Chapter VI

The Local Government
The Local Government

Section 1

The Village

Dr. T.V. Mahalingam rightly observes that "the foundation of any stable administration must necessarily be the village not only on account of its great antiquity but also on account of the fact that people in it are known to one another and have interests which converge on well recognized objects." The village was the smallest unit of administration. It was administered by the village assembly headed by the gāvunda. A group of villages formed a nādu for administration. There were towns, inhabited by merchants and businessmen, which were administered by the town-assembly called Nagara-Sāmīha. These local bodies were autonomous.

In the present study of the local government our main aim is to describe the part played by the officers of the government and not the self-governing bodies whose activities have been discussed in several other works. The village was usually under the control of the heads of the families inhabiting it. The gāvunda and the assembly shared the responsibility of maintaining the well-being of the village. The gāvunda was the village headman. He was the pivot round which the entire administrative machinery of the
village revolved. It is evident, from the records of this period that the office of the gavunda was bestowed either by the people of the village, or the nādagāvunda, or the king’s officer, or the king himself, upon a person who distinguished himself by rendering public service, particularly in the village or villages over which he was appointed. In A.D. 1180 Bammagāvunda obtained the gavundike of Sembolar by the favour of Amarāvaradēva in the presence of prominent men and guilds. During the rule of Jagadēkamalla I in A.D. 1026 Kundamarasa was administering the province of Banavāsi 12,000. At this time Baysarayya got the office of the gavunda of Karbhūru from Senevallarasa who was the Nādagāvunda of Basavūra 140. In A.D. 1085 Mahāmandalēsva Trībhuvanamalla Gagāe Permādēva presented to perggaṇe Nokayya a gavundavṛitti (headman’s inam lands) of eight villages. In A.D. 1081 Dandānayaka Kambayya gave the gavundagodage (headman’s lands) to Honnagāvunda who had built two tanks there in the name of his parents. The king gave this office of the gavunda to an individual of his choice.

Further, it may be noted that these gavundas were men of distinguished qualities. The three gavundas, Parama-gavunda, Śaṅkara-gavunda and Udayamarasa of the village Bāṭtūru were said to be foremost in all good qualities (akhila gunāgrani-galu) and earnest in performing works of merit (dharma-kāryyam nere nādalkāgrahīgal). Barma-gavunda was skilled in all arts and Śaṅkaragāvunda had obtained much fame (urbi sannuta kirtī).
It is interesting to note that some villages had more than one gāvunda. A Ratta inscription\(^9\) states that Sugandha-varti had twelve headmen. We further learn from the same record that the village of Elavore and the āgrahāra of Hasudi were each headed by the same number of gāvundas viz., twelve.\(^1\)

It is recorded that the local administration of Sundi was looked after by six gāvundas and eight ādīn. Sometimes we find these gāvundas administering different parts of the same village. Thus in the place called Linga (Lingasugur in Raichur district) there were separate headmen for its eastern and western parts.\(^1\)

An epigraph from Kardikal speaks of the Samūha, three ērodeyas and the ādīn of two puras who were associated with the transaction of the gift there.\(^1\) This might be due to the large extent of the place which necessitated the appointment of more than one ērodea (gāvunda) of the kind to cope up with the greater amount of work.

The term prabhu which also means chief or head is met with in epigraphs. The precise significance of the two terms ērodea and prabhu is not clear. But they appear to be synonymous terms. This becomes clear from the description of the ērodeyas in a record\(^1\) which is prefaced by a reference to them as prabhus.

The rent-free land of gāvundagodege constituted the mainstay of the gāvunda. An inscription from Kotavamachige refers to his sources of income viz., a rent-free land, a house site, dues from sales and performance of rites like sacrifices, upanayanas and marriages and the fees paid on
the occasions of festivals like Badube, Karapunnume, and Dipalige. Voluntary contributions were made to the gavunda for his services towards his fellowmen.

As the chief executive, the gavunda shared all the responsibilities of the village assembly. There are many instances of the gavundas, either individually or along with other bodies helping in the construction and maintenance of tanks, aravattigaa or water-sheds, guest-houses, gateways and other public works.

We have seen above that the distinguished officers of the central and provincial government were honoured with rewards, titles and the like for the meritorious services rendered by them. A similar practice was followed even with regard to the officers of the local government like the gavundas. Further, it is interesting to note that these officials received honours not only from the king but also from the members of the royal family and the governors of provinces. During the reign of Jagadékamalla Jayasinghadéva in A.D. 1032, Māraśinga was the gavunda of Behûr in Eyyatta 70 of Banavâsi 12,000. He obtained the name of Jagadékamalla gavunda and all royal emblems from the king. In A.D. 1067 (January 3), when Sômēsvara I was ruling, Mahâmandalâsvâra Ōyimâdeva was governing Banavâsi 12,000 and Panumgal 500, in the year Kâsava gavunda held the office of the gavunda of Pottiyur. He received from Hariga, the chief of the Kadamba family, many tokens of royalty, to wit, a number of yak-tail fans, a flag, a palace, drums, conches, parasols of many peacocks and feathers and a white parasol. Châlukya Gânga Permade
(Prince Vikramāditya VI) was pleased with him and said that he (Kēśava-gāvunda) was to him like a son and gave him the name Chālukya-Ganga-Vermādi. Prince Vikramāditya VI gave the royal emblems of the Gangas and the Chālukyas to Kēśi gāvunda, viz., the honour of the excellent white parasol, a pair of golden yak-tail fans, a flag, a warrior's drums, a parasol of peacock feathers. In A.D. 1101 under Tribhuvanamalla Pōysala Dēva, Chinnagāvunda the son of Pōysala-gāvunda, had acquired the privilege of having the musio of the pañonamahāsabda.

In addition to the gāvunda, who was an officer trusted by both the government and the people, there appears to have been a government officer probably of the equal status in some villages. In A.D. 974 in the village Kadkeri (Bijapur district) there was a village administrator (Adhikārī) in addition to the headman.

In the village there was the accountant called sēnabōva or kulakarni. The sēnabōva of the village seems to have been appointed by the village assembly. The post was always hereditary. The Sōmasvāra Sātaka of about A.D. 1200, emphasises the fact that the sēnabōva was both the servant of the community in the village as well as of the government. Further, it is said that he was to be loyal to the government and at the same time win the affection of the people. He must be impartial and straight like the balance which does not lean to any one side. He should expose enemies whether they were outsiders or his own fellowmen. In addition, there was the watchman of the village.
Section 2

The Agrahāras

In the lexicon the term agrahāra is defined as a village assigned to Brāhmaṇas for their maintenance. Thus, the agrahāra was a grant of the village given by the king or his officers to an individual or individuals who became its inhabitants. Taila II gave Manigavalli (Managoli, Bijapur District) to Tālavāghanīśāsa an agrahāra which he divided it among 500 Brāhmaṇas including himself. He and his descendants became the headmen (ūrodeya) of that village. In A.D. 1012 Dandaṇāyaka Kesavayya who was administering the two six-hundreds, after seeking permission from the king, made Ummēchige in Narayanagal 12, into an agrahāra, and granted it to Māṃnara Śrīdharabhatṭa of Rōṇa. The latter entrusted the village to the 104 Māhājanas. Śrīdharabhatṭa and his descendants were to be the headmen (māhāprabhus) of this agrahāra.

The ūrodeya in an agrahāra was the executive head corresponding to the gāvunda in the village. It is noticed that in a number of cases the head of the agrahāra was a nominee of government. He divided the lands of the village among other Brāhmaṇas. These Brāhmaṇas constituted the self-governing body called the Māhājanas of the agrahāra. The remuneration of the ūrodeya consisted chiefly of income from lands and house sites that were granted to him.

The Māhājanas of the agrahāra were men of great qualities. Inscriptions generally describe them as practising
self-control, well-versed in the Vedas and devoted to meditation, silence, prayer and religious vows. Some of them learned were skilled in philosophic systems like Mīmāṃsa, Lōkayata, Bāudhā, Sāṅkhyā, Vaiśeṣika and other śāstras and āgamas. They were also the performers of agnistoma and all other sacrifices.

The number of the Mahājanas varied from agrahāra to agrahāra as is evidenced by epigraphs. The agrahāra of Balguli had fifty Mahājanas. There were two hundred Mahājanas at Maladalur agrahāra. The agrahāra of Kukkanūr had one thousand Mahājanas.

The assembly of the Mahājanas could be summoned by an officer or by a governor. In A.D. 1053 Kadamba Mahāmendalaśvara Harikāsarī sent a summoner (Bali) to the three hundred and Mahājanas of the agrahāra Nīrili, convening them made over the house tax to them for the expenses of the tank known as Piriyaṇkere. In A.D. 1054 Dāsimayya, the manneya of the Kisugundi agrahāra summoned the fifty Mahājanas led by the Urodeva and made a grant of fifteen gadyānas. The Mahājanas met on their own initiative also. Perhaps these meetings must have been routine ones. In A.D. 1075 the one thousand Mahājanas of Lokkigundi headed by their Urodeva met and granted for god Marutēśvara the income from a tax on oil mill and an orchard.
The Mahājana met at a prominent public place in the agrahāra. The Mahājana of Ummahige agrahāra met in the assembly hall meant for that purpose. Temples in agrahāras served as the meeting places of the Mahājana. In A.D. 1144 the Mahājana of Hūvina hadagile met in Kōtisankaradēva temple. The Mahājana also met in public places like schools. The Mahājana of Kukkanūr met in a Brahmaṇa sāle in Kukkanūr in A.D. 1093. Sometimes they met in open places also. The Mahājana of Hosaholalu and others assembled beneath the banyan tree at the northern gate of the agrahāra.
Section 3

The Nadu:

Size of the Nadu:

A group of villages came together and formed a nādu with a view to regulate their common matters. The number of villages that a nādu comprised varied. Thus, in A.D. 985 a certain Eragērī was holding the office of nādagāvunda over a group of 500 villages. During the year A.D. 1028 Kannama was the nādagāvunda of Basavūra 140. In A.D. 1092 Boppadeva was holding the office of nādagāvunda of Nāgara-khanda 70. Jaggayya was the nādagāvunda of Jede 12.

Executive:

Just as every village had the uragavunda as its head, the nādu had a nāda-gāvunda who is also called nālgāvunda in many records. Nādagāvunda, as the term itself clearly indicates, was the headman of the nādu. Usually the nādagāvundas were chosen because of their outstanding qualities. For example, in a record dated A.D. 1045 Nārgāvunda -- Chāvunda is described as yama (death) to the forces of the foes, kārya brihaspati (Brihaspati in work), vādyavidya vāhaspati (skilled in musical instruments), saranāgata vajrapanjara (diamond cage to those who sought refuge in him), vinaya vikhyāta (renowned for politeness), sujena prasama (encouraged good men), sāhasottunga (great adventurer), ēkanga vīra (excellent warrior), kadana prēchanda (master of battles) and so on. In course of time
the office of nādagāvunda once chosen became hereditary as and the it was the case with the offices of the gāvunda, senābōva and others. A record dated A.D. 918, six decades earlier to the period under study, gives us an interesting account of the office of the nādagāvunda of Nāgarakhanda 70, being continued to the widow Jakkiyabbe on the death of her husband Sattarasā Nāgarjuna. She was a Jain and rejoicing in her beauty, was distinguished for the skill and ability of her management. Though a woman, the record says, she protected the nād well with pride in her own courage. But on being attacked by some bodily disease, she retired in favour of her daughter and ended her life with the performance of the Jain vow of Sallekhana (death by starvation).

The emoluments of nādagāvunda must have been similar to those of the gāvunda of the village. An undated Harlakunte inscription 48 says that nādagāvunda was given by the people of his nādu, land of the sowing capacity of half a khanduga and the right to collect aya (a fee), house tax, and tolls on merchandise. There was the accountant of the nādu called Nādasēmabōva 49 who was also known as Nādakarana. 50

Assembly of the Nād:

The nād assembly was also known as the nādu. 51 It consisted of the gāvundas or headmen of villages who represented their respective village assemblies. About A.D. 1074 52 in Devalige 70 the nād assembly consisted of seventy gāvundas or headmen which clearly establishes this. The nād assembly
met whenever requests for the same were made by certain
individuals to settle important issues. Thus, for instance,
Kalagavunda assembling the brahuis of Barasul
in A.D. 1129 Manigavunda, son of Binavura and other places
in Edenād 70 showed them the canal and the tank he had built
and requested the nadu to give land for the maintenance of
the tank. Besides these special meetings the nad assembly
must have met periodically to discuss the routine matters.
At these meetings government officials also were present.

In the nadu there was a nādarasa who was a government
officer. He was assisted by the nādgāvunda. The functions
of nādarasa were general in character. Thus an inscription
dated A.D. 1045 records certain gifts to a matha and
adds that the matha was a neishthika sthāna, a place meant
for celibates. Further the record says that if any of its
inmates failed in practising celibacy it would be the duty
of the arasa ruling the nadu, acting with the manneya and
ūrōdaya to expel such persons from there and install others
who would observe the vows correctly. The nādarasa and —
nālgāvunda were present when in A.D. 1058 Aychagāvunda
of Posavur made an endowment to the basadi built by him in
memory of his wife Kaṇchikabbe. Unfortunately not many
details are available regarding the duties of nādarasa.
Section 4

The Town:

The towns which were the head-quarters of the feudatory chiefs and other provincial governors. The towns were given special charters by princes and high government officials. Thus we see a constitution (śāsana maryyāde) being given to the capital, town of Sudā by all the ministers of Akkādevi together with the nāḍpergaḍe. This statutory constitution (śāsana maryyāde) granted to the town of Sudā prescribed even minute details regarding the construction of shops and houses. Such houses were immune from all imposts including land rent (śiddhāya) for two years (śrābes). After this they were to be charged with sarva-āya annually. Finally they were to pay a fixed land rent of 18 gold gadyānas to the department of charities.

We see in one instance that when an extension of a town was to be made it had to receive the sanction of the head of the division in which the town was situated. Thus an inscription dated A.D. 1074 states that Mahāśatama Jayakesi-yarasa, who was the Rāṣṭrāṅga of the Purigere 300 division, visited Permi-Basadi at Purigere and made it into an extension (pura) at the request of Tribhuvanachandrapandita. Thus, we notice that when a town was established its constitution was approved by the government and when its extension took place, it had to receive a similar sanction.
The representatives of the town inhabited by merchants and businessmen were called the nakaras and their assembly was known as Nakara-sanmūha. Nakbara, a variant of nakara, also occurs in many records. The original term must evidently be the Sanskrit negara and instances of the use of this expression are not lacking.

The chief executive of the town-assembly was pattanasvāmi or mayor. The number of pattanasvāmis in a place depended upon the extent of the town. There were three pattanasvāmis in Balligāve. The pattanasvāmi enjoyed the confidence of the government and the people of the town. Thus, for instance, in a record Pattanasvāmi Nokkayya of Pombushaha is described as a dweller at the feet of king Vīra Sāntaradēva and also an ornament to the face of the citizens. The functions of pattanasvāmi were similar to those of the gāvunda of a village. He built temples, tanks and such other works of public utility. Apart from the mayor, the other officials who were indispensable were the senābōva and talāra. Mostly taxes like land-tax, house-tax and tolls and fines constituted financial resources of the town assembly. Sometimes, when a village grew into a town the old administrative arrangements were continued along with the new ones. Thus in Yalisirūr, the old okkalu, with their headmen worked with the new town assembly. In Südi when the charter (vyavastha) was revived the Settis also functioned along with the households and their headmen. Besides merchants and households, the Mahājanas of the brāhmaṇapuri also joined the town assembly. The mathes or monasteries were also represented probably by their athūnapatis in the assembly.
We have seen above how the king's officers participated in the administration of smaller divisions like the village, the agrahāra, the nādu and the town. Besides these, there were also local hereditary chieftains who administered small territorial divisions. These offices were bestowed upon them by the royal feudatories. The chiefs of Banihatti were perhaps the most outstanding members who were subordinate to the Rattas. It is said that Rudrabhatta, a renowned poet, received eighteen villages, of which Banihatti was the chief, as a reward for his proficiency in the art of poetry from Karna, a Ratta chieftain. Thus he came to possess the proprietorship of these eighteen villages. The members of this family played an important part under the Rattas for about two centuries. For instance, Mallikārjuna, a member of this family rose to fame as a counsellor of Munichandradēva, the chief minister in the administration of Sugandhavarti.

Under the Rattas the Nāyakas of Nesarige were administering the circle of six villages of which Nesarige was the chief town. There were six headmen (gāvundas) for the six villages of that circle.

The chiefs of Kōlāra rendered military services to the Rattas. The headship of Kōlāra was a hereditary one. For instance, on the death of Mādirāja, Bijjavve, his elder sister assumed the headship of Kōlāra. She continued to hold the office till the day of the marriage of Gauri, the daughter of Mādirāja. This village was then presented to Mallikārjuna of Banihatti, the bridegroom of Gauri, as dowry.
Section 5:
The Relation between the Local Government and the Provincial Government

We may now consider the relation that existed between the local government and the provincial government. It is necessary to understand how these two spheres of administration supplemented and complemented each other in realising security and the welfare of the people. This relation may be studied under the following heads:

(a) Provincial governor as a source of authority of the gavunda.
(b) The relation in religious matters.
(c) The relation with regard to public works.

(a) Provincial Governor as a source of authority of the gavunda

The provincial governor was a source of authority of the gavunda. As seen earlier in A.D. 1085 Mahāmandalāśvāra Tribhuvamalla-Ganga-Permādi presented Senior Perggade Nokkayya with the gavunda-vritti of the eight villages, twenty horses and five hundred slaves together with the fixed rent of the villages. To note another instance, in A.D. 1103 (October 15) Mahāmandalāśvāra Tailapa was governing the division of Pānumgallu 500. He endowed the village Gejjihalli situated in the tract of Edevolal 70 to Boppagavunda of the Gejje family and named the village after his family.
In matters of religion there existed a close administrative link between the two. The provincial governor issued commands to the officers of the local government to make grants to temples. The governor along with the gāvunda and the Mahājanas made endowments to temples. The governor made gifts to temples built by the gāvundas and the Mahājanas. And grants made by provincial governors were entrusted to the care of the gāvundas and the Mahājanas.

A few instances may now be noted. In A.D. 1074 Dandañaya Udādityadēva was administering the Sayiramumam (the thousand ?), the vaddarāvula, the perijunka of Banavāse 12,000, and the perijunka of Sāntalīge 1,000 province. By his order, Dātāgāvunda of Torevardhana in the Nāgarakanda 70 of Banavāse 12,000 made a grant of land in memory of his father Kappagāvunda and his mother Aresiyabbe gāvundi for the repairs, incense and offerings in the temple of god Gangesvara. Further grants of land were made for the matha and for burning oil lamps there.

The gāvundas made grants in concert with others at the command of provincial governors. In A.D. 1066 during the reign of Sōmēśvara I, Vishnuvardhana Mahārāja Vijayādityadēva was administering the Nalambavādi 32,000 province. By his order Dandañāyaka Dévapayya Perkgade and the Chief Accountants Nāgatiyarasa of the Thousand Manneya, Mūkarasa of the Twelve Manneya, prabhus of the place, Mācha Gāvunda and Mala Gāvunda made a grant for the decorations of the temple of Mulemathagod Mahādeva of Bettur.
The gāvundas were invited to make endowments. Under king Vikramāditya VI in A.D. 1123
Gonka was administering Tēridāla 12 in Kūndī 3,000 province. He erected the
Gonka jinālāya and invited the twelve headmen, with all
their subjects and dependants, the Settiguttas and other
Nakaras to provide for the support of the priests of the
temple of Nēminātha for the worship of god and for repairs.
Gonka himself gave 72 matters of land and one matter of
garden land to the temple. The twelve headmen and 60
families of the place gave one measure out of twelve heaps
of corn to the temple. The Settiguttas and other Nakaras
of that place of different professions gave a share in the
revenues derived from the sale of betel leaves.

The gāvundas made gifts along with the provincial
governors. In A.D. 1138 Jayakēśi II was governing the
division of Halasīge 12,000. He granted a field for the
worship of god Śrī Svayambhu Kalidēva. The gāvundas of the
village Māndūr granted a flower garden and coins etc. for
the worship of the same deity.

The gāvundas made requests to provincial governors to
make gifts to temples. Thus, for instance, in A.D. 1005
Mahāsāṃanta Sōbhānaraṣa was governing Halasīge 12,000,
Bēlvōla 300 and Purīgēre 300. He made a grant of six
matter of land to Revabbe Goravi of the temple of Mūlasthāna
at the request of the Eight gāvundas and Sixty tenants of
Sīrivūra.
Gifts made by provincial governors were kept under the protection of the gavundas and the Mahājanas. In A.D. 1060, Dandanayaka Nāgadevayya was governing Kisukād 70, Toragere 60. His seigniors Dadigayya, Doddayya, Ajjarayya and others made over a part of their revenues to a pious foundation. And this was taken charge of by the gavundas and the Eight settis of Sundi.

In A.D. 1069 and 1075 Dandanayaka Kottimayya administered Kisukād 70 and Chandravarti. He made a gift to god Achalesvara and it was kept under the protection of the Six gavundas and Eight settis. Also here it may be noted that sometimes gifts made by the gavundas were placed under the custody of a higher authority in the division. For instance, in A.D. 1121 (December 16) during the reign of Vikramaditya VI, Mahamandalesvara Tribhuvanamalla Pandyadeva was governing the province of Nolamba-vādi 32,000. His subordinate Mahamandalesvara Ghattiyarasa was ruling over Kōgali 500 which was a sub-division of the province. The Brāhmaṇa Nāgavarmayya Nāyaka was the headman of the village Sōgi. He built the temple of Keśavadeva. Together with his brothers Kalimayya Nāyaka and Mahādevayya Nāyaka, he made a gift of land for the daily worship of the god there. Mahamandalesvara Ghattiyarasa was made the guardian of the gift.

The provincial governors made gifts to temples built by gavundas. Thus, for example, in A.D. 1121-22 during the reign of Vikramaditya VI, prince Jayakarna was governing Kundi 3,000 province. Nidhiyama gavunda built a shrine
of Jina at Kondanuru. Prince Jayakarṇa made a grant to this Jaina basadi.

Sometimes gavundas and Mahājanae made gifts with the permission of the provincial heads. In A.D. 1113(December 24), Mahāmāndalēśvara Permādiyaresa administered Māsavādi 140. Kaligavunda, with the sanction of Mahāmāndalēśvara Permādiyaresa made a gift of land to the Mallikārjuna temple built by Per gade Jōgi Setti at Kakkūra in Māsavādi mādu included in Kuntaladēsa. In A.D. 1125 the Mahājanae of Abbeyagēri made a gift of land to god Sōmeśvara after washing the feet of Mallikārjuna Pandita, with the permission of Mahāmāndalēśvara Acharasa.

Provincial governors or their officers made gifts to Mahājanae for services to be rendered in temples. In A.D. 1087 Sōmeśvara Śhatta Dandanāyaka governed the two six hundred province (viz., Belvola 300 and Purigere 300). His subordinate officers Per gade Śivarāja and the toll officer Dandanāyaka Śavara along with Singabhūpati and Vatsarāja made a gift of certain taxes to Māchi Rudramaya, the ārodeya and the Two-hundred Mahājanae of Martyapura for the benefit of the temple of Bhōgeśvara in that village.

(c) The Relationship in Public Works

Gifts were made to Mahājanae by the officers of governors for maintenance of public works. During the reign of Vikramāditya VI in A.D. 1082 (December 25) Trailōkamallavēra-Nolamba-Pallava-Permēnadi Jayasinghadeva was governing Purigere 300, Belvola 300, Banavāsi 12,000 and Kundūr 1,000.
His subordinate officer Dandanāyaka Vāmadēva made a gift of income accruing from fines on offences such as defamation, assault, etc. for the benefit of the Kadalagere tank to the Ürodeya and the Two-hundred Mahājanēś of the agrahāra. In the year corresponding probably to A.D. 1041 (November 1), during the rule of Jagadēkamalla I, Mahāsāṃanta Ereyamma of the Ratta family was administering Kündi 3,000. He made a gift of certain incomes accruing from fines etc. to the Mahājanē of Daivada Mantūru and to Ürodeya Madhusūdānāya for digging a tank called Rattasamudra in that place.

The Gavundas and Mahājanēs made requests to governors to make grants for tanks and such other amenities. In A.D. 1080, Dandanāyaka Tambarasa was governing Sāntalige 1,000, Mandali 1,000, Jiddulige 70, Nagarakhanda 70. He had an officer, named Lōkenāthaiya, who was a perggade over Sāntalige 1,000. In this year the Mahājanēs of Banniyūr agrahāra, situated in Sāntalige 1,000 and Lōkenāthaiya requested Dandanāyaka Tambarasa to reconstruct the breached tank. He gave the income from the quit rent (śiddhēya) of the village Banniyūr for two years, and got it rebuilt and named it Tambasamudra.

Mahāmandalēśvara Ācharasa administered Kisukād 70 in A.D. 1113 (March 19). He had a subordinate officer, Ācharāja who was a perggade of Abbeyagere in Nareyangal 12 of Belvola 300. At the request of Acharāja, eight Gavundas and sixty families and others, Mahāmandalēśvara Ācharasa renewed the lapsed grant of land to the tank Ďēvīngere.
Gifts were made by the officers of governors in concert with the Mahājanas for public utilities. In A.D. 1010 (May 1), Iriva Nolambadhirāja ruled over Nolambavāḍī 32,000, Kangali (Kōgalī ?) 500, Ballakunde 300, the Kukkanūr 30 and the five towns in Māsavāḍī. His subordinate officer Mahāprachandadandanāyaka Vameyalāhatta, having received land from the Brodeya, in concert with the Two-hundred (Mahājanas) of Ālūr, presented it as an endowment to Amarāchārya of Guheya Matha of Sirivūra for the benefit of his monastery.

Provincial governors made gifts for public utilities and entrusted them to the Mahājanas. Thus, for instance, in A.D. 990 (October 21) during the reign of Tāla II, Chattayyadeva of the Kadamba family was governing Panungallu 500. He made a gift of all lands in Easangere for the feeding house and entrusted it to the Mahājanas of Mandegōdi.

In A.D. 1021 when Jayasimha II was ruling Akkādēvi was governing Kiskūkād 70. In memory of her elder brother -- Vikramāditya V she allotted the Perūr agrahāra as a saṃvamsa grant. And the grant thus made by her was to be preserved by the Four-hundred Mahājanas of Perūr.
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Taila II, a powerful king, re-established the Chalukya power and the able rulers like Somaswara I and Vikramaditya VI retained and consolidated the empire they inherited. During its hey-day the Chalukya empire spread from modern Nagpur in the North to the areas beyond the Tungabhadrā in the South. Able as they were, the members of this family ruled Karnātaka for over two centuries bestowing upon their subjects the benefits of benevolent administration.

It was a period when new dynasties like the Cholas in the South and the Paramāras and Gurjaras in the North vied with one another for supremacy. The Chalukyas whose territory lay in between had to be on constant vigil and ready to drive out the enemy making inroads into their territory. The Chalukyas had to be on the offensive in their efforts to expand their empire in all directions. Hence they had to wage many wars with their neighbours. It was precisely because of the good administration of that the subjects lived happily unaffected by the hardships and miseries of wars, and therefore their normal life remained undisturbed. The records do not speak of people taking notice of victories won by their rulers. This can be seen in the case of the battle of
Koppam of which the Chalukya records are silent, while the Chola records of the period give exaggerated account of the battle and always take the credit of victory. But only when the common man's routine was disturbed and institutions were affected did the people take cognizance of political activities that caused such dislocations. It was this peace and security which prevailed in the country that made Bihana to remark that Vikramaditya VI revived Ramarajya and Vijnanesvara exclaim that neither has been previously nor would there be in the future a king like Vikramaditya VI.

The Chalukyas selected able persons for imperial services. These officers were promoted to higher ranks as and when they showed their merit. There was no limit to which an efficient officer could rise. We can say that careers were open to talent. People of all castes participated in the administration of the realm. Besides, people were associated with the administration in the villages, towns and groups of villages and towns. The government officers in charge of these units enjoyed the confidence of both the people and the government. The evolution of such offices like the village head-man may be considered as a contribution of India to public administration.

Further, we find that people in general were always ready to defend their homes and property, as also their country. The innumerable hero-stones strewn all over the Chalukya empire speak eloquently of the courage of the heroes who laid down their lives in the defence of their
neighbours, their property and the honour of their women. Inhabitants in villages, very often risked their lives in meeting such situations. Thus one can see that people then were instilled with the spirit of courage and self-reliance.

In spite of this apparent success of the Chalukya administration the practice of entrusting the administration of territories to the vanquished royal families had its own evil consequences, as it was the case with many dynasties of the period. These feudatory families often nursed the ambition of reviving their fallen fortunes. When the suzerain was powerful these feudatories kept quiet and even professed loyalty, but the moment he showed his weakness they took advantage of it to become independent. And it was exactly the case which happened when a weak ruler like Taila III ascended the throne. Kalachuri Bijjala who aspired for independence had slowly strengthened himself and finally ousted his overlord. The Yādavas and the Hoysalas also asserted their independence. And this served as a signal for other feudatories - big and small - to overthrow their allegiance to the Chalukyas.
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