



---

---

*Chapter – III*

---

---

---

---

*Polity and  
Administrative System*

---

---

The whole South India, in 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D. had been divided into large divisions like Kuntala, Andhra, Chola, Chera and Pandya, each of them which preserved and developed its own culture and administration. Of these, the extent of the Kalyana Chalukya Empire certainly substantiates this demarcation of the boundary. Besides the present boundaries of Karnataka, the Kalyana Chalukya Empire extended over districts of Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra states. Evidences are present for the rulers of this family in the Anantapur,<sup>1</sup> Kurnool,<sup>2</sup> Mahaboobnagar,<sup>3</sup> Medak,<sup>4</sup> Nizamabad,<sup>5</sup> Karimnagar,<sup>6</sup> Warangal<sup>7</sup> and Nalgonda<sup>8</sup> districts which region formed a part of the empire. Some of the records are also found in Kadapa,<sup>9</sup> Nellore,<sup>10</sup> Guntur<sup>11</sup> and Godavari districts.<sup>12</sup> But they are quite a few and were set up during the periods of conquest of temporary occupation in the reign periods of Somesvara-I, Vikramaditya-VI and Somesvara-III.

For holding together such a vast empire and maintaining peace and security, huge administrative machinery was very essential. The king who was at the top of the administrative machinery ruled the kingdom. The nature of government was monarchical. The king was identified with the State. All powers vested in him and all others in the administrative hierarchy held office at his pleasure.

The Chalukyas of Kalyana were the decedents of the Chalukyas of Badami and they naturally claimed some sort of hereditary right over the country ruled by

their predecessors. They continued to have the peacock on their banner, and the boar on their seals. Like the primeval Boar that raised the earth sunk in waters, to the ground and sustained it, these rulers took upon themselves the task of protecting the earth, viz., the kingdom they ruled over. This idea is repeated, in verse, in the very beginning of a number of their records. Hence, they took special appellations like *samastabhuvanarayana* (asylum of the whole world) and *prithvivallabha* (lord of the earth) *sarvalokarayana*, Vishnuvardhana and Vijayaditya were titles rarely used by the Chalukyas of Kalyana, but more commonly attributed to their kinsmen, the Chalukyas of Vengi. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri refers to “the punning epithet applied to the bow of Irvabedanga *Satyasraya* in the Kauthem plates, *saravavarnadharana dhanuh* the bow which supports all classes without distinction, also the bow which bears all colours like the bow of Indra, the king of the Gods, the rainbow”.<sup>13</sup> As protectors, *dushta sikshana* and *sishta rakshana* punishing the wicked and protecting the good i.e. maintaining law and order was their responsibility and the foremost duty.

### **Monarchy**

The government was monarchical, the king being the supreme authority over his kingdom. It was also hereditary. Power passed generally from the father to the eldest son, and the law of primogeniture was operative. During Ancient and Medieval period kings normally adhered to this practice. Satyasraya, Somesvara-I,

Somesvara-III and Jagadekamalla-II succeeded their fathers respectively, they being the eldest sons. But, from what has been narrated by Bilhana. It would appear that a choice was made by the ruling king in deciding his successor, competence and worthiness, in addition to seniority, being the criteria in selection. His father in preference to the elder son Bhuvanaikamalla Somesvara-II selected Vikramaditya-VI. It is possible that Bilhana makes this a ruse to extol his patron, for, he says that the prince, however, politely, yet firmly, declined the offer. Even granting that this event was an invention of the poet that such a possibility existed has to be accepted.

If the ruling king did not have male issue to succeed him, the throne passed on to the living brothers in the order of seniority that was what happened in the case of Vikramaditya-V, Ayyana and Jayasimha. If *Ayyana vamsacharitikavyam* can be relied upon, Ayyana's would be a case of abdication of the throne in favour of his younger brother. Taila-III succeeded his brother Jagadekamalla-II who had no issue. Vikramaditya-VI on the other hand, rebelled against his elder brother. Reason for justification of the act apart, this was a step rather unusual, for, earlier he had himself accepted the law of primogeniture which gave a right to the elder to crown himself.

The coronation ceremony was performed with grandeur. Nilakanta Sastri has said that Kisuvolal (i.e., Pattadakal in Bijapur district) continued to be the

place where the *abhisheka* of the kings took place.<sup>14</sup> This is, however, doubtful, at least so far as the later rulers of the family, from Somesvara-I, are concerned. Somesvara-II was probably in the capital at Kalyana when his father expired. This place was rather far away from Kisuvolal. Further, Kisuvolal had gained prominence under the Chalukyas of Badami, whose capital, Badami was close by.

### **Yuvaraja**

Long before the coronation the king designate, heir-apparent, was holding the office of Yuvaraja. Generally the prince is found administering the two divisions, Belvola 300 and Puligere-300, more popularly designated as Eradarunuru. This was obviously due to the fact that it was situated almost in the center of the kingdom. A necklace appears to have been worn by the heir-apparent, as a symbol of the high office he held. As said above that Chola Virarajendra, in course of his third encounter against the Chalukyas, is said to have burnt Kampili before Somesvara-II could untie his *kanthika*. Here is an evidence to indicate that as heir-apparent Somesvara-II was wearing the symbolic necklace which he had to remove before his coronation, soon after the death of Somesvara-I. Normally this office of Yuvaraja was held by the heir-apparent. In the case of Jayasimha, the younger brother of Vikramaditya-VI was described as Yuvaraja. He was in charge of the administration of several important divisions till the moment of his revolt against the elder brother. Bhulokamalla Somesvara-III

was quite old at the time of his father's death. Naturally he would have been of grown up age when Jayasimha was Yuvaraja. It is not possible to say why he was not designated Yuvaraja. It is likely that his disinteresting the political affairs of the kingdom vis-à-vis, the shrewdness and capabilities of Jayasimha might have weighed greatly in favour of the latter's selection as Yuvaraja. Obviously, here is an instance of legal claim being brushed aside in favour of competence.

It has been said that in the absence of qualified prince of the royal family, some trusted official was temporarily elevated to that place.<sup>15</sup> The instance in point appears to be that of Sobhanarasa who is said to have been governing Belvola-300 and Purigere-300 with the status of Yuvaraja.<sup>16</sup> The reference cited by Prof. Sastri however, is wrong. It refers to Singanadevarasa mentioned in the next sentence by Prof. Sastri. Sobhanarasa was a subordinate of Satyasraya and his date occurs at least two decades earlier. It is true that this officer was holding charge of the two provinces in 1002 A.D. as also in 1005 A.D. But he is not said to be holding them with the status of a Yuvaraja.

The training of the princes was quite an important aspect. The best way of imparting such training was to associate the princes both in times of peace and war, in administration and warfare. Ranna, the author of *Gadayuddha* refers to prince Irvabedanga, assisting his father in the latter's conquests. The Chikkerur inscription of 995 A.D. refers to this prince described as Mahamandalesvara and

bearing the title Ahavamalla, proceeding against the Paramara in the north, after establishing peace in the south.<sup>17</sup>

Likewise, Jayasimha-II described as ruling the country in 1010 A.D. although Vikramaditya-V was still actually ruling. Jayasimha was assisting even his uncle Satyasraya in the administration of the country as early as in 1007-08 A.D. So far as the two brothers, Vikramaditya-V and Jayasimha-II are concerned, it would appear that it was an instance of joint rule. It is well known that Vikramaditya-VI played a prominent part during the reign period of his father Somesvara-I. Interestingly he did not hold the office of Yuvaraja which was the right of his elder brother, although he figures more prominently in the contemporary records. He received training in matters of administration and warfare for quite a long period.

### **Administration**

The ministers reciprocated by offering prayers for the prosperity of their rulers. Thus, on the occasion of a solar eclipse, *Dandanayaka* Lakshmarasa made a gift of rent free land to god Kesavadeva Mandayagudi for worship and sacrifices, at Chalukya Bhimavaram in Vengi-*nadu* for the wealth, strength, long life, health, prosperity and power of the emperor.<sup>18</sup>

The king tested the ministers before appointing them. The Yewur inscription<sup>19</sup> of 1077 A.D. says that, Koppadeva, father of *Dandanayaka*

Ravideva, earned the approbation of King Jayasimha-II by the unique manner in which he showed his uprightness under test before he was appointed as an officer in the treasury. It was enjoined by Hindu political writers that the king, before taking them into service must test the virtue officials in the fire of temptation and this inscription supplies us with an actual instance. The king did not merely stop at this. He continuously observed them through his spies.

### **The Secretariat and the Departments**

The Secretariat of the Chalukyas was under a minister who was called the Head of the Seventy two Departments (*Bhattaraniyogiidhipati*). Some of the references to this office are as follows, in an inscription<sup>20</sup> dated 1058 A.D. *Dandanayaka* Madhusudana is said to have held this office and further he is described as a very *Yaugandharayana* in the efficient employment of these seventy two services. In another inscription<sup>21</sup> of 1168 A.D. *Dandanayaka* Bolikeya Kesimayya is described as *Sanadibahattaraniyogadhishtayaka*.

This *Bahattaraniyogadhishtayaka* was very likely to have been the officer in charge of co-ordinating the work of the various departments of the government, something like the Chief Secretary to the Government in modern times. Since the time of Manu the conventional number of departments in government is seventy-two. Curiously enough the *Manasollasa*<sup>22</sup> gives a list of sixty six departments. While the *Manasollasa* gives a list of 66 departments the conventional figure since

the time of Manu is 72. In actual practice, the number of departments seems to have depended upon the size of the kingdom. A large empire like that of Chalukyas may really have had seventy two departments. Out of these 72 departments only a few of them are described in some detail in inscriptions. The organisation of some departments like Military, Finance, Religion and Records will be described.

### **Military Organisation**

In the Manasollasa,<sup>23</sup> six kinds of troops, viz., *maula* (hereditary), *bhrtya* (hired troops), *sreni* (guild troops), *mitra* (troops of an ally or friendly power or feudatory), *amitra* (troops that once belonged to the enemy) and *atavika* (wild tribes as troops) are described. The epigraphs of this period while describing the victories resulting in the surrender of war materials refer to elephants, infantry and cavalry.<sup>24</sup> But there is no reference to chariots. It may be noted here that although we do not hear of the chariots in the Chalukya epigraphs there is a reference to the officer of the chariots (*Rathadhikari*) in the Manasollasa as noticed above. Hence, it is rather difficult to say whether the Chalukya army contained the usual four divisions. But it definitely contained the three divisions, viz., elephants, horses and foot soldiers.<sup>25</sup>

There was a Commander-in-Chief (*Mahasenadhipati*), who was probably in charge of the overall control of the army. Inscriptions contain references to the

existence of another important officer - *Senadhipati* or *Senapati*.<sup>26</sup> It could be that *Mahasenadhipati* and *Senadhipati* were identical or more probably the latter might be the leader of a section of the army. There are references to other officers like *Karituragapattasahani* and *Aneya Sahani*.<sup>27</sup> They were, in charge of elephants and horses respectively. Each corps of the army had its own commander. References are made to the commander of the elephant corps and cavalry corps.<sup>28</sup> The recruitment to the army was open to all the classes and it was not confined to any class or classes in particular. A description of the Deccani army which occurs in the account of a military review given by Somadeva Suri in his work *Yasastilaka* is interesting.<sup>29</sup>

The hero stones from Alampur, Panagal, and Nalgonda, all belonging to the 12th century A.D.<sup>30</sup> depict the arms and weapons used by the soldiers in battle. The foot soldiers protected their bodies with steel armour covering the arms and descending well below the knees. All the infantry carried their broad sword as their chief weapon. These swords were rather long, sometimes straight and sometimes slightly curved. They are also seen carrying round shields which had rings inside to be fixed on the forearm. In addition, they are found equipped with either spear or cross-bow and arrows. It can be seen that the horses were not only provided with saddle but their vulnerable parts like the neck, the loins and the knees were also covered by coats of mail. The elephants carried the howdah. The

military band consisted of the kettle-drum, the battle-horns and the conches. The kettle-drum was sounded when the army was marching.<sup>31</sup>

The soldier's ideal was a lofty one. It was to win or to die; to flee from the battlefield was to incur indelible infamy. The soldier who died in the frontal fight was ranked with a *Yogi* and he had a glorious entry into heaven through the disk of the sun.<sup>32</sup>

**Forts:** Forts played a dominant part in the defense of the realm. The *Manasollasa* speaks of nine kinds of forts, viz., water fort (*jala durga*), hill fort (*giri durga*), stone fort (*pashana durga*) brick fort (*ishtika durga*), mud fort (*mriddika durga*), forest fort (*vana durga*), desert fort (*maru durga*), wooden fort (*daru durga*) and men fort (*Nara durga*). Of the nine kinds of forts mentioned three types are referred to in the Kalkere inscription of Vikramaditya VI which describes vividly the valorous activities of *Dandanayaka* Govindarasa. It also says that this general could easily scale over the forts which even the king considered to be impregnable forts whether they are water-fort (*jala durga*), hill-fort (*giri durga*) or forest-fort (*vana durga*).<sup>33</sup>

Further, the *Manasollasa*<sup>34</sup> prescribes that forts should possess plenty of arms, food-grains, drugs and other materials, wealth, horses, elephants, beasts of burden, machines, water and fodder. Besides, the services of the Brahmanas and artisans were to be made available there. The inscriptions in the Gutti fort<sup>35</sup> speak

not only of the equipment necessary for the defense of a fort but also give many more details about its administration.

### **The Revenue**

The Manasollasa says that the king's treasury should be always filled with gold, silver, jewels, ornaments and costly clothes and that pure gold in the form of bars, *nishkas* (coins) or ornaments should be held in reserve in the royal treasury. Various taxes collected in the territory constituted the principal revenue to it. A study of the inscriptions of this period shows that a large number of taxes and dues were levied and collected. However, it may be noted here that the actual import of many of these revenue terms referred to in the records is not clear and hence some suggestions have been made about their actual meaning.

The various taxes collected in the kingdom may be broadly grouped into royal dues and local cess. The royal dues include the agricultural taxes, commercial taxes and judicial fines.

### **Revenue Officers**

The administration of these innumerable taxes and tolls required the services of a large number of officials. The Chalukyas took great pains in selecting revenue officials. For instance, in an inscription<sup>36</sup> dated 1068 A.D. *Mahamandalesvara* Lakshmarasa is described as a strict revenue servant.

Ministers were charged with the duties of overall administration of these taxes and tolls. Thus, in 1112 A.D.<sup>37</sup> during the reign of Vikramaditya VI *Mahasamantadhipati* Anantapalayya was in charge of the collection of *Vaddaravula* tax of the entire Seven-and-a-Half country. He had *Mahapradhana* Dandanayaka Aliya Madirajarasa as his subordinate who was in charge of the *Vaddaravula* of Banavasi 12,000, Halasige 12,000; and Nolambavadi 32,000. *Dandanayaka* Payimarasa was a subordinate of *Dandanayaka* Aliya Madirajarasa. The former held the charge of the *Vaddaravula* tax of Nolambavadi 32,000 division. In another inscription of 1102 A.D.,<sup>38</sup> *Dandanayaka* Bhivanayya is said to have had among other duties the control of *achchupannaya* of the entire seven-and-a-half land country. *Mahapradhana* Bhogabhattaya is found in a record<sup>39</sup> dated 1127 A.D. to be in charge of the administration of the *Vaddaravula sumka* of the whole country and had under him a number of officers.

At the imperial court, there was the Chief Accounts Officer called *Srikaranadhishtayaka*. There were other dignitaries to assist him in the accounts department.<sup>40</sup> Inscriptions indicate that there were accountants for different taxes and levies.

### **Exemptions**

Exemptions or *pariharas* were indicated when gifts of land or village were made. Thus, for Instance, an inscription<sup>41</sup> of Somesvara-II dated 1074 A.D. states

that *Mahasamanta Jayakesiyarasa*, the *Rashtrakutaka* of Purigere 300 visited the Permadi *basadi* at Purigere and made it into a *pura* (city) and exempted it from paying *kirudere*, comprising taxes like *manevana*, *piriyaravana*, *dhanabala* and others due to the *manneya*.

That the Chalukyas like other Indian kings of their time spent on the palace and general administration, the army and on public works is very apparent. But since the records do not give any indication about the proportion of these expenses to the total revenue, it is not possible to write anything more on this aspect.

### **The Treasury**

Inscriptions of this period throw considerable light on the administration of the treasury. The monarch appointed the Officer of the Royal Treasury, (*Bhandaragarana*)<sup>42</sup> who seems to have exercised control over the entire financial administration in the kingdom. It appears that branches of the treasury were operating in different parts of the territory. In an epigraph<sup>43</sup> dated 1065 A.D. *Mahapradhana* Rupabhattacharya is described as the Treasurer of Bedargupe (Bedargupe *Bhandari*). There was also a *Dandanayaka* who was in charge of the fiscal reserves (*tadeya dandanayaka*) in the kingdom.

### **Administration of Religious Matters**

As said earlier, the king evinced keen interest in promoting the proper practice of religion. For this purpose, he appointed the Superintendent of Religion

(*Dharmadhikari*) of the rank of a Minister (*Mahapradhana*) who looked after the administration of grants and gifts and utilised the material resources (*samasta sampada*) for erecting halls of instruction at several places where discourses were held on *Vedas*, *Sastras* and the lore of the Sun and the Moon.<sup>44</sup>

### **Office of Records**

Many epigraphs of this period tell us that kings, ministers and other officials issued many charters. Hence, there was the need for the proper maintenance of such records. At the imperial court of the Chalukyas there was a *Sasanadhikari* (officer of records) who was responsible for the proper maintenance of records. He had a large number of subordinates to assist him as stated in a record dated 1024 A.D. which refers to Maipayya, ascribe attached to *sasanadhikari Mahaprachanda Dandanayaka Prolarya* (Officer in charge of Royal Orders). When such grants were made, it was necessarily brought to the notice of the concerned officials. Thus, for instance, in 1077 A.D. Vikramaditya VI, on the petition of Raviyanabhata, made a gift of land to *Svayambhusiva* temple with the approval (*sammata*) of *rashtrapati*, *vishyapati*, *gramakutaka*, *ayuktaka*, *niyuktaka*, *adhikarika* and *mahattara*.<sup>45</sup>

### **The Administration of Justice**

Contemporary literary works, particularly the *Manasollasa*, throws much light on the administration of justice. It may be noted as follows. The

qualifications of a judge are set out in the Manasollasa.<sup>46</sup> The judge should have conquered all passions and be generous and courageous and well-versed in smritis and sastras. It styles a judge as *Dharmadhikarin*. When owing to the presence of other weighty business or ill-health, the king cannot attend to the work of administering justice the *Dharmadhikarin* or the chief judge should decide the disputes.

The chief judge who was known as *Dharmadhikarin* and *Sabhapati* was to be preferably a learned Brahmana. The Manasollasa prescribes that, if a learned Brahmana cannot be had for the post of *Sabhapati*, then a Kshatriya or Vaisya who works for the promotion of the welfare of the people may be appointed; but the king should never appoint a *Sudra* as a judge. It is *uttama* if a Brahmana is the *Sabhapati*; it is *madhyama* if a Kshatriya is the *Sabhapati* and *adhama* if a Vaisya is the *Sabhapati*. Further, the author, Somadeva,<sup>47</sup> says that the king should have three or five or seven jurors (*Sabhyas*) to associate with the *Sabhapati* in the disposal of suits. They should be learned in the *Vedas* and the *Dharmasastras* and be truthful. Thus, the *Sabhapati* (chief judge) with the *sabhyas* constituted the court. There were also Brahmanas who were members in this court. The distinction is that the *sabhyas* were appointed by the king while Brahmanas who were high born, pure in character, rich with experience and not jealous could attend and function as members of the court.

## **The Court Procedure**

The transaction of the business has four stages from the king's or judge's point of view-first receiving information from a person, then finding out under what section of law (*vyavaharapada*) the information falls, then consideration of the pleadings of the parties and the evidence by them and lastly the decision. Manasollasa enumerates twenty *vyavaharapadas* (complaints lodged before the king). Crimes and wrongs entailed punishments and also religious sanction (*prayaschitta*). Fines were imposed upon the criminals. These were the salient features of the Central Government under the Chalukyas of Kalyana.<sup>48</sup>

## **CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION**

The rule of the king was fully personal. He took all decisions alone. But before doing that he consulted a number of his high-ranking officers who are described as *mantri* or *amatya*. Was there a council of ministers? How it was constituted and how large was it, are questions that can't yield clear answers. There are no doubt evidences to show that such a council existed. But no evidences are there to indicate that such councils were constituted by every king and at all times. The Sudi inscription of Somesvara-I gives a vague idea of a council of ministers. But even here the available information is inadequate to come to any clear conclusion. The record refers to a *maneverggade*, two *tantrapalas*, *pradhana*, *adapa*, *tantrada senabova* and interestingly, the Aliya i.e.

the son-in-law of the king. The place of *Maneverggade*, the steward of the household, and the *Adapa* the betel bearer or a steward, is not clear. There were a number of officers under the king who were described as *mahapradhana* or *dandanayaka*, terms translated as Prime Minister and Commander of the army. What was the position of such ministers? It would appear that there was no hierarchy of such officers. Clearly these officers held the offices on personal ability at the pleasure of the king. There was no fixed number of ministers who formed the council. Further, these ministers did not always stay in the capital to be readily available for consultations. Most of them were in charge of administration of different provinces, as seen in the chapters above.

It would thus become clear that although there was Council of Ministers, it consisted of such of those officers who were close to the king and near at hand for consultation. Some of them might be his confidants. As stated above, Somesvara-II declared that after Vikramaditya and Jayasimha, Lakshamarasa was the most intimate of his officers, and that all others were only junior to him. The ministers also do not appear to have held any fixed portfolios. Several instances of one individual holding several offices, judged from the point of destinations and titles held by him. Anantapala-dandanayaka, for example, was the *mahapradhana*, a commander of the army, steward of the household but also a *Banasaverggade* i.e. the steward of the royal kitchen. It is likely that he rose from a humble position of

a *banasaverggade*, to that of the *mahapradhana*. Otherwise, it would be difficult to assume that he held all these offices simultaneously.

It appears that most of these officers held charge of certain departments of administration. Military service was a necessary requisite, a reason why most of these officers were dandanayaka also. Mention may be made of the *sandhivigrahi* or *herilala kannada sandhivigrahi*, officer who was in charge of the department of peace and war analogous to the modern-day department of external affairs. The *anthonradhyaksha* appears to have been in charge of the management of the royal palace. *Tantrapala* is described as the secretary, of the council who also wrote down its proceedings.<sup>49</sup> But this interpretation does not seem to be satisfactory. If the *tantrapala* wrote down the proceedings and acted as the secretary, what were the duties of yet another officer, *tantrada senabova*. *Tantra* means either an army or government, according to Dr. Mahalingam,<sup>50</sup> but the term is explained as `Home affairs` by Dr. Mirashi.<sup>51</sup> It is interpreted as chief of the army by Sri Subrahmaniam.<sup>52</sup> Another official designation that figures in contemporary records is *tantradhyaksha*. It may stand to mean the *adhyaksha* or Superintendent of administration and would be synonym of *tantrapala*. The *senabova* was the clerk (or accountant) in the office of the *tantrapala kadita verggade* was the officer in charge of the documents. Often times, as Prof. Sastri puts it, this officer was more or less in constant attendance on the emperor when he was engaged in

public business and made notes of his oral orders to put them, later into proper shape for further action.<sup>53</sup> *Karana* is again a synonym for *Senabova*. The Lekhapadthati<sup>54</sup> lists *Karanas* wherein this term is taken to mean in a general way a department. *Bhandari* was the treasurer in charge of the royal treasury. As already stated that *dandanayaka* Chattapayya is referred to as *manika bhandariga* under Vikramaditya-VI. He appears to have been therefore, a treasurer of precious stones. *Maneverggade* was the chief officer (*heggade*) in charge of the household affairs. It can be surmise that he was the officer in charge of the royal palace. Some feudatory chiefs also had such officers under them. It is possible that the king reposed great confidence in him. Yet another officer who also enjoyed the confidence of the king was *adapa* (orhad). Literally this term would mean the bearer of the betel-bag. Such officers are found in greater numbers at a later period when the Kakatiyas, Hoyasalas and the Vijayanagara rulers were in power.<sup>55</sup> This officer, from the nature of his duty, appears to have been attending upon the king more frequently than others and was naturally in a position to overhear discussions, consultations and the like obviously; such an officer had to be in greater confidence of the king.

## **PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION**

The kingdom was divided in to several provinces. It has been a special feature of this region of the south that these administrative divisions in almost all

cases came to be attached with a numerical figure, especially from the 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries when Karnataka Andhra were under the hegemony of the Rashtrakutas and the Chalukyas of Kalyana. It continued to be so in the region ruled by the Seunas while the practice appears to have been not very popular during the Hoyasala rule in south Karnataka. Several interpretations have been offered regarding the significance of these figures. It has now been generally accepted that the divisions with smaller figures connected with it were the areas with as many villages (*badas*) included therein. Dr.Ritti has shown how Kukkanur is described as the head quarters of Kukkanur-30 comprising 30 villages (*trimsadgramadhipati*) and the Kolanur inscription enumerates all the 30 villages included in Kolanur-30 division.<sup>56</sup> Similarly he has shown that Belvola-300 means 300 villages included in Belvola division.<sup>57</sup> However, such numbers like 96,000 of Gangavadi and 32,000 of Nolambavadi cannot be properly explained.

These divisions included in the kingdom where administrated through provincial governors directly are through feudatory chieftains, indirectly. They are referred to in inscriptions as *Mandalesvaras* or *Mahamandalesvaras*. Generally these divisions are referred to as *nadu*, *vishaya* or *kampana*. The term *Rashtra* is rarely found in the period under study. From the epigraphical evidences it may probably be said that *kampana* was a smaller division, being a part of *nadu* or *vishaya*. *Thana* or *Thane* is taken to be a territorial division.<sup>58</sup> But

it was something like a cantonment where a contingent of an army was placed or it was a military camp and a camping place for the king or the officers on tour.

Designations like *rashtrapati*, *vishayapati*, *gramakutaka*, *ayuktaka* and the like figure in copperplate charters, which are few and far between so far as the Chalukyas of Kalyana are concerned. The provinces were administered by *Mahamandalesvaras* who, as seen above, also acted as counselors of the king. These *Mahamandalesvaras* or *Mandalesvaras* were in charge of the general administration of the province under their control. But, since they had quite often to participate in the battles on behalf of the king, they had to delegate the powers to the officials immediately below in the hierarchy. These officials wielded great powers although all their decisions and actions implied royal sanction. They were assisted by officials, like the customs officers (*sunka vergadde*) the *karana*, *srikarananadaprabhu*, *nadasenabova*, *nadagavunda*, *sarvadyaksha*, etc.

The following are the Administrative divisions of the Chalukyas of Kalyana known from the inscriptions found in Andhra Pradesh.

Adavani-500, Aleru-40 *Kampana*, Ane-marga-70, Anmakonda-7,000, Anmanballe-11, Ayije-300, Ayyanavadi-300, Bagi-12, Belvala-*nadu*. Enmadale-6,000, Eruva-*vishaya*, Garuje-70, Gudikallu-24, Hambulige-30, Kadipalu-70, Kalvachedu-40 *Kampana*, Kandukuru-24, Kanduru-1,000/1100, Kaniyakal-300,

Kanne-300, Kandravdi-1000, Kasavulu-70, Kavutalu-12, Kodada-12, Kodiyananadu, Kogali-nadu Kollipaka-7,000, Kondapalli-300, Kosavala-1,25,000, Kudala-12, Kudiyape/Kudiyana-40, Kulakuliya-13, Lombulike-70, Manchalu-35, Mottavadi-nadu, Mulki-300, Naravadi-500 or Nalavadi-nadu, Nolambavadi-32,000, Panugal-500, Pedekal-800/5,000, Pulgunuru-70, Pullanuru-70, Rodda-300, Sabbi-1000, Sarimale-12, Saulu-70, Sindavadi-1000, Sire-nadu, Suliyannuru-70, Tumbula-30, Vaddavana-500, Velpugonda-24, Vengi-14,000, Yettapi-90.

**Adavani-500:** It is possible that the earlier name of this division was Hadavana, a corrupt form of Sadavani or Sadavahani. A record of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, dated 1106 A.D., refers to Adavani-500.<sup>59</sup> Besides being itself a major subdivision of Sindavadi-1000; it had further been divided into several small units, namely, Tumbula-30, Manchalu-36 and Garuje-70. The headquarters of this division Adavani is the same Adoni town and the division corresponds to the taluk of Adoni in Kurnool district. Ramachandra Murthy in his 'Study of the Telugu Place-Names' opines that this division owes its name to the dynasty known as the Yadavas of Devagiri.<sup>60</sup> According to him, Yadava+Avani =Adavani. But the Yadavas in question could flourish only in the twelfth century onwards, and since the inscription in which Adavani-500 is referred to is of 1106 A.D., it is too early to give the dynastic name of the Yadavas to the place. That by the time of the inscription Adavani must have been a well-known place is evident from its

being made the headquarters of the division. Hence, the opinion of Ramachandra Murthy is historically unsound.

**Aleru-40 *Kampana*:** An inscription at the time of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jayasimha-II Jagadekamalla, dated 1034 A.D. from Saidapur, Bhongir taluk, refers to this *kampana*. Two constituent villages of this unit were Muppanapalli and Goshthipadu which are identified with Muppanapalli and Gottipadu in Bhongir taluk, Nalgonda district.<sup>61</sup> The region was probably situated on the banks of the river Aleru near Kollipaka.

**Ane-Marga:** An inscription<sup>62</sup> at the time of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jayasimha-II, dated 1032 A.D., refers to this unit and included in it the village of Gadicheruvu which has been identified with Gadicherla in Bhongir taluk, Nalgonda district. Probably this unit was a subdivision of Kollapaka-7,000 to which the region of Bhongir taluk at that time belonged.

**Anmakonda-7,000:** Anmakonda is identified with Hanumakonda, the seat of the early Kakatiyas. Before the advent of the Kakatiyas it was an important division of the Chalukyas of Kalyana. An inscription of Satyasraya Irivebedanga, dated 1007 A.D., refers to this division and gives the name of one of its constituent villages called Ayyanavolalu.<sup>63</sup> Kadipalu-70 was a subdivision of Anmakonda-

7,000. The division may be identified with the region between the towns of Warangal and Karimnagar.

**Anmanballe-11:** An inscription<sup>64</sup> of Taila-II, the first king of the Kalyana Chalukyas, in the year 991 A.D., refers to Anamanballe-11. It was a part of Yattapi-90 which itself belonged to Vaddavana-500 in Kandur-*nadu*. This chain of hierarchical administrative divisions indicates that the *nadu* was the largest division in which the subdivisions were known according to the strength of their *gramas*. Since the above referred inscription, belonging to the first king of the Kalyana Chalukya line, reveals a well knitted administrative system, it may be inferred that these divisions were already at work in the previous regime under the Rashtrakutas who had a well organized administrative set up which their successors, the Kalyana Chalukyas, inherited. Since Anmanballe-11 was a subdivision of Yattapi-90, and Yattapi itself has been identified with Yetam in Kolhapur taluk, this unit is to be located in Kolhapur taluk, Mahaboobnagar district.

**Aije/Ayije-300 or Aija/Ayije-Nadu:** Two records of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara-II, one from Siddhesvaram<sup>65</sup> in Nandikotkur taluk, and the other from Alampur<sup>66</sup> refer to Ayije-300. No constituent village is mentioned. Another record of the same king refers to Pariyalatirtha belonging to this division.<sup>67</sup> A little later, the inscriptions of Vikramaditya-VI style this division variously as

Ayaje-300, Ayje-300 and Ayije-*nadu*.<sup>68</sup> Some of its constituent villages mentioned in these inscriptions are Baraveli, Gudiyuru, Kadaburu, Madduru, Polasanuru and Undaveli. After the downfall of the Kalyana Chalukyas the Kakatiyas held sway over the same region. The Srisailam Temple pillar inscription at the time of the last Kakatiya king Prataparudra dated 1313 A.D., mentions Aija-*nadu* or Ayije-*nandu*<sup>69</sup> along with two of its villages, viz., Karapaka and Kudamkaluru. Its headquarters is identified with Ayije in Gadwal taluk. The division corresponds to some parts of Alampur and Gadwal taluks of Mahaboobnagar district.

**Ayyanavadi-300:** An inscription from Pulakurti, Rayadurg taluk, Anantapur district, dated 1058 A.D., refers to this division along with Kaniyakallu-300 as adjacent division governed by Gonarasa and Bhimarasa, the *Mahasamantas* of the Kalyana Chalukya king Trailokyamalla.<sup>70</sup> Being adjacent to Kaniyakallu (Kane-kallu) and the find-spot of the inscription being Pulakurti in Rayadurg taluk, the division may be identified with the same taluk in Anantapur district.

**Bagi-12:** This unit has a floral name as the name Bage represents *Calesantis Indica blum*. An inscription of Somesvara IV, in the year 1184 A.D., refers to this small unit as part of Sindavadi-1,000.<sup>71</sup> It included the village of Katarige which has been identified with Katarika in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district.

**Belvala-nadu:** An inscription from Draksharama at the time of Somesvara-III of the Chalukyas of Kalyana dated 1134 A.D., registers a gift of a lamp to the temple

at Draksharama by an officer from Ittagi-*agrahara* in Belvala-*nadu*, a division of the Chalukyas of Kalayana.<sup>72</sup> The division has been identified by Mulay with the modern Gadag taluk in Dharwar district, Karnataka. Ittage is identical with Ittage in Raichur district. Thus, this division as well as the previous one, Bavihara-*vishaya*, was not units of the Andhradesa but they are included here as they point out, to some extent, the Andhra-Karnataka relation. The visit of an officer of the Chalukyas of Kalyana to the temple at Draksharama at the time of Somesvara-III may point out that the military achievements of Vikramaditya VI in the Vengi region persisted for some time even after the demise of the latter, notwithstanding the pressure from the Chalukya-Cholas.

**Enmadale-6,000:** The division had a faunal name as the word '*emme*' means 'buifalo'. In the year 1126 A.D. Anantapalarasa, a *Dandanayaka* of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, was governing over Vengi-12,000 and Emmadale-6,000.<sup>73</sup> This division was, therefore, adjacent to Vengi division. Enmadale is identified with Yenamadala in Narasaraopet taluk. Hence the division can be identified with that part of Guntur district along the river Krishna, corresponding to Velanandu-6,000. The Kalyana Chalukyas had only a temporary occupation of Vengi-12,000 and Emmadale-6,000. Soon they were overcome by the Chalukya-Cholas.

**Eruva-Vishaya:** An inscription of the Badami Chalukya king Vikramaditya I refers to Eruva-vishaya.<sup>74</sup> The head-quarters of this *vishaya* were Turutataka which has been identified with Turimella in Markapur taluk. Later on, an inscription<sup>75</sup> of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, dated 1122 A.D., refers to this *vishaya* and gives some of its constituent villages, namely, Brahmapalli, Ponnakoru, Komarampadu, Gurrapusala, Cherunadu, Machchapura, Lanjyadona, Mankulakunta, Rachhavemu and Chandravidu. Under the reign of Kakatiyas, it was called Eruva-nadu . From the identification of some of the places mentioned, it is evident that the division comprised parts of Prakasam and Kadapa districts.

**Garuje-70:** This small division belonged to the Kalyana Chalukya territory as revealed in an inscription at the time Somesvara-III.<sup>76</sup> It was a subdivision of Adavani-500. One of its villages was Ittage which is also referred to in Belvalanadu. As part of Adavani-500, the division is to be located in the adjoining parts of Adoni taluk in Kurnool district, and of Raichur taluk in Karnataka State.

**Gudikallu-24:** This small division has been referred to in an inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara-IV, dated in 1186 A.D.<sup>77</sup> One of its villages was Nandavura, identified with Nandavaram in Adoni taluk. The centre of this division is the same Gudikallu in Adoni taluk, Kurnool dist. Though no inscriptional reference, this unit was a subdivision of Adavani-500.

**Hambulige-30:** An inscription from Ramarajupalli, Gooty taluk, dated 1121 A.D. in the 45<sup>th</sup> year of Vikramaditya VI, registers a gift of land by Tailapadeva who was governing Sindavadi-1,000. His feudatory Trailokyamalla is stated to have been the administrator of Pombulige-73 (Hambulige) and some other provinces.<sup>78</sup> Another inscription of the time of Vikramaditya VI, dated 1122 A.D., refers to this division and its village Badamiluturu which has been identified with Miduturu in Gooty taluk.<sup>79</sup> The Bana chief Chittarasa, as a subordinate of the Kalyana Chalukyas, was for some time ruling this division in the capacity of a *Mahamandalesvara*. Later, this division came under the Yadava dominion. An inscription dated 1215 A.D., in the 6<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Simhanadeva, refers to Hambudege governed by his *Mahamandalesvara* Jagatapi Dandideva-chola.<sup>80</sup> The find-spots of the inscriptions and the identification of Badamiluturu, and the reference to Pombulige-73 as a subdivision of Sindavadi 1,000, all seem to suggest that Hambulge 30 corresponds to a part of Gooty Taluk in Anantapur district.

**Kadipalu-70:** A Kalyana Chalukya inscription<sup>81</sup> from Karimnagar district refers to this unit as a subdivision of Armakumd-7,000 (vide: Anmakonda-7,000). Since Kadipalu is identified with Kadparti in Karimnagar taluk, the division is located around Kadaparti in Karimnagar district.

**Kalvacheu-40 *Kampana*:** A record of the Kalyana Chalukya monarch Vikramaditya VI in his 37<sup>th</sup> regnal year refers to this unit.<sup>82</sup> It was a subdivision

of Kolli-*desa* or Kollipaka-7,000. One of its constituent villages was Nellutu which has been identified with Nellutla in Jangaon taluk, Warangal district.

**Kandukuru-24:** This small unit has been noticed in the Karakanthapuram (Adoni taluk) plates of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jagadekamalla-III.<sup>83</sup> One of its villages was Kosageyahalu which has been identified with Kosagi in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district.

**Kanduru-Nadu/Kanduru-1000/-:** It was a large division of the Kalyana Chalukya kingdom. In the inscriptions of Somesvara I, it was called *Kanduru nadu* which included the subdivision of Vaddavana-500 which again included Yettapi-90 in which was the smallest unit called Anmanballe-11.<sup>84</sup> Inscriptions of Vikramaditya VI refer to it as Kanduru-1,000 or Kanduru-1100.<sup>85</sup> Kandur-70 might have been a small unit comprising the headquarters of the division. Budupuru was one of the villages of Kandur-70. The whole division under the Kalyana Chalukyas corresponds to a major part of the modern Mahaboobnagar district. It is stated in an inscription<sup>86</sup> that from about 1060 A.D. *Kandur-nadu* was ruled by Telugu Cholas of Kanduru. Obviously, these rules were subordinates of the Kakatiyas, the village of Chilugumbidi in *Kundur-nadu* was granted to the Mallikarjuna temple at Srisailam.<sup>87</sup> *Kundur-nadu* seems to be a scribal error for *Kandur-nadu*.

**Kaniyakal-300 / Kaneyakallu:** A pillar inscription of 970 A.D. from Amidala, Gooty taluk, states that the pillar was raised by Kenta Marayya the son of Vira Biliyamayya of Kargur when the Mandalika Chandayya was ruling over Kaneyakallu.<sup>88</sup> Chandayya had the title ‘Kancipuravaresvara’, that is, at that time Kaneyakallu was part of the Chola Empire. Later, under the Kalyana Chalukyas, it is stated that during the reign of Vikramaditya VI, one of his Mahamandalesvaras, named Mangarasa was ruling over Kaniyakal-300 and Rodda-300.<sup>89</sup> Gondavadi, now called Govindvadi in Rayadurg taluk, was one of its constituent villages. Towards the end of Vikramaditya’s reign this division is referred to as Kaneyakallu.<sup>90</sup> At the close of the 12<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the division was under the domain of the Telugu Chola king Tribhuvanamalla Bhoja Choda and referred to as Kaniyakallu-*nadu*.<sup>91</sup> The headquarters of this division is identified with Kanekallu in Rayadurga taluk, Anantapur district.

**Kanne-300 / Kanne-Nadu / Karmmadu:** An inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara I refers to Kanne-*nadu*<sup>92</sup> and its villages of Juvuturu and Kalgotu. The Kottapalli plates of the same king mention some more of its villages, namely, Atukuru, Dudhiyala and Sivapuram.<sup>93</sup> As a feudatory of Somesvara I, the Telugu Chola chief Irugana Cholamaharaja was the governor of Kanne-300, Pedekal-300 and Naravadi-500, residing at his capital at Mosaleyamaduvu<sup>94</sup> which is now known as Mosalimadugu in Nandikotkur taluk. An inscription of Vikramaditya VI

refers to Kanne-300 and its villages, Yeragere, Chillara and Vaddamanu.<sup>95</sup> Another inscription of Vikramaditya VI states that his feudatory Bijjana Chola Maharaja was the administrator of Kanne-300, Pedekal-500, and Naravadi-500. Hence these divisions were adjacent to each other. Kanne-300 of the Kalyana Chalukyas corresponds to the region of Nandikotkur and Nandyala taluks of Kurnool district. At the time of the Kakatiya king Ganapatideva, in 1250 A.D. the village of Tadimada was in Kanne-300.<sup>96</sup> At the time of Prataparudra, in 1313 A.D., the division was probably known as Karnnadu. The Srisailam Mallikarjuna temple inscription<sup>97</sup> registers a gift of villages to the temple of which the following villages had belonged to Karnnadu: Sivapuram, Kurukunta, Indresvaram, Nandikunta, Dandyala, Vedurupadu, Tummaluru, Tatipadu Ganapuram, Edamatham, Biraprolu, Palamarripadu, Siddhesvaram, Kotivimdala, Bollapuram, Korrapolu and Gandevemu. From the identification of some of these villages it may be stated that the Kakatiya division of Karnnadu was larger than the Kalyana Chalukya division of Kanne-300, extending also up to the taluk of Atmakur in Kurnool district.

**Kasavulu-70:** This division is recorded in an inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Taila-II obtained from Korapolu, Medak district.<sup>98</sup> The inscription mentions a town in this division called Korapola which is the same place as the find-spot of the inscription. The division is thus identified with the region around Korapolu in Medak district.

**Kavutalu-12:** The Badanihalu (Adoni taluk) inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara I<sup>99</sup> refers to it along with its villages, Nerila and Badalapadu (find-spot of the inscription). The Karakanthapuram plates of Jagadekamalla II<sup>100</sup> refer to it and to its village Tohi, the modern Tovi in Adoni taluk. The headquarters of this unit is known today by the same name in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district.

**Kodada-12:** An inscription from Kolanupaka, Bhongir taluk, Nalgonda district, issued by the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, dated 1088 A.D., refer to Kodada-12<sup>101</sup> and three of its villages: Sandularahalu, Recheruvu and Pakugunte. Since none of these villages could be identified, this division, on the basis of find-spot, may be located somewhere in Bhongir taluk, possibly near Kolanupaka. Kodada-12 might have been one of the several mini-units of Kollipaka-7,000.

**Kodiyana-Nadu:** At the time of Vikramaditya VI, an inscription, dated 1081 A.D., from Palturu, refers to Kodiyana-*nadu* and its village Nadahalli.<sup>102</sup> The unit may be located around Palturu in Gooty taluk, Anantapur district.

**Kogali-nadu:** It has been mentioned as a subdivision of Nolambavadi-32,000 in an inscription during the reign of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jagadekamalla II.<sup>103</sup> Kuttangi, one of its villages, is identical with Uttangi in Jammalamadugu taluk, Kadapa district, to which taluk the division might correspond.

**Kollipaka-Nadu/ Desa/ 7,000:** This was a major division in the dominions of the Rashtrakutas, Chalukyas of Kalyana and the Kakatiyas. During the Rashtrakuta period, one of their feudatories or governors named Sankaragandarasa was ruling over Kollipaka-nadu-20,000.<sup>104</sup> The Kolanupaka inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jagadekamalla I dated 1033 A.D. refers to the village of Gadicheruvu in Kollipaka-7000.<sup>105</sup> Under Vikramaditya VI this division was known as Kollipaka-7,000, Kollipaka-2,000 and Kollipaka-desa.<sup>106</sup> The villages of Panupura, Kolar, Koduru, Kollipaka and Ittikala were reckoned among its villages. Kalvachdu-40 kampana was one of its small units. Being a large division, it might have been comprised of the modern taluks of Bhongir in Nalgonda district, Siddhipet in Medak district, Jangaon in Warangal district and some parts of Karimnagar district.

**Kondapalli-300/ Kondapalli-Nadu:** One of the Tripurantakam records of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI brings to light that his Dandanayaka Govindarasa was the governor of Kondapalli-300.<sup>107</sup> Inscriptions of Govindarasa have been noticed at Huzurnagar and at Burugedda in Nalgonda district.<sup>108</sup> Hence the Kondapalli mentioned as the headquarters of this division is the present Nelakondapalli on the borders of this division is the present Nelakondapalli on the borders Suryapet taluk. Thus the division formed parts of Suryapet taluk and the whole of Huzurnagar taluk in Nalgonda district on the northern bank of the

Krishna. It is to be distinguished from the hill fort of Kondapalli in Krishna district. Govindarasa's maternal uncle Anantapalarasa was at the same time ruling over Vengi-12,000 and Emmadale-6,000. So the uncle and nephew simultaneously governed the regions adjacent to each other on either side of the Krishna.

**Kosavala-1,25,000:** Rajaditya, a subordinate of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, defeated the Cholas and Kurumbas while he was administering Chabbi-21,000 (from its headquarters at Lembulavada) which was subdivision of Kosavala-125,000.<sup>109</sup> Chabbi is a variant of Sabbi. Being a very large division, it must have had several subdivisions and extended far beyond Karimnagar district probably up to South Kosala.

**Kudala-12:** This small unit has been referred to in an inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara I from Sangamesvaram, in Alampur taluk, Mahaboobnagar district.<sup>110</sup> Its headquarters Kudala may be identified with Kudali-Sangam. Kudala (Telugu: *Kuduta* = to join) got its name on account of its being the meeting, point of the rivers Krishna and Tungabhadra.

**Kudiyana-40/ Kudiyape-40:** Inscriptions at the time of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI refer to this division variously as Kudiyape-40, Kudiyana-40 Kudiyali-*stala*<sup>111</sup> and Kudiyapeya-*stala*. The villages included in it were

Togarikunta, and Reddiyapalli. The division comprised parts of Dharmavaram and Anantapur taluks in Anantapur district.

**Kulakuliya-13/ Kulakuliya-Baliya:** The Mallesvaram temple inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara I<sup>112</sup> refers to this small unit and one of its villages, Chavunapalli. It has also been referred to as Kulakuliya-*baliya*.<sup>113</sup> It was a part of Yettapi-90 which in turn was a subdivision of Vaddavana-500 in Kandurnadu. Being a part of Yettapi-90, the unit corresponds to some area near Yetam in Kolhapur taluk, Mahaboobnagar district.

**Lombulike-70:** The Chilkur pillar inscription<sup>114</sup> of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya V refers to this division. An unpublished inscription of Vikramaditya VI, dated 1090 A.D., shows that Chilkur the find-spot of the above inscription was the capital of Lombulike-70. Chilkur is a village 32km from Hyderabad in Hyderabad district.

**Manchalu-36:** An inscription from Gurajala, Adoni taluk, at the time of the Kalyana Chalukya king Jagadekamalla II, dated 1142 A.D. refers to Manchalu-36 and its village Gurindala.<sup>115</sup> The headquarters and the village have been identified with Manchala and Gurajala respectively in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district.

**Mottavadi-nadu:** Under the Chalukyas of Kalyana this division has been referred to in the Tripurantakam temple inscription of Vikramaditya VI, dated 1122 A.D.<sup>116</sup>

The villages stated to have belonged to it are Kavalakunta, Rachagonda, Satakodu, Muttuvalu, Kambhamupadu, Mranepalli, Medapi, Guttalapalli, Miriyamupadu and Duvvali. An inscription from Bapatla mentions Tripurantaka of Mottavadi.<sup>117</sup> Later on when it was a Kakatiya division, the village of Pullacheruvu in it was granted to the temple of Tripurantakesvara at Tripurantakam by Gandapendara Gangayyasahini for the merit of his master, the king Ganapatideva.<sup>118</sup> The division is also recorded in the Mallikarjuna temple inscription at Srisailam.<sup>119</sup> From the identification of the place-names mentioned in the Tripurantakam inscriptions referred to above, the division under the Chalukyas of Kalyana and probably under the Kakatiyas also, can be identified with Markapur taluk of Prakasam district.

**Mulki-500/ Mulki-Nadu:** Mulki-500 was at first a division under the Rashtrakutas. An inscription at the time of Govinda IV from Kamalapuram<sup>120</sup> refers to Mulki-500. Another inscription at the time of Krishna-III from Pushpagiri,<sup>121</sup> calls it *Mulki-nadu*. The Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya-VI built a tank at Chilamakuru in Mulki-300.<sup>122</sup> In the year 1182 A.D., the Telugu, Chola chief Chiddanadeva granted lands in Koduru in *Mulki-nadu* for the service of god Indresvara of Pushpagiri.<sup>123</sup> Inscriptions at the time of the Kakatiya King Prataparudra refer to *Mulki nadu* and the villages of Rajavolu, Mallayavemulu and Perakapadu.<sup>124</sup> On the basis of identification of the above place-names, and the

find-spots of the inscriptions, the division may be identified with Kamalapuram taluk and parts of Kadapa and Pulivendula taluks of Kadapa district.

**Naravadi-500/ Nalavadi-Vishaya:** This division is named after the family of the Nalas who were for sometime feudatories of the Badami Chalukyas. A record at the time of the Badami Chalukya king Vikramaditya, obtained from Kurnool, reveals about Nalavadi-*vishaya* and its village Ratnagiri.<sup>125</sup> The village has been identified with that of the same name in Madakasira taluk, Anantapur district. From the find-spot and from the identification of the village it may be said that originally, at the time of the Badami Chalukyas and even later, Nalavadi comprised parts of Kurnool and Anantapur districts. Under the Rashtrakutas the division was called Naravadi-500.<sup>126</sup> An inscription of Krishna-III, dated 967 A.D., refers to Naravadi-500. The find-spot of this inscription is Nayakallu, Kurnool taluk. Under the Chalukyas of Kalyana the division was known as Nalavadi-*nadu*, Nalavadi and Naravadi-500. The Panchalingala inscription of Somesvara II refers to Nalavadi-*nadu* and its villages Gudigere, Cheruvumbadu and Kalpalli.<sup>127</sup> Another record of the same king speaks of the village of Mandagiritirtha in Nalavadi.<sup>128</sup> Inscriptions of Vikramaditya-VI and Somesvara-III speak of Naravadi-500.<sup>129</sup> Saulu-70 was a subdivision of Naravadi-500. As the region later on came under the Kakatiyas, it was simply called Naravadi. At the time of Prataparudra, in the year A.D. 1313, the village of Rachavidu in Naravadi

was granted to the temple of Mallikarjuna at Srisailam.<sup>130</sup> Identification of these places shows that during the Kalyana Chalukya and Kakatiya period the division comprised a major part of the present Kurnool district and northern fringes of Anantapur district.

**Nolambavadi-32,000:** As observed under the Nigarili Sola mandalam, the Nolamba-Pallavas under the Chola pressure advanced towards Anantapur-Kurnool region in the middle of the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. As they were establishing themselves in the new region, they were easily overcome by the Chalukyas of Kalyana. An inscription dated 1150 A.D. during the reign of Jagadekamalla II, makes reference to Nolambavadi-32,000.<sup>131</sup> It is likely that the region was annexed by Vikramaditya VI. One of its subdivisions was Kogali-*nadu*. The division may be identified with the region around the adjoining areas of Kurnool, Anantapur and Bellary districts.

**Panugal-500:** The Chinna Tumbalam inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, dated 1092 A.D., refers to Panugal-500.<sup>132</sup> It is doubtful whether its headquarters can be identified with Panugallu in Nalgonda district or with Hangallu in Bellary district, Karnataka State.

**Pedekal-800/- 5,000 / Pedekal-Vishaya/ Pedekallu-Desa:** An inscription of the Badami Chalukya king Vijayaditya, dated 689 A.D., from Togarchedu, Nandyal

taluk, refers to Pedekal-vishaya.<sup>133</sup> The villages of Togarchedu, Gullavelenduvu, Ereyuru and Battayuru were reckoned as its constituents. Another inscription of the same king, dated 692 A.D. reveal the same division along with its village Alikunde.<sup>134</sup> His successor Vijayaditya, in the year 700 A.D. while residing at Pottalikanagara in Bavihara-*vishaya* granted the village of Yukrombe in Pedekal-*vishaya*.<sup>135</sup> This inscription refers also to the village of Vinchchihicedi. The last two inscriptions were obtained from Mayaluru, Koilkuntla taluk, Kurnool district. The division under the Badami Chalukyas comprised at least Koilkuntla, Nandyala and Banganapalli taluks in Kurnool district. The division later on became a part of the Kalyana Chalukya dominion. An inscription of Somesvara, dated 1061 A.D., refers to it as Pedekal-800<sup>136</sup> along with Ayije-300, Kanne-300 and Naravadi-500. The Bichapalli (Alampur taluk) inscription of Somesvara II,<sup>137</sup> the Gadigarevula (Nalgonda taluk) and Sangamesvaram inscriptions of Vikramaditya VI refer to the same Pedekal-800.<sup>138</sup> The headquarters of this division is identified with Pendekallu in Dhone taluk, Kurnool district. From the proximity of Ayije-300, Kanne-300 and Naravadi-500 the division can be identified with a large portion of Kurnool district. The division is referred to in the inscriptions of the Kakatiyas as Pedekallu-*desa*. An inscription, dated A.D. 1319, found in the courtyard of the temple of Viranarayanasmami at Panem, Nandyal taluk, states that Mummadi Juttiya, the governor of Pedekallu-*desa*<sup>139</sup> and other southern districts during the reign of Prataparudra, made a gift of the fees payable by the people of several

classes to the temple of Viranarayana at Panyamu. The division at this period might have been identical in size with that of the Kalyana Chalukya period.

**Pulgunuru-70:** This small division along with one of its villages named Sanagara has been referred to in a record, dated 1100 A.D., of the Kakatiya chief Beta II when he was a subordinate of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI.<sup>140</sup> It was a subdivision of Sabbi-1,000 in the Kalyana Chalukya domain. When the jurisdiction of Sabbi-1,000 was handed over to Beta II, Pulgunuru-70 became part of the Kakatiya territory. Its headquarters Pulgunuru is identical with Pulluru in Siddhipet taluk, Medak district, and the village of Sanagara is known as Sanigaram in Karimnagar taluk. The division was, thus, comprised of parts of these two adjacent taluks.

**Pullanuru-70:** An inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, dated. 1104 A.D, from Kolanupaka<sup>141</sup> refers to this division and a village in it called Maddigatlu. The name of this division is a variant of Pulgunuru-70.

**Rodda-300:** During the reign of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI, in the year 1079 A.D., his *Mahamandalesvara* Mangarasa was the governor of Rodda-300 and Kaniyakallu-300.<sup>142</sup> Rodda is identical with Roddam in Penugonda taluk, Anantapur district.

**Sabbi-Sahasra/ Sabbi-1,000/ Sabbi-Nadu:** Under the Vemulavada Chalukyas this division was known Sabbi-*sahasra*. An inscription<sup>143</sup> from Parbhani, Maharashtra State, reveals that the unit of Repaka-12 belonged to this division. Under the Kalyana Chalukya it was known as Sabbi-1,000. The Vemulavada Bhimesvara temple inscription of Vikramaditya-VI dated 1106 A.D., records the grant of a flower garden situated on the south of Lembulavada-agrahara in Venisala-70 of Sabbi-1,000.<sup>144</sup> A little earlier inscription<sup>145</sup> of the same king in the Rajesvara temple, dated 1083 A.D. refers to Lembulavada as the capital of Chabbi-21,000 which was counted as a constituent unit of Kosavala-125,000. This shows that the division, Chabbi or Sabbi, was a very large one in the early years of Vikramaditya-VI and that he divided the bigger divisions into smaller ones for the sake of efficient administration. Since Vemulavada was its chief town, the division under the Kalyana Chalukyas should be located around Vemulavada, probably occupying a major portion of Karimnagar district. The Kakatiya chief Beta II in return for his loyalty, submission and allegiance to the Kalyana Chalukya monarch Vikramaditya-VI, received from the latter a gift of a region called Sabbi-*sahasra*. According to an inscription<sup>146</sup> Beta II dated 1100 A.D. the village Sanagara was in Pulgunuru-70. Again according to the records of Prola II, son of Beta II, the same village Sanagara is stated to have been in Sabbi-*sahasra*.<sup>147</sup> Hence Pulgunuru-70 was a subdivision of Sabbi-*sahasra*. In the year 1171 A.D. Gangadhara, a minister of Rudra-I, gives an account of his construction of temples in several places of

which one temple was constructed at Nagaruru, the capital of Sabbi-nadu.<sup>148</sup> At the time of Prataparudra the villages of Challagaraga and Gudlakota in Sabbi-nadu<sup>149</sup> were granted to the temple of Mallikarjuna at Srisailam. The Kakatiya division of Sabbi-nadu, as under the Kalyana Chalukyas, may be identified with a major portion of the present Karimnagar district.

**Sarimale-12:** This small unit along with its village, Vrepikatta, has been referred to in an inscription<sup>150</sup> of Vikramaditya VI, dated 1100 A.D., from Mallesvaram, Kolhapur taluk. It was a part of Yettapi-90 which itself was a sub-division of Vaddavana-500 in of Yettapi-90 which itself was a sub-division of Vaddavana-500 in Kandur-nadu. Sarimale-12 therefore was situated near the present Yettam and Nagarkurnool in Mahaboobnagar district.

**Saulu-70:** The Kunkanuru inscription<sup>151</sup> of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara-III dated 1129 A.D., refers to Saulu-70 as a subdivision of Naravadi-500. One of its villages was Kukuvanuru which has been identified with the find-spot, Kunkanuru in Pattikonda taluk, Kurnool district.

**Sindavadi-1,000:** This was the home territory of the Sindas in the 9<sup>th</sup> century A.D. and hence the name, Sindavadi. Later on it became a part of the Kalyana Chalukya territory, and as a division it was first referred to in an inscription of Somesvara-I. In the records<sup>152</sup> of Vikramaditya VI it is referred to as Sindavadi, Sindavadi-nadu

and Sindavadi-1,000.<sup>153</sup> Some of its constituent sub-divisions and villages mentioned in these inscriptions are Adavani-500, Tumbula-30, Chindavadi (Sindavadi)-86, Pombulige-73, (vide: Hambulige-30), Gutti, Kanchagara Belagallu, Tumbula and Gadiya Poturu. The Pedda Tumbalam inscription<sup>154</sup> of Somesvara-III, dated 1132 A.D., refers to Sindavadi-1,000 and its sub-division Adavani-500. An inscription<sup>155</sup> of Jagadekamalla-III, dated 1164 A.D., refers to its chief town as *Kirtinarayana-nagara*, an alias of Tumbula. According to an inscription<sup>156</sup> of Somesvara-IV, Bagi-12 was a subdivision of Sindavadi-1,000. Its chief town, Tumbula alias *Kirtinarayanaganara* is identified with Pedda Tumbalam in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district. The division comprised more or less a major portion of Kurnool district and some parts of Anantapur district.

**Sire-Nadu/ Siri-Nadu:** This division has been found recorded first in the Hemavati inscription<sup>157</sup> of Vikramaditya-VI, dated 1126 A.D., which states that the King's subordinate *Mahamandalesvara* Tribhuvanamallideva Chodamaharaja, lord of Oreyuru, while ruling at Hemjeru, widened the well that was dug at the capital town of Hemjeru, widened the well that was dug at the capital town of Hemjeru in *Sire-nadu*. Hemjeru is now called Hemavati, the find-spot of the inscription, in Madakasira taluk. The Eradukere inscription of Jagadekamalla-II, dated 1139 A.D., refers to Suliyannuru-70 of this division.<sup>158</sup> Another inscription from Hemavati, at the time of Jagadekamalla-III, dated 1168 A.D. refers to this

division and the town of Hemjeru.<sup>159</sup> The Malayanuru inscription of the same king refers to the division and the village of Malayanuru. The region around it seems to have been subjugated by the Chalukya Chola emperor Kulottunga-III. For, in the year 1180 A.D., the division was referred to as *Siri-nadu* in *Nigarilisola mandalam*. The division has been identified with the region comprising parts of Kalyanadurga and Madakasira taluks of Anantapur district. The name ‘Sire’, probably, is still retained in the suffix or Madakasira.<sup>160</sup>

**Sulitanuru-70:** As just noted above, this unit was a sub-division of Sire-nadu. And the village of Eradukere belonged to this unit.<sup>161</sup> It may be identified with a part of Kalyanadurga taluk.

**Tumbula-30:** This unit was a part of Adavani-500 which itself was a sub-division of Sindavadi-1,000. Since Tumbula was the capital of Sindavadi-1,000, Tumbula-30 had functioned as the central division and was the most important unit in Sindavadi-1,000. According to the Karakanthapuram inscription<sup>162</sup> of Vikramaditya VI, the village of Badagikunte was in Tumbula-30. The Pedda Tumbalam inscription<sup>163</sup> of Somesvara-III mentions the villages of Badambeyyamgeri and Tumbalabidu in this unit. It has been identified with the region surrounding Pedda Tumbalam in Adoni taluk, Kurnool district.

**Vaddavana-500:** The Agastyesvaram temple inscription<sup>164</sup> of the Kalyana Chalukya king Taila II as well as the Mallesvaram temple inscription<sup>165</sup> of Somesvara I of the same family refers to Vaddavana-500. Besides being itself a subdivision of Kundur-*nadu*, it included within it Yattapi-90. As seen under the respective units, Anmanbelle-11, Sarimale-12 and Kulakuliya-13 were small units under Yattapi-90. The headquarters of Vaddavana-500 is identified with the village of Vardhamanapura in Nagarkurnool taluk. The division, therefore, comprised parts of Kolhapur, Wanparti and Nagarkurnool taluks of Mahaboobnagar district.

**Velpugonda-24:** An inscription<sup>166</sup> of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI dated 1124 A.D. from Guduru, Nalgonda district, speaks of Velpugonda-24. The headquarters of this division Velpugonda is represented by the modern Zafargadh in Warangal district.<sup>167</sup>

**Vengi-14,000/ Vengi *Rashtra*/ Vengi *Vishaya*/ Vengi *Nadu*:** The achievements of the Kalyana Chalukya king Vikramaditya VI in the eastern region included also the subjugation of Vengi region. Vengi was for a while ruled by Vikramaditya VI through his efficient generals. An inscription<sup>168</sup> from Kommuru, Bapatla taluk, dated 1118 A.D., refers to it as Vengi-14,000. Another inscription from Tripurantakam dated 1126 A.D., reveals that Anantapalarasa<sup>169</sup>, the *Dandanayaka* of Vikramaditya VI, was ruling over Vengi-12,000 and Emmadale-6,000. Under

the Kalyana Chalukyas the Vengi division must have comprised the entire Krishna district and parts of Guntur, West Godavari and East Godavari districts. The Chola inscriptions record it as *Vengi-mandalam*.

*Vengi-vishaya* the central administrative unit of the Eastern Chalukyas and an important division of the Chalukya Cholas became a division in the eastern outskirts of the Kakatiya kingdom.<sup>170</sup> However, Vengi remained as the headquarters of a rather large division called Vengi-16,000 as recorded in an inscription<sup>171</sup> in the temple of Virabhadra at Yenamadala, dated 1269 A.D. This large division of the Kakatiyas comprised probably Nuzvidu and Gannavaram taluks of Krishna district, that is, contiguous to the Kondanataavadi division, and extending right across the West Godavari district reaching up to the river Godavari.

**Yattapi-90/ Ettapi-90 *Kampana*, Yattapi-70 *Baliya*:** The Mallesvaram temple inscription of the Kalyana Chalukya king Somesvara I informs about Yattapi-90 as a *kampana* of Vaddavani-500 in Kandur-nadu.<sup>172</sup> Anmanballe-11, Sarimale-12 and the villages of Banmanam and Battugam were reckoned to be its constituent parts. Yattapi-70 referred to as a *Baliya* in the Mallesvaram temple inscriptions.<sup>173</sup> Its headquarters Yattapi is identified with Yetam in Kolhapur taluk. The division must correspond to the contiguous parts of Kolhapur, Nagarkurnool and Wanaparti taluks of Mahaboobnagar district.

## **The Military Administration**

The interesting feature of the Military administration of the Chalukyas of Kalyana is that most of the civil officers were bound to offer military service also. That is a reason why most of them were described, as dandanayakas. Infantry and cavalry were two branches of the army. Senadhipati, dandanayaka, mahapradhana and *nayaka* were the senior officers of the army. *Sahani*, *pattasahani* were in charge of cavalry. *Sahani* means a groom who was qualified to tend and train horses. Elephants formed a part of the military force. Aneya-sahani was the groom in charge of elephants. Excepting perhaps the officials of the lower cadre like the *sahani*, the generals and other senior officers held the military office along with their civilian duties. The hero-stones of the period depict the arms used by the army. Sword, bow and arrow were the most common weapons. Shields were used for defense. Javelins, long spears and such other weapons were also used.

Available evidence indicates that almost all the officers were paid in kind for the services rendered by them. They were given land grants on tenure (*vritti*) basis several terms in this connection occur in the epigraphs an analysis of which shows noteworthy features. *Umbali* was such a tenure wherein lands were granted for various public offices held. This term occurs in records of a slightly later period and quite commonly in the Vijayanagara period. Most of the officers were authorized to use the revenue assignments or specified income from taxes etc., for

themselves in lieu of the services rendered. The queens and princes were also holding such assignments. As said above that Ketaladevi, wife of Somesvara-I was governing the agrahara Bannigola in Karadikal-300 as *Kuttumbitti*, which has been interpreted to mean *kutumbavritti*,<sup>174</sup> tenure for maintaining one's family. *Kumaravritti* may be described as a gift of land on tenure given to the princes.

On the other hand, *gavunda*, the village official who looked after the welfare of the villagers, acted as the police, the justice and also the revenue officer. He was the headman of the village and was assisted by *senabova* (*karanika*) who was the accountant that maintained the records, kept accounts etc. *Senabova* figures often as the person who drafted the texts of inscriptions. When he turned out to be a literary person he drafted them not in the usual official prose but in chaste poetic form.

*Nadu* was a bigger administrative unit headed by had the *nadagavunda* (*nalgavunda*) who was sometimes designated as (*nalprabhu*). Instances of a *gavunda* of a village also holding the office of a *nalgavunda* are also found. Mostly in such cases, the villages of which he was the *gavunda* formed the head quarters of the *nadu*. This would mean plurality of offices, which was not uncommon in the period under study. As in the case of the village, even in a *nadu* there used to be an accountant (*nada-senabova*). These officials in the lowest

rungs of hierarchy formed the backbone of administration since they were responsible for the regular collection of revenue and maintenance of law and order. They were also to protect people and their property, look after the endowments made to temples and institutions, keep accounts and impart justice also.

Besides the villages, there were bigger towns and cities described as the *ur* and *nagara*. The *ur* had the *urggavunda (urodeya)* as its officer. The *nagara* was generally a mercantile place and it was administered by the *nakhara* a commercial guild. *Nagaradhyaksha* was the chief officer of such places. *Nagarasreshthi* was the head of the guild, its president, who was generally a banker. *Pattanasvami* is also a term used to designate the head guild.

Villages and *urs* were autonomous bodies, which had several privileges in matters of administration. Although the king or his officer was free to make gifts of lands in the villages, he could do so only after consulting the village authorities. One obvious reason was that it was the village official that maintained the records at the source and was in a better position to offer advice regarding the feasibility of the gift. Further, it was he who had to later keep note of such gifts to enable the officials to collect taxes or desist from collecting them in case they were free of imposts. It was not always that these gifts were made free of all imposts. Some usual and unavoidable taxes had to be paid. All these would be kept note of only

by the village officials. Tanks in the villages had to be properly maintained and the irrigational canals had to properly channelised so that every land below the tank received its due share. The village had to be protected from external aggression, cattle raids and the like; justice had to be done in cases of dispute, either private or partisan. For all these, the village headman had to consult the local village body. The *gaudu-praje*, i.e., the elders and citizens formed such a body where the problems pertaining to the village were discussed and solutions arrived at. The *agraharas*, erroneously described as Brahmana settlements, consisted of mahajanas, the elder citizens who formed the village council.

It may be noted in this connection that within the kingdom there were small areas, which were being ruled by the feudatory chiefs hereditarily. These chiefs had carved out small principalities for themselves and ruled over those areas quite independently. However, they showed loyalty to the overlord by way of offering occasional tributes, supply army and such other military services in times of war. Yet, the king deputed his own trusted officers to chieftaincies obviously to watch the activities of the chief. Also there were certain taxes levied directly by the central government the collection of which was the responsibility of the central government officers. In so far as the internal administration was concerned, these chiefs were independent as long as peace was maintained. Only in cases of disturbances and revolt did the king interfere in the administration of the chieftaincies.

## **Feudal Element and the Feudatories of the Kalyana Chalukyas**

The Rashtrakutas of Manyakheta who dominated the politics of Deccan for nearly two hundred years came to an end by the emergence of the Chalukyas of Kalyana under the leadership of Taila II. He ruled roughly for twenty-three years, i.e., from 973-74 A.D. to 996. The last king of the family was Tribhuvanamalla Somesvara IV (1182-1200 A.D). The most powerful and the feared monarch of this dynasty was Tribhuvanamalla Vikramaditya VI who started a new era called the Chalukya Vikrama Era. It was during his time that the Western Chalukyan Empire reached its highest watermark. But during the weak rule of Jagadekamalla-II and Tailapa-III the Kalyana Chalukyan sun started sinking. Bijjala of that Kalachuri dynasty, who originally started his life as a feudatory, later on became the most powerful of Tailapa-III's subordinates and finally usurped the throne by overthrowing his overlord in 1156 A.D. Then the Yadavas of Devagiri, the Hoysalas of Dvarasamudra and the Kakatiyas of Warangal divided the Western Chalukyan kingdom between themselves.<sup>175</sup> Thus came to an end one of the most glorious and illustrious charters in the history of Deccan.

The Kalyana Chalukyan Empire, though it became a victim, many a time, to external invasions and internal irruptions, enjoyed comparatively peace and prosperity. Many of the monarchs were great builders and patrons of letters. Bhuvanaikamalla Somesvara-III, the son of Tribhuvanamalla Vikramaditya VI,

was the author of *Abhilashitarthachintamani* or *Manasollasa* which deals with the science of administration, justice, medicine, astrology, architecture, iconography, etc. Trade, commerce, industry, agriculture and irrigation were patronised.

Before going to investigate the feudal element in the Kalyana Chalukyan polity it is better for us to know first of all the nature of feudalism that existed in the early mediaeval and mediaeval India. Prof. R.S. Sharma states: 'Those who wish to investigate the nature of feudalism in the Indian context are faced with the absence of any fixed theoretical model which can be applied to this country. The early concept of feudalism based on West European experience, especially that of France and England, no longer enjoys universal validity. Conditions in Chow China, in the middle kingdom of Egypt and Kassite Babylonia are thought to be feudal. Some emphasise the military aspect of feudalism stating that the knight's service is the key to the feudal institutions; others emphasize its legal aspects the contrast between the lord and the vassal; and still others its manorial aspect in which the peasants worked as serfs in the manner of the lord. In a broader sense I consider the existence of landed intermediaries to be the essence of feudal order which furnishes an agrarian economy buttressed by the decline of trade and shortage of money. It is obvious that all these features will have to be taken into account and the comparative method for the study of feudalism pursued rigorously. Only then it will be possible to bring out specific traits of Indian

feudalism'.<sup>176</sup> He further observes:<sup>177</sup> 'To us the European experience suggests that the political essence of feudalism lay in the organisation of the whole administrative structure on the basis of land; its economic essence lay in the institution of serfdom in which peasants were attached to the soil held by landed intermediaries placed between the king and the actual tillers; who had to pay rent in kind and labour to them'. Radhakrishna Chaudhary says: 'The rise of feudalism in South India is traces back to the decline of the Satavahanas. There were a number of dynasties in South India and even the mighty Samudragupta could not bring all of them under his control. After the Guptas almost all the dynasties of South India became independent and fought for supremacy in the South. The situation was ripe for the development of feudalism in the whole of *Dakshinapatha*. It was only after the fall of the Satavahanas that the feudatories rose to prominence but these feudal chieftains were different from their European counterparts in the sense that they never struck out as independent productive agencies or corporations'.<sup>178</sup> It is evident that the Indian feudalism evolves round the land-grants which were directly responsible for the emergence of powerful politico-economic intermediaries. Therefore, it is in the light of this vital feature of feudalism that an attempt is made to investigate the traces of feudal element during the period under our consideration.

The feudal character of the Kalyana Chalukyan polity was evident by the existence of a large number of powerful political intermediaries in the form of

*samantas, mahasamantas, mahasamantadhipatis, Mahamandalesvara*, etc. The Western Chalukyan emperors were served by the Kadambas, the Silaharas, the Rattas, the Yadavas, the Hoysalas and the Kakatiyas in their conquests and in maintaining the administration of the realm.<sup>179</sup> Tailapa II, the founder of the Western Chalukyan line of Kalyana, was originally a feudatory of the Rashtrakuta Krishna. In 957 A.D. *mahasamantadhipati* Ahavamalla Tailaparasa i.e. Tailapa II was ruling the Bijapur district as a Rashtrakuta feudatory.<sup>180</sup> Sobhanarasa,<sup>181</sup> *mahasamanta* Santivarman,<sup>182</sup> a Ratta chief of Saundatti and *Mahamandalesvara* Aparajita of the Silahara family were the feudatories of Tailapa II.<sup>183</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Jemarasa is referred to in an inscription of 1066 A.D. from Hottur as the feudatory of Somesvara I.<sup>184</sup> The early Kakatiya chiefs Beta I, ProIa I, Beta II and ProIa II, who enjoyed the title *Mahamandalesvara* were the subordinates of Somesvara I and Vikramaditya VI.<sup>185</sup> *Mahasamanta* Ajjarasa is figured in an inscription of 1050 A.D. as the vassal of Somesvara I.<sup>186</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Seuna II, a Yadava prince, recognised the supremacy of Somesvara II.<sup>187</sup> The Hoysala Vishnuvardhana enjoyed the title -*Chalukya-mani-mandalikachudamani* ‘the crest-jewel among the feudatory chieftains of the jewel of the Chalukyas’.<sup>188</sup> A Nagai inscription of 1062 A.D. mentions *Mahamandalesvara* Chauttinayeha of the Ahiheya family and his overlord Tribhuvanamalla Somesvara I. *Mahamandalesvara* Lokarasa,<sup>189</sup> Anemarasa,<sup>190</sup> Jagaddevarasa,<sup>191</sup> Rajaditya,<sup>192</sup> Halluvarasa,<sup>193</sup> Ahavamalla Permani,<sup>194</sup>

Tondarasa-Chola Maharaja,<sup>195</sup> Natavadi Duggarasa<sup>196</sup> and Mallā-maharaja of the Vaidumba family<sup>197</sup> were some of the feudatories of Vikramaditya VI. *Mahamandalesvara* Soma Permadi<sup>198</sup> and Pampa Perumanandi<sup>199</sup> were the vassals of Tailapa-III. It is clear from the above discussion that the Chalukyas of Kalyana were served by a large number of feudatories in looking after the administration of the empire.

The *samantas*, *mandalikas*, *mahasamantas* and *Mahamandalesvara* were provided with extensive fiefs for their maintenance. Thus the *Mahamandalesvara* Asagamarasa, lord of Lattaluripura and of the Rashtrakuta family was ruling Kollipaka 21,000 and Sabbi 1,000 countries.<sup>200</sup> In 1047 A.D. Kommanayya, a feudatory of the Chalukya Trailokyamalla was administering Kollipaka 7,000.<sup>201</sup> In 1123 A.D., *Mahamandalesvara* Bibbarasa, a subordinate of Vikramaditya-VI, was ruling Alande 1,000.<sup>202</sup> The Hyderabad Museum inscription of Vikramaditya VI introduces his subordinate Tribhuvanamalla Vira Nolamba Pallava Permanadi who was governing the tract of Karadikal-400.<sup>203</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Devarasa was in charge of the administration of a major province like the Edadore-2000 during the time of Somesvara-I.<sup>204</sup> *Mahasamanta* Nagavarmarasa of the Kadamba family enjoyed the region of Navile as his fief.<sup>205</sup> A Sinda chief by name Korlaganda is mentioned in an inscription found at Hosur in the Gadag taluk of Dharwar district as the lord of Mulugunda-12.<sup>206</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Lokarasa

was the governor of Aralu-300 and Miriti-300 during the reign of Vikramaditya-VI.<sup>207</sup> In 1093 A.D. the above mentioned regions were governed by the *Mahamandalesvara* Anemlrasa.<sup>208</sup> In 1083 A.D. Rajaditya was governing the areas of Kosavala- One and quarter lakh and Chabbijoyi-71000 from his capital Lemulavada.<sup>209</sup> Kundamarasa figures as the ruler of Banavasi 12,000 and Santalige 1,000 in the records of the reigns of Vikramaditya-VI and his successor Jagadekamalla Jayasimha 11.<sup>210</sup> The Kakatiya ProIa-I acquired from Somesvara-I the hereditary ruler ship of *Hanumakonda-vishaya*.<sup>211</sup> Tondarasa Cholamaharaja was ruling the province of Kollipaka 7,000 in 1088 A.D.<sup>212</sup> In 1067 A.D., *Mahamandalesvara* Chiddana Chola *maharaja* was governing the tract of Ayaje - 300.<sup>213</sup> The same feudatory, in 1073 A.D. was ruling Kanne -300, Pedakal - 800, Naravadi-500 and Ayaje-300.<sup>214</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Sobhanarasa ruled Belvola- Three Hundred and Purigere Three Hundred with the status of a *yuvaraja* (*yuvarajapadaviyolam*).<sup>215</sup>

Members of the royal family, like the *yuvarajas*, queens and *rajagurus* were also empowered to maintain and enjoy fiefs of their own. It is known from the Kharepatan grant that Tailapa II's son and successor Irivabedanga Satyasraya was governing Rattapadi, most probably as *yuvaraja*.<sup>216</sup> In 997 A.D., Pampadevi the daughter of a Chalukya Permanandideva was ruling in the Mysore district. Akkadevi, the sister of Vikramaditya-V, was ruling Kisukadi-70 in 1010 A.D.<sup>217</sup>

The same queen is found ruling Banavasi 12,000 together with Mayuravarmadeva who held sway over Panugal 1000, during the time of Jayasimha II.<sup>218</sup> In 1053 A.D., Mailaladevi was governing Banavasi 12,000 and in 1054 A.D. Ketaladevi was ruling Ponnavaada *agrahara*.<sup>219</sup> Prof. N. Lakshminarayana Rao observes: ‘She (Akkadevi) was a Chalukyan princess who was ruling over various divisions of the Chalukyan dominions such as Banavasi, Kisukadu Masavadi, for as long a period as nearly half a century. This great administrator was the daughter of Dasavarman and Bhagaladevi and was the sister of Vikramaditya V and Jayasimha II, both Chalukyan emperors of Kalyana.’<sup>220</sup> Chandralekha or Chandaladevi, the daughter of Silahara Marasimha and one of the queens of the redoubtable Chalukyan emperor Vikramaditya VI was the governor of Karhata, modern Karhad in the Satara district of Maharashtra State.<sup>221</sup> Vikramaditya VI as a *yuvaraja*, governed the Gangavadi region.<sup>222</sup> Somesvara’s younger brother Jayasimha figures as the ruler of Kogali-500, Kadambalige-1000 and Ballakunde-300 in 1068 A.D. and a little later he was ruling from Kampili over Nolambavadi-32,000 and Sindavadi-1000; a position which he seems to have held up to 1073 A.D. <sup>223</sup> Lakshminahadevi also called Lakshmadevi is referred to in some inscriptions as ruling over eighteen *agraharas* and Dharmapuram in 1096 A.D. <sup>224</sup> *Yuvaraja* Mallikarjuna, the son of Vikramaditya VI, was in charge of Taradavadi-1,000 from 1096 A.D. to 1116 A.D.<sup>225</sup> Somesvara, another son of Vikramaditya VI and Chandaladevi, is found ruling the ‘Two Six Hundred’ and Banavasi as early as

1089 A.D. and earlier still in 1083 A.D. he was governing Kisukadu 70, Badage 70 and Nareyagal 12 with - the title *Mahamandalesvara* Bhuvanaikamalla Permadi.<sup>226</sup> The Alavanipalli inscription of 1110 A.D. states that *Mahamandalesvara yuvaraja* Tailapadeva, the son of Vikramaditya VI, was ruling Kandur-1,000 from the capital town of Kodur.<sup>227</sup> Anantasivadeva, the *rajaguru* of Vikramaditya VI, is described as the ruler of Unukallu in 1111 A.D.<sup>228</sup>

The extensive regions governed by the feudatories and the scions of the ruling family betray a tendency towards decentralization rather than the real exaltation of royal authority. It further paved the way for the feudalization of state apparatus. The feudal lords were also invested with the powers of granting villages, plots of land, assigning the income of certain taxes etc., to the religious and secular institutions. They were empowered to enjoy civil, criminal and administrative powers within their fiefs. *Mandalika* Joyimayya, granted Talimitta, a hamlet of Perur, as an *agrahara* to god Svayambhu Somesvara and the *mahajanas* in two equal halves.<sup>229</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Asagamarasa, granted some land in the village of Devulappali to the temple of Savabesvara, built by his mother. He also granted *angadi-siddhiyam*, one *dramma* from the *uttama*, six from *madhyama* and forty-four from *kanishta* varieties of shops.<sup>230</sup> *Yuvaraja* Jayasimha, the son of Vikramaditya VI, who obtained Lombalika 70 as *kumaravritti* granted land at Chilukuru to god at the request of *Nadadhikari*,<sup>231</sup>

*Mahamandalesvara* Sankaragandarasar is said to have ordered in 1077 A.D. that all the merchant guilds at Kollipaka to pay taxes at the rate of one *gadyana* for each shop per annum for the enjoyment of *preggada* Kavanayya and other *Karanams*.<sup>232</sup> Paramara Jaggaddeva granted a village named Goshthipalu to the god and for feeding the ascetics.<sup>233</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Rayaparaju of the Haihaya family granted two *mattars* of land to the god Kamisvara of the village of Uriya (*Peddavuru*).<sup>234</sup> Bammayyarasa and Siriyammarasa, by common consent, bestowed three hundred *mattars* of land to the god Svayambhu of Diggavi.<sup>235</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Lokarasa in conjunction with the preceptor Aghorasakti *Pandita* made a grant of a large endowment of land measuring one thousand *mattars*, besides small plots of wet and dry lands, flower gardens etc., to the god Lokesvara of the town of Pandrike.<sup>236</sup> *Yuvaraja* Tailapadeva granted to the *mahajanas, pattusalis* etc., certain privileges regarding property rights.<sup>237</sup> In 1113 A.D., he granted a charter to *pattasalisettikaras* of the capital of Avancha regarding heirless properties. The Karadkal inscription, dated 1191 A.D., registers the gift of one hundred *mattars* of land in the village of Limga for offerings of god *Mahamandalesvara* Bijjarasa and his minister Aneya Malayya Nayaka after purchasing the same from the headman of the place.<sup>238</sup> In 1014 A.D., a *Mahamandalesvara* of Vikramaditya VI by name Pampa Permanadi is said to have made the gift of the village of Kovuru to the god Mahesvara with *sarvabhyantarasidehhis* that is with all the internal privileges.<sup>239</sup> The Alampur

inscription dated 1057 A.D., records that at the instance of Irugana *Chola-maharaja*, his *sunkavergade*, Lokamani Setti made a gift of income from specific tolls to the god Brahmesvara of Alampur.<sup>240</sup> In 1107 A.D., *Mahamandalesvara* Mallarasa made a gift of the income accruing from certain taxes and fines collected in the village Kandनावोल on the Tungabhadra to the god.<sup>241</sup> Generally the feudal lords and the scions of the royal family made the grants with or without the consent of their overlord. Sometimes the grants were made at the instigation of the overlord and in conjunction with the local administrative units and in the presence of some state officials. However, the civil, criminal, administrative and fiscal powers enjoyed by these feudal lords undermined considerably the central authority and thereby paved 'the way for the emergence of political intermediaries between the king and the people.

The feudal character of the Kalyana Chalukyan polity was further emphasized by the high sounding titles and titles assumed by the feudal lords. It has been suggested that the terms *samanta* and *samanta-chudamanyah* were used in the sense of a vassal in South India as early as the third quarter of the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. in the Pallava inscriptions.<sup>242</sup> The feudal lords of our period were generally styled *Mandalika*, *mahasamanta*, *mahasamantadhipati*, *maharaja*, *Mahamandalesvara*, *Chalukya mani mandalikachudamani*, etc. These titles were invariably followed by the expressions, viz., *tatpadapadmopajivi* and

*samadhigata- pamchamahasabha* etc. Some of the feudatories bear very high sounding titles. Tribhuvanamalla Vira Nolamba Pallava Permanadi bears the titles, *Sri Prithvivallabha*, *Maha-Pallavanvaya*, *Pallava kulatilaka*, and *Kanchi puravaresvara*.<sup>243</sup> The privilege of *pamchamahasabha* was conferred upon a vassal who had rendered certain remarkable services to his overlord. This was the highest distinction that could be attained by a vassal, for even the *yuvaraja* enjoyed no higher feudal privilege than this. According to *Manasollasa*, this privilege signified by the use of five musical instruments such as *sringa* (horn), *sankha* (conch shell), *bheri* (drum), and *jayaghanta* (bell of victory).<sup>244</sup> This was possibly at first a prerogative of the paramount power but later extended to vassals. To give an example, the Kadamba Adityavarman recites the full *prasasti* of his family with flag, seal and everything else in a record from Kogali, dated 992 A.D., whilst the *pattabandha* (coronation) of another feudatory ruler, a Nolambadhiraja, is particularly mentioned in a record of 1044 A.D.<sup>245</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Nagavarmarasa and Butarasa enjoyed the titles *Toredadiya-Bhima* (the Bhima on the bank of the River), *Naveleya-Partha* (the Arjuna of Navele) and *Manneya-godati* (Axe of feudal peers).<sup>246</sup>

Prof. K.A.N. Sastri records, ‘Their (the feudatories of the Kalyana Chalukyas) rule is often described in nearly the same terms as that of the emperor himself; they too are said to be ruling from *nelevidus* or *rajadhanis*, to be

suppressing the wicked and protecting others, and to be occupying their leisure in noble and pleasant social and intellectual pursuits; their courts also were minor replicas of the imperial establishment, and they had their own ministers and administrative staff quite distinct from the corps of residential officers of the emperor; in one instance no fewer than five ministers of a single feudatory are mentioned'.<sup>247</sup> Vikramaditya-VI bestowed on general Ravideva all the insignia of royalty such as the white umbrella, the great drum and the fly-whisk.<sup>248</sup> Similarly he made Somesvarabhattacharya his *mahamatya*, bestowed on him all the insignia of royalty, put him in charge of *Dharmadhikara*, the administration of grants and gifts and also placed his material resources (*samastasampada*) at his disposal.<sup>249</sup> The emperor was the supreme bestower of honours but this prerogative was apparently delegated to the feudal lords enjoying the confidence of the emperor. Thus during the reign of Somesvara-I a certain Kesava *Gavunda* of the Goduva family obtained the use of royal insignia from the Kadamba Harikesin of Bankapur.<sup>250</sup> Vikramaditya-VI while ruling as the governor of Gangavadi conferred on a certain Kesava his own title *Chalukya-Ganga-Permadi* and allowed him to use the white umbrella, the double chauris of gold, the flag, the war-drum, the parasol of peacock-feathers and other insignia.<sup>251</sup> Under the Rashtrakutas, the political predecessors of the Kalyana Chalukyas, the feudal lords were permitted to use the feudal throne, fly-whisk, palanquins and elephants.<sup>252</sup>

This clearly indicates the trend towards the feudalization of the political functionaries during this period.

The feudal lords were expected to carry out royal orders in the fiefs held by them. They were free to increase the taxes or to impose fresh ones. They paid yearly tributes to the emperor. Some of the feudal lords went to the extent of contracting diplomatic matrimonial alliances with their overlords. Vinayaditya Hoysala offered his daughter or sister in marriage to Somesvara I.<sup>253</sup> Ereyanga married Mahadevi, the daughter of a certain Irukkavel or Irukkapala the younger brother of a Pandyan prince who assisted Vikramaditya VI.<sup>254</sup> Akkadevi, a Chalukyan princess, seems to have married Mayuravarman, a Kadamba chieftain.<sup>255</sup> Chandralekha or Chandaladevi, one of the principal queens of Vikramaditya VI, was the daughter of Silahara Marasimha.<sup>256</sup> Jayakesi II of Goa married Mailaladevi, the daughter of Vikramaditya VI.<sup>257</sup> Some of the feudatories even style themselves as the sons of the emperor. Kundamarasa who governed Banavasi 12,000 and Santalige 1,000 is described in some records as the son of Irivabedanga. It has been suggested that here the title 'son' is evidently commemorative of king's appreciation of loyal and valuable service rendered by a feudatory.<sup>258</sup> All these instances will give us an idea to state that the feudal lords not only maintained very close links and relations with the emperor but also

indicate the growth of feudal organisation of the state which ultimately reduced the strength of the centre.

The feudatories were allowed to preserve their original fiefs and status intact in every respect, generally subject to the open and loyal recognition of the political paramount of the emperor by reciting his imperial titles and reign first of all and then afterwards introducing their own respective *prasasti* with some phrases like *tatpadapadmopajivi* - dependent upon the lotus feet of the emperor. This fact has been testified by some scores of inscriptions issued during the period under our survey. However, the chief obligation of the feudatories was to render military assistance to their overlord. This practice was in vogue in the feudal polity of the Rashtrakutas. There are many instances where the feudatories participated in the campaigns conducted by the Rashtrakuta emperor with their feudal militia.<sup>259</sup> One can notice this feudal feature also playing a vital part in the Kalyana Chalukyan polity. The Chilukuru inscription of 1067 A.D. gives a long *prasasti* of Asagamarasa of which the following titles, viz., *Chola gaja bhatamalla*, *Chola bala jalabdhivadabanala*, *Chola kataka Surekara* and *Kaveri Arikakara* figure prominent. It appears from these titles that Asagamarasa had taken a leading part in the wars of Trailokyamalla Somesvara-I against the Cholas and was thus responsible for many of his victories.<sup>260</sup> The Kakatiya Prola I, son of Beta I, got *Hanumakonda-vishaya* along with Sabbi-1000 as a permanent fief through a charter from Trailokyamalla Somesvara-I apparently in return for a

meritorious deed which must be of a military nature.<sup>261</sup> Vinayaditya Hoysala sent a large contingent of Kannadiga troops under the command of his youthful son Ereyanga to support the cause of Somesvara-II against Vikramaditya-VI and Jayasimha.<sup>262</sup> By the orders of Tailapa-II, the *yuvaraja* Satyasraya Irivabedanga, chased the *Konkanesvara* (Rashtrakuta) to the sea, conquered the Gurjara and made the earth happy.<sup>263</sup> The Kadamba chieftain Chattaga or Chatta is said to have put the Malava to flight, drunk the waters of the Godavari and earned for himself the title 'guardian of the high land' from the emperor Jayasimha-II.<sup>264</sup> Madhavaraja, the son of Kesavaraja, participated in the Chalukya-Chola war and won the admiration of Jayasimha-II by his skilful handling of a strong cavalry force during the war.<sup>265</sup> *Mahamandalesvara* Revarasa helped his overlord Somesvara-I in suppressing the Silahara Mummuni and Paramara Bhoja.<sup>266</sup> Ereyanga's military support to his overlord is very well attested by many of his inscriptions. It is recorded that the Malava king's hill fort, which was too strong for the Chalukyas, he, without effort plundered while Chalukya was looking on.<sup>267</sup> In another place it is said that Dhara was considered to be the loft (male) of the Malava kingdom, but Ereyanga easily won it and made it over to his liege lord.<sup>268</sup> Thus it would appear that one of the important functions of the feudal lords was to supply soldiers and to participate in the campaigns conducted by their overlords. For the service rendered, these feudatories were neither paid in cash nor kind, but

as stated above, they were assigned extensive fiefs as their remuneration. This clearly shows the prevalence of feudal element in the Western Chalukyan polity.

It is very interesting to note in this connection that petitions were presented to these feudatories by the people in the same way as to the emperor. Thus in 1078-79 A.D. a *binnapa* was presented to the *Mandalika* Joyimayya by Perggade Kambanna for the gift of land to the god Kambesvara.<sup>269</sup> Sometimes the *mandalikas* sought permission from his overlord before making a gift of land, village etc. This shows the growth of feudal relations during the Kalyana Chalukyan period. One of the important rights of the feudal lords was to create their own sub-vassals, some of whom were given the privilege of using the five great musical instruments, and making grants independently.

The emergence of sub-feudatory intermediaries fostered the growth of sub-infeudation. The right or the practice of sub-infeudation was practiced very widely under the Rashtrakutas and the Kalyana Chalukyas might have inherited the same from them.<sup>270</sup> Sufficient evidence are not there regarding the royal machinery which exercised control over the feudatories. Prof. R. S. Sharma states that the officer *viz.* '*Mahasandhivighrika*' was in charge of the Rashtrakuta royal policy towards vassals both in times of war and peace.<sup>271</sup> It appears that the *sandhivighrika* continued to perform the same function during the period under consideration.

The Manasollasa states that the *sandhivigrahika* should be an expert in summoning, dismissing and installing the *samantas*.<sup>272</sup> Kaliyarasa, the son of general Madhuva of the Vanasa family was the Great Lord of Peace and War of the Kannada country. The Kolanupaka inscription of 1107 A.D. describes Anantapala *dandadhisa* as *mahasamantadhipati* (Lord of the Great Feudatories), *mahaprachanda-dandanayaka* (the Formidable Commander of Forces) etc.<sup>273</sup> It would thus appear that the *mahasamantadhipati* was in charge of the feudatories of the realm. It has been suggested that the major feudatories were expected to entertain in their capital a political agent from the central government. These agents were known as *samantadhipatis*, on account of the control which they exercised over the feudatories or *samantas*. The disloyal feudatories were dismissed from office and were punished.

The feudal character of the Kalyana Chalukyan polity is further supported by the existence of a large number of military commanders who is referred to in the inscriptions as *Senapati*, *Dandanayaka*, *mahadandanayaka*, *mahaprachanda-dandayakas* etc. Bayala Nambi was the famous general of Satyasraya Irvabedanga who carried fire and sword into the Chola Empire by attacking the fortresses of Dannada (Dhanyakataka) and Yenamadala.<sup>274</sup> *Mahaprachanda dandanayakas* Madhusudana, Nagavarma and Bachiraja were the other generals of Somesvara-I. Anantapala and his nephew Govinda were the famous generals of

Vikramaditya VI and they has participated in the Chola-Chalukya wars and brought glory and fame, to the emperor.<sup>275</sup> These generals not only extended their military support to their overlords but also were empowered to make gifts of their own to secular and religious institutions. Madhuvaparasa, (Madhusudana) made a sumptuous endowment of land for the educational institution called *Ghatikasthan*, founded, in the *agrahara* of Nagavavi.<sup>276</sup> General Chavanayya constructed a tank and a shrine and made a gift of land for their maintenance.<sup>277</sup> Bhanudeva, the army officer of Kallakelagu *nadu*, made a gift of the income derived from the tax *Vaddaravula* and a tank with the adjoining land for the offerings and worship of a Baddi Jinalaya in 1186 A.D.<sup>278</sup> The Kolanupaka inscription dated 1107 A.D., records the gift of income derived from certain specified taxes to the god Jagaddeva Narayana by Anantapala *dandanayaka*.<sup>279</sup> Sometimes, at the request of the military generals, the feudal lords donated villages and lands to the temples. Thus at the request of Sayimayya, the army commander of Kollipaka 2,000, the *mahamandalesvara* Chalukya Ganga Permadi Kumara Somesvara made a gift of the village of Panupura to the goddess Ambika in 1125 A.D.<sup>280</sup> The military commanders, like the feudal lords, were assigned fiefs for the services rendered to their overlords.<sup>281</sup> The famous Anantapala *dandanatha* is described, in an inscription of 1118 A.D., as the ruler of Vengi 14000.<sup>282</sup> Govinda *dandanatha* was ruling Kondapalli in the Krishna district in 1127 A.D.<sup>283</sup> *Dandanayaka* Savipayya was in charge of the region of Kollipaka

2,000 in 1124 A.D.<sup>284</sup> The achievements, powers and privileges enjoyed by the military commanders unmistakably paved the way for the growth of a feudal aristocracy which undermined the prestige of the royalty. The growing hereditary character of these military officials tended to feudalize the administration further. These military tenures came to be known as *maraya*, *nayanikara*, *unibaliga*, *amarani* and *padai-parru-sarvamanya* during the time of the Cholas, Kakatiyas and Vijayanagara.<sup>285</sup> The military functionaries were called as *nayakas* under the Eastern Gangas, *rautas* under the Chandellas and Gahadwalas and *rajaputras* under the Chalukyas where feudalism based on military tenure prevailed.

The general trend towards feudalising officials was reflected not only in assigning fiefs in lieu of their services and bestowing high sounding titles to emphasize their rank but was also indicated by the practice of combining several offices in the same person. Thus *dandanayaka* Nagadevayya held the offices of *maneverggade*, *amatya* and *bahattaraniyogadhipati*<sup>286</sup> Baladevayya enjoyed the posts of *Mahapradhana*, *heri sandhivigrahi*, *senadhipati*, *kaditaverggade* and *dandanayaka*. Hemmadi *dandanayaka* is said to have enjoyed the offices of *mahapradhana srikaranam*, *sarvadyaksha*, *maneverggade*, *mahapasayita* etc. The Burugugadda inscription of Vikramaditya-VI describes his general Anantapala, *mahasamantadhipati*, *mahaprachanda dandanayaka*, *mahapradhani*, and *maneverggade* etc.<sup>287</sup>

The feudal military character of the Kalyana Chalukyan state is also evident from the practice of granting land to the descendants of the heroes who sacrificed their lives for the cause of the emperor, empire, village, fort etc. They are described in the South Indian land grants as *netturu padi manyam*, *ratta kudagal*, *virabhoga* etc.<sup>288</sup> In South India, since 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the practice of erecting hero-stones (*Viragallu*), on behalf of heroes who sacrificed their lives and granting lands to their descendants was profusely followed.<sup>289</sup> R.Chandrasekhara Reddy observes: In the history of medieval Andhra, one can observe a band of heroes whose faithful attachment to their lords was incomparable. Their devotion sometimes took an extremely personal turn. These heroes seem to have taken to their heart the high principle that their lives were dedicated solely to the wellbeing of their patrons; to render every kind of service to the lord, to fight for him in the battle-field, to defend him against enemies at home, to make him happy in every way, was considered their one and only life task, and when he happened to die, these followers even went so far as to decide that their own lives were no more worth living.<sup>290</sup> The Alampur inscription of the time of Vikramaditya-VI records the gift of a land to perggade Mallimayya in connection with the death of a person, who was killed in a scuffle.<sup>291</sup> Another inscription records the gift of one *mattar* of rice land measured by a long rod in the tank area, a house and freedom from taxes to a certain *Dasi* who lost his life in a fight.<sup>292</sup> The land that was granted to the descendants of a hero was known as *kalani*, *kalniitju* and *Jivane* in the Andhra

region.<sup>293</sup> The vast number of *Viragals* found in the Nalgonda, Mahaboobnagar, Kurnool, Kadapa, Anantapur and Nellore districts prove that the inhabitants of these regions were the most warlike of all the Telugu speaking people.<sup>294</sup> Hence, it is evident from the above discussion that the practice of rewarding the descendants of the heroes who sacrificed their lives in protecting the emperor, empire, village, fort, cattle, etc., by rent free lands houses and toll incomes created landed intermediaries between the emperor and the people.

The preponderance of the military element in the Kalyana Chalukya polity may be inferred from the numerous military and administrative camps that are referred to in the inscriptions of our period. In 1024 A.D., it is stated that Jayasimha-II was staying in his victorious camp in the neighbourhood of Kollapura (modern Kolhapur) and planning further to conquer the northern territories.<sup>295</sup> Etagiri, Kollipaka, Hottalukere, Ghattadakere and Kalyani were the other *nelavidus* that figure prominently in the inscriptions<sup>296</sup> of Jayasimha-II. The Pulijala inscription of the time of Somesvara-I (1064 A.D.) was issued jointly by the two Chalukyan princes Ganga Permanadi Vikramaditya and Nolamba Permadi Jayasimhadeva while camping at Mamchchala (*nelevidu*) on the bank of Tungabhadra on their victorious advance to repel the Chola invasion.<sup>297</sup> This might be a reference to the famous Kudal Sangam battle that took place between the Cholas and the Chalukyas. In 1049 A.D., Somesvara-I was residing in the

*nelavidu* at Vaggapura in Karhada-nadu after his conquest of the Pallavas.<sup>298</sup> An inscription from Sudi, dated 1061 A.D., mentions that Somesvara-I was at that time in camp at Paliyappayanavidu in Sindavadi after his *digvijaya* in the South and the conquest of Chola.<sup>299</sup> There is epigraphic evidence to state that Somesvara II was in camp at Balikapura in 1071, 1074 and 1076 A.D. at Kalyani and Vikramapura in 1074 A.D. and at Tangodage on the north bank of the river Krishna in Taradavadi in 1075 A.D. In A.D.<sup>300</sup> Hoysala Vishnuvardhana's general by name Gangaraja made successful night attack upon the imperial forces (Vikramaditya's) encamped at Kannegala under the command of the twelve *samantas*.<sup>301</sup> The prominent residences and the temporary military camps of Vikramaditya-VI that are referred to in his inscriptions were Ponusuppe, Etagiri, Pottalakire, Appayanadakuppa, Ballakurde, Manyakere, Kollipaka, Jananathapura etc.<sup>302</sup>

The development of feudal relations between the State and the guilds which characterized the Rashtrakuta polity also continued to exist during the Western Chalukyas of Kalyana.<sup>303</sup> A large number of guilds are referred to in the inscriptions of Andhra and some of them are the Five Hundred Swamis of Ayyavole, *Nakharamu*, *Vira-balanjas*, *Ubhaya-Nanadesi*, *Setti-guttas* etc.<sup>304</sup> The titles and designations like *Riijasresthi* (Royal merchant), *Vaddavyavahari* (the great merchant), *Samayachakravarti* (President of the meeting of the guilds known as *mahanadu*), *Nadapergade* (head of a district), *Pattanasvami* etc., enjoyed by

the prominent *sette's* betray feudal relationship between the state and the guilds.<sup>305</sup> It is likely that the royal merchants enjoyed the insignia of royalty such as the white umbrella, the great drum, the fly-whisk etc. The *mummuridandas* that are referred to in the inscriptions of Andhra and Karnataka regions might be the militia of the Balanja merchants.<sup>306</sup> It is known from the inscriptions of the Tamilnadu that the *Nanadesi* guild of merchants had soldiers of their own known as *Eri-viras* and *Kongalvas*.<sup>307</sup> The title *Chalukya rajya mula sthambhayamanulu* assumed by the guild of *Teliki* 1,000 indicates the military support extended by the merchants. It is even suggested that the first Chalukyan king of Vengi had some *Teliki*<sup>308</sup> contingents in his army. The guilds were allowed to maintain their own flags. Thus the *Pekkandru* guild had a flag of its own bearing the figure of a *Garuda Suddhagarudhadhavaja virajitulu*.<sup>309</sup> The guilds had the right to punish the recalcitrant persons of the *samaya*. The epigraphical evidence shows that the merchant guilds had their own assemblies and enjoyed full autonomy in the management of their own affairs.<sup>310</sup> They made gifts to the temples and institutions of charity and also played a prominent part in the revenue and judicial administration.<sup>311</sup> Thus it would appear that the merchant guilds emerged as powerful intermediaries monopolizing the trade and commerce of the empire and also controlling the local civil, revenue and judicial matters.

Another distinctive feudal character of the Kalyana Chalukyan polity was that of assigning either regular and exclusive levies or *manya* land to the officials

who were in charge of the local self government in return for their services. *Nadugavunda* whose position was hereditary was either appointed by the king or elected by the people. He was the chief executive of the *nadu* assembly and his functions were taxation, improvement of agriculture, administration of justice, etc.<sup>312</sup> It is known from inscriptions that his remuneration consists of the income from the *inam* land, a fee from each one of the villages under his jurisdiction, toll on merchandise from the fairs conducted within his *nadu* and house tax.<sup>313</sup> The *Gavunda* was the centre round which revolves the entire administration of the village. Prof. G. S. Dikshit states that the office (*Gavunda*) was given either by the king, or his officers, or by the people of the village or the *nadu*, to a person who distinguished himself by public service, especially in the village or villages to which he was appointed. If he was not appointed by the government, he had to be confirmed by it, because throughout, the village headman has functioned both as a representative of the people and as an agent of the government.<sup>314</sup> Like *Nadugavunda*, *Gavunda* also received as his remuneration, rent-free *inam* land called *gaudagodage*.<sup>315</sup> He was the magistrate of the village and had the village militia under him. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the village headman had received presents during the *dipavali* festival and fee at the time of the sale of land apparent by the people living in the area under his jurisdiction purely a feature which prevailed under feudal polity.<sup>316</sup> *Nada-senabova* or *Nada-karana*, the accountant of the *nadu*, was also assigned *inam* lands in lieu of his

services.<sup>317</sup> The village servants of the *ayagars* that are mentioned in the Kalyana Chalukyan inscriptions either individually or collectively (other than the above mentioned) are the boatman, the *barika*, the *totiga*, the stone-mason, the blacksmith, the goldsmith, the carpenter, the barber, the astrologer etc.<sup>318</sup> These servants were given *inam* lands but they were not to be mortgaged. Sometimes as an alternative they received a fee or *aya* in the form of a grain or other income in kind at harvest time. Thus the practice of assigning *inam* lands to the officials in charge of local self-government in lieu of their services betrays traces of feudal element in the Kalyana Chalukyan polity.

The practice of rewarding plots of land, villages, fiscal and administrative rights to the Brahmanas and the temples by the kings, queens, feudal-lords, private individuals, guilds and the other institutions paved the way for the emergence of powerful landed intermediaries between the king and the people during the time of the Chalukyas of Kalyana.<sup>319</sup> Thus Abhinava Sarasvati, the queen of Tribhuvanamalla Vikramaditya VI made a gift of a village of Bellera in Kanne *nadu* to Brahmesvaracharya Pandita.<sup>320</sup> The same queen assigned the village of Damagatla to Brahmesvarasvamy of Alampur.<sup>321</sup> A certain Chola Maharaja granted Pular situated on the bank of Tungabhadra for the worship of a god.<sup>322</sup> Kumara Tailapa assigned the village of Vemugallu to Gokarnarasi Pandita.<sup>323</sup> The practice of granting rent-free land and villages to the Brahmanas, temples,

educational institutions, and the heroes who sacrificed their lives for the cause of the emperor, empire, village, fort etc., paved the way for the creation of powerful landed intermediaries. The feudal character of the trade guilds is evident by the supply of militia to their over-lord and the powers enjoyed by them in the civil, criminal, commercial and administrative matters of the realm. The officers in charge of the local-self government were assigned inam lands in lieu of their services. All these features clearly support the existence of feudal element in the Kalyana Chalukyan polity.

## **FINANCE**

### **Sources of Revenue**

The major source of revenue to the exchequer was, of course, the land revenue theoretically, king was the master of all the land ruled by him and he distributed it among his subjects, under different systems of tenure. It is not necessary here to enter into discussion about the existence or otherwise of private ownership of land. Available evidences amply show that land could be owned privately; but whether the landowner could alienate the land under all circumstance cannot be definitely stated.

That the village as a unit owned the land and that it was managed by the village council is also clear in cases of gift or such other transactions the approval and permission of the king and his officials was implicit. There is also evidence to

show that the king himself had the right to own private land, which is generally referred to as de mesne land.<sup>324</sup>

Agriculture being the main profession of the country, quite naturally much of the treasury's income was derived from the land tax. The inscriptions of the period under study reveal the names of a number of taxes, but the exact imports of many such are obscure and absolute. Land was divided into different types, as wet, dry, garden land, grassland, wasteland, and forest. They depended upon the fertility of the soil and the taxes were assessed accordingly. The different land taxes to be paid were *siddhaya*, *dasavanda*, *divasayada sunka*, *bhattatya niruni-sunka melivana*, *tippe sunka* and the like. *Siddhaya* was a fixed tax. But it is not possible to state that it was a tax levied only on land. Instances may be cited to show that it was levied also on houses and shops. Hence, it may be interpreted to mean fixed aya (income) tax levied on immovable properties like land and houses and also shops. It was subject to revision. *Dasavanda* (also spelt *dasavanda*, *dasavamdja*, *dasavamma*) is another word, which has been differently interpreted. It has been taken to mean (1) one tenth of the revenue set apart for repairs to the tanks and wells for purposes of irrigation, (2) land, the income from which would be equal to the amount thus set apart, (3) the right of collecting one tenth of the produce of lands irrigated by the person who repairs the water source or (4) tax equal to one-tenth of the subject.<sup>325</sup> Available evidences seem to indicate that it

may not be taken to refer exclusively to the revenue on land payable in connection with the construction of a tank or any such water source. It would appear that it was also one-tenth portion of tax payable to the authority concerned from out of the yield from land or revenue. *Nirunisunka* was the water cess to be paid by the farmer. It is probably synonymous with *nirukuli*. *Melivana* may probably be taken to mean the tax levied on ploughs. *Meli* means a plough; but it is also a name applied to the guild of agriculturists, and unless it is taken to mean that such guilds were also to pay taxes. This may be the tax levied on ploughs. The Gobbur inscription<sup>326</sup> records a grant of money collected at the rate of one *hana* on every *kuntay meli* by the *Meli-1000* (body) for worship and offerings to god *Mahalinga Melesvara* installed by them.

Sources of revenue included other kinds of taxes like the commercial taxes such as on transport, sale and purchase of goods, profession tax, social and community taxes, judicial fines and the like. Some of them were *perjjumka*, *kirudere*, *santevana*, *manevana* (*manedere*) *hostilavana*, *handarahana*, *sulavalapana*, *kannadivana*, *maduvega-sumka*, *angadidere*, *volvaru*, *horavrau*, *dandaya*, *dombadere*, *ganadere*, *navidavari* etc. *Perjjumka*, *kirudere*, *volavaru* (import) *horavaru* (export) and the like were customs levied on trade and articles of merchandise. *Santevana* may be taken to mean a tax levied on merchants carrying on business in weekly markets. *Angadidere* (tax on shops), *dombadere*

(tax on tumblers), *gaanadere* (tax on oil mills), *navidadere* (tax on barbers), were professional taxes. *Sulavalapana* is perhaps the tax collected by the *sulavala* i.e. a functionary in charge of music and dancing services, held regularly in the temples, although the term may not mean that he was a music and dance master maintaining professional women skilled in such fine arts.<sup>327</sup> *Kannadivana* (tax on mirror) is obviously a tax connected with a similar profession. House tax (*manevana*), tax on threshold (*hosatilu*) and the pandals (*hamdara*) were property taxes levied by the local bodies. Dandaya is the revenue collected from judicial fines. But interesting is the tax levied on marriages (*maduveya sumka*). These are only a few of the several more varieties of taxes, the income from which filled the treasuries of the state as also the local bodies. There were commercial taxes collected on merchandise. Many articles of merchandise that were brought into the market were levied upon and the amount of tax depended upon the quantity of the commodity. Inscriptions from Alampur<sup>328</sup> for example, enumerate in detail the amount of tax collected on each commodity brought into the market of the area, such as cotton, salt, turmeric, pepper, oil, ghee, ginger, jaggery, areca nuts, betel leaves, sugar, etc and even loads of firewood.

In this connection, it is necessary to refer to the various guilds that functioned during the period. These guilds, which were purely economic organizations, controlled the administration of many townships, specially the

urban ones and also preserved self-government in trade. The *nanadesi*, *mummuridanda*, *gavare*, *gatrige*, *banangige*, *tambulige*, *tellige*, *gole*, *nakara*, *sahavasi*, *sale*, *toraha*, *salige*, *setti*, *settigutta*, etc were all members of such guilds, which seem to have had the headquarters at Ayyavole, the modern Aihole in Bijapur district. Their most important function was to carry on trade. The Belagami inscription,<sup>329</sup> which gives the most, detailed description of this organization, explains how the members of this organization carried on their work of trade by visiting all *gramas*, *nagara*, *khedas*, *pattanas* and *dronamukhas* with all the merchandise. But they took active part in local administration also. While levying taxes or making a gift of income from taxes, the government consulted them. They themselves figure as very generous donors of grants to temples, tanks, etc of the country. The organization seems to have had its own staff to control the affairs. The *pattanasvami* seems to be one of them in the upper rank and perhaps he was the president of the guild, while the *vadda-vyavahari* was the senior merchant and also a moneylender. In the lower ranks were the *nada heggade*, *nada prabhu*, *mangara* etc. Dr. Mahalingam refers to a corporation of the agricultural community called the *Chitrameli* in Tamilanadu and says that they “very probably had control over the production and distribution of the produce from land”.<sup>330</sup> In Andhra also there was similar organization of the agricultural community, which is referred to as *meli*. An inscription found at Nellore dated in 1197 A.D., refers to *Nellur Chitrameli* i.e. ‘the guild of cultivators having

jurisdiction over Nellore region'. It further records that the members of this guild pertaining to various territorial divisions assembled at *Chitrameli mandapam* in *Tirupparakadar – Chitrameli Vinnagar*, and made a grant.<sup>331</sup> The term *okkalu* occurring in the inscriptions of Karnataka and in some parts of western Andhra is a reference to a corporate body and the *Okkalu* appear to have been the counterparts of the *Chitra meli* of Andhra and Tamilnadu. Generally the term means a cultivator, though it also taken to mean a household or family. The cultivators usually grouped themselves into batches of fifty or sixty etc referred to in the records as *aivattokkalu*, *aruvattokkalu* and so on. These *okkalus* seem to have had certain rights and privileges. Instances are found in inscriptions where grants of lands etc are made to temples or individuals with the consent of this body. They also acted as witnesses to gifts even as trustees of charities. It is thought that they also owned land in common. But that as a body they were making grants “for charitable purposes, levied taxes parts of which they on occasions assigned towards charities, were witnesses to acts of charity and maintained the charities of others is no doubt clear from the records.

So far as the system of land, liquid and grain measures are concerned, once again the inscriptions give us a variety of technical terms, the meaning of many of which, however, is not always clear. *Putti*, *Khanduga*, *Kamma* and *marttar* etc. are two terms commonly used for land measure. But the unit of these seems to have

differed in different areas. Some other measures known are *na* i.e. *naluva*, *matlu*, *gocharmamu*, *adda*, *patikadu* or *patuka*, *visa* or *visamu*, *kuli*, *kunta*, and *patta*.<sup>332</sup>

## COINAGE

Gold and silver coins were in use during the rule of the Chalukyas. Quite a number of coins are known to us from the records, like *dramma*, *gadyana*, *pana*, *suvarna*, *sahani-kati*, *salike*, *gulike*, *kagini*, *mada*, *visa*, *adda*, *pratapa*, *dharana*.<sup>333</sup>

It seems that there are several types of *gadyanas* like *dusaragadyana*, *Kataka-gadyana*, *perggade-gadyana* and *ani-gadyana*.<sup>334</sup> An Inscription from Lakkundi refers to a *belli-gammata* which may imply a mint of silver coins. The term *kammata* mentioned in the epigraph is a reference to the mint where the coins were struck. Sri N.L. Rao has already shown that there existed a mint at Sudi, and he surmised that there was one more at Lokkigundi, i.e. modern Lakkundi. This surmise is now confirmed that inscriptions refer to the *anikara* (mint-master) at Lakkundi and to *Lokkiswaheyagadyana*.<sup>335</sup> Yet another epigraph refers to the *gadyana* of *Lokkiyaachchu*. Some coins ascribed to Taila-II, Jayasimha-I and his sons and other members of this dynasty are described by Buhler and others. Some of the terms like *achchu*, *ani achchina keni achchina mole*, connected with the mints of the period are known to us from the records.

Though the Chalukyas of Kalyana attracted the attention of historians from a long time, their numismatic history, however, is not bright. No serious attempt

was made till recently to study the coinage of this dynasty in a detailed way. However, scholars like Krishnasastri, Deshikachari, Altekar, Bhandarkar, Rama Rao, M.H.Krishna and others published some notices of the coins of this dynasty.<sup>336</sup>

The coinage of the Chalukyas could be studied from three sources, namely, the inscriptions of the Chalukyas of Kalyana, the specimens of the coins so far discovered and from the references to coinage in the contemporary literary works. The first two are examined here. From the large number of references to coins, mints, various denominations, the names of coins in the contemporary inscriptions, it becomes clear that the period was very rich from the numismatic point of view. Unfortunately, the inscriptions supply stray information without giving the details of the coinage of the times.

It becomes clear from the epigraphic references that there were many mints working in the Chalukya period. Considering the number of references to it the mint at Lokkigundi seems to have been prosperous during the period. The existence of another mint at Sudi is evidenced by an inscription of the time of Tribhuvanamalla.<sup>337</sup> The inscription mentions gifts made by Uttavoja, the goldsmith and the mint-master of Tribhuvanamalla, to god *Kammatesvara* at Sudi. It also becomes clear from the details given in the record that gold coins were minted under the orders of Uttavoja who was the royal mint-master. He had the

privilege of owning the die (*Kammatada ani*) containing the royal seal for striking the coins. Another inscription at Lakkundi of the time of Somesvara IV mentions such terms as *acchu, ani, acchina kani* and *acchina mole*, which are connected with the minting of coins.<sup>338</sup> The same inscription mentions the word *belliyagammata*, which shows that silver coins were also minted in addition to gold coins.<sup>339</sup> In some cases, the coins are mentioned along with the name or the initial letter of the place of the mint. For example *Lokkigundi gadyana* or *Lokki gadyana* are obviously *gadyanas* minted in the mint at Lokkigundi.

Though coins of many denominations and types are mentioned in the inscriptions of the period, *Gadyana* seems to have been the most popular coin. It was written in various forms and abbreviated as *gadya* and *ga*. Many types of *gadyanas* are mentioned in the inscriptions and it is difficult to understand their precise nature. It was already referred to *Lokki gadyanas* which were obviously *gadyanas* minted at Lokkigundi mint. Kondguli inscription of Bhulokamalla dated 1132 A.D. mentions *Varttaka Lokki gadyana, Kataka Piiya gadyana* and *Kataka gadyana*. Dr Ramesh who has edited this inscription surmise that *Varttaka Lokki gadyanas* were the coins minted by merchant guilds of Lokkigundi.<sup>340</sup> He also thinks that the *gadyanas* associated with the word *Kataka* were minted in the city (*Kataka*), and the *Priya gadyana* was so called because of the higher gold content in it. Kurhatti inscription of Jagadekamalla II, dated 1142 A.D. mentions

*Lokkiyacchina gadyana*.<sup>341</sup> Another inscription of the time of Tribhuvanamalla from Hubli mentions *Lokki Sraheya gadyana*, the exact nature of which is not known. An inscription of the time of Tribhuvanamalla dated 1098 A.D. from Kuditini in Bellary District furnishes some interesting information in this regard.<sup>342</sup> It mentions two types of *Pon* namely *Navilacchina pon* and *Lokki pan*. Probably the former contained the punch of a peacock as different from the latter which was minted at Lokkigundi mint. The inscription in question refers to an agreement according to which Savimoja who wanted to convert *Lokki pons* into peacock *pons* was to give peacock coins of the same weight<sup>343</sup> and in consideration of the profit should pay twelve *gadyanas* to the temple of Svamideva.

Though it is difficult to know precisely the relative value of all the different coins mentioned in the inscriptions, some idea about them can be had from some inscriptions. An inscription from Nidugundi mentions the relationship between a *gadyana* and a *pana*<sup>344</sup> This inscription gives a list of donations in Gold and specifies the total as six *gadyana*. The details mentioned are five *gadyana* and ten *panas*. The total of these two being six *gadyana*, it becomes clear that one *gadyana* consisted of ten *panas*. From references in other records of the period the following table may be deduced:

$$1 \text{ gadyana} = 10 \text{ panas}$$

$$1 \text{ pana} = 4 \text{ haga}$$

1 *pana* = 4 *kagini*

1 *haga* = 4 or 5 *Visas*

1 *haga* = 2 *bile*

Now, let us examine the specimens of coins discovered from various parts of the country. Though we get number of references to coins and transactions involving various coins in inscriptions of the period, disappointed by the small number of coins and coin types of the Chalukyas of Kalyana so far discovered and reported. Even in the study of these coins does not give the information, because these coins generally contain not the names but the titles of the rulers, which were common to more than one king. Thus the coins which contain the legend Jagadekamalla may belong to any of the three Chalukya rulers who had the title Jagadekamalla.

So far, gold and silver coins of the Chalukyas have been found, though there are epigraphic and literary references to copper coins also. The Chalukya coins are generally round and punched with various symbols on one side of the coin only. Thus their reverses are blank. Usually they contain Kannada legend of the name of the king and *Sri* in Kannada characters, Sun and Moon, temple *gopura*, elephant, lion and boar. Because of the large number of punches on thin sheets of metal, they have assumed the cup shape. Kalyana Chalukyan coins have been reported from Karnataka, Andhra, Tamilnadu and Maharashtra. One of the richest collections of the Kalyana Chalukya coins is from the Kodur treasure

trove.<sup>345</sup> Kodur is a small village in the Nellore District of Andhra Pradesh. Here was discovered, in 1913, by some villagers copper and earthen pots containing gold coins numbering to 15,462.<sup>346</sup> This forms the basis of the study of the coins of the Kalyana Chalukyas.

### **Coins of Jayasimha II (1015-1044 A.D.)**

There were three persons having the name Jayasimha in the Kalyana Chalukya dynasty. Of them, Jayasimha II, also called Jagadekamalla I was the most famous. Hence, it is presumed that he issued certain gold and silver coins.

**Type A:** Hultzsch describes six specimens of this type. They weigh about 57 ½-59 grains each.<sup>347</sup> Each coin contains nine punches of which five represent a lion, two punches represent two 'Sri' in Kannada characters, the eighth punch has the word *Jaya* and the ninth punch contains *diva* in Kannada characters. This Jayadeva has been taken as Jayasimha and hence this coin is ascribed to Jayasimha II.

**Type B:** M. Rama Rao has described some coins which are in the coin cabinets of Andhra Pradesh Government Museum, Hyderabad.<sup>348</sup> These coins either of gold or of silver measure 0.63" to 0.80" in diameter and their weight ranges from 54 to 60.58 grains. They are punched coins having obverse only. They contain four punches. But instead of the lion as in Type A, these coins contain the punch or punches of *Varaha* or boar. They also have one or two *Sri* punches and the legend

*Jaya* punched in Kannada characters. From the fabric, weight, size and even the legend they closely resemble the coins of Jayasimha. Hence there is no doubt that they are the issues of Jayasimha II of the Kalyana Chalukya family. These coins are found from various places in Medak, Nalgonda Districts of Andhra Pradesh, Gulbarga and Bidar Districts of Karnataka.

**Type C:** Rama Rao has also published a coin which is almost similar to the coins described above.<sup>349</sup> But the coin in question contains a bull in seven punches, the word *Jaya* in another punch, and the word *diva* in the last punch. This weighs 59.69 grains and measures 0.80" in diameter. This coin has been found in Gulbarga district of Karnataka. But for the symbol of bull, the coin is similar to other Chalukya coins. Hence, this may also be ascribed to Jayasimha II.

**Type D:** In the above collection are two more specimens which are similar in weight, size and fabric to the coins described above.<sup>350</sup> Instead of the boar or the lion, the coins in question contain an elephant. The elephant running to right with trunk hanging in central incuse and in four incuses in the corners, *Sri* in one incuse and *Jaya* in two incuses, the coins can be ascribed to Jayasimha II.

Whether Jayasimha issued coins with four different symbols such as lion, bull, boar and elephant has to be considered. Though the Badami Chalukyas had boar as their symbol, the Chalukyas of Kalyana had lion on their coins. What is

important in their coinage is the number of punches and the Kannada letter *Sri* and the Kannada legend. As stated earlier, an inscription which shows that some Chalukya coins contained peacock as their symbol. Thus there does not seem to be any improbability in Jayasimha issuing these coins with various symbols.

**Type E:** M. H. Krishna has published a coin of 0.75" diameter and 57.8 grains in weigh. It contains five punches of lion obliterated by four superior punch marks with one and two as *Sri*, the third mark being large spear head with dots below and the fourth mark containing the Kannada legend *Yaja*. This legend has been taken as a mistake for *Jaya* and hence this coin can be attributed to Jayasimha.<sup>351</sup>

### **Coins of Jagadekamalla**

**Type A:** The Kodur treasure contained 62 gold coins of this type.<sup>352</sup> They are round with diameter ranging from 0.6" to 0.8". Their weight also ranges from about 67 to 69 grains. These coins contain four punch marks namely the legend *Jaga*, *Jagade* or *Jagadeka* or *Jagadekamalla* in old Kannada characters. Opposite to it at the extremity of the coin is a symbol of a miniature temple. In between these two are two punches containing the conventional *Sri* in Kannada characters. Within the temple are seen a tree, dots, a crescent etc. On the reverse side which is generally plain are seen, occasionally a *naga*, a *chauri*, *svastika*, a *conch*, elephant etc. The legend *Jagadeka* is generally found either at the top or at the bottom of

the coin. A similar coin has been noticed by Elliott also,<sup>353</sup> but he has not ascribed it to any particular dynasty.

**Type B:** Vincent Smith<sup>354</sup> describes some coins of this type which are thin concave cup shaped gold pieces ranging in diameter from 1.03" to 1.1". They are varying in weight from 67.2 to 68 grains. These coins contain a big temple in the centre with Kannada legend *Jagadekamalla* on the basement of it. On the margin are found *Sri* punched three times and opposite to them are the punches of the legend *Jagadekamalla*, punched four times. Thus this coin contains the word *Jagadekamalla* punched five times in the whole coin. From this point of view, this can be called a unique issue of *Jagadekamalla*. There are some minor variations in the punching of the legend or the other symbols on some coins. Some coins contain *Sri Jagadekamalla* while others have simply *Jagadekamalla* at the base of temple or *Pagoda*.<sup>355</sup> In some others on either side of the *Sri* at the top are two punches *Jagade* on one side and *Kamala* on the other. The same pattern is repeated below also.

**Type C:** In the Kodur treasure trove is a single coin which is slightly different from those described above.<sup>356</sup> It is roughly round with a diameter of 0.6". At both ends of the vertical diameter are found the legend *Jagade* in old Kannada characters. At the other extremities are the conventional letters *Sri*. The central punch contains a human figure sitting with left arm bent at the elbow and placed

on the hip. At the top is a crown. The interspaces are filled with dots and pellets. Though Krishna Sastri did not assign this coin to any dynasty there is no doubt that this coin belongs to *Jagadekamalla* on the similarity of the legend and also the conventional *Sri*. The fabric and the size also are similar to those of the known Jagadekamalla's coins.

**Type D:** M. Rama Rao has described a coin from the museum of the Andhra Pradesh Government, Hyderabad.<sup>357</sup> This gold coin measures 0.72" in diameter and weighs 515.27 grains. It has been discovered at Matnoor in Adilabad District of Andhra Pradesh. It contains a symbol like *Linga* on *Vedi* in one punch and the legend *Sri Jagadeka*. The clear reading of the legend on the coin makes it possible to ascribe this coin to Jagadekamalla.

**Type E:** Rama Rao has also noticed two more coins from the cabinets of the same Museum.<sup>358</sup> They are about 0.61" to 0.64" in diameter and weigh 54 grains. The central punch contains a boar facing right with crescent above, *Sri* in two punches lotus in two punches and the legend *Jaga* in one punch. Jayasimha also issued coins with a boar and hence this coin may be taken as an issue of Chalukya Jagadekamalla. Now, the problem is which Jagadekamalla of the Chalukya family issued these coins mentioned above. There were at least three persons in the Kalyana Chalukya family who had the name or the title Jagadekamalla. They were Jayasimha II who had the title Jagadekamalla I (1015-44 A.D.), Jagadekamalla II

(1139-49 A.D.) and Jagadekamalla-III, (perhaps the son of Taila-III). Of these three the first two were powerful and ruled the wide Chalukya Empire. The third Jagadekamalla was a governor somewhere and he was not powerful. Hence, Jagadekamalla-III as the author of these coins. Paleography alone comes to our help in deciding the author of these coins. These forms can be ascribed to the twelfth century. Hence the coin in question should be ascribed to Jagadekamalla 11 of the 12<sup>th</sup> century and not to Jagadekamalla-II who lived at least a century earlier. However, most of the scholars have attributed these coins to Jagadekamalla-I (Jayasimha-II) mostly on the ground that this ruler was more important and more powerful.<sup>359</sup> This argument cannot be considered convincing. Paleography is definitely a better criterion to decide the period to which the coins belonged and hence these coins have been assigned to Jagadekamalla II. Our argument is supported by the famous Epigraphist Krishna Sastri, who wrote that 'It is not unlikely that our coins belong to Western Chalukya King Jagadekamalla-II'.<sup>360</sup>

### **Coins of Trailokyamalla Somesvara-I**

Gold coins of this ruler though rare have been reported by Hultzsch<sup>361</sup> and M.H. Krishna.<sup>362</sup> Hultzsch examines three specimens which are about an inch in diameter and weigh 5 grains. Each of these coins contains nine punches of which five represent a lion, two punches contain- *Sri*, one punch of *Trelo* and the other

representing *malla*. On the basis of the legend *Trelo- malla* which should have been *Trailokyamalla*, and the similarity of these coins with the already known Chalukya coins, the present coins are ascribed to Somesvara-I.

Krishna attributes another type of coin containing spear head and *Nagari* legend without lion as belonging to Trailokyamalla Somesvara and calls it type B.<sup>363</sup> Curiously the *Nagari* legend on this coin reads *Sri Jagadeva* and not *Trailokyamalla*. He surmises that Somesvara was called *Jagadeva* in Northern provinces of the empire. This is not supported by known facts. Further all the known coins of the Chalukyas of Kalyana contain Kannada legends and not legends in Nagari. Hence the attribution of Krishna is highly conjectural and cannot be accepted.

### **Coins of Bhuvanaikamalla Somesvara-II**

The Kodur treasure trove contains 90 coins in which the legend *Bhuvana* in Kannada characters is seen.<sup>364</sup> The legend *Bhuvana* may be taken as an abbreviation for *Bhuvanaikamalla*. Hence these coins have been attributed to Somesvara II who had the title *Bhuvanaikamalla*. These gold coins are round with a diameter ranging from 0.6" to 0.65". In fabric and weight they are similar to coins of Jayasimha-II. These coins contain nine punches. In the centre is seen a lion around which are four lotuses. There are two punches at the sides

representing two *Sri*. Sun and moon are also present on the coin. On the top of the coin near the extremity is the Kannada legend *Bhuvana*.

M.H. Krishna described coin with an elephant as the central punch and having the legend *Bavana*.<sup>365</sup> This may be taken as a different type of Bhuvanaikamalla's coin.

### **Miscellaneous Coins**

In addition to these coins described above which are of definite attribution, many coins of uncertain or doubtful attribution have been reported. They may be studied now.

### **Coins of Ayyana (1015 A.D.)**

In the Kodur treasure trove are coins which may be attributed to Chalukya prince Ayyana.<sup>366</sup> It is known that Vikramaditya-V was succeeded by his brother Ayyana and he ruled for a couple of months. The coins in question are round and contain two *Sri*, Sun and moon and the legend *Yana* in Kannada Characters. Some coins contain lion in the interspaces. Krishna Sastri thought that the legend *Yana*, perhaps, is a contraction of *Narayana*. However, it is more likely that *Yana* represents *Ayyana*, the name of the Chalukya prince. The coin in all other respects resembles the Chalukya coin. Hence, in all likelihood this coin may be an issue of Chalukya prince Ayyana.

Taila-II had a son named Dasavarman and it is quite likely that he did not come to the Chalukya throne. Probably he was a *Mahamandaladhipati* under his elder brother's rule. In the Kodur treasure trove are certain coins which can be attributed to this ruler.<sup>367</sup> Only one coin of this type has been noticed. It is about one inch in diameter and almost resembles certain coins of Jayasimha and Trailokyamalla.<sup>368</sup> In the centre is a tusked elephant and round it Sun and moon flanked by Kannada legend *Dasa* at the top and *Varma* at the bottom. As this coin resembles in all respects the Chalukya coin and also the fact that it contains the legend *Dasavarma*, there is no difficulty in attributing this coin to Chalukya prince Dasavarma.

In the Kodur treasure trove are seen certain coins which resemble the Chalukya coins in fabric and size.<sup>369</sup> They are roughly round and are punched, on the obverse only. They vary from 0.7" to 0.8" in diameter. They bear the legend *Bhujaba*, obviously standing for *Bhujabala* in Kannada characters of the twelfth Century A.D. They also have conventional *Sri* similar to the other Chalukya coins. Also seen are Sun and Moon and some minor symbols.

There are some minor variations in the coins described above.<sup>370</sup> Some of them show a hook attached to a spear having a dot inside the hook and three dots in a cluster on the other side of the spear remote from the hook. The point of the spear is flanked by the moon and the sun on its right and left sides. The legend *Bhujaba* and conventional *Sri* are similar to those on the coins mentioned above.

It is very difficult to say who this *Bhujabala* was. Most of the Chalukyan kings had that title *Bhujabalavira*. Hence, it is possible to ascribe this coin to any particular Chalukya king. However, the palaeography of the legend suggests twelfth Century A.D. as the date of these coins. Though the title *Bhujabala* and *Bhujavira* are common in the Telugu-Chola kings of Nellore region, the unmistakable Kannada legend on these coins, excludes them as the authors of these coins. Moreover these coins are extremely similar to those of the coins of Jagadekamalla, Trailokyamalla and Bhuvanaikamalla. From these points, one can ascribe these coins to the Chalukya dynasty. M.H. Krishna attributes these coins with the legend *Bhujabala* to Vikramaditya-VI. His argument is ‘the great number of the coins and the attempted restoration of better art indicate a long and prosperous reign which could be only that of Vikramaditya-VI who reigned for 50 years’<sup>371</sup> This attribution is highly conjectural.

Krishna ascribed certain coins containing the legend *para* to Taila. These coins contain nine which representing five lions, two *Sri* and the legend *para*, Kannada characters twice. Though this is a Chalukya coin, its attribution to Taila-II is conjectural.

Another coin almost similar to the above mentioned one contains the legend *Mana*. Krishna thinks that *Mana* may stand for *Manavya*, the generic name assumed by the Chalukyas. He attributes this coin without any justification to Vikramaditya-V.

A similar coin with the legend *gaja* has been ascribed by Krishna to prince Jayasimha. A coin with the legend *Bhujabala* has been ascribed by Krishna to Somesvara-III. Another similar coin with Tamil legend *Bhujaba* has been attributed to Vikramaditya-VI. The Tamil legend, Krishna thinks, was due to Vikramaditya conquering Kanchi and staying in Tamil country for some time. All the above attributions are highly conjectural and should remain so until further fresh evidence is available.

From above study, it becomes clear that different were their sources of revenue for the state. They were properly collected and disbursed by the official machinery at the central and local levels. It shows that there was also a great deal of economic prosperity. Unlike in the later part of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and thereafter, people do not seem to have groaned under heavy burden of taxation. The economic prosperity, however, did not mean economic equality. Although the conditions were such that ordinary men did not feel the urge to revolt, there appears to have a great deal of economic disparity.

## REFERENCES

1. M.Rama Rao, *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh*, Vol:II, Tirupati, 1968 Nos.66, 67, 72, 73,85, 91, 92, 99, 101, 123, 140, 248, 268.; *SII*. Vol: IV No.1309.
2. *SII*. Vol: IX.Nos.74, 105, 150, 241; Vol: X. No.331.; *MER* 516 and 522 1915; *MER* 519 and 718 of 1919; *MER* 617 of 1930.
3. N.S.Ramachandra Murthy and P.Joginaidu (Eds), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Mahaboobnagar District*, Hyderabad, 2003.
4. N.Mukunda Rao and N.S.Ramachandra Murthy (Eds), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Medak District*, Hyderabad, 2001.
5. N.Venkataramanaiah (Ed), Andhra Pradesh Government Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1966, Hyderabad Nos. 300-311.
6. P.V.Parabrahma Sastry (Ed), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Karimnagar District*, Hyderabad, 1974.
7. N.Venkataramanaiah (Ed), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Warangal District*, Hyderabad, 1974.
8. P.V.Parabrahma Sastry (Ed), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Nalgonda District*, Hyderabad, 1974.
9. P.V.Parabrahma Sastry (Ed), *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh: Cuddapah District*, Hyderabad, 1977.
10. Butterworth. A and V.Venugopala Chetty: 'A Collection of Inscriptions on Copper plates and stones in the Nellore District', New Delhi, 1990. Three Parts.
11. *SII*. Vol. VI
12. *Ibid.*
13. *EHD*, p.382.
14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.* p.385.
16. *Epi.Ind.* Vol: XXXIII, p.131.
17. P.B.Desai (Ed), *Corpus Incriptions in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad State*, Hyderabad, 1958, No.2.
18. K.R.Bajavaraja, 'The Central Government under the Chalukyas of Kalyana'; in M.S.Nagaraja Rao (Ed) *The Chalukyas of Kalyana* (seminar Papers) Bangalore, 1983. p.105
19. *CTI.*, No.6, p. 6 ff.
20. *Epi.Ind.* Vol: V, p.225.
21. *Manasollasa.* II, vv.1207-1233.
22. *Ibid.*, v.536.
23. *ARSIE*, Bk.2 of 1935-36.
24. *SII*, XI, (1), No.76.
25. *ARSIE*, Bk.68 of 1927-28.
26. *SII*, IX, i, 143, 11.21-22.
27. *SII*, XI, (1), No.170.
28. *SII*, XI, (1), No.76.
29. *Yasastilaka*, Ch.III , p.461ff.
30. Md.Abdul Waheed Khan, *Stone Sculptures in the Alampur Museum*, Hyderabad, 1973, pp.5-18.
31. *EC*, VIII, Sa.45.
32. *SII*, XI, (1), No.57.
33. K.R.Bajavaraja, *Op.Cit.* pp.106-107.
34. *Manasollasa.* I, vv.541-555.

35. *Ibid.* p. 109.
36. Sharma, R. S., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 102-109.
37. *Manasollasa*, II, V. pp.128-113.
38. *KIAP*, Gb. 3.
39. Dikshit, G. S., *Local-Self Government in Mediaeval Karnata*, Dharwar, 1064, p. 14.
40. *EHD.*, pp. 321-118
41. *SII.*, VI, No. 101.
42. *EHD.*, p. 327, *Ep. Ind.*, XVI, pp. 75 ff.
43. *BK.*, 69, of 1934-35; *Hyd. Arch. Ser.*, No.8, p. 13; Gb. 2; *EHD*, p. 339.
44. *EHD.*, p. 369.
45. *KIAP.*, Gb. 2., Mn. 50.
46. K.R.Bajavaraja, *Op. Cit.* p. 110.
47. T.V.Mahalingam-south Indian Poetry, p.125
48. T.V.Mahalingam-Administration under Vijayanagaram, p. 240
49. Corpus Inscription Indicarum vol IV, p.196
50. T.N.Subrahmanyam (ed)-south Indian Temple I(nscription), pxx1.
51. KAN Sastry OPGt, p.388
52. Lekhapaddati.
53. Kakatiyas Adapa.
54. S.H Ritti – the Sevunas, pp.218-19
55. *Ibid.*, p.335
56. *EHD*, *Op. Cit.*, pp.399-400
57. *SII IX .I.* No.172.
58. S.S.Ramachandra Murthy. A Study of Telugu Place Names, p.47.

59. *Select Epigraphs of A.P.*, p.21.
60. *ARE*: 1927, p.127
61. *Select Epigraphs*, p.2.
62. *Telingana Inscriptions.2. K.Ch.* p.41.
63. *ARE*, 1943: B-18
64. *ARE*, 1960: B-115
65. *EI*, XXXVI-69 ff
66. *ARE*, 1960: B-125, 1963: B-63, 192. *Stone Sculptures in Alampur Museuem* pp.7&18.
67. *SII*, 10: p.504
68. *SII*, IX-I, p.122
69. *SII*, IX-I, p.272
70. *Ibid.*, p.226.
71. *Ibid.*, p.213.
72. *EI*, XXIX:160 ff
73. *SII*, IX-I-204
74. *Ibid.*, p.226.
75. *Ibid.*, 279.
76. *Ibid.*, 202.
77. *ARE*, 1920, p.356.
78. *SII*, IX-I, p.365.
79. *IAP*, Karimnagar District 10.
80. *Select Epigraphs of A.P.* No11.
81. *SII*, IX-I-294
82. *EI-XXXV*, p.253.

83. ARE, HYD.1966, p. 250.
84. EA. Vol.IV. 55ff
85. SII, X, p.504.
86. ARE, 1892, p. 419.
87. EI. Vol IV-218, SII, IX-I-146
88. ARE, 1920, p.420.
89. SII, IX-I, p.298.
90. *Ibid.*, p.121.
91. *Ibid.*, p.119.
92. ARE, 1943: B-8.
93. ARE, 1960: B-123.
94. Corpus of Telangana Inscription, Vol.IV, p.30.
95. SII. X, p.504.
96. Kannada Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Md: 5
97. SII. IX-I, p.116.
98. *Ibid.*, p,250.
99. ARE, 1962: B-63, 70, 94
100. ARE, 1920, p.434.
101. SII, IX-I, p.257.
102. Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Warangal District No.3.
103. Kannada Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh No.50.
104. IAP, Wgl No 27-A, ARE, 1962, pp. B-84,85,87
105. SII- IX-I, p. 213.
106. Kannada Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh No.41.
107. IAP, Karimnagar No.18.

108. ARE, 1963: p.B-209
109. SII. IX-I: 221, ARE, 1942: pp. B-69,70
110. ARE, Hyd 1966: p. 249.
111. Telingana Inscriptions: 2, 39
112. Epigraphia Andhrica, Vol.II, No.7.
113. SII. IX-I, p. 240.
114. *Ibid.*, p.204.
115. SII. VI, p.128.
116. SII. X, p.346.
117. *Ibid.*, p.504.
118. ARE, 1938, p. B-235.
119. SII. IX-I, p. 69.
120. Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency cdp No.404.
121. IAP Cuddapa District Vol.I, No 129.
122. SII. X, pp.306, 504, 536
123. Journal of Bombay branch of Royal Asiatic Society, Vol.46, p.225.
124. ARE, 1953, p. B-290.
125. EI Vol:XXXVI, p.139.
126. ARE, 1956: p.B-65.
127. Indian Antiquiram Vol.36 P70, SII. IX-I, p.147.
128. SII. X, p. 504.
129. SII. IX-I, p.257.
130. *Ibid.*, p.161.
131. Journal of Bombay branch of RAS, Vol.XVI, p.231.
132. Journal of Oriental Research, Vol.10, p.27.

133. EI Vol.XXXIII, p.31.
134. ARE, 1943, B-38.
135. EI Vol.XXXVI, p. 70.
136. ARE, 1933: B-153, SII. IX-I: p.147.
137. SII. X, p.528.
138. Epigraphia Andhrica, Vol.IV, p.74.
139. ARE, 1962, p.B-90.
140. SII. IX-I, p.146.
141. ARE, 1962, p.B-33.
142. IAP, Karimnagar District No.20.
143. *Ibid.*, p.18.
144. Epigraphia Andhrica, Vol.IV, p.67.
145. *Ibid.*, p.81
146. IAP, Karimnagar, p.25.
147. SII. X, p.504.
148. EI Vol.XXXVI, p.76
149. ARE, 1936, p.1.
150. SII. IX-I, p.55.
151. SII. VII: 271, SII. Vol.8: 364, 372, 374, SII. IX-I: 172, 190, 202; Indian Antiquiram Vol XX p.275; ARE, 1903: 90-c, 84-A.
152. SII. IX-I, p.226.
153. *Ibid.*, p.294.
154. *Ibid.*, p.277.
155. ARE, 1917, p.15.
156. SII. IX-I, p. 233

157. SII. VI: p.555.
158. SII. IX-I: p.273.
159. *Ibid.*, p.233.
160. *Ibid.*, p.172.
161. ARE, 1957: B-46
162. Telingana Inscriptions 2: K.Ch No. 39, 41.
163. EI Vol.XXXV, p.253.
164. ARE, 1961: B-107
165. Kundssi Isvaradutt: Historical Geography of Andhra Pradesh, p.311.
166. SII. IX-I: p.196.
167. *Ibid.*, p.213.
168. IAP, Warangal No.43, IAP, Kurnool No.25.
169. SII. IV: p.935.
170. EI Vol.XXXV, p.253.
171. Telingana Inscriptions 2: No 38.
172. EI Vol.XXXV, P39 and p.38 note
173. Y.GR – The Feudal Element in the Western Chalukyas Polity, p.113.
174. Sharma, R. S., ‘Methods and Problems of the Study of Feudalism in Early Medieval India’, *IHR.*, 1974, Vol. I, No. I, p. 81.
175. Sharma, R.S., *Indian Feudalism*, Calcutta, 1965, p. i, ff.
176. Chaudhary, Radhakrishna, ‘Some Aspects of Feudalism in South India’, *JIH*, Vol. LIII, p.70.
177. Yazdani, G., (Ed.) *EHD.*, London, 1960, VII-XI, pp. 577-584; K.K. Murthy, ‘Ratta Administration-A Survey,’ *JIH.*, XLIX, pp. 239 ff; Derrett, J.D.M., *The Hoysalas, A Medieval Indian Royal Family*,

London, 1957,.pp. 16 ff; Coelho, William, *The Hoysala Vamsa*,  
Bombay, 1950, pp. 25 ff; *JBBRAS*- IX, p. 275; *Ind. Ant.*, V, p. 278; *EG*.  
V. Cn, 260; *SII*, IX, i. No. 115.

178. *EHD.*, p. 319.
179. *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 206.
180. *Ibid.*, XVI, p. i; *JBBRAS*, X, p. 204.
181. *Ibid.*, III, p. 272, v. 13.
182. *Ibid.*, XVI, p. 81.
183. *EHD.*, pp. 577 if.
184. *SII*, IX, i, No. 86.
185. Fleet, J. F., *DKD.*, Bombay Gazetteer, I-II, 1896, p. 515.
186. *Ibid.*, p. 498.
187. Sreenivasachar, P.and Desai, P.B., *KIAP.*, Hyderabad, 1961, Gb.3.14-A.
188. *Ibid.*, Gb. 3.
189. *Ibid.*, Gb. 4.
190. *Ibid.*, Kn. 5.
191. *Ibid.*, Kn. 7.
192. *Ibid.*, Mn. 59.
193. *Ibid.*, Md. 3.
194. *Ibid.*, Ng. 46, 48.
195. *Ibid.*, Wg. 17.
196. *Ibid.*, Nos. 86, 88.
197. *Ibid.*, Md. 4.
198. *Ibid.*, Md. 6.
199. Sarma, M. S., *CTI.*, Pt. IV., Hyderabad, 1973.
200. Sastry, P. V. P., *SEAP.*, Hyderabad, 1965, No.3.
201. Desai, P. B., *SSIAP.*, Hyderabad, 1962, No. 22.

202. Desai, P. B., (Ed.), *A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad State* (HAS, No. 18), 1958, No.6, pp. 46 ff.
203. *Ibid.*, No. 18, p. 16.
204. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
205. *BK.*, 260 of 1927-28. It is known from inscriptions that the Sindas were governing Purigere Three Hundred and Kunde Three Hundred in the 11<sup>th</sup> century A.D. apparently as the feudatories of the Western Chalukyas of Kalyana (*BK.*, 141 of 1926-27; 270 of 1927-28).
206. *KIAP.*, Gb. 3
207. *Ibid.*, Gb 4.
208. *Ibid.*, Kn. 7.
209. *EHD.*, p. 325.
210. *Ibid.*, p. 578. Cc
211. *KIAP.*, Ng. 48.
212. *Ibid.*, No. 83.
213. *Ibid.*, No. 94.
214. *EHD.*, p. 335.
215. *Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 297.
216. *EC.*, IV, Hs. 50.
217. *Ep. Ind.*, XV, pp. 75 ff.
218. *EHD.*, p. 329.
219. Lakshminarayana Rao, N., Eminent Women of Karnata " *QJMS*, XLV, p. 8.
220. *Ibid.*, 8 ff.
221. *EHD.*, p. 350.
222. *SII*, IX, I, 132, 133; *EC.*, XI, Cd. 82; *SII*, VI, 571; *BK.*, 100 of 1929-30.

223. *BK.*, 76 of 1927-28; *Ind. Ant.*, X, pp. 185 ff.
224. Saletore, G.N., *Two Unknown Chalukyan Princes-Yuvaraja Mallikarjuna and Tailapa III IHQ*, Vol. XII, No.2, pp. 160 ff.
225. *BK.*, 66 of 1934-35; 2 of 1927-28.
226. *Mn.*, 39, 41, 57.
227. *SII.*, IX, I, 151, 185.
228. Venkataramanaiah, N., *Perur Inscriptions*, Hyderabad, 1973, No.3.
229. *CTI.*, No. 6.
230. *Ibid.*, No. 10.
231. *SEAP.*, No.7, p. 15.
232. *Ibid.*, No.8, p. 18.
233. *CTI.*, No. 13, p. 35.
234. *SSIAP.*, No. 16, p. 49.
235. *Ibid.*, Nos. 18, 19, pp. 54 ff.
236. Sastry, P. V. P., *A catalogue of Inscriptions Copied up to 1964*, Hyderabad, 1965, No. 61.
237. *Ibid.*, No. 62.
238. *HAS.*, No. 18, No. 16, p. 83.
239. *Annual Report on Epigraphy*, 1967, Hyderabad, 1975, Part I, p. 6. 68.
240. *KIAP.*, No. 91.
241. *Ibid.*, No. 109, p. 106.
242. Sharma, R. S., *Indian Feudalism*, p. 24.
243. *HAS.*, No. 18, No.6.

244. *Manasollasa*, III, V. 1336.
245. *SII.*, IX, i, 77 LL. 5-10, 98, L. 6.
246. *HAS.*, No. 18, No.6, pp. 18 ff.
247. *EHD.*, p. 384.
248. *Ibid.*, p. 397.
249. *Ibid.*
250. *EHD.*, p. 394.
251. *Ep. Ind.*, XVI, p. 80, II. 23-26.
252. Altekar, A. S., *Rashtrakutas and Their Times*, Poona 1934, p. 263.
253. Derrett, J. D. M., *Op. Cit.*, p. 27.
254. Coelho, William, *Op. Cit.*, p. 51.
255. *QJMS.*, XLV, p. 8.
256. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
257. *CTI.*, p. XIV.
258. *EHD.*, p. 325.
259. Sharma, R. S., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 100 ff.
260. *CTI.*, No.6, p. 6 ff.
261. *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Karimnagar District*, Hyderabad.
262. Derrett, J. D. M., *Op. Cit.*, p. 28.
263. *EHD.*, p. 321.
264. *Ibid.*, p. 327.
265. *Ibid.*
266. *HAS.*, No. 18, p. 16.
267. *EC.*, V., Ak. 117.
268. *Ibid.*, XII, Tp. 123, cr. Coelho. William. *Op. Cii.*, p. 52.

269. *SII*, IX, i, 143, 11.21-22.
270. Sharma, R. S., *Op. Cit.*, p. 88 ff.
271. *Ibid.* P.102.
272. *Manasollasa*, II, V. 128.
273. *KIAP.*, Ng, 41,44.
274. *SII*. Vol:VI. No102.
275. Y.G.R – The Feudal Element in the Western Chalukyas Polity, 113109.
276. *KIAP.*, Gb. 2.
277. *Ibid.*, Mn. 50.
278. *Ibid.*, Mn. 60.
279. *Ibid.*, Ng. 44.
280. *Ibid.*, Ng. 43.
281. *EHD.*, p. 352. .
282. *SII.*, IX, i, 196, IV, No. 1322.
283. *ARE.*, 285 of 1905; *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 261; *SII*, IX, i, 213.
284. *KIAP.*, Ng. 42.
285. *JIH*, LIII, pp. 86 ff.
286. *EHD.*, p. 391.
287. *Ibid.*, p. 392.
288. *JIH*, LIII, pp. 84, 88.
289. Nagaswamy, R., *Hero Stones of Tamilnadu*, *JIH*, LI, p. 265 ff., Acharya, G.V., *Memorial Stones in the Bombay Presidency Proceedings and Transactions of the Third Oriental Conference*, Madras, 1924, p. 237 ff.
290. R.Chandrasekhar Reddy. *Heroes, Cults and memorials: Andhra Pradesh (300 A.D. to 1600 A.D.)*, Madras, 1994.
291. *KIAP.*, No. 105.
292. *EG.*, 144, VII, Sk. No. 70.

293. *JIH.*, XXIX, p. 286; *EC.*, X, Mb. 228, 244., Bp. 13; *AR,E* 165, 171 of 1933-34.
294. R.Chandrasekhar Reddy, *Op. Cit.*
295. *EHD.*, p. 326.
296. *EG.*, Sk. 153; XII, Si. 37; *SII*, IX, i. No. 69.
297. *Annual Report on Epigraphy*, 1967, Hyderabad 1975, Part I, p. 6.
298. *SII.*, XI, i, No. 83.
299. *Ep. Ind.*, XV, pp. 85 ff.
300. *EG.*, VII, S. 129,221, *BK.*, 207 of 1926-27, 75 of 1935-36; *SII*, XI, I. Nos. 114, 116.
301. *EC.*, II, 73, 125; Cf. *EHD.*, p. 362.
302. *BK.* 67 of 1936-37; *EG.*,VII, Sk.124; *SII*,XI, i, 150, V, No. 51, *BK.*, 237 of 1928-29; 12 of 1936-37.
303. Sharma, R. S., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 104 ff.
304. *Clio* (1974-75), pp. 4 ff.
305. Dikshit, G. S., *Op. Cit.*, pp. 30 ff. -21
306. *Clio*, Vol. I, p. 22.
307. *AR*, 342 of 1912, Cf. *Clio*, Vol. I, p. 22.
308. *SII.*, V, No. 774; *JIH*, XXXIX, pp. 81 ff. Proceedings of the *All India Historical Congress, 1954*, p. 21.
309. *Clio*, p. 23.
310. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
311. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.
312. Dikshit, G. S., *Op. Cit.*, p. 40.
313. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

314. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
315. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
316. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
317. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
318. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
319. Sister, M. Liceria, A. C., *Emergence of Brahmanas as Landed Intermediaries in Karnataka C.A.D. 1000-1330, IHR.*, Vol. I, No. i.
320. *Telangana Inscriptions*, II, Hyderabad, 1960, Ch. No. 20.
321. *Ibid.*, Ch. No. 26. -47
322. *Ibid.*, Ch. No. 33. -49
323. *Ibid.*, Ch. No. 39. -51
324. B.R.Gopal, *The Chalukyas of Kalyana and the Kalachuris*, Dharwad, 1981, p.400.
325. ARE, 1961-62 No.84.
326. D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, p.84
327. ARE, 1958-59 No665
328. Md. Abdul Waheed Khan: *Stone Sculptures in the Alampur Museum* No5, P34-38
329. EC. VII, Sk.118
330. T.V.Mahalingam, *Op.Cit* P386
331. NDI Vol.II. Nel Nos.55, 75: JAHRS. Vol XXV P119
332. YGR: *Some measures and weights in Medieval Andhra: JAHRS*, Vol.XXXII P102-114

333. A.V.Narasiha Murthy, *The Coins of Karnataka*, Mysore, 1975, Ch.IX.;  
A.V.Narasiha Murthy, 'The Coinage of the Chalukyas of Kalyana', in  
M.S.Nagaraja Rao (Ed) *The Chalukyas of Kalyana* (Seminar Papers)  
Bangalore, 1983. pp.16-25.;A.V.Narasiha Murthy, *Some Aspects of  
Early Historic Archaeology and Numismatics of Karnataka*, Madras,  
1991. pp.39-41.
334. *SII.* XX, Inscriptions 47 and 77.
335. *Ibid.*, Nos. 39, 60, 82, 118.
336. *Ibid.*, Nos. 76, 82, 85, 102, 106
337. *SII.*, XI, Pt. I, No. 153.
338. *Ibid.*, XV, No. 67.
339. Though silver coin of the Chalukyas are rare, some of them have been reported, and the present reference confirms the minting of coins in silver also.
340. *Ep. Ind.*, XXXVII, p. 190.
341. *SII.*, XV, No. 22.
342. *ARIE.*, 1925-26, c. 437.
343. *SII.*, IX, Part I, No. 164.
344. It is also possible that *Navilacchina pan*, as in the case of *Lokki pan*, may mean *pan* minted at *Navilur*.
345. These coins were studied by H. Krishna Sastri who prepared a note on them and this note was published by the Government of Madras (Home Department) as Government Order No. 1106, dated 11th October 1917, under the title *Kodur Treasure Trove*.

346. The broken pots are kept in the Madras Government Museum, Madras.
347. *Ind. Ant.*, 25, p. 321, Specimen No. 29. Similar coins has been described by Desikachari and he also ascribes this coin to Jayasimha II. *South Indian Coins*, p. 54.
348. *APAS.*, No. 13, Specimens 29 to 35.
349. *Ibid.*, Specimen No. 104.
350. *Ibid.*, Specimens 129 and 130.
351. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, group X.
352. *Ind. Ant.*, 25, p. 321, Specimen No. 29. Similar coins has been described by Desikachari and he also ascribes this coin to Jayasimha II. *South Indian Coins*, p. 54.
353. *Coins of Southern India*, Plate II No. 60.
354. Smith, V. A., *Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum*, p. 313.
355. Similar coins have been reported from Bijapur by Bhandarkar, *JBBRAS.*, Vol. 21, p. 66. The word *pagoda* has been used by some of the Western numismatists to denote certain type of gold coins which contained the symbol of a temple. *Pagoda* originally meant a temple and as some gold coins contained that symbol, the word became common for gold coins. Such *pagodas* were in use till recently.
356. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, group XII, No. C.
357. *APAS.*, No. 13, coin No. 26.
358. *Ibid.*, Specimens 27 and 28.
359. *MAR.*, 1933, p. 1.01; *EHD.*, p. 802; Smith, V. A., *Op.cit.*, p. 313; Gupta, P. L. *Coins*, p.74.

360. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, p. 7.
361. *Ind. Ant.*, 25, p. 321.
362. *MAR.*, 1933, p. 102.
363. *Ibid.*, Coin No. 10. Altekar simply follows Krishna in this regard and accepts these coins as those of Somesvara I. Cf. *EHD.*, pp. 802-03.
364. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, group XI.
365. *MAR.*, 1933, p. 103.
366. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, Group VIII.
367. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, Group XII, category F.
368. *Ind. Ant.*, 25, p. 321, Nos. 24-29.
369. *Kodur Treasure Trove*, Group V(a).
370. *Ibid.*, Group V(b).
371. *MAR*, 1933, p. 104.

\*\*\*\*\*