APPENDIX VII

A NOTE ON "AVASITA-VIVIDHA-DIVYA ETC."

The Polamuru set I praises Madhavavarman IV as avasita-vividha-divya-stri-vap-nagara-bhevana-sata-varama-yuvati-jana-viharana-ratip (lines 8-9). Scholars who have edited and interpreted this record (JDL, XI, pp. 31 ff; JAHRS, VI, pp. 17 ff; SS, pp. 127 ff., 334 ff.) split this passage into two epithets viz. avasita-vividha-diyyah and Trivaranagara-bhevana etc.

The interpretation of the first epithet poses a problem. For, avasita generally means "abolished" or "put an end to" and diyya is used in the sense of "ordeals" in the Dharmaashastras. Therefore the epithet under question should ordinarily mean "one who has abolished the various types of ordeals". But Madhavavarman of the grant, on account of his performance of Avasita eleven times has been taken to be "a fanatic" (SS, p. 127). At the same time the present epithet thus interpreted would characterise the king as a great judicial reformer. Therefore scholars find it a bit difficult to reconcile these two allegedly contradictory claims of the king. Naturally they have been compelled to take avasita in the less popular sense, viz. "known" or "accomplished". So, it is believed by all that the epithet avasita-vividha-diyyah means "one who has known or accomplished the various forms of ordeals". This interpretation has consequently led to much speculation regarding the king's
alleged administration of justice by āryas (SS, 127-28 etc.; BD., pp. 540 ff; etc.).

The second epithet viz. Trivarānagara etc. is taken to be a parallel of Trivarānagara etc. of the Ipur set I. The meaning and significance of this epithet have already been fully discussed (Appendix I) and they need no repetition. However it may be pointed that the reading in the present case is Trivarā etc. and not Trivarā etc. as we have in the Ipur set I (See also II, XXIII, p. 90).

Now, regarding the generally approved meaning of the first epithet (viz. avasita-vividha-diwarah) one may be permitted to observe this: It is extremely doubtful if any king of the ancient India would have claimed to be an accomplisher of ordeals, in spite of the fact that they have been sanctioned by the Dharmaśastras. For, leaving the present case there is not a single instance either in literature or in epigraphs where a king is found making such or similar claim.

On the contrary, there are umpteen instances in literature where the poets, while praising the just rule of the kings, declare that there had been no necessity for such ordeals in their respective kingdoms. For example, Subandhu describes that while the king Chintāmāni was ruling, the purification by fire and by balance (i.e. the two forms of ordeals) was found necessary only for gold and not for
human beings (agni-tulā-śuddhi suvarpaṇam. See Vasava. p. 23). He also praises the reign of the hero Śringārāsekhara as having no occasion for the ordeal by balance even for kanyās or young ladies (śaśiṇaḥ kanyā-tulā-rūpanam - ibid. p. 145). It may be remembered that no ordeal other than that by balance is prescribed for the fair sex. (SS, pp. 368-69). Likewise, Bāṇabhaṭṭa tells us that the different divyas like those by water, by fire, by balance and by poison, had disappeared in the kingdom of Tārapiḍa (cf. Vanakarīnām vāruṇapravāsap, vratīnām-śaṃdiṣṭhapam, grahaṇām tulā-rūpanam, Aṣṭātyādaye viṣhaṇaṇdhī. See Kāda. p. 126). Therefore there can hardly be any doubt now that avasītā-vividha-diyaṇ means "one who has terminated (by his exemplary and just rule) the different ordeals". The fact that the author of the Polamuru (I) text had tried to emulate the writers of Bāṇa's type is clear from lines 14 ff. of that record itself (See translation of the same, and Inscr. X, notes 31 ff.) The above aversion to the diivas, shown by the writers in general, may be due to the fact that even the Smṛtis, which prescribe them for settling legal disputes, make it quite clear that the kings or judges should taken them only as a last resort where all of his other means of settlements, like reasoning, arguments, evidences etc., prove to be ineffective. (See passages quoted in Viṇ. Vyavahāra., p. 169). So it is unlikely that the prasastikāras of ancient India were inclined to describe their heroes as experts in using the diivas.
Another interpretation of the above title of Madhavavaran may also be possible. In the lexicons the word avasita is recognised also in the sense of "rich" and "stored" or "accumulated". Besides, Prof. Jacobi has shown that at times the word "divya" may mean "insignia of royalty". (Tawney's The Ocean of Story, Ed. N.M. Penzer, Vol. V, p. 175). These meanings also seem to suit well to the present context. Therefore the epithet under question may also be translated as "one whose royal insignia are rich and varied" or "one who has accumulated variety of the royal insignia". The reference to the insignia of royalty of Madhavavaran IV immediately following description of that king as a sovereign of the daśa-śata-sakalā-dharaṇītala, i.e. chakravartti-kshetra (see Appendix VI) reminds us of the Kavyamāna of Rajasēkhara. For there also the list of royal insignia of the chakravarttins immediately follows the definition of Chakravartin as a lord of the daśa-śatī-chakravartti-kshetra. The relevant passage runs as follows:

\[
\text{daśa-śatī-chakravartti-kshetra ī tēm vilavamīnīā-
chakravarttī bhavatī ī chakravartti-chimāni tu :}
\text{Chakram ratō nepir-bhārvā nīdhīr = āvā gajas-tathā ī}
\text{prōktānī sāpta ratānānī sarvāhām chakravarttinnam} \overline{\text{I}}
\text{(Kāvya. p. 92).}
\]

The verse in the above passage means "The insignia of Chakravarttins are: the wheel of authority, the chariot, the
gem, the wife, the treasure, the horse and the elephant.
(These) are stated to be the seven jewels of all shakravartins". It is also interesting to observe, in this context that while narrating the story of the rise of one Vishnuvardhana, stated to be the grandfather of Pulakesi I, the Chellur plates of Vīra Chōga (SII, I, pp. 49ff.) tell us that the said ruler had accumulated variety of insignia of sovereignty for himself and became the ruler of the Southern Chakravartikshetra or South India between the Setu and the Narmadā. And there the passage in question runs:

Śvātātarattvā + + yamunācīnī + + +
śamrāitvā-caihānī samādāya + + Setu-
Narmadā-madhvām Dakṣināpatham pālahānāșa
(ibid. p. 54, lines 23-26; see also Bh, pp. 34 ff.).

The title of Madhavavarman under discussion may be interpreted in another way also. For in the passage evagita-vividha + + + ratih quoted above, the author has employed the words in such a way that both the above titles put together may also make a single epithet and it may praise the king as the "one who has put an end to (his) desire to play with celestial ladies, and with the best women (of his own) in the house in (his) best city". The epithet thus interpreted would indicate that Madhavavarman had an aversion to enjoy things both in this world as well as in the other. (in-āmutra-bhāsa-virāga). This title of the king with some
sort of philosophical import may be compared, to a certain extent, with a similar epithet of his grandfather Vikramendra-varman viz. *virahita-ripu-shaag-
vara* meaning "one who is free from the six Enemies (viz. Desire, Anger, etc.)"
(Inscr. X, line 3). The above description of Mādhavavarman IV, as interpreted now, reminds us of a similar description of the aged Raghu by Kālidāsa. The verse under question goes:

Viśāvēṣu viṇēa-dharmē-apātri niṣprītha = bhavat. (Raghu. VIII, verse 10). By his 68th regnal year, Mādhavavarman IV might have passed 68, and the composer of the Polamuru text perhaps thought it appropriate to picture his aged hero in the way Kālidāsa had characterised his aged hero Raghu in the above verse.

Before concluding it may be pointed out that indulging himself in the ślesha or pun, the author of the Polamuru text perhaps intended to convey all the above and other possible ideas - not one or two alone - by the epithet (or epithets) under examination, viz. *sastra-vidha-dīya-sīrī-(or ṛś-
Trī)varga-pasa-sāva-sagata-parama-yuvtī-
aṇa-viharapa-
ratih.*