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1. RISE AND EARLY RULERS

It is not possible in the present state of knowledge to ascertain precisely how and when the Viṣṇukundins rose to power. They ruled over the country of Raikā from their capital city which may be identified with the village of Kōṇḍapūr, before they rose to pre-eminence as rulers of entire Deccan.¹

A general survey of the political conditions of the Deccan gives an idea of the Viṣṇukundin rise to power and pre-eminence.

I. Political Background:

The Deccan plunged into political disunity following the disappearance of the Sātavāhana empire. It was disarrayed among the mutually warring splinter principalities, spotted over different parts.² The Vākāṭaka of Vidarbha and the Pallava of Tondaimandalam could rise among them to the position of supremacy. The southern campaign of Samudragupta was an event of great impact, which disturbed the political situation and balance of power in Eastern Deccan and South India.

A. The Vākāṭakas of Deccan:

Altekar³ supposed that the Vākāṭakas originally
hailed from Andhradesa and their suzerainty was, perhaps, accepted by the Śālaṅkāyana of Vēṅgli. He further surmised that the legend, the Śraśāla-sthala-māhātmya had some Vākāṭaka connection and an evidence to their overlordship as far south as Śrīśailam. Mirashi too felt that the Vākāṭakas were originally as Andhra dynasty and that the close resemblance of their inscriptions with the Prakrit grants of the early Pallavas, as well as the titles, Dharmamahārāja and Hāritiputra held by Pravaraṇa I clearly show their south Indian origin. He concluded that the Vākāṭakas under Harishena could have enjoyed overlordship of Andhradesa and the king must have supplanted the Śālaṅkāyana power and placed the Viśṇukundin king Govindavarman on the throne of Vēṅgli.

D.C. Sircar has rightly refuted the conclusions, by pointing out that the resemblance between the Vākāṭaka and Pallava inscriptions was due to their common inheritance of traditions from their predecessors, the Sātavāhanas. He has dismissed the historicity of the Śraśāla-sthala-māhātmya and doubted whether Prabhāvatigupta, who was identified with Candrāvatī, the ardent devotee of Śiva in the legend, could have any such passionate devotion to the
god on Śrīśailam, herself being an atyanta Bhagavadbhaktā, in other words, a great devotee of Viṣṇu.

N. Venkataramanayya believed that the temple on Śrīśailam did not exist in the Viṣṇukundī-Vyākata period and rejected the identification of Candrāvatī of the legend and the ruined capital of her father can be found close to the river Kṛṣṇa, on its north bank. Thus, he rejected the conclusion of the Vyākata suzerainty over the Śrīśailam area. But, S. Sankaranarayanan tried to uphold the conclusion of Altekar and believed that the Vaishnavite leanings of Prabhāvatīguptā could not have prevented her becoming a devotee of Śiva in the same way as her brother Kumāragupta because a devotee of Mahāsena, besides being paramabhāgavata. He suggests that the queen might have arranged for the offering of a garland of jasmines everyday to the god. Apart from the uncertainty of existence of the temple on Śrīśailam, at such an early time, the argument cannot be accepted, for the devotion of Candrāvatī in the legend cannot be equated with the arrangement of a garland of jasmines every day by Prabhāvatīguptā. Such stories of devotees, with their unflinching devotion to Śiva, becoming one with the god, came into vogue only after
A.D. 1000 after the emergence of militant devotional cults, such as Vīraśāivism.

More certainly than suggested by the legend, the circumstantial evidence points out to the Vākāṭaka suzerainty over the Śrīśailam area and the Viṣṇukundin rise, due to the former's decline. The political disunity prevailing over Deccan before the rise of the Vākāṭakas suggests the possibility of Pravarasena I extending his suzerainty right upto Śrīśailam. While the four Āvamedhas performed by him suggest his empire-building activity, the titles Dharma mahārāja and Hārītiputra specify his conquest of Kuntalā, held by the Cūtus or the early Kadambas. It could not have been possible for him to conquer Karnāṭaka, without extending his suzerainty over the Śrīśailam region, on the way. The Bāsim branch of the Vākāṭakas ruled over Asmaka and also Kuntalā in the time of Vindhyāsakti II. The Viṣṇukundins of Reikā country must have accepted the overlordship of the kings.

Scholars earlier believed that the two branches of the Vākāṭakas had cordial relations and that they co-operated with each other. But their relations were many times even otherwise and appear mainly responsible for the ultimate dissolution of the Vākāṭaka power.
The Bāsim branch seems to have been uneasy with the main branch becoming a subordinate ally of the Imperial Guptas. Vindhyāsakti II (c. A.D. 355-400) conquered Kuntalā perhaps from the Kadambas, after the death of Pravarasena I. He assumed the title Dharmamahārāja, in token of the victory. But, subsequently, the country was in the realms of Pravarasena II of the main branch, as suggested by the literary traditions, connected with the Prakrit kāvya, Setubandha and he had his son, Narendrasena, married to a Kuntalā princess, Ajhitabhāṭṭārikā. He must have brought Kuntalā into his sphere of authority only by defeating the Bāsim branch, after the death of Vindhyāsakti II. The latter's son and successor, also named Pravarasena II, died leaving a boy of eight years on the throne, most likely in the hands of Pravarasena II, of the main branch.

Narendrasena of the main branch was credited with suzerainty over Kosalā, Mekalā and Malavā and they were included in the Ajanta inscription among the countries which accepted the suzerainty of Harishena of the Bāsim branch. He could not have claimed the overlordship of the countries without defeating the main branch. Prthvishena II, the son and successor
of Narendraśa, was described to have twice uplifted the fallen fortunes of his house. At least one of the two calamities he had to face must be the invasion of Harishena.

The internecine warfare between the two branches of the Vākāṭaka house, seems to have brought the Viṣṇukundina to forefront, as a powerful ally of one of them. The ultimate dissolution of the Vākāṭaka power, owing to mutual enmity of the two branches, left the Viṣṇukundina with the vast country between the rivers Narmadā in the north and Kṛṣṇa in the south open for their exploits.

V.V. Mirashi has rightly suggested that the story of Viśrutacaritra, in Dāśakumāracaritra of Dandin, reflected the political condition of the time, leading to the extinction of the Vākāṭaka empire. The story goes to say that a great empire, whose seat was in Vīdērībha was overthrown by a confederacy of several of its feudatories, led by the king of Asmaka. He supposed that the main branch ceased to rule, earlier than the other, and so, it was the Vākāṭaka empire under Harishenā, thus overthrown. But the story seems to speak actually the fate of the empire of prthvishenā II, brought about by Harishenā, who must
have contrived the confederacy of feudatories of both the branches, Viṣṇukūndins being the most important among them.

The overlordship of Harishena as described in the Ajanta inscription cannot be considered as the result of his conquests, and the rulers of the countries enlisted therein were, perhaps, his associates in the confederacy, that he had formed. The mention of Āndhra in the list seems to suggest that the Viṣṇukūndins had already extended their power from their original home in Raikā, into Āndhradesa on the east coast. Their campaigns in Kalinga, Kosalā and Vīdarbha, perhaps, soon after the death of Harishena, indicate that they were the most powerful among the Vākāṭaka feudatories. Thus, their alliance was much sought after by Harishena and it was firmly cemented by the marriage of Mādhava-varman II with a Vākāṭaka princess, but whether she was the former's daughter or sister cannot be ascertained.

B. The Pallavas in South India:

The fourth century A.D. in the history of South India witnessed the emergence of Pallava rule, and the disappearance of the Ikṣvākus in Kṛṣṇā Valley. The latter could withstand the Ābhira invasion about the year A.D. 278, but lost their power to the Pallavas
about the year A.D. 311. The discovery of a stone
inscription of the early Pallava king Simhavarman at
Mañcikallu, very close to the Ikṣvāku capital,
suggests this fact.

The Mayidavālū plates of Śivaskandavarman, issued in the capacity of Yuvamahārāja, was addressed
to the Vāpta (Skt. Vyāpta), who was stationed at
Dhānñakaḍa, in charge of Āmādhāpaṭhā. Obviously,
Āmādhāpaṭhā, or Āndhradesā became a part of the
Pallava dominion, as early as Simhavarman of Mañcikallu
inscription and Śivaskandavarman was his son and
successor. The reign of Simhavarman may be placed
between A.D. 300-325 and his invasion of Āndhra
country in A.D. 311.

Śivaskandavarman, whose reign can be assigned
to A.D. 325-350, may have ruled Āndhradesā, till his
power was disturbed by revolts in Āndhra and Kānṭāṭaka.
The revolt in Āndhradesā was most probably led by the
Bṛhatphalāyanas in Kuḍūr-āhāra and the Śālekāyaṇanas in
Vēṅglī area. They might have taken advantage of the
Vākāṭaka invasion over coastal Āndhradesā, as mentioned
above. It is interesting to note that the revolt in
Kānṭāṭaka, led by the Kadamba chief Mayūraśārman had
its base of operations in the Griparvata region.
where the early Viṣṇukūṇḍins had their kingdom. He
defeated the Ābhīras, according to his own Chandravalli
inscription, probably in the same region, during his
early exploits. During the troublesome days of the
Pallavas, about the close of the reign of
Śivaskandavarman, the Ābhīras seem to have founded
some principalities in the southern Āndhradesa. Ugrasena of Pālakkaḍa, mentioned in the Allahābād
prasasti of Samudragupta, was perhaps, an Ābhīra
chief.

The successor of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman
was, perhaps, Viṣṇugopa, who suffered defeat in the
hands of Samudragupta. Thus, he was unable to bring
the situation in Āndhra and Kēraṇṭaka under control.
We hear again of the Pallavas, from the ēmōgōḍu (set I)
plates, issued by Vijayaskandavarman, from the
victorious city of Tēmbrāṣa, identified with the modern
village of Chēbrōlu in Guntur district. Thus, the
king may have led a victorious expedition upto the city
of Tēmbrāṣa, or upto the south bank of the river Kṛṣṇā,
by his 33rd regnal year, when he issued the record.
The year corresponds with A.D. 433.

C. Coastal Āndhra Country:

Between the years A.D. 350 and 433, when the
Pallava overlordship was weak, Andhradesa was divided among three ruling dynasties, viz. the Brhatphalāyanas, the Śālaṅkāyanaś and the Ānandagotres. The Brhatphalāyanas were referred to in a stone inscription from Nagarjunakonda but the dynasty is known mainly from the Kondemudi plates. It is a prakrit record, closely resembling the Ikṣvāku inscriptions and the Mayidavolu plates of Śivakandavarman. It mentions only the name, Jayavarman and is dated in his 10th regnal year. From the palaeographic features of the record, the king may be assigned to a time very close to Śivakandavarman. He must be one of the chiefs who proclaimed independence of the Pallavas, but the fact that he was not referred to in the Allahabad prasasti points out that his power came to an end by the time of the south Indian expedition of Samudragupta in A.D. 350. The Kondemudi record refers to him as the lord of Kudur-ahāra as included in his kingdom, but the extent of his kingdom cannot be assessed precisely. Kudur-ahāra appears prominently in the Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions, and it may be suggested that the Śālaṅkāyana king Hastivarman I must have defeated the Brhatphalāyana king and dispossessed him of his kingdom, before himself met a debacle at the hands of Samudragupta.
The Śālaṅkāyana king Hastivarman I (c. A.D. 340-365), the founder of the independent rule of the dynasty, has perhaps taken advantage of the confusion to which the Pallavas were subjected by the revolt of Mayūradarman. He was one of the chiefs defeated by Samudragupta, in his south Indian expedition. His successor Nandivarman I, the donor of the Kāṇukollu prakrit plates seems to have consolidated the power, which suffered defeat and humiliation at the hands of Samudragupta. He seemed to have enjoyed a long reign of 35 years, as suggested by the Dhārikāṭura grant of his son Acalaivarman. The latter might have assisted his father both in his wars and administration, in the capacity of Yuvamahārāja and succeeded him to the throne.

Vijayadevavarman, the donor of the Ėlūru plates appears to be a powerful king in the dynasty, as suggested by the Āśvamedha performed by him. But his place in the genealogy and chronology still remains uncertain and he probably ruled the kingdom following Ac añavarman, between A.D. 420-435. He was, thus, a contemporary of Govindavarman of the Viṣṇukundins and Vijayaskandavarman of the early Pallavas.

Three generations of Ānandagotra kings are known from two copper plate grants as rules in the southern
Krsnā valley. The records do not specify the relation of the kings with each other, and the genealogy of the dynasty is controversial. But the statement in Gorantla plates that Attivarman, the donor of the record, was born of Hirayagarbha and the Mattapāḍu plates describing Dāmodaravarman, its donor as the son of one who was born of Hirayagarbha seems to suggest that the former was the father and the latter was the son. Attivarman was described to be born in the dynasty of a king called Kandara and Dāmodaravarman issued his Mattapāḍu plates from Kandarapura. Thus, Kandara must be a predecessor of the two kings mentioned above, but we cannot decide whether he was their immediate predecessor for want of proper evidence. Probably he built Kandarapura, after his own name, which was perhaps the capital of the dynasty.

As the kings were not mentioned in the Allāhābād prāśasti, the Ānandagotras might have come to power following the Gupta invasion, when the Pallavas were suffering defeats and disgrace. The chronology of the dynasty may thus be arranged as: Kandara, A.D. 375-400, Attivarman, A.D. 400-425 and Dāmodaravarman, A.D. 425-433. The last mentioned may have been defeated by the Pallava king Vijayaskandavarman, before he issued
his Omgodu (set I) plates in A.D. 433. The Pallava king thus brought once again the Southern Andhra country under his suzerainty, overpowering the Anandagotras, besides subjugating the rising Abhira principalities. Anandagotras are heard again, only about the time of the Viṣṇukundīna decline, continuing as the vassals of the Pallavas.

The victories of Vijayaskandavarman over the Anandagotras might have prompted him to push his conquests north of the river Kṛṣṇa, crossing swords with the Śaṅkāyanas under Viṣṇuyadavavaran. But the Śaṅkāyana king seems to have proved himself strong not only to check the Pallava advances northward across the river, but also annexed the territories south of the river, including Kugūr-Āhāra, either from the Pallavas or the Anandagotras, who were the latter's vassals. The honorific viñāya, borne by the Śaṅkāyana king and his performance of Aśvamedha point out that he defeated the Pallava king, who was also an Aśvamedhin.

The Pallavas renewed their attempt to bring Andhra region under their suzerainty, when the Śaṅkāyanas were involved in internecine warfare, shortly after the death of Viṣṇuyadavavarman. Skandavarman
and Nandivarman II apparently fought for the throne of VängI, in which the latter seem to have ultimately emerged successful. He had the title Dharmamahäräja which was common among the Pallavas. He might have taken the help of the Pallavas who were waiting for an opportunity to regain their suzerainty over southern Andhradesa. His rule continued till the dynasty was ousted from power by the Viṣṇukundins.

II. Beginning of the Viṣṇukundin Rule:

Earlier writings on the Viṣṇukundins were based on the presumption that either Mādhavavarman I or Vikramahendra was the founder of the dynasty. Scholars believed that Govinda varman, Madhavavarman set aside the Śālaṅkāyana power, helped by the Vakatakas and the latter's marriage with a Vakataka princess was especially attached significance in the context. But it can be asserted now, that the dynasty descended from the eponymous king Viṣṇukundí, and that the early Viṣṇukundins had nothing to do with VängI country.

Vishnuvarma must have been the first important member of the dynasty, for it came to be known after him. But no regnal title of the king is known and his political status also cannot be definitely
ascertained. He was such a distant ancestor of the kings, that he was only respectfully remembered.

The other kings, Indravarman I and Mādavavarman I, are reported by the Tummalagūḍem (set I) plates as Mahārājas. But the eulogistic overtones in the record renders their status unclear. However, the Viṣṇukūṇḍins before Govindavarman are to have been the vassals of the Vākāṭakas.

A. Govindavarman: His Personality:

The first great king of the Viṣṇukūṇḍinas was Govindavarman, the donor of the Tummalagūḍem (set I) plates. According to the statements of the record, he annexed the territories of the vassals of other kings, by his qualities of valour, courage and sympathy, and was a righteous and enlightened ruler. He was applauded to have built numerous temples and vihāras, given numerous and various gifts to Bhikṣus and Brāhmins. These qualities of the king are mentioned in other records of the dynasty as well. But the two Tummalagūḍem charters report an hitherto unknown characteristic of the king, that he was a Buddhist. D.C.Sircar doubts the truth in the statement while Sankaranarayanan supposes that the description was so, because the records were, perhaps, composed by the Buddhist monks.
in the Vihāra, to which they registered gifts of villages. He further surmises that the king adopted Śaivism at a later stage and became a devotee of Mallikārjuna on Śrīdālām. But the Buddhist leanings of the king need not be doubted and his turning to Śaivism cannot be substantiated, as explained above. 82

B. His Career:

Govindavarman initiated the policy of expansionism, both by war and diplomacy. He must have resented the revival of the Pallava overlordship under Vijayaskankdevavarman in alliance with the Śaḷāṇkāyana, close in the neighbourhood of his own kingdom. As a counter measure, he seems to have strengthened and extended his power by means of diplomacy, cemented by matrimonial alliance with other chiefs in the neighbourhood.

i. Govindavarman & prthvimūla:

The Tummalagūḍam (set II) charter reports 83 that Parama (bhāṭṭārikā) mahādevī, the chief queen of Govindavarman, was born in Śrīprthvimūla family, perhaps, the family to which prthvimūla belonged. 84 The Keṭṭucheruvu grant of prthvimula names a distant ancestor of the king, by name, Mūlarāja, 85 who was
perhaps the father of Paramabhattarika Mahādevī. The Prthvīmūla dynasty is reported to be ruling over Tālupāke-viṣaya identified with Razola Taluk of the present day East Godavari district, which was contiguous with the Sālaṅkāyana kingdom. It appears likely that Mūlarāja was a vassel of the Sālaṅkāyana, but was won over by Govindavarman to his side and their political alliance, was strengthened by the latter's marriage with the former's daughter. It was easy for the Viṣṇukundin king to the Sālaṅkāyana power, already disarrayed in internecine warfare.

ii. Govindavarman & the Pallavas:

After destroying the Sālaṅkāyana power, Govindavarman seems to have turned his attention on the Pallavas. Simhavarman II of the early Pallavas, the son and successor of Vijayaskandavarman, ascended the throne of Kāṇcī in A.D. 436. He was one of the greatest conquerors and empire-builders in the history of the Deccan and south India. He was determined to fulfill the policy of expansion, into Andhradesa, initiated by his father. He appointed his younger brother Viṣṇugopa, in the capacity of Yuvaśri Mahāraja to accomplish the task. The Sālaṅkāyana civil war and perhaps the request for help by Nandivarman II offered him the opportunity to
bring coastal Andhradesa once again under the Pallava authority. The Vesanta grant of his nineteenth regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 455, indicates that the Pallava reconquest of coastal Andhradesa was a fait accompli. It registers the gift of the village of Vesanta in Nādattapāṭi-viṣaya, identified with Natripāṭi-viṣaya of the Chikkula plates, which extended on either side of the river Kṛṣṇa in the present day Guntur and Krishna districts.

However, the Pallava success appears only short lived, as the Tummalaṇḍham (set I) plates of Govinda Varman suggests. The record, dated in his 37th regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 472, registers his gift of two villages, Ėmbudala and Paṅkapara to the vihāra at Indrapura. B. N. Sastrī and M. Ramaraṇa could not identify the villages, but Sankaranarayanan suggests that they were identical respectively with Yerrabaliguda and Paṅkara in Nalgonda district of Andhra Pradesh. The suggestion is not acceptable, for, the suffix gūḍa, in Yerrabaliguda is obviously, a corruption of the Telugu word gūḍam, which is not a part of the name Ėmbudala. Even if the suffix is accepted as a subsequent addition, no phonological similarity exists between Ėmbudala and Yerrabali(guda). On the other hand, Ėmbudala can be more plausible identified with Yanamadala in Guntur.
district, on the Grand Trunk Road between Guntur and
Chilakaluripet. The village was referred to in several
medieval inscriptions as Enumandula, or Yenmandula. Similarly, the village penkapara has nothing to do with
Panakabanda, for the banda is neither a synonym nor a
corrupt form of the achaic Telugu word para. Several
village names in Guntur district still end with the term
para or parru. The name Pankapara is come across in the
Omagodu (set II) plates of Simhavarmana, the son of
Yuvamaharaja Vishnugopa and also in a grant issued by the
Eastern Calukyan king Jayasimha II. Both the records
specify that Pankapara was situated in Kamarāstra, which is identical with some parts of the present day
Guntur district.

From the above analysis of evidence, it is clear
that the Pallavas brought coastal Andhadesa under their
overlordship, by interfering in the Salakayana civil war.
But, Govindavarman-Mularaja alliance desecrated the
Salakayana power by A.D. 445, the last known regnal
year of Nandivarman II, the last of the dynasty. Sometime
after the year, but by A.D. 472, to which the 37th regnal
year of Govindavarman corresponds, he expelled the
Pallavas from coastal Andhadesa and issued his Tummala-
gudem (set I) charter, registering his gift of village
in Kamarāstra. There is no evidence of Pallava
suzerainty over Andhadesa, from A.D. 455 to 486,
when the Māngagūr grant of Simhavarman, the son and successor of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa was issued. 103

Simhavarman II, the Pallava emperor, was at that time totally preoccupied with his wars with Kadambas 104 and seems to have granted autonomy to the line of Yuvamahārāja Viṣṇugopa, so that they may have the free hand in dealing with the impending Viṣṇukundin expansionism. Thus, the Āndhra branch of the Pallavas, the so-called Nellore-Guntur branch, came into existence, independent of the central Government at Kānci. 105 The Māngagūr grant of Simhavarman, the son and successor of Viṣṇugopa of the Āndhra branch of the Pallavas, registers his gift of the village, Māngagūr in Vēṅgōraṭra. 106 The record was dated in his 8th regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 486. 107 This shows yet another successful bid of the Pallavas to revive their overlordship on Āndhradesā, but the year falls out of the reign of Govindavarman. The subsequent Pallava-Viṣṇukundin relations have been dealt with within the next chapter.

iii. Govindavarman and the Vākāṭakas:

The second matrimonial alliance contracted by Govindavarman was with the Vākāṭakas, when Harishena was at war with his cousins in the main branch. 108
Govinda Varman was already powerful in Andhradesa and his alliance was, perhaps, much sought after by the Vakataka king, who might have married his daughter, or sister to Madhavavarman, the Vishnukundin crown prince. The latter seems to have undertaken expeditions in rescue of the Vakatakas against their enemies, though the latter's power was lasting towards decline. But the Vishnukundin alliance with the Vakatakas seems to have introduced them in the Central Indian politics and paved the path for the subsequent victorious campaigns of Madhavavarman II in Viderbhā, Kosalā and other countries.

Thus, Govinda Varman initiated the policy of expansionism, which was carried to the glorious point by his successors, especially, Madhavavarman II. True to the statements of his Tummalagudem plates, he was more inclined in adopting peaceful methods of diplomacy rather than conquest.
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21. V.V. Mirashi, *ABORI*, XXV, pp. 36 ff. CII., V, *Intro*, opines that Ašmaka was a part of Vidarbha, but, D.C. Sircar seems to be right in his suggestion that the country was separate from Vidarbha and was under the rule of the Bāsim branch. The reference to *Kāmasūtra*, by Sircar is more creditable than Rājadeskhara's mention of Ašmaka as a part of Vidarbha, cited by Mirashi, for it was far removed from the times under discussion.


23. The fact is suggested by the importance given to the Gupta genealogy in the Vakāṭaka records, having been referred to as *Mahāraj-āchirājas* and the latter simply as *Mahārājas*. Altekar, *NHIP*, VI, p. 106, tried to substantiate that the latter title does not signify feudatory status. He was right. But in the present context, as D.C. Sircar, *HCIP*, III, *The Classical Age*, p. 180, note 1, points out, "it is impossible to think that the officials and subjects of the Vakāṭakas were not conscious of the difference in meaning between the two titles."

24. CII., V, No. 25, l. 7, reading *Kuntal-andram vijitya*

Sri Vindhyasena ...


Pravarasena II, helped by Kālidāsa, as mentioned by a sixteenth century commentator of the Kāvya, named Rāmadāsa. But D.C.Sircar rejected the literary tradition and pointed out that Pravarasena II, who got his son married to a Kuntalā princess (see below, note no. 28) could not be the Kuntalaśvara of the tradition. He is right, but the literary tradition may be trusted so far as it suggests, the overlordship of Kuntalā, if not literally the country was under the direct rule. His victory over the country might have earned him the significant epithet.

26. The Bālaghāṭ plates of Prthvīśeṇa II, the grandson of Pravarasena II describes himself as: Kuntalādhipati sutavām-Mahadevavām-Ajhitabhāttārikāvām-utpannasva, indicating his father Narendrasena married the Kuntalā princess. CII., V, No. 18, ll. 30-31.

27. CII., V, No. 25, l. 8.


29. Supra, note no. 10.


31. The Bālaghāṭ plates, l. 33, dvimagna vamāsavyordhārtaub.

32. Altekr, NHIP., VI, pp. 118-19, suggested that the two crises were the invasion of the Nāla king Bhavadatta varman and Traikūṭaka king Pahrasena.
Nala invasion was after the final disappearance of the Vākāṭakas. See below, Pt. III, Ch. 2, sect. II. If one of the events was the invasion by the Traikutakas, the other must be by Harishana’s from Vatsagulma.

33. CII., V, Intro., xxxii-xxxiii.

34. This explains his claim of his overlordship on Kosalā and Avanti (or Mālavā), which were originally under the suzerainty of the main branch of the Vākāṭakas.

35. See below, sect. IIB.

36. The Nāgarjunakonda inscription of the Abhira king Vasushena, Epi. Ind., XXXVIII, pp. 197 ff. according to D.C. Sircar, the editor of the inscription suggests an Abhira invasion on the Ikṣvāku capital, but R. Subrahmanyan, APGAS., 5, pp. 19-20 and I.K. Sharma, Indica, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1-18 and M. Ramareo, JII., XI, p. 56, The Ikṣvāku of Vijayapurī, pp. 19-20, and UMEL(OR), pp. 64-65, are of the opinion that the inscription does not warrant the conclusion of an Abhira invasion, but the king, along with a group of several chief-tains paid a friendly visit to the Ikṣvāku capital. The view is not acceptable and O. Ramachandraiyya, UMEL(OR), p. 39, note 5, is right in suggesting that the record indicates invasion, see my paper on the subject, PAPHC., V, pp.

37. See Appendix III, below, for the Ikṣvāku chronology.

38. Epi. Ind., XXXII, pp. 89 ff.

39. Ibid., VI, pp. 84-89, I1. 3-4.
40. Ibid., XXXII, pp. 87-88.

41. Itihas, VI, No. 2, pp. 21-43, for the genealogy and chronology of the Pallavas and p. 36, for the table. But the date of the king is slightly changed here, on further thought, see also appendix III below.

42. See the author's articles in Itihas, V, i, p. 9 and VII, 2, pp. 9-11, for a brief discussion on the subject.

43. The Tālgunda inscription, Epi. Ind., VIII, pp. 24 ff. ll. 5-7. Kielhorn identified Śripārvata with Śrisailam and tried to relate it with that, mentioned in the Viśnukundin inscriptions.


45. Sankaranarayanan, Vișnukundis., p. 35, suggest some alliance and co-operation of the Kadamba chief with the Vișnukundins. But the chronology adopted here does not warrant such a possibility, for the Vișnukundins were yet to become powerful by the time, see below.

46. See the author's paper, PAPHC., V, pp.

47. See the Author's paper, Itihas, VI, No. 1, p. 31 and 32.


49. B. V. Krishnareo, EDA., p. 225 and M. Ramareo WME(LM), p. 84.

51. A Brhatphalayana chief, Sridharavarman was mentioned in an inscription from Nagarjunakonda, *Ind. Arch. Rev.*, 1955-56. O. Ramachandraiyaa has correctly concluded that the dynasty was Ikṣvāku feudatory before founded independent power in Kuḍūr-āhāra, *UMELO*(OR), p. 39 and note 7.


54. Text line 41.

55. Text 1. 1, says that the grant was issued from the city of Koḍḍūrā and 1. 23, says that the gift village Pāmṭūrā was in the Kuḍūr-āhāra.

56. The two sets of Kantārū plates, issued by the two last members of the dynasty record gifts of villages in Kuḍūr-āhāra.


60. *Itihasa*, VIII, 2, pp.


64. Hultzsch, *Epi. Ind.*, XVII, p. 328, followed by several others like B. V. Krishnarao, *EDA*, pp. 329-36, considered that the Gorantla plates were palaeographically later than the Mattepadu plates. The former was a completely Sanskrit one, while the latter was found to be influenced by Prakrit. Thus, they concluded that the donor of Mattepadu plates, Dameravarman, was the predecessor and Attivarman, the donor of the other was the successor. But, D. C. Sircar, *Successors*, p. 59, rightly pointed out that Attivarman was the performer of Hiranyagarbha, while the other was, one born of a performer of Hiranyagarbha. He is right in the conclusion.

65. The Gorantla plates, l. 3, *aprameya hiranyagarbha prasavana*, meaning who performed the Hiranyagarbha ceremony.


68. L. 1, *Vijaya Kandarapurat*.

69. A chief who is connected with the dynasty, the daughter's son of Anandagotra king Kandara, is known from an inscription at Cezarla, *SII*, VI, 594 and 595. He was a vassal of the Pallava king Mahendravarman I, referred to as Mahendravikrama, in the record. See below, *Pt. III*, Ch. 4, sect. III.
70. For a detailed discussion, see the author's article, in *Itihas*, VII, No. 2, *oppl. cit.*

71. His Guntupalli stone inscription, *Bharati* (Tel.) 1978, August, pp. 29 ff. l. 4, the title was attributed to Hastivarman I, the grandfather of the donor.


73. R. Subbarao, *JAHRS.*, II, pp. 158.


75. *Supra*, pt. I, Ch. 2, note no. 176.


82. *Supra*, pt. II, Ch. 3, sect. IIB. There is no reason in supposing the scribes to have taken so much independence that they described Govindavarmen as a Buddhist. The recopy of set I must have been made in the presence of Vikramandravarmen. For a similar view, D.C. Sircar, *Itihas*, VII, 1, pp.
83. supra, pt. I, ch. 2, note no. 211. M. Ramarao, JIH., XLIII, pt. iii, p. 746; UMEI(MR), p. 109 ff. doubted whether this Prthvīmūla was the same as the donor of the Gōdvārī plates.

84. It is interesting to note that the two records of Prthvīmūla, do not allude to his dynastic name and he was referred to in the Tummalagūḍem (set II) charter, only as belonging to a famous dynasty, supra, pt. I, ch. 2, note no. 222.

85. APCAS., No. 6, p. 246, even before the auspicious term, Svasti, following immediately the verse invoking lord Buddha, Mūlarāja was praised again in a verse, ll. 3-5. Except Mūlarāja, all other personages were introduced only in the prose passage. This distinction clearly indicates that Mūlarāja was quite a distant ancestor of the donor. The verse reads:

Tadana jayati bhūmā Mūlarājas-samanatād-
Vātata ruśiṁ bhaśval-loka vikhyāta kirttib
Bahu samara jay-opatt-onnata śrīr-ejayasya yaaya
Sukadīra guṇa pāśābadha niśēṣa lokah.

86. The record registers the gift of a village in Tālupaka viśaya, text 1. 25.

87. N. Ramesan, APCAS., No. 6, p. 243.

89. *APGAS.*, No. 6, pp. 211 ff. text 11. 25-26, Amad-
vijayarāja saṁvatsara ekonaviṁśa Māghe māsa
duklapaka daśamāṁ.

90. For a detailed discussion, see, *Itihas*, VII, 2,
pp. 1-21, by the present writer.

91. Text 1. 18, Nādattapātyām Vesanta grāme yakān-īttham
ējñāpayati.

92. Sankaranarayanan, *Vishnukundis.*, pp. 82-83, followed by
late M. V. N. Adityasarma, *Bhārati* (Tel.) October,
1977. But the identification is doubtful,
because the dropping of repha in Nātripati, and
its becoming Nātavādi, in subsequent times is
normal pattern. But the Nādattapāti does not
contain repha, and its addition to form Nātripati
in subsequent times is unthinkable. Perhaps, the
term Nādattapāti, might be a scribal error.

93. B. V. Krishnarao, *EDA.*, p. 503.

94. Supra, pt. I, Ch. 2, notes nos. 185 and 186.


98. See below, Pt. III, Ch. 2, note no. 106, for anote
on the identification of places of inscriptional
references.

99. *SHI.*, IV, No. 955, l. 18, calls the village as
Enamandula, *Ibid.*, 934, calls as Enamadela
and *Ibid.*, 939 refers to it as Enumandala and
its present name is related to those of the inscriptive references in meaning also. *Venumu* and *Embu*, which was an archaic form of *Emmu*, in Telugu means synonymously as Ha-Buffalo. See below, pt. III, Ch. 2, note no. 87.


102. The *Omgōdu* (set II) l. 10, says that the gift village was in the Karmāśtra and the Cālukya grants says, Karmāśtra, Paṇkaparru nāma grāma..

103. *Itihas*, V, 1, P. 10 and VIII, 2 P.

104. *Infra*, pt. III, Ch. 2, sect. IIIA.


106. Unlike the records of the Yuvamahārāja, dated in the regnal years of Mahārāja Simhavarman, his elder brother, those records of the former’s son and successor Simhavarman were not dated in the regnal years of the sovereign at Kāñci.

107. N. Venkataramanayya suggested in his Telugu work, *Pallavulu Cālukyulu*, pp. 53-58, that Vāngōrāśtra was identical with Vāngī country. The Pallava-Sālaṅkāyana relations traced above supports the suggestion, beyond any doubt. The former must have referred to the country after the latter, their allied power. The gift village Māṅgoḍur may be reasonably identified with Māgulūru or (santa) Māgulūru) in the present day Addanki.
taluk of Prakasam district. *Santa* in Telugu means fairs, conducted weekly, where all commercial transactions, sales and purchases were carried on. The village must be a reputed centre of such a fair in medieval times and thus its name was prefixed by the term *santa*.

108. Simhavarman might have proclaimed his independence in A.D. 478, after the death of his uncle, Simhavarman II, during the latter's Karnataka expeditions. The Māṅgādūr plates of the former were assigned to A.D. 486 dated in his 8th regnal year.

109. *Supra*, sect. IA.

110. See below, Pt. III, Ch. 2, sect. II.

**  **  **  **
3. THE MERIDIAN: MĀDHAVARAŬMAN II

The Viṣṇukundin kingdom reached the meridian of its power and glory under Mādhavavarman II, the son and successor of Govindavarman. He was, by far, the greatest of the Viṣṇukundin monarchs, considering his conquests and the record performance of Vedic rituals. He carried on the policy of expansionism, initiated by his father, till the Deccan was politically integrated for the first time after the disappearance of the Sātavāhana empire and brought it under the Viṣṇukundin hegemony. The Viṣṇukundin empire reached its widest extent under him and his personality appears to be a source of inspiration to them, especially, in the case of Vikramendravarman II, in the midst of his overwhelming troubles.

In His Personality:

Mādhavavarman II claimed in his two copper plate grants, the Īpūrú (set I) and the spurious pōlamūrū plates, conquests and qualities of a great ruler. The two records describe him as performer of eleven Aevamedhas, thousand kratus and the Hiranyagarbha. The records of his grandsons identically describe his regal and ritualistic achievements, but omit the performance of Hiranyagarbha. Significant is the
The epithet *susthitakarman* he claimed for himself in his *Ipūrū* (set I) plates, interpreted as "one whose religious rites were everlasting," and as "a person of great persistence in (all) activities." Both the interpretations seemingly purport the same, as performance of many great, elaborate and arduous rituals, as enjoined by the sacred texts surely require perseverance, which quality he claimed more explicitly among others, as mentioned above.

But the three copper plate grants of his great-grandson, Vikramendravarman II, grossly exaggerate the number and variety of sacrifices. It led some scholars to distinguish Madhavavarman, the donor of the *Ipūrū* (set I) and the *Pōlamūrū* plates from the homonymous ruler, mentioned in the records of Vikramendravarman II. The exaggeration reached the extremes of deifying him in terms of *Paramesṭhi* and *Devātidāva*. Sahkaranarayanan was apparently under the impression that Madhavavarman II actually performed all the rituals attributed to him, in the records of his great-grandson, as he takes much pain in explaining the meanings and procedures of the rituals.

The title Janāḍraya of the king was another point
on which scholars in the past distinguished Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Pālamūry plates from the one, mentioned in the Chikkullā and Rāmatirthām plates. They laid much emphasis on the title and tried to associate the king with the composition of a Sanskrit treatise on prosody, called Janārāya Chandovicitī. It has been concluded above, that Mādhavavarman did not assume the title Janārāya and the treatise on poetics and prosody seems to be an early medieval work, at least, separated from the Viṣṇukundin period by a considerable gap of time.

II. His Career:

Mādhavavarman II claimed in his own records, that his commands respectfully obeyed by the kings all over the earth, that he delighted the young woman (women) of Trīvaranagara and that he obtained overlordship of the entire country, between the Himalayas and Cape Comerin. The Tummalagūḍem (set II) charter describes him as the lord of the earth, bounded by the river Narmadā in the north and the ocean on the remaining three sides. The same record at another instance says that he forcibly made many kings his vassals. Eventhough, the two latter statements are a little bit exaggerated and poetical in expression,
there need not be any doubt that he overran the whole of the Deccan. The discovery of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin coins at a number of places in the coastal and the interior of Āndhradesa, as well as in Vīdarbhā and Aparāntā countries as well as the Māṇāpur plates support the conclusion. A survey of the political conditions of the Deccan provides the circumstantial evidence to substantiate the conclusion.

The ḫīṟū (set I) and the pōḷāmūṟū charters of Mādhava-varman, of his 37th regnal year record that he camped with his army, on the bank of the river Gōḍāverī, being desirous of conquering the east. It is interesting to note that he performed eleven nāṉāṉamadhas and thousand kṛatūs, by the time, but the Vēḷīṟū stone inscription of his 33rd regnal year makes no reference to them. Thus, some scholars suggest that the inscription was issued by some feudatory of Mādhava-varman, but not by himself. But the extent text of the inscription does not warrant any such conclusion, either overtly or covertly and the omission need not be taken seriously.

The confederacy of a number of powers formed by Harishāṇa disintegrated, apparently, after his death
and the confederates freely indulged mutual warfare for supremacy and this landed the whole of the Deccan in chaos. Under the circumstances, a powerful and enterprising monarch like Mādhavavarman would not have missed the opportunity of building an empire. He must have undertaken an expedition into Viderbhā, Kosalā and other countries, early in his reign, but we have no evidence to substantiate the suggestion. Some scholars opine that Mādhavavarman II must have felt himself rightful claimant to the Vākaṭaka dominions, by virtue of his matrimonial relations with the house. But a conqueror he was, would not have needed any legal ground, in his military enterprise.

The revival of the Pallava suzerainty by Simhavarman, son of Yuvamahārāja Visnugopa, over the southern Andhredā, seems to have sufficiently attracted his attention. As explained below, he personally marched on them, at the head of any army and made all arrangements for the containment of the Pallava expansion. Thus the expeditions of Mādhavavarman II, in the north as well as in the south can be studied under the heads, the northern and southern. The records issued in the last part of his
reign from military camps suggest that he invaded Kalinga and the circumstantial evidence as analysed below indicates that the invasion was continued into Vindhyen lands. It must be, in that case, his second northern expedition, preceded by wars with the Pallavas.

III. The Southern Campaign: A. The Pallavas:

As noted above, the Pallavas could revive their supremacy in southern Andhradesa, by the year A.D. 486, as suggested by the Mahagur grant of Simhavaran of the Andhre branch. The Velpuru stone inscription of Madhavavarman II, of his 33rd regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 508, says that he came down to Velpuru and camped there with his army. Scholars suggest that the installation of the idol of Vinayaka, reported in the inscription, suggests the beginning of war operations by the king. The record refers to the Pallavas and the obvious deduction from these facts is that Madhavavarman II came to Velpuru at the head of an army, assuming the command personally, to offer a battle to the Pallavas. The personal assumption of command by the king suggests that there have been a protracted warfare between the Pallavas and the Viṣṇukūndins, before the particular one,
suggested by the Vēlpūrū inscription. Vijaya Viṣṇugopaverman⁴⁷, the donor of the Cūrā grant and the son and successor of Simhavarman of the Āndhra Branch, appears to be the Pallava contemporary of Mādhavavarman II. The honorific viṣaya borne by the king also suggests that the protracted warfare and his successes at times.

Hence, Mādhavavarman was obviously determined to expel the Pallavas out of the southern Āndhradeśa. The final victory in the protracted warfare seems to have favoured the Viṣṇukundin king, as for about half-a-century thereafter, no trace of the Pallava hegemony is noticed in the region.

B. Ṭrikūṭamalayā Branch of the Viṣṇukundins (II):

It has been concluded, in a previous chapter,⁴⁸ that the kings known from the Īpūrū (set II) plates, viz. Devavarman and Mādhavavarman III belonged to the collateral branch that ruled over the Ṭrikūṭa region. It was apparently created by Mādhavavarman II, after his Vēlpūrū battle with the Pallavas, as the frontier guard of the kingdom against the possible revival of the Pallava power in the time to come.
The Īpūrū (set II) plates of Mādhavavarman III describe that his father Devavarman became famous by his display of matchless valour in exterminating Kṣatriyas. There is reason to believe that the term "Kṣatriya" in the statement includes the Pallavas. Devavarman may have accompanied Mādhavavarman II to Vālpūrū and participated in his battles with the Pallavas. After gaining victory Devavarman might have been appointed as the governor of the Trikūṭa country, who was, perhaps, succeeded by his son Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates, to the governorship of the country.

The Trikūṭa branch of the Viṣṇukundins appear to have played a noteworthy part in checking the Pallava expansion into southern Āndhra country. They could not have territorial gains in Kṛṣṇa valley, till the date of the Chendalūrū plates of Kumāraviṣṇu II, (A.D. 545-560) when the Viṣṇukundin power was waning.

IV. Northern Expedition: A. Kalingā:

The 37th regnal year of Mādhavavarman II, when he camped with his army on the banks of the river Gōdāvari, on his expedition to the East, corresponds to A.D. 512. The country of Kalingā between the river and the Mahendragiri hill was in a state of political
confusion, at the time. The Mātharas and the pitṛbhaktas, who endeavoured to unite the country politically, disappeared about the close of the fifth century. The Vāsiṣṭhas of Devarāṣṭra seems to have carried on the mission, but unsuccessfully, even though they bore the epithet Kaliṅgādhīpata, they do not appear as the rulers of entire Kaliṅga. One Viśākhavarman, whose dynastic appellation is not known, was ruling over some parts of Kaliṅga, and another chief who issued the Sarabhavaram plates was the ruler of some other part, probably, when Mādhavavarman II invaded the country.

2. Eastern Gaṅgas and Rāmakāśyapās:

The earliest of the Eastern Gaṅgas known at present was Indravarman, the donor of the Jirjingal plates of the year 39. It was perhaps, the regnal year of the king and the reckoning seem to have become the Gaṅga Era, as continued by his successors. The initial date of the era has been fixed as 14th March, A.D. 498, and thus the actual date of the record falls in the year A.D. 536. The king must be independent, as he dated the record in his regnal year. But his reign coincides with the hay-day of the Viśnukūṇḍin overlordship in Kalinga under Mādhavavarman II.
Hence the independence of the king must be shortlived and he was forced to accept the Viṣṇukūṇḍin subordination about the year A.D. 512, as a result of the expedition of Mādhavavarmman II into Kalingā. It may not be unreasonable to suggest that the emergence of the Eastern Ganga power in Kalingā was the prompting reason for the aged Viṣṇukūṇḍin king to undertake the expedition into the country.

The Rāmakāyapa, or the Rāṇaduraṭaya dynasty, is known from the Tāṇdivāda and the Collāvallī plates of Prthvimahārāja dated in his 46th and 49th regnal years, respectively. They are assigned on palaeographical grounds to the beginning of the seventh century and mention the king as the grandson of Mahārāja Rāṇaduraṭaya and the son of Vikramendra. Prthvimahārāja seem to have ruled over the coastal Andhradesa, independently, till Pulakṣāṇin II invaded in A.D. 617. As the fifty years reign of Prthvimahārāja ended in the year A.D. 617, the date of his accession may be fixed in A.D. 567. By assigning 25 years of reign each to the predecessors of Prthvimahārāja, as their actual regnal periods are not known, the chronology of the dynasty may be arranged as: Rāṇaduraṭaya c. A.D. 517-542, Vikramendra, c. A.D. 542-567, Prthvimahārāja c. A.D. 567-617. The
name Vikramendra in the dynasty suggests that Ranadurajaya was a contemporary of Vikramandravarman I, accepted the later's suzerainty and named his son after the name of his suzerain. He must have accepted the Viṣṇukundin overlordship, obviously, being defeated by Mādhavavarman II. As such, the former reign has to be slightly proposed to a time before A.D. 512.

Sankaranarayanan opines that the Eastern expedition of Mādhavavarman IV, along with several vassals of the king like Pṛthvīmahārāja, progressed victoriously, upto Jājnagar in Orissa, of the present day. He writes that the subsequent developments are not known, but presumes that it ended in the defeat and also in the death of the Viṣṇukundin king. The theory cannot be accepted, as there was no Mādhavavarman IV in the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and the expedition, that Sankaranarayanan accounts to the Viṣṇukundin king was, in fact, the invasion by Pṛthvīmahārāja himself, as an independent king and that it was not upto Jājnagar, as he believes. Mādhavavarman did not die in the Kaliṅgā expedition, but he must have continued his onslaughts, but in Kosalā, after subduing the ruling powers in the former country.
B. Trivaranagara:

Mādhavavarman II is described to have delighted the young woman (women) of the city of Trivaranagara and the identification of the city remains a subject of controversy, over since Krishnasastri suggested it to be identical with Tewar. K.V.Lakshmanarao accepted the identification and went further by suggesting that Mādhavavarman married a princess of the place. Hultzsch was not convinced by the conclusions, for the city was too far from the territory, over which the Viśnukundins ruled. He supposed that the city might be the capital of the Viśnukundin, though he did not try to identify it.

H.C.Raychaudhuri suggested the Viśnukundin-Maukhari-Somavāṃśī synchronism, by identifying Suryavarman, the maternal grandfather of Mahāśīvagupta Bāḷārjuna, who issued the Sirpur inscription, with the Maukhari king of the same name, mentioned in the Harāhā inscription and the Andhradhāpati of the same inscription with Mādhavavarman, the Viśnukundin king following the synchronisms, D.C.Sircar rejected the identification of Tivaranagara with Tewar proposed by K.V.Lakshmanarao, and suggested that it might be the Somavāṃśī capital, probably called after Trivaradeva.
The king was the son of Nannarāja, who issued the Bhāṇḍak inscription and grandson of Indrabala, the founder of the dynasty. He is known by his Rājim, the Bālōḍa, and the recently discovered Bāndā plates.

V. V. Mirashi further worked out the Mādhavavarman-Tīvaradeva synchronism and assigned Candragupta, the grandfather of Mahāivagupta Bālārjuna, to A.D. 550-570 and the former's elder brother and predecessor, Tīvaradeva to A.D. 530-550. Thus Tīvaradeva becomes the contemporary of the Vaiṣṇukundin king Mādhavavarman, whom D. C. Sircar assigned to A.D. 535-585. B. V. Krishnarao was another, who accepted the identification of Tīvaranagāra with the Somavāṃśi capital, but supposed that Candragupta, the younger brother and successor of Tīvaradeva, was the contemporary of Mādhavavarman. He surmised that the Vaiṣṇukundin king defeated the Somavāṃśi, and married his daughter, whom he identified with the princess Candrāvatī of Śrīśaila sthalamahātmya. It has to be noted, in this context, that the records of Tīvaradeva, referred to above and those of his successors, were issued only from Śrīpura and none of them indicates the renaming of the city of Tīvaradeva. Neither the legend is historical, nor is the manipulation of the Somavāṃśi
chronology in such a way, as to suit the Viṣṇukundin chronology desirable.

AGhosh reasonably rejected the Somavamśi-Maukhari synchronism, for the former's inscriptions including the Bhāṇḍak inscription of Nannarāja must be later on palaeographical ground, than the Āraṅg plates of Bhīmasena II, dated in Gupta Era 282. Secondly, they closely resemble the Sālodbhava records, in respect of the alphabet and the Kondadāda and Nivīna grants of the Sālodbhava king Dharmarāja refer to Tīveradeva, as defeated by him. Dharmarāja was the grandson of Madhava-Śainyabhīta, whose Ganjam plates are assigned to A.D. 619 and thus the former belongs to the second half of the seventh century A.D. Ghosh, on the other hand, upheld the identification of Trivaranaagara with Tewar and suggested that it was a partly prakritised name of Tripuri.

Mirashi tried to maintain his own stand by reading the year, mentioned in the Āraṅg plates of Bhīmasena II as 182 Gupta Era and by comparing the alphabet of the Bhāṇḍak inscription with that of the Bōdh Gaya inscription of Mahānāma, dated in Gupta Era 282 (A.D. 602). He fixed the accession of Mahāśīvagupta Bālārjuna, on the basis of his Bōndā
In spite of these and other subsequent revisions by the learned Professor, the Somavamsi-Viṣṇukūṇḍi synchronism suffers from the problem raised by the Sālidabhava records, referring to Tīvaradeva. The supposition, as a way out of the problem, that there were two Tīvaradevas, the first being the Viṣṇukūṇḍin and Maukhari contemporary and the second as the Sālidabhava contemporary, is disproved by the Abhāra plates of Nannarāja, the son of Tīvaradeva. The record credits Tīvaradeva with the overlordship of Kosāla and Kāliṅga, thus making him the contemporary of the Sālidabhava king Dharmaṇāja and has to be assigned to the latter half of the seventh century A.D. TheSomavamsis came to power only after the Sarabhapuriyas of South Kosāla and not before A.D. 590. The Viṣṇukūṇḍins disappeared by the time and thus the synchronism of Mādhavavarman and Tīvaradeva is impossible.

Another group of scholars maintain even to this day, that Trivaranagara was the capital of Mādhavavarman, as suggested by Hultszch. But they sharply differ
from one another in identifying it, while some of them suppose that it was not one, but three great (Tri means Three and vara means the pure, the best, etc.) cities. K.A.N. Sastri doubted whether a powerful king like Tivradeva could have been defeated by Mādhavavarman and suggested that the term stood for three great cities in the Viṣṇukundin kingdom, "where the king resided in turns." It is improbable to suppose that Mādhavavarman dwelt by turns, in three cities of his own kingdom. N. Venkataramanayya upheld the identification of Trivanagara with Tewar. According to him the donor of the Īpūrī (set I) and the Pōlamūrī plates, whom he considered as Mādhavavarman IV, ruled from the city, before he came to rule over Vāngī country after Vikramendravarman II.

The theory is not acceptable for there is no place for Mādhavavarman IV in the Viṣṇukundin genealogy, nor is there evidence either to show that the Viṣṇukundins ever ruled in the Tewar region, or that they shifted their capital to Amaraśīrā and that the town was identical with Amaraśi. O. Ramachandraiya has reasonably rejected the theory of Mādhavavarman IV obtaining an apparaşage and the king ruling over the Tewar region.
Sankaranarayanan presumed that Vikramandaravaman II shifted his capital from Vêngî to Indrapurâ, due to the Pallava menace and Madhavavarman IV returned to Vêngî country, having at his capital Trivaranagara. He identified the town with the modern Tiruvuru in Krishna district. He compares the epithet Trivaranagara bhavanagata yuvati hrdayanandaprabh or "Paramayuvatijana vihagaratih" in the Viṣṇukundin records with some literary references describing the women in the capital cities being jubilant at the return of kings after victorious expeditions. Neither the identification of the town, nor the substantiation can be accepted because, at the first instance, the Sanskrit name Trivaranagara does not have at least a remote linguistic relation with the name Tiruvuru, formed by two Dravidian terms Tiru (means śrī) Ûr (means village, or a town). Secondly, the literary descriptions full of poetical imagery, hardly help in understanding the inscriptive statements.

Hence, in the present state of knowledge, the best answer to the problem is taking the term "Trivaranagara" as meaning "three great cities."
But the cities were his conquests and that conquerors are often described both in literature and inscriptions as to have personified as Lakṣmī. Mādhavavarman II himself is described in the Tummalagūḍām (set II) plates as to have forcibly made the fortune of other kings his own. Thus, the reference to Parameyuvatī or Yuvatijana in the context has to be understood as the fortune of the royal houses, won over by Mādhavavarman II in wars.

C. Kosāla and Aparantā:

About the beginning of the 6th century A.D. the country of Kosāla was under the rule of the Sarabhapūriyas. They seem to have risen independent under Narendra (c. A.D. 500-525), the donor of the Pipardula plates of his 3rd regnal year and the Kurud plates of 24th regnal year. He seems to have taken advantage of the decline of the Vaiśekakas and the eventual death of Harishena, by about A.D. 500, to proclaim independence. But his independent rule in the first quarter of the sixth century coincides with the time of the Viṣṇukundin expedition under Mādhavavarman II. Thus, it can be plausibly suggested that the king defeated Narendra, sometime between his 3rd and 24th regnal years and that the Sarabhapūriyas had to accept the Viṣṇukundin suzerainty. The fact
that the dynasty was not heard of again, till Praeannamatra revived the glory of the house, supports the conclusion.

The Traikūṭakas were the rulers of northern Maharashtra, or the Aparānta country during the latter half of the fifth century. Dahrasena of the dynasty (c. A.D. 455) is believed to have made inroads into the Vākaṭaka empire of the main branch, at the time of its decline. A copper plate grant from Kanheri dated in the year 245, obviously of the Traikūṭaka era, corresponding to A.D. 493, shows that they were powerful in the region till the end of the fifth century A.D. The discovery of Viṣṇukundin coins at Nāsik, Navasa and Prakāsa in northern Maharashtra suggests that Aparānta came under Viṣṇukundin influence, perhaps, subjugated by Mādhavavarman II during his northern expedition.

D. Southern Mahārāṣṭra:

Mānāṅka, a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Māṇḍūra, was described to have conquered Vīdarbhā, Aesaka and Kuntala countries and the first two are identified with the territories held by the two branches of the Vākaṭakas. It is thus apparent that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas extended their power in south and east, taking advantage of the decline of the Vākaṭakas. The
Rāstrakūṭa chief was, perhaps, identical with the king of Kuntalā, referred to in Viśrutacaritra, who was in the company of Harishena and subsequently defeated the latter or his successor. Scholars suppose that Viṣṇukūṇḍin king Madhavavarman II might have rescued the Vākāṭakas, in vain. If the story and the conclusions based thereon, are believed to contain any historical element, the Viṣṇukūṇḍin king must have subdued the Rāstrakūṭa chief Mānāṅka, in his earlier expedition. The Undikāvāṭikā grant of Abhimanyu, a later member of the dynasty seems to refer to Jayasimha, the founder of the Cālukya line of Bādami, as a vassal of the Rāstrakūṭas. Thus, Abhimanyu may be assigned to the beginning of the sixth century A.D.

Eventhough, the Khaṇāpūr plates of Madhavavarman are doubted for their genuineness, they are taken to suggest the Viṣṇukūṇḍin influence in southern Maharashtra, that continued to a far later date than the event. It was surely the result of the victorious expedition of Madhavavarman II. Either Abhimanyu, or some of his successors must have been defeated by him and the Rāstrakūṭas must have acknowledged the Viṣṇukūṇḍin suzerainty for some time.

Sankaranarayanan writes that the Khaṇāpūr
plates were not issued by Mādhavavarman himself, but by some Rāstrakūta king of Manpura, at the former's request. He surmises that the Rāstrakūtas and the Viṣṇukundins had alliances, both political and matrimonial, and co-operated with each other in repudiating the Vakataka overlordship. He relied on the name of Dēvavarman, the "singular and unique" among the Viṣṇukundin personal names, to substantiate the conclusion, supposing that the prince was the son of a Rāstrakūta princess, married by Mādhavavarman II and that she was the daughter of the Rāstrakūta Dēvārāja. But the suggestions are not convincing, for the name Dēvavarman was not foreign to Andhra country, to be searched for its source elsewhere. The marriage of Mādhavavarman II with the Rāstrakūta princess cannot be accepted, for it was not referred to in the Viṣṇukundin charters. At least, the Īpūrū (set II) plates, do not allude to it, as against the repeated reference to the Vakataka alliance in the records of the later Viṣṇukundins. Neither the Viṣṇukundin alliance with the house, nor their political co-operation, notwithstanding the fact, that both the dynasties rose to independence about the same time, are not acceptable suggestions for want of evidence. The record must be a grant of Mādhavavarman II, but as it is available to
us is a later forgery of an earlier one, with later day concepts on the personality of the king, as is the case with the Pōlamūru plates.

Mādhavavarman II died, perhaps, in the year A.D. 515 and the Viṣṇukundin Empire marks the widest extent at that time. V.V. Mirashi suggests that the king must have conquered the southern Mahārāṣṭra country, perhaps, through Vidarbhā, similar to the observations made in these pages. But the view has been doubted by other scholars. The latest epigraphical and numismatic evidence, as analysed above, in the light of the circumstantial evidence, prove that the views of Mirashi are quite reasonable. The empire must have stretched by the year A.D. 515, over the much of the Deccan plateau indicated by the latest epigraphical evidence cited above.
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90. Some Gupta inscriptions, eg. CII, III, p. 59, 1. 5 describing Skanda gupta having been chosen by the Goddess Laksñmi to be her consort, is a good example. D.C. Sircar, Itihas, VII, 1, p. 3, has
very aptly compared the concerned statements in the Viṣṇukundin inscriptions to the description in the Bilhari inscription of the Kalacuri prince, Yuvarāja II, *Epi. Ind.*, I, p. 265, verse 24, his conquests of Gaudā, Karnāṭa, Lāṭa, Kalīṅgā etc. It has been explained above, pt. II, Ch. 3, sect. IIA, that the statement in the Tummalagūdem (set II) charter, that Madhava Varman made the fortune of other royal dynasties as his own, was analogous to the epithets under discussion.


95. *Infra*, pt. III, Ch. 3, sect. IIB, i.

96. A. S. Altekar, *NHIP.*, VI, pp. 118-19 and *EHGY.*, pp. 184-85, seems to be right in suggesting that one of the catastrophes that Prthvishega II had to face was the Traikūṭaka invasion.


98. *Supra*, pt. I, Ch. 3.


100. D. C. Sircar, *Geography*, p. 188 ff.


102. *Supra*, sect. II.


105. Supra, Pt. I, Ch. 2, sect. B5 and also Pt. II, Ch. 3.

106. D.C. Sircar, Itihas, VII, 1, p. 5, has rightly observed that it was forged by people, who were aware not only of Mādhavavarman's celebration of eleven Advamedhas and thousand kratus, as well as his expedition over Satara region, but also, the greatness of the king as to have performed eleven Paundarikas and others, as we find in the Tūndī plates of his great-grandson, in all its exaggerated tone.


108. Epit. Ind., XXVII, pt. ii, pp. 314-16, based on the identification of Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Khanapur plates, with the Great Visnukundin king Mādhavavarman.

109. B.Ch. Chabra, Ibid., p. 315, note, writes that the identification of the donor of the record with the Visnukundin Mādhavavarman and "assigning such a vast empire to the otherwise little known dynasty of the Visnukundins...to say the least, is not very convincing."

** ** ** **
The Viṣṇukundin overlordship that reached its zenith during the glorious reign of Mādhavavarman II was apparently shortlived, as his grandson Indravarman II, and great-grandson Vikramendravarman II were busy with wars on all fronts. Obviously, the victorious campaigns of Mādhavavarman II had no follow-up action and the forces of disintegration set in themselves. Indravarman II had to put up strenuous fights with fissiparous trends in order to maintain the suzerainty of the house achieved by his grandfather.

I. Vikramendravarman I (c. A.D. 515-525):

A. His Personality:

Vikramendravarman I, who succeeded Mādhavavarman II to the Viṣṇukundin throne, was the son of the Vākāṭaka Mahādevī, obviously, the Vākāṭaka princess, married by the latter. He was described as the ornament of the two families, the Viṣṇukundī and the Vākāṭaka. The Tummalagūḍām (set II) charter describes him as a Paramāsaugata and a Mahākavi.

Scholars in the past generally viewed Devavarman as the eldest son of Mādhavavarman II, but predeceased him and thus, the latter was succeeded by Mādhavavarman III, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates. Some of the scholars supposed that Vikramendravarman I followed
Madhavavarman III on the throne, at a fairly old age, and assigned him a regnal period of five to ten years, suitable to their respective schemes of chronology. Some others doubt whether Vikramandaravarman I ascended the throne at all, because none of his records are so far discovered; and he might not have had a chance to ascend the throne, as his father enjoyed a long reign of 40 years. It has been rightly pointed out the fact, that no record of the king has yet been discovered, cannot be a proof that he did not rule, especially, because the Rāmatirtham plates describe him as Rājā. The recently discovered Tungi as well as the Tummalaugudem (set II) charters too accredit him with the title Mahārāja. These titles are sufficient to show that he succeeded his father to the throne.

B.V. Krishnarao supposed that the short reign of Vikramandaravarman I was inglorious and ended in disaster, as Mahārāja Prabhākara usurped the throne, having received help by the Vakataka king Harishena. Vikramandaravarman I might have ruled only for a short period, but there is no evidence to show that it ended in disaster. Neither Mahārāja Prabhākara was an usurper, nor could he register the help of Harishena, who was, perhaps, no more by that time.
A.M. Shastrī has assigned the king a decade of rule between A.D. 519-529. This conclusion is quite reasonable, in view of the fact that his father enjoyed a reign of 40 years and his own son and successor Indravarman II also had a moderately long reign of 30 years. But, the regnal period has to be slightly preponed.

B. His Career:

The above mentioned epithets in the description of Vikramendravarman I, clearly suggest that he was a mild king with a pious disposition and fine tastes. The description in the Tūndī plates of his grandson that Vikramendravarman's lotus feet shone with the diamonds studded in the tiaras of many feudatories might only be a conventional eulogy and an exaggerated glorification. This is the only reference to the king, in the Viśvakundin inscriptions, as a ruler of paramount power. More significant in the context is the omission of such a description in the Rāmatirtha plates issued by his own son and successor.

Vikramendravarman I did not, perhaps, evince much interest in politics and his reign may have had inglorious end as some scholars opined. His weak rule was not fit to follow the powerful reign of his father and perhaps, provided the newly conquered kingdoms and
feudatories with the opportunities to proclaim independence.

i. Central Deccan:

The Sarabhāpurīyas of south Kosalā seem to have registered a revival of their power, contemporaneous to the reign of Vikramendravarman I. The Kurud plates of Narandra dated in his 24th regnal year suggest that he was independent, obviously, following the death of Mādhavavarman II. He was perhaps, succeeded by Prasannamātra, who seems to be pre-eminent in the Sarabhāpurīya line of kings. He founded a new city named after himself and issued his coinage in gold and silver. The successors of Prasannamātra seem to have extended their realms, till their power was checked by Indravarman II of the Viṣṇukūndins.

About the same time as the reign of Vikramendravarman I, the Cālukyas rose to power and prominence at Bāḍāmi under Pulakēśin I (c. A.D. 520-546). The Cālukyan king was an Aśvamedhin as his sons Kirtivarman I and Maṅgalesa extended the Cālukyan power over entire Central and Western Deccan and even entered Kāliṅga. These countries were, perhaps, occupied by the Cālukyas from the Nāḷas and Kālākuris. The Kāḷācuri kings Kṛṣnarāja and Saṅkaragāna seem to have
been in possession of Anūpa and Aparānta countries in the middle of the sixth century as testified by the silver coins of the former and the Ahbōnā plates of the latter. It is thus clear, that Nāsik region, which was included in the Viṣṇukundin empire, as the result of Mādhavavarman’s victories on Traikutakas, passed into Kaḷacuri hegemony, during the reign of Viśramendravarman I.

ii. Kālīṅga:

The two vassal powers of the Viṣṇukundins in Kālīṅga, viz. the Rāmakāśyapas and the Eastern Gaṅgas apparently revolted against their suzerainty, during the weak rule of Viśramendravarman I. The Tāṇḍivāda and the Gollāvalli plates of PrthviMahārāja attribute his grandfather, Raṇadurjaya, the title of Mahārāja, reasonably suggesting that he proclaimed his independence. The fact that the donor’s father Viṣramendra was not quite distinctly, attributed the regal title, supports the conclusion. The eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman I was brought back to obedience by Indravarman II, the Viṣṇukundin, as shown below. Obviously, he too proclaimed independence, following the death of Mādhavavarman II.

Thus, the weak rule of Viṣramendravarman I,
stands in contrast to the vigorous activity of warfare during the reign of his son and successor, Indravarman II. It tended the centrifugal forces to become active and forms the background to the latter's busy time in curbing them.

II. Indravarman II (c. A.D. 525-555):

Indravarman II, or Indrabhattārakavarman, who granted the Rāmatīrtham plates was the son and successor of Vikramendravarman I. He was a war-like king who claimed victories in many four-tusked elephant battles and his lotus-like feet were engulfed by the rays that emanated from the diamonds in the crowns of kings of (the earth bounded by) four oceans. Apart from these statements, the records of his son and successor Vikramendravarman II describe the king more glowingly. They report that he attained the overlordship of the entire Cakravartikṣetra, by his own prowess, and that he entirely exterminated the dayādes, or rival agnate kinsmen. They describe him as Dharma-vijaya, thus suggesting, his military exploits were not brutal conquests. From these descriptions in his own and his son's records Indravarman II appears to be the greatest conqueror in the dynasty, next only to Mādhavavarman II. A study of the contemporary political condition of the Deccan and Andhradesa, against the background of the
inglorious reign of his father, testifies the truth of the statements.

In addition to these war-like qualities, Indravarman II was described by his son as to have established cātikā<sup>29</sup> and one who enjoyed unlimited merit, obtained by his ever giving of lands, cows, brides and gold.<sup>30</sup> Both his own record and those of his son describe him as a paramamāheśvara, or an ardent Saivite.<sup>31</sup>

The Rāmatirtham charter of Indravarman II was dated in his 27th regnal year,<sup>32</sup> but it does not allude to his victories against the rival kingmen, which are invariably mentioned to his credit in the records of his son. Hence, they must have taken place after he issued the charter. The Chikkulla and Tummalagūḍam (set II) charters of his son mention that himself was called on to bear the burden of the kingdom, while he was an infant.<sup>33</sup> From these facts, the reign of Indravarman II appears to have abruptly ended, probably in his wars with the kinsmen, even though the records of Vikramandaravarma II try to make us believe that he scored easy victories off them.

A. The Caturdanta Battles:

The caturdanta battles waged by Indravarman II
were a matter of debate among scholars as to their course and results. They were referred to not only in the Viṣṇukundin but also in the Gōḍavaṇī plates of pṛthvīmūla, the Khaṇḍkheṭ plates of Pratāpasīla, the Jirjīṅgī plates of the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman I and, perhaps, in the records of some other dynasties as well. It is reasonable to take the kings, who claimed victories in the four-tusked elephant battles as contemporaries and involved in the wars.

i. The Caturdanta Battles and the Eastern Gaṅgas:

The Gōḍavaṇī plates of pṛthvīmūla describe the caturdanta battles in more detail. One Indrādhirāja, the son of one Mitavarman, who hailed from Menālkudi obtained pure fame that pervaded all over the surface of the world, by felling the elephant Kumuda, himself mounted on the elephant Supratīka; when numerous kings enthusiastically and expeditiously formed a confederacy and marched to overthrow Indrabhaṭṭāraka. Indrādhirāja was said to have approached pṛthvīmūla, to make a gift for the merit of his own parents, and the grant was thus made at the behest of the prince.

The Viṣṇukundins were unknown when Fleet published the Gōḍavaṇī plates, for the first time. Thus
he supposed\textsuperscript{40} that Kumuda and Supratika represent the south-west and north-east respectively and stood for Indrabhat\texttt{t}\texttt{a}raka, the Eastern C\texttt{a}lukyan king and the Eastern Ga\texttt{n}ga king Indravarman of the years 87 or 128 of the Ga\texttt{n}ga era. When the Chikkull\texttt{a} plates were published, Kielhorn\textsuperscript{41} not only drew the palaeographic similarity of the record with the G\texttt{d}\texttt{a}v\texttt{a}r\texttt{I} plates, but also suggested that Indrabhat\texttt{t}\texttt{a}raka, mentioned in the former, was the same as against whom the confederacy of kings, referred to in the latter record was formed. He identified Indr\texttt{d}hir\texttt{a}ja with the Eastern Ga\texttt{n}ga king of the years 128 and 154. But none of the Ga\texttt{n}ga kings, suggested by Fleet and Kielhorn, described themselves as the victors in catur\texttt{d}anta battles. When the Jirj\texttt{i}ng\texttt{i} plates came to light, D.R.\texttt{B}handarker\textsuperscript{42} suggested that Indr\texttt{d}hir\texttt{a}ja of the G\texttt{d}\texttt{a}v\texttt{a}r\texttt{I} plates might be the same as the donor of the former, as he claimed victories in catur\texttt{d}anta battles.

Following the identifications proposed by Kielhorn and Bhandarker, G.J.\texttt{D}ubreuil\textsuperscript{43} concluded that the catur\texttt{d}anta battles took place between the Vi\texttt{\texttt{n}}ukundin king Indravarman and the Eastern Ga\texttt{n}ga king Indravarman and the former lost his life in the course. B.V.\texttt{K}rishnara\texttt{a}\textsuperscript{44} accepted the conclusion, but M.Ramarao\textsuperscript{45} and N.Venkatar\texttt{a}ram\texttt{a}n\texttt{a}y\texttt{a}\textsuperscript{46} quite plausibly rejected the
identification of Indradhiraja with any Eastern Ganga king and the conclusion based thereon. They point out that there was no Indravarman among the Eastern Gaṅgas, mentioned as the son of Mitavarman, who was a dvija, or Brāhmaṇa, as required by the Gōdāvari plates. They suggested correctly that Indradhiraja must be a vassal of Prthvīmulā, as indicated by the fact that he approached the latter to make a gift for the merit of his own parents. Against the above views, Sankaranarayanan argues, rather incoherently, that the term dvija stands even for a Kṣatriya and the suffix 'varman' in the name of Mitavarman suggests that he was a Kṣatriya; identifies adhiraja Indra of the record, with the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman I; and suggests that the Eastern Gaṅgas were Brāhmaṇas like the Kedambas. Quite curiously, he suggests that the epithet 'adhiraja' in the Gōdāvari plates stands for "at least of a feudatory, if not a sovereign," and the Gaṅgas were not yet become prominent at the time. The argument loses its weight if the specific dynastic name 'Gaṅga' is looked for in the case of Indradhiraja, for the donor of the Jirjīngi plates was clearly a Gaṅga king. Again, the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman was a victor of caturdanta battles, by the year A.D. 537 (498+39). The accession of Prthvīmulā
on the basis of the cumulative evidence of the Gōdāvarī plates and the Tummalagūdeṁ (set II) charter cannot be assigned to any date earlier than the year A.D. 545. As such, the contemporaneity for the Gaṅga king Indravarman I and prthvīmūla as well as the former being a vassal of the latter, are quite impossible.

However, the contemporaneity and the common claims to victories in the caturdanta battles of the Viśnukundin king Indravarman and the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman, as several scholars, including Sankaranarayanan suggested, point out their confrontations. But the conclusion does not involve the identification of Indrādhirāja of the Gōdāvarī plates with the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman. It seems probable that the wars waged by the Viśnukundin king Indravarman II excepting his internecine warfare with the agnate rivals, were generally termed as caturdanta battles. It might be, because his army consisted more elephant force and he was ostensibly proud of them. Hence, the caturdanta wars need not taken in the sense of his confrontation with any specific king.

The jīrjīgī grant describes Indravarman, quite significantly, as Trikalīngādhipati. But, its meaning might be different from the claims of some mediaval
dynasties of Kalinga and Kosala. It seems to stand in the case of the king, for the overlordship of the three regions of Kalinga, previously held by the Matharas, Pitrbhaktas and the Vasisthas. Thus the epithet was equivalent to (Sakala) Kalingadhipati, claimed by the three latter mentioned dynasties, which included the region around Pistaipurā. It was held by the Rāmakāyapas under the Viṣṇukundin suzerainty and the caturdanta battles might have taken place between the Eastern Gaṅgas and the Viṣṇukundins for the supremacy over the Pistaipurā region. It may not be unreasonable to suggest that the Rāmakāyapas became subordinate allies of the Eastern Gaṅgas and took part in the confedera cy of kings, that threatened the Viṣṇukundin kingdom.

The inevitable conclusion from the relative Viṣṇukundin and Eastern Gaṅga chronology, based on the Rāmatirtham and Jirjinji copper plate grants is that, the Eastern Gaṅga king was successful in caturdanta wars by A.D. 537 and the Viṣṇukundin king by A.D. 552 (525+27). It precludes the possibility of the defeat and death of the Viṣṇukundin Indravarman II in the hands of the Eastern Gaṅga king Indravarman, as suggested by some scholars in the past. On the other hand, it may be suggested, that there might be an event.
other way round sometime after the year A.D. 537. The Gaṅga king Indravarman could not have lived up to the year A.D. 552, to be defeated by the Viṣṇukundin Indravarman. At the present state of knowledge, Mahāsāṃvantavarman, the donor of the Ponnatūr plates of the year 64, was the successor of Indravarman on Gaṅga throne, who claimed himself to be Trikaliṅgādhipati. It may not be unreasonable to take that this king was defeated by the Viṣṇukundin king Indravarman, about the year A.D. 552, before he issued his Raṇḍviratham plates. Mahāsāṃvantavarman must have risen independent and assumed the title Trikaliṅgādhipati, after the death of Indravarman of the Viṣṇukundins in A.D. 555.

ii. The caturdanta Battles and Prthvimūla:

B.V. Krishnareo suggested that Mahārāja Prabhākara, father of Prthvīmūla, was the agnate rival of Indravarman II and was the protege of the Vākṣṭaka Harishena and that he ruled between c. A.D. 493-500. Thus, he presumed the Catuḍanta wars described in the Gōdāvari plates took place between Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Viṣṇukundins and Prthvīmūla, the latter having led the confederacy of kings, supported by his overlord, Indrādhirāja. He identified the latter with the Gaṅga king Indravarman, the donor of the Jīrjiṅgi plates
and concluded that he placed Prthvimula on the Viṣṇuṇūḍin throne. Finally, he opined that Vikramendravarman II, the son and successor of Indravarmen II, defeated and slain both Prthvimula and his overlord Indradhiraja. Sankaranarayanan also made Prthvimula the principal contender against Indravarmen II and suggests that the Gōḍāvari plates reflect the jubilant mood of the former at his nascent victory and independence. He writes that the ultimate victory of Indrabhattāraka and the loss of independence of Prthvimula are also suggestive in the record itself, while it says that the confederacy was hastily and hurriedly formed.

The Gōḍāvari plates do not mention the dynastic particulars of Prthvimula and his father and they cannot be taken, as B.V. Krishnarao opined, to be the dayādas, whom Indrabhattāraka annihilated. Moreover, the Viṣṇuṇūḍin-Prthvimula relations were quite otherwise of what the two scholars supposed. The second of the sets clearly states that the kings of the Prthvimula dynasty had undisturbed qualities, in other words, they remained loyal during the vicissitudes of the Viṣṇuṇūḍin, till their power fell down. Mūkārāja, the executor (ajñā) of the record, who uplifted the fortunes of his suzerains house, when it had fallen down, was none
other than prthvimula, the donor of the Godavari plates. Such loyalty and standing by the side of the suzerain in his odds, cannot be expected from a feudatory who had lately attempted an unsuccessful revolt. He emerged independent ruler, but only after the total collapse of his suzerain house, as explained in the next chapter.

In fact, there is nothing in the Godavari plates to associate prthvimula with the confederacy of kings, which formed with the intention of overthrowing Indrabhattaraka and that he was ultimately overthrown. On the other hand, the record expresses the rejoice of prthvimula at the defeat of the confederacy in its aim. It was only a presumption that Kumuda was mounted by the Visnukundin king, which was felled by Supratika, mounted by Indrādhirāja. In fact, the record is silent as to the detail and the truth seems to be that Kumuda had on its back the enemy of Indrabhattaraka, rather than himself. Indrādhirāja perhaps led the armies of prthvimula, that might have played an active role in the war, on the Visnukundin side and he earned fame by his performance in the event. The interpretation of the same lines of the Godavari plates, as expressing the happiness of prthvimula and also that the confederacy was hastily formed and that it was ultimately destroyed,
is possible in literature, but not in historical works. It is antithetical to the letter and spirit of the record.

iii. The Caturdanta Battles and the Cālukyas of Bādāmi:

Pulakāśin I (c. A.D. 520-546) of the Cālukyas of Bādāmi, who celebrated an Advamedha, was perhaps the first independent king of the dynasty. He assumed the title Satyāśraya, which came to be traditionally held by the successors of the king. Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Viṣṇukundins, as well as the middle part appears to have borne the title.

Kīrtivarmā I, the son of Pulakāśin I won victories of many kingdoms like Vaṅgā, Aṅgā, Kaliṅgā, Vaṭṭurā, Magadhā, Mūṣakā and many others and enabled the latter to perform his horse-sacrifice. Even though the list was certainly an exaggeration, he might have defeated, at least some of them. The Aihole inscription of Pulakāśin II, which is a more reliable historical record, describes Kīrtivarmā to have scored victories off the Nalas, the Mauryas and the Kadambas. The Nalas were apparently in possession of Viderbhā and Utkalā regions, while the Mauryas were ruling in Northern Mahārāstra. It is significant to note here that the Cālukyan power extended around Andhradesa, but it cannot be expected that they did not attempt to conquer
Andhradesa, which is contiguous to their seat of power. Sankaranarayanan surmises that some sort of friendly alliance might have existed between the Calukyas of Badami and the Vasingukundyas, in the event of the latter's invasion on the Maukharis and Našas. But there is more positive evidence that points out their relations were otherwise and the Calukyans invaded Andhradesa even before Pulakeśin II.

An Elāvaram inscription in 6th century characters mentions the presence of Ranavikrama, the well-known title of Pulakeśin I, reports the presence of the king at that place. His presence cannot be explained in any other manner except that the king must have come to the place on an invasion. The enemy of Indrabhāttāraka, mentioned in the Godāvari plates, as to have mounted Kumuda, can now be taken in the light of these pieces of evidence, as the Calukyan invader. It may be noted here that the Calukyans too had large elephant army, as testified by contemporary writings and they must have formed a confederacy of some of their vassals and allies in Kosala and Kalinga countries. B.V. Krishnarao suggests that Pratāpasāla, the donor of the Khaṇkhāḍ plates, which describe the king as the victor of Caturdanta battles, was one of the members. But the genuineness of the record is doubted, especially because of its silence about the dynastic particulars.
of the king. He might be a chief ruling somewhere in Central Deccan under Calukyan suzerainty. Mahesamantavaramn, who was perhaps the Ganga contemporary to Indravarman II might also have been a member in it, for Kalinga accepted the Calukyan overlordship, according to the Mahakuta pillar inscription.

The Viṣṇukundin army, together with their feudatories, of whom the chief was, perhaps, Prthvimula, might have faced the confederacy, in which Indrādhiraṅga played a very prominent role. The war ended apparently with the Viṣṇukundin victory, as suggested by the appropriation of the Calukyan title, Satyaśraya, by Indravarman II and the jubilation of Prthvīmūla expressed in his Gōdāvari plates at the fall of Kumuda. The silence of the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription about their overlordship of Śvīndradasa is also a point that Calukyan invade.

iv. The Rāmakāśyapas:

As suggested above, the Rāmakāśyapa chief Raṇadurajayasa could have declared independence during the weak reign of Vikramendravarman I. He was a senior contemporary of Indravarman, who must have defeated and brought him back to obedience. His successor Vikramendra, not being attributed the title, Mahārāja, must have
continued to be a fadatory of the Viṣṇukundin sovereignty under Indravarman II.

B. North Indian Expedition:

Indravarman II issued his Rāmatīrthamplates from the present day Visakhapatnam district, which formed a part of ancient Kalinga. His claim for overlordship of entire cakravartikṣetra, his victories in Kalinga must have been carried on, further into the heart of Kosala and other central Indian countries. He must have determined to bring once again, those lands, where the dynasty commanded suzerainty during the triumphant days of his illustrious grandfather. He must have pushed his marches further and further into the Gangetic plain, till his progress was checked by the Maukharis.

i. Kosala:

Eventhough the Sarabhapuriyas of Kosala repudiated the Viṣṇukundin suzerainty and Prasannamātra and Jayarāja revived the prestige of the family, the subsequent history of the dynasty presents a picture of disturbance and confusion. The two rulers are assigned respectively to A.D. 525-550 and 550-560, but the ninth regnal year of the latter, the latest year of his rule known to us, might be equivalent to the 27th regnal year of the Viṣṇukundin king Indravarman II. Thus the reign of
Jayarāja may be slightly altered as c. A.D. 542-552 when he suffered defeat in the hands of the Viṣṇukūndins monarch. The short reigns and irregular succession often indicate clearly that the kings had troublesome reigns and met with unexpected and also premature deaths. They must have had frequent set-backs in wars with enemies, of whom the Viṣṇukūndins under Indravarman II appear the most important.

The Pāṇḍavas, or the Pāṇḍuvamśis of Makalā were rising to prominence about the time and Nāgabala of the dynasty had his queen Indrabhṛtārikā. If the name of the queen suggests any Viṣṇukūndin relation, the Pāṇḍuvamśis of Makalā may be taken to have accepted the overlordship of Indravarman II and extended him, the assistance in his conquest of Kosalā. Indravarman II might have supported the Pāṇḍuvamśis against the Sarabhapūriyas, in his bid to strengthen his hold and keep the country of Kosalā under his suzerainty. He could have marched thus, against realms of the Maukharis.

ii. The Viṣṇukūndins and the Maukharis:

The Harāhā and the Jaunpūr fragmentary inscriptions of the times of the Maukharī king Iśānavarman describes the king as to have defeated an Āndrādhipati.
The Harāhā inscription refers to the slphant force in thousands, possessed by the Āndhrādhapati. The Jaunpūr inscription says that the lord of Āndhäs, with his elephant troops and armies spread among them, shining by the lustre of their swords, was defeated and "wholly given over to fear, took his abode, in the crevices of the Vindhyān mountain." There was no Āndhra dynasty, except the Viśnukūdins, powerful enough to go on a war with the Maukhaṇis.

H.C. Raychaudhuri suggested that the said Āndhrādhapati was perhaps Mādhavavarman II, the donor of the pūlamūru plates, as he crossed the river Gōdāvari, being desirous of conquering the East. D.C. Sircar accepted the suggestion and arranged the Viśnukūdin chronology based on the Mādhavavarman-Īśānavarman synchronism.

But the Viśnukūdin chronology, given here does not make Mādhavavarman II to be the contemporary of the Maukhaṇi king Īśānavarman, whose reign has been fixed between A.D. 550-576. On the other hand, Indravarman II comes to be the latter's contemporary, and his caturdanta wars suggest that he had a large elephant force, required for the identification with the Āndhrādhapati of the Maukhaṇi inscriptions. N. Vankateramanayya and
Sankaranarayanan\textsuperscript{91} plausibly suggested similarly and the former had supposed further that the Indravarman made peace with the Maukharis following his defeat and married his daughter to Sarvavarman,\textsuperscript{92} the son and successor of Isanavarman.

Some scholars\textsuperscript{93} suppose that the Maukhari victories referred to in the two inscriptions were two different events and the Vignukundins were twice defeated, once by Isvaravarman, father and predecessor of Isanavarman, and the second, by the latter. D.C. Sircar\textsuperscript{94} seems to be right in suggesting that the Jaunpur inscription also belongs to Isanavarman. Thus, the incidents referred to in the two records were to be considered as one and the same and dated to about A.D. 552, after the victorious Kosala expedition of the Vignukundin king. As the Jaunpur inscription seems to refer to Raivataka mountain and the rulers of Dhara and other contiguous countries,\textsuperscript{95} Indravarman II might have formed a confederacy of the kings, before he marched on the Maukharis.

It has been suggested recently,\textsuperscript{96} that the expression, \textit{Dharamārga vinirgrat-agnikanika}, in the Jaunpur inscription, does not mean an enemy that came upon the Maukharis, from the side of the city of Dhara,
because comparison of an enemy with agnikanika, hardly comes across in Sanskrit literary traditions. Thus, they suggest that the expression speaks the speed and mode of the running horses, as producing sparks from their hoofs in friction with the ground, signifying the fast advancing cavalry of the Śūlikas, whom the Harāhā inscription refers to have possessed large cavalry. But the Jaunpūr inscription seems to speak exclusively of Īśānavarman's conquest of Āndhras which was, perhaps, earlier than his victory over the Śūlikas and Gaudas.

If agnikanika cannot stand for an enemy, it may signify the calamity to which the Maukhari realms were subjected from the side of the city of Dhārā and Īśānavarman averting it, which is figuratively described as the king extinguished the spark of fire.

The statements in the two Maukhari inscriptions clearly say that the Āndhra, the Viṣṇukundin armies, were routed and the king Indravarman II, was forced to retreat. The disastrous defeat must have resulted, not only in the huge loss of men and money, but to have also adversely affected the prestige and stability of the kingdom.

\textbf{C. The Trikūṭamalayā Branch (III):}

The records issued by Vikramendravarman II
invariably describe Indravarman II as exterminator all
the dayādas, or the agnate rival kinsmen, simply by
frowning his eye-brows, or even by exhale. The
suggestion that they were identical with Maharaja
Prabhākara and his son Prthvīmūla, has been referred
to above and rejected. The agnate rival was none
other than Madhavavarman III, the donor of the Īpūrū
(set II) plates, for it was the only collateral
family suggested by the inscriptions of the family.
He must have defied the authority of Indravarman II,
and was possibly killed along with all his supporters
and relatives.

K.A.W. Sastrī opined that succession to the
throne after Madhavavarman II was the cause of the
dayāda wars, fought by Indravarman. The learned Professor
supposed that Madhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū
(set II) plates, was the rightful heir, but the throne
passed on to Vikramendravarman I and his successors.
He has concluded that the internecine war came on, when
the former claimed the throne, ended with the success
of Indravarman II and Madhavavarman III having satisfied
with the rulership of the Trıkūṭamalaya country, as a
nominal feudatory of the former. His theory is not
acceptable, as it goes quite opposite to what the records
of Vikramendravarman II unanimously state about the fate of the dayadas and also the cause of the war, as rooted in the question of succession, for Mādhavavarman II was not the rightful heir.

N. Venkataramayya supposed that Mādhavavarman III, succeeded Mādhavavarman II and emerged as the overlord of the entire Cakravartiksetra, by Vanquishing the Vākatakas and others. He then presumed that the king was overthrown by Indravarman II and the latter had thus, obtained cakravartiksetra, as described by his son. Another agnate, but not a rival of Indravarman II was Mādhavavarman IV, who was concurrently ruling over Tewar region and came to rule Andhra country, only after A.D. 570, when Vikramendra II died. His arrangement of genealogical and chronological scheme of the dynasty, to substantiate some impossibilities, has been discussed and rejected above.

D.C. Sircar has pointed out that Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates, had no royal title and perhaps, issued the record at the instance of one Vignakundy-adhiraja. He identified the adhiraja with Mādhavavarman II, to whom the former must have acted as a viceroy. M. Ramarao and J. Rama Chandrasiya also held more or less similar opinions. The suggestion
that the donor of the Ṛpūrū (set II) plates was a viceroy of his grandfather is quite acceptable, but the record being dated in the regnal years of the donor seems to suggest that he proclaimed independence, when he issued it.

Sankaranarayanan has suggested that Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Ṛpūrū (set II) plates, belonged to a collateral family ruling over southern Āṇḍhra-dēśa and he tried to occupy the country between the rivers Kṛṣṇā and Gōḍāvēri. He has suggested, based on the fact, that the king issued the record from Kṛdūrāpurā on the north bank of the river Kṛṣṇā. So far the suggestion is quite plausible, but his further supposition that the king was helped by the Vākāṭaka Harishena and the battle took place before the issue of the Rāmatirthaṁ plates, cannot be accepted. It is against the Vākāṭaka chronology adopted here and the circumstantial evidence, discussed above.

However, there appears some reason to suggest that Mādhavavarman, the agnate rival of Indravarman II received help from some quarter, inimical to the Viṣṇukūndin supremacy and they were the Āṇḍhra branch of the Pallavas. The latter were, perhaps, bidding time for the reoccupation of the southern Āṇḍhra
country, after their expulsion by Mādhavavarman II, about A.D. 508.113

Eventhough the Ṛpū (set II) plates are dated in the 47th regnal year of Mādhavavarman III, his regnal period cannot be taken independent in its entirety. From the year A.D. 500, when the Trikūṭa-Mālaya branch was founded by Mādhavavarman II, the 47th regnal year of Mādhavavarman III becomes equivalent to A.D. 555, when the reign of Indravarman II abruptly ended and his infant son ascended the throne. Thus, it is clear that Mādhavavarman III proclaimed independence, and entered into a family feud with Indravarman II. He claimed the overlordship of Trikūṭamālaya country, perhaps, as the first step, to pick up the quarrel with the main branch. Obviously, he must have taken advantage of the debacle of Indravarman in the hands of the Mukharis, about the time.

About the same time, a war seems to have been going on between the two branches of the Pallavas. Kumārāṅgaṇa III (A.D. 545-560)114 issued his Chendalūru plates, in his 2nd regnal year, registering a gift in Karmarāṣṭra.115 His contemporary in the Andhra branch was Simhavarman II (c. A.D. 525-565), who ascended the throne of Kānci and ruled the whole of the Pallava
realms, both in Andhra and Tamil countries. A close study between the lines of these two points of evidence makes it clear that the two Pallava branches were at war with each other; the main branch encroached upon the autonomy of the Andhra branch; and the latter ultimately overthrew the former and occupied the throne at Kāñcī.

Thus, Mādhavavarman III of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins and Simhayarman II of the Andhra branch of the Pallavas had similar designs and found themselves in identical situations. They might have forged an alliance for mutual help and perhaps defeated Kumarāviṣṇu III, some time after the date of his Chendalūru plates in A.D. 547. Simhayarman III might have helped his Viṣṇukūṇḍin ally, in return, when the latter was at war with Indravarman II of the main branch.

Indravarman II must have destroyed the family of Mādhavavarman III, as his son described him, but, as referred to above, he must have met with his death in the course of the war. The trikūṭamālayā branch of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins, which acted as bulwark against the Pallava expansion, for about half-a-century, has come to an end, as a result of the dāyāda warfare. Its discontinuance helped the Pallavas, who had the combined
realms and resources of Andhra and Tamil countries to combat with the Viṣṇukūṇḍins, as it will as be shown in the next chapter.

III. Resume:

As the political scene in Andhradesa and the Deccan plateau, analysed above, the reign of Indravarman II was eventful with his strenuous warfare with the centrifugal forces, in and out of the family. The short and inglorious reign of his father, which could not consolidate the conquests of the great monarch of the dynasty, Mādhavavarman II, had in addition, created crises for him. True to the descriptions of his son, Vikramadityarvarman II, Indravarman II emerged victorious in numerous wars, exterminated dēyādas and brought the turbulent vassals once again under the Viṣṇukūṇḍin suzerainty. But all the gains were momentary, overpowered by the half-subdued forces of disintegration. He bequeathed, in his turn, an empire of problems to his son, himself becoming a victim to the warfare.
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** ** ** **
4. THE SUN-SET: VIKRAMENDRAVARMAN II

Vikramendravarman II was the last of the Vīṣṇukūṇḍin kings. He inherited the empire, which began to show unmistakable signs of decay, as early as the closing times of the reign of his father Indravarman II. Hence, the king had to put up a strenuous fight for existence, incessantly, all through his reign, with fissiparous forces of disloyal vassals and the hostile powers like the Pallavas. He had to fall back on the support of some faithful feudatories in that hour of crisis, which exposed the inherent weakness of the empire. His sudden death, apparently during the course of his wars, brought the end of the empire.

I. His personality:

Vikramendravarman II, or Vikramendrabhattāraka-varman, as he called himself in some of his records, was the eldest and the dearest son of Indravarman II. He described himself in his records, as analogous to his father in valour and prudence. He was described as a Rājarṣi. He eulogised as having feet shone with the radiance of the diamonds in the crowns of numerous bowing vassals, the diadem of the Vīṣṇukūṇḍin family; of undaunted power like Ṣiva (Siva) and Indra on earth. He described himself as
Dharmavijayi, extremely righteous in his conduct,* and a Paramamanahesvara. Apart from the element of exaggeration that marked his statements, in general, the descriptions of the king reflect incessant warfare, in which he was as well as the political concepts of the period.12

The records of the king unanimously report13 that he was called on to shoulder the burden of the kingdom, by prakiritimandala, or the Council of Ministers and other high dignitaries, quite as a child. Ostensibly the sudden death of his father, about A.D. 555, must have necessitated him to ascend the throne at a very tender age and assume the reins of the government. His records clearly indicate the anxiety, he was subjected to, under the impelling situation, in describing his ancestors as great conquerors and subduers of numerous potentates. Especially significant is inflating the number and variety of rituals performed by Mādhavavarman II beyond the bounds of truth and exalting his personality almost equivalent to the God of gods.14 This phenomenon was not only due to the reverence, generally paid to ancestors by their successors, but also indicates that he took Mādhavavarman II as a source of inspiration to him. His own description, in somewhat analogous terms indicates his
ambition to be a worthy successor of them and to emulate their activities and accomplishments.

As referred to above, the records of Vikramandaravarman II, clearly bring out his dependence on loyal feudatory, Prthvimūla, both in the sphere of war and peace. There is a verse at the end of the Tūndī plates,¹⁵ which enjoins sins that would befall on kings, who would fail in keeping the gift. The same verse appears at the end of the Keṭṭuscheruva grant, issued by Prthvimūla¹⁶ as well as the Tummalagūḍem (set II) charter.¹⁷ In addition, the latter record describes that the house of Prthvimūla had, through generations, personas, of undisturbed virtues and gratified the Viṣṇukundin dynasty by its close relation.¹⁸ In other words, the members of the family continued to be loyal to the Viṣṇukundins through generations, as distinct from the disloyal houses, like the Rāmakāśyapas. More significant is the eulogy of the executor of the record, Mūlarāja,¹⁹ as to have uplifted the sunken fortunes of his overlord. He was the same as Prthvimūla, the donor of the Gōdāvari and the recently discovered Keṭṭuscheruva copper plates.²⁰ It may not be unreasonable to suggest that Prthvimūla played an important role in the
prakrtimandala, which had placed Vikramandravarman II on the throne. These facts bring out the extreme weakness of the Visnukundin empire, under the grave situation, in which Vikramandravarman II found himself.

The latest regnal year of Vikramandravarman II, so far as known to us, is 14, when he issued his Tundi copper plates. The year corresponds to A.D. 569-70, when the Visnukundin empire abruptly disappeared. Probably, the king died, leaving no heir to the throne, and the kingdom was apparently divided among the erstwhile feudatories, whose mutual warfare for the spoils, was the time when the Calukyan invasion under Pulakēśin II on coastal Āndhra took place.

II. His Career: A. The Pallavas:

The dissolution of the Trikūṭamalayā branch of the Visnukundins yielded a twofold result. The empire became unwieldy, added to its growing weakness and secondly, it removed the bulwark against the Pallava expansion into southern Āndhradesa. The Tummalaṅgūḍem charter refers to the victory of Vikramandravarman II on a Pallava named 'Gīhha.' It shows clearly that the latter were reviving their power, taking advantage of the obvious decline of the Visnukundins and perhaps, they constituted the most serious threat to the empire.
M. Ramarao, identified the Pallava, defeated by Vikramendravarman II with Simhavarma, the donor of the Mangadur charter, which registers the gift of the village, Mangadur in Vengarastra. He supposed that the Pallava king invaded Vangi country, across the river Krsna, but was arrested by Prthvimula, the vassal of the Visnukundins. Sankaranarayanan too thinks the same way and further that, the Pallava threat forced Vikramendravarman II to shift his capital from Lendulura to Indrapura, sometime between the dates of his Chikkulla and Tummalaguda (set II) charters. He argues that the former record does not refer to the Pallava threat, while the latter specifies the Visnukundin victory over them. But the views of the two scholars are not acceptable, for the Pallava king, whom they considered in the context, was a contemporary of Madhavavarman II, the great-grandfather of Vikramendravarman II and flourished between A.D. 470-495. Again, there was no occasion for the Pallava invader to cross the river Krsna, or the Visnukundin kings to shift their capital, to and fro, the Vangi country. The final phase of the Pallava-Visnukundin warfare, as shown in the previous chapter, commenced in the closing part of the reign of Indravarman II, together with the wars with his dayades.
As to the identification of Simha, the Pallava adversary of Vikramandaravarman II, a short account of the Pallava history of the period is necessary in the context. D.C. Sircar rightly suggests that the list of the Pallava-kings, known from the Vayalur pillar inscription is trustworthy, as far as the predecessors of Mahendravarman I, (c. A.D. 610-640) are concerned. It gives the name Visnuśota as father and predecessor of Simhavarman, the grandfather of Mahendravarman I. The former is identified with the donor of the Cura plates and thus the immediate predecessors of Mahendravarman, viz., his father Simhavishnu, and grandfather Simhavarman, originally belonged to the Andhra branch of the dynasty. As explained in the previous chapter, Simhavarman, the grandfather of Mahendravarman I annihilated the main branch and ascended the throne of Kāñci. He ruled the united Pallava kingdom and had the combined resources of the kingdom, at his disposal. Thus, the Pallava Simha, mentioned in the Tummalagudem (set II) charter, was one of the predecessors of Mahendravarman I. It has to be noted that the charter does not say that Simha was a Maharāja and hence, he must be Simhavishnu, the son and successor of Simhavarman III, and father of Mahendravarman I. He is known from the Pallankōvil
copper plate grant as an enterprising prince and virtually the ruler in the last years of his father, who undertook several expeditions. He must have led expeditions over āndhradesa, as his father Simhavārman III (A.D. 525-565) had despatched him with armies and one of the encounters took place about the year referred to in the said Viṣṇukundin charter.

Sankararayanan writes that Vikramandravarman II faced the Pallavas in the country north of the river Kṛṣṇa. But there is no evidence to show that the Pallavas crossed the river. The king arrived at Sekapurā, or Indapurā, on his way back to his capital, which town cannot be located much far to the north of the river Kṛṣṇa. Hence, the Pallava-Viṣṇukundin battle could not have been fought north of the river but to its south and most probably at Vālpūrā.

Even though, the Tummalagudem (set II) charter states that Vikramandravarman II, easily humbled the Pallavas, it appears that he could not have obtained an easy victory. From the cumulative evidence of the Chikkullā plates of his 10th and the Tummalagudem (set II) charter of 11th regnal years, he appears to have stayed in coastal āndhra, at Lendulūrā, for about an year during A.D. 565-566. It was obviously to direct the war operations personally and he must have exerted all his energies to expel the Pallava power. He might also
have reinforced the alliance with his powerful vassal Prthvimula, before proceeding against the Pallavas and received much help from him. The statement in the Tummalagudem (set II) charter, that he uplifted the sunken fortunes of the house of his suzerain, suggests the magnitude of the Pallava invasion and the valuable help he rendered to his suzerain in that context. He appears to have accompanied Vikramandrawarman II, to the battle field and further to his capital and on the way, executed the gift made by the latter to the vihara at Indrapura.

Notwithstanding the victory on the Pallavas, referred to in the Tummalagudem (set II) charter, the Visnukundins seem to have lost subsequently, the territories up to the south bank of the river Krṣṇa, sometime after the 14th regnal year of Vikramandrawarman II. The Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II, which makes no reference to the Visnukundins, indicates that the Cālukyan king had to march on the Pallavas for annexing the southern Āndhradeśa, following his conquests at piṣṭapurā and Kunalā. Obviously, the Visnukundins lost the country to the Pallavas, as Vikramandrawarman II could not follow up the victory in his 11th regnal year, being busily attending to the affairs in Kāliṅgā. It may not be unreasonable to suppose that he was,
perhaps, killed in another war with the Pallavas after his 14th regnal year, when the latter could wrest southern Andhradesa.

An inscription at Chëzerla, which is palaeographically similar to the inscriptions of Mahendravarman I, at Mâmallapuram, reports that a prince whose name is lost in the record was ruling over the region. The record says that he was the son of an Ānandagotra princess, a daughter of Kannara, and refers to some well-known titles as well as the name of the Pallava king Mahendravarman I. Thus, the prince must be a subordinate of the Pallava suzerain, and it clearly points out that their overlordship was established in Andhradesa, after the Viṣṇukūṇḍin disappearance, but before the Cālukyaen occupation.

B. Kalinga:

It has been referred to above that Vikramendraivarman II went to attend the affairs in Kalinga, soon after his successful encounter with the Pallavas. The vassal powers of the Eastern Ganges and the Rāmakāsyapes, seem to have revolted against the Viṣṇukūṇḍin suzerainty, taking advantage of the confusion prevailing in the last years of the reign of Indravarman II.
Having settled his tussle with the Pallavas, Vikramendravarman II apparently proceeded to Kālīṅgā, as the Tūnḍī plates of his 14th regnal year indicate his presence in that country, obviously, to subdue the rebels.

1) The Eastern Gāṅgas:

Mahāsāṃmantavarmāṇa, the donor of the Ponnāṭūr plates of the year 64, corresponding to A.D. 562, was the contemporary of the Viśṇukūndin king Vikramendravarman II on the Gāṅga throne. The king claimed titles, Mahārāja and Trikālīṅgadhipati, and must be an independent king, when he issued the record. Sankaranarayanan has supposed that the very name, Mahāsāṃanta, smacks of feudatory status, and that he might be a protege of the Viśṇukūndin king Indravarman II on the Gāṅga throne. It is indeed curious to suppose that the parents of the king, who named him so, had only hoped him to be simply a mahāsāṃanta. However, the titles of the king mentioned above think otherwise.

The Tūnḍī plates registering the gift of the village, Tūnḍī, identified with modern town of Tuni in the East Godavari district, seems to have been issued from his military camp and executed by himself. It bears, quite unusually, the bull on its seal, which
was the crest symbol of the Eastern Gaṅgas and the proof of the plates appears to be a palimpsest. It appears, thus, Vikramendravarman II subdued the Eastern Gaṅga king Mahāsāmantavarman and issued the record, making use of an earlier Gaṅga copper plates.

2) The Rāmakāśyapas:

Vikramendra of the Rāmakāśyapa dynasty was succeeded by his son Pṛthvīmāhārāja, about A.D. 567, as shown below. The two copper plate inscriptions issued by him are dated in his 46th regnal years respectively and they describe him as having overpowered the entire host of feudatories by his own strength. Thus, the king must be an independent king, but his political status and achievements formed a matter of keen controversy among scholars.

N. Venkataramanayya rightly suggested that Pṛthvīmāhārāja ascended throne in A.D. 567-568 and that he was the lord of Kāliṅga and Vāṅgī before the Cālukyan invasion. But his further conjectures that the Viṣṇukundin king Mādhavavarman IV shifting his capital from Taurar to Amarpaur and having to fight with the former, in his 37th regnal year (about A.D. 583) are not acceptable. There is no place in the
Viṣṇukūndin genealogy to a king, Mādhavavarman IV and
the conclusions based on the premise are untenable.

O. Ramachandraïya, who could not assign any
amount of time for the independent rule of Prthviṁahārāja,
criticised N. Venkataramanayya for the independent reign
assigned to the king over Kaliṅga and Vēṅgi, before the
Cālukyan invasion. His suggestion that the Cālukyan
annexation of Piṣṭapurā by the year A.D. 617, does not
indicate their annexation of Vēṅgi as well, can be
accepted for different reasons than he has given.

But his conclusion that the Cālukyas did not occupy
Vēṅgi from Durjayas, against the clear statements in
the Eastern Cālukyan inscriptions, cited by
N. Venkataramanayya, and his suggestion that Pulakāśin II
invaded Karmārāstra, soon after his annexation of
Piṣṭapurā, to prevent a collusion of the Viṣṇukūndins
and the Pallavas, are quite against the evidence and
cannot be accepted.

Sankaranarayanan has correctly concluded that
Pulakāśin II had not come down to Karmārāstra and the
gift village Māṟṭura, is identical with Māṟṭēru of the
present day, in West Godavari district. Dhis view
that Prthviṁahārāja associated himself with Māḍhavavarman IV
in the latter's Kalinga expedition, and the former was
an independent king only between A.D. 612, to which year
he assigned the latter's Pālamūru plates and the year A.D. 616, when Pulakēśin II annexed Piṣṭapurā. C. Somasundararao opines similarly, but assigns the independent rule of Prthvīmahārāja, to the period, between A.D. 621 and 624, on the same grounds. Besides being any theory, involving the creation of Mādhavavarman IV is untenable, the express statements of Prthvīmahārāja in his inscriptions about his subjection of vassals and issuing them in his own regnal years defy their conclusions. It cannot be said that the king was not independent before his 46th regnal year.

The Māruṭūra grant of Pulakēśin II, issued in his 8th regnal year enables us to fix the date of his annexation of Piṣṭapurā, in A.D. 617, where the Rāmakāśyas ruled. Hence, the rule of Prthvīmahārāja from Piṣṭapurā cannot to beyond the year, which was perhaps, the same with his 49th or 50th regnal year and he must have ascended the throne in A.D. 567, as mentioned above. It was the time when Vikramendravarman II was busy with his wars, with the Pallavas and nothing would have prevented him to proclaim independence at the time. The loyalty of the Rāmakāśyas was doubtful, even from the times of Ranadurajya, as shown in the previous chapters. Vikramendravarman II must have
reduced Prthvimahārāja, again to vassalage, during the course of his expedition on the Ganges, about the year A.D. 570. But the Viṣṇukūṇḍin success was shortlived, for the king must have died about the same time and Prthvimahārāja could have retrieved his independence.

Prthvimahārāja issued his Tāṇḍivāḍa grant to register his gift of the village Tāṇḍivāḍa, in the Pāguṇāraviśaya. The region is identified with Bhimavaram and Tanuku taluks of the modern West Godavari district. It was perhaps, contiguous to the Tāḻupaka viṣaya, identified with Narasapur and parts of the Tanuku taluks. The latter was under the rule of Prthvimūla, according to his Gōḍāvari plates (set II) plates, issued in his 25th regnal year. Prthvimūla issuing the charter in his regnal years indicate that he was independent at the time, but only after the disappearance of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins in A.D. 570. Hence, his accession may be assigned to A.D. 545 and the date of his Gōḍāvari (set I) plates to A.D. 580. The inevitable conclusion from the cumulative evidence of the two records is that Prthvimahārāja invaded the territories of Prthvimūla, sometime after the latter's 25th regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 580 and annexed his territories.
The Gollavalli plates of Prthvīmahārāja were issued from his victorious camp at Virajenagara, registering his gift of the village, in Kudravatī-viṣaya. Virejagara seems to be identical with Urjam in Srikakulam district, rather than the distant Jajnagar, especially in view of the fact, that it registers the gift in Kudravatī-viṣaya, which is identified with Guddavādi-viṣaya, of the Viṣṇukundin records. The region of Virajenagara was, perhaps, under the rule of the Eastern Gaṅgas and the king issuing the charter from his military encampment at the place suggests that he invaded the Gaṅga kingdom. It is thus clear that, Prthvīmahārāja was an independent and expansionist king and ruled over the Kaliṅgā and Vēṅgī countries, at the time of the Cālukyaṇ invasion. Either he, or some of his successor, was the Cālukyaṇ contender in their wars at Piśṭapurā and Kuṇāla.

C. Kosala:

The Sarabhapurīyas of Kosalā might have repudiated the Viṣṇukundin suzerainty, following the death of Indravarman II and Vikramendravarman II might have proceeded against them, after his successful Kaliṅgā wars. But there is no proof in support of the conclusion, which can be substantiated on a study of the circumstantial evidence.
The Sarabhapuriyas at the time following Jayaraja (c. A.D. 542-552) were a divided house. Vyaghra of the Mallar plates, who was perhaps the son of Jayaraja, ruled for 4 years. Two more kings Sudevaraja and Pravararaja, who were the sons of Manamatra alias Durgaraja also ruled the kingdom, but it is not known, whether they ruled before or after Vyaghra. It may not be unreasonable to suggest that an internecine warfare took place between the lines of Jayaraja and Durgaraja, in which Vyaghra was superseded by Sudevaraja, following the expedition of Indravarman II, in A.D. 552. About the same time, the Naes of Bastar and the Calukyas of Badami might have invaded their territories and their feudatories like the Somavamsis were rising to power. Vikramendravarman II might have found it convenient to march on Kosala, at such an hour of confusion and led his victorious armies from Kalinga into Kosala.

In this context, it is tempting to suggest that the village name Tundi, gifted by Vikramendravarman II resembles Tude or Tundaresaka that occur in some Sarabhapuriya grants, as the headquarters of a district. However, Vikramendravarman II can be suggested to have successfully made his way into the heart of Kosala about his fourteenth regnal year, corresponding to A.D. 570, which also coincides with the disappearance of the Sarabhapuriya power.
Nothing is known about the events in the reign of Vikramendravarman II, after his 14th regnal year, or A.D. 570. But a careful study of the circumstantial evidence enables us to reconstruct the course of events, with a degree of certainty.

As referred to above, the Pallavas must have renewed their onslaughts, after their defeat in A.D. 566 and Vikramendravarman II had to attend the impending situation, after he freed himself from the Kalinga-Kosala expeditions. The Chēzerla inscription of Prthviyuvarāja refers to two fierce battles, in which the chief was victorious. One of them was the tumultous elephant battle, fought at Dhānyakaṭa, which seems to be the final Pallava-Viṣṇukūrīṇi encounter. The latter were perhaps, totally defeated and Vikramendravarman II was killed in the war. The Pallava armies might have been led by Prthviyuvarāja in the war, or he could have played crucial role in it.

The sudden death of Vikramendravarman II seem to have left the kingdom, with no heir to succeed the king. Some scholars in the past supposed that the king adopted a boy, from a sāmanta family and the supposition was disproved. The king was obviously in the prime of
youth, when he died, and would not have proposed to adopt a boy at such an age.

As analysed above, the death of Vikramendravarman II was followed by his principal feudatories asserting independence and dividing the kingdom among themselves. The repeated Vīṣṇukaṇḍin expeditions seem to have reduced the Śrībhpurīyas in Kosalā and resulted in the Somavāmśas setting them aside by A.D. 570. The Gaṅgas strengthened themselves in northern parts of Kālīṅgā and Prthvīmahārāja emerged independent in the Pīṭhapura region. Prthvīmūla must have proclaimed independence, appropriating the territory between the rivers Gōḍāvarī and Kṛṣṇā and the country south of the river Kṛṣṇā was seemingly held by Prthvīyuvarāja, as a vassal of the Pallavas. Likewise, the Tālangana must also have been shared by petty chiefs, but nothing precise can be said, for want of evidence.

The ambitious king Prthvīmahārāja, as explained above, undertook successful expeditions to the south and the north of his realms. Either Prthvīmūla, or his successor was ousted from power, and Vēṅgī passed under the Rāmakāśyapa rule, sometime about A.D. 613, when he issued his Tāṇḍīvāda plates. In his northern expedition too, though he could not remove the Gaṅgas from power,
he must have wrested some parts of Kalinga, probably up to the Mahendragiri mountains, about A.D. 616. Either the king himself, or most probably his successor was defeated in A.D. 617 by Pulakesin II, who issued his Martura plates in the year, from Kalurapura, soon after his annexation of Pistapura. Hence, the Ramakasyapas lost the Pistapura region in the year, to the Calukyas and had to shift their power to Vangî, but pursued by Pulakesin II. Sankaranarayanan identifies Kalurapura with a town in the region of Kolleru lake, and also that it was the same with Kollaras, referred to in the Chézerla inscription of Prthvíyuvarâja. Thus he concludes that a fierce battle took place between the Pallavas, whose army was led by the chief and Pulakesin II, on the banks of the lake; and that the latter was defeated. The suggestions are plausible on circumstantial evidence, but the fact that the Nihole inscription referring to the lake as Kaunâla, renders the identification of the places doubtful.

However, there appears no doubt that Pulakesin II was defeated at the time and had to take another opportunity, about A.D. 624, to invade Vangî. It may be suggested in this connection, that Prthvíyuvarâja might be yet another Ramakasyapa chief, probably a successor of Prthvimahârâja and he defeated Calukyas.
near Kolleru, allying himself with the Pallavas. In such a case, it may also be suggested that even Prthvimaḥārāja too had an alliance with the Pallavas, in his bid to oust the Viṣṇukundins from power.

The Cālukyan invasion in A.D. 624 seems to have taken place under the command of Kubjavīṣṇuvardhana, whom the Eastern Cālukyan inscriptions often describe to have conquered Vāṇgī from the Durjayas. Apparently, he defeated Prthvīyuvrāja, but also haunted him to Chāzerla, probably the capital of the chief at the time, as an inscription of Viṣṇamasiddhi at the place, points out that he came there. The defeated Rāmakāśyapa chief might have accepted the overlordship of Viṣṇuvardhana I and obtained the lordship of seventy villages in the Giripācaśīma, which fact is alluded in some later inscriptions of the scions of the Durjaya family. K.V.S. Aiyer and Sankeranarayanan are right in suggesting that the Prthvīyuvrāja was identical with a prince of the same name, mentioned as Ājñapti in the Kopparam plates of Pulakāsin II, who was described as the victor in numerous battles, destroyer of enemies and who obtained a kingdom in the lineage of his own son. The last mentioned point apparently pertains to the same substance as the medieval inscriptions propose to say.
The mutual warfare of the erstwhile Vişnukundin feudatories, especially, the prthvīmahārāja and his successors on the one hand and prthvīmūla on the other, seem to have thrown the country into disorder and confusion. The Mārtūra plates make a passing reference to the state of the country that Ālūka Mahārāja, who was prominent in the Cālukyan army, had to traverse the dangerous country, desolate and chaotic, in connection with the expedition. Obviously, jungle law prevailed in the country, and socio-economic setup was disturbed. Brāhmans were deprived from enjoying the grants, they had previously obtained from kings. After law and order was restored by Cālukyas after their occupation of the country, some of the gifts were, perhaps, restored to the rightful donees. The Poḷamūrū plates of Jayasiṁhavallabha, issued in favour of a pūrva-grahārīke, appears to be one such example.
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