The nature of the relationship between suzerain and vassal needs to be investigated afresh because the literary texts discussed so far present an ambivalent picture. The pioneer scholars of Indian history were Britishers. They undertook the task of writing Indian history thinking this would enable the British Government to administer the people of this land effectively. As a result of which the classical literature and inscriptional records and such other historical materials were rendered into English for the convenience of the researchers intending to work on Indian history and it is they who provided us the model and inculcated in us the idea of knowing our own history and to think of its institutions afresh. The "Suzerain - Vassal relations" were first brought to light by scholars and thus, they gave us a model of work upon it. It is but natural to have a look into the European Model in order to understand the suzerain vassal relations as existed in Middle Ages. A changed administrative structure is reflected in the literary as well as in the archeological records of early India which points towards the centralisation of administrative machinery under the ages of early
Indian emperor. Henceforth the relations between suzerain and vassal were less confusing and more clear. Here we are making modest attempt to illustrate about the precise relation between suzerain and their vassals.

The word 'Suzerain' convey the different meaning. It is derived from French Sus and from Latin Susum or super. It corresponds to a 'Low Latin' type suseranus and another from of the word is Souseran or 'suzerain' which is a word of feudal law, used to describe person or status in position of superiority to other. It was generally used in Europe during Middle Ages to describe a feudal lord or the supreme suzerain being the king. In modern times the term has come to be applied as descriptive of relation, ill-defined and vague, which exist between powerful and dependent states. This word was not used by all scholars in the same sense but it was used in different manner and in various sense. In Indian context it means a paramount ruler or emperor (Samarat)

The word 'Vassal' is used variously by the scholars. It has been derived from the German Gast, a guest, meaning thereby an outsider to whom a portion of a free domain was assigned in return for the rent and
certain fixed services. This derivation has got some what a fantastic air and seems to have been framed to suit an hypothesis. The French words, like vassus, vassaut and vassault were used for the tenant and follower of a feudal lord. The commonly accepted etymology is from the Breton gwaz, Welsh gwas, or a servant. Scholars are of the opinion that the vassals were great officials of state to act as assessors, the counts in the courts, or to settle such question which affect the interest of the central power; to organise and govern a march. In return to these services they were rewarded with benefices and with the growth of feudalism these developed into hereditary fiefs. The vassus or vassullus were naturally retained as implying the relation to the king as overlord or suzerain and was extended to the holder of all fiefs, whether capital or mediate. As feudal independence increased in status, the word vassal lost every vestige of its original service sense, and since it had come to imply a purely military relation acquired rather the meaning of "free warrior." According to feudal law the vassal owed certain duties to the lord; he promised fidelity and service and the lord was bound to perform reciprocal duties. The relations between a lord and his vassal implied in the oath of fidelity and this had been extended to states of unequal power. Hence it is
convenient to designate certain states as vassal state and their superiors as suzerains.

In the beginning there was no written codes of mutual feudal obligations; custom and practice served in their place during ‘Middle Ages’ in Europe. Vassal kept in mind the six points as (1) "well being of lord, (2) security, (3) utility, (4) honour, (5) interest, and (6) prosperity. The vassal gave aid and counsel to his lord if he wishes to be worthy of his fief (beneficium) and the oath of fidelity he has sworn. The lord owes the vassal equal obligation." If the lord does not fulfill his obligation he will be acting in bad faith; the same is true of the vassal, in defection, the offending party will be acting perfidiously and in pregury. But primary duty of a vassal was to serve his suzerain in war in person on the horseback with full equipment. If he had his own vassals, then he must gather them under his banner and share his privileges and his prestige custom. Sometimes required him to be attended by at least one or two squires. On the other hand there were no foot soldier in his contingent. The vassal also owed castle duty, that is, the duty of protecting the lords castle in war and peace if so requested. The lord could requisition the vassal’s castle and goods, demand
transportation and money and request his presence at court where he not only offered his advice but also performed ministerial services. The vassal was also required to his lord’s eldest son and to the expense involved in the knighthood of the lord’s eldest son and in the marriage of the lord’s eldest daughter. Since the vassal was at once subject and master he would often have vassals of his ability might be thought to oblige him to join the lord’s army, together with the entire body of his dependents. He was authorised to bring with him only a stated number of followers, the figure was fixed once for all, and might be less than the number he employed in his own war. It was the chief desire of vassals both great and small not to be held to an indefinite period of military service. But neither the traditions of the Carolingian state nor the earliest usages of vassalage offered direct precedents for limiting its duration. Both the subject and the household warriors remained under arms as long as their presence seemed necessary to the king or chief. The old Germanic employed a sort of standard period fixed at 40 days or 40 nights. Frankish military legislation itself adopted 40 days, and at the end of the eleventh century the normal standard for the obligation imposed on vassal, on the expiration of the 40 days. They were free to return to home usually for the rest of the
It seems that vassals had been summoned by their lord only for war but they had to attend royal ‘Court’ in peace time at more or less regular intervals and during ceremonial display they had to present gifts, such as horses, arms and vestment which were at once guarantee of their fidelity and the symbol of their subordination. The vassal was bound by his fidelity to render aid to his lord in all things and it was taken for granted that this meant placing his sword and his counsel at the disposal of his lord. If a private warrior leaves only a daughter, she has to remained under the control of the master who will find her a husband of the same social status. If however, she herself chooses a husband against the will of the master she was obliged to restore to the latter all the gifts which her father had received from the lord. But as Europe was transformed from barter to economy; many of the above services was discharged by monetary payments, such a procedure was known as ‘Commutaion.’ Thus among the population of the vast empire there became distinguishable a relatively very numerous class of ‘Vassals’ of the lord - that is, of the lord king (vassi-dominice) enjoying the special protection of the suzerain and being responsible for furnishing a large
part of troops.

The lord, moreover, was made officially responsible for the appearance of the vassal in the court and when required for his military service. If he himself took part in a campaign his vassals fought under his order. It was only in his absence that they came under the direct command of the king’s representative - the count. Once in power they had to reward their ‘men.’ They distributed lands to them. Further more as marquess of the palaces and then as king they had to get supports and above all create an army. So they attached into their services frequently in return for gifts of land many men who were already of high rank. Former members of the military following established on property granted by the ruler did not cease to be regarded as his vassals and his new followers were considered to be bound to him by the same tie, even if they never been companions in arms. Both groups served in his army, followed by their own vassal, if they had any. There was marked difference between free warriors and household warriors in their living condition. Each one of them was the centre of a more or less widely scattered group of dependents whom he was expected to keep in order, if necessary, he might even be required to exercise a
similar supervision over his neighbours.  

The beginning of political speculations were evidently inspired by the rapid increase in number as well as in size of the Aryan kingdom in India and the consequent growth of power and majesty of the ruling chiefs who had mostly outgrown the stage of tribal leaders and became territorial monarchs. The Aryan had spread over nearly the whole of Northern India and established a large number of states. Theoretically, the king (Suzerian) was the ultimate authority and power but in the feudal system practice did not always coincide with theory. Suzerains made thorough use of this legal principle. Since all tenures and right were vested in the king, the objective of the feudal legal principle was concatenation and centralisation not decentralisation. Regardless of government inefficiency, agencies existed for the purpose of maintaining order. Though the concept of the modern state was not known in early India, still certain governmental institutions were very much there. The king (Suzerain) was the apex of the feudal pyramid, and from him land tenures and offices officially derived their existence. The office of the kingship was common in early India and the conception of emperorship was attached to the early India. Generally speaking the
requisites for the royal office was heredity in Monarchial system. The early India's connotation of the modern "free" election. It usually meant consent given by the magnates.

The emperor (Suzerain) claimed suzerainty over a number of petty kings and smaller state or rulers, who offered allegiance to him, usually served him in war and offered him tribute who reclaimed their autonomy in internal administration. The term Áśvamedha⁷ is derived from the Sanskrit word which means horse sacrifice. The description of Áśvamedha in the texts show that the ambitious kings strove to be powerful by extending their way over neighbouring kingdoms. It seems to imply the existence of tribal kingdoms in Rgvedic society which had probably grown in size through amalgamation and expansion. Three was most probably no great kingdom during this period.

During latter Vedic period a marked differences can be noticed in religious practices. The Áśvamedha sacrifice was performed by Samrāt and Rājan could perform only Rāhasūya sacrifice, (which was less important and low or smaller sacrifice than Áśvamedha). During the course of Áśvamedha sacrifice the Samrāt was accepted as suzerain by all petty kings and smaller
The Asva (stead) was turned loose to wander at will for a year under the guardianship of a hundred princes, a hundred nobles, hundred sons of warriors and treasures equipped with various kinds of defensive and offensive weapons. If the horse was seized by any chief, or king then that chief or ruler was regarded as an opponent. The conqueror sent out his army or himself leads the expedition put down the opponent with the might of his arm and recover the animal. If the year passed successfully the stead was to be sacrificed and full suzerainty was claimed as a matter of right. The Śātapatya-Brāhmaṇa refers to the Āśvamedha of Bharta, son of Duśyanta and Pituga, who celebrated sacrifice after his digvijaya and it gives a list of thirteen kings who had celebrated the Āśvamedha and Rājasūya in Brāhmaṇa literature show that the ambitious kings tried to be all powerful by extending their sway over neighbouring kingdoms or small states. These sacrifices seem to be politically motivated but sanctioned by religious custom. But with the commencement of the historical period this sacrifice fell into destitude due to the fact that the true Kṣatriya lines had become impure by mixed marriages and there was no monarch like kings of heroic age to indulge in such costly rites. It is also noticed that the sacrifice was not the exclusive right.
of the Kṣīrya, even Brāhmaṇa could also perform it. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa\textsuperscript{13} indicates the aim of the Āśvamedha which is the atonement for everything, the remedy for everything, thereby, the gods redeem all sins even the slaying of the Brāhmaṇa. It was too believed that the performance of one hundred sacrifices would lead to the attainment of the seat or world of Indra, (who was described as Samrāt). But it is worth remembering in this connection that Āśvamedha involved an asseration of power and display of political authority such as a king of undisputed supremacy could have ventured upon and according to its celebration in the form formulated in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and Kātyāana-Śrauta-Śatra, Baudhyāna-Śaruta-Śutra, could hardly be held before the emergence of territorial state in India roughly around the 8th century B.C. The concept of universal emperor (suzerain or samrāt) was also known to the Mauryan period. The concept of universal emperor was added the inspiration of the revival of the Brāhmaṇic ceremonies as the Āśvamedha which apparently fell into desuetude under the Mauryan period but was revived by the Śuṅgas Puṣyamitra Śuṅga, a Brāhmaṇ general of Bhadratha the last Mauryan king succeeded in gaining power by a palace revolution performed in Āśvamedha sacrifice to prove his suzerainty over whole empire or all petty kings and
smaller states.  

In epics Āsvamedha seems to become fashion and politico-religious factors helped the growth of the feudal states in India. The Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa tell us that Yudhiṣṭhira and Rāmachandra and many other sent out their horse of Āsvamedha sacrifice accompanied by a band of picked soldiers. All the petty kings and the nobles of the earth with folded hands waited for the suzerain with presents of various kinds of gems, wealth, precious stone, gold, silver and handsomse horses etc. The Āsvamedha Parva lays down the Kṣatriya can free himself from impious acts through the performance of the Āsvamedha sacrifice. Vyasa is said to have advised Yudhiṣṭhira to prepare for Āsvamedha when the latter desired to get rid of the sins he had perpetrated by taking human liver on the battle field Kurukṣetra. King Daśaratha performed Āsvemedha sacrifice. Rāma on returning to Ayodhyā expressed his desire for the performance of Rājsūrya sacrifice but Bharat asked him not to perform this sacrifice and his younger brother Laxmana requested him to perform the Āsvamedha sacrifice. It is clear from the inscription that Pravarasēṇa I performed the Āsvamedha sacrifices. The Jamb Plates of Pravarasēṇa II tells us that the Vākāṭakas were Samrāt. D.C. Sircar also
suggests that Pravresena I was *Samrāt*. These rulers were considered as universal monarch or *Samrāt* not as feudatories. Kālidāsa also expressed similar view in his work *Raghuvaikālsa*. The nature of the Aśvamedha which has been referred to by Kalidasa was absolutely political. No religious consequence or merit was expected to follow from it at least, in this case Paśyamitra as a means to *digvijaya*. Kālidāsa’s description has touched the ground of contemporary times, as it was bound to be parallels with his own age. It is very clear from his description that Aśvamedha was performed by paramount ruler. Sometime *Samrāt* himself leads the armies in person from provinces to province and country to country. Ancient Indian political thinkers had placed the ideology of *digvijaya* before the king for political unity of the country and establishment of an all India empire. This idea of *digvijaya* was realised by performing the Aśvamedha which necessitated the conquest of whole of the country. The Hirahaḍagallī copper plate inscription of Śivaskandavarman of about the middle of the 4th century A.D. records the Aśvamedha sacrifice. The Nālandā Copper Plate Inscription of Samudragupta as having performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice. His inscription on the Aśvamedha type gold coins show the legend *aśvamedha - parākramaḥ*
which is not mentioned in detailed in Allahabad records must have been performed towards the end of his life. Krṣṇavarman I, the performer of the Aśvamedha sacrifice, who ruled the Kuntala country about the middle of the 5th century A.D was 'ek-ātapatra, possessor of the sole umbrella, is indicative of universal suzerainty. It shows that Krṣṇavarman I claimed a sort of suzerainty over the whole of the Deccan. The Baragṅgā stone inscription of Bhutivarman (6th century A.D), records the Aśvamedha sacrifice and Bhutivarman is credited with the suzerain title Mahārāja- dhirājāsamedhayājina. Same sacrifice is recorded in the Nandpur copper plate inscription Yājñavarman, the ruler of Maukhari. King Mādhavarman it is credited with the performance of elven Aśvamedhas in all the Viṣṇukundin plates of Ipur and Badami Rock Inscription of Pulakesin I (6th century A.D), he is described having performed aśvamedha sacrifice.

The ceremony called the Aśvamedha or horse sacrifice has come down to us in a political veneer. It seems to be religious on the one hand and politically prestigious on the other hand, that dominated the performance of the Aśvamedha by a suzerain (Samrāt) by performing this sacrifice he establishes his pre-eminence in the empire. This
sacrifice was in fact a challenge thrown to the existing political powers. The Aśvamedha was a corollary of the digvijaya. Infact the digvijaya was incomplete in itself. It was the horse sacrifice that gave it completeness. This sacrifice considered to be prestigious one, which shows that with the passage of time it was regarded as a symbol of one’s overlordship or suzerainty. Since this sacrifice could not be performed by all states because of the peculiarities and large economic and military power involved in such a sacrifice, and hence small power preferred to remain content with their subordinate position. But most of the kings remained unchecked or uncrushed because they used to submit themselves to their suzerain without making fight with suzerain. Virtually they were free and might be cherishing the hope of challenging the suzerain?

Early India did not have the nation of a modern nation-state but a large number of states, varying in size as well as status. The relations among the modern nation-states are rightly called ‘International’ relation in early India had developed some kind of diplomatic relations with their neighbouring states, but the notion of foreign policy, as we know it today did not arise in early India. We
get very little information about the inter-state relations of the Vedic period. State was still to a great extent tribal and for a long time they were engaged in subjugating the non Aryans. Their mutual relations were, therefore, generally peaceful. The Aryans however, began to become envious of one another owing to the difference in success achieved by the different tribes to which they belonged. We therefore, sometimes find them fighting among themselves, often taking the non Aryan chief.32

But in the later Vedic period small Aryan tribes became fused into bigger territorial states. Their normal size, however was still not very large. At the beginning of the 6th century B.C there was no paramount power in North India which was divided into a large number of independent states. There were sixteen great kingdom (Solasamaha-janapadā) which might be flourished shortly before time of Gautama Buddha. They are as follows: Anga, Magadha, Kāśi, Kosala, Vriji (Vaffi) Malla, Chedi, Vatsa (Vamsa), Kuru, Pañchāla, Matsya (Machchha), Śūrasena, Āśvaka or Asmaka (Assaka), Avanti, Gandhāra and Komboja, each being named after the people who settled down there or colonised it.33 This list shows both Monarchical and Republican states.
The status and prestige of the different states differed according to their resources and the leadership of their rulers. Titles such as ekarat, samrāt and adhiraṭ were used by different rulers, indicate clearly a difference in status, but what exactly its nature was it is difficult to determine at present. Some of these rulers e.g. Samrāts were probably enjoying a much higher status then the rest, but whether they were in the position of the emperor to his feudatories, we do not know. It is likely that the weaker states may have paid a tribute to the stronger ones. The religion and culture of later Vedic period placed the idea of the emperorship before the Aryan ruler. The notion of Aśvamedha\textsuperscript{34} in early India, naturally introduced a principle of instability in the inter state relation. The usual pattern of kingdom familiar to Indian was a confederation of smaller kingdoms and republics. The pattern changed under the Nandas, when an attempt was made at a centralised monarcy. This form developed into centralised control of the Maruyan government over areas which gradually lost their independence and were included within an extensive political and economic system planned by this government. Kingdom and autonomous states situated on the borders of the empire naturally maintained a lesser relationship with the Mauryas. Areas lying within the
empire was not confederated but were regarded as subordinate to Mauryan rule. Since, however, this was the first occasion that a centralised empire had been established on such a vast scale in India, it is possible that some tribes though within the empire or on its border still maintained their political organisation. The *Arthasastra* mentions certain tribal republics such as the Kambojas who were governed by a corporaion of warriors and others such as the Licchavis, Vṛjjis and the Pāñchalas, which though tribal republic, were governed by a titular rāja. But these tribes were in no way federated to the Mauryan state, as there was no question of their being equal or near enqual units. They were permitted to continue with their political organisation, was based largely on the practical consideration of this system facilitating administration. As long as these tribes did not disrupt the organisation of the Mauryan empire they were permitted their political privileges. The free accessibility of these tribes to Mauryan agents were regarded as adjuncts to the empire they were not given the importance that might be expected had they been consiederate areas.

The organisation of the early Indian state was determined by its geographic and economic
environment. Every state tended to encroach upon its neighbours, the concept of "bigkingdom," the kingdom extending up to the sea, and "the universal dominion," was common in early India but such an empire could not last long. An ambitious king could at any time launch a campaign of conquest. It was natural for it to seek expansion at the cost of its neighbour kingdom. There was a king or emperor at the centre claiming suzerainty over a number of princes offered allegiance to him subordinated their foreign policies to his diplomatic moves usually served him in war and offered him tribute, but who retained their autonomy in internal administration. These princes and petty chief in their turn might have feudatories who stood towards their suzerain. During the Mauryan period the suzerain had sufficient control over his vassals in all matters. The vassal should always be ready to place themselves at the disposal to their master or the suzerain and various type of treaties who concluded between powerful and weaker states for different purpose like colonisation acquisition of territories and construction of forts etc.

Thus, all these tendencies are reflected or exaggerated, systematised or undutifully simplified, analysed or synthesised in a very logical and abstract
manner by the doctrine of Maṇḍala (the circle of states usually consisted of twelve kings), which imparted a symmetrical form of relationships resulting from the quest for suzerainty and the consequent need of astute diplomacy and alliance. The Maṇḍala is supposed to consist twelve kings, such as:

(a) The Vijigīṣu or the suzerain in the centre. Than next in geographical order, were five kings in front of him viz.

(b) Ari, the enemy

(c) Mitra, the friend of the Vijigīṣu.

(d) Ari-mitra, the friend of the enemy

(e) Mitra-mitra, the friend’s friend of the Vijigīṣu.

(f) Ari-mitra-mitra, the friend’s friend of the enemy. In his reaward stood in geographical order.

(g) Pārśnigrāha, or a reaward ememy.

(h) Ākranda, reaward friend.

(i) Pārśnigrāhāsāra, friend of the enemy in the reaward

(j) Ākrandāsāra, friend of the friend in the reaward.

The circle was completed by
(k) Madhgama, or the intermediary.

(1) Udāsīna, or the neutral.41

Within the circle the Vijigīṣu as an aspirant to absolute suzerainty is enjoined by Kautilya to embark on a career of conquest, subdue the surrounding states, and shine forth as the supreme undisputed monarch. Stricking at the right movement, the conqueror attains his objective and at the same times seems to it that the balance of power is maintained among the kings of a circle. He has to take note of the fact that he himself encircled as it were by a varity of realationship ranging from absolute indifference to friendly alliance or set hostility.

Kautilya43 describes that "each of the twelve kings shall have their elements of suzerainty and power." Regarding the interdependence of the state, he states the objective of all state policy. "Strength is power and happiness is the end.44 The main thust of the Maṇḍala theory was to acquire power and wealth for the conqueror.45 Kautilya discusses the various kinds of treaties between independent kings. One of them was an alliance with another state with state with ultimate target of forming a coalition against an enemy and various type of treaties are concluded between a
powerful and a weak state when latter is threatened by the former. There are divided into three broad categories according as the essential condition are the cession of territory, payment of money, or promise of military aid by the weaker state. These various kinds of treaties are general indication of the relation between states of unequal power.\textsuperscript{46} The treation included the payment of the product of his lands, produce, or the amount of indemnity may be sent for the help of the superior king were to be led in person by the king of inferior state, his son and commander in chief or by some person, person of high rank or a woman was to be given as hostage, evidently to ensure the presence of the king or the prince with his troops.\textsuperscript{47} Thus these treaties indicate in a general way the relation between state and unequal powers. Kautilya states that in the event of two kings coming together in an expedition, the acquisition of land is better than the acquisition of an ally. By gaining land the king can gain both the ally and the money and by gaining money he can gain the ally.\textsuperscript{48} When a weak king is attacked by a powerful king, he should seek the help of equals or even inferior king, or shut himself up in an impregnable fort, and adopt the dual policy in a situation when he finds that he is in need of extraneous help. Kautilya suggests that Vajigīsu to
make peace with a king who is his equal or superior and he should wage war with one who is inferior to him.\textsuperscript{49} The weak king should accept the most humiliating term. The details (given by Kautilya) about these terms indicates the extent of suzerain king's authority over his vassal. Without the permission of the former the latter could not undertake among other things to construct forts, celebrate marriage of sons or daughter, hold the installation ceremony of his heir apparent, purchase horses capture elephant, perform sacrifices march against enemy of even go out on excursion for amusement. He was not free even in his dealing with his officers and subjects. Even on occasions of worshiping the gods and making prayers he should invoke the blessings of gods and making prayers he should help the protector as much as he can and always proclaim his readiness to place himself at the disposal of his suzerain.\textsuperscript{50} The Arthaśāstra refers that the vibhūṣa desirous of expanding his territory should keep engaged his neighbouring enemy and should march against a third enemy. After having conquered that the enemy of equal power, he should take possession of his territory. But Kautilya does not subscribe the practice of making captives and enslaving the sons and wives of the defeated kings. He suggests the Vibhūṣa to install the fallen dynasty on the throne and treat
the defeated princes with honour and kindness. In the case of the vassal’s death, his son should be enthroned.\textsuperscript{51} It shows that stronger and powerful kings attached their weaker neighbours or weak ruler in all ages, primarily because later were weak.

The granting of feudal lands by a vassal lord to another to hold as vassal of himself rather than of his own superior was known as sub-infeudation during Middle Ages in Europe. A natural consequence of hereditary benefice was that those who possessed them carved out portion to be held of themselves by a similar nature. Abundant proofs of this custom best known by the name of sub-infeudation in early India. At a latter period it became common and what had begun perhaps through ambition or pride was at least dictated by necessity. The oath of fidelity which they had taken the homage which they had paid to the suzerain, now exacted from their own vassals.

We come to know that some feudatories state had their own feudatories. The first reference to sub-infeudation in early India comes from an Inscription of Central India (AD 397), records the consent of one Mahārāja Svāmīdasa, a feudatory of the Imperial Gupta to the grant of a field by a marchant.\textsuperscript{52} Though this
grant does not illustrate sub-infeudation as it was in western Europe, the Indore grant authorises the donees to enjoy the field, cultivate it, get it cultivated so long as he observes the conditions of the brahmadeya. This indicates that even feudatory could make religious grants without royal approval. We get reference to true sub-infeudation first time in 460 A.D. For example, king Mātravisṇu of Eran was a subordinate of king Suraśmichandra who was also in his turn a feudatory of Buddhagupta. The powerful feudatories of such as the Parivrājaka, Ucchakalpa and Varmans got better freedom. They denoted land to the donees without the consent of their over lord. Some did not even mention the names of their suzerain in their records. The Kumārāmāya-mahārāja Nāndanā granted a village in the modern Gaya District in the middle of the sixth century A.D. According to an inscription from Central India Pulidabhāta, after getting the land as a mark of favour granted it to the priest named Kumāravāmin, for which he act obtain the sacntion of mahārāja Sarvanātha. In Bengāl in A.D. 544 Vijasasēna, the vassal of chief of Gopachandra granted some land to a Brahmana. Maharaja Narayana and Mahārāja Śatrughna who were the feudatories of the Vākātaka feudatory. Rudradatta who was himself a feudatory of Vainyagupta owing allegiance to the Imperial authority and felt the
necessity of securing imperial permission for alienating the revenue of some villages of their own state. The Narmand Inscription shows that Mahāsāmanta maharaja Vainsena enjoyed the allegiance of smaller feudatories. Mahasamanta Vinsena had two vassals under him namely Mahārāja Padadāsa and Mahārāja Rudradatta. It is very clear that sub-feudatories used to pay all tribute to their immediate lords. The grant of village or land made by feudatory chief without the consent of the suzerain to their own feudatories. Sub feudatory owed allegiance to his immediate lord and pay homage to him. Some powerful vassals practised sub-infeudation without any reference to their suzerains. But smaller vassals did it with the premission of suzerain. Whatever might be the difference between the bigger and smaller vassals, sub-infeudation was practised in early India. The process of sub infeudation was not extensive in early India, as it was in Western Europe, but it became common in Indian History in later period.

The system of matrimonial alliances between the kings of different states and between suzerain and vassal was a remarkable feature of early Indian polity. The system existed right from the remotest time when tribal society was sufficiently transformed into well demarcated territorial states, which brought with it the
territorial disputes and its corollary imperialism. Thus originating with the need of resolving dispute between two states of varying powers, the system of matrimonial alliance, with the passing of time became an efficacy to maintain healthy and harmonious relationship between vassal and overlord. Besides the system proved to be fruitful for it and enhanced the military and political influence of a state, whose ruler had matrimonial alliance with some other state. In the time of need the aggrieved state could seek the help of a king who had intergrated himself with the family of aggrieved state through matrimonial alliance. Apart from this, the matrimonial alliance helped resolve the old enmity between the state. When the marriage contracted between the kings of two or more states, they were to forget and forgive their old enemity and entered into a new relationship. But earlier matrimonial alliances were among only royal household and between equal powers but with the passage of time, the matrimonial relation between suzerain and vassal became social obligation. Sometime lesser kings used to give their daughter in marriage to their overlords by option not under any obligation just to enhance their political and social status. Sometime defeated kings or vassals were forced to give their younger daughter in marriage to the conquerors or
overlords.

The kingdom of Kāśi was founded by King Śīśunāg, belonged to Śīśunāga dynasty, the ruler of Kośala Vanka was contemporaneous king of Kāśi did not think it safe to wage war against Śīśunāga, whom he considered bigger in might than him. Thus both the kings of Kāśi and Kośala were always at loggerhead with one another and the weaker had to go to the wall. But the marriage ties united both the kings and resolved the old enmity. The king Udayan had married King Kunik's daughter Padamāvatī and King Udayan daughter was married to Nāgdivardhan the first Nand king. The ruler of Vāsali, named Chetah had seven daughters, one of them was Prabhavati who was married to Udayan of Sind-Sauvīra. The second Padmāvati, was married with Dadhivahan king of Aṅgadēśa, Chaṇḍa Pradyot of Avanti married the third named Śivādevī. The fourth, Mṛgavati became the queen of Śatānīk, king of Vaksa. The fifth, Jyeṣṭa was married with Nandivardhan price of Kundragram and sixth was married with Srenik, king of Magadha, and Sujyesta became nun. King Bimbisār married to the daughter of the king Chetak named Chillaṇa. The daughter of Nand IX was married to Chandragupta. Seleucus Nacaton a favourite general of Alexazandra the great emperior had
established his authority over Syria. He began to
invade India to complete the task begun by his master,
between B.C 316 to 305, he marched into India 18
times, but had to retreat every time and driven away by
Chandragupta Maurya. At least he was forced to come to
term with him and offered young daughter in marriage and a number of Greek women would have accompanied her.
The grandson Dāsaratha the governor of Magadha married
the sister of Sātkarāṇi II of Āndhra Dynasty of South
India, and numerous princess of defeated king.

There were matrimonial tie between the
Mahārathi and Mahābhoja during Sātwāhana period. The
Nanaghat and Kanheri Inscription speak of the marriage
alliance between the kings and the mahārathi, showing
thereby, the rise in power and prestige of the latter.
The matrimonial alliances between king and small rulers
was prevalent during the epic age. The purpose of such
an alliance was to effect political bond in order to
become more powerful politically with mutual support
and cooperation. The marriage of Pāṇḍavas with the
daughter of Drupada, the Pāncāla king and daughter of
Virata with the son of Arjana, who were principal
allies of the Pāṇḍavas points to this fact. The
Nālandā copper plate inscription of Samudragupta and
Gaya copper inscription record that Chandragupta I
married to Licchavi girl. The Licchavi girl. The Vākāṭakas had no hesitation in accepting a Gupta princes in marriage. The Poona Copper Inscription of Prabhāvatigupta records that she got married to Vākāṭaka māhārāja Ruderavarman II. The Tālagunda inscription records that Kākuskhavarman of Kadamba dynasty gave his daughter in marriage to princes of the Gupta dynasty and other families. The Tippera copper inscription of Lokanātha records that his father Bhavanātha married Gotradevi. Yuan Chwang states that the daughter of Harsa was married to king of Vallabhi. Rājyasri daughter of Prabhākarvardhan was given in marriage to the Makhari king Grahavarman. The prospect of an alliance may have been one of the reason why Prabhākarvardhan married his daughter at an early age. A few references of political interest also occur in this connection. We are told that the Vassal kings and their queens assisted in several way in the manifold task entailed in getting ready for the great occasion. R.S.Sharma is of the view that conquered kings were expected, to give their daughter in marriage to the conqueror for the first times in gupta period. It is clear from the Jātakas that defeated kings or vassals used to give their daughters in marriage with the Yuvarāja or conquerors. It shows that even earlier the defeated kings and vassals had to give
their young daughter in marriage to the conqueror. This practice seems to be prevalent even in the Buddhist period.

Thus the warring states having left their aged old enmity could provide peace and tranquility to its people, under which they could adequately develop themselves. However, in course of time the purpose of matrimonial alliance was somehow transformed and was made as social obligations on the part of feudal lords. Under the ethics of the time the feudal lords were supposed to give their daughter in marriage to their suzerain, whereby the feudal lords not only respected the social norms of the erstwhile society but also it helped enhance their status in the society. On the other hand the overlord was least anxious to watch the activities of his vassals. Because sometimes, the vassals became so powerful that they could successfully challenge the central authority. The system of matrimonial alliance played a significant and stupendous role in the political system of early India.

The archaeological and literary sources tell us certain obligations which feudatories or vassals had to fulfil such as (1) to supply soldiers in times or war, (2) attendance at royal court on certain occasion,
(3) to pay homage and allegiance to their suzerain (4) annual tributes etc., Suzerain too granted certain privileges to his feudatories or vassals such as freedom from the royal officer for the collection of taxes, freedom from the forced labour, freedom from the land being dug for salt, freedom from the supply of touring officers, like rice, cooking pot, water pot, bullocks, horse. The important vassals were authorised to the use of five musical instruments, such as Śringa (horn) Śaṅkha (conch), bheri (drum), Jayaghanta (bell of victory) and Tamta.77 D.C. Sircar, notices fifty nine obligations and exemptions in archaeological sources. He noted down all fifty-nine obligations and privileges in a systematic manner. This work seems to be first of its kind. But Sircar took up archaeological sources for this purpose and covers whole period of Ancient India. His long list of obligations and privileges is as follow:78 (1) Obligation to supply to the king or landlord on occasions and to the touring officers or local officials such articles as rice, cooking pot, fire wood, accommodation, servants, milk, curds, guard, myrobalan, vegetables, flowers, bullocks and cows, hide seats, charcoal, etc. (2) taxes in general (3) professional tax on artisans, (4) tax for producing salt, sugar, toddy, etc., (5) supply of unpaid labour, (6) Surrender of treasure troves and deposits, (7)
fixed taxes and occasional levies including the tax on temporary tenants, (8) supply of sacrificial animals, (9) tax on shopkeepers and shops of metal and leather workers (10) tax on the out castes, masked actors, water diviners, weavers and barbarians, (11) tax on marriage and gambling (12) tax for the maintenance of spies, surveyors, gate keepers or toll collector etc., (13) tax on artisans enjoying free holding, (14) presents of various kinds to be made on different occasions, (15) payment of small quantities of grains per month, (16) two handfuls per putti measure grains payable to the village officials, (17) tax on uncultivated land, (18) surrender of half the produce of the field, (19) levy for the supervision of partition of land and other property, (20) taxes in kind and cash (21) Income from change caused by natural agencies and cyclones, (22) fines for the ten offence, (23) restriction on the ownership of various taxes, etc., (24) restriction on the production of certain crops, (25) confiscation of the property of one dying without leaving an heir, (26) income from the bees such as honey and, (27) power to deal with cases of abduction unmarried girls, (28) appropriation of all sources of income, (29) appropriation of all internal revenue incomes, (30) power to deal with the recovery of stolen goods, (31) power to assess taxes afresh (32)
obligation relating to the supply of free labour, (33) tax on the merchant, (34) taxes relating to the Turuskas, Andhras and Tigulas or Tamil, (35) profession tax on the wrestlers. (36) payments of one silver coin on the occasion of the birth of a prince, (37) water tax for fishing rights, (38) cattle tax for grazing rights, (39) tax for the possession of race bullocks, (40) fixed on regular taxes and occasional or irregular taxes (41). perquisites for hereditary officers, (42) quarrying rights in the hills, (43) dues payable for the maintenance of armed constables, (44) income from the receipts of the examiner of coins, (45) tax for the maintenance of elephants, (46) levy on amounts lent out the money lender, (47) levy on amounts realised by the money lenders (48) on the arrears of tax or fine, (49) levy for the maintenance of or profession tax on snake charmers, (50) levy for the medical treatment of king when he is sick, (51) fine in lieu of imprisonment, (52) presents to be made to the king especially when he is returns from a military campaign, (53) tax for the maintenance of swordsmen, (54) tax for the maintenance of Paiks, (55) transit duties, (56) profession tax on the goldsmith, (57) tax for the grazing and watering of cattle, (58) obligation to supply uncooked food, (59) collective tax for land partitioned among cultivators, etc. But large number of
obligations are recorded in literary sources. All of them are not recorded in a single text and most of the records mention more or less same types of obligations.

However, military obligation seems to be important in early India which defeated king and feudatories had to fulfil. Mauryan empire was controlled by a single power. Chandragupta Mauryan conquered many provinces, he must have provided military help by petty chiefs during war. Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta annexed Kalinga to his empire. After the downfall of empire it was divided into many provinces or political regions each with its own ambition. The final blow was struck at the vast empire by the revolt of Paṣyamutra Śunga, the Commander-in-chief (Senapati) of Brihadeśa, who killed his lord while inspecting the army and ascended the throne. Paṣyamitra Śunga son’s Agnimitra Śunga was the Suzerain and ruled over many vassals state. He defeated the king of Vidarbha and Northern Western India was vacated from the Yavana chiefs by the help feudatory’s armies. The Kanheri Inscription and Kārle Inscription tell us that mahārathis and mahābhojas were the vassal chieftains next to the prince. They sometimes seem to be provided help to their master in war. They used to donate land by their own accord,
mahārathi’s Somandasa made a grant of village. It is clear from the inscription that there vassal chieftain gave military help to Sātavāhana rulers, who were their overlords. Rudramanman reinstated the defeated king because they had fulfilled military obligation. Large number of population of Sātavāhana was governed by the feudatories or vassals chieftains. The mahādandanāyaka and mahāprachandaṇḍanāyaka were probably the vassals of the higher grades who discharged their military help to the king. The Rāmāyaṇa tells us that during war the state army was supplemented by troops of feudal lords. On hearing the abduction of Śitā by Rāvaṇa, Bharta had collected a huge army of feudatories or petty chiefs at Ayodhya, they were asked to offer army assistance to Rama in the conflict with Rāksasa. The kingdom of Kiskinđha was vassal state, during Rāma exile it was under the jurisdiction of Bharata. But Rāma was not happy with the activities of Valin, as a result of which he killed Valin and placed his brother Surgriva on the throne. He had to fulfil military obligation, and helped Rāma in war against Rāvaṇa. Many other vassals or feudatories fought war on both side of Rāma and Rāvaṇa. Kālidāsa tells us that the marches of powerful suzerain the "dust raised by the vanguard of horses, effected the disapperarnce of the shooting rays of the crest
jewels of the tributory princes, who followed him in his train. He was the hump (nrpatikakuda) as it were of the ball whose component limbs were made up by feudal vassals”. Thus the military obligations was a marked feature of the time of Kālidāsa.

We come to know that many ruling dynasties of early India who helped their suzerain during war. Bāṇa also gives some idea about the military obligations. In the time of the trouble the vassals (Sāmanta) helped the emperor. When Harṣa entered the Vindhyan forest to search of his sister Rājayaśrī, a Sāmanta named Vyāghraketu met Harṣa in forest and assisted the emperor in finding out the whereabout of Rājayaśrī. The Kādambrī states that Chandrāpida was helped by his Sāmantas (vassals) during war with every things they possessed. Rājavardhana was accompanied by mahāsāmanta on his campaign against the Hūṇas. Harṣas invading armies comprised of all the soliders of the kingdom, including Sāmantas. The Aihole Inscription shows that Harṣa army was helped by many vassals during was against Pulakaśin II. It is clear from literary and Inscriptional sources that vassals were under obligation to help their suzerain in wars a fact which became more important during Harṣa period.
The vassals had to present themselves in the royal court on special occasions. We come to know from the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samundragupta that defeated princes, those were reinstated in the thrones were expected to pay all such to carry out royal to present themselves in royal court in special occasion and to render homage to the conqueror and daughter in marriage etc. The *Mahābhārata* tells us that the petty kings and nobles of the earth with folded hands waited for the suzerain in royal court with presents of various kinds. At the time of horse sacrifice performed by Daśratha’s it was attended by many vassal chiefs. It is evident from the epic that defeated kings had to attend the ceremony of installation bearing costly presents with him. The *mahāyajña* of Yudhiṣṭhira was attended by many vassals, rājās and petty kings, with many costly things. Many South India kings were asked for clearing the vassels of Yudhiṣṭhira. The royal court of Ayodhya is oftenly described in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as being attended by subordinate kings.

*Kālidāsa* works refers to the vast number of kings prostrated themselves at the feet of their overlord or emperor at the time of their appearance in the royal court. The references to attendance of
feudal chief at the royal court were frequently mentioned in Raghūvamāsa. They used to attend imperial court on important occasion like conquests or sacrifices or they had to stay over there forever. Some mahārāja or raja also held important office at the kingscourt, Mahāsāmanta mahārāja Īśvaragupta held the office of mahākṣapaṭadhikaranādhikṛta.

Bāṇa also gives some ideas of the obligations of Sāmanta (vassal) or defeated king. The Kādambarī tells us five modes of saluting such as salute suzerain by bowing the head and touching the palm of the feet of the emperor or suzerain and finally placing the head on the earth near the feet of the suzerain. Bana further tells us the defeated mahāsāmanta greated the conqueror by removing their crowns and headdresses. They were subjected to various kinds of humiliation in the court of Harsa. Some served as bearers of fans, other prayed to for life by trying a sword to their neck and still others deprived of all their possessions, were always eager to salute the emepror with folded hands and allowed their beard to grow till their fate was finally decided by the conqueror. The defeated kings were made to render three kinds of services to the king in the court. They held chowries, served as a door keeper in royal courts,
and finally served as recitiers of the auspicious words uttering success (jaya). These defeated kings were reduced to the position of vassals (sāmanta) similar mode of serving by the defeated kings are also mentioned in the Kādambī. According to the Bāna the defeated Sāmantas (vassals) furnished their son to the conqueror probably they were to be trained in the imperial tradition, so that they might grow loyal to their overlord. When in Thāneser court the two brothers Mādhākarvardhana and Kumāragupta were formally introduced by Prabhākarvardhana, the two brothers were saying "As your Majesty commands' rose from their seats and saluted Rājyavardhana and Harsa by awaying their heads again and again to the earth. But we should bear in mind that Prabhākarvardhana's mother was most probably a sister of Mahāsēnagupta the father of these princes. It shows that the two brothers were regarded as feudatories in the Thāneser court. We find evidences of social obligation in Bāna works. On the occasion of installation Yaśovati as chief queen was consecrated by the wives of sāmanta (vassals) with water from golden pitchers and offered their services. At the birth of the son of Prabhākarvardhana named Harṣa, the wives of the neighbouring kings came in thousands to the palace from every side. Sometimes vassal (Sāmanta) living in
the imperial court had to carry out certain social obligations. They took part in amusements, such as gambling, dice playing, playing on the flute, drawing portraits of the kings solving puzzle etc.\textsuperscript{111}

The defeated kings and feudatories had to pay a certain amount of annual tribute and owed allegiance to suzerain. Many defeated kings and chiefs were reduced to tributory rulers and were allowed autonomy in their internal administration. However, sometimes relationship between suzerain and his vassal chiefs varied in different regions. We have noticed how the conqueror was expected not to annex the territories of a king defeated by him. This gave rise to a large number of vassal states. Their number was further increased when the senior posts of divisional or provisional governors began to be hereditary and their incumbent began to be invested as mahārāja, Sāmanta and mahāsāmanta etc. In the Mahābhārata Bhagiratha has been mentioned as a Chakravṛti (paramout monarch) and word ādhipatyam\textsuperscript{113} is used for suzerain whose suzerainty was accepted by other small states which also offered tributes to the suzerain. The discomfited princes had to pay a heavy tribute to the suzerain and pay homage.\textsuperscript{114} The Rāmāyaṇa tells us that Sāmantas used to pay their tributes to Daśaratha.\textsuperscript{115} The barabar and Nagarjuni Hill
Inscriptions records the title *nrpa*, which was usually applied to vassal chiefs who paid tribute and allegiance to suzerain. During Harṣa many vassal chiefs ruled over different regions and enjoyed considerable freedom in internal administration. They paid regular tribute to the suzerain. Bhāskaravarmān of Kāmarupa and Dhrva-bhaṭṭa of Valabhi were his tributary vassals.\(^{118}\) The Chinese traveller states that there were twenty tributary chiefs of fairly important status in Harṣa empire. Bāṇa\(^{119}\) states that tribute was paid to the suzerain by ruler from the far flung area or snowy mountains.\(^{120}\) Thus we can deduce safely that vassals or defeated kings had to cater, social, economy, and military obligations. They had to pay a certain amount of annual tribute and render military service when asked to do so. They owed allegiance to suzerain and present themselves in the royal court on some occasions. But it is not exactly of the type of relation of suzerain and vassal usually associated with feudalism in Western Europe. Though conditions of similar development cannot be ruled out.

It is very clear from the survey of archaeological and literary sources that the vassals or semi-independent states existed in large number in
early India. We notice how the conqueror was expected not to annex the territories of a king's defeated by him, but allow their state an autonomous existence under his suzerainty. The control which the suzerain exercised naturally varied with the status of the vassal and its own capacity to check him. Generally suzerain expected many social economic and military obligation to be catered by vassal or defeated king. But certain privileges were granted by suzerain to his vassals because he was dependent upon his vassals or feudatories for military aid. The vassals were usually required to acknowledge their subordinate position in official charts issued by mentioning the name of the emperor first and could not issue their coinage. But some vassals did not bother about mentioning the name of suzerian on the charter issued by them. For example the Parivrajak, Ucchakalpa and Varmans, issued their land grant without mentioning the name of their overlord. It indicates that state had become weak. The imperial court was teeming with vassals came to pay personal homage to the suzerain. A regular tribute was sent to the imperial capital. The suzerain was responsible for increasing the number of vassals. It had become a fashion to convert princes and defeated king into tributary chiefs or vassals and the later followed the same practice. A suzerain could exercise
his supervisory and power of general control over vassal states or feudatories. He had a large number of spies under him to detect whether the vassals were contemplating sedition or thieving to revolt against the Imperial power. Thus naturally the vassals were always cherishing the hope of throwing the imperial yoke one day and the Imperial power had to keep a vigilant watch over their actions and intentions. He could not disarm them because he needed their forces for his own purposes too.
There is distinction from suzerainty and protectorate (a) concession on the part of the suzerain, (b) the vassal states are bound to perform specific services. (c) the vassal state has larger power of action than those belonging to a political state (d), there is a reciprocity of obligations. Marc. Bloch, uses this word in the sense of one who holds land from a superior on condition of homage and allegiance; a tenant in fee; or a feudatory in system was called ‘vassal’. A word of a Celtic origin, the simpler form *vassus* (used in the same sense) corresponds to old Garlish *Vassus, Vasso*. Although in the ancient Germanic societies the affairs of the kindred group and people offered sufficient scope for normal energies, they had never been able to satisfy the spirit of adventure ambition. The chief surrounded themselves with ‘companions’ (in old German *gisind* meaning literally, companions for an expedition) and in the intervals of rest gave
them hospitality in their great wooden ‘halls’ where the atmosphere was congenial for long drinking bouts. The little band was the mainstay of its certain in wars and vendettas; it supported his authority in the deliberation of the freemen; and the general gifts of food and drink, of slave, of gold rings—which he lavished upon these follows was an indispensable element of his prestige. In the last mentioned term, (old name of German was companions). It seems to have been in current use in Merovingian Gaul, as indeed in the whole of the barbarian world, as a name for the private fighting man. Progressively, however, it yielded place to the indigenous word, ‘Vassal’ (Vassus, Vassallus) which was to have such a splendid furture the connotation of ‘Vassal’ at the moment when it passed into spoken Latin was very much humble. It mean ‘Young Boy’—this meaning was to persist throughout the Middle Ages in form of the diminutive Valet, Varlet—and also by an imperceptible transaction such as had occurred in the case of the Latin puer, domestic slave”. Cited in Marc. Bloch, Feudal Society, op.cit., pp. 154-55.
H.E. Hall, defines "vassals state under the suzerainty of others are protection of the latter which during a process of gradual disruption or by the grace of suzerain have acquired certain of the powers of an independent community, such as that of making commercial convention, or of conferring their exequatur on foreign consas." cited in Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vols. 25-26, op.cit., p. 174.

The technical vocabulary of feudalism was modified. Beneficium retained its technical documentary usage, but it was replaced by fief in everyday language. The word fief assumes variations - for example in Latin feomum, in Provençal feu, and in other localities it was written feo feos, fieo likewise, gastsindus and trustis were replaced by vassus. Vassus was a corruption of the Celtic giwar, meaning a young boy attached to a lord. The diminutive vassalus, meaning young boy in a state of vassalge
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