahmin girl is said to have brought about a family in which the Brahmana author Guṇḍāṇya was born.

Now arises a question: If the Andhras was Brahmkshatras according to the Purāṇas, how to compromise it with the direct Purānic statement that the member of the dynasty who put down the last Kāṇvāyana was a vrishala? But, it may be pointed out that it is the tradition recorded in the Bhāgavata that calls the said Andhra king a vrishala, and according to the same authority, as we already saw, the founder of the Andhra family or clan was a son of Bali, the Paurava. So the word vrishala may have to be taken in its original sense 'a wicked man', and not in the sense 'a śudra'. Otherwise the Purāṇa would be lacking in unanimity (ekavaṁkyatā-bhanga). It also deserves attention that the Purāṇas refer to the said Andhra sa-latīya, (i.e. of the same race) of the Kāṇvāyana whom he put down and who was evidently considered to be a descendant of that Kāṇvāyana, the grandson of Ajamīdhā of the Paurava family and to be consequently a Brahmana. Thus there can be no objection if the Andhra kings (Andhra-catis) are designated as Brahmkshatras.
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EI, I, p. 6, text line 19. The Prakrit form of this name Khandakondi is Sanskritised without doubt by Bühler as Skandakondi (Ibid., p. 8) and we have actually Vishnukondi in the Polamuru plates I. For the interchanging of u and o. Cf. also Polakēśi of the Aihole prāśasti and Pulakēśi of many other Chalukyan records.

Scholars once believed that both the inscriptions belong to one and the same king (e.g. BG, p. 277; EI, VIII, p. 29; RC, lxxxiii ff.). Now it is held that they belong to different kings (SS, pp. 222-30 AIU, p. 209).
See LL, No. 124 b. Here syārthika-pratyaya is added to the name as in the case of Chutuka of the coins. See EI, XXXV, p. 76, Coins Nos. 4-5 etc.


See N. Dey's Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India, 2nd ed., s.v.


See Ch. 96, verse 148.

I.e., in a Sanchi inscription. See EI, II, p. 371, inscription No. 133. But cf. LL, p. 175 & No. 188.

SED, s.v.

SS, p. 112, fn. 2.

EI, XXXII, p. 86.

CII, V, p. 96, line 3.

RC, pp. lxxxiii ff., 59; EI, XXXV, pp. 75 ff.

RC, Pl. V, Nos. 106 and 111; p. 59, and fn. 2. Unfortunately this Chutu coin has not been illustrated by Rapson. However he compares the Nāga symbol on it with that on the Mungā coin, which, therefore, is illustrated here in Plate I, fig. 5.

BI, XVII, p. 334.

SS, pp. 130-31.
(iii) Social Status of the Vishnukundis
ED, p. 423.

Cf. सुरभिंधो राधयो साध्रो विनिष्टयो।

(MB, Adi, Ch. 127), verse 11.

Cf. अचार्य स्रीदेवी यो राधायो साध्रो विनिष्टयो।

tatkuśno-सरस-राधयो साध्रो विनिष्टयो।

Ibid., Ch. 126, verse 34.

CHI, I, pp. 593 ff.


JPASB (NS), V, pp. 186 ff; IA, XL, pp. 35 ff.

SEHI, p. 436.


EKA, p. 38.

Taking into account the forms of the names Puśumāvi, Čhutukula, some have viewed the Satavahanas and the Chuṭus to be of Dravidian blood. See Lectures, p. 34 f.n. But we have already seen the untenability of the theory that takes Čhuṭukula for personal name. Again Puśumāvi is same as Pulōmāvi of the Parāṇas and it might be a name of god Indra, avī meaning 'pain'. Cf. Indra's name Pulōmāṛi (cf. also SED s.v. Pulōman). Moreover even if Puśumāvi is proved to be Dravidian it may not decide the issue, as the majority of the Andhra kings bore Sanskritic names.
139 I.e. according to Bhāga, IX, Ch. 23, verses 1 ff.

140 I.e. according to Hari. I, Ch. 31, verse 1 ff. See below.

141 See Bhāga. IX, Ch. 23, verses 4-6; Hari. I, Ch. 31, verses 33-35 and 39.

142 The origin of the Andhra dynasty has been dealt with by many scholars. See e.g. CHI, I, p. 599; AIW, pp. 192 ff; Com. HI, pp. 296 ff; EHD, pp. 73 ff.

143 Bhāga, IX, Ch. 20, verse 1.

144 Cf. Brahmakshatrasya vō yōnir-vamśō dēvershi-satkritah ! Vāyu. (Ch. 99, verse 278) Matsya. (Ch. 50, verse 83) Bhāga. (Ch. 23, verse 44) reads Brahmakshatrasya vai prōktō vamśaḥ.

145 Cf. Sarve Brāhmapatāṃ gatāḥ (Matsya, Ch. 49, verse 40) and also Cf. Kshatropetāḥ dvijaatayah (Vāyu. Ch. 99, verses 160; 164; Matsya. Ch. 49, verses 38, 41), all describing some of the members of the Puru family. See also below.

146 Hari. I, Ch. 31, verse 56. It may however be noted that Milakaṇṭha, the commentator, explains this expression to mean "one who is superior to the Brāhmaṇas by his virtues and to the Kṣatriyas by his prowess."

147 Vāyu, Ch. 99, verses 138 ff; Matsya, Ch. 49, verses 14 ff; Hari., I, Ch. 32, verses 13 ff; Bhāga. IX,
148 Cf. Tasmād-dīvya Bhāradvājō Brāhmaṇyo- Kshatriyo- bhavat

149 Cf. Tasmād=api Bhāradvājōt Brāhmaṇyo Kshatriyo bhaviti

dvāmānudvāyana-kaulināḥ smṛitāḥ-tē dvividhōna cha

150 Cf. Saptārṣavo niśaipād sārdhaṁ santanārtham yuṣa yuṣa

151 Ch. X, verse 320. The same passage occurs in the

152 See the king's Tiruvellara (Tiruchirepalli District)

Inscription (SII, XII, No. 48). It is really interesting
to note that the Pallavas, Andhras along with the Madras
seem to be described as being born of the Brāhmaṇa
families (Brāhmaṇa-prasūtāḥ) in the Santiparvan of
the Mahābhārata (Ch. 65, verses 13–14). The Southern
Recension of the Epic reads Pallava instead of Paḷava.
It is also equally interesting to find that the Paḷavas
claimed the gōtra of Bhāradvāja and that the person with
whom, according to the Purāṇas, the Brāhma-kṣatrakūla
started was also one Bhāradvāja.
153  Cf. Brahmakshatramayin śriyam + + bibhrāṇena, a description of Brahmadhiraja, a Brahmin minister of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (SII, II, pp. 350-51, lines 89-90);

Brahmaḥ kṣatramyaḥ sat-tātā sat-vapuṣṭa vāpṣuṣṭa babhara yaḥ — a description of Vatsarāja (EI, XXXVII, p. 55 verse 4);

Brahmakshatranvitaḥ, an epithet of the Gohila king Bhartripatī (EI, XII, p. 13, verse 7); Sa Brahma-

kṣatrayaṇām=ṣaṇi kula-śro-dama Samantasenaḥ, a description of Samantasena (EI, I, p. 307, verse 5).

Chāmudārāya, the minister of the Western Ganga

Mārasimha II is stated to have been born in the Brahma-
kṣatra race (EI, V, p. 171).


156 VIJ, I, p. 88.

157 See e.g., the Hari., Ch. 31, verses 58 and Nīlakanṭha’s commentary thereunder.

158 See the MB, Adi., chapters 126-27.

159 Cf. Pitrīyam=amśam=upavīta-lakṣhaṇam mātrikaḥ=sa dhanur=ūritam dadhat I (Raghu., XI, verse 64).

160 Cf. Dēśarāthī Rāma’s words: Na prahartum=alam=asmī

nirdavam vipra ity=abhībhavat=ari tvayi (Ibid., verse 84) and also Brahmaḥ=ṣiṣṭi mē pūrvah (Rāma., I, Ch. 76,
verse 6). Jamadagni tells his son Paraśurāma Jayaṁ hi 
Brahmanah (Bhāga., IX, Ch. 16, verse 39).

161 See EL, XVIII, p. 95, verses 6 ff; CII, V, pp. 116, 
verses 6 ff.

162 Cf. Brāhmaṇaṇ Kṣatriyā rājan sarbhārthinyāḥ bhichahrkramah ! 
+ + + Tataḥ sushuvrā rājan kṣatriyān virvasammatan \nMB, Adi, Ch. 58, verses 5-8; etc.

163 See Bhāga., IX, Chapters 18, 19, 20 and 23.

164 See the Kathā., Lambaka I, Taranga 6, verses 8-20.

165 See DKA, p. 38, f.n. 2.

166 SED, s.v. vrishala.

167 For example Pushyamitra Śunga killed the last Maurya 
Bṛhadreṣṭha and Bāṇabhaṭṭa characterises the former 
as an-ārya (The Harsha., Ch. VI, p. 269). On that 
account nobody has suggested that the Śunga belonged 
to the non-Aryan race. All take the word an-ārya in 
the same sense of "base-born" or "wicked man".

168 Cf. Śiśukōndhrab sa-jātiyah (DKA, p. 38). The rendering 
of the expression sa-jātiyah as "with his fellow tribes-
men" does not appear to convey the intended meaning. 
The text here is rather corrupt. The context as well 
as an analysis of all the available varied readings of 
the passage seem to suggest the intended reading as 
Kānvaṇam tato bhūityah Suśarmāṇam upasaha tam !
[Ch. II, Sect. iii, n.

96:

Śunāṇām ch-ātva yāch-chhēshām kshapayitvā baliyasam |
Śīśukō-ndhrah sa-jātivāḥ prāśvat-īmaṁ vasundharam |