CHAPTER II

KING AND GOVERNMENT

Section I. King

The Chalukyas of Badami ruled over a kingdom comprising extensive regions of Karnataka. It was Pulakesi I who established an independent dynasty and laid the real foundation of the kingdom. He styled himself Maharaja, a title which his successors took. A few years later, as the extent of the kingdom became larger, the successors of Pulakesi assumed the title of Maharajadhiraja. For instance, Pulakesi II and his successors styled themselves Maharajadhiraja and Paramesvara, in addition to other high-sounding titles. Of these, the title 'Paramesvara' is said to have been assumed by him after his victory over Harsha. In this connection, it may be pointed out that Pulakesi had assumed the title even earlier. However, Pulakesi bore this title which his successors must have associated with the major event in the former's reign, namely, the defeat of Harsha.

MONARCHY: The form of government organised over the dominions of the Chalukyas was essentially monarchical in character. This form of government was in agreement with the political system which prevailed in Ancient India.
NATURE OF KINGSHIP: Epigraphical records of the Chalukya kings invariably refer to their performance of the Vedic sacrifices\(^3\). Pulakesi I has been described to have performed the Asvamedha (horse) sacrifice in addition to other ones. The Mahakuta Pillar inscription of Mangalesa describes that his father, Pulakesi I performed the Asvamedha, Hiranyagarbha, Agnistoma, Agnichayana, Vajapaya, Bahusuvrarna and Paundarika sacrifices\(^4\), as prescribed in the Vedic literature. It is an accepted fact that the Horse sacrifice is credited to have been performed by Pulakesi I. However, one later record mentions that even Pulakesi II performed the same sacrifice\(^5\). Probably, the reference in later records was associated with even Pulakesi II as a mark of distinction. But actually there is no reference to Pulakesi II as having performed the horse sacrifice in the records of his period. Anyway, it is a well known fact that these sacrifices were in practice even from the Vedic times. Performance of the Vedic sacrifices like Asvamedha, Rajasuya indicated imperial authority. They also had a constitutional significance. Among the several sacrifices which were in practice in ancient India, the Asvamedha sacrifice was considered as 'the King of Sacrifices'\(^6\) because its celebration was symbolic of the status of a ruler of undisputed supremacy.
Another feature common to the rule of Chalukya Kings was their inevitable wars with the Pallavas. Military campaigns were undertaken by the kings either for conquest and expansion or for defence against aggressive enemies. Inspite of the ceaseless wars which engaged the attention of kings, the Chalukyas organised a system of administration and gave to their dominions peace, prosperity and security. All the rulers in the dynasty bestowed their attention to proper discharge of their functions towards the people. Pulakesi I founded a small but independent kingdom with Badami as capital which witnessed unprecedented expansion and consolidation in the period of his successors. Pulakesi I also constructed a strong protective wall around the capital city for defence of the newly-founded kingdom, to withstand onslaught of the enemies. Kirtivarma I beautified the city with temples and other buildings. His younger brother Mangalesa completed construction of a cave temple near Badami and gave the village of Lanjisvara as the donation for the upkeep of the temple. Despite stress and strain of warfare, Pulakesi II paid the much-needed attention to maintenance of peace and tranquility within the dominions. There are evidences to show that the people were in a prosperous condition. Inscriptions of the Chalukyas and foreign writings of the period do not refer to any incidents as having disturbed the normal life
of the people. Pulakesi II gave patronage to poets and learned men. Rāvikīrti, the celebrated poet of the age adorned Pulakesi's court. His influence on the King was very immeasurable. Vikramāditya I also continued his father's policy of giving encouragement to scholars. Nagavardhana was his religious teacher. Similarly, Sri Neğhaçharya is described in the inscriptions as his 'Śvākiyaguru'. The reign of Vijayāditya is well known for construction of temples at Pattadakal. In the same way the period of Vikramāditya II is remembered for temple-building. The temples were endowed with large donations. Kirtivarman II issued a charter to the people of Lakṣmīśvar by means of which, he conferred certain privileges to them. The many-sided activities of the Chalukya kings have been described in their records in a cursory manner. However, the dominions had an administrative organisation the basis of which incorporated the ideals enunciated by the law-givers and practised by ancient Indian kings who preceded them.

The King was the pivot of administration. He exercised all authority of government. He represented the living-force behind all that happened in the kingdom. He was associated with the manifold aspects of government and administration of the empire and all powers that were along with government and administration. Hence his authority was all-pervasive in his dominions. The King's
ascendancy in matters of state was an accepted canon.
But he could not also be an autocrat. He had to respect
several customs, traditions and laws. His authority was
controlled and guided by several restraints.

Another term, very commonly used to mean a kingdom
was 'rasra'. Ancient writers on polity also attribute
the seven prakritis as having constituted the kingdom\textsuperscript{12}.
The term prakriti [a detailed discussion of this term
is made elsewhere in this chapter] is found very
frequently used in the inscriptions of this period. If
the seven prakritis constituted the basic elements of the
state in ancient India, they must have functioned as very
powerful components of the body-politic. King was the
most prominent element constituting the seven prakritis.
So the King was himself the Government. He was
responsible for the upkeep of social order. As society
existed for the welfare of the individual, his authority
functioned ultimately for the welfare of society.

\textbf{IDEALS BEFORE A KING:}

The ideals set before a king were of a very high
order. Even as a prince, the king was to receive a
training in state-craft. These ideals were generally
followed by all the kings. There might have been lapses
on the part of some rulers. He was to set a model for his
people. A good king is short, worked for the practical welfare of his people. His duties were attuned to achieve the activities in relation to dharma, artha and kama. The king fulfils the aim of dharma by his justice and protection. He fulfils the aim of 'artha' by promoting the material welfare of his subjects. In the time left from his many duties, he is perfectly entitled to enjoy life in whatever way is legitimately possible. Thus the king could be regarded as 'the father of his people'. He may also be called the husband of the land, giving him the title to seek 'devoted self-effacing obedience and service from his subjects'. Hence, the ideal before the king was in accordance with the Kautilyan principle. The king was expected to do 'not merely that which pleases himself, but which while pleased the people'. So the principles of polity described in the Dhamasastra of Manu and Arthasastra of Kautilya and the time-honoured traditions and practices of the period constituted the character and personality of the king.

It was not enough if the king paid proper attention to the capital city and outlying regions. He was also expected to get an assurance for himself of the allegiance of rulers of all component parts. His authority extended over the territorial units as well. Details of territorial units and their organisation are reviewed in
Chapter II. Further, the king associated freely with subordinate rulers and hereditary officers of approved ability. By such a policy he could keep an overall control over the several constituent parts of the kingdom. The Chalukya kingdom did consist of a number of administrative units and independent states which were under the rule of governors appointed by the King or feudatories, respectively.

Functions of the King:

Besides looking after the entire overall authority and controlling all-absorbing central authority and organising the provincial administration, the king had many other functions to do. Literature of ancient India sets forth a long list of functions. The Santiparva provides several details in regard to king's functions, defence of his kingdom, military operations, government of the country, administration of justice, levying of revenues etc. Manu's Dharmaśāstra and Kautilya's Arthaśāstra give an elaborate description of the king's functions. The king was expected to look to conservation of traditions. He was to protect the religious and social organisation. He was to restrain the evil elements and forces in society. His primary duty was to look to development of social and moral life of the people and protection of the people for which he was to
possess ability. The Santiparva states that "a king destitute of ability and dexterity (āpakṣa) cannot protect his subjects." Similarly, the king could protect the people with a proper wielding of the 'danda' or 'the power of punishment to keep evil-doers under control. He was to bring about an alround development of the people. He gave grants and gifts of land and villages on important occasions and events. He also gave patronage to literature, art and architecture.

**USE OF 'DANDA':**

King's exercise of 'danda' has been emphasised by all writers as a very fundamental function. He exercised 'danda' to "restrain the natural turbulence and depravity of man, to violate the regulations of different castes and orders of life so that certain matters of conduct of public behaviour having a vital bearing on the progress of society may be obtained." According to Manu, 'it is danda that rules the subject; it is only danda that protects all people; danda is aware when others sleep; hence, according to the learned, danda is dharma itself.'

The law-givers add further that danda helps the government to fulfil the motto, 'dushtanigraha and bhishparipalana', (protection of the good and punishing evil-doers). As a matter of fact, its application in practice was the standard to measure whether the government was good, just,
and benevolent. We may here draw a reference to one of the verses in the Vishnu Sahasranāma Stotram which purports to the maxim that Lord Vishnu would take care of those devotees who surrender unto him and that he would protect the good and punish the wicked. It was

"Yogakshema vahamyaham
Paritranaya sahunam vinasayacha
duskritam...."

It was a common belief even among the kings of old to divert their activities in conformity with the above maxim and help the cause, divine! At least some of the kings kept in line with this belief in their administration. Quite a good number of the Chalukya inscriptions proclaim this ideal as having been implemented.

For instance, one of the records reads as 'dushtaigraha
sisha pari palanadim sukha-samkatha vinotadin rajyam
gayttulire'. These are the expressions which occur in this context. The effective manner in which administration of the kingdom was carried on by the Chalukya monarchs indicated that they were conspicuously aware of their responsibility as rulers in maintaining and wielding the 'danda'.

Being the supreme authority of the state, the king exercised executive and judicial functions. He enforced laws which did not contravene customs, traditions and
opinions of scholars on law. He supervised entire administrative organisation. The revenue and military departments received special attention by the king.

The king represented the foremost element constituting the 'Saptanga' (the seven elements) of the Kingdom. He exercised several powers and did many functions. He appointed ministers and the other officers of the government and supervised the work of public servants. He directed the progress and economic activities of the kingdom. He was responsible for promotion of agriculture, trade and attainment of public well. He provided facilities like irrigation, famine-relief, clearance of forests and remission of taxes in times of draught. He made donations to temples and supervised construction and renovation of temples. On certain important occasions like the birthday of the king or his victory over his enemies, the king released prisoners whose conduct was found to be good. He also conferred titles and other benefits to competent and eminently deserving persons. Although, the Chalukya inscriptions do not give definite details relating to the above functions, they do not lack references on the king's functions in general terms.

Another function common in those times was that the king took a lead in military expeditions. For instance,
the Chalukya kings since Pulakesi I never had respite from
war, except for short intervals. They had to be
particularly aware of enemies on the frontiers of the
kingdom. They also followed a careful diplomatic policy
in view of frequent external aggressions.

A few kings evinced a keen personal interest in the
administration of the kingdom. Naturally, this attitude
only raised the efficiency of the rulers. Their attitude
was similar to the ideal of Asokamauya, who acted as
'father of the people'. They were both feared and loved by
their subjects. It was considered to be the responsibility
of the kings to undertake the duty of protecting their
subjects as the latter were 'law-abiding'. The kings
even made themselves easily accessible to the subjects so
that they could know their grievances and settle them
without much delay.

ADHESENCE TO 'DHRAMA':

The king's policy and decisions on administrative
matters centred round the concept of 'dharma' and conformed
to its injunctions. In fact, it was the touchstone as
it were of all actions. It will be apt here to refer to
some of the observations of a few scholars on the concept
of 'dharma'. According to Dr. Radhakrishnan, "Virtue
(dharma), wealth (artha), enjoyment (kama) and liberation
(moksha) are the four great aims to be attained by all human endeavour and the pursuit of each of these was aided by a normative science (sastra) devoted to an exposition of its nature and the means to its attainment. Among the sciences that guided the policies of kings, the most prominent were the Dharmastra of Manu on sacred law and the Arthasastra of Kautilya on the manual of polity. The term dharma also has an all-engrossing meaning (which is given by) Prof. Kielhorn, who says, "I find no English word by which I can express all the meanings of the Sanskrit, Dharma." In the same way, Prof. Iyengar observes, "Dharma connotes law proper, virtue, religion, piety, justice, innate property or quality." Again, according to Dr. A. L. Basham, "the terms dharma, artha and kama would mean piety, profit and pleasure." It was dharma as described above the adherence to which was generally the practice of the Chalukya kings.

**SAPTANGA OR THE SEVEN ELEMENTS OF THE STATE**

Political organisation in ancient and early medieval periods was distinctly based on the theory of the Saptanga or the seven elements of the State. They were svami (sovereign), amatya (ministers, councillors, heads of departments), janapada (rajya, territory or people), durga (forts), kosa (treasury), danda (bala, arms), and mitra (allies). Although it has been doubted by some scholars...
that the seven elements may not resemble the elements constituting a modern state, we cannot help remarking that these elements were the fundamentals of the body-politic in ancient times. These elements did form the epitome of theory of Hindu polity. The Chalukya kingdom had a political organisation which conformed to the general pattern prevailing in the period.

QUALIFICATIONS OF A KING:

As the king was expected to do several functions, described already, and 'carry the ship of state' smoothly, he was to have certain qualifications, befitting his high position. Such qualifications have been enumerated in sections on 'rajadharma' in Manusmriti, Mahabharata and similar other treatises. A few of the qualifications may be mentioned here. A good king was expected to be the abode of learning, lusture, prudence, sportiveness, profundity, high-mindedness, valour, fame, a friend of all living beings, spurning riches of others, making gifts to priests, chiefs and the learned and honouring them and keeping their company. In addition to these, the king was to be well-versed in 'Shadguna', 'chaturpaya', and 'Saptaprakriti'.

After reviewing the achievements of the Chalukya kings as found in their inscriptions, we find that they possessed many of the qualifications mentioned above.
They were the greatest warriors. They were the best statesmen. They were also learned. They proved to be very good as rulers. We give below some of the instances bearing on the above.

That Pulakesi I possessed several qualifications is borne out by the British Museum Plates. He was "conversant with the code of laws of Manu and the Purāṇas and the epics of the Ramayana and the Bhārata, equal to Brihaspati (preceptor of the Gods) in Philosophy. He is described as 'Vriddopadesagrahī'. Referring to Pulakesi's performance of sacrifices, the same record says, that he had become the favourite of the World on account of his meritorious qualities (such was Vallabha). Further, the Nerur grant also bears ample proof of the qualifications possessed by Pulakesi I.

About Kirtivarāṇa I the Godaohi copper plate dated in the 12th year of his reign says that he was well-versed in all the sciences, keen in intellect and had an eye towards dispensation of justice.

Mangalesa is said to have "adorned to justice in his own country.... acquired wealth of other kings by strength and prowess of his own arm; who had gait and sight and voice of bull who had the actions of a choice elephant infuriated with passion, who had the valour of a lion; who was endowed with the wealth of statesmanship and modesty
and charity and tendencies and sincerity and truth; who was possessed of the three constituents of power and who was an excellent worshipper of (the God) Bhagwan (Vishnu)\textsuperscript{36}. He was also an adept in construction of forts and warfare. The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription adds further that he was endowed with polity, refinement, knowledge, liberality, etc. In line 7 of the same record he is described as well skilled in counsel, in (the selection of) spies and messengers, in (arranging) peace and war\textsuperscript{37}. According to the Badāma inscription, Mangalesha is said to have trained his mind in all the \textit{sastras}\textsuperscript{39}.

In regard to the qualifications possessed by Pulakēṣi II the Aihole inscription describes the brave qualities required of a great military general. Verse 25 of the inscription states that Pulakēṣi was "almost equal to Indra because like that deity he possessed certain saktis; but he was inferior to him because his saktis were three — namely, powers of mastery, good counsel, and energy, while Indra possesses eight saktis". In verse 32 of the record, Satyasraya (Pulakēṣi II) is described as one "endowed with the powers of energy, mastery and good counsel, (he) having conquered all the quarter, having dismissed the kings full of honours, having done homage to Gods and Brahmins, having entered the city of Vatapi — is ruling like one City, this earth which has the
dark-blue waters of the surging sea for its seat.\textsuperscript{39} However, the latter description is purely a conventional phraseology. Pulakesi II also possessed the three powers which were so essential for a successful ruler. They were prabhusakti (power due to possession of army and pleasure), mantrasakti (power due to good counselling), and uttahasakti (power due to personal valour). He is described in the inscription as ‘prabhantrotsasa saktitraya sampannah’.\textsuperscript{40} He is also said to have had the virtue of ‘suhrudavanah deenasandha kripana samapabhuja manavibhahah’. These three powers which ancient Indian writers on polity have deemed as the most necessary qualifications were possessed even by the other kings of the Chalukya dynasty.

Other kings of the dynasty were also adequately endowed with many virtues. For instance, Vikramaditya I, Vinayaditya and Vijayaditya have been described as having attained mastery in Asvavidya or the science of horsemanship. They possessed excellent soldierly traits, proficient in the use of horses in the battlefield, and sure of winning the battles. The Kolkleri plates of Kirtivarman II describes that his father Vikramaditya I was “perfect in wisdom and reverence”.\textsuperscript{41} It should also to be said to the credit of Vikramaditya I that he imparted and equipped his son and grandson with great many virtues by actively associating them in administration. Similarly,
Vijayaditya is said to have attained mastery of the various \textit{\textit{sastras}} (sciences) quite early in life.

Even Vikramaditya II and Kirtivarman II were in no way inferior to their predecessors in their attainments and proved worthy of the valuable traditions of the dynasty.

\textbf{SUCCESSION TO THRONE:}

Succession to the throne in the Chalukya dynasty was usually by the principle of hereditary right. Normally, the eldest son of the ruling king would be nominated to succeed to the throne. The reason for this practice was that the successor to the throne was not only the person of the king's choice but also he would have associated with the king in administration and foreign affairs for a good part of his early life.

Pulakesi I had two sons Kirtivarman and Mangalesa of whom the former, being elder, ascended the throne after Pulakesi's demise. Likewise, Vikramaditya I, Vinayaditya, Vijayaditya and Vikramaditya II adhered to the Law of Primogeniture in nominating their successors.

The practice of selecting the heir-apparent or the nominee to succeed a ruling king after his death may be inferred from the Chalukya inscriptions. One of the inscriptions\textsuperscript{45(a)} of Pulakesi I states that he made over
the right of ruling the kingdom to Kirtivarman I in the presence of several merchants and dignitaries. The inscription also refers to the abilities of Kirtivarman I to rule the kingdom. He was sufficiently powerful to protect the whole circle of earth and he was endowed with many victories acquired in battles. Similar references in the case of a few other kings of the Chalukya dynasty indicate that the most essential factor governing succession to the throne was general and unanimous consent or acceptance of the ruler by all the people of the kingdom, besides his capabilities. In fact, it was this objective which must have made Pulakesi I to select Kirtivarman as his successor in A.D. 503.

When we review the history of the Chalukya of Badami we find that on two occasions, succession to the throne was determined in the manner most suited to certain special circumstances prevailing in the period and no violation of the above tradition was made. These instances were those of succession to throne by Mangalesa in A.D. 597 and of Vikramaditya I in A.D. 635.

The circumstances leading to accession of Mangalesa were the following. Kirtivarman I died in A.D. 597-98. In the interest of security and defence of the kingdom, Kirtivarman’s younger brother Mangalesa succeeded to the throne. Mangalesa was devoted, loyal and affectionate
towards his brother. With great respect to Kirtivarman, Mangalesa saw to the construction of the Vaishnava cave on the hill at Badami and dedicated the temple to Kirtivarman. In other respects also, Mangalesa's rule proved beneficial. He brought about an expansion of the dominions as far as Goa. But at the end of his reign there was a civil war between him and his nephew Pulakesi son of Kirtivarman I. According to the Aihole inscription the cause of the quarrel was Mangalesa's attempt to place his own son on the throne. Unfortunately the inscription does not mention the name of Mangalesa's son. But he has been identified by some with Satyasraya - Dhruvaraja - Indravarman. However this identification is not tenable.

The other details connected with the family-feud between Mangalesa and Pulakesi form part of the political history, an outline of which is described already. What is important from the point of view of succession is that Mangalesa tried to outstrip the traditional practice of the age. With all his ability as a ruler and devotion to his elder brother when he was living, Mangalesa contemplated a selfish idea of setting aside Pulakesi's claim to the throne. He attempted to violate the traditional practice of primogeniture purely on account of his personal ambition. On this issue, works on polity of ancient times repeat very often that the basic principle of succession is to hold the kingdom as a 'trust' till the
lawful claimant comes of age. Kirtivarman had permitted Mangalesa to succeed him and hold the kingdom as a 'trust' until Pulakesi attained proper age. Kirtivarman's supreme confidence in Mangalesa that the latter would keep the dominions intact and give it back to his minor son on attaining age was the main cause of his nomination in favour of Mangalesa. But as events that followed show, that Mangalesa did not mean to keep up his promise. So Pulakesi was compelled to recover the throne by means of resistance. Pulakesi must have received a very large support by the people and some subordinate kings in fulfilling his just claim. In the civil war that followed Mangalesa is said to have lost his life and Pulakesi got back his ancestral kingdom. Thus Pulakesi was able to put an end to the short period of disorder and confusion so that the kingdom did not fall a prey to the recalcitrant elements in the country.

The other occasion when succession had to be settled on grounds of competency of the ruler to suit the needs of the times and special circumstances came about in the last years of Pulakesi's rule. In about A.D. 642 Pulakesi was defeated by the Pallava king Narasimhavarman I son and successor of Mahendravarman I. This defeat of the Chalukyas must have subsequently been responsible for the premature death of Pulakesi II. His death left a gap
of thirteen years during which the question of succession was not settled. Inscriptions of the Chalukya dynasty bearing dates after A.D. 642, mention that Pulakesi was succeeded by one of his younger sons. This younger son has been styled in the inscription as the 'Priyatamary' (dear son). This dear son or a 'favourite of his father' was no other person than Vikramaditya himself.

What exactly was the position of the Chalukya kingdom during the thirteen years i.e. from A.D. 642 to 655 is not described in the inscriptions. It is evident that the kingdom was in a troubled state of affairs after the death of Pulakesi. It is also very clear that the Pallavas did not occupy the Chalukya dominions as such. On the evidence corroborated by the Nerur and Koehre grants, it is known that Chandrâditya, the eldest brother of Vikramaditya did not rule the entire Chalukya dominions. Another brother of Vikramaditya, Aditya by name also did not rule the dominions. He must have lost his life while fighting against Harsha. Some scholars are of the opinion that there must have ensued a war of succession among the brothers of Vikramaditya for the throne. Their main argument that none of them was proclaimed as king in A.D. 642 itself and that there was a gap of thirteen years for Vikramaditya to succeed are not adequate grounds to stake that there was a war of succession after A.D. 642. Inscriptions also do not
mention anything like a dispute for the throne among the sons of Pulakesi. The very fact that Vikramaditya proclaims to have become king in A.D. 655 instead of A.D. 642 indicates that there was no dispute for the throne. Dr. D.C. Sircar rightly observes, "it does not appear that Vikramaditya was a rival claimant from the very beginning, for in that case, he would have probably dated the commencement of his reign in A.D. 642 and not in A.D. 655. Dilating on the use of the term, 'dear son' in the inscriptions relating to this period, we may say that it was a term of equal reference to all the sons of Pulakesi II and not exclusively in the case of Vikramaditya alone. Hence, we may infer that either the other three brothers of Vikramaditya continued to rule for some more years after the death of Pulakesi, in their respective viceregal territories or must not be living at all by the time of Vikramaditya's accession to the throne. We cannot have any definite idea as to what happened to Adityavarma and Chandraditya during this period. Taking it for granted that one or two of the brothers lived even after the death of Pulakesi, they must have agreeably permitted Vikramaditya to assume kingship which materialised in A.D. 655. As far as Chandraditya and his queen are concerned, it may be said with certainty that there was general agreement in favour of Vikramaditya succeeding to the throne. The two grants of Chandraditya's queen,
Vijayabhattarika speak of Vikramāditya as "the restorer of the fortune and sovereignty of his ancestors"\(^{50}\). Some scholars hold the view that Chandrāditya might have enjoyed a feudatory status, though there existed cordial relationship between the two. This view is based on the ground that the name of Vikramāditya in the inscription cited appears before that of Chandrāditya. But this view is not tenable because, it is highly doubtful whether Chandrāditya was alive when his wife issued her two grants\(^{31}\). What is significant in the inscription is that Vikramāditya has been referred to in the most cordial terms by Queen Vijayabhattarika. The expression reads:

"rāja ripu - marēndra (n) hatvā dīśi (dīśi) jītva
sva - va (ā sa - jānau lakshmi pra (3) pyā......".

(Says Burgess "the king Vikramāditya, the unrepulsed, who having slain the hostile kings, and having conquered in country after country, recoupled the fortunes of those of his family, and attained the supreme lordship").

From the foregoing details, it may be noted that there was no dispute for succession to the Bārama throne among the sons of Pulakēśi. It is quite possible that on account of their early training and cultured breeding, the brothers of Vikramāditya must have evinced a sense of cordial cooperation among themselves and exhibited boundless respect towards their parents. In addition to this possibility, the political conditions of the period from A.D. 642 to 655 must have accelerated assumption of kingship of Vikramāditya. Vikramāditya, even before becoming the king had been entrusted by his father in..................
his last days to look after security and defence of the headquarters of the kingdom. Pulakesi was aware of Vikramaditya's talents for organisation and administration. He was quite aware of administrative responsibilities as he was associated with his father in the art of governance and planning campaigns for conquest and defense. Such a method of selecting the most competent person, though younger in rank, was resorted to by Chandragupta I of the Gupta line, in nominating Samudragupta as his successor. Pulakesi must have also been promoted by considerations of ability and competence in nominating Vikramaditya as his successor. Between A.D. 642 and 655 Vikramaditya must have busied himself in the task of freeing the dominions from enemies and invaders. He must have also engaged himself with securing the forthcoming support and assistance of the neighbouring feudatories. Finally, he succeeded in his attempts and restored the ancestral dominions to its former position of prestige and stability. Therefore, the succession to the throne by Vikramaditya in A.D. 655, although an younger son in the family was brought about by the exceptional circumstances of the period and was not in violation of the traditional practice of hereditary kingship.

Except for the two occasions described above, succession to the throne in the Chalukya royal family was based on the principle of primogeniture. If the eldest son had no prescriptive right by birth alone, the choice
of an heir by the ruling king fell upon the king's uncle, if younger than himself or a son or his elder brother or his own son or an adopted son. Along with seniority by virtue of age, fitness to rule was also taken into consideration to decide the question of succession particularly in times of trouble and insecure condition of the kingdom and other sons happen to have no competence or non-existing.

When succession to the throne was normally decided on the principle of hereditary privilege, such a person would be designated as the Crown Prince or the heir-apparent of the Yuvaraja. Generally the eldest son by the senior queen was appointed as Yuvaraja. If the ruling king had no son or if the son was a minor and not able to carry out responsibilities of administration, the king's choice fell on his younger brother or uncle or some one belonging to a collateral branch of the royal family. For instance Mangalesa acted as regent for some short period after the death of Kirtivarman I. Ever since the appointment of a person as Yuvaraja, he would be associated with the ruler in all important matters connected with administration and foreign affairs.
As regards the competence of the Yuvaraja in view of responsibilities to be shouldered by him, he was given a good training. He was imparted education in the science of politics, use of elephants, archery, literature, medicine, poetry, grammar, drama, art of dancing and music. References to the crown Prince as having received instruction in these varied subjects may be conventional. He might have become proficient and exhibited his capabilities in at least a few of these subjects.

From the Satara grant of Vikramaditya, it is evident that Pulakesi II passed over his younger brother, assumed the title of Yuvaraja and claimed succession direct from Kirtivarman I. Pulakesi had received in his boyhood the necessary training to equip himself to become a successful ruler.

Pulakesi II is stated to have installed his brother Vishnuvardhana on the Eastern branch of the dynasty. Vishnuvardhana had already associated with Pulakesi in the government as Yuvaraja according to the usual custom before he could be installed as an independent sovereign of the Eastern branch.

A copper plate grant mentions that Kubja Vishnupardsana, the founder of the Eastern Chalukya house, styled himself as the Yuvaraja. This fact is mentioned
while tracing the genealogy of the dynasty from Pulakesi I. The donor of the grant is Vishnuvardhana himself. That he was ruling the Satara region as Viceroy is evident from the Satara copper plate where in also he styles himself as Yuvaraja.

There are instances in the reign of Pulakesi IV to show that the princes were also invested with governorships so that they could learn how to grasp the problems of state-craft and diplomacy and also to utilise their rich experience thus acquired, in the future. Chandraçita was governing the Savantavadi region and Aditya that of the Kurnool area as evident from their inscriptions. Vikramâditya was associated with his father in administration from a long time and he had been entrusted to look after the Capital city and its immediate neighbourhood.

The Surat inscription informs us that Śrīsūrya Silāditya styled himself as Yuvarāja, which shows that this ancient Indian custom was adopted by the Chalukya kings.

The latter part of the history of the Chalukyas of Badami show that the crown prince not only obtained the necessary education but participated in wars along with the king and his army. The crown prince had the status of Pañchamahāśabdas and was invested with a necklace to symbolise his office as the insignia. Besides this,
the crown prince sometimes issued grants also with the permitination of the king.

According to the Sorab grant, Pulakesi II selected among his sons, Vikramaditya as Yuvaraja, though he was the youngest. This record describes the accomplishments of Vikramaditya I. He has been described as 'impetuous' and he was associated in administration due to his intellect. The relevant portion reads:

Vitra (kra) māditya - paramēśvara -
bhattāra kasya mati - sahāya -
sahasamatra - samadhigatani

He possessed extra-ordinary skill for battles which he won. He marched in the 'van of battle'. He put to humiliation the king of the Pallavas who depended very much on the support of the kings of Chela, Pandya and Kerala. The king of the Pallavas who had bowed down before no others performed obeisance to Vikramaditya.

The relevant portion of the record reads as follows:

Samupalabāha - kirtti - sa (pa) tāk -
āvabhasita - digantarasya himakara - kara -
vimala - kula - parishavana - vi.
In his earlier days Vikramaditya acquired his educational attainments from the instructions of two teachers, Nagavar- dhana and Sri Meghasarya.

According to the Meru Copper Plate, Vijayaditya acquired in his early childhood a knowledge of all writings on the use of weapons.

The Vokkalari plates of Kirtivarna describe in detail the position of a crown prince and the training he received in his early days. It is clear from this record

........Contd.
that Kirtivarma had been appointed as the crown prince on attaining proper age in the reign of Vikramāditya II. Kirtivarma II subsequently defeated the Pallavas and benefited himself to be called a sarvabhauma. The inscription points out that Kirtivarma, the donor of the grant, on attaining the proper age was made the Yuvaraja and in order to distinguish himself by some war-like exploit, requested permission of his father to march against the kingdom of Kanchi, the enemy of the house. The inscription reads as follows: "His dear son, in youth, well instructed in the use of arms, perfect in subduing the six kinds of passions, who through the joy of his father felt on account of his good qualities had attained the rank of Yuvaraja, praying for an order saying, "send me to subdue the king of Kanchi, the enemy of our race...............; immediately on obtaining permission, he marched forth ...............; and broke the power of the Pallavas. According to the practice prevailing in ancient times, the normal age for the prince to take an active part in political affairs was 24 or 25 years. This has been supported by the Hathigumpha inscription of king Kharavala of Kalinga and also by the Brhadāranyaka Sūtra.
The young prince marched against the Pallavas whose power had only been reduced in the preceding periods but not crushed. The prince made the Pallava ruler feel so much weakened that he was not able to withstand him in battle. So he was compelled to seek refuge in a hill-fort. Kirtivarma, then, seems to have left the Pallava ruler
there in the fort, scattered his armies and plundered his treasures and carried off elephants, rubies and gold which he gave to his father.

The Vokkaleri plates make mention of the capabilities of Chalukya Kings (leaving apart conventional phrases). For instance Vikramaditya I is referred to as "perfect in wisdom and reverence". Vinayoditya Satyavraya is described as Tarakarati (Kumaraswami) the Balendushkhara (Siva) to the forces of his enemies. Vinayoditya is said to have acquired in youth the use of all the weapons and accomplishments of a great king.

Regarding the attainments of Kirtivarman II we may cite the inscription itself in part. The relevant portion of the record reads as follows:

"His dear son, in youth well instructed in the use of arms, perfect in subduing the six kinds of passions, who through the joy which his father felt on account of his good qualities had obtained the rank of Yuvaraja, praying for an order, saying, "Send me to subdue the king of Vanchi, the enemy of our race," immediately on obtaining it marched forth and going against him broke the power of Pallava, who unable to make war on a large scale took refuge in a hill fort and capturing his lusty elephants, rubies and treasury of gold delivered them to his own father; thus in due time obtaining the title of Sarvabhuma, the lotus
of his feet covered with the pollen, the gold dust from the crowns of lines of kings prostrate before him through reverence or fear, Kirtivarman, favourite of the earth and fortune, great king of kings, supreme lord and sovereign thus commands all people....."

The inscription\(^{60}\) also makes a reference to the training that Kirtivarman had received in his youth. He had acquired a knowledge of the use of all the weapons and secured the accomplishments necessary for a great king. He had a very bold and ambitious policy of even conquering the kingdoms in the north. So he was very well trained in the art of warfare. "War was his chief policy". By following the three modes of policy, he broke the pride of his enemies. By his generosity he won the affection of his people. He acquired a kingdom, 'resplendent with the Pālīchvāja\(^{61}\) and other tokens of all supreme wealth'.

Besides receiving training in the art of warfare, a crown prince, sometimes, issued grants as well as has been already pointed out in this Chapter earlier.

The prince was also permitted to participate in the deliberations of the king with the ministers. This opportunity was given to him with the main objective of making him acquaint himself with some of the certain core problems affecting the kingdom and their position. Although the Chalukya inscriptions do not give definite references
to the prince participating in the royal deliberations, it may be surmised that he was not beyond the pale of such deliberations and consultation which was so common among the kings of the period.

\textbf{Section III: King's Coronation}

The crown prince occupied a unique place in the political organisation of the kingdom. As the Chalukyas observed several Vedic ceremonies, the crown prince would normally receive the designation and insignia of the office at a ceremonial function known as 'Yuvarajyabhisheka'. But the most important ceremony was the coronation of the prince as king. By means of this function, the prince was installed as the king either immediately after the demise of the ruling king or even in his last years of his rule, if he so desired. The coronation ceremony would also give the prince a legal title to govern and hence it was of great political and constitutional significance.

Besides the religious nature of the ceremony it also had its secular character. The ceremony was conducted with all paraphernalia. The King-elect, after the celebration of his pattabandotsava would be taken in procession to the palace on horse-back and received thereby the ministers and prominent persons of the palace and the kingdom. If he was married, his chief queen would also be coronated along with him.
Inscriptions of the Chalukyas indicate that the Coronation ceremony was usually held at Pattadakal. Therefore Pattadakal acquired a prominent place. The name of the town Pattadakal finds mention in the inscriptions of the Chalukyas. In all probability Pattadakal was a seat of anointing the king and the coronation ceremony was also held there as well as at Badami. Such a practice was common even among the Chola kings of South India who had Tanjore, Gangaikonda Cholapuram and two other places as seat of Coronation of the King. It may be apt here to quote the opinion of Prof. Kielhorn who says that the prefix of the name Pattadakal, namely, 'Pattada' was evidently used in the sense of conducting the ceremony. The king was made to sit on a golden seat and decorated. If he was married, his principal queen also would sit beside him. Celebration of this significant function were held at Pattadakal and also Badami.

Section VIII The Royal Court

The royal court was an empire in miniature. The court symbolised the various interests of the kingdom. It also provided an assurance to the king regarding security, and stability and safeguards of the kingdom. The kings maintained the dignity and decorum of the court. The court was attended by all the feudatories, the
members of the four-fold divisions of the army, dancers, spies and women. It was the general practice for the members of the army, Cavalry and elephant forces to wear costly and glamorous uniforms. The court was also attended by the crown prince, other princes, ministers, poets, astrologers, and other high dignitaries including envoys, if any. The court assembled once a year regularly for which there would be a gracious invitation by the king to all the feudatory rulers comprising the kingdom and other dignitaries. Absence of any such subordinate king, high official or dignitary without proper grounds and previous intimation to the king would give a hint to the king to ascertain whether the person so absent was loyal or not and help the king to get a confirmation of his impression about the person. Subsequently the king could think of precautionary measures or any course of action considered fit by him and also by his ministers, particularly if the absence of the person was deliberate and sufficient to cause some disturbance in the kingdom in the future.

Section IX

Royal Preceptors

The princes and also the kings received rich and enduring training at the hands of preceptors who were noted for their learning and wisdom. Pulakesi II used to consult and adhere to the advice of the celebrated poet,
Section X. The Queen

The queen held an important place in the administrative setup of the kingdom. Although the kings were in the habit of taking a number of wives, for various reasons described below, the most senior queen was designated as Pattamahevi. On the coronation day, it was customary for the queen to take her seat on the throne with the king. The Chalukya inscriptions do not definitely say whether the queen took a cognisable part along with the king or not, in administration. However, an instance may be cited though it relates to a later date. Among the Rashtrakuta kings, one queen Silamahadevi, by name associated with her husband in administration.

It was also a common practice that the queen would have received a certain amount of education and training even before her marriage. Normally the belief was held that the queen had her share of responsibility in the discharge of the kingly functions which vitally affected the kingdom. Her co-operation was expected in making the administration purposeful. Some of the queens...
accompanied their kings during military expeditions. Similarly, some queens remained at the headquarters of the kingdom in the absence of the king and rendered help and guidance in administration. The queens also evinced a keen interest in the religious life of the people and in undertaking welfare and humanitarian activities.

Sometimes the queens were in the practice of conferring grants. For instance, an inscription from the Virupaksha temple belonging to the reign of Vikramāditya II states that the queen consort, Lekhamahadevi confirmed the singers of the locality regarding the enjoyment of the grants and privileges that had been conferred on them by Vijayaditya. The conferment is to the effect that the covenants, bonds of morality or propriety, established rule, custom and agreement were restored as in previous years. One Ruggamara of Uppadugga in the country of Eryya obtained this concession.

One of the guiding principles on the part of the kings to select several wives besides the Pattamahisi was the system of dynastic marriages. Such a practice was common in India even from ancient times and it had the objective of strengthening the power and position of the ruling king. It also had another purpose of obtaining mutual benefits on the part of kings.
Matrimonial alliances, to strengthen the king's rule were common to political traditions of ancient India. For instance, the Gupta monarch Chandragupta II gave his daughter Prabhavati (by the queen Kuberanājā) to the Vākaṭaka king Pravarasena II in order to enlist support and strength from the latter in his war against the Sakas of Western India (Malwa). Although the Chōlas belong to a slightly later period, one of their rulers viz., Aditya had given his daughter in marriage to Krishna II of the Rastrakūta dynasty.

Pulakesī I married Indukanti and Surlabhaḍēvi belonging to the Satpūra family. Kirtivarman I married the sister of Kējāśimha vallābha Prithivīvallābha of the ēndraka family. Chandrāditya's queen was the celebrated poetess, Vijayamahādevi or Vijā, mentioned in literary traditions. Pulakesī II's queen was Pādmalādevi. Vikramaḍitya's chief queen was Mahādevi (Lokamahādevi) of the Naḥya family. It was she who built the great temple of Śiva in the name of Lokēśvara, now called the Virūpaksha temple at Pattadakal. Another queen of Vikramaditya was Trailokya Mahādevi, who was responsible for the construction of a great temple of Śiva in the name of Trailokyēśwara, in the vicinity of Lokēśvara's shrine. Kirtivarman II's chief queen was Mahādevi.
In the age of the Chālukya kings, some of the families which had acquired an important status were the Batpūra, the Nāihaya, and the Sēndraka families with whom the Chālukya kings had formed matrimonial alliances and consolidated their power in Karnataka. Of these dynasties, the one by name Batpūra cannot be identified.

It will be apt to cite here the observation of Dr. P. B. Desai. Says he, that the marriage alliances became more common during the time of the Nātrakutas of Mālkhed, (the successors of the Chālukyas of Bādami). For instance Krishna II, Jagatiṣṭha, his son Indra III, his son and Krishna III married Chēdi princess, Kālaśuri Princess and Amūgavaśrṣa III and Krishna III married Kālaśuri princesses, respectively.

Section XI  Celebration of Vedic Sacrifices

The Chālukya kings were in the practice of celebrating certain sacrifices which had a certain amount of political significance in addition to their religious importance. Normally, celebration of the sacrifices would be resorted to by the kings after the establishment of peace and tranquility within the kingdom.

It may be apt here to mention a few of the general aspects regarding celebration of sacrifices. For instance sacrifices like the Aūvamedha, the Rājasūya and the
Vajapāya denoted and signified supremacy and sovereignty of the king, while the other ones like the Bahusuvāra, Paundarīka etc. were of a religious significance. These sacrifices also aided the king to maintain goodwill among kings. These sacrifices became very common from the Gupta period.

Pulakēśī I performed the Āśvamedha, Agniḥayana, Vajapāya, Agnisthoma, Bahusuvāra and Paundarīka sacrifices. Thus he celebrated both the secular and the religious sacrifices and by virtue of the former, laid the true foundations of the dominions. Kṛtivarman I, who acted as his father's commander-in-chief is stated to have celebrated the Bahusuvāra and Agniṣṭoma sacrifices subsequent to the foundation of the city of Badami by Pulakēśī I.

According to a later inscription, Pulakēśī II is said to have possessed horses and noble elephants and to have bestowed 2000 most excellent villages to the priests at the time of celebration of the horse sacrifice. As pointed already, the glory of the Āśvamedha sacrifice as celebrated by and acquired by Pulakēśī I must have been subsequently associated with the person and rule of Pulakēśī II also, on account of the latter's great renown. Hence an inscription of a later date refers to celebration of the sacrifice in the reign of Pulakēśī II.
According to the Gadwal plates, Vikramaditya I is said to have performed the Asvamedha or the Horse-sacrifice. Celebration of the sacrifice by kings and Pulakesh I is only the association of the fame and glory of the Southern to Pulakesh I and Vikramaditya I.

A large number and variety of land records and copperplates of the Chalukya kings are available. They point out to the existence of a system of drafting of royal orders and endowments by the king's confidential officers. There must also have been a central office like the modern secretariat which was the source of all state business and transactions.

Pulakesh I is stated to have made two grants after founding of the capital city of Yatsapi (Badami). But a larger number of land grants were issued by Kirtivarman I than those of Pulakesh I. He gave the entire village of Langigevara to a cave temple of Vishnu built by his brother Mangalasa. Mangalasa's donative records from Nerur, Mahakuta, and Badami register grants of land to temples and scholars. Records of Pulakesh II are available from Nalabhad and Goa. He made a gift of a village of Makarappi near the villages of Melkurki and Cudagah to a learned inhabitant of Tagara near Daulatabad. The Nalabhad copper plate, Goa copper plate, Kastra copper plate, Sanjan plates, Rayagadah and other records of the same period by the kings of the Eastern
Ohalukya line refer to gift of land to men of learning and temples as well. Gifts of land by Yuvaraja Viṣṇuvalvaldhaṇa⁹² in the time of Pulakeśi II in Alandah tīrtha, Karmarastrā and the villages of Benira and Dhuṅipura⁹³ were given as religious gifts to God Mahādeva. Pulakeśi's maternal uncle, Senananda-raja⁹⁴ gave certain portions of the village in Anuvātikā Viśhaya. Grants made by the Śeṇḍraka Ujîśū Durgāśaktī⁹⁵, son of Kundaśaktī and grandson of Jayāśakti are also extant. Another grant of Pulakeśi II⁹⁶ registers a gift of land of the village of Kuvalmīśh to a learned person. Similarly, the Chaḷāḷa plates also register a gift of land by Pulakeśi IV. Another grant of Pulakeśi II refers to the donation of the island of Rovati. The purpose of this grant is to register a gift for the maintenance of the hālī, chērū and vāśvādeva sacrifices⁹⁷. The Koṭhara grant of Viṣṇumahādevi shows that the gift of land was made in the village of Koṭhara for the promotion of religious activities¹⁰⁰. A grant by Abhinava-dītiya¹⁰¹, grandson of Pulakeśi II registers a gift of land to a learned brahmin. Records of Vikrama-dītiya I from Kurnool¹⁰², Bellary¹⁰³, Savantavādi¹⁰⁴ and other areas register gifts of land. He also bestowed the village of Kurthakunte¹⁰⁵ in the Belvola country to a learned individual. Vikrama-dītiya gave a gift of the village of Chintakunta¹⁰⁶ near Rundegol to one Rāndamān for his attainment and excellence of
the supreme knowledge of the entire Vedanta through austerity and penance. By way of honouring his preceptor, Sri Meghacharya, Vikramaditya gave a gift of the village of Flasattigrama, situated near Kalchumbra.

Records of Vinayaditya are found in Bhilwara, Bellary, Kurnool, Keppal, Saival and Palayatthana regions. They register grant of villages to learned men and temples. Inscriptions mention grant of villages like Marivalli, the town of Bhaltikavada, the villages of Peravanur, Gangavur, Puligere and Gondhagaram. Vinayaditya also gave a few villages on the banks of the river Pampa and some villages in Jogurshada and Kurnool districts. He also made a gift to learned persons in Malavad Vishaya. He also restored certain grants previously given to temples and individuals in the presence of the Vishayapati and gramakootas. He bestowed charities when he made a journey to Muranda from his permanent residence at the capital, Raktapura, situated on the northern bank of the river Malapahari. This fact is evidenced by a set of copper plates which register gift of land to persons well versed in Vedic lore. For the reign of Vijayaditya, there are several references in inscriptions registering gifts of land. The Mahakuta inscription, Nerur copper plate, a stone inscription from Kottapalle (Ananthapur district), Shiggaon copper plate, Morum
In the reign of Vikramaditya II, an inscription in the Virupaksha temple, a record from Tippaluru in Kamalapuram taluk of Gudespah district, an inscription from Chikkamangalhalli, record of Makkeswara temple, Lakshmeswar stone inscription provide references to gifts of land.

Though, Kirtivarma II was the last great ruler of the dynasty, he did not lag behind his predecessors in the issue of land grants. The Adur stone inscription, and Vekkaleri plates offer references to gifts of land to ascetics, scholars and temples. The Adur grant (about A.D. 750) was announced in public and attested by Unshhovinda and others as witnesses. He also made a gift to a temple of Jinendra in the City of Pandipura. In addition to this gift, Kirtivarma caused the construction of a danaśala or hall for the distribution of charity at the Jaina temple built by a village gemunda or headman. He also made another grant of land to a well-versed scholar by name Krishnaswamy.

Many of the land grants contain elaborate description of the boundaries of the land offered as gifts to give more accuracy regarding the size of land. Some of the grants
also contain names of witnesses before whom the gift was made. They also contain details of the purpose of the grant. Hence, I may infer that there must have been a record office where all the land grants were not only prepared but also preserved for future use.

References to a number of Charter writers and private secretaries show that there must have been a central office at the capital city where all the land records, treaties of war and peace, announcements of levy of taxes, conferments by the king, exemption of taxes by the king, and trade concessions to economic guilds must have been maintained. Ever since the time of Manu, there was a practice of having a systematised body of servants for the governance of the kingdom. The office of records and documents of endowments and other grants of a miscellaneous nature must have been under the supervision and care of an officer. He must have been in charge of accounts and records and his name in the period of Harsha and later years was clearly mentioned as Akehpatalika.133

Section XIII

Writers on Hindu polity unanimously agree in recommending that a king should always act in consultation with a group of ministers and also get their cooperation. Proper exercise of sovereign powers by the king was possible only with the assistance of well qualified ministers.134 The king selected and appointed ministers.
Ministers so appointed were generally speaking, men of sterling character and possessed very high qualifications. Writers on policy have prescribed a list of qualifications to be possessed by good ministers. When one reads through the long list of qualifications, one is surprised at this list and entertains a doubt whether the list was something maintained as an ideal or conventional description actually possessed by the ministers. But it is also true to point out that a very large kingdom like the Chalukyas was satisfactorily administered and what is more, provided with the needed security and solidarity. It also achieved progress for a good number of years. This was possible only with a group of able, loyal devoted and hard-working ministers who thought in terms of the interest of the country in which they served and whose aspirations were entirely associated with it.

Unfortunately, the data for the study of origin, constitution and functions of the group of ministers (known in later times as the king's council) under the rule of the Chalukya kings is very meagre. However, a study of the history of their immediate predecessors and contemporaries as far as incorporating in their administrative set up a council of ministers, indicates that the Chalukyas also could not have carried on their administration without a group of ministers. The council comprised of top-ranking ministers. The king consulted these ministers
and took decisions on important matters of home and foreign affairs.

The ministers were assisted in their work of administration by officers. For instance, references are available pointing out the existence of a council of ministers in the Satavahāna period. The ministers were called amācchā under the Satavahānas. Under the Kadambas, a Council of five ministers functioned. Even the names of the ministers like Mannevargade (Steward of the household) tantrapāla (an officer well-versed), Pradhaṇa (minister of State) and Steward of bavellag and Secretary of the Council appear in their records. Among the Pallavas of Kāñchi, mention is made in the Vaikuntha Perumāl temple inscription of a council of ministers to assist the government of the kingdom. Even among the Ganga kings, the contemporary allies of the Western Chālukyas, there appears to have functioned a council of ministers. Their inscriptions mention the designations and indicate their main functions. They were - Sarvadhikāri, Daṇḍanāyaka, Mannevargade, Kriya bhanḍāri, the yuvaraja, Šadhinigrāhi, Sutrādhikāri and Mahapradhāna. Among these functionaries only the top-ranking members were included in the Council of ministers. For instance, the Mahapradhāna, Yuvrajā and Šadhinigrāhi. Rest of the functionaries were officers assisting the king and his ministers. The Rāstrakutas who succeeded the Chālukyas of Bāṇḍa had also set up a council of ministers.
Taking the position of ministers among the kings of the Eastern Chalukyas of Vengi—an offshoot of the main dynasty—we get a clear evidence of the existence of a council of ministers in their records. The administration of a Vighaya was carried on with the help of certain functionaries whose status was similar to that of ministers. They were—the mārti, purūhitā, yuvārajā, senapati, amātya, pradhu, dāvārīka, kātakarāja, bandadhinātha and Bādmanājaka, commander of the army, minister chiefs, superintendent of the royal camp door-keeper, chief justice and judge. In this instance also, the mārti, purūhitā, yuvārajā, amātya, pradhu formed the members of the council of ministers while others comprised officers who assisted the king and his ministers in administration. Among the list of officers given, the place of the minister was next in importance to that of the Sovereign. It may be quite suited here to quote king Vimaladitya's declaration in his Ranastrapadānta grant, which reads, that, among the seven constituent parts of a kingdom, the foremost is sovereignty and second so it is a suitable ministry (amātya-paddavī). 140.

Another contemporary power of the Chalukyas of Bādāmi was that of Harṣā. Harṣā had set up a large empire in the north. During the age of Harṣā, the
administrative organisation was organised on sound and systematic lines. The Haracakarita mentions several imperial officers like the Mahasandhivigradhikrita, the Mahabaladikrita and the Mahapratihara. Similarly, land-grants of Harsha speak of officers like Mahakaplaladhi-karamadikrita, Sennatamaharaja and the Mahakaplatalika, Svenatamaharaja, the Mahapramatara; Mahasanam, the Mahasandhivigradhikrita, the Mahabaladikrita and the Mahapratihara. It is very likely that all these functionaries must have formed a Council because collective deliberation of the ministers in the interest of the State has been affirmed as the best method, in all books on ancient Indian Polity.

In the same manner, an inscription of Bharasgama II dated in the Vallabhi year - Sam. 252 (A.D. 571-72) makes mention of official designations like the Senapati or Bhataraka Ayuktakas, Miniyuktakas, drangikas, mahattarasa, chatas, bhatas, dhruvadhikarnikas, saulikas, pratiasakas, dandapanikas, chaurodhiranikas and others. Other names of functionaries like dutaka, and sandnivigradhikrita are also mentioned. The grant is stated to have been given by king Bharasgama to all the above-mentioned officers. However, the council of ministers comprised of the top-ranking functionaries and the rest were functionaries who assisted the king and his ministers.
Likewise, another forged Vallabhi grant of Dharasena II saka sam. 400 also states that the king "being in good health, addresses these orders to all governors of zillas, governors of taluks, headman of villages, officials and employees, greatmen, chiefmen and others." These functionaries did not comprise the king's Council of Ministers but were the assistants of the king and his ministers.

Although the term 'Council' does not occur in the records of the period, we may infer that the ministers appointed by the king formed themselves into a Council and assisted the king in the discharge of his functions. The ministry was the most important wheel of administrative machinery. Even Kautilya recommends that at least 3 ministers were to be appointed by the king to assist him. It is quite likely that the ministers - 3 in number or even more - acted jointly and formed a council to carry on deliberations and assist the king in the discharge of his functions. Kautilya is also of the opinion that the council could comprise as many ministers as adequate to meet the requirements of the dominion.

In view of the existence of a council of ministers in the kingdoms which flourished in Karnatak just before and after the rule of Western Chalukyas, we may reasonably surmise that the Chalukya kings must have had
a few ministers who acted collectively and formed a Council as well. The functions must also have been similar to those of a Council which prevailed in the contemporary kingdoms. A large empire as that of the Chalukyas of Badami could not have carried on its administration without a group of Counsellors or ministers\textsuperscript{145}. (A glossary of administrative functionaries as far as available in the inscriptions has been given in the Appendix).

Section XIV Central Government

Council of Ministers

The Council of Ministers under the rule of the Chalukya kings of Badami comprised the king, the crown Prince (Yuvaraja) and the high Minister for foreign affairs or War and Peace (the Mahāśayāhāraghā). These functionaries must have formed a Council to advise and assist the king in the discharge of his functions as kingship in ancient Karnātaka as well as in India was sinequanon with the Sachiva, Mantri or Minister and known to have taken decisions on affairs of the kingdom in the mantralōchona sahā (Council of ministers for deliberation). Very few kings acted
independently of the council of ministers. Certain designations like the Mahadandanāyaka and the Maha Sandivigrahi clearly show that as the Chalukya Kingdom became extensive and attained supremacy in Karnāṭaka, even the designations must have underwent a change from dandanāyaka and Sandivigrahi to Mahādandanāyaka and Mahāsandivigrahi, respectively.

King

The king was the pivot of administration. He presided over the deliberations of the Ministry. The Personal Character of the King exercised much influence on taking decisions on home and foreign policies. From a general study of the available material we may say that a king like Pulakesi II guided the destinies of the kingdom by his wise counsel and far-sightedness. In the same manner it was customary that the king would not bypass the considered opinions given by the ministers, some of whom were very well known for their age, maturity of wisdom and learning.

For instance, Ravikīrti, the celebrated poet in the Court of Pulakesi was also known for his deep foresight and wisdom. A stone tablet set into the outside of the east wall of a temple at Mēguti states that the learned Ravikīrti composed the eulogy in the Aihole Praśasti. Making use of the occasion of founding a
Jaina temple at Aihole, Kavikirti has described the achievements of Pulakeśi II in the Prasasti.

Yuvarāja

The Yuvarāja (Crown-Prince or heir-apparent) held a very prominent position in the council. It was customary for the kings to have associated the Yuvarāja in all the business of the kingdom, because it was he who held the responsibility of maintaining the kingdom intact after he assumed the place of the king. As a matter of fact the Yuvarāja was known by the designation 'Kusaramatya' in the Gupta period which meant that he was a "Counsellor of the Crown".

The term Yuvarāja, according to Dr. D.C. Sircar, was the designation of the heir-apparent or crown prince. According to Kautilya the Yuvarāja is considered as one of the 18 tirthas of the State. He occupied an elevated place in the council of ministers. The council referred to as 'Parīṣata' in the Arthashastra comprised two units - the Pradhāna mantri, Purushita, Śeṣapati, and Yuvarāja, forming the inner cabinet and Dauvaraka, Antarvēṣika and others forming the external unit. The main purpose of the Yuvarāja being permitted to participate in the deliberations of the council (particularly an accomplished and able crown prince)
was that he should become conversant with the conduct of business in the council, get a full and first hand knowledge of the affairs of the kingdom but also form a correct impression of the attitude of the affiliations and loyalty of the members of the council. Needless to conclude that all these placed him in a good stead when he succeeded to the throne.

We get a clear idea from the inscriptions of the Chalukyas regarding the distinctive role played by the 'Yuvarāja' in the affairs of the kingdom, since the times of Kirtivarman I or at least Pulakesi II. The achievements of Vikramaditya, Vinayaditya, Vijayaditya, Kirtivarman (II) and of Kubja Vishnu Varmanas of the Eastern Chalukya branch have been referred to earlier in this chapter. Further the Chalukya inscriptions describe that the Yuvaraja had the right to status of Panchamahādādas and Samanta and invested with a necklace as insignia of his office, from the days of Pulakesi III.

**The Mahasandhivigrahika**

Among the top-ranking functionaries whose designations appear in the Chalukya records as the Sandhivigrahi (Later styled as Mahāsandhivigrahi) (The Minister for War and Peace and the High (great) Minister for war and peace, respectively) played a very prominent role in the administrative organisation of the Chalukya kingdom.
The Sandhindigrahi was the minister of war and peace and the Mahādandrividigrahi as the same office was designated in later years of the Chalukya rule, was the Great or High Minister of war and peace. He was solely responsible for looking after the foreign affairs as directed by the king and guided by himself also. As such he must have exerted his influence on the king to a very great degree, particularly, in taking decisions on matters concerning defence of the land, declaration of war and conclusion of peace. The peace and tranquility of the kingdom depended very much on his efficiency and safety measures. He therefore occupied an exalted position and enjoyed the supreme confidence of the king.

The designation of the Sandhindigrahi is always associated with one of the basic departments of administration namely, Sandhindikarana. This term denotes that it was a department entrusted with foreign affairs. An officer in charge of this department, according to Dr. D.C. Sircar, was known as Sandhindigrahamādhikrita or Sandhindigraha or Sanandhigraha. Sandhindigraha or the Mahā Sandhindigraha was not merely the minister in charge of war and peace, but he was also in charge of foreign relations department. He also wrote important charters of the king.
The office of the Sandhivigrahi existed in India since the days of the epics. The Mahabharata mentions the designation. Therefore this office was an ancient one associated with "acts of peace and that of war".

It is interesting to note that the designation of the term 'Sandhivigrahi' was derived from the earliest term 'd̄uta'. According to Arthasastra, Rajadharma Purva and Manusmriti the term 'd̄uta', meant a foreign minister. This term underwent a change through the times. Most of the epigraphical records, particularly in chalukya records, make use of the mere pompous and expensive title of 'Mahasandhivigrahika' to denote the person who held that responsible office in the Ministry.

In many of the inscriptions of the chalukya kings the foreign minister is referred to as the 'Maha sandhivigrahi' the high minister who was entrusted with arrangement of war and peace. The circumstances of the period must have necessitated the acquisition of paramount importance in the administrative set up. Defence of the frontiers, peace and order in the provinces and territories of the feudatory kings and wars with the Pallavas account justly for the distinctive place, in a way, enjoying a unique place and mention in the records of the chalukya kings.
The Mahāsandhi vīgrahī was also entrusted with the work of composing grants and charters issued by the king. For instance, a Vallabhi grant of A.D. 478-79 (almost of the same period covered by the thesis) states that the record was written by Skandabhātta the minister for peace and war, in the reign of Dharasena.

Likewise Vajravarma and Jayasena held the office of the Mahāsandhi vīgrahīka in the reign of Vikramāditya I. The Dayamadimne record of Vinayāditya was composed by Sri Rama Punyasvallabha. He also wrote other charters of the king wherein he is described as the Mahāsandhi vīgrahīka, or the high minister for peace and war. The relevant line reads as follows: "Mahāsandhi vīgrahīka Sri Rama Punyasvallabhēva likitham idam asaṇam". For instance, the Togurshode inscription states that the grant was made by Rama Punyasvallabha, the Mahāsandhi vīgrahīka or the minister for peace and war. It adds further that this charter was written by Sri Rama Punyasvallabha the Mahāsandhi vīgrahīka - the high (minister) who was entrusted with the arrangements of peace and war. The terms of reference used in the instance of this minister conclusively proves the high position occupied by the minister for foreign affairs and also how treaties of peace, declaration of war and other orders were entrusted to be composed by a
minister of such eminence and confidence. Similarly, another copper plate grant of Vinayaditya dated A.D. 695 and also the Harihar Plates were written by the same Minister who occupied the high position. In the same manner, the Nejur copper plate refers to Miravadya Punyavallabha as the 'Mahasandhivigrahika' or the high minister for war and peace. The relevant portion of the inscription reads thus: Mahasandhivigrahika, Mira (va) dyu Punya Vallabhemalikhitam-i-dam Sansam". Finally, the Vokkalikari plates mentions that Anivarita Dhananjaya Punyavallabha occupied the same position in the reign of Kirtivarman II.

Another administrative functionary of the status of a minister was the 'Senapati' (Commander-in-chief). In one of the inscriptions from Aihole, (No. LIX Ladkhan) although belonging to a slightly later period, there is the mention of the term 'Senapati'. This office was held by one Skandabhatta, according to the inscription. Subsequently, the Senapati must have been subordinated to the Mahasandhivigrahika thus loosing his previous independent status and also the place in the council.

According to Dr. D.C. Sirkar, the term Senapati or Senani or Senadhupati was equivalent to that of Dandanayaka. He was also sometimes called Mahapradhana. Pradhana was the official designation used to indicate
the designation of the Chief Minister or administrator. Sometimes he was also called Pradhāna Sachiva.

It is apt here to point out that in the dominions of Harsha, the contemporary of Pulakeśī II, another functionary discharging the functions of a Dandanāyaka existed. This office was called Balādhiṭhakīra or commander of the army. He may also have been the head of a territorial unit.

**Dandanāyaka, Mahādandanāyaka**

Another functionary whose status was that of a minister was the "Dandanāyaka". He exercised functions of 'leader of the forces'. Some of them happened to be the feudatory chiefs who were designated as 'dandanāyaka' on account of skill in warfare, devoted and loyal service to the country and the king. As loyal chiefs, they must also have held the position of ruling over a territorial division belonging to the king. As a high provincial officer, he must have supervised collection of revenue due to the kingdom and remittances of collections after retaining the portion of the revenue collections for himself as reward for his services.
Similarly, the term Mahādandanaṅyaka was common to India since the rule of the Kuśānas. It was also in vogue in the 3rd century in the Telugu country. The term indicates a military title, denotes the position of a judge, Chief officer of police, Prefect of Police, a high Judicial officer or a great general according to Dr. Fleet, Bloch, Marshall, Vogel, Vogue and Linders, respectively.

According to Dr. Sircar, the designation, Dandanaṅyaka meaning a military commander also stood for Mahāsūrānta, Mahāpradhana or Sarvadharmi. (Ep. Cl. p. 80).

According to Marshall, N.G. Majumder and R.G. Basak, the office of the Dandanaṅyaka indicated respectively, an officer of police, a Judge and a Magistrate. This officer, therefore, had military and judicial functions because the army under the direction of the Dandanaṅyaka, 'was also the rod of Punishment'.

**Rahasayadhiprīta**

The rahasyadhiprīta was another important officer who must have held the status of a minister. Reference to this term is available in even the Kadamba
According to P.C. Sinha, the functionary, 'rahasya-dhikrita was an officer who functioned as a 'Privy Counsellor' or Private Secretary.

'Prakriti' ['Representatives of Several Classes']

In one or two inscriptions, mention is made of the term 'Prakriti'. This term is not uncommon to ancient Indian polity. 'Prakriti' is found in ancient books. According to Neelakantha, the term includes seven functionaries viz., Durgādhyaśaka (commandant of the Citadel), Balādhyaksha ('Controller General of the army), 'harmādhyaśaka (Chief of the departments of charity and justice), Camūpati (Commander in the field), and others like the Chaplain, Physician and astrologer. A question arises whether these officers functioned in the 'halukya kingdom.

According to J.C. Apte's dictionary, the term 'Prakriti' denotes the constitution elements of a state. They are the king, Minister, allies, treasury, army, territory, fortresses and another, sometimes, standing along with the seventh element, viz., a corporate body.
of citizens. Hence the term 'Prakriti' denotes a term implying the king's ministry, subjects in general and also a corporate body of citizens. Sometimes the term 'Prakriti' was also used to denote the 'Saptanga' or the seven elements of the State as the use of the term 'Prakriti Saptangina' shows.

According to Kittel's dictionary, the term 'Prakriti' stands for the term 'astadasa - radhana' or eighteen ministers. The use of this term 'astadasa Pradhana' may be found in Kautilya's Arthasastra, Panchatantra, Santipurvan of the Mahabharata and Vajatarangini'.

In fact, the Lakshmeswar Pillar inscription of Yuvaraja Vikramaditya states that the latter granted the social constitution in his capacity as Yuvaraja to the Mahajanas and the burgesses and the 18 prakritis of Porigere. Some writers suggest that a group of 18 ministers is not a valid connotation of the term cited above and that it should be understood to mean the classes of population. They argue that population was usually being classified into eighteen Jatis or communities.

The Lakshmeswar pillar inscription of Yuvaraja Vikramaditya states that a charter was granted to the mahajanas and the burgesses and the 18 prakritis denotes normally, 19 royal ministers on whose charter was
Ordinarily the term means a minister and mention of 18 prakritis denotes normally, 15 royal ministers on whom the charter was conferred. But as this meaning does not suit the context in the inscription, it is to be interpreted that the constitution was granted by Vikramaditya to the prominent leaders of the various classes of population comprising 18 classes. As the classes themselves could not have received the charter, it should be surmised that the 18 prakritis must have been the 18 chief representatives of the 18 divisions. Therefore the 18 representatives in the time of Vikramaditya's conferring the charter were recognised by the imperial authority as very responsible and prominent members to whom was entrusted implementation of the charter and of the various provisions of the Charter in the whole locality.

Section XV

Territorial administration

The Chalukya kings exercised authority over the several territorial units which comprised their dominions. Broadly speaking the limits were either under the rule of a Governor, appointed by the king or areas ruled even by feudatory allies. An account of the territorial units and their administration is given in Chapter I. 162.
Section XVI

Other functionaries

The Chalukya inscriptions provide some information on some of the other functionaries employed by the kings. They were the Lakhaka, the architects and craftsmen.

The Lakhaka was a charter-writer. He was also a composer of inscriptions, land-grants and oral orders of the king. He was a man of great literary accomplishments. He would have worked along with several colleagues who drafted and inscribed royal charters. Their work possibly was carried on under the supervision of the Sandhivigrani. Hence there must have been a special department in which men having a technical knowledge of the work were busy in writing of charters. As drafting of charters and inscriptions required a knowledge of the scripts, languages and technique of drafting and engraving, it may be reasonably surmised as pointed out already, that there must have been a central office of record where materials of engraving, registers of all original charters and documents were maintained and used from time to time. Generally, the grants contained the royal sign manual, the names of the composer of grant and the person who conveyed it to the grantee. For instance, a record at Badami assigned to the reign of..... is stated to have been engraved by Aghavinaigal. The
Aihole inscription of Pulkashi II composed by Vakikirti, the Mahasandhivigrahaika the style of which exhibits that he was a great scholar and well-versed in arts and sciences, must have been set to writing by a lekhaka.

The Peddavadaguru stone inscription from Anantapur states that it was written by one Mahendra pallavachari.148

Similarly, the Gadwal plates169 of Vikramaditya I was composed by the Mahasandhivigrahaika, 'the glorious Jayasena' and set to writing by a lekhaka. In the same way, another of his inscription, namely, the Talmanchi plates is stated to have been written by Vajravarman.170

We come across another name of a person known as Shinguti171 as having written another record. The Vokkaligiri plates of Kirtivarma II was composed by the Mahasandhivigrahaika, Srimad Anivarita Dhamanjaya Punyavallabha172 and set to writing by a lekhaka. The Annigeri inscription of Kirtivarma II is stated to have been written by a person called Pinapala.173 The Yekkeri rock inscription was written by Isana.174 Another inscription of Kirtivarma (II 7) from Anantapur was written by one Bharata (Surasdvarna vikrama).

It may be apt here to mention that many charters were written by the family writers bearing the surname, Punyavallabha. According to the Dayamadhina records, Ramapunya vallabha is stated to have written the charters of the king.
The Rayaghad plates of Vijayaditya refers to the writer as Miravadya Punyavallabha. It is known from the Kanchi inscription of Vikramaditya II that Anivarita Punyavallabha, successor of Sri Nama punyavallabha wrote the record in saka 616. The Vändur grant states that Dhananjaya Punyavallabha wrote the record in saka 672. He speaks himself as Srimad Anivarita Dhananjaya Punyavallabha in the Vokkaleri plates of saka 679.

Another record assigned to the reign of mentions one, Vinayaka son of Dirghabai as the writer of the charter apportioning certain villages.

Sometimes, the name of the architect is found engraved on some records. For instance, the record of king Vinayaditya and the Gondraka ruler Pegilli (saka 655) mentions the name of Anantaguna, as the architect. There must have been a large number of technical staff like the engravers in stone, carpenters, and stone masons employed for the purpose of engraving inscriptions. Another inscription No. XCI from Pattadakal records the name of Gunda as the builder of the temple. While it refers to readmission of artisans of a locality who were outcasts before, it mentions a term, 'balligavarte', or a caste or a group of skillful people. The term indicates that there existed a large
number of artisans who had obtained great mastery in masonry and building construction.

Incidentally, I may mention that the names of temple builders also find mention in the records. For instance the Pattadakal temple is stated to have been built by one Gunda, mentioned already, who was known by the title 'Tribhuvanāchārya'. He is also styled as 'Sarvasiddhāchārya' as borne out by the inscription. Similarly, the Pāpanatha temple is stated to have built by the guild of Sarvasiddhāchārya. An inscription in this temple is in praise of one Chaitra - Rāvajī Ovajji who was the builder of the most celebrated temples in the southern country and that he belonged to the guild of Sarvasiddhāchārya.

Section XVII

REGENCY

In the administrative history of the Chalukyas of Badami, Regency was an important feature of occurrence. Generally speaking, the need for a regency arose whenever an young prince was anointed who could not by himself look after the responsibilities and problems of administration. The need for a regent would also arise in the case of a minor son or even in the period of king dying without an heir and consequently entrusting the kingdom to be administered by the king's brother or the nearest relative.
The Mira\rplates point out that Mangaleśa became a regent during the minority of his nephew Pulakesi I, as Pulakesi was the eldest son of Kirtivarma I. As Pulakesi was only a minor at the time of death of Kirtivarma, he entrusted the care of the kingdom to his brother Mangaleśa. Mangaleśa was all along a very loyal brother and would do anything only with the permission of Kirtivarma. I have already pointed out how Mangaleśa gave expression to his affection to his brother by dedicating a cave temple at Badāna. Therefore, Kirtivarma, in good trust, appointed Mangaleśa to rule the kingdom till Pulakesi came of age. In the early years of the regency, Mangaleśa ruled in the best interest of the royal family and the kingdom. He, at first, had no intention of usurping the throne for himself or place his own son on the throne and thus deprive Pulakesi of his good claim. But he did not continue this attitude for long; soon, he carried his personal ambition too far and placed his son on the throne which subsequently led to the civil war between him and Pulakesi, but finally Mangaleśa lost his life in battle and Pulakesi won the throne.

The basis on which a regency is normally set up has been pointed out already. The regent thus appointed was expected to hold the kingdom in trust till the attainment of age by the minor son. The regent is also
expected to do anything in the name and behalf of the minor. So, the period of regency cannot constitute a period of 'kinglessness' or 'arājaśaka', because the regent would fill in the deficiency of the kingdom and maintain it intact. From this point of view, Mangalēsa fell short of the expectations, became selfish and wicked as to perpetuate rule of his own family. He also broke the promise which he had made to Kirtivarma I, who had breathed his last in peace. Therefore as unlawful attempts for throne or other possessions would have it, Mangalēsa became the target of popular hatred from the people, feudatories and ministers of the kingdom. Ultimately he was foiled in his attempts, as events proved later.

Another instance of regency is to be found in the Savantavādi region which formed a provincial unit of the empire. The Hērur plates read along with the Kochre grant gives us to understand that Vijayabhattārīka did reign after her husband's death—probably as regent—during the childhood of a son whose subsequent death must have led to taking over the province by Vikramāditya for purpose of administration. The Kochre grant was issued by Vijayamahādeva or Vijayabhattārīka, the queen consort of Chandradīvya. Possibly she ruled her husband's dominion not only as a regent but as governor also.
In the case of a minor son succeeding to the throne, there was a practice for the queen mother to have aided administration. She styled herself as the 'rajamāta'. The Badami inscription of Vijayaditya Satyāśraya mentions that the temple at Badami was founded by Vinayavati. Vinayavati is described as 'rajamāta'. According to this record, Vijayaditya had a queen, Vinayavati who may have survived her husband. She established a sanctuary and made an endowment to it in the reign of her son. The record also gives for the first time the name of Vinayavati. She installed the images of Brahma, Vishnu and Mahāśvāra at Vatāpi.

A few records indicate the part played by women. For instance, the Kōbhe grant makes mention of a concubine or harlot by name Vinapōti or Sādē. She was the beloved mistress of Vijayaditya. She made gifts at the time of making the 'hiranyagarbhaśāna' to the 'deity comprising a pitha set with rubies covered by a silver umbrella and a field called Mangululle measuring 400 units'.

Her grandmother, Rēvananēchal and her daughter Kuchipōti bestowed the entire gift of a 'hiranyagarbha' and having a pedestal for the god with rubies and having set
up its silver umbrella, gave the field called Mangalalle (of the measure of eight hundred).

Names of two other women appear in inscriptions of अझिक also famous for their gifts. An inscription states that to the temple of Vijayeswara, Matibhodissa made a votive offering of a pillar: 'Pâka (was) the fashioner of the ornamentation of these two pillars of Matibhodissa'—thus concludes the inscription. Similarly another inscription on the north face of another pillar on the south side of the nave in the centre hall of the above temple speaks of this two other pillars as the votive offering of Chalabbe, a harlot of the temple.

Section xxi Oral Orders

The Chalukya kings were in the practice of issuing decrees or proclamations. Their inscriptions mention the term 'raja-gravitas'189 (a) (royal proclamation). For instance, the Belgam inscription of Vinayaditya, Afhele inscription of Vikramaditya II, and the Lakshmineswar inscription of Yuvaraja Vikramaditya make references to the term. Such orders of the kings were set to writing by secretaries who waited on them. Subsequently, the orders were communicated to the concerned officers or parties or engraved on stone or copper plate. It is significant to note that a minister of a very high rank
as the Mahasandhivigrahika drafted the proclamations of
the king as is borne out from the closing lines of the
inscriptions, cited earlier in this Chapter.

**Administration of Justice**

Inscriptions of the Chālukyas do not describe any
judicial organization which prevailed in the kingdom.
However, it may be inferred that the king himself occupied
the place of the highest Judge. According to the
practise in the monarchical states and Kautilyan
principles the king was the fountain of justice. But he
must have been assisted by a number of courts - Civil and
Criminal - in his work of dispensing justice. There may
have been a department of justice. There was proper
decision of the accused person and trial. If the department
was not guilty, he was acquitted; otherwise he was
punished. Guilt was proved or disproved by evidences
like the instruments used in committing the crime,
accomplices and abettors, the stolen articles and
persons concerned in their sale or purchase was taken
into account. The Kautilyan ideal of justice between
man and man was generally followed. In the villages, the
village headman or the village assembly assisted the
imperial authority by deciding cases arising in the
locality. Sometimes the guilds and Merchants in towns
decided the cases in their areas. But as a common practice, they gave punishments to evil-doers after ascertaining truth by means of ordeals.

**Beneficial Nature of Administration**

Glory and prosperity of the kingdom and happiness and contentment of the people depended to a very large extent on the personality of the king, his policies and actions. Generally, speaking, it was the close bonds of affinity between the king and his people which helped create an atmosphere of goodwill and happiness; otherwise the king would not justify his position. Although this was generally, the ideal which many kings followed, there were at certain times a reversal of the ideal and the ages could not be simply golden. But, normally, with the personal exertion of talented rulers, the people felt very much secured, happy and contented. The activities of such kings were shaped by the rules of 'rajadharmā' to which they paid credence. The king could receive his share of the taxes paid by the people, only when he made it a point to do his functions and duties in the most satisfactory manner. The Shāntiparva says that the people entered into an agreement with Manu, their first king, the agreement was meant to overcome Manu's reluctance to rule and only stipulated for the subjects payment of the royal dues and their granting the king immunity from their own sins. Reluctance on the part of the first king
was as to how far he would be able enough to fulfil his obligations towards his people. According to the Arthasāstra¹⁹⁰ there is an implied contract between the king and his subject. The implication of the contract is stated to be that the king was spiritually responsible for misgovernment while he was entitled to his usual one-sixth share, even from hermits dwelling in the forest.

It may be apt here to refer to the questions put by the epic hero Śrī Rāma¹⁹¹ regarding the true test of a king's good rule. He put a few questions to Bharata to ascertain whether his rule was ideal or not. They were, "Are the people attached to you, the king, the state assembly? Are they attached to your work? Are they prepared to lay down their lives for you?" Answers to these questions may well indicate good administration.

Another instance from the Mahābhārata¹⁹² may be given to lend support to the nature of rule by a good king. In a conversation between Bhīma and Yudhiṣṭhira, the royal sage, Bhīma goes on to say, "why should the people submit to one man except for his divine quality." 

"The king's divine nature is explicitly declared to be the basis of his rule over his subjects." The people respected the king and obeyed his authority by virtue of his divine qualities.
As a result of good training and imparting the habit of adhering to 'dharma', the rule of many of the kings of the Badami Chalukyas was beneficial to the people. The king no doubt exercised all authority by himself. But he could never be a despot. His powers were limited by conventions and the 'dharma' to which he had to adhere. Hsien-Csang in his itinerary gives a graphic account of the rule of the Chalukya kings, the political conditions and nature of the people. His account shows that he was impressed by the power and greatness of Pulakesi whom he describes in the following glowing terms: "He is of the race of Kshatriyas. His name is Pulakesi. His ideas are large and profound and he extends widely his sympathy and benefactions. . . . . . .

the state maintains a body of brave champions to the number of several hundreds. Whenever there is a march, these warriors march in front to the sound of the drum. Besides they intoxicate many fierce elephants. . . . . . .

no enemy can dare stand before them in battle. The king, proud in the possession of these men and elephants, treats with contempt the neighbouring kingdoms". The Chinese Pilgrim, further describes the heroic temperament of the Kannada people of that period. He natives are tall and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude, but he that offends them will not escape their revenge....
When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally, they make him wear women's clothes and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds.................194.

Ap. endices on Royalties, Crest, Capital city visitors etc. at the end of the thesis.
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