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Introduction

The review of the economy of Andhra region can not be completed without the discussion about the non-agrarian sector. While it covers the factors like transactions of commodities, types of merchants and use of metallic currency, the tendency to examine commercial activities in terms of requirements,\(^1\) the system of producing goods and the consumption and distribution of commodities by exchange at market places also are included in it.\(^2\) The recognition of the importance of the study of the non-agrarian sector in the field of the history of early India is relatively recent development and that too took place through different stages.

During the 6\(^{th}\) - 10\(^{th}\) century Andhra region, the non-agrarian sector of economy developed side by side the agrarian sphere. This sector included cattle-rearing, several artisanal activities and trade. Epigraphic references to these activities are small in number and sometimes their existence is understood only indirectly. B.D.Chattopadhyaya has commented that the rise of a kingdom or an empire would not necessarily bring in trade and urbanism. And he says “We have as yet no substantial evidence of either, for example, in the long-lasting kingdom of the Eastern Chalukyas of Andhra.”\(^3\) However, the situation was not so bad as has been perceived, though the number of epigraphs pointing to the evidence of trade is certainly small.
Artisanal classes

In the Śatavāhana-Ikṣvāku era, the craftsmen like the charmakāras (leather workers), thapatis (architects), pāśāṇikas (stone-masons and carvers), and sūtradhāras (carpenters) were included in the society of the Andhra people. But in later periods, not much can be said about their conditions owing to the fact that they were not the focus of the inscriptions. However, two sparse references to vaddavi or wood-cutter (known otherwise as vaḍḍakī or vaṛddhakī) comes from the 9th-10th century Cuddapah region. The largest number of artisans in charters figure as engravers of copper-plates. They were called differently in different regions and subsequently, their surnames and titles had a close bearing upon their specifications. In the Eastern Gaṅga territory, they were labelled as aksāsāālikas (owner of aksāsāāla or goldsmith’s workshop). But, in the Renāṭi Chōla regions of Cuddapah, they were styled as kammāri (black-smith) or simply as koṭṭali (engraver). Parts of the Krishna-Guntur region distinguished them as āchārya. Among them, Koṇḍāchārya and Jayantāchārya (or Jonṭāchārya) are known to have been engraved several charters of the Eastern Gaṅga rulers. The same community was known as āchāri in Chittoor. However, Chittoor also yields epigraph which was engraved by a person named Śrikanṭhadevāchārya, i.e., an engraver with the āchārya name-ending. Oju or Ojha (upādhyāya) also was familiar as engravers as noticed by Nagolu Krishna Reddy. They were frequently mentioned in the post 10th century Srikakulam sector. Apart from engraving charters, the black-smiths also made iron-implements. Krishna Prasad Babu has mentioned the name of Tellakunta in Guntur as an iron-manufacturing centre and according to P.V.P. Sastry, from the 4th to the 7th century CE., the armours manufactured here were sold on commercial basis.
Achāryas not only engraved inscriptions, but also were experts in the building of mansions. Inscriptions from Palnad taluka of Guntur district acquaint us with a famous line of architects who built some temples in the area. According to an inscription from Aingaripalem, written in the characters of the 7th century, the temple of Jalpeśvara was built by one Kalgarabharanāchārya. Another interesting epigraph from Macherla of the year 1101 CE., gives the pedigree of the architects, Navōju and Tippōju, who built the Adityesvara temple at the place. It proves that the ējus too were employed to construct temples.9

As we have seen, gold-smiths or akṣaṭālikāc also were employed for engraving charters. Besides being known as akṣaṭālin, they have been introduced as hemakāra or suvāṇṇakāra. The 9th century Masulipatnam plates of the Eastern Chālukyan king Vijayāditya III was inscribed by the foremost of goldsmiths ( hemakarāgraganya ) Kattaya.10 The expression agraganya implies the existence of hierarchical divisions within this community. In the 10th century Kākumrānu grant we come up with a suvāṇṇakāra named Bhīma Nāyaka who got a field with the sowing capacity of three khaṇḍugas of kōdrava seeds together with an akkaśilā ( goldsmith’s workshop).11 This information indicates that at least some of the artisans were not solely dependent on their hereditary professions and had additional provisions. Goldsmith’s workshop has been found in Nāgarjunikonda of Guntur which flourished probably in the Ikṣvaku and Pos:-Ikṣvaku period. It yielded crucibles, moulds of gold jewellery, touch-stone, weights and iron-hammers.12 Metal-working was not a neglected sector. The writer of the Sataluru grant of Gunaga Vijayāditya III was described as a Viśvakarmā-kula-sambhava. He is credited with having built a ghaṇṭaśālā, probably meaning a bell-factory or
a factory manufacturing bells. The ‘Visvakarma’ in medieval peninsular India constituted a group representative of five crafts. The constituted craft persons were goldsmiths, brass smiths, blacksmiths, carpenters and masons.

In the period of our study, the temple-building activities were in a flourishing stage. The relevant inscriptive evidences indirectly indicate that right from the 6th century CE. to the onset of the 11th century CE., the builders and masons were employed to construct religious establishments or even parts of them. Besides this, various grants to the temples in order to repair them also show that the sculptors and builders were frequently recruited for that purpose. In Andhra, the professionals dealing with blacksmithing, carpentry, stone-carving, metal-work and jewelry were known collectively as panchahananamvaru. Inscriptive evidences of building activities are shown below through a chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narasingsapalli plates, Eastern Gaṅga Hastivarman</td>
<td>King set up a temple of Raṇabhitodaya after his own biruda Raṇabhīta</td>
<td>Srikakulam</td>
<td>579 CE.</td>
<td>EI XXIII, pp. 62-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alampur, Vijayāditya, the Chālukyas of Ψατάπι</td>
<td>Construction of enclosure by Ṭaṅkisārya, Mahabootnag</td>
<td>Siddhamatrika script and Teहgu</td>
<td>713 CE.</td>
<td>IAR1959-60, p. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattikonda, pillar inscriptions</td>
<td>Koṇḍalayya, son of Koyya- gāvunḍa and Pollama- gāvunḍa, son of Dippa gāvunḍa of Mududāra family- donors of two pillars</td>
<td>Kurnool</td>
<td>9th c</td>
<td>IAR1963-64, p. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddivaripalli,</td>
<td>Death of his warrior Mallikārjuna, on hero-stone, image of hero with the bow and arrow, sculptor-</td>
<td>Sobadevana, son</td>
<td>10th c</td>
<td><em>IAP.CD</em> I.p. 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaidumba Gandatrinetra</td>
<td>Sobadevana, son of Prabhuteja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danavulapadu, Indra III Construction of pedestal for bathing images of Śāntinātha</td>
<td>Jammalamadugu,</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td><em>IAP.CD</em> I.p. 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddappah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamalapuram, Indra III Construction of the main entrance and mandapa of the temple of Ēkāṇṭīsvāra</td>
<td></td>
<td>925 CE</td>
<td><em>IAP.CD</em> I.p. 95-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddappah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pudur, Gaja-lakṣṇī panel fixed into the wall of the manḍapa near the Śiva temple outside the village,</td>
<td>Malabooobnagar</td>
<td>926-927 CE.</td>
<td><em>IAR</em> 1965-66, p. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made by Poravana gavunda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masulipatnam plts. Of Amma II Two Jaina temples were constructed at Vijayavāṭikā (Bejwada) and village</td>
<td></td>
<td>10th c</td>
<td><em>EI XXIV</em> pp. 268-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Guntur was donated to it</td>
<td>Guntur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tandikonda grant of Ammarāja II Vijayaditya built at Vijayavāṭikā the temple of Sakalabhuvanāśraya (deity</td>
<td></td>
<td>10th c</td>
<td><em>EI XXIII</em> pp. 161-170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uma-Mahēśvara)</td>
<td>Bejwada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maliyapundi grant of Ammarāja II Temple of Jinālaya, named Katākābharaṇa Jinālaya- made by Katakarāja</td>
<td></td>
<td>945 CE.</td>
<td><em>EI IX</em> pp. 47-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durgaṇa.</td>
<td>Guntur-Prakasham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oil-pressing activities

A few references to oil-mills donated to temples clearly prove the existence of the oil-pressing activities, though much can not be said about the oilmen community. According to a 9th century Chittoor epigraph, the assembly (sabhai) of the town Tiruvipiramapetti ordered that all the oil-mills existing in the village shall be set up on a particular plot of land which was purchased by a member of corporation (gana) and donated to temple for supply of oil. The declaration indicates the existence of a cluster of oil-pressing machines in a particular location. Again, in another 10th century inscription from Cuddappah district, an oil-mill is seen to have been donated by Revamayya to the temple of Āditya built by the donor. Oil-pressing industry developed more and more in succeeding period and the oilmen community emerged as a noticeable group in the later centuries.

According to P.S. Kanakadurga, the donations to keep up the activities of temples increased the importance of the Telikis who were engaged in extracting and marketing oil and she picks up the Teki plates in order to prove that by the time Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana (624-640 CE.) was conferred the rulership of Vengi, the Telikis were well-accomplished as craftsmen and traders in the coastal region and extended their support to the newly formed kingdom. Nagolu Krishna Reddy holds the view that there was cordial relationship between the kings and merchants in Andhra. He has mentioned the fact that the kings made endowments either in association with or at the instance of the merchants. In support of his opinion, Reddy has referred to the Cheruvu-mādhavaram plates of Kali-Viṣṇuvardhana (9th century) which register a tax-free gift of land, to the deity Nagaresvarā-bhaṭṭāraka, consecrated by the king in association with the merchant community (nagara...
at Vijayavāṭapura. K.Suryanarayana has mentioned the fact that the vaisyas were the devotees of Nagaresvaradeva and in all vaiśya towns there was a temple of Nagaresvara. In the 10th century CE. also, this friendly relation continued as we will see in the Kākumrānu grant.

Settis in Andhra

In the Ikṣvāku period, Andhra had connections with different parts of the country. An inscription from Nāgārjunikondā belonging to the Ikṣvāku period speaks about the monks of Tāmrapaṇī who converted Kāśmīra, Gāndhāra, China, Chhilata, Tešali, Aparaṁita, Vaṅga, Vanaṅsi, Yavana, Damila, Pālura and the island of Tāmrapaṇī. However, in our period of study, there are a few inscriptions (enlisted below) which record the names of traders and speak about their role in contemporary Andhra. They operated in different places (Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Reference to traders</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nelakondapalli, Khammam, Nakara (trading organization)</td>
<td>7th-8th c.</td>
<td>IAR 1985-86, p. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapatla, Rayachoti taluk, Cuddappah, on a hero stone near a Śiva temple</td>
<td></td>
<td>IAP, CD I, pp. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahadanakaram plts. Of Vişnuvardhana V, Mahasatēvahas and mahānāvikas, vaṇiyu</td>
<td>9th c.</td>
<td>JESI I, pp. 124-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākumrānu grant, Guntur Pōlayana setti</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>EA III, pp. 16-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Reference to traders</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masulipatnam plts. Of Amma II Sresṭhīn</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>EI XXIV, pp. 268-278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vemulavada, Karimnagar, of Arikeśari II Chandra sresṭhi and nava-sresṭhins</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>IMCDA, pp. 10-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of them belongs to the reign of the Eastern Chālukya king Chalukya Bhīma I, i.e., in the 10th century CE. According to the charter, a merchant named Pōlayana (introduced as vaisyeśvara and setti), son of Kundeya (who was vaisyādhīpa and sreṣṭhī) and grandson of Divākara (a mahāsārthavāha of Oreyūr), received from the Eastern Chālukyan king the tax-free gift of the village Kākumrāṇu in the Oṁgērū-mārga viṣaya (in Bapatla of Guntur) and gave it as an agrahāra to 86 brahmaṇas and a suvaprakāra.72 Pōlayana was a pattupa-setti (great caravan-merchant) who built a Śiva temple called Chālukya Bhīmeśvara at Prayāga. The information revealed in the charter carry some importance. First, being a native of Oreyūr (Uraiyūr in Tamil Nadu), Pōlayana built up a temple at Prayāga (near Allahabad in Uttar Pradesh) which means that he carried his caravans far into the North India and probably took the route through Guntur. Located on the bank of the Ganges, Prayāga had certainly some commercial importance where Pōlayana could have sold his merchandise. Second, in some way or other, Pōlayana was favoured by the Eastern Chālukyan king. Either their gradual involvement shifting from the Tamil region to Andhra, or their expansion of activities to north India led them to enter into the Chālukyan kingdom which ultimately led the merchant to build up a temple after the name of the Eastern Chālukyan ruler. Or, it might well be a move to exert influence at Prayāga on the part of Pōlayana. Second, the changing status of the family of Pōlayana from mahāsārthavāha (the great caravan-merchant) to setti (a very rich merchant) is to be noted. In this context, we can mention the trading traditions of Uraiyūr. Uraiyyūr near Tiruchirapalli (Figure 4) was an inland town of political and commercial importance and besides being a
consumption-point, it had the textile-manufacturing traditions corroborated by
the literary and archaeological evidences. Later, the trading organisation like
Māṇigrāmam controlled prestigious markets in Uraiyūr. Champakalakshmi
has pointed out that the Māṇigrāmam was apparently a descendant of the
group of traders from Vānikak-grāma in Kāvērippumpattīnām, who after the
decline of external trade in the earlier period, moved into the interior to
places like Uraiyūr and Koṇumbāḷūr, where they re-emerged as Māṇigrāmam,
an organised group of traders by the 9th century CE. Pōlayana’s grandfather
Divākara probably was a dominant caravan-merchant of Urayūr and his
wealth helped his son and grandson to be famous as financiers or very rich
merchant (setti). This process can be compared with the emergence of settis
in the early-historical period who invested their agricultural surplus in risk-
taking ventures and poured the wealth from commerce into the adornment
of religious monuments. Third, why did Pōlayana grant land and akkāsāla
(goldsmith’s workshop) to a suvarnakārā? Could it mean that Polayana had
the power to mint coins? We can not answer this question. But we can
mention the fact that the gold-smith’s shop at Nāgārjunikonda yielded a
hoard of coins. And the author like Nagolu Krishna Reddy also thinks that
the engraver mentioned in epigraphy like the Ahadanakaram inscription was
engaged in minting coins. For, the engraver here was a pendattārā (perun-
dattaran or mahāsuvarṇakāra).

In the regions surrounding Andhra, the course of developments was in some
way different. In the territory of Orissa, some artisanal classes took the
professions of merchants. The Orissa Museum plates of Rānabhaṅjadeva and
the Aida plates of Rāṇaka Rānabhaṅjadeva (9th-10th centuries) mention about
the vanikasuvarkāra family (merchant goldsmith family or merchants of
gold). In the Dasapalla grant we come across the vanik class who were goldsmith (pandi) by profession. But, epigraphs from Andhra show nothing of this kind of feature.

Evidences from coastal Andhra, Rayalseema and Telangana show the activities of the settis in the 10th century CE. (Figure 3). The Eastern Chālukyan king Amma II, at the time of donation of a village in Guntur to the Jain temples, addressed sresṭhin among the other officials. He certainly addressed one particular financier whose identity is not known. He was one of his sāmānyak. Thus, the wealth and power of settis could help to acquire him even the feudal status. This approach of ruler to settis is continued even after the 10th century CE. In Vemulawāda of the Karimnagar region also, we find the mention of Chandra sresṭhi and nava-sresṭhis who witnessed grant to a Sun-temple given by Arikeśāri II, the Chālukyas of Vemulawāda. The factor to be noted here is that Chandra sresṭhi has been mentioned by his name while the names of the nine other sresṭhis have not been written individually. Evidently, the status of Chandra sresṭhi was higher than the rest. It further points to the existence of hierarchy even within the ranks of sresṭhis. We can not determine whether all of the sresṭhis formed an organization headed by Chandra sresṭhi. Settis were active in the Rayalseema sector too. The name of Śrī Vabila Chandeya Setti is inscribed on a hero-stone near a Śiva temple in Devapatla of Rayachoti taluka of Cuddapah region. We can not determine if he was killed at the time of carrying his goods. In this context, we can mention about the 9th century Alattur hero-stones coming from the Gundlupet taluka of Mysore in southern Karnataka. This epigraph speaks of the death of the son of Bappa Setti who died in a cattle-raid on Atti in Chōla-nādu. Remembering the
vigorous pastoral and cattle-breeding tradition of the southern Karnataka region, Malini Adiga holds the view that the son of the setti was a cattle-trader who died in defence of his merchandise. Did the setti mentioned in the hero-stone at Cuddappah face the same situation? We know that it was included in the Rayalseema region which also had a long tradition of cattle-rearing. Another notable point is that the hero-stone mentioned by Adiga indicates the movements of merchants from Karnataka to Tamil region and vice-versa which is also attested by the Bandipalli grant of 10th century CE. We do not know if the traders from Cuddappah also entered into the Chola dominion.

In this context, mention may be made of the roads which passed through Andhra and appeared in different names like rājamārga, mahāpatha, iradi-mahāpatha and pedda-trōva in different inscriptions. Apart from these great roads, there were smaller ones which served as link between villages and were termed as patha in inscription. Water-ways were also important means of communication. There are the references of jalāmārga and udakamārga in the grants from Srikakulam. The places like Rāvireva and Intupurevu probably was familiar for riverrine trade and commerce (revu means harbour). Ravi-reva was situated on the bank of Kṛṣṇabennā as known from the Chikkulla plates of Viṣṇuṇukundir Vikramendravarman.

Mahāśārthavāha, mahānāvika and setthi—the network of trade

The only inscription which shows the existence of foreign trade is the Ahadanakaram inscription of the Eastern Chālukyan king Viṣṇuvardhana V (847-848 CE) alias Kali Viṣṇuvardhana. From this epigraph we come to know that the īru-svāmul (svāmīs of the īru) granted to Karigalla vadāvār̥̄u
installed in the uru called Prithivipallava-pattana the income from taxes ari, dagu-tere, siddayayabu and danju-dasa paradhabu, leviable on the residents of Renduvadalapattana. The donors of the grant were the pattana-svamis of Prithivipallava-pattana. In this context, three administrators of Renduvadalapattana have been mentioned. Their names are as follows:-

1. Mahanabiyul Naraloka mahasatthavul
2. Virapara mahanabiyul
3. Samasta-bhuvanāraya Kanadiraju, an agent (nadupul) of Gajñabu-Sethi.

Some persons acted as witnesses of this grant. Their names are as follows:-

a. Vayyeli-mahanāvika
b. Sarvalokāraya-mahāsartha-vāha, the son of Sekala
c. Perddal Niravadya mahāsartha-vāha
d. Veṭandal Charuvayya who was described as Pasindi-muthlu
e. Viṣṇuvardhana- mahāsārthavāha
f. Prithvī-mahāsārthavāha, the agent (nadupul) of Gajñabu-sethi, the son of Achchakurna-vanīy, the son of Pasukshēvul

g. Niravadya prithvī Kanadirāju, the son of Viṣṇuvardhana mahāsārthavāha, the agent of Veṭandal Ponika-ksbēramukoļ

h. Gunavana mahānāvika

i. Muddakaṅchikol

j. Rāmēsvara-Prithvī-mahāsārthavāha
k. Korinthikol, the son of Apayajanuvakol

l. Sakalalokāśraya Prīthvī mahāśārthavāha, the agent of Nandi mahānāvika, the son of Karigala Prīthvī-mahāśārthavāha

m. Divākarayyapañchakol

The terms like Mahanabiul and Mahāsatthaval were nothing but the corrupted forms of mahānāvika (master-mariner) and mahāśārthavāha (great caravan-merchants) respectively. So it appears that some mahānāvikas (master-mariners) and mahāśārthavāhas (great caravan-merchants) operated in the pāttanas mentioned above. The names of these traders suggest that traders from both the Tamil and Andhra territory were present here. The names like Viṣṇuvardhana, Niravadya and Sakalalokāśraya were probably prevalent in the areas administered by the Eastern Chalukyan kings who bore these titles. Again, the name like Karigala Prīthvī mahāśārthavāha could have been prevalent in Tamil region as the title Karigala is seen among the kings of this area. And his son Nandi mahānāvika possibly belonged to the Tamil territory. The place-names Prīthivipallava-pāṭṭana and the deity called Karigāḷavadavaru are connected with the Pallavas and Karigala respectively which also points to their Tamil connection whereas Renduvādalapattana might have been affiliated with Rennāḍu region (Nellore-Guntur area) in Andhra. Rennāḍu comprised the land between the rivers Chitravati in the north-west and Cheyyuru in the south-west, the tributaries of river Pennar. Renduvādalapattana and Prīthivipallavapattana were probably coastal and port-towns for Krishna Kumari Myneni has shown that most of the places in Andhra with the suffix pāṭṭana were port-towns where trading communities like Ainnurruvar, Anjuvarmam and Balanjīar operated after the 10th century.
So, it is evident that these traders of the 9th century Andhra region exercised their power in these two *pattanas*. It is not improbable that they were incorporated in a group. And among the taxes which were leviable on Renduvāḍalapattana, there was *ari* or tax levied on oil-mills for the maintenance of the perpetual lamp in the temple and *tere* which was “a levy payable to the middleman between the seller and buyer of produce.”

So, Renduvāḍalapattanam was an exchange-centre where traders assembled with their commodities. One of the witnesses named Divākarayya reminds us of the *mahāsartha-vāha* Divākara of Oreyūr (Uraiyaṟ region in Tamil Nadu), the grand-father of Pōlayay seṭṭī who was referred to in the 10th century Kākumrānu grant. We do not know if these two persons were identical. Divākarayya was probably linked with *pañcak arrest* (*pañcakula*) which was either an assembly of administrators usually consisting of five members or a body charged with control of the customs house. So, the traders played different roles (Figure 2).

A closer look at the inscription shows that some of the traders had been pursuing trading activities for two generations. Gajnabu-setthī was the son of a *vaniyu* (*vaniya*) of Achchakurra. As the suffix *setthī* shows, Gajnabu was a very rich merchant or financier whose father was only an ordinary trader (*vaniya*). But it is clear that the profit from trade resulted into this family’s enhancement of status from *vaniya* to *setthī*. Nandi *mahānāvikas* was the son of Karigala prathivī *mahāsarthavaha*. While the father made wealth from long-distance trade, the son did not hesitate to invest wealth in sea-trade. From the epigraph, we also come to know about four more *mahānāvikas* namely, Viṟāpara and Naraloka (among administrators) and Vayyēḷī and Gunavana (among witnesses). There is no hint about the area to which they
belonged. *Mahāsārthavāhas* came from Andhra as well as the Tamil area (*Rāmesvāra Prithvī mahāsārthavāha* probably came from Tamil region as the prefix *Rāmesvāra* shows connection with Tamil culture).

We also get an idea about the mode of operations in the *pattanas* from the Ahadanakaram inscription. Nandi *mahānāvika* had one deputy named Sakalalokāśraya Prithvī *mahāsārthavaṇāha*. Undoubtedly this *mahāsārthavāha* brought goods from distant lands and supplied those to Nandi *mahānāvika* who again loaded them in his ships. *Mahāsārthavāhas* came into contact with the *sethis* (*setthi*). *Prithvī-mahāsārthavāha* was the agent of Gajñābu-*sethi*. It is interesting to note that Gajñābu had his agents both among the administrators and the witnesses of the inscription. He was the only *setthi* mentioned in this epigraph too. It is likely then that he enjoyed special position in this territory even without being himself an administrator. The only person successful both as *mahānāvika* and *mahāsārthavāha* was Naraloka who was an administrator of Renduvadalapattana also and he is mentioned at the top of the list. Therefore, he brought merchandise from distant places and carried them in his ships to sell them. Thus, *pattana* was a centre where traders sold the goods of inland markets and purchased those coming by sea.

*Mahānāvikas* probably carried their ships to the south-east Asia. A 1st century CE. inscription (undated, but written in *Prākrit* language) from Ghaṇṭaśāla near Masulipatnam mentions about a *mahānāvika*. A 5th century inscription from the Malaya peninsula also mentions another *mahānāvika* named Buddhagupta who came from the Raktamṛttikā *mahāvihāra* (located in Chiruti of Murshidabad in Bengal). A bronze coin from southern Thailand shows a stylized double-masted ship which is similar to the double-masted
ships on the Satavahana coins circulated in the Andhra and Coromandel coast in the 2nd century CE. The other side of the coin shows a figure of a cow. Suchandra Ghosh takes the specimen as the indication of link between Andhra and Malay at that time. She also points to a Tamil inscription of 3rd century supporting the presence of craftsmen from India and the large number of objects of western origin and glass and semi-precious stone-beads discovered from this site. According to her, Dhānyaakaṭaka of Andhra helped to supply rice for the west coast of Malay peninsula for its rocky surface and ever-green rain-forest were unable to provide its inhabitants with sufficient crops.47 We do not know to what extent agricultural commodities formed part of overseas trade in the 9th century CE. However, in the post 10th century era, the guild members of Andhra drew their incomes from the trade of the commodities like perfumaries, oil.48

Historians hold the view that the stone and metal images of Buddha had a market in foreign countries. Based on the similarities between the Buddha images found in Amaravati, Krishna and south-east Asia, John Guy has concluded that the monastic workshops of Andhra produced them for the purpose of export. The large vessels probably stocked them and alongside took the Buddhist scholar-monks, followers of Vajrayāna, to south-east Asia, specially Java having a large number of Vajrayānist devotees there.49 We have the evidence that the Amaravati stūpa was visited in the 9th-10th centuries. Here the shrine of Jambhala, Tantric icons, stone-images of Maitraka, Heruka, Tārā and Ugratārā indicate its association with Vajrayāna.50

From the epigraphs of south-east Asia also, we come to know about contacts between the eastern coast of India and Indonesia, East Java and Bali. The Telga Batu inscription (686 CE.) of Indonesia mentions puhawang
(ships captain), vaniyaga (long-distance or seafaring merchants) and sthapaka (sculptors). The Kalirungan Sanskrit inscription dated 883, from Kedu in central Java, is the earliest south-east Asian source that lists the foreign traders (vanigrāma or banigrāma). This included merchants from Champa, Remman (lower Maynamar), Kmr (Cambodia), Kling (Kalīṅga), Aryya (Āryapura/Ayyavole), Pāṇḍikara (Karnataka) and Singhala (Sri Lanka). The term Vanigrāmam reminds us once again of the Uraiyūr and Koḻumbāḷūr Manigrāmam, the mahāsārthavāha of Oreyūr named Divākara and about Divākarayya Pañchakol who was a member of the trading organization of mahānāvikas and mahāsārthavāhas in the Andhra region. Kenneth R. Hall has observed that by the 14th century CE, the various south Indian merchants were collectively categorised in the epigraphs of south-east Asia as Karnataka if they came from the Tamil-speaking regions, and Kling (Kalīṅga), if they came from the east coast regions farther north. Still it is doubtful if any port of Andhra except Kaliṅgapatnam was really active at that time.

Sea-voyages was accompanied by improved shipping technology. Water-crafts have been depicted on Buddhist monuments in narratives of seafaring activity from the 2nd century BC onwards till the 7th century CE. The change in construction of vessels started from the 11th century onwards. Himanshu Prabha Ray observes the distinctive and diverse characteristics of vessels operating in the eastern seaboard since the ancient times and the different requirements of boats used for fishing, cargo carrying, for coastal travel or for ocean voyages. He also noted the fact that the distinction between these was often blurred depending on the geographic conditions along the Indian coasts.
The improvement in the boat-building technology curing the early-medieval times encouraged the traders for ocean voyages.

**Trade in Andhra: some characteristics**

Compared to other regions of peninsular India, Andhra, during this 500 years, gives insufficient information regarding trade. Save one or two inscriptions, there is nothing from which a clear picture of merchantile activities can be drawn. We also notice some differences from other parts of the peninsula. Ranabir Chakraborty has highlighted the existence of *penthā* in parts of Deccan during these centuries. The *penthās* were regular market-place as against the temporary market-place called *saṁthe* and *aḍḍa* (*hatta* or fair) and was provided with fortification (*prākāra*), rampart (*vapra*) and moat (*parikhā*). However, within our period of study, *pentkās* do not seem to have been originated in Andhra though later during the rule of the Kakatiyas (13th-14th centuries), Andhra witnessed the emergence of *penthās* or *pentas*. Even the term *hatta* in the sense of limited localised market is absent in epigraphs except the locality called Hattaravanna in the 6th century Srikakulam. Here the term *hatta* is suffixed by *vanna* or forested region. And the place itself was situated amidst fields, a step-well, and ant-hills.

It is revealed by epigraphic evidences that the places which were famous for trading activities in the Sātavāhana era, were no more in prominence in the later ages. Ghantasāla, which was a mart earlier, figures in the 9th century grant as inhabited by *brāhmaṇa* population and as the place of *pannasā* grant in the 10th century. Nowhere its importance as a market-place is mentioned. Apart from some assumptions such as Kalingapatnam and Salihundam were active till the 8th century CE., there is no epigraphic
evidence from Andhra to suggest that the sea-borne trade link was uninterrupt from the 6th century onwards. The most important port like Masulipatnam had lost its importance long ago.

But, there were some interior localities which transformed their character slowly. Dantapura of Srikakulam was referred to as a grāma and situated around a forested area in the 716 CE. It was located besides a water-course (jalamārga). In the 9th century CE. It was once more referred to as grāma. And in the 10th century CE., it was mentioned as a vāsaka (camp) as we know from the plates of Vajrahasta. Only in the 11th century CE., we come to know about the settlements of some merchant families here. We do not know whether it was the same Dantapura which became significant for trade in the early-historic period and identified with Dantavaktrunikota which revealed Buddhist stūpas, brick platform, earthen rampart and pottery including Northern Black Polished ware, Rouletted ware, grey ware, dull red ware, red slipped ware and knobbed ware spread over an area of 500 hectares of land.

However, the process of growth regarding trade was not absent in Andhra, but slower than other parts of the subcontinent. The problem was twofold. First, the centres of trade in the first centuries of the Christian era were no more in a flourishing state in the succeeding ages. Second, the sea-borne trade probably suffered a setback. Third, the process of the emergence of new centres of trade was slow. The causes are not very clear from epigraphy. Archaeology which could have been provided us with some insight is also silent here. For, almost all excavations conducted in Andhra have revealed the remains of either early historical or late medieval settlements or objects. The greater part of early-medieval phase is more or less unknown as yet.
Geographical factors might have some connections with the decay of ports. Sila Tripati mentioned two causes like sedimentation and spit formation for the decay of ports in Orissan context. She has mentioned the fact that the beach sediment transport has regional variation due to the geological and physiographic factors. How far the factor of sedimentation was responsible for the decay of the ports of Andhra we can not find out at present. However, we all know that the number of ports on the east coast is smaller in number than that of the west coast for the simple geographical reasons. And when that small number of ports was not active anymore, the period of slowing down of overseas trading operation was sure to come.

If we look towards the then society of Andhra, we will see that some traces of pastoralism existed there. The Brhatsamhitā labelled the people of Andhra as Chañchukas (modern Chenchus) who lived on hunting. The Chenchus exist in Mahabubnagar, Prakasham, Kurnool and Guntur and they still live on forest-produce. In hero-stones, there are the description of cattle-rafts and the heroes, as protectors or seizures of cattle were memorised. In this context, we can mention about the Bōya community. The early-medieval society attributed them honour and prestige. The Bōyas are today divided into Uru (village-men) and Mysa (grassland men). Within this prominent division they are sub-divided into buffalo-men, men of the herd and fishermen. In Andhra epigraphs issued from the 6th to the 10th century CE., we find the evidences of grant of land to the bōya-brāhmaṇas. They were brāhmaṇas coming from the Bōya community. Interestingly, very few bōya brāhmaṇas are known to have received education prescribed for the brāhmaṇas whereas, all of them took the name-ending Ārāmaṇa. Probably, they gradually distanced themselves from the rest of the community. It should be kept in
mind that no other community in peninsular India was granted the status of brāhmaṇa. Probably, it was a part of acculturation as well as a move to exert influence on the entire Bōya society on the part of the state. However, this policy was not fully successful. Because, they consolidated their power in Bōyavitharadesā by 848-49 CE. and from the Dharmavaram epigraph we come to know that Pāṇḍaranga, the general of the Eastern Chālukyan ruler, had to destroy the power of the bōyas.69 So, the bōyas came to occupy an important position in early-medieval Andhra society. And this community was not involved in trade. The other categories of society (rāja, rāju, kālu, gāmundins etc.) which generally appear in the charters were not related with trade either. So, in Andhra region those groups became important who were not engaged in trade. The situation changed in the 9th-10th century CE. when the sreṣṭhis, mahānāvikas and mahāsārthavāhas started to gain prominence.

Personal initiative on the part of the ruler was a significant factor in matters of trade. Among the Eastern Chālukyan kings, Kali Viṣṇuvardhan was the first to recognise the importance of trading community in the 9th century CE. He was on throne for a very short time. Later, the rulers like Amma I and Amma II recognised the position of settis. There is one more factor which attracts our attention. The epigraphical reference of coins appears at about the same time when the settis became important in Andhra society. And the districts which witnessed the activities of the settis also were used to the usage of coins. The references to coins, taxes and the evidence of revenue in cash in the context of Andhra region are shown below.

Revenue assessment in cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

296
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gudimallam ins.</td>
<td>Gift to temple</td>
<td>30 kalāṇjus of gold (manjadis, pōn)</td>
<td>Srikalahasti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the king Vikramāditya II</td>
<td>of temple</td>
<td>amount in rālis</td>
<td>Chittoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IA XL, pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108-109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### References of taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>898 CE.</td>
<td>Ramesvaram ins.,</td>
<td>10th c. Gift to temple (tax and land)</td>
<td>Proddutur,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa II or III, 9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuddappah,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IAP, CD I</em>, p. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choppadandi</td>
<td>Gift to temple</td>
<td>70 drammas</td>
<td>Karimnagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription, 992 CE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IAP, KD</em>, pp. 21-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veligallu ins., Vaidumba Maharaja</td>
<td>Grant of taxes</td>
<td>The income of <em>biruda</em> (house-tax)</td>
<td>Madanapalle, Chittoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganda Trinetra, 9th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>biruda</em> (house-tax)? House-tax? Accruable in the village of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Velunguguntaj and whatever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>viṣaya-sūhka</em> was available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevuru pts., Amma I, 10th c.</td>
<td>Donation of village</td>
<td>Umikili in Gudrāhāra <em>viṣaya</em>, Vemarāja was made the</td>
<td>krishna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gramani,</em> excepting him from all manner of tax, except the</td>
<td><em>EI XXVII</em>, pp 41-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traditional fixed tribute of 8 <em>gadyānakas</em> (*kramagata-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>siddhayastagadyānakam partiyajya</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalakada ins., Vaidumba Bhuvana</td>
<td>Remission and non-remission</td>
<td>Remission of all minor taxes including the <em>tivulasas,</em> but</td>
<td>Vayalpal, Chittoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinetra, 10th c.</td>
<td>of taxes</td>
<td>with the exception of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dogūrachapāṇṇu,</em> <em>Pedēvālapāṇṇu,</em> <em>Padiyēri</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like other parts of the Deccan, the *nagaras* of Andhra were probably a combination of political, administrative and religious centres where commercial exchange also took place. But, there is no way of determining the type and nature of this exchange. And, the picture of trade in rural sector is completely unknown. The epigraphical references to *nagara* and *pattana* have been shown in the following chart:

**Evidence of *nagara/pattana***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turimella ins. of Chalukya Vijayaditya I, Cumbum, Kurnool</td>
<td>Turutaṭaḷkanagara</td>
<td>656 CE. <em>EI XIX</em>, pp. 160-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayalur grant of Vijayaditya, the Chalukyas of Vatapi</td>
<td>Pottalikanagara, near Hyderabad</td>
<td>700 CE. <em>EI XXXIII</em>, pp. 311-314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The picture we get from epigraphs about the non-agrarian sector in the 6th-10th century Andhra region is interesting and specially the situation of the trading world. The features which are seen in this period culminated in later ages when we get more evidences about varieties of traders, trading guilds and their activities and contacts with different regions. And in this sense our period can be seen as a formative stage.
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