CHAPTER III

NATURE OF LAND CONTROL: POLITICAL AUTHORITIES, OFFICIALS AND RURAL SOCIAL GROUPS
The present chapter seeks to understand how different social groups in the areas under Raśtrakūṭa control had access to land and the nature and pattern of ownership on the basis of information contained in the inscriptions of the Raśtrakūṭas. It may, however, be stated in the beginning that the corpus of the inscriptions under study seldom provides us with any direct information on this issue. One may, however, hope to arrive at some understanding on the nature and extent of proprietary rights enjoyed by different social groups by analyzing the composition of donors. The focal point of the present exercise, therefore, would be to analyze the authority status of the donor making grant and the nature of grant that emanated from them.

Apart from this, two other aspects of inscriptive information, usually ignored by scholars, would also be taken up for analysis. The first one relates to the boundary specifications, and the second one to the category of people who figure in the list of addressees or witness to the grant.

The idea behind the exercise is to see the issue of proprietary rights not in its absolute terms as has often been the case, but in terms of hierarchy of differential indicators of property rights enjoyed by different authorities, social groups and individuals at different levels. This would help us to know the varied degree of control exercised by different categories of people, starting from village community to peasant to his immediate lord to the lord of

1 See, B.D. Chattopadhayay, *Aspects of Rural Settlement and Rural Society in Early Medieval India*, 1990, section II.
the land etc. The exercise may also throw some light on the nature of community organization at the rural level and may also suggest the way in which the inscriptions data may contribute to the debate on the issues of ownership that has been largely text oriented.

The exercise has been divided into two sections. The first section deals with the those early houses of Rāṣṭrakūṭas which were primarily local, or at best, regional powers, not powerful enough to claim the kind of authority status the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed did little later. As far as the organization of the data is concerned, they have been organized in chronological sequence by the house they relate to. Due consideration has also been given to the spatial dimension of the data as the possibility of the occurrence of variation in a given pattern even at the local level cannot be precluded altogether. We would begin our discussion by taking up the charters of the house of Vidarbha.

House of Vidarbha

We have four charters of this house at our disposal ranging in time roughly from sixth century up to the eighth century. As stated earlier, in the second section of the first chapter to be more precise, the geographical contexts of all the charters of this house invariably

---


relate to the areas which fall in the sub-regions of Wardha-Wainganga basin.

In the first charter of this house\(^4\), datable to c. AD 573, Nannarājā figures as the donor. The charter does not carries any title along with his name and, therefore, it is little difficult to make out the authority status he might have had. He is, however, stated to have 'meditated on the feet of his brother Svāmirājā who has been described as ‘bhāṭṭāraka-pād-ānudhyāta parama-māheśvara Svāmirājā’. This description of Svāmirājā points to his subordinate status, though the charter does not disclose any details as to who this ‘Bhāṭṭāraka’ was. Thus, all that we can figure out about the authority status of Nannarājā is this that the he came from the family of a subordinate ruler and in all likelihood might have been helping his brother in managing his territorial domain.

The charter records two donations. The first one, which consisted of 12 nivartanas of land in a grāma, was made by Nannarājā at the request of the Assembly of the Corporation (gaṇa-samūha) whose following members have been mentioned:

1. Kaliṅga, the President (sthavira) of the Mahā-Mātragaṇa,
2. Kēṭabha, Rōladēva, Pradīptabhaṭa, two Śivadēvabhaṭas, Mātrisvāmin, Gaṇadēva, Kōṅkabhaṭa, the Physician of Elephants (hasti-vaidya) named Sāmasvāmin, Asaṅgata, the chief of the Elephant Corps (pīlu-pati) named Māllāyika and Prabhākara. They all have been cited as the members of the executive committee (pramūkhas) of the assembly (samūha).

\(^4\) Nagardhan plates of Swamiraja, EI, XXVIII, pp. 1-16
The second grant, which consisted of a grāma, was probably made by Nannarāja on his own account and it was made according to the rule of avani randhra-nyāya which is the same as bhūmicchidra-nyāya\(^5\).

A noteworthy feature of the charter is the seal on it, the upper part of which contains a symbol, apparently of a god lying horizontally and the lower portion carries the legend that reads as gaṇa-dattih (a gift of the corporation). This evidently points to the fact it was the Corporation (gaṇa), and not the existing authority, which had affixed its seal on the charter. This has been explained by the editor in terms of the gaṇa having no right to donate the land, yet to be powerful enough to affix it seal on the charter.

An alternative explanation would be that the gaṇa in question did have the right to make donation which they possibly did and also got the charter prepared. This is indicated by the fact that at the end this charter does not carry the name of the writer of the charter, as is the usual practice. Instead what we have is the reference to kshatriya Dugāditya as the engraver of the charter (ukt kirīṃ-meta-ch-sāsana). However, despite gaṇa having this much of right also required the stamp of the existing authority to give it a final shape. Thus, this explains why the grant which was in reality made by a gaṇa required its announcement by Nannarāja to certain state functionaries\(^6\).

\(^5\) Ibid, fn.3,p.11

\(^6\) Ibid.,The list of the addressee consisted of Rājasthānīya, Uparika, Dāndapāsika, Chât, Bhaṭa, Dūta-samprēšanika and Drāṅgika,(l.2-3),pp.8-9.
The second charter of the house is dated Saka era 553 (c. AD 631)\(^7\). It records the donation of three pieces of land by three persons having differential authority status. It may, however, be mentioned that this charter carries a seal with a legend \textit{Yuddhāsura} which has been taken to be the second name of Nannarāja. As to the status of Śrī-Nannarāja, we are told that he had attained the privileges of \textit{pañcha-mahāshabda} (\textit{prāpta-pañchamahāshabda}) which clearly shows his subordinate position.

The first piece of land consisting of fifty \textit{(nivartanas)}, located in Tivērēkhēṭa, was donated by Nannarāja through Śrī-Śamkaragaṇa. Nothing has been stated in the charter as to who this Śamkaragaṇa was.

The second piece of land, measuring fifty \textit{nivartanas} in Ghûikhēṭa, seems to have been donated jointly by Nannarāja and Śrī-Śamkaragaṇa.

The third piece of land, which consisted of ten \textit{nivartanas}, was donated jointly by a \textit{dharmakaśa} (Superintendent of religious affairs) and a \textit{mahāsandhivigrahaṇa} (Great Minister for peace and war). This piece of land was located ‘on the east bank of Sārasavāhalā and on the east bank of Darbhavāhalā of Karaṇjamalaya’.

The donee in all the three cases is the same. The charter does not speak of the transfer of any right/privileges to the donees.

The third property transfer document of the house of Vidarbha is dated Śaka 615 (AD 693)\(^8\). The donor in this charter is

\(^7\) Tiwarkhed Plates of the Rashtrakuta Nanaraja, \textit{EI}, XI, pp.276-81.

the same Nannaraja. However, barring the fact that the donor was staying at a place called Padmanagara, the charter does not speak anything about his title that would have indicated his status. Whatever might have been the status of the donor, the detail in the charter, especially the seal, which bears his second name 'Yuddhāsura', on the charter, makes it clear that he wielded enough authority to make grant on his own.

The object of donation in this case was two pieces of land (kṣhētra) in two grāmas to a brāhmastra who was the resident of the area other than the donated one. This donation, unlike his earlier one, was made in accordance with the bhūmicchidra-nyāya. However, like the earlier one, this charter also does not speak about the transfer of any rights and privileges in favour of the donee.

The charter also carries the list of the addressee which runs as: rāj-sāmanta-vishayapati-grāma-bhōgika-purillaka-bhata-sēvak-adin.

What is noteworthy in the list is the reference to grāma-bhōgika. The term has been used to denote those who enjoy a village as rent-free holding. This might suggest that the grāma in which the donated properties were located might have been enjoyed by some grāma-bhōgika as rent-free village.

In the fourth charter, dated Śaka Samvat 631 (AD 708), Nannaraja once again figures as the donor. We hardly have any information relating to his status in this charter as well. Surprisingly enough, here he is not even described as having the

---

9 See D.C. Sircar, 1966, p. 120.
10 Multai copper plate grant, IA., XVIII, pp. 230-236.
privilege of *pañcha-mahāshabda* as was the case in his first charter. In the absence of any title, it may not be wrong to assume that he continued to enjoy a subordinate status. It may also be mentioned that like his earlier charter even this one carries a seal with legend 'Śrī-Yuddhāsura' which is believed to have been his surname.

The object of the present charter is to record the donation of a village to a *brāhmaṇa* of Kautuka gōtra. Like the earlier charter, this one also does not speak of the transfer of any right or privileges to the donee.

In the list of addressees, once again we have the reference of *grāma-bhōgika*.

The last charter of this house, which is datable to seventh or the beginning of the eighth century on paleographic grounds, registers grant of a village to a *brāhmaṇa* by Svāmirāja who has been described as an *anuchara* of Pratāpaśila-Kakkarāja of Mahārāṣṭrakūṭa family. The donation, we are told, was made after receiving the assent of his overlord (*parama-svāmī*) Kakkarāja. The charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights or privileges.

The charter does not mention any addressee to the grant. It however states that the grant was made in the presence of *san(dhi)vṛishabha* and *purōhita*. Both were apparently part of state apparatus.

---

12 Ibid., the editor reads it as *sandhivigraha*, see, p.32.
The charter discussed above was the last evidence of the existence of the House of Vidarbha in this region. After this rest of the charters belong to the Rāṣṭracūṭas of Malkhed.

13 Ibid., san[dhi]vrishabha-purōhita-samakashaṅ dattah, l.22, p.35
Before we take up the charters of Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed for discussion, it may not be out of the place to discuss one charter which relates to this region, though it is difficult to relate the ruler, who issued the charter, with any of he houses of Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

The charter is known as the Khamkhed plates of the time of Pratāpaśīla and on paleographic grounds, it has been datable to the beginning of the eighth-century. As to the ruling house he belonged to, nothing has been stated in the charter. It, however, refers itself to the reign of samadhigata-pancha-mahasabda mahārāja Pratāpaśīla which clearly indicates the subordinate status of Pratāpaśīla.

The purpose of the charter was to record the donation of a grāma by Davana Druhaṭa who was the son of Utaragana who was the eldest brother of Pratāpaśīla. The recipients of the grant were certain brāhmaṇas.

What is noteworthy in the charter is the inclusion of śreṣṭhīn Gōlamma in the list of addressees.

House of Māṇpura

The geographical contexts of the properties transferred through the charters of this house relate to the Poona-Satara areas which fall in the sub-regions of the Bhima and the Upper Krishna basin.

---

14 The Khamkhed plates of the time of Pratapasila, El, XXII, pp.93-96
15 Ibid., list of people who were conveyed the transfer included: the Purōhita Iśvarabhaṭṭa, Nāgammabhāṭṭa, the Bhōjika Gōvinda, the Śreṣṭhīn Gōlamma and the Sēnāpati Durggahari at Śrikarna (record office).
The first charter of this house, datable to the 5th-6th century on grounds of paleography, speaks of the donation of an agrahāra and a dakshiṇā of fifty bars (śalākā) of gold.

The donor has been described as Syāvalaṅgī Mahādevī, the queen consort of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dēvarāja and mother of Māṇarāja. The donation, we are told, was made with the consent of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Vibhurāja, who has been described as Mahārāja. As to the status of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dēvarāja or Māṇarāja the charter does not say anything. Also, the charter does not provide any information on the precise nature of relationship that might have existed between the donor and the authority giving consent for the grant. However, on the basis of the genealogical details of this house as given in this charter it has been suggested that she might have been the mother of Mahārāja Vibhurāja.

The next two charters of this house relate to the sub-region of the Upper Krishna basin in terms of the geographical contexts of the properties transferred through them.

The first of them, which has been assigned the date of seventh century on grounds of paleography, registers a donation by Avidhēya. As to the authority status of Avidhēya, no information is available in the charter. However, on the basis of the details of the genealogy of this house, as given in this charter, we may try to get some ideas on this issue.

The genealogical portion of the charter begins with Mānāṅka who has been described as the one who had terrified Vidarbha and

---

16 Hingni Berdi Plates of Rashtrakuta Vibhaja; Year 3, *EI*, XXIX, pp.174-77.
Asmaka and was ruling over Kuntala (vasudhā-vidhi-sanrasta-Vidarbh-Āsmaka-māndalah Mānāṅka- nṛpatih śrīmān-Kuntalānām praśāsitā)\(^{18}\). It then introduces his son Dēvārāja. No title indicating his status has been mentioned in the charter. Then we are told about the son of Dēvārāja who is Avidhēya, who also figures as the donor in the present charter. Again, in the case of the donor we do not see any tile along with his name, except the fact that at one place he has been described as rājā. Even this does not take us to any point of certainty. Whatever might have been his political status, the absence of any reference to any overlord in the charter and the fact that he was able to issue charter on his own should be taken as an indication of his autonomous authority in the area around the locale of the object of donation.

The object of donation consisted of a grāma called Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli together with hamlets of Kāmyaka and Jāula\(^{19}\). The recipient was a brāhmaṇa.

The charter does speak of the transfer of any rights and privileges to the donee\(^{20}\).

The second charter\(^{21}\) of this house of Raṣṭrakūṭas was issued sometime around the seventh century A.D. It records the donation

\(^{18}\) This passage has been read differently by Dr. M.H.Krishna; see 'Panduranga-palli grant of Avidheya' in *Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological department for the year 1929, Bangalore*, 1931, pp.197-210

\(^{19}\) Ibid., Dr. M.H. Krishna reads the passage: as 'Pāṇḍaraṅgapalli along with Anevari, Chāla, Kandaka and Duddapalli'. See p. 198.

\(^{20}\) It may also be mentioned that on the reverse side of the third plate, there is another description of donation which reads as 'this grant was made by Sarbarasa, lord of Kannavāda, Gangavāda, Baleyavāda, Rernādāla, and Siyalara. The plates were prepared by Sembāja of Sintarge'. See, *EI*, XXXVII, p.23, also, *Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological department for the year 1929, Bangalore*, 1931, pp.197-210
by Abhimanyu, who was residing at Mānapuram. The donation consisted of a grāmaka (small village). The recipient of the grant was a temple of Dakshinā-Śiva.

Like the earlier charter, there is no reference to transfer of any right/privileges in favour of the donee in this charter as well. It has only been stated that nobody should practise deceit towards this grant.

It, however, mentioned that the grant was made in the presence of Commander (of the fort) of Harivatsakōṭṭa (harivatsakōṭṭa-nigraha).

Apart from these three charters, we have one donative inscription\(^{22}\) referring to a king called Dējja Mahārājā who has been described as 'born out of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty\(^{23}\). The charter which is datable to AD 532-33 records a donation by his favorite adhirāj Indrananda of the Sēndraka family.

The donation consisted of fifty nivartanas of land in a grāma, which was included in a vishaya. Neither the village nor the administrative unit has been identified. It has however been suggested that they may be located in an area around the find place of the charter which is Gokak in the Belgaum district.

As to the status of Dējja Mahārājā, he seemed to have had sovereign status and the donor was certainly his subordinate. However, it seems that even though the donor enjoyed a

\(^{21}\) Untikavatika grant of Abhimanyu, *EI*, VIII, pp. 163-166
\(^{22}\) Gokak plates of Dejja Maharaja, *EI*, XXI, 289-292
\(^{23}\) Rāṣṭrakūṭa-ānvaya-jāta-Śri-Dejja-mahārājā, I.5-6.
subordinate status in relation to Déjja-Mahârâja, he exercised enough authority to issue land charter in the region.

The kind of picture that we get out of the exercise done above is far from being homogenous either in terms of authorities making grants or in terms of the authority enjoyed by different donors in the process of the transfer of landed property. Also significant is the occurrence of terms like râja-sâmanta, grâma-bhôgika etc. We would take up the implications of these in the concluding section of the chapter.

**SECTION II**

After having discussed the nature of authorities issuing the grants during the periods the different local houses of the Râśtrakûtas, we would now take up the analysis of donative inscriptions of the period of the Râśtrakûtas of Malkhed which has generally been regarded as a supra-local imperial power. Given the larger volume of data and the wider and varied geographical contexts of the objects of donations recoded in them, it has been decided to group the donative inscriptions by the sub-regions they would relate to in terms of the locale of the object of donation. It may be added here this organization of data is in no way prompted by the desire to give primacy to geography over chronology. The data of each sub-region would necessarily be organized in a chronological sequence. The idea behind this exercise is, therefore, to see the temporal variation, if there was any, over of time. We would begin our discussion by taking up the region of Wardha-Wainganga basin first as this was the area which was earlier controlled by the Vidarbha branch of the Râśtrakûtas.
WARDHA-WAINGANGA BASIN

The first charter of the Malkhed house of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, belonging to this sub-region that we have at our disposal was issued by paramabhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara Śrī Akālavarnaśa (i.e. Krīṣṇa I). Dated Śaka 694 (c. AD 772), it records the donation by him of a grāma to the bhaṭṭāraka of the temple located in Uduinvara-manti, which was located at the distance of a gauyūti from the donated grāma. The grant, we are told, was made at the request (vijñāpanā) of a person called Madana. As to the status of Madana, the charter does not give any information.

The charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights and privileges. However, what is relevant for us is the details regarding boundary specification of the donated settlement. In the process of boundary specification, we are told about the areas which were exempted from the grant. They consisted of 'former gift to gods and brāhmaṇas; and also the river along the boundary of Umvara-manti to the north of the Deva-tadāka and to the west of the Rājiṇi tadāka'. Going by the prefixes, the first tadāka seemed to have belonged to certain temple and another one probably to some individual. Whatever may be the fact, their occurrence is indicative of the existence of certain proprietors of land around the donated area. The reference to Madana as requester for the grant has its

---

24 Bhandak plates of Krishnaraja, EI, XIV, pp. 121-130.
25 Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara would henceforth be referred as PMP.
26 The details of the object of donation is little confusing. See, line 49-53
27 Ibid., A gauyūti is believed to be equal to 4,000 dandās or two krōṣas, see p. 129, fn. 2
own implication for the issue we are at present concerned with. We would dilate upon this in the concluding part of this chapter.

The second charter of the eighth century was issued by Śīla-Mahādēvi (c. AD 786) who has been described as ‘paramēshvari-paramabhaṭṭārikā’ and the great queen of PMP Dhārāvarsha (Dhruva I).

The charter states that the queen donated a grāma to two brāhmaṇas in accordance with the bhūmicchidra-nyāya. One of the recipients has been stated to be the resident of the vishaya within which the donated village was located. The charter was apparently issued without any formal sanction by the sovereign authority PMP Dhārāvarsha. This also gets strengthen by the fact that at the end of the charter the dutaka and the writer of the charter are said to have carried out their respective duties according to her order.

As to the list of addressees, we find the inclusion of grāmakūta and mahattara.

We have two charters falling in the time span of the ninth century.

In the first one, Gōvinda III, who has been described as ‘PMP prrithvīvallabha prabhūtavarsha śrīvallabha Narēndradēva’ figure as the donor of a grant which consisted of a grāma to thirteen brāhmaṇas and the transfer of certain fiscal and administrative rights in their favour. It is also specified in the charter that the revenue of the village was to be divided into

---

29 Anjanvati plates of Govinda III, *EI*, XXIII, pp. 8-18
eighteen equal share of which two of them were to receive five and the remaining eleven one each.

We are however told that at the end of the charter that it was written by the order of the paramēśvara, (apparently Gôvinda III), and with the consent of Mahâdëvi, (the great queen)'. This act of seeking the consent by the sovereign power might have been just a formality, it nonetheless points to Mahâdëvi having some claim over the donated area.

The list of addressees mainly consisted of state functionaries, though we do find the inclusion of grâmakûta and mahattara.

The next grant was also made by Govinda III30. The charter does not mention any royal title along with the name of Govinda. He has simply been described as Śrī Gôvindarâja mediating on the feet of PMP Dhârâvarsha. At the end of the charter it has also been mentioned that charter was drafted in presence of king31 and the writer have had the privilege of pañcha-mahâśabda.

The grant, which was made in accordance with the bhûmicchidra-nyāya, also records the transfer of certain rights and privileges. Among the list of addressees, we have reference to grâmakûta and mahattara.

The last property transfer document in this region belongs to the time span of the tenth century and was issued by PMP·Krishṇa III in c. AD 940-41 ( Saka Samvat 862)32. It is stated in the charter

30 Jharika grant of Rashtrakuta Govinda III,EI,XXXII,157-164
31 Ibid,mahâparameśvara-pratyakṣhm,1..73
32 Deoli plates of Krishna III,EI,V,pp.188-97, Plates of Krishna III, Saka Samvat 862, EI, V,pp.188-96
that PMP Akālavārasadēva (Krishṇa III) made the donation in the name of his brother Jagattuṅga.

The object of the donation was a grāma along with certain rights and privileges. The donation was made in perpetuity in the manner of the gift to a brāhmaṇa.

**UPPER GODAVARI BASIN SUB-REGION**

Four charters of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas relating to this region were issued during the period of the eighth century.

The first one was issued by Dantidurga who has been described in the present charter as samadhigata-pañchamahāśabda and mahāsāmantādhipati\(^{33}\). This clearly suggests his subordinate status. Dated Śaka 663 (c. AD 742), the charter tells us about the donation by him of a grāma to certain brāhmaṇas who had originated (vinirgata) from Navasarika. The grāma, as recorded in the charter, was given along with limited rights only\(^{34}\).

Most of the names figuring in the list of addressee consisted of officials. However, what is of relevance for us is the inclusion of the bhōgika, and mahattar-ādīn.

In the next charter, (c. AD 775), PMP Dhāravarṣa Śri Dhruvarājadēva has been mentioned as the donor\(^{35}\). As the title PMP suggests, the donor enjoyed the status of a sovereign authority.

The charter records the donation by him of a grāma to a brāhmaṇa. The grant, which was made in perpetuity, was made in

\(^{33}\) Ellora plates of Dantidurga: Saka 663, EI, XXV, pp. 25-31

\(^{34}\) Ibid., only abhyantara-siddhi and sarv-ādāna-sangrāhya have been mentioned in the list of rights and privileges

\(^{35}\) Pimpri plates of Dharavarsha-dhruvraja, saka-samvat 697, EI, X, 81-89
accordance with the *bhûmicchidra-nyâya* and was to be enjoyed according to the rules of *brahmadeya*.

The charter, apart from giving the list of rights and privileges of the donee also offers the list of addressees in which we find the occurrence of *grâmakûṭa* and *mahattar-âdîn*.

The next charter, dated Šaka Samvat 701 (AD 779), belongs to the Gujarat branch of Râṣṭrakût̄as. It records a donation by Suvarṇavarsha Pratâpaśīla śrī-Kârkâra who has been described as having obtained the five great sounds (*samadhigata-pañcha-mahâsabda*) and the younger brother of PMP Prabhûtavarsha (Govinda II). The charter, we are told, was issued by the order of the donor.

The donation, which was made in accordance with the *bhûmicchidra-nyâya*, consisted of a village along with certain privileges only. What is noteworthy in the charter is the occurrence of *râj-sâmanta, bhogika and mahattar-âdîn* in the list of addressees.

We have one charter of Râṇaka Durgahasti of the Šendraka family, who was a subordinate of the Râṣṭrakûṭa king Dhruva. The charter registers the grant of a village to a *brâhmaṇa*.

---

36 Dhulia plates of Kârkâra, *EI*, VIII, pp. 182-187
37 Ibid., only *udranga* and *uparikara* are mentioned in the list of rights and privileges.
The last eighth century charter was issued by Govinda III. He has been described as PMP Prithvīvallabha Prabhūtavarsha Śrīvallabha-narēndradēva... Gōvindarājadēva.

The charter, datable to AD 794⁴⁰, records the donation of a grāma to a number of brāhmaṇas who seemed to have belonged to different areas⁴¹.

While specifying the boundaries of the donated settlement, we are told that it was situated to the north of hala which belonged to Dhōna grāma (uttaratah Dhōna-grāma-halam).

The term hala has been taken to mean arable land, which may imply the existence of arable land belonging to the community of Dhōna grāma.

The grant was made in accordance with the bhūmicchidra-nyāya along with certain rights and privileges.

As to the list of addressee, barring mahattar-ādīn, all were government functionaries.

Of the ninth century charters, the first three mention Gōvinda III as the donor. It may be pointed out that in all the charters he has been referred as sovereign authority. In the first charter of ⁴² the object of donation was a grāma and the recipient was a brāhmaṇa.

---

³⁹ The editor of this plate has not given the other detail of the grant.
⁴⁰ Paithan plates of Govindaraja, EI, III, pp.103-110.
⁴¹ This portion of the charter is not legible.
⁴² A grant of the Rashtrakuta sovereign Govinda III, JBBRAS (NS) III, No. 4, pp. 187-189.
The second\textsuperscript{43} and the third charter\textsuperscript{44} also speak of the donation of a village to individual \textit{brāhmaṇa} in accordance with the \textit{bhūmicchidra-nyāya}. The list of rights and privileges which were transferred to the donee\textsuperscript{45} and list of addressee\textsuperscript{46} as given in this charter are the same as in the earlier two charters discussed above.

After the last charter of Gōvinda III in this region which was issued sometime around c. AD 809, we do not hear of any grant during the period of the ninth century.

The next three charters that we have fall in the time span of the tenth century and in all three Indra III of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas figure as the donor. His status in all of them has been that of a sovereign authority.

\textsuperscript{43} Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscription No.CXXV,IA, XI(June1882),pp.156-163.
\textsuperscript{44} Dharur plates of Rashtrakuta Govinda III, Saka 729,EL,XXXVI,pp.285-96.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., Rāṣṭrapati, Vishayapati, Grāmakūṭ, Yukta-Niyuktak, Ādhikārika, Mahattara etc, (ll..39-40),pp.293-94.
His first charter\textsuperscript{47} tells us about the donation of a grāma to a brāhmaṇa who came from (vinirgata) Vengi. Though the charter does mention the term' bhūmicchidra-nyāya, the rights and privileges which were transferred to the donee were the same as we see in the charters of Govinda III discussed above. This charter also refers to mahattar-ādīn in the list of addressees.

We have a set of two charters issued by Indra III\textsuperscript{48}. The first one, called grant A, datable to AD 915\textsuperscript{49}, speaks of gift of two villages to a Jaina monastery and the site of the monastery itself to a preceptor named Vardhamāna. It may be mentioned that the monastery was known as Amoghavasati and was located at Chandrapuri-pattana. The grant has bee described as `namasya-grant (grāma namasyā datta).

The second grant, termed as Grant B\textsuperscript{50}, speaks of the transfer of six villages to a Jaina monastery of Uriamma, located in Vadanāra-pattana, to preceptor named Vardhamāna. The recipient of this grant seems to be the same person as is the recipient in the case of Grant A. This grant has also been called namasya grant.

\textsuperscript{47} Jambagaon plates,\textit{EI},XXXVI,pp.232-38.
\textsuperscript{48} Two grants of Rashtrakuta Indra III from Vajirkheda, saka 836,\textit{EI},XXXVIII,pp.5-22.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, pp.15-20 for transliteration.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid,pp.20-26 for transliteration
As to the list of addressee, both the charters refer to *mahattar-ādīn* in the list of addressees to the grant.\footnote{Ibid., *Rāṣṭrapati, Vishayapati, Grāmakūt, Āyuṭa, Niyuktak, Ādhikārika, Mahattara etc.*,’}

We are informed of certain transaction in this region during the period of Kṛishna III through an inscription inscribed on a stone slab\footnote{Fragmentry Rashttrakuta inscription from Kandhar,\textit{El.},XXXV,pp.105-114.}. Though the inscription speaks in detail of the arrangements to run what seemed to have a temple establishment, it does not refer to any land transaction and, hence, we would leave it out of the present discussion.

Kakka III of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas issued the last donative inscription in this region\footnote{Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions, No.CXXXVI, pp.263-70.}. The charter registers the grant of a village to a *brāhmaṇa* by him. He has been described as PMP *śrīmad*-Akālavarsadēva (Kakka III).

The list of addressees as given in the charter is little different from those discussed so far as we find reference to *mahattara* among the groups of state functionaries, rather then at the end. Also, the list of the addressee does not end with expression such as ādīn.

I. Eastern Tapi Basin sub-region

We have only two charters recording donation in this sub-region and both of them were issued by Govinda III in the
capacity of a sovereign authority as suggested by the title PMP used along with his name.

The first one records the gift of a grâma and the site of habitation in another named Môragaṇa (Môragaṇa-grâma-dhana-samanvitah).

The recipient of the grant was a brâhmaṇa who was a resident of Dhârâśiva.

The list of addressee is the same as in most of the royal charters of this house.

In the second charter the description of the donor, i.e., Govinda III, is the same as above. His genealogy and the titles are also largely the same. However, the details of the object of donation is a little different in the sense that it records transaction of two types. First, it records the donation of a grâma by PMP Govinda III and then goes on to narrate the transaction that was made by the recipient of the grâma.

As to the transaction by the donee, we are told Bhaṭṭa Rishiyappa, reserving 400 nivartanas of the land in the donated village for himself divided (the revenue of the remaining land) into 120 parts of which he assigned 60 to Mâdhava, Śrîdhara, Dôdhâma, Aghakuṭi and others and the remaining 60 to

---

54 Two copper plate inscriptions from Berar, A. Sisavi grant of Govinda III, Saka year 729, EI, XXIII, p204-212
55 Ibid., Râshtrapati, Vishayapati, Grâmakût, Āyukta- Niyuktak, Ādhikârika, Mahattara etc., p108.
56 Lohara grant of Govinda III; Saka Year 734, EI, XXIII, pp.212-22
Lökabhaṭṭa, Śridhara Dīkshita, Madhua and Prithivibhaṭṭa and others.

The list of the addressee is the same as in his other charters discussed above.

Western Tapi Basin sub-region

The first charter recording donation in this region does not belong to the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed. Rather, it belongs to the house of Kakka, which as shown in the first chapter, was different from the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Datable to AD 757, it records the donation of a grāma by Śrī-Kakka-rāja who has been described as 'samadhigata-pañcha-mahāśabda – paramabhaṭṭāraka –mahārājādhirāja –paramēśvara śrī-Kakka – rāja'.

Looking at the title of the donor, it becomes little difficult to judge as to what his authority status was as it carries the epithet samadhigata-pañchamahāśabda, which is indicative of subordinate status, as well as paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja–paramēśvara, which is indicative of sovereign status. What one would, therefore, like to believe is that he might have been a semi-independent ruler of the area around the location of the object of grant. Whatever might have been


58 See R.S. Sharma’s remarks on this in Indian Feudalism, (Reprint), 1990, p. 81.
the truth, this much can be said with fair amount of certainty that he wielded enough authority to make donation on his own. The grant which was made by him consisted of a grāma in favour of a brāhmaṇa who was an inhabitant of Jambusara (Jambusara-sthāna-vāstavya, I.26).

The charter does not refer to the transfer of any rights and privileges to the donee. It however carries a list of addressee that included mahāsāmanta, sēnāpati, balādhikṛita, chōrōddharaṇika, bhōgika, rājasthānīya etc. A look at the list of the addressees would show that all of them were part of state apparatus. Perhaps, the only expression which stands out is that of the mahāsāmanta. No doubt, that at times the term is used for a vassal chief holding the position of a minister or governor⁵⁹, it has also been taken to be the designation of a subordinate authority, who apart from other things, enjoys certain proprietary rights over land.

Apart from this, we do not have any charter belonging to the eighth century. Of the ninth century charter in this region, the first two were issued by the sovereign rulers of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

In the first ninth century charter Govinda III figures as the donor⁶⁰. He has been described as PMP prabhūtavarṣha-prithvīvallabha śrī Gōvindarājadēva. Datable to c. AD 809, it records the donation of a grāma with certain rights and

privileges in favour of a *brâhmaṇa*. The list of addressees is the same as in his other charters discussed above.

The second charter, which was issued after the lapse of about a decade (c. AD 820) since the charter of Govinda III discussed above, records a grant by Amôghavarsha who has been described as *PMP śrī-Tribhuvanavallabha-śrīmad-Amôghavarshadēva-śrīvallabha-narēndradēva*. He is stated to have made the donation at the request of one *bhattachārika* (noble lady) Śrīmad-Asagavvâ. Though the charter does not provide us with any information as to who this *bhattachārika* was, it has nonetheless been suggested that she was either the wife of the donor or a member of the Rāșṭrakūṭa royal family.

The object of the grant was a *grâma* with certain rights and privileges. The recipient of the grant in this case is again a *brâhmaṇa* who had migrated from a place Ka(th)chi *nagara*.

The list of addressee in this case included, apart from others, *mahattara* also.

Aside from these two charters of the Rāșṭrakūṭas of Malkhed, we have six more charters of the ninth century and they all belong to the Rāșṭrakūṭas of Gujarath house. The rulers of this house enjoyed a subordinate status in relation to the rulers of the Rāșṭrakūṭas of Malkhed.

Their first charter was issued by *samadhigat-āśeṣa-mahāśabda mahāsāmantādhipati* Suvarṇavarsha Karkkarāja in

---

61 Javakheda plates of Amoghavarsha I, Saka 742, EI, XXXII, pp. 129-34.
62 Ibid., see fn. 2, p. 130.
63 Ibid., See the remarks of the editor of the charter, p. 130.
AD 821 (Saka 743)\textsuperscript{64}. As is obvious from his title, the donor enjoyed the status of a subordinate authority.

The donation made by Karkkarāja consisted of a field called "Hiranyayōgā. The description of the boundary specification of the donated field offers several details which are of relevance to us for the issue under discussion.

To begin with, we are also told that the field was irrigated by the well (vāpi) of Dhāshu, and was located to the north of the village Ambāpātaka, attached to Śrī-Nāgasārikā. After giving this locational detail, the charter proceeds on to describe the boundary of the donated field which reads as follows: to the east (the field watered) by the well (vāpi) of Śrīdhara, to the south a stream, to the west the great river Pūrāvī, and to the north the (public) well(vāpi) of Sambapura".

The recipient of the grant was a Jaina, called preceptor Aparājita of Sēna saṅgha who was attached to the temple of Arhat situated within the boundaries of Śrī - Nāgasārikā.

The point of our concern is the reference to the existence of field watered by the wells which were apparently owned by individuals. As to the well of Sambapura, it seems to have been owned by the temple of Arhat for it is stated that Sambapura

settlement itself was attached to the temple of Arhat. These evidences clearly indicate the existence of individual proprietors of land as well as land controlled by certain religious institution/group in the area of donation.

Another noteworthy feature of the charter is the occurrence of grāmapati along with grāmakūṭa in the list of addressees. Grāmapati should be understood in the sense of village landlords. As to the term Vāsāvakamahattarādhikārin it has been suggested that it represented those who were the descendants of the original colonizers of the village\textsuperscript{65}.

The next charter, dated Śaka 757(c. AD 835-36) was issued by Dhruva I of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas who has also been described as samadhigat-āśeṣa-māhāśabda Mahāsāmantādhipati Śri-Dhruvarājadēva\textsuperscript{66}. The purpose of the charter was to record the transfer of a grāma by him in favour of a brāhmaṇa along with certain rights and privileges. It is however, also specified that the grant does not include those which were already in the possession of brāhmaṇa or temple (pūrva-pradatta-deva-brahma-deya-rahita)

In the list of addressees, we again find the reference to mahattara ādīn.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid. What has been read by the editor as 'Vāsāvakamahattarādhikārin' may just be the compound form of Vāsāvaka-mahattar-ādhikārin., see p.146

\textsuperscript{66} A Copper-Plate Grant of The Gujarat Branch of Rashtrakuta King Dhruva II., Dated Saka 757, IA, XIX, (July 1885), pp.196-203.
The next charter was issued by Dantivarman of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas who has also been described as samadhigata-pañcha-mahāśabda mahāsāmantādhipati who has the biruda of Aparimitavarsha.... The charter, datable to AD 867 records grant of a grāma by him to a vihāra located at Kāmpilya.

In the list of the people/officials who were informed about the grant, we find the reference to vāsāpaka and Mahattarādīn.

In yet another charter belonging to the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas Dhruva II figures as the donor. Datable to AD 867, the epithets applied to him are similar to those which we see in the case of Dhruva I discussed above i.e., samadhigat-āśeṣa-mahāśabda mahāsāmantādhipati Dhruvarājadēva (Dhruva II).

The charter registers the donation of a village, apparently by him to a brāhmaṇa. The donee has been described as the grandson of Śrī-Diddhi who had received Trennā from Dhruvarājadēva and had founded a sattra for the good of all men.

In the list of addressee we find the occurrence of the term 'Vāsāpakamahattara-adīn. This seems different from the term Vāsāvaka, though D.C. Sircar treats both as same and explains it to be an ‘officials whose duty was to assign places of residence to strangers’.

---

However, what is relevant for us is the fact that we are told about the proprietor of a settlement Trennā in the form of Śrī-Diddhi, the grandfather of the donee. Considering the fact that the sattra founded by the donee’s grandfather came down to him, it may not be wrong to suggest that the same would have happened in the case of Trennā as well. Thus, we already see the existence of individual proprietor in the form of the present donee. Another point of relevance would be the reference to the village of the brāhmaṇas called Mottaka in the context of boundary specification. These points would be taken up in the concluding section of this chapter.

The next charter was issued by the same ruler in AD 884 and it records the donation of a grāma to a Buddhist vihāra. It may be pointed out that it is same vihāra (the Buddhist vihār of Kāmpilya) which also figures as the recipient of donation in the charter issued by Dantivarman discussed above.

The last charter of the ninth century, which also belongs to the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, was issued by Kṛṣṇa II in C. AD 888. He has been described in the charter as... Mahāsāmantādhipati Akālavarsa Kṛṣṇarāja. The charter though record the transfer of a grāma in favour of two

---

70 A new copper plate of Dhruva II of the Gujarat Rashtrakuta branch, dated Saka 806, EI, XXII, pp. 64-76.
71 Rathor Grant No. IV. A grant of Krishna II of Ankulesvar, of 888 AD, IA, XIII (March 1884), pp. 65-69.
brahmans, it also specifies certain amount of money which was to be given to the recipient, apparently by the villagers.

The charter disused above was the last charter of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas in this region. After this, three of the charters rerecording donation in this region were issued by the rulers of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas and all three fall in the time span of the tenth century.

The first of them was issued by PMP śrī-Nityavarshanarṇendradēva (i.e. Indrarāja III) in c. A.D. 915. It records the grant of a village by him to a brāhmaṇa who hailed from Pāṭaliputra.

The second charter which is datable to AD 929 registers PMP Govinda IV. He has been shown bearing different birudas such as nitya-Kadarpa, chāṇakya- chaturmukha etc. He is stated to have donated a grāma to eight brāhmaṇa who seem to have migrated from different places.

The third charter was issued by Karkka III in c. AD 972. He has been described as PMP śrīmad- Amōghavarshadēva - prithvīvallabha- śrīmad vallabha-narṇendradēva. As stated in the charter he made the donation of a grāma as ‘namasya grant’ to a brāhmaṇa along with certain rights and privileges.

---

72 Two grants of Indraraja III, No.2, EI, IX, pp.33-41.
74 Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions, No. CXXXVI, IA, XII (October, 1883), pp.263-70.
All the three charters mention *mahattara* in the list of addressees, though the order of occurrence is not the same in all the charters.

**MAHI BASIN REGION**

Most of the property-transfer documents relating to this region were issued by the different rulers of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas. In fact it is only during the period of the tenth century that we hear of grants made by the ruler of Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas, otherwise all the charters of the ninth century, excepting one, were issued by the rulers of Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas. As to their authority status, all of them have been described as *mahāsāmantādhipati*.

The earliest charter recording donation of a *grāma* in this region is assignable to c. AD 81075. It mentions Gōvindarāja or, as he is described in the charter *samadhigat-āśeṣa-mahāśabda mahāsāmantādhipati prabhūtvarsha śrī Gōvindarājadēva*, of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as the donor. The donation, we are told, was made according to the rules of *bhūmicchidra-nyāya*, in favour of a *brāhmaṇa* who had immigrated from the Gauda *deśa* and was residing in another *grāma*, quite close to the donated one76. The charter also list certain rights and privileges that were transferred in favour of the donee.

---

A subordinate of Gōvindarāja, who has been described as mahāsāmanta Buddhavarsha is stated to have issued the second property transfer document in this region which is dated Śaka Samvat 735 (c. AD 812)\(^7\). The inscription, however, refers itself to the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king PMP Govinda III and then introduces his nephew Gōvindarāja of Gujarat branch\(^8\). We are also told that Gōvindarāja had conferred an estate (prabhujyamāna) called Siharakkhi twelve (siharakkhi-dvādaśaka) on a mahāsāmanta śrī-Buddhavarasa who belonged to the family of Śalukika. The charter then goes on to state that out of this estate (prabhujyamāna) Buddhavarsha donated a village and its hamlet named Mēshuvallikā to thirty six brāhmaṇas who belonged to the various gōtras. The grant was made according to the rule of bhumiḥchchhindra.

Of all the details of the charter two of them are relevant for us in the context of the issues under discussion. The first one relates to the existence of a sāmanta as the proprietor of a group of villages. If Siharakkhi-dvādaśaka really meant group of twelve villages, then the sāmanta parted with only one village and a hamlet. His claim over rest of the villages remained as they were.

The second point relates to the recipients of the grant. Given the numbers of the beneficiaries of the grant, it may not

\(^7\) See the details on the identification of the places mentioned in the charter, Ibid.,p.251

\(^8\) Torkhede Copper plates of the time of Govindaraja of Gujarat,E/I,III,pp.53-58.
be wrong to assume that a series of individual proprietors were created through this charter in the area of donation. As to the nature of right enjoyed by these proprietors, it seems that they had enough authority to transfer their share to any person of his choice, as it is recorded in the charter that one of the donees gave his share to his daughter's son.

Thus, this charter brings out the hierarchy of rights that might have existed in this area.

As to the addressees, the charter only uses the expression 'sarvâeva bhâvi bhûnipâlân-samubôdhayaty-astu vah-samviditam(ll.19-20) which has been translated as 'informs all future kings'.

The third grant in this region was made by of Karkka II in AD 812\textsuperscript{79}. The status of the donor in this case is that of a mahâsâmantâdhipati. The end portion of the charter, however, gives the impression that it is more a case of restoration of grant rather then the actual donation\textsuperscript{80}.

The restoration, however, was not without modification. The end part of the grant tells us that the village was earlier

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., No title has been attached along with the name of Govinda. He has simply been referred as Govindaraja, see I. 12.

\textsuperscript{79} Sanskrit and old Canarese inscriptions, No.CXXVII,IA, (June 1883),XII,pp.156-164.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., The last portion of the charter carries a sort of post-script which runs as '...ayam cha grâmo-tita-narapati-parikshin Ankoṭṭaka-Śri-chaturvâidyaya datto-bhut...( I.70) This only suggests that the same village was given by some former king to the society of Chaturvedis of Ankottaka the enjoyment of which seems to have been interrupted by
given to the *chaturvēdīs* of Ankoṭṭaka which, we are told, was located on the western side of the donated *grāma*. This possibly implies that earlier the donated *grāma* was enjoyed by the *chaturvedīs* of Ankoṭṭaka as communal property. Now what was effected through this charter was the conversion of a communal in favour of an individual *brāhmaṇa* who seems to have migrated to the donated village as we are told that though he belonged to the society of *chaturvēdīs*, was a migrant from the city of śrī Valabhi\(^81\).

The charter also states that the grant was made according to rule of *bhumi-cchidra* and it was to continue in perpetuity. It speaks of the transfer of certain rights and privileges in favour of the donee\(^82\) but at the same time also excludes the grants previously made to ‘gods and *brāhmaṇas*’.

The charter also carries a list of the addressees which includes *mahattara* (*ādin*) etc.

Another point of relevance for us in this charter comes from the details of the boundary specification of the donated property. In the context of the boundary specification, it is stated in the charter that on the south of the donated *grama* was located the tank named Mahāsēnaka\(^83\). Though we cannot be sure whether Mahāsēnaka was some designation or the name of some individual, yet this much can be said with some degree of certainty that it might have been owned by an

---

\(^81\) Ibid., Exp. used *Śrī-Valabhi-vinirgga* (I. 44)
\(^82\) Ibid., see II.49-51.

some king and Karka II now gave it to one of the *brāhmaṇas* who belonged to that society.
individual who might have had some land in the area around the tank.

After the lapse of about three years we are told about the transfer of two grāmas in this region by the same mahāsāmantādhīpatī śri-Karkkarajadeva through a charter which has been dated Saka Samvat 738 (C. AD 815)\textsuperscript{84}. Though the charter carries the sign manual of the donor, we are also told towards the end that one of the donated grāmas named Sambandhi was caused to be given by a person called Rāṇahari. The charter does not say anything as to who this Rāṇahari was and what did he do to cause this grant.

Along with the donation of grāmas, which were made in perpetuity, the charter carries a comprehensive list of rights and privileges which were transferred in favour of the donee.

As to the donee, he has been described as the resident of Bādāvi, which has been identified with Bādāmi in Bijapur district.

In the list of addressees, we find the occurrence of the 

\textit{mahattar- ādīn}.

\textsuperscript{83} No.CXXVII,IA, (June 1883), XII,.....loc. cit, Exp. used : Mahasenak- akhyam tadagam, l.47, p.160
Once again, after the lapse of about three years, we hear of another donation by the same mahāsāṃtādhipati. The charter which is dated Saka 739\(^{85}\) (C. AD 818) records the transfer of a grāma, according to the rules of bhūmcchidra in favour of a brāhmaṇa. The donee was also given certain rights and privileges along with it.

The last charter of the same mahāsāṃtādhipati śri Karkarājadēva in this region is datable to AD 824\(^{86}\). It records the grant of a grāma to a brāhmaṇa along with certain rights and privileges.

However, what makes this charter different from other charters of Karkka discussed above is the presence of the signs manuals of his overlord Amoghavarsha along with his own at the end of the charter. This tends to give the impression that the grant was probably made effective only after it was ratified by the sovereign authority.

The recipient seems to have been a resident of a place called Kaddibhara which has not been identified.

We hear of another donation of a grāma in AD 826\(^{87}\). The donor in this case is Gōvindarāja of the Gujarat branch who has also been described as mahāsāṃtādhipati. The charter recording

---

\(^{85}\) Anastu Copper Plate Grant of Karka-Suvarnavarsha, Saka year 939, in A.S. Gadre, *Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State*, Vol. 1, 1943, pp. 25-34.

\(^{86}\) Brahamanapalli grant of Karka Suvarnavarsha: Saka 746, *El, XXII*, pp. 77-85.

\(^{87}\) Inscription from Kavi, II-. The grant of Govindaraja, IA.,(May, 1796), pp. 144-152.
the donation carries the sign-manual of Gôvindarâja along with the statement that the charter was written by his order.

The recipient in this case, however, was apparently a temple, which was situated in Kotipura which was included in Kapîka.

After the charter of Gôvindarâja, we no longer hear of any grant in this region till the beginning of the tenth century.

We have a set of two land charters belonging to the period of the tenth century, and unlike the charters of the ninth century the authority behind the donation was that of a paramount ruler. In both the charters sovereign ruler Indra III of the Malkhed branch of Râstrakûtas figures as the donor.

Issued in Śaka-Samvat 836 (C.AD 915) the donor in both the cases has been described as 'the PMP Śri Nityavarsharêndradêva'. The object of donation in each case is a grâma. The phraseology of both the charters largely follows the same pattern. Even the expressions denoting rights and privileges to the donees are almost similar to a large extent.

As far as the recipient is concerned in the case of the second it was a brâhmana who is stated to have come from as far an area as Pâtaliputra. In the case of the first grant, it was again a brâhmana but his place of residence has not been given.

SABARMATI BASIN REGION:

We have five property transfer documents pertaining to this region. One belongs to the period of the eighth century, one to ninth century and the rest three fall in the timespan of the tenth century. One of these is of the period of the ninth century.

---

88 Two grants of Indraraja III, Saka-samvat 836, EI, pp.24-41,
century. The composition of the donors in this region is a little more varied than what we have noticed in the case of the Mahi basin.

The first charter belongs to the house of Kakka and is datable to AD 788\(^{89}\). It may be mentioned here that this house represents a separate branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. One of their charters datable to AD 757 has already been discussed in the context of the discussion on Western Tapi basin sub-region.

The charter speaks of the donations by a mahāsāmanta śrī Chandrāditya who has also been described the vishay-ādhipati of Harshapura -mahādhishthana. He was apparently a subordinate of Kakka (or Nanna) who has been described as mahāsāmantādhipati paramarājādhirāj paramēśvara, ruling the kingdom from the Khēṭaka-mahādhishthāna.

As to the authority status of Kakka, it has been suggested that having both feudatory and imperial title at the same time may be taken to be an indication of his semi-independent subordinate status. It has also been suggested that he might have been a subordinate of the contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Dhruva Dhārāvarsha\(^{90}\). Whatever might have been the reality, all that we can say with certainty is that Kakka was influential enough to have a sāmanta working under him and the sāmanta had enough authority to make donation of land on his own. It is also significant to note the statement of the donor to the effect that for the gift he is

---

\(^{89}\) Hilol plates of Year 470,\(E/\), XXXIV, pp.213-18 & 219

\(^{90}\) See, Note on Hilol Plates of year 470, \(E/\), XXXIV, p. 219
going to get only the wealth of good luck arising from the donee blessing.\textsuperscript{91}

The objects of donations were two pieces of land, which constituted a quarter (\textit{chatur-bh\āga}) 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 \textit{bhūmi} and in another case it has been called \textit{babbulaka-kedara-miśra}, which may be translated as ‘marshy land with \textit{babbulaka} tree thereon’.\textsuperscript{92}

The details regarding boundary specification of two pieces of lands are significant as they throw important light on existing nature of land proprietorship at least in this region.

The first piece of land which has been described as marshy land with \textit{babbulaka} tree (\textit{babbulaka-kēdāra-miśra}), is stated to be located to the south of the entrance of Hilohila \textit{grāma}. The boundaries of the piece of land is described as follows: "to the east there is a (plot of) land (\textit{kshētra}) belonging to the deity of Vardhamānēśvara; to the south there is the land (\textit{vāta-kshētra}) containing an orchard belonging to the \textit{brāhamana} Bhāulla, to the west there lies the tank (\textit{taṭākam}); (and) to the north (the localities called) Karīra, Rushī and Kōṭmbaka".

The details of the boundaries of another piece of land located in Padataka \textit{grāma} have been described in the following

\textsuperscript{91} On the significance of such statements see D.C. Sircar, \textit{Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India as Revealed by Epigraphic Records}, Lucknow, 1969, pp.7-8

\textsuperscript{92} 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.
terms: "in all directions there are fields (shetram=kshetram) belonging to the brāhmaṇas who are: Bhaṭīsvāmi-sāmanta; and sāmanta brāhmaṇa Sāmjaka; and the sāmanta Ishvara of Madahara; and the brāhmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Prathilla; and sāmanta Dhāimaka of Madahara and Bhatt Ishvara of Siharakhibjya; and the brāhmaṇa sāmanta Sāmbasharman"

As to the meaning of the word sāmanta, the term 93 has been interpreted by D.C. Sircar as 'one who was in the possession of a piece of land in the neighbourhood of the gift land' 94. If this rendering of the word sāmanta is correct then the details given above clearly indicate the prevalence of individual holdings around the village and also the manner in which these holdings were distributed in rural space in this region.

The details of the person owning the land around the donated piece of land in Hilohila grāma are also noteworthy. Of all the sāmantas mentioned in the context of its boundary specification, there were at least three of them who seem to have been the inhabitants of areas other than the areas of the grant.

What is interesting here is the nature of right which has been given to the donee along with the land. The charter though speaks of the enjoyment of the fines for ten (minor) offences as well as the customary presents, apparently from tenants; it also speaks of the donee having no right to raise an enclosure at the border of the gift land and of winnowing grains at the border. The expression 'a-kara pravrittam' (without any rent fixed) clearly points to the fact that what was being given to the donee to enjoy was a rent-free

---

93 See the editor interpretation of the term 'sāmanta', Ibid.
94 See Note on Hilol plates .......loc. cit.,p. 220.
land only. This implies that recipient only gets usufructory rights over the land not the complete ownership of it.

Another point of our concern is the details regarding the process of finalizing the document. The charter gives us the list of the witnesses to the gift, which is as follows: - 'brāhmaṇa Aggaka, brāhmaṇa Varisha, Bhatta Līlāla, an inhabitant of the village Khallāpalli, Kōtaka, the brāhmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Datta, an inhabitant of the village Kūsumba, brāhmaṇa Sēnabhatta, brāhmaṇa- Ṭūshēka and Siddhuyaka. It may be noted that many of the witnesses were not from either of the villages where the objects of donation were located.

At the fag end of the charter we are told that the charter was handed over to the recipient in the presence of a group of officials stationed at Harshapura and of the brāhmaṇa mahābalādhikrīla Bhatta Īśvara of Kaisattaka, adhayaṅksha Vāsudēva, mahāpratihāra Bhaṭṭa Armmata, and Bhāulla of Vālēkhabha. The group of officials which has been referred at the beginning seems to have been different from those which the donor used to have, as at the end of the charter we find the reference to the presence of donor’s own officials as well.

Thus, the details of the charter clearly bring out a hierarchy of rights starting from mahāsāṃtādhipati to sāṃanta to individual resident coming from different areas.

We hear of the next property transfer in this region only in the ninth century by mahāsāṃtādhipati Gōvindarāja of the Gujarat branch of Rāṣṭrakūtas. The charter which is datable to AD 819 also carries the statement at the end that it was written by

---

95 Devali plates of Govinda, vallabhi 500, /I, XXXV, pp.269-80.
the order of Gôvindarâja. It records the transfer of a piece of land (*kshêtra*) located within the boundaries of a place called Deellika. The donation, which was a permanent one, was made in accordance with the *bhûmicchidra-nyâya* and it was to be enjoyed according to the rules of *brahmadeya*.

The recipient of the grant was a *brâhmaṇa* who resided at a place called Vallabhi that has been identified quite close to the locale of donation.

This charter of Gôvindarâja is the last ninth century charter in this region. Like what we see in the case of the Mahi basin region in this region too, we hear of another grant by the Râṣṭrakûta rulers only after a gap of nearly a century which falls in the time span of the tenth century.

Of the property transfer documents of the tenth century, the first two were issued by the sovereign rulers of the Malkhed branch of Râṣṭrakûtas.

The first one is dated Śaka 832 (C. AD 910-11). The charter begins with a short genealogy of the Râṣṭrakûtas of Malkhed and then offers us the genealogy of his *mahâsâmanta* Prachânda and introduces his two brothers named Akkuva and Sella-Vidyâdhara. The way they all have been described gives the impression that they all were warriors of repute.

After this little before making announcement of the grant we are told that the sovereign ruler enjoyed a group of seven hundred and fifty villages which were designated by their chief town Śrî.

---


Harshapura and a danandaya of Mahâsâmanta Prachanda was stationed there.

After giving all these details, we are told that the sovereign ruler donated one village out of the group of seven hundred and fifty villages to a brahma. The noteworthy feature of the charter, however, is that, though the sovereign power Akalavarsha (Krisna II) has been stated to be the donor, it carries the signatures of two persons at the end. Of the two signatures, one of them is of Akkuka, the brother of Prachaanda, and the other one is that of the dandanayaka of Prachaanda living in the 750 villages.

About the significance of the signature of Akkuka and Prachaanda, it may be suggested that probably they were the real donors but since it was only the prerogative of the royalty to transfer certain rights and privileges, it was the sovereign ruler who was apparently projected as the donor. This may also explain why at the beginning of the description of the grant the king himself takes the credit, (Exp.used: I gave as donation) whereas at the end, the grant has been described as the one 'given by us'.

Unlike the earlier case, where we find the involvements of individual holders and also the representatives of the local communities along with state functionaries in the matter of property transfer, in this case we do not hear of their involvement at any level of the transaction, though seven villages have been referred in the context of the boundary specification of the donated area.

The second property transfer document of the tenth century was issued by Govinda IV in AD 930 who has been described as PMP Suvarnavarshadéva-Pithvivallabha Śrî
Vallabhanarêndravadah. It records the donation of a village to a brâhmaṇa who was a resident of Mânyakhêta, though he originally came from Kâvikâ. While specifying the boundaries of the village we are told that on its north lay the boundary of the land (talasimâ) belonging to the holy place of Kavika.

This is yet another evidence of land being owned by the temple and in the vicinity of that individual proprietary right over land was created through this charter.

In the list of rights and privileges, we are told of the transfer of karmânta of the village as well. It has been suggested that the word stands for cultivated soils. If the suggested translation of the term is correct then it might indicate the existence of certain cultivators of the land who must have had certain rights over it. It may also indicate the existence of temporary tenor in the village.

The last donation in this region was made by Paramâra Siyaka. However, the charter carries the seal which has Garuda symbols. At the beginning of the charter, we also find the reference to Akalavarsha and Amoghavarsha with imperial titles such as PMP. The donor has been described as mahâmaṇdalika-chûdâmaṇi mahârâjâdhirâjapati Sri Siyaka. This clearly shows that srî-Siyaka was a subordinate of the Malkhed branch of Râṣṭrakûtas.

We are told that Siyaka made two grants, each consisting of a grâma at the request of Srî Khêṭaka-maṇdal-âdhipati. The

98 Ibid. It is stated in the charter that the donee came from the holly place of Kavika. The donated place has been described as 'lying quite close to the holly place of Kavika'.
granted properties was located in the personal estate (sva-bhujamāna) of Śrī Siyaka.

The charter at the end bears the sign manual of Śrī Siyaka and mentions ṭhakura Vishṇu as the Dāpaka (i.e., the person who caused the grant to be made). The writer also claims that the charter was written under the order of the king. The recipients in both the cases were individual brāhmaṇas hailing from places other than the donated ones. In the list of address here we see, the reference to all the officers and the neighboring villagers (samasta-rāja-purushān-prativaāṣi-janapadam...).

This is again a case which brings out hierarch by of control exercised by different authorities. Also important in this case is the reference to Dapak and members of Janapada in the context of grant.

BHIMA BASIN SUB-REGION

The first charter datable to the 5th-6th century recording donation in this region belongs to the Mānpur branch of Rāṣṭra-kūṭas99 which has already been discussed.

The next charter, which we have is dated Śaka 690 (C. AD 768)100, and it belongs to the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭra-kūṭas. The charter records a donation by Kṛishṇa I who has been described as prithvīvallabha-mahārājādhirāja-paramēśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka śrīmad-Akālavardhāvē. The donation, we are told, was made at the request of Gōvindarāja and two other persons named Vāsishṭhaśrīkumāra and Jaivanti Pāṇaiya. About the status of these individuals, the charter remains silent.

99 Hingni Berdi plates of Vibhraja,EI,XXIX,pp.174-77
100 Talegaon Copper plates of Krishnaraja; saka 690, EI,XIII, pp.275-39.
The object of the donation was a *grāma* which seems to have been combined with three other settlements.

The recipients of the grant were: I. a group of *brahmāṇas* residing in the Karhātaka ten thousand, and II. Bhaṭṭa Vaśudēva, whose place of residence is not mentioned. The charter also specifies that the second donee was to get two shares.

In the case of this charter also *mahattara* figures in the list of addressees.

The point of relevance for us is the involvement of different individuals who figure in as in the capacity of requester for the grant. Gōvindarāja who is stated to have made the request can be identified with Govinda III who might have been at the time of the grant controlling the area. The two individuals, Vāsisṭhāśrikumāra and Jaivanti Pāṇaiya, who might have been locally influential persons, requested him for the grant. Apparently Gōvindarāja did not have enough authority to make grant on his own and therefore he might have requested the sovereign authority Kṛishṇa I to make the grant which he did.

The next charter\(^{101}\), dated Saka Samvat 730 (C. AD 808), also belongs to Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūtās. It mentions grant of a village by Govinda III who has been described as PMP *prthvīvallabha-Śrīmat-Prabhūtavarsa-śrī-vallabhanarēndradēvah*.

The information which is relevant for us comes from the details of the boundary specification. In the process of giving detail

---

\(^{101}\) Radhanpur plates of Govinda III,EI,VI,pp.239-51.
about what constituted the boundaries of the donated gráma, the charter refers to Varahagráma being located on the north. About this gráma we are told that it was the gráma of certain bráhmaṇas—the chief of whom (pramukhānām) were Anantavishnubhaṭṭa Viṭṭhuduvē, Gōindaṃma-shadaṅgavid, Savvaibhaṭṭa, Chandadibhaṭṭa, Kuṇṭhanāgaibhaṭṭa Mādhavairiyappu, Viṭṭhapu, Dēvaṇaiyyabhaṭṭa, Rēyaīyyabhaṭṭa, etc. These brāhmaṇas are stated to have been associated with the forty Mahājanas'.

Thus, the picture that we get out of this is that Varha-gráma was a settlement of brāhmaṇas whose affairs were being managed by the body of Mahājanas. Since the village of Varha seems to have shared one side of its boundary with the donated one, it was felt necessary even by the sovereign power to involve them in the process of the transfer of village. Given the nature of information though it is not possible to know the precise nature of their involvement, it may not be wrong to suggest that they might have had some role in the process of delineating the boundary of the donated village or they might have acted as witnesses.

We have three stone-inscriptions all engraved on a pillar, found at Salotgi in the Indi Taluka of Bijapur district102. Out of these three, two of them belong to the period of our concern.

The inscription called A 103, datable to C. AD 945, refers itself to the reign of Akālavarshadēva Kṛishnārāja (Kṛishṇa III) and records a donations made by Chakrāyudhabudha who is stated to be the grāmapati (or proprietor) of the village of Pāviṭṭage. It is

102 Saltogi pillar inscriptions, E.I, IV, pp. 57-66
103 Ibid, see pp. 60-63 for text and translation.
also stated that while making the grant, he was accompanied by two hundred of the chief twice born. The objects of grant have been described as follows:

1. First rate land (*bhumi-uttamân*) measuring 500 *nivartanas*
2. 27 furnished dwelling places (*nivesanâni*)
3. 4 *nivartanas* of land as flower garden (*kusuma-vâtikâm*)
4. 12 *nivartanas* of land
5. 5 flowers of good metal
6. 50 *nivartanas* of land and one dwelling place.

The recipients of all the grants were the resident scholars attached to a school or hall (*śâlā*) at Pâviṭṭage.¹⁰⁴

Thus, the authority behind the grant was not only that of *grâmapati*. The fact that he was accompanied by two hundred of the chief twice born also indicate that they also had some claim over the land which was being donated.

The inscription B which may be datable to the same period as A, speaks of another grant to the same *śâlā* by certain Kañchiga who is stated to have come from a place called Kupaṇapura and belonged to the race of Selaṇṇas. The inscription does not throw any light as to his authority status, yet on the basis of what all has been said about him in the inscription it may not be wrong to assume that he was an important person who was known for his valor and strength.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., We are told that the school or hall (*śâlā*) was established by the chief minister and *sandhibivgrahin* of Krishñarâja called Nârâyaṇa, who was an inhabitant of other village.
It is also stated that he enjoyed certain rent-free holding (*dasavanda*) possibly in Pavitţage itself. It is out of his rent free holding that he decided to give some land for house sites. What is noteworthy is that in this donation we do not see the involvement of any authority or local social group. We are told that even the job of getting this order (*śāsana*) inscribed was done by him. Thus both the inscriptions brings out different nature of land proprietorship existing within the same locality at the same time.

We have one incomplete grant of Sinda king Adityavarman who has been described as *mahāśāṃanta*\(^{105}\). It has been suggested that he was a subordinate of Krīshṇa III. Datable to AD 965-66, it records a donation of a *grāma* by the *mahāśāṃanta*. The recipient was a *brahmana* who had immigrated from Madhyadēśa.

**UPPER KRISHNA BASIN SUB-REGION**

After the two charters of the Manpur house of Raṣṭrakūṭa viz., Pandarangapalli grant of Raṣṭrakūṭas Avidheya\(^{106}\) and the Untikavatika grant of Abhimanyu\(^{107}\), the rest of the charters in this region belong to the Malkhed branch of Raṣṭrakūṭas.

In the first charter of the Malkhed branch of Raṣṭrakūṭas datable to AD 753\(^{108}\) Dantidurga or as he is described in the charter, *prīthvīvallabha -mahārājādhirāja- paramēśvara-bhaṭṭāraka- khadgāvalōka- śrī-Dantidurggarājadeva*, as the donor.

\(^{105}\) An incomplete grant of Sinda Adityavarman,Saka 887,*EI*,XXV, pp.164-171.

\(^{106}\) Pandarangapalli grant of Rashtrakuta Avidheya,*EI*,XXXVII,pp.9-24.

\(^{107}\) Untikavatika grant of Abhimanyu,*EI*,VIII,pp.163-166.
The object of grant was a grāma and the recipient was a brāhmaṇa who was an inhabitant of Karhāṭaka. We are also told about the transfer of certain rights and privileges along with it.

The next eighth century charter is datable to C.A.D 769\textsuperscript{109}. We have reference to two authorities in the context of grant. The charter first refers to the reign of PMP Kṛishṇa I and then records a donation by Gōvindarāja (Govinda II) who has been described as samadhitgata-pañcha-mahāśabda and Yuvarāja which is indicative of his subordinate status in relation to PMP Kṛishṇa I. We are also told that Gōvindarāja made this grant at the request of one Vijayāditya who is stated to be the son of Dantivarman.

The object of donation was a village together with bhōga (with all enjoyment) and vaṇa (groves of trees) of the village of Arasiyavāda\textsuperscript{110}.

The next charter dated Śaka 702 (C. A 781) mentions PMP Dharavarsha Dhruvaraja as the donor of a village.\textsuperscript{111} The recipient was a brāhamana who resided in other village.

The other point of our interest is the reference to mahattara etc. in the list of addressees.

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{109}] Alas plates of the Yuvaraja Govinda II,\textit{El},VI,pp.208-13
\item[\textsuperscript{110}] Ibid.,\textit{Arsiyavada grāma vānen sha-sabhoga dattah}, l.34,pp.211.
\item[\textsuperscript{111}] Bhore state Museum copper plates, A. Bhore state Museum plates of Dharavarsha Dhruvaraja,\textit{El}, XXII,pp.176-186.
\end{itemize}
We have one inscription dated Śaka Samvat 715 (C. AD 793)\textsuperscript{112}. Since the charter has been declared a forged one, we would leave it out of discussion.

We have another charter which has also been declared spurious\textsuperscript{113}. It, however, contains details, which may be relevant for the present discussion.

The record claims that the Indra III granted a village as mahāgrahāra which was to be enjoyed by the recipients according to the tribhōgābhhyantarasariddhi (i.e., on a joint tenure by brāhmaṇas, by a god or gods, and by a private person). It is also stated that each brāhmaṇas was to receive twelve nivartanas of land.

The other items of donation included a hamlet and houses laid out according to the measure of seven cubits (hasta). It further records that a tenement of one thousand nivartanas according to the rod (danḍa) of twelve spans (vitasti), was created as prabhujyamāṇa (the property of the lord of the village), and another tenement of four thousand nivartans was created as dēvadāya (portion of the god).

As far as the description of the donee is concerned, we are told that they were one thousand one in number, though the name of only one of them has been mentioned.

What is relevant for us is the different terms which are reflective of different types of land control. To begin with, tribhōgābhhyantararasiddhi is generally taken to mean a joint tenure by brāhmaṇas, by a god or gods, and by a private person. The

\textsuperscript{112} Daulatabad plates Of the Rashtrakuta Sankaragana, EI, IX, pp.193-98.

\textsuperscript{113} The places mentioned in the spurious Wadgaon plates, EI, pp.371-77.
second term is *prabhujyamâna* which may be taken to mean in the present context the private possession of the temple. Then we have *devadâya* which represents a rent free holding of a temple. Apart from these, we have private holdings of each *brâhmaṇas* consisting of twelve *nivartanas*. Thus by one land charter what we see is the creation of different types of land-proprietary in one grâma.

In the next charter which belongs to the time span of the ninth century (dated Saka 727=C. AD 805)\(^{114}\) we hear of a donation by the sovereign authority Govinda III. He is stated to have made the grant at the instance of a chief named Nâgahari of the Brihach-Chhinda family of the Pañândra race\(^{115}\).

The object of donation was a village which was transfer to the donee in accordance with the *bhûmicchidra-nyâya*. The donee as usual was a *brâhmaṇa* who belonged to area other than the donated one.

However, what is noteworthy in the charter is the fact that donation and the rights and privileges did not come free for the donee. After narrating the rights and privileges it has also been stated in the charter that ‘five thousand are payable to the illustrious governor (*Śrī vishayapati*) of the district per annum’\(^{116}\).

On the basis of the reading of this passage D.C.Sircar suggest that the annual rent for the village was fixed at five

\(^{114}\) Nesarika grant of Govinda III, Saka727, EI., XXXIV, pp. 123-134; also see, ‘Notes on Nesarika grant of Govinda III’, EI, XXXIV, pp. 135-40.

\(^{115}\) ibid., The Chhinda family ruled from Bagalkot and Yelburga in Bijapur and Hollavour and Belagutti in Mysore. p. 124
thousand coins probably of copper and the donated village therefore was not made a rent free village in favour of donee.\(^{117}\)

We have two charters for the period of the tenth century and both of them have been issued by the sovereign authority.

In the first one\(^{118}\) Govinda IV figures as the donor. He has been described as *PMP śrīmat- Suvarṇāvaraśadēva* - *prthīvallabha- śrī mad-Vallabhanarāṇḍradēva*. He is stated to have made the grant of a *grāma* which was to be held as *namasya* grant. The recipient was a *brāhmaṇa*.

As far as the list of the addressees is concerned it we find the inclusion of *mahattara* in it.

We hear of another donation of a village after the lapse of about twenty five years through Karhād plates of Krīṣṇa III.\(^{119}\) The charter speaks of a donation by PMP Akalavarshadeva that consisted of a *grāma* to a *brāhmaṇa* who had migrated from the Karanājakhete.

As to the list of addressees, we find the reference to *mahattara*. But the order of occurrence is different.

**MALPRABHA GHATPRABHA BASIN SUB-REGION**

We have large numbers of inscriptions recording donation of land/villages in this region. However, unlike the regions we have

\(^{116}\) See line 71-72, also Notes on Nesarika grant of Govinda III Saka 727, *EI*, XXXIV, p.135-140

\(^{117}\) See, Notes on Nesarika grant of Govinda III, *EI*, XXXIV, p.140

\(^{118}\) Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions, No. CXXXIII, *IA*, XII, pp.247-54.

discussed so far, it is the local authorities of different types, which figure as donors.

The first donative inscriptions that we have at our disposal belong to the period of the eight century. Datable to C. AD 778\textsuperscript{120}, it mentions a harlot of the temple of (the queen) Lōkamahādevī as the donor. The inscription, though it refers itself to the reign of PMP Dhārāvarsha, does not mentions the involvement of any authority. The object of the donation consisted of an abhyamukhi and some land the nature or the size of which has not been stated\textsuperscript{121}. The donation was apparently made in favour of the temple of Lōkamahādevī.

The next donative inscription belongs to the second half of the ninth century. Datable to C. AD 865\textsuperscript{122}, the charter begins by referring to Amōghavarsha I as mahārajādhirāja-paramēshvara-bhaṭāra. It then introduces Kuppēya as the governor of the Purigere district (Purige-ṛṇā[m] Kuppēyan=āle).

After referring to the sovereign and local authorities the inscription records the grant of 85 mattars of cultivable land, six plots of garden land, and the property of Ādityabhaṭāra. It is also stated that these grants were made ‘free from all molestation’. The recipient of the grant has been stated to be Gōkarṇapāṇḍita.

\textsuperscript{120} Sanskrit and Old- Canarese Inscriptions, \textit{IA}, May,1882,pp.124-25.
\textsuperscript{121} Exp.used : bhūmidānamum
\textsuperscript{122} Some records of the Rashtrakuta kings of Malkhed, D- Mantrawadi Inscription of the time of Amoghavarsha, \textit{EI}, VII,pp.198-02
The details of the inscription suggest that the donation was made in a meeting in which forty mahājanas of Elpuṇuse, and the Gorava Moni, and the Managers of Elamvalli (Elamvalliya sasanamuma) which belonged to the god Mahādeva participated. We are also told about a certain Nāgadēva who acted as the president of the meeting in the matter of this grant.

While specifying the boundaries of the donated land the inscription refers to various fields which were apparently owned by certain individual and the local temple.

Thus apart from providing evidence of the existence of individual and institutional proprietors of lands in the locality, it also clearly brings out the dominant role, in the process of the transfer of local resources, played by the local social groups and authority.

We have another inscription which comes from an area not far way from the one we have discussed above. Like the earlier one, this is also datable to C. AD 865\(^{123}\). The purpose of this inscription, however, was different from that of the earlier one in the sense that it does not relate to the transfer of any landed property. Rather it talks about the tax exemption and the transfer of certain local taxes. The natures of authorities involved in the process are entirely different from what we have seen above.

The inscription refers itself to the reign of \(mahārajādhirāja-paramēshvara-bhataṭāra\) Amoghavarsha I and mentions his subordinate Kuppēyarasa as the governor of Purigere 300 (Purigere mūnūrumam Kuppēyarasa-âle). Apart from these two, who also figure in the inscriptions discussed above, we are

\(^{123}\) Shiggaon Inscription of Amoghavarsha I, I/I, XXXV, pp.85-88.
also told about Maṇalera Gādiga as the Nāl-gāmuṇḍa; Kallaman of Kargāmuṇḍar as the Urgāmuṇḍa and Pendaman as in charge of the Kallavalla taxes of the 300 division.

After referring to all these authorities, we are told about the remittance of the Kallavalla taxes of Shiggāme to Kalneretibhaṭārī, probably the goddess of the place. This transfer of Kallavalla taxes in favour of the local goddess was done by Pendaman with the permission of Kuppēyarasa.

We are also told about the remission of all the minor taxes (kiru-dere) in favour of the same goddess directly by Kuppēyarasa. The recipient of the gift was a certain Lōkākshara-bhaṭārā who apparently belonged to the temple of the local goddess.

In the next inscription, which incidentally comes from the locality quite close to the one we have discussed above, the descriptions of the local authorities is not only different but varied also

The inscription is datable to C. AD 874/75 and it refers itself to the reign of ‘mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara bhaṭārā’ Amōghavarsha ( I ) and goes on to mention Baṅkēyarasa as the governor of Banavāsi twelve-thousand, the Belgati three-hundred, the Kundarage seventy, the Kundūr five-hundred, and the Purigere three hundred. It then mentions his son Kuṅdattē as the governor of Nidugundage twelve (Kuṇḍattē Nidugundage-panneradumān).

The details as given in the inscriptions give the impression that Kuṇḍattē and certain Rāpa made the donation of one mattar of garden land and five mattars of cultivable land in favour of a local

124 Nidagundi Inscription of the time of Amoghavarsha, EI, VII, pp.208-14
god. The donors seems to have done so after taking consent of Bankêyarsa.

The inscription seems to record another donation the text of which runs as follow, 'On Malda giving his own share, that same honorable Kuppa caused the temple to be made; and, while Śamkara was holding office as Nāl-gāmunda, Gâdiyamma, protecting that property, acquired it so that it continued unimpaired....'

Given the manner the whole passage has been constructed, it seems a little difficult to derive information which may be relevant for us. It may be possible, as suggested by the editor\(^{125}\), that the passage in question talks about the previous funding of the temple, and the original endowment of it. Whatever may be the fact, the references to individuals such as Malda, Kuppa, Gâdiyamma in the process of the transfer of property is of relevance to us.

We have one inscription belonging to the last decades of the ninth century which talks about the tax exemption granted to a place called Palásur\(^{126}\). The inscription which is datable to C. AD 895 refers itself to the reign of the mahāsāmantādhipati Kannara-vallaha who may be identified with Kṛishṇa II of the Malkhed branch of Rāṣṭrakūṭas\(^{127}\). We are also told about several local authorities such as Lokade as the governor of Banvāsi Twelve thousand, Omkāra-Siva-bhātāra of the temple of Dindēsvara as

\(^{125}\) Ibid., p.214, fn.2

\(^{126}\) Kunimellihalli Inscription of Saka 818, EI, XVI, pp.277-80.

\(^{127}\) The editor suggests that it may be because of the continuance of earlier memory when he bore the title of Mahāsāmantādhipati. p.278
administrator of Palasûr, Alâditya Gôva and Kalpâta as Nâl-
gâmunda of Anniga’s hundred of Pâñugal.

After referring to a hierarchy of authorities, the inscription tells us that about the remission (from taxation) granted to a place called Dautavûra. The person who obtained the remission was Asagañana, son of Maṉugulara Āyicha Gâvûnda who was holding the town-shrievalty (Ur-gavûndu). The person who granted the remission was Omkâra-Śiva-bhâṭâra of the temple of Dindêsvara who was the administrator of Palasur (Palasuran=aluttire).

The details discussed above tend to give the impression that Dautavûra was probably paying certain taxes to the religious establishment located in Palasûr and was headed by Omkâra who finally granted the exemption. What is noteworthy is the fact that the person who obtained the remission was not holding any position of authority, excepting the fact that he was a son of an Urgâmuṇḍa.

Another inscription128 which comes from the same district as the last two inscriptions discussed above talks about a Mahâsâmantâ making donation of land. The inscription datable to C. AD 897 refers to the reign of Akâlavarsha (Kṛishṇa II) and introduces a mahâsâmantâ whose name has been lost. He belonged to the Yâdava-vamśa who was governing Kôgali Five hundred and Mâseyavâdi one hundred and forty. It is stated that he constructed a temple of Kôyagesvara at Melividu129 and granted some land for the same which was received by Vêdavâhna-Bhâṭâraka.

129 The place has been identified with modern Mêvundi in Mundargi Petha, Dharwar district.
Of the tenth century donative inscriptions the first one that we have belongs to the period of Indra IV who has been described as *Nityavarsha-śrī prithvīvallabha mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara.* Datable to C. AD 916-17, it records the donation by *samadhigata-pañcha-mahāsabda...Śrimat-Lendeyarasa.* He has also been described as the governor of Purigere three hundred.

The donation consisted of Vutavura (village) of Kachchavara-Kādamba. The inscription does not mentions who the recipient was. However, on the basis of the sculpture at the bottom of the inscription it has been suggested that it might have been some Jaina establishment.

Apart from the *mahāsāmanta* who figures as the donor, we are also told about the presence of ‘Two hundred and twenty mahājanas’ of (the village of) Paltiya-Maltavura at the time of the grant. Though it is not stated in the record as to what role these Mahājanas had in the process of donation, the way they have been referred to gives the impression that probably they were there in the capacity of witness to the grant.

In next donative inscription, datable to AD 929/30, the picture that we get of the donors is quite varied. The inscription begins by referring itself to the reign of Prabhūtavarsha and speaks about several grants in favour of a local tank called Pergeṭe / Kaṭṭamāgerē.

The first grant consisted of twelve *mattar* of wet lands / culturable land. It was given as *mānya* grant by certain individual

---

130 *Karnataka Inscription, II,p,11-14*
at the command of Dhòra. Nothing has been said in the inscription as to who this Dhòra was.

The second grant which was made by the brāhmaṇas of the place (dvija-mukhyar) consisted of the following money- incomes

I. three drammas received at the time of the marriage of the vipras
II. two drammas received at the māni (i.e. the upanayana ceremony);
III. one dramma at the marriage of the Śūdra gaṇa;
IV. all the money- incomes in paṇa accruing from expiatory ceremony;
V. the income tax in paṇa on the hiranīya revenue of the village.

The third donation consisted of seventeen mattar of land which was donated by the whole kēri (the resident members of the street). It is also specified here that the donated land should be exempted from tax and for which two mattars of wet land was granted by Kēsaba.

The inscription ends with the statement that two hundred and twenty members (of the mahājanas) had assembled there and they also got this inscription written. Apart from indicating the existence of a whole Kēri and certain individual having enough right to make donation, the inscriptions also brings out the varied role of the Mahājanas in the process of resource transfer.

The reference to Mahājanas as the donor of certain resources once again occurs in the next donative inscription belonging to the period Govinda IV or Gojjiga-vallabha as he is mentioned in the
record\(^{131}\). The inscription which is datable to C. AD 929-30 records two grants.

It first speaks about a donation which was made by Govinda IV as \textit{sarva-namasya} tenure. This grant, we are told, was made on the occasion of the performance of \textit{arghya} to the \textit{danandanyakas} named Rêvadâsa-dîkshita and Visôttara-dîkshita and it consisted of bestowing on these two \textit{danandanyakas} the town of Ereyana-Kâdiyûr as \textit{sarva-namasya} tenure.

The real purpose of the inscriptions, it seems, was to record another donation which has been described after the royal donation discussed above. This donation, we are told, was made by two hundred \textit{brahmañas} (\textit{Mahâjanas}) householders of Ereyana-Kâdiyûr in assembly. The grant was meant for the maintenance of the local cults.

As to the object of grant, it is stated that they (two hundred \textit{brahmañas}) sold the fee for penitential rites, the \textit{aṅka-vaṇa},(and) the \textit{pasumbe-vaṇa}( probably an octroi on ‘bagmen’ or peddlers) and the money which they got out of it went into the making of certain arrangements in the town. It is also mentioned that these mahâjanas made this donation when the met for fixing ‘constitution for the tank named Koṇdaligere’.

We have one inscription recording grant of land in this region by seven Gâvûndas. The inscription is datable to AD 941

\(^{131}\) Kalas Inscription of the Rashtrakuta Govinda IV, Saka 851, El, XIII, pp. 326-38.
and it refers itself to the reign of PMP Akalavarsha. However, before giving the description of the grant and the donors, the inscriptions offers us the list of various local authorities such as:

1. a subordinate of the king called satyavākya-Kongunivarma Permādi dharmma-mahārājādhirāja as the governor of Puligere three hundred and Belvola three hundred,and

2. his subordinate Āychayya as the administrator of Karaṇa Gurīpaṭṭi with internal authority (Karaṇa-Gurīpaṭṭyan-abhyantra-siddhiy-āle).

After referring to these local authorities the inscription tells us about the donors which consisted of Toṇdayya, the country Gāvunda of Belvola three hundred (aruvar=ggamundugalum=ildu, l.14), and the six Gāvundas.

The donation made by them consisted of:

1. field measuring fifty mattars by the king’s measures( rāja-māna-mattar-ayvattu) to a temple constructed by Āychayya.
2. one mattar of land for a garden.
3. twenty-four dwelling houses of seven cubit and five cubits (in width) at Devamagere.

Apart from the donation of land, the present inscription also speaks of the fixation of revenue on the granted property probably by the donors. It is stated that on this (apparently on the donated property), for the share of the kings the fixed revenue shall be two gold gadyananas, for the share of the country-Gāvundas (nal-gāmundara) the fixed revenue shall be two gold gadyananas. It is

---

further specified that on this field and the houses there is not single other impost.

We have one inscription on stone tablet located in a temple in Soratur\textsuperscript{133} which speaks about various donation made by people having different authority status. It first refers itself to the reign of Śrī Kannaradēva (Krishana IV) and mentions his aṅgaraksha (bodyguard) śrī Ruddapayya as the governor of Sarṭavura.

The first grant consisted of a piece of garden land, measuring one thousand (betel-nut) creepers, to the god. The donors were Āchapayya, the Pergade of Ruddapayya, and gâmunda Sâmi Kalteyamma. The grant was made in favour of a local god.

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 t,'Tant consisted of twelve mattar of culturable land for the matha and for education. The donors of this grant were the same\textsuperscript{134}. The donation seems to have been made at the request of Úrodeya Piṭṭayya.

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

\textsuperscript{133} No. CXXXV, IA, XII, pp.256-258
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid, Achapayya, the Pergade of Ruddapayya and the village headman after washing the feet of the (fifty Mahajanas),
Apart from these grants, the inscription also records two other grants. One consisted of contribution of a 'young betel-lea: plants in the leaf' donated by the fifty mahājanas uniting together. Another one consisted of 'one papa on each peru' donated by Bhavāniseṭṭī.

It is also stated at the end that the mahājanas shall protect these grants and that it was they who got this inscriptions written.

We have one donative inscription on a stone tablet located in the wall of a temple at Adragunūchi in Hubali taluka of Dharwar district\textsuperscript{135}. It is datable to AD 971-2 and it refers itself to the reign of Koṭṭiga and mentions his subordinate mahāmandalēśhvara Pemānadi-Māraśiṅghadēva as the governor of Gangvāḍi Ninety-six thousand, the Purigere three hundred, and Belvola. The inscription records two grants by two persons having different status.

The first grant was made by Paṅchaladēva who was governing the Sebbi Thirty. It consisted of the contribution of twelve aur-gadyanas of Rona and a fixed contribution of kana of salt and ghee and a vajjani of sugar cane juice.

Another grant consisting of six mattars of land, one aru vana and a dharna of gold of Rona. Malliga Gadayya whose status has not been mentioned made this grant. Though both the grants were meant for a local temple it was the Eighty-four (mahājanas) who received the gift in both the cases.

\textsuperscript{135} No. CXXXIV, IA, XII, pp. 255-56.
The next inscription belongs to the reign of Khottiga. It speaks of the renewal of a grant of land in favour of a local temple, the details of the inscription give the indication of it being a karaśāsaṇa. The grant, we are told, consisted of six garden and 24 mattars of kisukādu (red land) and the gifts of cess realized on the occasion of fair (Jatrāmukham). We are also told that aruvaṇa fixed for this gift was 24 drāmmas.

Although the inscription refers to the daughter of a person called Dhānapa as the donor, it seems to have been actually made at the request of the Nāl-gāmundaṇas of Purigere 300 who is stated to have paid aruvaṇa to secure the release of the income due to the goddess. The charter ends with the instruction that twelve Gāvundas of the village should protect the gift.

We have one inscription referring to the reign of prithvivallabha mahārājādhirāja paramēśvara śrīmat Kakkaladeva (Kakka III). Like any other inscription of this region, even this one first offers us a list of different authorities which is as follows:

1. Permāṇadi-Mārasiṅghadēva, the governor of Six hundred
2. Paṅjaladēva, the governor of the Ninety six
3. Muṅgūla Voja, the governing (the village) of Kadekēri
4. Bolagaditale and Rājayya, the Nāl-gāmundas of the village

137 No.CXXXVII./A., XII, pp. 270-72
138 Ibid., Pamjaladevam tombhatt-aruman ale
5. Manayya, the Urgâmunda of the village.

After referring to all these authorities the inscription records that Bolayya, Rajayya and Vojayya, being (in assembly), there were allotted (by Urgavunda Manayya) seven *mattals* of black soil land and one *mattal* of rice land to a local god.

Apart from these donative inscriptions, this region has also yielded certain hero-stones. The significance of hero-stones in this context lies in the fact that some of them relate to the boundary dispute of rural settlements. In order to illustrate the point and also to give an idea of the nature of information these records carry, we may cite some of the details of the one of them which have been found at a village called Lakshmipur in Dharwar district. The record is datable to c. A.D.925. It begins by referring to the sovereign authority Indra III and introduces local authorities of different kinds. The purpose of the inscriptions is to record the death of Beñña-gámiga of Kesangere in course of a fight in connection with the settling of a boundary dispute at Kammûru belonging to Talagavali, when the people of Mûvattichhisira caused the war. Records as these also offer useful insights about the nature of control over land in a given locality. Since we have several of them relating to this sub-region, instead of discussing them here we have presented them in a tabular form at the end of the charter.

TUNGABHADRA BASIN SUB-REGION

---

139 Ibid., Mu(me)ngula Vojam kadekeriyan ale
The first inscription of this region belongs to the period of Govinda III\(^{141}\). The purpose of the inscription is to record renewal of a grant by Govinda III in favour of a priest of the Kuruba caste. The charter conveys the impression that the granted property was previously donated to a temple of Shiva by a certain king Kirttivarma. The Govinda III has been described as *maharajadhiraja paramēshvara* and the occasion of the grant was his arrival on the bank of the river Tungabhadra to levy tribute.

Apart from this, rest of the donative inscriptions that we have for this region fall in the timespan of the tenth century.

The first tenth century inscription is datable to AD 902-3\(^{142}\). It refers itself to the reign of Akalavarsha and records a donation by ‘Mahâjanas together with children and old men’ made some allotment. The object of donation is not possible to make out. However, given the other surviving details, it may not be wrong to suggest that it was perhaps some land only.

Four of the inscriptions came from the a place called Kyasnur in the Hangal taluka of Dharwar district.

The first of them, datable to AD 945/46, refers itself to the reign of Kṛishṇa III\(^{143}\), and then mentions a *mahisāmanta*, as the ruler of Banavâsi, and the nāl-gâmuṇḍa of Edevolal nâdu. It then speaks of the transfer of the revenue of a field measuring two *mattal* by nāl-gâmuṇḍu of a Edevolal-nâdu to a special account for the upkeep of a local tank. The transfer was made at the request of a person named Poravayya.


\(^{142}\) No. CXXIX, *IA*, XII pp.220-21
In another inscription\textsuperscript{144} we are told about the grant made for the maintenance of a temple. The donation consisted of a field of two $mattal$ for the supply of oblations, lying below the Pulil tank, four $mattal$ separately, below the same tank; a filed containing one $mattal$ in the Budda-kanda.

The name of the donor is not mentioned. However we are told about the reign of Kandara – Vallabha, then of \textit{mahāsāmantādhipati} who was governing the Banavāsi–nād, and also about Gāmundigas who was the $nāl$-gāmundu of the Edevolal seventy.

The third inscription which is datable to AD 870 refers itself to the reign of Nityavarsha-Amoghavarsha (possibly Khottiga)\textsuperscript{145}. It does not record the transfer of land; rather it speaks about the revenue arrangement for a place called Kēsalū\textsuperscript{146}. The inscription, however, 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 $Nāl$-gāmundu’.

\textbf{UPPER KAVERI BASIN SUBREGION}

The first land charter that we have is datable to C. AD 808 and it records Raṣṭrakūṭa prince Raṇāvalōka Kambhayya as the

\textsuperscript{143} Some minor Rashtrakuta inscriptions, Kyasanur inscriptions of Saka 868 no. A \textit{EI}, XVI, pp. 280-1.

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid no. Č, p.283.

\textsuperscript{145} Ibid no. D. pp. 284 – 85.
donor\textsuperscript{147}. He has been described as the son of \textit{srīvallabha mahārājādhirāja} Dhārāvarsha, ‘mediating on the feet of PMP \textit{srīmat Gōvindarājādēva’}. This description of the donor is an indication of his subordinate authority vis-à-vis Gōvindarāja. It is stated in the charter that Raṇāvalōka Kambhayya made the donation at the request of his son Śankargaṇṇa\textsuperscript{148}.

The grant consisted of a village that was part of Punnāda-Edenādu-vishaya. The recipient of the grant, which was meant for the service of the \textit{vijayavasati} (basti or basadi), was Vardhamānaguru.

The charter does not speak of the transfer of any right and privileges in favour of the grantee. It also does not mention any addressee, instead we are told about the witness to the grant which consisted of people of Ninety six thousand country (\textit{dānasya sākshiṇah shannavati-sahasra-vishayah}, l. 64)

We have one inscription referring itself to the rule of Raṇāvaloka of Kambya\textsuperscript{149}. It speaks of two grants.

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., The provisions are the following: for a \textit{mattal} four \textit{damma}, for an \textit{udigal} three, for a house two, the \textit{damma} on houses is to be one gold.

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{E.C.},III, No.278,pp.352-357; pp.735-782 for translation

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., However what raises doubt about the authority of Raṇāvalōka Kambhayya to make donation on his own is the last section dealing with the exploits of the sovereign authority Gōvindarājādēva which ends with the statement that ‘by him... this grant to a \textit{brahmaṇa} was made’. Thus the possibility of Raṇāvalōka Kambhayya taking the consent of the sovereign authority Gōvindarāja before making the grant may not be discounted altogether.

\textsuperscript{149} \textit{E.C.}, vol II, no.38 (3\textsuperscript{e}) pp. 14-15 for transliteration,p.370 for translation
The first grant consisted of a certain piece of 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 but possibly, it consisted of some land. It was made by several persons having differential status such as the King’s account (Śrīkarana), Diṇḍiga-gāmunda, Vallabha-gāmunda, Rundi-vachcha, Rundi-māramma, Śrīvikram-gāmunda of Kadalur, Kalidurga-gamunda, Agadipo, Raṇapāra gāmunda, Uttam gāmunda, of Andamāsal, the Nāl-gāmunda of Navilūr, gāmunda of Govindapādi of Belgola.

In the next charter PMP Govindarājadeva (Govinda III) figures as the donor of a village. The grant was made at the request of two of his subordinates. One of them has been described as Mahāsāmantādhipati Dantivarman. The other one has been named Chākkirāja. Though there is no such title attached to his name which could indicate his precise authority status, yet the way he has been described give enough indication that he was an important person. The recipient of the grant was a brāhmaṇa.

The charter does not refer to any list of addressees. However, what is significant is the fact that once again the subjects of ninety six thousand country (Gaṅgavadi) have been cited as the witness of the grant.

---

150 Ibid., The inscription has many gaps and it is difficult to make out some of the details clearly

151 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.
We have another charter, datable to C. AD 812, recording donation by the same king\(^{152}\). We are once again told that the sovereign authority, (PMP Gòvinda III), made the grant at the request of Châkîrâja whose seems to have moved up in terms of his authority status by the time this charter was issued. In the case, he has been described as the adhirâja of Gaṅgâmanḍal (aṣeṣha-Gaṅgâmanḍal-ādhîrâja).

The object of the grant was a village and the recipient was a Jaina Muni on behalf of the temple of Jinendra at Śilāgrâma.

The charter does not speak of the transfer of any rights in favour of the donee. However, what is significant in the case of this charter is the list of witnesses to the grant which included various categories of people such as ‘Râcha-malla gâmûnda, Siṭa, Gaṅgâgâmûnda, Mâreya, Belgeṛe Odeyar, the Modabâge Seventy, the whole of Kunuṅgil’.

The next inscription belongs to the period of Krishṇa III\(^{153}\) the principal part of which is datable to C. AD 949-50. It describes him as the Paramēśhvara and paramabhaṭṭāraka and then introduces his subordinate dharmamahārājādhirâja...Śrīma-Permânadi who was governing (Gaṅgavâdi ninety-six-thousand). The inscriptions then introduces a warrior (ankakaram) of Śrīma-Permânadi called Śrīmat Maṇaḷera.

After introducing these authorities the inscription describes an event involving the fight between a boar and the hound in which

\(^{152}\) Kadamba plates of Prabhuṭavarsha, EI, IV, 332-348

\(^{153}\) C-Ātauṅkôr inscription of Krishana III and Butuga II, EI, VI, pp. 50-56
both the animals died. We are further told that order to commemorate the killing of a boar and the hound Śríma-Permānadi and Maṇālēra set up a stone in front of the temple of Challēśvara at Ātukūr and gave ‘land yielding two Kaṇḍugas (of grain) in the open space of the channel called the channel of the Malti-trees, below the large tank’.

The inscription then goes on to record the order of the donor to the cultivators, administrators and the Goravas of the locality. It is said in the charter that ‘any cultivator who destroys the land and any governor of the district or any governor of the village who destroyed this land shall incur the sin committed by that hound. If the Goravas, who manages the state, should fail to offer worship to that stone shall incur the guilt of the sin committed by the hound’.

There is a subsidiary record at the top of the inscription discussed above. It refers to the reign of Rāchamalla Būtuga (II) who has been described as the governor of Ninety-six thousand. It tells us about the killing of Rājāditya by Būtuga for which Kannarādēva awarded him by giving the Banavāsī twelve thousand, the Belvola three hundred, the Purigere three hundred, the Kisukad seventy and the Bāgenād seventy. We are further told that ‘the manner Maṇālera stood out in front of him and pierced (his foes), Būtuga gave (to him), as a bālgachchu-grant (bālgachchu-gottam), the Aātukūr twelve and the village of Kādiyūr of the Belvola (district)’

The details of the inscription discussed above offers several points which are of relevance to us in the context of the issue under

154 Ibid, p-56
consideration. To begin with, it tells us about a new type of land grant known as bālgachchu-grant which has been translated as 'sword-washing' grant. As the context of the use of the terms shows, it was given to warrior by their master in appreciation for their bravery. However, we do not know what its terms and conditions were. Apart from this, the details of the subsidiary inscription bring out clearly the existence of a group of warriors who were given proprietary rights over certain areas who were free to give part of it to whomsoever they wanted.

In the case of the first inscription, what is of relevance to us is the reference of cultivators and the management of property by Goravas. This obviously points to the existence of individual and common proprietorship on land in this region. These cultivators were certainly not the ordinary cultivators, rather they were seen as powerful enough to do damage to the granted property.

We have a charter datable to C. AD 951 which was apparently issued by the Chālukya Chief Rājāditya. The charter starts with a detailed genealogy of the family of the donor and then at the end of it refers to the rule of Kṛṣṇa III who has been described as ‘...paramēshvara paramabhattāraka paramēshvara śrī vallabhanarēndrēvah śrīmat Kṛṣṇarājadēva. He is stated to have granted a sāsana.

After stating, this charter introduces śrīmat Rājāditya, who carried the title of samadhigata-pañcha-mahā-śabda-mahā-sāmata, and was given Kadambalige by the sovereign power for his personal enjoyment( sva-prabhuyamāna). Out of this he is stated to have donated two villages in favour of a brāhmaṇa.
We have one inscription which is dated in the sixteenth year of the reign of Kannaradeva (Krishṇa III). It speaks about the sale of land by the village assembly.

The details of the inscription suggest that there were certain properties in the village which belonged to none and therefore the Sabha of the village declared them the common property (madhyama) of the assembly and then put it on sell / rent to those ‘inhabitant who promise to pay taxes on each kuli’. The Sabha also lays down certain penalty for those who would try to stake their claim, in any form, on any part of that property.

In another inscription, dated in the nineteenth year of the reign of Kannaradeva (Krishṇa III) we hear of the sale and purchase of land.

The inscription after referring to the reign of Krishṇa 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 patti of land called Kalarichcheruvu.

It has been suggested that the word kalari means ‘uncultivated ground’ and sēruvu 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 Īṣānasiva alias Nakkadi-Bhatṭa who paid the money for tax to the members of the assembly (sabha) which ‘gave (the land) tax free in perpetuity. The

---

156 Inscriptions of Kannaradeva, NoD, EI, III, pp. 282-86.
157 Ibid, see fn. 11, p. 285.
Sabha apparently belonged to the village in which the donated piece of land was located.

We have another inscription which is dated in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Kaṇñaradeva (Kṛṣṇa III)\(^{158}\). The inscription after referring to the reign Kṛṣṇa III, goes on to introduce Nulamba Tiribhuvandīrān and records donation by him of a village and the hills of Śūḍāḍāpāraī. The inscription gives the impression that his son had received them from Vira-Chola. The recipient of the grant was a shrine located on the granted hill.

The inscription does not throw any light on the status of the donor. The editor of the inscription, however, would like us to believe that he was the subordinate of Kṛṣṇa III and since he has also been called Pallava Murari he might have been connected with the Pallava rulers of Nolambadi Thirty-two-thousand\(^{159}\).

**KONKAN BASIN**

The first donative inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in this region belongs to the Malkhed branch. Dated Saka 613 (C. A.D. 749-50)\(^{160}\), it refers to Dantidurga as one who had won the right to have *pañca-mahāśahula*. This clearly indicates the subordinate status of Dantidurga, though we are not told as to who his sovereign was. The charter also mentions his subordinate Aniruddha who was holding Śrīpura as his *prabhujyamāṇa*.

\(^{158}\) Velur Rock Inscription of Kannaradeva, El.,IV,pp.81-83

\(^{159}\) Ibid,p.82.

The purpose of the charter was to record donation of a grāma by certain representatives of the Mahājanas (Corporation) of the Traividyas of the place (Śripura) viz. Bodavarma, Bhogika, Durga Bhogika, Devamma Bhogika, Goviyasaṅga Bhogika and Goviya. The recipient was the temple of Bādeshvara that was caused to be constructed by Bādadi Bhogika. Goldsmith Chandahari has been mentions as the engraver of the plates and Devaka Tribhogika as the scribe. Bhogikas also figure as witness to the grant.

The details regarding the process of the grant, the physical appearance of the charter, the seal etc. give enough indication that that Dantidurga and his subordinate had no role to play in the entire process of making the grant. The impression one gets is that the entire process of transfer of village was managed by the community of Bhōgikas which seemed to have been influential enough to put their seal on it a well. The absence of the state representatives looks even more intriguing when we realized that the donated village was a part of Śripura which has been stated to be the prabhujyamāna of the subordinate of Dantidurga.

The charter represents an example of the existence of proprietary rights of the groups of Bhōgika over the villages around Śripura which was unaffected by the existing political authority.

In the second charter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Malkhed the authority making the grant was that of a sovereign power. Dated Saka 793 (C. AD 871) it records grant of a village by

\[^{161}\text{Sanjam plates of Amoghavarsha, EI, XVIII, 235-255}\]
Amôghavarsha I or as he is described in the charter, PMP *paramêshvara* Šrî prithvîvallabha Šrîmad Amôghavarsha. The recipients of the grant were four *brâhmaṇas*, all hailing from Karhâd.

The list of addressee is the same as found in most of the royal charter.¹⁶²

We have two sets of charters from a place called Chinchani belonging to the Malkhed branch of Râṣṭrakûtas. The first one, dated Saka 848 (C. AD 926), pertains to the region of Indra III. The process of donations as recorded in the charter speaks of the involvement of three authorities of differential nature.

To begin with, it is recorded in the charter that Sugatipa alias Madhumati made a grant of a village and a piece of land (half a *Dhura*) in another village. Sugatipa, the stated donor, is said to have received the Samyāna maṇdala from Krishna II, and was apparently ruling over the area as some subordinate authority. It is also stated that the grant was made at the request of a certain person called Annaiya. As to Annaiya we are told that he was serving in some capacity under Nityavarsha (Indra III).

At the end of the charter we are told that the document was written by ‘the sandhivigrhika of Dhruvarâja’, with the cognizance of a Dhruva of Samyâna, and under order from Sugatipa who received instruction in this matter from *paramêshvara* paramabhattâraka mahârâjâdhirâja Nityavarsha (Indra III).

It may also be mentioned that the donee of the grant was a Mathika at Samyana constructed by Annaiya, who has been referred above as making the request for the grant.
Apart from bringing out the process of grant and the involvement of different authorities, another relevant information provided by the charter is in the context of the description of the witnesses to the grant. We are told that the endowment was announced by the governor to the assemblage of Hamyana-pauras, Dhruva and Vishayaka Ādhikārika. The last two were the part of state apparatus, whereas Hamyana-paura was possibly representing the citizen of Hamyana.

The second inscription belongs to the reign of Kṛishṇa III. The inscription does not speak of any property transfer; rather it speaks of a settlement of a land dispute (Vyastha) between two religious institutions.

The inscription tells us that a small piece of land belonging to the temple of Bhillamaladeva was wrongfully appropriated by another temple near by. This led to a situation of dispute between these two religious establishments. It then describes in details as to how the settlement was arrived at and also refers to 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 land-dispute noteworthy is the fact that nowhere do we see the involvement of state apparatus. Rather, the entire decision emanated from a deity, his attendants like Svadhyayikas, Varika etc. Even the writer of the
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162 Ibid., Rāṣṭrapati, Vishayapati, Grāmakūṭ, Yukt, Niyuktak, Ādhikārika, Mahattara etc.
163 Rashtrakutas charters from Chinchani, No.2 grant of the time of Krishna, I/I, XII, pp. 45-55.
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 analyzed above brings to light different categories
of donors having differential authority status. If on the one hand we
have sovereign authority making grant of villages, on the other
hand certain individuals, whose authority status was not important
enough to be mentioned in the charter, also figure as the donor. In
between them, we also find different categories of subordinate
authorities making grants. Added to this, we have references to
several categories of people figuring in various capacities in the
process of the grant. As is expected, they all did not enjoy the same
proprietary rights; nonetheless, they all did have some rights over
the landed property.

This point can easily be illustrated by identifying different
categories of donors who figure in the donative inscriptions.

During the period of the AD Pre-750, apart from the
sovereign authority, their subordinates and the members of the
royal family figure as the donors. They seem to have enjoyed
enough authority to transfer the landed properties of different
dimension on their own. In most of the cases, they did not even

---


165 See, Khamkhed plate, *El*, XXII, pp. 93-96, also see the charters belonging to
the Manpur house of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.
care to refer to their sovereign authority, much less appealing to them for their approval.

To this period belong two charters relating to two different regions in which members of certain community seemed to have more say than the existing authority. In fact, in one case the *samāha* of *Mahāmātragāna* was powerful enough to affix its own seal, rather than the seal of the sovereign authority. Another similar example comes from the Konkan region when we see the community of the Traividya having a dominant role in matter of land transfer.

The list of the addressees in the charters of the period also shows considerable variations. The impression that we get is the absence of regular functionaries relating to the transfer of land. On the contrary, we have the landed elements such as *grāma-bhojakas*, *rājā*, *sāmanta* etc. figuring regularly in the list.

The situation seems to have changed after AD 750 and two of them which are quite obvious are: 1. absence of the practice of grant of land by the members of the royalty on their own. Related to this was the relative decline in the practice of subordinate authorities making donation without the consent of the sovereign authority, or without referring to it in the charter.

Another change relates to the list of addressees. From 750 onwards we see the appearance of certain state functionaries with unfailing regularity. The only non-govermental group that figures in the list is that of *mahattara*.

For the period after 750, we may classify the donors into the following categories.

---

To begin with, the first category of donors may include the sovereign authority that made grants, largely of villages, entirely on the basis of their authority. Most of the donations emanating from such authority during the period of the hegemony of the Malkhed branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were largely concentrated in the regions of the Godavari basin, Tapi basin, Wardha-Wainganga basin, Krishna and the Bhima basin sub-regions. It may also be pointed out that these areas of royal grants were not constant for all time; rather it keeps changing from one period to another.

The second category of donors was those who enjoyed the status of the mahāsāmantādhipati. However, not all the mahāsāmantādhipatis had the same rights as far as donation of land was concerned. The mahāsāmantādhipati of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas enjoyed enough authority to issue grants on their own. Their authority in this respect, if the distribution of the grant made by them is any indication, was confined to the region of the Sabarmati, Mahi and the adjoining small segments which would fall into the region of the west Tapi basin. The other mahāsāmantādhipati, even if they belonged to the family of the Malkhed branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, did not enjoy such autonomy in case of transfer of land or its resources. They have invariably been shown doing this only after seeking the consent of the sovereign authority. The process described in the charters referring to Rānāvalōka\textsuperscript{167} and another two charters referring to Chākirāja\textsuperscript{168} may serve to illustrate this point. We indeed have two charters in

\textsuperscript{167} No. 278, E.C., III, Mysore, 1974, pp. 352-57.
which Mahāsāmantādhipati has been shown making donations on their own, but in each case, the donation was made out of their own estate (prabhujymāna) which was given to them by the sovereign authority.

In the third category, we may include those who have been described as mahāsāmantā/samanta, mahāmandalika, dandanāyaka etc. As far as mahāsāmantas are concerned, they seemed to have enjoyed rights to make donation but their rights were confined to the locality which was given to them by their overlord. The grant made by mahāsāmantas Budhavarsha in the Mahi basin, and the Dhuradaṅkakāra in the Penner basin may be cited as examples.

As far as sāmantas are concerned, it may be stated that we do not have many reference to the existence of samanta in our records and therefore they do not figure on any significant scale as the donor. Most of them figure in the regions of Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin and the Tungabhadra regions as the governor of administrative units of various dimensions, and in most cases, they are shown transferring the resources of the land rather than land itself and that too with some agreement with the local groups. In cases where they have been shown making the grant of land, it invariably consisted of pieces of land. It may also be pointed out that most of the references to their making donations of land belong to the first half of the tenth century.

169 (In fact we if we use the charter of Budhavarsha relating to the Mahi basin, the hierarchy that we get is the followings:
King→Mahāsāmantādhipati→sāmant→recipient→actual cultivators.)
In the fourth category we may include the local authorities of different types starting from those described as governor of larger administrative units to gāvūndas and the Mahājanas. They were mainly concentrated in the regions of the Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin, Tungabhadra and the Krishna basin. The property transferred by them mainly consisted of small plots of land.

In the last category, we may include those who figure in the capacity of making request for the grant.

It may be pointed out that the broad categories identified above are not exhaustive and one can possibly point out certain other categories as well. However, the point one is trying to make by identifying the broad category of donor is to point out the differential propriety rights exercised by them. It may also be pointed out that these categories are not specific to any regions, rather all the categories having differential rights could exist in single locality.

Apart from these categories of the donors having differential rights, our records also shows the existence of a local landowning stratum. Some of the grants, particularly the Hilola plates, clearly speak of the plots of land owned by individual brāhmanas. Also, in the region of the Malprabha-Ghatprabha basin, we have several references to individuals making donation in the favour of tank or religious institutions.

As far as the evidence of sale and purchase of land is concerned, though we may not have enough evidence, yet we have at least two records which clearly point to the existence of the practice of sale and purchase of land. This is also an indication of the existence of private ownership of land.
Our discussion also brings out the point that the transfer of land or its resources was not a matter which concerned only the donor and the recipients. There are frequent references to different categories of people in different capacities in our records in the entire process of transfer of land. It would be logical to assume that they must have some concern over the property that was being transferred.

Apart from these, there were areas where the question of ownership was a yet a matter of contestation, even though they seemed to have become part of state society. The areas mentioned in the hero stones probably reflect the continuation of such areas even during the period of our discussion.

These points can possibly be brought to bear upon the debate on the nature of landownership in the context of the early medieval India. For a long time the colonial and the nationalist historiography, largely on the basis of textual evidence, have argued on the lines of the exclusive state-rights or individual rights over land in ancient India. Our data, however, points to the need of looking at the issue of land rights in terms of the hierarchy of rights rather then one group, individual or authority having exclusive or absolute right over land.