CHAPTER IV

ALTERING THE RURAL ORDER?
DONATION OF LAND, CONDITIONS OF
ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF
ASSIGNED RESOURCES
The present chapter aims at analyzing the nature and extent of changes in the existing agrarian setup brought about by the land assignments created by different authorities during the period of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the region of the Deccan. The exercise would focus on two aspects of the corpus of Rāṣṭrakūṭas inscriptions. The first one relates to the study of the nature of rights and privileges, generally known as parīhāra, that were transferred in favour of different recipients along with the village/villages or land/lands. The second aspect relates to the study of the nature of composition of the recipients of those assignments, with certain rights and privileges, which were created through land charters. The idea behind the exercise is to see the nature of control the class of recipients was to have on different agrarian resources. Apart from bringing into light the varieties of agrarian resources generated by rural society\(^1\), the exercise would also help us to examine the widely held assumption that the process of making land grant to brāhmaṇa led to a

\(^1\) The epigraphic information on this aspect of agrarian economy has largely been used by different scholars to construct what is popularly known as the revenue system which is generally treated as an integral part of a given administrative set up. Each term figuring in the parīhāra section of the land charter is treated as an item of revenue and the total number of it is generally taken for calculation, generally with the help of literary data, to ascertain how much of surplus/revenue a given state was able to appropriate from society. Finally, the cumulative result of this statistical exercise is used to determine the character of state—whether it was a benevolent one or the oppressive one. This kind of writing has been one of the characteristics of the conventional historiography but the continuation of this characteristic is visible in some of the recent works where the aspects of the regional distribution of various terms of revenue/tax has not been taken into consideration. For a
series of changes in the agrarian set up culminating into bringing about a new social formation\(^2\).

The organization of the data is little different from the earlier chapter in the sense that that the data of each regions has been grouped by century. Also as and when possible the charters of each century of a particular region have also been grouped on the basis of authority involved in making the grants. The idea behind this is to see not only the regional distributions of various terms denoting rights and privileges but also to see if certain rights and privileges were specific to certain authorities.

\section*{C. AD 500 to 600}

\footnote{This assumption is central to the writings of the proponents of Indian feudal social formation. To cite some representative examples, see R.S. Sharma, \textit{Indian Feudalism}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn., Delhi, 1980, R.N. Nandi, ‘Feudalization of state in Medieval South India’, \textit{Social Science Probing}, Vol.1, No.1, March, 1984, also, ‘Client, Ritual and Conflict in Early Brahmanical Order’, \textit{The Indian Historical Review}, Vol.6, nos.1 and 2. etc. Recently many scholars have expressed their discomfort against the exaggerated importance given to the process of making land grants to \textit{brāhmaṇas} during the period of early medieval India. See for example, Introduction in B.D. Chattopadhayaya, \textit{Aspects of Rural Settlements and Rural Society in Early Medieval India}, Calcutta, 1990, also \textit{The Making of the Early Medieval India}, New Delhi.}
We have five charters assignable to the period of the sixth century out of which three of them belong to the Manpur house of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, one to the Vidarbha branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and one that was issued by Dejja-Mahārāja. As far as the geographical context of their object of donations is concerned, they all belong to different sub-regions.

The first charter of the Manpur house of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, datable to C AD 501, registers a grant in the Bhima basin region. The grant, which was made with the consent of Vibhuraja, was given according to the rules of bhumi-cchidra, and consisted of an agrahāra.

The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa of Agastya gōtra whose place of residence has not been mentioned.

Two of the charters of this house record donation in the upper Krishna basin. One of them, datable to the C. sixth century, mentions the donation of a settlement called Pāndaraṅgapalli along with four other settlements called Anevari, Chāla, Kandaka and Duddapalli.

The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa of Bhārgava gōtra. The charter does not speak of any terms and conditions regarding the donated property.

The second charter records the donation of a grāmaka (small village) called Uṇḍikavāṭikā. Like the earlier charter, there is no reference to the transfer of any rights / privileges in favor of the donee in this

---

3 It may be clarified that since the precise dates for all these charters have been difficult to work out, the order in which they have been arranged for discussion does not necessarily follows the chronological sequence.

4 Hingni Berdi plates of Rashtrakuta Vibhuraja; Year 3, EI, XXIX, pp. 174-77.

5 Pandarangapalli grant of Rashtrakuta Avidheya, EI, XXXVII, pp. 9-24.

6 Untikavatika grant of Abhimanyu, EI, VIII, pp. 163-166.
charter as well. It, however, carries, at the end of the charters, only the instruction of the donor to the effect that nobody should practice deceit towards this grant.

The nature of the recipients of the grants in both the charters is different. In the first case, the recipient was a brāhmaṇa named Jayadvīṭha of Bhārgava gotra with three pravaras, whereas the recipient in the second case was a recluse named Jātābhāra who received the grant for Dakshiṇa-Śiva of Pēṭha-Pangarakā which has been identified in the same district in which the donated property was located7.

We have one charter which was issued by a subordinate (Adhirāja) called Dējja- Mahārāja 8. It relates to the sub-region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha. It records the donation of a kṣhētra, measuring fifty nivartanas by the royal measure (raja-mānēna) in a grāma.

Even this charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights and privileges in favor of the donee. In fact, in the context of the boundary delineation we are told about a canal (Muṇja-jalamārga) and a tank (pushkarini) as constituting two sides of the donated property. It seems that the demarcation of the donated kṣhētra was done in a manner so as to keep these resources out of the purview of the granted property.

The recipient has been described as belonging to the Jambukhandagana. His place of residence has not been mentioned.

The one charter that we have of Vidarbha branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas9 speaks of two grants, consisting of certain landed property and a grāma in the region of Wardha-Wainganga basin. Unlike the charters of the

---

7 For identifications of the places mentioned in this charter, see Studies in Indology, 1968, pp. 195-203.
9 Nagardhan plates of Swamiraja, EI, XXVIII, pp. 1-16.
Manipur branch of Rāṣṭraṇa, this charter carries a list of rights and privileges that were transferred in favor of the donee.

The section of the charters dealing with the rights and privileges of the donee begins with expression ‘ā-candr-ārk-ārṇava-kṣiti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-paurā-ānvaya-kram-opabhogyayay...’. The literal translation of the term would be ‘to be enjoyed by his sons and son’s sons as long as the moon, the sun, the seas, the earth, the rivers and the hills exist’. The term in implication conferred on donee the permanent hereditary rights over the donated property.

After this, the charter proceeds on to list the following exemptions which the donated grāma was granted.

I. sarva-ditya: This term has been rendered as ‘free from the obligation of the gifts’ by the editor of the inscription. D.C. Sircar, also attribute the similar meaning to it. The term is perhaps not referring to the exemption from ‘gift’ as gift ceases to remain a gift the moment it becomes obligatory. Therefore in actuality it would only imply exemption from the obligatory transfer of certain resources of the donated area, in some form or other, to donor.

II. viṣṭika: This is probably a derivation of the term ‘viṣṭi’ which has been taken to mean 'labour which the villagers were obliged to provide to the king or the landlord on occasions'. It has also been interpreted as unpaid labor or forced labor.

---

10 D.C. Sircar, takes it to mean ' free from the burden of all that is ditya', see, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966, p.403.
## Details of the donees as given in the Ngardhan plates of Svamiraja

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GÔTRA</th>
<th>SHÂKHÂ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divâkara</td>
<td>Upamanyu</td>
<td>Vâjasanêya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dévasvâmin</td>
<td>Maudgalya</td>
<td>Kânva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šaṅkara</td>
<td>Kauśika</td>
<td>Kânva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āditya</td>
<td>Bhâradvâja</td>
<td>Kânva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmmodar</td>
<td>Upamanyu</td>
<td>Kânva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sôma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatasa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suprabha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumâra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taittriya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishâna</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sâmâeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravichandra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravigaṇa</td>
<td>Kauṇḍin</td>
<td>Kânva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karkasvâmin</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. *Jēmaka-kara-bhāra parihīna*: This meant the freedom from obligation of the villagers to provide food to royal officers on tour\(^{12}\) as well as exemption from other taxes

IV. *sarv-ādāya-visuddh*: It has been taken to mean 'with all kinds of taxes fixed'\(^{13}\)

V. *antah-siddhika*: The term is the sort form of *abhyantara-siddhika*,\(^{14}\) which has been taken to mean 'internal income or revenue, or tax payable to the village authorities as against those payable to the king'.

It may be pointed out here that the charter records the transfer of certain land and a village to the same group of donee. However as far the exemption of certain taxes is concerned, they only related to the village. The charter is silent about the privileges of the donees over the piece of land which was donated at the request of *Gaṇa-samīha*.

The recipients of the grant were several *brāhmanas* of different gotras and śākhās. However, the details about only some of them have been given in the charter which has been have been arranged in a tabular form on the page facing this.

Thus, the impression that one gets is that none of the charters of the sixth century speak of the transfer of any rights over the donated area in favour of the donees. The maximum that was granted to them was certain exemptions. However, as to the question of who the beneficiary was of those exemptions is something we have no way to ascertain.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., p. 135
\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 403
\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 22
Apart from this, most of the charters do not mention the home of the donee. In one case where the place of the recipient has been mentioned, it was quite close to the locale of the donated property.

AD 601-700

For the period of the seventh century, we have three charters of the house of Vidarbha and all of them record property transfer in the region of Wardha-Wainganga basin.

The first charter records a grant by Svâmîrâja, with the consent of his overlord\textsuperscript{15}. The object of the grant consisted of a gráma.

The charter does not refer to the transfer of any privilege in favor of the donee.

The donee was a brâhmaṇa of Vatsa gôtra and was a Kâṇva. His place of residence has not been mentioned.

The second charter of this house, dated in Saka era 553 (AD 631),\textsuperscript{16} records the donation of three pieces of lands measuring certain nivartanas in two different grámas by three individuals having differential status. One was Nannarâja, who was a subordinate of Sankargaṇa, and rests two were his officials (dharmakaśa and mahâsandhivigrasin).

This charter also does not speak of the transfer of any right /privileges to the donee who was a Mâdhyaudina brâhmaṇa of the Bhâradvâja-gôtra. His place of domicile has not been mentioned.

The third property transfer document of this house was issued by the same Nannarâja and is datable to AD 693\textsuperscript{17}. It records the donation of

\textsuperscript{15} Bhîndon plates of Rashtrakuta Karkaraja, JESI, X, 30-35.
\textsuperscript{16} Tiwrikhed plates of Nanaraja, EI, XI, pp. 276-81
\textsuperscript{17} Sanglooda plates of Rashtrakuta Nanaraja, EI, XXIX, pp. 109-115
### Detail about the Donees as Given in the Charters of the 7th Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charter</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gotra</th>
<th>Shakha</th>
<th>Pravara</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhindon plates</td>
<td>Bhānu-bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>Kānva</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwalkheda plate</td>
<td>Mundibhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>Mādhyandina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangaloda plates</td>
<td>Haraganadadvīdin</td>
<td>Vārula</td>
<td>Taittirīya</td>
<td>Kauśika</td>
<td>Tagaravāstavya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pieces of land (*kṣetra*) in two *gramas*. The charter does not speak of the
transfer of any rights and privileges in favour of the donee.

The donee has been described as a *brahmāṇa* of Vârula *gotra* and resident of Tagara (*Tagara vāstavya*) which is modern Ter in Osmanabad
district. It may be pointed out that the donated property has been located
near Akola.

**C. AD 700 to 800**

We have several charters belonging to the timespan of the eighth century. The geographical contexts of the object of donations of these charters are
much varied then what we have seen so far.

The first of them, which relates to the region of Wardha-
Wainganga basin, is datable to AD 708 and belongs to the Vidarbha
branch of the Râṣṭrakūṭas. It speaks of the donation of a *grāma*.

Like most of the charters of this house, even this charter is silent
about the transfer of any right or privileges to the donee.

As far as the donee is concerned, we are only told that he was a
*brahmāṇa* of Kautsa *gotra*. There is no reference to his place of domicile.

We have three more charters recording donations in the region of
Wardha-Wainganga basin. They were all issued by the sovereign rulers
belonging to the Râṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed. The relevant details of these
charters have been arranged in a tabular form on the page facing this.

As is evident from the table, there was a gradual progression in
terms of the rights and privileges which were delegated to the recipients of the grants.

---

18 Multai copper plate grant,*JA*, XVIII, pp. 230-236.
## Rights and Privileges As Given In the 7th Century Charters of Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed in Wardha-Wainganga Basin Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT OF DONATION</th>
<th>ASSIGNED RESOURCES</th>
<th>OTHER PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>CONDITION OF ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhandak Pls. of Krishanaraja</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>Grāma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Pūrva-pratā-deva-brāhma-deya varja tathā param Umvarā-mantī-tala-simā deva-tadakasyo-uttaratah-rajani tadake paschimato nadi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first charters, datable to AD 772\textsuperscript{19}, which was issued by the sovereign authority at the request of some individual, and consisted of a grāma, does not speak of transfer of any privilege in favor of the donee. On the contrary, the charter specifies those privileges that recipient was not to have. They were:

I. \textit{purva-pradatta-deva-brahma-daya-varjita}: This refers to the absence of the donee’s right to have any control over the land in the gift village which was already a rent-free holding in the possession of the god or brāhmaṇas;

II. \textit{‘thatā param Umvara-manti-tala-sīmāya dēva-tadākasyo-uttaratah-rājani tadāke pāschimato nām evam nivartana shatah’}: The meaning of the passage is not clear. However, this has been rendered by the editor as 'and also the river along the boundary of Umvara-manti (the object of donation) to the north of the Dēva-tadāka, and to the west of the Rājini-tadaka. Thus altogether one hundred nivartanas.

The recipient of the grant was the Bhaṭṭāraka of the temple of Āditya in the town of Udumvara-manti which as been identified with modern Umrvati or Amraotí. This place is stated to be about sixty kms away from the place where the object of donation has been identified.

In the second charter, issued in AD 786\textsuperscript{20} by the Parmeshvari Parama-bhaṭṭtarika-Silamahadevi, the queen of PMP Druvarājadēva, we for the first time hear of the transfer of rural resources in favour of two brāhmaṇas.

\textsuperscript{19} Bhandak plates of Krīṣhpāraja, 	extit{EI.XIV}, pp.121-130.

The grant of grāma that was made according to the rules of bhūmicchidra was given along with the followings:

1. *sa-dhānya-hiranya-ādāya* which means together with the king’s grain share and taxes in cash. This implies that what was earlier given to the King in form of grain and others taxes in cash would now go to the donee.

2. *a cāṭa-bhata-prāveśyah*. This refers to the privilege that the granted village was to enjoy. Cāṭa and Bhata possibly represented the lower rung of the state officials. It has been suggested that Bhata represented a constable or a Pāik or Piāda whereas Cāṭa seems to have been leader of the group of them. Thus the use of the expression ‘a cāṭa-bhata-prāveśyah’ would mean the freedom of the gifted grāma from being entered by these lower-rank officials.

3. *akhila-rājikīyānām a-hastaprakṣepaṇiya*. The term is the same as ‘sarva-rājakīyānām a-hasta-prakṣepaṇiha’ which occurs in many other charters under consideration. This again is a privilege and it implies the freedom given to the donated village from any interference by royal agents.

4. *ā-candrārk-ārṇava-kṣiti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-pautranvaya-kram-opabhogyah*: This expression occurs earlier as well and it is indicative if he permanent nature of the grant.

5. *yatonayoreta bhuḥjanayoh-bhojayatoh prati...*(not clear)

---


The recipients of the grants were two brāhmaṇas of different gōtras and shākhās, though both were adhvaryu. Both he brāhmaṇas were also domicile of two different places. One of them was resident (vāstavya) of a place called Kurugōṭa and another was residing (vāstavya) at Nāndipuradvārī. It may be mentioned here that Nāndipuradvārī has been stated to be the viśaya in which the donated village was located.

The third grant, which is dated Saka 722 (AD 800)²⁴, is a royal charter. The list of resources and the privileges, which were transferred in favour of the recipients, gets longer in this charter. Before we examine the list, it may be necessary to refer to the nature of transaction recorded in the charters. The object of grant is a grāma and the recipients were thirteen brāhmaṇas. It is further stated that the village (or its revenue) was to be divided into eighteen equal shares. At the end of the charter it is specified that out of this eighteen shares Dikshita Ruddappa was to get five, Dēvadatta two, and the remaining eleven one each. The detail of the recipients is given in the tabular form on the page facing this.

The list of resources and other privileges that were transferred to the recipients contained the following:

1. s-ōdranga: The term is same as udranga which has been taken to represent ‘the fixed tax’, ‘the land tax’, ‘the principal tax’ or the tax on the permanent tenants. It has also been suggested that the tax might have been paid in grain²⁵.

2. soparikara: It is same as uparika which occurs in many charters along with udranga. It has been taken to mean ‘an additional taxes, ‘unfixed taxes’, ‘minor taxes’ or the tax paid by the temporary

²⁴ Anjanvati plates of Govinda III,El.XXII,pp 8-18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GÔTRA</th>
<th>VEDIC AFFILIATION</th>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruddapa Dikshita</td>
<td>Vasishṭha</td>
<td>Rīgvēda</td>
<td>Vēyaghana vastavya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durgappa</td>
<td>Kramalita</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Talēvāṭaku vastavya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvadatta</td>
<td>Hārīdra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>Kutimāsha</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maṅgappa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vōppaṇa</td>
<td>Hārīdra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiyanī</td>
<td>Mōggala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gantiyamma</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavvaiya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasamaṇa</td>
<td>Kaśyapa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhathikumara</td>
<td>Vājaśanēya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāraukha</td>
<td>Siguli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tenants. It may be mentioned here that the term *s-ôdranga* and *sa-parikara* have been referred twice in the charter.

3. *sa-dhânya-hirany-âdâyah*: This term also occurs in one of the charters discussed above and its meaning has already been explained.

4. *âbhyantara-siddhiya*: This term that figures in other charters also usually occur at the end of the expression denoting the rights and privileges of the donee. It indicates that apart from what all has been listed in the charter the donee was also given the rights to have 'internal income or the local tax'.

After talking about the transfer of these resources in favor of the donee, the charters goes on to speak about other privileges that the donated area or the donee was to have and it reads as ‘*samastâ-râjakîyânâm a-hastapraakṣepanîya â-candrârk-ârṇâva-kyâty-sarit-parvata-sama-kâlin-putra-pauritava-kram-opabhogyâ*...’ The significance of all these expressions has already been explained in the context of the charter datable to AD 786. However, what is new in this charter is the occurrence of the expression ‘...hhuñjato-bhojayatah krisatah-karsayatahpratidiśato vâ na ken-âpi paripathanâ kâryâ’. The expression, that occurs in other charters under consideration also, is the first instance of empowering the recipients to cultivate his benefices or get it cultivated, to enjoy it or get it enjoyed.

The rights and privileges which the recipients were to enjoy were not without limitation which come in the form of the condition that the

---

26 Ibid., p. 322.
grant was to be enjoyed according to the norms of *brahmadeya* (yatōsy-ōchitayā brahmadāya-sthitya).

We have one inscription that comes from a place called Indragadha near Bhanpura, about 13 miles from the Jhalawar station road in the district of Mandasur. Dated in VS 767 (AD 710 -11) it refers to Nannappa and his father Bhamana of Rāṣṭrakūṭas lineage. The purpose of the inscription is to record the construction of a temple of Shiva by the Pashupata Acharya Danarasi during the reign of Nanna. In this context, the inscription records certain endowment made by the 'daughters of one Kumara of the Pragvate caste'. It is further stated that the responsibility of maintaining the temple was delegated to the city administration.

We have four charters the geographical context of which would relate to the Upper Godavari basin sub-region.

Out of these, two were issued by subordinate authorities of different types. A list of the privileges figuring in those charters is given below in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT OF DONATION</th>
<th>LIST OF PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellora Pl. of Dantidurga</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>grāma</td>
<td>a cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāveṣyah ṣābhya-siddhiya sarv-ādāna-sai-grāhyya</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhulia Pls. of Karkanaja</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>grāma</td>
<td>x-ātraṅga sa-parikara a cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāveṣyah bhūta-pāṭa-pratyāya bhūmicchidra-nyāvena dattah</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, the first grant\textsuperscript{30} consisting of a gr\textit{ā}ma was made by Mah\textit{ā}s\textit{ā}m\textit{ā}nt\textit{ī}dhipati and it carried a rather small list of rights and privileges that were assigned in favour of the donee. However, we have the occurrence of the term '\textit{sarv-ādāna-saṅgrāhya}' for the first time. The term has been taken to mean the recipient's right to levy all the dues from the donated gr\textit{ā}ma\textsuperscript{31}. The other privileges consisted of abhyantara-siddhiya and a-\textit{cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāveśyah} the meanings of which have already been explained.

The recipient of the grant was a certain \textit{brāhmaṇa} originating (\textit{vinirgata}) from Navasāriṅka which has been identified with Nausārī in Gujarat while the donated village has been located near Malegaon in Nasik district.

The second grant, which was made by Karkkaraja after the lapse of nearly three decades\textsuperscript{32}, included more rights and privileges in favour of donee. The grant, which was made as \textit{bhūmi-cchidra-nyāya'}, conferred on the donee the rights to have \textit{s-odranga} and \textit{sa-parikar}. The donated gr\textit{ā}ma was also made free from the entry of \textit{cāṭa} and \textit{bhaṭa}.

The recipient of the grant was a \textit{brāhmaṇa} of Kaushika \textit{gotra} whose place of residence has not been mentioned.

A noteworthy feature of these charters is the absence of expression indicative of the period for which the grant was given. Also none of them either talk about donee right to sublet the donated property or refer to any


\textsuperscript{31} Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966,p. 403.

\textsuperscript{32} Dhulia plates of Karkaraja,\textit{El},VIII,p.182.
limitation on the donee with regard to the enjoyment of the object of donation.

In comparison to the charters of subordinate authorities, the list of rights and privileges occurring in the charters of sovereign authority is invariably larger. A tabular statement of the list of privileges as given in the two charters emanating from sovereign authority is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>LIST OF PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dharavarsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruvaraja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govinda III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at the table clearly suggests that in comparison to the recipients of the grants made by subordinates the recipients of royal grants invariably got more rights and privileges along with the objects of
donation. Both the royal grants, which were made according to the rules of bhūmi-chhidra, conferred on the donee permanent hereditary rights and also the right to sub-let their property. However, what is new in the second charter is the occurrence of the term s-doṣa-daś-āparādha which meant the right to fine including those imposed for the ten offences.

Apart from this we have two more terms which figure in this region for the first time. They are:

1. bhūta-pāta-pratyāya: The term has often been explained as 'excise and octroi duties'. D.C. Sircar, however, suggests that the term really meant the income resulting from storms, earthquakes, changes in the course of river etc.

2. s-otpadyamāna-viṣṭika: The term has been translated as 'together with the right to get unpaid labour whenever that may be due from the tenants'.

Rest of the expressions such as āḍranga, parikara, bhūta-pāta-pratyāya, dhuinya-hiraṇy, a cāṭa-bhūta-prāveśyah, sarva-rājakīyānām a-hastaprapṣepaniya etc. occurs in the some of the charters which have been discussed above and therefore, they do not require any fresh explanation here.

It may however be mentioned that the wide ranging powers conferred by the royal charters were not without limitation as the inclusion of the expression yatasyochitaya brahmadaya-sthitya would indicate. Also, both the charters carry another expression pūrva-pratta-(same as pradatta)

---

33 Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966, p. 80
34 Ibid., p. 59
35 Ibid., p. 406
The recipient of the first grant was a brāhmaṇa of Bharadvāja gotra and the Kanva śākhā who was a native (nivasi) of Jambūsara-sthāna.

In the case of the second grant we are told about a number of brāhmaṇas as the recipient of the grant. The charter apparently carried the information about the gotras and residence of all the recipients. Since this part of the charter has been damaged, nothing much can be made out of it except the fact that possibly one of them came from Pratishthāna which is modern Paithan.

We have one royal charter relating to the sub region of the Bhima basin. Datable to AD 768 the charter36 was issued by PMP Krishnaraja (Krishna I) at the request of Govindaraja. Two other persons also figure in the list of persons making request for the grant which consisted of a grāma along with (sarīta) four other rural settlements, which were part of Pūnaka viśaya.

The recipients of the assignments, as stated in the charter, were the resident brāhmaṇas of Karahāṭa ten thousand (Karahāṭa-daśasahasrāntatḥpātīshhyo vrāhmaṇēḥhyat, 1.26). It is however also stated that two shares were especially reserved for a certain Bhaṭṭa-Vāṣudēva who possibly belonged to the same area. It may be pointed out that while Karahāṭa ten thousand has been identified with modern Karhāḍ in Satara district, while the Pūnaka viśaya in which the donated village was located has been identified with modern Poona district.

It may be pointed out that the charter conferred on recipients the privileges of ‘sarva-vādhā-rahita’ (read as sarva-bādhā rahita) which suggests, that the donated settlements were only exempted from the oppression of taxation.

Four charters of the eighth-century record donations in the sub region of Upper Krishna basin. Though all the four grants were made by the members of the family of Rāṣṭrakūtas of Malkhed, their authority status was different. Two of the grants were issued by persons having subordinate status. The lists of rights and privileges to the recipients as figuring in those two charters of subordinate have been arranged in a tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>DONATION</th>
<th>PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alas plates of Govinda II</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>Yuvaraja, at the request of one of his family member</td>
<td>grāma</td>
<td>Arsiyavad-grama vāneṣa saha sa-bhōgo- dattah, L33-34</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatabad plates of Rashtrakuta Sankargana</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>With the consent of sovereign authority</td>
<td>grāma</td>
<td>sa-ābhyaantara-siddhi- sarv-adāya-parihina</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is obvious from the table, both the charters speak about limited privileges that the recipients were to have. However, what is noteworthy in the first charter is the nature of donation. It is the first case wherein

---

37 Alas plates of the yuvaraja Govinda II, El. VI, pp.208-213.
we hear of the transfer of the right to enjoy (*bhoga*) a *grāma* along with *vana* (groves of tree) of another *grāma*\textsuperscript{38}.

The recipient of the grant was a *brāhmaṇa* of Bhāradvāja gotra. His place of residence has not been mentioned.

In the second charter\textsuperscript{39}, recording donation as *Guru-dakshiṇa*, the terms of grant were different. The expressions which occur in this context are:

1. *sa-ābhyaṇṭara-siddhi*: This implies assigning the right to the donee to have those internal income or revenue or taxes which were payable to the village authorities as against those payable to the king.

2. *sarv-adeya-prahina*: This implies exemption in favour of the donated settlements from all the burden of *ditya* or tax.

Thus the implication is that now donee will have the right over *ābhyaṇṭara-siddhiya* but since the village has also been made free from the burden of *ditya* the donee was not to pay any tax to the donor.

In comparison to the charters of subordinates, the royal charters of the period under discussion carried more privileges in favour of the recipients. All the privileges that figure in the two royal charters have been arranged in a tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTERS</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{38} The term 'sa-*bhoga*' has been translated by the editor as 'with all enjoyment'. D.C. Sircar, however, takes it to mean 'together with *asta-bhoga*'. The term *asta-bhoga*, he explains, means the privileges of the donee of a rent free holding, believed to be grouped into eight classes which are sometimes enumerated as *nidhi, niksepa, jala, pasana, aksinin, siddha* and *sandhaya*, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, 1966, pp.397, also, pp.30-31.

\textsuperscript{39} Daulatabad plates of Rashtrakuta Sankargana, *EI*, IX, pp.193-98.
A look at the table shows not only a longer list of privileges that were delegated to the donees through the royal charter, but also a different way of detailing those privileges. In case of the first charter\(^{40}\) we find the occurrence of following expressions before the enumeration of the privileges of the recipients:

1. **bhumi-cchidra-nyayena**: This obviously refers to the nature of land tenure which has been discussed earlier.

1. **a caja-bhaṭa-praveśyah**: This term occurs in many of the charters belonging to different period and regions and its meaning has already been discussed.

---

\(^{40}\) Samangad copper plate grant of Dantidurga, I.A. (April 1882), p.108.
2. *asan-nara-pravṛitti-viniścīt-ācāraḥ*: This expression figures for the first time and and in this region alone. It has been taken to mean that the established customs of the gift land were to be withheld from injury by the enterprise of wicked men.\(^{41}\)

3. *sarva-bāḍha-parihāra*: This means freedom from all oppression (taxes)

After referring to these privileges, the charter turns to specify the object of donation and its boundaries and then goes on to list the following resources and the rights that were transferred in favour of the donee:

1. *sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula sva-simāparyanta*: This expression *sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula* would possibly suggest that the *grāma* was given to the donee its rows of trees. D.C. Sircar, however, translates it as 'together with various gardens and plantations'.\(^{42}\)

2. *siddh-āya*: This may mean 'fixed income; regular income'.....

1. *hiranya*: This has been taken to mean 'tax in cash'

2. *sa- daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha*: This term occurs frequently in the charters of other regions as well and its meaning has already been discussed.

3. *yathā-samuchita-bhāga-bhoga-kara-sarva-ōtpaty ādi sahito*: This would mean whatever is payable in the form of taxes in general together with the king's share of grains and the periodical offerings payable to him (*bhaga-bhoga-kara*), and whatever was being produced (*sarva-ōtpaty*).

---


\(^{42}\) Ibid, p405
It may also be pointed out that the list of privileges ends with the term ādi which implies that apart from the privileges enumerated in the charter; there were perhaps some others as well which were also transferred to the donee. Added to all these was also the right to 'enjoy it or cause it to be enjoyed, or cultivate it or cause it to be cultivated'.

This is possibly one of the longest lists of privileges occurring in the charters discussed so far. It gives the donee not only control over varied resources of the donated settlement but also certain administrative rights. However, the use of the term asan-nara-pravṛitti-vinivṛtti-ācārah is significant here. This must have put a check on the donee to use these wide ranging powers in an arbitrary manner.

The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa resident (vāstavyāya) of Karhataka and belonged to Vasishtha gōtra and Bahvricha shākhā.

As far as the second charter of the eight century is concerned, all the privileges which figure in the list is already known to us through the charters discussed above. (Please see the table). They therefore are not taken up for fresh discussion.

As far as the profile of the donee is concerned, we are told that he was the resident brāhmaṇa of Karhāda which has been identified with modern Karād in Satara. Thus, the place of donee was little away from the donated grāma which has been identified near Poona district.

We have one charter which relates to the region of Tapi East. It belongs to the house of Kakka of Gujarat. Datable to AD 757 it was

---

43 Two Bhor State museum plates, EI, XXII, p. 176
issued by Kakka who seems to have had independent authority to donate a grāma. The donation, we are told was made according to the rules of bhūmi-cchidra and abhyantara-siddhiya. The gift is stated to have been a perpetual one to be enjoyed by the donee and his descendents (ā-candrapārk-ārṇava-kṣiti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-pautranvaya-kram-opabhogyah).

Apart from this the charter does not speak about the transfer of any rights in favour of the donee who was a brāhmaṇa residing (vāstavya) at Jambūsara which has been identified with modern Jambūsar in the Broach district. The object of donation, it may be mentioned, was located in area which now falls under the Surat district.

We have one more charter of the house of Kakka of Gujarat and it records donation in the region of Sabarmati basin. Datable to AD 788\(^{45}\) it speaks about the transfer of lands by a mahāsāmanta who also hold the position of a vishay-ādhipati under Kakka who himself has been described as mahāsāmanta-ādhipati. Before we start discussing about the rights and privileges of the donee, it may be worthwhile to explain the nature of the donation itself.

The objects of donations were two pieces of land, which constituted a quarter (chatur-bhāga) of two different villages. The nature of these two pieces of land seems to have been different as in one case it has been described as bhūmi and in another case it has been called babbulaka-Kedara-misra\(^{46}\).

\(^{45}\) Hilol plates of Year 470,El.XXIV,pp.213-18 & 219.

\(^{46}\) D.C.Sircar translate the passage as 'A plot of land which is the) quarter (of the village),which is partly marshy land with (a plantation of)babbulaka(tree thereon),ibid,p.221
The details of the boundaries of another piece of land located in Padataka grâma has been described in the following terms: “in all directions there are fields (shettram=kshêttram) belonging to the brâhmanas who are: Bhattisvâmi-sâmanta; and sâmanta brâhmana Sâmjaka; and the sâmanta Ishvara of Maçahara; and the brâhmana Bhatta Prathilla; and sâmanta Dhâimaka of Madahara and Bhatt Ishvara of Siharakhibjya; and the brâhmana sâmanta Sâmbasharman”

The point which comes out very clearly from details of the boundary specification is the presence of a group of brâhmanas in and around donated as some of the brâhmanas, who are stated to have belonged to other areas, have been cited as witnesses to the grant.47

As far as the rights and privileges of the donee are concerned, it lists the transfer of the following:

1. daś-āparādhā (the enjoyment of the fines for ten (minor) offences), and
2. a-kara-pravṛttam dattam (customary presents, apparently from tenants without any rent fix).

The expression ‘a- kara pravṛttam’ (without any rent fixed) clearly points to the fact that what was being given to the donee to enjoy was a rent free land only and it also brings out the fact that the system of paying land rent was prevalent and it was possibly designated as kara.

47 Ibid., The list of the witness as given in the charter is as follow: ‘Brâhmana Aggaka, Brâhmana Varisa, Bhatta Lìella, an inhabitant of the village Khallapalli, Kokataka, the Brâhmana Bhatta Datta, an inhabitant of the village Kusumba, Brâhmana Senabhatta, Brâhmana Tuseka and Siddhuyaka.”
However, what is noteworthy about the charter is the fact that after listing what all the donee was to get, it proceeds on to specify the rights which he was not to have. These have been specified as:

I. *na-vriti sthāpanam* i.e., no right to raise an enclosure at the border and,

II. *cha sīmāyāmayam-sphōṭanam* i.e., no right to winnowing grains at the border.

The beneficiary of the grant was a *brāhmaṇa* of Kāshyapa gōtra and hailed from Sāñanda-sthana (Sānamda-sthāra-vinirggata) which is now represented by modern Sānand in Ahmedabad district. The donated places, however, have been located in the area falling under Kaira district.

We have one inscription that relates to the region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin. Datable to AD 778-9, it refers itself to the reign of PMP Dharavarsha and records the donation by a harlot of the temple of (the queen) Lokamahadevi.

The object of the donation, apart from other things, consisted of the grant of a plot of land also. It does not refer to the transfer of any rights, whatsoever, in favour of the donee.

One of the eighth century charters records donation in the region of Konkan. It belongs to the Malkhed branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Dated Saka 613 (c. AD 749-50), it refers to Dantidurga as one who has won the right to have pañca-mahāśabda. It also mentions his subordinate Aniruddha who was holding Śrīpura as his prabhujyamāna.

---

48 Sanskrit and Od- Canarese Inscriptions, IA. May,1882,pp.124-125.
49 Exp.used: bhūmi-danamum
50 Manor Plates of Dantidurga:Saka Year 671, Studies in Indian Indology, II,pp.10-15
It is important to note that this charter was issued not by Dantidurga but by the corporation of the city of Śrīpura. The object of grant was a grāma and the recipient was the temple of Bādeshvara that was caused to be constructed by Bādadi Bhogika. The charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights and privileges in favour of donee. It, however, closes with the names of certain persons who apparently were witness to the grant. The other noteworthy feature of the charter is that goldsmith Chandahari has been mentioned as the engraver of the plates and Devaka Tribhogika as the scribe.

C. AD 801 to 900

We have only one charter of the ninth century relating to the region of the Sabarmati basin. Datable to C. AD 819, it was issued by mahāsāmantaḥdhipati Gōvindarāja of Gujarat branch recording the transfer of a piece of land (kshētra) located within the boundaries of a place called Dēllikā. The list of the privileges transferred along with the kshētra runs as follow:


\[\text{Ibid. Devali Plates of Govinda, Valabhi 500, EL.XXXV,pp.269-280.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{51} It is stated that certain representatives of the Mahājāna : (Corporation) of the Traividyas of the place viz. Bodavarma, Bhogika, Durga Bhogika, Devamma Bhogika, Goviyasanga Bhogika and Goviya made the donation.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{52} Devali Plates of Govinda, Valabhi 500, EL.XXXV,pp.269-280.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{53} Ibid. Devali simā pratibaddha kṣētram. Line 58-59.}\]
### Details of the rights and privileges as given in the 9th century charters of the Gujarat Branch of Rāṣṭrakūtas relating to the region of Mahi basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMEPLATE</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>DONATION</th>
<th>PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The list of the privileges enumerated in the present charter is the same as in Bhor state museum plates of Dharavarsha Dhruvaraja discussed above. The only difference, apart from the status of the donors, is that while in the case of the Bhor state museum plates these privileges were given along with a *grāma*, in the present case they all occur in the context of donation of a *kṣetra*.

The recipient of the grant was a *brāhmaṇa* who was a resident (*vāstavya*) of Valabhi which is modern Vala in the Bhavanagar district. This area is quite close to the locale of the donated area in the same district. About the donee we are also told that he belonged to the Śāndilya gōtra and Vājasanēya-Mādhyandina śākhā.

There are seven charters of the ninth century recording donations in the region of the Mahi basin. Out of these, six have been issued by the members of Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭraṅghas who have been described as *mahāsāmangādhipati*. It may also be pointed out that three of them pre-date the charter discussed above.

The relevant details, as given in those six charters, have been arranged in a tabular form on the page facing this.

A cursory look at the table and its contents might suggest a tendency towards the standardization of the phraseology regarding the transfer of rights and privileges in favor of donee in the charters of the rulers of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭraṅghas. However, a closer look at the
apparently standardized set of rights and privileges brings out some significant variations.

To begin with, the first charter\textsuperscript{54}, which was issued by mahāsamantādhīpati Gōvindarāja of the Gujarat branch, speaks of a donation as per the rule of bhūmi-cchidra. The rights and privileges which were transferred to the donee were limited ones as we hear of hiraṇya-dāna, bhoga-bhāga, daṇḍa-daś-āparādha, and samasta-rājakyānāṁ a-hastapraṅkepanīya only. Thus, apart from the absence of many of the privileges which occur in the later charters of the same rulers, what is noteworthy is that the charter gives donee neither the rights to sublet the property nor does it say anything about whether his successors would have had any claim over the donated property or not.

The second charter of the same ruler\textsuperscript{55}, which was issued after a gap of about sixteen years, carries the list of privileges larger than the first one. It consisted of \textit{s-ōdranga sa-parikara, sa-bhūta-pāta-pratyāya sa-daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha s-otpādhyamāna-viṣṭika sa-dhānya-hiraṇy-ādeyah a-cāta-bhāta-prāveṣyah sarva-rājakyānāṁ a-hastapraṅkepanīya, bhūmi-cchidra-nyāyēṇa ā-candrārk-āṛṇava-kṣiṭi-sariṇ-parvata-samakālin-putra-pautranvaya-kram-pabhogaya pūrva-pratta-deva-brahmadeya-rahita abhyantarā-siddhyā... yatōśy-ōchitayā devadāya-ṣṭhitya bhuṇjato-bhojyatāh karsayatāh-pratidiśato vā krishatah pratidiśato vā na kenchit pariṇpanthānā kāryā.}

If we compare the set of rights and privileges mentioned in this inscription with those figuring in his earlier charter of AD 819 belonging to the region of the Sabarmati basin, we find them quite the same

\textsuperscript{54} Gujjara Rashtrakuta Govindaraja hayacha tamra patra, BISMQ, pp. 101-108.

\textsuperscript{55} Inscription from Kavi, II. The grant of Govindaraja, IA., (May, 1796), pp. 144-152.
Details of the donee in the 9th century charters of the Gujarat Branch of Rāstrakūtas relating to the region of Mahi basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LINEAGE</th>
<th>GÔTRA</th>
<th>VEDIC AFFILIATION</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales Museum Plates of Givindaraja</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Bhobhika</td>
<td>S/o Bhatajaya</td>
<td>Atri</td>
<td>Student of Samaveda</td>
<td>Charmman-ihauha grāma västavya, came from Gauda country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum Plates of Sri Karkarajadeva</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>Bhanu</td>
<td>S/o Bhatta Somaditya</td>
<td>Vâstavya</td>
<td>Madhayandina shâkhâ</td>
<td>Sri Vallabha vinirgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausari copper Pl. charter of Karkka I</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>Gobadi</td>
<td>s/o Baddadi</td>
<td>Bharadvaja</td>
<td>Student of Taitraya school</td>
<td>Badavi västavya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahanampa Ili grant of Karkka Suvarnavasrasha</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>Bhatta Damodar</td>
<td>S/o Nagakumar</td>
<td>Kaundinya</td>
<td>Vajasaneya</td>
<td>Kaddibhar( västavya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastu copper plate of Karka Suvarnavasrasha</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>Sri-Batta</td>
<td>s/o Kukura</td>
<td>Vasishtha</td>
<td>Student of Rigveda</td>
<td>Bharukachchha (nivāsīta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription from Kavi, II. The grant of Govindaraja</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>Temple of jayaditya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Situated in Kotipura in Kapika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
excepting the fact that this charter included ābhgyantara-siddhya\(^{56}\) and that there is variation in the order of the occurrence of certain terms. However, if the same is compared with his earlier grant made in the same region in AD 810 we see a trend towards assigning more rights and privileges to the recipient of the grant.

As to the rights and privileges of the recipients of the four grants made by Karkka I in this region, all the charters speak about the transfer of largely the same set of rights and privilege in favour of the recipients. However, despite this obvious similarity certain variations can also be pointed out.

For example, in the first charter of Karkka II\(^{57}\) we come across all the expressions that occur in the second charter of Gòvindarâja discussed above. However, two of the privileges i.e. \(a\) cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāvēṣyāḥ and ābhgyantara-siddhiya do not figure in this charter.

In the second charter of the mahāsāmanta-dhīpata Śrī Karkkaraṇadeva\(^{58}\), as he is described in this charter, however, we find the inclusion of those two expressions also but again it is different from the first one in the sense that the granted property is not stated to have been donated as per the rules of bhūmi-cchidra as was the case in his first grant. Similarly, while his third charter speaks of the grant being made as bhūmi-cchidra-nyāyēna\(^{7}\) the fourth one does not refer to this term at all.

As to the recipients of these grants, their detail has been arranged in tabular form on the page facing this.

\(^{56}\) The term has been taken to mean 'together with the internal income or the taxes to be paid to the local authorities', see, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966, p.385.

\(^{57}\) Sanskrit and old Canarese inscriptions, No.CXVII,IA.,(June 1883),XII,pp.156-164.

\(^{58}\) Brahamānapalli grant of Karka Suvarnavarsha : Saka 746, \(EI\,XX\), pp.77-85.
As far as the profile of the recipient of the grant discussed above is concerned they were all brāhmaṇas of different gōtra and had different Vedic affiliations. As far as the places of their residence are concerned, the table shows that they belonged to different localities. In the case of the first grant,⁵⁹ we are told that originally he was a resident of the Gauda country (Gauda desha) and at the time of the grant he was residing (vāstavya) in a village which is now represented by modern Chāmarwārā which is about two kms away from Wāsan which has been identified with the donated village.

In the case of the second charter⁶⁰ the donee is stated to have originally started from the city of Valabhi (Śrī—Valabhi-vinirggata).

In the third case⁶¹ the donee is stated to be residing at Bādāvī (Bādāvī vāstavya) which has been identified with Badami in Bijapur district. It may be pointed out that the donated place has been located in the district of Broach in Gujarat.

The recipient of the fourth grant was resident⁶² of a place called Kaddibhara which has not been identified.

In the case of Anastu copper plate of Karka Suvarnavarsha⁶³, we are told that the recipient was a resident of modern Broach. The object of the grant has not been identified so far, but given the geographical context of other grants made by the same ruler, it may not be wrong to suggest that it may not be far from the place of residence of donee.

---

⁵⁹ Prince of Wales Museum Plates of Givindaraja, EI, XXVI, pp.248-255.
⁶⁰ British Museum Plates of Sri Karkarajadeva, No.CXXVII, JA. XII, pp.156-164.
⁶¹ Nausari copper Plate charter of Karkka I, JBBRAS, XX, 1969, pp.131-149.
⁶² Brahamanpalli grant of Karkka Suvarnavasrsha, EI, XXII, pp.77-92.
In the case of the sixth grant\(^\text{64}\) the recipient is a temple which was located a little away from the place with which the donated place has been identified.

Apart from the charters of the *mahāsāmantādhipatis* of Gujarat branch we have one charter which was issued by a *mahāsāmanta* of Gōvindarāja of Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas in AD812\(^\text{65}\). The *mahāsāmanta* is stated to have received an estate (*prabhujyamāna*) called *Siharakkhi twelve* from Gōvindarāja and the donated property which consisted of a village and a hamlet, were apparently located in that *prabhujyamāna*.

As far as the rights and privileges are concerned, the list does not carry many of the expressions that occur in the charters of *mahāsāmantādhipatis* discussed above. The charter speaks of the transfer of the following\(^\text{66}\):

I. *sa-hirany-ādana* which, as explained earlier, stands for 'together with levies in cash'\(^\text{67}\)

II. *daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha sa-sīmā paryyanta*. This would mean 'the right to fines including those imposed for the ten offences up to the boundaries of the donated area'\(^\text{68}\),

---

\(^\text{64}\) Inscription from Kavi, II. The grant of Govindaraja, *IA* (May, 1876), pp.144-152.

\(^\text{65}\) Torkhede copper plates of the time of Govindaraja of Gujarat, *EI* III pp.53-58.

\(^\text{66}\) Ibid., the exp. used runs as follow ' *sa-hirany-ādana sa-daṇḍa-daś-āparādha sa sīmā paryyanta sa-tīrttah Meshuvalīka- pravesukah semasta-rājakīyānāṁ a-hastapakṣeṇapiya ā-candr-ārk-āmrava-kṣiti-sarīt-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-paurāṇyaya-kram-opabhogyah bhūmi-cchidra-nyāyēna' (L.40-43)


\(^\text{68}\) Ibid., p.80.
III. sa tirtah Meshuvallika-pravesukah (name of the helmet)

IV. sarva-rājakīyānām a-hastapraṇeṣeṇāya. The meaning of this term has already been explained,

V. ā-candrārkārṇava-kṣīti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra- pautranvaya-kram-opabhogyah: The expression implies conferment of the permanent hereditary rights over the donated property.

VI. bhūmi-chidra-nyāyena: As explained earlier, this literally means 'the maxim of the fallow land', the principle of the rent-free enjoyment of land by one who brings it under cultivation for the first time. The maxim is based on the old custom of allowing a person, who first brings a plot of fallow or jungle land under cultivation for the first time, to enjoy it without paying rent. The term gradually came to mean 'uncultivated land'.

The above stated grant was given to about 36 brāhmaṇas who belonged to different gōtras. About their residence, nothing is stated in the charter. Only in the case of one brāhmaṇa we are told that he belonged to the community of the Chaturvēdins of Badarasiddhi which has not been identified.

We have eight charters of the period of the ninth century recording donations in the region of Western Tapi basin out of which two of them are royal charters. The first one was issued by PMP Sri-Govindarajadeva i.e. (Govinda III) in AD 809 and the second one by PMP Amoghavarsha I in AD 820 at the request of one Bhaṭṭarikā. Despite the time gap of

69 Ibid., p.58.
71 Javakheda plates of Amoghavarsha I, Saka 742, EI, XXXII, pp.129-34.
about a decade and the fact that the second one was issued at the request of an individual, the list of rights and privileges in both the charters remains the same, (see the table given below). In fact, all the rights and privileges figuring in this charter of Govinda also occur in his other charters which have already been discussed. Since all of the terms and their implications have also been in the context of his earlier grants, they do not require a fresh explanation here. The rights and privileges as given in these two royal charters have been arranged below in a tabular form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DONATION</th>
<th>RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govinda 3 rāmayuha bahulvad tamrapatra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plates of Amoghavarsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as the recipients of these grants are concerned, the donor in the first case has been described as a brāhmaṇa of Vatsya gotra who was the resident (vāstavya) of a place called Nimbasthali which has not been identified.

In the case of the second grant the donee has been described as a brāhmaṇa of Kaundinya gotra and Taittirīya shākhā. He is also stated to have migrated (vinirgata) from Kamchi-nagara (possibly modern Kañchī).

Apart from these two, rest of the charters was issued by the rulers of Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrapātas who enjoyed the status of mahāsāmantādhipati. A tabular statement of the rights and the privileges which were conferred on the donees through their charters is given in a tabular form on the page facing this.

A perusal of the table brings out clearly variations in the rights and privileges which were transferred to the recipients of the grants made by the mahāsāmantādhipatis of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrapātas.

To begin with the first charter issued by mahāsāmantadhipati Karkaraja in AD 821 (Saka 743) records donation of a field called "Hiranyayōgā (irrigated by) the well (vāpi) of Dhāshu situated to the north of the village Ambāpātaka, attached to Sri-Nāgasārikā. It may be pointed out that the grant only consisted of the field and not the vāpi which irrigated the field.

The recipient was a Jaina, called preceptor Aparajita of Sena sangha who was attached to the temple of Arhat situated within the boundaries of Sri-Nāgasārikā.

---

72 Surat plates of Karkkaraja Suvarnavarsha of the Gujarat Rashtrakuta branch: dated Saka year 743, EI XXI,p-133-147
The rights and privileges, which were transferred to the donee in this case, were not as many as we see in the case of the earlier two charters issued by the sovereign rulers in this region. The only resource that was transferred to the donee in the case of the present grant was the right to receive revenue in corn and gold (sa-dhânya-hirany-âdeya).

However, the donated place, was exempt from (the exactions levied at) the entry of the regular -irregular soldiers (a câta-bhâja-prâveśyah) and was also made free from the interference from all the royal officers. Apart from this, the donee was also given the right to sublet the property.

Though the grant was made in perpetuity, it has also been specified that the granted property was to be inherited by his successive disciples and not by his successive generation. Thus, it was basically a grant which was made in favour of religious institution rather than in favour of an individual.

The next charter dated Saka 757(C. AD 835-36) records the transfer of a grâma in favour of a brâhmaṇa of Lavânas gōtra who was the resident (vâstavya) of Vadarasidhi which has not been identified.

The grant which was made in perpetuity and was to be enjoyed according to the rules of brahmadeya speaks of the transfer of the following: udranga, uparikara, danda-daś-âparâdha, bhûta-pâta-pratyêya, s-otpadhyamâna-vîśīka, dhânya-hiranya. The village was also made free from the entry of chât and bhat, and also from any interference on the part of the royal officials (sarva-râjakîyânâm a-

---

73 Ibid, sa-dhânya-hirany-âdeya a câta-bhâja-prâveśyah sarva-râjakîyânâm a-hastapraṣeṇaṇīya' L.48
74 A Copper-Plate Grant of The Gujarat Branch of Rashtrakuta King Dhruva II., Dated Saka 757, IA, XIX, (July 1885),pp.196-203
hastapraksepanīya). The donee was also given the right to sublet the property.

The third charter, datable to AD 867\textsuperscript{75} also records the grant of a grāma. The donee, however, in this case is a vihāra located at Kāmpilya which has been described as a sacred place.

The list of rights and privileges of the donee as given in this charter is different from the one discussed above. It consisted of: 'uparikara, vṛkṣamālā-kula, upadhyamāna-vistika, and dhānya-hiranāya.

Apart from this the donee was also given the right to sublet the property. It is also stated that no body should cause obstruction to it as long as it is being enjoyed as the devadāya\textsuperscript{76}. It may be noted that there is no reference to udranga, danda-dosa-daś-āparādha, or bhūmicchidranīyāya)

In the fourth charter, datable to AD 867\textsuperscript{77}, the object of donation is once again a grāma, to a brāhmaṇa who has been described as the grandson of Sri-Diddhi who had earlier received Trenna from Drhuvarājadēva and had founded a sattra for the good of all men. It is also stated that both brāhmaṇas and men of royal descent dined daily by thousand in his house.


\textsuperscript{77} Rathor grant No. III-A grant of Dhruva III of Bharoch, IA,July 1983,pp.179-190.
The grant which was made in perpetuity was made in accordance with the bhūmicchidra-nyāya and carried the following rights and privileges in favor of the donee: udranga uparikara, sa-vṛkṣamālā-kulasa-simāparyanta, danda-doṣa-dāś-āparādha, otpadhyamāna-vistika, dhānya-hiranyādeyah (L.13-15). It is further stated that the donee had the right to sublet the granted property, and that it was made free from the interference of chata and bhaṭa and also from royal officials.\(^{78}\)

The grant which was made in AD 884\(^{79}\) consisted of a grāma to Buddhabhattaraka who belonged to the Buddhist vihāra of Kampilya. It may be pointed out that it is the same vihāra (the Buddhist vihāra of Kampilya) which also figures as the recipient of donation in the charter issued by Dantivarman discussed above.

The rights and the privileges, which were transferred to the donee, however, were as elaborate as we usually find in most of the royal charter discussed above. The only difference is the occurrence of two new expressions such as ‘kara sahita’ and ‘vātodariya’. Also, the charter does not refer to the transfer of dhānya-hiranyā instead it mentions sa-hiranyādeyah only.\(^{80}\) The donee was also given the right to sublet the property.

Here once again we find that the grant was to remain with the monastery in the time to come and not to the successive generation of the recipient Buddhabhattaraka.

\(^{78}\) Ibid., p. bhūñjato-bhojayatah kṣatah karsayatāh pratidīṣātā vā na ken-āpi paripanṭhanā kāryā

\(^{79}\) A new copper plate of Dhruva II... Saka, 806, EI. XXII, pp-64-76.

\(^{80}\) Ibid., 75, ed. Ian L. Allard.
The last charter of the ninth century\textsuperscript{81} records the transfer of a grāma to two brāhmanas viz. Taṅua Vāsāvaka and his brother Guheśvara who belonged to Kundinas gōtra and lived at Variavi which has been identified with Variāvi near Surat. The place is stated to have been located on the western side of the donated village.

The rights which were transferred along the village are almost the same as above, except the absence of the terms kara sahita. Apart from this, the present charter mentions sa-dhânya-hiranya-âdeya, not only sa-hiranya-âdeya as was the case in the charter discussed above. Also the term s-otpadhyamânâ-vistika does not figure in this charter\textsuperscript{82}.

On the basis of the charter discussed above we can have the following inventory of the rights and privileges which figure in the charters of this region:

I. \textit{s-odranga}: Barring two cases (i.e. Surat plates of Karkkaraja and Plates of Dantivarman), the term \textit{s-odranga} figures in all the charters.

II. \textit{sa-parikara}: We have the occurrence of this term in all the charters. The only charter that does not refer to it is the Surat plates of Karkkaraja.

\textsuperscript{81} Rathor Grant No.IV. A grant of Krishana II of Ankulesvar, 888 AD, IA, XIII(March 1884),pp.65-69

III. *sa-dhānya-hirany-ādeya*: This term figures in all the charters except the copper plate grant of Dhruva II where we get only the half of it i.e. *sa-hiranya* only.

IV. *sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula*: barring the Surat plates of Karkkaraja, the term appears in rest of the charters.

V. *s-otpadhyaṁaṇa-viṣṭika*: This term occurs in only two charters, Plates of Dantivarman and Rathore grant No.III, of Dhruva II. Rests of the charters do not refer to this at all.

VI. *daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha*: Barring the Surat plates of Karkkaraja Suvarnavarsha and Plates of Dantivarman this term is mentioned in all the charters.

VII. *sarva-rājakṛṣṇam a-hastaprakṣeṇaṇya*: This expression figures in all the charters.

VIII. *bhūta-pāta-pratyāya*: It occurs only once in the charter datable to AD 835

IX. *abhyantara-siddhi*: Baring one case, i.e. the Surat plates of Karkkaraja Suvarnavarsha, rest of the charters mention this term.

X. *a-cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāvesyah*: This expression figures in all the charters.

XI. *ā-candr-ārk-ārṇava-kṣiti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-pautranvaya-kram-pabhogyah*: This expression occurs in six of the charters. The only charter in which it does not occur is the Copper plate grant of Dhruva II. This expression, in two cases, is followed by the expression such as *putra-pautranvaya-kram-opabhogyah* which also implied the permanent nature of the gift to

---

be enjoyed by the donee as well as his descendents\textsuperscript{84}. In two cases, however, instead of putra-pautranvaya-kram-opabhogyah, we have the expression such as ‘prashishya -shishyanvaya-karam-opabhogayah\textsuperscript{85} and sanghasaya shishyanu-shishya-karam opabhagaya\textsuperscript{86}.

XII. pûrva-prdatta-deva-brahma-deya-rahita: This expression with minor variation occurs in all the charters, except one\textsuperscript{87}. This has been taken to be an indication of the absence of the donees right to have any control over that land in the gifted village which was already a rent free holding in the possession of god or brâhmañas\textsuperscript{88}.

XIII. bhûmicchidra-nyâya: This expression occurs in one the charter only\textsuperscript{89}.

Apart from these rights and privileges which occur in many of the charters discussed above, we also find the occurrence of certain new terms such as kara and Vatodariya.

XIV. Kara: The term kara is the new one which figures in only two of the charters. It first figures in the Copper plate grant of Dhruva II which was issued in AD 835. It once again appears in the New Copper plate of Dhruva of Gujarat which was issued in AD 884. In both the cases it has been referred as ‘sa sîmâparyanta kara sahita.

As to the precise meaning of the term kara there seems to be a

\textsuperscript{84} Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966.p.397.
\textsuperscript{85} Surat plates of Karkkaraja Suvarnavarma of Gujarat,\textit{EI},21.p.133
\textsuperscript{86} Plates of Plates of Dantivarman of Gujarat,\textit{EI},VI,pp.85-294
\textsuperscript{87} Surat plates of Karkkaraja Suvarnavarsha,..opp.cit.
\textsuperscript{89} Rathor grant No.III,\textit{JA}, (July,1883),p179-90
great deal of uncertainty. Though it has been explained by a commentator as 'the dues (bhaga) to be realized by the king for the enjoyment of royal land by using it for cultivation and for grazing cattle', the term seems to have been used in different context as well.

XV. Vatodariya: This is again a new term occurring only in two of the charters, (i.e. in the copper plate grant of Dhruva and in the new copper plate of Dhruva of Gujarat), of this region. The term has been taken to mean epithet of gift land.

We have two royal charters belonging to the Tapi basin region. Both of them were issued by Govinda III of the Imperial branch of the Rāstrakūtas. The list of the rights and privileges given in them are the same. They have been arranged in a tabular form on the page facing this.

A cursory glance at the table would show that all the rights and privileges listed in both the charter also occur in the royal charters of other regions and also in the charters of Gujarat branch of Rāstrakūtas. In fact, we do not find any new expression in either of the charters. It may also be pointed out that almost the same set of rights and privileges are to be found in his charter relating to other regions discussed above.

The picture that we get about the region of the Godavari basin relating to the nature of assignments or the rights and privileges which were delegated to the recipients is not much different from the earlier period. Though we have three royal charters for the ninth century relating to donations in the Upper Godavari basin, the details about the rights and privileges of the recipients is available in two cases only and both of them

91 Ibid., p.408.
were issued by PMP Govinda III. The list of rights and privileges given in them are the same as we see in the case of Paithan plates which was issued by the same ruler in AD 794, and which has already been discussed. (See page 358.

Recipients of these two grants were brāhmaṇas of different gotras and sākhās. As far as their place of domicile is concerned, in the case of Wani plates of Govinda III we are told that he was residing (vāstavya) at Vemgi. In the case of Dharur Plates of Rashtrakuta Govinda III nothing is said about the place of the residence of the donee.

We have one charter issued by the same ruler, i.e. Govinda III in AD 808. The object of donation has been located in the region of Bhima basin.

Despite the different geographical contexts of the grant, the list of rights and privileges which were transferred to the donee was the same as we see in his other charters discussed above. It consisted of "ś-ōdranga sā-parikara, sa-daś-āparādha sa- bhūtō-pāta-pattīyā s-otpadhyamāna-viṣṭika sa-dhānya-hiraṇy-ādeyāḥ, a cāṭa-bhāṭa-prāveśyāḥ sarvārājakīyānām a-hasṭaprakṣepanīyā a-candr-ārk-arṇava-kṣiti-sarita-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-pautranvaya-kram-āpabhogyah pūrvā-pradatta-śe-va-brāhma-dāya-rahitā ābhyantara-siddhyā bhūmi-cchidra-

93 Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions,No.CXXV,pp.156-162.  
95 Radhanpur plates of Govinda III, EI.VI,pp.239-51.
nyāyēna ... yatōsy-ōchitayā brahmadāya-sthitya ... bhuṇjato-bhojayatah
krisatah-karsayatah pratidiśato vā na kaiścid-āpi paripanthanā
kāryā'.

The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa of Bhāradvāja gōtra who
dwelt (vāstavya) at Tigavi which is now represented by Tugaon about 80
miles north-west by north from Ratunjun which has been identified with
he donated grāma. It may also be mentioned that in the context of the
boundary specification of the donated village we are told about the
existence of other settlements of brāhmaṇa around it.

One of the charters of Govinda III relates to the region of the
Upper Krishna basin in terms of the location of the donated property.
Datable to AD 805\textsuperscript{96} this royal charter refers to the transfer of all those
rights and privileges\textsuperscript{97} which figure in his earlier charters or the charters
which were issued after this, even though the nature of assignment was
entirely different from those discussed above.

In fact the details of the assignment clearly show that quite unlike the
earlier cases where the object of donation consisted of a grāma, in this
case the donated grāma was not made a rent free holding in favour of the
donee as it is stated at the end of the charter that 'five thousand are

\textsuperscript{96} Nesarika grant of Govinda,\textit{EI}, XXXIV, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid. The list of rights and privileges runs as follow: 's-ōdranga sa-parikara, sa-
danda-daś-āparādha sa- bhuṭṭō-pāta-pattyāya s-otpadhyamāna-viṣṭika sa-dhānyā-hirany-ādeyah ,a
cāja-bhaṭa-prāvesyāh sarva-rājakēyām a-hastaprakṣeṇāya ő-candr-ārk-āṛgava-kṛiti-
sarit-parvata-sama-kālin-putra-pūtranta-pauranavaya-kram-āppabhogyah pūrva-pratta-dēva-brahma-
dāya-rahitā abhyantarasa-siddhābhūmi-cchidra-nyāyēna ... ytōsy-ōchitāyā pradaya-sthitya
... bhuṇjato-bhojayatah krisatah-karsayatah pratidiśato vā na kaiścid-āpi paripanthanā
kāryā'.

payable to the Vishayapati (governor of the district) apparently by the donee.

The donee, as usual, was a brāhmaṇa of Angiras gōtra, and was the resident (vāstavya) of Ikshu grāma which has not been identified.

In comparison to the earlier period, the region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha yield more donative inscriptions during the period of the ninth century. It may be pointed out that the nature of donative inscriptions found in this region is different from the rest of the regions discussed so far. While in other regions the transfer deeds have been invariably recorded on copper plates, such activities in the region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin have been recoded on stone. Apart from this, the nature of assignment, its terms and conditions and the composition of their recipients ise entirely different from all the regions we have discussed so far.

The first ninth century donative inscription in this region is datable to AD 865. It first refers to the reign of Amoghavarsha I and then mentions Kuppeya, the governor of the Purigere district (Purigere-nādam Kuppēyan=āle).

It records the grants of 85 mattars of cultivable land, six plots of garden land, and the property of Adityabhattara. It is also stated that these grants were made \textit{\textasciitilde} sarvva-bādha-parihāram which would only mean that the donated property was made tax free. The impression that one gets out of the details of the granted property is that what was given to Gōkarnapāṇḍita probably constituted the property of the Saivite temple of the Mūlasthāna and was being managed by the Goravas of the place.

\footnote{Some records of the Rashtrakuta kings of Malkhed, D- Mantrawadi inscription of the time of Amoghavarsha. \textit{El. VII.dd.198-202}}
Thus the donee was merely given a tax free piece of land. This also indicates that apart from culivable land, the garden land and the property of individual were subject to taxations.

The details of the inscription suggest that the donation was made in a meeting in which forty mahājanas of Elpunuse, and the Gorava Moni, and the Managers Elamvalli (Elamvalliya sasanamuma) participated. We are also told of certain Nagadeva acting as the president of the meeting in the matter of this grant.

The next inscription c. AD 874/75, registers donation of one mattar of garden land (or-mmattar-ittōṭam) and five mattars of cultivable land (ay-matter-kkeyyu koṭṭam) by Kundate and Rāpa. Kundate has been stated to be the son of Bankeya and also the governor of Nidagundage twelve. About the status of Rāpa, nothing has been stated.

The donation is stated to have been made in favour of the god Mahadeva of the temple of Kuppana the Pergade of the Nidagundage twelve. The inscription further records that there was certain person who gave his own share (nature not specified). Possibly the share was of land as it is stated that it is only after this that a temple was made.

The inscription further records that while Samkara was holding office as Nāl-gāmundu, Gadiyamma protecting this property acquired it so that it continued unimpaired, free from all molestation. This possibly indicates that certain payment was made by the person who acquired the property to make it tax free or (sarvva-bādhā-parihāram)

Apart from inscriptions relating to the grant of lands, we have certain inscriptions which inform us about the transfer of various other resources.

To begin with we have one inscription which deals with the remission from taxation of a settlement called Dautavura. What is noteworthy about the inscription is the detail regarding different authorities which were involved in the process of tax remission.

The record refers itself to the reign of mahāśamantādhipati Kannara-vallaha (Krishna II). It then mentions Lokade as the governor of Banavāsi Twelve thousand (Lökade Banavāsi-pannirchchāsiramumana-le), Omkāra-Siva-bhāṭāra of the temple of Dindēsvara as administrator of Palasūr (Palasūran-ālutt-ire), Nāl-gāmuṇḍu of Anniga Hundred of Panugal, and Ur-gāvunda of the town Ayicha Gāvunda.

After referring to all these authorities, the inscription speaks about obtaining the remission (from taxation) of a place called Dautavura. The person who obtained the remission was Asaganna, son of Manugulara Ayicha Gavunda who was holding the town-shrievalty (Dautavura bidisidom). The person who granted the remission has been stated to be the governor of Palsur (Palasuran=aluttire).

The details in the inscription tend to give the impression that Dautavur was given immunity from payment of taxes to Palasur which probably was property of the local Shiva temple. Another point which the inscription brings out is the hierarchy of authorities, ranging from supra-local to local one, in the process of tax remission.

Another such instance is datable to AD 870. The record refers itself to the reign of Nityavrasha-Amoghavarslia (possibly Khottiga) then

---

mentions Śankaragānda as the governor (ālutt-ire) of Banvāsi-nād, Gāmundiga as Nāl-gāmundu of Edevolal Seventy.

After mentioning them all the charter speaks about the revenue arrangement for a place called Kesalur. Which was as follows: 'for a mattal (the tax is to be) four damma, for an ūdigal three, for a house two; the damma on houses (is to be) one. gold'. The inscription, also mentions at the end that when the thirty-two crown officials (arasu) hold the survey; they shall provide the rice for one year. This would be provided by nal–gavunda.

The inscription thus provides us with information about the items which were subject to taxation and also the amount of taxation. The only problem is that it does not state anything about the authority which made this arrangement for taxation. It may be possible that it was decided by all the authorities mentioned in the inscriptions.

We have certain inscriptions referring to the transfer of tax on clarified butter.

One such inscription belongs to the period of Amoghavarsha I. The inscription, which is datable to AD 860, refers to the reign of Amoghavarsha I and then introduces Deva.nayya as the governor of Belvola 300. It is then stated that Dēvannayya assigned the tax on clarified butter to the Two hundred Mahājanas of Srivūra (or the modern Sirur).

We have another inscription which is also datable to AD 866. It also refers itself to the reign of Amoghavarsha and mentions

102 Ibid., The provisions are the following: for a mattal four damma, for an udigal three, for a house two, the damma on houses is to be one gold.
104 Nilgund inscription of the time of Amoghavarsha I, El.VI,pp.98-108
Dëvannayya. In this case we are also told about one more person called Kulappaya who was governing Mulgunda 12.

This inscription also records the assignment of tax on clarified butter in favour of hundred and twenty Mahâjanas of Nirgunda. The only difference here is that in this case it was done through a royal decree (râjaśrâvita) which was obtained by Dëvannayya who was requested by Kulappayya to do so.

Another inscription, which is datable to AD 867-68, also belongs to the reign of Amoghavarsha 105. It registers a remission of taxes on Ghee in favour of Fifty (goudas?) of Sartapura given by a mahâsâmanta and gift of Ghee made to the (community of) Five hundred.

In another inscription 106, datable to AD 869, referring to the reign of the same king we are told of the taxes on Ghee made over to the Mahâjanas of Gâvadivâda when Devannayya was governing Belvola 300.

In the next inscription, which is datable to AD 872 107, and refers itself to the same king, we are informed about Fifty Mahâjanas of Sisulahâlu being exempted from taxes on Ghee. The exemption was granted by Dëvannayya, the governor of Belvola 300.

In yet another inscription belonging to the reign of the same king and datable to AD 874 108, we are told about a donation of clarified butter and male buffaloes to the Mahâjanas of Rona. Certain Ballavarasa about whom nothing is stated in the inscription made the donation.

Apart from tax on clarified butter we also hear of gift of Gosasa.

105 S/1 XI, (Bombay Karnataka Inscriptions), Mysore, 1986, pp. 8-9, No. 12.
106 Ibid., No. 13, p. 9
107 Ibid., No. 14, p. 10
One such inscription belongs to the period of Krishna II\textsuperscript{109}. The inscription called A, datable to AD 883-84, records the gift of \textit{gosasa} by certain Chidanna. The gift, we are told was made in the presence of the Fifty (Mahâjanas).

We only have two royal charters in this region and both of them belong to the period of ninth century and both were issued by Govinda III. Surprisingly enough, none of them speak about the transfer of any elaborate rights and privileges in favour of the donees as has been the case with his charters belonging to other regions. In the first charter\textsuperscript{110} we come across the term \textit{sarvva bâdhâ parihârena}'. This term occurs earlier in the charters of other regions also and its implication has already been discussed.

The second charter\textsuperscript{111} registers the renewal of a grant to the priest (Gorava). The charter carries an expression which runs as \textit{mudumbeyaman=untu}. The meaning of the term is not clear. It has however been suggested that it was either the name of a locality or possibly signifies some former privileges attached to the grant.

Apart from these royal charters, we have one inscription which refers to the transfer of various local resources by local authority.

The second inscription is datable to AD 865\textsuperscript{112}, and refers to a tax called \textit{Kallavalla}, which seemed to have been prevalent in Purigere -300. The inscription under discussion speaks of the remittance of the tax of a


\textsuperscript{110} Mane Copper Plate, \textit{E.C.}, 9,N1.,pp.51-53.

\textsuperscript{111} Sanskrit and Old Kanarese Inscriptions,CXXIII, 1A,XI,(May, 1882),pp.125-27.

\textsuperscript{112} Shiggaon Inscription of Amoghavarsha,\textit{EI}.XXXV,pp.85-88
place called Shiggame to the local goddess called Kalnereti-bhatêri. The person who granted the remission was holding the charge of Kallavalla tax of three hundred division (kallavalla Pêndc.man=āluttam) and he did so only after seeking the permission of Kuppeyarasa who was governing Purigere –300(Purigere mûnûrûmam Kuppeyarasar-āle) and who has been described as the subordinate of Amoghavarsha. It also refers to a Nāl-gâmundas and Urgâmunda of 300 division.

We have two royal charters in this region and only one of them refers to the transfer of certain privileges in favor of the donee. The first royal charter, datable to AD 810, was issued by Govinda III at the request of mahâsâmantâdhipati Dantivaraman, also known as Châkîrâja.113

The object of the donation was a grâma along with 'sarv-bâdhâ parihâra'114. The same expression ‘sarv-bâdhâ parihâra' figures in his charter relating to the region of the Tungabhadra basin which has been discussed above.

The grant also mentions the subjects of ninety six thousand country (Gangavadi) as the witness to the grant.

We have another grant of the same king115 making donation at the request of the same Châki Râja who has been described here as the 'Gâ nga-mândal-âdhirâja'.

113 A new Rashtrakuta Copper Plate Grant of A.D. 810. The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, 24, Jan 1924, no.2, pp. 82-88.
114 Ibid., sarv-bâdhâ parihârōpē dattah, L.8-9
115 Kadamba plates of Prabhutvarsha, Fl.IV,332-348
The object of the grant is a gráma and the recipient is a Jaina Muni, on behalf of the temple of Jinendra at Silagrama. The charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights or privileges in favour of the donee. The boundary specification of the donated gráma tends to give the impression that care was taken to exclude many of the resources of the surrounding area from the area of donation.

It is also significant to note that various categories of people have been cited as the witness to the grant. The list of witness included Ṛāchamalla gámunda, Sīṭa, Gaṅga-gámunda, Māreya, Belgere Odeyar, the Modabāge Seventy, the whole of Kunungil.

Apart from these two royal charters, we have certain inscriptions in which the transfer of property was effected by subordinate authorities. The first such evidence for the period of ninth century is datable to C. AD 808 when we are told of a grant by a Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Ranavaloka Kambhaya, who mediated on the feet of PMP Govindarajadeva.

The grant consisted of a gráma that was part of Punnāda-Edenādu-vishaya. The recipient of the grant, which was meant for the service of the Vijayavasati (basti or hasadi), was Vardhamānaguru who has been stated to be the disciple of Elavāchārya. The charter does not speak of the transfer of any right and privileges in favour of the grantee. On the contrary, like the earlier royal charter, the boundary of the gráma was delineated in a manner so as to exclude many of the rural resources which were located right on the boundaries of the donated gráma.

\[116 \text{Et.}. \text{III. No.278, pp.352-357; pp.755-782 for translation.}\]
Like the royal charters of this region, we are once again told about the witness to the grant which in this case consisted of people of Ninety six thousand country (dānasya sākṣiṇah shāṇḍavati-sahasra-vishayah, L 64)

We have another inscription referring itself to the rule of Ranavaloka of Kambya\(^{117}\) which speaks of two grants.

The first one consisted of certain land from among the fields of 'per-gGalvappu' (the great Kalvappu). The grant was made to a Jaina preceptor.

The name of the donor is not clear. It reads as Barasa Kalvappu.

The nature of the second grant is not clear\(^{118}\). It was made by several persons such as the King's account (srikarana), several Gāmundas and Nāl-gāmundas. The grant was made to Govindapadi near Belgola. The item of the grant however is not specified.

As far as the Konkan region is concerned, we have only one charter issued by the sovereign authority. The charter which is datable to AD 871\(^{119}\) speaks about the donation of a grāma along with certain rights and privileges. Though the list pf privileges includes all those expressions which occur with regular frequency in many of the royal charters, yet what is different in this charter is the order of arrangement of these expressions.


\(^{118}\) Ibid., The inscription has many gaps and it is difficult to make out some of the details clearly

\(^{119}\) Sanjam plates of Amoghavarsha, EI,XVIII,pp.235-255
The section dealing with the rights and privileges of the inscriptions starts with *grāmam sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula-bhōktavaya* which means the village was to be enjoyed along with its resources. Usually this is not mentioned separately in other charters. After specifying that the charter lists the transfer of the following: ‘*:s-ōdranga sa-parikara, sa-dās-ōparādha sa-bhūtō-pāta-pratyāya s-otpadhyamāna-viṣṭika sa-dhānya-hiran̄y-ādeyah a cāṭa-bhāṭa-prāveṣyah sarva-rājakīyānām a-hastapraṅśepāṇiya ā-candr-ārk-ārṇava-kṣiti-sarit-parvata-sama-kālinputra-pautranvaya-kram-ōpabhogyah pūrva-pratta-dēva-bhraṁa-dāya-rahitā ābhyaṇtara-siddhya bhūmi-cchidra-nyāyēna( L.66-68) ... yatōsy-ōchitaya brahmadāya-sthitaya ... bhuñjato-bhojayatah krisatah-karsayatah pratidīśato vā na kaiścid=āpi paripanhanā kāryā (L.69-70)’.

The recipients of the donation were four brahmaṇas of different gōtras. They all however, hailed (vinirgata) from the same place namely Karahada which may be identified with Karhad in Satara district. The locale of the donated property, however, has been identified in the present district of Thana

**C. AD 900 Onward**

Most of the charters of the tenth century are royal ones and the nature and the conditions of assignments as reflected in them point to certain changes. Apart from the continuation of many of the earlier rights and privileges, we also notice the emergence of certain new ones during this period. Also, there are certain terms which though existed earlier now start occurring more frequently in the list of rights and privileges.

In the region of Sabarmati basin the nature of authority transferring the resources seemed to have changed in this period. Unlike the earlier period, all the tenth century charters recording resource
transfer in the region of Sabarmati basin emanated from sovereign authority. Apart from the changes in the nature of authority transferring resources in this region, changes can also be seen in the nature of assignments. The rights and privileges as given in the two royal charters have been arranged in a tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The change in the nature of resource transfer is amply reflected by the first charter. A look at the table would show that apart from certain expressions such as sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula and, dāṇḍa-dōṣa-dāś-āparađha which occurs in earlier charters also, this charter mentions certain new expressions. They are:

I. sa-kāṣṭa-trīṇa-kūpa-tadāg: This expression occurs for the first time and the literal translation would be 'its timber, grass, wells, tanks',

II. sa-bhoga-bhāga: This has been translated as 'its enjoyment and shares'.

D.C. Sircar, however, takes it to be a fiscal expression in which bhāga means the king's share of the produce and bhoga the periodical supplies made by tenants to the king.

---

120 A Rashtrakuta grant of Krishna II, Dated Saka 832, Ed. 1, p.52-58
121 Ibid., pp. 47-48
III. *catur-aghāt-anopalakshita ghanaka pala sameta*: this would mean together with all pasture and straw of the granted village.

If these expressions are read together, it would only imply a wide ranging power to the donee over all the possible natural resources of the granted rural settlement. This also provides an example of creating individual property rights by eroding the rights of the village community as resources like rows of trees, timber, pasture etc. were generally held not by an individual but by the entire village community.

In the second charter¹²² also though the earlier expressions such as *sa-vṛkṣamālā-kula* and *daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha-sa-sīmā-paryanata* figures in the list of privileges, we also come across certain new expressions such as:

I. *sa-karmmanta*: The term which occurs for the first time has been translated as 'its cultivated soil' by the editor which is not beyond doubt.

II. *samast-otpatti-sahita*: Like the term *karmanta*, this expression also occurs for the first time which has been translated as 'together with whatever is produced (i.e., crop or income)

Apart from these, another new development is to be seen in the use of ending the list of rights and privileges with *ādi* which would give certain leverage to the recipients to claim more than what all has been enumerated in the charter.

As far as the recipient of the first grant is concerned, he was a \textit{brāhmaṇa} of Bharadvāja 
\textit{gōtra} and lived (\textit{vāstavya}) at a place called Bhatta which has not been identified.

In the case of the second grant, the recipient has been described as a \textit{brāhmaṇa} of Māṭhara 
\textit{gōtra}, residing at Māṇyakhēta at the time of the grant. We are also told that he originally came from Kāvikā. The donated place, however, was located in the present day Kaira district which is far away from the place where the donee is stated to have resided at the time of grant.

The charters recording donation in the reign of Mahi basin are also royal ones\footnote{Two grants of Indrārāja III,Saka-sambvat 836,\textit{I},pp.24-41.}. The list of rights and privileges obtainable in these two charters, however, do not refer to any new expression. The table given below would shows that the list in both the tenth century charters is identical. The only difference that one can point out is the absence of the use of expression \textit{'purva-pradatta-deva-brahmadēya-rahitah'} in the second charter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two grant of Indrārāja III, 1</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\textit{Grāma} | \begin{itemize}
\item \textit{S-ūdranga sa-parikara, sa-daṇḍa-doṣa-dāś}
\item \textit{āparaḍha sa-otpādhyamāna-viṣṭika sa-}
\item \textit{dhānya-hiragy-ādeyah ābhyaantara-siddhya}
\item \textit{pūrva-pradatta-deva-brahma-dāya-rahitā} ...
\end{itemize} | \begin{itemize}
\item \textit{yatōṣy-āchetayā}
\item \textit{brahmādēya-sthitya}
\item \textit{bhunjato-bhojyatah}
\item \textit{krisatah-karsayatah}
\item \textit{pratidiśato vē na}
\end{itemize} |
Two grants of Indrana III, # II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gráma</th>
<th>Parípanthanti Ktiryti'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 915   | :S-ôôranga sa-parikara, sa-daÇda-daÇ-daÇ-
aparâdana sa- -otpadaíamâna-vîøiîka sa-
dhánya-hirany-âdeyáh ábhyaíara-siddhyá |
|       | yatûsy-ôchitayá |
|       | brahmâdáya-sthitya |
|       | ...bhuïjato-bhoïjayatah |
|       | krisatah-karsayatah |
|       | pratiëišato và na |
|       | kaiëhid=ûpi parípanthanâ kâryá' |

Thus the set of charters of Mahi basin present a contrasting picture in relation to what we noticed in the Sabarmati basin. Here we see transfer of limited rights and privileges in favour of the recipients. Aside from the fact that many other privileges which occur in many of the royal grants are absent in both the charter, nowhere in either of the charters do we hear of the tenure of the donation. In the absence of this it may not be wrong to suggest that possibly both the grant were to last only till the life time of the donees and the charter did not confer any hereditary right over the donated property to the recipient.

The recipients of both the grants were two brâhmaÇnas who belonged to the Lakshmanâ gôtra and Vâji-Mâdhyanâ sôkha. As far as their places of domicile are concerned, nothing is said about the recipient of the first grant. In the case of the second grant we are told that the recipient was a migrant (vinirgata) from Pataliputra.

The two royal charters relating to the transfer of properties in the region of Western Tapi basin reflect certain variations in the rights and privileges that were given to the donees through them. It may also be mentioned that most of the terms which occur in the context of rights and
privileges are those which figure in the earlier royal charters. However, a close look at the table given below would also indicate the occurrence of certain new expressions. This may possibly imply the inclusion of certain new resources in list of rights and privileges which were transferred to the donees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>AD OBJECT</th>
<th>RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As the table shows, apart from the continuation of the rights and privileges occurring in the charters of the earlier period, certain new expressions make their appearance for the first time in this region which are:

I. *sarv-otpatti-sahita*: Though the same expression occurs in the tenth century charters of other region (see the Combay plate of Govinda IV, dated AD 830, discussed above) it figures for the first time in this region in the first charter of the tenth century datable to 929.\(^{124}\)

---

II. *sulka adi*: The term occurs only in the last charter\(^{125}\). The expression as given in the charter reads as '...*sulka adi samasta-otpatti-sahita*'. As far as the expression 'samasta-otpatti-sahita' is concerned it occurs in one of the tenth century charter discussed above. However, the addition of the term *śulka adi* with it is noticed for the first time.

The term 'śulka' has variously been interpreted as 'tolls; custom duties; octroi duties; taxes particularly levied at ferries and passes and on roads, etc\(^{126}\). The use of the term *adī* along with it is possibly indicative of the fact that apart from 'śulka' the donee was also given certain other rights which might have been similar to *śulka*.

It may also be pointed out that in neither of them do we find the use of expression 'yatōsy-ōchitaya brahmadāya-sthityā\(^{127}\).

The recipients of the first grant were eight *brāhmaṇas* of different *gōtras* and *shākhās* and they all have been described as migrants (vinirgat) from different places.

In the case of the second grant the recipient has been described as the *brāhmaṇa* of Bhāradvāja gōtra and Bahvricha Shākhā and a resident of Gejaravāṇī. It is also stated in the charter that he had come here (possibly the area of donation) on some business.

The lone tenth century royal charter of the Wardha-Wainganga basin region\(^{128}\) also shows the continuation of the rights and privileges which are mentioned in the earlier charter. However if we compare the

---

\(^{125}\) No. CXXXVI. IA.XII, p.263

\(^{126}\) Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966. p.327

\(^{127}\) Two grants of Indraraja III, No. II, Saka-samvat 836,EI,IX,pp.24-41,

\(^{128}\) Deoli plates of Krishana III, EI, V, pp.188-97.
list of rights and privileges as given in the tenth century charter with the earlier ones we see some changes. For example, the tenth century charter carries two expressions which do not figure in the earlier charters of this region, though they do figure in the earlier charters of other regions. These expressions are:

I. Sa-danda-doṣa-daś-āparādha, and
II. sarv-otpatti.

Since the meanings of both of them have already been explained, they do not require any fresh explanation here now.

Apart from this, the nature of the grant seems to have been different from the earlier charter of this region in the sense that it has been described as namasya grant which is the same as mānya grant which meant rent free tenure.

The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa of Bhāradvāja gōtra who had migrated (vinirgat) from Nandivardhana. It may be mentioned that the donated village has been stated to be located in Nāgpur-Nandivardhana, the chief place of which has been identified with modern Nagpur.

The tenth century charters relating to the region of Godavari basin do not reflect any substantial departure from the earlier trends. It may be pointed out that all the tenth century charters are royal charters issued by Indra III possibly the same year. The details of the nature of assignments as given in these three charters have been given on the page facing this.

A fleeting glance on the table clearly suggests the continuation of the practice of transferring largely the same set of rights and privileges in favour of the donees. The only new development that one can point out is the inclusion of the term ‘samasta-otpatti-sahita’ in two of the
charters\textsuperscript{129}. Apart from this, one can possibly point out some incidental variation such as the use of the term ‘sahita’ with \textit{dañda-dośa-daś-āparādha}. It may also be pointed out that in the absence of ‘a cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāvesyah’ in the second grant. This seems may be of some relevance when we realize that it figures in the first charter which was drafted by the same person who drafted the second one and that both the grant were made at the same time on the same occasion.

If we compare the tenth century’s list of rights and privileges with that of the earlier period we find another change and that relates the nature of assignments. In the case of earlier period we find most of the grant being made as per the rule of \textit{bhūmi-cchidra}. However, this term does not figure at all in the tenth century charters. In fact two of the tenth century grants have been described as \textit{namasya} grant the meaning of which has already been explained in the context of a tenth century charter discussed above.

Also as far as the expression ‘yatōṣy-ōchitayā brahmadaya-sthitya... karyya is concerned, it occurs in only one charter\textsuperscript{130}.

The description of the recipients of the grant in the first two charters (vajirkheda,\# A and B) is different from the usual ones. It is stated in the first charter that the recipient of the two grāmas was a Jaina monastery that was known as Amōgha. As far as the site of the monastery itself is concened, we are told that it was given to the preceptor Vardhamān. In the case of the second grant (Vajirkheda,\# B) we are told that the six villages were given to the Jaina monastery at Uriamma in the city of Vadnera and the residential monastery itself to a preceptor named

\textsuperscript{129} Two grants of Indraraja III, No. A and B, \textit{EI}, XXXVIII, pp.24-41.

\textsuperscript{130} Jambagaon Plates,\textit{EI},XXXVI,pp.232-238
Vardhamán. Both the recipients seem to be the same person as apart from their name, the other details about them are the same. Both are described as belonging to the prominent Virgarna of the Dravida Saṅgha and to the Virnāya or Virṇāyya-anvaya. As far as the identification of Vādrnera is concerned, it is now represented by modern Vādner about fifteen miles to the north west of Mālēgaon. All the villages figuring in both the charters have also been identified in the areas around Vādner.

In the case of the Jambgaon plates, the donee is stated to be a brāhmaṇa of Bhāradvāja gṛṭra and a migrant (vinirgata) from Vengi.

The lone tenth century charter relating to the Bhima basin\textsuperscript{131} does not refer to any such rights or privileges in favour of the donee which has not figured in any of the tenth century charters discussed so far. However, we do see the use of a new expression which reads as ‘samast-otpatti-śulka- uttopatti – sahita’. Thus the list of rights and privileges that we get in the sole royal charter consisted of the followings:

I. sa-vṛṣamālā-kula,
II. sa-dhānya-hiraṇy
III. sa- daṇḍa--daś-āparādha
IV. samast-otpatti-śulka- uttopatti - sahita.

The occurrence of the first three has been noticed in the charters of other region as well. Only the last one i.e. samast-otpatti-śulka-uttopatti sahita occurs for the first time. The expression has been translated as ‘together with all the produce of the land and the income arising from toll’\textsuperscript{132}.

\textsuperscript{131} A fragmentary grant of Rashtrakuta Suvamavarsha. \textit{EI}, XXIII,p101

\textsuperscript{132} Indian Epigraphical Glossary, 1966. p. 401.
Apart from the sole royal grant, we have two other cases of transfer of resources by persons having subordinate status. The first one is a pillar inscription\textsuperscript{133} and it tells us about tax exemptions on the object of donations which consisted of:

i. first rate land (*bhûmium- uttàm*), and two other pieces of lands measuring certain *nivartanas*;

ii. certain furnished houses (*nivéśanâni sàrddhâni saptavimsatim*);

and

iii. Flower garden (*kusum vāṭikam*).

All these were donated by *Grâmapati* of Pavittage along with 200 Dvījas. They all have been stated to be exempted from tax which has been referred as *manyâm / mânyâni*.

The recipient of all the grants were the resident scholars attached to a school or hall (śâlâ) at Pavittage. We are told that the school or hall (śâlâ) was established by the chief minister (*pradhânah Krîshṇâjasya mamtrî*) and *sandhivigrahîn* of Krîshṇaraja, called Nârâyaṇa an inhabitant of other village\textsuperscript{134}. It may be relevant to mention here that the village Nârâyaṇa belonged to was located in a *vishaya* different from the one in which Pâviṭṭâge was located.

The inscription B which may be datable to the same period as A, speaks of another grant to the same śâlâ by certain Kañchiga who came from a place called Kupanâpura and belonged to the race of Selaras.

\textsuperscript{133} Salotgi Pillar inscriptions,*EI,IV*, p.57.

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid, the grant however specifies that all, except the VIth one, were given to the community of scholars of the school (śâlâ). The VIth one, i.e. 50 *nivartanas* of land and one dwelling place has been has been destined for the teachers in this school.
The object of grant consisted of a few of the house sites \((nêșana=nîvêśana)\) in his reni-free land \((dasmavanda)\).

In the second charter\(^{135}\) the list of privileges which donee was to enjoy was a limited one. It consisted of \(âbhyantara-siddhy\) and \(daṇḍa-daś-âparâdha\). Since both of them have already been explained, we need not do the same here.

The two tenth century charters relating to the region of Krishna basin also do not show any significant departure from the earlier ones in terms of the nature or condition of assignments. The relevant details given in a tabular form below shows the continuance of the transfer of largely the same rights and privileges in favor of the donees as we see in the earlier charters of this region.

In the first charter\(^{136}\) most of the expressions are those which are referred in the earlier inscriptions also. However, the word \(satottariya\), occurs for the first time and in this region only. Its meaning or implication, however, remains uncertain.

The list of rights and privileges as given in the second charter of the tenth century\(^{137}\) also carries expressions that have already been discussed. It may however, be pointed out that like many other charters of the tenth century the expression \('sarv-otpatti sahita'\) occurs in this charter also.

\(^{135}\) An Incomplete Grant of Sinda Adityavarman: Saka 887,\textit{EI},XXV,pp.164-171.

\(^{136}\) Sangali plates of Govinda V, Sanskrit and Old Kanarese Inscription, No. CXXXIII,\textit{IA},XII,pp.247-55

\(^{137}\) \textit{Kachal} plates of Krishna III \textit{EI IV} n 278
Two other points may also be made here. One relates to the absence of expression like *yatôsy-ôchitayâ brahmadâya-sthitya* in both the charters. Rather what we see now is the practice of mentioning the name of the donee before citing the right to sublet the property.

The other point relates to the use of the terms *brahmadaya* -*nyâyêna* and *namasya* in the same inscription. Possibly the idea here is to indicate that the object of donation was to be enjoyed as rent free holding as both the terms *brahmadaya* and *namasya* mean rent free holding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARTER</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DONATION</th>
<th>RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangali plate of Govinda V</td>
<td>933</td>
<td><em>Grâma</em></td>
<td><em>Sa-vrûksamâlâ-kula sa-dhânya-hiranyâyâdeyâh dânda-doêsa-das-ôparâdha bhûta-opâtta-pratyâya-âc-câta-bhâta-prâveêyâh satottariyo brahmadayanya-yayen aç chmdr-arkkam namazyô datta h L.48-50</em></td>
<td><em>Kesava-dikshitasya (name of the donee) Krisatah-karsayatâh bhûjato-bhojayatâh va na kenachid vyaghtah kâryâ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karhad plates of Krishana III</td>
<td>959</td>
<td><em>Grâma</em></td>
<td><em>Sa-vrûksamâlâ-kula sa-dhânya-hiranyâyâdeyâh dânda--das-ôparâdha sarv-ôtpatii sahita a-candr-arkkmayâ namasya datta (L.62-63)</em></td>
<td><em>Gaganshivashaya (name of the donee) Krisatah-karsayatâh bhûjato-bhojayatâh va na kenachid vyaghtah kâryâ</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recipients in both the grant were *brâhmañas*. In the case of the first grant he has been described as belonging to the Kaushika gôtra whose father had come from the city of Pundavardhana which has been identified with Bôgra in Northern Bengal.
In the case of the second grant we are told that he was well versed in Śivasiddhântas and was the pupil of Īsânaśiva of Karahâta which is modern Karhâd. The donated village, we are told, was also located in the same area.

The tenth century donative inscriptions belonging to the region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin do not convey the impression of any significant deviation from the earlier trend in terms of condition of assignment or the nature of resources being assigned. In fact, like the earlier period, we find evidence, with unfailing regularity, of resource transfer by local authorities largely in favour of varied local institutions.

The first donative inscription that we have at our disposal is the Dandapur inscription (C. AD 929-30)\(^\text{138}\) which refers itself to the reign of Prabhûtavarsha. It speaks about several donations by different categories of people. The relevant details of the inscription have been arranged in a tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>OBJECT OF DONATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Nannivedanga, at the command of Dhora, II. Chief Dvija, (dvija-mukhyar) III. Resident member of the street (kērī) IV. Certain individual named Kēasabbe</td>
<td>I. 12 mattar of wet land as mānaya to the tank, II. a pana out of village revenue etc. to the Kaṇuamagere in perpetuity, III. 17 mattar at the foot of the hill (moradi), IV. 2 mattar of wet land to made the above donation tax free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{138}\) Karnataka Inscription, II, pp. 11-14.
The inscription under discussion brings out several points about the resource management in the area related to the activities described above. To begin with, the first grant is stated to have been made by the local authority Dhôra and the grant has been described as manya grant which suggest that the granted land was made a rent free holding or tax free land. This clearly shows the power of the local authority to make the land rent /tax free.

The second grant was made by the dvija-mukhyar which obviously refers to the head of the brahamana community of the place. The grant made by him consisted of the following:

I. a pana out of the village revenue (hiranyo) in gold and whatever pana was got as income on account of prâyaśchitta by chief Dvijas;
II. three drammas (as fee) received by them ( brâhmañas) as present at the time of the marriage of the vipras,
III. two drammas ( as fee) at the māni (i.e. the upanayana ceremony),
IV. one drama ( as fee) at the marriage of the sūdra gāṇa,

The detail of this grant tells us not only about the varieties of sources of income for the local brâhmaṇa community but also about the prevalence of hiranya as part of revenue, collected not by the state authority but by the local body of the brâhmaṇa who apparently also had the power to transfer it to whatever they wanted to.

The third grant, consisting of seventeen mattar of land at the foot of the hillock, was made by the resident members of the street (keri) to a local tank. But the grant made by them was not free from taxation. Therefore, to get the land exempted from the tax two mattar of land was donated by certain individual.

---

139 Indian Epigraphical Glossary, p. 198
This brings out the fact that the right to make any given land tax free rested with the local authority who usually did so only after being compensated for the loss of revenue which the grant would cause.

The entire grants discussed above were apparently being made for a local tank called Pergere at one place and Kannamagere at other.

The inscription ends with the statement that two hundred and twenty members (of the mahājanas) had assembled there and it was they who caused the present inscriptions to be written.

The point that this inscription brings out clearly is the nature of control exercised by different categories of social groups and local authority on the local resources.

We have two inscriptions located at the same place and both referring to the reign of Krishna III. The inscription A, datable to AD 945-6, begins by referring itself to the reign of Kannara (Krishna III) and then states that while mahāsāmanta Kali-Viṭṭa of Chellakētana lineage was governing Banvāsi-nād (Kali-Viṭṭa Banvāsi-nād āle) and Gāmunḍiga was serving as nāl-gāmunḍu of Edevolal- Banvāsi-nālke, on the given date, the revenue of a field was transferred by Gāmunḍiga to a special account for the upkeep of a local tank.

The field measured two mattal and the remission was given at the request of certain individual named Poravayya.

In the second inscription referred as No.C we are first told about mahāsāmantādhipati Šaṅkaragāṇḍa as the governor of Banvāsi-nād

---

140 Kyasanur Inscription of Saka 868,El.XVI,pp.280-81.
141 Ibid.,p.283.
(Banvāsi-nāḍ ālutt-ire) and Gāmundiga as nāl-gāmundara of Edevolā-ēlpatakka.

The purpose of the inscription is to record the following three donations:

1. a field containing two mattal for the supply of oblations, lying below the Pulil tank (Pulil-kereya);
2. four mattal below the same tank;
3. a field containing one mattal for the supply of oblation in the Buda-kanda.

Given the context of the inscriptions, possibly what is being transferred by the local authority was the revenue of these field for the purposes specified with each grant.

In another inscription of Kṛishṇa III 142 we are told of a new term for tax/revenue called siddh-āyam. What is noteworthy is in this case is the fact that we have siddhayam of two types, one meant for the royalty has been referred as arsara desege siddh-āyam and another meant for the local authority has been described as nalagāmundara desege siddh-āyam.

The term occurs in the context of donation made by Toḍdayya 143, who has been described as the country Gāmundi of three hundred, (Belvola- mūnūraranār—ggāmundam) and the six Gāmunda (aruvar=ggamundugalum). The donation consisted of a piece of land of

---

142 Tuppad-Kurhatti inscription of the reign of Akalavārsha Kṛishṇa III, Saka 868, E1, XIV, pp. 364-66
143 Ibid. The inscription after referring to the reign of Kṛishṇa III also refers to various local officials such as the governor of Purigere three hundred and Belvola three hundred, his subordinate Aychayyaas the administrator of Karna-Guripatţi with internal authority (karna-Guripattoy=abhyantara-sidhi=alle, L13) etc.
fifty mattar by the king's measure (rāja-māna-mattar...) and also one mattar for a garden.

The donation was made for a temple built by Āychayya who was administering Karaṇa-Guripatī with internal authority.

After recording this donation it is stated that 'on this, for the share of the kings the fixed revenue (shall be) two gold gadyanas', for the share of the county -Goudas , the fixed revenue shall be two gadyanas.

Apart from land, the same donors also made the donation of twenty-four dwelling houses of seven cubits and five cubits (in width) at Devamagere. After recording this donation it has been specified that on this field and houses there are not a single other impost implying thereby that the dwelling houses were also covered under siddh-ayam.

The term siddh-āyam once again figures in another inscription of the reign of Kṛishṇa IV. It occurs in the context of several grants that were made by different individual with differential authority status.

The inscription starts with mentioning the rule of Akalavarsha and them introduces his anguish (body-guard) Śri-Ruddapayya as the governor of Saratavura. It then proceeds on to detail the grants.

The first grant consisted of a piece of garden land, measuring one thousand (betel-nut) creepers, to the god. The donors were Achapayya, the Pergade of Ruddapayya, and gamunda Sami Kalteyamman. The grant was made after washing the feet of the (fifty Mahājanas)

---

144 Ibid. exp. Used: idarke arasara desege siddh-āyam pom-gadyānam=eradu 2, L. 16-17, p. 365
145 No. CXXXV, IA. XII, pp. 256-257
146 Ibid. exp. used: Saratavaraman amgarakam Śri- Ruddapayyan=ihutirc. L. 3, p. 257
After referring to the grant it is stated that 'all the fixed contribution was that the Goravas should supply to the god, year by year, thirty drammas of charcoal (being the amount) appointed (to be given) to the king’

The other grant consisted of twelve mattar of culturable land for the matha and for education. The donors of this grant were the same.

The fixed contribution on this property is stated to be six drammas of charcoal every year.

Apart from these grants, the inscription also records two other grants. One consisted of contribution of a young betel-leaf plants in the leaf donated by the fifty mahajanasa uniting together. Another one consisted of 'one pana on each peru' donated by Bhavanisetti.

It is also stated at the end that the Mahajanasa shall protect these grants.

We have another inscription referring to the same term siddh-āya. The inscription records two grants. The first one consisted of the contribution of twelve aur-gadyanas of Rona and a fixed contribution (siddh-āya) of kana of salt and ghee and a vajjani of sugar cane juice. Pnachaladeva who was governing the Sebbi Thirty made this grant.

Another grant consisting of six mattars of land, one aru vana and a dharna of gold of Rona was given by Malliga Gadayya whose status has

---

147 Ibid, Achapayya, the Pergade of Ruddapayya and the village headman after washing the feet of the (fifty Mahajanasa).

148 No. CXXXIV, IA, (sep 1883), pp.255-56
not been mentioned. Though this grant was meant for the temple, it was the Eighty-four (mahājanas) who received the gift in both the cases.

In one of the inscription of the reign of Kṛṣṇa III,¹⁴⁹ we have reference of the term kara. The inscription after referring to the reign of Kṛṣṇa III introduces his subordinate Garvindara and then records that an impost of 55 gadyanas was required of the mahājanas of Posavur from the interest of which certain brāhmaṇa were to be fed.

We have one more inscription from the same locality¹⁵⁰. This inscription does not record the actual transfer of land rather it speaks about the revenue arrangement for a place called Kesalur¹⁵¹. The arrangements consisted of the following:

I. for a mattal four damma,
II. for an udigal three,
III. for a house two, the damma on houses is to be one gold.

The inscription ends with the statement that when the thirty-two crown officials (arasu) hold the survey; they shall provide the rice for one year. This would be provided by Nāl-gāmundas.

Apart from the records discussed above, we have certain inscriptions which though do not relate directly to transfer of land; nonetheless they thaw useful insights about the nature and varieties of local resources and the group controlling them

We have one inscription recording transfer of revenue. It belongs to the reign of Akālavarsa-Kannaradēva and is datable to AD 956¹⁵².

¹⁴⁹ Devihosur Inscription of Saka 884, EI,XVI,p.286.
¹⁵¹ Ibid. The provisions are the following: for a mattal four damma, for an udigal three, for a house two, the damma on houses is to be one gold.
¹⁵² SII, IX,part I, Miscellaneous Inscription in Kannada,1986, No.66,p.38
The inscription after referring itself to the reign of Kannaradēva introduces his mahāsāmanta Rottaya, ruling over Māsivādi hundred and fifty etc. and then records a grant by him. The grant consisted of the whole of the revenue raised from Bābandī to Pashupatibhatta, the Urodeya of Bālguli. Another chief named Dhorapayya is said to have made some gift.

We have one inscription that talks about the donation of a tank. The inscription\(^{153}\) begins with the reference to the reign of Krishna III and then introduces his Ganga subordinate Būtayya-Permādi who was governing the Gangavādi Ninety-six thousand. It registers a gift of tank made to the dāna-shāla attached to the basadi constructed by Padmabbarasi. It is also told that the gift was entrusted to Gunachandra - Pandita.

Another record belongs to the reign of Kṛṣṇa III and is datable to AD 971\(^ {154}\). It registers a gift of gāsahasra made by Sānta-Gāvunda to the temple constructed by him.

Apart from these inscriptions, we come across certain hero stones in his region. They invariably record the death of certain individuals defending the resources of the rural settlements they belonged to. The relevant information about them has been arranged in a tabular form below.\(^ {155}\)

---

\(^{153}\) SII,XI, (Bombay Karnataka Inscriptions), No.38, pp.23-24

\(^{154}\) Ibid, No.44, p.29

\(^{155}\) It has been generally been noticed that there was the practice of awarding the hero’s family some land which were known variously as Kal nād, Kodagi grant, Rakta-kodagi or
Now the impression one gets out of the donatives inscriptions discussed above is the important role played by the local community, specially Mahâjanas and also the local authorities in managing the resources. The details of the inscriptions also bring out the mechanism by which different authorities at different level were trying to appropriate the resources by taxing varied resources.

We have some donative inscriptions relating to the region of Tungabhadra basin and they seem to reflect the same picture as we have just noticed in the case of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin.

We have another inscription datable to AD 972. The records which belongs to the period of Khoṭṭiga\(^{156}\) refers to various local resources in the context of the renewal of a grant by Ankabbarasi.

The inscription tells us about a new term called jêtrâmukham which was the cess realized on the occasion of fair. The term is referred to in the context of renewal of gift which included, apart from jêtrâmukham, six gardens and twenty four mattar of kisukadu (red land). The person who is stated to have renewed the grant has been named Ankabbarasi, the governor of Pullunga. The renewal was done at the request of Nâl-gâmunda of Purigere 300.

The term aruvana has been described as some kind of price for the entire gift as the record says that ' the aruvana fixed for this gift was 24 nettara-kodgai, see Mysore and Croog from Inscriptions, by B. Rice, London,1909. However, during the period of our study this seem to have been a rarity.

\(^{156}\) Huglur inscription of Khottiga, Saka 893, El, XXXIV, pp.59-62
drammas' and this was paid by the requestee of the gift i.e. Nāl-gāmunda of Purigere 300. We are also told that it was only after paying the aruvana that the income due to the goddess Pullungurabe was released.

In one of the inscription belonging to the reign of Krishṇa III\(^{157}\) we are told of the transfer of revenue of a field of two mattal by Nāl-gāmunda Gamudiga , at the request of certain person, for the upkeep of a local tank. The term which has been used for the remission is -olag ir-mattal-keyam(?).

We have one inscription referring to the reign of Kakka III\(^{158}\) which registers the donation of seven mattal of black soil land (bitta kariya key-mattal) and one mattal of rice land to the god. Manayya, the Urgamunda of the village, said to have been made the donation in an assembly which was attended by the Nāl-gāmundas of the village and the district\(^{159}\).

Thus in the case of his region Nāl-gāmunda seems to have had the same role as Mahājanas in the region of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin.

The first tenth century inscription, datable to AD 902\(^{160}\) begins by referring itself to the reign of Akalavarsha (Krishna II) and then introduces mahāsāmanta Lokateyarsa as the governor of 31,102 villages (bada) which consisted of various administrative unit of different

---

\(^{157}\) Kayasnur inscription of Saka 868, etc. No. A,El,XVI, pp.280-283.

\(^{158}\) No. CXXXVII, IA, XII, pp.270-72

\(^{159}\) Ibid, about the donor of these properties the inscription says that while Bolayya, a Nāl-gāmunda, Rajayya, another Nāl-gāmunda and Vjayya, the governor of the village were in assembly the land was probably allotted by Manayya who was the Urgāmunda of the village.

dimension\textsuperscript{161}. He, as stated in the inscription, granted Dandipalli to Bittaya who has been described as the \textit{pergade} of the \textit{nâdu} governed by him. The place was located in the Nagarakhanda -70 whose \textit{gâvunda} and the pergade of the \textit{gâvunda} has also been mentioned. The inscription, however, does not speak of the transfer of any economic rights in favour of the donee.

The second inscription also belongs to the reign of the same ruler and is datable to AD 903\textsuperscript{162}. The subordinate authorities mentioned in this inscription are different from the earlier one\textsuperscript{163}. The inscription records the grant of certain dues to the \textit{mahâjanas} of \ldots\textit{tandi}. The nature of the dues, however, is not clear.

Several persons who seemed to have come from different background, and whose name has also been given, made the grant\textsuperscript{164}. Apart from these two inscriptions, the rest of the donative inscriptions record the local authorities as the donor of landed properties of various dimension, yet we come across term for taxation in only one of them.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., He is stated to be the governor of 31,102 village (bada) comprising the Banvasi 12,000, the Palasige-12,000, the Manyakheda-6,000, the Klanu-30, the Lokapura 12 and the Toregera-60.


\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., It mentions \textit{prachanda-dandanayaka} Damanapiya as the general of all the south and stationed at Mane. It also mentions Dandanayaka of Durvinitarsa.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid, The following have been mentioned as donors: Durvinitaarasas \textit{dandanayaka}, together with the thousand Bhattavuttas, the five hundred Ole and the three hundred Beya. The record also gives the names of a few of the Bhattavuttas and Beyas and also specifies that the grant was made by these. Who this Durvinita-arsa was is not clear from the details of the inscription. However, we may guess that probably he was he was an officer like Damapaiya who is referred in this inscription as prachanda-dandanayaka.
The sole inscription refers to the term *irgai-dravayam* (money for taxes) to make the donated land tax-free. The *irgai-dravayam* was apparently given to the *samba* of the place which made the donated land tax free.

The inscription after referring to the reign of Kṛṣṇa III, speaks about a person who built a hall near a temple and, for providing water and for supplying fire to the hall, granted a well and one *paṭṭi* of land called *Kalarichcheruvu*.

It has been suggested by the editor of the inscription that the word *kalari* means "uncultivated ground" and *seruvu* means a field and thus the expression "*Kalarichcheruvu*" was probably a proper name, denoting a certain tracts of rice fields. We are told that the donee had purchased the land from a person called Isanasiva alias Nakkadi-Bhaṭṭa who paid the money for tax to the members of the assembly (*sabhā*) and then *Sabhā* made it tax free in perpetuity. The *sabhā* apparently belonged to the village in which the donated piece of land was located.

We have only one inscriptions of tenth century which refers to certain donation in the region of Konkan. The sole charter however throws important light on the issues under consideration.

The purpose of the inscription was to record the creation of an endowment under the instruction of sovereign power through the governor of Samyana mandala. We are also told that the endowment was the result of the request made by a person called Anniya who was not

---

165 Inscriptions of Kannaradeva, NoD, EI, III, pp. 282-286
166 Ibid, sec fn. 11, p. 285
167 Rashtrakuta charters from Chinchani, 1. Grant of the time of Indra III, Saka 848, EI, XXXII, pp. 45-54
only a friend of the minister of the governor of Samyana but also seemed
to have been serving the sovereign power in some capacity.
The endowment consisted of a village and half a *Dhur* of land located in
another village. The donee was also given certain rights and privileges
over the landed properties which are not much different from the one
mentioned in the earlier royal charter. Followings are the rights and
privileges given to the donee:

I. *s-ôdranga*

II. *sa-parikara-

III. *sa-bhoga-bhâga*

IV. *sa-daûda-daš-âparâdha*

V. *sa-dhânya-hiranâya*

VI. *s-otpâdyamâna-višṭika*

VII. *s-âbhyantara-siddhya*

VIII. *a câta-bhâta-prâvesyah*

IX. *sa-vrksamâlâ-kula*

After specifying these rights which were given to the donee, the
charter goes on to specify certain rights which donee was not to have and
it is in this context that that we are told of the following:

1) *nidhan* (treasure trove)

2) *alipaka* (also called aliyaka, possibly meaning indestructible objects or
metal ores)

3) *kumari-sahasa-dosa* (i.e. fines for the modesty of unmarried girls)

We have one *vyavastha* charter found at the same place as above and
in this charter we have the occurrence of a new term called *srotaka*. The
charter belongs to the reign of Kṛishṇa III and records terms of settlement of a land dispute between two religious institutions. The inscription conveys the impression that a small piece of land belonging to the temple of Bhillamaladeva was wrongfully appropriated by another temple near by. The inscription contains the details of how the settlement was arrived at and the reference about the people who were involved in it. It also records various provisions, which were made and agreed upon by the members of both the religious institutions.

What makes the entire settlement of dispute interesting is the fact that nowhere do we see the involvement of state apparatus. Rather, the entire decision emanates from a deity, his attendants like Svadhyayikas, Varika etc. Even the writer of the inscription says that he did this with the consent of the parties, viz., the devotees of the god and those of the goddess.

We have three inscriptions from Kanheri. Since none of them are related to the transfer of any landed property, we can afford to leave them out of discussion here.

**Concluding remarks:**
The data that we have discussed above shows that the rights and privileges that were delegated to the recipients along with the land/village were not exactly the same in all sub-regions. In fact one notices a great degree of variation in them through time across space. A chronological review of the list of rights and privileges shows that most of the charter of the 6th and the 7th century and even eight century usually

---

168 Ibid, Rashtrakutas charters from chinchan, No,2 grant of the time of Krishna,pp.
169 Three Inscriptions from Kanheri, IA,XIII pp133-38
do not speak about the transfer of many rights and privileges in favour of the donee. Even in those cases where there is reference to the transfer of certain privileges, it was largely limited to certain exemptions. The practice of transferring elaborate rights over resources of the donated land/settlements in favour of the donee had not yet become a regular feature.

The practice of transferring greater number of resources starts from towards the close of the eighth century which also coincides with the transformation of Raṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed from subordinate to imperial status. It is in the charters of the ninth century that we see the frequent occurrence of an elaborate list of rights and privileges that were transferred to donee. But even during this period regional variation in the number of rights and privileges continues to occur. This possibly shows that at no point of time the state was willing to let go all its control over the donated settlements.

One of the important developments of this period was the inclusion of the term sa-vṛṣamālā-kula but apart from this we do not get evidence of the transfer of any other resources.

However, what is important about the ninth century charters is that if on the one hand the list of rights and privileges got longer, on the other, we also notice occurrence of certain conditional clauses in the list with unfailing regularity. One of the terms which figures quite prominently is yatōṣy-ōchitayā brahmadāya-sthitya and pūrva-pradatta-deva-brahma-deya-rahitā. We should also not forget the occurrence of expressions such as asan-nara-pravṛtti-vinivṛtt-ācārah. Though this figures only
once\textsuperscript{170}, yet it must have acted as an important check on the wide ranging rights and privileges that were given to the recipient.

During the period of the tenth century, we find a tendency to transfer greater number of resources in the favour of the donees. It is during this period that apart from \textit{sa-\textit{vṛkṣamālā}-kula} we also hear of the transfer of \textit{sakastha,-trina,-kupa-tadag,-opeta} and \textit{ghanaka, pala}, in the same charter. Also it is during the tenth century, and that too in the royal charters, that we see the frequent occurrence of the term \textit{sarv-\textit{ōtpatti-sahita}}. These possibly may give the impression that the recipients started having greater control over resources. But there is another trend which should be seen together with this and that is the relative decline in the occurrence of two immunities. One is \textit{a cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāveśyah} and other is \textit{sarva-rājakīyānām a-hastaprakṣepanīya}. In fact in the charters of the tenth century rarely do we find the recipient being granted the privilege of \textit{sarva-rājakīyānām a-hastaprakṣepanīya}. It may also be mentioned that these two terms occur with unfailing regularity in almost all the charters of the ninth century.

However, it may be mentioned that this increasing tendency to transfer more rights and privileges in favour of the recipients cannot be generalized in the context of the entire spatial domain of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The regions like Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin, Tungabhadra basin and to a large extent even Cauveri basin reflect an entirely different picture.

The picture that we have of the Malprabha-Ghatprabha region is entirely different. To begin with, the inventory of resources that comes from this region is entirely different. Out of this inventory there is none

\textsuperscript{170} Samangad copper plate grant of Dantidurga,J.A.(April 1882),p.108.
which is stated to have been delegated to individual. Even the instance of
the donation of land to individuals in this region is a rarity. Most of the
transactions, either of resources of the land or of land itself were made in
favour of tanks or religious institutions or in favour of Mahâjanas. In fact
there is hardly any case of the resources transfer wherein we do not find
the involvement of local community in some form or other. Also
noteworthy is the point that the cases of the exemptions from certain levy
are no less frequent than their transfer. It may also be mentioned that this
is the area which has yielded maximum number of hero-stones which
invariably speak of the fights and consequent death of individuals in that
area. The reasons for the fights in most cases have been either the dispute
over village boundary or the wealth of cattle. This phenomenon may also
be taken into consideration while understanding the distribution and
control of local agrarian resources.

The region of Tungabhadra shares the same pictures to a large
extent. This region also has its own inventory of levy/tax. The only
difference that one can point out between Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin
and the Tungabhadra basin is the differential role of the body of
Mahâjanas and the gâvunda. While in the case of Malprabha-Ghatprabha
basin the body of Mahâjanas seems to have played active role in
allocating and receiving the local resources, the gâvunda seemed to have
played the same role in the region of Tungabhadra. It may also be pointed
out that both of them figure quite prominently in these two regions.

The picture of Cauveri basin seems to have been different from all.
The land charters in this region do not carry any elaborate rights and
privileges in favour of the recipient. The only expression to this effect
that we see in the charters of this region is that of *sarva-bādhā-parihara*. The references to the body of Mahājanas and also of Gāvunda are also frequent in the context of resource transfer. It may also be pointed out that the boundary specification of some of the donated settlements tends to convey the impression that particular care was taken to keep the natural resources or the common resource property out of the limits of the donated settlements.

Konkan to a large extent shares the same picture that we have of the regions we have spoken of first. However, in the latter grant we are told about certain rights which the donee was not to have. These rights are

4) *Nidhāna* (treasure trove)

5) *alipaka* (also called *aliyaka*, possibly meaning indestructible objects or metal ores)

6) *kumārī-sāhasa-dōśa* (i.e. fines violating for the modesty of unmarried girls)

Now this must be seen in the light of the fact that the donee was also given *daṇḍa-doṣa-daś-āparādha* and immunity from *a cāṭa-bhaṭa-prāveśyah*.

As far as the composition of the donee is concerned most of them were individual *brāhmaṇa* though their *gōtra* and *sākhās* were different. As far information about their home is concerned most of them have been described as *vāstavya* of a place which was not far away from the locale of donation. In some cases we are told about their migration to the donated areas but we must remember that such cases were largely limited to individual *brāhmaṇas*. While assessing the impact of such migrations we must also keep in mind that our charters clearly points to the existence of *brāhmaṇa* community in and around the area of donation. What is
noteworthy is the fact that no record relating to the sub-regions of the Malprabha-Ghatprabha, Tungabhadra and Kaveri basin speaks about the migration of brâhmaṇa. In fact our records give us enough indication to believe that brâhmaṇas were already an integral part of the rural population in these regions and the manner of reference to the brâhmaṇas in the records of these regions hardly points to any sharp differentiation between them and other social groups.

In taking the practice of land donation in the Râṣṭrakûta region or elsewhere we must also take into account the fact that we do not have any idea of the total area held either by the major ruling family or by minor families. Since the impression, from the phraseology used in the inscriptions, seems to be that the grants were mostly in the cultivated landscape, a violent upheaval in the social world of the villages through land grants seems unlikely, at least during the period. In addition, those who are mentioned in the records as already holding land or as witness on the occasion of the grant were actually participating in a way in the occasion. This does not seem to substantially alter their social status; rather, it seems to suggest new individuals as recipients of land joining their ranks of elite in rural society.