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Section I Qualifications of Ministers

Writers on Hindu polity are at one in saying that the chariot of government never moves on a single wheel and therefore they strongly recommend that a king should always act in consultation with a group of ministers and with their cooperation. The machinery of central administration of the Chalukyas does not run contrary to the ideas of ancient writers on polity. In the contemporary work Manasollasa we are told that the king should arrive at certain policies after consultation with ministers. There is ample evidence to show that the Chalukyas were not far removed from the ideal set in the Manasollasa in seeking advice and help of their ministers who, from the way they are introduced in their inscriptions, seem to have earned the appreciation of their masters by rendering faithful service.
The qualifications of ministers are laid down in the Manasollása. He must be a native of the country, born of high family, influential, well trained in arts, far-sighted, wise, of good memory, vigilant, eloquent, bold, intelligent, endowed with enthusiasm and dignity, capable of endurance, pure in mind and actions, well disposed, firmly devoted to the king, endowed with character, strength, health, spirits high, free from arrogance and fickleness, affectionate and one who would not have recourse to hatred even when offended by the king. It may be noted that much earlier, Somadeva in his Yāṇavatikā has stated that those alone who were in constant fear of their lives and who had no motives of self-interest in deliberations deserved to be consulted by kings and not those who were like leeches. Further, he says that often the minister's position, understandably, was unenviable, as he was bound to obey the king and follow his directions. But this, according to him, might lead to his doing what was against the interests of the people. In such instances, however, a conscientious minister would be in an uncomfortable dilemma. The fact that the Chālukyas paid much attention to these qualifications while seeking men to occupy the exalted positions of ministers is amply borne out by inscriptions of this period and a few are cited below.

Ravidēva was a loyal and versatile minister. His descent and career are set forth in great detail in the Yēwūr inscription of A.D. 1077 and in another epigraph of A.D. 1090. He was a master of many languages and scripts.
In addition, he was also a distinguished musician and when he began to play, every one present asked, "Is not this a downpour of fresh honey, or a river of nectar, that is falling upon?" By the splendour of his vast learning he obtained the office of Lāla-Sandhivigrahin from the ruler Āhavamalla Sōmesvara I. Subsequently, Sōmesvara II was pleased to appoint him as both Army Chief (Senāchitya) and Senior Minister for Peace and War (Hērī Sandhivyagrihikā). And further, when Vikramāditya VI became the ruler, he bestowed on Ravidēva all the insignia of royalty such as white umbrella, the great drum and the flywhisk. Thus, Ravidēva had the unique distinction of having served by his merit three Chālukya monarchs successively "like a hand-mirror in their hands" and his achievement is all the greater because two of these monarchs - Sōmesvara II and Vikramāditya VI - did not see eye to eye with each other. But he had the confidence of both the rulers.

An even more gifted minister was Sōmesvarabhatta. The Gadag inscription of the 23rd year of the Chālukya Vikrama era (A.D. 1098) contains a detailed account of this illustrious scholar-statesman. The most learned scholars came to consult Dandanāyaka Sōmesvarabhatta before reaching a decision on points of law or on the words and word order (pada and krama) of the texts of the Rigveda. He was a master of all branches of learning, sacred and secular (vaidika and laukika). Vikramāditya VI appointed him as the Superintendant of Religion (Dharmaḥikāra). Further, noticing his
extraordinary efficiency in the development of the fiscal resources of the empire and the complete integrity of his character, Vikramaditya VI made him the Pradhan mahamatiya and bestowed on him all the insignia of royalty. The king also put him in charge of the administration of grants and gifts and placed all the royal material resources at the disposal of Mahapradhana Somesvarabhatta.

Lastly we may refer to an equally distinguished minister Dandanayaka Bhivanayya. The Lakshmesvar inscription of the 27th year of the Chalukya-Vikrama era (A.D. 1102) refers to his outstanding qualities. Vikramaditya VI had a great regard for Dandanayaka Bhivanayya whom he considered as the greatest leader in battle and a perfect counsellor among the most capable. It looked as though there were no others equal to him. Being pleased at his conduct the ruler graciously honoured him and addressed him respectfully as "jiya" and spoke in words of high approval and admiration. Thus we notice that the Chalukyas chose usually men of proved trust and eminence as their ministers.
Section 2

Hereditary Ministership

There are instances to show that the Chalukya kings selected the sons and relatives of ministers while making new appointments to the ministry, provided they possessed the necessary qualifications for the same. This practice began from the time of the Guptas where we have examples of sons succeeding to the ministerial positions of their fathers. That such a practice prevailed even in our period becomes clear from a story narrated in a contemporary work Vaddārādhana. The story illustrates that the son could succeed his father to the high office of minister provided he was well qualified for the same. A king called Atibala, after the death of his minister Sōmasaraṇa, made enquiries whether the deceased minister had sons to succeed to the office. It was found that the minister was survived by two sons called Agnimitra and Vāyubhūti. Then the king summoned them to his court and examined their capabilities. But when the king realised that they were utterly ignorant he sent them away declaring that the ministership was given only to the person well versed in śāstras. (Śāstraṃgalaṃ balloṃgam mantripadaviyam bāllumāṃ pratipattiyumām kottudu). Incidentally it may be stated that the two sons were after several years of training and education found fit and appointed as ministers. Inscriptions also throw light on this aspect. A few examples may be cited here. The minister Mahāprachanda Dandanāyaka Kesavayya was administering the Belvola 300 and
Kesavarasa's eldest son Yavanarasa (Kesavarasara tadagra tamujam) was also a minister and held the office of Mehavanandhivigradhipati under Jayasimha II. Another similar example of ministership being hereditary is that of Dandanayaka Kalidasa. He was the son of Dandadhisa Madhusudana who was a prominent member of the council of ministers and held the office of Kaditavergade and Kannada Sandhivigrahi. Dandanayaka Kalidasa was raised to the rank of Mehapradhana and held the same offices of Kaditavergade and Kannada Sandhivigrahi.

In addition to the practice of sons succeeding their fathers as ministers we also find ministership being given to members of families who had distinguished themselves in the service of the empire. A few such examples will now be given.

Dandadhisa Madhusudana was a distinguished warrior and statesman. He belonged to the Vannasa family. About A.D. 1058 he was at the height of his career. In an inscription at Nagavari we get a detailed account of the history of this family of soldier-statesman. Madhusudana was the most distinguished member of this family. He was the third among the six sons of Kalidasa and Rabbanabbe. Kalidasa is described as the person who was greatly responsible for the rise and prosperity of the Chalukya territory. Bachiraja, the elder brother of Madhusudana, is said to have secured for his king the glory of imperial sovereignty.

Dandanayaka Anantapala was one of the most distinguished generals we come across in the administration of the Chalukyas of Kalyana. He was not the only member of his family who had rendered meritorious services to the
Chalukya monarchs. He was an outstanding minister. A stone epigraph dated A.D. 1126 gives us many details of the ancestors of Dandanaśaka Anantapāla. He was the son of Mahēśvara Dandāhipā who, by rendering yeoman's service to the Chalukyas, had earned the title Chalukyakulaśulasthambha (main pillar of the Chalukya family). Mahēśvara Dandāhipā was the son of Bhīma Dandāhinātha who exhibited great valour on battlefields and was the most prominent of the feudatories (sāmantaś) of the king.

The record further eulogises the members of the family of Anantapāla's nephew, Govindarasa, son of his sister Padumālavī. Gaṇēśvarachamūpa, the great grandfather of Dandanāśaka Govindarasa hailed from a celebrated Brahmana family of Madhyadesa. His son was Padmaṇābha and grandson Krishṇachamūpa, who is described as Kuntalavishaya Vadhūmandana (lord of the bride Kuntal region). It was this Krishṇachamūpa who married Padumaladevi and to them were born Lakṣma Dandanāśaka and Dandanāśaka Govindarasa. Dandanāśaka Govindarasa was another outstanding minister of the Chalukyas. Thus we notice the meritorious services rendered to the Chalukyas by the members of these two families which came from far off places.
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Section 3

Strength of the Council of Ministers:

It is said in the Manasollása that the king should select seven or eight ministers. However, regarding the actual composition of the ministry at the centre we have no direct information. Some inscriptions issued by the Silāhāras of North Konkan, who were the feudatories of the Chālukyas, frequently describe their entire council of ministers naming all the ministers and their respective portfolios. Thus under Silāhāra Chittarājadeva in A.D. 1024 the ministry consisted of five members. The Yadavas who were ruling over a small territory had a ministry of seven members in A.D. 1069.

The Śūḍī inscription dated A.D. 1050 gives us the details of the ministry that functioned when Akkādevī was governing the territories of Kīsukād 70, Toragere 60, and Māsīyavādi 140. The council of ministers consisted of seven members: Superintendent (Maneverggade) Kalīdāsaya, Councillor (Tantrapāla) Millayya, Tantrapāla Chittimayya, Pradhāna Dāmanna, Aliya Chaudimayya, Adapada (Bearer of the Betel Bag) Chāvundarāya, Tamtrada Senābōvat (Secretary of the Council) Dasimayya (antu samasta pradhānaruṃ).

It can be said that the council of ministers of Akkādevī, who was a member of the royal family and possessed rich administrative experience, might have closely resembled that of the imperial council. The writers on polity do
not enunciate any hard and fast rule regarding the strength of the ministry. The number varied from eight to twenty and some predecessors of Kautilya preferred very small ministries of two to four. In actual practice the Hindu ruler seems to have remembered the view of Kautilya that the strength of the ministry should correspond to the needs of the situation and acted accordingly. Taking into account the size of the territory, the Chalukyas must have had a large ministry and definitely larger than those of their feudatories, mentioned above.
Section 4

Individual Ministers:

The administration of the empire had become complex and demanded the services of intelligent and distinguished ministers. In modern systems of administration we distinguish between ministers and secretaries of various departments. In earlier times, at any rate, in mediaeval India, it is difficult to make such a distinction. Hence in what follows we include officers who in modern terminology might have been only secretaries and not ministers. However, care has been taken to include under individual ministers only those who have been called as Mahāpradhāna in the records.

The Royal Priest (Purohita) appears to have been one of the most important ministers. The Mānasollāsa\textsuperscript{19} prescribes that the priest must be well-versed in the Vedas, the principles of administration (dandanīti) and the performance of rituals. Further, he should be acquainted with the sciences of astronomy and astrology and be able to calculate the movements of the planets and their influence. In a Kādaśa inscription at Dēgāśa belonging to Śivachitaśrīśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaśrīśaș
of the Purūhita’s part in the council of ministers.

The Minister for Peace and War (Sandhivigrahi) was an important member of the ministry. The designation literally means "the maker of peace and war." The qualifications required for the Sandhivigrahi are many. The Mānasollāsa among others includes qualifications like competent acquaintance with many languages and scripts and outstanding tact and skill in dealing with sāmantas and māndalikas i.e., feudatories and vassals, besides shrewedness in diplomacy and finance. The functions of the sandhivigrahi were of vital importance and touched the whole range of imperial relations, internal as well as external. The Chālukya territory contained a large number of feudatory kingdoms. These feudatories were to be dealt with properly by the sandhivigrahi.

In Sōmadēva's Yasastilaka some of the functions of the Sandhivigrahin are described. It is said that he received the envoys of friendly courts and ushered them into the king's presence; and dealt also with the envoy of a hostile court, addressed him and drafted a threatening letter to the enemy. The Sandhivigrahin was thus in charge of matters affecting peace and war and he was in close attendance on the king. Sōmadēva tells us that he should be able to read, write, narrate and interpret all scripts and languages. He should be ready-witted and capable of gauging the relative strength of his own master and other princes.
Many records show that the Sandhivigrahi was also normally in charge of drafting the copper plate charts, granting lands and villages to Brahmans, temples and monasteries. This practice looks strange, but Dr. Altekar has pointed out that these charters had usually to describe the genealogy of the dynasty with the exploits and achievements of each ruler, and therefore it was the Sandhivigrahi who was the best person to approve of the texts of such grants. An anonymous text cited in the Mitakshara expressly states that the Sandhivigrahi should draft the copperplate grants.

Understandably, the work of the Sandhivigrahi was heavy and exacting. It was divided region-wise. Even the small Silahara kingdom of Chittarajadeva had one Mahasandhivigrahi and another Sandhivigrahi for Karnataka. If such a feudatory kingdom required the services of two Sandhivigrakis, both of the status of a minister, one can very well realise that the Chalukya ministry must have had several Sandhivigrakis working under the directions of Mahasandhivigrahadhipati. In A.D. 1127 Dandanayaka Bhogabhallayya was the Sandhivigrahi for Karnataka. In A.D. 1147 Dandanayaka Bammasaayya was Heri Kannada Sandhivigrahi (senior minister for peace and war for Karnataka). In A.D. 1147 Dandanayaka Kesiimaya held the office of Heri Lata Sandhivigrahi (Senior Minister for Peace and War for Lata). In A.D. 1028-29 a Dandanayaka Vavanarsasa held the office of Mahasandhivigrahadhipati. Thus we notice that Mahasandhivigrahadhipati directed the affairs of this office with the help of many other Sandhivigrakis.
The *Sandhivigrahī* worked with the help of the envoys (dūtas). Sūmadēva in *Yaşastileka* as well as in *Nītivākyamrīta* explains the qualifications and functions of an envoy. The envoy should be an aged Brāhmaṇa, learned, eloquent, forbearing in the face of provocation and amiable. He should be efficient, courageous, pure, wise, bold and ready-witted.

Even when an envoy is entrusted by his master with a provocative message, he should regulate his speech according to the temperament, character, or the resources of the king to whose court he is sent. To a proud enemy he should speak in conciliatory terms; to one well-versed in polity he should talk about principles; to one who is powerful he should speak about dissensions among his subjects; while to an enemy inferior in resources he should speak in terms of war. The responsibility of an envoy is shown by the fact that the prosperity of a king, however great, is endangered by the misconduct of envoys who are greedy and rough in the manner and conduct of their speech.

**Espionage**

It would not be out of place to speak a few words about the espionage which as we know was a definite and well organized institution since the time of the Mauryas. Ancient writers like Manu, Yajñavalkya and Kautilya have discussed at great length the need for such organization and suggest the action to be taken by the king on the report of the spies. It must have been continued in this period though evidence for it is to be found only in literary works like *Nītivākyamrīta* and *Vikramāndēvāccharīta*. Understandably the spy organization must have been under the control of the Minister for Peace and War.
On espionage Somadeva seems to reflect the facts of his times and ever India. Broadly speaking secret agents fell into two classes, those who engaged themselves with discovering the misdeeds of officials and the feelings of subjects and those who sought to probe the intentions and plans of neighbouring rulers. In either case they were to disguise themselves as ascetics and scholars, mathematicians and astrologers, physicians and soldiers, tradesmen and artisans, singers and dancers, foresters and snake-charmers, sorcerers and jugglers and so forth. They must be paid adequately. In Vasastilaka, too, he is indebted to Kautilya in the description of the spy employed by the ruler. Reference is made by Somadeva to the chief of the secret agents and it was he who reported to the king the arrival of the spy from his tour.

Another important minister was the Chief of the Army (Sanadhipati). According to the Manasollasa he should come from a good family; possess refined character, great courage and proficiency in several languages; be clever in riding horses and elephants and in the use of arms, well-versed in the meaning of omens and the administration of medicine; and be liberal, sweet-tongued, self-controlled, intelligent and resolute. He was to be an expert in theory and practice of war and the art of organisation. Probably it was his duty to see that all forts were properly garrisoned and all branches of the army were properly equipped and were kept at the highest efficiency.
The Hitivākyamrita is opposed to the inclusion of the Chief of the Army in the Ministry. But the records of this period clearly show that this office of Sānāpati was held by Mahāpradhānās of eminence. A few examples may be noted in this regard. Dandanāyaka Mahādevavayya whom the record styles as Mahāpradhāna held the office of Senādhipati in A.D. 1138. Another distinguished general Kesārāja of the status of Mahāpradhāna held the office of Senādhipati in A.D. 1147. During the reign of Sōmeśvara IV in A.D. 1184 Mahāpradhānadandanāyaka Padmidēvarasa of the rank of Mahāpradhāna held this office of Senaipati.

There were other offices carrying out financial and revenue duties. There was the chief treasurer (Kōśādhyakša) who was selected by the king with great care. He was an important minister. The Hitivākyamrita describes that the treasury was the vital arm of the state and must be properly looked after. In A.D. 1147 Dandanāyaka Kesārāja held the office of Kōśādhyaksha (chief of the treasury). A similar practice prevailed in the courts of feudatories of Chālukyas. For instance, in the ministry of the Silēhāra only ruler Anantadēva though the ministry contained three members, the Treasurer was included in it.

The Revenue Minister (Kaditavergade) was another important member of the imperial council of ministers. Not many details are available regarding this office.

Dr. Altakar remarks that while making grants "the officer who must have been principally consulted by the king
must obviously have been the Revenue Member or Amātya, whose office used to keep the necessary records connected with land tenures and ownership.  

The Dharmaśīkāra was another minister in the imperial government. He was responsible for the proper administration of grants and gifts. The Manasollasa lays down that he should be well-versed in Smriti and Śāstras. Inscriptions also extol the qualities of Dharmaśīkāra.

The Minister of Records (Akaśapatalika) is mentioned in Yasastilaka. Judging from literary and epigraphic references, Akaśapatala was the royal archives containing the records of grants and deeds of gifts. From the Miraj plates of Jagadēkamalla Jayasimha II we learn that the Minister of Records (Mahākaśapatalika) had a number of Karanikas or clerks under him. The Government kept the originals of the copper-plates in a state Record of Rights at the capital.
Section 5
Ministers in charge
Management of the Royal Household:

The management of the royal household was entrusted to the ministers. Prominent among them was Aṃṭahpurāḍhyaśaka, the superintendent of the palace. When Vikramadevi VI was ruling, Dandanāyaṃka Bhīvanayya held this office. It was held by distinguished generals and statesmen. Dandanāyaṃka Anantapālarasā, one of the most distinguished ministers, held the offices of the Superintendent of the Royal Kitchen (Bāṇasaṃvergga, bānaśa literally means kitchen) and the Superintendent of the Royal Household (Maṇevārgga). There was another minister called Dandanāyaṃka Kesirāja who served the ruler Jagadekamalla II as the Mahāpasāyita (Chief of the Robes). Another important minister of the palace was — the Chief of the Property of the Court (Āsthānānavaṣṭunāyaṃka). In A.D. 1074 Dandanāyaṃka Udayāḍityadēva held this office. Still another office of importance was that of the Bearer of the Betel Bag (adapada). In A.D. 1147 Dandanāyaṃka Bommadēvarasā was holding this office. Inscriptions refer to the office of the king's officer (Rājāḥyaṃka). There was a Rājāḥyaṃka of Rāṇīwāsa (Harem). A record dated A.D. 1124 styles: Dandanāyaṃka Suriyega Hemmādiyarasa as Rāṇīvāsangala Rājāḥyaṃkaṃya.

Another minister who is supposed by some to be connected with the palace administration was Sahavāsi galaṭhishtāyaṃka. L.D. Barnett renders it into "President of the Intendants", while Rice translates it as "Regulator of the Companions."
Prof. K.A. Nilakantasastri explains that "Savaśīs (literally, dwellers together) were indeed companions, companions of honour, a select band of devoted soldiers who were ever ready to lay down their lives in the service of the monarch.

... Sahavāsigaladhishtāyaka may therefore be taken as meaning 'the captain of the companions of honour.' However, it may be noted that the term Sahavāsi has been interpreted differently as referring to a kula (family) of Brāhmaṇas who came from Kashmir. In some inscriptions they have been described as devotees of goddess Sharadādevī of Kashmir, and it is further suggested that Savaśī is some tantric cult and those that professed this cult were Sahavāsi Brāhmaṇas, who originally belonged to Kashmir. If this interpretation is accepted, it will be difficult to take the term Sahavāsigaladhishtāyaka as an officer.
Section 6

Importance of the Council of Ministers:

Having dealt with individual ministers let us now consider ministers as a whole. The first question that confronts us is whether there existed a council of ministers under the Chālukyas. Contemporary works like Vikramānkeśadeva-Ādihārlita and the inscriptions of the feudatories of the Chālukyas not only refer to the existence of this council but tell us about the way it functioned. However, in the records of the Chālukyas themselves we do not come across any reference to it. But still we can conclude that the council existed and functioned as it did in the courts of their subordinates, who must have borrowed it from their suzerains. Here are a few references in literature to the council of ministers of the Chālukyas. These examples clearly show that the king, on certain occasions, acted according to the advice of the ministers.

When Somesvara I went to perform penance with his queen, in order to obtain a son, he made over the kingdom to the care of his ministers. Further, it is said that the same king took the consent of his ministers before he travelled to the sacred stream of Tungabhadra where he died. In A.D. 1050 Akkādevī was governing Kusukād 70, Toragere 60 and Māsavādi 140. The record says that in the camp of Pannalayakôte, on the specified date, seven ministers in concert with the officer in charge of the nādu (nādepur-gade) and other administrative officials granted to eight
and eighty households a renewal of the charter of their local administration, which had partly broken down in the stress of the war with the Chālas. In an inscription dated A.D. 1054 we are told that Jagadekkamalla Nolamba Brahmāhirāja Ghattiyarasa, the Urodeva Śivamayya, and the hundred and twenty Mahājanas assembled together and, with the consent (anumataolan) of the five ministers of the Nolamba chief, Nārāsinghadēva, made a gift of land to the Jaina teacher, Ashtopavasi Bhalara for the basadi constructed by them. In Degamve inscription of A.D. 1174 we get some very interesting details. Kamaladevi, the wife of Śivachitta-Vīra-Permadidēva, the Kadamba chief, expressed her desire to make a grant to the Brahmanas of the village of Degamve and took her husband’s consent. All the ministers headed by the Purōhita Śri Vindhyavasī Bhattopadhyāya having pondered over the matter, notified their consent also (dattanumatisho cha perāmarśapu . . .); and there after in A.D. 1174 Kamaladevi gave to those Brahmans, the village of Degamve as an agrahara. The Hoysalas who were earlier the feudatories of the Chālkūyas had a council of five ministers, the way it worked is made clear to us by the following example.

In A.D. 1220 Mārkandadēva, the Urodeva of Hebbāri in the Asandi Writti and a number of gaudas of Holalkere writti disputing the boundary of Badanahalu, Malahālu and Kalkere, went to the king who had pitched his camp outside Silugōdu. There king Ballaladēva and his five ministers settled the dispute that had arisen regarding the boundary of the two Mandas, Nolambavādi and Gaṅgavādi.
Section 7

Plurality of offices held by ministers:

From the records of the Chālukyas we get the information that some of the distinguished ministers held more than one office. A couple of examples may be cited here. An epigraph of A.D. 1092 describes Dandanāyaka Chāvundarasa as Mahāpradhāna, Superintendent of the Palace, Antahpuradhyaksha, Heggade and dandanāyaka of Banavāsinādu, Mahāpradhāna of Madhyadesa and Mahāsandhivigrahi. In a stone inscription, Dandanāyaka Bemmādevarasa is designated as Mahāpradhāna, Antahpuradhyaksha, Karitūragasāhanevaggade (chief of the cavalry and elephant corps), Sri Karana (chief accountant), Hāri Kannātasesandhivigrahi (Minister of peace and war of Karnātaka), Pāsāyita, Manevaggade, Sānadhhipati and Adapade. In addition to these ministerial offices at the centre, some members of the imperial council were also entrusted with the administration of provinces as will be shown in Chapter V. From these examples as Professor K. A. Nizamuddinmissioni says, it appears that one and the same minister held a number of offices. Whether he held all of them at the same time or at different times is difficult to make out.
Ministerial Titles:

Normally, the Chalukya kings had a high regard for their ministers and the latter were loyal to them. A few instances of kings honouring their loyal ministers by means of titles may now be noted. In A.D. 1068 during the reign of Bhuvanakamalla Somesvara, Mahamandalesvara Lakshmarasa, who was the most distinguished minister is described as "beloved servant, active, victorious, indispensable to the Chalukya kingdom, accomplished, strict in revenue matters, greatly honoured of high rank and one who had acquired fame in war." Further he is styled as 'Sri Bhuvanakama1a Vallabharaja samuddharanam (promoter of the kingdom of Bhuvanaka-
malla Somesvara II). Dandanayaka Anantapala is described as Ayyana singa (lion of his lord.). Dandanayaka Govindarasa is called Tribhuvanamalladewa Vijayadakshinarbhuja dandam (rod of victory in the right arm of Tribhuvanamalladewa).

Besides conferring titles the kings honoured their favourite ministers. A copper plate of Saka 1009 (A.D. 1086), states that on the occasion of the victory the ruler conferred on the minister Bemmaya Nayaka several titles and honours such as palanquins, umbrella, fly-whisk and an escort of cavaliers and one thousand foot-soldiers and granted to him the village Chalikheda situated in Kolamuru together with the taxes on several articles of merchandise.
The ministers reciprocated by offering prayers for the prosperity of their rulers. Thus, on the occasion of a solar eclipse Dandaneyaka Lakshmarasa made a gift of rent-free land to god Kesavadeva Mandayagudi for worship and sacrifices, at Chalukya Bhimavaram in Vengi-nadu for the wealth, strength, long life, health, prosperity and power of the emperor.
The king tested the ministers before appointing them. The Yewur record of A.D. 1077 says that Koppadeva, father of Dandanayaka Ravidėva, earned the approbation of king Jayasimha II by the unique manner in which he showed his uprightness under test before he was appointed as an officer in the Treasury. It was enjoined by Hindu political writers that the king, before taking them into service must test the virtue of officials in the fire of temptation and this inscription supplies us with an actual instance. The king did not merely stop at this. He continuously observed them through his spies as the following account from Yasastilaka will show.

The author of Yasastilaka regards the proper control and supervision of the activities of the ministers by the king as the first and foremost requisite in the administration of the state. He expresses that the evil ways of ministers cease only when the king is strict in determining issues of justice and injustice; if the king is lenient, indolent and bent on the pleasures of the moment, the ministers are bound to prove insolent and disloyal. The evil consequences of ministerial corruption are summed up thus:

Sedition among the citizens, depletion of the treasury, decimation of the population, disaffection of kinsmen, hostility of friends and the emigration of the high-born.
The king watched the activities of his ministers through spies. The importance of spies is stressed thus by Somadeva in *Yasastilaka* 73: "Let those kings, who have the curiosity to visualise what is in the mind of every one, have spies only for eyes. Those who are not aware of the situation of themselves and others, through the movements of spies, are deprived of both wealth and life by the action of their officials and foes."

Further in the *Yasastilaka* 74 there is an interesting account of the report of a spy on the activities of a minister that is worth noting here. The spy gives an idea of the particular minister's administration by saying that the latter demands unpaid labour when the people are busy sowing and collects taxes before the corn is ripe, while the harvest is spoilt by the unlicensed movements of the soldiers. The minister is described as a monster of corruption, to wit, bribery and extortion and after cheating the ruler as he did the former kings, will one day go over to some other king like a trumpeter who serves any one employing him. He is said to be brave and valiant in the presence of merchants, physicians, the weak and the deformed but, like an ape, maintains discreet silence in the presence of warriors and desperadoes. Speaking on the origin of villains, the spy relates that, in the olden days, there came into being fourteen, or rather eighteen of them. He declares that the king's minister combines in himself vices of all the categories of villains enumerated by him. Further, the
spy represents that minister as an enemy of religion. He
misappropriates money donated for the worship of the gods,
and breaks or melts down valuable idols and replaces them by
others of lesser value. Sometimes, he would sell an idol,
and, with the proceeds, celebrate a religious festival. It
is also his habit to rob people by employing the methods of
thugs. Besides, he confiscates villages and property endowed
for the purpose of maintaining the worship of the gods. Crime
and irreligion play their part in a more serious charge —
brought against the minister. The latter had employed five
ghandales, knowing to be such, in his household for cooking
and drawing water; but this violation of the caste-rules gave rise
to a scandal, and on one night he murdered them all while
they were fast asleep. The spy concludes by saying that the
religious merit of a king and the joy and happiness of his
friends and servants depend upon the removal of wicked
ministers.
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