PART II

DYNASTIC BACKGROUNDS

Chapter I  Name and Origin
Chapter II  Original Home and Capital
Chapter III  Genealogy and Chronology
1. NAME AND ORIGIN

The inscriptions of the Viṣṇukundins give the dynastic name in a variety of forms and meaning. The Chikkullā plates, published earliest of them give the form as Viṣṇukundīnām and interpreted by Kielhorn, the editor of the record as, "of the family of the Viṣṇukundins." The Īpūru (set I) plates give the form as Viṣṇukundīnām, but the sense is the same. The term is interwoven in a compound in the Rāmatīrtham plates meaning, "of the line of kings (or the dynasty) that emerged from the king Viṣṇukundī." The reading of the term is uncertain in the Īpūru (set II) plates and controversial in the polamūru plates. The Vālpūru stone inscription mentions Viṣṇukundīgōtra while the Tūndī and the two Tummalaṅgūḍem charters give a variety of connotations, as: Viṣṇukundīnām, Viṣṇukundīkula, Viṣṇukundīkula-vamśa, and Viṣṇukundī-vamśa or ṛṇvaṃśa.

Naturally, scholars differ in their views as to the form and meaning of the dynastic name. Following Kielhorn, there were attempts to alter the term into a nakārānta, where it does not actually
warrant, and referring to the dynasty as Visnukundin. On the other hand, scholars like B.V. Krishnareo and M.S. Sarma referred to the dynasty as Visnukundi, but not as Visnukundin. Recently, S. Sankaranarayanan has suggested that Visnukundi is the only correct form and used it as such throughout his work. But some scholars have pointed out that "Visnukundin" is not an altogether incorrect form and it is better to use the term, in view of its longstanding usage since the time of Kielhorn.

I. Meaning of the term Visnukundi:

The dynastic name Visnukundin was interpreted divergently, as the gotra appellation and as a derivation from the territorial denomination over which they ruled. Kielhorn even suggested that Vinukonda in Guntur district was the capital city. Some scholars built up a hypothesis that the dynastic name was after the place name. The hypothesis, though held ground for a long time has been criticised and rejected recently. Sankaranarayanan has rightly pointed out that the dynastic name was after the place name, the proper term should have been "Visnukundi." Those
scholars who viewed the term "Viṣṇukundī" as the gotra appellation of the dynasty proposed theories on the social status of the family.

A. Kṣatriya Origin:

K.V. Lakshmanarao\textsuperscript{22} and K. Gopalachari\textsuperscript{23} supposed that the name Viṣṇukundin indicate that the dynasty emerged out of a kunda, a fire-pit, named after Viṣṇu; and that the name was the gotra appellation as in the case of the Śālākāyanas. Mahābhārata\textsuperscript{24} refers to the custom of naming fire-pits in rituals after some deities. Thus, they suggested the status of Agnikula-Kṣatriya to the dynasty. But the protagonists of the theory admitted that the name Viṣṇukundī was not found in the gotra and pravara lists in literature. B.V. Krishnarao\textsuperscript{25} rejected the view, because the Viṣṇukundas never claimed Kṣatriya status and, on the other hand, explicitly declared themselves to have exterminated Kṣatriyas.\textsuperscript{26} Such traditions, as claiming Agnikula origin, or descent from mythical personalities or Epic Heroes was not a custom during the period under study. He suggested that the act of exterminating Kṣatriyas points out that they claimed even more superior status, perhaps Brāhmaṇa. But this suggestion is equally unacceptable,
as the kings never mentioned their gotra indicating their Brahmanical descent similar to the Bharadvaja gotra of the Pallavas and the Harita gotra of the Kadambas. Again, their extermination of Kṣatriyas alone cannot entitle them to brahman status, just as a Mahākṣatrántaka like Mahāpadmananda was a Śūdra.

S. Sankaranarayanan\textsuperscript{27} has pointed out that the dynasty descended from a person called Viṣṇukūṇḍi, like "the descendants of the kings Raghu, Gupta, Vākṣṭaka, Pallava etc., and that these names have a grammatical sanction."\textsuperscript{28} He identified the king Viṣṇukūṇḍin with the Cūṭu king Viṃhukaḍa (*Kadda) Cūṭukul-ānanda Sātakarni, who is known from the Bheravasi and Malvalli inscriptions.\textsuperscript{29} He suggested that kadda and kundi were synonyms and meant Śiva; and that the name Viṃhukaḍa Cūṭukul-ānanda Sātakarni was similar in form and meaning to another personal name Viṃṇurudra Śivalānanda Sātakarni.\textsuperscript{30} On the basis of the statement that Govinda varman was the greatest among the Śrīpārvatayas,\textsuperscript{31} he connects the Viṣṇukūndins with Śrīpārvatayas, mentioned in the Purāṇas as the successors of Sātavāhana. He identifies the Cūṭus with the said Śrīpārvatayas
and proceeds to trace an Andhra origin to the Viṣṇukūḍina through the former. He argues that the Purāṇas refer to the Satavāhanas as Andhras, because they were descendants of a prince called Āṇdhra, who was a son of Bali, mentioned in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. Based on the view, that the Cutus had Satavāhana blood in them, and they held the suffix "Sātakarnī" in their names, he suggests that they were the descendants of the Satavāhanas and thus the Āṇhras of Śripārvataye denomination. He concludes that the Viṣṇukūḍinas were Āṇhras, being the latter’s descendants, by referring to the Haraha inscription, which mentions an Āṇhradhipati defeated by the Maukhari king Isanavarman, identified with a Viṣṇukūḍin ruler.

He points out that no ruling family between the Satavāhana and the Viṣṇukūḍin was called Āṇhradhipatis, especially in the Allahābād pradēsti, eventhough, Samudragupta conquered several chiefs of the region. It was because, he explained, they were not Āṇhras, in the sense of descendants of the prince Āṇdhra.

The argument is a strange attempt to mix the puranic mythology with historical facts. Eventhough, the Viṣṇukūḍinas were accepted as the descendants of the king Viṣṇukūṇḍi, the identification of the king
with the Cūtu king is not possible because the latter belonged to Mānavya gōtra, called himself Hāritiputra and held the suffix Sātakarni which was absent in the Viṣṇukundin personal names and descriptions. The suggestion that the epithets had some relation with the overlordship of Kuntalā country only, is disproved by their continuation by the Eastern Cālukyas, while they ruled over Āndhra and thus their discontinuance by the Viṣṇukundins cannot be explained, except by wild presumptions. Even if it was accepted that Viṣṇukāda was synonym to Viṣṇukundī, it is highly improbable to suppose that synonyms were employed to denote dynastic or personal names, which has no example in support. Bāli and his son Āndhra were not historical persons whose existence is not proved by any inscriptions or coins. Āndhras were ranked among mlecchas and barbarians several times in Epic-Purānic as well as secular literature and their connection with any ancient Kṣatriya dynasty cannot be accepted, especially when such accounts are reported by late Purāṇas.

Just as the Agnikula myth, the custom of tracing the origin of royal dynasties from purānic personalities was the order of the early medieval period, datable to 8th or 9th centuries. The term Āndhrādhipati in the Harāhā inscription plainly means the king of Āndhradēsa, or the country, where Āndhras lived but
not to a king of Andhra descent. The Allahabad prasasti could call none of the kings of the region as Andhradhipatis, simply because, no one among them was the ruler of entire Andhra country. Andhradesa, which had lost its political unity after the fall of the Sātavāhanas was again integrated, atleast to a great extent, by the Viṣṇukundins only and the latter had the eligibility to be referred to as Andhradhipatis. Finally the term Śrīpārvataya in the Tummalagudem (set II) was to be understood in the geographical sense, that Govinda Varmam ruled territories on either side of the Śrīpārvata. The puranic reference to the term Śrīpārvataya, cannot be applied to any other dynasty, in its true sense, except the Ikṣvākus, who ruled at the foot of Śrīpārvata, with whom the Viṣṇukundins could have no connection.

B. Brahmakṣatras Theory:

The recently discovered Tummalagudem (set II) grant describes the Viṣṇukundins to have incorporated in themselves the vitality of Brahmakṣatras. Some scholars call the Viṣṇukundins as Brahmakṣatras, but they differ in interpreting the term. N. Venkateramanayya considers that the dynasty was originally a ब्राह्मण one, but adopted the खेत्रिय profession of wars and
administration and thus became Brahmacasatras. He compared the dynasty, in this respect, with the Pallavas and the Kadambas of the same period. But it has to be noted that none of them called themselves as Brahmacasatras, as the Visnukundins did. The Brahmanical origin of the Visnukundins cannot be proved, as pointed out above and hence their choosing of Kṣatriya profession, and becoming Brahmacasatras has no basis. Moreover, the Brahmanical origin of the other dynasties also is not beyond doubt.

Sankaranarayanan interpreted the term Brahmacasatras, as the Kṣatriyas who could rise to the level of Brahmanas and refers to the puranic statements that the house of Pūru was the source of Brahmacasatras. He argues that Vedic tradition bestows Brahminhood on Kṣatriyas and even lower castes during the performance of great sacrifices, and the status can be retained. He has also cited the statement of Manu that the sceptre of just sovereigns was made of Brahmatejas. Thus, he concludes that the Visnukundins, who were originally Kṣatriyas, being the descendants of Bali and Andhra, could attain the status of Brahmacasatras by their Vedic ritualism and just
politics. This argument, to prove the Kṣatriya origin of the dynasty, excessively depends on the mythology and allegorical expressions, whose substance has to be differently taken, when historical investigations are conducted on scientific lines. Manu's statement is an instance of deification of the king's power and nothing more than that can be read from it.

The term Brahmakṣatra has to be taken as a dvandva compound, signifying the claim of the dynasty to have incorporated the qualities of the Brāhmaṇs as well as of the Kṣatriyas, in themselves. A scientific study of the social developments during the period, would justify the conclusion. The reference to the term in the Viṣṇukundin inscription is very much significant in the context of studying the social evolution, as it clearly suggests the concept originated in Andhradesa about this time, before gaining popularity among the Rājput dynasties in North India, during 8th and 9th centuries.

II. Conclusions:

The fact which almost all the scholars overlooked is that, one of the Viṣṇukundin records explicitly describes that the dynasty emerged from the Viṣṇukundī.
But he is so far, as obscure as Sri Gupta, Vākaṭaka and others who were progenitors of their respective lines of kings. Any attempt to identify the king in the present state of knowledge would lead only to impossible conjectures and hopeless presumptions. From their claim to be Brahmakṣatras, they appear to be of a low social origin, not to speak Brāhmī̄n or Kṣatriya. They followed Buddhism at the beginning and had contact with some Buddhist families. Several foreign hordes and primitive peoples adopted Buddhism in the past, because of its emphasis on social equality. Subsequently, the devotional cults like Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism came to be popular and they too had the principle of social equality as their key note. The devotionalism could serve the process of Indianisation as Bhāgavata purāṇa describes that a number of uncultured (mlecchas) peoples, including the Āndras, could relieve their backwardness by resorting to Vaiṣṇavism. It may not be unreasonable to suggest that the Āndras referred to, were the Vaiṣṇukūṇḍins, for they were the rulers of Āndhradēśa at the time of its composition.

The rituals performed by Madhavavarman II seem to be no less important as means of elevating the
social status of the dynasty. Rituals like Advamedha seem to have acquired purificatory significance during the period, as the repeated statements in the inscriptions of the family say that the king got removed himself from the worldly stains by taking avabhrthā baths at the end of eleven horse sacrifices.55

The Viṣṇukundin matrimonial alliance with the prestigious Brāhmāṇ dynasty of the Vākaṭakas appears specially significant, in this context, from the repeated references to it, in their inscriptions. It seems to have accorded recognition to a high social status of the dynasty. As shown below,56 the alliance politically was more beneficial to the Vākaṭakas, but they did not refer to it in in their inscriptions. On the other hand, the Viṣṇukundins invariably referred to it in their inscriptions. No wonder that Mādhavavarma II whose political prowess and ritualism enhanced the prestige of the house and enabled itself to elevate in social status, was so much respected by his successors that almost all claimed their descent from him and attributed to him epithets like Paramesṭhi and Devāṭidava.
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2. ORIGINAL HOME AND CAPITAL

The Viṣṇukūṇḍin charters do not refer to their original home and capital city. Thus, an attempt at determining them has to be based entirely on such details as the tutelary deity, the place of issue, and the particulars of the gift villages mentioned in them. Proper identification of the localities and the abode of the tutelary deity would enable us to fix the original home and capital of the dynasty, as well as to trace the course of expansion of their realm.

The Viṣṇukūṇḍin records generally describe the kings as the devotees of Bhagavat-Śripervataśvāmi, who was obviously the presiding deity on a hill called Śripervata. Generally, the ancient ruling dynasties had their tutelary deities, in the vicinity of their capitals, or at least, within their dominions.

The Viṣṇukūṇḍin inscriptions were issued from different places, some of them military camps. However, scholars hold differently that Amaraṇarā and Lenulūra to be the capitals of the Viṣṇukūṇḍine. The inscriptions mention provinces like Plakī-rāstrā, Netripāti-viṣaya, Guddādi or Guddāvādi-viṣaya, while stating the locating of the village and lands gifted
by the kings. Apart from these localities, the two sets of the Ḫūrū and pāḷamūru plates mention two more places, Trīrānagāra and Trīkūṭa-Malayā, in connection with the exploits of the kings and the extent of their kingdom. The above mentioned names of provinces occur in several Eastern Gāṅga and Cālukyan inscriptions as well, and may roughly be taken to correspond to some parts of the present day Visakhapatnam, East Godavari and Krishna districts.

Identification of the places enlisted above, together with that of Ṣrīparvataśēmin, formed two schools of thought as to the original home and extent of the Viśṇukundin kingdom, and the location of their capital city. One opinion advocates that the dynasty hailed from Āndhra country. This view was subscribed to by a majority of scholars. The other proposes a North Indian origin for the dynasty.

I. Theory of Āndhra Origin:

While editing the Chikkullā plates, Kielhorn pointed out that the Telugu influence on the Sanskrit language of the record and the place of its issue speak for Āndhra origin. He suggested that the kings had perhaps, their turela
deity was probably Lord Mallikārjuna on Śrīśeśīlam.
Śripurva-Nāgārjunakonda had not yet come to light, when he proposed the identification. He has further suggested that Vinukonda, a small town in the present day Guntur district, about 70 miles north-east of Śrīśeśīlam, might be the capital of the kings and that the dynastic name still survives in the name of the town. These suggestions were followed by Hultzsch and K.V.Lakshmanarao. The latter was so much convinced of the Saivite leanings of the dynasty that he identified Amarapura of the Īpūrī (set II) plates with Amarasvati in Guntur district, which was mentioned as a famous seat of Kālāmukha Saivism in the Tadikonda grant of Ammaraja II. Several others like G.J.Dubreuil, S.V.Visvanatha, D.C. Sircar and B.V.Krishnarao followed the conclusions. The latter had theorised the above conclusions which were followed by subsequent writers like M.Ramarao.

B.V.Krishnarao evolved a phonological formula to derive the place name Vinukonda from the dynastic name Viṣṇukundī; that Viṣṇukundinagara or *pura in Sanskrit, could have become Venhukundi in prakrit, finally transforming into the Telugu name Vinukonda.
He sought to substantiate the hypothesis that Viṣṇukundinagara was so called, as it stood on the banks of a river called Viṣṇukūndī and identified it with Pasupulēru, which flows by the present town of Vinukonda. This presumption was based on the reference to the rivulet Gundlakamma, into which Pasupulēru flows, as Brahmakūndī in some late inscriptions. He even looked for another stream in the vicinity to have the name Rudrakūndī. Eventhough, Śrīparvata-Nāgārjunakonda came to light by the time of writing, he maintained the identification of Śrīparvata with Śrīsailam, as it was referred to by the former term in literature and in some late inscriptions. He supposed that the devotees of Śiva would seem to have distinguished Śrīsailam by that name, from the general reference to the whole Nallamalai ranges as Śrīparvata, while the name applies in a restricted sense to Śrīparvata-Nāgārjunakonda also. He suggested the identification of Trikūṭa-Malaya with Kōṭappakonda in Guntur district and the Eastern Ghat respectively and thus concluded that "the Viṣṇukūndins rose to power in Karmarāstrā, or the Guntur district and that they were originally an Andhra family."
This theory cannot be accepted for several reasons, first among them being that the place name Vinukonda is purely a Telugu word of Dravidian origin analogous to several other place names like Inagallu, also in Guntur district. It is futile to explore for its Sanskrit root and the formula of derivation. There is neither epigraphical nor literary evidence to show that Pasupulāru was ever called Viṣṇukundī and there is no other stream in the area to be called Rudrakundī. N. Venkataramanayya had not only rejected the phonological formula but also pointed out that Vinukonda was referred to as Śrutaparvata, in some medieval works. The sanskritisation would not have been warranted if the name were of Sanskrit origin. Secondly, the term Śrīparvata used in literary works, representing Śrīsailam cannot be accorded historical value for it was just the employment of synonyms in poetical usage. The epigraphical references to Śrīsailam as Śrīparvata were of a far later date, when Śrīparvata-Nāgārjuna-konda had completely gone out of the memory of the people. Moreover, scholars have pointed out that Śrīsailam as a śaivite tīrtha could not have come into existence by the Viṣṇukundin time and that the region was never included in Viṣṇukundin realms.
On the other hand, the Viṣṇukūḍin inscriptions show that the early realm of the dynasty was in the neighbourhood of Śrīparvata. Hence, the Śrīparvata of the Viṣṇukūḍin records cannot be identified with Śrīsañlam. Thirdly, the identification of Amarapurā with Amarāvatī is difficult to be accepted, for the earliest inscriptive reference to Amarāvatī belongs to 10th century A.D. Hisum Tsang visited the place and refers to it only as Dhānyakaṭaka, or Dhānñakaṭaka.

II. The theory of North-Indian Origin:

Shortly after Hultzsch published the Rāmatīrthām plates, H. Krishnāśastri in a note on the dynasty, suggested a North Indian origin for the dynasty. The Viṣṇukūḍin-Vākāṭaka matrimonial alliance, the discovery of some coins of the former in the neighbourhood of Vizianagaram, and the Rāmatīrthām plates referring to some places in the same area led him to the conclusion. He identified Trikūṭa-Malaya with the mountainous region in Western Deccan and Trivanagaram with Tewar, the ancient Tripūrā, near Jabalpur. He suggested that the Viṣṇukūḍines came down to south as vassals of the Vākāṭakas, and the four-tusked elephant battles referred to in their inscriptions, as well as in the Gōḍāvari plates of prthvīmūla, were fought in
connection with their south-ward movement. Hultzsch partly subscribed to the theory, by accepting the identification of Trikūṭa-Malayā as suggested by Krishnashastri, though he doubted the identification of Trivarangarā. Following the theory, R. Subbarao suggested that the Viṣṇukundin immigration into Andhradesa through Kālīṅga is indicated by their connection with purāṇiśāṅgama in the Vizianagaram area and subsequently with Lāndulūra in Gōdāvari area. He further suggested that Mādhavavarman I occupied Andhradesa, overthrowing the Sālanākāyanas, with Vākāṭaka help.

The theory failed to convince the scholars at large as the Vākāṭakas themselves were a Southern dynasty and the alliance cannot support North Indian origin for Viṣṇukundins. No scholar had so far suggested the Ikṣvākus, the Kadambas, etc., of North Indian origin, on the basis of their matrimonial connections with North Indian dynasties and there is no reason in such a suggestion in the case of the Viṣṇukundins alone. As shown below, the Viṣṇukundin rule over Kālīṅga was not in the wake of their south-ward march, but on the other hand was the result of their north-ward expansion.
III. The Theory of Telangana Origin:

The Tummalagudem charters considerably ease the problem, by stating that Govinda Varman ruled in the Śrīparvata region. B.N. Shastri, who published the records for the first time, suggested that the original home and the capital of the dynasty were probably in Telangana. He reported that a tract for about two miles length, bounded by the river Mūsi and a hillock called Indapalagutta, exposes many ruined temples and basements of residential houses. He suggested that the ruined town was Indrapurā, where Parama (bhāṭṭārikā) Mahādāvī, the chief queen of Govinda Varman built the Vihāra, to which the Tummalagudem charters register the gifts of villages. According to him the town was the Viśukundin capital.

B.N. Shastri may be correct in identifying the ruined town with Indrapurā or Śakrapurā mentioned in the records, but they do not speak of the town as capital city. Moreover, the set II charter clearly says that Uttamāṣraya, who was Viśramendra Varman himself, had arrived at Śakrapurā, on his way from the battle field, obviously to his capital. Hence the capital city of the king must be some other place.
Recent excavations at Kīsaraguṭṭa are described to have exposed the Viṣṇukundin capital, 54 where a ruined fort, built by bricks of 18"/ 10"/ 3" size and a large number of Viṣṇukundin coins were discovered. It is said that about a kilometer south of the site is a village called Parvatāpuraṇa and another called Kundanapalle, about five kilometers away and they are supposed to have some connection with Śrīparvata and Viṣṇukundin respectively. Another fact pointed out was the proximity of the site to Indrapura and also to Ghaṭakēsar, which is believed to have been the place, where Indravarman established a ghatika. The site is said to have been surrounded by many hillocks and one of them was suggested to be Śrīparvata.

These suggestions have been criticised and rejected 55 for the reason that Śrīparvata may not have been an insignificant hillock in the neighbourhood of Kīsaraguṭṭa. The identification of Kīsaraguṭṭa as the capital cannot be accepted in the absence of either epigraphical or literary evidence; especially in preference to the celebrated Śrīparvata-Nāgarjunakonda. Secondly, the Viṣṇukundin connection with the names of the villages, Parvatāpuraṇa and Kundanapalle, is only a guess, because the names are clearly later than the period under reference and are not the
The discovery of Visnukundin coins and a label inscription, cannot prove the site, as the capital of the dynasty. Finally, nearness to a Ghatikāsthāna cannot be a criterion to identify a place as capital city. A Ghatika flourished during the time of Eastern Cālukyas at Aṣanapurā, far removed from their capital city.

Above all, the capital towns in ancient times, were mostly situated on the river sides, or in fertile plains or valleys. They must have been surrounded by rich and populous villages, throbbing with agricultural and industrial affluence. Dhanyakāṭaka and Vengī clearly exemplify the fact, as far as early Āndhra history is concerned. Kisaraguṭṭa does not seem to have had such a potentiality and can hardly be taken as the Viṣṇukundin capital in the present state of knowledge. But, the ruined fort of bricks datable to the Ikṣvāku and post-Ikṣvāku period points out that the site could have commanded some importance from the military point of view.

Sankaranarayanan has accepted the identification of Śrīparvata with Śrīdallam and Trikūṭa-Malayā with Kōṭappakonda and suggested that the Viṣṇukundins being an off-shoot of the Cūṭus of Vanavāsa, hailed from the
Sri^ailam region. His views cannot be accepted in the light of the discussion made above. 62

IV. Conclusion:

Eventhough none of the ancient sites in Telangana mentioned above can be properly identified as Viṣṇukūḍin capital, the statement about the location of the kingdom of Govindavarman in the Tummalagūḍa (set II) charter, 63 together with the discovery of the Viṣṇukūḍin coins in large numbers in the districts of Nalgonda, 64 Medak, 65 and Karimnagar, 66 clearly suggest that Telangana must have been early home of the dynasty. The region corresponds to Asikā 67 of the Śatavahana times and Ṛṣikā of the Purāṇas, and Brhatśamhitā. 69 The region passed into the Vākāṭaka hands and formed a part of the dominion Vatsagulmā branch of the dynasty. Probably the early members in the Viṣṇukūḍin dynasty ruled over the country as the feudatories of the Vākāṭakas. 70 Several local traditions of Anumakonda region, eventhough later in origin, speak the country to be the home of early Viṣṇukūḍin rule. 71

Accepting that Viṣṇukūḍins originally hailed from the region of Telangana here is an opinion hazarded that we may further narrow down the homeland
to Asika, the present day Medak district. This is a rich agricultural area watered by the Manjirâ river, perhaps, having had its capital, where the present day Kondâpur stands. Excavations at Kondâpur revealed that it was a flourishing mercantile centre during the Sâtavâhana and the succeeding periods. Hence, Kondapura, the modern Kondâpur appears more probably than Kundanapalle, as the capital of the Viśnukundins.
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3. GENEALOGY AND CHRONOLOGY

The Viṣṇukūṇḍin genealogy and chronology has been a much discussed and so far, an unsolved problem in early Andhra history. There are as many schemes as there are scholars who worked on the subject. Several permutations and combinations of genealogy have been tried of the lists of kings given in the records of the dynasty. Schemes of chronology were worked mainly on the basis of the undependable evidence of palaeography, and the regnal years of the donors, mentioned in the inscriptions, assigning regnal periods conjecturally, where actual facts were not available. There are a few, but vague synchronisms, such as the Viṣṇukūṇḍin-Vakāṭaka relations and the cātudanta wars, but they were adjusted by the scholars as suitable to their schemes of the chronology of the dynasts. The Vālpūrū stone inscription and the Tummalagūḍēṃ (set II) charter refers to the Pallavas as to have been at war with the Viṣṇukūṇḍins. But the former was ignored till recent, while the latter has not been properly worked out, because, the Pallava chronology was another subject of controversy. Generally the chronological schemes were arranged on the assumption that Cālukyans ousted the Viṣṇukūṇḍins from power and the invasion led by Puhākāśin II thus formed the lower limit. But, scholars differ in views
Kiernan dated the Visnukundins to 7th or 8th century, on the basis of their matrimonial alliance with the Vakataka and supposed that the palaeography of the Chikkulla plates would support the view. But the Vakataka chronology was itself subjected to a revision, after the discovery of the Poona plates of Prabhavatigupta and accordingly the Visnukundin chronology was also reconsidered. These dynasties are now assigned to a period somewhat contemporaneous to the of the Guptas in North India.

Scholars, however, agree on a single point in the midst of the keen controversy centred on the genealogy of the Visnukundins. It is that the list of kings mentioned in the Ramatirtham plates is identical with the first three kings in that of the Chikkulla plates. Madhavavarman, mentioned at the top of the lists in the two records, was identically described as a performer of eleven Asvamedhas and thousand krtus, though the Chikkulla plates further credit him with performance of more numerous and varied rituals. His son and successor, Vikramandaravarma, was described as the ornament of both the families, the Visnukundi and the Vakataka. Notwithstanding a
more elaborate description of the next king Indravarman in the Chikkulla plates, as founder of ghatikas and exterminator of dayadas, he can be identified with the donor of the Rāmatirtha plates. The accreditation of victories in caturdanta battles to him was common in both the records, thus further justifying the identification. The donor of the Chikkulla plates was his son and successor. The Tūndī plates present the same list of kings, as mentioned in the Chikkulla plates. But the former record shows eulogistic overtones than the latter. Thus, the combined lists of the Rāmatirtha, the Chikkulla and the Tūndī copper plates give the following Viṣṇukundin genealogy, beyond any controversy.

1. Mādhava varman
   (performed eleven Ādvaṭmedhas and thousand kratus and many other sacrifices.)
   2. Vikramandravarman I
      (the ornament of the two families, the Vākṣṭaka and the Viṣṇukundī;)
   3. Indra (Bhattāraka) varman
      (the donor of the Rāmatirtha plates, victor in many caturdanta battles, established ghatikas and exterminated dayadas.)
   4. Vikramandravarman II
      (the donor of the Chikkulla and the Tūndī copper plate grants.)
H. Krishnasastri\textsuperscript{15} and Hultzsch\textsuperscript{16} first arranged the Viṣṇukūṇḍin genealogy based on the palaeographical features of the two Ipūrū charters. From the comparatively early type of alphabet of the Ipūrū (set I) plates, Hultzsch suggested the identification of its donor, Mādhavaavarman, with the grandfather and great-grandfather, respectively of the grantors of the Rāmatīrtham and the Chikkullā plates.\textsuperscript{17} The suggestion is quite acceptable in view of the identical description of the king as performer of eleven Āvamadhas and thousand krātus in all the charters mentioned above. He remarked\textsuperscript{18} that the alphabet of the Ipūrū (set II) plates was even earlier than that of the set I and resembled that of the British Museum plates of Gārudāví.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, he considered that Mādhavaavarman the grantor of Ipuru II set was the grandfather of the synonymous donor of the I set as grandsons were frequently named after their grandfathers, and assigned him to the time, same as that of the said Pallava grant, to the middle of the fourth century A.D., and arranged the scheme of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin genealogy, based on the two Ipūrū, the Rāmatīrtham and the Chikkullā plates, as follows:
1. Madhavavarman I
   (performed eleven Advamedhas and thousand kratus.)

2. Devavarman

3. Madhavavarman II
   (the donor of the Ipuru (set II) plates and the Lord of the Trikūṭemalaya)

4. Govindavarman

5. Madhavavarman III
   (performed eleven Advamedhas and thousand kratus, the donor of the Ipuru (set I)

6. Vikramendravarman I
   (the ornament of the Vignukundin and the Vākāṭaka families)

7. Indravarman
   (the donor of the Rāmatirtham plates.)

8. Vikramendravarman II
   (the donor of the Chikkullā plates.)

I. The Problem:

After the discovery of the pōlamūrū plates, Krishnasastri²⁰ identified Vikramendra, mentioned in the record, as the grandfather of the donor, Mādhabavarman, with Vikramendravarman II, the donor of the Chikkullā plates. Dubreuil²¹ suggested that the pōlamūrū plates of Mādhabavarman were issued shortly before the Cālukyaṇ invasion by Pulakesin II.
Thus the above scheme of the Viṣṇukūndin genealogy was extended downwards, as:

Vikramandaravarman II
(the donor of the Chikkullā plates and identified with grandfather of the donor, of the pōlamūrū plates)

9. Govindavarman II

10. Mādhavavarman IV
(the donor of the Pōlamūrū plates, performer of eleven Āśvamedhas and thousand kṛatās.)

The schemes consist of three Mādhavavarmans each being a performer of eleven horse-sacrifices and thousand kṛatās, but at the same time two of the Mādhavavarmans were each a son of a Govindavarman. K.V.Lakshmanarao could improve upon the above scheme by identifying the donor of the Īpurū (set I) plates with that of the pōlamūrū plates, reducing the number of Mādhavavarmans from three, to two. He supposed that the pōlamūrū plates of Mādhavavarman might not have been more than a generation earlier than the pōlamūrū plates of Jayasimha I, the Eastern Cālukya ruler, because of palaeographical similarities between the two records. On a study of the lineal succession of the donees in the two records, and the Eastern
Calukyan grant specifying its donee as पुर्व-ाग्रहारिका, he concluded the latter was the son of the donee in the Viṣṇukūḍin grant.

K.V. Lakshmanarao supposed that the Calukyan invasion of Śrīhādāsa took place in A.D. 610, followed by the independent rule by Viṣṇuvardhana I, between A.D. 617-33. Thus, the pāḷimūrū plates of Jayasimha I, dated in his 5th regnal year, were assigned to A.D. 637. He calculated the date of the Viṣṇukūḍin grant, based on the astronomical details therein, as A.D. 594 and the initial year of the donor king, Mādhavevarman, considering the 48th regnal year given in the record, as A.D. 546. The Viṣṇukūḍin king supposedly overthrown by Pulakeśin II, was assigned, between A.D. 546-610, a period of sixty four years. He assigned 25 years of reign, on average, to all the kings except, Mādhavevarman II and III and presented the scheme of the Viṣṇukūḍin genealogy and chronology as:

1. Mādhavevarman I, 357-382
   (performer of eleven Asvamedhas and thousand kratus.)

2. Devavarman, 382-407

3. Mādhavevarman II, 407-444
   (the donor of the Īpuru (set II) and the Lord of Trikūṭa Malaya.)
4. Vikramadityavarman I, 444-469
(the ornament of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin-Vākāṭaka families)

5. Indravarman, 469-496.

6. Vikramadityavarman II, 496-521
(the donor of the Chikkullā plates, identified with Vikramahendra, of the Pōlamūru plates.)

7. Govindaivarman, 521-546

8. Madhavavarman III, 546-610
(performance of eleven pāvamedhas and thousand kratus, the donor of the Tōru (set I) and the Pōlamūru plates.)

The scheme was accepted by most of the scholars like K.R.Subrahmanyam, R.Subbarao, M.Somaschekara Sarma, and others.

It has been rightly said that the Viṣṇukūṇḍin genealogy was a mess before D.C. Sircar has pointed out that Madhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates, can neither be the grandfather of the donor of the Īpūrū (set I) plates, nor can be identical with the homonymous ruler mentioned in the Rāmtīrtha and Chikkullā plates. The donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates was the lord of Trikūṭamalayā, while the latter was not, but he had the performance of eleven horse-sacrifices and thousand kṛatus, among others to his
credit, while the former did none of the kind. The second and more important point in his argument is that the identification of Vikramandaravarman with Vikramahendra involves an unnatural duplication, even triplication in some cases of Mādhavavarman, who performed the same number and variety of rituals. He has drawn the attention of scholars to the fact that "no other Viśukundin king is as yet known to have performed a single sacrifice of any kind except the one named Mādhavavarman and also the unique numbers—Eleven Advamedhas and Thousand Agniṣṭomas (kratus)." He firmly advocated that "it is highly improbable that two kings of the same name and dynasty and of the same period, performed exactly equal number of eleven and thousand sacrifices, such as the Advamedhas and Agniṣṭomas." He has objected to early Viśukundins being assigned to the fifth century A.D. and holds that it was the time of the Śaṅkāyana rule at Vaiḍūrya. Following Raychaudhuri, he opines that the Andhradhīpata, referred to in the Harāhā inscription was Mādhavavarman, the donor of the pōlamūru plates and assigned him to A.D.535-585, a time close to the regnal period of the Maukhāri king Īśānavarman. He suggested that the gap of time between the two pōlamūru records was about half-a-century and
the successors of Mādhavavarmān ruled at Vēṅgī, contemporaneous to the early Eastern Cālukyas, who ruled apparently from pīṭapurā. Thus, he arranged the scheme as:

Vikramahendra
(or Vikramendra I), 500-520

2. Govindavarman, 520-535

3. Mādhavavarmān I, 535-585
   (the donor of the Īpūrū (set I) and the Pōlamūrū plates, the performer of eleven Āśvamedhas and thousand kratus, surnamed Janāśraya)

4. Mādhavavarmān II
   A.D. 585-615
   (the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates and the Lord of Trikūṭa-Malaya)

5. Vikramandavarman
   (or II) 615-25

6. Indravarman, 625-55
   (the donor of the Rāmatīrtham plates)

7. Vikramandavarman (II)
   655-70
   (the donor of the Chikkullā plates)

The Viṣṇukunḍin genealogy and chronology presented by Sircar are very much reasonable by avoiding the multiplication of Mādhavavarmān, the performer of rituals. But it has two improbabilities,
the first being the place assigned to the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates as to have successor to his grandfather, and the second is the concurrent Viṣṇukūṇḍin and the Eastern Cālukyan rule in Āndhradesa. He corrected them subsequently, when some chronological difficulties after the discovery of the Kopparam plates of Kubjaviṣṇuvardhana forced him to revise the scheme. He rearranged the genealogical and chronological scheme, from Mādhavavarman I, by excluding the list of kings of the Īpūrū (set II) plates from the main line of succession and by fixing the end of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin rule at A.D. 631, as:

Mādhavavarman I  535-585
Vikramandaravarmā  585-590
Indravarman  590-620
Vikramandaravarmā II  620-631

But the discovery of the Tūndī plates, dated in the 14th regnal year of Vikramandaravarmā II, forced another revision in the scheme, which was affected by reducing the regnal period of Vikramandaravarmā I to two years between 585-587 and assigning Indravarman to 587-616 and Vikramandaravarmā II (or III) to 616-31.
Thus two schools of thought arose, as to the Visnukundin genealogy and chronology, the first being the one arranged by K.V. Lakshmanarao, providing for two Madhavavarmanas, who performed eleven Aevamahdas and thousand kutas each. The second was that, arranged by D.C. Sircar, which contains only one Madhavavarman the performer of kutas.

The first school of thought was continued by B.V. Krishnarao followed by K.A.N. Sastrī and others, who criticised the scheme, presented by Sircar. They maintained and tried to substantiate the differentiation of Madhavavarman, the donor of the Ipurū (set I) and the Pōlamūru plates, from the homonymous mentioned in the Chikkulā and the Rāmatūrtham plates. They pointed out that the former, whom they called Madhavavarman III, had the additional attributes, which are absent in the case of the latter. They are: 1) the epithet suggesting the connection with the woman, or women of Trivar Nagar; 2) the epithets signifying his qualities of charity, benevolence, enlightenment and intellectual accomplishments etc.; 3) the title, Hīranyagarbhaprasūtah; 4) the title Avasita vividha divyam and Janāśraya. However, they were convinced of the impossibility of
identifying the donor of the Ṛṣṭra (set II) plates, with Mādhavavarman of the Chikкуla and Rāmatīrtham plates, pointed out by Sircar.

S.V. Visvanatha had almost overlooked the scheme presented by Sircar and upheld the one presented by K.V. Lakshmanarao. He discontinued the statements of the performance of the unique number of rituals, as a poetic fancy of the composers of the inscriptions, and as no sure guide in fixing the place of Mādhavavarman in the Viṣṇukundin genealogy. He arranged the chronology of the dynasty based on the Vākāṭaka and Gālukyan synchronism with the Viṣṇukundins, suggesting Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Ṛṣṭra (set II) plates as the son-in-law of Prabhavatigupta and assigned him to A.D. 450-500. He supposed that Mādhavavarman of the Ṛṣṭra (set I) and the pōḷamūrū plates belonged to the period, A.D. 610-50 and that he lost his kingdom gradually, from about A.D. 630.

B.V. Krishnarao followed Hultzsch and Lakshmanarao in fixing the dates of the Ṛṣṭra (set II) and the pōḷamūrū plates, as well as the end of the Viṣṇukundin rule. He assigned Mādhavavarman I to
the time of the Vākātaka king Narendrasena, whom he fixed between A.D. 420-470. He accommodated the list of kings in the Īpūrū (set II) plates in the main line and supposed that its donor Mādhavavarman II was succeeded by his half-uncle, Vikramendravarman I, at a fairly advanced age. He upheld the Viṣṇukundin-Somavāmśī synchronism, suggested by Mirashi, and suggested Mādhavavarman III invaded South Kosala during the reign of Candragupta, the brother and successor of Tīvaradeva. He arranged thus the scheme as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>420-455</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Performed eleven Āvamedhas and thousand krūtas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455-58</td>
<td>Devavarmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488-493</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-530</td>
<td>Indravarmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-540</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the donor of the Chikkullā plates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540-546</td>
<td>Govindavarmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546-611</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the donor of the pōlamūru and the Ipuru (set I) plates, and entitled Janāśraya.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
K.A.N. Sastri, after whose name, the above scheme
of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy is widely known, slightly
differed from it in fixing the place of kings in the
Īpūrū (set II) charter. He excluded them from the
main line of succession and arranged the scheme of
genealogy and chronology of the dynasty, based on the
Vākāṭaka and the Eastern Gāṅga synchronisms with
Viṣṇukundin history. The Vākāṭaka princess married
by Mādhavavarman was supposed to be either a daughter,
or a sister of Devavarman of the Basim branch and the
Caturdanta battles fought by the Viṣṇukundin king
Indravarman were held to be the same as the battles
referred to in the Jirjiṅgi plates of the Eastern
Gāṅga king Indravarman I. He doubted that a
powerful king like Tiwaradeva could not have been
defeated by Mādhavavarman III and suggested that
the latter's eastern expedition referred to in the
Polamuru plates was "obviously, to recover the
country lost to the rulers of Kālīṅga." He
concluded that the king, or his son
Maṇḍanaḥbhaṭṭaraka, was overthrown by Pulakāśīn II.
He presented the scheme of the Viṣṇukundin
chronology.
Mādhavavarman I 440-460
Vikramendravarman I 460-480
Indravarman 480-515
Vikramendravarman II 515-535
Govinda varman 535-556
Mādhavavarman III 556-616

R.S. Panchamukhi\textsuperscript{60} followed more or less the scheme of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology, based on the synchronism suggested by K.A.N. Sastri, but accepted the Viṣṇukundin-Samavamśi synchronism\textsuperscript{61} and assigned Tiṭvaradeva to the beginning of the seventh century A.D.\textsuperscript{62} He arranged Mādhavavarman I as a contemporary of the Viṣṇukundin Harīshaṇa and assigned him to A.D. 500, accepted the contemporary of Indravarman with the homonymous Eastern Gaṅga King and fixed the date of caturdanta battles at about A.D. 535. He had independently calculated and fixed the date of the pālamūru plates based on the astronomical details in it, as 21st February, A.D. 621,\textsuperscript{63} close to the time of Tiṭvaradeva and a decade before the issue of the Kopparam plates by Pūrakāśin in A.D. 631.

The second school of thought, proposed by D.C. Sircar\textsuperscript{64} was accepted with some minor changes.
and followed by K. Gopalachari, V. V. Mirashi, K. S. Vaidyanathan, and M. Ramarao. Gopalachari supposed that the two pōlamūrū grants were separated by one generation, and placed Mādhavavarman between A.D. 553-93. He assigned Vikramandradvarman I and his successors, 25 years of rule each, on average and fixed the end of the Viṣṇukūḍiṇī rule about the "later part of the seventh century A.D., a generation after the advent of the Cālukyas." Mirashi has suggested that Tīvra-vanagara was the capital of South Kosala, perhaps, referred to by the name after Tīvara-deva, and that the Viṣṇukūḍiṇī king could have married a south Kosala princess, following his victory. By way of this interpretation of the epithet in the Īpūrū (set I) and the pōlamūrū plates, the Viṣṇukūḍiṇī history was synchronised in some subsequent schemes with the history of South Kosala. He supposed that the time-gap between the two pōlamūrū plates was about 60 years, assigned Tīvra-deva to the period between A.D. 530-550 and Mādhavavarman between A.D. 525-568. But Mirashi had to change his views many a time, on the samavamiśī chronology, as new pieces of evidence coming to light, and on the Viṣṇukūḍiṇī chronology too, along with the former.
K.S. Vaidyanathan excluded Devavarman of the Ípūrũ (set IX) plates from the main line, assigned Indravarman and Vikramendravarman II respectively 30 and 10 years of reign and concluded that the latter was supplanted by ViṣṇuVardhana I of the Eastern Cālukyas. Apparently, he did not lay more emphasis on the proximity of the two pōlamūry plates and arranged the scheme of the Viṣṇukundin chronology, in the main line of succession as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman I</td>
<td>457-487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govindavarman</td>
<td>487-517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavavarman</td>
<td>517-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman II</td>
<td>565-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravarman</td>
<td>575-605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman III</td>
<td>605-615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The Tummalagūḍam Charters and the Problem

The problem of arranging the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology assumed a new dimension with the discovery of the two sets of Tummalagūḍam charters. The first of sets brings to light two hitherto unknown kings. The second charter presents the succession of kings from Govindavarman to Vikramendravarman II, connecting the lists of kings known from the Ípūrũ
Thus, the new evidence vindicates by D.G. Sircar's stand on Viṣṇukundin genealogy. A continuous line of succession of the dynasty can be arranged by identifying Govindavarman, the donor of the I set, with the king of the same name, mentioned in the other. The second set gives the 11th regnal year of Vikramandaravarman II, as well as its corresponding Saka year, as 388, expired, which comes to be A.D. 566. Thus, it enables to fix the initial year of the king's reign in A.D. 555-56, which has since then become the basis for all the subsequent attempts of reconstructing the chronology of the dynasty.

But, the palaeographical features of the pōlamūṟu plates, with its late alphabet and the genealogical sequence with Vikramahendra as the grandfather of its donor, Mādhavavarman do not tally with the new evidence of the Tummalagūḍem plates, which suggests another Mādhavavarman, in the place of Vikramahendra. Hence, scholars tried to press the new evidence into service, to support their old theories, based on the pōlamūṟu plates. As a result, the Tummalagūḍem charters created more problems, than they would solve.
B.N. Sastri, who brought the records to light, arranged the schema of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology by suffixing the list of kings in the Pōlamūrī plates to the combined lists of kings known from the two Tummalagüḍêm plates. In other words, it was the same schema presented by B.V. Krishnarao, after prefixing the list of kings mentioned in the Tummalagüḍêm (set I) charter, including the accommodation of the kings, known from the Ipūrī (set II) plates in the main line.

The reign of Vikramendravarman II was assigned to A.D. 556-570, on the basis of the Saka year, given in the set II of the charters and accordingly the scheme was formulated as:

```
Indravarman I, 388-400
Mādhavavarman I, 400-418
Govindavarman I, 418-455
Mādhavavarman II, 455-490
(performer of eleven Āvamadhānas and thousand krātus.)
```

```
Devavarman, 490-493
Mādhavavarman III, 493-522
(the donor of the Ipūrī (set II) plates and lord of Trikūṭa-Malaya.)
```

```
Vikramendravarman I 522-528
Indravarman II, 528-556
(performer of the Ramatīrtham plates.)
```
Vikramendravarman II
556-570
(the donor of the Chikkulla and the Tummalagudem (set II) plates, identified with Vikramahendra of the polemuru plates.)

Govindavarman
570-576

Mādhavavarman IV,
576-623
(the donor of the Ipurū (set I) and the polemuru plates, performer of eleven Švamedhas and thousand kratus.)

The scheme of Viṣṇukundin genealogy gives altogether four Mādhavavarmanas, two of them being the sons of Govindavarmanas, and performers of eleven Švamedhas and thousand kratus. Most of the scholars adopted the scheme with a few minor adjustments to tide over some chronological difficulties in arranging chronology and accommodating the kings of the polemuru charter.

N. Venkataramanayya accepted the date of the polemuru plates as computed by K. V. Lakshmanarao, but rejected his conclusion, that the donor ruled for 64 years till the Cālukyan invasion. He has pointed out that in view of the fact that Cālukyan invasion has
now been fixed in the year A.D. 617, according to the epigraphical evidence, the king's reign cannot be further extended to that and also that the Cälukya did not occupy Vēṅgi from the Viṣṇukundins. He had thus concluded that the lower limit of the Viṣṇukundin chronology cannot be fixed on the basis of the pālamūrū charter; and that the respective donees of the two charters may not have been the father and the son. So far he may be correct, but suggested that Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates was the successor of his grandfather, Mādhavavarman II and that the former assigned the region of Tāwār as an appanage to Mādhavavarman IV, who belonged to a collateral line emerged from Viṣṇukamandarvarman I. He further presumed that Mādhavavarman III was set aside by Indravarman II, agnate rivals included Mādhavavarman IV as well. Venkataramanaya fixed the latter's reign at Tāwār as concurrent with those of Indravarman II and his son Viṣṇukamandarvarman II and concluded that he shifted his power to Vēṅgi, having had his capital Amarapura, following the reign of Viṣṇukamandarvarman II, sometime about A.D. 570. His scheme of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology is as given below:
before coming to Andhradēsa. He accepted the date of the pōlamūrū plates, as fixed by R.S. Panchamukhi and suggested that the Cālukyas dispossessed the Viśnukūndinas of Vāṅgī country, shortly after the issue of the pōlamūrū plates by Maḍhavavarman IV, in A.D. 621.

The scheme he has presented is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Monarch</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>380-394</td>
<td>Indravarman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394-419</td>
<td>Maḍhavavarman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419-456</td>
<td>Govindaivarman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456-503</td>
<td>Maḍhavavarman II</td>
<td>(performer of eleven Aśvamedhas and thousand kratus.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503-528</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528-569</td>
<td>Indravarman II</td>
<td>(the donor of the Rāmatīrthaṁ plates.) 528-569.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555-569</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman II</td>
<td>(the donor of the Chikkullā, Tūndi and the Tummalagūjem (set II) plates.) 555-569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569-581</td>
<td>Govindaivarman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581-621</td>
<td>Maḍhavavarman IV</td>
<td>(the donor of the Ipūrū (set I) and the pōlamūrū plates.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maṇḍpaññabhāṭṭāraka
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Rulers</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>358-383</td>
<td>Indravarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383-403</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman I</td>
<td>(the donor of the Tummalagudem (set I) charter.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403-445</td>
<td>Govindavarman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445-482</td>
<td>Pladhava varman II</td>
<td>(performer of eleven Advamedhas and thousand kratus.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482-529</td>
<td>Devavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529-556</td>
<td>Indravarman II, Govindavarman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indrabhaṭṭārakavarma</td>
<td>(the donor of the Rāmatīrtham plates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482-529</td>
<td>Mādhavavarman III</td>
<td>(the donor of the Ipūrū (set II) plates and the lord of Trikūta-Malayā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>546-594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mādhavavarman IV</td>
<td>(the donor of the Ipūrū (set I) and the Pōlamūrū plates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramandra varman I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramendra varman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramandra</td>
<td>(bhaṭṭāraka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varman II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556-570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vikramandra</td>
<td>(the donor of the Chikkulla, the Tūndi and the Tummalagudem (set II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>556-570</td>
<td>plates 556-570.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O. Ramechandralaya has presented a scheme of Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology, almost similar to the above two schemes, except for the inclusion of the kings mentioned in the Ipūrū (set II) in the main line. Hence, he disapproved the view that Mādhavavarman IV was ruling over the region of Tāvār,
before coming to Andhradesa. He accepted the date of the pōlamūrū plates, as fixed by R. S. Panchamukhi and suggested that the Cālukyaśa dispossessed the Viṣṇukundins of Vēṅgī country, shortly after the issue of the pōlamūrū plates by Mādhava-varman IV, in A.D. 621. The scheme he has presented is as follows:

Indravarman I, 380-394
Mādhava-varman I, 394-419
Govinda-varman I, 419-456
Mādhava-varman II, 456-503
(performer of eleven Rāvamedhas and thousand kratus.)

Deva-varman

Vikramendravarman I
503-528

Indravarman II
528-569

Vikramendravarman II
555-569

Govinda-varman II
569-581

Mādhava-varman IV
581-621
(performer of the pōlamūrū plates.)

Mañcānabhaṭṭēraka
Sankaranarayanan argues that the donors of the Ṛpuṟu (set I) and the pōḷamūṟu plates were not identical and the titles like Trivaranaqara bhavanagata... etc., in the two inscriptions can neither identify their respective donors, nor differentiate any one of them from the homonymous ruler mentioned in the Chikkullā and the Rāmatīrtham plates. Thus, he differentiated the donor of the pōḷamūṟu plates because its palaeography and the language were clearly later than those of the Chikkullā plates, while the Ṛpuṟu (set I) plates were, on the same ground, quite earlier than the latter. Again, the grandfather of the donor of the pōḷamūṟu plates was Vikramahendra (Vikramendra), but the combined lists of kings from the Tummalagudem charters name the grandfather of Madhavavarman, as another Madhavavarman. Hence he suggests, quite peculiarly, that the donor of the pōḷamūṟu plates was the successor of Vikramendravarman II, as he himself claimed, Vikramād-apta bhūri bhūḥ. It means, one who had obtained the vast earth, or the kingdom from Vikrama, i.e., Vikramendravarman II.

He further argues rather curiously that the donor of the pōḷamūṟu plates might also have performed eleven Āvamadhas and thousand kratus, in token of his newly obtained independence, or may have been
influenced by the example of his illustrious ancestor, Mādhavavarman II. His father, according to the scholar was not a king, but "took active part in the wars fought" by Indrabhattāraka and obtained the title Vikramāditya. Thus he hoped against the evidence that such an arrangement of genealogy and chronology "certainly relieve one, of the unnecessary assumption, that the pōḷamūrū set I may be a later copy of an earlier inscription." He assigned the donor of the grant to A.D. 564-612 and fixed the date of the record to be 22nd February, A.D. 612, shortly before the annexation of Piśṭapura by Pulakeśin II. He has, thus, arranged the schema as given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indravarman, 375-400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavavarman I, 400-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govindaivarman I, 422-462 (the donor of the Tummalagudem (set I) plates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavavarman II, 462-502 (the donor of the Vālpūrū stone inscriptions, the Īpūrū (set I) and the Khāṇāpūr plates, performed eleven Horse sacrifices and thousand krātus.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devavarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhavavarman III (the donor of the Īpuru (set II) plates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramendravarman I 502-527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravarman, or Indrabhattāraka varman, entitled Satyāditya and the donor of the Ramatirtham plates.) 527-555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Analysis Afresh:

From the foregoing analysis of different schemes of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology, it is clear that the polamuru plates constitute the main difficulty in arranging a scheme satisfactorily to all. Its palaeography and language as well as the list of kings are incompatible with those of the other Viṣṇukundin inscriptions, especially, with the combined list of kings known from the two Tummala-gudem charters. While the two charters give a continuous line of succession, without involving the duplication of Mādhavavarman, son of Govindavarman and of identical epithets, the polamuru plates necessitate duplication only for accommodating Vikramahendra, the donor's grandfather.

A. The Theory of Two Mādhavavarman: Review:

D.C. Sircar has wondered long back, whether
The Polamuru plates were not a later copy of an earlier record, as suggested by its palaeographic features. Sankaranarayanan too has observed the palaeographic and linguistic peculiarity of the record, but soon resorted to a number of presumptions to uphold the genuineness of the record. But, the present writer has been convinced after a fresh study of the record that it is spurious, and forged at a far later time than the Visnukundin period. The forged document shows: 1) some concepts that are found in later records; ii) some legendary traditions of a far later time, that grew about the name of the donor king; and iii) characters similar to those of the Eastern Calukyan inscriptions of the 7th and 8th centuries. The record is analysed, hereunder, in the light of these observations:

1) Such titles as Vikramāditya and Janāditya, attributed respectively to Govindavarman and Mādhavavarman in the record, are absent in all other Visnukundin inscriptions, including the two Īpūrū plates. One of them, issued by Mādhavavarman himself, describes his father Govindavarman, with glowing epithets, but does not give him the title of Vikramāditya. The other set also ignores the
title Janāsraya in reference to Mādhavavarma, even when the latter's ritualism and supremacy over many vassals were faithfully referred to. This shows that the two kings originally had no such titles, but the pālamūrū plates attributed them to the kings, in imitation of similar titles with āsraya terminals, held by Indravarman II and Vikramendravarman II.  

b) The title Mahātāla Ṛṇpati Bhāsārā, the Sun among the kings of the earth, given to Mādhavavarma in the pālamūrū plates is an echo of Bhaṣābhāskara in his Khāṇāpūr plates, which were decidedly spurious. Again, the epithet Sarvabhūta parirakṣāna caṅcūh, in the record is clearly an echo of his description in the Tūndī plates as, Sarvamedh-āvāpta sarvabhūta svārājyasya, or the epithet describing Vikramendravarman II himself, as Sakalabhuvana raksābhār-sīk-āsrayaḥ.

c) The record describing Mādhavavarma as Udvahannurubhābhātī Vikramād-āpta bhūribhūh, meaning that he shone by espousing the vast earth obtained by his valour, is another late concept, based on the epithet Bhuvobhartuh in the Tummalagōdem (set II) charter. The Caṅkayas of Bādāmī had titles like prthvīvallabha and Śī-
110 prthivivallabha, meaning the Lords of Earth and Lords of Wealth and Earth respectively. It is shown below that Indravarman and Vikramendravarman II had a long time warfare with the Cālukyas and appropriated their titles like Satyāśraya. The title Bhuvabhärude was obviously coined after prthivivallabha. Reference to a similar title in the pālamūrū plates must be in imitation either of the late Vīṣṇukundin or the Cālukyan title.

2) The epithet Avasita vividha divyāḥ, attributed to Madhavavarman in the pālamūrū plates is unique and is found in no other record of the dynasty. It means that the king was the master of the Divyās, or ordeals, indicating his sense of justice in administering law. The interpretation that he destroyed the ordeals, though sanctioned by grammar, cannot be accepted, for the composer of the inscription must have meant it that Madhavavarman was superior to Divyās in administration of justice. It was perhaps incorporated in the record, based on a later day tradition, that Madhavavarman sentenced his son to death, when the latter was guilty of causing death to the son of a poor woman.
Another title Desidata sakala dharapitaka nerapatih of Mādhavavarman in the record, is again an example in the context. It was interpreted by N. Somasekhara Sarma as the 'lord of Vēṅgī country,' based on some medieval inscriptions referring to Vēṅgī country as Vēṅgī Thousand. N. Venkataramanayya supposed that Mādhavavarman shifted his capital to Amaravati and conquered the country of Vēṅgī by A.D. 594, gifted the village in Guddādiviṣaya, before proceeding on his eastward expedition. All this presumption was only to substantiate the meaning of the above epithet, and this hypothesis was rejected by O. Ramachandraiya.

Mādhavavarman was already a performer of eleven Aśvamedhas, obviously in token of his victorious military exploits, when he issued the Īpurū (set I) plates, which register the gift of a village in the same region. Still no record of the dynasty other than the pālamūrū record refers to his lordship over the Vēṅgī country by any such title.

The epithet Desidata sakala dharapitaka does not refer to the "entire" Vēṅgī country, for it is ludicrous for a king, who performed eleven Aśvamedhas,
claiming lordship over the entire Venugī country, of one thousand villages. It actually means that the king claimed overlordship of India, which measures one thousand yojanas from north to south. Eventhough Kautilya mentions the concept, there seems to be no inscriptional reference to it and on the other hand we find it in Rājadekhara’s Kavya Mīmāṃsā. The Pōlamūrū plates by referring to the concept, indicate that much of the text was composed, not by royal officers, but by Sanskrit scholars. Sankaranarayanan writes that the text of the record contains gṛhaśāṅkārās, which come across in such late Sanskrit works like Vāsevadatta, Kādambari, etc. The language of the record is more complex than the simple and crisp expressions of all the other inscriptions of the dynasty.

3) The text and alphabet of the Pōlamūrū plates are distinctly a variant from those of other Viṣṇukūṇḍin inscriptions, showing a predominant Cālukya influence. Its characters are, besides being uncouth and carelessly incised, are later in their forms, resembling those of the Eastern Cālukya inscriptions of seventh and eighth centuries. The prose text of the record is interspersed by a verse, and it is a feature,
unusual to any other Viṣṇukundin record. Some Western Cālukyan inscriptions, and some Eastern Cālukyan records of a later day, exhibit such an epigraphical formula. Even the length of the text is in contradistinction to the records of the time, not only the Viṣṇukundin but also the records of other dynasties, pointing out its late production. Apart from the complexity pointed above, the language of the record in describing the donor king was spirited with arrogance and also unpolished in some cases, being markedly different from the Īpūrū (set I) plates, though the substance of the description is the same in both records.

Further, in the description of Govindevarman, the record ignores the essential quality of the king, benevolent ruler with a charitable disposition, which was extolled in the Īpūrū (set I) and the two Tummalagūḍam plates. On the other hand, the pōlamūrū plates praise his valour, quite significantly, in the same terms as used in the description of Viṣṇuvardhana I, in the pōlamūrū plates of Jayasimha I.

b) The grant portion of the record is almost a verbatim copy of the pōlamūrū plates of Jayasimha,
except for the king's name Janāśraya in line 27. It traces the descent of the donees eulogistically for two preceding generations as the grant of Jayasimha does. That practice is quite common with many Eastern Cālukyan inscriptions, but no other Viṣṇukundin charter does this. The Tūṅgī plates however mention the father of the donee, but without any eulogy and all other records mention only the name and a few particulars of accomplishments of the donees. The official dignitaries to whom the grant was addressed, with instructions for its upkeep, are again the same in both the charters.

These observations clearly point out that the pōlamūrū plates of Mādhavavarman, "as they have come down to us, are not the original" but a later restoration, making room for several anachronisms and hearsay. The name Vikramahendra and his description in the record must either be fictitious, based on the frequent occurrences of the name in the dynastic lists, or a mistaken reference to the last king of the dynasty, Vikramendravarman II, who must have been still in the memory of the people. Mādhavavarman might have made the gift of the village of pōlamūrū and issued a charter, but in his 37th regnal year only,
when he led the eastern campaign. The incompatible statements including the date and uncouth alphabet of the inscription show that it was unauthorisedly restored. Hence, it does not deserve the importance that scholars hitherto bestowed on it, in the reconstruction of the genealogy and chronology of the Viṣṇukūṇḍins.141

The distinction drawn between Mādhavavarman, mentioned in the Chikkullā and Rāmatirthām and other charters from the donor of the Īpūrū (set I) and the pōlamūrū plates, on the basis of the titles and attributes like Hiranyagarbhaprasūtah and Trivaranagara bhavanagata yuvatīhrdaya nandanah is quite improbable. Their omission in the two other mentioned records was obviously because, they illsuit in their highly eulogistic description of the king.

The reference to a purificatory ceremony like Hiranyagarbha-Mahādāna would be antithetical, when the king was credited with the performance of numerous great and elaborate sacrifices. As pointed above,142 the records of Vikramendravarman II overtly exaggerate the number and nomenclature of the rites and sacrifices, in a schematic way, deleting the less important and adding more prestigious ones and their numbers inflated.
It may be pointed out here, if the numbers and names of sacrifices were taken to differentiate Mādhavavarman, the king, as mentioned in the Rāmatīrtham plates, for the former do not credit him with such a long list of number and variety of sacrifices as the latter. But no scholar had so far ventured to suggest so, as it would be totally absurd.

The epithets suggesting the king's relation with the damsel(s) of Trivaranaagara also cannot, in fact, suggest such a differentiation, for there was no city by name Trivaranaagara, and Mādhavavarman had not taken any princess or princesses from that city for his wife. It is only a figurative expression of the king's conquest of three great cities and synonymous to the statements in the records of his successors that his feet shone with the rays of diamonds in the tiaras of many bowing vassals, or that he appropriated the fortune of other royal families, or that he espoused the vast Earth.

Similarly, the statements enumerating his qualities of smṛti, māti, bala, etc., are not required in describing a king, who was elevated to the rank of Paramēṣṭhi and devātīdeva in the records of the dynasty. Their absence in the description, surely, does not
mean that the king lacked them and it cannot be a significant factor of differentiation from another king supposedly had had them.

B. The Tummalagūdem Charters and the problem:

After discussing the problems posed by the Pōlamūrū plates, the supposed perplexities in the two Tummalagūdem plates and the doubts of their genuineness deserve consideration.

V. V. Mirashi, has first doubted the records as spurious, since the second of them mentions a Śaka date. He believed that the usage of Śaka era was introduced in Āndhradeśa by the Eastern Cālukyas, about 7th century A.D. He has doubted the date of the inscription also on the ground, Mādhavavarman being a contemporary of the Vākēṭaka Harishena of A.D. 500, the rule of his successors may extend beyond the date of pulakēśin's conquest of Āndhradeśa. But he revised his view, as the Hisse-Borala inscription of the times of Vākēṭaka king Devasena has subsequently come to light, mentioning Śaka date. He arranged the genealogy and chronology, as based on the evidence of the Tummalagūdem charters by identifying Indravārman mentioned in Set I, with the donor of the Rāmattēram plates, obviously led by its late palaeographic
features. Thus, Mādhavavarman, mentioned in the record was taken as the half-brother of Vikramendravarman II, and further identified with Mādhaverāja, referred to in the grant portion of the second set. He suggested that the prince was looked upon by Vikramendravarman II as his own son, as the record seems to speak; and further that he might have assisted the latter in his wars and succeeded him to the throne. The professor has concluded that Mādhavavarman's successor, Govindevarman, the donor of the Set I of them, was the contemporary of Pulakēṣīn II, and was overpowered by him.

Mirashi has rightly identified Govindevarman, mentioned in the genealogical part, with Govindarja of the grant portion of the Tummalagudem (set II) charter and also that Prthvīmūla, in whose family Paramabhattārikā Mahādevi was reportedly born, was an ancestor of the donor of the Gōdāvari plates. But the scheme of genealogy arranged by him has two serious drawbacks. First is that, in the two Tummalagudem sets which register gifts of lands to the vihāra, constructed by Paramabhattārikā Mahādevi, the chief queen of the donor of the I set, the donor
of the second set could not have preceded the former, for the grant portion of the II set clearly states that the donor king Vikramendravarma was recalling his ancestors to his memory, those that have born in his family, and not obviously referring to Govindavarman and Paramabhattharika Mahadevi. Secondly, the identifi-
cation of the donor of the Ramatirtham plates with Indravarman of the Tummalagudem (set I) plates is not possible, because nothing is known of the latter's achievements, while the former had the significant epithets like the victories in Catudanta wars, extermination of dayadas and establishment of ghatika.

In a recent note on the date of Tivaradave, Mirashi suggested a tentative scheme of the Visnuvundin chronology, based on the contemporaneity of Madhavavarman and Tivaradave. He has fixed the initial year of Madhavavarman as A.D. 488, calculating backwards from the year A.D. 566, the eleven year rule of Vikramendravarma II, the 27 year reign of Indravarman and forty years of reign of Madhavavarman II. Thus, he assigned the Polamuru plates of the king to the year A.D. 528, but later on adjusted it to A.D. 527, as lunar eclipse occurred in that year in the month of phalgun, according to Indian Ephimeries.
D.C. Sircar has opined that palaeographically the two Tummalagudem charters look somewhat later than the Chikkulla and Tundi plates of Vikramendravarman II. The genuineness of the records appeared to him more dubious than that of the Palamuru plates as they describe Govinda Varman as a Buddhist, the customary invocation of the tutelary deity is absent in the Set I, and do not proclaim the gifts to the concerned villages and officers. Thus, he has not proposed any scheme of Visnuvardin genealogy and chronology revised on the evidence of Tummalagudem plates.

The characters of the two Tummalagudem charters are similar and they are more rounded than those of the Chikkulla plates. But the difference is more due to some regional peculiarity and need not be taken to be later than other records of Vikramendravarman II. Their characters very closely resemble the alphabet of the Kattucheruvu grant of the same time whose genuineness cannot be doubted unlike that of the Palamuru plates, the neat incision of the Tummalagudem charters suggests that they must be original, or at least, authentic restoration in the case of the Set I.

The similarity of alphabet of the two Tummalagudem
charters, no doubt, clearly suggests that the set I was a later copy of an earlier record and might also have been composed by the monks of the Paramabhaṭṭārikā Vihāra, as suggested by Sankaranarayanan. But the Buddhist leanings of Govindavarman cannot be accounted for the smart handiwork of monks. They could not have taken so much independence, especially when the descriptions of the personae in the set II, are quite in accordance with the descriptions in other records of the dynasty. The ritualism of Mādhavavarman was also highly praised though it was unpalatable to the Buddhist authors. The descriptions of Govindavarman in the two charters, as a benevolent and just ruler, is supported by the Īpūrū (set I) plates. However, the characteristic tone of exaggeration in the II set of the time of Vikramendravarman II, is as much present in the other set and this surely points out that it was surely rewritten under the official supervision.

C. The Tummalagūḍem Charters: Incongruities:

M. Ramarao supposed that the Tummalagūḍem plates contain some incongruities presenting difficulties in arranging the Viṣṇukūḍin genealogy and chronology. Even though the line of succession given in the II set was a support to the genealogical schema of the dynasty
he presented earlier. But the list of kings mentioned in the other set posed him difficulty in accommodating in the scheme, as it "does not tally with that contained in any other Viṣṇukundin grant." Secondly, he felt that the Viṣṇukundin rule should have ended by the year A.D. 566, years before the date of the Cālukyan invasion over Andhra country in A.D. 615. Hence, he arranged the kings mentioned in the set I as a junior branch of the Viṣṇukundins and supposed that they usurped power following the death of Vikramendravarman II in A.D. 570. The alphabet of the record and the statement that GovindaVarman obtained svarājya by his own prowess, by forcibly annexing the dominions of feudatories of other kings, are taken in support of his contention. Thus, he arranged the scheme as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vikramahendra, 450-458} \\
\text{GovindaVarman, 458-468} \\
\text{Mādhavavarman I, 468-518} \\
& \text{(performed eleven Āsāmedhas and thousand kratus.)} \\
& \text{Mādhavavarman II} \\
& \text{(the donor of the Ṛpurū (set II) charter and Indravarman, the lord of Trikūṭa-(the donor of the Rāmatīrtham plates.) 528-555} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Further, Ramaraao raised some doubts on evidence of the two Tummalagudem plates, as summarised below:

1) The Vikramendravarmman II is known to have adopted a boy called Mādhavarāja from a feudatory family. Did he ascend the throne following the former? 2) Can pṛthvīmūla, in whose family Paramabhaṭṭārikā Mahādevi is said to have been born, be identified with the donor of the Gōdāvari plates? What was the relation between the queen and Vikramendravarmman II, the donor of the record? 3) What is the relation between the queen and Govindarāja, who is introduced in the record, in association with the queen? The statement that the queen intended to expose the greatness of Govindarāja indicates that the king was related to the Viṣṇukundin house. What was the relationship?
Ajaymitra Shestri has accepted the suggestion by Mirashi, that the donor of the Tummalagudem (set I) plates was identical with Govindavarman, as well as Govindaraja, mentioned respectively in the genealogical and the grant portion of the other set. The identification is supported by the description of Buddhist leanings and construction of numerous vihāras all over the Deccan, common to the king in the two records. Similarly, Parama Mahādevī, who built the vihāra at Indrapurā, was the same as Paramabhaṭṭārikā Mahādevī, mentioned in the grant portion of the other set, both being the builders of the vihāra at Indrapurā or Sakrapurā, to which the two grants register gifts.

More significant is his suggestion that Govindaraja or Govindavarman of the two Tummalagudem plates was the same as the king mentioned in the Ipūrū (set I) and the pōlamūrū plates. He has, thus, removed the Visnukundin genealogy from the raging controversy and pointed out that the combined list of kings known from the two Tummalagudem charters was the line of succession of the Visnukundin kings in the main line. But, he too has been obsessed by the incompatible evidence of the pōlamūrū plates in adopting such a scheme of Visnukundin genealogy and presented two alternative
schemes first, by identifying Vikramahendra with Mādhavavarman, the donor's father of the Tummalagūḍem (set I) plates, suggesting it to be the title of the king. The other was prefixing the list of kings known from the Tummalagūḍem (set I) plates to the schemes of genealogy, previously arranged by D.C. Sircar, but metaphorical mention of the king by a title, instead of personal name, was not the usual practice of the Viṣṇukundins.

III. Conclusion:

The Pōlamūru plates having been considered spurious and unreliable in the reconstruction of the Viṣṇukundin genealogy and chronology, the combined list of kings known from the two Tummalagūḍem charters remains the most satisfactory scheme of the dynastic succession of the kings. The Saka date, given in the second of the charters provides the more reliable evidence for the purpose of arranging the chronology of the dynasty.

A. The Trikūṭamalaẏa Branch (I):

Fixing proper place to the donor of Êpūrû (set II) plates, viz. Mādhavavarman and his father Devavarman, requires some attention. His identification with the king of the same name in the Chikkullā and Rēmatīrthām plates, was clearly pointed out by
D.C. Sircar, as next to impossibility. On the other hand, his grandfather Mādhavavarman, who was also a performer of eleven Āśvamedhas, and thousand krūtas, has to be identified with the homonymous mentioned in the said two records. Thus, Mādhavavarman, the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates and his father Devavarman, form a collateral line.

But most of the scholars, including D.C. Sircar, in his earlier writings, accommodated Devavarman and his son in the main line of succession. V.S. Ramachandra Murthy pointed out that the two kings were not in the main line and ruled over the country of Trikūṭamalayā. He supported the identification of the places, as suggested by B.V. Krishnarao and pointed out that the dayādas, exterminated by Indravarman, were the members of this line. A detailed analysis of the contemporary political situation in Āndhradesā surely points out that a collateral power, Trikūṭa branch of the dynasty, has been constituted for the upkeep of their authority over the territories south of the river Kṛṣṇā. The history of the Trikūṭa branch and its dissolution will be dealt within these pages, at appropriate places.
It has to be pointed out in this context, that scholars in the past fixed the places of Devavarman and Mādhavavaran forming the right wing of the genealogical schema. It was obviously, under the impression that they formed the older branch of the dynasty. But there is no evidence to substantiate the conclusion and in view of the fact, that the successors of Vikramendravaran I continuously ruled the kingdom, it is plausible to take him as the successor of Mādhavavaran II. The former was invariably spoken of, as the son of the Vākātaka Mahādevī and the statement supports the conclusion that he, not Devavarman, who had no such claim, was the legal successor of Mādhavavaran II. Hence, the line of kings that succeeded Vikramendravaran I was the main line and has to be shown on the right side of the table, as arranged below.

B. Chronology of the Dynasty:

The chronology of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin can now be fixed by calculating the regnal years of the kings from the base year A.D. 565-566, the eleventh regnal year of Vikramendravaran II. His reign of fourteen years can be assigned to the period, A.D. 555-570.
Indravarmān, the father and predecessor of Vikramendravarttāna II, has to be assigned a reign of 30 years, between A.D. 525-555, because, his Ramātirtham plates are dated in his 27th regnal year and a margin of 3 years has to be assigned to his rule, on circumstantial evidence.

Some scholars opine that Vikramendravarttāna I never ascended the throne, while some others allot him a reign of five to ten years, in such a way as to suit their own schemes of chronology. There is reason to believe that he ruled the kingdom, but it may not be more than a decade between A.D. 515-525, in view of the long reigns of his father as well as son.

Mādhavavarttāna II, the father and predecessor of Vikramendravarttāna I, was the greatest of the dynasty and is known to have ruled for 40 or 48 years, according to his pōlamūrū plates. It has been concluded above, that the king must have granted the gift of pōlamūrū about the same time as the Īpūrū (set I) plates, in his 37th regnal year, during the same expedition to conquer the East. The pōlamūrū plates must have wrongly quoted the date and the king may be allowed a reign of 40 years, with a reasonable margin of 3 years, which can be substantiated in the
light of circumstantial evidence. Govindavarman, who preceded Mādhavavarman, was the donor of the Tummalaṅgūḍām (set I) charter dated in his 37th regnal year and he may be allowed a rule of 40 years.

Nothing about the lives and achievements of two early members, Indravarman I and Mādhavavarman, mentioned in the Tummalaṅgūḍām (set I) charter. As per the general usage, they may be assigned a reign of 25 years each.

As to the lower limit of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin chronology, scholars in the past surmised on the basis of the proximity of dates of the two pālamūru plates, that it lasted up to the invasion of Pulakesin II. Thus much trouble was taken to fix the lower limit of the Viṣṇukūṇḍin chronology at A.D. 610 or 615 or 621. But the genealogy of the dynasty now settled, based on the combined lists of kings of the Tummalaṅgūḍām plates makes Vikramandravarman II the last king of the line. His reign cannot be supposed, in the present state of knowledge, to have continued beyond the year A.D. 570. But there would be no lacuna in the early Āndhra chronology between the year A.D. 570, when the Viṣṇukūṇḍin rule disappeared and 617, the year in which Pulakesin II is now known to have invaded coastal Āndhra, as shown below, in these pages. The Viṣṇukūṇḍin genealogy and chronology can be, arranged as shown below:
Indravarman I  
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Mādhava Varman I  
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Govinda Varman  
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(performed eleven Adhamas and thousand kratus.)

Vikramendravarman I  
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Dāravarman  
Mañcana Bhaṭṭāraka

Indravarman II  
or Indrabhaṭṭārakavarmān  
(the donor of the Rāmatīrthām plates.)

525-555

Mādhava Varman II  
(the donor of the Īpūrū (set II) plates.)
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or Vikramendrabhaṭṭārakavarmān  
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