CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATION

While examining the political history of Banavāsi earlier, it had been pointed out that there was no conclusive evidence to show that under the Mauryas the Vanavāsa country formed a part of the Mayuran empire. Accordingly, it would be unreasonable here to extrapolate the structure of the Mauryan administration to the Vanavāsi region. However, under the Satavāhanas for the first time, we get clear indications of the inclusion of at least a part of the Vanavāsa kingdom in their empire. Right from this period till the close of the period dealt with in this study, we notice that the basic feature of the Government was monarchical. The Banavāsi country was ruled by the king, through a feudatory of a governor or directly by the King himself. As has been pointed out elsewhere, under the Satavāhana ruler Gautamiputra Satakarni the Vanavāsa country came to be a part of the Satavāhana empire. Possibly the Satavāhanas instituted their kith and kin like the Chuṭus at the head of Banavāsi region. With their downfall, these dynasties ruled for a short period until they were replaced by the Kadambas.

It has been pointed out by the earlier writers that the Satavāhanas followed the same policy as had been laid down by Arthasastra of Kautilya, Ṛṇava Dharmaśastra,
and the like. In fact, the Nasik cave inscription of Gautamiputra Satakarni expressly states that "He properly devised time and place for the pursuit of the trivarga and sympathised fully with weal and woe of the citizens". The trivarga is composed of Dharma, Artha and Kama and the statement cited above is in accordance with the principles laid down by Kautilya.

Under the Satavahanas, the king was the supreme authority. The succession to the throne was hereditary in the male line. The kings of the dynasty performed Vedic sacrifices like Asvamedha and Rajasuya. They were not content with the simple title Raja, but assumed titles like Rajaraja i.e. king of kings. A detailed picture of the Satavahana administration is not furnished by the inscriptions. The dominion was governed by feudatory chieftains and royal officers. The Banavasi province itself was probably under the Chuṭus who functioned as feudatories of the Satavahanas. The state was divided into a number of Ahāras or Rashtras consisting of at least one central town called Nigama and a number of villages called Gramas. A few royal officers can be identified from Satavahana inscriptions. The Amāyas were governors of Ahāras. The Rajamāyas probably attended on the king constituting the advisory body. Specific tasks were commissioned to be executed by Mahāmatra. The supervision of stores was looked after by Bhandagārika. The Heranika functioned as a treasurer. The Mahāsenapati
who sometimes acted as governor was also a commander of State forces. The Lēkhaka worked as the secretary of state and drafted all documents emanating from the king. The registration of such documents was looked after by Nibandhakāras. There could have been other departments such as those of Police, Finance, Justice, Army, Agriculture, Industries, etc., although inscriptions do not refer to them. The Maharathis and Mahabhōgas ruled as feudatory chieftains. The smallest administrative units were grāmas and Nigamas. The Gathasaptasati of Hāla refers to grāmanι, who administered about 5-10 villages. Considerable autonomy was enjoyed by the administrators managing villages and towns. The towns were centres of commercial activity. Some of these seem to have had an assembly of the citizens called Nigama-Sabha. Frequent references are found to the term Grihapati. This may have been the designation of the head of a certain number of household cultivators. Sometimes, Grihapatis were also members of Nigamasabhās. References are also found to śreni meaning a guild. These institutions administered local affairs within their own spheres of activity.

With the fall of the Śatavāhanas, the feudatory houses in various parts of their empire assumed independence. In Banavasi it was the Chuṭu family and possibly they introduced hardly any change in the administration of the region. Titles like Rāja and Maharāja are encountered in their inscriptions. There were ministers
like Amātya and Mahāvallabharajaṇuka who are mentioned in connection with grants. Thus an Amātya Khadasati or Skandasvāti is mentioned as having supervised the grants made by Śivakhaḍa Nāgasiri, the mother of Yuvarāja and daughter of the Maharāja of Mahābhūvi family. Similarly in the same period, mention is made of Mahāvallabharajaṇuka, who was commanded by the king that the specified grant for the God had been made.

Under the Kadambas also, we get hardly any information about the details of the administrative functioning of the kingdom. The rulers began to assume somewhat glorious titles like Dharma Mahārajaḍhirāja which occurs in the grants of almost all the kings of the dynasty. Officers assisting the king particularly in the administration of the provincial governments are occasionally mentioned. It would appear that in many cases even the succession of the ministers was hereditary. However, the ministers were not necessarily Brahmāṇas. A good instance of this is that of the administrative officers stationed in Halsi which was the second capital of the Kadambas. In the Halsi plates of Kākusthavarma we are told that Senāpati Śrutakīrti saved the life of Yuvarāja Kākusthavarma and as a reward he was granted land in Khetagrama. In the later inscriptions of the Kadambas themselves found in Halsi, we get information about fresh grants or renewals made to the successors of Śrutakīrti. The genealogy of the family to the time of Ravivarma can be reconstructed
In Mrigesa's inscription from Devagiri, a Senapati Naravara is mentioned. In some other inscriptions of the same king, one Kirtivara is stated to have written the records. It is difficult to pin-point the functions of these officers. In the inscriptions which are actually meant for recording grants, they are either mentioned as recipients of the grant or the writers of the grants. Possibly, apart from looking after the military administration of the region in which they were stationed, they were also expected to look after the records of the grants made by the kings in their region. Other offices mentioned in the contemporary records consist of Ayuktaka and Desamatya. In an inscription of Mrigesa a Jiyanta is mentioned as the Ayuktaka and recipient of the grant. In an inscription of Ravivarma from Sirsi, one Nilakantha is described as Desamatya and the royal physician (Vaidya). The post of private secretary, Mahasayadhikrita has been mentioned in the inscription of Mandhatrivarma. At the lower level there were officers looking after village administration
also. They are referred to as Gramabhojaksas.  

For administrative convenience the kingdom under the Kadambas was divided into various provinces. The most important places serving as administrative headquarters of the provinces were Triparvata, Palāsika and Uchchanda. For quite sometime, these were ruled by the different branches of the main Kadamba line. Apart from these, there were some other areas which were invested with the feudatory families. Thus in the Halmidi inscription we get references to an administrative area called Narida-vilenaṇḍu which was ruled over by chiefs named Mrigēsa and Naga. There are also references to Alupagaṇa, the Bāṇa and the Šendraka. Apparently the feudatory families ruled over their areas hereditarily. They were expected to provide military assistance to their overlords at times of war. Another family of the feudatories of the Kadambas is that of the Kekayas. They were ruling over the coastal region around Honnavar. The feudatory families appear to have been considerably free in their areas of the jurisdictions. Sometimes they issued copper plates in their own name, though they mentioned their overlords. For instance, the Honnavar plates of Kekaya Chitrāsenaka mentions Chitrāsenaka Kella as the issuing authority though at the beginning, mention is made of his overlord Ravimaharāja. The same record also mentions Jinanandi, son of Simha as the Šenapati.
Another feudatory family which finds mention in the early Kadamba inscriptions was that of the Sendrakas. The Halsi plates of Harivarman which record a gift of a village to a Jaina temple at Palasika states that the grant was made at the request of Bhanusaktiraja, who was an ornament of the Sendraka family. From the records of the early Chalukyas it is known that the Sendrakas had shifted their allegiance to the Chalukya rulers. But the Kadamba record referred to above shows that at least till 524-525 A.D., the Sendrakas had been the feudatories of the Kadambas of Banavasi. All the kings of this family bore names ending with Sakti.

After the Chalukya conquest of Banavasi the independent status of the kingdom of the Kadambas was lost. The region was reduced to the position of a mere administrative unit designated the Banavasi Mandala. The Chalukyas wrested the authority from the Kadamba hands and placed the administration of Banavasi Mandala into the hands of their trusted feudatories, the Alupas, with whom they had matrimonial relations also.

The Chalukya king was a supreme monarch with an imperial status. The kings bore various titles such as 'Satyasraya', Prithvivallabha, Maharajadhiraja, Bhattaraka, Paramesvara, etc. Sometimes their religious inclination is also suggested by the titles. A majority of the kings before the accession of Vikramaditya I bore the title Paramabhagayatha, i.e., great devotee of Vishnu.
The Chalukya kings became converts to Shaivism with Vikramaditya I, who held the title Paramamahēśvara, great devotee of Mahēśvara.

As in the case of the Kadambas, the succession of kings to the throne under the Chalukyas was from father to son. The eldest son was entitled for succession to the throne, the coronation and accession to the throne took place only after the reigning king was dead. However, in cases when the rightful heir was premature, the younger brother of the king succeeded as a regent, as in the case of Maṅgaleśa who succeeded after his brother Kīrtivarma I. Political expansion through conquest and conversion and protection of the conquered territories was an important goal before the king. Often the kings kept up to this expectation. The sons of the kings were holding the position of the prince and led the royal armies on behalf of the kings. But in cases of imperial expansion, the conquests are known to have been made by the king himself. An interesting aspect of the Chalukya policy under Pulikēśi II, was the establishment of new royal houses, in freshly conquered territories to ease the administrative problems. Thus Pulikēśi established two Chalukya houses, one in Andhra and the other in Gujarat. This policy kept the empire of the Chalukyas quite safe from the north eastern and north-western quarters.
From Chālukyan inscriptions very little can be made of the council of ministers. There are indications that the entire administration of the state was practically vested with the members of the whole Royal family and the feudatories who were placed in charge of different regions inherited by them.

A few inscriptions suggest that the queen and the princesses took an active part in public affairs and were devoted to learning and charity. For instance, Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, the queen of Chandrāditya, who was the elder brother of Vikramāditya I, issued two grants in her own name. She was a poetess who won high esteem at the hands of literary critics. Likewise princess Kuṃkuma Mahādevī, younger sister of Vijayāditya and wife of the Alupa king was present with him in his camp at Huhundinagara, in 705 A.D. and took the initiative to cause a grant of a village to be made to a learned Brāhmaṇa. A stone inscription from Kurtakoti belonging to the time of Vijayāditya mentions that Lokatinimmadi was administering Kuruttakuṇṭa. A suggestion has been made that she could be the same as Lokamahadevi, the daughter-in-law of Vijayāditya and queen of Vikramāditya II.

Certain courtesans associated with kings are mentioned in some records. More important among them is the name of Viṇāpoṭi, the beloved of Vijayāditya, who
made certain grants to the temple at Mahākūṭa. A few other offices are also mentioned in Chalukya records. Mahāsandhivigrahika is more common among them and connotes the office of a great maker of peace and war. Śrīrāma Niravadya, Anivārita and Dhanañjaya were some of the Mahāsandhivigrahikas mentioned in the Chalukya records.

As mentioned earlier, the administration of different provinces within the empire was allowed to be in the hands of the feudatory families who were expected to obey the suzerainty of the emperor and pay periodical tributes. Āḷupas, Sindas, Śendrakas, Baṇas, Gaṅgas, Telugu-Chōlas, etc. were among these families. References are made to terms like Rāṣṭra, Vishaya and Nādu. Their sizes were not regular. Vishayapatis, Sāmantas, Grāma-bhōgikas, Mahattarās etc. are mentioned in the records. However, the duties of these offices are not clearly defined.

As in the Kadanba times, the village remained the lowest unit of administration even under Chalukyas. The village officer titled Gaṇunda or Gavunda is frequently mentioned in the records of the period. He served as a link between the villagers and the king's government. It is not clear from the records whether the Gaṇundas were appointed by the centre or enjoyed the office hereditarily. The Grāmabhōgikas mentioned in Sanskrit
inscriptions are probably identical with Gaûndas. In the Adur inscription, apart from Gaûnda, the office of Karana or village accountant is also mentioned. The regulation of social and economic affairs and to some extent the details of village administration were in the hands of Mahâjanas or the village elders. The Mahâjanas of Badami are stated to have taken the initiative in causing a cave to be excavated in honour of the deceased Chalukya king (?) Satyasraya, probably Pulikeśi II. Beñiyur was being governed by the Mahâjanas of that place in the reign of Vijayaditya. In another case the permission of the Mahâjanas is stated to have been obtained before giving away a piece of land to a temple as grant.

The relation between the government of the king and the administrative institutions is furnished to some extent by the Lakshmesvara inscription. The charter of rights and duties (Acharavyavasthe) as given by the Yuvarāja to the Mahâjanas, Nagara, and the eighteen Prakritis of Puligere is recorded in this inscription. It mentions Rajapurusha (Royal Official) and lays on them the duty of protecting certain established rights. It prescribes the rates of taxes to be given to Desadhipatis every year in Vaîsakha month and to the Sreni (Guild) in Kartika month.

As to taxation, not many details can be had from the available records. The Lakshmesvara inscription of
Yuvarāja Vikramaditya seems to indicate that persons who owned houses and house sites paid taxes on them, whereas the families which had no house property paid taxes of fifteen (15), ten (10), seven (7), and five (5) panas per year to the king’s officers. Taxes were also collected on occasions of public festivals and auspicious domestic functions. In the Balligāve inscription of the time of Vinayaditya,35 it is stated that an Adhikāri named Kandarba obtained a royal proclamation in the territories of Nāgarakhaṇḍa and Jejugura remitting the contribution due to the royal treasury from the levies on great festivals, salt and property of the childless. In the move to gain this concession, Dasas of Balligāve, certain temple establishments and three Gamundas, representing different villages, are stated to have participated.

Another inscription of Vijayaditya’s reign from Badāmi records a gift of several taxes and incomes in kind like oil, sugar etc. to be paid at the prescribed rate by each shop to the shrine of Trimūrtis there.36 Similarly an Aihole inscription of 709 A.D. speaks of the gift of oil at one ladle full per oil mill to the God of the Huchchimalli temple.37 A similar gift of betel leaves amounting to 50 leaves per load to the God Āditya of Komarasinga’s temple at Aihole is recorded in an inscription of Vikramaditya II.38 This gift had the sanction of the king as well as the Nakara before the Mahājanas. At Paṭṭadakal a levey of two Kula of millet on each mattar of land was assigned to God Lōkeśvara in the reign of the same king.39
Thus taxation was both in cash and kind.

Under the Rashtrakutas not much changes were noticed in the overall pattern of administrative machine. The king stood at its head and his office was hereditary. The crown passed on to the eldest son who was formally proclaimed Yuvaraja when he became sufficiently old and experienced. He helped the king in carrying on the administration and in military expeditions. The names of the various offices of the ministers cannot be obtained from the records, but some ministers like Dalla, the foreign minister of Dhruva, enjoyed the feudatory status. The ministers are often described as right hand of the king. The Rashtrakuta empire consisted partly of vassal states and partly of directly administered areas. Certain feudatories like those of southern Gujarat enjoyed practically complete autonomy. They granted villages without imperial sanction. They had their own sub-feudatories also. The other feudatories had very little independent power and were to obtain sanction of the king before alienating revenues or granting villages. Periodically they attended the emperor's court and expressed personal royalty and paid regular tribute. They were also expected to supply the required fighting troops for campaigns. Often they took part along with their forces in military campaigns of the king. If they rebelled they were subjected to indignities.
As pointed out above, for administrative convenience, the Rashtrakutas divided their empire into several provinces or Rashtras. The governors of provinces were either feudatory chiefs or persons appointed by dint of their distinguished military services. An example of the latter can be seen in the appointment of Bankeya as the Viceroy of Banavasi-12000 under Amoghavarsha I. The provincial governors had their capitals and courts. They were of the status of Mahasamanta or Mahamandalesvara and quite often bore the title of king, i.e. Raja in Sanskrit or Arasa in Kannada. Under Dhruva, the governor of Banavasi was called Marakarasa and under Govinda III, Rajaditya Rajaparamesvara. Bankeya and his descendents who ruled in the Banavasi province from about 850 A.D., were hereditary Mahasamantas. As pointed out elsewhere, the administrators of Banavasi were frequently changed by the Rashtrakuta overlords possibly because of the fear of the feudatory families becoming powerful. The provincial governors were enjoying considerable powers over their subordinates. In 912 A.D. for instance, when Mahasamanta Kalivittarasa was governor of Banavasi, his subordinate Nagavunda of Giduvalge-70 became disaffected and was about to escape to Gangavadi. However, on the orders of the Governor he was arrested in Kumbise District. Earlier around 797 A.D. when Chitravahana, the ruler of Aluvakheda-6,000 became insubordinate, the Governor of Banavasi attacked him. It is clear from the
above instances that the provincial governors had large standing armies under their control, and that these were used in times of peace for controlling disobedient officers and feudatories as also for maintaining peace and order; at times of war these forces were sent to assist the imperial forces to fight battles. This is indicated by the Konñur inscription of Amōghavarsha I, wherein, we find the governor of Banavasi who was fighting with the Gaṅgas, ran up to the capital to suppress a rebellion there with his own battalions and then again joined the imperial forces in the campaign against the Pallavas. 46

Provincial governors were also the head of the revenue administration. This is clear from the grants in which officers were requested not to interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of the rent-free lands and the villages granted by the emperors. In conjunction with the local bodies the revenue settlement of the villages was carried out by these officers. Such a fresh settlement was necessitated in 941 A.D. by the drying up of an old canal, referred to in the inscription of Sorab taluk, then in the province of Banavasi-12,000. 47

In spite of the considerable powers enjoyed by the provincial officers, the making of grants of villages was not in their hands. For instance, Baṅkēya, the governor of Banavasi under Amōghavarsha I, had to take the permission of the king to make the grant of village in favour
of a Jaina temple. Only in a doubtful case in Niḍa­
gundi inscription do we find Baṅkēya giving some culti­
vable lands to the temple of Mahādeva at the request of
his son.49

The provinces were further sub-divided into smaller
regions called Bhuktis which were in their turn sub-divided
into smaller circles of ten to thirty villages. Thus we
find references to smaller divisions like Atkūru-12 as
a reward for Maṇalēra who showed bravery in the battle
fought with the Chōlas.50 There were hereditary, local
revenue officers like Nādagūndaś, in Karṇāṭaka. Some­
times the smaller administrative divisions were ruled
over by kith and kin of provincial governors. For
instance when Baṅkēya was governing over Banavāśi-12,000,
his son Kundatte was the officer over Nīlgundīge-12,51
However, another person named Rūpa is also mentioned as
having been summoned before Baṅkēya made grant of land
at his son's request to a local temple. It would thus
seem that there were hereditary headmen ruling over smaller
divisions. Sometimes even the ladies are known to have
held the posts of Gavundā. A good example of this can
be had from an inscription from Śīkāripūra, which records
that when the Naṅgaūnda of Nāgarakhaṇḍa died, fighting
for Kaṅḍīṭṭeraśa, the governor of Banavāśi, his wife
succeeded to the office and managed the affairs for seven
years.52 She was a Jaina by faith and when she decided
to perform *Sallekhana* she sent for her daughter and nominated her to the office of *Nalgaunda*.

The village was the lowest unit of the administration. It was in the charge of a village headman whose position was hereditary. He was more a representative of the people. This can be realised from an inscription in Šikaripura region. It is stated therein that a headman died of broken heart in 999 A.D. on seeing the ruin of his own town. *Gavunda* is the term used to designate his office.\(^{53}\)

The defence of the village was in charge of the village headman. Because of the frequent wars, every villager had to be ready and trained in the use of arms. There are examples of even bangle sellers fighting to the bitter end.\(^{54}\) Cattle lifting sometimes caused animosity between neighbouring villages and the numerous hero stones scattered in Karnataka record the death of such heroes in the fight defending the cattle. Good number of Sorab inscriptions belonging to reigns of Kṛṣhṇa II, Kṛṣhṇa III and Karka II refer to deaths of village heroes caused by cattle-lifting or *Gogrāhana*. The village headmen were themselves at the head of the militia and were good fighters.

An inscription of 975 A.D. refers to a robber's attack on Kundaṇa, a son of Gavunda Kevasekula who fought and died with the robbers.\(^{55}\) In a mutual clash among the
Nalagaundas, another village headman is stated to have
died in the same place. As in the previous regime, the
Mahajanag continued to represent the village assembly and
had considerable local powers.

The Chalukyas of Kalyana, under whom the Kadambas resumed feudatoryship, continued the inherited administra
tive system in their empire. The numerous inscriptions
which belong to their period are scattered all over their empire and the information that can be gathered from them about their administrative machinery is copious. The Chalukyas like their forefathers had the Varaha lanchhana but their feudatories in Banavasi region had the Simha lanchhana. Chalukya monarch was at the top of the administrative system and the succession was hereditary, generally in the eldest male line. There were exceptions when the ruling king either had no male issue or was too weak to carry on the administration smoothly. For instance, Vikramaditya V and his brothers succeeded to the throne because Irivabedanga had no male issue. Likewise Vikrama
ditya VI, inspite of being not the eldest son, waged war against his brother and deposed him from the throne. The office of Yuvaraja went to the heir-apparent. When there was no qualified person in the royal family, the place of Yuvaraja was temporarily conferred on some trusted official. The king styled himself with high-sounding imperial titles such as Samastabhu
vamāraya,
Śripṛthvīvallabha, Mahārajādhirāja, Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Satyārṣrayakulatilaka, Chālukyabharanē Śrīmat etc. followed by the favourite title of individual king. Thus Sūmeśvara I had titles Āhavamalla and Trailokya-malla; Vikramāditya VI had the title Tribhuvanamalla and so on. The relations of the Chālukya kings with their feudatories were cordial compared to those of the Hoysalas. The emperors as recorded in the contemporary works were expected to honour the tradition established in respect of the conquered territory. Subordinate rulers were allowed to use their original legal titles and preserve their state intact in every respect. However, they were expected also to openly acknowledge the sovereignty of the emperor by reciting his imperial titles and reign and then introducing their own respective prāsastis with some phrases like tatpāda-padmopajīvi. The inscriptions of the period followed this model in respect of the feudatories and their subordinates. The petitions for making grants were made in a similar fashion to the feudatories also. The rule of the feudatories is described in the same glowing terms as those of the emperors. Like their emperors, they are stated to have been ruling from Nelevīḍu i.e. camps or Rājadhānis i.e. capitals. They are also described as suppressing the wicked and protecting the good and spending their leisure in noble and pleasant social and intellectual pursuits. They had their
own courts, ministers and administrative staff. In one of the inscriptions, as many as five ministers of a single feudatory are mentioned.\(^{56}\)

For administrative convenience, the empire had been divided into various administrative units. They were named after an important place, serving as the centre of activity in that division. Thus there were Banavāsi-12,000, Palasige-12,000, Gangavādi-96,000 and so on. Each of these had sub-divisions with some important places as the headquarters. Thus Mugunda-30 was located in Maharajavādi-Nādu which itself was a part of Palasige-12,000.\(^{57}\) As to the suffixed numbers, there has been some controversy. However, it is generally accepted that the suffixed number represents the approximate number of villages contained in the respective division.\(^{58}\)

In the Banavāsi-12,000 area, there were frequent changes in the administrative officers. The revenue officer in 1112 A.D. during the reign of Vikramāditya VI was Mahāsamantādhipati Anantapālayya, who was in charge of the Vadāravula tax of the entire Banavāsi-12,000 region as well as of the remaining administrative divisions, which were in his charge.\(^{59}\) His subordinates Daṇḍanāyaka Aliya Mādirājarasa was in charge of Vadāravula of Banavāsi-12,000, Halasige-12,000, Nolambavādi-32,000.\(^{60}\)

Sometimes two or more major administrative divisions were kept in charge of the royal office. For
instance, under Somesvara I, in 1055 A.D. Vikramaditya VI
was appointed as governor over Gangavadi-96,000 and
Banavasi-12,000. A couple of years later, Nolambavadi-
32,000 was also added to his jurisdiction.

There is evidence that provincial heads were transferred from time to time from one division to another.
In such transfers, the efficiency of the officer seems to have counted much. Perhaps, stopping the growth of vested interests was also intended by these transfers. In the Banavasi region, this can be attested to by frequent changes in the administrative heads. Under the Rashtrakutas, Kadamba Chattayya was its governor. He continued to be the governor even after the Chalukyas replaced Rashtrakutas. Between 979 and 993 A.D., there are inscriptions referring to Chattayya as the head of Banavasi division. But he did not rule this area without break. In September-October 984 A.D. Chattayya was governing Banavasi, while in November-December of the same year, a person named Sobhanarasa was ruling the same region. Once again in 991 A.D. Sobanarasa was administering Banavasi besides Eradunuru. In 993 A.D. again Chattayya was back at Banavasi. He was succeeded by Bhimarasa.

A similar feature can be noticed in the reign of Vikramaditya VI. In 1110 A.D. Periyadaanayaka Anantapala was governing Banavasi region. In 1121 he was
once again the governor of Banavasi division. Again in 1126, he was administering Vengimandala. All these go to indicate that there were transfers of the governors of provinces according to the wish of the king.

There were also smaller units of the provinces which were called Kampanas. The Officer in charge of the Kampanas was known as Manneya.

About the administration of justice within the provinces, there is hardly any material forthcoming. However, it may be guessed that the petty disputes were settled at the village level by the village headmen themselves, while disputes of higher order would have been settled in the presence of the provincial governors or the court of the king according to the nature of the dispute.

The sources of revenue for the state and the provincial governors were various. It appears that a sixth of the share of the produce went to the royal treasury. Thus the land assessment would have been at 1/6th of the total produce. Apart from land revenue, revenues came in the form of taxes. Some of these were in kind, while others were in cash. From the available records, it is clear that there were taxes on oil mills, on beasts of burden, betel leaves, salt etc. There also appear to have been taxes on village artisans such as carpenters, goldsmiths, barbers, blacksmiths, potters etc.
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