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THE GAHADAVĀLA ADMINISTRATION
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Section I. Political Divisions

A). Feudatory States

The Gahadavālas during their palmiest days, ruled over an area extending roughly from the city of Delhi to Muddagiri and from the foot of the Himalayas to the south bank of the Yamunā. Inscriptions indicate that, the whole of this vast area was not under the direct rule of the Gahadavāla monarchs; there were some semi-independent feudatory chiefs variously styled as Rānaka, Mahānāyaka and Rājā and Mahārājā. Rānaka Lavarāpravāha is recorded to have granted the village of Rēmālīthā in Śigurodhā pattalā during the reign of Madanapāla I. The Kamauli plate of V.S.1191/1134 A.D., records the gift of the village Āmbuvara in the Rāpaḍi viṣaya by the Mahārājadiputra Vatsarāja of the Śīhagara family. As the geographical references contained in these two inscriptions

1. IA, XVIII, pp.14-19.
2. EI, IV, pp.130-33.
have not been identified, it is not possible to locate the area ruled over by these two Gahadavāla feudatories. The states of other two feudatories, Mahānāyaka, Pratāpadavala of Jāpila and Rānaka Vijayakarṇa were situated respectively in the Raktasgaṅḍa and the Mirzapur district (U.P.). The existence of a chief, named Madana of the line of Gādhipurādhipati Gopāla is attested by the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S. 1176/c. III9 A.D. issued by his influential minister Vidyādharā. The fragmentary stone inscription of queen Uddalladevi proves the existence of a prince, belonging to the Gahadavāla lineage in V.S. 1294/1237 A.D. The status of this prince is not clearly stated in the inscription, but he may have belonged to a branch of the Gahadavāla family, which was feudatory to the Imperial Gahadavālas of Varanasi. From the context of this fragmentary stone inscription, it appears that Śrī Mahamandadeva, the husband of Uddalladevi, was a feudatory of Śrī Ādakkamalla and the territory ruled over by him may have been situated in the southern part of the Gahadavāla dominion near the Vindhyas. Besides these, there seem to have been some other ruling dynasties, which acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gahadavālas; both the Rāṣṭrakūta dynasty at Badaun and the Tomara dynasty at Delhi were most probably subordinate to the Gahadavālas and there also appears to have been a Kalsauri dynasty at Kasia. It is evident from the geographical references so far as they have been identified, that these feudatory states were situated mostly on the frontiers of the Gahadavāla dominion and they may have generally served the purpose of frontier guards.

B). The Kingdom Proper

The kingdom proper, which was directly ruled by the Gahadavāla monarchs, was divided and subdivided into many

1. JAOS, VI, pp.547-49.
2. JASB, IXII, pp.743-45.
5. Vide supra p. 82
administrative units. The smallest unit mentioned, of course, was the village or the "grāma". Some of these villages had one or more "pātakas" (cf. "Kulam grām-alkadesaḥ pātakākhyāḥ") or outlying hamlets. The Gaṇḍavāla inscriptions refer to about one hundred and fifty villages, a few of which have been identified.

The next administrative division was pattala. The villages granted were mostly located in respective pattālas and the Gaṇḍavāla land-grants refer to about sixty pattalas. As relevant data are not available, it is not easy to determine the average dimension of a pattala or the number of villages a pattala generally comprised. Some of the pattalas, however, appear to have comprised a fairly large number of villages. Thus the Candrāvatī inscription of V.S.1150 records the gift of Kaṭhehali pattala with the exclusion of thirty-six villages already given away (cf. "pūrva-datta-deva-dvija-Vikaragrāma-varjita"), and that of V.S.1156 grants thirty villages in Bṛhaḍdevaraṇṭha pattala. The names of two of the pattalas, Vādācaturāsīti and Mānighapura-caturāsīkā apparently suggest that these two consisted of eighty-four villages each. Actually, they seem to be reminiscent of the traditional clan holdings of Western India, each of which generally consisted of 42, 84 or 126 units; this system of agrarian settlement may have been introduced in the Doab region by the Imperial Pratiharas. But by the time of the Gaṇḍavālas these had ceased to be clan holdings, being already absorbed in the king's dominion and conveniently forming administrative units, after possible readjustments. Under the new system, older names may have been retained, but the number denoted by them may have continued in a conventional sense, so that one cannot be sure if a pattala actually comprised 84 villages, even when its name suggests it.

2. BI, XIV, pp.195 & 196.
3. JUPHS, 1941, p.75 & supra-p. 172.
4. The name of another pattala or pattali 'Neulāsātāvisikā', mentioned in the Kamauli grant of V.S.1173, likewise indicates that originally it may have consisted of 120 units.
The next two administrative divisions, Pathaka and Visaya, are but rarely mentioned in the Gahadavala records. Some pathakas, namely, Onavala, Govisālaka and probably also Dudhāli were situated in Saruvāra; these were subdivided into pattalas. It has been suggested by Kielhorn that, both Saruvāra (or Sru(ga)-ra, as misread in the Kamauli plate of V.S.1176/119 A.D.) and Koṭhatakoṭi-varahottara were districts, that is "viṣayas". Besides these, Rāpaḍi has been expressly mentioned as "viṣaya". It is, however, curious that the villages, granted in Rāpaḍi viṣaya and Koṭhatakoṭi-varahottara are mentioned as located directly in these two viṣayas, without reference to pathakas or pattalas.

Besides these administrative units, there were also pattanas, towns and cities, from where some of the Gahadavala grants were made. Sometimes they appear to have been named after kings or the crown王子, as is shown by the name Rājyaspālapura, on the Ganges (unidentified) where Mahāraja-putra Rājyaspāladeva made a grant in V.S.1203. The practice of naming a place after a king or a crown-prince was well known in India.

Section II. ADMINISTRATION

A). Central

a). King, Queen and Yuvaraja

The kingship in the Gahadavala dynasty was hereditary and from Candradeva, the first independent king of the dynasty to Hariścandra, the last one, we find an unbroken line of successors for six generations, the son always following the father, in order of succession. In fact kingship in contemporary India was hereditary everywhere; in the absence of any direct successor usually a collateral line stepped in.

2. Benares Grant of V.S.1203 (EI, VIII, pp.150 ff.).
3. Also cf. Govinda-vatiṭaka, where Govindacandra bathed before making the grant recorded in the Kamauli plate of V.S.1190. (EI, IV, p.112).
The epithets used by the first king of the Gahadavala dynasty were "parama-bhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-paramesvara"; these were conventional expressions of sovereignty used by independent rulers. They further claim to have been served by "samasta-rāja-akra" (i.e., a whole circle of kings, cf. "rājacakra-vartin"). That this claim is not merely conventional, is proved by the references to more than one feudatory chief in the Gahadavala documents. There is a good deal of controversy over the significance of another title, which was assumed by Govindaçandra and was continued by his successors, namely, "āśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rajaçray-adhipati". According to some scholars "narapati" and "gajapati" refer to the respective rulers of Telengāna and Karṇāṭa, while according to another suggestion, these three terms are indicative of different classes of feudatories. In the Gahadavala inscription we come across three different designations of feudatories, Mahā-nīyaka, Rāma and mahārāja. Separately, these three terms "āśvapati", "gajapati" and "narapati" were used by many contemporary kings, but the group of titles mentioned above, as used by the Gahadavala kings is generally found to have been used by the Kalacuri kings. The study of the Gahadavala inscriptions show that the exact Kalacuri form of the title was used by the Gahadavala kings, never before the defeat of the Kalacuri king (either Yasāk-Karna or Gaya-Karna) by Govindaçandra, but almost always after it. The later Pāla kings, Kesāvasena and Viśvarūpasena also used this group of titles probably after the spectacular Pāla success against the Gahadavala king during the reign of their father Lakṣmīna-sena. Some of the inscriptions of Candradeva claim that, Narapati, Gajapati, Trisāmkuṣapati and Giripati submitted to his prowess; the use of the last two terms may show, though not definitely, that some of the chiefs, whom he defeated, belonged to the hill-tribes and totemistic tribes (cf. "trisāmku" or fire fly).

I. HE, Tripathi, pp. 302-03.
Abhiseka or coronation of one of the Gahadavala kings is mentioned in the Kanauli grant of V.S.1126, where Jayaccandra is said to have made a grant after performing the *mantra-onana* at his coronation (cf. "abhiseke mantra-snanen snatva").¹ The ceremony of anointing a king has been described by Lakṣmdhara in the "Rāja-dharma-kānda" of his nibandha 'Krtya-kalpataru', where he has quoted the rites described in the Brahmapurāṇa and the Rāmayana. The anointing of the king must take place on an auspicious moment selected by the court astrologer ('Sāmvatsarika' of Lakṣmdhara and 'Naimittika' of the Gahadavala inscriptions); Jayaccandra was anointed as king on Asadha sudi 5, Samvat 1226 (21st June 1170 A.D.). Lakṣmdhara has devoted a long chapter on duties of an anointed king "abhisikta-krtyani", most of which is concerned with protection of the interests and privileges of the Brahmanas, upholding religion and performing necessary religious ceremonies for the welfare of the subjects and the state. It is interesting to note that the author has referred to seven religious ceremonies, which should not be neglected by a king, who desired to be prosperous; these are "Deva-yātra", "Kaumudī-mahotsava", "Indrardvajochrāya", "Navarātripūjā", "Chhims-pūjā", "Gavotsarga" and "Vasordhāra". The list of royal duties also include development of trade and crafts, the relief of destitutes and liberal medical relief.³ A separate chapter describes in detail the "Yātra" or warlike expedition in which, every king should participate.

There is no express reference to a regency in the Gahadavala inscriptions but there are indications of it in two of the landgrants issued by Mahārajaputra Govindaacakrā; one of these, the Basahi grant of V.S.1161, was written with the consent of ("etfcsam sammatyi,") Purohitā Jaguka, Pratihāra Gautama and Mahattaka Bāłhana, while the other, the Kanauli grant of V.S.1182, was written with the consent of the queen.

Ralhadevi, in addition to that of the above mentioned personages. A third inscription in which Mahārajaputra Govinda-
candra announces a grant by Rāmaka Lavarā-pravāha, was written
with the consent of Mahattaka Gāṅgeya ("Mahattaka-Sṛi-Gāṅgey-
ānuśhaya likhitam")\textsuperscript{1}. This procedure of making gift of tax-
free land without any reference to the reigning king but with
the consent of the other officials is rather uncommon in Gah-
dāvāla administrative history. Whether the responsibility of
those who consent to the grants ceases there, or whether they
constituted a regency, is not known. After the discovery of
the Badera grant, issued by king Madanapāla himself in V. S.
1104/1107 A.D., necessity of a regency in V. S. 1161, 1162 and
1166 cannot be explained. Also, it is remarkable that neither
the "Mantrīn" nor the "Senāpatī", two important officials of
the State, figure in the list of persons who gave consent to
these grants. Further, it should be noted that the contem-
porary "nibandha"-writer Maha-sāndhivigrahika Lakṣmīdhara
does not deal with any such emergency, which may necessitate
the forming of a regency.

A few words must be said here about the queen, who
seems to have enjoyed a special recognition in the Gahadavala
administrative system. According to Kautilya the queen is in
the same category with the king's mother, the commander-in-
chief, purohita (sacrificial priest), minister and yuvarāja
and could draw the highest salary of 48000 pānas annually\textsuperscript{2}.
The Gahadavala inscriptions show that the chief queen or
"paṭṭa-mahādevī" was endowed with all the royal prerogatives
("samasta-rāja-prakriy-otpeta"); on three occasions Nayanakeli-
devī and Gosalladevī, Govindacandra's "paṭṭa-mahādevī" granted
tax-free villages with the consent of the king\textsuperscript{3}. During the
reign of Madanapāla, his queen Ralhadevi, gave her consent to
one of the grants issued by Mahārajaputra Govindacandradeva.

\textsuperscript{1} IA, XIV, pp.101-04; II, pp.358-61; IA, XVIII, pp.14-19.
\textsuperscript{2} Kautilya, V, 3.
\textsuperscript{3} Kausuli Grant of V. S. 1176 (II, IV, pp.101 ff.) &Banagamarūdha
(or Banagavan) Ins. of V. S. 1208 (II, V, pp.116 ff.).
Some of the queens seem to have personal 'bhāṇḍagāra' or treasury, which probably consisted of marriage gifts, bath and toilet money from the father and income from the property, settled at the time of marriage by the husband and such other personal funds. The Hathia-dah pillar inscription of V.S.1207/I151 A.D. records the excavation of a tank by one Bellana, described by Cunningham, who noticed this inscription, as the Bhāṇḍagārika of queen Gosallādevī. The Macchlishahr inscription of Hariścandra refers to a piece of land which previously may have belonged to Mahārājā Ṣaumāmaḍari.

As enjoined in the orthodox Smṛti literature, the heir-apparent to the Gahadavāla throne was often selected in the king's lifetime and vested with all the royal prerogatives. Lakṣmīdhara, however, has not dealt with the coronation of a Yuvarāja. The Gahadavāla documents record that like the queens, Yuvarāja Āśphoṭacandradeva, and Yuvarāja Jayaccandradeva, all exercised the royal prerogative of granting tax-free villages with the consent of the ruling kings (cf. "tad-eta-t-sammattya samasta-rāja-prakṛiya-opeta-yauva-rājy-ābhiṣikta-mahārājaputra-Ṣrīmad-Āśphoṭacandradevaḥ" and "samma-sammattya samasta-rāja-prakṛiya-opeta-yauva-rājy-ābhiṣikta-mahārājaputra-Ṣrī-Jaya­ccandradeva")3. Mahārājaputra Ṣaivaṇapāladeva, a son of Govindacandra, was not actually proclaimed as a Yuvarāja, but he too was vested with all royal prerogatives and issued two grants during his father's reign (cf. "Ṣrīmad-Govindacandradeva-pāda-padma-sammattya samasta-rāja-prakṛiya-opeta-mahārājaputra etṣy")4. It is to be noted that, the Gahadavāla princes, including the Yuvarāja announced their grants in their own name, while the gifts, made by the queen had to be announced by the reigning king.

The case of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra was rather different from the above cases. In none of the grants made by the Gahadavāla queens and princes, the donor was eulogized.

---

1. Cunningham ASR. I, pp. 96-96.
2. TI, X, pp. 93-100.
3. Senares Grant of V.S.1190; RAS Grant of V.S.1225.
4. Gagaha Grant of V.S.1199, Benares Grant of V.S.1203.
in the genealogical or "pradasti" section, Govindacandra, however, was openly praised especially for his splendid military achievements in the inscriptions, which he issued during his father's reign period. Moreover, it is significant that though he referred to his father Madanapala as the ruling king, he used the royal seal in his own name on the grants, which were issued not with the ruling king's consent but with consent of the Purohita, the Pratihâra and the Mahattaka. It thus appears that, though not actually proclaimed a Yuvarâja, as the absence of the title indicates, Mahârajaputra Govindacandra, by dint of his own personality and also because of the unexplained inactivity of the reigning king, exercised special power in administration, which was not enjoyed by the other Gahadavala princes.

The Gahadavâla princes seem to have enjoyed the special privilege of having a separate insignia or "lânchana", different from the Gahadavâla royal seal, which consisted of a figure of 'garuda' above and a conchshell below with the name of the king in between*. The Yuvarâja's insignia consisted of a conchshell above and an arrow below with the name of the Yuvarâja across the centre; such seals were used in the inscriptions issued by Āsphotacandradeva and Râjya- pâladeva. It seems that during the reign period of Madana- pâladeva the separate seal for the Yuvarâja had not yet evolved, but the existence of a separate "lânchana"(emblem) for the prince is evidenced by the conch-shell and arrow drawn vertically in the proper right margin of the Basahi and the Kamauli grants; these grants were issued with the Gahadavâla royal seal, bearing the name not of Madanapala but of the prince Govindacandra.

(b). Officials ("Aâtîyas")

The Gahadavâla land grants refer to a number of officials, to whom the king "commands, explains and orders" ("ajñâpayati, bodhayati adiśati") about the land-grant. The

The inscription of Kalacuri Sodhadeva from Kahla (V.S. 1134/1077 A.D.), which has much in common in technique and style with the Gahadavala land-grants, mention in this connection two distinct classes of officers royal and others (cf. "Mahāsandhi-vigrahikā-mahamahātaka-mahapratiḥāra... balaḥīra-prabhrtīṁ samasta-rajapuruṣān bhaṭṭa makutika-mahattama-pramukhan janapadāṁ")¹; while the first group (‘rajapurusān’) is certainly appointed by the king from the centre, those belonging to the second, may have been selected or elected by the village people. The Jhusi inscription of Pratihāra Trilocanapāla (V.S. 1084/1027 A.D.) and many other inscriptions of the period also make similar distinction (cf. "Samupagatān rajapurusān Brahmān-ottarāmsō-prativesi-samasta-mahattama-jana-pādīṁ" etc.). The village officials in these cases were generally referred to as "mahattama" or "mahattara". In most of the Gahadavala inscriptions, however, there is no mention of the village headman; the "janapada", the village community or population, however, always figures in these land grants. Evidently under the Gahadavala system of administration, the "rajapurusas" were more directly concerned with the formalities and technicalities of a grant, than the village headman.

Rājan, rājī and yuvarāja are mentioned at the beginning of the list of royal officials (‘puruṣa’), who are to be informed about the land grants. It has been suggested that, these three terms refer either to the feudatory chiefs and to their families, many of whom, generally lived in the court or to the provincial governors and their families². But a perusal of the list, which further includes mantrin, purohitā, pratiḥāra, senāpati bhāṇḍāgarika, akgapeṭalika, viṣak, naimittika, antahpurika, dūta, and officers in charge of kari (elephants), turaga (horse), pattana,ākara,

1. Ri, VII, pp.85 ff.
sthāna and gokula ("kari-turaga-pattan-akara-sthāna-gokul-ādhikāri-purushān"), indicates that all these officials, who were to be informed about the gift, were either intimately connected with the king and his court or directly under his personal authority. Most of the Gahadavala chiefs on the other hand, as we have already seen, occupied frontier regions and were like frontier guards; as such they could not have lived idly at the imperial court. Moreover, these chiefs could not have any concern in the land grants which were not made within their territories. On the other hand it is quite possible that this was an official convention to refer all the grants to the three highest personalities in the central administration, namely, the king and also the queen and the prince.¹

¹. Mantrin: According to the ancient political thinkers of India, mantrin (minister) is an important wheel in the administrative machinery. Indeed the political history of ancient India shows, that many a time ministers enjoyed a position of extraordinary importance and influence. The history of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries gives us instances of many ministers, who claim to have practically directed and framed the king’s policy and were respected and obeyed by the king. Sometimes they are openly praised in the inscriptions of their masters, who are described openly as paying respects and homage to their ministers (cf. ministers Vilvasīva and his grand son Vidyādhara are said to have been respected and propitiated by Gāḍhipurāḍhipati Gopāla and his son king Madana, who appears to have been a Gahadavāla feudatory).² Able and ambitious ministers may have sometimes acted as effectual checks to the arbitrariness of kings. But the influence exercised by the minister

¹. The Kahla plate of Sodhadeva Kalacuri, which displays a striking similarity to Gahadavāla grants, also refers to 'mahārājānī' and mahārājaputra' in the same style.
². IA, XVII, pp.61-64; JPASB, 1925(N3), pp.105 ff.
over kings was not apparently derived from a constitutional source; it was a purely personal influence, which depended on the strength of their own character and their ability to dominate a weak-minded king.

Though the Gaṅgadāvala inscriptions do not disclose the name of the ministers, who may have helped this dynasty to rise to prominence, one of the contemporary literary work reveals the name of one minister, who undoubtedly exercised considerable influence on the policy of the greatest king of the dynasty. As we have already noticed, in the Krtyakalpa-taru, which was written at the command of Govindaśandra, the author Lakṣmīdhara claims that the success of his patron is due to his wonderful counsel (cf. "Tat sarvam khalu yasya mantra-mahim-āsārayam" etc.)\(^1\). This Lakṣmīdhara is described both as a "Mahāsāndhivigrāhika" (Minister for Peace and War) and as a "Mangrīśvara" (Chief Minister). His father Bhaṭṭa Hṛdayadhara also was a "Mahāsāndhivigrāhika". It thus appears that Govindaśandra had more than one minister to help him in his task of administration and empire-building and Lakṣmīdhara by virtue of his own eminence not only acted as the Chief Minister and thus guided the general administrative policy but also was put in charge of the most important department - the Foreign Office.

The Rājadharmā-kānda of the Krtyakalpa-taru quotes many ancient authorities which enumerate various qualifications a minister, who tops the list of "amātyas" or officials, should possess; to sum up - a heroic and successful person, born of good family cool-headed and well versed in "sāstras" and "nītis" and "mantra" should be chosen as minister; the quotations give preference to the Brāhmaṇas, and to the "maulas" or hereditary officers (explained by Lakṣmīdhara as 'pitr-paitāmahān')\(^2\). Being the son of a mahāsāndhivigrāh-

---

hika, the author himself was a 'maula' officer. Though the importance of a minister places him at the top of the official hierarchy, both in the inscriptions and in the Rajadharma-Kānda, it is strange that his name is not included among those, who gave their consent to the grants of the Mahārāja-putra Govindacandra-deva, which refer to a pūrḥita, a pratiḥāra and a mahattaka in this connection.

ii). Pūrḥita: As befitting a revivisit state, the next important personage in the Gahadavāla court is the Pūrḥita or priest. He is expected to perform all the religious ceremonies, sacrifices and yajñas, homas and danas, chanting of the Vedas and the like, which a king should undertake for the prosperity and welfare of the state. Following the ancient precepts, Laksmiṅhara advises that a Brāhmaṇa of good family, who has done penance and is well versed in the Vedas, Itihāsa, Dharmasāstras, Astrology and in the process of performing various sacrifices and religious ceremonies, should be chosen as a priest (‘pūrḥita’).\(^1\)

From the reign of Govindacandra the family of Vīlha or Vīlha-kāya dīkṣita, the donee of the grant of V.S.1162, rose to prominence, as is clearly evidenced by a large number of grants made in their favour by the different Gahadavāla kings. Vīlha's son Mahāpūrḥita Jāgusārman may be identified with pūrḥita Jāguka, who consents to the grants mentioned above. Jāgusārman who evidently acts as the court-priest of king Govindacandra receives a large number of taxfree villages. His brother Vyāṣa also receives a grant in V.S.1178/I12I-2 A.D.\(^2\). Jāgusārman's son Praharāja-sārman or Prahlāda-sārman is not only the court-priest of Jayaccandra-deva, but also his precepter or guru (cf. "Vaiṣṇava-ṣūla-vidhi-guru"). Probably it was he, who performed the "abhiseka" ceremony of Jayaccandra and the "jatakarman" and the "nāmakarana" ceremonies of his son Hariścandra. Jāgusārman also appears to have performed the

\(^{1}\) Kṛtya, Rāja-Dharmakānda, pp.t.x. 164 ff.
\(^{2}\) Kamauli Grant III, pp.169-II.
annual "sraddha" ceremonies of Govindacandra's father and mother. Thus the court-priest under the Gahadavāla regime has many duties to perform; not only is he expected to perform all the religious ceremonies undertaken by the ruler to promote the prosperity of his domain and all important state ceremonies like the coronation of kings, but also he is the family priest of the dynasty and perhaps he often acts as preceptor to the princes.

iii). Pratihāra: Next in importance in the official hierarchy was the pratihāra; he was probably the same as the dauvarika of the earlier days. The pratihāra has always been looked upon as an important officer of the royal court; he should have a fine presence, tact, charm and suavity. Importance of his position in the Gahadavāla administration is evidenced by his inclusion among those, who consent to the grants issued by the Mahārājaputra Govindacandra. This however appears to have been an extraordinary case; the general duties and responsibilities of a pratihāra were probably more or less like those of the royal chamberlain and palace mayor.

iv). Senāpati: The simple title senāpati used in the Gahadavāla records is equivalent to the high sounding titles used by the other dynasties (cf. "Maha-pracanda-dandanāyaka", "mahi-valāchikrta" or "mahī-senāpati") to designate the commander-in-chief. It is interesting to note that Lakṣmīdhara has accepted Matsya-purāṇa's view, that a Senāpati may be either Brāhmaṇa or Kṣatriya. A senāpati is expected to be of good family, valiant and hardy; he should know the use of different weapons and have some knowledge of elephants and other animals used in warfare; he should also be well-versed in military strategy and be acquainted with different formations of army. The Gahadavālas doubtless possessed an eM-

efficient army from the very beginning and its efficiency and size may naturally have increased in the reign of Govinda-
candra, who had many military achievements to his credit. The imposing vastness of Jayacandra's army is well testified to by the author of Pṛthvīrajā-Rāsa and by the Muslim historians.\(^1\) The position of an officer, in charge of such an army, can easily be realised, the Gahadavāla records however do not supply us with the name of any of the senāpatis, who served in them and helped them in their career of victory.

v). Bhāndagārika: The position of this officer among the list of officials in the Gahadavāla document indicates that he is an important personage and as such probably may be compared with the treasurer or collector-general ('samāharta') of the Arthasastra\(^2\). Literally it is to be translated as the officer in charge of the royal store; such a title is significant, in view of the fact that, a large part of the revenue was probably collected in kind at that period.

vi). Aksapatālika: Another officer in the revenue department, one in charge of receipts of royal treasury, was designated by Kautilya as "sannidhāta"\(^3\). He may be compared with the accounts officer, or more correctly accountant-general. The aksapatālika of the Gahadavāla records was probably an officer of this type and his responsibilities embraced not only the receipts and accounts but also general records and royal orders relating to the revenue department. According to Lakṣmīdhara the "aksā-rakṣita" or "aksā-paripālaka" must not only have knowledge of income and expenditure but he also should be able to read people's character and be well informed about the produce of the land, (cf. "āya-vyaya-jīva-loka-jīva des-otpatti-visāradah")\(^4\). During the first four reigns the Gahadavāla land-grants were mostly written by the "karanikas" and the "kāyasthas", who were most probably the clerks attached to the records and revenue officers. The reign of Jeyac-

---

2. Kaut. II, 35.
Jayaccandra, however, saw an innovation; land-grants henceforth were mostly written "by the senior officers in charge of the records, receipts and accounts; in this connection we come across the names of Mahākṣapataḷiṅka Sripati and Bhogāditya and Aksapataḷiṅka Vivika." 

vii). Bhishak: The next in the list comes the name of bhishak or physician ("prāṇācārya" of Lākṣmīdhara). He was concerned with the Gahadavāla grants like other high officials of the state and it may be presumed that he was not only a court physician and as such one of the chief personal attendants of the king but also an officer placed in charge of the public health department, whose existence however is not directly indicated. Certain Prāṇācārya Bhaṭṭa-pāṇḍita Khoṇa-sārman figures as the donee in the Benares grant of V.S.1187.

viii). The Naimittika or the astrologer, whose duty is to announce auspicious moments and propitious occasions is probably the same as "samvatsara" of Viṣṇu. He is naturally included in the list of officials of the revivalist Gahadavāla rulers.

ix). Aṁtahpurika: As in the inscriptions, Lākṣmīdhara also enumerates the seraglio officer ("antahpur-ādhyakṣa") as one of the important officials of the state.

x). The Duta, mentioned in the list of the "rājapurūṣas", does not seem to have been a messenger or a lower-grade official. The contemporary records indicate that he was more like an envoy or ambassador or political agent and as such one of the top-ranking officers of the kingdom. Lākṣmīdhara following the earlier writers describes him as a person of high talent, integrity and character.

xi). Other officers (cf. "Kari-turaga-pattan-ekara-sthāna-
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these was the mahaśāndhiyigrehika, who was in charge of the Department of Peace and War, such a person should be adept in airśphuct policy, a judge of opportunity and a diplomat.

The salary of the kings officials, according to Kautilya, is generally to be paid in cash but he also recommends occasional gifts of land in lieu of valuable service. We have no information, regarding the payment of the Gahadavala officers in cash, but it appears that sometimes they received tax-free land from the state. The Candravatī grant, mentioned above, records the gift of a whole pattala with the exception of the villages previously granted to gods, Bhumisugas and as

**Administrative of visaya, pathaka and pattala**

The Gahadavala inscriptions do not supply much concrete information about the administration of the 'visaya', 'pathaka' and 'pattala'. The contemporary inscriptions of other dynasties refer to various gradations of administrative officers like the 'rāṣṭrapati', 'visiyapati', 'bhogapati', 'manḍalarasta' and such like. The Gahadavala records mention only two designations which may be compared with the above ones. The Candravatī inscription of V.S.1180/1020 A.D. includes the name of the 'visay-adhikari-purusa' in the list of officers to be informed in respect of this landgrant. This instance is unique in the Gahadavala records and the necessity of the introduction of the 'visay-adhikari-purusa' is easily realised, if we remember that on this occasion, not a village, but whole pattala, with the exception of certain villages, is granted. Evidently these visay-adhikari-purusas are the

1. L., XVI, pp. 134-43.
administrative officers in charge of the visayas or provinces in the Gahadavala domain. A careful study of the list, in which he has been placed among the officers in charge of elephants, horses, towns, mines and cow-pens, however indicates that probably he is a less important person in comparison with the mantrin, the purohita, the commander of forces, the record officers and others, directly connected with the central administration and executive. This officer in-charge of the visaya, may have been directly responsible to the king for the administration of his province, but he, it seems is not generally concerned with the comparatively small land-transfers like the gift of a village, which is to be notified to the authorities, directly concerned with them through the records and accounts department. The Candravatf inscription indicates that he is directly addressed and commanded by the king on the occasions of big and important land-transfers.

The inscriptions give us absolutely no information about his office but it may have included all the important administrative departments within his jurisdiction.

No evidence is forthcoming about the administrative officer in charge of the pathaka or his functions, but presumably these were on the lines of the office and functions of the "visay-ādikāri-puruṣa" on a more limited scale.

The only designation which may have been connected with the pattala, is found in the undated Sarnath Inscription of Kumāradevī, the queen of Govindasandradeva; this inscription records that, Jambukī, at whose request, the Dharmacakra-Jina,(erected by Dharmāśoka), was repaired, was placed at the head of all the pattaliṅgas (cf. "Śrī-Dharmacakra-jina-śāsana-samībaddha śā Jambukī saṅkāla-pattalik-āgrabhūta")\(^1\).

The 'pattalikā' also (and probably also 'pattalika') appears to have been junior administrative officers in charge of a pattala\(^2\). Instances of women being appointed as provincial

---

1. HI, IX, pp.
2. According to Dr. D.C. Ganguly in the Paramāra administrative system, the king's representative in the village was the 'pattalika'; vide History of the Paramāra Dynasty, p.244.
governors are to be found in the history of the Cālukya and the Hāstrakūṭa dynasties in South India. The designation pattalikā indicates that women administrative officers are sometimes placed in charge of the pattalikās, under the Gahādavaḷa administrative system.

C). Town Administration

The importance of the town was understood by the Gahādavaḷa kings. The pattan-ādhikāri-purusa or the city administrative officer is enumerated among the high officials, who were directly associated with the king in affairs concerning land-grants. The specific and separate mention of the municipal officer, even in a grant which refers to the "viṣay-ādhikāri-purusa" indicates that the Gahādavaḷa towns probably were not under the authority of the provincial or the district administrative officers, but formed separate administrative units and the officers appointed over them may have been directly responsible to the crown. Some towns have been mentioned in the inscriptions but details about the municipal administration are not available.

D). Village Administration

Mahattama, an officer, who may have been connected with the village administration, is mentioned only in four land-grants, namely the Basahi, the Kamauli and the Rahan grants of Maharājaputra Govindaśandra and the B.A.S. land transfer inscription of the same person, as a king. It is to be noted that, in these cases the 'mahattama' is carefully distinguished from the 'purusa' or officials (cf. "Samasta-mahattama-janapada-nivāsi-lokān prativāsilo-kān rāja-rājñi-yuvarāja-purcita" etc. and "anayer-mahattama-kalvarta-prabuṛti-prejā-lokān tathā nivāsino nikhilajanapadān-api rāja-rājñī etc." ) in the same style as in the Kahla inscription.

of Sodhadeva. Earlier inscriptions and many of the contemporary ones also sometimes refer to "mahattara" in this connection (cf. Later Gupta inscriptions and the Pāla inscriptions). The Arthasastra mentions two classes of village officials, the headman or the "grāmika" and the village elders or the "grāmavṛddhas". Later, however, the designations of these officers may have changed and the grāmavṛddhas came to be known as mahattaras and the headman of the village, probably as the mahattama; the basis of selection also may have changed from age to property. The explicit distinction made between the "mahattaka" and the "rājapuruṣa" clearly indicates that, the former is not appointed by the crown, but probably elected by the villagers or the village elders. Generally however, the Gahadavala inscriptions do not include mahattama among the persons and dignitaries who are to be informed about the land-grants. The above mentioned exception may be due to the fact that these inscriptions granted land in territories, which were only recently conquered at the time of issuing these documents and the local system of administration was not yet replaced by the Gahadavala system.

Two other officials bearing designations similar to "mahattama" also may have been connected with village administration. "Mahattaka" of the Gahadavala inscriptions may be the same official as "mahattama" of the Kahla plate of Sodhadeva, who unlike the 'mahattama' is included among the "rājapuruṣas" (officials) enumerated therein.

Two mahattakas gave consent to the land-grants issued by the Mahaśrījapatra Govindaśrīnideva - Mahattaka Bālhana to the Basahi and the Kamuli grants and the Mahattaka Gāṅgeya to the Bahā grant. It is to be noted that on all these occasions, the 'mahattama', is included among the personnel to be informed about the grants. A third mahattaka Dayimśarman

1, Kaut, II, 35 & 48. Also vidi Sādāṣ, pp. 171 - 76.
received a house (āvāsa) at Vārānasi, under Govinda's Benares grant of V.S. 1771/1775 A.D. I. A mahā-mahattaka is mentioned in the B.A.3 grants issued in V.S. 1733/1777 A.D. This person Thakkura Vidyādhara by name was the father of Rāuta Rājyadharavarman Kṣatriya, the recipient of a number of grants by the king.

Both of these two officials, mahattaka and mahā-mahattaka, may have been connected with the village administration; it is however certain that the duties and responsibilities of a mahattaka are not limited to one village only. Mahattaka Bālhana consents to the grants of two different villages, Vasābhi and Uaitha, both of which, however, were situated in the same pattalā, Jīvatī; on the other hand Mahattaka Gāngeya consents to the grant of a third village Rāma in a different pattalā, Siṃgradha. Lakṣmīdhara's quotations also indicate that though there may have been rural self-governing bodies the king was expected to appoint his own officers both in town and in village (cf. "gṛāmasu negaresu ca kāryān sucin satya-śālar prajāguptaye nidāchyāt. Teṣām puruṣa-tathārūpā eva sya"). Such royal officers in villages were probably the same as the "gṛāma-adhyākṣas" of Viṣṇu. As during the later part of medieval Hindu India, the designation of the village headman (who was not a rājapurūpa), changed from "gṛāmika" to "mahattama", so also the designation of the royal officer posted in groups of village, or in a pattalā may have changed from "gṛāma-adhyākṣa" to "mahattaka". On this analogy it may be presumed that Mahā-mahattaka was appointed to superintend the activities of all the mahattakas posted in a 'viṣaya'.

E). Feudatories

Because of the paucity of materials it is extremely difficult to form an idea about the status of the feudatory chiefs under the Gahadavalas. All the official inscriptions

1. IHQ, 1940, pp. 109-112.
2. Kṛtya, Rajadharmakānda, p. ix. 79.
of the dynasty conventionally refer to the king as being served by a circle of all the princes ("Samasta-rāja-cakrāsaheṣe-viṣe-caragam"). The word 'samanta' is mentioned only once in one of the records of this dynasty, the very last one, issued by the last king Harīsandradeva in V.S.1253/1197 A.D., among the officials, who were to be informed about the land-grant and it is interesting to note that he is placed between pratibhā and senāpati. The inscriptions themselves present direct evidence of the existence of at least five lines of feudatories, represented by Rāṇaka Laverapraṇāha of the Rahan grant of V.S.1186/1110 A.D., king Madana of the Set-Mahet inscription of V.S.1176/1119 A.D., Śiṅgara Vatsarāja of the Kāmuli grant of V.S.1191/1134 A.D., Mahāṇāyaka Pratēpadhavala of Jāpila of the Taṭicānḍi Rock inscription of V.S.1225/1169 A.D., and Rāṇaka Vijaykārpa of the Belkhara Pillar Inscription of V.S.1253/1197 A.D.

The existence of some other lines of feudatories is suggested by the numismatic and later epigraphic evidence; among them may be enumerated the Tomaras of Delhi, the Rāṇārakūṭas of Vodāsayaṭā and the northern Kalacuris of Kosia2.

The Set-Mahet Inscription of V.S.1176 was not issued by the king Madana, but by his influential "saciva" or minister Vidyaśāhara, on the occasion of the construction of a vihāra at the unidentified town of Ajērā or Jeṣērā3. This inscription, which is not a land-grant, nowhere mentions the name of the reigning sovereign Govindacandra. The inscription of Maharajaputra Yatsarāja of Singara dynasty whose great-grand-father acquired a "rāja-paṭṭi" (royal fillet), on the other hand, is a land-grant, and records the donation of Ambuara village in the Rapadī-vidaya. This grant is issued by the donor himself, but contains an eulogy of the Gahaḍavāla kings from Vaddoviraḥa to Govindacandra, in the usual Gahaḍavāla style; then follows the

1. BI, X, pp.65 ff.
eulogy of the donor and his family Śiṅgara; the seal is missing!

Unlike the preceding one, the land-grant by Rāṇaka Lavara-prāvēha also is announced by the suzerain who at that time was Maharajaputra Govindacandra. The inscription of another Rāṇaka, issued probably during the last days of Harisćandra, the last king of the dynasty, indicates that this term 'rāṇaka' has been used to denote the feudatory chiefs; the Belkharā inscription of V,S,1253/1197 A.D., records the erection of a pillar by Rāuta Śri Sakaruka in the "reign" of Śri Vijaya-karna 'in the victorious reigning year of 1253 Kēnya-kubja' (cf. "Śrīmad-Kēnya-kubja-vijaya-rūjya sambat 1253... Rānaka-Śri-Vijayakarna-rūjya" etc.). This inscription indicates that in the Gahaḍāvala regime, the areas ruled by the Rānakas were looked upon as feudatory states. The charter, issued by Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala, the ruler of Jāpila, found incised on the Tārācandī Rock in V,S, 1225/1169 A.D., is of peculiar administrative interest. The Mahānāyaka in this charter declares, that some Brahmaṇas have bribed Deu, an officer of the overlord of Kēnya-kubja and secured forged grants regarding the gift of two villages and that the spurious document is not to be believed and the taxes and the dues are to be collected as before. The grant is probably endorsed by Maharajaputra Śatrugna, who was a son of the Mahānāyaka, as an undated inscription of the chief reveals. Nothing is stated in the charter to indicate that the Mahānāyaka was not a rājapurūṣa himself, but his rather contemptuous reference to Deu, who had the authority to convey grants and messages from the Central Government to him, and as such, was doubtless an important "rājapurūṣa", either in the records department or in the embassy - seems to indicate, that, he himself was not a "rājapurūṣa" or in his own words "bhūpadāsa", but a feudatory chief. The fact

1. EI, IV, pp,136-33.
2. IA, XVIII, pp,14-19.
3. JASB, 1911, pp,763-65.
4. JAOS, VI, pp,547-49.
that the charter was issued specially for the information of his progeny, sons and grandsons, supports the above conclusion. No doubt the offices of the provincial governor and many other offices were often hereditary ('maula') but these officers were rājapurusas and as such had to be formally appointed by the king. The Mahānayaka Pratāpadhavala, however, refers quite confidently to his sons and grandsons as his successors, as if their appointment did not depend upon any superior authority. It is, however, indicated by this "rajasāsana", that the king had power to grant land in the territory ruled over by Pratāpadhavala.

Two other inscriptions belonging to Pratāpadhavala, have been found but none of them refer to the reigning king Vijayacandra of Kāhyakubja. One of these was issued about a month earlier than the above charter and records the construction of a road by the Kāhyaka Pratāpadhavala (afterwards styled māhanayaka); the other mentions his name with a date in the year V.S.1158/1214 A.D. From a fourth inscription, an undated one, it appears that this chief belonged to the Khayaravala dynasty; this dynastic name seems to have survived in the name of the tribe of the Kharwars, found around Mirzapur and Sahabad districts.¹

The foregoing discussion shows that there were three different feudatory designations under the Gahadavalas, namely, Rānaka, Mahānayaka and Maharāja; whether these denoted differences in status, is not clear. It has been noted however that while, a feudatory mahārajaputra (son of a mahārāja) had the authority to announce his own grant, the land-grant, made by a rānaka, was announced by the suzerain. There is no information as to the various obligations, financial and others, of these feudatory chiefs. Sometimes in the land-grants issued by the feudatory chiefs the authority if the Gahadavāla king is acknowledged by simple reference to him; in some cases at least the sovereign could grant land in the feudatory territory. Presumably the feudatories were required to help him

¹ I. II, IV, p.310 ff.
him in his wars with men and money.

The inscriptionsal epithet of the Gahadavala overlord describing that he was served by a circle of kings (cf. "Sama-
sta-raja-akra-samsevita-carama"), shows that these chiefs frequently visited the imperial court to pay respects to the monarch.

Section III. REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

A). Revenue

The sources of information regarding the revenue system of the Gahadavālas are their inscriptions, especially the land-grants. Almost all these land-grants were executed in favour of the Brāhmaṇas to whom were transferred the right of collecting taxes and other dues, by the donor, with the permission of the king, if he was not the donor himself (cf. 'Asmt-sammatyā' in Kamauli grant Govindacandra, V.S. II76/II22 A.D. announcing a grant by Queen Māyanakelidevi, and 'Srīmad-Govindacandradeva-pāda-padma-sammatyā', in the Gagaha grant of Mahārājaputra Rājyapaladeva V.S. II99/II43 A.D. announcing a grant by himself)I.

The epigraphic evidence of the dynasty shows that, generally these dues were divided into two broad heads, regular ("nity-ādaya" or "niyat-ādaya") and irregular("anity-ādaya" or "aniyat-ādaya"). A comparative study of these grants shows that 'bhāga-bhoga-kara' certainly was one of the nity-ādayas; other well-known dues of the period, which are also mentioned in the Gahadavāla grants were hiranya, nidhinikṣepa, daśavandha, lāvana-kara, ṁrṇakara, jalaka, gokara, ākara and pravaṇikara. Besides these, there were some other dues of uncertain character, which are not found anywhere else; of these Turuśkadaṇḍa, Kumara-gadiśāsaka and kūṭaka are mentioned frequently in the Gahadavāla grants.

akṣapataḥ-ādāya pratihāra-prastha varavajjhe, valadi and vāhyāvahyaṣṭarasiddhi occur only in the Basahi, Kamauli and Rahan grants of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra issued in V.S.1161, 1162 and 1166 respectively1.

a) Some taxes and dues mentioned in the Gahadavāla land-grants

i) Bhāga-bhoga-kara: This is a common enough tax of the period and is found mentioned not only in the Gahadavāla records, but also in the inscriptions of the Rastrakūtas, the Cālukyas, the Paramāras, the Kālacuris, the Candrātreyas and others. According to Tripathi this term really signifies three different taxes, namely the bhāga (grain-share or share of produce), bhoga (enjoyment of certain rights by the landlord when the land lies fallow) and kara (rent proper payable in cash or kind)2. Altekar explains the term "bhāga-bhoga-kara" as two different taxes, namely, bhāgakara (bhāga, sadbhāga or udraṅga) and bhogakara (representing uparikara or petty taxes realised in kind)3. Ghoshal on the other hand refers to it as a technical term signifying the king's grain-share on the produce of land paid in kind4. It is thus admitted by both Altekar and Ghoshal that, "bhāga-bhoga-kara" (whether the term refers to two different taxes or is used as the denomination of a single specific tax), constituted the portion of revenue, which was generally paid in kind.

All the land-grants of the Gahadavāla dynasty, except the 'Pañcāla' group of grants5, issued by Mahārājaputra Govinda-candra, commands the exemption of the donees (Brahmanas in most cases) from the bhāga-bhoga-kara; the Pañcāla group of grants however, refers to bhaga, bhāga-bhāga (bhoga?) and bhāga-bhoga in its place; it also mentions some obscure dues not known anywhere else. I have elsewhere contended that the Pañcāla region was probably a late conquest of the first Gahadavāla king Candradeva and that it was not under the direct rule of the dynasty for a long period but was probably placed under the dynasty of Gādhipur-ādhipati Gopāla6. The three

3. Altekar, Rastrakūtas, pp.214-15
5. See infra. p.215 (Appendix).
6. Vide supra, p.35.
grants, noted above, were the first to be issued from that region and it is possible that the usual Gahadavāla official phraseology and technicalities had not yet replaced the prevailing ones in the Paṅcāla region around Kānyakubjā. The bhāga and the bhoga of these grants thus may have been the same as udraḥga and uparikara (as explained by Altekar) and were probably collected separately. Under the usual Gahadavāla system however (as illustrated by the majority of their grants) the term "bhāga-bhoga-kara" appears to have been used as a single technical denomination, signifying king's share and other dues on land, to be realised in kind. This contention is supported by the position of the bhāndagārika in the list of officials, which shows that he was an important royal officer. Evidently a good percentage of the king's revenue, if not the most, consisted of the taxes and dues paid in kind and often in the shape of perishable food-stuff, which were to be deposited in the 'bhāndāra' or the storehouse and not in 'kosa' or the treasury; bhāga-bhoga-kara probably, comprising more than one royal dues (to be paid in kind), on the produce of land, may have been collected by a single set of collectors, acting under a single head, to facilitate quick conveyance to the 'bhāndāra', for immediate disposal.

The Gahadavāla inscriptions do not supply us with any information regarding the actual amount of land-tax levied by the government; the injunction laid down by the lawgivers of ancient India, however give us only a rough broad outline of the principle of taxation on land. Sukra's rules of taxation lays down that, the king should realise his revenue in such a way, that the cultivators are not destroyed, that he should do so like the garland-makers, who do not destroy the flower-plant and not like the charcoal-makers who destroy the tree.1 Lakṣmīdhara's quotations from different Dharmāśāstras also condemn any such method of taxation which may ruin the prosperity

I. Sukra, IV, 2, II3.
of the people. According to Šukra, the tax levied on land irrigated by river, should be half the produce and on those irrigated by tanks and wells, one-third the produce; unirrigated land should be taxed at the rate of one-fourth of the produce and barren ones at one-sixth. The Šukraniti further lays down that, before the assessment, land should be classified carefully on basis of fertility and measured exactly; and no tax should be assessed upon the persons who improve the land by irrigation, until they have earned twice their cost of production, including the government dues.

ii) Hiranya: It has been explained variously as gold, income-tax or tax on capital or as a term which signifies the state's right to gold and other minerals. Ghosal however has shown on comparative study that it was most probably land revenue paid in cash; possibly the tax on some of the produce, which was quickly perishable and not easily divisible into shares, were paid in cash, while the bulk of the land revenue was paid in kind as bhāga-bhoga-kara.

iii) Daśavandha: In the Gahadavāla inscriptions this has been mentioned only once, in the Basahi grant of V.S.1161. Manu explains this term as a fine imposed on witnesses, who do not appear in cases of loans of money. The Arthasastra explains it as a share of one-tenth of the produce given by a landlord to a cultivator or labourer. From the south Indian inscriptions it appears to indicate a special grant of land granted to persons for repairing or building a tank on condition of paying in money or in cash, one-tenth of the produce or one-tenth of the normal tax; these grants were known as 'daśavandha-māṇya'. This reduced amount of tax may have been mentioned in the Gahadavāla grant as the daśavandha due; this tax was little known in the Northern India though it was a common enough tax in South India.

1. Kṛtya Rājadharmā, pp.9x,87 ff.
2. Sukra, IV, 2, pp.II5-II6.
iv) Bidhinikṣepa: According to the lexicons both the terms 'ṇidhi' and 'nikṣepa' mean treasure-trove; nikṣepa also means unsealed or unclaimed property or the property of a buried person. Tripathi has taken the whole word to mean treasure-trove but as such the term is tautologous. According to Altekar it refers to the king's right to the treasure-troves and buried or unclaimed wealth.

All the ancient law-givers enjoin king's right to the treasure-troves except when the discoveror is Brāhmaṇa. According to some, the person, who finds the treasure should, inform the king, who would take it after giving one-sixth to the finder. When, however, a Brāhmaṇa finds it, he may keep the whole. Nārada recommends no remuneration for the finder and says that, the whole should be taken by the king, and that a Brāhmaṇa may take it only after, it has been given to him by the king. According to Śukra a king should issue edicts, forbidding his subjects to take treasure-trove.

According to the cannons of Gautama, Vasistha, Viṣṇu and Manu the property of the heirless non-Brāhmaṇas should go to the king. The Dharmaśāstras do not recognise brothers, cousins and uncles as heirs and a person dying without a male issue is considered heirless; the right of the widow to the property is also not recognised. Wirukta and Yājñavalkya, however, recognise widow's right of inheritance. Bidhinikṣepa is mentioned only once in the Gahadavāḷa records, namely in Jayaccandra's Kamauli grant of V.S.1230/1173 A.D.

v) Akara: As the name signifies this was most probably a tax on mines. The evidence of the inscriptions prove that mine...
was sometimes considered a state monopoly. Viṣṇu also says that the king can take the whole output of the mines. The Arthasastra which refers to the king's vibhāga on the produce of a mine together with various toll, dues and duties indicates that the mines were also owned by private persons and as usual the "vighāga" or the "sadbhāga" was paid to the king. Manu also enumerates the mines among the sources of revenue and enjoins that the king should take the half of the produce of the mines. Sukra too lays down, that after the expenses being deducted, half of gold, one-third of silver, one-fourth of copper, one-sixth of zinc and iron, half of the precious metals and half of salt should be paid to the king. It is possible that though the mines were sometimes considered a state monopoly, the private individuals were often allowed to own mines, specially base metal and salt mines (cf. all the Gahadavala grants conceding the right of "loha-lavan-ākara") with the permission of the king, and in such cases the tax levied on the output of the mines were known as the akara. This levy is mentioned only in one Gahadavala inscription, the Basahi grant.

Jalakara and Gokara are mentioned for the first time in the Gaṅghā inscription of Govindacandra in V.S.1199/1143 A.D. and then in the Benares grant of V.S.1203/1146 A.D. and also in some of the inscriptions of Jayaccandra. The first item, jalakara, was corrected by Kielhorn as jātakara, though all the plates clearly support the reading jalakara. The Arthasastra refers to a tax which may have been similar to jalakara or water-tax; according to Kautilya "udakabhāga" was to be levied on the tenants of the king's own land at the varying rate of one-fifth, one-fourth

1. Viṣṇu, III, 55.
2. Kaut, II, 12.
4. Sukra, V, 2, I17-12, 112.
5. IA, XIV, pp. 101-04.
6. Vide Kamauli Insc. of V.S.1224 & plate (EI, IV, pp. 117-20)
and one-third of the produce, according as the land is irrigated by the state; uniform rate of one-fourth the produce was levied on the lands watered by the rivers. According to Ghoshal to judge from later analogy it seems probable that these charges were levied not as a substitute for but as an addition to ordinary items of land revenue. According to Sukra, however, the primary land assessment should be based on irrigation and fertility of the soil; the water-rate over and above that would not only be a heavy burden to the producer, the same item in the same form would be taxed twice. The jalakara mentioned in the Gahadavāla records may not have been a tax of the same kind as udakabhāga of Kautilya; on the other hand it may have been a tax on the produce of water, fish for example. The Gahadavāla conditions of land-grants, which includes the term "sa-matya-ākara" prove that fish was a source of income at this period and consequently also a source of revenue. A South Indian inscription, issued by Mārvamman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, records a dispute between a temple authority and an individual over the ownership of a river, which was settled by dividing the income from fishing equally among the parties.

A tax on cow was levied in South India under the term "nalla" or good cows. Gokara likewise, may have been a similar tax levied probably on the breeding of cow. During financial crisis Kautilya has advised taxation on breeding of cow. Also "vraja" was a constituent of "āyasārītra" and according to Kautilya there were taxes on the sale and tending of cattle. On this analogy, Gokara of the Gahadavāla grants may alternatively have been a tax on the sale of cows in the villages.

viii & ix) Lavanakara and parnakara are mentioned only once in the inscriptions of this dynasty, in the Macchlishahr grant of Hariscandra issued in V.S. 1253/1197 A.D. Importance of salt as a source of revenue recognised by Kautilya and in his system of revenue administration there was an officer to superintend the department of salt, "lavanāchyakṣa". He was to collect out of prepared salt, the "lavanabhāga" and the "prakraya". It seems that while the salt mines generally may have belonged to the king private manufacture of salt was allowed under the king's license. According to the condition of the Gahadavāla land-grants the king's right to the salt mines and the base metal mines in the lands granted were conceded in favour of the grantee; further by this tax the 'king's share' of the private manufacture was also granted.

Parnakara or grass-tax is also mentioned in legal literature; according to Śukra the king is entitled to take one-third, one-fifth, one-seventh, one-tenth or one-twentieth from the collectors of grass and woods. The tax paid by the collectors of grass was probably called parnakara.

x) Pravanikara: This tax has been explained by Ghoshal as a tax imposed on a certain class of merchants; the term 'pravani' is mentioned after 'vanik' in a list of persons belonging to a village granted by Mathanasdeva. A grant of a Somavāsa king of Trilok, mentions pravanikara. Tripathi explains the term as a tax on turnpikes, intended to preserve the peace of the village by discouraging the advent of a large number of visitors; he has also suggested that it may have been a tax for the upkeep of the road.

---

1. El, X, pp. 93-100.
2. Kaut., II, 12.
6. HK, p. 348.
"Pravāna" according to the lexicons mean "catuspatha"; as such pravāna may have been some kind of road-cess or tax on road. The Arthasastra on the other hand refers to a kind of dues (deya) in connection with the expenditure involved in conveying the merchandise to foreign countries; it has been called ātivahikā and has been explained as 'mārg-ātivāhana-sahaya-bhūt-ayudhiya-deyam'; probably it was a fee for the military guides who escorted and helped the foreign merchants; these merchant-guides appear to have been appointed by the state. In the Gahadavāla domain also, there may have been 'pravāna' or state guides, posted in every village, whose duty was to escort and guide the merchants from the interior part of the country to the highway crossing leading to the next village or town. Pravānākara or the tax paid for the service of these guides, probably went partly to the remuneration of these guides and partly to the royal treasury.

xi) Turuskadanda has been interpreted variously as a tax on aromatic seeds, a tribute paid to Ghazni by the ruler of Kānyakubja, or a tax levied on the Muslim settlers in Kanauj, whose existence is known from the Kāmil ut-Tawārīkh, or a tax levied on the Hindus to ward off the Muslims. The first interpretation is vague; as to the second one, the Gahadavāla rulers as I have already shown in my chapters on the political history, had no reason to pay any tax to Ghazni. Any of the last two explanations is possible. The Kāmil ut-Tawārīkh however, testifies that the Muslims were allowed to practise their religion unhindered under the Gahadavālas; also a comparative study of the inscriptions shows that it was most probably a tax to meet the heavy expenses incurred in maintaining a standing army ('danda') to fight the Turuṣkas. This tax is often mentioned in the Gahadavāla grants, issued before the reign of Jayaccandra. During his reign however the tax

2. Vide my article on Turuskadanda IHQ, June, 1949, pp.135-38.
is no longer mentioned in the inscriptions; probably it was no longer levied, firstly because the Gahadavāla frontier on the west has shrunk eastwards, as the result of the occupation of Delhi by the Chamānas and the Gahadavāla dominion no longer touched the Tūrška-occupied India and secondly as a popular measure to relieve the heavy burden of taxation evidenced by the new taxes, which appeared in the later days of Govindacandra's reign.

xii & xiii) Kūtaka and Kumara-gadiāṇaka: These were two more taxes well known under the Gahadavāla regime but unknown elsewhere. In some of the inscriptions the first word has been spelt with a short "u". Kūta according to the lexicons is a house and kūtaka may have meant a tax on house; such taxes have been mentioned in both the Arthaśāstra and Śukra-nīti. The spelling however in most of the Gahadavāla inscriptions, is kūtaka and not kūtaka; according to the lexicons again kūta is a plough and kūtaka is a plough-share. A similar tax is met for the first time in the grant by the ruler of Ucchakalpa under the name 'halikākara'. This term being practically unknown to technical literature it is not possible to ascertain the cause or amount of tax on plough.

The other tax, Kumara-gadiāṇaka has been spelt variously in the inscriptions as kumara-gadiānaka, kumara-gadiāṇaka, kumara-gadiyanaka and such like; in a few cases the first part of the word is spelt as 'kumāra'. This obscure term has been explained as a tax at the rate of so much per gadyāṇaka (i.e. 32 gunja berries) on the birth of the royal princes. It may, however, be explained in another way with the help of the South Indian inscriptions. One inscription of Cola Rājendradeva II, dated in 1072 A.D., records that a "pudavāri" (?)cloth was to be given to the

2. Śi, XIX, p.21.
king for every 1500 kuli of land under the "kumari" cultivation by the hill tribes\footnote{1}. The "kumari" or "kumri" cultivation, well known in South India, has been explained by Yukti-kalpataru\footnote{2}, a work of the eleventh century, as shifty cultivation. It is possible that in the Gahadavala regime also kumari or shifty cultivation was carried on in some of the places, possibly in the hill side and the forest tracts and the assessment on the land under shifty cultivation was different from the ordinary land; because of the hard labour involved in the former process, the tax thereon was nominal. It appears that with some other taxes, this tax too was adopted by the Gahadavalaas from South India, retaining the South Indian coin-name gadyanaka; probably the cultivators in South India were required to pay some amount equal to one gadyanaka for some specified measure and the due in the Gahadavala kingdom became known as kumara-gadyanaka or gadalaka.

\textbf{xiv)} \textit{Viṣaya-dāna}: This due has been mentioned once in the Candravatī inscription of Candradeva in V.S.1050/1093 A.D. It has been explained by Tripathi as some kind of district tax\footnote{3}. This contention is supported by the fact that the grant, which mentions it records the grant of pattala, with certain exceptions. It seems that the viṣaya-dāna was a kind of tax paid to the district in connection with the pattalā. The exact nature and amount of the tax cannot be ascertained.

\textbf{xv & xvi)} \textit{Sva-nauka-bhātaka} and \textit{tar-adaya}: The Candravatī inscription, mentioned above, also refers to these two kinds of dues, which are grouped together. Tar-adaya is the same as tara-deya or ferry-duty ("yātra-vetanaṁ rāja-naubhiḥ saṃpatantaḥ" - Kautilya), a well known and important source of revenue. As for the other term, Kautilya refers to a similar one "nau-bhātaka"\footnote{4} and explains that the fishermen

4. Shamsastri prefers the other reading, which according to Ganapati Sastrī, is a wrong one, cf. "nau-bhātakaṁ-it-ayapūṭhaṁ" Kaut. Comm. I, p.307.}
and pearl-fishers, who use the royal boats, should pay rent ("bhātaka") for the same (cf. "Matsyabandhaka nau-bhātakam sad-bhāgam dadyuh.... saṅkha-mukta-grāhīṇaḥ nau-bhātaka-
bhātakam dadyuh")¹. In the Gahadavala dominion also, the royal boats ("sve-naukā") appear to have been used by the public, not only as ferry boats but also for private business projects. The inscription, which refers to these two dues, records the grant of Kathehalī pattalā, bounded on three sides by three rivers Gomti, Bhāgirathī and Baranā; as such these two dues must have fetched a considerable amount of revenue in this patta. These were however, conceded in favour of five hundred Brahmāṇa donees.

xvii) Vāhyāvāhyāṁtarasiddhi is mentioned only once in the Rahan grant of mahārāja putra Govindacandra of V.S.II66/II09 A.D. The term reminds us of the "āṣṭa-bhoga" rights or the rights of eightfold enjoyment; those rights were on nidhi (treasure-trove), nikṣepa (buried and unclaimed treasure), pāśāna (mountain and rock with mines and minerals), siddhi (cultivated land), sādhyā (product of land), jalāṃṛta (water and water-products), aksini (actual privileges) agamā (future rights)². Vāhyāvāhyāṁtarasiddhi includes almost all the rights mentioned above; vāhyāvāhyām may refer to nidhi, nikṣepa, and pāśāna and siddhi, both siddhi and sahaya, while tara may have meant water products. Rights over all these were conceded in favour of the donee.

xviii) Valadī is mentioned only in the Rahan grant of Govinda-
candra of V.S.II66. It was probably a tax like the "nalleruḍu" (good bull) of a South Indian inscription³. It may be noted here that the Arthasastra advocates emergency taxation on the breeding of cow⁴.

xix & xx) Aksapātalā-prastha or aksapatal-adāva and prati-
ḥara-prastha: According to Ghoshal these terms were 'centri-
contribution of so much per prastha (a well known liquid measure) payable by the villagers on account of the officers concerned.

Some other royal dues mentioned in the Gahadavala grants have not yet been explained; and it is difficult to throw any light on their meaning; these are 'vimsaticchavatha' 'visatiathuprastha' and 'varavajha' in Mahārajaputra Govinda-candra's grants, mentioned often in Jayacandra's grants and dagapasadīĪrghagovica in Hariacandra's Macchlishahr grant.

b) Sources of Revenue

The sources of revenue or "āya-dārā" according to Kautilya comprise durga, rāṣṭra, khani, setu, vana, vraja and vanikpatha. Among the taxes mentioned above bhaga-bhoga-kara, kumara-gadiyānaka, daśavandha, parṇakara, kūtaka and tara obviously go under the rāṣṭra head of revenue. Pravaṇākara, svā-nauka-bhātaka and jalakara may belong to either of the vanikpatha or rāṣṭra head of revenue. The gokara and valadī were dues of vraja type. Among the revenue from khani only lavanakara and ākara have been mentioned.

Besides these there certainly were various kinds of fees for business transactions like aksapatāla-prastha or ādayaa and pratihāra-prastha. Though the inscriptions do not mention, there were also the license fees for private mines and salt-plants. Fines for breaking the laws and committing offences and crimes also must have been another source of revenue; one such group of offences are mentioned in one of the Gahadavala inscriptions, namely, "daś-āparādha". Besides these the treasure-troves, the buried and unclaimed treasure and property of heirless persons were generally considered to be king's property.

Imposition of the Turuskadanda was certainly an emergency measure; two other taxes gokara and baladi, if
interpreted as taxes on breeding, go under the head of emergency taxation.

As the land granted by the Gahadavala kings are always in 'rāstrā' or rural area, it is only natural that those grants do not contain any of the items of revenues grouped under the durga head by Kautilya; but doubtless many of them, namely, tolls, fines, registration fees (mudrā), license fees, taxes on the building sites, artisans, merchandize, and duties on liquor, prostitutes and gambling, constituted important sources of revenue in the capital city and also in other towns and cities, which under the Gahadavala system of administration may have been separate units.

B). Expenditure

Sukra gives us an idea of the state expenditure of the period. According to him army is the most important head of expenditure and half of revenue must be spent on it. Gifts, principal officers, head of departments and king's personal expense, each of these four items is entitled to one-twelfth of the revenue; the balance about one-sixth of the total revenue is to be deposited in the state treasury.

Greater stress was laid on religious expense and gifts in the description of "vyayaadarśa" of Kautilya, which begins with expenditure for worship of gods and ancestors and presents for auspicious prayers by the priests ('svasti-vācana').

Lakṣmidhara also lays great stress on religious ceremonies, chanting of the Vedas and various sacrifices and pūjās, which must be undertaken by a king for the prosperity and welfare of his dominion. The Gahadavala inscriptions indicate that a vast amount of wealth was spent in religious activities specially in observances of various

religious ceremonies and sacrifices and subsequent "daksinās" and "dānas" bestowed on the Brāhmaṇas and the purohitas. Land they granted were almost always villages, sometimes with pātakas; once a whole pattalā, with the exception of some villages, was given away to the Brāhmaṇas.

Lakṣmīdhara, who as the Sāndhivigraha of Govinda-candra directed and undertook many victorious expeditions, has devoted a whole chapter to describe "yātra" or operations of war. The vastness of the Gahadavala army, as already noted, impressed both the Indian and the Muslim writers. Thus the military expense also appears to have been a heavy one as may be gathered from the maintenance of a vast standing army and the speedy expansion of the Gahadavala domain.

Another important item of expenditure was the remuneration for the state servants or 'rāja-puruṣas'. It is not certain whether they were paid in cash or in kind that is, in landed property. Kautilya refers to eight different grades in salary for different classes of officials; the epigraphic evidence of later period proves that the state servants were often granted land in lieu of their services for the state. Lakṣmīdhara's commentary on Saṅkhya-liṅkita refers to 'vetana' or wage (cf. "Prasiddhesu tu yodhesu dāna-vetan-ādhikam-api vastrādi deyan-ety-ārthah") from this commentary it appears that the warriors and also all the 'rāja-puruṣas' generally received remuneration in cash ('vetana') and presents ('dāna') in recognition of their valuable service; the famous warriors received robes over and above vetana and dāna. The E.A.S. land-grants of Jayascandra in which Rāuta Kṣatriya Rājayadharma-varman received some tax-free villages, indicate that sometimes the Gahadavala rāja-puruṣas received 'vetana' or 'dāna' in kind. This type of tax-free villages, granted to the rāja-puruṣas, are probably carefully distinguished from the two other types of tax-free villages, namely, "deva-grama" and
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"dvija-grama" (villages granted to the Brahmanas and gods), as "vikara-grāmas" in the Candravati inscription of V.S.1150/1093 A.D. I. Lakṣmiṭhara’s commentary mentioned above, also advocates state pension to the sons of warriors killed in action.

Epigraphic and numismatic evidence indicates that there was a heavy strain on the Gahadavala treasury as early as the last days of Govindaendra; a number of new and obscure taxes were imposed and gold and silver coins of extremely base metal were issued. This financial crisis may be attributed to the religious bounty of the Gahadavala kings, their military ambition and the Turkish menace on the west.

C). The Gahadavala Land-grants and Agrarian Concessions

All the official inscriptions of this dynasty, sixty-eight so far discovered, are land-grants bestowed on Brāhmaṇas and temples. Most of these, record gifts of one or a few villages, while a singular one records the transfer of practically a whole pattalā, to five hundred Brāhmaṇas; four other grants record the transfer of plots of lands in different villages.

Junior officials intimately connected with the land grants are 'karanika' and 'kāyaṭhā' who wore probably trusted with the charge of drawing up the document of gift in approved Gahadavala official form. During the latter part of the Gahadavala rule however (as has been noticed in a previous section of this chapter), Mahā-ākapatalika or Akapatalika is mentioned in the place of karanika or kayaṭhā (cf. "Lakhitam ca-adam tamra-patṭakam-akṣapatīliko thakkura Sri-Vivikena")2. The drawn up document was then passed on to the royal scribe, who incised it on the copper plates.

1. EI, IV, pp.193-96.
2. EI, IV, p.128.
Some of the royal scribes are described as "lohara" or "stradhara" and the scribe Mādhava, who inscribed the Candraśaṅkha grant of V.S.1156 appears to have been a sculptor, who made the image of Candra-Mādhava (cf. "Candra-Mādhavo yena ghatitah"). The following interesting statement is found in Candraśaṅkha grant of V.S.1150, comprising ninety lines written on five plates: "What should I speak of king Candra, by the sound produced from whose copper-plate grants given to Brahmaṇas and divinities at the time of their being engraved with rows of closely written lines, the universe become deafened". A majority of the Gahadavāla grants were made at Varānasī and the striking similarity they display in fineness of general execution and palaeography, indicates that the central record office was situated at this city, where the royal scribes, recording numerous gifts and other records, developed, what may be called, the Gahadavāla style of script.

The Gahadavāla inscriptions without a single exception, clearly distinguish between the agrarian rights of the king and the taxes and dues (dāya, adāya or pratyādāya) and describes them in two different clauses. Thus the official form of a grant of this dynasty is as follows:

a) Genealogy, 'prasāasti' and 'virudhas' of the donor in verse and prose.

b) Location of the village (or land) granted.

c) Notice to the officials and others who should be aware of the gift.

d) Description of the village (or land) with boundaries and specific mention of the agrarian rights to be conceded in favour of grantee.

e) Date, place and occasion of the grant.

f) Religious rites.

g) Name and family of the donee.

h) Announcement of the grant.

i) Specific mention of some of the taxes and dues conceded in favour of the donee.

j) Imprecatory and benedictory verses and the name of the karanika or kayastha and the scribe.

1. El; El, XVIII, pp.223-4; El, XIV, p.199.
2. El, XIV, p.196.
Pratihāra Trilocanapāla’s Jhusi grant issued from Prayāga in V.S.1034/1027 A.D. and Kalacuri Sodihadeva’s Kahla plate and a few of the inscription of the contemporary kings also attempt similar distinction between rights and dues.

The Gahadavāla grants generally donate land with sarv-ādāya or samast-ādāya and generally specify a few of them. As for the agrarian rights, mentioned, they are more or less the same in all the grants, whether they were issued from Vārānasī or from any other portion of the Gahadavāla dominion. The only remarkable exceptions are the land-grants of Maharājāputra Govindacandra, all of which were probably issued from the Kāhyakūṭa region.

A perusal of these inscription reveal that generally these royal rights extended over different part of the villages excluding the land inhabited and cultivated; it thus extended over jala-sthala, loha-lavāṇ-ākara, matsy-ākara, gartt-osara and madhuk-ākara-vana-vātika-tyagayūti-gocara. The first term jala-sthala may have meant either marshy land or plain land and water reservoir; these reservoirs probably included 'vāpi' (wells with flights of steps), kūpa (ordinary well), tadāga (tanks) and probably all the gardens on the bank of the reservoirs (kaccha-rama). The second term indicates the king’s right over the base(loha) metal mines and salt mines. The inscriptions of this period and earlier period show that generally mines were government monopoly; but the private persons specially the Brāhmaṇas, were sometimes allowed to own mines with king’s licence on condition of paying regularly the king’s share of the produce, which was probably called ākara. Matsy-ākara evidently referred to some of the water-reservoirs like tadāga and also the river, if any, which flows through or along the village; the right of fishing in these places was one of the royal privileges, this too was generally conceded to the Brāhmaṇas with the land. Gartt-osara
referred to the ditches, drains and trenches and sterile land in a village. The madhuka and the amra gardens were also considered royal property.

Trṇayūṭi and gocara are almost synonymous terms, the former meaning grass-plots and the latter grazing grounds. Trṇayūṭi has been explained sometimes as less fertile place which were allowed to lie uncultivated for a year or two by turns, as such however trṇayuti certainly was the private property of the cultivator and the king's right over it cannot be entertained. Kautilya enjoins the kings to provide pasture grounds in the uncultivable land and probably it was allowed to be used by the villagers on payment of a tax to meet the initial expense and the cost of upkeep. This plot may have been called trṇayuti and was distinguished from the common grazing ground which was probably the village-property, the state being responsible for its protection.

It may be noticed here that some of the rights mentioned above carried with them the responsibilities involved. Thus the donee was responsible for the preservation, protection and upkeep of the water-reservoirs, river-banks, fruit-gardens, grass-plots and grazing grounds, though the income from them was but normal. The only remunerative right was that over the base metal mines and the salt mines.

All the ancient law-givers refer to the king's right over the forests and the hill-tracts. These are mentioned in the Candravatī grant of king Candradeva of Y.S.II50, which records the grant of a pattalā; it was granted with the exception of the previous grants and with rights over “girigahana-pāsāna” together with almost all the rights mentioned above. These no doubt constituted an important source of income, yielding elephants, valuable trees and minerals.

As we have seen the grants of Mahārājaputra Govinda-candra issued from the Kānyakubja region, is different from
all other grants, in citation of the rights conceded. In the Basahi grant was donated with kṣetra-vana-madhuk-ākāsa-pātāla and daśa-sparādha and in the Kamauli grant with svasaṁ-trnvāyuŚ-gocara, jāła-sṭhala, āmra-madhuka-gartt-gṣara-pāqa-pāmadi-vana-lohaśvan-ākara daśa-sparādha-daṇḍa, ākāsa-pātāla. Kṣetra technically means cultivated land and the donation of it shows that the state owned some cultivated plots or some farm in that village. Another term which we have not met with before in the Gahaḍavāla grants, is 'ākāsa-pātāla' or 'ākāsa-pātāla-sahita'; probably the rights over mines and nidhi-nikṣepa were indicated by this term pātāla. What is meant by sakasa however is not clear; a similar term 'ākāsa-pattia' is known in a few of the Candrātreyā grants and the term was translated as the produce of the sky, has not been and was left unexplained. That may have been the produce of the sky is not known.

"Daśa-sparādha-daṇḍa" is a common term in inscriptions and land in ancient India was often granted with daśa-sparādha-danda or daṇḍa-daśa-sparādha. Fleet explains it as the donee's right to the proceed of fines for committing ten offences. While according to Ghoshal it indicates the donee's right of exemption from the punishment for daśa-sparādha. According to some the former explanation also implies the donee's right of jurisdiction over the offences committed. It is however possible that, though generally the balance of the fines and fees, after meeting the necessary expense of the village court, was returned to the central treasury, in some cases this balance was diverted to the donee; as such the term may not have implied the donee's jurisdiction over the village.

The villages were generally given away with all the four boundaries clearly marked ("catur-āghata-viśāda-svāsima-par-yantah"). Evidently in cases of grants of small

to maintain a large army and the religious policy of these rulers. The earlier period, as the evidence of Govinda-
candra's coinage shows, was marked by comparative prosperity; but as the history of the dynasty proceeds, we find a pro-
gressive debasement, a clear sign of financial deterioration.