CHAPTER V

GLORY

In the last chapter we have seen that the achievements of Mādhavavarman II followed one after another in quick succession. It is quite natural therefore that Mādhavavarman's prestige was ever on the ascent. He had before him the example of the Vakaṭakas, who had been once the overlords of his predecessors. He married a Vakaṭaka princess and found the rulers of her family boasting themselves of their glory exhibited by a surprisingly large number of royal sacrifices performed by Pravarasēna I. He also noticed the Bhārāśiva Nāgas, also related to the Vakaṭakas by marriage, exhibited their glory by performing Dasāsvamādhas or ten Horse-sacrifices. The Pallavas whom Mādhavavarman conquered, were also found glorifying their family on account of the Asvamādhas performed by them. Naturally Mādhavavarman thought it worthwhile to emulate them all. Why should he not perform more sacrifices? Besides performing a good number of royal sacrifices, Mādhavavarman II also assumed a few titles to mark off his glory. Here in this chapter the significance of both the sacrifices and the titles may be studied.

1) Sacrifices of Mādhavavarman II

The following list of Mādhavavarman's sacrifices is furnished by the epigraphs of his own as well as of his successors:
Many of these sacrifices are characterised in the śrūta literature as Rājaśāyas or sacrifices of the kings. Of the eleven sacrifices of the above list only the first two are claimed by Madhavavarman II himself in his own charters. They are stated to have been performed by him in the charters of his grandsons also. However all the eleven sacrifices are stated to have been performed by him in the inscriptions of his great-grandson. This discrepancy naturally raises a doubt in one's mind whether many Madhavavarman II actually performed all these sacrifices or whether many or a few of them were fathered upon him by the later members of his family. Moreover the ritualistic, religious and philosophical aspects of these sacrifices had been dealt with well by scholars like Julius Eggling, Macdonell, Keith, P.V. Kane, etc. Yet let us try here to understand the significance of these sacrifices confirming ourselves only to those aspects of them
that are quite essential for a proper knowledge of the history of the Vishṇu-kūṇḍis and for a clear understanding of the texts of their charters.

Prājāpatya: A writer has recently tried to identify this sacrifice with its namesake prescribed by the Gṛṣṇa-purāṇa as a prāyaśchittā or expiatory ceremony prescribed for the kings committing sins like illicit intercourse with women (agamyā-gamana), and drinking wine (śurā-pāṇa). But this Purānic Prājāpatya is after all a kṛichhchhra or penance which is defined by Manu, and others and it hardly fits in the Chikkulla list of the royal śrauta sacrifices. Moreover no king could be expected to boast himself, or his most revered forefather, of the observance of such a penance specially prescribed for the said heinous sins in the Purāṇa. Therefore the Prājāpatya of Madhava-varman seems to be nothing but the śrauta sacrifice of that name which, as the Tāndyamahābṛahmanā and Āpastamba-śrautasūtra say, is one of the eight sapṭāha-sacrifices which consists of an atirātra and prāṣṭhāya-śaḍahana.

Agnishtōmasahasra or Krāṭu-sahasra: These two expressions had been taken to mean "thousands of sacrifices" by some scholars and "one thousand Agnishtōma or krāṭu" by others. However they appear to be used to denote a single sacrifice named Sahasradakshin-āgnishtōma or Sahasradakshinapkrāṭu mentioned in the Śaṛutasūtras. It is a modified form of the gōma sacrifice (gōma-viṅkṛti) and sometimes referred
to simply as Sahaara. In the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, an Agnishtoma i.e., an ēkaṇa of the agnishtomasamsthā is prescribed with thousand dakshipas so that it may reap the reward of the Garga- trirātra (i.e. a three-day sacrifice comprising Agnishtoma, Ukṣhyā and Atirātra). Apart from this, three other ēkaṇa-sacrifices that are called Sahaaras have sahasradakshinas. They are Jyotir-Agnishtoma, Sarvaviṣṭa and Viāvaivistas. Sāyāṇa too speaks of an Apāryāma sacrifice (i.e. the last of the seven Soma-samsthās) with sahasra-dakshina or thousand fees, the performer of which is called Sahastrasāyaṇa. It is interesting to note that in the records, Madhavavarman actually styles himself as Agnishtoma (or kratu)-sahasrayāṇa. Thus the expression Agnishtoma-sahasra and Kratu-sahasra are of technical import and mean one and the same.

Purushamedha: This is a royal sacrifice consisting of forty days out of which twenty-three are dikshas (consecration), twelve upasās (i.e. form of ceremony) and five sutivas. It must be noted that the group of the sacrificial victims in this sacrifice includes also a human being. However he is not slaughtered but set free after the fire is carried round him (i.e. paryagnikarana). In the place of the purushaśāṇa or human victim, only ghee is offered as oblation. Thus the purushamedha is merely a symbolic offering of human being. It must be borne in mind that nowhere in literature the actual slaughter of man in sacrifice is prescribed and described. On the other hand it is condemned by the authorities like the Satapatha and the Mahābhārata. Scholars like Eggling and Keith had focussed the attention of
of scholars to many of these points as early as 1900. Therefore to condemn Madhavavarman as an "abominable fanatic" because of his performance of Parushamādha, can hardly be justified.

**Sarvamādha**: This is a type of Soma sacrifice of ten sутa days out of which the fifth and sixth are respectively the Āśvamedhika or Parushamādha days. Madhavavarman’s title **Sarvamādha-āyanta-sarvabhūta-svārāyīya** meaning “one who has attained the supremacy of all beings through Sarvamādha” reminds us of the Vedic passage एताद्याजानेन सर्वमेधेः sarvamādhaḥ sarvāḥ bhūtāṁ śraishēṣāṁ svārāyāyam adhīpyatyaṁ parvēti.

**Bahusuvarnaikādaśa**: The sacrifice Bahusuvarna seems to be same as Bahuhiraya, as one-day (ekaha) sacrifice of Agnishtoma type. As this sacrifice is praised highly as to bring to its performer the reward of the conquest of the regions of the luminaries (ज्वितिष्मतो लोकः-जयति) it is bracketed in the Epics along with other important sacrifices like Agnishtoma, Āśvamedha, Rājasuya etc. Therefore it is not without purpose that Madhavavarman is described as a performer of the Bahusuvarna. Madhavavarman claims to have performed this sacrifice eleven times. As this sacrifice does not involve as much time and as much difficulty as the Āśvamedha does, we may accept this claim of Madhavavarman at its face value. However, it must be confessed that the significance of the number eleven in this context is too difficult to explain satisfactorily at present.
Ekādaśa-Paṇḍarīka: Paṇḍarīka is an ahina-type of sacrifice consisting of eleven sutva (i.e. pressing of Soma) days, and it has the Dvādaśāha sacrifice as its prakṛiti or prototype. It is prescribed for the reward of svārāiya or supremacy. It is enjoined that the dakshinā or fees for the sacrifice are 10,000 cows and 1,000 horses. According to the Pūrva-Kimēśa-sūtras, as interpreted by Śabara-śvāmin, the above fees are to be given as a single unit, only once in the rite, i.e. in one of the sutva days. But, the Satvāgha-āgrantasūtra stipulates that there are altogether eleven fees, of which the first ten, consisting of 10,000 cows each, are to be given on each of the first ten days and the eleventh consisting of 1,000 horses is to be given on the eleventh or the last day. The follower of the second school distributing eleven fees as against the single fee of the former school would naturally believe that more fees beget proportionately more rewards. And he would also claim that his Paṇḍarīka would be equal to eleven Paṇḍarīkas of the other school.

That the performer of an ahina-type of sacrifice does have the choice of multiplying the dakshinā by the number of the sutva-days and that by performing the sacrifice in that manner he can claim to have performed as many such sacrifices, seem to receive support from the Aśvamedhaarvan of the Mahābhārata. The Aśvamedha is an ahina-type of sacrifice with three sutva days, and therefore like the Paṇḍarīka it is also a vikṛti or derived form of sacrifice of the Dvādaśāha. The Epic tells us that while Yudhisṭhir was about to
the *Aśvamedha*, the great sage Vyāsa advised the king to triple the fees (i.e. to multiply the fees by the number of the *ṣutya* days) of the sacrifice which has such a choice (*vikalpavān*) so that his *Aśvamedha* might become three *Aśvamedhas*.

In the light of the above discussion we may suggest that Mādhavavarman perhaps performed actually a single *Pauṇḍarīka* but, following the formula of Satyāśādha, distributed eleven-fold *dakṣinās* so that the sacrifice may be called technically *Ekādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka*. Of course, this sacrifice is not as difficult as the *Aśvamedha* is, and it is therefore not unthinkable that the king performed it eleven times as he did in the case of the *Bhūsavarna*. But in this sense the question that would naturally follow will be "Why did Mādhavavarman perform only eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas*, neither more nor less?" On the other hand, if the above technical sense is accepted, no such question can arise. For, by repeating the *dakṣinā* in the sacrifice one can claim eleven *Pauṇḍarīkas* only, neither more nor less. Again in some of the records the expression is *Ekādaśa-Pauṇḍarīka* while in some others it is simply *Pauṇḍarīka*. An interpreter of the former expression in the ordinary sense may find it difficult to explain this discrepancy satisfactorily. On the other hand following the technical sense, it is possible to explain that all the records refer to one and the same *Pauṇḍarīka*, while some of them add a few details of that
sacrifice. Truely, it is always better to accept new attributes to the already known thing rather than to accept new things themselves.

Mādhavavarman's title Ekaḍāśa-Paṇḍarīka-prāpta-sarvārdhi is based on the Śrautā-sūtra that runs as "Tāna (=Paṇḍarīkāna) sarvam-piddhim-piddhimti."

Ekaḍāśa-Āśvamedha: Much has been written on Mādhavavarman's claim of Ekaḍāśa-Āśvamedha meaning "eleven Āśvamedhas". Some of these writers have gone as far as to suggest that even a feudatory king could perform the Āśvamedha. Scholars have already answered those points with detailed and convincing arguments, and they need not be repeated here.

Writers usually hesitate to admit such a high claim of Mādhavavarman. The main difficulty the scholars seem to experience in this connection is this: The performer of the Āśvamedha is expected to protect the sacrificial horse let loose to roam about at its will for a year. From the three gāthās or verses in the Śataāṣṭha Brāhmaṇa and from the vast number of chapters of the Āśvamedhāparvan of the Mahābhārata, it is clear how difficult the task of protecting the horse would be. For, Arjuna, appointed in the task, had to conquer many and many a monarch who tried to snatch away the animal. Similarly in the Mañjuśrīnimitra, Kālidāsa refers to the fight that resulted when Pushyamitra Śunga's sacrificial horse was taken away by the Yavanas. Mādhavavarman was not the most powerful monarch of his time as the Epic heroes like Yudhīṣṭhīra and Arjuna, and the Śunga king of the histori-
cal period were. Further, while the great warriors like Pushyamitra, Samudragupta could not perform more than one or two Asvamedhas, how is it that a much less powerful king like Mādhavavarman could claim the performance of the sacrifice, not once or twice, but eleven times? Even the Bharasiva Nāgas claim only ten Asvamedhas and that too for their family as a whole. No doubt the Kadamba king Mayūravarman (originally Osarman) is credited with the performance of eighteen horse-sacrifices in an inscription of the time of the later Chālukya king Vikramāditya VI. But the early records of the Kadamba family are completely silent about it. On the other hand Mādhavavarman himself claims, in his own records, eleven horse-sacrifices.

But it must be borne in mind that no such fight and difficulty in protecting the sacrificial steed are stated to have been experienced by Dāsaratha and Rāma when their horse sacrifices are described in the Rāmāyana. Again in the Epic, Rāma is stated to have decided to perform the Asvamedha instead of the Rājasuya on the ground that the latter involves fierce fights resulting in the annihilation of many royal families. These tend to show that the seizure of the horse and the consequent fight recorded in the Satapatha and the Mahābhārata were not the necessary features of the sacrifice. Moreover even if the sacrificial animal was snatched away by a powerful enemy, the sacrifice need not be stopped on that account. A new horse could be brought in as a substitute and the sacrifice could be continued. It had the sanction of the Āruti. Nor is this
all. The dharma or the law of ethics of ancient India seems to have expected every king to see that the sacrifice was conducted in all success. This is clear from Śrī Kṛṣṇa's declaration in the Mahābhārata while enlisting the grave and hideous crimes committed by Śiśupāla. In his list, the third crime is that the arch-villain had formerly managed to carry away a sacrificial horse, let loose to roam about, so that the Āsvamedha might be stopped.

That is why only Indra, and no earthly prince, is pictured in the epics as to have thought it fit to carry away the sacrificial horses of Dilīpa, Sāgara etc. When the king Janamejāya thought of performing the Āsvamedha, the sage Vyāsa is said to have warned the king of the hindrance to his rite from Indra alone. Even in the Mālavikāgnimitra only the Yavana, and not any Indian prince, is characterised as capable of committing the sin of carrying away the sacrificial horse. In this connection one should not lose sight of another fact also: While in ancient India there were many kings, both great and small, claiming one or more Āsvamedhas, one is yet to meet a monarch in the history boasting himself as a conqueror of kings in the battles connected with his horse sacrifice. Nor is there an instance of a king boasting himself that he had snatched away the horse of an Āsvamedha of his enemy. All these may indicate that any independent king of ancient India was allowed to carry on his Āsvamedha to a successful end.
the latest example of this being Sawai Jayasingh of Amber (1699-1744).

The real difficulty regarding Asvamedha therefore seems to lie only in the long period of time required for it, and not in anything else. According to the śrānta writers it can be performed once in two years. Bādhāyana unequivocally declares that the period required for a single Asvamedha is three years. How was it possible for Madhavavarman to spend thirty-three \((11 \times 3 = 33)\) years on the Asvamedhas alone during his reign period of about 40 years? Again how did he find time to perform other sacrifices he claims? The difficulty in explaining his claims assumes a formidable proportion, especially when one remembers that Madhavavarman's reign was very much crowded with repeated wars.

By way of offering a solution it has been suggested by some that the performer of a single Asvamedha may be looked upon as a performer of three or eleven such sacrifices if he gives three or eleven times the dakshina prescribed for the rite. In support of this view our attention has been drawn to the passage in the Asvamedhavaṇya of the Mahābhārata where, as we had already occasion to see, the sage Vyāsa advised Yudhishṭhira to triple the dakshina of the sacrifice so that the Pāṇḍava might get three Asvamedhas. Another instance cited in support of this contention is this: In the Sāntiṇavaṇya the emperor Bharata is stated to have
performed 1,000 Asvamedhas and at the same time, is said to have sacrificed actually 334 steeds (334 x 3 = 1002).

On the basis of these facts it is concluded that Madhavavarman performed only one Asvamedha but with eleven fold dakshinā.

As has already been shown, in a given ahīna sacrifice like Asvamedha, a vikritī of the Dwadasaḥa, the prescribed dakshinā can be optionally multiplied by the number of the sutvānas, the sacrifice consists. It is well-known that the number of sutvānas in the Asvamedha is only three. That seems to be the reason why the sage advised the Pandava only to triple the fees and not more. The same fact perhaps explains why the ratio of Bharata's Asvamedhas with the horses he actually sacrificed seems to be 3 : 1. Thus it is extremely unlikely that Madhavavarman went against the injunctions and gave away eleven fold dakshinā in his single Asvamedha, so that he could claim eleven such sacrifices.

Therefore scholars may be on the right side when they suggest that Madhavavarman's Asvamedhas were perhaps of a type which was probably easier and less populous than that described in the Epic. But what could have been that easier form remains yet to be seen. In this connection the following two alternatives may be considered:

(1) The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa praises that the Nārasapūrṇamāsa (i.e., the New-Moon and Full-Moon Sacrifices as
a single unit) is the prākrita or original Aśvamedha and that the "well known Aśvamedha is just a modified one".

The same authority further adds that the performer of the Dāranāyukamāsa along with Agnihūtra, performs, in fact, the Aśvamedha every month. This may be an arthavāda or eulogium to show the importance of the Dāranāyukamāsa in general. Yet basing on this one may suggest, provisionally at least, that the major number of Mādhavavarman's Aśvamedhas were actually the original Aśvamedhas of the Śatapatha Brahmāṇa viz. the New-Moon and Full-Moon sacrifices. But at the same time the Vishnuśaṇḍi seems to have performed at least one regular Aśvamedha of great fame. This is suggested not only by his political achievements but also by his own epithet ēkādaśa-Aśvamedh-āvabhṛthā-āvadhanta-jagat-kalmasha meaning "one who has purified the whole world by the final purificatory bath (āvabhṛthā) of the eleven horse-sacrifices". For, from Manu we come to know that the āvabhṛthā of the famous Aśvamedha alone can destroy all the sins of all people who take part in it. Moreover in the New-Moon and Full-Moon Sacrifice there is no āvabhṛthā as such and the ritual of sprinkling water in some directions is considered to be only a symbolic one.

(2) The second alternative may be this: While discussing the meaning of the word saṁvatsara "year", the teachers of the Pṛyavānīmaṇḍa conclude that, as the span of man's life is quite brief and uncertain, the
above word in certain cases may have to be taken in the secondary sense viz., "one month" or "twelve days", as suggested by the Śrutī itself. Now if it is permitted to apply this principle to the śūtra of Bṛhadāyana etc., referred to earlier, then it may be suggested that Mādhavā- varman performed eleven real Āśvamedhas, each being completed in three months or thirty-six days (3 x 12 = 36).

Now arises a question: What is the significance of the number eleven? In other words, why does Mādhavāvarman claim to have performed only eleven such sacrifices, neither more nor less? A direct and satisfactory answer to this pertinent question is beyond what one can venture at present with the available material. However subject to the future researches what one may provisionally suggest is this: In the Rāmāyana, the hero Rāma, desirous of performing the Āśvamedha, is depicted as quoting an instance of how an earlier monarch performed that sacrifice to please god Rudra and how that god gave great boons to that king. It is well known that the Rudras are eleven in number. It is also equally well known that the Vishṇu- kṛṣṇa was a staunch devotee of Rudra-Śiva in the form of Śripaṇaśātanāmin. Therefore it may be that Mādhavavārman performed eleven Āśvamedhas, perhaps one for each of the eleven Rudras.

In this connection one may not be right to presume that number eleven might have been taken from the context of the Pāṇḍarīka and is applied to that of the Āśvamedha.
and Bahusuvarna simply in order to add the titles more weight. For, as has been shown over and again, the drafters of the texts of the charters seem to have been well acquainted with šrauta-literature and it is not likely that they could have done such a blunder. Moreover the above presumption would land one in another difficult problem of explaining why the same number has not been applied to the context of Mādhavavarman's other great sacrifices like, Sārvamēṭha, Vēḷapēṭa, Kēlagēya, etc.

Some scholars were inclined to be critical of Mādhavavarman as a fanatic on account of his performance of Aśvamēṭha. For, they point out "that no one except a fanatic can be expected to perform an Aśvamēṭha sacrifice and expose his wives to such indecent and obnoxious practices as are necessary in the performance of this sacrifice." But, if one is permitted to pass such a judgement in that light, then one may condemn as fanatics of first order all the great epic heroes, like Rāma, Yudhishṭhira etc. and all the great kings of the historical period like the Guptās, the Vakājakas, the Pallavas etc. who are known to have performed the sacrifice. On the other hand in ancient India, the performers of the Aśvamēṭha were venerated and the performance of that sacrifice was viewed as a great achievement. Moreover it is also not clear whether Mādhavavarman's sacrifice consisted of those practices of only a substitute or some symbolic actions in the place of them.
Rājasūyaprādhīryā: This expression occurs only in the Chikkulla plates and scholars have taken Prādhīryā as the name of a separate sacrifice. However adhirāya, evidently same as prādhīryā, means 'supermacy' and the Kandulapalem plates tell us that Mādhava-varman demonstrated or proved (upapādita) his adhirāya by his Rājasūyā performed according to the Vedic injunctions. Therefore in the Chikkulla plates also Rājasūyaprādhīryā may have to be understood only in the sense "Rājasūyā (that demonstrates) Prādhīryā".

Regarding the Rājasūyā, we had already an occasion to see how Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyāna, abandoned the idea of performing that great sacrifice on the ground that it results in bloody wars and in the annihilation of many royal families. A considerable portion of the Sabhāparvan of the Mābhārata is devoted to record how in connection with this sacrifice the Pṛṇḍavas had to encounter with many kings and how that rite led to fierce battle in which Śrī Kṛṣṇa killed Śīśupāla.

However there are reasons to believe that at times the princes of ancient India did not choose to fight with the performer of the Rājasūyā, and that, instead, they supported and encouraged the performer out of their regard and affection to him and out of their respect towards the sacrifice. For, in the Sabhāparvan itself Śrī Kṛṣṇa is said to given hints to Yudhisṭhira at the possibility
that many mighty monarchs might avoid fighting with the 
Pāṇḍava out of their respect towards him. At the time 
of Yudhishṭhira's Rājasya, Śiśupāla is depicted to have 
declared that many kings including himself had paid 
the Pāṇḍava their kara or tribute willingly, and not out 
of fear or otherwise. Vyāsa records that at the time of 
that sacrifice many kings paid huge wealth to Yudhishṭhira 
simply out of their regard to that great rite.

A study of Mādhavavarman's political career reveals 
that that monarch successfully maintained friendly and 
marital relationship with almost all the important royal 
families of the Deccan of his time, excepting the Pālavas 
whom also he had vanquished twice. So, it may not be wrong 
to suggest that Mādhavavarman might not have struggled 
very hard for his Rājasya and that his contemporary major 
powers, like the Vākaṭakas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānapura, 
the Kadambas of Banavāsi, all perhaps encouraged the 
Vishṇukupūḍi in his performance of the Rājasya.

The other three sacrifices of the list viz., the 
Uktha, Shodasīn and Vajasa are do not call for any special 
comment.

Other pious activities: Apart from the above sacrific 
es Mādhavavarman also celebrated the Hiranyagarbha-
manādāna and the misconception regarding his title Hiranyagarbha-prasāta has been brought to an end by Dr. Sircar 
by ably commenting upon it.
Madhavavarman's pious activities appear to have included also taking bath in the holy waters as evidenced by his epithet śāna-purvādka-pavitrikipta-siras, occurring in the Ramatirtham plates. This epithet, together with the fact that the gift village of the Khanapur plates (viz. Rēṭṭuṛaka) was very near the Krishna river and included two centres of holy bath (viz. Tamabtirtha and Kadambatirtha) seem to suggest that Madhavavarman, the ruler of the middle valley and deltaic area of the Krishna went perhaps on a pilgrimage to the upper reaches of the river, as that territory was under his ally or relative i.e. the Rāṣṭrakūṭa. It is probable that he took baths in the holy waters in the region and arranged for gifts of lands there.

ii) Titles of Madhavavarman

Almost all the titles of Madhavavarman are based on different sacrifices he performed and therefore are of religious import. Many of these titles and their significance had already been studied in the last section. Here let us therefore confine ourselves only to those titles, so far untouched. One such title praises the monarch to have got what is called paramēṣṭhitva or paramēṣṭhya by performing many sacrifices. Prof. Kielhorn took the above word in the sense of "supremacy". Recently an attempt has been made to interpret the word in the sense of "the status of saintly being". Consequently it has also...
been concluded that such a description indicates the beginning of a saga of Madhavavarman. But the lexicons do not generally appear to recognise paramēśṭhin in the sense of "saintly being". Further as we have seen on many occasions, Madhavavarman's titles, in connection with his sacrifices are scrupulously based on the phala-viḍhī or promises of rewards of the respective sacrifices. But there appears to be no such phala-viḍhī declaring the attainment of the status of saintly being a reward of any sacrifice.

On the other hand, from the Sabhacarvan of the Mahābhārata we learn that on hearing the extraordinary strength of Jarāsandha, the king Yudhishthira was afraid that even if he started performing the Rājasūya he might not attain its reward paramēśṭya. The Aitarāva Brāhmaṇa includes paramēśṭya in the list of rewards of the great anointing ceremony (mahābhishēka). As paramēśṭhin is primarily a synonym of praśāpati, Mitramiśra and Sayana correctly interpret paramēśṭya as praśāpati-loka-prāpti or attaining the regions of Prajāpati. The Anuśasanaśāstra also tells us that the regions of Prajāpati are only for those kings who are anointed (abhishiktā) after the Rājasūya and who have performed the Aśvamedha.

Thus the present epithet of Madhavavarman, just like other epithets of his, show that the authors of the
records had a good knowledge of the śrauta literature. Therefore it is improbable that they thought of "saintly being" by paramāṇūṭha.

Another title of Mādhavavarman is dēvātideva and it is found in the Kandulapalem plates. As the lexicons recognise the word dēva in the sense of 'king' the above title seems to be more or less a synonym of rājaśīla or rājaśīlalāla, the high sounding titles of some of the kings of ancient India. In this connection it may be observed that the poet Bāṇabhaṭṭa, whose date is not far removed from that of the Kandulapalem plates, endows his hero Harsha with the title dēvadeva, which, as Cowel and Thomas have rightly rendered, means only "king of kings". The above title of Mādhavavarman may also mean "most worshipful".

It is not unlikely that Vikramendravarman II, the donor of Kandulapalem plates regarded his great grandfather as "the most worshipful" just like Kunti did her father-in-law, the sage Vyāsa. Thus there is no justification in rendering the title as "supreme god" and in consequently regarding it as a step towards the "development of the Mādhavavarman Saga". Even the title bhagavat of the Eastern Ganga king Anāṅgabhaṅga III (c. 1211-39 A.D.), that has been quoted as an epigraphical parallel of Dēvātideva is in fact used only figuratively, to mean that the king had the virtues of wisdom, power, strength, dominion, might and glory unalloyed with blemish. The scholars who had already dealt with the meaning of the word at length had also come
to more or less the same conclusion.

It may also be pointed out that even if the titles dēvāti dēva is taken to be a case of deification there is nothing strange in it. For, in fact the great and serious law giver Manu praises the king in general as an epitome of all the eight lōkanālas. And the writers like Subandhu and Bāpabhaṭṭa take all pain to describe how their respective heroes not only resembled, but also in some respects surpassed, the great gods like Indra, Viṣṇu, Śiva etc. And the theory of divine origin of kingship is well-known from the famous maxim nā-Viṣṇun prithivinatih.

Mādhavavarman's another title viz., sthīrakarman is quite interesting. It is usually rendered as "one whose religious rites are everlasting". But Kaushitīya seems to describe sthīrakarman as the one who would not stop without completing his work. Kālidāsa also praises the hero Aja as a sthīrakarman who would not abandon his work in the middle without achieving success. Therefore the title may better be understood in the sense of "a person of great preseverance in (all his) actions".
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