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NATURE OF POLITY UNDER THE VAKATAKAS

The Vakatakas as they styled in their inscriptions and known to modern historians or Vindhyakas as they are called in the Puranas geographically played a very important role in the political history of the Deccan and Central India in particular and that of India as a whole in general. The original centre of the Vakataka power layed in the Vindhyan region of Madhya Pradesh to the north of Narmada as is evident from a study of Puranic evidence.¹ From where they moved southward to Vidarbha and other regions of Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka and exercised considerable influence over wide areas of the Deccan.

Like their Gupta contemporaries, Vakataka polity had an important place for allies and feudatories. But one element that characterized their polity was strict control or authority. There is evidence showing that Vakataka rulers exercised rigid control over their feudatories and administration. In these pages all these facts are dealt

with in detail, along with a brief description of early history of the Vakatakas.

**Early History**

The Puranas provide several indications to the fact that Vakataka originated in the Vindhyan region. Firstly, Vindhyasakti, the name of the founder of the family, signified one whose strength lay in the Vindhyas. Secondly, the Puranas describe the family of Vindhyasakti as *Vindhyaka* or ‘belonging to the Vindhyan region’, immediately after referring to the reign of the four sons of Pravira i.e Pravarasena I, the son of Vindhyasakti.² The use of the term *Vindhyaka* for the Vakatakas closely resembles the mention of the Satavahanas as *Andharas* or *Andhrajatiyas* in the Puranas.³ Just as the dynasty of the Satavahanas is called as such in the inscriptions and as Andhra or *Andhrajatiya* in the Puranas, the Vakatakas are called as such in the inscriptions and as Vindhyakas in the Puranas. Like Satavahana, Vakataka was evidently the family or dynastic name, while Vindhyaka referred to the area where

---

² DKA, p.50; The Puranas refer to the second Vakataka king as Pravira while all the official records of the Vakatakas mention him invariably as Pravarasena. Pravarasena was his coronation name and Pravira his personal name., *The Age of the Vakatakas*, ed., Ajay Mitra Shastri, New Delhi, 1992, pp.13-14.

³ DKA, pp.35-43.
they had their original habitat and continued to rule for some initial
generations.\(^4\)

The location of the early capital of the Vakatakas seems to have
been in the town of Kanchanaka. It is clearly referred to in the Puranas
as the centre of authority of Pravira or Pravarasena I. Their dynastic
sections inform us that he ruled from the city of Kanchanaka for six
decades, *Vindhyasakti-sutas ch=api Praviro nama viryavan bhokshyate
cha samah shashtim purim kanchanakam cha vai.*\(^5\)

According to Ajay Mitra Shastri both the ka-s in Kanchanaka,
initial and concluding, got dropped in course of time and the remainder,
nchana, got transformed into Nachna which was equated by K.P.
Jayaswal long back with the modern village of Nachna or Nachna-ki-
talai in the Panna district of the Bundelkhand division of Madhya
Pradesh.\(^6\) His suggestion has been fully endorsed by Ajay Mitra Shastri
for it seems to satisfy all the conditions of identification. It is situated in
the Vindhyayan region and known to have been an antiquarian site. A
number of early monuments including a couple of early Vakataka lithic
records and an early Gupta-Vakataka temple standing here a quite well

\(^4\) AV, p.12.
\(^5\) DKA, p.50, 73.
f.no.39; HI, p.16, f.no.3,p.70.
known. These facts fit well with the view that the Vindhyan tract including a major portion of the Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh formed part of Vakataka dominion during the days of Pravarasena I. However, it seems that later on when the gravity of Vakataka power shifted southward due to Gupta pressure or occupation of their original cradle land by Samudragupta, the Vakatakas found themselves compelled to shift their capital somewhere in the Vidarbha region. According to Ajay Mitra Shastri, the first such capital must have been Padmapura followed by Nandivardhana and Pravarapura.

As stated above Vindhyasakti I laid the foundation of the Vakataka power. Vakataka inscriptions provide a general description of his military successes suggesting that he was constantly engaged in military activities, but giving no specific reference to the enemies defeated by him. Vindhyasakti I may be assigned a reign of twenty five years viz. c.A.D.250-275. After him Vakataka kingdom was developed in to an empire by his able son and successor Pravarasena I (c.A.D. 275-335) who led to the extension of the Vakataka power towards south to Vidarbha. He supplanted the Andhra-Satavahanas around the close of
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7 AV, p.9; VSH, p.156.
8 Ibid, p.222.
the third century A.D.\textsuperscript{10} These achievements of Pravarasena I were fairly remarkable and justified the assumption of the title of \textit{Samrat} or emperor by him (which is used only for him among the Vakatakas).\textsuperscript{11} From the position of the king of a petty kingdom in Vindhya region he rose to be the ruler of a big empire which included all the territory from Bundelkhand-Baghelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh to the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra including all the intervening region of Madhya Pradesh.\textsuperscript{12}

Puranic account indicates a division of Pravarasena I empire amongst his four sons. It can not be determined certainly because the Puranas only state that four sons of Pravira (Pravarasena I) would become (became) kings,\textsuperscript{13} without giving further details. However, epigraphical records of the family testify to the division of Pravarasena I’s empire at least in to two parts: The first and foremost under the descendants of his son Gautamiputra ruling at first from Nandivardhana and later from Pravarapura. Both are located in the Nagpur and Wardha

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Both branches of the Vakatakas refer to Pravarasena I as \textit{Samrat} in their inscriptions e.g. \textit{Jamb plates of Pravarasena II, CII}, V. L.3,p.12; \textit{Basim Plates of Vindhyasakti II, year 37}, Ibid, L.2-3, p.96.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} \textit{VSH}, p.170.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{DKA}, p.50.
\end{itemize}
districts of Maharashtra, and second under his another son Sarvasena and his successors which had Vatsagulma as its capital identified with Washim in the Akola district of Maharashtra. These two branches are generally called Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch or main branch and Vatsagulma branch respectively. Genealogy and chronology of both the Vakataka branches are generally established by the scholars as under:

**Genealogy and Chronology of the Vakatakas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Genealogy and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vindhyasakti I</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 250-275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravira alias Pravarasena I</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 275-335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautamiputra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena I</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 335-355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithivishena I</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 355-385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena II</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 385-395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yuvaraja)Divakarasena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 395-410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damodarsena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 410-420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravarasena II</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 420-455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvasena I</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 325-355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindhyasakti II alias Vindhyasena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 355-400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravarasena II</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 400-425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvasena II</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 425-455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devasena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 455-480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harishena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 480-510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendrasena</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 455-480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithivishena II</td>
<td>(c.A.D. 480-500/505)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


15 Ibid, p.223.

On the basis of the above genealogical and chronological table the period of the Vakataka authority may be placed between mid-third century and close of the fifth century A.D. During this long period of about two and a half centuries Vakatakas provided peace and prosperity to the Deccan, and in terms of political power for sometime they were next only to the imperial Guptas.

Vakataka allies

The Vakataka rulers seem to be well aware of the political advantage of the matrimonial alliances which played an important role in strengthening their position. They established close relationship by contracting alliances with the Nagas of Padmavati, the imperial Guptas, the Kadambas of Karnataka and the Vishnukundins of Andhra Pradesh.

Vakataka matrimonial alliance with the Bharasiva Nagas of Padmavati who were very powerful in central India was contracted by Pravarasena I. His son Gautamiputra was married to the daughter of the Naga king Bhavanaga, whose family is said to have been created by god Siva who was pleased with them because of their carrying his phallus (Siva-linga) on their shoulders, to have been anointed with the pure waters of the river Bhagirathi obtained by their own valour and taken sacred ablution after performing ten asvamedhas.\(^{17}\) This matrimonial alliance...

\(^{17}\) \textit{CII}, V, L.4-7, p.12.
alliance was of momentous importance and appears to have played a
significant role in strengthening the Vakataka power and prestige and is
invariably mentioned with a sense of pride in all the official records of
the Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch. The records refer to Rudrasena
I, grandson and successor of Pravarasena I and son of Gautamiputra and
his Naga wife, as, *Bharasivanam Maharaja Sri Bhavanagadauhitra* (the
daughter's son of the illustrious Bhavanaga, the *Maharaja* of the
Bharasivas), in their genealogical portions.

It is generally believed that in the Indian dynastic genealogies the
maternal grandfather of a king is introduced only when he (the maternal
grand father) is known to have been a distinguished ruler, or when he
happens to have afforded considerable help to his grand son at a crucial
period, or when his kingdom happens to be inherited by his daughter’s
son. Ajay Mitra Shastri is of the opinion that ‘In the Vakataka records
*Dauhitra* is employed most probably as a technical term as in
*Lichchhavi-dauhitra* employed in referring to the Gupta emperor
Samudragupta who inherited the joint Gupta-Lichchhavi kingdom which
made substantial accretion to his power and dominion.’ According to
him Bharasiva Naga king Bhavanaga had perhaps no male issue and
therefore his daughter’s son from Gautamiputra, viz. Rudrasena I was to
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18 Ibid, L.7,p.12,14.
succeed him in his kingdom of Padmavati in addition to his own share of the Vakataka kingdom.\textsuperscript{19}

The most important alliance of this period was undoubtedly the Vakataka-Gupta matrimonial alliance which was contracted between Vakataka king Prithivishena I of the Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch and Chandragupta II Vikramaditya of imperial Gupta dynasty. Vakataka crown prince Rudrasena II, son of Prithivishena I married Prabhavatigupta, daughter of Chandragupta II, born of the Naga princes Kuberanaga. This event was of momentous importance and referred to with pride in all the subsequent official records of this Vakataka branch.\textsuperscript{20} It is generally believed that this marriage had a political motive behind it. Chandragupta II wanted to facilitate his contemplated conquest of Gujarat and Kathiawar by ensuring the presence of a friendly power on his southern flank, which might afford help at least to his commissariat and supplies, even if not with direct military aid.\textsuperscript{21} But according to S.R. Goyal and Ajay Mitra Shastri, the marriage of Prabhavatigupta with Rudrasena II took place most probably sometime between A.D. 375 and 380 and Saka Kshatrapa kingdom of Gujarat was

\textsuperscript{19} VSH, p.175. In the period of Samudragupta Padmavati was ruling by Nagasena who was ousted by the former. Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. CII. III, L.21, p.213; D.R. Bhandarkar, IHQ. I, pp.255-256.
\textsuperscript{21} VGA, pp.101-102; EHDY, p.174; PHAI, pp.554-555.
conquered by Chandragupta II probably towards the close of the first
decade of the fifth century A.D. (about A.D. 409). Thus, these two
events were separated from each other by about 30 years; in no case by
less than two decades and there was no casual relationship between the
Vakataka–Gupta matrimonial alliance and the Saka war of
Chandragupta II.  

The real advantage of this alliance was derived by the Gupta
empire, specially after the death of Rudrasena II, son-in-law of
Chandragupta II. He seems to have expired soon after his fifth regnal
year, i.e., in c.A.D.395. His death was a personal loss to
Prabhavatigupta and Chandragupta II but a political gain to the Gupta
empire. Prabhavati carried on the administration of the Vakataka state
for about two decades as the regent of her three minor sons, one after
another. During this period the influence of the Guptas on the Vakataka
court increased, exact nature and extent of which is difficult to
determine but most probably Chandragupta II had sent a number of his
trusted officers and statesmen to assist his daughter in governing her
kingdom.

---

23 A copper plate charter issued by him has been found at Mandhal in the Nagpur
district which was issued in his fifth regnal year, *AV*, pp.227-230.
24 *CII*, V, p. XXIV; *EHDY*, p.175; IG, p.303.
The Gupta influence on the Vakatakas is also indicated by the fact that in her copper plate grants Prabhavatigupta got her parental genealogy recorded instead of her husband’s and by her retention of her parental gotra (Dharana) as against the common practice of the wife changing over to her husband’s after the marriage. In this connection the fragmentary Ramtek Prabhavatigupta Memorial Stone inscription which was put up after the death of Prabhavatigupta and in the reign of Pravarasena II disposes interesting evidence. In this inscription high praise is lavished on not only Chandragupta II but also on his son Ghatotkachagupta. Chandragupta II is described as ‘devadeva’-‘god of gods’ and tri-samudra-natha- the lord of the three oceans while Ghatotkachagupta is mentioned as raja-raja-sovereign overlord. The employment of the title tri-samudra-natha for Chandragupta II in this inscription seems to indicate that at the time of its composition he was regarded, at least theoretically as the overlord of a considerable part of the South Indian peninsula. “This claim becomes all the more significant as it is met with in the inscription of another dynasty. Historically speaking, it is indicative of the tremendous influence verging on political hegemony wielded by Chandragupta II over a large part of the

---

26 AV, pp. 253-257.
27 Ibid.
Deccan during the regency of his daughter Prabhavatigupta covering the minority of her son Divakarsena and the reigns of Damodarasena and Pravarasena II.\(^{28}\)

The relations between the Guptas and the Vakatakas continued to be friendly till the very end of this branch of Vakataka dynasty. This is inferable from the continuation of the reference in glowing terms to the marriage of Prabhavatigupta with Rudrasena II in the copper plate grants of Prithivishena II, the last known king of this branch.\(^{29}\)

Epigraphical references indicate the friendly relationship between the Vakataka of Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch and Kadambas. The copper plates of Prithivishena II mention him as the son of Vakataka king Narendrasena, born of his queen Ajjhitabhattarika, the daughter of the lord of Kuntala.\(^{30}\) Here the king of Kuntala is generally identified with the Kadamba ruler Kakutsthavarman of Vanavasi (Uttarakannada district, Karnataka)\(^{31}\) because, firstly, Kuntala was known to have been the region ruled by the Kadambas and secondly, the well known \textit{Talagunda pillar inscription} of Kadamba Kakutsthavarman avers that

\(^{28}\) Ibid.


\(^{30}\) Ibid.

he gave his daughters in marriage to the Guptas and other kings. It is suggested that looking to the friendly Vakataka-Gupta relations that persisted all through it is quite likely that he (Kakutsthavarman) had his daughters married to the Vakataka kings as well. According to A.S. Altekar, this marriage must have established an *entente cordiale* among the Kadambas, the Vakatakas, and the Guptas."

The Vakataka-Kadamba relationship took a new turn in the later period. The influence of the Vakataka Vatsagulma branch on the Kadambas grew when the Kadamba kingdom was divided into two branches. Under Kakutsthavarman's two sons, viz. Santivarman and Krishnavarman. It is evident from the *Mudigere copper plate grant* of the fifth regnal year of the Kadamba king Simhavarman, son of Vishnuvarman and grandson of Krishnavarman. In this grant Simhavarman is bestowed with high conventional praise and is said to have been consecrated or crowned by king Sarvasena: "*Tad=anu-Sarvvasena-maharajena-murddh-abhishekenabhyar-chchitah*" Sarvasena is identified with the Vakataka king Sarvasena II of the Vatsagulma branch whose name has come to light from the *Bidar*

---

32 *EI*, VIII, p.33.
36 *VSH*, p.199.
copper plates of his son Devasena\textsuperscript{37} and from the \textit{Thalner copper plates} of his grandson Harishena.\textsuperscript{38} The description that Kadamba ruler Simhavarman felt honoured by being coronated at the hands of Sarvasena is indicative of the high esteem in which the former held the latter. If the statement properly interpreted, it would mean that Simhavarman regarded himself as a subordinate ally, if not a vassal of the Vakataka king Sarvasena II. In this connection it is noteworthy that the earliest date suggested for Simhavarman is c.A.D. 490\textsuperscript{39} and Vakataka Sarvasena II came to throne about A.D.425 and his rule must have come to a close before Saka year 380/A.D. 458, the known date of his son Devasena’s reign which comes from the \textit{Hisse-Borala stone-slab inscription}.\textsuperscript{40} Thus, there is a long gap of about thirty five years between the latest date for Sarvasena II and the earliest suggested date of Kadamba Simhavarman. In this regard Ajay Mitra Shastri suggests, “There is absolutely no certainty regarding the dates of individual Kadamba rulers as their inscriptions are all dated only in the years of individual reigns as most of the Vakataka records are. And this is the only known Sarvasena who could be a contemporary or near

\textsuperscript{37} JESI, XIII, pp.71-75.
\textsuperscript{38} AL, pp.251-253.
\textsuperscript{39} CJI, p.XXX.
\textsuperscript{40} EI, XXXVII, part I, Delhi, 1967, pp.1-4; G.S. Gai, S.Sankaranarayanan, Note on the date of Hisse-Borala inscription of the time of Vakataka Devasena, Ibid, pp.5-8.
contemporary of the Kadamba king Simhavarman and should consequently be identified with the Sarvasena mentioned in his only known record. This would indeed involve antedating the commencement of the reign of Simhavarman by a little over three decades which should not be difficult in view of the purely tentative nature of Kadamba chronology.”

Sarvasena II’s son Devasena entered into a new matrimonial alliance when he married his daughter to the most powerful Vishnukundin king Madhavavarman II Janasraya, whose son Vikramendravarman I is said to have adorned the twin families of the Vakatakas and the Vishnukundins by his birth. This relationship appears to have played an important role after Vakataka power ceased to exist.

**Feudatories**

There is very little information available regarding the feudatories of the Vakatakas. Grand eulogies like the *Allahabad Pillar inscription* of Samudragupta and copper plate grants like those issued by various feudatories of the Gupta empire are absent here. Whatever material is available is of incomplete nature on the basis of which it is very difficult
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41 *VSH*, pp. 199-200, 229-230.
to establish the exact position of the feudatories in the Vakataka polity. Insufficient information has given rise to the controversies among the scholars. And this is the very cause that till this date the identity of Vyaghradeva of Nachna-ki-talai and Ganj inscriptions and that of his Vakataka overlord and the true nature of the Vakataka Prithivishena II’s claims on behalf of his father could not have conclusively settled. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to ascertain the correct position in these matters on the basis of available data.

Nachna-ki-talai and Ganj inscriptions (Panna district Madhya Pradesh) of Vyaghradeva refer to some pious act made by him at this place for the religious merit of his parents. This unnamed activity seems to be the creation of a reservoir. The inscriptions describe Vyaghradeva as meditating upon the feet of Prithivishena, the Maharaja of the Vakatakas. Even though he is not clearly described so, scholars have generally taken him to be a feudatory of the said Vakataka king. However, there is a great controversy regarding the identification of Vyaghradeva himself and of his overlord Vakataka king Prithivishena because there were two kings of this name in the Vakataka dynasty and

---

43 Flect, CII, III, pp. 233-235; EI, XVII, pp.13-14. There is two inscriptions at Nachna-ki-talai, one is incomplete.

44 "वाकाटकानां महाराजं श्र (कर) पुर्वविवेकेनायक(ब)नुसरातो व्याप्देवो". Ibid.
both were the members of Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch. They are designated as Prithivishena I and II.

Paleography is sometimes used as a means of fixing the dates of individual records and correspondingly those of the rulers referred to in them. But as indicated by a comparison of paleographical arguments of D.C. Sircar and V.V. Mirashi, on paleographical considerations the inscriptions in question can not be assigned definitely to any of the two kings. K.P. Jayaswal, H.C. Raychaudhari, A.S. Altekar, and Ajay Mitra Shastri are inclined to identify Prithivishena with the first king of this name, while J.Dubreuil, K.N. Dikshit, V.V. Mirashi and S.R. Goyal favoured the second king. V.V. Mirashi proposes to identify Vyaghradeva of these inscriptions with Maharaja Vyaghra, the father of the Uchchakalpa Maharaja Jayanatha mentioned in the genealogical portions of the copper plate grants of the family. He seems to have ruled almost contemporaneously with Prithivishena II. According to Mirashi as the Uchchakalpa king Jayanatha is known to have been ruling in the G. years 174 and 177, his reign may be taken to have

45 *CA*, III, p.179, f.no.1. Here D.C.Sircar favours the attribution of Nachna and Ganj inscriptions to Vakataka Prithivishena I ; *Sel. Ins.*, I, p.456, f.no.1. He has changed his views and has attributed said inscriptions to the Vakataka Prithivishena II.
46 *CII*, V, pp.89-90.
47 *HI*, p.73; *PHAI*, p. 478; *VGA*, p. 101; *EHDY*, p. 173; *VSH*, pp.38-65.
49 *CII*, V, p.91; for the inscriptions of Uchchakalpa Maharajas see Fleet. *CII*, III, pp.117-139.
extended from A.D. 490 onwards and the reign of his father Maharaja Vyaghra may be placed immediately prior to it i.e. in c.A.D. 470-490 and this Vyaghra was the feudatory of Vakataka Prithivishena II whose reign he assignes as c.A.D. 470-490. He takes the Nachna and Ganj inscriptions as the evidence of the expansion of the Vakataka kingdom into the Bundelkhand region during the time of Prithivishena II.\textsuperscript{50}

However, the well known Puranic evidence and new epigraphical discoveries suggest that the Vakataka king Prithivishena of Nachna and Ganj inscriptions could be only Prithivishena I. As described above, according to the Puranic account the original home of the Vakatakas lay in the Vindhyan region (Bundelkhand-Baghelkhand) and Pravira (Pravarasena I) ruled over the city of Kanchanaka which is identified with modern Nachna\textsuperscript{51} and from where two of the present records has been found. Even though Pravarasena I had expanded his kingdom southward so as to include the Vidarbha and other adjoining regions, he continued to have his capital at Kanchanaka or Nachna and so did his grandson and successor Rudrasena I and latter’s son and successor Prithivishena I for at least the earlier part of his reign.\textsuperscript{52} Prithivishena’s hold over the Vindhyan region which had already slackened due to the

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{CII.} V, pp XXVII-XXVIII.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{DKA,} p.50,73; \textit{HI,} p.16, f.no.3, p.70; \textit{AV,} p.9.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, pp.11-12.
shifting of the focus further south in Vidarbha as well as because of the
decline of the Bharasiva Naga power in Central India, only put to an end
by the mounting pressure of the mighty Gupta emperor Samudragupta
whose Eran (Sagar district Madhya Pradesh) inscription\textsuperscript{53} shows that he
had extended his direct rule over this region. Since then Bundelkhand-
Baghelkhand region remained under the Gupta, not Vakataka, suzerainty
for quite a long period (to be precise at least upto A.D. 528), and this is
proved by \textit{Eran stone pillar inscription} of Budhagupta of the G. year
165/A.D. 484-485\textsuperscript{54}, by the Shankarpur (Siddhi district Madhya
Pradesh) copper plate grant of Maukhari \textit{Maharaja} Harivarman\textsuperscript{55} who
ruled over this region as a feudatory of the Gupta emperor Budhagupta
in A.D. 487-88, and by the inscriptions of the Parivrajaka Maharajas
whose kingdom situated to the west of the Uchchakalpa dominion and
who explicitly acknowledged the suzerainty of the Guptas upto the
G. year 209/A.D. 528.\textsuperscript{56} In view of these facts, the suggestion that the
Vakatakas succeeded in extending their power over the Bundelkhand-
Baghelkhand region in the period of Prithivishena II has to be taken as a

\textsuperscript{53} CII, III, pp.222-224.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, pp.340-341.
\textsuperscript{55} Thapalyal, Appen., pp. 156-157.
\textsuperscript{56} Khoh copper plate grant of Parivrajaka Maharaja Samkshobha, \textit{G.Year 209},
wrong observation and thus, it is conclusively established that the Nachna and Ganj inscriptions may not be attributed to him.

Let us now throw light on some arguments against the theory identifying Vyaghradeva of these inscriptions with Vyaghra of Uchchakalpa kingdom. Firstly, the inscriptions under review give the name of the supposed feudatory of the Vakataka Maharaja Prithivishena as just Vyaghradeva without any regal title, whereas the Uchchakalpa grants refer to the father of Maharaja Jayanatha as Vyaghra, (not Vyaghradeva) and his name is preceded by the feudal title Maharaja. Secondly, and this is very important, the Uchchakalpa records nowhere indicate that they were the feudatories of the Vakatakas in the time of Maharaja Vyaghra. Thirdly, as their Parivarjaka neighbours were the feudatories of the imperial Guptas, Uchchakalpas must have also owned, as a matter of geopolitical, if not anything else, compulsion, the Gupta suzerainty, even though their records are reticent on this point. This argument can be supported by the fact that they used Gupta era for dating their records which indicates that they acknowledged the suzerainty of the imperial Guptas in a general way.

57 Karaitalai copper plate grant of the Uchchakalpa Maharaja Javanatha, G. year 174. Fleet, CII, III, L.4, p.118.
58 VSH, pp.57-58.]
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Now the question arises, who was this Vyaghradeva. If he was feudatory of the Vakataka Prithivishena I, it is likely that his rule was brought to an end and he was included among the rulers of Aryavarta extirpated by Samudragupta and alluded to among the numerous other (ady-aneka)\(^6\) kings besides those named specifically in Allahabad Pillar inscription. It is equally likely that he was an important /ordinary state official, and not a vassal of Prithivishena, as generally assumed by scholars.\(^6\)

The states of Kosala (South Kosala, roughly corresponds to the districts Raipur, Bilaspur in Chhattisgadh and a part of district Sambhalpur in Orissa), Mekala (Amarkantak region, Chhattisgadh) and Malava (Malwa, Madhya Pradesh) were till recently regarded as the feudatory states of the Vakataka kingdom. This assumption was based on the acceptance of the claim made in the three copper plate grants of Vakataka Maharaja Prithivishena II. In these charters Prithivishena II’s father Narendrasena has been described as a ruler, whose commands were obeyed by the lords of Kosala, Mekala and Malava.\(^6\) On the basis of this statement S.R. Goyal puts forward the theory that “sometime in

\(^{60}\) CII, III, L.21,p.213.  
\(^{61}\) VSH, p.57, 64.  
\(^{62}\) कोसलमेकतालामलाविषिपति [शि] रामवितासानस्य प्रतापप्रणालारिति [शि] [शि] सनस्य वाक्राधानां महाराजांशि [शि] नवेन्द्रसेनि. Mandhal plates year 10, AV, p. 243; Mahurzari plates, ABORI, LIII, p.193; Balaghat plates, CII, V, p.81.
the middle of the fifth century A.D. the ruler of Mekala transferred his allegiance from the Guptas to the Vakatakas............this must have happened either towards the close of the reign of Kumaragupta-I or in the early years of the reign of Skandagupta. It appears that as a reaction against the aggressive policy of the Guptas, which led to the occupation of the Vakataka capital Nandivardhana by Bhavadattavarman, the Nala ally of the Guptas, the Vakataka ruler Narendrasena, soon after recovering the lost ground, launched an offensive against the Guptas when their empire was passing through a grave crisis.63 (viz. the Huna invasion).

The claim made in Prithivishena II’s charters in regard of Mekala was sought to be supported by Bamhani copper plate grant which was believed to belong to Bharatabala alias Indra64, the Pandava ruler of Mekala. B.C. Chhabra approximately equated the second year of his rule to A.D. 46065. The word narendra in verse 11 of this charter was taken to make a veiled allusion to the Vakataka king Narendrasena and it was

63 HVGR, p.110. According to S.R.Goyal Nala king Bhavadattavarman who invaded Vakataka kingdom in the period of Narendrasena was a Gupta ally Ibid, p.108. Bhavadattavarman is known from his Riddhapur plates which were issued from Nandivardhana, the earlier Vakataka capital EI, XIX, pp.100-104.
64 EI, XXVIII, pp.132-145; CII, V, pp.82-88.
65 EI, XXVII, p.138.
suggested that the verse aimed at describing by double *entendre* the contemporary Pandava king as a feudatory of Narendrasena. 66

This assumption has been proved to be erroneous by the *Mallar copper plate grant* of Bharatabala’s son and successor Surabala Udimavaira. 67 It has been established now that the *Bamhani plates* also belong to Surabala Udimavaira and not to his father Bharatabala. The *Mallar plates* have a short prose passage introducing Surabala, which has been left out by inadvertence in the *Bamhani plates* which are otherwise generally identical. The prose passage is, *tasyaputras=tat-pad-anudhyatahparama-mahesvarah parama-brahmanyah paramaguru-devat-adhid-aivata-viseshah srimatyam Mahadevyam=utpannah sri-maharaja-Surabalah.* 68 In addition to it the Mallar plates also contain the word *narendra* just after the name of the issuer of the grant viz. Surabala Udimavaira which leaves no doubt that the word has to be taken only in the sense of ‘king’ and it is employed only as an adjective of Surabala. 69 The same stanza also speaks of feudal chiefs falling at the feet of Udimavaira which clearly indicates that Udimavaira, the issuer of both the copper plate grants, regarded himself

---

as a paramount ruler with a number of feudatory chiefs acknowledging his sovereignty.\(^{70}\)

The date of Bamhani and Mallar plates has been fixed as about the beginning of the seventh century A.D.\(^{71}\) on the basis of the historical facts provided by these plates which shows that Bharatabala and his son Surabala Udirmavaira flourished considerably after the end of the Vakatakas and that consequently there could be absolutely no question of the two being connected in any manner.

As far as Kosala is concerned, in any case we have no evidence of Vakataka influence in that region. It is well known that the area was conquered by Samudragupta about the middle of the fourth century A.D. when it was under the rule of certain Mahendra.\(^{72}\) The continuation of the Gupta overlordship over this region can be proved by some important evidences. Sarabha, the first member of the Sarabhapuriya dynasty of South Kosala is regarded as a Gupta feudatory and is generally identified with Sarabharaja, the maternal grandfather of Gupta king Bhanugupta’s contemporary Goparaja who according to *Eran stone memorial inscription* died in battle at Eran in A.D. 510\(^{73}\) Sarabha’s rule is accordingly placed in the last quarter of the fifth century A.D. and the

---

\(^{70}\) Ibid. p.124.

\(^{71}\) Ibid, pp.125-127; *VSH*, appen .III, pp.82-83.

\(^{72}\) *CIH*, III, L.19, p.212.

\(^{73}\) Ibid, p.353; for the identification of Sarabha see *ISPS*, part-I, pp. 104-107.
Gupta emperor Budhagupta who was on the throne at that time was obviously his overlord. Sarabha’s son Narendra (c.A.D. 500-525)\textsuperscript{74}, as indicated by his Kurud copper plate grant\textsuperscript{75} continued to acknowledge the supremacy of the Imperial Guptas till at least the twenty fourth year of his reign. This grant was a renewal of an earlier one written on palmyra-leaf that had been granted to the present donee’s father by the Paramabhattaraka-pada while taking the ceremonial bath in the waters of the Ganga (apparently referring to the Gupta emperor, the well known Paramabhattarakas of their times, staying at the capital city of Pataliputra lying on the Ganga) when it was reported to Narendra that the leaf charter had been burnt in the conflagration in the house of the donee.\textsuperscript{76} It is interesting to note that the plates refer to his Gupta overlord in a respectful manner as Paramabhattaraka-pada while Narendra himself is given the comparatively simple title Maharaja and the grant was renewed by him not for the increase of his own merit but that of his overlord.\textsuperscript{77} Thus, the region of South Kosala was under Gupta suzerainty till at least A.D. 524.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, p.110.
\textsuperscript{75} EI, XXXI, pp.263-266; D.C. Sircar, A Note of Kurud plates of Narendra, year 24. Ibid, pp.267-68.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid, p.267.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
Regarding Malava it is surmised by S.R. Goyal that the Pushyamitras (who invaded the Gupta empire towards the close of Kumaragupta I’s reign or in the early years of the reign of Skandagupta) were subordinate allies of Vakataka Narendrasena and were instigated by him to attack the Guptas and during this period of trouble the Varmans of Dasapura shifted their allegiance to the Vakatakas.78

It is, however, very difficult to accept this speculation. No Aulikara ruler of Dasapura is known to have owed allegiance to any Vakataka monarch. It is very significant indeed that while there is not the slightest hint to the Vakataka suzerainty over Dasapura in the Mandasor stone slab inscription dated M.S. 524/A.D.467,79 the last known date of Skandagupta, this inscription specifically mentions the Gupta emperors Chandragupta II and his son Govindagupta80 and also records that king Prabhakara who was ruling over Dasapura in A.D. 467, was “the fire to the wood of the ememies of the Gupta dynasty”.81 Similarly the Mandasor inscription of the Guild of silk-weavers which

78 HVGR, pp. 111-115. The Pushyamitras have been identified by Goyal with the Pandava rulers of Mekala who according to him transferred their allegiance from Guptas to the Vakatakas sometime in the middle of the fifth century A.D. Ibid, pp.108-111.
81 Ibid, L.8, p.408, f.no.3.
was composed in M.S. 529/A.D.472 by the command of the same guild does not mention the name of the Vakataka Narendrasena.

Thus, in any case at present there is no independent evidence to sustain these claims made in Prithivishena II’s charters. Neither any record of the Vakatakas has been reported from these regions nor do the records of other ruling families of these regions provide any hint of Vakataka occupation. In view of these facts the rulers of Kosala, Mekala and Malava can not be regarded as the feudatories of the Vakatakas.

We may now turn our attention towards the known feudatories of the Vakatakas. Some of them are mentioned only by their names in the Vakataka copper plate grants, such as Satrughnaraja, Kondaraja and Narayanaraja, beyond this we do not know anything about them. Fortunately there is an inscription in the Ajanta cave XVII which certainly belongs to a feudatory of Vakataka Maharaja Harishena of the Vatsagulma branch. The inscription provides some details about the said feudatory and his predecessors but his name according to V.V. Mirashi has not been preserved due to the exposure to the inclemencies of weather. However, Ajay Mitra Shastri has read the name of the said

---

82 CII, III, pp. 322-332.
84 Ibid, pp.120-129.
85 Ibid, p.121.
feudatory as Dharadhipa in the expression *Dharadhip-akhyam* employed to him in verse 9 of the inscription. It is stated in the inscription that he was preceded by ten other princes. The name of the founder of the family has been lost. All members of the family or at least its last chief was a feudatory of Vakataka king Harishena. The object of the inscription is to record the excavation and donation by this feudatory chief (Dharadhipa) of a monolith *Mandapa* containing the *Chaitya* of the Buddha in the form of the present cave XVII, a large water cistern and a grand *gandha-kuti chaitya* (cave XIX) to its west. Verse 21 of the inscription contains the conventional coaxing description of the family’s overlord Harishena:

```
```

```
"while that moon among the princes, Harishena, whose face resembles a lotus and the moon, and who does what is beneficial for (his) subjects.............is protecting the earth."
```

Mirashi feels that the feudatory family represented by the present record was ruling over the Khandesh region of Maharashtra anciently known as Rishika. However, it can not be accepted as there is evidence against this theory. It is well known that two inscriptions of the reign of Harishena register

---

88 Ibid, p.126,129.
the execution of caves at Ajanta and nearby Gulwada by his minister Varahadeva,⁹⁰ and the absence of any allusion to the local ruling family clearly denotes that the region was governed directly by the Vakatakas.⁹¹

Bhagwanlal Indarji and Ajay Mitra Shastri have suggested on the basis of the verse 10 of the present record containing the name Asmaka etc. (Asmaka-adi), that the ruling family belonged to the Asmaka country, which most probably included the southern part of the Marathwada region to the south of the river Godavari together with some part of the Telangana region of Andhra Pradesh.⁹²

Besides, it is also suggested on the basis of Thalner grant of Bhanushena⁹³ of the Kumbhakarna dynasty that his ancestors were ruling, perhaps as feudatories of the Vakatakas, over Dhule region of Khandesh.⁹⁴

Beyond this we have no information about the feudatories of the Vakatakas. As stated above the Vakataka inscriptions are silent on this point and the inscriptions which are recorded by the feudatories are only three in number viz. the Nachna and Ganj inscriptions of Vyaghradeva (if he really was a feudal chief) and the inscription in Ajanta cave XVII.

⁹¹ VSH, p.48.
⁹² J.Burgess, Bhagwanlal Indraji, Inscriptions from the cave temples of Western India, Delhi, 1881, p.73; VSH, p.48.
⁹³ EI, XXXVIII, part-I, pp.69-75.
⁹⁴ A.M. Shastry, A Note on the Thalner plates of Bhanushena, JESI, XII, pp.53-58.
All these three are not official records and appear to be of the nature of pilgrims's records (or of religious nature) and do not provide any data of great significance to reach on a conclusive point about the position of the feudatory in the Vakataka polity.

In this situation it has to be concluded that the feudatories of the Vakatakas were few in number. Most probably they ruled in their own territories but certain conditions were imposed on them. Their ruling powers were very limited. Since the Vakataka copper plate grants discovered so far, all belong to the Vakataka Maharajas of both the branches, it may also be suggested that Vakataka feudatories were not allowed to make any land grant at least without the permission of their Vakataka overlord. We may say so, because not a single copper plate grant issued by any feudatory of the Vakatakas, has been found out as yet, and their inscriptions which are available to us, inspite of their religious nature, do not fail to mention their Vakataka suzerains viz. Prithivishena I of the Nandivardhana-Parvarapura branch and Harishena of the Vatsagulma branch.

Vakataka kings appear not even to have permitted feudatories within their jurisdiction. Kondaraja and Narayanaraja no doubt figure respectively in the Chammak copper plate grant and Pattan copper...
plate grant of Pravarasena II,\(^95\) but their title raja seems to be purely formal. Even if they were feudatories, it does not seem that they enjoyed any considerable power. They are seen requesting the Vakataka king to make certain land grants for some projects in which they were interested.\(^96\) Thus, the available evidence shows that the Vakataka empire was more united and centralized and less perforated by semi-independent feudatory states than was the case with the Guptas.

**Administration**

It is not yet possible to give a vivid and comprehensive picture of the administration of the Vakatakas. The material available for the purpose is very meagre. The Vakataka copper plate grants mention only a few officers and hardly supply us with any material for giving an adequate picture of the central and local administration.

Available inscriptive data indicates that the whole Vakataka kingdom was divided into divisions like, *rajya,\(^97\) kata,\(^98\) pattas,\(^99\) margas,\(^100\) aharas,\(^101\) bhogas,\(^102\) bhuktis,\(^103\) and rashtra.\(^104\) Of these,

\(^95\) *CII*, V, L.19, p.24, L.23, p.60.
\(^96\) Ibid.
\(^97\) Ibid, L.18, p.24; L.13, p.45; L.29, p.66; L.20, p.66.
\(^98\) Ibid, L.5, p.96; L.13, p.50; L.2, p.102.
\(^99\) Ibid, L.13, p.50; *AV*, p.239, 241.
\(^100\) *CII*, V, L.5, p.96; *AV*, p.228; *JESI*, X, L.19, p.113; *CII*, V, L.13, p.19; L.12, p.36.
\(^101\) Ibid, L.10, p.7; L.17, p.12.
\(^102\) Ibid, L.17-18, p.30; L.16, p.45; L.20, p.60.
\(^103\) Ibid, L.13, p.19; *AV*, p.251.
\(^104\) *CII*, V, L.13, p.19.
rajya and kata were large divisions. The rajya including sub-divisions like rashtra, bhoga and marga. While kata was divided into pattas and bhogas.\textsuperscript{105} The divisions patta and marga were probably named after the directions. Such as Aparapatta and Uttarapatta,\textsuperscript{106} and Uttaramarga, Padmapura-purva-marga and Padmapura-apara-marga.\textsuperscript{107} Other divisions like aharas and bhuktis were also probably the parts of rajyas.

As the Vakataka inscriptions, do not give sufficient information regarding the relations between these divisions, their status or their size etc, it is not possible to present a coordinate study of the administrative division under the Vakatakas.

As the form of government under the Vakatakas was monarchical, the king had supreme authority whose post was hereditary. The Vakataka kingdom was fairly extensive, but unlike the Guptas its rulers did not assume high sounding titles like Paramabhattaraka, Maharajadhiraja, Parmesvara etc. but contented themselves with the mere title of Maharaja. Only one amongst them, Pravarsena I, who was undoubtedly a great conqueror, took the title Samrat.\textsuperscript{108} But none of his successors bore this imperial title which was certainly due to their loss of imperial position. His empire was already partitioned between his

\textsuperscript{105} AV, pp.78-79.
\textsuperscript{106} \textit{CII}, V, L.13, p.50; AV, p.239, 241.
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{CII}, V, L.5, p.96; AV, p.228; \textit{JESI}, X, L.19,p.113.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{CII}, V, L.3, p.12.
two\(^{109}\) (or among his four sons, according to the Puranas)\(^{110}\) sons. They were certainly not powerful enough to warrant the use of the imperial title of *Samrat*, particularly in the presence of the mighty Gupta emperors like Samudragupta, Chandragupta II, Kumaragupta I, Skandagupta and so on. It does not mean that the position of the Vakataka rulers reduced to mere feudatory status, but they appear to have maintained a low profile before the Gupta emperors. It can also be said that they (Vakataka rulers) had acquiesced in the position of the Gupta's obliging allies.

Members of the royal family like the *Yuvaraja* (heir-apparent) and other princes must have been entrusted with some duties in the administration, but we have no definite information on the point. In the Vakataka empire dowager queens used to supervise and direct the administration, if the heir-apparent to the throne happened to be a minor. Prabhavatigupta, the widow of Rudrasena II successfully steered the ship of state through troubled waters for a period of about twenty years, of course, with the help of his father Chandragupta II Vikramaditya.

The administration of the kingdom must have been carried on with the help of a large number of officers, civil and military, but

\(^{109}\) One under the descendants of Gautamiputra and another under sarvasena and his successors.
\(^{110}\) *DKA*, p.50.
curiously enough they are referred to very rarely in the Vakataka records. One of the inscription in the Ajanta cave XVI, refers to a Sachiva or minister, without giving the proper designation of his portfolio. Besides, the Miregaon charter of Prabhavatigupta of the reign of Pravarasena II, year 20 refers to an Amatya (minister) named Chandra as the drafter of the grant.\footnote{CII, V, L.15, p.108; VSH, p.92.} We may, however, assume that the non-mention of the ministers in the Vakataka records is accidental and that the Vakataka government was carried on by the king with the help of an adequate number of advisors and deputies, as was the case in other contemporary administrations. The Ajanta record indicates that some of the ministers held hereditary offices.\footnote{Ibid, Varahadeva was the minister of Vakataka Harishena and the father of the former served under Vakataka Devasena as his minister V.19, p.111.} The Prime-Minister or Chief-Minister was the head of the Secretariat. He was in charge of the whole administration; it is probably he who is referred to by the appropriate and significant title Sarvadhyaksha in Vakataka grants.\footnote{See e.g. Ibid, L.20, p.12.} How he conducted the administration is not known for the Vakataka grants refer only to a very few officers, but it is certain that he was invested with authority to appoint subordinate officers called Kulaputras.\footnote{Ibid, L.20-21,p.12.} The Kulputras had various duties. Their primary function was of course the
maintenance of law and order. For this purpose they had a number of *bhatas* and *chhatras (chatas)* under them who are referred to as the member of the military forces and police in the Vakataka grants.¹¹⁵ These all officers worked under the direction of *Sarvadhyakshas* and are described in the Vakataka records as the officers who conveyed and executed royal orders. They were obviously like the inspectors appointed by the central government to tour in the kingdom and find out whether its orders were being properly carried out or not by the subordinate and district officers.¹¹⁶ They collected the land-revenue and various taxes due to the state. They were entitled to free boarding and lodging while touring in districts for the work of the state.¹¹⁷ They could seize the treasure trove, work salt and other mines, and make village people work free of charge for the state. They must, no doubt, have been exacting and oppressive in their dealings with the village people. They were therefore expressly forbidden to enter *agrahara* villages donated to Brahmanas, and could not claim from them any of the privileges allowed to them in other places. So long the donees of these land-grants did not rebel against the king and did not commit any offence against the residents of other villages, they were free from molestations of these

---

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p.9, f.no.1.
¹¹⁶ Ibid, L. 16-17, p.9, f.no.2.
¹¹⁷ Ibid.
officials. The *Kulaputras, bhatas* and *chhatras* had therefore to be specially informed of every land-grant made by the king. The inspection machinery of the central government is but rarely refereed to in ancient Indian records and the Vakataka plates are, therefore, regarded as very valuable evidence in this respect.

An officer called *Bhojaka* is mentioned in the *India Office plate* of Vakataka Devasena of Vatsagulma branch. He seems to denote an important official, but we have as yet not sufficient data for defining the scope of his office or duties. In the grant he is mentioned among the touring officials of the king. In the *Tirodi plates* of Vakataka Pravarasena II of the Nandivardhana-Pravarapura branch, one Chamidas is referred to as *rajyadhikrita*. According to D.C. Sircar the term denotes Chief Minister, while V.V. Mirashi is of the opinion that these officers were appointed to govern the *rajyas* or provinces of the kingdom.

The officer of the title *rajjuka* figures in a solitary grant as its writer; what precisely was his function in this period we do not know.

---

118 Ibid., pp. XXXVII-XXXVIII.
120 Ibid.
122 IEG, p.275.
123 CII, Vol.V. p.XXXVII.
124 Ibid, L.34, p.41.
Probably he was an officer in charge of the revenue administration and of the measurement of the lands in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{125}

How the different territorial units like districts and villages were administered? We do not know because Vakataka records are lacking in detail about their administration. Most probably districts were in charge of officers of the central government. They were heads of the general administration and were responsible for the maintenance of law and order. In all probabilities members of the police and military force (\textit{chhatras} and \textit{bhatas}) helped them in this work. The central government controlled the administration through its inspecting staff, which has been already referred to above.

The only military and police officials of higher ranks mentioned in Vakataka grants are the \textit{Senapati}\textsuperscript{126} and the \textit{Dandanayaka}.\textsuperscript{127} Vakataka plates state at their end that when they were issued, so and so was the \textit{Senapati} or general of the king.\textsuperscript{128} The manner in which the names of the generals are mentioned at the end of the copper plates suggests that the charters were drafted in their offices under their supervision. There were apparently frequent transfers of officers; for we find that the post of \textit{Senapati} was held by different persons or by the

\begin{enumerate}
\item[125] Ibid, p. XXXVIII.
\item[126] See e.g. Ibid, L.59-60, p.26.
\item[127] Ibid, L.2, p.102.
\item[128] See e.g. Ibid, L.59-60, p.26, 27.
\end{enumerate}
same person at different times during the reign of Pravarasena II.\textsuperscript{129} 

*Dandanayaka* was most probably a senior police officer who sometimes joined touring officials.\textsuperscript{130}

We thus get only an imperfect picture of Vakataka administration, but such evidence as we possess indicates that it was on the whole vigilant and efficient. It may be assumed that Copper plate grants appear not even to have issued before they had been checked, as each of them usually bears a certificate to this effect as testified by the term *drishtam* inscribed on the plates.\textsuperscript{131} The term denotes, 'has been seen', i.e. 'found correct and approved' indicating the approval of the proper authorities.\textsuperscript{132} There is evidence to show that inaccurate or unsatisfactory plates were rejected.\textsuperscript{133} Still more interesting is what has been stated above that even the Brahmana donees of the copper plate grants were not above the law; some of the grants expressly lay down specific conditions under which alone the grants were to be continued. First of all they and their descendants were to be loyal to the state and to offer the fullest co-operation in apprehending the person guilty of


\textsuperscript{130} *CII*, V, L.2,p.102.

\textsuperscript{131} See eg. Ibid, L.1, p.12.

\textsuperscript{132} *IEG*, p.102.

\textsuperscript{133} *EI*, IX, pp. 268-269; Ibid, XXII, pp.208-209.
treason, theft, and immorality. They were further not to interfere with the rights of neighbouring villages. If these conditions were not fulfilled, the state could resume the grant without any moral or spiritual compunction.\textsuperscript{134} This shows strict control exercised by the Vakataka rulers over their administration. Land also was carefully surveyed according to the measure determined by the state, and the requisite entries were made in the relevant records.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{134} CII, V, L.39-43, p.25.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid. L. 18-19, p.24.