CHAPTER X

ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS
The pattern of administration in the region and period under study was in no way different from other parts of the contemporary Deccan. We get hardly any details regarding the administration during the Sātavāhana and the Vakāṭaka periods in whose kingdoms the area was included. A clearer picture however emerges with the rise of the Chālukyas of Badami. The system of administration in this kingdom was also the same as the one laid down by Kauṭilya and followed in the earlier empires of the Mauryas and the Guptas. It is well-known that the pattern continued in the Deccan under the subsequent dynasties viz., the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa and the Śēṅgas. There might have been some changes here and there but broadly the pattern continued to be the same. It was
however, considerably affected with the entry of the Muslims in the beginning of the 14th century A.D. In course of time, with the establishment of the Muslim rule, the system of course, totally changed.

The system of administration followed in the period under study in the kingdoms of the Chālukyas, the Rāṣṭra-kūṭas and the Sēṇas is practically well-known and the sources from the region under study do not throw new light. The subject is therefore dealt with here only briefly.

The accepted form of Government was hereditary monarchy and the king was the head of the State. He was the supreme authority; yet he had his own limitations which prevented him from becoming an autocrat. He was governed by dharma and he dared not violate the laws, customs and traditions existing in his period.

An interesting feature of administration of this period is the decentralization of the functions of the Government and the freedom given to the different bodies in running the administration. The high officers, many of whom were governors of administrative divisions, the feudatory chiefs, the trade guilds and the village assemblies enjoyed considerable importance within their jurisdictions
and the central authority hardly interfered. Thus though the state was unitary in principle, in practice power was distributed and to a great extent it curbed the absolute authority of the king. That is why Shri S.K. Ayyanger remarked: "while the form of Hindu government may be described as a monarchy and even an autocracy and while it may readily even be conceded that the Hindu monarch had autocratic powers for application in times of emergency, the actual use of the power was made in a way to satisfy the exacting demands even of a pure and complete democracy, not only in form but more completely in spirit and that is what is really wanted, not the mere form of it."

The primary duty of the king was to protect the people and to all that was necessary for maintaining law and order and for promoting the well-being of the people. A king was expected to be a vījītāhu, a conqueror, and perhaps this was one reason for constant fights with the neighbouring rulers. The description of different kings in the inscriptions under study are indeed conventional yet they do give us an idea as to how they were engaged in religious and charitable activities such as temple building, honouring the religious teachers, making profuse grants for religious and educational purposes. Not that
everything was running in ideal circumstances. Fights for throne, personal ambitions and the like might have affected the political life but not many details of that type are available to us.

The administration was conducted by a host of officers who were picked up by the king for ability and uprightness. Many of them rose to eminence by means of their personal ability, skill in administration and valour in the war front. Such officers were normally known by the name Amātya, Pradhāna and some of them bore high sounding titles like Mahāpradhāna, Mahādandanaśvaka and so on. Though it can be imagined that when there were a large number of officers, the work of Government was distributed among them but it is difficult to know anything about the hierarchy or the gradation among such officers. It is sometimes held that Mahāpradhāna was higher than the Pradhāna or that Sachiva was lower than the Pradhāna and the like, but really speaking the sources at our disposal do not give any indication to that effect. On the other hand, it is clear that such superlative titles were ascribed to persons who showed extra-ordinary ability and skill.

Different branches of administration were headed by different officers such as Śrī Karana (The record officer)
Antahpurādhhyakṣa (officer in charge of the royal household)
Mahāpasāyita (Officer in charge of royal gifts) Mahēsandhi-vigrahika (officer for war and peace) and the like.

Finances were managed by the department meant for that purpose which was headed by Śulka-Adhyakṣa or Suṅka-Adhikāri who was in charge of collection of taxes. Bhāndārīga was in charge of royal treasury.

There were lower officers at the division and lower levels. Taxes were levied on agricultural land and house sites. Land was classified according to its fertility and irrigational facilities. It was measured into units for the purpose of assessment. The usual terms we get to denote such units are Mattar, Kamma or Kāma and Nivartana.

The inscriptions of the region also give the names of large number of taxes on land such as Siddhāya and Aruvana. Property and Professions were also taxed. Tolls were collected when the mercantile goods entered the market area. Sale and purchase also came under taxation. The goods carried on animals such as oxen, donkeys and elephants also came under taxation.

Inscriptions also refer to variety of coins, such as Nishka, Dramma, Gadyāna, Paṇa, Ėga, Kāni, Bēla and Vīsa.
It is however, difficult to know the exact denomination and mutual relationship and value between these coins. Nishka and Gadyana were gold coins and Dreemma was a silver coin.

Looking to the large number of terms denoting the taxes it looks as though taxation was heavy but hardly there are instances in the region under study, of expression of dissatisfaction or revolt by the people. Exemption from taxes was a dominant feature of the economy of these kingdoms. Land belonging to religious and educational institutions, articles meant for temple and religious purposes were exempted from taxation. The inscriptions in the region give the impression that exemptions were effected in very large numbers of cases. Modern economists may not approve of a system of heavy taxation and liberal exemption but perhaps the early economists thought that people in a position to pay were, as pay heavily to compensate the loss of revenue due to exemptions for religious, educational and other charitable purposes.

The military administration was managed by Senapati or Daundanavaka. The different wings were headed by officers like Turagasañhāni (chief of cavalry) Gaja-sañhāni (chief of the elephants) and the like. We hardly get reference to the
Rathas, a conventional wing of the army. Rathas must have been used for transport purposes but as regards their role in warfare our sources are silent. Occasionally we do get descriptions of heroism or the battles fought but such descriptions are almost always unconventional.

The judicial administration appears to have been conducted through different courts as laid down by Kautilya but hardly is there any reference to any aspect of this unit in our sources. An interesting feature of the ancient judiciary is the role of village assemblies. It is well known that each village had an Assembly of its own consisting of representatives called the Mahājana. They were learned scholars well versed in Law and traditions. They managed all the affairs of the village. They managed the temple property and they conducted educational institutions. They also settled disputes in the village. They were highly respected by the officers and the ruling monarchs and every activity in the village was conducted in their presence and with their permission. An interesting feature in this regard in the whole of Deccan is the fixation of a number of such Mahājanas in different villages, obviously depending on the size of the village. In the inscriptions of the Karnataka region we get copious references to Mahājanas and their number in villages of different sizes. Such instances are
however wanting in the inscriptions in the region under study.

**Provincial Administration:**

Provincial administration carried with it an interesting feature. Every kingdom used to be divided into different administrative divisions which were governed by members of the royal family or the officers appointed by the ruler. It is interesting to note that such offices were many times hereditary. Inscriptions of this region speak of Yuvarāja Mallikārjuna, the son of Vikramaditya VI, as governing some region in the Marathwada area.

There used to be also autonomous states which were governed by the feudatory families. In the matter of internal administration these feudatories were practically independent, with their own governmental set up analogous to the one at the centre. They had their own military also. The centre would not interfere in the administration of such states except in cases of revolts or other types of disturbances. Prominent among such feudatory families in the period and region under study were the Vāji, Vahni and Ratta, details about which are described earlier. Similarly, the names of different chiefs are associated with such
divisions as Brahirchohhasira-bâga, Muruâba 80, Gejje 700, Alande 1000, Avaravâdi and the like.

We shall now focus our attention to the study of such administrative units, big and small. The inscriptions in the period under study provide good details about the compositions of such units and we shall study them here in all the details since much new information is coming to light.

A characteristic feature of the formation of administrative units or divisions in the Deccan was affixing a numerical figure to such divisions. This method has its support in Kautilya but it came into practice more in the Deccan than anywhere else. The suggestion of Kautilya that such divisions should be grouped into specified numbers of villages was carried very far by the Deccan kingdoms. It began with the days of the Châlukyas of Badami and culminated in the days of the Châlukyas of Kalyâna. The usual terms to denote a division such as Nâdu, Dâsâ, Mandala, Kampana, and the like were in vogue but the names with numerical suffix are more predominant. Comparatively speaking this system was not so much in vogue in the contemporary southern kingdoms or the northern kingdoms.
There has been considerable discussion regarding the significance of the numerical figures affixed to such divisions e.g. It was held by Rice that the figure indicated the revenue income of the division. It was also suggested that the figure stood for population. Pran Nath suggested that the figure denoted the number of "estates" in a division. It was even suggested that when the suffixed figure was small it stood for the actual number of villages, in a division, while when the figure so suffixed was large, it indicated the number of the villages only figuratively. But it is worth noting that inscriptions in which such divisions with figures occur, do not admit of different types of explanations at all. In good number of cases the word grāma is used and in some cases the names of the grāmas included in the division are enumerated, e.g. in an inscription of Rāṣṭra-kūta king Amoghavarsha, a division Kolānūra 30 is mentioned, and all the thirty villages are enumerated. Even when a big figure is used the word grāma is associated; e.g. in the Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II the three Mahārāṣṭras of which he became the ruler is said to have consisted of 99000 grāmas. It can be noted here that in some areas there used to be a large number of villages situated close to each other depending on the fertility of the land and other facilities, while in some other areas the number of
villages in a particular area could be less and sparsely situated. Thus the figure suffixed to such divisions must be taken as the number of grāmas included in such a division. Divisions with such small figures as six (Tambalgrumbāda 6), twelve (Muḷugunda 12), thirty (Kukkanūr 30) dismiss the explanation that the figure indicated either revenue or population. Following are the prominent administrative divisions existing in different periods in the region under study.

Pratishṭāna → Pathe, Āhāra-Bhukti:

Pratishṭāna i.e. modern Paithan in Aurangabad district, has been an important historical place in the Marathwada region from the very early days. It is well-known that it was the capital of the Sātavāhanas in the early centuries of Christian era and even earlier. The region around was then known as Pratishṭāna patha. It figures in a number of donative records found at Sanchi. These inscriptions record the names of the devotees who went from this area and made donations at Sanchi. These inscriptions suggest that Rājataṭaka and Sadasevaju were situated in this patha. These places have been identified with Aurangabad and Ajanta respectively.
Under the Vakataka regime the region around Paithan was known as Supratishthita Ahara as an administrative unit. We come across three Vakataka records wherein the area mentioned as Supratishthita Ahara i.e. i) the Poona plates of Prabhavati Gupta, ii) the Jamb plates of Pravarasena II, and iii) the Wadgaon plates of the same ruler. It appears that Pratishthana or Supratishthapura was the divisional headquarters of the Ahara.

In the days of the Rashtrakutas the area came to be known as Pratishthana-Bhukti. There must have been changes in the jurisdiction also but details are not forthcoming. The Paithan plates of Govinda III, states that Kachcha or Sarakaccha, i.e. Sarakaccha division consisting of 12 villages was a part of the Bhukti. It is however not known as to how many villages were included in the Bhukti itself. The same Paithan plates state that Nimbaramika, Samatirthaka, Brahmapuri, Dhona or Vaṭagrāma, Vilva (Revā), Bhadra, Pratishthāna, Kacchauraja and Takli were situated in this Bhukti. The first named village was situated in Sarakaccha.

The grant village was Nimbārāmikā is stated to have been situated on the northern bank of the river Godāvari. It has not been possible to identify this place. Dr. Thosar
suggests that this village might have existed opposite of another village known as Nimārī on the southern bank of the Gōḍāvari in Sheggaon taluk of Ahmadnagar district. It is rather difficult to think that the grant of village could be so far off from the camping place of the king. Of the other villages, Samatīrthaka is identified with Shevata, Brahmapuri with Brahmandaon, Vaṭṭagrāma with Wedgaon, Takli with Mulani Takli, all in Paithan taluk of Aurangabad district. Sarakchohha, the headquarters of this division, has been identified with Kasode in Gangapur taluk though it is not known on what grounds it is done. Two other places mentioned in the inscription namely Bhadra and vilava are identified with Bhadli and Kutubkhede in Paithan taluk respectively.

The Jambgaon plates of Indra III mention some places in the vicinity of Paithan which therefore must have been included in the Pratīṣṭhāna-Bhukti. They are Khairondi, the donated village; to its north Nandaureaka; to the east Pipalagrāma; to the South Sirasikagrāma; and to the west Sedivalegrāma. The king was camping at Kurundaka, identified with Kurunda in Basmat taluk of Parbhani district. The grant village Khairondi is identified with Khirdi in Vaijapur taluk. Sirasikagrāma, Nandaureakagrāma and Sediyalegrāma are identified with Sirasgan, Aurangpur and Saigaon respectively all in Vaijapur.
Nāndikada-Mārga:

Nanded, the district headquarters in the Marathwada region, has great antiquity. In the days of the Vākāṭakas, it appears to have been the headquarters of an administrative division. The Basim plate of Vindhyaśēkta II mention a village Ākāsapāda which was situated near Takalakkhoppaka in the Northern region of Nāndikada. नांदिकादासा उत्तरामाग्गे ताकलाक्कहोपका भागाभ्यस्य अकासपादेसु।

Nāndikada is apparently modern Nanded. It is not known if it continued to be an administrative unit in the later days. In the Rāṣṭrakūta inscription at Kandhar it is mentioned as Nānditata where an educational institution is said to have been situated. This place occurs in the same form in the Ganeshwadi inscription of Vikramāditya VI, where Bhīmanātha a general of the latter king is said to have built a śāla. The Bargaon plates of Chālukya Vijyāditya mention a place Nandyāla on the bank of the Gōdāvari. Obviously, this Nandyāla also has to be identified with Nanded only.
Uchchhiva 40:

Uchchhiva 40 is an early administrative unit figuring in the Bergaon copper plate of Vijayaditya dated 520 A.D. It is stated that on the occasion of the king’s visit Nandyala i.e. Nanded, he made a grant of village Nāgarasōge situated in Uchchhiva 40 division. Other villages mentioned in this division are Mundi-grama to the east of Nāgarasōge, Amvayagrāma to the south of Nāgarasōge Karuva-gra to the west of Jayalagrāma, to further west Tungi-gra, Dhanagra, Vairivalagrāma, and Karanyagrāma.

Of these, Uchchhiva the headquarter of the division is identified with Ausa in Osmanabad district. The grant village Nāgarasōge is the same as Nāgarsoga in the Ausa taluk. Other identifications are as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscriptional name</th>
<th>Modern equivalent</th>
<th>Taluk</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tungi-gra</td>
<td>Tungi</td>
<td>Ausa</td>
<td>Osmanabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanora</td>
<td>Dhanora</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amvayagrāma</td>
<td>Amlala</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javalagrāma</td>
<td>Jawalga (Pomadevi)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanjagrāma</td>
<td>Karjgaon</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumurikhaila</td>
<td>Karemala</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuruva</td>
<td>Kurduwadi</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mundigräma  Daudpur  Ausa  Osmanabad
Nalandanadi  Nanand  "  "
Raktatataka  Taka  "  "
Vairivala  Viroli (Telori)  "  "

The above identifications are made by the editor of the plates, Shri G.H. Khare.

All the modern place names are almost similar except Daudour occurring in the inscription. Mundigräma is mentioned to the east of Nāgarasōge in the inscription but no such place can be located to the east of Nāgarasōge. Daudapura being situated to this direction, may be the changed name of Mundigräma. Obviously all these villages were situated in the Uchchhiva 40 division.

Bhallūki-Dēśā:

Bhallūki-Dēśā was another division in the kingdom of the Chālukyaś of Badami. The Jamalagama grant or Kasarasirsi plates of the Chālukya Vijayāditya mentions the grant of the village Jamalagama situated in between Pullevadali and Mugaligrama, to the west of Morakhamdi in the Bhallūki-Dēśā. As noted earlier the name of this division was read as Challiki-dēśā and it was suggested to be the home region of the Chālukyas. Rege reads it
as Challuki-desa and identified it with the Nasik region. As pointed out above, on an examination of facsimile published in E.I., Vol. XXVI, p. 313, it appears that the reading is Bhalliki or Bhallunki. Bhalluki occurs in Kannada inscriptions in the adjoining regions of Bidar district. In an inscription this division is named as Bhallunki-fesa and is identifiable with Bhalki, the headquarters of a taluk of the same name in Bidar district. Monkhandi is also situated in Bidar district. Other places namely Muguli and Jamalgama are identified with Jajan-Mugali and Heri-javalga or Bet-javalga. Hari-javalga is at a distance of eight miles to the west of Kal-Mugali and Bet-javalga is few miles to the North of Jajan-Mugali. It is approximately at a distance of twenty miles to the west of Kesarasirai and Thirty miles to the west of Marakhandi. Pullavadali is not traced.

**Dharaura-Vishaya:**

**Dharaura Vishaya** was an administrative unit during the Rāștrakūṭa period. We do not get any earlier reference to this division. This division figures in the Dharur plates of Gōvinda III of the 9th century A.D. (Beed grant). Dharaura, the headquarters of the division, is present Dharur in Kailj taluk of Bhir district. The grant village
Anhe-grama was situated in this division. The village is identified with Anegaon in the same taluk and district. Other villages situated in this division mentioned in the record as the boundaries of the grant village are: to the east of the grant village was situated Aivachhagrāma, to the south was Dhonigrāma, to the west was Vāuji-grāma and to the north Ananta-grāma. These villages are identified respectively with Avargaon, Dhanegaon, Bauchi, and Anandgaon all in Kaij taluk. Yet another locality called Paniathana was in the vicinity of Ananta-grāma but the identity of this locality is not certain.

It may be noted that this administrative unit perhaps continued in the subsequent periods also. No reference to this division is yet found in the inscriptions of Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa but in the Ambe inscription of Sēuṇa Siṅghaṇa, it is mentioned as Dhārsura-dēśa. It is stated that Khōleśvara the famous general of Siṅghaṇa II constructed a number of temples in this Dēśa.

The inscriptions of the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa which are found in large numbers in the region under study, mention many administrative divisions which were obviously created during this period for the purpose of efficient administration of the vast area.
Kuntaladesā

It is to be noted here that the whole of the Deccan formed Kuntaladesā. There has been considerable discussion on the extent of Kuntaladesā in different periods. Indeed the extent of Kuntala varied from period to period but by the time the Rashtrakutas established their hegemony in the Deccan, Kuntala came to stand for the region between the Godāvari in the North and the Kaveri in the South. The Rashtrakuta king Nāpatunga Amoghavarsha I describes this region as the region where Kannada was prevalent. This situation continued in the days of the Chalukyas of Kalyāna as well as the Śeṇas. A number of inscriptions on either bank of the Godāvari in the Marathwada region mention places as being part of Kuntala. In the south it extended over the whole of the present Karnataka area. In the thirteenth century both the Hoysala and Śeṇa kingdoms were situated in Kuntala only.

Alande 1000:

Alande 1000 was a prominent division in Kuntala covering adjacent areas in Maharashtra and Karnataka. Alande is modern Aland in the Aland taluk of Gulbarga district. This area roughly covered southern...
Osmanabad district and the adjoining northern region of Gulbarga district in Karnataka.

Gejje 700 was a big subdivision in Alande 1000. Gejje may perhaps be identified with Gajawadi in Tuljapur taluk, not far from Murum mentioned below:

Morumba was another division obviously adjoining Gejje 700. The same inscription tells us that a subordinate chief Rājarasa was governing this division and Gejje 700. Another inscription from the same place says that Morumba-Nādu was prominent in Alande 1000 which was a part of Kuntala.

From the three inscriptions in Morumba it becomes clear that among others the following villages were situated in the division. Koravura, Biḍaba, Tugāve, Būsenige and Mallarūdige. The probable identity of these villages is as below:

Koravura = Korhalli in Aland taluk of Gulbarga district; Biḍaba cannot be identified; Tugāve = Tugav in Aland taluk in Gulbarga district; Būsenige = Busnur in Aland taluk of Gulbarga district; Malleśūdige cannot be identified.

Benneyatora and Kesanahalla appear to be streams near Murum.
Dalimba was a small division in Morumba. Dalimba is modern Dalim in Omerga taluk of Osmanabad district.

Chinchvalli and Arjunige were two of the villages situated in this division. Chinchvalli is modern Chincholi on the borders of Osmanabad district in Aland taluk of Bulbarga district. Arjunige seems to be the village of the same name in Afzalpur taluk of Gulbarga district also adjacent to the Marathwada region.

A lengthy inscription from Kautha in Omerga taluk of Osmanabad district also describes Alande 1000 as a part of Kuntala. It further mentions a division of 15 villages but because of the unsatisfactory condition of preservation of the inscription, the name of the division cannot be made out. Kavitage i.e. modern Kautha the find spot of this record was situated in this division of 15 villages.

Another subdivision in Alande 1000 was one of 57 villages. It was called Aivattãlum-bada in an inscription from Narangwadi in Omerga taluk of Osmanabad district as a part of Alande 1000. Nagarakavadike i.e. the present Narangwadi was situated in this division. The same inscription mentions yet another division of 36 villages called
but it is difficult to ascertain if it was a part of Alande 1000.

Mannedadi 1000:

Another division of 1000 villages in this area was Mannedadī 1000.60 Mudugadū i.e. Ramling-Mudged in Nilange taluk of Osmanabad district, appears to have been the headquarters of a subdivision in this division. A lengthy inscription from this place which is badly preserved states thus: Mannedadī sāsirāda piriya kampānam .... Mudagedinalu 61.

Anandūru 300:

Anandūru, modern Andur in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district figures as the headquarters of a division of 300 villages in many inscriptions. From one inscription of this place 62 it can be gathered that the villages Dēvarapurā, Moraba and Honnipalli were included in this division. These villages are identified with Devkurali in Tuljapur taluk - Osmanabad district, Murum in Omerga taluk of Osmanabad district and Pimple in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district respectively.

Ankulga 86 was a subdivision in Anandūru 300. This information is obtained from an inscription at Itkal 63 in
Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district. Ankalgi is modern Ankalgi in Sholapur district. This subdivision figures also in inscriptions from Akkalke in Sholapur district.

From an inscription at Nilegaon dated 1192 A.D., we gather that the villages Nilegāve and Kuliyabhāga were situated in this subdivision. Nilegāve is modern Nilegaon, the find spot of the inscription in Tuljapur taluk of Osmanabad district. It is difficult to identify Kuliyabhāga. Nilegāve was donated to the Temple of Kapilā śiddhī Mallikārjuna at Sonnalige i.e. Sholapur which is not far off from Nilegaon.

Erad-irchhhēsāra-bāda:

The biggest administrative division under Chalukyas of Kalyāna in Marathwada was Erad-irchhūsāra-bāda occurring in a Karadkhed inscription. The Hottul inscription also mentions a big division i.e. Viṁśad-grāmesāta which is the same as the one mentioned in the Karadkhed inscription. This division consisted of 2000 villages grouped into two divisions of 1000 each. The Karadkhed inscription calls it Sahasramandala. The Bimra inscription mentions it as Sāyirābāga i.e. thousand villages. The Hottul inscription refers to it as Grāmaśeṣakā. The headquarters of the Sahasramandala was Karadikallu i.e. modern...
Karadkhed. The Bimra inscription mentions Avaravadi 700 as a part of this division. This may be modern Awarala in Biloli taluk in Nanded division. The village Kallakumbarigarave of this division may be equated as Kumbargaon, near Awarala.

The following are some of the villages included in this division as known from the inscriptions at Karadkhed. Alur = Alur in Biloli taluk; Borgave = Borgaon in Biloli taluk; Dayasavalige = Gavundagave, Gavudagave = Gaundgaon; Gukkave = in Deglur taluk, Hippalagave = Pippalgaon in Deglur taluk; Kavaligave = Kavalgaon in Deglur taluk; Nerlave = Nerli in Biloli taluk; Sahasramandal probably consisted of a smaller division of 80 villages called Sakkage. Sakkage the present Shekarga in Deglur taluk was the headquarters of this division. Places like Ehayigave, Ekkalagave and Tadaksallu included in this subdivision are identified with Bhaigaon in Deglur taluk, Eklara in Mukhed taluk and Tadkhel in Deglur taluk respectively, all in Nanded district.

Bödhana 700

Bödhana 700 was a division of 700 villages figuring in Sagrali and Karadkhed inscriptions. Bödhana is modern Bodhan, the taluk headquarters in Nizamabad district of
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Andhra Pradesh. This place is adjacent to Marathwada to the South-East of Deglur. There occurs a smaller division of 24 villages in this division viz., 24 Kampe numened in Sagroli inscription. The headquarters of this division was Savaravalli i.e. modern Sagroli in Biloli taluk, about 15 miles to the west of Bödhan.

The Ardhapur inscription refers to a small unit viz., Junnavanivishya comprising the area around modern Junni in Biloli taluk. This place is mentioned as Junnevalige in an inscription coming from Junni.

Vingapälidēsa:

An inscription from Rajna belonging to Seūna Siṅghaṇa II mentions Vingapälidēsa as being governed by Āmanadeva a subordinate of the king. This Vingapälidēsa is identified as area around Vinapali same as Hingoli in Hingoli taluk of Parbhani district.

Seūnādēsa:

Seūnādēsa was an administrative unit in the Chālukya kingdom governed by the early Seūna chiefs before they achieved imperial status. Hemādri places it around Danda- Karp Żyva with Dēvagiri as its chief town. On the basis of this statement Bhandarker thought that Seūnādēsa lay
between Nasik and Daulatabad. But the Asvi plates of Airamadeva extend its northern border upto the Narmada when they state that the Narmada flows in Sëunadësa. The Kalegaon plates of Mahadeva and the Paithan plates of Ramachandra describe Godavari as an ornament of Sëunadësa. These statements go to show that parts of Marathwada were included in Sëunadësa. The Paithan plates place Vadathana-grëma and Patåla Pîpalagrëma on the northern bank of the Godåvari in Sëunadësa. These villages are identified on the bank of Gôdåvari.

Sëunadësa also figures in the Neurgaon inscription of Ramachandra, Nûpuragrëma (i.e. Neurgaon), Gangapur taluk in Aurangabad district, the find spot of the inscription was obviously included in Sëunadësa. Nidhivåsa Kampanaka i.e. the subdivision of Nidhivåsa appears to have been a part of Sëunadësa according to this inscription. Nidhivåsa is modern Nevåsa in Ahmadnagar district not far off from Aurangabad. The villages referred to in the inscription are identified by the editor with those in the Nevåsa taluk of Ahmadnagar district. Bilva-grëma is identified to Belpandhari (Four miles from Nevåsa) and Pippala-grëma is equated Bel-pîmpalgaon about three miles in the same direction from Nevåsa. Surie-gau stands for modern Suregaon. Idala-gau is not identifiable. Punade-gau is present.
Punatgaon. Pachegāu is the old Pachegāu (these villages are on the northern bank of the river Pravara). Tākli is known as Takli-bhan and Domegrāma is present Domegaon. Ghogharagaon is a small village on the South bank of the Gōdāvari.

Kanhairi-dēsa;

The Purshottampuri plates of Rāmachandra mention a division called Kanhairi-dēsa and states that an officer of Rāmachandra created an Agrāhāra by combining 4 villages - Pokhari, Adagau, Vaghaura and Kurunaparagau. These villages were situated in Kanhairi-kampanaka a subdivision of Kanhairi-dēsa. The plates also give the names of hamlets attached to these villages and also the villages on the borders of the newly created Agrāhāra. These hamlets and villages are as below: Suēgāhvāṇa, Piṃpalagāhvāṇa, Fālipōkhāri (Pokhari), Piṃpalavāṇi, Kājalakōvi, Sōiжен (Adagau), Simpivihire, Gōlēgāhvāṇa, Dhāravāghāurē (Vaghaura).

Kanhairi the chief town of the kampana and the Dēsa is identified by Mirashi with Kanhairi "3 miles South-West of Chalisgaon in Khandesh" but Purshottampuri the Agrāhāra which is the modern Purshottampuri in Bhir district, situated in this division, could not have been so vast as
to spread from Bhir district to Khandesh. Realising this difficulty Dr. Thosar identifies this Kanhairi with Kandari in Ambed taluk of Aurangabad district. The other villages are identified as below by Dr. Mirashi: To the East of Purshottampuri Dandigau and Sadule, to the South Kesavapuri, Savarigava and Harikinibagau and to the West Rajagau, Hivare, Chinchavali and Mahadevapuri joined to Drugaleghvana. Purshottampuri is mentioned to the South of the Godavari.

An attempt is made to show these divisions in the map enclosed.
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