CHAPTER VIII

MINOR RULING DYNASTIES DURING THE SENA PERIOD

I. The Deva Dynasty

A line of kings belonging to the Deva family is known to us from five copper-plate Grants (C. 17-21). They introduce us to a dynasty whose genealogical list is given below:

```
Purushottama
| Madhumathana-deva
| | Vāsudeva
| Dāmodara-deva
| Daśaratha-deva
```

The family is said to have descended from the moon and was follower of the Vaishnava cult. The founder of the family, Purushottama, is described as the chief of the Deva family (Dev-ānvayagrāmaśī) (Grant No. C. 17). No Grant gives any royal title to him, and it may be assumed that the kingdom was founded by his son Madhumathana-deva who is referred to as a king. No details are given either of him or of his son Vāsudeva. Vāsudeva's son Dāmodara, during whose reign three Grants (C. 17-19) were issued, ascended the throne in 1153 Saka or 1231 A.D., and ruled till at least 1243 A.D. when the Grant No. 19 was issued. It may thus be assumed that Madhumathana-deva, the grandfather of Dāmodara, set up as an independent king shortly before or after the Muslim raid on Nadiyā.

So far as we can judge from the probable identification of localities mentioned in Grants Nos. 17, 18 and 19, Dāmodara's kingdom roughly comprised the territory corresponding to the modern districts of Tippera, Noakhali and Chittagong. Dāmodara seems to have been a powerful ruler. He is described as the suzerain of kings (sakala-bhūpati-chakravartī), and assumed, in imitation of the Sena kings, the high-sounding epithet Arirāja-Chānura-Mādhava.
Whether the area of his kingdom, indicated above, represents the kingdom inherited by him or also includes the territories added in his reign, is difficult to say. According to the Grant No. C. 21 he had performed a great festival in Gauḍa. As this is not mentioned in any of his own inscriptions he must have extended his dominions or political influence to Gauḍa towards the end of his reign, and this was undoubtedly helped by the decline of the power of the Senas. But in view of the existence of the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā, down at least to A.D. 1220, a portion of the district of Tippera must have been outside the jurisdiction of the family till that date.

Dāmodara-deva was succeeded by his son Daśaratha-deva, two of whose Grants are known (C. 20, 21). He is called Paramesvara, Parama-bhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, Arirāja-Danuja-Mādhava, the illustrious Daśaratha-deva. He is also given other high-sounding titles which are all faithfully copied from the records of Viśvarūpa-sena and Keśavasena. Further, corresponding to the expression Senakula-kamala-vikāśa-bhāskara of the records of the two Sena kings, Daśaratha is called Dev-anvaya-kamala-vikāśa-bhāskara. It would thus follow that Daśaratha, who belonged to the Deva family, was a Vaishnava. As the Grant was issued from Vikramapura, and the lands granted were also situated near it, there is no doubt that Daśaratha came into possession of the Sena kingdom in East Bengal. We are further told that Daśaratha obtained the kingdom of Gauḍa through the grace of Nārāyaṇa. What is exactly meant by Gauḍa is difficult to say. The Gauḍa proper, i.e., North and West Bengal, was in possession of the Muslim rulers, and there is no evidence to show that the name was used at this time in an extended sense so as to cover Eastern Bengal. It is, therefore, to be presumed that Daśaratha claims to have conquered a portion of West or North Bengal. This claim need not be regarded as a fantastic one, for it is quite likely that an enterprising Hindu ruler of Eastern Bengal occasionally led successful raids to the Muslim domains in his neighbourhood. Further, as stated above, his father had already established some kind of authority in Gauḍa. It has to be remembered also that the Muslim rulers had to carry on several military operations in order to consolidate their rule over the whole of Bengal, and there were occasionally internecine quarrels among them. Daśaratha-deva might have taken advantage of all this to seize a part of Gauḍa (North or West Bengal).
The close agreement in the titles shows that Daśaratha was not probably far removed from the time of Keśavasena. This is in full agreement with the palaeography of the record: If Minhāj is to be believed, the descendants of Lakshmanasena were ruling in Bang or East Bengal till 1245 or 1260 A.D., and we have to presume that Daśaratha-deva conquered Vikramapura after that date.

The title Arirāja-Danuja-Mādhava borne by Daśaratha makes it very probable that he is identical with king Danujamādhava, mentioned in the genealogical records of Bengal, and also with Danuj Rāi, the Rājā of Sonārgaon, near Dacca, who, according to Ziauddin Barni, entered into an agreement with Ghiyāsuddin Balban that he would guard against the escape of the rebellious Tughril Khān by water (1283 A.D.) The date 1283 A.D. would not be unsuitable for Daśaratha as his predecessor Dāmodara-deva ruled till at least 1243 A.D. (C. 19). If we accept the identity, we have to regard Sonārgaon as the capital of Daśaratha. It is probable, in that case, that Sonārgaon represents the capital city of Vikramapura mentioned in the records of the Senas. As is well known, the name Vikramapura is now applied to a wide area round about the modern town of Munshiganj in the Dacca district, and the designation originated from a village called Vikramapura, which undoubtedly existed in the neighbourhood of Munshiganj, though its exact location is not known at present. Sonārgaon is situated on the bank of the Dhaleswari just opposite Munshiganj, close to the confluence of that river with the Lakhia, the old Brahmaputra and the Meghna. Sonārgaon thus occupied a strategic position, and although it is separated today by a river from the localities chiefly associated with the traditions of the Sena kings, the known changes in the courses of rivers in that region do not make it at all unlikely that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D., it was contiguous to the Munshiganj and Rāmpāl area. In any event, if we accept the identity of Daśaratha, whose capital was Vikramapura, with Danuj Rāi, whose seat of government was Sonārgaon, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the ruins of Sonārgaon represent at least a part of the famous capital of Bengal.

Two copper-plates (C. 22-3) discovered at Bhāṭerā, about twenty miles from Sylhet, introduce us to a line of kings who may be represented by the following genealogical table:
In the family of the Moon

1. Kharavāna (Navagīrvāna)\(^5\) (not mentioned in No. 23).
2. Gokula-deva (Gokulabhūmipāla in 23).
5. Iśāna-deva (Donor of 23).

Keśavadeva is described as a great warrior who performed *Tulāpurusha* sacrifice.

The second Grant was issued in year 17, evidently the regnal year of Iśānadeva. As to the date of the first plate, opinions differ regarding the correct reading of the figures.\(^6\) But on palaeographical grounds the plates can hardly be regarded as earlier than the 13th century A.D., and may be even somewhat later. According to tradition, the *ṭilā* (mound), where the plate (C. 22) was found, is the place which belonged to Rājā Gauragovinda *alias* Govinda Simha. The prince was overthrown by Shah Jellal who invaded Sylhet in 1257 A.D., and brought some of the independent Rājās under his control.

Dr. R. L. Mitra held that the Govinda of the *ṭilā* is the same as No. iv in the above genealogical list, and the date proposed by him fits in well with the story of Shah Jellal's invasion.

The names of all the kings of the dynasty, excepting the doubtful No 1, end in *deva*, and in Plate C. 23 we have Keśavadeva-deva. It is not impossible, therefore, that they also belong to the Deva family.

II. The Kingdom of Paṭṭikerā

The existence of the small principality of Paṭṭikerā, in the district of Tippera, may be traced as far back as the 11th century A.D. The earliest reference to it occurs in a manuscript of *Ashṭasāhasrikā Prajnāpāramitā* preserved in the library of the Cambridge University. This MS. (Add. 1643), copied in the year 1015 A.D. contains the picture of a sixteen-armed goddess with the label "Paṭṭikere-Chundāvarabhavane Chundā."\(^7\) It proves that early in the 11th
century A.D., the image of the Buddhist goddess Chundā in Paṭṭikera was widely known.

The Burmese chronicles contain many references to this kingdom. According to Hmannan, the kingdom of Anoratha (1044-1077 A.D.) was bounded on the west by Patikkara, the country of Kalas (foreigners). The same text narrates the romantic story of love between the Prince of Paṭṭikera and Sweinthi, the daughter of king Kyanzittha (1086-1112). The Burmese king was agreeable, but his minister objected to the marriage and the Prince, baffled in love, committed suicide. It forms the theme of Burmese poems and two melodramas, one of which runs up to three volumes and is acted on the Burmese stage even up to the present day. Although Sweinthi’s love for the prince of Paṭṭikera had to be sacrificed to the welfare of the State, her son Alaungsithu, who succeeded Kyanzittha and ruled from 1112 to 1167 A.D., married a princess of Paṭṭikera. According to Burmese chronicles, Narathu, the son and successor of Alaungsithu, slew with his own hand this princess of Paṭṭikera, the widow of his father. The Arakanese chronic’es, however, give a different version of this incident. We are told that ‘a certain king Pateikkara of the kingdom of Marawa’ sent his two daughters as presents to the kings, respectively, of Arakan and Tampadipa. The general of Arakan sent the latter princess to Pagan with a request to king Narathu to send her to Tampadipa. Narathu, however, forcibly detained her in his seraglio. The princess having rebuked Narathu for his disgraceful conduct, the latter forthwith drew his sword and killed her.

Both the Burmese and the Arakanese chronicles agree about the sequel to the story. The king of Paṭṭikera

“on hearing of the murder of his daughter, disguised as Brāhmaṇs eight soldiers who were sworn to avenge the crime. They arrived at Pagan, and were introduced into the palace under pretence of blessing the king. They killed him with a sword, after which they either killed each other or committed suicide, so that all died in the palace.”

How far the above stories may be regarded as historical it is difficult to say. But it is evident that there was an intimate intercourse between the kingdoms of Burma and Paṭṭikera during the twelfth century A.D. The existence of the kingdom of Paṭṭikera in the thirteenth century is proved by an inscription engraved on a copper-plate found in the neighbourhood of Cómiilla (C. 25). It
records a grant of land in favour of a Buddhist monastery built in the city of Paṭṭikerā, by Śrī Dhaḍi-eba, the Chief Minister of Raṇavaṅkamalla Śrī-Harikāladeva, in A.D. 1220, in the 17th year of his reign. There is no doubt that this Paṭṭikerā was the capital of the kingdom which has been referred to in the Burmese chronicles as Patikkara or Pateikkara. Although the city of Paṭṭikerā cannot be identified, it must have been situated within the district of Tippera, for an important pargaṇā of this district which extends up to the Maināmatī Hills, five miles to the west of Comilla, is still known as Pāṭikārā or Pāṭkārā. In older documents this pargaṇā is called Paṭikerā or Paṭtikerā which more closely resembles the old name.

It is difficult to ascertain the status of this kingdom during the 11th and 12th centuries A.D. vis-a-vis the Pāla and Sena kings of Bengal. The references in the Burmese chronicles imply, but do not certainly prove, that it was an independent State. Harikāladeva Raṇavaṅkamalla, who ascended the throne in 1204 A.D. and was ruling till 1220 A.D., was undoubtedly an independent king. As we have seen above, the founder of another royal line, the Deva family, also set up an independent kingdom about the same time in the immediate neighbourhood. Both of them might have taken advantage of the decline of the Senas to establish their independence. The name-ending -deva in Harikāladeva tempts us to regard this king also as belonging to the same Deva family, though Deva, in this case, might be nothing more than the usual honorific ending of a royal name. The existence of at least three ruling families in the 13th century A.D., with name-ending -deva, two of whom are definitely said to belong to the Deva family, is however, not without significance. It is probable that they were all important feudatory chiefs and attained to high position after the collapse of the Sena power.

Whether Raṇavaṅkamalla belonged to the old royal family of Paṭṭikerā referred to in the Burmese chronicles cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. In any case, we do not hear of the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā after him. It was most probably absorbed in the growing kingdom of the Deva family.

III. The Kingdom of Piṭhi

A family of kings with names ending in -sena are known to have ruled over a kingdom called Piṭhi. An inscription found at
Jānibighā,\(^{10}\) about six miles to the east of Bodh-Gayā, records the grant of a village to the Vajrāsana (i.e., Mahābodhi temple) by king Āchāryya Jayasena, lord of Pīṭhī, and son of Buddhhasena. The latter must be identified with Āchāryya Buddhhasena, lord of Pīṭhī, who is mentioned in an inscription found at Bodh-Gayā as having issued some directions to the inhabitants of Mahābodhi in respect of some grant made to Śrī-Dharmarakshita, the religious preceptor of Aśokachalla, king of Kamā.\(^{11}\)

The two inscriptions leave no doubt that the kingdom of Pīṭhī, over which Buddhhasena ruled, certainly comprised the Gayā district.\(^{12}\) As already noted above, Bhīmayaśas, one of the feudal chiefs who helped Rāmapāla in his expedition against Bhima, is called in Rāmarcharita\(^{13}\) both Pīṭhī-pati, lord of Pīṭhī, and Magadh-ādhipati, suzerain of Magadha. From this Mr. K. P. Jayaswal,\(^{14}\) and following him Mr. N. G. Majumdar,\(^{15}\) held that Pīṭhī and Magadha are practically identical. This does not, however, follow from the statement in Rāmarcharita which merely implies that Bhīmayaśas, lord of Pīṭhī, was also overlord of Magadha. On the whole, all that we can definitely assert is that Pīṭhī included the region round Gayā. An inscription of Pīṭhī-pati Devasena dated in the 14th regnal year of Madanapāla has been found at Ārmā, in the Monghyr District.\(^{16}\)

The date of the Sena kings of Pīṭhī is not free from doubt. The Jānibighā inscription is dated in the year 83 of ‘Lakṣmaṇa-senasya-dīttarājya.’ The true meaning of this expression has been discussed above (see supra pp. 243 ff.). The most reasonable view seems to be that the year is to be counted from the end of Lakṣmaṇaṇa’s rule in the Gayā region i.e., about 1200 A.D., and hence Jayasena’s reign falls in c. 1283 A.D. (see p. 246).

There is no evidence in support of Mr. Jayaswal’s view that Buddhhasena and Jayasena were scions of the great Sena family in Bengal.\(^{17}\) He identified Buddhhasena with the king of that name mentioned by Tāranātha along with three other Sena kings, as noted above.\(^{18}\) The fact that Tāranātha refers to them as ‘minor kings, subordinate to the Turushkas, shows that their reigns must be placed later than 1200 A.D. As such Buddhhasena of his list might not improbably be the Pīṭhī king of that name. For though the name of the successor of Buddhhasena of Tāranātha’s list is different from Jayasena, such errors occur even in Tāranātha’s account of the Pāla kings where we have no doubt that names like Gopāla,
Devapāla and Dharpapāla were really historical. But even if we accept the identification, which is at best doubtful, there is nothing to support the contention that Buddhasena and Jayasena of Pīṭhī were related in any way to the Senas of Bengal, though this cannot be regarded as altogether beyond the bounds of probability.

A special importance has been added to the history of this petty dynasty of Pīṭhī chiefs on account of the theory propounded by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri that the well-known era La sam, starting in 1119 A.D., was founded by king Lakshmanaṣena, the founder of the royal house of Pīṭhī, to which Buddhasena and Jayasena belonged. This view has been already discussed, and does not appear to be a very probable one.

IV. The Minor Gupta Dynasty

The Panchobh copper-plate of Saṁgrāma-Gupta introduces us to a line of kings which is represented by the following genealogical tree:

1. Yajñēśa-Gupta
2. Dāmodara-Gupta
3. Deva-Gupta
4. Rājāditya-Gupta
5. Kṛishṇa-Gupta
6. Saṁgrāma-Gupta

Nos. 1-III are simply referred to as kings. No. VI, the donor, is called paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja, parameśvara, as well as mahāmāṇḍalika. He is said to be the son of the illustrious prince Kṛishṇa-Gupta, meditating on the feet of Rājāditya-Gupta, who is given the same title as Saṁgrāma-Gupta. Both are described as parama-māheśvara-vṛishabhadhvaja-Somānvaya-j-Arjuna-vainkodbhava-Jayapura-parameśvara. In other words these kings were Saivas, had bull as their insignia or emblem, claimed descent from Arjuna of lunar family, and were lords of Jayapura. This line of rulers, we are told, became reputed as Gupta (vainko-Gupta).
The inscription may be referred on palaeographical grounds to the 12th century A.D., its characters resembling those of the grants of Lakšmanaśena of Bengal.

Jayapura, the seat of the family, has been identified with modern Jayanagar near Lakhisarai in the Monghyr district.

The use of the title Mahāmāṇḍalika along with the imperial titles in the case of Nos. iv and vi indicates that the family had at first been feudatories (of the Pālas or Senas or of both) and assumed independence after the defeat of Lakšmaṇasena by Muhammad Bakhtyār Khilji.

The mention of the word Gupta-vaiśa indicates that perhaps the dynasty claimed descent from the Imperial or Later Guptas.

It is interesting to note that the grandfather of the Brāhmaṇa to whom Saṃgrāma-Gupta granted land was an immigrant from Kolāñcha.
Footnotes

1 This is the reading of Grant No. C. 17. In Grant No. C. 19 the name is given as Madhusūdana. But as the original Grant is missing, and we have to depend upon an artificially prepared facsimile (IB. 158), the reading of Grant No. 17 may be accepted.

2 Grant No. 17 was issued in 1156 Śaka, in the fourth year of his reign.


4 Edited by Dr. R. L. Mitra in Proc. ASB 1880, pp. 141 ff. No. 1 was re-edited by Dr. K. M. Gupta (EI. XIX. 277 ff.) and K. Gupta, Copper-plates of Sylhet, p. 153.

5 Dr. Mitra remarks, "The words Navagirvāna and Kharavāna are so placed that either of them may pass for a proper name, or both of them may be epithets" (op. cit. 145 f.n.). Dr. Gupta takes Kharavāna as proper name and reads the other word as 'na (ra)-girvāna'.

6 Dr. R. L. Mitra observes as follows: "The date of the record has been read by Pandit Srinivāsa Ṛṣṭrī to be the year 2928 of the era of the first Pāṇḍava king: Pāṇḍavakuladipāḷaḥda sāṁ 2928. But in the original the first figure is very unlike the third, and has been moreover scratched over and is abundantly doubtful. The second is also open to question. I am disposed to take the first for 4 and the second for 3, which would make the date 4328=A.D. 1245" (op. cit.).

Dr. K. M. Gupta (op. cit.) read the date as 4151 (=1049 A.D.). So far as can be judged from the facsimile of the plate the reading of both Dr. Mitra and Dr. Gupta must be regarded as conjectural, as none of the figures is clearly legible. But the paleography of the inscription is decidedly against the view of Dr. Gupta.

7 Foucher-Icon. p. 199, pl. VIII. 4.

8 The references in Burmese chronicles are summed up in AS.—Burma, 1921-22, pp. 61-62 ; 1922-23, pp. 31-32 ; cf. also Phayre, History of Burma, pp. 49-50, from which the account of Narathu is quoted.

9 Attention has justly been drawn by the Editor of the Plate to the "extraordinary nature of the three names of the grantor 'Dhaṇḍi-eba', his father 'Heḍi-eba' and the writer 'Medint-eba'. There is a great deal to be said in favour of his "conjecture that here we have evidence of a respectable family of Burmese origin" settled in this region. "For 'ba' and 'ye-eba' (modified to 'e-va') seem to be the characteristic of Burmese names even now." (IHQ. IX, pp. 284-5). It is also interesting to note that Śri-Harikāladeva ascended the throne of Paṭṭikerā in 1203-4 A.D., i.e., only 33 years after the tragic episode of the murder of the Burmese king at the instance of the king of Paṭṭikerā, as narrated in the Burmese chronicles.

10 Edited by H. Panday, JBORS. IV. 273 ff; commented on by Jayaswal, ibid., 266 ff; re-edited by N. G. Majumdar, IA. XLVIII (1919), 43 ff. For another inscription of Jayasena dated in the year 70 of the new era of the Gauḍa king, cf. Ep. Ind. XXXV. p. 79. The reading of the date is, however, very doubtful.

11 This is the interpretation of N. G. Majumdar (op. cit. 44-46).

12 Panday pointed out that the village Jānibighā must have been included in the
dominions of Jayasena. Buddhase's Ins. at Bodh-Gayā, containing an order to the people of Gayā, also confirms the view.

Mr. S. S. Majumdar has discussed at length the identification of Piṭḥi, and does not agree that it included the Gayā district. He locates Piṭṭhī in the region lying between the modern railway stations Colgong and Sakrigali Junction on E. I. Ry. Loop line, and identifies it with Pitrapati (JC. V. 379 ff.).

Commentary to v. 5, Ch. ii.

Mr. Jayaswal writes (op. cit. p. 267) : "There cannot be any doubt that in the early Sena times Piṭṭhī denoted the whole of the province of Bihar (except Mithilā)."

Op. cit. p. 44.
Ep. Ind. XXXVI. 42.
JBORS. IV. 266.
See supra. p. 261.

This view is also maintained by Mr. N. G. Majumdar (op. cit. p. 46).

The Gayā inscription, dated 1813 of the Nirvāṇa Era, records the construction or restoration of a temple at Gayā by Purushottamasiṃha, chief of Kamā (Kumaon), and reference is made to the permission or help he received from his overlord king Aśokachalla and 'here from the Indra-like Chhindā King.' It has been suggested that the allusion, in the latter case, is to king Buddhase in whose kingdom Bodh-Gayā was situated. If this view be accepted, we have to regard Buddhase and his son Jayasena as belonging to the Chhindā family. This view is held by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (IA. 1913, p. 84) and N. G. Majumdar (op. cit. p. 46). The Chhindā family is known from two other records, but they belong to an earlier date (IA. 1881, p. 345 ; 1880, pp. 143-144). It appears from one of these records that the Chhindās were ruling in Gayā region as early as the 10th or 11th century A.D.

See supra pp. 244-5.

The copper-plate was found, while digging earth, by one Amiri Chaudhuri about two and a half miles from Panchobh, situated about five or six miles to the west of Laheria Sarai, the chief town of the Darbhanga district in Bihar. It was edited in JBORS. V. 582 ff.
CHAPTER IX

ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

I. Pre-Gupta Period

No definite information is available regarding the system of administration prevailing in Bengal before the 4th century A.D. All that we may reasonably infer from stories and legends preserved in later literature is that monarchy was the prevailing form of government. If, as suggested above, the Gangaridai of the classical authors be taken to refer to the people of Bengal, we may reasonably conclude that their king ruled over a vast empire extending up to the borders of the Punjab. If, further, we may rely on the testimony of the Purāṇas and regard the then ruler of Bengal as belonging to the Śūdra dynasty founded by Mahāpadma Nanda, we may deduce the very important and interesting conclusion that even by the end of the fourth century B.C. the immigrant Aryans had not been able to establish their undisputed supremacy over the original inhabitants of the land, either politically or culturally. In view of the recent discoveries of the remains of a high degree of material civilisation in West Bengal before the advent of the Aryans we may well believe that the Bengalis had already developed a powerful political organisation which culminated in the establishment of the first great historical empire in North India. Unfortunately, no details of its gradual evolution are known to us.

The strength and efficiency of the military force of the Gangaridai necessarily indicate a highly developed form of State-organisation. An advanced stage in the general political consciousness and State-craft may also be inferred from the references in the political alliance of petty States against a common enemy, the occasional establishment of a strong monarchy by the combination of a number of smaller kingdoms, and the diplomatic relations maintained by kings of Bengal with foreign potentates.

For nearly a thousand years after this Bengal never attained the status of a great independent political State. It probably formed a part of the mighty Maurya Empire and was certainly incorporated in the vast Gupta Empire. The essential features of
the administrative systems of the Mauryas and the Guptas are well-known, and we may well believe that the system of Provincial administration developed by them also prevailed in Bengal. But we have no definite knowledge of the system prevailing during the Maurya period, nor are we better informed about the system of administration in the independent States that flourished in Bengal during the period of more than five hundred years that intervened between the fall of the Mauryas and the incorporation of Bengal within Gupta Empire.

“The reference to a mahāmātra in the Mahāsthān Inscription, the single epigraphic record that we possess of the period, seems to indicate that both in theory and in practice the government in Bengal partook of the general character of the Maurya administration of which we possess an abundant knowledge from various sources. The inscription records some beneficent activities of the ruling power and indicates a concern for the good government and welfare of the people which is so characteristic of the Maurya emperors, particularly Aśoka. The inscription records the grant of paddy, and probably also of money, to the people, by way of loan, in order to relieve the distress caused apparently by famine. The clear indication therein of the Government store-house (koṭhāgāle) being provided with grains for the relief of the people during flood or famine finds its support from instructions laid down in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra (11. xv) to the effect that the Government store-keeper (koshṭhāgārādhyaksha) shall keep apart one-half of the stores of agricultural products for meeting such emergencies.”

II. Gupta Period

We are more fortunate in regard to the system prevailing under the Imperial Guptas. For although we do not possess any detailed or even general account of the administrative system of Bengal as a whole, its essential features and some very interesting details are supplied by no less than eleven copper-plate Grants (A. 4-14) issued during the rule of the Gupta Emperors between G.E. 113 and 159 (433-479 A.D.). Five of these copper-plates (A. 6-10), found in the village Dāmodārpur in the District of Dinajpur in North Bengal, refer to sale of lands in the Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti and Kuṭivarsha-Vishaya (the name of the Vishaya in one case being omitted). An idea of the general style and purport of these
records may be obtained from the following translation of the earliest of them.

"In the year 100 (and) 20 (and) 4 (=124), on the 7th of Phālguna, while parama-daivata, parama-bhaṭṭāraka, mahārājā-dhirāja Sri-Kumāra-gupta was the ruler of the earth, and upārīka Chirātadatta was the receiver of favours from him (lit. was accepted by his Majesty's feet) in the province (bhukti) of Puṇḍravaradhana and kumārānāya Vetravarman, appointed by him (Chirāta-
datta), was, in the ever-prospering district (vishaya) of Koṭivarsha, administering the government of the locality, in the company of Dhrītipāla, the guild-president of the town, Bandhumitra, the merchant, Dhrītimitra, the chief artisan, and Śambapāla, the chief scribe, whereas the Brāhmaṇa Karpaṭikā (thus) addressed (them)—

"Deign to make a gift, according to nivī-dharma, of khila land, as yet unploughed and not (already) given (to any one), (receiving a price) at the rate of three dināras for each kulyavāpa, for the convenience of my agnihotra rites,—to be enjoyed (by me) for ever, as long as the moon, the sun and the stars (exist)." When, according to the determination of the record-keepers, Riṣidatta, Jayanandin and Vibhudatta, it was ascertained "(Land) may thus be given", one kulyavāpa of land was given to him in the region north-west of Doṅgā, after three dināras had been received (from him). Here apply the verses regarding grants of land: "He who confiscates land given by him or by another, becomes a worm in ordure and rots with his forefathers".8

We may easily envisage the general framework of administration prevailing in Bengal from these records. It appears that the whole of Bengal was not directly administered by the Gupta Emperors. Large slices of territory were ruled by feudal chiefs referred to as Mahāsāmanta and Mahārāja. Reference may be made to the cases of Mahāsāmanta Sasāṅka7 and Mahārāja Mahāsāmanta Vijayasena.8 The various titles assumed by Vijayasena, such as Dūtaka, Mahāpratihāra, Mahāpilupati etc.,9 show that sometimes important State-functions were entrusted to them.

The territory directly administered by the Gupta Emperors was divided into a series of well-defined units, such as Bhukti, Vishaya, Maṇḍala, Vīṭhī, Grāma, and other minor subdivisions, each of which generally comprised a number of the next following units.

The two administrative divisions, Bhukti and Vishaya may be taken to be somewhat akin to the 'Division' and 'District'
of the modern period, and the *Uparika* and *Kumarāmātya* corresponded to modern Commissioner and Collector. The lowest administrative unit was a village, and there were intermediate units like *Vīthīs, Maṇḍalas* etc.

Each of these units seems to have an *adhikarana* or office of its own.

Some changes in the title of the local rulers and the procedure of sale of land are noticed in later Grants. Thus the title *Uparika* is changed to *Uparika-Mahārāja* (Nos. A 8-9) and *Kumārāmātya* is substituted by *Ayukta* (A. 9, 12) and *Vishayapati* in A. 10.

As regards procedure we find in the plate, dated 163 (A. 8), that there is no reference to the District Officer at all and "the mahattaras, the ashta-kul-ādhikaranaś, the village heads (grāmikas) and the householders (kutumbas)", being approached by the intending purchaser, and after receiving a report from the Record-keeper, informs the chief Brāhmaṇa and the prominent subjects and householders (kutumba) that the land applied for has been sold subject to the inspection "by the mahattaras and others, the officers and householders," and demarcation of the land after proper measurement. This indicates that in some localities even villages and other units, smaller than a *Vishaya* or district, exercised independent administrative authority.

The Divisional Commissioner was undoubtedly appointed by the King-Emperor, and in A. 10 he is styled *Rājputradeva-bhatṭaraka*, evidently either a prince or a member of the Imperial family.

That the District Officer, whether called *Kumārāmātya* or *Ayukta*, was appointed by the Divisional Commissioner (*Uparika-Mahārāja*) is distinctly mentioned in all the four plates (A. 6, 7, 9, 10) which refer to the District Officer. But the language of a similar Grant found at Baigrām (A. 5) seems to indicate otherwise. In this plate, there is no reference to *Uparika-Mahārāja*, and the *Kumārāmātya* is said to have mediated on the feet of the *Bhatṭaraka*, the King-Emperor. This Grant is dated in the same year as a Dāmodarpur Plate (No. 7) and the land granted is connected with Vaiyigrama, a village mentioned in another Dāmodarpur Plate (A. 8). In view of the nearness of the locality and the contemporaneity of the records it is difficult to explain the anomaly. It has been suggested that the *Vishayapati* was appointed by the King on the advice or recommendation of the Governor of the *Bhukti*. But this does not satis-
factorily explain the anomaly. It is not unlikely, therefore, that in some cases the king directly appointed the District Officer, for reasons not known to us. It may be due to the relative importance of the particular post (perhaps in any special circumstance) or to the importance and dignity of the person appointed (perhaps a member of the imperial family was directly appointed by the Emperor and made directly responsible to him). But, in any case, we get a clear idea of the general framework of the administrative system, viz., the division of the province into one or more Bhuktis and each Bhukt into a number of Vishayas, corresponding to modern District, (with minor sub-divisions down to a village), and while the Commissioner of the Division—Uparika-Mahārāja—was appointed by the King-Emperor, the Collector of the District was ordinarily appointed by the Commissioner, though in some cases the appointment was probably made directly by the king.

We learn from the Dāmodarpur Plates (A. 6-10) that the Collector had a regular office or adhikaraṇa (collectorate) situated in an adhishṭhāna (town), and a staff of officers working under him, among whom the Pustapālas (keepers of Records) naturally played an important role in the transactions of land sale. There were several Record-keepers, one of whom was regarded as chief (A. 12). It is interesting to note that apart from these officers a large number of other persons, certainly not regular officials, were consulted in connection with the transaction of the sale of land.

An extreme case is furnished by the Plate No. A. 8, mentioned above, where the District Officer is altogether eliminated. But even where there was a District Officer he had to consult these non-official bodies.

It is said in the Bāigrām CP. (A.5) that the Collector, as soon as he received the application for purchase of land, not only referred the matter to his office (Vishay-ādhikaraṇa), but also informed the “Village-householders along with the Brāhmaṇas and Chief Officers of the locality where the land to be sold was situated.” Their exact functions and locus standii in the matter cannot be ascertained except what may be gathered from the Collector’s order to them to the following effect.

“(So) you shall make over (to the two applicants the portion of land) by fixing their boundaries on four sides with marks of chaff and charcoal which will be permanent, after having defined (the area) by the measurement of 8×9 reeds by the hands of Darvākārma,
in places which have no conflict with your own agricultural work, and shall preserve it for all time to come by the principle of perpetual endowment. The present and the future administrative agents and others also should preserve it out of regard for religious merit."  

It is, however, interesting to note that sometimes the persons and bodies mentioned above themselves offered to purchase the land. Thus the Kalaikuri CP (A. 11) narrates how the Āyuktaka and the (members of the Vīthī) Board (of administration) attended by the Vīthīmahattaras and Householders (a large number of individuals named) were approached by the Kulika, six Kāyasīchas (names given) and two Pustapālas (names given) with a proposal to purchase a piece of land which they desired to offer as akshayānī to three Brāhmaṇas of Puṇḍravardhana, well versed in the four Vedas, so that they might perform their Pañcha-mahāyajñas (five sacrifices) uninterruptedly. As the applicants or donors themselves are referred to in other records as included in bodies deciding upon such application, it is a singular instance of the obligation imposed upon one and all to strictly observe the rules of procedure. It is also not unlikely that the lands asked for lay outside the jurisdiction of the body of applicants, and this view would lend some support to the view that the Āyuktakas were officers in charge of sub-divisions, several of which were comprised in the District. In that case the administration of sub-divisions had also an element of popular control like the districts, Vīthīs and villages.

It seems to be clear from the Dāmodarpur Grants (particularly Nos. A. 6, 7, 9, 10) that the Collector was aided in his administrative work (saṁvyayavahāra) by a Board of Advisers, which is found to have been constituted of four members, representing the various important interests of those days, viz., (1) the nagara-kreshṭhin, the most wealthy man of the town, representing, perhaps, the rich urban population, and the President of the town guild of bankers, (2) the sārthavāha (the chief merchant), representing, perhaps, the merchant class or the various trade-guilds, (3) the prathama-kulika (the chief artisan), representing, perhaps, the various artisan classes, and (4) the prathama-Kāyasīcha (the chief scribe), who may either have represented the Kāyasīchas as a class or have been a Government official in the capacity of a Chief Secretary of the present day.”

The existence of such an advisory body of four members attached to the District Officer is, perhaps, the most interesting feature in
the whole system of administration. It is very unfortunate that so little is known of them, and of their functions, excepting their association with the District Officer in regard to the sale of lands.

The constitution of the district *adhikaraṇa* raises several interesting problems. First, even assuming that three of the four additional members represented the trade, industry and banking corporations, we do not know whether they were nominated by the Governor or elected by their respective constituencies. The fact that each of these bodies had a *nigama* or a corporation of its own, makes it very likely that the presidents of these corporations became automatically members of the *adhikaraṇa*. But whether these presidents were elected by the associations or nominated by the king we have no definite means to determine. It appears, however, from a study of the *Dharmasūtras* by Nārada and Bṛhaspati, which belong approximately to the same period with which we are dealing, that the presidents of these associations were elected by their members.¹³

The second problem relates to the position of the additional members *vis-a-vis* the District Officer. It has been held by some that the direct responsibility for managing the affairs of the *adhikaraṇa* lay in the hands of the District Officer, but he carried out his duties in the presence of the additional members.¹⁴ Other scholars regard the latter as a Board of Advisers¹⁵ to the District Officer. This is certainly a more reasonable view than the former. But the word *puroga*’ used after the names and designations of the additional members would rather seem to indicate that they formed an integral part of the *adhikaraṇa* and possessed rights and prerogatives beyond those of mere advisers. Although their exact constitutional position is difficult to determine, it would not be unreasonable to assume that they held concurrent authority with the District Officer in the general administration or at least in certain specified branches of it.

There is, however, no doubt that the existence of such advisory bodies indicates the popular control over the Government and the democratic principle followed in local administration, of which we possess abundant evidence, both literary and epigraphic, in various parts of India in ancient times.¹⁶

Perhaps an extreme type of popular control is illustrated by the procedure in the Dāmodarpur Plate A. 8, described above (p. 289). Palāśa-vṛindaka, mentioned in this record, was probably the type of an important village, or rather something between a town (*adhishṭhāna*)
and a village (grāma). For, here no reference is made to Vishayapati or his Board of Advisers, but their function, as agents of Government land, is exercised by the Mahattaras, the Ashtakulādhikaranā, the grāmikas and the householders as mentioned above (p. 289). It is they who inform the Chief Brāhmaṇa, the prominent subjects and house-holders in the village (Chaṇḍa-grāma, about the application for buying land. There is no doubt that this Chaṇḍa-grāma was a village, and the inscription proves the importance of a village as an organised political unit.

The Copper Plate No. A. 4 refers to an application received by the Ashtakulādhikaranā of a certain village and its prominent or leading persons. The Vishay-ādhikaranā also referred applications for purchase of land to village authorities, presumably because the land asked for lay in the jurisdiction of that village (A. 5, 12). It has been suggested that the above instances refer to a village community, a rural institution, which exercised great authority in local affairs without any official control. It was often a powerful body which managed all the local affairs of the village and exercised not only executive but also judicial functions within some limitations imposed by the Government.

Dr. U.N. Ghoshal, however, takes a different view. He observes: ‘It is possible that we have here two sets of administrative arrangements for disposal of the unappropriated waste. In the one group (Nos. A. 4 and A. 8) the administrative authority consists of the officers in charge of the eight kulas, the leading men, the heads of families, the village headman and so forth. Evidently we have to deal with a mixed body of officials and non-officials. As regards the other group (Nos. A. 6, 7, 10 and 12) it will be noticed that No 12 expressly contemplates the District Officer and the office of the district headquarters as receiving the application. Moreover, in No. 10 which alone has preserved the seal intact the legend shows that the charter was issued by the office of the district headquarters of Koṭivarsha. From this it would follow that the authority charged with the disposal of the waste lands was, at least in the first instance, the headquarters office of the district in whose jurisdiction the land was situated. A connecting link between these two groups is furnished by Nos. A. 8 and 12, which contemplate the Brāhmaṇa, the leading men and the heads of families, apparently of the nearest village, as receiving information of the application for purchase, possibly to enable them to offer their objections, if any.’
Even if we accept the view that the Ashtakuladhirkaṇa and others were regular officials—a question which will be discussed later—there is no doubt that the people exercised great authority, at least over the sale of lands.

As mentioned above, we learn from other records that the Vishaya or District was subdivided into Maṇḍalas, Vithis and villages (grāmas), and perhaps there were other minor sub-divisions.

These sub-divisions, except perhaps village, varied in different ages. Thus Bhukti and Vishaya as well as Vishaya and Maṇḍala were sometimes used as synonymous; a Vishaya was sometimes included in a Maṇḍala and sometimes the case was just the reverse. Daṇḍa-bhukti is referred to as a Maṇḍala of the Vardhamāna-bhukti.

The exact connotation of Vithi in the Gupta age is not quite clear. Later, it denoted a sub-division of the Bhukti or of a Maṇḍala.

"Other sub-divisions of maṇḍalas referred to in epigraphs are khaṇḍala, āṣṭi, and apparently, bhāga. The āṣṭi was further sub-divided into chaturakas and the latter into pāṭakas. The chaturaka is mentioned in certain grants as a sub-division of a maṇḍala, and the pāṭaka, of a bhāga. The pāṭaka seems to have been the lowest administrative unit. Hemachandra defines it as one-half of a grāma or village.

"Inscriptions of the Gupta age disclose or imply the existence of three bhuktis in the area now known as Bengal viz., Puṇḍravardhana, Vardhamāna, and an unnamed bhukti which included Suvarna-viṭhi and Navyāvakāśikā. The first two of these along with five others, viz., Tīra-bhukti, Śrīnagara-bhukti, Kaṇkagrāma-bhukti, Daṇḍa-bhukti and Prāgjyotisha-bhukti are known from the Pāla and Sena records to have formed part of the Gauḍa empire. Of these Tīra-bhukti (Tirhut in North Bihar), Śrīnagara-bhukti or Magadhā-bhukti (in South Bihar), and Prāgjyotisha-bhukti (in Assam) in the main lay beyond the limits of Bengal proper. An old bhukti was sometimes incorporated with a neighbouring division, and a new bhukti carved out of an older one. In the Irda record of the tenth century A.D., Daṇḍa-bhukti forms part of the Vardhamāna-bhukti. In the time of Lakshmīnāsena the northern part of the Vardhamāna-bhukti, together perhaps with some adjacent tracts, was constituted into a separate administrative division styled Kaṇkagrāma-bhukti."
Although the epigraphic records make special reference to the adhikaranā of the Vishaya alone, it may be taken for granted that other administrative units like Bhuktis and Vīthis had also adhikaranā at their headquarters. We have clear reference to the Mahattara adhikaranā (A. 22) and Vīthi-adhikaranā in the epigraphs of the period immediately after the Guptas. As regards the Bhukti we have reference to an adhikaranā of the town of the Pundravardhana, presumably the headquarters of the bhukti named after it. It is natural to regard it as the adhikaranā of the bhukti corresponding to that of a vishaya, though it is not specifically referred to as such. It is clear, therefore, that the adhikaranā of Pundravardhana performed the same function, in regard to sale of lands, as that of a vishaya. The only difference is that the Governor of the bhukti is not referred to at all in connection with this adhikaranā. It has been suggested that “the head of the provincial government of Pundravardhana was not directly connected with his adhikaranā at least in so far as it concerned itself with transactions of land sale.”

This is very unlikely. It may be mentioned in this connection that a seal (No. 20) discovered amid the ruins of the ancient city of Vaiśālī refers to the adhikaranā of a Governor. Of course, the records specifically refer only to the adhikaranā of the Vishaya. The details leave no doubt that the District Officer was advised, if not controlled, by a Board, and so far at least as the sale of the land was concerned, also by a large number of popular non-official elements. No definite idea can be formed of their other functions, as all the records deal with the sale of lands alone.

The role of the Pustapālas or Record-keepers, whose number was five in some cases, is briefly stated in the Dāmodarpur Plates. But it is a little more elaborated in the Baigrām CP. (A. 5). After the application for the purchase of land was received by the Collector of the District, he referred the matter to the Record-keepers and made the following announcement to the householders and others mentioned above.

“Since we inform you that it has been determined by the Record-keepers, Durgādatta and Arkadāsa (thus),—there exists in this vishaya (the procedure of) sale at the rate of two dināras for each kulyavāpa of shrubless fallow fields, which are beyond the possibility of yielding revenue (to the king), to be enjoyed for all time to come as long as the moon, the sun and the stars endure.” Moreover,
there can be no objection (out of fear of any loss) on the king’s behalf in the matter of such sale of khila fields, free from taxes; (rather) there is (possibility of) some income for the Bhaṭṭāraka-pāda (or the king) and also of the acquisition of one-sixth of the religious merit (accruing from such an act). Hence the (land) should be given (by sale).”

The above passage refers to the sale of fallow-lands (khila). But the object of the purchaser being the endowment of temple he also required homestead lands to serve as an endowment “to meet the expenses of flowers, perfumes etc. required for daily worship and occasional repairs of the temple (A. 5).

The procedure described above for the sale of land was continued even after the end of Gupta rule in Bengal. For we have similar records of a later period at least for a century or more (Nos. A. 18, 20-23)

The sixteen CP. Grants, mentioned above, recording sale of lands supply interesting information. For example, the price of land was paid in a foreign coin called ‘Dīnāra’. The following observations of Dr. R. G. Basak, who edited the Baigrām CP, throw interesting light not only on this question but also on varying prices of lands.

“A note on the relation in value between a dīnāra and a rūpaka coin as met with in this inscription may well be added here. The name dīnāra is of foreign origin and is derived from the Latin denarius, as we all know. The word rūpaka occurring in this inscription, I think, requires an explanation. As two dronāvāpas of land are priced at 8 rūpakas in lines 6 and 14 of the inscription it appears certain that 8 rūpakas are equivalent in value to $\frac{1}{2}$ dīnāra, because 1 kulyavāpa (8 drons) is explicitly priced at the rate of 2 dīnaras according to the prevailing custom of sale described in the inscription. Hence one full dīnāra will be equal to 16 rūpakas. We may, therefore, surmise that the term rūpaka, which may ordinarily stand for coin of any variety, refers to silver coins in this charter. In Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra the word rūpa seems to mean a coin which may be of silver or copper, i.e., rūpyā-rūpa (silver coin, e.g., paṇas) and tāmra-rūpa (copper coin, e.g., māsha). The officer who examines coins or controls currency is called Rūpa-darśaka in that work.

“As regards the different rate of price of khila and vāstu land we find that in some of the Dāmodarpur Plates the rate
was three dināras for a kulyavāpa (tridīnārikya-kulyavāpa), but in our inscription, as in the Pāhārpur one, we have the rate of two dināras for a kulyavāpa (dvidīnārikya-kulyavāpa); whereas in almost all the Faridpur Plates the rate is that of four dināras for a kulyavāpa (chaturdīnārikya-kulyavāpa). This difference may have been due to the difference of localities and also, probably, to the character of the land sold.

"From the Pāhārpur Inscription it has become clear that one kulyavāpa of land is equal to 8 dronavāpas, for there 12 dronas are totalised as one and a half kulyavāpas; and the same result is also obtained even by reference to the money value proposed in the grant in accordance with the prevalent rate. The formula found in some Sanskrit lexicons for one kulyavāpa being equal to 8 dronas is therefore, established." 23

The differences of price were undoubtedly due either to the quality of the land or the prevalence of different rates in different localities. The term kulyavāpa, as a measure of land, is also an interesting one. It denoted, literally, as much land as could be sown with a kulya measure of grain. A kulyavāpa, according to various authorities, was equivalent to 8 dronas and this is proved by the Pāhārpur Grant (A. 12) in which 12 dronas are regarded as equivalent to one and a half kulyavāpa. 24

The principle governing the transfer of land was known as nīvī-dharma which has been explained as a perpetual grant, but "non-transferable; that is to say, the donee had all the right given to him by the donor, except perhaps the right of making further transfer of the property in future." 25 It seems, however, that this limitation might be avoided by destroying the nīvī-dharma at the time of purchase, i.e., with the right of alienation. But the term akshaya-nīvī-dharma seems to indicate a perpetual restraint from transfer.

The applicants for purchase of lands had to specify whether he wanted cultivable or homestead lands. Some lands described as aprada (not given, unoccupied), aprahata and khila (fallow) were exempt from payment of customary dues and extra-taxes. The prices of lands, settled beforehand, were paid to the District or Village authorities to whom application was made for purchase.

There is no doubt that there was a regular system of measurement of land. Two nulas, nine and eight cubits long, were used for measuring, respectively, the length and breadth of the area. Taking
the average measurement of a *hasta* to be 19 inches, the area would be $19 \times 8 \times 19 \times 9$ or 25992 square inches. It is not possible to determine how many times this area a *kulyavāpa* contained.

Lands were of three varieties: *Kṣetra, Khila* and *Vāstu*. The first denoted a field under cultivation and the third, a dwelling site.

According to *Amarakośa* (II. 105) and *Halāyudha* (233) *Khila* was synonymous with *aprahata*, meaning waste or fallow land. But such lands were not to be deemed unfertile as Roth supposed. According to the *Nārada Smṛiti* (XI. 24) "a tract of land which has not been cultivated for a year is called *ardha-khila*. That which has not been cultivated for three years is called *khila* (waste)."

Incidentally, the records of land-sale referred to above throw some light on the question of the ownership of land in ancient India on which very different opinions have been expressed. It is an intriguing problem, on which a vast literature has grown, and it is not necessary to discuss the theoretical question in all its aspects. We may, therefore, discuss only the bearing of the transactions of land-sale, described above, on this very controversial question.

Dr. R. G. Basak sought to reject the theory of the State-ownership of land on the following grounds:

(a) The State could not alienate lands "without the consent or approval of the peoples' representatives, the *mahattaras* and other businessmen of the province and the district, and sometimes even the common folk."

(b) The *Faridpur Grant* (A. 20) "mentions in very clear terms that 1/6 of the sale proceeds in these transactions will go to the royal exchequer according to the law." "It seems very clear, then, that the remaining 5/6 of the price used to go to the funds of the village assemblies."  

Dr. U. N. Ghoshal has challenged this view. He has successfully refuted the second argument by pointing out that the king did not get one-sixth of the sale proceeds, but of the spiritual merit acquired by the donee for the religious endowment for which the land was acquired. This is clearly proved, as he says, among other things, by the express statements in A. 12 that by selling the land the Emperor would acquire wealth as well as one-sixth of the spiritual merit. Reference may also be made to similar statements in Plates, A. 5 and 19.
But Dr. U. N. Ghosal’s attempt to demolish the first objection is not equally successful. He observes: “We have already shown reasons for holding that the persons whom Mr. Basak understands to be the peoples’ representatives were more likely minor officials. In the two instances (A. 8 and A. 12) in which the Brāhmaṇas, the principal subjects and the heads of families are mentioned, they merely receive information of the application for purchase, it may be, for the hearing of any possible objections on their part. In any case the idea of “consent or approval” of these persons being necessary for the performance of the sale is not warranted by the evidence.”

The first argument, as has been shown elsewhere in the chapter, is not valid, and as he himself admits, it is only “more likely.” As regards “the consent or approval”, it may not be strictly proved one way or the other. But the question may justly be asked, what was the object or necessity of this complicated process of summoning leading men and other individuals if it were purely a transaction of sale, by the State, of the land owned absolutely by it. The plea that it was resorted to “for the hearing of any possible objections on their part” does not carry great weight: on the other hand, the fact that the proceeds of the sale went to the royal exchequer prove the ownership of the king. But there is a great deal of force in Dr. Basak’s final and positive conclusion that the Grants “belong to a period when the Crown began to be recognised as absolute owner of all land” in place of the people who were the original proprietor. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that the people, taken collectively, as represented by the Village Assembly, had at least some limited right in the ownership of the land, to the extent of accepting or rejecting a new-comer in occupation of the land within its jurisdiction. Instances of this are found in South India in ancient period.

III. Period of Vaṅga as an independent State after the end of Gupta rule (C. 550-750 A.D.)

The essential features of the administrative framework, described above, continued under the independent rulers of Bengal. There must have been notable changes, but there are not sufficient materials to indicate them in detail. The old division into Bhuktis, Vishayas Vīkhis etc. continued. Probably new Bhuktis were created. As
mentioned above, reference is made to Vardhamāna-bhukti and another with its headquarters at Navyāvakāśikā, though both of these probably existed even during the Gupta rule. The Governor of the latter is called Uparika as well as Mahāpratihāra, and also Antaraṅga in one case. The Faridpur Grants (A. 18, 20, 21, 23) do not mention Bhukti but to officers enjoying a higher status than that of Vishayapati. They were appointed directly by the king. Their titles are (a) Mahārāja (b) Mahāpratihāra (defender of frontiers) and (c) Uparika, to which some more (including Kumārāmātya?) appear to be added. In A. 23 we find Antaraṅga and Uparika. In three out of the four Plates from Faridpur, ‘Uparika’ is used which shows their status to be like that of Uparika of Dāmodarpur.

There were also feudatories under the independent rulers of Bengal. They were known as Sāmantas or Mahā-Sāmantas.

The administrative unit, Vīthi, comes into prominence. Suvarṇa-Vīthi in A. 23 was taken to mean “the bullion market,” but it is definitely used in the sense of an administrative unit in A. 19 and 13, and we must also take it in the same sense in 23 (cf. for example, Suvarṇa-grāma, as a well-known place-name) where it was included in the Province of Navyāvakāśikā whose Governor enjoyed a higher status than that of the Vāraka-manḍala Vishaya. In A. 19 also a village is described as in the Vakkattakka-Vīthi in the Vardhamāna-bhukti, without any reference to a Vishaya. The Dakshināṃśaka-Vīthi in A. 12 is also referred to as lying within the jurisdiction of the Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti, but Nāgiratṭa-Manḍala was probably comprised in it. But that Vīthi also denoted a much smaller area is proved by A 16, in which Nanda-Vīthi is comprised within the jurisdiction of Ambila-grām-āgrahāra, probably the headquarters of the Vishayapati.

A Vīthi mentioned in a copper-plate of this period (A. 19) and two others of earlier and later periods, are said to be situated on a river. Hence it has been suggested by N. G. Majumdar that Vīthi denoted a tract of land bordering on a river.30

There are specific references not only to the adhikaraṇa of the Vishayas, but also of the Vīthīs. The latter consisted of mahattaras, agrahārīṇas, khādgīs, and at least one vāha-nāyaka (A. 19).31

The village, generally speaking, was the smallest administrative unit, but some villages, with names ending in agrāhara, seem to have enjoyed a much higher status as is proved by the Ambila-grām-
administrative system mentioned above, which comprised a Vishā and was probably the headquarters of a Vishaya.

The procedure for the sale of lands, mentioned above, is also continued in this period (A. 20-23). Reference has been made above to office of the District Officer in the town, called adhishṭhānādhikaraṇa in the Dāmodarpur Plates (A. 6, 7, 9, 10), where he carried on the administration together with four members (the guild-president, the leading merchant, the leading banker or artisan and the leading scribe). Opinions differ regarding the exact nature of this institution and it has been translated as ‘an administrative board of the district,’ ‘the royal tribunal in a city,’ ‘the office and probably the court of a District Officer,’ and a ‘Secretariat and Advisory Council.’ Dr. U. N. Ghoshal has drawn attention to ‘a court of justice called adhikaraṇa, mentioned in the drama, Daśaka-Kumāra-Charita, and to Act IX of the Mitrīchhakaṭika, describing the famous trial scene. He observes: “It refers to the king’s judges (called adhikaraṇikas and adhikaraṇabhojakas) sitting in the courthouse (adhikaraṇamanḍapa), who are assisted by the guild-president (śreshṭhin), the scribes (Kāyasthas) and so forth. It will be noticed that the leading scribe of the epigraphs is represented by the ‘scribes’ of the drama, while the guild-president is common to both. It would thus appear that the adhishṭhānādhikaraṇa of the Gupta Empire had its prototype in the adhikaraṇa at the capital contemplated in the drama, which by a natural extension of meaning (such as is seen in the later word cutchery) came to be applied to the office of the district headquarters as well. The above comparison, moreover, shows that in the place of the vague list of unspecified officers of the drama the inscriptions mention ‘the leading artisan’ and ‘the leading merchant’, besides the guild-president and the chief scribe. If it be supposed that the adhikaraṇa of the drama represents the loosely organised institution of earlier times, that of the Gupta Empire would be a development of the same with a well-defined organisation and with the addition of administrative functions as well. The reversion of the Gupta institution to the type of administrative boards described by Megasthenes for the Maurya Empire is no doubt a witness to the enduring influence of the popular pañchāyats.”

During the period under review the authority disposing of the land is in every case the adhikaraṇa, and the seals of the plates, wherever preserved (A. 20, 21, 22) refer to the office of the
District, in which, presumably, the land sold was situated. But the adhikaraṇa is headed by the chief Scribe (Jyeshṭha-Kāyastha) and leading men of the District (A.21) whose names are given. To these are added unnamed principal Vyapāriṇs (A. 18) or Vyavahāriṇs (A.23) and Mahattaras. The Prakṛitis headed by 18 leading men of the district (names given) is mentioned in A. 20.

“It has been suggested that the mahattaras represented the landed gentry and the vyavahāriṇś, the industrial or commercial interests of the district. This is plausible enough, but cannot be regarded as certain. As to the adhikaraṇa itself, it is described as headed by ‘jyeshṭha-kāyastha’ in two cases, and ‘the chief adhikaraṇika’ in another case. The other members of the adhikaraṇa are not specified. It has been inferred from the two descriptive expressions of adhikaraṇa that the Vishayapatī did not control the affairs of the adhikaraṇa, and his functions were separated from those connected with the adhikaraṇa. It is difficult to accept this theory, which stands on the same footing as the view upheld by the same scholar, on similar grounds, that the provincial Governor had no connection with the adhikaraṇa of the headquarters of the bhukti. But whatever might have been the actual constitution of the adhikaraṇa of the district of this period, its association with the leading men of the district while exercising its authority shows that the old democratic spirit in local administration was still the characteristic feature of the government. That the same spirit prevailed in the vīti-adhikaraṇas of this period has already been mentioned above.”

Dr. U. N. Ghoshal identifies the Vyavahāriṇś with the Vyapāriṇś and regards them as ‘administrative agents’ on the analogy of the vyavahāri-janapadas (A. 36) and vishayavyavahāriṇś (B. 2). Far less justifiable is his view that the ‘Prakṛitis’ and ‘leading men’ were also not private individuals but persons concerned with the administrative functions’. It is, therefore, difficult to accept his theory that during the period under review “the authority charged with the administration of the lands concerned consisted of the District Officer and many named and unnamed minor officials.”

There is no valid ground to suppose that the popular element in administration of the earlier period disappeared and the popular representatives were replaced by minor officials.

Dr. Ghoshal’s view has not met with general acceptance and has been criticised by several scholars.
It is only natural to expect that the independent kings of Bengal, would assume the titles like *Mahārājādhirāja* which, though less pretentious than the imperial titles of the Guptas, was more dignified than the simple title of *Mahārāja* assumed by Chandra-varman, Sīhā-Varaman and even Vainyagupta. The independent kings had also feudal chiefs under them called *Sāmanta*. There are references to *sāmantas* in the records of Samāchārādeva, Devakhaṇḍa and Jayanāga. In the last case, the *sāmanta* was a powerful chief, with a *mahāpratihāra* ruling over a *vishaya* or district under him. When Śaśāṅka established an empire, the independent kings conquered by him became feudatory chiefs. One such ruler, called *mahārāja mahāsāmanta*, is known to us, but there were probably others.

Some light is thrown on the organisation of the central administration by the list of officials mentioned in the Malla Sarul C. P. (A. 19) given in Appendix A.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that some parts of the independent kingdom of Bengal were ruled by feudal chiefs or vassal rulers who enjoyed autonomy in internal administration. Vijayasena of the Malla Sarul C.P. (A 19) is a striking illustration. He had the title of *Mahārāja*, used his own seal, and communicated his orders to the officials (Appendix A). It may be mentioned that he was probably the same person mentioned as *Mahārāja Mahāsāmanta* and *Dūtaka* of Vainyagupta (A. 14)

**IV. Pāla Administration**

The Pālas ruled over Bengal and Bihar for nearly four hundred years, and during a part of this period their sway extended over a large part of Northern India. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that a highly developed and stable administrative system had grown up gradually during this period. Unfortunately, as in the earlier periods, we do not possess any detailed account of it, and are almost entirely dependent for such information as we possess upon the stereotyped list of officials given in the land-grants, and others casually mentioned in epigraphic records. These cannot obviously enable us to draw even a detailed outline, far less a complete picture, of the system of administration during their rule, and we have to rest content with a few characteristic general features and a number of isolated facts throwing glimpses upon the nature of the administration. We shall deal mainly with the...
administration of the home provinces comprising Bengal and Bihar, only casually referring to the system of administering the empire of which we know very little.

The system was based on a strong central hereditary monarchy with practically unlimited powers vested—at least theoretically—in the hands of the king. The enhanced power and prestige of the head of the State is indicated by the assumption of new royal titles introduced for the first time in Bengal, namely Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja, evidently on the model of the Imperial Guptas.) The same thing is also evident from the grandiloquent description of the royal camp at Pāṭaliputra (Patna) in the Khalimpur C.P. which has been quoted above.36

As usual, the king was helped by a group of officials at the head of which stood the Ministers, called mantrī or sachiya. But it seems that the position or status of the mantrī was highly developed and there was occasionally, if not always, one of them, with high dignity, occupying the position of that of a Prime Minister of the present day. This is revealed by a unique Inscription (B. 20) engraved on a pillar at Bādal.

This inscription contains the panegyric of a line of four or five hereditary ministers who served under Dharmapāla, Devapāla, Śūrapāla (probably Vigrahapāla I) and Nārāyaṇapāla. In view of the great importance of the record, a summary of its contents, bereft of rhetorics and details, not necessary for our present purpose, is given below.

It begins with a reference to one Garga belonging to a highly respectable Brāhmaṇa family tracing descent from the mythical Jamadagni. To Garga is given the credit of making Dharma (Dharmapāla), who was only the lord of the East, the master of all the other three directions. His son was Darbhapāṇi, by following whose policy, Devapāla was able to make tributary the earth as far as the Nārāmadā in the south, the Himālayas in the north, and the two oceans on the east and the west. Even this Devapāla, who was usually attended by princes from all quarters, “stood at the gate of Darbhapāṇi, awaiting his leisure” and “first offered to him a chair of State and then sat upon his own throne, while trembling.”

The son of Darbhapāṇi was Someśvara, and the latter’s son was Kedāramiśra. By attending to his wise counsel the lord of Gauḍa ruled the sea-girt earth, having eradicated the race of the Utkalas, humbled the pride of the Hūpas, and scattered the
conceits of the rulers of Draviḍa and Gurjara. The sacrificial ceremony performed by Kedāramiśra was often attended by Śūrapāla of his own accord and he “with bent head received the pure water.”

Guravamiśra, the son of Kedāramiśra, was possessed of great valour and showed it in the battlefield by destroying the conceit of the bravery of enemies. He was held in high esteem by Nārāyaṇapāla.

The learning and other virtues of these Brāhmaṇa ministers are described in most extravagant language and the record would furnish an excellent example of hyperbole.

This unique record furnishes much interesting historical information, but raises several intriguing problems.

In the first place, it seems to be difficult to assess the real historical value of the part alleged to be played by Garga, Darbhapāṇi and Kedāramiśra in the expansion of the empire during the reigns of Dharmapāla and Devapāla. One would naturally be tempted to discard, wholly or to a very large extent, the credit given to the three Brāhmaṇas for brilliant military victories. But it should be remembered that the record was a public document, open to all, and composed at a time when the Pāla dynasty was still ruling and the victories of Dharmapāla and Devapāla were almost in public memory. It is hardly likely that such a story, involving considerable disparagement of the two great Pāla emperors, would be fabricated and given publicity at a time when the people at large would have no difficulty to realise the falsehood and absurdity of the whole thing.

On the other hand, we must remember that the record must have been set up during or shortly after the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla when the Pāla Empire and its glory were things of the past, and for all we know, this ruler and his predecessor were probably worthless rulers—almost nonentities—who depended entirely upon their ministers, somewhat akin to the rois faineants who sat on the throne of Delhi after the death of Aurangzib. The proverbial short memory of the public perhaps accounts for the fact that the relations subsisting between the rulers and their ministers at the time when the record was set up was taken to be a fair image of what prevailed in olden days. In support of this it may be pointed out that the Khālimpur CP. of Dharmapāla (B. 2) and the Monghyr CP. of Devapāla (B. 8), issued towards the end of their reigns, do not associate either Garga, Darbhapāṇi or Kedāramiśra with the
brilliant victories of these two rulers. On the other hand, the Khālimpur CP. expressly states that the praise of Dhramapāla—not his minister—was sung everywhere by all types of people.

On the whole we may well believe that the four Brāhmaṇas mentioned above served as the ministers of the Pāla kings with great credit, and, as a reward of this, for at least five generations from Garga to Guravamiśra were hereditary ministers of the Pālas. It is to be noted that the record which extols them beyond measure nowhere refers to any of them as holding the office of Mantri (Minister), but there is little doubt that they not only held this office, but their position probably resembled, practically, if not theoretically, that of Chief or Prime Ministers (Mahāmantri), a term referred to in B. 40, 40. The description of their scholarship and manifold virtues, though highly exaggerated, may have some basis in fact as, otherwise they could not have been hereditary ministers for at least five generations. Their case has a precedent in Kauṭilya vis-a-vis Chandragupta Maurya. As a matter of fact the appointment of wise learned Brāhmaṇa as a minister, as well as hereditary offices, including those of Ministers, may be regarded as traditional in India, and the Pāla kings either initiated or followed a well-known policy. The predominance of the Prime Minister during the reigns of Vigrahapāla and Nārāyaṇapāla may be due, partly to the adoption of the hereditary principle in the appointment of ministers, and partly to the lack of capacity and personality of the rulers.

A modified form of hereditary occupation of the office of ministers is illustrated by Bhuvaneśvara Praśasti of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva (B. 90) which gives an account of seven generations of a distinguished family of Brāhmaṇas, who claimed descent from the sage Sāvarṇa, and lived in the village of Siddhala in Rājha (W. Bengal). One of them Ādideva was a minister of the king of Vānga and was successful as (his) supreme councillor and supreme official in peace and war (Mahāmantri, Mahāpātra, Sandhi-Vigrahī). His grandson was Bhavadeva “who for a long time served under king Harivarman as his minister of peace and war.”

The Pāla Emperors had numerous vassal kings and feudal chiefs under them who are referred to as Rājan, Rājanyaka, Rājanaka Rāṇaka, Sāmanta, and Mahāsāmanta.) It is not possible to determine the difference in status indicated by these designations. They might have included some of the independent kings defeated by the Pālas
and then re-instated on their thrones, with some obligations the precise nature of which is not known. But they were certainly required to attend the Durbar, vivid description of one of which is given in the Khālimpur CP. (B. 2) and quoted above (p. 109). It has been suggested that Mahāsāmantādhipati, mentioned in the Khālimpur CP. (B. 2), was an officer appointed to exercise a general control over the feudatories. But it is certain that their relation with the Emperors varied in accordance with the increase or decrease in the power of the central authority. In the dark days of the Pālas caused by the Kaivarta revolt in North Bengal the vassal kings were de facto independent rulers. This is definitely proved by the detailed account of the Sāmantas who responded to the appeal of Rāmapāla as described in the Rāmācharita. A more positive evidence is furnished by Ramganj CP. of Īśvaraghosha (B. 97) who calls himself Mahāmāṇḍalika. The following comments of N. G. Majumdar, who edited the plate, clearly bring out the importance of the record and the status of the donor.

"The donor Īśvaraghosha does not possess any of the titles of a paramount sovereign. Indeed he has not even the epithet of ‘a king’, although, curiously enough, he arrogates to himself the privilege of issuing orders to Rōjans, Rōjanyakas, Rōjūīs, Rāyakas, Rājaputras and so forth who are supposed to be under his authority. No stress can, of course, be laid on this stereotyped form of the court language, found more or less in all land grants. Hence the title Mahāmāṇḍalika assumed by Īśvaraghosha can alone be considered to determine his real position. Mr. Maitra has brought forward two important data from the Rāmācharita in this connection: Firstly Dhekkari, whence this copper-plate was issued by Īśvaraghosha, was the seat of one of the sāmantas or a vassal king (of the Pālas); and secondly, these sāmantas were known as māṇḍalādhipati, which is the same as māṇḍalika. He, therefore, concludes that Īśvaraghosha, the Mahāmāṇḍalika, held the position of a vassal king under the suzerainty of the Pāla dynasty."

The Plate expressly refers to the Vishaya as a sub-unit of Maṇḍala, which may, therefore, be regarded as akin to the territorial unit called Bhukti. The Bhukti is also referred to in the Pāla records which mention Puṇḍravardhana, Vardhamāna, and Daṇḍa-bhuktis in Bengal, Tira-bhukti (Trihut or North Bihar) and Śrīnagara-bhukti in Bihar, and Prāgijyotisha-bhukti in Assam. It seems that the Bhukti, as of old, denoted a large administrative unit, directly ruled by the
Pāla kings, while Maṇḍala denoted the territory of a Sāmanta or vassal-chief enjoying internal autonomy. The Nālandā CP. of Devapāla (B.5) refers to Balavarman, as the ruler (adhipati) of Vyāghrataṭi-maṇḍala and describes him as the right-hand person of king Devapāla. He evidently held a position superior to that of the Governor of a Bhukti. So there were powerful feudal chiefs, enjoying local autonomy even in the palmy days of the Pālas. No wonder that their powers and pretentions grew in the same proportion as those of the Pālas declined, till they were regarded more as subordinate allies than feudal vassals. The case of Vijayasena, mentioned above (p. 42), shows that there were probably similar feudal chiefs, in fact if not in name, in Bengal during the post-Gupta period of independence. Leaving aside the semi-independent dominions of the feudal or vassal chiefs of various categories mentioned above, the territory directly administered by the Pāla kings was divided into administrative units like Bhuktis, Vishayas, Maṇḍalas and other smaller units. The exact connotation of Vishayas and Maṇḍalas is very puzzling, for sometimes the former comprises the latter, and sometimes the case was just the reverse. The records also refer to a large number of smaller units such as Khaṇḍala, Avritti, and Bhāga. The Avritti was subdivided into Chaturakas, and the latter into Pāṭakas. The precise nature of none of these is known to us. The Pāṭaka is defined by Hemachandra as one-half of a grāma or village, and is most probably the origin of the modern division of a Bengal village (and town) called Pāḍā, denoting a part inhabited generally by a particular category of people belonging to a social or professional unit. In any case Pāṭaka may be taken as the smallest administrative unit named in the epigraphic records."

"The most important part of the administrative machinery of the Pālas is the organisation of the Central Government directly under the king. There was no question of such an organisation so long as Bengal formed only a part of the Gupta Empire. But it must have been an important part of the administrative system when Bengal became an independent kingdom in the sixth century A.D. Unfortunately the only clue to such an organisation is furnished by the list of officials mentioned in the Malla Sārul CP. (A. 19) issued by Vijayasena during the reign of Gopachandra. Curiously enough, no such list occurs in the epigraphic records of the other independent kings of Bengal. Whether the Secretariat of Vijayasena, who probably served previously under Vainyagupta, simply repeated the
stereotyped list used in Gupta records, or gave a genuine list of officials actually serving under Gopachandra or Vijayasena, it is difficult to say. In any case a perusal of the list which is given in the Appendix I to this chapter with the probable meaning of the official designations—which in some cases is purely conjectural—gives us some idea of the main departments of the Central administrative organisation. So far as the Pāla period is concerned we are also dependent to a very large extent on the list of officials. As could be expected, the list of officials\(^{41}\) in the Pāla records contains a larger number of designations which may be grouped under the following broad heads.

1. Central—Civil
   1A. Revenue.
   1B. Judicial.
   1C. Police.

2. Central—Military.

3. Provincial and Local.

4. Of doubtful significance.

1. Central—Civil—General

The election of Gopāla as king in order to save the country from chaos and anarchy constitutes a very intriguing problem in the administrative and constitutional history of Bengal. The state of anarchy has been described above and needs no further comment. But the procedure of election referred to in the Khālimpur CP. (B. 2) and by Lāmā Tāranātha raises an intriguing question and has been discussed in some detail by Dr. B. C. Sen.\(^{42}\) (The difficulty is caused by the use of the word ‘Prakṛiti’ as the agent of election in B. 2. Prakṛiti denotes ‘people’ as well as the seven elements of sovereignty.) The former sense is preferable on two grounds. In the first place, it agrees with the view of Tāranātha who clearly says that the people elected him. Secondly, while describing a political situation similar to that prevailing in Bengal which led to the election of Gopāla, Kauṭilya uses the same term Mātsyanyāya and adds, that in order to avert it the ‘Prajā’ elected Manu as king. The word Prajā can only denote people.

But though we might, therefore, accept the election of Gopāla by the people, it is difficult to take this literally, as, so far as we know
there was no machinery in those days to take the votes, or otherwise ascertain the views, of the people. We may, therefore, hold that recognised leaders of the people or representatives of popular assemblies met together and chose Gopāla as king, and this was tacitly accepted by the people by vocal expression or demonstrations. Indeed Tāranātha also, in his account, at first refers to the choice of Gopāla by the 'leaders'.

Dr. B. C. Sen is also more or less in agreement with the above view, though he puts it in a somewhat modified form. He says: "It can be shown that in the earlier period local leadership in villages and districts had been quite an effective and serviceable factor of the prevailing system of administration. In such limited regions individuals designated Mahattara and various institutions of local self-government had been accustomed for centuries to functions of a responsible character. It is probable that local authorities of such types connected with a comparatively small area joined together or took the initiative in electing a sovereign, who afterwards gradually extended his sphere of authority, so that the whole country came to accept his rule."43

The strength of popular element in the administration is not only proved by the election of Gopāla, but probably also by the rebellion against Mahīpāla which cost him his life and throne.44

But apart from these two instances a stable Government based on hereditary monarchy and succession on principles of primogeniture characterised the Government from the eighth century till the end of the Hindu rule.

Under this system the Yuvarāja or heir-apparent naturally played an important role. But unfortunately we know very little about his functions and activities, either in the Pāla or post-Pāla period. The available informations have been summed up as follows by Dr. B C. Sen.

"The king's eldest son, as usual, was meant for heir-apparency (yuvarājyam). As to his duties and functions, no detailed information is supplied. One such Yuvarāja or heir-apparent, Tribhuvanapāla, carried out the duties of a messenger in connexion with the Khālimpur Grant; another, viz., Rājypāla, was entrusted with similar business in the matter of the Monghyr Grant. Vigrahamapāla, the Pāla king, abdicated in favour of his son Nārāyaṇapāla who was acting as the Yuvarāja at the time of the renunciation of the throne by his father. The term Kumāra was applied to a son of the
king, appointed to a high administrative post such as a provincial governorship. The Kūmaṇa sometimes gave a good account of himself by taking part in the reigning king’s military campaigns. Thus Lakṣmaṇasena in his youth, before his installation as a king, appears to have participated in some victorious expeditions (Mādhāinagar Grant). Rāmapāla used to hold consultations with his sons, particularly Rājyapala, in connexion with his war-preparations against the Kāvartas, the collapse of whose power was not only the greatest achievement of his reign but one of the most notable episodes of the closing period of Pāla history.

"Not only the king and his son or sons were interested in the government, but the former’s cousins sometimes intimately associated themselves with its policy and activities. Dharmapāla and his son Devapāla were each, in turn, assisted generously by their respective cousins, Vākpaṇa and Jayapāla, in the prosecution of their military plans. The Sāhitya Parishat Grant of Viśvarūpasena gives the names of two Kūmaṇas, Sūryasena and Purushottamasena, recording the gift of a plot of land measuring 10 udānas by the former to Halāyudha on his birth-day (varshavriddhau 1.54), and the gift of another plot measuring 24 udānas by the other Kūmaṇa. The Kūmaṇa used to have his own āmātyas, styled Kūmaṇāmātyas. Whether such āmātyas, distinguished from the Rājāmātyas, were to be attached only to those among the princes who had been appointed to provincial governorships, or to all such persons whether free or in such service, is not clear. From the inscriptions of the earlier period it appears that the Kūmaṇāmātyas used to be appointed as Vishayapatis or district officers. This was perhaps because the administration of a province was generally regarded as a matter principally reserved for a Kūmaṇa. Consequently, those who were to be appointed as Vishayapatis were usually recruited from the rank of the Kūmaṇāmātyas."

Dr. Sen’s views about Kūmaṇāmātya are somewhat conjectural and may justly be questioned, but cannot be regarded as unreasonable and deserve serious consideration.

(The Ministers referred to above not merely possessed vast learning and scholarship, but some of them were also distinguished for their military skill.) Thus Guravamiśra is not only compared to Parāśurāma but is also credited with having achieved victory in battlefield by his valour (B. 20). But he is not a solitary example. Vaidyadeva, who was a Sāchiva, obtained a great victory in a naval
battle in South Bengal and his constant care and anxiety for properly maintaining the ‘seven limbs’ of the State made him dearer than life to his royal master (B. 94). As noted above, when the vassal ruler, Tiingyadewa of Kāmarūpa (Assam) rose in rebellion against Kumārapāla, Vaidyadeva was sent at the head of an army to suppress it, and, after forced marches, he defeated the rebel and became king of Kāmarūpa (p. 156). Whether king Kumārapāla, as a reward for his valour, appointed him ruler of Kāmarūpa, or he himself ascended the throne of Kāmarūpa, is not definitely known, but there is no doubt that he was practically an independent king when he issued the Kamauli CP (B. 94), for it refers to him as Parama-Māheśvara, Parama-Vaishnava, Mahārājādhirāja Paramesvara Parama-bhattāraka and is drafted in the right royal style and is dated in the fourth year of his reign.

The earliest Pāla CP. Grant (B. 2) mentions Yuvarāja as Dūtaka, but several later Pāla Grants mention a ‘Mantri’ as Dūtaka (B. 18, 40, 50). This shows the dignity of the office as well as the importance of the Mantri. The function of the Dūtaka seems to be to place before the king formally the request for grant of lands. In the Khālimpur CP (B. 2) the Mahāsāmantādhipati communicates his application for grant of land to the Emperor through the Yuvarāja. Mahārājā Vijayasena acted as such Dūtaka to Vainyagupta. There are other references to high dignitaries acting as Dūtaka or (envoy of the Grant).

The long list of officials and courtiers to whom the royal order in land-grants was communicated begins with Rāja, Rājanaka (or Rājanyaka) and Rājaputra. The first two of these denote feudal chiefs who probably happened to be in the court. Rājanaka has been equated with Rāṇaka by some, but both designations sometimes occur together in the same record. A more plausible suggestion is that Rajanaka is a corrupt form of Rājanyaka and both may be regarded as a diminutive form of Rājanya. It has been suggested that Rāṇaka is possibly more or less equivalent to Rāṇā of the Chamba inscriptions denoting vassals of the Rājā. But the engraver of a Sena record (C. 2), Śūlapāni, is called a Rāṇaka and the head of the guild of artisans of Varendra. This is hardly compatible with the above view. The third, Rājaputra, of course, denotes a Prince.

What part, if any, the first two played in the administration is not quite clear. As regards the third, as we have also reference to Yuvarāja in the Pāla records, Rājaputra probably means a younger
prince who carried on some regular duties or functions assigned to him. But as regards the Feudal chiefs or Princes (other than Yuvraja) their names were probably included as they normally happened to be present in the Court and the royal order was formally communicated to those present (samupagatān).

(Another three occurs the name of Rājāmātya. He must, therefore, be regarded as a very high official, and it has, accordingly, been suggested that he was the Prime Minister (who is elsewhere probably referred to as Mahāmantri), other Ministers being referred to as Sachiva or Mantri. Another suggestion is that the Rājāmātyas denoted companions of the king who probably also advised him, and this term “is to be understood in contradistinction from the term Kumārāmātya, the two denoting member of the staff attached, respectively, to the king and the Kumāra (Prince).” But this is very unlikely as Kumārāmātya is often associated with district administration.

The Irdā CP. (B. 92), issued by a ruler of the Kāmboja tribe, mentions the Mahishī (queen), the Yuvraja (crown-prince), and Purohita (priest) along with the Ritviks (engaged in sacrifices), the dharmaṁjñas (persons versed in religious scriptures), and the Pradeshris (probably the Pradesikas of Asoka).

(Next in rank were Amātyas, a general term which probably denotes the officials of high rank—something like the members of the I. A. S. of the present day. They were assisted by adhyakshas (heads of Departments) with a staff of clerks (Karaṇas) mentioned in Irdā CP. (B. 92).

(Then there were special officers in different departments. To the foreign department belongs Sāndhi-Vigrahika which literally means one who deals with peace and war.) To this and the designation of some other officials, the prefix ‘mahā’ is sometimes attached, evidently denoting the chief officer or the head of the department. Mahā-Sāndhi-Vigrahika may, therefore, denote Foreign Minister. To this Department also belongs the Dūta or envoys. The designation is sometimes written as Dūta-praishāṇika. Literally it would mean ‘one who sends out a messenger. But it probably consists of two separate words Dūta and Praishāṇika, somewhat akin to modern ‘Ambassador’ and Messenger or a special envoy sent to a foreign court with a specific or special message. An analogous instance of such errors is probably furnished by Rājasthāniya and Uparika both of which mean the Governor or Viceroy. Generally they are
used as one and the same name, but at least in one inscription (B. 8) they are treated as different. The exact function of the official called *Kholā* cannot be determined. It is not to be found in Sanskrit dictionary, but it is translated in the Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary, on the authority of *Pinda-nirāvṛkta* of Bhadrabāhu, as 'spy'. (This is very probable, as espionage has always been regarded as an essential department of Government, and there is no other term in the long list of officials which may be regarded as belonging to the Intelligence Department, with the exception of *Gudha-purusha*, mentioned in the Irā. CP. (B. 92).

The officials named *Pramaṭri* and *Kshetrapa* probably refer to surveyors of land. Evidently, there was regular office for survey of lands which may be regarded as indispensable for purposes of fixing the land-revenue. But *Pramaṭri* has been taken by some to be a judicial officer trying civil cases only.

A class of officers described as *adhyakshas* or supervisors of elephants, horses, colts, mules, cows, buffaloes, goats and sheep, must be distinguished from army officers in charge of some of these referred to later.47 They may be regarded as Superintendents of elephant, horses etc. maintained by the State, and their functions and duties may be similar to those of functionaries of the same names described in the Kauṭiliya *Arthaśastra*.48

1 A. *Revenue Department*. There were different classes of officers for collecting revenues from different sources. Those from agricultural lands must have been mainly collected through the heads of territorial units, such as *Uparika*, *Vishayapatī*, *Dāṣagrāmika* and *Grāmapati*. The exact nature of these revenues is not known to us, but they are referred to in general terms as *bhāga*, *bhoga*, *kara hiranyya*, *uparikara* etc.49 in the land-grants. (We have a specific reference to an officer called *Shashtih-ādhyātita*, and it is probable that he collected the sixth part of various articles which belonged to the king according to *Manu-smriti*.50) Another officer, called *Bhogapatī* probably collected the tax referred to as *bhoga*. The other kinds of taxes and revenues may be inferred from the designations of officials employed to collect them. If our interpretations of these terms are correct, the following taxes were imposed during the Pāla period.

1. Tax payable by the villagers for protection against thieves and robbers.51
2. Customs and tolls.
3. Fine for criminal offences.  
4. Ferry-dues.

These taxes were collected respectively by Chauroddhāranīka, Śaulkika, Dāśāparūdhika, and Tarika.

The Accounts (and probably also Records) Department was in charge of Mahākshapatālika. He was probably assisted by Jyeshṭha-kāyaṃstha.

Official names like Kshetrapa and Pramātri seem to refer to a department of land-survey.

IB. The Judicial Department was in charge of Mahādaṇḍa- 
nāyaka (called Dharmādhiṅkāra in Ins. No. B. 94).

IC. The Police Department had several officers such as Mahā- 
pratīṃhāra, Daṇḍika, Daṇḍapāśika and Daṇḍāśakī. The first was 
probably in charge of the palace, but the duties of the others cannot 
be defined. Another officer Khola was probably in charge of the 
Intelligence Department, as mentioned above.

2. Central—Military.

The Military Department was in charge of Senāpati or 
Mahāsenāpati. There were separate officers under him in charge 
of infantry, cavalry, elephants, camels, and ships which formed the 
chief divisions of the army. The names of some special officers 
are also mentioned such as Koṭṭapāla in charge of forts, and 
Prāntapāla, the Warden of the Marches.

In the Irā B. 90 the royal order is communicated, among 
others, to the Senāpatis and the Sainika-Saṅghamukhyas, both in 
the plural number. This raises some intriguing problems about 
the organisation of the army. In the first place, the existence 
of more than one senāpati shows that this term denotes, not the 
Commander-in-Chief, but only one of several Commanders, and one 
would like to know whether there was any Commander-in-Chief, or 
the king himself assumed that position. The title Mahāsenāpati 
supports the former view.

Sainika-Saṅgha literally means organised corporations of soldiers, 
of whom again there were several, each with a head. As the Grant 
was issued by a ruler of Kāmboja race, one is naturally reminded 
of the Saṅghas of Kāmbojas who lived by agriculture, trade and 
wielding weapons. Such Corporations within the army itself are
otherwise unknown, and nothing can be definitely said about their nature and organisation.

That cavalry and elephant forces formed an important part of the army in Bengal from very early times is quite clear from the classical accounts of the Gangaridai mentioned above.55

A few interesting details about the military force may be gathered from epigraphic records. One inscription (B. 8) distinctly says that horses for the army of Devapāla were imported from Kāmbhoja, a region noted in ancient times for horses of good breed. Still more interesting is the enumeration of different tribal elements in the army of the Pālas.

The mention in the Pāla records of a number of tribal names along with the officials may be taken as referring to the military units recruited from those tribes. These are Gauḍa, Mālava, Khaṣa, Kulika and Hūṇa in the Nālandā CP. of Dharmapāla (B. 3). Karnāṭa and Lāṭa are added in the records of subsequent kings, while Choḍa occurs in a single inscription (B. 66) of the time of Madanapāla, the last Pāla king.56 The fact that there is no reference to these tribes in the Khālimpur CP. of Dharmapāla (B. 2) might lead one to presume that this military organisation was not fully developed till towards the close of his reign. The name Gauḍa in the list is certainly very interesting and possibly refers to the soldiers recruited in the home territory of the Pālas. Kulika cannot be obviously taken as an artisan or merchant and must be regarded as the name of a people.57 The other tribes are well-known. It is obvious from this list that the Pāla kings recruited mercenary soldiers from all parts of India.

The words chāṭa and bhaṭa which follow the tribal names mentioned above, perhaps refer to ‘regular’ and ‘irregular’ troops.

It is somewhat surprising that Pālas also maintained a camel-force (B. 4, 8).

Reference may be made in this connection to the fact that the epigraphic records refer to the five traditional branches of the military force, namely, elephant, horse, chariots, infantry and navy. There is, however, reference to the officers in charge of all of them except chariots. But chariots are illustrated in the sculptures of Pāhārpur, along with armed soldiers. Bowmen are also represented, but not mentioned in the records. In Bengal, full of rivers, navy must have played an important part and the epigraphic records refer to naval battles.
3. Provincial and Local

While the Pāla records furnish more details of the Central Government, the information about the Provincial and local Governments is very meagre. That the territorial divisions like Bhukti, Vishaya Manḍala and Grāma still continued is proved by reference to these terms as well as to Rājasthānika, Uparika, Kumārmātya, Vishayapati add Grāmapati. Possibly TadĀyuktaka and Viniyuktaka correspond, at least to some extent, to the official designation of Āyuktaka. Some new features are introduced by the designation Daśa-grāmika, which literally means head of ten villages, an officer mentioned in the Manu-Smṛiti (VII. 115-120) along with heads of twenty, hundred and even thousand villages. There might have been some such gradation, but we have specific reference to only the head of ten villages.

There is a reference to Mahā-Kumārmātya, which probably means the same officials of a higher status, or a supervisor of the works of several Kumārmātyas, somewhat like a Divisional Commissioner of the present day over a number of Magistrate-Collectors of districts.

Various minor officials are mentioned indicating new departments. The Superintendents (adhyaksha) of elephants, horses, cows, buffaloes, and goats, undoubtedly refer to civil officers for looking after them. Military officers in charge of some of these (elephants and horses) were referred to as Vyāpritaka (B. 8).

There is no clear reference to the popular element in the administration of districts and smaller local units. But the Khālimpur CP. of Dharmapāla (B. 2) refers to Jyeshṭha-Kāvastha Mahā-Mahattara, Mahattara and Daśa-grāmika as administering the Vishaya (Vishaya-Vyavahārinah). This is an indication that the democratic element in the administration of districts and other minor localities had not altogether disappeared. It may be noted that even Brāhmaṇas and Kuoṭumbinyas are mentioned in some records. The lack of land-sale records, like those of the Gupta-period, giving the details, may be purely due to accident rather than non-existence of old system. This view is strengthened by the fact that the strength of popular element in political affairs is reflected in the election of Gopāla, mentioned above.

4. Miscellaneous

The designations of some officials are somewhat obscure, and their functions cannot be exactly determined. Khaṇḍaraksha, for
example, may denote an officer of the Public Works Department, specially charged with the construction and repairs of buildings. The term Śaunika occurs only in one inscription (B. 66) in the place where we would expect Śaulkika, and may be a mistake for it. But it may be equivalent to Śūnādhyaksha mentioned in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra and denote the Superintendent of slaughterhouse. The designation Gaulmika is also of very uncertain significance. It may mean “an officer in charge of a military squadron called gulma, consisting of 9 elephants, 9 chariots, 27 horses and 45 foot-soldiers.” Gulma, however, also means a wood, fort and a police-station. Dr. Fleet translates gaulmika as ‘superintendent of woods and forest’ 58. Dr. U. N. Ghoshal 59 takes gaulmika as collector of customs duties and refers to ‘gulmacya’ used in the Arthaśāstra in the sense of ‘dues paid at the military or the police-stations’. His view is evidently based on the fact that Śaulkika is immediately followed by gaulmika in the Pāla records; but, in Sena records gaulmika immediately follows the names of military officials.” 60

The Irdā CP. (B. 92) refers to Mantrapāla along with the Mantrī. The former has been translated as ‘political advisers’, but this is somewhat vague. Dauḥsādha-sādhanika, denoting one or two official designations, Gamāgamika, Kartṭukṛīttika, Abhitvaramāna, Śarabhaṅga, Sarvādhikṛīta, etc. are obscure designations, and conjectures, based on their literal meaning, have been made of their functions, though these carry little weight. But the very large number of official designations, even though their real meaning or function is at present unknown, indicate a highly organised and complicated administrative machinery.

V. Administration of Chandras, Varmans and Senas.

The land-grants of the Chandras and Varmans, who were contemporaries of the Pālas and of the Senas who succeeded them in the sovereignty of Bengal, contain lists of officials which show a large measure of agreement with those of the Pālas. The discrepancies 61 do not seem to be of vital importance, except in a few cases. The omission of Grāmika may be significant if we regard it as indicating a decline in the importance of local rural administration. But this is not a necessary inference. The addition of Rājñī may indicate greater political importance of the queen. Other new additions are Mahāvyūhapati and Mahāpilupati in the military department, stressing perhaps the importance of Vyūha or military formation in the
battlefield, and elephant-force. Similarly *Mahā-Dharmādyaksha* (Chief Justice), *Mahā-Purohita* (Chief Priest) and *Mahā-Sarvādhikṛita* (probably Supervisor of general administration of a high rank) are probably indicative of greater or better organisation rather than any innovation.

Many new grandiloquent titles were assumed by the Sena Kings and even minor ruling dynasties in imitation of them. To these usual titles some of the Sena kings added their own *birulas*. The *birulas* assumed by Vijayasena, Vallālasena, Lakshmaṇasena, Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena were, respectively, *Ari-vṛishabhāsaṅkara*, *Ariṅga-Nīlaśaṅka-Śaṅkara*, *Arirāja-Madana-Śaṅkara*, *Ariṅga-Vrīshabhāṅka-Śaṅkara*, and *Ariṅga-Asahya-Śaṅkara*. The title *Parameśvara* is assumed by Vijayasena, Vallālasena and Lakshmaṇasena, and the epithet *Aśvapati-Gajapati-Narapati rājaratrayādhipati* is bestowed upon Viśvarūpasena.

The territorial divisions like *Bhukti*, *Vishaya*, *Maṇḍala* and *Grāma* etc., continued, though the *Maṇḍala* was sometimes a big area comprising several *Vishayas*. A notable change was the gradual extension of the Puṇḍra-vardhana-*bhukti* which probably began under the Pālas. In any case it ultimately comprised not only North Bengal, to which it was originally applied, but also included Samataṭa and Vaṅga which corresponded, respectively, to South-East and East Bengal. The Puṇḍravardhana-*bhukti* included a large number of *Maṇḍalas* each comprising several *Vishayas*, and of *Vishayas* of which each comprised several *Maṇḍalas*. So the meanings and areas of these units varied from time to time or in different localities. The following *Vishayas* and *Maṇḍalas* were included in the Puṇḍravardhana-*bhukti*.88

1-2. Vyāghrataṭi-*Maṇḍala* to which was attached the Mahantā-prakāśa-*Vishaya*.
3-5. Sthālikkaṭa-*Vishaya* to which was attached the Āmra-shaṇḍikā-*Maṇḍala* near the Uḍragrāma-*Maṇḍala*.
6. Kuddālakhāṭa-*Vishaya*.
7-9. Koṭi-Varsha-*Vishaya* in which were included the Gokālikā- and Halāvarta-*Maṇḍalas*.
10. Brāhmanigrāma-*Maṇḍala*.
11. Nānya-*Maṇḍala*.
12-13. Khediravalli-*Vishaya* which included the Vallīmuṇḍā *Maṇḍala*. 
14-15. Ikkaḍaśi-Vishaya which included the Yolā-Maṇḍala.
16-17. Sataṭa-Padmāvatī-Vishaya in which was included the Kumāratālaka-Maṇḍala.
19. Adhaḷpattana-Maṇḍala.
20. Khāḍi-Vishaya or Maṇḍala.
21. Varendra or Varendra-Maṇḍala.
22. Vaṅga which included the Vikramapura-Bhāga and Nāvya.

The most important Vishaya was that named Koṭīvarsha which is also mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions. The city from which it derives its name is referred to in the Vāyu Purāṇa. The Jaina Prajñā-panā places it in Rāḍhā (Lāḍhha). But Gupta and Pāla inscriptions invariably include it within the Punḍravardhana-bhukti. The headquarters of the vishaya have been identified with mediaeval Diw-kot (Devakoṭa or Devikoṭa). The ruins of the city are found about eighteen miles south of Dinājpur town in the village of Bāngarh. Several names of the famous city are mentioned by lexicographers, e.g., Umā (Ushā-?) vana, Bāṇapura and Šonitapura.

The name Sataṭa-Padmāvatī-Vishaya (No. 16) is of great interest, as it indicates the existence of the river now known as Padmā. Khāḍi, lit. estuary, is referred to as a vishaya in the Barrackpore Grant of Vijayasena and as a maṇḍala in the Sundarban Grant of Lakshmana-sena. It is known to the Dākārṇava as one of the sixty-four pīthas or sacred seats and is distinguished from Rāḍhā, Vaṅgāla and Harikela. The name survives in the Khāḍi parganā of the Diamond Harbour sub-division of the district of Twenty-four Parganas.

Khāḍi or Khāṭikā was split up into two parts by the Ganges. The eastern part, Pūrva-khāṭikā or Khāḍi proper, was included within the Punḍravardhana-bhukti. But Paśchima-khāṭikā which lay to the west of the Bhagirathi in the present Howrah district was a sub-division of the Vardhamāna-bhukti.

The area of the Vardhamāna-bhukti also seems to have been gradually extended, and during the period under review it stretched at one time from the Mor river in the north to Suvarṇārekhā in the South. But in the time of Lakshmana-sena the northern part (Uttara-Rāḍhā) formed part of the Kaṅka-grāma-bhukti, the name of which is not found in any other record.
The Kānkaprāma-bhukti included a number of administrative areas styled vīthī. In the Vardhamāna-bhukti, the maṇḍala came between the bhukti and the vīthī. But the new bhukti seems to have been split up directly into vīthīs. Like many of the older territories of Bengal, Kānkaprāma had a northern and a southern sub-division. The southern part (Dakṣiṇavīthī) embraced Uttarā-Rājha or at least that portion of it which was watered by the river Mor.

The names of a large number of cities in ancient Bengal are known from epigraphic records, but the location of most of them is doubtful. We may locate with a tolerable degree of certainty Tāmralipi (Tamluk), Punḍranagara (Mahāsthānagarh), and Karṇasuvarna, (p. 7), but other towns named in the epigraphic records, including the metropolitan city, cannot be located.

Curiously enough, the records of the earliest Pāla kings do not afford any clue as to the location of their metropolis. We have only reference to a few camps of victory, mostly in the neighbouring province of Bihar. In the time of Dharmapāla, who is referred to as Vaṅgapati in a Rāshtrakūṭa and a Pratihāra record, the ancestral capital may have been in Eastern Bengal. But from the time of Devapāla, who is styled Gaṇḍēśvara in the Bādāl Pillar Inscription (B. 20), Gauḍa seems to have been the metropolitan Vishaya or city.

Gauḍa was also the capital of the Senas at least from the time of Lakṣmaṇasena, and it was probably he who renamed it Lakṣmaṇāvatī. As Gauḍa is mentioned by Pāṇini, it may be regarded as the Eternal City of Bengal. Its ruins lie near the town of Mālād. Rāmapāla founded a new capital city, named after him Rāmāvatī, which is referred to in the Rāmarācharita. It was probably not far from Gauḍa.

The Senas, and probably also Chandras and Varmans, had another capital at Vikramapura, which is even to-day the name of a locality in East Pakistan not very far from Munshigunj in Dacca District. Nādiyā or Nadvīpa was also a capital city at the time of Lakṣmaṇasena. The Pavanaṭūta of Dhoyi places the capital of Lakṣmaṇasena at Vijayapura probably named after Vijayasena. It stood on the Ganges not far from Triveni (Hooghly District), but its exact position is uncertain.

The epigraphic records throw some light on the system of measurement of lands. The available information has been thus summed up:

"The system of measurement shows an accuracy, which could have been possible under an administration that paid due attention to surveys of land for purposes of taxation, and also to the
necessity of preserving all relevant documents bearing on the history of any assignment that might be contemplated. Every copper-plate Grant was to be stamped with Royal Seal, which must have been in the keeping of the Mahâmudrâdhikrita. As regards measurement, a uniform system was followed in the particular area where the grant may have been situated. Thus measurement on the basis of the standard represented by the Samataṭīya Nala was current in Samataṭa. The use of the Vrîshabha-Śaṅkara Nala was current in the days of Vallâlasena, as known from his Naihati Grant (C. 5). In some Grants, however, there is no mention of any specific standard of measurement, but it is clearly stated that the Nala system which seems to have been universally based on the accepted unit was current in a particular locality (tad-deśīya-saṁvyavahāra-shat-pañchāsat-hasta-parimita-Nalena; tatratyā deśa-vyavahāra-nalena). The unit in every case must have been the hasta or cubit. But two points are to be specially noticed in connexion with this system of measurement. First, a standard hasta must have determined the unit of the measurement. The name Vrîshabha-Śaṅkara-Nala shows that the hasta of the king Vallâlasena was the unit followed, while in those cases where no such definite indication is given, it is to be understood that some fixed standard must have been followed, although it may not be known whose hasta supplied the unit in those instances. Secondly, with regard to the measurement of a Nala, the Govindapur inscription of Lakshmaṇasena (C. 6) shows that it was equivalent to 56 cubits. Entire plots of lands or even villages were to be measured by the application of the Nala standard locally current. Thus the Barâckpur Grant (C. 1) mentions that four Pâṭakas of land were given away as measured by the Nala used in Samataṭa.”

We are equally ill-informed about the currency of Bengal in the Pâla and post-Pâla period. Reference is made to Kaparaddaka-Purâṇa in connection with the income derived from land. “The discovery of a number of silver coins with their weight varying approximately from 52 to 58 grains with the legend Śrî-Vigra (ha), Śrî-Vi or simply Śrî, including those found in ‘Devapâla’ temple at Ghoshrawa, show that silver coins of the weight fixed for a Purâṇa were in use in the Pâla period. It is quite probable that the name Drâma was given to this type of coinage. The restoration of the older name to the silver coins used in the dominion by the Senas who came from the Deccan is proved by the references to Purâṇas or Kaparaddaka-Purâṇas to be found in their inscriptions.”
APPENDIX

A

List of officials mentioned in the Malla Sārul Copper-plate of the time of king Gopachandra (Ins. A. 19).

1. Āgrahārika—Supervisor of agrahāra land, i.e., lands offered as free gifts to Brāhmaṇas for their subsistence or settlement therein, or for some religious purposes.

2. Audraṅgika—Collector of Udraṅga which is probably a tax on permanent tenants (U. N. Ghoshal—Hindu Revenue System, 210).

3. Aurnaṅthānika—Officer in charge of woollen articles (?) (IC. vi. 160).

4. Āvasathika—Probably the supervisor of royal palace and other government buildings, including temples, rest-houses etc.

5. Bhogapatika (p. 314)—Kielhorn takes bhoga as equivalent to bhukti (EI. IV. 253, f.n. 6).


7. Devadroni-sambaddha—Officer entrusted with deva-droni (probably temples and sacred tanks).


10. Kumārāmātya—District Officer. For other meanings of this term, cf. R. D. Banerji—Imperial Guptas, pp. 71 ff. His contention that some of the Kumārāmātyas were equal in rank to the heir-apparent and even to His Majesty the king is highly improbable. The word-pādiya, which Mr. Banerji interprets as ‘equal in rank,’ should rather be taken as ‘belonging to the foot of.’ In other words, Kumārāmātya was the general name of a class of officials some of whom were directly under the king or the crown-prince. It is difficult to accept the usual interpretation of Kumārāmātya as Prince’s Minister. The term probably refers to one who has hereditary right to a high office of State.
11. Pattalaka—Pattalā denotes a territorial unit in Gāhaḍavāla records (El. XIX. 293).

12. Tadāyuktaka—This may be a class of officials called āyuktaka (pp. 289, 291, 317).

13. Uparika—Provincial Governor; probably also used in the sense of a superior officer.

14. Vāhanāyaka—Superintendent of transport (?)

15. Vishayapati—District-Officer.

B

List of officials mentioned in the land-grants of Pāla kings (excluding the compound terms noted on p. 330, f.n. 47).

1. Abhitvaramāṇa (also with suffix 'ka').

2. Amātya—Probably a general designation of a class of high officials.

3. Āṅgaraksha.

4. Balādhyaksha—Officer in charge of infantry (f.n. 47).


10. Dāśagrāmika—Head of ten villages.

11. Dāśaparāḍhika—Probably an officer who collected fines for ten specified kinds of criminal offences (p. 315).

12. Dauḥsādha-sādhanika.


14. Dūta-praiṣhaṇīka—This is written as one name, but as Rājasthāṇīya and Uparika are treated as different in Ins. No. B. 8, and as one name in other inscriptions, dūta-praiṣhaṇīka may be really names of two officials, dūta and praiṣhaṇīka. As a compound word it literally means 'one who sends out a messenger' (IB. 185).

15. Gaṇāgamika.


17. Grāmapati—Headman of a village.
21. Koṭṭapāla (also Koṭapāla)—Officer in charge of forts.
24. Mahā-dāṇḍanāyaka—Chief Judge, General, or Magistrate.
27. Mahākṣhapaṭalika.
29. Mahā-pratihāra—Pratihāra means a door-keeper. Mahā-pratihāra was evidently a high official in the Police or Military department. The title is applied to both military and civil administrative officers and feudatories (p. 300).
30. Mahā sāndhivigrahika—Sāndhivigrahika occurs in Ins. No. B. 66 as the dūtaka of the Grant, but is not included in the regular list. (cf. App. C. No. 13).
32. Nākādhyaksha (probably a mistake for Nāvādhyaksha or Naukādhyaksha—Superintendent of ships).
33. Pramāṭri—Probably an officer in charge of land-survey. According to some, he was a judicial officer in charge of recording evidence.
34. Prāṇtapāla—Warden of Marches.
35. Rājāmāṭya—Amāṭya generally denotes high officials of State. As this name occurs immediately after Rājaputra, it has been taken by some as denoting a high minister of State, probably the ‘Prime Minister’ (EHBP. 114), cf. p. 313.
36. Rājasthāṇiya—Regent or Viceroy.
37. Samāgamika—It occurs only once in Ins. No. B 2 and is probably a mistake for No. 15 above.
38. Sa(or Śa)rābhāṅga.
39. Śau̥l̥kika—Collector of tolls and custom dues.
40. Saunika—This term occurs only in Ins. No. B. 66 in the place where we would expect Śau̥l̥kika. So it may be a mistake for this term. Otherwise it probably denotes the Superintendent of slaughter-house (cf. Śūnādhyaksha in Arthaśāstra, ii. Ch. xxvi).
41. Senāpati—Commander of the army.
42. Shashṭhādhikrīta—p. 314.
44. Tarapati (also Tarapatika)—Probably supervisor of ferries.
45. Tarika—Probably collector of ferry dues.
46. Uparika—Provincial Governor. It is usually preceded by rājahṣṭhāniya (No. 36) as mentioned above (pp. 313-4), and the two together probably have the sense of a Viceroy and a Governor.
48. Vishayapati—District-Officer.

C

List of officials mentioned in the land-grants of Chandra, Varman, and Sena kings excluding (1) the compound term ‘nau-balaha-stvy-ās-sva-go-mahish-āj-āvikādi-yāpritaka’ (for which see f.n. 47) and (2) the names already noted in App. B (Nos. 6, 7, 13, 16, 21, 27, 29, 31, 35, 39, 48). For notes and interpretations, cf. IB 183 ff. The following notes may be regarded as only supplementary.

1. Antaraṅga—For various suggestions about its meaning cf. IC. I. 684; EHBP. 118. Cf. supra, p. 300.
7. Mahā-duḥsādhika (cf. 4 above).
8. Mahā-gaṇapasta—Probably a military officer. Gaṇa denotes a body of troops consisting of 27 chariots, as many ele-
phants, 81 horses, and 135 foot. Mr. N. G. Majumdar
interprets it differently (IB. 186).

9. Mahā-mahattaka—It has been interpreted as Prime Minister
(IB. 131), but this is very doubtful.

10. Mahā-mudrādhikṛita—Some take it as the Mudrādhvakṣa
of the Arthāśāstra, i.e., the Superintendent of Passports.
It does not, however, seem to have any connection with
coins or currency, as the use of mudrā, in the sense of a
coin, belongs to a later period.

11. Mahā-pilupati—Probably the chief trainer of elephants.

12. Mahā-purohita—Chief Priest. The prefix ‘Mahā’ probably
indicates the great importance attached to religious and
social aspects of administration during the rule of the
orthodox Hindu Kings.

13. Mahā-sāndhivigrahika—This name also occurs in the Pāla
records. But the office was one of great importance
during this period. Both Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva and
Ādideva, his grandfather, were Sāndhivigrahika and
Prime Minister of kings of Vaṅga. In the Bhāwāl CP. of
Lakshmanasena (C. 12), Śaṅkaradha, the Mahā-sāndhi-
vigrahika of Gauḍa, is said to be the chief of a hundred
mantrās (El. XXVI. 10, 13). This officer was also
generally the dūtaka of the Sena grants.


15. Mahā-vyūhapati—Military officer in charge of battle-arrays
(vyūha).


17. Pīṭhikāvitta—Probably an officer concerned with the
arrangement of seats in an assembly or the royal court
according to rank and status of their occupiers.

18. Purohita—Priest (above No. 12)


D

List of officials mentioned in the Rāmganj CP. of Iśvara-
ghosha, and not met with in any other record in Bengal.

1. Ābhyantrika—Probably an official of the Harem.

2. Aṅgikaraṇika—Officer for administering oaths (?)
4. Auttohitāsanika—Officer in charge of arranging seats (?)
5. Bhūktipati—Head of a Province. But “Uparika” is also mentioned separately.
6. Daṇḍapāla—Probably the same as App. C. 3.
8. Ekasaraka.
10. Karmakara—Was he an Officer in charge of Labour? It has been taken to mean artisan (IB. 183).
11. Khaḍgagṛha—Body-guard (?)
12. Khanaḍapāla—probably the same as App. B. 19. It has been translated as Superintendent of repairs (IB. 180).
16. Mahā-balākoshṭhika—Military officer
18. Mahā-karanaṇḍhyaksha—Chief of the secretariat, or keeper of Records.
21. Mahā-pādamūlika—Chief Attendant (?)
22. Mahā-tantradhikṛita—Probably the High Priest in charge of religious rites.
23. Pāṇiyāgarika—Superintendent of rest houses (?)
25. Śirorakshika—Chief of the royal Body-guards.
26. Tadāniyuktaka—Probably the same as B. 43.
27. Thakkura, c.f. IB. 184.
28. Vāsāgārika—Officer in charge of residential buildings (?)
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In the Khālimpur CP. (No. 2) we have the compound ‘hasty-aśva-go-mahishy-aj-āvik-ādyaksha’ as well as balādhyaksha and nākādhyaksha (evidently a mistake for nāvādhyaksha or naukādhyaksha). In the Nālandā CP. of Dharmapāla (No. 3) we have ‘hasty-aśv-oṣṭra-bala-vyāpṛītaka’ as well as ‘kiśora-vaḍavā-go-mahishy-ādhikṛita.’ The Monghyr CP. of Devapāla (No. 6) has ‘hasty-aśv-oṣṭra-bala-vyāpṛītaka’ and ‘kiśora-vaḍavā-go-mahishy-aj-āvik-ādyaksha.’ With the addition of ‘nau’ before ‘bala’ in the first, these two expressions become stereotyped in the later Pāla Grants. It is obvious that we have to deal with two sets of officers, referred to respectively as ‘vyāpṛītaka’ and either ‘ādhikṛita’ or ‘ādyaksha.’ The use of the words ‘nau’ and ‘bala’ indicates the military character of the former. Adhyaksha should then be taken in the sense of a superintendent in the civil administration.

Bk. II. Chs. xxix-xxxi.

The meaning of these terms is not definitely known, but the following suggestions may be provisionally accepted:

Bhāga=Land-revenues paid in kind.
Bhoga=Periodical supplies of fruits, firewood, flowers and the like which the villagers had to furnish to the king.
Kara=A general property tax levied periodically.
Hiranṭya=Tax in cash levied upon certain special kinds of crops as distinguished from the tax in kind (bhāga) which was charged upon the ordinary crops.

Uparikara=Impost levied on temporary tenants.

For discussion, with references, cf. U. N. Ghoshal, op. cit., pp. 34, 237, 36, 60, 210. There are, in addition, two kinds of taxes, each mentioned only in a single record, pīṇḍaka (Ins. No. B. 2) and ratnātraya-sambhoga (No. B. 66) the meaning of which is unknown. Dr. Ghoshal’s interpretation (op. cit. p. 244) of these two terms is hardly convincing.

Ch. VII. V. 131.


Cf. Footnote 47.

Mentioned in Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra, Book xi, Chapter i.

See p. 30 above. According to Curtius Rufus Quintus, the King of the Gangaridae and the Prasii “kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 20,000 cavalry and 200,000 infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and, what was the most formidable force of all, a troop of 3,000 elephants” (Classical Accounts of India, by R.C. Majumdar, p. 128).
The word 'Gauḍa' was wrongly read as 'Oḍra' in *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, 321, and hence Oḍra has been added to this list by some (cf. *EHBP*. I. 142).

'Kulika' is mentioned as the name of a people, along with Yavanas, Gandhāras etc., in the *Brahma Purāṇa* (Ch. xxvii, vv. 45-50). It is explained as 'hunter' in Monier William's Dictionary on the authority of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* X. 47-19.


See p. 99.
