PART THREE

APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

TRIVARANAGARA

The Vishṇuṅkupṭa king Madhavavarman of the Ipur set I is endowed with the title Trivaranagara-bhavana-gata-yuvatilana-hṛidaya-nandana meaning "one who has delighted the hearts of the young women in the houses at Trivaranagara". The king Madhavavarman of the Polamuru set I is also found endowed with the same title in a slightly modified form. Scholars who have dealt with the history of the Vishṇuṅkupṭa sharply differ from one another in identifying Trivaranagara and in interpreting the title. Their views fall into five distinct schools. They are as follows:

1) The first school, started by Sri H. Krishna Sastri, believes in the North Indian origin of the Vishṇuṅkupṭa and proposes to identify Trivaranagara with Tripuri or Tewar, the capital of the Kalachuris, near Jabalpur (ARE, 1920, p. 99).

2) The second school is of Dr. Bultsch. It does not subscribe to the above theory of identification of Trivaranagara with the distant Twar or Tripuri. But it believes that the place was a residence of Madhavavarman. However, it has made no attempt to identify this place. (EI, XVII, p. 235).

3) The third school was founded by Sri Lakshman Rao. On the basis of the epithet under discussion this school attributes both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to one and the same Madhavavarman of the post-Indrabhāṭṭārakavarman period.
It underlines the Trivaranagara-Tripuri equation of the first school, but takes the epithet as indicative of the Vishṇukūḍi’s marriage with a princess of Tripuri (JDL, XI, p. 39).

4) The fourth school has been started by Dr. D.C. Sircar. On the basis of the epithets of eleven Asvamedhas and Agnishaṭoṣa-sahasra, this school ascribes both the Ipur (I) and Polemuru (I) charters to that Mādhavavarman who was the grandfather of Indrabhaṭṭaraka-varman. It renders the expression Trivaranagara as “the city of (the king) Trivara”. It identifies this Trivara with Tīvara of the Pāṇḍava family (also called Sōmavāṁśa) of South Kosala. It looks upon the epithet under question as indicative of the king’s conquest of that city. Coming to the age of the said Tīvara, this school rejects the opinion of Dr. Fleet and Prof. Kielhorn in whose opinion the characters of the Pāṇḍava records are of the eighth century. On the contrary, it concurs with those who assign the said charters to the 6th century (SS, pp. 129 ff; CA, p. 203). Some scholars who follow this school have also worked out a synchronism of Mādhavavarman with the Pāṇḍava king Tīvara by assigning the former to 525-68 A.D., and the latter to 530-50 A.D. (EI, XXII, p. 21).

5) The fifth school is of Prof. K.A.N. Sastri. It interprets the expression Trivaranagara in the sense of “three good cities”. It concludes that the epithet under question therefore “means no more than that there were three flourishing cities in the Vishṇukūḍi kingdom where the king resided by turn” (CA, p. 225).
It may be seen that out of the above five schools, the second and fifth ones, in spite of their mutual differences, agree to locate what is called Trivaranagara within the Vishnukundli kingdom itself, viz. the Vengi country. Thus they constitute a single group which may be hereinafter called as the First Group. Likewise the first, third and fifth schools, notwithstanding their individual disagreements, concur to locate Trivaranagara outside the Vengi country. These three schools may be referred to hereinafter as the Second Group. Even among these three schools, the first and the third ones identify Trivaranagara with Tripuri while the fourth school equates it with a Panḍava capital. The relative popularity of these groups is this:

No scholar now takes up the First Group seriously while many writers favour the Second Group. Even there also, only a few believe (EI, XXV, p. 263) in the Trivaranagara=Tripuri equation of the first and the third schools. On the contrary, many including a good number of writers who ascribe both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates to the later Madhavavarman have joined the fourth school of Trivaranagara=Panḍava-capital equation (EI, XXII, pp. 19 ff; EI, XXII, p. 91; BD, pp. 620 ff; QSMS, XXX, pp. 63, 314 ff; APGAS, No. 8, pp. 15-16; etc.) Thus, the title proves to be a mysterious one. Hence an attempt is made here to arrive at a plausible solution to this problem.

To begin with one may examine the respective theories
of the different schools of the popular Second Group.

School 1) Regarding the first school, it hardly needs to be pointed out now that, in view of what has been studied in detail earlier (Ch. II and III), it is no longer possible to maintain, with reason, the theory of North Indian origin of the Vishṇukunḍis.

School 3) Coming to the third school, one may naturally ask why Tripurī should be referred to as Trivanagare at all, not only once, but twice. For, in the Betul inscription of Saṅkshōbha of the Gupta year 199 (518 A.D.) (EI, VIII, p. 284 ff.) the Jubbulpur area is called only as Tripurīvishaya (EI, XXVI, p. 228). Again it has already been seen that Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set I was different from, and much earlier than, Mādhavavarman of the Polapur set I. Therefore the interpretation of this school would naturally lead to an untenable assumption that both the Vishṇukunḍis married the princesses of Tripurī of their respective times.

If, on the basis of the epithet, both the said records are attributed to the earlier Mādhavavarman (i.e. Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman's grandfather), then it would be inexplicable why that Mādhavavarman should boast himself of his marriage with a Tripurī princess alone. For, in his records he appears not to care even to refer to his marriage with the princess of the Vākṣaṭaka family, the most supreme power of the Deccan of the period. The question of ascribing the above two charters to the later Mādhavavarman of the post-Indrabhaṭṭāraka-varman period will be discussed subsequently.
While studying the theory of most popular fourth school, the following points may be borne in mind:

The Kondedda (EI, XIX, pp. 275 ff.) and Nivina (ibid., XXI, pp. 24 ff.) grants of Mānabhīta Dharmarāja (c. 695-730 A.D.) (EI, XXXIV, p. 113) credit that Sailōdbhava king with a spectacular victory over a Sailōdbhava scion Mādhavavarman along with the latter's ally Trīvara in a war at the foot of the Vindhyas. The said Sailōdbhava charters bear no dates in any era and therefore on palaeographical grounds they are to be assigned to the 8th century A.D. At the same time the above Trīvara of these records is also be taken as a Pāṇḍava ruler of South Kosala. So the scholars of this school are compelled to maintain (EI, XXI, p. 21 f.n. 5; EI, XXXIV, pp. 112-13) that there were two Trīvāras in the Pāṇḍava family. The first of them, who issued the Rajim (CII, III, pp. 291 ff.), Baloda (EI, VII, pp. 104 ff.) and Bonda (EI, XXXIV, pp. 111 ff.) plates is to be assigned to the third quarter of the sixth century; and it was this king who is referred to in the epithet of the Vishṇukupśi Mādhavavarman, now under discussion. The second Trīvara, unknown otherwise, is believed to be a descendant of the first and to have been defeated by the Sailōdbhava Dharmarāja along with his protege Mādhavavarman. It is really interesting how to note that the same scholars, who are allergic to the very idea of two Vishṇukupśi Mādhavvarmanas of eleven Aśvamedhas, thus find themselves in a situation where they can not escape
maintaining the existence of two Pāṇḍava Tīvras, both of whom had political contacts, in one way or other, with their neighbouring kings who were named Mādhavavarman and both the contacts proved to be disastrous for both the Pāṇḍavas.

Furthermore, it has already been seen that Mādhavavarman, the grandfather of Indrabhaṭṭarakaḥavarman is to be assigned to the later half of the fifth century. At the same time, even according to the liberal view of the fourth school, the first Tīvra is to be assigned only to the second or third quarter of the sixth century (EI, XXII, p. 19; EI, XXXIV, p. 113). So this school may have to accept necessarily one more Pāṇḍava Tīvra in the fifth century, simply to be vanquished by his contemporary Vīshukūṣṇi Mādhavavarman.

As we saw earlier, the fourth school includes also those scholars who, on the basis of the title under question, ascribe both the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) records to the last of the Mādhavavarmanas. As that king is assigned to 565-612 A.D., these scholars may avoid a similar predicament of accepting a Tīvra in the fifth century and may conveniently identify the alleged adversary of the said Mādhavavarman with that Tīvra of the Rājim plates etc. But as we have seen over and again, there are many a reason to believe that the Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I was quite different from, and much later than, that Mādhavavarman of the Ipur set I.

Now, it may also be seen that even if both the above plates are attributed to Mādhavavarman IV simply on the basis
of the epithet Trivaranaeara etc., ignoring all the other reasons given earlier, it may not be possible to work out a synchronism of that Vishpukundhi with the Pândava Tîvara. Firstly, the palaeography of the Pândava records would come in the way. For, it has been accepted on all hands that there must have been one Tîvara in the Pândava family about the last quarter of the seventh century and that it was this king who was defeated by the Śailodbhava king Dharmarâja. In fact, there appears to be no valid reason why one should not identify that Tîvara himself with the issuer of the Rajim plates etc. Really there is much truth when scholars point out (EI, XXV, p. 268 ff.) that the forms of the letters in the Bhandak inscription of Nanna (or of Bhavadeva Rânakēsarîn) (Bhandarker's list No. 1650; JRAS, 1905, pp. 617 ff.) the father of Tîvara are later than those of the Arang plates of Bhūmasēna II of Gupta year 282 (=601 A.D.) (EI, IX, pp. 342 ff.); and that the former do not differ much from the characters of the said Kondedda and Nivina grants. Therefore Nanna's son Tîvara may have to be placed in the last quarter of the 7th century, i.e. nearly half a century after the total disappearance of the Vishpukundhis.

By way of counteracting the above argument of palaeography, some have proposed to read the date of the Arang plates as 182 (501 A.D.), and not as 282 (602 A.D.) (EI, XXVI, 287-28). But the untenability of that reading has already been exposed even by those scholars who too believe in the Tîvara-Madhava-varman synchronism (CA, p. 218 fin.; EI, XXXIII, p. 256).
In this connection one may also add that the characters of the Arang plates bear a good resemblance to that of the Kanas (Puri District) Plates of Lokaviraha, dated in Gupta year 280 (600 A.D.) (EI, XXVIII, plate facing p. 331).

A similarity between the characters of the Panduvarasi records and those of the Bodh-Gaya inscription of Mahanāman of the Gupta] year 269 (588-89 A.D.) (CIII, III, pp. 274 ff.) has been suggested as an antidote to the above palaeographical difficulty. Consequently it has been concluded that a date about 550 A.D., or the third quarter of the sixth century for Tīvara is not palaeographically impossible. (EI, XXVI, p. 228; XXXIV, p. 112). But it is not clear why, in order to arrive at the approximate date of the characters of the Bhandak (Chanda District, Maharashtra) inscription one should go all the way to the far off Bodh-Gaya (Gaya District) in search of the inscription of Mahanāman, especially when there is a dated inscription of Bhimesāṇa II at Araṅg (Raipur District, M.P.) nearby. In fact, an inscription of the very same Bhavādeva Raṇakāśarin comes from Araṅg itself (Hiralal's List, II Ed., p. 110, No. 183). And the above Bhandak inscription is also believed to have originally come from Araṅg (EI, XXIII, pp. 116 ff., XXXIII, pp. 252 ff.). Thus on the above reasons of palaeography, Tīvara is to be assigned to a period not earlier than the middle of the seventh century, when the Vishnuśukūḍis had already disappeared.

However, to fix up a date for Tīvara in the sixth century,
the above scholars do not depend so much on the palaeography of the Pāṇḍava records (for they have been assigned to the eighth century by Kielhorn - EI, IV, p. 258; and Fleet - CII, III, p. 294) and their language and style (for they may point to the seventh century also - EI, XXII, p. 118) as they do on Prof. Raychaudhuri's theory (PHAII, I Ed. 1923, p. 305; VI Ed. 1953, p. 605) of the supposed synchronism of Tīvara's nephew Harshagupta with the Maukhari Sūryavarman of the Haraha inscription of V.S. 611 (554-55 A.D.) (EI, XIV, p. 110). This synchronism, if accepted would naturally lead us to the Tīvara-Mādhavavarma synchronism. But, the above theory is based on the suggested identification of the said Maukhari with his namesake who figures as the father-in-law of Harshagupta in the latter's son Mahāśīvagupta Bālārjuna's Sirpur inscription (EI, XI, pp. 184 ff). The relevant passage of that record, on which the theory rests, runs as follows:

Nishpaṇkte Magadhādhinatyamaheśatam jatah kulē Varmanēm
+p + + + + + i yam-āśāvya utaṁ Himāchala iva ārī-
Sūryavarmanā nirapā, praṁ prāk-Paramēśvara-āvasurat-
āgarvanikharvam padam i (EI, XI, p. 191, verse 16).
(yam stands for Vāsaṭā, the queen of Harshagupta)

This verse clearly shows that Harshagupta's father-
in-law Sūryavarman belonged to the family of the Varmas. There are scholars who are of the opinion that that family was different from the family of the Maukharis (EI, XXV, p. 270) and that that Sūryavarman flourished in about the
eighth century and belonged to the Western Magadha dynasty (EI, XI, p. 185). It may also be added here that the Maukharis never called themselves Varmans, though, they had names ending in varman, just as the names of the kings in many other contemporary dynasties of India. Had the author of the Sirpur prasasti thought of a Maukari in the context, he would have as well composed something like utpanna Magadhādhipatva-mahatām ārī- Maukharipāṇī kulā etc.

Moreover any attempt to assign Tīvara either to the last quarter or to the middle of the sixth century so as to make him a contemporary of Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru set I may go counter to certain accepted facts in the history of South Kosala. For, the very scholars of this fourth school (EI, XXII, p. 17; CA, p. 219) are inclined to identify the king Sarabha the founder of the Sarabhāpurīya dynasty with his namesake, the maternal grandfather of Goparāja, who was a feudatory of the Gupta king Bhanugupta and who died a heroic death at Eran in 510 A.D., as stated in the Eran pillar inscription of that king, dated Gupta year 191 (510-11 A.D.) (CII, III, pp. 91 ff.). Consequently, the chief Sarabha may have to be assigned to the last quarter of the fifth century i.e. 475-500 A.D. It is known that the said chief was followed on the Sarabhapura throne by (1) (his son) Narendra, (2) (the latter's son) Prasannamātra, (3) (his son) Jayarāja, (4) (his brother) Mānamātra Durgarāja, (5) (his son) Sudēvarāja and (6) (his brother) pravararāja. The last king or one of
of his immediate successors is believed to have been overthrown by the Pāṇḍavaṇḍi king Nanna or his son Tīvara (CA, pp. 219-20 and 715). To accommodate all these rulers between 500 and 575 or 600 A.D. is not easy without some unnecessary assumption. Further, according to another scholar of this school, who assigns, as we have already seen, Tīvara to 530-50 A.D. (EI, XXII, p. 21) and who prefers to take the date of Arang plates of Bhīmasēna II to be 501-02 A.D., the last mentioned king, viz. Bhīmasēna II, was overthrown soon after that date by the Śarabhapurīya king Jayarāja (EI, XXVI, p. 229). The latter's rule was followed, as we know by the reigns of the rulers listed above. The difficulty of accommodating all these reigns between 502 A.D. and 550 A.D. is quite obvious.

On the other hand, it is natural to assume that the reigns of those six or seven kings must have comprised normally atleast about 125 or 150 years. Therefore Tīvara may have to be assigned to sometime later than the middle of the 7th century. This suggestion seems to receive corroboration from the synchronism of that king with the Śailodhava Dharmarāja, the grandson of Mādhavarāja II i.e. Sainyabhīta Mādhavarāja of the Ganjam plates of the time of Śaśāṅka, dated in Gupta year 300 (619-20 A.D.) (EI, VI, 143 ff. See CA, p. 145).

Thus from the point of view of the genealogy and chronology of both the Vishṇukunḍi family and of the Pāṇḍava rulers; and also from the point of view the palaeography and
contents of letters' charters it is clear that the Pāṇḍuvamśi king Tivara might not have been a contemporary either of the second or the fourth of the Mādhavavarmans of the Vishṇukundī family. Therefore that king cannot be thought of here while interpreting the epithet under question.

Even the meaning of that title seems to go against the suggestion of Mādhavavarman's victory over Tivara. As we have already seen, the epithet means that Mādhavavarman delighted the hearts of the women in the houses of what is called Tīvaranagara. Here the expression Tīvaranagara does not seem to have been used in the sense of "the city of Tivara". For, usually the royal cities do not seem to have been referred to in that fashion. On the other hand there are names of cities like Vijayanūra of the Ikṣvākus, Pravarapura of the Vākaṭakas, Sarabhapura of the Sarabhapuriyas, Indrapura of the Vishṇukundīs, Yātīnagura of Yātīpurā of the Śomavamśis of Orissa and so on. These names, may indicate that the cities were founded respectively by individuals named Vijaya, Prava etc. But, they cannot possibly mean "the city of Vijaya" etc. In the same way the name Tīvaranagara too, though indicates its founder, may not establish the contemporaneity of Mādhava-varman with Tivara. It may also be borne in mind that the Pāṇḍava records speak of Śripura perhaps as the royal capital and they do not refer to any such Tīvaranagara at all.

The second and perhaps more important point is this:
If Madhavavarman was a conqueror of Tivara and his city, he could have hardly delighted the hearts of the women folks there. Rather, he must have made them weep. Literature is abundant with the descriptions of sufferings of the women of the vanquished enemies. Cf. e.g. chaksbur-viksheno vipakshena-naripam, an epithet of Gurjara prince Rašaka (EI, XXVI, p. 201, line 14) and nirmalasyāpi maliniśīrāti-vanīta-mukha-kamalagunatāp, a description of Tarapīḍa (Gāda, p. 121).

By way of suggesting a way-out, two scholars of the fourth school have cited two examples each (SS, p. 401; EI, XXII, p. 20). The first example is a passage that refers to the kaumāra-kelī of Laksmanasena in the Madhainagar copper plate of that king. It is believed that the above kelī was with the women of Kalinga which the king conquered. But in fact, the passage under question in that record speaks only of the said Sena king's kaumāra-kelī or child's play in the form of the seizure of the wealth of a Gauḍa king by violence (cf. Asid-gauḍēavara-śrī-nātha-parapa-kalā vasya kaumāra-kelib - N.G. Majumdar, Inscr. Bengal, III, p. 111, verse 11).

The second example cited in this connection is the passage from the Bilhari inscription of the Kalachuri king Yuvarāja II, in which the king Kēyuravarsha Yuvarāja I is described to have fulfilled the desire of the Gauḍa woman, and to have enjoyed the women of Kāraṇṭa, Lāṭa, Kāśimīra and Kaliṅga (CII, IV, p. 211, verse 24). But this description may simply indicate that the author of that verse, followed in his description, the age-old tradition of the Indian poets
who often indulge in praising their prosperous heroes to have drawn to their harems princesses from different communities and countries. Vālmīki description of Rāvana in that manner (Rāma. V. ix, verses 68-69; xxii, verse 45) is well known.

In the fourth act of his Viddhasalabhaññika, the poet Rājaśekhara describes the hero Karpūravarsa as having married princesses of Magadha, Mālava, Pāṇchāla, Avantī, Jālandhara and Kērala (CII, V, p. lxxvii f.). These descriptions, even if they are to be taken seriously, can only indicate that those princesses were in the harems of the respective heroes. Again, unless there are evidences to the contrary, these passages may better be taken as an indication of a cordial relationship of those heroes with the hometown of those princesses.

The third example is the eighteenth verse in the fourth act of Rājaśekhara’s Viddhasalabhaññika. True, in this example the feet of the hero of the play viz. Karpūravarsa are described to have been worshipped by the women of the Mūrala country, which the king’s commander Śrīvatsa had just conquered. But, it must not be forgotten that the victory of the commander was yet to be known by the king and that at the same time those Mūrala women are stated to be remaining along with the king in his capital Tripūrī itself and not in the Mūrala capital. For, the verse in question runs Svasti śrīmat-Tripūryān + + + Mūrala-jana-yadhū-lēchanair-archya-śrānā etc. So, there is no question of the women of the vanquished enemy’s country remaining in their city and feeling happy about the victory of the conqueror.
The fourth example is the 1069th verse from the Gandavahā of Vākpati. But, in fact there the unmarried daughters (kumārīs) of Yasōvarman's enemies are stated to have an amorous play with that monarch of Kanauj only after they had become his wives by a gāndharva form of marriage. Here, Vākpati evidently follows the path of Valmīki, who describes, at length, how Rāvaṇa had brought to his capital Lāṅkā many princesses as booty of wars and how they madly fell in love with him (Rāma, V, canto 9, verses 69-70). It is one of the ways of Indian poets, describing the saubhāgya (i.e. grace or prosperity) of the heroes. Therefore, the contrast between Mādhavavarman's title we are discussing on one hand and these four examples on the other is too glaring to be missed. So, the epithet Trivaranagara etc. may not indicate Mādhavavarman's conquest of Trīvara and the his (Trīvara's) capital.

Now the implications of the theories of different schools of the First Group may also be studied.

School 5) Coming to this school the doubt that arises first is this: If Trivaranagara of the title under examination means simply "three good cities" in the Vishṇukūṇḍi kingdom, how is it that no Vishṇukūṇḍi other than Mādhavavarman IV (for this school ascribe both the first sets of the Ipur and Polamuru plates to that king) is endowed with that title? Moreover, a description of the kings and heroes in that fashion is not met with anywhere else.
School 3) In fact the solution seems to lie in the third school of Dr. Hultzsch who has taken Trivaranagara to be the name of the residence of the king. An interpretation of the epithet bearing on this meaning of Trivaranagara may be well in tune with the Indian poetic tradition of describing the women folks of the capital cities to have felt elated when their beloved kings and princes went around in the streets of the cities (See MB, Sānti. Ch. 39, verses 3-4; Kāda. p. 185; Kathā. Lambaka III, Taranga vi, verse 223, Brihatkathā-mahā-jātaka, Lambaka III, verses 311-14, 414).

Thus, it is almost certain that Trivaranagara was the capital of the Vishṇu-kuṇḍis and that the epithet under question signifies that the king Madhavavarman II brought prosperity to this capital. Trivaranagara has already been identified with the modern Tiruvuru, the headquarter of the taluk of that name in the Krishna District. The circumstances, under which both the Madhavavarmans of the Ipur (I) and Polamuru (I) plates shifted their capitals from Indrapura to Trivaranagara, have already been studied (Ch. IV, Sect. ii; Ch. VII, Sects. i and ii). This may explain why other Vishṇu-kuṇḍis are not endowed with such or similar title.