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The administrative systems of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi rulers form a landmark in the history of Orissan polity. Both the royal dynasties controlled the destinies of the people of Orissa for a period of four centuries (736 AD to 1110 AD) and established a uniform, integrated and strong administration which brought into force a stable government in the State. The strong, powerful and stable administration which took a definite shape for the first time during the Bhauma-karas and their Somavamśi successors, widened the areas for the growth of finer aspects of culture in Orissa.

The sources of informations about administrative set up during the period under study are based mainly on the epigraphic evidences of the two royal dynasties. The epigraphic records of contemporary dynasties in other parts of India and general works on polity like the Manu Smriti and Kāmaṇḍaka Nitisāra enable us to draw a somewhat elaborate picture and comparative study of the administrative systems of the Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśīs. A study of the monuments assignable to the period under study will further help us in this regard.

The Governmental organisations and political set up followed by the Guptas in the 4th and 5th century AD had
greatly influenced the Bhauma-kara administration and the Somavaṃśīs who ruled after the Bhaumas must have followed the administrative patterns of their predecessors with some modifications and alterations according to the taste of the times and the demand of circumstances. In setting up of their administrative superstructure the Bhauma-karas and the Somavaṃśīs might not have deviated from the original method of traditional Indian administration. They accepted what was the best in ancient Indian political system and added to it Orissan native colour which catered to the needs of the people of Orissa in solving their own problems.

The extent of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī Empire.

The Bhauma-kara kingdom was known as Tosali or Tośala according to the Bhauma charters. Tośala was divided into Uttara Tośala and Dakshina Tośala of which river Mahānadi formed the boundary line. Its capital was Guheśvarapātaka or Guhadevapātaka on the bank of river Baitarani. Uttara Tośala comprised a portion of the modern district of Puri and the districts of Cuttack, Dhenkanal and Balasore and some portions of Midnapore district of West Bengal upto the mouth of the river Gang s, whereas Dakshina Tośala which was named as Koṅgoda maṇḍala during the rule of the śailodbhavas, was made a separate political unit by the Bhauma-karas. It included the rest of Puri district and
the district of Ganjam upto Mount Mahendra.

The Bhauma-karas were powerful rulers who contributed their might in defending the territorial limits in the south as well as in the west. In the south the Bhaumas had to meet the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, a powerful adversary, who were a great menance to the integrity of the Bhauma-kingdom. Therefore the Bhauma-karas could not but follow a policy of aggressive warfare towards the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga. As a part of their war policy, the Bhauma-karas supported the Śvetaka Gaṅgas, a branch of ruling dynasty of Śvetaka Mañḍala (Modem Chikiti in the district of Ganjam) and played them off against the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga. As a mark of their war diplomacy, the Bhaumas made Śvetaka Mañḍala a buffer state in the south to meet as a bulwark against aggressive war designs of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga. Thus the Bhauma-karas wanted the safety of their Southern boundary lines from the menance of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga.

To the west of Tosāli the Bhauma-karas had to face the challenge of a greater adversary than the Gaṅgas. They were the Somavamśīś of South Kośala who conquered coastal Orissa and ultimately expelled the Bhauma-karas from Utkal. The Bhauma-karas were less powerful than the Somavamśīś and did not dare to pursue an aggressive policy of warfare against them. Repeated defeats at the hands of the
Somavamsīs forced the Bhauma-karas to follow defensive method of warfare against the Somavamsīs. Khīnjali Maṇḍala was created as a buffer state in the west comprising the Boud-Phulbani and Sonepur region with Dhrutipura as its capital. The Bhaṅjas ruled over this territory as feudatories and had to check the frequent raids of the Somavamsīs. But during the time of Ranabhaṅja in the second half of 9th century AD, the Bhaṅjas did not pay allegiance to the Bhauma-karas. As a result, the honeymoon days between the Bhaumas and the Bhaṅjas were over and the Bhaṅjas turned to be vehement enemies of the Bhaumas. When the Somavamśi king Janamejaya invaded Khīnjali Maṇḍala, the Bhaumas did not come to the rescue of the Bhaṅjas for which Ranabhaṅja had to submit his authority at the feet of the Somavamsīs. Thus this feudatory state of the Bhaumas came under the control of the Somavamsīs. After that the Somavamsīs, in gradual process of conquest, occupied Utkala (Toṣāli) and Kalinga and became the paramount rulers of entire Orissa. The Somavamśi empire was much bigger than the Bhaumas comprising south Kośala, Utkala and Kaliṅga.

The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi rulers were architects of a sound system of administration in Orissa. For the convenience of administration, they divided Orissa into a number of territorial units which bore different
names and connoted different meanings from time to time. It is not so easy to interpret the denotation and connotation of the various units found in the inscriptions of the period. However, the various terms regarding the territorial divisions may be taken into consideration and interpreted as faithfully as possible.

During the Bhauma-kara period, the whole kingdom was divided into two zones such as northern Tosālī and Southern Tosālī. But during the Somavamśī rule we donot come across such divisions as the two divisions were geographical not administrative. The Somavamśī inscriptions mention Deśa, which denotes a modern province, the largest administrative unit under them. In the inscriptions of the members of the Somavamśī dynasty, we find support to the above territorial unit, such as Odra Deśa, Utkala, Koṅgoda, Kośala deśa, and Kaliṅga. Perhaps there is no difference between Deśa and Maṇḍala. Both the Somavamśīs and the Bhauma-karas had maṇḍalas as administrative units. The terms Deśa and maṇḍala were used to signify the entire kingdom. The best illustrations of the above two divisions are Chedi maṇḍala (Dāhala Maṇḍala) chedi Deśa, Chakra kota maṇḍala, kiṅjali Maṇḍala etc. A close study of the significance of Deśa and Maṇḍala will reveal that both the terms have not been used to
signify entire kingdom. The Maṇḍalas had formed a part of Mahāmaṇḍala or Ahimaṇḍala and as such signify a principality.

The mention of Desā in the Somavāṃśi charters, with administrators like governors and Sandhivigrashikas, denote that Desā has been used in the sense of a province. Desā in the sense of a province was divided into a number of districts (Viṣaya) and also included maṇḍals lying in its area. In the earlier part of their reign the members of the Somavāṃśi dynasty divided their Kingdom into two administrative units, viz. Kosala and Odra, each equivalent to a province. This is proved from the copper plate inscriptions of Yayāti-I, who first brought the coastal Orissa under Somavāṃśi control.

Immediately after the conquest of coastal Orissa Yayāti-I appointed two separate Mahāsandhivigrahis for both Kosala and Odra. Dr. B. Rath thinks that Yayāti-I appointed his own brother Vicitra Vīra as the subordinate ruler of Odra on the basis of the Kandarpur stone inscriptions. The inscriptive evidences of the Bhauma-kara and the somavāṃśi rulers mention about the existence of gift villages in the larger administrative units Desā. The Neulpur plates of Subhākara I issued in the year 54 (AD-790) records the gift of the villages Kompāraka, Dandānki and Yoka in panchala Viṣaya in Uttara Toṣali.
The Hindol plate of Subhākara III issued in the year 103 (AD-839) registers the gift of the village Noddilovisaya in Uttara Tōsāli and the Dharākot plate of the same ruler, issued in the same year, registers the gift of the village Guṇḍāja in Jayakataka viśaya in Daksina Tōsāli. The Talcher plate of Subhākaraṇa IV issued in the year 145 (AD-881) mentions the gift of the village Addhendrakona in Kanera Viśaya in Daksina Tōsāli. The Talcher plate of Śivakara III, issued in the year 149 (AD-885) records the gift of the village Kallāri in Purvarāstra Viśaya in Uttara Tōsāli. The charters of Yayāti-I issued in the 4th and 9th regnal years suggest the location of gift villages in Odra deśa. His charters issued in the 15th and 24th years of his reign record land grants in Kośala-deśa.

The Somavāṃśīs were not satisfied with the territory that they inherited from the Bhauma-kara rulers. In due course new territories were conquered and annexed to the Somavāṃśī Kingdom. From the reign of Dharmaratha, Kālīṅga constituted a separate province of the Somavāṃśī Empire and Indraratha, the brother of Mahāśīvagupta Dharmaratha II, acted as a governor in it. This fact is attested by the Banpur charter of Indraratha. Again the gift village of Laputakambha is described to have been located in the Thorana Viṣaya in the same charter. Thus Kālīṅga formed
a part of the Somavamśī dominion of Kośala and Odra. The Somavamśī kingdom under Yayāti I was a conglomeration of three units of territory viz. Kośala, Odra and Kalinga.

This position of territorial division was changed under Yayāti II's reign. From the Jatesinga and Dungri plates we know that the Somavamśī kingdom of his time had four units with the inclusion of Koṅgoda with it. The word Odra, denoting a territory was replaced by the word Utkala representing the same territory. This is corroborated from the information supplied by the Narasimhapur charter of Udyota keśari, son of Yayāti II. The same charter records that the gift villages as located in Odra, Rudradatta is referred to as the Mahāsandhivigrahi of both Utkala and Kośala. From this, it is obvious that the reign of Udyota Keśari constituted two major territories of Utkal and Kośala and both territories were placed under one Mahāsandhivigrahi and Odra probably constituted a part of Utkala. We donot find any other reference of territory in the Somavamśī inscriptions. These two territorial units - Utkala and Kośala continued to exist till the end of Janamejaya's II reign and then Kośala was lost to the Nāga kings of Chakrakoṭa.

MANDALA

We find the territorial division of Maṇḍala in both the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī periods. Maṇḍala
corresponded to a province. But B.K. Ratha is of the opinion that Maṇḍala as an administrative division corresponds to a Revenue division. A maṇḍala denoted at different times either a province or a district in the modern sense. According to U.K. Subuddhi, Maṇḍala denotes a Revenue Commissioner's division during the rule of the Bhauma-karas. The Somavamśī inscriptions reveal that a maṇḍala was bigger in dimension than a Khanda or a Viṣaya. From the gift villages it is evident that Maṇḍala constituted the next administrative unit after a province. According to tradition recorded in the Dharmāśāstras, state is called a Maṇḍala, roughly a square either of 20 Yojanas or of 40 Yojanas. From the Bhaumakara records we find two Maṇḍalas such as Koṅgoda maṇḍala and Daṇḍabhuktī maṇḍala. The Ganjam and Kumurāṅg plates of Daṇḍi Mahādevī mention Koṅgoda maṇḍala corresponding with the modern district of Ganjam. On the other hand, the Boud plates of Tribhubana Mahādevī II state about Daṇḍabhuktī maṇḍala corresponding with the Midnapur district of West Bengal. The Maṇḍala states mentioned above more or less conformed to the tradition of Dharma sāstras. They were under the direct administration of Bhauma Monarchs. There were some Maṇḍalas which were under the indirect influence of Bhauma rulers. They were Śvetaka, Yamagartta, Airāvata
and Khinjali Mandala. Of the above mentioned mandalas Śvetaka, Kodālaka, Yamagarta, Airāvata and Khinjali Mandalas were autonomous. Thus we find two types of Mandalas in the Bhauma-kara Kingdom.

On the contrary we find from the inscriptions of this period references to eight Mandalas in the Somavamśī Kingdom. They are Gandhatapati, Sidanda, Gandhara Vādi, Koṅgod, Airavata, Rongada, Koleda, and Sangama. The Gandharapati Manḍala which occurs in Nibinna Charter of Yayāti-I has been identified with modern Gandharādi in the old Boudstate. Gandharādi, where the twin temples of Lord Sidhesvara and Nilamādhava are found to day near Boud in the district of Phulbani, was the Head quarters of a Manḍala under Somavamśī administration.

Another administrative division that existed during the Bhaumas and the later Somavamśīs was Koṅgoda Manḍala. It is the earliest known Manḍala over which the Śailodbhavas ruled from the later part of 6th century upto the first quarter of 8th century AD. During its palmy days in the 7th century this Manḍala extended from the Mahānādī in the north to the Mahendra hills in the south. Its capital was at Koṅgoda Vāsaka identified with Baṅkada near Nilādripasad village about 35 Kms. from Bānpur on the bank of village Sālia. The Koṅgoda Manḍala was occupied
in Dakshina Tosali. It is proved by the Badakhemondi plates of Śvetakaganga king Jayavarmadeva. When the Somavamśīs occupied Dakshina Tosali they also called that division as Koṅgoda. Koṅgoda Maṇḍala, according to the accounts of Hiuen Tsang, was a hilly country bordering on the sea (the Chilika lake) and was about 1000 Li or 200 miles in circuit. The Bhaumas also ruled over this Maṇḍala, as they were masters over an extensive territory. Koṅgoda Maṇḍala which was a province of Bhauma kingdom, had no political existence and was part and parcel of the Bhauma kingdom of Tosali.

Śvetaka maṇḍala was established in the 8th century AD by the Gaṅga ruling family and comprised the Ex-Zamīdāries of Sanakhimedi, Bada-khimedi and Chikiṭi of Ganjam districts. The capital of this maṇḍala is identified with Śvetakapura, the present Chikiṭi, about 20 miles from Berhampur. The Śvetaka Gaṅgas were feudatories of the Bhauma-karas and the Śvetaka rule came to an end with the fall of their overlords in the third quarter of 10th century AD. The next Maṇḍala state during the Bhauma-kara rule was Ko-dālaka maṇḍala organised by the Śulkis who according to Tārānath were a foreign tribe like the Tukhāras (Kushānas). They are very often referred to in the Indian epigraphy and literature. During the 8th century AD a branch of this family was ruling over an extensive
territory comprising the modern district of Dhenkanal and the Nayagarh sub-division in Puri district with its capital at Kodālaka identified with modern Kuālo. The ūlūkis were the feudatories of Bhauma-karas but in course of time they declared themselves independents by challenging the authority of their overlords. So the powerful Bhauma-karas put an end to their rule and divided kodālaka Mandala into two divisions called Yamagartta and Airāvatta Maṇḍalas and river Mahānādī formed the dividing line of these two maṇḍalas.

After the dissolution of Kodālaka Maṇḍala, Yamagartta Mandala and Airāvatta came into existence out of its ruins and flourished during the second half of the 9th century AD. Yamagartta Maṇḍala comprised of the northern part of the present Dhenkanal district and some portions of Keonjhar district. The Tuṅgas were the paramount rulers of this region and were the feudatories of the Bhauma-karas. The capital was Yamagartta identified with the present village Jamrā on the river Mandākinī.

The Airāvatta Maṇḍala a offshoot of Kodālaka Maṇḍala was comprised of southern part of Dhenkanal district, western part of Cuttack district and Nayāgarh sub-division of Puri district. This maṇḍala occurs in the Narasinghapur charter of Udyota kesharī deva. The Nandodbhavas ruled over Airāvatta Maṇḍala with their capital at Jayapura
identified with a village of the same name in the southern Dhenkanal district. Perhaps, the capital Jayapurā derived its name from the earliest ruler of the family named Jayānanda. This is attested by the genealogy of the dynasty given by the Dasapallā plate of Devānanda II and Talmula plate of Dhruvānanda. The Nandodbhavas were feudatories of the Bhauma-karas and after the fall of the Bhaumas, they paid allegiance to the Somavamśīs.

Khiṅjali Maṇḍala was established by the Bhānja rulers in the 8th and 9th century AD. It corresponded to the old Boudsonapur state and the Phulbani region with its capital at Dhrutipura identified with Modern Boud. The Somavamśī king Janamejaya conquered Khiṅjali Maṇḍala and its ruler Ranabhaṅja submitted to the Somavamśīs. The rule of the Bhānja family of Boud came to an end on 1st January, 1948 when it merged with Orissa.

We find mention of Bhukti both in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī charters. There is no distinction between Bhukti and Bhoga. Both the terms have an identical meaning i.e. enjoyment but a precise meaning cannot be attached to these terms. D.C. Sircar opines that Bhukti denoted a bigger area similar to a province which included a number of Viṣayas and Maṇḍals. According to A.S. Altekar,
Bhukti conforms a bigger territorial unit than the Maṇḍala of northern India under the Guptas and the Gurajāra Pratihāras. On the contrary Bhukti denoted a small territorial division even smaller than a modern Tahasil or Tāluk, in the Deccan and Madhya Pradesh and Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire. Thus it is proved that the size of a Bhukti varied from time to time in the north and farflung south of India. Here the Dandaka Bhukti Maṇḍala, occurring in the Boud plate of Prithvimahādevi indicates that the Dandaka region was originally a Bhukti comprising of a large territory but at the time of making the land grant it had been reduced to the smaller territorial unit of a maṇḍala.

The Somavamsi copper plate charter of Tivaradeva refers to the Bhukti of Piharaja penthama. Again the Mahākośala Historical society plates of Mahābhavagupta refer to the Prithura Bhukti. But the kingdom of Kośala, at the time of Tivaradeva was a small one and has been referred to as Kośala Maṇḍala. Bhukti did not denote a bigger division than a Maṇḍala. In Kośala mandala, Bhukti corresponded to a district. D.C. Sircar mentions that Phoga may refer to a sub-division of a district (Bhukti). According to Somavamsi charters two Bhogas i.e. One Bhoga existed during the period under study. Since the time of Janamejaya I the above territorial divisions i.e. Bukti and
Bhoga are not found to be in vogue. Perhaps attempts were made to convert Bhoga into Viṣaya, which is evident from the existence of Devi-bhoga-Viṣaya during the Somavamśi rule.

The officers who were in charge of Maṇḍalas were designated as rāṇakas or Māṇḍalikas, and that of Bhuktis were Uparikas. In the Bengal inscriptions the term Bhukti was most probably applied to administrative units bigger than those we found in Orissa.

**VIṢAYA**

The next unit of administration during the Bhaumakaras and the Somavamśis was Viṣaya which may be compared with a modern district. From the inscriptions of both the royal dynasties and their feudatories we come across with a number of Viṣayas. The Bhauma inscriptions mention twenty Viṣayas. They are Pañcāla, Vubhyudaya, Antaruda, Sutantarakumbha, Kaṅkāvira, Jayakata, Olāśrama, Menera, Purvarāstra, Madhyamakhanda, Tamālakhanda, Daksina Khanda, Varadā khanda, Arttani, Tamura, Khidingahāra, Talamura and Gahangu, Venaṭhāra and Aśvavana katia are yet to be identified.
The Somavamsi inscriptions mention seventeen Viṣayas. They are Oṅgātalā, Pota Kosalada, Nimuna, Pova, Sandana or Samāni, Tokkāra, Ganditama, Sānula, Mardā, Tetākata lāvada, Sakhangadyanha, Devibhoja, Antaruda, Bhrānda and Uttaravalī. Among viṣayas, Antaruda Viṣay is found to be existed both in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamsī age has been referred to in the Khandapada plates of Dharmaratha and has been identified with the Antaruda Viṣaya mentioned in the chaurasi plates of Śivakaradeva of Bhauma-kara dynasty. This Antaruda or Antarudra is identical with the Antarodha pragana in the sadar subdivision of the Puri district. The next administrative division after Viṣaya, was Khanda corresponding to a sub-division under a modern district. The Ganjam and Santigrama copper plates of Daṇḍimahādevi refer to a Khanda in a Viṣaya such as Purvakhanda in Varadākhanda Viṣaya and Pascimakhanda in Tamura Viṣaya in the present Palhara sub-division of Dhenkanal district. It is evident that Khanda constituted a territory which is equivalent with a modern sub-division under a district. During the period under study we find the use of Khanda with Viṣaya, such as Varadā Khanda Viṣaya, Dakshiṇa khanda Viṣaya and Tamala khanda Viṣaya and so on. There are nine khandas prevalent in Orissa during the period of our study. These Khandas are Lupattara, Uttarāpalli, Abhapara, Samsarāva, Santolarda, Yamatāda, Kesaloga, Astavīmśa and
Kantarada. The above khandas were most probably formed a part or a fragment of a district. In the chargers of the šulkis the territorial unit khanda denoted a smaller territory than a viṣaya, but like a Bhoga corresponding to a taluk.

**GRĀMA**

Each Viṣay was divided into a number of Gramas which formed the lowest unit of administration during the rule of the Bhaumakaras and the Somavamśis, we find the names of a number of villages from the inscriptions of our period. They include the gift villages as well as residential villages of the donee. Villages granted to Brāhmanas were known as agraharas and villages granted to gods and goddesses for worship and offering were known as devāgrahāras. It is remarkable that villages granted to Vaiśya were known as Vaiśyagrahāras.

In those days of our history grama did not mean modern villages. It meant to a locality with certain definite measurement. Sukrāchārya mentions that Grāma denotes a piece of land which is a Kroṣa (about two squire miles) in area.
In some of the Bhauma-kara and Somavamšī charters we find the reference of Pāṭaka or Paṭika, Padra, Padraka which probably stand for Grāma or villages. The epigraphic records of the period refer to a number of villages for example, Mannesvara Talapātaka included in Tamala khanda Viṣaya\(^83\) existed during the Bhauma-rule and Nālipadra, \(^84\) Vatapadraka\(^85\) and Sarkarāpātaka\(^86\) during the Somavamšī rule.

There were some big villages which varied widely in area as well as in population. The village, Kantsarānagar in the Khidingahāra viṣaya which is known from Kumurāṅg plate of Daṇḍi Mahādevī needs special mention during the Bhaum age.\(^87\) The suffix of the word pura denotes a bigger village than a grama. The name of two combined villages such as Dandaṅki and Yoka\(^88\) were given to Salonapura mentioned in the Neulpur plate of Śubhākara I. We also get Suradhipura, Pustariyapura, Gayādapura, Saṅkpura, Kalyanipura, Hastināpura from the Talcher plate of Śivakaradeva \(--\)\(^89\) The Somavamšī inscriptions also mention Suvarṇapura and Vinitapura. These big villages maintained the status of a town where from the royal charters were issued. The capital units under different rulers of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamšī dynasties might have formed distinctive administrative unit on the grounds of the concentration of royal authority. Guheśvara-pātaka, Suvarṇapura and
Yayātinagara probably formed separate administrative units by themselves. But we do not get any direct evidence to the above mentioned facts from the inscriptions of our period.

Thus the administration of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃśi rulers was based on territorial units right from the kingdom up to the village level.

Central Administration

The Bhauma-karas and the Somavāṃśi rulers based their central and provincial administration on the traditional Indian pattern. The most important feature of central administration during the period under study was the rule of Monarch who was just like the sun in the solar system. The supreme authority was vested in the King. The king was divinely ordained. The Smrīs and Purāṇas regarded the kings as divine beings. Manu says that the post of kingship was created for the protection of the world. The Gupta rulers popularised the theory of divinity of the kings. In the Allahābad pillar inscription Samudra Gupta compared himself with Dhanada, Indra, Varuna and Antaka (Dhanada Varunendrantākasama). The Bhauma-karas and the Somavāṃśis believed in the divine origin of kings.
They have compared themselves with divine beings in their charters. The Bahuma Monarch is mentioned as a Dhanada in the Talcher plate of Śivakara III\(^92\) and in the Hindol plate of Subhākara III.\(^93\) The rulers of the same family describe themselves as Indra in the Dhenkanal plate of Tribhuvana Mahādevī I.\(^94\) They also described "As glorious as Vaikuntha (Vishnu in the Talcher plate of Śivakara III. The Bhaumas trace their origin from Nāraka who was son of 'Viṣṇu'. Thus we may ascribe divine origin to the Bhauma-karas.

The Śukranīti,\(^95\) Agni Purāṇa,\(^96\) Mastyapurāṇa,\(^97\) Padmapurāṇa,\(^98\) and Markandeya Purāṇa\(^99\) ascribe affinity with various gods. The area of divinity of kings was made wider by the courtiers and panegyists taking into account the above purāṇas.

Nānnarāja, the son of Tivaradeva the founder of Somavamśa dynasty, is described as Pradyumna,\(^100\) the son of Lord Krishna, Bālārjuna, the son of Harshagupta and queen Vāsata is described as Kārtikeya,\(^101\) one of the sons of Lord Kṛttivāsa (Śiva). Yayāti I who was Viṣṇu by birth and upbringing, compares himself with the epic heroes like Nala, Nahusa, Mandhatā and others.\(^102\) Bhimaratha, in the Brahmeśvara temple inscriptions has described him as second Parśurāma.\(^103\) In the same inscription, Udyota keśari,
son of Kolāvati describes himself as the sun of the eastern mountain brightening the earth and heaven by his lustre. In the Narasinghpur charter, Yayāti II is called the representative of Madhusudana (Viṣṇu). The Somavāṃsi queen also believed in the cult of royal divinity. Vāsata, wife of Harṣagupta and mother of Balārjuna, has been called the goddess of wealth (Laxmī) and ascribes herself as Śailatānapā. Kolāvati mother of Udyota keśarī, has been described as Laxmī and Durgā. Rājalatā, the mother of Jājalladeva I, finds an identical analogy in the Ratnapur stone inscription of her son. Thus we see that both male and female rulers of the two dynasties of Orissa have compared themselves with various divine beings with the intention of enjoying loyalty of the subjects and not strengthening the theory of government. It may be also a fact that the rulers of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃsi dynasties made themselves divinely ordained to create a religious fear in the mind of the subjects for getting their support towards administration.

The king was at the apex of the administrative organisation and controlled all the threads of the administration by his own hand. As such the institution of kingship played vital role in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃsi polity. In both the periods monarchy was the
normal and continuous form of government of Orissa. Neither in the contemporary literature nor in the inscriptions nor foreign travellers' accounts disclose the existence of non-monarchical form of government anywhere in Orissa during the period under review. The central administration in Orissa is headed by the king always.

The king of Orissa wielded powers on hereditary basis as enjoyed by their counterparts in other parts of India. In the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamsi inscriptions the successor usually referred himself as meditating on the feet of the Predecessor. In few cases, we usually come across the theory of selection or election of the kings in Orissa during medieval period but sometimes the decision of the feudatories and officers of the kingdom proved to be the determining factor in deciding royal succession. As such when Subhākaradeva II died leaving his minor son to succeed him, his mother Tribhuvana Mahādevī I, the widowed queen of Śantikara-deva I was raised to the throne by the feudatories and officers of the kingdom with full regal status. During the Somavamsīs rule we find two instances of election of the king to the throne. According to Bānpur charter Indraratha was the chosen king of Kośala, after he had defeated and killed Abhimanyu who was in possession of Kośala by the grace of priests and ministers and Brahmanas. The Maranjmura charter of
Yayāti II issued in his third regnal year mentions that when the country was in an anarchical condition the ministers and the feudatories of Kaliṅga, Utkala, Koṅgoda and Kośala elected Yayāti II, as their ruler. The clear implication of it is that there was some serious internal trouble in Trikaliṅga country before the accession of Yayati in the middle of the 10th Century AD, and this led to election of the King.

The Law of Primogeniture was followed by the Bhaumakara and the Somavamsī rulers. Generally the throne was inherited by the eldest son of the ruler or to the next claimant in order of seniority but in some cases this principle was not obeyed. This case happened when Subhākaradeva II had to succeed his father Śivakaradeva II, the claim of the former was kept aside by his uncle Śantikaradeva I.112

We also find another case of succession that if a king dies, without an heirapparent to the throne, the crown used to pass to his younger brother and in the absence of his younger brother, it passed to the widowed queen of the deceased. During the Bhauma period when Śantikaradeva III died without any issue, his younger brother Subhākaradeva V ascended the throne as successor. If the king was a minor, generally one of the kiths and
kins had to act as a regent to the ruler. During the minority of Santikaradeva II, his grand mother, Tribhubana Mahādevī ruled Bhauma kingdom as a regent.113

Thus when Bālārjuna Mahāśivagupta ascended the throne at a very young age, his mother Vāsata acted as his regent.114 During the Bhauma-kara rule an unusual phenomenon occurred in the annals of the history of Orissa with the accession of four Bhauma queens to the throne with unbroken succession. This unusual phenomenon had taken place due to absence of male heirs. When Subhākaradeva V died without any male heir the throne passed to Gourimahādevī, Daṇḍi Mahādevī, Vakula Mahādevī and Dharma Mahādevī successively.115 This deviation in the history of Orissa might have taken place owing to the superior sagacity and un-common physical strength of the female members in comparison to the male members of the Bhauma family.

There is another way of proving this unusual event that some of the Bhauma queens such as Tribhubana Mahādevī I and Tribhubana Mahādevī II secured the throne with the help of their fathers, Rājamalla I of Western Gaṅga dynasty and Janamejaya Śvabhavatūṇga of Somavamśī dynasty respectively.116 However, the Bhauma-queens played a very significant and predominant role in the body politic of Orissa. It further hints that adoption of heirs was not popular under the
period of our review. The practice of passing over the throne to female members due to lack of male heirs is not noticed during the Somavāṃśī period. When Dharmaratha died childless, his younger brother Nahusa or Indraratha ascended the throne. From the Ratnagiri charter of the last Somavāṃśī king mentions that after the death of Janamejaya II, his eldest son Purañjaya ascended the throne and after him his brother Karnadeva succeeded.

Qualification of the King

The king had to enjoy certain qualifications which were prescribed by the Sukraniti, Nitiva, Agni purāṇa and other works on polity. That a king should study the art of government, should respect the elders, cultivate righteousness, protect the subjects and associate himself with learned and virtuous men. He should be kind hearted and should not oppress the subjects. He should possess discipline, prowess, strength, Valour and intelligence. He should not be talkative, addicted to excessive gambling and hunting and over-indulgent in music and dancing. Many of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃśī kings possessed these qualities.

The king had to perform certain meritorious acts (Sakala punya krtām). He is given credit for not oppressing the subjects by the imposition of taxes as the
rising moon does not cause distress by its rays (Chandrodayaivakrita Karodvegah). He should be liberal and adorned with majesty (bhutiviblushana). He was devoid of anger but not of power (Svalpa Krodhe na prabhave). He was covetous of fame but not of seizing of property of others (Luvdho Yasasi na paravittapahare). He can indulge in pleasant conversation but not dallying with wanton women (Saktah Subhashi-teshu na Kaminī krādasu). In the Śirpur stone inscriptions of Vāsata, Chandragupta's bravery and manifold virtues have been extolled. In the malla plates Bhārjuna is praised for the study of royal lores, patronage to accomplished persons, valour, intelligence and majesty. He is described as the Dharmāvatāra. The princes were provided with suitable tutors who taught them the royal lores. Besides receiving education in theoretical subjects, they were also given training in military science such as archery, horsemanship, elephant riding and other military strategies. Bālarjuna is stated to have been fond of war and was an adept in the use of bow. The king, before he took reigns of government to his own hands, must learn some knowledge in the art of administration and management of military campaigns to distant places, Kumāra Someśvara and Dharmaratna acted as the governors of their fathers. Indraratha served as Governor of Kalinga during the reign of his brother Dharma-ratha.
Thus it is seen, that the kings of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši dynasties had qualities of greatness and were born kings of men, just and upright rulers, intrepid, benevolent, just judges and patrons of art and letters.

**Titles of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši Kings**

The inscriptions throw a flood of light on the series of titles used by the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši rulers. The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši rulers were very powerful rulers and overlords of extensive kingdoms. They adorned their names by the use of proud and grandiloquent titles such as Mahārajaḥdrīraja (king of kings), Paramabhaṭṭaraka Parameśvara. The title of Mahārajaḥdrīraja (the noblest of the Supreme) and Parameśvara (Supreme lord) indicate the Supremacy of the kings over the kingdom and their paramountcy over the feudatories and the vassals. Paramabhaṭṭaraka (the noblest of the supreme) meaning to most worship one, indicates the paramount sovereignty of the king over the kingdom. Besides these titles, the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši kings used other titles to identify themselves to a particular faith. The Bhauma inscriptions use some new epithets as unmattasimha, Parama-Saṅgata, and Paramatathāgata. Unmattasimha refers to courage and valour. In the chaurasi plates of Śibhakaradeva II, Śubhākaradeva I has been given the sovereign titles of paramabhaṭṭaraka, Māhārajaḥdrīraja and Parameśvar which identify the Bhauma-kara
rulers as Buddhist rulers of Orissa. The titles of parama mahesvara and Parama-Vaishnava used by the Somavamśi rulers indicate their personal faith about Saivism and Vaishnavism. As we have discussed in other chapter that the Somavamśi, though devout worshippers of Lord Śiva, had shown reverence to Lord Vishnu. Tivaradeva and his son Nannarāja called themselves parama Vaisnava and all others were known as Parama Mahāśvara. All of them, excepting Indraratha adopted alternatively, the coronation sobriquets of Mahāśivagupta and Mahābhavagupta. These two epithets identify the rulers as descendants of Somavamśi (Lunar race). Some scholars called the Somavamśi as Kośalaguptas or Somaguptas. Some of the princes and kings of this dynasty decorated their names with the title of Keśari. Thus the Somavamśi dynasty is usually known as the keśari dynasty of Orissa.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE KING

The inscriptions of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi period shed light on the powers and duties of the Monarch. The king as the head of administration exercised extensive and unfettered powers. All the powers were concentrated in the hands of the king. His powers were unlimited. He was the head of executive, commander in Chief and fountain of justice. He appointed all the
posts of civil and military establishments. He conferred the necessary titles on the deserving feudatories and vassals and gave promotion to officials who excelled in merit. The endorsement of the monarch was imperative for the endowment of lands. He also distributed patronage to poets and scholars entitled to by dint of merit.

The Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃśī rulers were the possessors of three irresistible powers. The first one was the Sovereignty or the majesty of the King himself (Prabhu sakti). The second was the wise counsel (Mantra sakti) and the third was the energy, power and strength (utsaha sakti). The kings were fully aware of these indispensable powers which were the keys of administration. These three legal powers helped the monarch to work out the details of Administrative scheme. The kings did not neglect these powers. Equal emphasis was laid on all these elements. The Tālcher plate of Śivakaradeva mentions that Tribhuvan Mahādevī I made her three energies (Prabhu sakti, Matrusakti and Utsaha sakti) shine perpetually. As a result, the enemies were extirpated, the glory spread abroad and there was harmony among the people.

The inscriptional evidences of the period stated that the kings did not assert sovereign rights only but were also conscious of their manifold duties and
responsibilities for the kingdom and their subjects. Protection of the subjects and promotion of general happiness were considered as the most important duties of the kings. We know from Manu Smrti\textsuperscript{141} that the king did not claim infallibility and the divinity would be proclaimed only if he upheld the moral and social laws and maintained peace and tranquility in the kingdom.

Though the monarchs claimed divinity, they were upholders of danda and dharma and worked within the frame work of Rajadharma. According to Rajadharma, the king was to maintain law and order of the kingdom, to defend the country from internal disorders and external invasions. The Neulpur plate\textsuperscript{142} states that the protection of the people was the highest aim of Subhākaradeva I. The king, besides protection of the people, had to work for the promotion of peace, material prosperity, moral and spiritual values. He had to guarantee just and efficient administration, administer justice to all irrespective of status, sex, caste and creed. The king had to please the people.\textsuperscript{143}

During the period of our study, we have seen that absolute powers were vested in the King. Monarchy rested on autocracy. The kings virtually were despots being the
head of the civil as well as military administration. But they were in most cases acted as benevolent rulers. Royal autocracy was based on popular consent. A perusal of the inscriptions would reveal that the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi kings did not assert their sovereign authority only and were also conscious of their duties and responsibilities to the kingdom and the people. The absolutism of the kings is curtailed to a great extent by their deep study of the sacred lore and proper understanding of the spirit, inherent in them. This is evident from the Tālcher plate of Subhākaradeva IV that the king was well-behaved (Sad-Vṛtta) peace-loving (Sukha sitala) affable (sangata) and peerless in quality (aniditaguna) and source of truth, charity and courage and was widely praised in charity. Instead of oppressing the people the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi rulers regarded themselves as benefactors of all the living beings. The absolute authority of the kings was hindered by the theory of checks and balance. The officials of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi period acted as checks and balance to the powers of the king. Nevertheless, it can never be contended that monarchy during the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi age was constitutional or limited in nature. It may be at best described as "benevolent despotism". Maintenance of territorial integrity and conquest of new lands were some
of the important duties of the king. The army was behind the king and whole heartedly supported in conquering new regions. In this regard the Tālcher plate of Śivakaradeva III states that Śivakaradeva I Utmattasimha⁴⁸ alone in the battle, formidable with vast numbers of warriors, poured forth sharp arrows from his bow, drawn up to his ears, took away in victory, the daughter of the king of Rādha.⁴⁹

The Narasinghpur charter of Udyotakesāri⁵⁰ and the Brahmesvara temple inscriptions⁵¹ state that three great powers such as the paramaras, the colas and the Kalachuris of contemporary India threatened the integrity of Orissa and Yayati II successfully repulsed the foreigners and restored order in the kingdom. In addition to this he carried the Somavahāsī banner into the Lords of Karnata, Lata and called himself Visva Vijayi or conqueror of the world, Gurjāra, Kānchi, Gauda and Rādha.⁵² In the Khandapadā plates also Dharmaratha is credited with victory over Gauda and Andhra country. From Brahmesvara temple inscriptions it is known that Janamejaya killed the king of Odra with a spear. It is known from the three charters of Yayāti I, he captured thirty two big elephants of Kalachuri Yuvaraja I.⁵³ Udyota kesirī and Janamejaya II had shown their intrepidity in the war fought against contemporary powers which is evident from the inscriptions of the family.⁵⁴
Thus the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi rulers made earnest endeavours to maintain territorial integrity of the kingdom as commanders in Chief.

The final decision regarding declaration of war and peace must have rested with the king only. Sometimes, the king had to fight a war in the battle field. The king was assisted by his Sandhivigrahi or Minister of war and peace.

The kings also performed religious duties. Most of the rulers were in possession of religious bent of mind and for the sake of the spread of religion they founded a number of temples and endowed them richly with gifts of land and money. Several Brāhmans of distant places were encouraged by means of land grant to settle in Orissa to perform vedic rites and aśvamedha sacrifices. The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi rulers followed the policy of toleration towards religion. The kings took steps for the promotion of trade and commerce in the kingdom. The Vaiśyas were encouraged to settle in the state by means of liberal land grants. The king granted some tax free villages to Kamalavana merchants' association who had migrated from Khadirapadā in Suvarṇapura. It is obvious that merchants were encouraged by the offer of land grant to settle in the kingdom probably for the development of
internal as well as foreign trade.

The economic powers of the king were based on humane and sound principles. The king had the power to fix the revenue of the land and increase or decrease taxation in the state. The Hindol plates\(^\text{156}\) and the Dhenkanal plates\(^\text{157}\) mention that the kings "Did not like oppressive taxation" and delighted the people with light taxation (Mrdu kara).\(^\text{158}\)

The mention of different types of taxes in the charters of the period would substantiate the view that the power of deciding the measure of taxes largely depended on the king alone. Some donated villages\(^\text{159}\) had to pay a fixed amount of revenue to the royal treasury.

The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī rulers encouraged education and learning. Land was granted to the Brāhmaṇas who were to impart education to the people. Janamejaya granted four villages by three charters to Sādhārana\(^\text{160}\) a scholar of intellectual erudition. Besides this the kings kept poets and scholars in the royal court for the spread of learning. The Dhenkanal plate of Tribhuvana Mahādevī I states that "the kings always liked to be associated with the company of distinguished scholars."\(^\text{161}\) Scholars from different parts of India came to Orissa to study yogic literature. This is proved by
the visit of Buddhist monk named Prajña to Odra (Orissa) for studying yoga and carried the manuscript of Gaṇḍavyūha to China during the time of Śivakaradeva I Unmattasimha. Thus education of the period under study was not neglected.

We do not find in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi records the description of royal court, although similar narrations are to be found in the records of the contemporary ruling dynasties of India such as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the pālas and the Kalachuris. But a close study of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi records indicate that princes, royal chamberlain, royal physicians, poets, astrologers, royal preceptors, civil and military officers constituted the royal court.

Another duty of the king was to undertake royal tours throughout the kingdom to check administrative corruption and guard against oppressive officials. The duties prescribed by them was carried out by the rulers. Thus charters were issued when they were on tours in various parts of their kingdoms.

One of the duties of the king is to support the poor and the distressed. Copper plate charters of the period refer to the establishment of free feeding house or (Sattra)
Further, the kings tried to enforce Varnaśramadharma, which formed the basis of Hindu social polity. Each caste was to pursue its occupation and compete with other professions. In the Terundia plate dated AD 706, Subhākaradeva II claims to have established the order of Varnaśramadharma in its golden age purity in strict conformity with the holy scriptures. In Sirpur stone inscriptions, queen Vasatā the mother of Bāḷārjuna Mahāśīvagupta mentions herself as a patron of four Varnas and four aśramas. Thus the Bhauma-kara and Somavamśī rulers were advocates of Varnaśrama-dharma in Orissa.

The kings extended the most generous patronage to art and architecture also. Their greatness is attested by the construction of magnificent temples and sculptures at Puri, Bhubaneswar, Jajpur, Sirpur and Suvarṇa-pura.

Thus, duties of the king were confirmed not only to the expansion of territorial limits and preservation of peace but also embraced other aspects of life social, economic, religious and cultural.

Yuvarājas or Crown princes

The Yuvarāja or crown prince played a significant role in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī administration. He held a very high political status and helped the king
in administration of kingdom. We find him exercising royal prerogative of granting villages. If a king had no son and the king was old, sometimes the younger brother was made Yuvarāja (crown prince), we donot find any mention of Yuvarāja or the crown prince neither in the Bhāuma-kara nor in the Somavamśī records. A kind of officers namely Kumāramātyas used to live in the capital and actively participated in the Bhāuma-administration. They were the princes of royal blood.

The Kumār-amātyas might have played the role of a crown prince in the Bhāuma-kara period. The word Kumār-amātyas was combination of two words such as Kumār (prince) and Amātya (Minister). According to J.F. Fleet, Kumāramātya means councillor of the crown prince. In the opinion of Bloach it means prince's minister. The word Kumāramātya was profusely used during Gupta period. Perhaps Kumaramātyas helped the crown prince in discharging administrative functions. During Somavamśī period we donot come across Kumāramātyas.

The crown prince was trained in a proper manner to shoulder administrative responsibilities. He was learned, brave and self-restrained. The princes were provided with suitable tutors who taught them the royal lores. They were given training in military science and arts like archery,
horsemanship and driving elephants and other military tactics. \textit{Narsingapur charter}^{171} describes Yayāti II as the ocean of learing.

The princes received training in practical state craft. They were entrusted with the administration of certain areas and direction of military campaigns. Kumāra Someśvara and Yuvarāja Dharmaratha were governors of Kośala with capital at Suvarṇapura during the reign of their fathers. The Bānpur plates\textsuperscript{172} mention Indraratha who served as governor of Kaliṅga and Koṅgoda during the reign of Dharmaratha.

\textbf{Princesses and Queens}

The Bhauma-kara and Somavamśī queens had played important roles in administration. The inscriptions of the period under review throw ample light on the achievements of the princesses and the queens. The Bhauma-kara queens directly wore the crown but no Somavamśī queen wore the crown of Orissa in the period in question. Šubhāka-rađeva III was succeeded by his mother Tribhuvana Mahādevī I since his son was a minor.\textsuperscript{173} In this case Tribhuvana Mahādevī the daughter of Rājamallađeva (817-835) of the western Gaṅga dynasty of Mysore did not act as a regent to the minor son of Šubhāka-rađeva III. She assumed the imperial epithets Paramabhaṭṭārika, Mahārajađhirāja and
Paramesvari. But in case of the minority of Balarjuna, the dowager queen mother Vasatā had a successful regency without assuming the imperial epithet. 

The advent of Prithivīmahādevī alias Tribhuvana Mahādevī II to throne was an event of great significance in the Bhauma administration. She assumed the throne of Tosāli on the death of her husband Subhākaradeva IV after establishing league with her brother Yayāti I, the then Monarch of Kośala and made an abortive attempt of amalgamating the two kingdoms—Tosāli and Kośala. From the copper plate inscriptions we know that four Bhauma queens namely Gouri Mahādevī, Daṇḍimahādevī, Vakula Mahādevī and Dharma Mahādevī ascended the throne of Bhauma-karas in continuous succession in the event of failure of male heir apparents and played a very important role in administration. This is an unusual phenomenon in the whole range of history of Orissa.

But during the Somavamśī rule such deviation is not seen. Some Somavamśī queens influenced state craft during the reign of their husbands or sons. Trikaliṅgāmahādevī, the queen of Vidyadhara Bhañja of Vañjulvaka also played an important role during the reign of her husband as indicated by the two charters of her. Vijaya (Vidya) Mahādevī, the queen of Raṇabhañja of Khiṅjalimaṇḍala enjoyed patronage
and was in charge of the royal seal. The Ratnapura stone inscription of Jajalladeva I mentions the name of Rajalla, the wife of Prithivideva I, who was held in high esteem during Somavamšī rule. The name of queen Kolāvatī, the mother of Udyota Keśarī, deserves special mention as she played a very important role during the reign of her son and was responsible for the construction of Brahmeśvara temple at Śidhatirtha Ekambra. Thus we can come to the conclusion with confidence that the queens of both Bhauma-kara and the Somavamšī dynasties were well versed in the art of government and occupied commendable positions in the administrative hierarchy in cope with the exigencies of time and circumstances.

Council of Ministers and Officers

The Ministry or an advisory council is described as an important organ of government by Arthaśāstra, Manu Smrti and Kamandaka Nitiśāra. King-in-Ministry was the normal form of government in the empire. Ministry being the most important wheel of administration since earliest times, the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamšī administrations were no exception to this general rule. Though we donot get any concrete evidence from the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamšī records about existence of a ministry, a close study of some of the Somavamsi inscriptions
would lead us to believe that ministry constituted the main organ of administration during period of our study.

The Purānas also consider ministerial advice to be imperative for the peace and prosperity of the realm. The most important limb of the government was the council of ministers. Yajñavalkya mentions that one of the seven elements of the state consists of the amātyas (Ministers). Sometimes the kings had to acknowledge the advice of the minister on important matters of the state business. Ministers were appointed on hereditary basis but sometimes this principle is deviated if the person seems unsuitable for the post or does not satisfy the requisite qualifications. Person having genius and administrative ability were taken as ministers.

Qualification of the Ministers

The ministers who were administrators of high calibre, during the period under study, had to possess certain qualifications which had been laid down by the polity writers like Śukra and Kamandaka. According to them the minister should be wellborn and well versed in political lores. They should have good character and personality. They should be resourceful, virtuous, brave and modest. They should be above the vices of the age like gambling, dining and sensuality. Military ability may also
have been counted for the qualification of a minister.\textsuperscript{187}

We do not come across any mention of ministers in the Bhauma-kara records. There is however, a reference to the Mahāsindhi-vigrahi or the minister of war and peace in the Ganjam Grant of Daṇḍi Mahādevī.\textsuperscript{188} During the Somavamśī rule also the same minister (Minister of war and peace) is found to have been mentioned in the Sonepur plates of Kumāra Someśvara.\textsuperscript{189} The names of a panel of ministers are known from the official records of the Somavamśī period. Among them Sādhārana,\textsuperscript{190} Chhichchhatēśvara,\textsuperscript{191} Netradeva,\textsuperscript{192} Singhadatta\textsuperscript{193} and Vigrāharāja\textsuperscript{194} were important.

**Strength and composition of Ministry**

The inscriptive evidences as regards the actual strength and composition of ministry are very little and are not very clear. It is very difficult to know whether the Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśīs had a central council of Ministers or a Mantri parisad.\textsuperscript{195} The ancient and medieval political thinkers of India, though unanimous in their opinion about the strength of Ministry, they have expressed views in their own way also. Manu\textsuperscript{196} and Kautilya\textsuperscript{197} are one when they say that the number of ministers should depend upon the needs of time and the exigencies of the situation in a state and there is no hard
and fast ruler about the strength of the ministry. The individualistic view of Manu is that the number of ministers should consist of seven or eight. It is known from the inscriptive sources that the member of Gaṅga ministry was sixteen. Kautilya recommends that the King should consult three or four ministers. It seems that the kings of our period might have followed the principles laid down in the Arthasāstra of Kautilya only when their kingdoms were small. But with the expansion of kingdom, there must have been the need of more number of ministers to assist the king in administration. We come across Mahāsandhivigrahi Ugraditya in the Ganjam grant of Daṇḍi Mahādevi and he was assisted by a panel of Lesser Sandhivigrḥis since he was entrusted with a work of the most delicate nature. During the reign of Yayāti I two Sandhivigrḥikas one for Kośala and the other for Odra (Khiṅjalis were appointed since one could not bear the heavy burden of Administration in both the Kingdoms). The Kalachuris of Tripuri had formed a big ministry consisting of 14 members with the inclusion of the queen and the crown prince. It seemed that the Kalachuri empire was a big empire and to deal with multifarious problems, they had formed a big ministry. The Ratnapur Kingdom was small and the ministry ruled over it was also small. Their records do not refer to any other minister except the Sandhivigrḥika. It seems that the kings of our period might have followed the principles mentioned in the Arthasāstra of Kautilya.
From the study of the Somavamśi inscriptions, it is evident that the post of Chief Minister existed and he was usually referred as Manritilaka or Mantrivara in the charters. The Chief Minister was the first important member of the ministry. Sādhārana was the Manritilaka which meant of Chief Minister of Janamejaya Mahābhavagupta I, according to the Kālibhāna plates of Janamejaya I. The Khaṇḍaparā plates of Dharmaratha mentions Netradeva as Mantrivara. The Chief Minister had to shoulder heavy administrative responsibility. Overall supervision of various administrative departments was the most important function of the Chief Minister. Śukra mentions that the Chief Minister ought to be Sarvadārsī (Supervising) the entire administration. The Choudwar plates of Janamejaya I informs us that the king entrusted the entire burden of administration to his Manritilaka Sri-Sādhārana. Besides general administration, the Chief Minister had to draft the royal edicts which were issued during his reign. Mantri Vara Netradeva was doing this work. The Chief Minister under the Somavamśis played an important role in administration. But we donot find any mention of the post of Chief Minister in Bhauma charters. The ministers were not people's representatives but they were solely appointed by the king on the basis of merit. So from the constitutional point of view, the ministers held their tenure of office
at the royal pleasure. However, we get no cases of removal of ministers in the records under review.

After the Chief Minister, the next minister in weightage of responsibility was perhaps, Sandhivigrahika which required the guidance of the complete six fold state policy with Sandhi (treaty of peace) and Vigraha(war) as two main constituents. The Mahāsandhivigrahi as the word implies, was the minister of peace and war and was probably the head of the foreign department. We find the word Sandhivigrahika in the Arthaśāstra and the Mauryan king Asoka had his own Sandhivigrahika. But during Gupta period the word is profusely used by the rulers. The Gupta rulers broadened the base of governmental responsibility by instituting this office of Sandhivigrahika. During the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī period Mahāsandhivigrahi played a key role in administration especially maintaining good relationship with foreign countries. The Bhauma-kara rulers had two border challenges, the Somavamśīs in the west and the Gaṅgās of Kaliṅga in the south and in the inter-state relations, the vehement enemies were the palas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and the Gurajāra Pratihāras. The Bhaumas must have entrusted the foreign affairs department to a wise and shrewd officer known as Mahā-Sandhivigrahi, who successfully must have dealt with their enemies. He was not only responsible for the admission and despatch of
foreign embassies, but also for cultural mission to foreign
countries, particularly to China, we come across Mahāsan-
dhivigrahi Ugraditya in Ganjam grant of Daṇḍī Mahādevi.210

In Somavamśi charters we find that the Mahāsandhivigrahi with the addition of foreign affairs, had to accomplish other works like drafting the charters and edicts.211 Most of the copper plate charters are found to have been issued and drafted under his supervision and endorsement.212 The Kayasthas, who were attached to the foreign office, had written the charters.213 Sometimes the Mahā Kshapatalika prepared charters only with the permission of Mahāsandhivigrahika214 and in a few records, he himself is mentioned as the writer of charters.215

The Mahāsandhivigrahi was put in the charge of drafting charters.216 For the foreign office of which he was head, possessed the most reliable and up to date information on the exploits and genealogy of the donor to be incorporated in the grant.217 During the time of peace, the foreign minister drafted all secular charters and the land grants were made to the Brāhmanas and temples.218

Besides this, the Sandhivigrahika appears to have been put in the charge of the military department as there was no separate ministry to control this department. The Somavamśi rulers were great conquerors and as such they
maintained big armies. The Brahmaśvara temple inscriptions of Kolavati mention the armed forces of Udyota keśarī as an akshauhini, which was composed of elephants, chariots, horses and infantry soldiers and was termed as Chaturanga Vala (forces containing four elements). Perhaps the minister of war and peace was entrusted with the task of controlling the huge military establishments. As revealed from Narasinghpur charters Rudradatta, the minister of peace and war was the president of the corporation of horse riders. The officer Sandhivigrāhika held the military and feudal titles of Rānaka, Nāyak and Sāmanta. Almost all the Sandhivigrāhikas of the Somavāṃśi kings had borne the military title of Rānaka and Mālladata, the MahāSandhivigrāhi under Janamejaya I was accorded the feudal title of Sāmanta. Thus the ministers of peace and war were military genius of high calibres during the period under study. The next important officer in the central administration who was in charge of keeping the records and accounts has been mentioned in the Bhaumakara and the Somavāṃśi charters with a slight difference. He was the Mahā Kṣapataladhikrita in the Bhauma charters and the Mahā Kṣapataladhyaksa in the Somavāṃśi charters. But in the Arthasastra he is defined as the Accounts General whose function was to submit the accounts of different departments to the Samahartri. Therefore we may
assume that Mahāksapataladhikrita or Mahāksapataladhyaksa of
the Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃśī period was the Chief
Accounts General. According to Mr. B. Das Mahāksapatala-
dhikrita who was a Dutakā and sometimes a Rāṇaka was
certainly a topranking officer at the centre.225

Besides the above mentioned officers, we find large
number of central as well as provincial officers in the
Bhauma-kara and the Somavāṃśī inscriptions. They are as
follows:

1. Antarāṅga or Rājasatka

Antarāṅga and Rājasatka were the two designations
of royal physician who intimately associated with the king.
B. Mishra mentions him as the Kinsmen of the King.226 But
according to D.C. Sircar, he acted as royal physician227
who was intimately related with the king. The sāntigrāma
copper plate of Daṇḍimahādevī describes Rajasatka in place
of Antaranga. Antarāṅga and Rajasatha were thus two
different designations of the royal physician. Such an
officer does not find mention in the Somavāṃśī charters.

2. Pratihāra

The post of Pratihāra is found to have been mentioned
in the Bhauma-kara as well as the Somavāṃśī charters. It is
mentioned as the chamberlain or the royal door keeper in
both the periods. The Ganjam grant of Dandi Mahādevī and 31st line of the Khandaparā plate of S.N. Rajguru gives the testimony of this category of officer. One Pratihāra named Prabhāsa existed during Bhauma age. He ushered people into royal presence and communicated royal orders to the officers concerned.229

3. Another important officer enjoying the rank of minister was Rājaguru,230 who is known from the Somavahāśi charters. The Khaṇḍaparā plates231 also mention Rājaguru or royal preceptor. One Sahadeva was the Rājaguru of Dharmaratha. We know also from the Bhaktī Bhāgavata Mahākavyam232 of Kavidindima Jivādevacharya that Bhavadeva was the preceptor of Udyota kesāri. Thus they were the spiritual guides of the king. The nature of their functions suggest that they attained proficiency in the vedas, the Vedaṅgas, the Dharmasastras and the Smṛtis.233 The most important function of Rājaguru was to preside over the various sacrifices performed in the royal house-hold. He also determined the auspicious days for different purposes like the grant of Lands, beginning military campaigns. He was also in charge of charity endowment and ecclesiastical departments and censor of Public morals. It seems that the names of the persons and temples were recommended by him who deserved to enjoy royal patronage.
But during the Bhauma age, we do not find the mention of Rajaguru in the Charters. The manifold works of Rajaguru during the Somavamśī age were accomplished by some other officers of Bhauma period.

4. **Dutaka**

Though Dutaka is found to have been mentioned in the provincial and district administration, it is certainly a top ranking official at the centre. The office of Dutaka was attached to the office of Maha Ksapataladhi-krita. According to Manu,\(^{234}\) the Duta is spoken as Chief Minister in special confidence with the king. He drew up and delivered the charters.\(^{235}\) According to R.C. Mazumdar, Dutaka is the royal agent for religious grants and endowments. Perhaps Dutaka enjoyed parity in rank with Ranaka, which is evident from the Ganjam grant of Daṇḍi Mahādevī.\(^{236}\) The functions of a Dutaka was to act as a delegate of the king in order to convey his command to local officers to whom the charter was delivered. It is interesting to note that in the Kamanḍaka Nitisāra\(^ {237}\) Dutakas are regarded as spies and thus were called the eyes of the king.

Besides the officers mentioned above, we find other officers of Central administration in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī charters. There were heaters (tapakaras),
engravers of royal charters, Vijñāni, Suvarṇakara, Kāyastha and Sutradhars (Masons). From the reference to these minor officials it would seem that they were the residents of the capital who were always ready to attend the duties in the royal court whenever they were called upon. We know from the Chaurasi plate of Śivakaradeva II that Hastivarman, who acted as a heater and engraver, lived at Virajā (Jajapur) near the capital of the Bhauma-karas.

Provincial Administration

As mentioned earlier the kingdoms of the Bhauma-karas and the Somavāṁśīs were divided into a number of small provinces for administrative convenience. Officers appointed in various branches of administration have been mentioned in the charters. In the Bhauma charters, Mahāsamanta, Mahāraja Rājaputra, Antaranga, Kumaramātya, Uparika, Dandapāsika, Sthānāntarika, Vallabha, Viṣayapati, Ayuktaka, Chāta and Bhāta are mentioned to discharge the provincial administration. As regards the district administration, Mahāmahattara, Vrhadbhogi, Pustakapāla, Kutakola and Sadyādhikarana are mentioned. No specific status was given to MahĪ-Sandhīvigrahi, Mahāksapalīdhikrita, Mahā Ksapatalika, Rānaka, Kula puttraka, Pratihāra, Dukaka and Bhogi in the central, provincial and district administration. The Somavāṁśī Charters also mention a number of
officials such as Samāhārtrī, Sannidhātrī, Niyuktadhi-kārika, Piśunavetrika and Avarodhaiana.

Thus we find a long list of officers peculiarly mentioned in the charters in the provincial administration under the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī rule. Although the exact nature of the powers and positions of many of them is not clearly known, nor we have a systematic account of machinery of central, provincial and local governments of this period, the above list enables us to form a general idea of the wide scope of the administrative machinery and the different departments through which it was carried on. The powers and positions of each of them are discussed below.

1. **Mahāsāmanta (Officer in charge of Frontier provinces)**

According to B. Chhabra, the Mahāsāmantas were high dignitaries in charge of the frontier provinces. As mentioned earlier, the Bhauma-karas had to face border challenges with the Somavamśīs in the west and the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga in the South. It is possible, that they had appointed Mahāsāmantas as administrative officers in the bordering provinces. Perhaps at the time of peace, Sāmantas acted as officers of the centre.
2. **Rāja putra**

The nature of function of this officer is very difficult to ascertain. Ordinarily Rājaputra means "the son of king". It is suggested that Rājputra of Land grant were most probably not princes of royal blood but ordinary Rājput soldiers holding fiefs from the king in return for military services.\(^\text{240}\) B. Sarma peculiarly describes that Rājaputra is the favourite of the king, younger son of the king and village head man respectively.\(^\text{241}\) Again B. Misra has described Rājaputras as descendants of degenerate ruling families \(^\text{242}\) who were entrusted with certain powers at the centre taking into account their administrative experience. In Bhauma records Rājaputras enjoyed the status with the Mahāsāmanta. The above discussions may suggest that Rājaputras enjoyed some status as officers of the centre.

As regards Antarāṅga mention has been made earlier.

3. **Kumāramātyas**

Scholars hold divergent opinions about the meaning of designation and functions of this officer. J.F. Fleet suggests that Kumāramātya means minister or councillor of the crown prince.\(^\text{243}\) According to B. Mishra, a Kumara carrying on the function of a minister was called
Kumāramātyas. 244 Bloch 245 explains it as one who has been in service of the king since has boyhood. Beni prasad says that it refers to minister of the prince viceroy. 246 H.N. Sastri meant it prince's or heir apparent's minister. 247 It is also suggested by the scholars that Kumāramātyas were princes of royal blood with whom the ruling chief very often consulted on the point of imperial importance. 248 Again another group of scholars suggest that Kumāramātya was an administrative officer corresponding to I.C.S. or I.A.S. officers in the present day hierarchy. 249 V.V. Misashi opines that it was a general term denoting officers of different grades. 250 R.C. Mazumdar says that Kumāramātya served as a district officer. 251 All these terms are correct etymologically. But they are not supported by internal evidence of the records in which the term is mentioned. Several inscriptions reveal that they worked as executives in the central, provincial and district administration and on the strength of their efficient work, they were promoted to the post of Maha sandhivigrahika under different dynasties of Orissa. The Kumāramātyas held high executive posts, earned much popularity and honour during the age of the Mauryas and the Cuptas. In the official list of the Šailodbhavas, 252 Šulkis, 253 Tungas 254 and Gaṅgas 255 we find the Kumāramātyas had occupied the first position in administration. It is probable that the Bhauma-karas, the
contemporaries of the Sailodbhavas of Kuṇgodamanḍala must have retained this officer in administration. The Bhauma records seem to suggest that they were associated with the provincial administration during Bhauma age.\textsuperscript{256} It is curious that we do not come across this officer in the official list of the Somavamśī rulers although this designation appears in the records of the pālas\textsuperscript{257} and the Kalachuris.\textsuperscript{258} In all probability, the Kumāramātyas were responsible executive officers chosen from among the princes of royal blood.

4. Uparika

Since we do not come across in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī records as regard to the function and position of Uparika in state administration, there is a good deal of controversy among the scholars about him. But in the administration of the Guptas and Harṣa, Uparika played an important role, as the governor of a province. In a Gujarāt inscription belonging to 6th Century AD he too appears as the head of a province.\textsuperscript{259} R.C. Mazumdar also opines that he was the provincial governor or a Superior officer.\textsuperscript{260} An eminent modern historian of Orissa Dr. H.K. Mahatāb says that he may be ranked with a modern Commissioner of a Division.\textsuperscript{261} Perhaps Dr. Mahatāb meant him as a Revenue Divisional Commissioner as Uparika owed his origin
to the fiscal term Uparika. In Pala administration he (Uparika) occupied the position of a governor of a province and have it can be presumed that uparika occupied the same position in the Bhauma-kara kingdom. This is brought out by the fact that he is invariably mentioned in the charters of the Bhauma-karas along with other officers and is directed not to interfere with the rent free holdings of the donees. Probably the Uparikas enjoyed no autonomy and remained completely subservient to the king in Bhauma age. In the Bhauma period, they were possibly appointed to head the Revenue administration of the province with the help of subordinate officers, but the Somavamśī records are silent about this officer.

5. Dandapāsika

The Dandapāsika who was in charge of Danda (of punishment) and nooses (to restrain criminals) is found to be associated with police administration of provinces during the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī rule. Danda means army, fire or rod of Chastisement, and may therefore be used with reference to military, judicial or police administration. During Gupta rule he discharged military and police functions. The Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśīs must have followed the pattern of the Guptas. During Bhauma rule he discharged military functions at the time of war and
police duties at the time of Peace. He was assisted by some subordinate police officers who are not found in the inscriptions of the period. Dr. Bina Sharma thinks that perhaps Daṇḍapāsika worked as the village constable as the present Oriya Daṇḍuasi or Daṇḍasi is the corruption of Daṇḍapāsika. But the view of Dr. Sharma seems to be partially correct. Daṇḍapāsika must have served as a police officer in the provincial, district and village administration.

6. Sthānāntarika

Sthānāntarika as an officer has been mentioned next to Daṇḍapasika in all the Bhauma plates except in the Talcher plate of Subhākaradeva IV. He was probably in charge of criminal department. D.C. Sircar opines that he was perhaps a Spy and probably used to give reports to the king about the latest development in the Kingdom. It is significant to mention that this officer did not exist in the other parts of the country. It was only seen in Orissan administration during the period under study.

7. Chāṭṭas and Bhāṭṭas

These two categories of officers are mentioned in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi charters as petty or inferior
police officers who enjoyed status of present constables. According D.C. Sircar, they were regular and irregular troops respectively, who were forbidden to enter into the agrahāra village probably for their hard and exacting nature. J.P. Vogel interprets these two officers as head of praganā police officer and his subordinate. A.S. Altekar has also described them as "Ordinary members of police force." According to B. Das chāṭṭas and Bhāṭṭas in the Bhauma period may be taken as junior officers who qualified not only for military duties but also for police duties. Though they were meant for provincial administration they were probably posted in the districts to maintain law and order in the localities under their jurisdiction. This feature in Bhauma administration was also common in Somavāṇśī administration. The Chāṭṭas and Bhāṭṭas frequently appear in the land grants of the Kalachuris. These two officers perhaps enjoyed rent free holdings.

8. Vallabha

During Bhauma age the word Vallabha has been mentioned in the Talcher plate of Subhākaradeva IV. Perhaps the officer incharge of royal stable was called Vallabha. Vallabha had to work under the Vallabhapāla. Though primarily meant for military functions he performed police
functions in the time of peace in the provinces under his jurisdiction. But we do not find such officer in the Somavaṃśī records.

9. Pisunavetrika is an officer found in the Somavaṃśī charters only. Scholars differ very well in their opinions regarding the interpretation of the above term. Debal Mitra277 interprets it as one, who canes the wicked while. B. Mishra278 accepts it as cruel cane holder or constable. But Sircar suggests that Pisuna was spy and Vetrika was a Watchman.279 A.P. Shaha suggests that the above two officers under Somavaṃśī administration excercised some police functions in connection with the realization of revenue or intimidation of the wicked. However, it is very difficult to say the jurisdiction of these officers in which they worked. Such officers are not found during the Bhauamkara period.

10. Avarodhajana

The term is only mentioned in the Somavaṃśī records only. This may be due to the matriarchial influence of the tribal people in Kośala. D.C. Sircar suggests that Avarodhajana meant the ladies of the harem who enjoyed higher status as officials and feudatories.280 Nothing more is known about them. Thus the above officials played important roles in the provincial administration under the
Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśis.

**District Administration**

It is an arduous task to make a clear distinction between Maṇḍala, Bhukti, and Viṣaya. Maṇḍalas are principalities (Provinces) but almost equal to districts in area. We find similar officials in the administration of the above territorial units under the Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśis. The Mahākośala Historical society charter of Mahābhavagupta mentions the name of officers in the Bhukti who are a kin to that of the viṣaya. Hence, it appears that Bhukti is administered in the same manner as a Maṇḍala and a Viṣaya. In the Somavamśi charters we find a panel of officials of the Maṇḍala, which are also seen in connection with the administration of Viṣaya. This indicates that a maṇḍala was also administered in the same manner as viṣaya. But maṇḍalika or Maṇḍalapati was the hereditary feudal Chief and paid allegiance to the king not to the provincial governor.

The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśi records refer to a number of officers who were attached to the administration of the district. The head of Viṣaya was called Viṣayapati. He was like a modern district collector and his main tasks were to look to the law and order situation and revenue collection. Viṣayapati had his office in the main
town of the district which was called Adhistāna as revealed from the Damodarpur plate inscriptions. During the Bhauma period, the power and prestige of Viṣayapati increased and as such he figured in the Bhauma plates among the officers of the province. He ranked with Ayuktaka Kumāramātyas and Uparikas. For the collection of revenue the Viṣayapati was assisted by the Samaharti and the Sannidhātri. The title of Bisoyi or Besoi used by certain class of people in present Orissa was probably a corrupt form of Viṣayapati.

Besides, the revenue officers, we find some other district Officers who carried on the district administration. The most prominent among them were the Chief Banker, Chief trader, Chief artisan and the Chief scribe, who worked successfully in co-operation with Mahāmahattara. The district administration that time was representative in charter. B. Das mentions that probably the district was governed by district board at that time, which consisted of Mahāmahattaras. Perhaps the mahāmahattaras helped the Viṣayapati in running the Administration of the district.

Sub-Divisional Administration

In the Somavamśī records we find a Viṣaya is divided in to a number of Khaṇḍas (Sub-divisions) equal to a modern sub-division and the head of the Sub-division was
called the Khandapati. But during the Bhauma age we donot come across with such territorial division. In the Bhauma records a Viṣaya is divided into number of Grāmas. This territorial feature was prevalent during Somavamśi age because the Somavamśi kingdom was bigger than the Bhaumakaras. For better administration the Somavamśi divided Viṣaya into Khaṇḍas. The functions of Khaṇḍapati were like those of the Viṣayapati. In the collection of revenue in a Khaṇḍa, the Khaṇḍapati was assisted by two important revenue officers such as Yuktadhikarika and the Niyuktadhikarika. According to Mirashi they were Sub-ordinate officers who came to be called as Adhikarikas. Later on Dr. H.K. Mehatab opines that the Ayutaka and Viniyuktaka the sub-ordinate revenue officers during the reign of Kalachuris can be equated with the Adhikarikas. The Yuktdhikarika appears to have been a treasury officer like the Yukta of Aśokan inscriptions. Niyuktadhikarika was, probably his assistant.

Village Administration

Under any government right from the ancient to the modern age the administration of the village is the pivot of the state administration. In all through the ages village administration existed in Orissa and it is the lowest administrative unit of the state hierarchy. Unfortunately we donot get any mention of village administration
in the Bhauma records. However, in the two zones of Bhauma kingdom such as Northern Tosāli and Southern Tosāli, so many gift villages have been mentioned. The Neulpur plate of Subhākara I issued in the year 54 (AD. 790) records the gift villages Komparaka, Dandaṅki and Yoka in Pañchala Viśaya in Uttara Toṣāli. The Dharākota plate of Subhākara III issued in the year 103 (AD 839) registers the gift village Gundajā in Jayakataκa Viśaya in Daksina Toṣāli. We find large number of villages under the rule of the Guptas and Harṣa. The village administration under Gupta rule was carried on by the Grāmika and Grāmyeka respectively. The Grāmika or Grāmapati was the village head man and was probably selected on the basis of hereditary rights, informed village opinion and approval of the government. Probably the Bhaumas followed the pattern of Gupta village administration in Orissa.

From the epigraphic records, it is learnt that, there were large number of villages in Orissa during the Somavamśī rule. Some times we find the name endings of the villages were as such padra padraka, Pātaka or Grāma. Epigraphic records of the period mention the names of the following villages - they were Nālipadra Vatapadraka, Sarkarāpātaka and Rishigrāma etc. Prithivīdeva I, claims that he was the ruling authority of 21000 villages.
From the above discussions we can conclude that large number of villages existed in Orissa during the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī rule. The villages were the real centres of social, and fiscal life in the rural society of Orissa. The importance of the village lies in the fact that every charter is addressed to the householders and the villagers (Pratimivāsi Kutumbi Jūnapatana) and often the charters recorded the pious intention of the donor for the welfare and happiness of the villagers (Sukhena Pratī vastavyamiti). But unfortunately the charters do not focus much light on the officials and administration of the period under study.

Grāmika or Grāmapati (village headman) occupied the key position in the village administration. During the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī period the village head man was Mahāmahāttama or Mahāttama under whose direction and supervision the administration was carried on. During the Somavamśī rule, it is seen that Mahāmahāttamā was acting as the Liasion officer, of ministerial rank and regulated the relation between the centre and the village headman. Śrī Sādhārana, before he assumed the charge of Chief Minister, was the Mahāmahāttamā. From the epigraphy of the period it appears that this officer was incharge of defence of the village and protection of the people from anti-social elements. Besides this, his duties were to maintain law and order to collect revenue.
and to keep records relating to assessment, sale and transfer etc. of land. In addition to this, the village headman had to promulgate royal edicts and to preside over the village councils.

Thus the village headman played a conspicuous role in the village administration for which the kings made it a point to appoint Dutākas\(^\text{310}\) to convey the royal order concerning land grant to the village headman.

To lighten the heavy burden of administration, the village headman was to be assisted by a number of subordinates. In the matters of revenue collection during the Bhauma age, he was assisted by Mahāttaras or elders. And during Somavamśī age an officer designated Sashthigavura\(^\text{311}\) who is mentioned in the charger of Kumāra someśvara, helped the headman of the village in revenue matters. For keeping watch and ward in the village the Mahāttama appears to have been assisted by the pratihāras.\(^\text{312}\)

Another officer who was in charge of accounts and records of the village was called Pustakapāla\(^\text{313}\) during the Bhauma age and Karana or Karanika\(^\text{314}\) during the Somavamśī age.

It seems as if the village administration of Orissa during the period of our review, was carried on in accordance with Śukraniti\(^\text{315}\) which contains the post of six village officers viz- Sahasādhipati (Magistrate) Bhagahara (revenue collector), Śulkagrāha (tax collector) Pratihāra (gatekeeper) headman and the Accountant.
The most important feature of village administration during the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamsi rule as the autonomous village council which was composed of prominent personalities like the Mahāttaras\textsuperscript{316} or elders and Pradānā Prativasina\textsuperscript{317}. The village council was the most powerful body of local administration. The main function of the village council was to settle disputes of the village and to look after the works of public utility and other needs of the village community. We are at a fix, if there was an elected executive council in those days when the election attached to it was fast vanishing from the body politic of the kingdom. The village head man was at the apex of the council and was perhaps consulting the village elders on important matters of village administration. Probably the title Nāyak which is still current in Orissa was the village head man. The functions of rājavallabha, rājputra and bhogijana cannot be determined. They are regarded as the favourites of the king, younger son of the king and village headman respectively.\textsuperscript{318}

**Judicial Administration**

We do not find any direct evidence to the existence of judiciary in the records of the Bhauma-karas and the
Somavamśīs. In the long list of officials found in the records, no official is known to have acted as the justice of either of the provinces or of the districts. But the accepted meaning and functions of some of the officials mentioned in those records would show that there was no separate department of justice under the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī, administration. Probably the idea of independent judiciary and separation of powers in the modern sense of the term did not evolve. Executive and Judicial powers were combined under single authority. As stated earlier the king was probably enjoying the highest status of Judicial authority and was dispensing with justice to the people. The king was the fountain of justice and the final court of appeal. The inscriptions of the period would suggest that the kings were guided by the Smṛti Sāstras with regard to the administration of justice. As such they must have been giving proper justice to the people in matters of legal disputes.

The Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśīs were the masters of big kingdoms and certainly it would have been impossible on their part to dispense with justice to all the people living in the state. The king must have delegated judicial power to the princes of royal blood to act as highest judicial authority in the provinces where they had to act as governors. Similarly the authorities like the
Mandalika or Mandalādhipati, Viṣayapati, Khaṇḍapati and Mahāmahāttama who were executive authorities of the territorial units, must have yielded judicial powers in their respective jurisdictions. Other officials connected with department of justice were Dandapāsika, Chāṭṭa and Bhāṭṭa and pisuña-vetrika who probably had something to do with the dispensation of justice to the subjects.

Military Administration

In all the ages under any government the army has been an important and indispensable institution of the state. The medieval age was no exception to it. Protection and preservation of territorial integrity largely depended on the strength of army. As such the Bhauma-karas and the Somavamśi rulers maintained strong and efficient military establishments and devoted special attention towards it which largely accounted for the success of imperial expansion during the period under study.

Even though the Bhauma-plates do not give any account of military strength, we know from the Hudūd-al-Alum, which describes that "Dahuma (Bhauma) does not consider any one superior to himself and is said to have an army of 30,00,000 men." It is further supported by the Dhenkanal plate of Tribhuvanamahādevī I which states that the rulers of the dynasty possessed a strong army. From this we
can form an idea of the strength of the Bhauma infantry.

The Bhaumas maintained a grand army which was composed of infantry, elephantry and cavalry, we do not find references to charioteers in the records of this dynasty. The Bhauma increased their military strength as they had to face two challenges— the Somavaṃśi in the west and the eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga in the South.

The Somavaṃśi were no way inferior to the Bhaumas in the point of military strength. The inscriptions of the period states that the Somavaṃśi kings themselves were great warriors and were head of army. Their army was also grand and powerful and was composed of infantry, elephantry and cavalry.

The army was an indispensable institution of the state in the Bhauma-kara and the Somavaṃśi rule. Probably the army rendered multiple services both in the time of war and peace. The Mahāsandhivigranis (Minister of peace and war) and the Sandhivigrahikas, their sub-ordinates, as we have stated earlier, rendered great military service to the Kings, in addition to other services. Most probably there was no division of the civil and military-jurisdictions. Because the Sandhi-Vigrahikas also played an important role in respect of the preparation of copper plate charters. They were expected to have the heavy burden of the state affairs.
Besides, Sandhivigrahika, we know few designations of the military officers of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśī kingdoms. The copper plates of Dharma Mahādevī and Vakula Mahādevi mention the designations of two military officers viz- the Valadhi and Samavali, who were very efficient military officers. The word Vala denotes army and therefore valadhi means the officer in charge of armed forces stationed in border areas. The Pratihāra records accepted the above military designation in the same sense. Samavali was the Chief Cavalry officer.

The Bhauma-kara and the Somavamśīs also maintain standing army to meet the immediate challenge of the enemy. They were drawing regular pay from the royal treasury. There were also some hired soldiers who were appointed to meet the special need of the time. The Chāṭṭas and Bhāṭṭas, which are regular and irregular soldiers mentioned in the charters, belong to the above category. The irregular troops constituted the local military militia. The Chāṭṭas and Bhāṭṭas performed police duties during peace time and military duties in war time. The feudatories also besides ruling over their own territory were expected to help the king alongwith their armies during war time.
Thus the military department was the vital point of administration. The Bhauma-karas and the Somavamšis devoted their energy and resources for the improvement and efficiency of the army. The well-organised army accounted for the great success of the Bhauma-kara and the Somavamši kings.

Thus the Bhauma-karas and the Somavamši rulers brought salutary changes in all conceivable branches of administration of Orissa. Their administration was more elaborate and systematic than the Šailodbhavas who preceded them. The medieval administration under these two royal dynasties made enduring contributions to the Orissan polity.
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