SECTION III: ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER ASPECTS

CHAPTER X
ADMINISTRATION
i) ADMINISTRATION

1. Capital and the fort:

**Anumakonda:** As noticed before Garuda Beta or Beta II was the earliest member who settled in Anumakonda. The name of the town as Armakonda is noticed in the early inscription dated 58th regnal year of the Rastrakuta king Anoghavarsha I, A.D. 872. It was set up by the Chalukya king Satyasraya Bhillarsa, who according to the Rügi inscription was the great grandfather of king Taila II. Therefore the statement of the Bayyaram record of the reign of Ganaapadidewa that Beta II after killing the enemies Anuma and Konda made Anumakonda his capital is mere fictitious, although it is true as far as Beta II is concerned. This ancient town of the Rastrakuta period, probably a Jain centre, continued to be the capital of the Kakatiyas till Rudra became independent. The early structures of the thousand pillar temple and the Prasanna Kesava temple, Padmakshi temple on the hillock, and Betesvara and Prolesvara shrines are some of the temples of that period. The remains of an old fort are also noticeable here.

**Orugallu:** After becoming independent Rudra found it necessary to have a strong fort to meet the defence needs of his capital. So at a distance of about 5 K.M. from Anumakonda an extensive site was chosen for the new fort. The locality on
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account of a huge boulder or single stone hillock is called Omti-koïḍa or Oruvagallu and sanskritized as Ekasilānagara. Tradition gives us the account that Prola II, in course of his cart journey detected a teekh stone or Parsavedi and realizing its importance built a Śiva temple over it. Since then it is called Svayambhu Śiva which has become the family deity of the Kakatiyas. Rudra started his fortification around that temple. Subsequently Ganapati took up the work and completed the construction.

The fort consists of three fortified walls. The first wall, a mud bund of about ten feet high runs by the side of the villages Karparti, Kazipet and Anumkonda and now it is broken at several places and not easily identifiable. The second fort is the huge mud wall outside the village. It has four gates on four cardinal points. The wall is surrounded by a deep moat filled with water. It is impossible for the enemy to cross the moat and get up the huge bund which is about 20 ft. high. We have no idea what more precautions they took in those days to make the enemy's access into the fort impossible. At present there is civilian town inside this bund. At a distance of about one furlong there is the third fort built in stone, generally called Kanchu-kōta, i.e. bronze fort. A similar moat, probably deeper than the outer one is kept always full of water. This fort is provided with more bastions than the outer one; the number of the bastions according to the Telugu chronicle is 72 and they were always
guarded by nāyakas or generals. One can climb over this rock 
fort only from inside, and from the outside it is absolutely 
inaccessible. In side this fort perhaps the king's palace and 
the Svayambhudeva temple along with administration offices are 
said to have been located.

At present we find only the two walls, the mud wall and the 
stone wall along with the moats and the four pairs of the 
entrance gates. While going inside we can see only the four 
toranas supposed to be the entrance gates of the Svayambhūdeva 
temple which owing to wrath of the Musalmans is no more extant. 
We find nothing but broken pieces of sculptures. There are 
also temples called Virabhadra temple, Venkatesa temple, 
Śambhunigudi and other shrines. A detailed description of the 
fort is given in the Telugu work Krīdākhiramamu, of Srinātha 
or Vimukonda Vallabharaya of fifteenth century. Some localities 
called Velipālam, Medarivāda, the bazar street, the markets, 
and the various commodities available in the markets, the 
elephant and horse stables, the various temples and the costumes 
of the people, are described in that. Some more details are 
given in Pratapacharitra which seem to be more exaggerating 
than factual.

2. The king and the Māndalikas:

The history of South India in the latter part of the 
twelfth century was marked with the dwindling of the two dominating 
empires the Chālukyas and Chōlas. In their place kingdoms of 
smaller magnitude came up. The Telugu country particularly
which remained for a long period under the influence of those two powers came under the hands of a number of Māndalika chiefs who for all purposes exercised independent power. The only power that can be reckoned in the coastal region was that of the Velanāti chief Prithvīśvara. In the first decade of the thirteenth century Gaṇapatiḍeṇa could put an end to this powerful chief and annex his territory to the Kākatiya kingdom. All the remaining chiefs either became allies or relatives to the Kākatiyas. Gaṇapatiḍeṇa's sovereignty over these chiefs who were almost enjoying a sort of independence was mere nominal. He allowed them to remain as they were in the Chālukya-Chōla period i.e. A.D. 1070-1200. It is quite evident from the numerous inscriptions in that region during Gaṇapati's reign, which do not mention him at all. The Chāgi chiefs for instance, who were ruling the Natavādi region in the heart of the Kākatiya kingdom never seem to have mentioned any Kākatiya king in their records. The Haihayas chiefs of Konamandala, the Chōlas of Nellore, the Kondapadumati Parichhedis also come under this class. The Kākatiyas do not seem to have asserted imperial status. Their common praśasti or eulogy does not contain the high sounding titles as Mahārajādhirāja paramēśvara etc. which even the petty Kolani chiefs or the Kōta chiefs used to mention invariably in their records. This peculiar type of political relationship between the Kākatiya rulers and their subordinates, throughout their regime of nearly two centuries leads us to the conclusion that they tried to introduce a new
The subordinate chiefs were allowed to have their freedom in all respects except for foreign matters. The only care they took was to check their overgrowth in power. Appointed officers were always there throughout the kingdom. Only a single instance we can point out where a subordinate chief, with the connivance of the outside enemies revolted against the overlord and he was the Kāyastha chief Ambedēva who revolted against, Rudramadēvi and declared independence in A.D. 1290. Thus from their records and the nature of the relation they maintained with the subordinates we are led to believe that they preferred decentralized type of administration with limited central enforcements. They always remained as Mahāmandalāśvaras and never tried to exercise imperial power.

Our reasons for this conclusion are 1) Their original praśasti contains the simple title which have no significance and there is no consistency in them. The only title they retained throughout was Mahāmandalāśvara. 2) They did not exert any sovereignty over the subordinate kings. They treated them as co-rulers. Most of them did not even make a reference in their records to the Kakatiya ruler and 3) They did not disregard the local traditions in the conquered areas. For instance a dignitary no less than Jayapanayaka while making a gift of lamp to the god Bhīmēśvara at Daksāra in 1175, A.D. 1253 refers to the 37th regnal year of the Chōla king Tribhuvana-chakravarti Rājarāja II. It was the 37th regnal year of Rājarāja III but
not of Rajādhiraśa the ruling Chōla king in Ś.1175. Similarly another record of the Kākatiya minister Indulūri Gannaya at the same place refers to Ś.1215 along with the 76th regnal year of Rajādhiraśadēva which corresponds to A.D.1293. In this case also it was the 76th regnal year of Rājarāja III, but not of Rājadhirājadeva. Neither of these two Chōla kings was no more at the time of the record. However the famous Kākatiya minister alone seems to honour the custom. The imperial authority of the Chōlas over the Telugu country absolutely ceased to exist long back and in fact Jāyapanāyaka was governing the Velanāndu region even before this date under the Kākatiya sovereignty. There is no point in assuming that the Chōla Kings were exercising any authority at Dakshāramam. Quite contrary to this, the Western Chālukya subordinates including Anantapāla-dandanāyaka used to reckon their records at the same place in Chālukya Vikrama era without referring to the regnal years of the Chōla kings. What made Gaṇapatidēva adopt this polity with regard to his political status, is a point of considerable importance. It cannot be attributed to his weakness, because by this time he had already accomplished the victory over Kāṇchi where his minister Sāmantā Bhōja set up an inscription reckoning in Śaka 1172, Saumya corresponding to A.D. 1249, without referring to the regnal year of the Chōla king. The mention of Chōla regnal year at Dakshāramam therefore, must be attributed to some other reason. His political relations with the local mandalikas of that place are not so plain as we think. The Kona
chiefs of the Haihaya family and the Chālukya chiefs of
Pithāpuram were still exercising some power in the Godavari
region under the shadowy supremacy of the Chōla kings.
Obviously they too seem to be equally apprehensive that any
attempt on their part to declare sovereignty would lead them to
a conflict either with the rulers of Kalinga in the east or
the Kākatīya monarch Gaṇapatidēva. The latter instead of
entering into a direct quarrel with the Kalinga kings allowed
these Kona chiefs to remain as they were. Although Gaṇapatidēva
invaded the Kalinga country as alluded to in the Upparapalli
inscription there is no evidence to say that he could gain any
material benefit in that campaign. On the other hand there is
a doubt, whether he suffered a defeat at the hands of the Ganga
king Narasimha. Absence of Kākatīya records beyond Dākshārānanain
the East is a clear indication in this regard. Our concern
in the present context is about his undue lineant attitude
towards the māndalikas which leads to the conclusion that his
political motive was never imperialistic. His success over
Prithivīsvara, the Velanāṭī king was only to check his overgrowth
which may endanger the very existence of the Kākatīya kingdom.
Gaṇapati having suppressed the Velanāṭī king annexed the coastal
Andhra from Gōdāvari to Penna to his kingdom. His invasion over
Kāṇchi and the Cudōapah region was intended to assist Manumasa-
siddhi, the Telugu Chōḍa king of Nellore. Even in the conquered
area of the coastal districts he never tried to impose his
supremacy over the mandalikas. They were allowed to enjoy their freedom. It is doubtful whether some of the chiefs like the Chāgis, the Kona chiefs ever used to pay any tribute to the king. So Gaṇapatidēva seems to maintain the status quo of the mōndali ke system, himself being the mahāmāndalēśvara. A wonderful polity indeed!

Thus the erstwhile imperialistic pattern of the Chālu ky a and Chōla regimes was reduced to a decentralized monarchism in the Telugu speaking country. In the known history of the Deccan, for the first time the Kākatīyas either wantonly or otherwise encouraged this novel type of polity where there was no pomp, no eulogy of high sounding titles, no imposition of supremacy. Even some of the most loyal subordinates in course of time began to omit the mention of the king in their records. The Cheraku chiefs for example, who served the Kākatīyas right from the beginning of Rudradeva's career, surprisingly omitted the reference to their Kākatīya masters in their inscriptions at Amarābad. It seems many subordinates and occasionally officers practically forgot this formality of referring to the reign of the king in their records. Yet in loyalty they were second to none. A copper plate charter, recently discovered at Karimnagar although issued by the king Gaṇapatidēva, after mentioning the date in Vikramā era 1303, Parabhava refers to the king's reign with the simple sentence 'Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva mahā śāsati' (while Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva ruling the earth). Not even Mahāmāndalēśvara title is attached. The charter was issued by
the king himself and contains his legal decree over a canal dispute. Similarly the Uttarēśvara grant of Pratāparudra after describing the town of Orugallu alludes to the king as 'Tasyām asti sa-Vīra Rudra-nipatī Pratyarthī Prithvīpati-sphūrjat-ratna kiriṣa-koti-vilasat-pādēraviḍa-dvayaḥ' On the other hand some of the most insignificant chiefs used to attribute themselves with a lengthy prāṣasti and refer to the Kākatiya overlord with simple attribute mahāmāndalesvara. The Kākatiyas, it is evident, did not try to exercise imperial power at the cost of the māndalika chiefs. There are instances where their own officers did not mention the king's name. Mahārāyasakalasena-senapati Rudradeva, in his Durgi epigraph datable to A.D. 1297 makes no mention of Pratāparudrādeva. The said Rudra-senāgati was one of Pratāparudra's trusted generals who effected the subjugation of Ambadeva in the Tripurantakam region. Similarly certain Peddaya and Potaya the commanders of Ganapatideva's armies set up inscriptions at Kolavennu in Krishna district without any reference to Ganapatideva. Such instances can be easily multiplied. This attitude of the officers does not mean their disloyalty to the king. Nor it can be mistaken to be the latter's ineffective control over them. In fact the fall of the Kākatiyas was mainly owing to the undefendable attacks of the Muslim armies, but not to the internal revolts or the disloyalty of subordinates.

The foregoing analysis of the Kākatiya polity with regard to their subordinates leads us to the conclusion that they
favoured decentralized power rather than keeping all the administration under their control which amounts to suppression of the subordinates. They proved this novel experiment as almost successful. It was only Ambadeva's revolt in the last days of Rudranadēvi which went against the king. Such stray cases always occur in any period and in any type of polity.

3. The people and the Government (Local Self-Government):

The time-honoured tenets of Hindu dharma laid down by the great rishis of yore right from Manu to Kautilya were the basic guide to the ruler and the ruled of Bharat in general. In spite of their diversity the dharma-śāstras in those days were, in fact used to command the statutory position of the modern constitution. Neither the ruler nor his subjects were allowed to take arbitrary decisions with regard to their administration or citizenship as the case may be. The king is abode by rājanīti whereas the subjects by dharma-śāstra. The king is a mere custodian of the latter and sees that his subjects are strictly following the principles. Kalidāsa rightly observes that the subjects of Dilipa did not trespass even hair breadth, the well-trodden path of Manu-dharma just like the wheels which never go away from the well trodden track. The king in return has the heavy responsibility to protect the good law-abiding subjects from the evil-doers. Āsta-rakshana and dusta-sikshana are the essential duties of an ideal ruler. Further, the
law-makers of ancient India provided the utmost protection to the people in the administration of the rulers. They have gone to the extent that when a conflict arises between the king's law i.e. rājanīti and the social law i.e. the dharmaśāstra, the latter is to be honoured superseding the laws of rājanīti or artha-śāstra.

"Yatra vipratipettis-syād-dharmaśāstrā-ārtha śāstrayoh | artha-śāstrōktaṁ utṣṭijya dharma-śāstrōktaṁ ācharēt"
(Nārada-smṛiti I-39)

"artha-śāstrāttu balavad-dharmaśāstram iti sthitāḥ"
(Yājñya-valkya-smṛiti-II 21)

Even in those days of ancient and mediaeval period when monarchism was the way of government the people could exercise considerable power in the affairs of social life. We shall examine how the Kākatiya rulers and their subjects put into action the above principles of mutual adjustibility. In other words, we shall examine to what extent the democratic element prevailed in the Kākatiya civil administration.

Samayasi

On the basis of the numerous inscriptions it is unequivocally proved that the society in the period under study led a corporate life. Besides the main four castes viz. brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya and sūdra there are several sub-sects formed mainly according to their professions. The usual way of representing the people in general is by mentioning them as ashtādaśa-praja, that is the eighteen sects of people, a
comprehensive term covering the whole society. The eighteen sects, according to a copper plate inscription of the late Vijayanagara period\textsuperscript{14} are the four main castes; the \textit{vyavahārikas} (officers?); the \textit{pāṭchāla} (the smiths and carpenter); \textit{Kumbhālika} (potter); \textit{tamtvāya} (weaver); \textit{vastrabhedaka} (dyers); \textit{tilaghātaka} (oil mongers); \textit{Kurrentaka} (periyas); \textit{vastra-rakshaka} (sewers of cloth); \textit{devārāja} (spinners); \textit{perika} (transporters of goods by pack loads); \textit{gō-rakshake} (cowherd); \textit{kirāta} (hunters); \textit{rajaka} (washerman) and \textit{kshauraka} (barber). Although it is a late record, on the basis of the records of our period mentioning at least some of these sects, it is possible to assume that the same social structure prevailed in the period under study.

All these eighteen castes used to organize their communal associations, particularly to look after the well being of their individuals. They are called \textit{samayas}. They were internally governed by their own laws and customs called \textit{samavachara}, and they elect their elders, not in the modern voting system but by mutual acceptance based on moral integrity. These elders are vested with powers to levy certain taxes on the members of their community and utilize that contribution for the organizational expenses as well as the benefit of the community, like the construction of a temple in their locality, a gift of ghee for lamps in the temples on their behalf, and so on.

A body of the Perika community of Tripurantaka whose profession is to transport merchandise from place to place for
the merchants, is noticed in an inscription dated A.D. 1245 to have got the remission of tax on their hulls, granted by sarvādhikārī Pochana preggada Gaṇapaya the svākādhikārī of Gaṇapatideva. Perhaps the grant is in lieu of their service in transporting the temple goods free of cost. Our concern in the record is about their representation as a corporate body.

The Girmājipet epigraph dated A.D. 1228 records the installation of the deity Śaśeśvara by the Dharma-sālīs or weavers of Maṭṭiya-sṭhala and an endowment to the same in the form of individual contributions. It inflicts on the defaulters a punishment of excommunication from the samaya. It is thus evident that the weavers of the sṭhala or group of villages, in the present case as stated in the record, the sṭhala of the towns of Anumakonda, Orugallu and Maṭṭevāda, constituted themselves as a corporate body to look after their communal affairs. It is also stated in the record that they have nominated certain Manniseṭṭi and his son Venni setṭi to install the said deities on their behalf. Thus, we see that the different communities of a village or sṭhala or nādu formed into samayas and used to organize their communal affairs. Their elders who were nominated by the community used to represent the samaya in the general administration of the village or sṭhala.

A twelfth-thirteenth century inscription at Palakollu, records the exemption of the communal levy to certain Kaśa Śūrāchāri, who is in-charge of the (mason) work in the Śaṃalīṅgēśvara temple, by the panchāhanam-vāru or the elders of
the sculptors' community. Hence it is purely a transaction of the samava, a corporate body which takes this decision. A similar record at Amaravati of the fifteenth century records the donation of the levies due from the panchapana-vāryu of Amaravati and Dharaṇikota to the god Kamathēśvara of Amaravati. In both the cases the corporate bodies of the panchanam community are the organisations of not villages but nādu. This indicates the samayas or corporate bodies were organised on sthala, vishaya and nādu levels. The body of the teliki-vēvuru or oil mongers was also an organisation of considerable influence. Even the temple servants, form themselves into corporate bodies called sānī-munnūrvuru, Vaishnava-samaya, Šaiva-samaya and the like under whose authority the daily administration of the temples was being conducted. The gifts were also made in their charge. The Ikunuru inscription of the time of Kakati Rudradeva represents the ekkatis or warriors of that village as a corporate body. Similarly the Maktal inscription of the time of Pratāparudra mentions the warriors as a corporate body. All such corporate bodies possess certain powers in the administration of not only their internal community affairs but also the administration of the public institutions like the temples or even the village administration.

The brahmanas of a village generally form into a body called Mahājanās. The assembly of Šaiva pūjāris (or priests?) are called asamkhyātas. An inscription at Umamahēśvaran dated A.D. 1320 states that maheśvaras of some villages included in
the Hannaluru-sthala as a body called asamkhvata Mahāmaheśvaras made a gift to the Mahēśvara with the permission of the king Pratapārūḍra. It is specific in the record that the arrangement made by this samaya or body of asamkhvata-Mahēśvaras is an order (ajāśa) and those who violate this order would be liable for the punishment of not only the king but also the samaya (samaya-dandana). This arrangement is stated to have been made in pursuance of an understanding arrived at in an assembly of the members held in the mukhamandapa of the temple of Umāmahēśvara at the request of the head pujāri named Ganakhi Viśaya and the seventy-two nivēra-holders of the temple. From this record one can understand how the samayas in those days were endowed with powers to manage their affairs. A similar assembly of the asamkhvatas is stated to have met in the mukhamandapa of Viśabhadradeva temple at Srīśaila to conduct the business of the temple administration of Mallikārjunadēva. These bodies were autonomous in certain respects of their internal affairs.

A similar samaya of the Vaishnava priests is noticed in the records of the Bhavanārāyaṇa svāmi temple in Sarpavaram East Godāvari district. The inscription is dated some time later than our period. The samaya of the Vaishnavas is stated to have granted some lands of the temple to certain persons who probably by the order of the samaya dismantled the nandi-pillars set up by the jaṅgams (or Śaivas) encroaching on the lands of the temple. The samaya, therefore could exercise some extra-
ordinary powers even without referring to the king or his representative. While dealing with the temple administration we shall see more instances of this nature. The mahājanas of two villages named Vesantapuram and Vellaṉgōdu are stated in an inscription at Pālemu, Mahbubnagar district to have settled a dispute over the boundary of those villages. It is also interesting to note that in order to make the minor adjustments, that is to keep the natural barriers like the streams, hillocks etc. as boundaries, they have asked to parties to compensate the loss by foregoing some land in other direction in favour of the looser.24

The prevalence of the corporate bodies known as samayas during the Kākatiya period is also noticed in the Maktal inscription dated A.D.1321, wherein it is stated that certain grant was made to the mason who built the temple with the consent of all the samayas of the village, together with the Vaishnava-samaya.25 The particular mention of the Veishnava samaya among others is to see that they may not escape from the contribution towards the said gift, under the plea that they were the temple priests.

The corporate bodies of the merchants which generally called as nakaras, ubhaya-nāṇādesi pekkārdru, svadēśi-bharulu are the main merchant guilds. Although Virabānanja community of the Jaina faith dominated these guilds in pre-Kākatiya period, we notice several other communities including, reddis, potters,
weavers, oil-mongers, kāmpus and the like also becoming members of the said guilds during the Kākatiya period. Their organizations were well constituted with special privileges as will be dealt with in the following item on 'Trade'.

**Village Councils:**

Dr. G.S. Dikshit opines that the nagaras or towns in the Mediaeval Kārnāṭaka were administered by the local bodies called nagaras, the villages by ēruṣ and the agraharas by Mahājanas. With slight modifications the same system prevailed in Andhra during the Kākatiya regime. The Katakuru and Matedu inscriptions of Prataparudrā's period mention nagaramu along with mahājanas, kāmpus, Balinjasettis as a corporate body in addition to the eighteen sects of praṇa. All these bodies, it is stated, agree to grant some gift to the local temple. The Matedu record particularly states that the individual contribution to the temple would be at the rate of five visas per nāda of the amount what they pay to the nagaru or town corporation. This is a clear indication that nagaru is empowered to collect some dues from the villagers of all communities. Nagara need not be mistaken with nakara, which means a merchant guild. But nagaru in this case is not a body of the town alone as Dr. Dikshit says, but it is a corporate body of the ordinary village also. In the Telugu country the body ēruṣ is not noticeable. Mahajanas as a body does not exclusively apply to the agraharas as Dikshit says. The brāhmaṇas community in any
village is known as Mahājanas. That even in the Andhra country, the agrahāras or other ordinary villages were governed by village assemblies is borne out by epigraphical evidences. The inscription in the Gopalasvāmi temple at Durgi dated A.D.1269, states that the donor Karanamu Nāmaya of brāhmaṇa caste and Kāśyapa-gōtra was the prabhu-aukhya of the agrahāra of Nandāpura. A record at Juttiga also states that Potana, the prabhu of the agrahāra made gift. The Sanigaram inscriptions of the time of Prola I, states that this chief made a gift of lands to the temple in the village, with the permission of the prabhu of the village, named Nāgarāja. Similarly Beta I and Beta II also made the gift in that village with permission of the local gaundas and raddis. This is a clear indication that the villages were governed by the village committees. An epigraph at Endambetta village near Nagarkurnool, dated A.D.1148, set up by the Chōda chief Udaya of Kanduru mentions the prabhu of that ūru named Bhīmanāyaka.

The samayas of the eighteen sects of people are of two kinds, the sthala-samaya or the corporate body of a group of villages and the ūru-samaya or village body. The Tangeda record refers to the former type. With regard to the ūru-samaya we find an example in the Mahabubabad epigraph of Rudramadevi’s reign. It is stated in it that a chief made a gift of land to the temple with the consent of the eighteen samayas of the ūru or village. These and similar instances already indicate that the samaya of a village or a group of villages is a corporate
body representing the people. Even the dignitaries of rank want to make any gift of village land or toll amount to the god, they have to obtain the consent of this body. From this we understand that the body samaya is not only of a communal nature like the Vaishnava-samaya, Sāle-samaya but also a corporate body like the nagaru. Our available epigraphic evidence does not furnish a clear distinction between samaya and nagaru. The former seems to be of wider range, being applicable to sthala or group of villages, whereas the term nagaru is applicable to a village or a town only.

A stronger evidence to prove that there existed in those days a kind of corporate system of local administration is noticeable from the numerical numbers attached to such bodies, as ainūrvar, Mahājanas, Sāni-munnuru, seventy-two niyogas (dakkavai-redu-niyogaśvārav) Ayyāva益-ainurvar, perika-नुरु, Teliki-वर्वु, Pedda-munnuru, etc. These numbers are decidedly not the strength of the population of that community, because there is little possibility that these numbers alone remain years together, that too like 100, 300, 1000, 500 all round numbers not 98, 295, 507 which are quite possible, had they been intended to represent the population. The nature of these numbers and their continuance for centuries together clearly indicate that those numbers denote the strength of membership of the respective organizational bodies, for example, if we take sāni-munnur, it is not to be taken that all the temples where we find the mention of this number maintained in 300 sānis.
So also Ayavali-500. The member of the merchants may increase or decrease but the strength of the main organization used to remain only 500 constantly for centuries. Unless it is an organization of certain corporate nature these numbers do not convey any sensible meaning and much less their consistency.

Thus, Ayyavali-500 means, that the organisational body consists of 500 members, irrespective of the number of trading merchants affiliated to this body.

Sani-300 means that their organisational body consists of 300 members irrespective of the number of sanis serving in a particular temple.

Perika-100 means that the organizational body of that community consists of only 100 members irrespective of the strength of the organisational body.

But in course of time, it has become mere customary for all the merchants or sanis or mahajanapadhisti to mention the number although the main organization ceased to exist. For instance a merchant named Bairisetti in an inscription at Chittapur in Karimnagar District of the reign of Prataparudra claims himself to be a member of Ayyavali-500. It is highly doubtful that the organization was in existence at that time. But our concern is that such bodies associated with numbers were definitely corporate bodies.

Now let us examine some instances where these corporate bodies like samayos, merchant guilds, profession guilds etc.
take considerable part in the local administration. An epigraph in the temple of Ramanāthadēva in the village Tangeda, Guntur district of the time of Pratāparudra states that the eighteen samayas of the sthala and the merchant guild ubhaya-nānādesi pakkandru in the presence of the general Devarināyaka made the gift of the toll tax on sales at the rate of one vīsa on each māda (of sales) to the god Gantala Pāmanātha of Tangeda. A close examination of this record reveals the role of the local people in the administration. Here there are three parties mentioned in this gift deed.

1. **The donor** - The merchant guild alone, because the levy is on the sales only and the sellers are guild members and the local producers like the agriculturists.

2. **The eighteen Samayas of the Sthalas** - The people in general, who come to the sthala penta or the weekly fair of the sthala to make their purchases. They are the consumers or purchasers. They need not pay any thing as purchase-tax i.e. (vilchusuṣā) although it was also compulsory in those days, at other market places. Here the gift amount is raised only from the amrūhadī-suṣā or Sales-tax.

3. **Devarināyaka the general** :- In his presence the gift was made, Why? It is because he was the king’s representative who is empowered to collect the said suṣā. So he is to allow the said amount to be credited to the temple as gift.
Now the people in general i.e. the eighteen samayas of the sthala as corporate body had exercised their power to impose on the merchants who sell the articles in sthala-pędga or local fair a levy on the sale proceeds for the purpose of their local institution, the temple. They were its trustees so they have a right to collect the taxes. The king's representative is also included in the transaction to see that sunka is properly credited to the temple and not to the government as in other such pagitas or markets.

Thus, we notice a clear instance in this record that the local samayas had in those days the power of collecting sunkas with the king's permission for the benefit of public utility. Is it not a modern Panchayati? If the samayas do not interfere, the merchants have to pay the levy to the king's officer Devarinayaka. They have any way to pay the tax, be it to the king or the temple. Even today we see in the villages that the local Panchayati-samitis collect taxes as tolls on merchandise, pullari or grazing tax on the cattle breeders who graze their cattle in the village pasture lands and the like.

Another example in this aspect can be conveniently drawn from an inscription found at Duggirala, Guntur district which records the settlement of a dispute regarding village boundaries. It is stated that in 8.1136 (or A.D.1214), the villagers of Duggirala pʊndi, Moramapuṇḍi and Evani represented to the king Gaṇapatiđēva, a dispute regarding the boundary of those
villages, when the king was camping (in those parts) after
the conquest of Velanādu. Consequently he deputed his ministers
Mallaparāju and Rudraparāju to visit the place and settle the
dispute. The respective villagers represented their cases to
the ministers. The latter asked the mahājanas to offer their
opinion in the matter. They select certain Suraparāju of
Evani village to walk on the boundary line. The watchman of
the boundary is asked to walk first and Suraparāju followed him
marking out the line of boundary. Adopting this procedure they
could mark out the boundary and plant stones at all the
important points.

The contents of the record being so, we have to infer
that even the king had constituted a legal body consisting of
the local mahājanas presided by two ministers. The mahajanās who
were supposed to be the authorities on law and men of unsuspected
integrity were recommended by the ministers to decide the line
of boundary. The mahājanas in turn chose certain Suraparāju
probably the Karanam or a revenue officer, to walk along the
boundary with the official watchman of the boundary, because
he knows the traditional boundary better than others. These
officers could not do any mischief in the presence of mahājanas
and ministers and even if they do so it will not be accepted
because they were not the deciding authorities. So they have
naturally to walk on the original traditional boundary instead
of going on a wrong way and become unpopular. Thus the local
people themselves i.e., the maha.ianas and the local officers were asked to settle their dispute, the ministers being only presiding officers, who will simply attest the royal seal on the decision made by the maha.ianas.

For the disposal of disputes, the law book on rājanīti called Rājanīti-ratnākara prescribes four types of sabhas or legal courts pratiṣṭhitā, apratiṣṭhitā, sumudritā and sāsīta. The same authority defines the terms. Pratiṣṭhitā is a temporary court constituted in a pura or capital town, apratiṣṭhitā is the court constituted in other villages; these two kinds of courts are again divided as sumudritā and sāsīta.

![Diagram of Sabhas or (temporary courts)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pratiṣṭhitā</th>
<th>Apratiṣṭhitā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(in the capital town)</em></td>
<td><em>(in other villages)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1. sumudritā
- 2. sāsīta
- 3. sumudritā
- 4. sāsīta

Sumudrita-sabhas are courts presided by some authority like a prādvyāka or ministers. Sāsīta-sabhas are the courts where the king personally awards the decrees.

The present sabha of Duggirala being consisted of maha.ianas presided by the ministers in a village other than
capital town can be called \textit{Apратिष्ठिता-मुद्रिता-सभा}. The local \textit{महाजनस} are the deciding authorities - under the supervision of the ministers. This example thus furnishes the practice in the \textit{Kākatiya} administration regarding the disposal of the disputes and the prominence given to the local people by the government in settling the disputes.

A similar case regarding a canal dispute and its disposal by the same king \textit{GaṇapatiDEśa} is recorded in a copper plate inscription dated A.D.1946 recently discovered in \textit{Karimnagar district}. It states that in the village \textit{Nedhavura}, when certain \textit{Ravidatta}, \textit{Nāthadēva} and \textit{Hingadēva} were serving as local officers a dispute arose over the right of a canal called \textit{Gonugu-kālya}. The matter was referred to the king who deputed \textit{Maṇchirāja}, the minister of \textit{Jāyapanāyaka}. Accordingly \textit{Maṇchirāja} visited the place and assembled the \textit{महाजनस} and other elders of the concerned villages named \textit{Chamanapalli}, \textit{Kūmmarikunta}, \textit{Devanapalli} and \textit{Kātyakolapalli} and obtained their opinions in the matter. With this he went to \textit{Orugallu} and submitted their views to the king. The king in the presence of the Governor of the region named \textit{Maḥāraja \textit{Akshayachandradeśa}}, basing on the findings of \textit{Maṇchirāja} gave his final decision and deputed two officers named \textit{Nārāyaṇa} and \textit{Maḥārūka} the nephews of \textit{śrīpāṭhaka} to \textit{Chamanapalli} to communicate the king's order in the matter to the local officers and the parties concerned. It is interesting at this stage
to note that the said officers conducted a second enquiry and after confirming the first report of Manchirāja delivered the king's decree over the dispute by means of a copper plate charter. It is decided that the canal belonged to mahājanas of Chāmanapalli and those of other villages need not have any claim over it.

In this case also due importance was given to the opinion of the local people of all walks of life, the redds, the barber, settī, the temple priests, the jaina priests etc. The decree in this dispute being awarded by the king personally this sabhā is called śāita-apratīṣṭhitā-sabhā the fourth variety of the above table.

These two examples give us an idea how legal procedure was adopted in those days. There were no permanent courts like the present taluk courts, Session courts, High courts etc. The maximum staff the kings used to employ is the Prādyvākas or the authorities on law and dharmasastras who were permanently stationed in the capital to assist the king. Most of the cases were disposed of in the above manner, through local sabhās consisting of the mahājanas and the king's one or two officers, temporarily constituted for the purpose and dissolved soon after the dispute is settled. As already pointed out most of the communal disputes, were settled by the samayas.
These examples will fully illustrate how the common people could express their voice even in the matters of justice. The kings also used to give due importance to the decision of the people particularly when it is not against the law. The judges are the local mahājanas. From this we can understand that the people at large were law-abiding and the king could easily impart justice to his subjects.

4. Civil Administration:

Nādu: For the purpose of administration the kingdom was divided into several nādu: The following are some of the important nādu of the Kakatiya period, mentioned in the Śrīśailam inscription of Pratāparudra dated A.D. 1313:  

Besides these, the well known, Vēngi-nādu, Velu-nādu, Natavādi, Kōnamandala, Visuru-nādu, Eruve-nādu, Kanduru-nādu, Mārjavādi, Kondapalli-nādu, Sakali-sīma, Prolingdu.

Sthalas: The nādu are subdivided into sthalas. The sthala being a unit of about twenty villages, the number of sthalas in the kingdom is naturally very large. In one of the Warangal
inscriptions the capital complex of Anumakonda, Mattewada and Orugallu is represented as one sthala. The following are some of the sthalas:


Among the officers who assist the king in the administration mahāpradhanas come first. There only few of this category. Pradhanas, pradgas, amātyas, mantris are the next cadre. We have no knowledge about the distinctive among these dignitaries. Vellaki Gaṅgādhara and Jāya are officers who have been promoted form a small post to amātya rank.

The administration was divided into seventy-two niyogas or branches. They were under the supervision of a high officer called hātrash-niyog-adhipati. The Kayastha chief Gaṅgaya-sāhini was holding that post during the reign of Gaṅapatideva. Subsequently it was entrusted to the Induluri chief Gannaya. Poṅkala Mallaya-preggada was later noticed holding this post. Although this term occurs in the inscriptions, we are not certain whether this dignitary was empowered with enormous power or simply holding designation as title, we can assume that at least the mahāpradhanas were wielding such power over all the seventy-two branches of administration.

The sthalas generally consist of twenty or less number of villages. The Pedakondūru-sthala comprised eighteen villages,
the Mānūru-sthala twelve villages. Gurindāla-sthala is stated to have comprised sixty villages.42

While the administration of the nāḍus is entrusted to the officers of the rank of an amātya or perggada, the officers of the sthala or generally of a lower rank called sthala-karana, sthala-swākara, and sthala-tārpari.

The village is the small unit of administration. Officers called āyagar look after the administrative aspect of the village including the collection of taxes, maintaining the accounts of the lands under various tenures are some of the duties of these officers. Talāri is also one of the āyagars; similarly nārakaṭṭu or waterman who distributes the water of a tank to the cultivators was also the village āyagar. All these village āyagar are granted some lands as vrittis and besides that they collect from the cultivators some grain as mēras.

Some more administrative designations:

1. Tantarapala Prōla-rautu is mentioned in the Kopparam inscription.43
2. Śasanādhikari, sandhyivrāhi Devanāmatya is mentioned in the Ghantasala inscription.44
3. Paḍālu - Certain Bragannaya nāyundu is stated to be the paḍālu of mahāpradhāni Podukamuri Aśinaladeva, in one of the Tripurantakan inscriptions.45 The actual duties of this officer paḍālu are not known.
4. **Srīkārana** - The inscription referred to above also mentions Srīkāranam. The duties of this Kārana are to maintain the accounts of the village as it is now in vogue. For different accounts different kāranas used to be appointed. For example, the sthala-karagas are the general kāranas; surukā kāranas are the kāranas who maintain the accounts of the toll taxes etc.

5. **Tirparisi** are those officers who assess the tax on the Government share of the produce in a field or the income by levies in a market.

6. Sri Bhāndāru is the chief Treasurer of the royal exchequer in the capital. It is known from Kodumuru epigraph of Harihara I the Vidyanaya vrittanta and other sources that the founders of the Vijayanagara empire were the Śribhāndarīs of Kākatīya Pratāparudra.

7. **Sarvādhiṃkārī**: According to some scholars the king’s agent in all the administrative matters is called sarvādhiṃkārī.

8. **Sukādhiṃkārī**: Like Kāranas these officers who collect the suruksas or tolls in a sthala are called sthala-sukārīs.

**Miscellaneous officers**:  
Aḍapamu is the bearer of the betel-bag  
Aḷavattamu is the officer bearing the chānara or the royal fan  
Kotṛṛḷuḷu is the officer in charge of the stores of the palace  
Aṅgarakshaka is the body guard of the king
Nagari Śrī vākili is the gate-keeper of the king's palace.\textsuperscript{48}
Errava-lemka was the Śrīvākili of Kakati Pratāparudradeva in A.D. 1314.

Ngari-adhikāri: - The officer in charge of the king's palace administration is called Nagari-adhikāri. Certain Konda-peddi manchi is stated in the Rompicharla inscription dated A.D.1320 to have made a gift to the god for the merit of the king.\textsuperscript{49}

Talāri is in general, the village watchman. The talāri of the palace is a dignified officer.

Sāvāsi - This is a term used to denote a military officer - like anāgarakhaka and tantrapāla. Certain sāvāsi Ravvabattu is stated in the Chinakandukuru epigraph to have made a gift for the merit of Ganapatideva.\textsuperscript{50}

Some of these officers were of a high rank next to amātyas and others are noticed holding both high and low ranks. Talāri for example is a common village watchman as well as the palace watchman.


The Kākatiya regime was marked with the introduction of the military system nāyaṅkara. It is noticed in the Rudramadevi's period and well organized by her successor Pratāparudra. According to Nītisāra of Prataparudra, the king should assign villages to the nāyakas in lieu of their salary and the maintenance of some army for the king's use.\textsuperscript{51} All the erstwhile
samants under the present definition were entrusted with the responsibility of maintaining compulsorily some army for the service of the king in times of war. The number of elephants, horses and foot soldiers which they had to maintain is stipulated according to the fiefs they held. In addition to the supply of army to the king, they have also to pay the regular tributes as usual. In this way the king will have the idea that how much force he could gather at the times of war. It is a meaningful boast what is stated in the popular verse that Prataparudra possessed nine lakhs of archers. According to Pratapacharitra Prataparudra entrusted the defence of the seventy-seven bastions of his fort to seventy-seven nayakas of the Velama community allotting to them one-fourth of his kingdom as estates to enable them to maintain the stipulated army. It may not be true, that all the seventy-seven were Velama nayakas, because nayakas of other castes are also noticed in the inscriptions. The lekkas who seem to be equal to the nayakas in this respect include reddis and other also. Juttaya-lekka-Gonka-reddi, Rudravya-lekka, Samaya-lekka, Madaya-reddi, Dechaya-lekka, Pinnaya-lekka are not Velamas.

Miyideva-lekka for example is granted the nayakara of Konduri-sthala of eighteen villages in the present Tenali taluk. It is interesting to note in this connection that a hamlet of this village called Virula-palem still exists and all the residents of not only of that hamlet but also of the surrounding two three villages are reddis even today. We
notice some hero stones as well in the vicinity of these villages. This clearly indicates that the above said Māyideva-leṣaṇa maintained a regular cantonment at Pedakunduru in those days. An inscription in the local temple of Anandēśvara record the remission of the levy of bantela-āya on the temple lands. This suggests that on all other lands he used to collect a special levy under that head for the maintenance of bantua or soldiers. Similarly Maktal in Mahbubnagar district was a large cantonment maintained by Gundayyanāyaniāgaru, also called Gundayya-sāhini. Koppāram in the Guntur district was a cantonment (or nāyakara sthala) maintained by four lekas named Tikkaya Rudraya-leṣaṇa, Māraya-leṣaṇa, Picchaya-leṣaṇa and Rudraya-leṣaṇa.

The nāyakara system of military organization introduced by the Kakatiya rulers became a prominent feature of the later Vijayanagara administration.

Besides the army maintained by the nāyakas, the king maintained large units of four classes of troops, viz. ratha (chariot), sāja (elephant) turaga (horses and padāti (foot soldiers). According to chronicles the Kakatiya army during the reign of Pratāparudra consisted of 100 elephants, 20000 horses and 9,00,000 foot soldiers and their commanders were called sāja-sāhini, turaga-sāhini and sānādhīpatis respectively. It is stated in an unpublished epigraph found near Nalgonda,
that Gaṇapatideva brought the Kayastha chief Gangaya-sāhīṇi from north India for the purpose of training his cavalry. The Kayastha chiefs for a long period served the Kākatīya rulers as commanders of the cavalry. The famous general Jaya of the Ayya family was the gaja-sāhīṇi of Gaṇapatideva for a long time.

The kings themselves used to lead the armies in times of war. The next highest officer was sakala-saṇādhipati or commander-in-chief. Somayājula Rudra devaya was the sakala-saṇādhipati of Prataparudra during the battle with Ambadeva. Similarly Adidamu Mallu and Somaya-leṃka also held that post. The common bantus or soldiers were granted vrittis in lieu of their salaries, whereas the commanders were posted as governors of the nāḍus.
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