ECONOMY

We have seen above how almost the entire Rayalaseema of those days depended only upon rivulets and there was no major river system which would help the people grow plenty and live in flourishing conditions. Irrigational network was, no doubt, formed; but without perennial water supply, this irrigation had to depend on water from tanks, an aspect which we shall examine later, in the pages that follow. Naturally, for such conditions, administrative machinery had to be properly geared up. There was definitely a change in the administrative systems. One aspect that stands out boldly is the institution of what one would call 'feudal' type of administration. It is interesting to note that in the region closer to the capital the king had to appoint officers and he had to, perforce, utilise the assistance of his own kith and kin.

Administrative System:

Here it may be noted that in the earlier centuries the princes and princesses rarely interfered in matters of administration. The heir-apparent was
invariably entrusted with the responsibilities of administration. This was more with an object to train him in matters of administration. Surprisingly, we do not come across too many claimants to the throne in the earlier centuries. But, with the founding of Vijayanagara and the quick strides it took in enriching itself, the problem of internal squabbles and intrigues grew in number. The disgruntled princes who were much too many, born to innumerable queens, were accommodated in the administrative set up. But most of them were around the periphery of the capital. The nāyaṅkara system introduced in this period, saw the rise of several chieftaincies in far off regions which could not be directly controlled by the king. To those places he sent his deputies now and then, perhaps to supervise and collect the fiefs from the chieftain. According to A.V. Venkataratnam, the terms "sīme, sthala, valīta and vēṇṭhe replaced the term rājya". However B.R. Gopal states that these "seem to stand for certain demarcated divisions, one being a part of the higher division".

However, all these divisions and their subdivisions are not uniform. Sometimes, some subdivision is omitted. Vēṇṭhe, as a subdivision, figures more frequently in the inscriptions from Bellary district. Hastināvatī-valīta, had, as subdivisions, Mūganāḍu-vēṇṭhe and Kurugōḍu-sīme; of Pāṇḍya-nādu and Kōgalī-vēṇṭhe, this latter example indicating that a vēṇṭhe was a smaller division than nādu. However, even here there was no uniformity. For example, the Non-abanarasiyakere-valīta figures as a subdivision of pāṇḍya-nādu. Some of these divisions in Bellary district may be noted:
A majority of the divisions, however, were named sīmes, like Kōtūru, Āvinamāḍu, Bāgalī, Tekkalakōte, Guḍḍam, Gaṅgāvati, Chōramāṇūru, Soṅgūru, Kuragōḍu, Rāyadurga, Kujēnūru, Guttavolalu, etc. This is not an exhaustive list.

Such divisions also figure in the other districts of Rāyalaseema. A record of 1542 A.D.,6 refers to Hastināvati.

Hastināvati
Muda-nāḍu
Ādavāni-valita
Kōṭeyakallu
In another record they are listed as follows:

Gutti rājya
Pāleṭi-sthāla
Kenaganapalli-sime

Yet another record of 1579 A.D.\(^8\) states that Chigulārēvusthāla was in Chīra-māgani which was itself a subdivision in Gutti- rājya. Among the nāḍus, the prominent were Rodda, Guyyalūru, Rēnādu, Muṇānādu. There were a good number of sīmas - Kaḍavagallu, Kundurpi, Agali, Ādavāni, Manḍimaḍugu, Turnmula, Gutti, Gaṇḍikōṭa etc. Further subdivision was māgani, We come across Cheyyēṭi and ChīraMāgani which were quite prominent. Kaṃbadūru, Kāmasamudra, Pālēru, Tumbekallu, Sādali, Agali, Chigulārēvu and the like were headquarters of sthalas. We can see that some of these are situated today in Bellary and Kōlar districts of Karnataka.

In Cuddapah and Kurnool districts we see the area divided mostly into sīmas and they were under the direct control of the king, generals and ministers. In Cuddapah we find Guddaluru, Gaṇḍikōṭa, Sakali, Peda Sagali, Kallūru, Avuku, Chernūru, Pākanādu, etc. Some of these had spread over the present Anantapur district. In Kurnool Siruvōlu, Kōṭaka, Dōni, Tallapaḍavūru, Kōvilakuṇṭla, Ādavāni, Kandanaṇōlu, Pānem, Tākaṇṭikōṭa, Kōṭakoṇḍa sīmas. Even here we see that Ādavāni had spread over Bellary and Anantapur district also.\(^9\) In the Chittoor district also we find sīmes as lower administrative divisions; but they are much influenced by the pattern that existed in the earlier Tamil dynasties. But, only with a few exceptions like the record of 1549 A.D.\(^{10}\) wherein we find
Rajendrasinga Nallūr being situated in Perundī-mānuḍu of Paḍavūr-kōṭṭam, we find most sīmas referred to as sīrmais. They are, for example Nallūr, Paḍanāḍu, Avukku, Kālava, Kaṅchigunda, Siruvōlu, Mērai Pāḷaiyam and Gaṅḍikōṭa. Even here some of these divisions - Avukku, Kālava, Gaṅḍikōṭa, figure in the inscriptions from Cuddapah and Kurnool districts. Such divisions, as stated above, would help the king and the officials to have greater control over these regions, more so in the collection of revenues, control over recalcitrant chiefs, subordinates etc. It could also facilitate administrative control.

**Nature of the State:**

Such a vast kingdom had to be economically managed efficiently so that it would be beneficial to the king as also the people. It is appropriate at this juncture to consider Burton Stein’s remarks about what he calls agrarian integration in the Vijayanagara period. Taking cue from Nilakanta Sastri, Stein says that the appellation Vijayanagara would mean a change in the military and political structure of the South into what has been called the most warrior dominated and warfare - oriented State ever established by the Hindus. Such a condition required a fundamental reorganisation of the agrarian order. But, we have shown above that Vijayanagara was not a military state and if it was engaged in continuous warfares, it was more in defence to save the country from alien rule and to protect the age old Hindu dharma.

As a corollary to such a thinking, Stein considers the aversion of nucleus and of the former period, into areas of private jurisdiction of the warrior-dominated regime. These areas called amarams were not military service
estates, but those that were validated by the Vijayanagara rulers. The warrior holders of such *amarams* had seized existing territories or had opened new territories by burning forest after conquering the people there. Even with regard to this we hold the opinion that the empire being geographically so vast, the kings could not have direct control over far flung regions and so left such areas to the chieftains considering them as *nāyakas*. Hence, it is difficult to agree with Stein’s contention that in this period one cannot speak of a revenue system, but that there was a new channelling of resources and wealth through new redistributive centers among which the local warriors and their overlords were of first importance.¹⁴

There is a section of thought which feels that the feudalism prevalent during the Vijayanagara period was of the classical European model. The *Nāyakas*, *Amaranāyakas*, *Daṇḍa Nāyakas* etc., belonged to the category of Vassals. In the opinion of these scholars, the Sarvamāṇya land grants, hereditary land distribution and the titles of the Amaranāyakas were important features of feudalism. And sub-infeudation was significant in their thinking.

The evidence in the inscriptions of the period between 1345 and 1565 makes it clear that the feudalism of a different type was prevalent. The Nayakas were given the right to collect the land revenue, with clear instruction regarding their share. Even the rate of tax was fixed by the king. And they were not the sole enjoyers of the tax. Thus essentially Nāyaṅkara system was a land tenure in which a share of land revenue was assigned to the nāyakas on condition of rendering military service.
The inscriptions at Tarnupadu village makes it clear that the Amaranayaka's duty was 1) collecting revenue in demarcated area. 2) to pay yearly tribute to the king 3) to maintain a fixed number of troops 4) to assist in sharing the revenue of the village. (This depends upon the will of the king) It is very clear that even the Amarnāyaka was not based on hereditary right. Inscriptions show that Tārnāpādu village and its hamlets changed hands thrice in 6 years and none of them were related to each other. This indicates that the king in his own right appointed whom so ever he liked.15

Thus the application of feudal terminology of Europe to denote any institution of Vijayanagara which might have superficial resemblance with the former is highly appropriate and misleading. The conditions till 1565 A.D. did not warrant a feudal structure at all. The king was in full control of his domain and he was the sole protector of the people.

**Agricultural Scenario:**

Considering the conditions during the Vijayanagara period, agriculture could be treated as the major source of income since the prosperity of the empire depended mostly on agriculture. As we have seen above, the districts of Rayalaseema have scanty rainfall, but oppressive heat in summer. They are situated in a dry belt, even the major river Tungabhadra having practically no water during the summer. Yet, cultivation was practically the only source of their livelihood.

Here we may consider the types of land and the system of land tenure. Land was broadly classified as cultivable and cultivated lands. Of the latter, three
types could be marked. The Kannada inscriptions of the period refer to gadde (wet land), beddalu or hola (dry land) and tōta while in Telugu these are referred to as nirunelam, velichēnu (or polam) and tōta bhūmi. Forest waste land and pasture come under the category of cultivable lands. Wet land was also known as maṇḍī. The Peddasetṭipalle epigraph of 1558 A.D.,16 refers to a gift of two khanḍukas and three magamu of maṇḍī near the upper Vāṅgu for the temple of Kēśava. Khanḍuka and māgamu mentioned here are measures and they refer to the wet land and quantity of sowing capacity. The Pāṃem inscription of Sāluva Narasimha II dated 1503 A.D.,17 refers to a gift to the sthānikas of Pāṇikēśvara temple of lands which included nirāramba (that is land under water cultivation) and kāḍāṟṟāmbāba (cultivation of forest land). The Kēsvuvaṟipalli epigraph dated 1544 A.D.18 registers a grant of cultivated dry (velichēla ārambālu) and wet (nirārambālu). The Pōrumāmidda epigraph19 of Krishṇadēvarāya dated 1526 A.D., speaks of a gift of land for the digging of a well and raising of a flower garden and orchard nearby. The Miṅtuṟu inscription of Sadāśiva20 dated 1547 A.D., records an interesting transaction. According to this, land to the extent of putṭīs and ten tūmus (of sowing capacity) in Miṅtuṟu was exchanged for several pieces of land belonging to the temple of Chennarāya (Chennakēśava) which lay scattered in the village. The chief, Kōnayadēva mahārāya, to whom these were made over, got excavated a tank (kōṇēru) in the Kilikcheriḷa street and laid out a garden nearby. For this garden he had to take additional space and for this purpose he endowed four (tūmus).? of land. The Chēmulḷapalle inscription in Cuddapah district21 states that Pāpināyaniṅgāru, the chief of Chennūru-sīme got a Vishṇu temple constructed at Yellamāmbāpuram, a new village founded by him and had a grove planted thereat. This was in 1539 A.D.
Soil was classified in the earlier periods, in Karnataka, as *uttama* (best), *Madhyama* (middling) and *Kanishṭa* (inferior). This classification continued even in the Vijayanagara period. An inscription in the adjacent Kolar district, dated 1482 A.D., states that a *gauda* after excavating a tank, took one share from the revenue of the paddy-yield due to him which he made over to the temple treasury while the other shares were made over to his sons who were to divide the lands among themselves, keeping in view the *uttama, madhyama* and *kanishṭa* facilities of the soil. But, such a distinction is rarely found in the Vijayanagara period. Besides the wet, dry and garden lands noted above, we come across also the pasture lands, waste (fallow) lands and forest areas. The Niḍuzuvvi record in Cuddapah district, dated 1545 A.D., in the reign of Sadāśiva, registers a gift of *yēdumuc bīduchēnu* (fallow land) within the limits (*polamēra*) of Mālepādu to a certain Anikana for maintaining watershed in Nuḍuzuvvi. The Erragudi inscription of 1545 A.D., refers to *varimaṇi* (wet land) and *rēgādi* (dry land) gifted to the temple of Rāmayadēva by Būpatirāya. 

In this connection we can refer to one of the oldest works on polity, *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, wherein Kauṭilya also refers to such classification of lands. Land which cannot be used for agriculture is called *bhūmichidra* - a weakness in land, an inferior type of land. Such lands could be used for pastures or forests. So far as pastures are concerned he speaks of an officer - *Vivitādhyaksha*, 'superintendent of pastures' who was responsible for laying out grass lands, provide wells and tanks for that purpose. From this it would appear that all grass lands belonged to the State. But this latter does not appear to have been accepted in the period and region under study.
Types of Villages:

The village (grāma) itself has been defined by several scholars. In *Arthaśāstra* the village is to contain between 100 to 500 families, mostly belonging to the sūdra agricultural class, and in view of the frequent boundary disputes, the boundaries between villages are to be well marked out. Grāma literally means a settlement, which was the basic unit of revenue administration. It has been interpreted by Pran Nath to mean an estate with cultivated and also fallow lands, besides pasture and inclusive of buildings, wells and the like existing on it. But Nilakantha Śāstri has criticised this view. Kautilya is clear about the settlement with 100 to 500 families, which goes against its being considered as an estate. According to Baden Powell a village is a group of land holdings situated in one place, with a common tank, grave yard, cattle shed and scrubs, obviously with more than one group of dwellings.

These villages were classified on the basis of types of tenures and ownerships, besides topography and situation of the land. Those that belonged to the king- crown- and the revenues of which were deposited in the royal treasury have been described as *bhanḍāra*vāḍas. *Agrahāras* were villages gifted to Brāhmaṇas while *maṭha-māṇya* villages were those made over to religious institutions like the *maṭhas* (monasteries) making it tax free (*māṇya*). *Amara* villages were held by the chieftains under the *amaranāyaṅkara* system. The *Nasanakōṭa* epigraph of Sadāśiva dated 1546 A.D., records a remission of taxes on barbers in *bhanḍāra*vāḍas, *dēva grāmas* and *agrahāras*. The *bhaṇḍāra*vāḍas were also referred to as *Kara* villages wherefrom tax was collected. The Velkūru record of 1564 A.D., states that the village Tiruvengānallūr (in
Chittoor district) as amara-nāyaṅkara. Katteraganḍa inscription (Cuddapah district) of 1546 A.D., seems to record the remission of dommaripannu in the villages of the categories of amara-grāmas, umbali-grāmas, bhanḍaravāda-grāmas, dēvasthāna-grāmas and agrahāras. Umbali is a rent-free land or village, gifted, probably in lieu of services rendered. Lakumarasa-nāyaka had received the village Bestavēmula as umbali from Sāluva Gōvindarāja during the reign of Kṛṣṇadēvarāya. The village Gōpavaram had been bestowed upon Vāgumaḍugu Vīrama-reḍḍi as umbali by Salakarāju Tirumalayadēvamahārāju, during the rule of Achyutarāya.

Village Assemblies

Apart from the appointed officials. There were the people's assemblies which functioned at the local level.

The Praje

The usual phrase accompanying the praja is Samasta, that is all. An inscription of A.D. 1520 from Havinahalu-Virapura in Bellary Taluk records that the people of the village of Dondavate made a grant of land to Mālesani for repairing the tank at the Village

Meeting of the Assembly:

The Assemblies were having authority to make decisions. Decisions were taken sometimes in the presence of the representatives of the people. For example, the barbers of Kottūra sime were exempted from certain taxes. The order was made in favour of Timmōja, Bhadrōja, Koṇḍōja and other repre-
sentatives.\textsuperscript{35} During the reign of Sadāśivarāya, unable to bear the burden of numerous taxes, and their enhancement, the people of the village Chebale had deserted it. Dalavāyi Appala Nāyaka invited the people, and persuaded them to resettle in the village giving them some concessions.

Functions of the Assembly

These assemblies had the powers to grant even land for specific purposes. And the epigraph at Havanihalu-virapura of 1529 records that the samasta prajegalu (people of the village) of Donḍovate made a grant of land for repairing a tank of the village. Samasta prajegalu is obviously a reference to the uru assembly.\textsuperscript{36}

The fact that village assemblies did exist in the Vijayanagara period cannot be disputed although inscriptions containing references to the assemblies and their activities are not as numerous as during the \textit{chōla} period. On the basis of the available evidence, it cannot be denied that the Vijayanagara rulers allowed the local institutions to continue to function as before. They were not without sympathy for them as promoters of Pūrvada-maryāde. But circumstances might have forced them to leave them to their fate\textsuperscript{37}

The System of land Revenue:

Before land revenue was fixed, it was essential that lands in each village (\textit{grāma}) were measured and surveyed. Although there are no direct epigraphical sources to show the system of land measure, different kinds of land measures referred to would show that land was systematically measured. The measure,
however was not the same all over. As in the earlier periods even in the Vijayanagara period several measures were used. Sometimes the measures were indicated by the sowing capacity of lands. Having known that a given area of land would have a sowing capacity of, for example, a \( \text{tumu} \) or \( \text{putti} \), those different quantities of yield were associated even in land measure. The Paṭṭām inscription (Anantapur district) of Bukka I, dated 1367 A.D., records a grant of one \( \text{putti} \) of wet land (\( \text{puṭṭīṇḍu maḍī} \)) below the Pāntarlapalle tank to god Ahōbala of Kadiri.\(^{38} \) Here \( \text{putti} \) refers to a measure, the sowing capacity of which is taken to be the extent of land. \( \text{Tumu} \) is yet another measure. The Miḍutūru inscription of Sadāśiva, dated 1547 A.D., \(^{39} \) registers a single plot of land which was \( \text{puṭṭis} \) and 10 \( \text{tumu} \)s in extent. Here too, \( \text{Tumu} \) is a reference to a measure, indicating the sowing capacity. Another term that figures in this connection is \( \text{gocharma} \). The Kōḍūru epigraph of 1518 A.D. registers a gift by an individual, of a \( \text{gocharma} \) of land in the village Kōkaṭam to gods Chennakēśava and \( \text{anumanta} \) and also to the pipers and drummers. Here the record specifies that a \( \text{gocharma} \) was equivalent to 4-1/2 \( \text{puṭṭis} \) of land. This would be somewhat different from the definition of \( \text{gocharma} \) given by Parāsara, according to whom ten times a piece of land whereupon 100 cows and a bull could stand without being closely tied, is equivalent to a \( \text{gocharma} \).\(^{41} \) Sircar takes it to be equal to 10 \( \text{nivartanas} \) although the exact area varied in different localities and periods. But this appears to be the normal area understood although different interpretation are noted by him.\(^{42} \) Peda Kōmativēma,\(^{43} \) the Vēma chief is stated to have made a gift of land of 4-1/2 \( \text{puṭṭis} \) (\( \text{nālugu puṭṭum baṇḍumu kṣhētram} \)) which was equivalent to a \( \text{gocharma} \). Hence, Parāsara’s definition may not be accurate. Further, on the face of it, it becomes a very big area. Another measure of the period was \( \text{yēdumu} \). The
Niduzuvi grant noted above\textsuperscript{44} refers to one y\textit{ēdumu} of fallow land. The Peddasettipalle epigraph of 1558 A.D.\textsuperscript{45} refers to three m\textit{āgamu} of wet land, besides two \textit{khaṇḍukas}. The exact import of m\textit{āgamu} as a measure is not clear. But \textit{khaṇḍuga} is taken to mean 'a land measure of 64,000 square yards of dry and 1000 square yards of wet land.'\textsuperscript{46} But, the exact meaning of these terms varied in different periods and different localities.

Before considering the types of land tenure and other aspects of agricultural economy, it is worthwhile considering, incidentally, the problem of ownership of land. Theoretically all the land ruled over by the king being \textit{Chakravarti-kśetra}, it is argued, the tillers of the soil, land owners and the like held the land only in trust and they had no title over the land. One school of thought represented by Manu and others holds that the king, although responsible for the protection of the subjects, was virtually a god in human form and the lord of all land. Commenting on Kautilya's \textit{Arthasastra}, Kangle says that there can be little doubt that \textit{Arthasastra} recognises private ownership of land, though it presupposes at the same time the existence of State-owned or Crown lands. All unoccupied land belongs to the State while those that are not under the supervision of the royal officer - \textit{Śīlādayaksha} - belonged to the private owners.\textsuperscript{47} Land ceremoniously granted by the king, in the possession of a family for three generations, of which care is taken by good tenants and enjoyed by virtue of the charter of an earlier king, could not be confiscated by the king.\textsuperscript{48} This would mean the recognition of private property. Epigraphs provide evidence to the right of the people for proprietorship over land. The Sampagekōṭe inscription of Sadāśivarāya, dated 1552 A.D., \textsuperscript{49} is a charter issued declaring that the property
of all those who died without heir would be distributed among the descendants of the same ṣāma, and if no such descendant was available, it would be made over to the temple and that in no case it would be seized by the king. If the landowner had no proprietorship, such hereditary rights would not have existed at all. In this connection the Kannada record from Lēpākshi dated 1531 A.D. may be noted. It registers a gift of the village Cheluvinda renamed Veṅkaṭādriyapura to god Pāpavināśana and the village Gaṇapathihaḷḷi to Virupaṇa of Penukoṇḍa and states that the ownership of both the villages lay with the latter.

Agriculture of the period under review was considered an industry. Industries, in the modern sense, did not exist then. Much of it was only home industry and handicrafts for the sale of which tax was levied as customs duty. All the rulers strove to improve the land system by providing irrigational facilities. Vijayanagara was no exception. On the other hand, for filling the rapidly depleting treasury, greater extents of land were brought under cultivation, by acquiring uncultivated lands and bringing them under cultivation.

Land revenue was the major source of income. The Rājabāvanahalli epigraph of Dēvarāya II, dated 1419 A.D. is interesting in that it states that Hariyaṇṇa, a son of Lakhappa, chief of the mahājanas was granted the village Hariyasamudra as a stōṭriya-grāma (rent-free village gifted to Brāhmaṇs well-versed in Vēdas). The donees had actually founded the village by the reclamation of forest land, and excavation of a tank. It speaks of several taxes levied on wet land, dry land (beddalu), areca- nut, cocoanut, jack fruit and mango trees, sugarcane, plantain trees, betel- creepers (eleyabalī), ḍāryan tree, forest land
made ready for cultivation (kummari), dry land cultivable with rain water (kāḍāramba), income in gold, tenancy where the cultivator shares the yield with the landlord (vāra), wet land cultivable with rain water or below the tank (kāru), saffron coloured rice for blessings (sēse), fixed income (siddhāya), tax on salt pan (uppina mōle), ghee, healthy ox and buffalo (nallēru, nallemme), some tribute due to the king called hodake, the import of which is not clear, tirupu (a kind of tax), magga (tax on looms), seal-bearer (mudre) perhaps a fee to be paid, sule (kraya) compulsory payment (kaḍḍaya ?), seized income (hārikāya), dried fruits or vegetables (bāluka), tamarind, grass, supplies furnished gratuitously for journey (ulupe), presents (uḍugoṛe), free labour (bitti), pounded rice (koṭṭana), milk, amassed wealth (kūḍu), camp fee (bīḍāra), watchmanship by rotation (amgajāvige), basketry (māḍārike), presented to the officer, office of accountant, rotative playing on musical instrument (bādina varttane ?), leap month (adhika māsa) etc. The meaning of some of the technical terms used are not clear. Here we have also reference to some professional taxes, like those on basketry, playing on musical instrument, watching by rotation. Some of them are duties which could be overcome by payment instead of service, like hālu, bīḍāra etc. which refer to the supply of milk, providing supplies in camp (for the officers), tax on salt-pan, ulupe, etc. from which one could be exempted.

We come across other agricultural levies in the epigraphs of the period. One such, for example, is maḷavraya which is a tax on consummable vegetables. We have noted above the bijavari is the sowing capacity of seeds on the basis of which the yield was roughly calculated and the revenue fixed. In this connection we may note the term siddhāya fixed income (revenue). Nīlakanta Sastri
considers this term to mean a traditional tax, taken for granted and not in need of any fresh fixation. But *siddhāya* is referred to even in cases of, for example, houses or shops. These revenues were collected either in cash (*suvarṇādāya*) or kind (*bhattādāya* or *dhānyādāya*). The Chidipirālu inscription of Achyutarāya, dated 1542 A.D., refers to serveral incomes from several taxes like *grāmakāṭ-nam, maggastāvarālu, kōmati- siddhāyam, gānuga-siddhāyam, ṭidigi-siddhāyam, gollā- siddhāyam* and *uppara-siddhāyam* due from the village Chidipirālu and Chāpili for burning a perpetual lamp in the temple of god Agastyeśvara. It also names three tax collectors (*sumkari*) of Ghanjikota-sīma, named Mallayya, Yallayya and Obalayya. Here we see that *siddhāya* is associated with professions. *Siddhāya* was also levied on barbers of Korapāḍu who were exempted from that tax.

Land revenue was received by farming out the lands under several conditional grants. *Jōdi* is one such levy - a quit rent on *īnam* lands. The Peddachintakunṭa epigraph of Sadasiva, dated 1548-49 A.D., registers a remission of several taxes one of which is referred to as *jōdi*. *Srōtriya* is an assignment of land to a learned Brāhmaṇ. There is also a reference made to *srotriya sthāvaram* and *sthāvaram maḍi*. Here *maḍi* is wet land and it is *sthāvara*, i.e., an immovable property. But such lands could not be alienated.

_Gutta_ is a term applied to land leased out for a fixed sum. _Gutta_ is also defined, besides other meanings, as an income of variable amount sold, or let for a fixed sum. It is a contract used for land cultivation, entered into by tenants under several conditions. There is another term used - _Kattuguttage_ which would also mean a production tax paid by tenant to landlord, irrespective of
yield.\textsuperscript{59} This tax was also a fixed one, to be paid annually as stipulated. These are types of farming out of land to the cultivator. It could be farmed out either by the king, or, the landlord. The king could only farm out such of those lands that belonged to the crown.

Another type of farming out lands was the \textit{nāyaṅkara system}. The chiefs governing the regions far removed from the capital were, for all practical purposes, confirmed of their possession and they were the \textit{amara-nāyakas}. The main condition that these chiefs had to fulfill was to pay a fixed financial contribution to the government and maintain, for the king's use, a specified number of troops. It may be incidentally noted that such nāyankaras existed mostly in regions far away. Yet, even nearer we find villages held as nāyaṅkaras by some chiefs or governors, who were, in a number of cases, the relatives of the kings. Timmarājāyādēva of Nandēla (Nandyal) held Ghaṇḍikōṭa-sīma as nāyankara\textsuperscript{60} by Sadāśiva in 1548 A.D. This system simplified, to a great extent, the process of tax collection. However, this placed the cultivators and landowners in a difficult situation. The nāyaka had now the freedom to fix the revenue, not at the rates specified by the king, but arbitrarily. The burden, naturally, fell upon the landowners who passed it on, at least most, if not all, to the actual cultivator. People naturally revolted against this. We have a good number of records to show how complaints were received by the king about harsh and, in several cases, illegal collections forcing the king to interfere, rectify and redeem. To this we shall revert later.

For services performed by the officials, be they in permanent or continuous service, the king, or the chieftain, or even the big land-holder remunerated
them by grant of lands. This is also a service tenure - a rent free land granted in lieu of public service. A Chinavōliṭi epigraph of Achyutarāya dated 1535 A.D., registers a gift of that village, as *umbali-grāma* to Telugurāyani Channarājuddēva-mahārāja by Salakarāju Chinna Tirumaladēva who was governing from Ādavāni-fort.⁶¹ This donor was a brother-in-law of the king. The village Kōkaṭam had been gifted to Peddayyarāgūr, by Krishnādēvarāya.⁶² This donee had been a poet, son of Allasāni Chokkayyarāgūr and is the same as the famous court-poet Allasāni Pēddana. *Mahāmanḍalēśvara, apratikamalla* Achyutarāya had received Pāṭuvagalla-śīma as *umbali* from Sadasāiva, as specified in the Kadiri epigraph.⁶³

Certain *umbalis* were granted for specified purposes. In Karnataka, specially the southern region, we come across a variety of *umbali* the *pallakki-umbali*, which was a tenure granted for the specific purpose of maintaining a palanquin.⁶⁴ Likewise a *gāraḍī umbali* is for the maintenance of gymnasium⁶⁵ while *sottigi umbali* is for the maintenance of a *chhatra* (umberalla used for the king).⁶⁶ But such instances are not found in the records of Rayalaseema. Records referring to *rakta* (*nettaru*)- *koḍage* - a blood-grant for the dependants of the heroes that laid down their lives in the battle fields are also few and far between in the region under study.

As already stated the Chittoor district came under the hold of Vijayanagara after the Tamil rulers lost their possession there. The area had come under the influence of the Hoysala general. The Yādavarāyas, chieftains of the region in the early 14th century were also practically under the control of the Hoysala generals. Hence, smoothly, did this region pass over to the Vijayanagara rulers. But, the Tamil language and Tamil system of administration
continued. In the epigraphs of Andhra Pradesh or Karnataka, we do come across a number of officers. But their hierarchy could not be explained in the records. Such was not the case with Tamil epigraphs. They very clearly define the hierarchy.

The Tamil records indicate that the higher official, the highest for that matter, would issue a *nirūpa* order, obviously emanating from the capital and, in all likelihood, with the knowledge of the king, to the officials of lower cadre, in the local administration about a grant made, with instructions to give it effect. The king, or his representative, first gave oral instructions - *chōrpāṭī* i.e., as orally ordered, being the term used to indicate this. A record of Kampana II \(^{67}\) from Eḍūru confirms the earlier grant of lands made as *devadāna* making it free from all taxes. This was made according to the oral instructions of the treasurer (*bhanḍāri*) Viṭṭappa, and under the *nirūpa* of *mahāpradhāna* Sōmappa-uḍaiyar. It states that the grant had fallen into disuse for fifty years. This is dated 1360 A.D. Next year at the instance of the same prince the *mahāpradhāni* Sōmappa ordered the treasurer Viṭṭappa and *adhikāri* Virupaṇṇa to make a grant of lands in Nallūru.\(^{68}\) The *nāṭṭār* (i.e., the members of the *nādu*) of various *nādu* also were a party. We find reference to a *sunīgar- adhikāri* of Puli-nāḍu in yet another record from Kūrmāyi.\(^{69}\) We come across an officer called *aramania kaṇṭakku* (accountant of the palace, *i.e.*, palace treasury). The *mahāpradhāna*, the treasurer and the accountant form the officers of the government at the centre. The order issued reaches the officers (*adhikārīga*) of the local bodies, like the *nāṭṭār* and the *suṅka-adhikāri* who give effect to those orders.
The Tirumala epigraph of 1473 A.D.\textsuperscript{70} refers to income from *kār, kōḍia, kaḍamai, poṇvari*. In fact, these are not to be considered as income from taxes. On the other hand *kār* and *kōḍai* refer to the rainy and summer seasons respectively. They, therefore, mean the share of the crop-yield of these two seasons. *Kaḍamai* may perhaps be equated with *siddhāya*, a general tax due. *Poṇvāri* is cash payment.

Several of the *nāyaṅkaras*, referred to as *mahanāyaṅkāchāryas* enjoyed their feudal estates for a life time and not hereditarily. These *nāyaṅkaras* were conferred upon select individuals as a reward to their services. What figures as *karyakarta* in Telugu and Kannada is termed as *kāryattukkuk-kaḍava* in Tamil. He was an agent of the king. The *sthānattārs* were the temple *sthānikas* who collected the revenue. Besides the king, the *mahāpradhānas* and *nayaṅkarāchāryas* had the right to exempt payment of taxes. Of course, these were subject to the approval of the king, except in cases where the *nāyakas* who, as feudal chieftains were holding some bigger territories with independent powers with regard to internal administration. In these areas, often, the income of the village was assessed in its entirety, in a lumpsum.

In the Tamil country, specially the different incomes were specified and the total amount was not assessed. But, this system seems to have been replaced by calculating the net incomes, as is clear from several epigraphs of Chittoor district. Varadājīdevi, the queen of Achyutarāya endowed a total sum of income, amounting to 920 *rekhai-pon* from two villages in Gaṇḍikōṭai-śīrmai, three in Koṇḍavīdu-śīrmai and one in Nārayanāpura-śīrmai\textsuperscript{71} to god Tiruven-gaḍāmudāiyān. Appalayar, son of o *karaṇikam* Kāmarāsappan, made a grant of
185 rekhai-pon and 8-1/4 pañam from seven villages situated in different šīrmais to the god named above and also to god Gōvinda rājan. This lumpsum assessed is obviously referred to as rekhai-pon.

Irrigation

Rivers and lakes are the primary source of water for mankind. But it is a scarce resource. Water is said to constitute even less than one per cent available on the earth. Hence, management of water is always a problem in the history of mankind. The vagaries of rainfall make the problem more difficult. Thanks to floods and drought, we have more water when we do not need and no water at all when and where we need it. Naturally, conservation of water has been an age-old method of facing the scarcity of water.

Unlike in north India, in the southern peninsula, tanks are a peculiar feature. In this semi-arid region tank irrigation is predominant even today. Besides, tanks control floods and drought, increase subsoil water, help aquaculture and keep the environment clean. Kautilya says that such a land which is not dependent on the god of rain is the best (advamāṭṭikō). But when such a one is not available, irrigation works must be undertaken by the State (sahōdakam-āhāryōdakaṃ vāśāturī baṃḍhayēti). Here there are two types of sātus i.e., embankments (or dams) built for holding water. One is sahōdaka, meaning probably tanks, wells and the like fed by natural springs of water. Āhāryōdaka seems to imply storage of water by constructing embankment.

Pōrumāmilla tank is one of the gigantic reservoirs of the Vijayanagara period. The Sanskrit inscription of 1369 A.D., found there says that it was the
prince Bhaskara Bhāvadvūra that got the tank excavated. The record, incidentally, extols this work of the tank, called Anantarājasāgara. Following the precepts of Hēmādri, the record says that excavation of a tank is the greatest of all the charities whereby water is gifted, and of the śrutis according to which ‘from water alone food is produced and food is Brāhman’. With one thousand labourers working at the tank and the dam daily and one hundred carts pressed into service for the masonry of the sluice and the wall, Bhaskara-bhāvadvūra took two years to complete the work. There was no limit to the expenditure of money and grain in this connection. Measured by rekhādanda, the tank was 5000’ long 7’ height and 8’ wide.75

In the neighbouring Gauribidanur taluk of Kolar district, abutting Hindupur of Anantapur district, at Kallūḍi we have a record of 1388 A.D., which refers to prince Bukka II, son of Harihara II and states that he gave an order in the open court to jalasūtra (hydraulic engineer) Singaya-bhaṭṭa, a master of ten sciences (dāśa vidyā-chakravarti) to bring the waters of the Henne river to Penukoṇḍa-paṭṭana, so that, water being the life of the living beings, all subjects must live in happiness. Thereupon Singaya-bhaṭṭa got excavated a channel - Pratapa Bukkarāya- maṇḍalada kāluve connected to the Siruvera tank. This record76 is almost two decades after the excavation. It is quite likely that the engineer had the knowledge of the newly constructed Pōrūmāmilḷa tank.

The Pōrūmāmilḷa epigraph defines twelve aṅgas (constituents) for the construction of a tank. They are: 1) a righteous, rich and happy king desirous of acquiring permanent fame, 2) a Brahman learned in hydrology, 3) hard clay soil, 4) a river of sweet water 3 yōjanas away from its source, 5) hill, parts of which are
tract with the tank, 6) a dam, built between the parts of the hill, with a compact stone wall, not too long, but firm, 7) two extreme, pointing away from fruit-yielding land outside, 8) deep and extensive bed, 9) a quarry of straight and long stones, 10) the neighbouring lands being rich in fruit, 11) sluices having strong eddies on account of the position of the mountain and finally a group of men skilled in the art of construction.

Kṛishṇadēvarāya, in his Āmuktamālyada states that the State should create irrigation facilities by constructing tanks and excavating canals and that the land should be given on a favourable rate of assessment to poor farmers for cultivation which would naturally bring in plenty of money to the treasury.77

This irrigation system drew the attention of the foreign travellers also. Nuniz, for example, says that the successor of Harihara II, i.e., Bukka II greatly improved the capital city and that his great work was the construction of a huge dam on the Tuṅgabhadrā river and the formation of an aqueduct fifteen miles long from the river into the city. Says he:

And so he did, damming the river itself with great boulders ....... This water proved of such use to the city that it increased his revenue by more than 3,50,000 paraos.78

This is the same lake to which Paes also seems to refer.

"(The tank) is at the mouth of two hills, so that all the water which comes from either one side or the other collects there; and, besides this, water comes to it from, more than three leagues by pipes which run along the lower parts of the range outside. This water is brought from a lake which itself overflows into a little river".79

Specially in the period under study the need for irrigation was great, taking into consideration the geographical conditions. Paes emphasises this
point when he says:

"This country wants water because it is very great and has few streams. They make lakes in which water collects when it rains .......... we find many (lakes) quite dry, so that people go about walking in their beds and dig holes to try and find enough water, even a little for their maintenance .......

Quite often, epigraphs and literary works use the suffix samudram, sāgaram etc. to the names of the tanks- like Anatasāgaram, Nāgasamudram, Narasāmbudhi etc. But these only indicate the fancy of the donor or the builder in naming it. Though they might be large, how large they were cannot be determined. Cheruvu, kuruṭa, tāṭāka are terms used with reference to tanks. Pedda cheruvu (hiriyakere), chinna cheruvu (chikkakere), Kättē, kuruṭa are other terms. The basis for such a classification is not indicated. But, Francis Buchanan who travelled through the length and breadth of the then Mysore State gives some explanation. Kättē is a small reservoir which supplied water for the cattle to drink. Larger reservoir for supply of water to lands is cheruvu (kere). A square cavity dug in the ground forming into a tank is kuruṭa.81

It was but natural that excavation of tanks and their renovation, as also digging of canals etc. were righteous deeds which would bring credit to the person(s) responsible for such deeds. In fact, in this period we find both the king and the public participating in such acts. For the former it was a duty to be performed in the interests of the State and more so its exchequer, besides, of course being also an act of piety. In the Chittoor district, a different type of transaction with regard to such charitable works is noticed. The temples at Tirumala-Tirupati are the greatest beneficiaries. Expenses for acquisition of lands
and maintenance of tanks etc., could not be met with from the temple treasury. Hence, individual donors were made to undertake such responsibilities and the temple made food offerings etc., to the deity in their names and also handed them over a part of the offerings.

Let us take the case of the tank at Āvilali. In 1409 A.D., the trustees of the temple at Tirumala entered into an agreement. Mallanagal alias Mādhavādāsar, at his cost, got an old channel from Mudari river connected to the Āvilali tank and also got a channel dug from that tank to the nearby fields. The temple, in turn, supplied necessary provision for food offerings to the deity of Tirumala, equivalent to the interest on the money invested by him. The village itself was a dēvadāna. The point to be noted here is that Mallanāṇa spent the money on repairs, construction, etc., thereby enhancing the yield of the lands in the village. His was an act of charity and he was blessed for his service. The beneficiary, in the ultimate analysis was the temple itself.

In the same village, in 1450-51 A.D., a channel was arranged to be dug for a tank at Āvilali. That would have passed through two villages. But the villages of Payinḍipalli protested. Although a sale deed was executed by the donor Mādhavadāsa, to the affected residents, the villagers were afraid that it would damage their lands. Hence, a fresh and different channel was dug out. The source for both the channels at Āvilali and Payinḍipalli was the same kaśakkāl.

In Anantapur district, the Rāmāpuram epigraph dated 1485 A.D. states that Rāyapparāja, son of Bayarajadēva-chōla-mahārāsa made a gift of land and a
channel called Śankaradēvana-kāluve to three Brāhmaṇs (named), under the stipulation that they would convert the valley adjoining the land into a tank to be named Nārasāṃbudhi. The land was situated in Agāli. In 1538 A.D., Vīrānanāyaka, son of Naṇḍi Lakki-setti constructed a canal called Nūtana Tun-gabhadrā, from a spring to the north of the village Modeya alias Achyutarāyapuram, and made a gift of land under the new canal for the service of Godesses Mahālakshmi at Haruhe Lakhānapura. The tank of the village Tammatāḷihalḷi having breached at three places Chenna-gauḍa and Timma-gauḍa repaired them at their own cost. They were thereupon granted land at kaṭ-ṭugadagi for permanent enjoyment by Tipparāja-mahā-arasu. This was in 1541 A.D.

A tank called Nāgasamudram, named after the mother of king Kṛishṇarāya was got constructed by a Brāhmaṇ, Raṅganatha-dīkshita, a royal priest, in a village received by him as a gift. The village was named Nāgalapura and converted into an agrahāra. The temple of Nāgēśvara and Nagendra-sayana were also built therein. This is from Bellary district. Another record from Guḍiḥalḷi in the same district, dated 1527 A.D., states that at the instance of Nāgarāsayya, the administrator of Kōṭūru-sīme, Timmarasa administering Arasikere had the sluice of the tank of that village which had broken and fallen down, rebuilt strongly with mortar and stone.

The Kuchchupāpa epigraph of Achyutarāya dated 1530 A.D., is described as a gift deed of Antarangāna-kāluva. Karanam Rangarāju, paṁ-chāla Timmaya and others (named) of that village were given some lands for excavating a tank and a canal called Antaragāṅga-kāluva and, in lieu of the work
done, they were also given some lands as dasavanda by mahānāyaṇkāchārya Chari Narasa-nāyaka, for the merit of his son Chāri Ayyaharusu. Narasa-nāyaka, son of Kasavi-nāyaka, the mace-bearer (kaṭṭiga) of the king constructed a canal (kaṭṭu- kāluve), according to the Rāvulukolanu inscription.90 Liṅga-reḍḍi and others, besides Pāṇḍarāṅgini Anantayya and Pāpayya, the karanams constructed on antaraṅga- kāluva91 in Pottapi of Siddhāvatam-sime and named it after Kōnamāṁba, mother of Varadayyaḍēva-Chōḍa-mahārāja, son of Māṭla Pōchara-jayadēva-chōḍa- mahārāja. The former made a daśavanda grant of land in recognition of their services. Daśavanda or daśabandha is explained as a tax or cess levied to preserve the sources of water supply through the tank etc.92

From the available records in the Kurnool district it may be deduced that there are very few records pertaining to excavation of tanks and digging out of canals. One factor may be that the river Tuṅgabhadrā, is not perennial, but one of the biggest of the South, flows through parts of this district keeping the area fertile. The Erramala and Velikoṇḍa range of hills have created valleys here and there and there is more of greenery in the district. The Turimella epigraph dated Saka 1314, of Harihara II, records the construction of a tank at Turimella and states that lands below the tank were assigned to the families of those who took part in its construction, including the karanams.93 Sāluva Parvatayyaḍēva-ōḍeya himself built a tank - Gaṅgasamudra - at Siddapura, in 1468 A.D., and granted wet lands below the tank for daily offering in the temple of Mallikarjuna.94 Bhōgaya received land in Tāḍūru by Veṅkata-nāyaniṅgāru for the construction of enclosures and mantapas, laying out gardens and excavating tanks at Gun-
In 1554 A.D., Van Sathagōpa, the trustee of the Narasimhaswamy temple at Channa Ahōbilam and other officials made a grant of land in Pedakallu to mahāmanḍalīśvara Aubhaḷarāju for having constructed the tank Kōna-samudram alias Srīmāṇnarāyana-samudram to the north east of Alamūru.96

For looking after the tanks and water management, officials like nīrāgaṇṭi, talāri and tōti were appointed. These were members of the village organisation called the Āyagāras. There were twelve functionaries in each unit who were collectively referred to as āyagāras. Wilks describes their functions, according to which the gauḍa or pāṭil was the judge in the village assembly while the karanam (sānubhōga) and the tōti were the watchmen, not only of the village but also of the tanks, canals and even crops.97 Iswara Dutt takes talāri to be one of the classes of temple servants. Talārikaṇṭaṁ is the fees paid for watch and ward employees specially during the festival day, while talārikana is the tax or fees levied for the maintenance of a watchman.98 In Kannada also the talavāra, tajāra means a watchman while tōti is an inferior village servant, a sweeper or scavanger. Nīrugaṇṭi is the person who distributes water from the canal to the fields as stipulated by the village assembly or the government.

Emigration and new settlement

Despite all these, the Vijayanagara period witnessed movement of people from one place to another 'seeking pastures anew'. This was because quite often the administrators directly dealt with the people without taking into confidence the local-governing authorities and the village officials who had better knowledge of the conditions that prevailed in the settlements. The government
treasuries became empty as soon as they were filled. The king had to face external aggressions and quell internal revolts. The kingdom being vast, the king could not directly administer and hence the need of chieftains as already shown above. There was huge wealth but too many greedy claimants who indulged in easy life, claiming immunity on ground of their relationships with royalty. Too many queens, too many princes and too many parasites! It is natural that even officials in service made hay while the sun shone.

A few examples may be cited in this regard. The village Tammadiyahalli (in Chittoor district) in Mārjavaṇḍya-nādu had been gifted to god Mallikarjuna of Chandragiri, besides the income from kāṇikes (donations) made on festival days like Śivarātrī. But the officers of Dēvarāya claimed that all these belonged to the palace and having sent for the priests demanded a payment of 25 ḫons to the palace on the account. The priests thereupon furnished documentary evidence to show that right from the days of Kempaṇṇoḍeya, Bukkaṇṇoḍeya and Chikkoṇḍeya these had been freed from all encumbrances and the diety was to receive offerings from this. The king Dēvarāya I was convinced of the arguments and issued orders to the officers not to make this unjust demand. The officers, the tax officers (sumkiga) and the talavāra were prevented from entering (the village and the temple?) for this purpose. This was in 1405 A.D. This record is in Telugu characters. But near the same village at Mallayyanakonḍa we find a copy of this in Kannada characters.

The Kanagānipalle record of 1533 A.D. is an order (nirūpa) of Śivarayya, the agent (Kāryakarta) of Vākiti Timmappa-nāyaka according to which Bhīmi-reḍḍi, karaṇam Honnayya and others of the village as also the paṅchālam
(artisan) of 32 villages had deserted the place since they (the pañchalams) were forced to pay vetti, vēmu, kāṅika, etc. and had migrated to Kundurpi-sima and Pākala-sīma. They were invited back to their villages for rehabilitation on condition of their being exempted from payment of all taxes. The slab is broken and the record incomplete. The Pulivendla epigraph of 1535 A.D., is described as a nammika-śāsanam, i.e., a charter of faith, according to which Tuluva Yellappa-nāyaniṅgaru, agent for the affairs of Timmarāju Saṅkayyadeva-mahārāja, gave an assurance to the settis, pattaṅgasvāmis, reḍḍis, karanas and 18 prajes etc. of Pulivendala-sīma that the kānpus (cultivators) who had left the villages and those that have come afresh would not be burdened with heavy taxation and without breaking the promise he would fix the pannu (tax) which they should honour. He would also do away with the taxes that were being levied earlier. For any offence committed, the fines would not exceed 12 rūkas. Another record of Achyutarāya dated 1538 A.D., in Pērusōmala (Kurnool district) states that mahāmanḍa-leśvara Hanumeyadēva-mahārāja remitted the levies in cash and kind on the lands that had been exempted from taxes (mānīya) but had been unjustly collected by former rulers from the Mahāliṅga, Chennakēśava and Virayya temples in Pērusōmala which was an urpbaji village. In Yelāhaṅji, Sōmalāpuram and two other villages which had been given as sarvamānīya-agrahāras to Dakshinamūrthi Śivachārya, the hasāṇidyaṇgāndlu (?) illegally collected money, fines, etc. On receipt of the complaint from the villagers mahāmanḍalēsvara Rāmarāju Viṭṭalarāya Tirumalarājāyadeva stopped such collections and directed that the amount from fine etc., so collected till then should be utilised for repairing temples, tanks, etc. The same chief, in the same year, viz., 1556 A.D., received representations from the villagers of the agrahāra village
Bhūpatirāya-samudram alias Sarvajña Kriyāśaktipuram about unauthorised taxes that were being levied by the local officers (maṇīha-gāṇḍlu) and after enquiring into it, remitted the taxes.\textsuperscript{104}

The copper-plate grants of Sāluva Narasimha may be noted here. Both of them are of irregular dates, probably of 1387 and 1394 A.D., respectively. The first of them records the grant of reḍḍirikam of the villages Pelakurti and Surabōyinipādu to Mallu Timmā-reḍḍi who colonised some families in the uninhabited tract of Yādavadurgam and Drōnachalam, at the instance of the king.\textsuperscript{105} The second record states that the regions around Yādavadurga and Drōnachala having become deserted, the king proclaimed kānāchi (i.e., hereditary) rights to those who came forward to settle there. In response to this people from Guddili, Billakallu, Bānāla, Manukōṭi etc., approached the king and secured the right to settle in Dalādūli Kōṭakoṇḍa which was one of the regions there open for settlement.\textsuperscript{106} It would appear from this that on the earlier date no concessions or privileges were shown to the settlers who obviously vacated it early. Hence, the conferment of hereditary rights was offered as an incentive to new settlers.

Another important reason for emigration was famine. In the dry zone, into which Rāyalaseema falls, the rainfall varies widely from place to place, from 800 m.m. to less than 400 m.m annually. The dry belt which consists of the major portion of the cultivable lands is prone to frequent droughts. In 1396 A.D., the whole of India south of Narmada witnessed a great famine which lasted 12 years.\textsuperscript{107} According to Ferishta, there was a great famine in the Deccan for two years and this has been calculated from December 1422 to November 1424 A.D.\textsuperscript{108} Ferishta speaks of a famine which ravaged the Deccan and the Telugu
districts in the second half of the 15th century when, unable to bear its severity, people migrated to other places.\footnote{109} According to Burhan-i-Masir of Tāba Tāba about the year 1475 A.D. there was a terrible famine in the Deccan and the country of the Telugas, and this lasted two years.\footnote{110} The Hoṇḍarabāḷu inscription of 1540 A.D. states that during the period grain was sold at 7 mānas per one hāga and that 'men ate men', clearly indicating the serious famine that had gripped the region.\footnote{111} But epigraphical evidences, directly referring to such conditions are practically nil in the region under study.

The main crops of this region are pulses, grams (green, black and Bengal) and Indian corn - millet (jōla). The Kautāḷam (Kurnool district) epigraph of Achyutrāya dated 1533 A.D., records the emigration of the people of Kautalsime who were oppressed by tyranny of the officials, and their return from Māsavēya-sīme at the invitation of mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Salakayadēva Chikka Tirumala. In this connection it is stated that they could cultivate paddy, sajjē (a kind of grain), navane (Italian millet), millet (jōla), sesamum, Bengal gram, mustard, cotton, etc. the share of which was to be made over to the palace was stipulated.\footnote{112} Of these, cotton was a cash crop. There were also fruits and flowers. The Pul-lgāripalle record of 1369 A.D., states that mangoes, tamarind, cocoanot etc. grown in the gift garden land was to be endowed to the temple of Bhairava.

Industry and Trade

During this period Rāyalaseema witnessed even Industrial growth, if not on a large scale. But it gave scope for further expansion.
Silk Industry:

Silk industry was in flourishing conditions *Pattu sales* and *Togatas* were engaged in the industry. There was also a reference a *Pattu sāles* in *Āmuktamālyada*\(^{113}\) Dharmavaram, Gutti, Rāyadurga and Bellary were centres for silk industry.\(^{114}\) The silk fabrics of Rāyalaseema must have competed with the Japan silk in the local markets, as silk was also imported.\(^{115}\)

The *Panchānāmvaru* or *Panchālās* claim their origin from Viswakarma who have five sons *Manu, maya, Silpi, Thvastra, Viswagna, Silpakara* - (architect), *Kanchara* (Alloy industry) and *Agasata* (Goldsmith).\(^{116}\) In a village, they lived in separate quarters. They were usually attached to the temples in which they resided. Without their services, in fact the temples could not have been maintained. The following are the industries pursued by the members of *Panchānāmvaru, Kammara, Vadraṅga, Silpa, Kanchara and Agasāla*.

Kammara Industry:

The most important industry from the point of view of the village economy was *Kammaramu* or blacksmithy. As the profession was of vital importance, the *kammari*, had his īnām and *meras* from the ryots.\(^{117}\) In addition he charged some money or grain for making the iron articles.

Kanchari or Alloy Industry:

Alloy industry was also in thriving condition. kancharis of the sub-caste of *Panchānāmvaru* were engaged in this industry. Tirupati and Śrikalahasti probably must have become the famous centres for the industry.\(^{118}\) This
industry was in flourishing condition in some other important business centres.

Jewellery (Goldsmithy) : There was a general fascination for ornaments. The precious metal, stones used in the industry were gold, silver and many varieties of diamonds. The Agasālas or kamsālas were the experts in making ornaments. Presenting ornaments to the deities of the temples by the people, Royal officers, Amaranāyakas and Royal families and the kings reveal the flourishing condition of the trade.

In the rural areas certain industries like carpentry, blacksmithy and pottery-making catered to the rural economy. On the whole it may be pointed out that Rayalaseema appears to have attained self-sufficiency in the field of industrial production. But without a market and without the existence of an active and enterprising merchant class, neither agricultural production nor industrial production would have progressed as it did in Rayalaseema during the period of our study.

The foreign travellers, in their accounts have given a picture of the flourishing conditions of the empire, Nicolo de Conti who visited Vijayanagara in 1420-21 A.D., calls Vijayanagara by the name Bizenegali. According to him, one finds a hill (mountain) after travelling northward from Vijayanagara for a fortnight. This he calls Abenigaras. In the inaccessible valleys of this hill, he says one finds diamonds which are collected by throwing lumps of flesh to which the diamonds stick and which are carried up to the summit by the eagles which are thereafter driven off and the stones collected. Sewell thinks that this is a reference to Golconda which had mines of diamond. But this was to the east and not north.
of Vijayanagara.\textsuperscript{125}

Abdul Razaak was sent to Vijayanagara as an ambassador by Rukh Shah of Persia in 1441 A.D., when he was just 28 years old. He speaks of seven forts around the capital city, and the seventh, to the north, is the palace of the king.\textsuperscript{126}

By the king’s palace are four bazaara placed opposite each other ..... Each class of men belonging to each profession has shops contiguous the one to the other, the jewellers sell publicly in the bazaars pearls, rubies, emeralds and diamonds.

Lodovico of Varthema, the Italian traveller who visited India in the first decade of the 16th century speaks of gold ornaments and spices that were imported by Mecca. He came to Bisnagara from Cannanore after a forthnight’s travel overland. He speaks of great trade that was taking place here. The value of the ornaments with which the king’s horse had been decorated was more than the value of our cities. He also refers to coins like the golden pardao, the silver tāra and small coins of gold called fanam. There were also kāsus, 16 kāsus being one tāra.\textsuperscript{127}

From the third to the seventh fort there are innumerable shops in the bazaars. In front of the main gate of the royal palace there were four rows of bazaars facing each other on both sides of the roads. These bazaars/streets were quite long and wide. There are different shops for different professions. Jewel merchants openly sell diamonds, pearls and emeralds. Razaak was taken to the king’s presence on the third day of Mahānāvami. The king’s throne was quite huge and was made of gold embedded with diamonds and emeralds.\textsuperscript{128}
Barbosa refers to the diamonds in the kingdom of Narasinga. He says that there were two diamond mines, one in his kingdom and the other in Dakhani kingdom. These may be references to the diamonds of Vajrakarur and Golconda respectively. The people are fond of jewels embedded with emeralds, diamonds, and pearls. Of the objects of import, Barbosa refers to copper, mercury, saffron, scents, opium, camphor and musk which are imported. According to Paes:

You have a broad and beautiful street, full of rows of fine houses and streets of the sort I have described ....... In this street live many merchants, and there you will find all sorts of rubles, and diamonds, and emeralds, and pearls and seed-pearls, and cloths and even other sort of things there is on earth, and that you may wish to buy.

Paes speaks of coins like pardoas which was worth 360 reis, gold used for these coins are of a medium fineness the coins being round and minted. He says that on some coins there is a legend in 'Indian script while on the other face is seen the figure of a male and female.

The available source materials definitely indicate that overseas trade had picked up in the kingdom. But, the beneficiaries were mostly the Arabs first and the Portuguese later. For their own warfare the kings needed horses and Indian horses were too short and unfit for warfare of that intensity that was seen in Vijayanagara. The panels on the outer walls of the temples at Hampi as also those of the period found in the region under study show that those horses were from Arabia. According to Barros the coastal trade was entirely in the hands of Muhammadans. When Krishṇadēvarāya commenced his rule he sought the friendship of the Portuguese who were then colonising Goa. Though he knew
that they were most unreliable and were sea pirates, the need for horses changed his attitude towards them, only with regard to the purchase of those animals. He was afraid of the Arabs selling them to the Sultans and got an assurance from the Portuguese that they would not sell them to the Sultan.

If we turn our attention to literary sources we have the writing of Kṛishṇadēvarāya himself who in his Āmuktamālāya 132 states that horses, elephants, gems, sandals, pearls were all imported from abroad and the foreign merchants who brought them were provided with all facilities and in times of famine and other distresses they treated well those that sought shelter.

In another verse he says that the merchants of distant countries should be provided with facilities so that they should settle down in the capital itself.133

But this policy in one way stunted the growth of external trade by the local merchants. Foreigners, specially, the Portuguese, took advantage of the situation and practically monopolised overseas trade.134

Taxes

Not much is known about the conditions of trade in general. Internal trade, however, flourished and a great deal of it was in the hands of the local merchants. In the region under study we get an idea of these conditions through the epigraphs. The taxes levied indicate the articles of merchandise marketted on which tolls, customs, etc. had to be paid. In fact, we could classify these
taxes like commercial taxes, professional taxes and social taxes. However, the
inscriptions refer to a number of taxes. The exact connotation of such terms
used therein are not clear. Inferences are to be drawn. But there are also
records which clearly indicate the nature of the taxes.

The Katteragandla (Cuddapah district) epigraph of Kṛṣṇaṅraṇāya dated
1525 A.D.,\textsuperscript{135} registers a gift of lands, income from taxes, etc. to god Chen-
nakēśava of the place. In this connection it speaks of achchuvirāḷa (taxes
regularly collected), and the taxes to be paid to the tax-officials (ṣuṃkaraṇārṇu).
These taxes were grāma kaṭṭam (taxes due from villages), sahaṭṭapannu (?) taxes
on looms, oil mill, immovable property and taxes collected from merchants who
came from outside and sold or purchased herein. These were in the form of tolls
both ways - \textit{i.e.}, import or export. This \textit{ubhaya mārga-suṅka} is explained as
wayfare tax. The Animela inscription dated 1531 A.D.,\textsuperscript{136} refers to magama (tax
levied in the shape of tolls) on cotton bales (dūdi kaṭṭlam) and spices passing
through the valleys (kanuma) of Pulivenda, Chinta and Gandi, by the ayyavāli
(merchant guilds) of the Vīra-baliṅja. Two more records\textsuperscript{137} from the same place
refer to arecanuts, jaggery, pepper (miṟṟalu), sesamum (nuvuḷu) and cloth
besides rice, millet, rāgi. The latter were weighed in gunny bags.

The Balija (trading) community was to pay tolls on several items of
merchandise as noticed above. A record of 1560 A.D.\textsuperscript{138} from Cheruvu Belagallu
in Kurnool district states that the customs from the military camp (ṭhāṇyaṃ
suṃkam) of Kere Beḷugallu was to be collected by Jinnarasu, son of Narasaya, the
customs officer (suṃkara). This latter gifted 6 varahas out of 14, as taxes on
immovable properties (stāvara) to be paid by the balijas of the pēla, \textit{i.e.}, the town.
An interesting inscription from Attirāla dated 1477 A.D. states that Saluva Narasimha, on his visit to Siddhavattam, found that worship and offerings in the temple of Kshētrēśvara, Parasurāma and Bhairava had stopped since the tax payers had given up contributing the income from toddy (sura-sum-kam) from the palm trees, and made a grant of land. The record does not say what happened to the collection of income from toddy custom. But this would show that toddy also was subject to taxation. Betel leaves and grain that was imported or exported were also subjected to toll and collected at Rupalagudi, a military camp in Bellary district.

Mulavīsa is taken to mean tax levied on articles brought for sale. This would amount to toll. It is also interpreted as the original tax levied proportionately upon the profits of a trader. This may therefore, refer to income-tax. The Suluvaīy inscription dated 1561 A.D., registers a gift of money, with the concurrence of settis, patṭaṇaśvāmis (mayor of city/town/local bodies) and other officials of the nadu to god Kallinātha. This money came from mūlavīsa at the rate of one kāsu per hāga from two villages (names lost). Here, obviously, we find a reference to toll-income, a part of which was made over to the deity.

Another term to be noted here is sthala sumka. Sthala means a land or a locality. Inscriptional evidences indicate that they were local cess-tolls collected from a locality. The Muttukūru epigraph of Sāluva Immadi Narasimha dated 1493 A.D., states that Sunkayya, brother-in-law of Timma-nāyaka, an officer of the treasury (bokkasam) made a grant of income from sthala-suṅkam of Muttukūru. Here it would mean a local cess. The Pāmidi record of 1535 A.D., states that Tirumalayadēva who had received Pāmidi as a magani got a new pālem (hamlet)
established and made a gift of its local cess (sthala-suňkam), besides others to God Bhôgêśvara of Pâmidi.

Several other small taxes also may be noted. One is pullari, a grazing tax for allowing cattle to graze obviously in the forest area. This is also referred to in the record noted above. Another tax term is kuŗiteâ or Kuŗiderige. This tax was exempted from payment by the shepherds as is stated in the Koṭṭûr inscription of 1580 A.D.144 The shepherds with their flock of sheep would be moving from place to place and specially in the dry lands, they camp for a day or two for which the owner had to pay them stipulated amount, for, the sheep's manure keeps the land fertile. This is the income that the shepherds get from their sheep and naturally this income was also taxed.

There were also several professional taxes referred to which indicate the various professions followed by the people. The most popular of the professions was that of dommaris. These were acrobats who amused the inhabitants, mostly in the villages and thereby earned their livelihood. There are also instances to show that the villagers themselves had to pay tax for maintaining such dommaris. In the Râyalaseema region such acrobats were perhaps found in great numbers. We have several records relating to these dommaris. The Râyachôti epigraph145 of Sadâśiva refers to 24 kulas of his community, for whose benefit Basavarâju made a gift of income from dommari pannu to god Tiruvêṅgâlanâtha of Môṭakâṭ-la. Similarly another record from Āhavalapâdu146 dated 1552 A.D., registers a gift of 23 chakram coins to gods Bhôgêśvara and Chennakêśava for the merit of 24 kulas of his community. The donor was Pederâju. Kâki Padmarâju,147 Kûtari Sûraparâju and Dommari- mîsara-gaṇḍa Komaragiri-reḍḍi148 mîsarigaṇḍa
Punnā-ṛṛdi, Tippirāju, Turukāṇayam Basavarāju and Vōdipotināyudu, Chin-
na Gaṅgarāju, Goparāju, Timmarāju are some other dommaris whose names are
recorded in epigraphs. The last mentioned persons figuring in the Beḍudūru
inscription make the gift for the merit of 24 families of dommaris residing in 56
(chhappannāru) countries. It also states that the annual income from dommari
pannu from the village amounts to 8 varahas.

The other most popular community is that of vipravinōdis who were
acrobats. Originally they were vipras (Brāhmaṇs) who entertained the king or the
chiefs and heads of divisions etc. by jesting. But, slowly they lost their position
in the Brāhmaṇ hierarchy of caste and came to be considered as degenerate.
They received contributions from the public in the form of Vipravinōdi pannu.
The Koppōlu epigraph states that the vipravinōdis named therein belonged
to Kāsyapa-gōṭra and Atharvaṇāśākha and that when they visited Koppōlu, they
made a gift of income through vipravinōdi pannu received by them annually from
the mahājanas of the place, to God Siddhēśvara, for the merit of all those that
belonged to their kula. The last portion of the record refers to Yakṣhiṇīvidya with
which perhaps they were acquainted. Kōvilakunṭṭa epigraph of 1554 A.D., refers
to vipravinōdis of Kāsyapa Vaśisṭha- gōṭras, Kātyāyana-sūtra and Yajur
(Prathama)-Śākha Parvatayya of Chāṅgalarāri, Mādhavayya and others, who,
having agreed upon, made a grant of tyāgvavarttana given to vipravinōdis
annually by the mahājanas of the place to god Viṭhalēśvara, for the merit of all
members of the community settled at Vidyānagara (s.a. Vijayanagara),
Beḍadakōta, Kaṭāka (Orissa ?) and Drāviḍa-dēśa (the Tamil region) and several
other regions (nānūdēśālu). The Bētapalli epigraph (Anantapur district) refers
to a gift of income from vipravinḍi-varttana, by the Vipravinddis named mantramūrti Basavayya and Gōvindayya to God Vēṅkaṭādri. The Chinnahōtūru inscription\textsuperscript{153} refers to two other Rudraya and his son Gōvindayya. The records are dated 1555 and 1556 A.D. respectively and Gōvindayya of the two records may be identical. More than fifty records of such type are found in Rāyalaseema as on today. A record from Rāgulapādu describes mantramūrti Basavayya, Gōvindayya and others as Vidyāpravīnas.\textsuperscript{154}

Viṅramuṣṭi is another class of acrobats, who were not brahmins, but belonged to the Vīraśaiva community. They were disciples of Vīraśaiva pontiffs and were associated with some of their maṭhas. For example, Chinna Basavayya, son of Būmayya, a viṅramuṣṭi of Ratnagiri was a disciple of Bhikshavrittī Ayya, the pontiff of the maṭha at Śrīśaila. With the permission of the Ayyāvale who were devotees of Gaṅeśvara and Gaurīśvara he made a gift of the Viṅramuṣṭi-pannu collected from the temple priests (tammāḷu) to God Sōmeśvara of Peddamuḍiyam. The record also refers to jaṅju, nārasa, paṭṭidi, mōṭupalaka the meanings of which are not clear. They are taken to be taxes.\textsuperscript{155}

The Vallūru inscription\textsuperscript{156} refers to Siddha Bhikshavrittī-ayya of Śriparvata whose disciples Immadi Liṅgayya, Guṇṭe Rāchayya and other viṅramuṣṭis made a gift of income from the tax to god Vīrana of Vallūru.

One more professional tax was mangala-pannu - tax on barbers. In fact, this had become so popular but oppressive that barbers of Karnataka, headed by Kondōju, appealed to Aliya Rāmarāja who had to recommend to the king Sadāśiva the withdrawal of levy of this tax. This was later on followed by the
barbers of Rayalaseema. The Nallabalī epigraph\textsuperscript{157} clearly states that at the instance of Rāmarāja, king Sadāśiva, made over the tax on barbers (\textit{mangali pannu}) to Koṇḍōja of Karnataka. This tax due from Nallabalī was also remitted. The Chintalaputtūru inscription,\textsuperscript{158} also states that under the royal orders Aliya Rāmāyyadēva having exempted tax on barbers in Karnataka, \textit{mahāmandalēśvara} Timmāyyadēva of Nandyāla followed suit and exempted payment of such tax for the whole of Ghanḍikōṭa-sīma.

\textit{Pañcālamvāru} were the artisans of five classes the goldsmiths, blacksmiths, braziers, carpenters and stone-cutters. They were also to pay professional taxes from which they were exempted as found from epigraphs. The \textit{Kanagānīpalle} inscription\textsuperscript{159} of Anantapur district dated 1533 A.D. of the reign of Achyutarāya records an order of Īśvarayya, the agent of Vākiti Timmappanāyaka exempting the artisan caste (\textit{pañchālamvāru}) from payment of all the taxes in the 32 villages as of old, in order to rehabilitate them in their former places from which they had migrated to Kundurpi and Pākāla-sīmas when these taxes were imposed on them. Two records from Chidipirāla and Kamalāpuram\textsuperscript{160} record an agreement between two parties of goldsmiths of Chidipirāla, Kamalāpuram and other nine villages (named) - Peddamallōju, Chinna Mallōju and Basavaya on one side and Pāpōju and Siddhayya on the other - according to which one party would get 2/3 of the income from the hereditary right (kāṇāchi) of collecting the professional tax called \textit{vōjarika} (tax on goldsmiths - agasāla) from the 11 villages.

There were the \textit{upparās} who were engaged in salt industry. The term \textit{upparā} also means a brick mason. But since the term \textit{uppa}-mōle figures along with \textit{upparā} it would be in the fitness of things that \textit{upparā} is interpreted as
salt-makers. This industry was not confined only to the coastal region but also had spread over to the interior. In fact, it was a State monopoly. The Bāḷaṅgōṭī epigraph of 1521 A.D.,\textsuperscript{161} is in the form of an order issued to the salt-makers (uppara) Kōṭībōva, by Chiṅkala Tirumalabōva, the maṇeḥagāra (superintendent of tolls) of Kaṭṭige Kāmaṇa-nāyaka. The order pertained to the uppina móle (the heap of mud for preparing salt). But the details are not clear.

The Pennahōbilam epigraph\textsuperscript{162} cites a number of taxes which were exempted from payment by the mahājanas of 16 agrahāras (named) in Uruvakoṇḍa-sīma by Konḍapadēva-mahā-arasu. Of them, we have the tax on betel leaves (yeleya pannu) the fee to be paid to the mint (kammaṭada kūli - obviously for conversion of metal lumps like gold and silver into coins), fee for the watchman of the nādu (talavārike), fee for accountants (karaṇikara varttane), ulūpa (food grains to be supplied) for the mahānavami festival and also for Hennedēva,\textsuperscript{163} the tenure (guttage) to be paid to the piṁjanīga (may be the s.a. carder or comber of cotton - piṁjāra), soppe (probably tax paid on the straw of the various kinds of millet), chinivāna (small taxes) and jānasāle (?). It also refers to the contribution (presentation) made for (maintaining) the daṇḍu (s.a. army which was on move).

Tax on looms and oil mills also were collected. The Chidipirāla epigraph\textsuperscript{164} refers to magga-stāvarālu, gānuga-siddhāyam, īḍigi-siddhāyam, golla-siddhāyam uppara- siddhāyam (sumjani ?) - Siddhāyam gifted by the customs officers of Chidipirāla which is described as belonging to the sumka-thanya of Ghaṇḍikōṭa-sīma. Siṁjari herein may be a mistake for pinnjāri. The meaning of īḍigi-siddhāyam is not clear.

Some more taxes, social in nature may be noted. We hear of samaya-suṅka or kula-siddhāya. The Aṭhavaṇatantartram says that some prominent persons specially of the lower castes were chosen by the king or his officials, as leaders of those groups. These leaders were empowered to enforce caste rules, try cases of violation and give suitable punishment. It says: "in virtue of the monopoly granted to him by the state, he (the leader) derives much income from the community. He is required to pay a portion of this income to the government as a tax, which is known as samaya-suṅka."

Fairs

Weekly fairs were organised in prominent villages where the people from the neighbouring places could come to market their produces. There are very few inscriptions of the period which refer to such weekly fairs. The Lēpākshi epigraph registers a gift of tolls collected by the merchants at the sante held every Sunday in the hamlet of Viśvēśvaradēvarapura belonging to Lēpākshi and of other tolls raised. This is dated 1534 A.D., N.Venkataramanayya refers to some inscription in the Local Records which refer to a number of goods which move from one place to another for exchange. Āmuktamālyada refers to the fairs held in each town and here the people of neighbouring villages went to purchase articles required after selling the articles which they manufacture. The Gāndikōṭa kalīyat of Talumanchipuram refers to the exemptions given in collection of taxes from the merchants in the weekly fair, by avasaram Timmarasa and this was to be effective for a period of six months.
We find, however, evidences for establishing new bazaar streets within a town. The Vēlpumaḍugu epigraph\textsuperscript{170} is an order issued by Lingarāśa of Dhārāśura to the setṭis, sēnabōvas and local and outside merchants thereof (nānādēśada setṭi paṭṭaṇaswāmi) at Vēlupadige alias Krishṇarāyapura fixing the rate of taxes in the new bazaar. Accordingly, no taxes were to be levied for the first three years. Thereafter taxes fixed were one varāha per oil-mills, 3 panas for loom, 3 panas for a shop, one pana for a shop selling minor articles (cheluvāna binugu) the tenants (vokkalu) of different jatis 1 pana, after three years.

For the movement of merchandise, several trade routes existed. Originally they were routes for the movement of army. Some records refer to it as daṅḍu-dōva or daṅḍinadāri. For example, a late record of 1592 A.D. from Beludoṇa (Anantapur District)\textsuperscript{171} registers a gift of land to five persons for having repaired a well in the place which was to the north of the road called daṅḍina-dāri (road of the army). The undated Haligēri epigraph of Sadāśiva refers to the conducting of a feeding house for the Brāhmaṇs, the aradeśis and paradeśis who were using the military road - daṅḍu dōva.\textsuperscript{172}

Let us see what some of the travellers have spoken of this aspect of trade in the kingdom. Razaak speaks of four bazaars by the king's palace. Says he : "Each class of men belonging to each profession has shops contiguous the one to the other.\textsuperscript{173} According to Barbaso : "There is an infinite trade in this city .... In this city there are many jewels which are brought from Pegu and Celani (Ceylon), and in the country itself many diamonds are found, because there is a mine of them in the kingdom of Narasinga and another in the kingdom of Deccani."\textsuperscript{174}
We have seen that gold nuggets were converted into coins in the mints at stipulated rates. By this time coins were very much in circulation and barter exchange had almost made way to money exchanges. Inscriptions refer to several coins. Gadyāṇa was also referred to as varaha or pon. Nuniz speaks of pardaos vintees, pagodas (gold) and fanams.  

The Atthavana tantram refers to the export of cotton and silk from Dharmavaram, Tāḍapatri, Gutti etc. in Rāyalaseema to places like Śrirangapat-tana; cotton from Ādoni to Kolar and sidlaghatta; tobacco, ghee and oil from Dharmavaram to neighbouring districts. But doubts may be expressed about some of these. Mahārāja-tīralu and mahārāja prayōjanālu are two terms that figure in some inscriptions. Both the inscriptions cited are from Chittoor district. The terms are not noticed in Iswara Dutt’s Glossary. But K. Satyanarayana opines that these were dues from villagers collected by the kings as a consequence of the superstitious beliefs that the king would protect the villagers from epidemics by himself worshipping the village Goddesses. These were collected on behalf of the king by the amara- nāyakas. But one is not sure whether such an interpretation could be accepted.

The records of Chittoor district, influenced by the administrative system under the Chōḷas give us details of a hierarchy of officers. The Nallūrupalle epigraph registers a grant of land by the nāṭṭārs of various nāduś and officer (adhikari) Viruppaṇnar under the orders of Somappa-uḍaiya, the mahāpradhāni of the royal palace. The Eduru record speaks of an order (nirūpa) of the same mahāpradhāna converting the dēvadāna lands of the temple as sarvamāṇya, including the taxes due from the tirumaḍaividāgam of the širmais of
Ändärkutṭai and Narasingaṅkīrai. This was under oral instructions (enorpadi) of bhandāri Vittappar for the pāṭrabhōga and performance of festivals to God Valaittalumba-nāyaṇār of Viḍaiyūr. The officers of Puli-nādu and Māyaṇan, the aramaṇai- kaṇakku (the palace accountant). This is a record of Kampaṇa II dated 1360 A.D. The taxes mentioned in the Nallūrupalle record are stated to be mērpon, suṅgam, kaṭṭina-kaḍali, urirukkai, āḍu-tīrai, makkal-tīrai, pāśāna- tīrai, etc. The terms used for export and import in the Chōla period are ēru-sattu and ivaṅgu-sattu which, Sampath thinks, seem to have led to mēlvattai and kīlvattai, terms that stand for collections on articles of merchandise that pass through the village.181

An inscription from Tirumalai, dated 1473 A.D.,182 refers to income from taxes like kār, kāḍamai, koḍai and paṇvāri. They are related undoubtedly to the proprietor’s share of the crop of the rainy (kār), summer (kōdaḻ, general land tax (kāḍamai) and sundry collection in cash (pon vāri)183 Another epigraph of Dēvarāya I dated 1405 A.D.184 states that the temple priests having produced documentary evidence confirmed the grant of that village besides an income of 25 hons from the contributions collected during the Sivarāṭri. It is stated that these incomes were being paid till then to the palace.

The study will show that a good number of fresh taxes were levied in this period. Trade developed greatly. Venkataramanayya has tabulated - based on Local Records - some details to show the movement of goods. From Rol-lamadugu and Animela peṅkas of bales of cotton and rasavargas, pulses, nuts, fruits, bales of silk from Bukkapatnam, nuts, pepper, jaggery, yarn, cloth etc. from Animala, perfumes like sandal, camphor, musk etc. from Udayagiri were
exported. There were several routes, one of them is referred to as the Ancient Road, Tirupati Road, Ahobilam Road etc. The Atthavana Tantram gives more details about such routes.

Naturally, such a heavy traffic had also to face difficulties in the form of robberies and piracies. Literary works refer to such instances and even the foreign travellers speak of it. But what is of interest to note is that these travellers narrate the experiences they underwent even in other countries like Arabia etc. through which they travelled. Nikitin, for example, addresses his Christian brethren of Russia that the Mohammedans are very partial and therefore advises them to come after declaring themselves as Mohammadans. St. Stephen says that he was robbed by robbers at Azami. Barbosa says that at Mombasa the thieves took away gold, silver, copper, ivory and other costly articles of merchandise.¹⁸⁵

The above study of the Agricultural, Trade and Industrial scenario explains, the conditions of Rāyalaseema region. On the basis of the available evidence, it cannot be denied that the Vijayanagara rulers allowed the local institutions to continue and function as before. They did respect the tradition. But circumstances might have forced them specially in the regions to leave them to their fate. The introduction of Nāyaṅkara system in the provincial sphere resulted in the Nāyakas being more interested in collecting their revenues. And more over, the frequent change of Nāyakas, as already cited, resulted in the disintegration of the system and more so with the disapperance of central power.
The disappearance of central authority then led to the disappearance of Agrahāras also. Bālguli (Bagali, Bellary district) in Karnataka had civic life for 400 years from the 10th century A.D. to the commencement of the 14th century A.D. An epigraph dated A.D. 1534 records that while Krishnappa Nāyaka, Son of Haḍapada Bayappa nāyaka was ruling over Kottūru in Kōgali district, and the Thirty-two provinces. Haḷavi Nāyaka was ruling over Bālguli made a gift of paddy and gold for the service of the God Kālideva. Another epigraph dated A.D. 1551 records that Haḷavi-nāyaka, son of Chami-Nāyaka of Bāguli, in the subdivision of Kottūru-sīme, which had been granted by Haḍapada-Krishnappa-Nāyaka exempted the shepherds of Bāguli and its hamlets from tax on their sheep. From these epigraphs, we can see how Bāguli came under the control of 'Amara-nayaka' and thus lost its self-government.

So the eroding authority of the amara nāyakas slowly led to the disappearance of local institutions and the agrahāras in these regions. This gradually led to the loosening of the economic structure and the central authority.

It further shows that the burden of taxation was quite heavy for the commoners. But it did fill the royal exchequer to a great extent enabling the kings to indulge in extensive, expansive, and also defensive warfare.
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