CHAPTER III

GROWTH OF FEUDALISM

The study of the growth of feudalism, which covers many a centuries is indeed a complex subject. The disintegration of Mauryan Empire sounded the death knell of highly bureaucratically Centralised administrative system which in turn contributed towards the rise of fragmentary political powers drawing their resources from regional petty chieftains. When powerful among them strove to unify the scattered powers under one authority. They could do so only by granting regional autonomy. These factors along with others like foreign invasion etc., could create a distinct social institution unknown to India before. This institution is known as Indian Feudalism. How this institution came into being in India form the main theme of our discussion in this chapter.

The great Mauryan emperors Chandragupta and Aśoka were very powerful in ancient India. Aśoka demanded adherence to the law of piety from the neighbouring small kingdoms like the Colas, Paṇḍyas, Satapūtra, Keralaputra, Tāmraparṇi, etc.,1 In the South, and Syria and other kingdoms in the North West.
He gave them occasional advice and established philanthropic institutions in their dominions. In other words, he having forsaken his idea of conquest by sword followed the policy of spiritual conquest or dharmma-Vijaya. The rulers of these small kingdoms were supposed to fulfil the moral obligation to (Devānampriya-priyadarśi) Aśoka. But, after the death of Aśoka, the Mauryan empire was on the wane. Many petty independent or semi-independent states sprang up all over India. The growth of feudalistic elements in Indian society and polity began during the weak successors of Aśoka and it accelerated further under the Śuṅgas period onwards. During Śuṅgas period the reformed Brāhmaṇism with its social institutions indulged in chivalry and valour, discarded by Buddhism. This new ideological equipment became more suitable for the growth of feudalistic states. We come to know from the Mālavikāgnimitra that Agnimitra son of Sēnapati Puṣyaṃmitra, ruled from Vidīśā under the overlordship of his father residing in a distant capital. Agnimitra established his supremacy over Yajñāsena and Mādhavāsena in two different kingdoms, with the approval of his Manti-pariṣad; Ayodhīyā, Kauśāmbī, Mathurā and Paṅcalā were under the Śuṅga suzerainty. Āśāṅhasēna was a feudatory of the Śuṅgas, and Vaṅgapala who was a provincial governor under the Śuṅgas became
independent as the Śuṅga empire declined. Appllodotus accepted Śuṅga suzerainty and he was allowed to rule in Sindhu-Sarvira as a Śuṅga vassal. He had accepted Śuṅga suzerainty under certain compulsions which had now disappeared and he could afford to take things easy. The Śuṅgas on their part exercised suzerainty by issuing occasional orders. Thus, the Śuṅga kingdom originally comprised almost the entire Gaṅgā valley, although some of the regions were not under their direct control and merely owed them political allegiance to the Śuṅga’s rulers. The Indo-Greek rulers such as, Demetrices, Eueratides and Menander ruled or governed their kingdoms with the help of the subordinance rulers owing allegiance to them and vassal chief under king Menander, Viyakamitra used the title apprach-rāja (one who has no royal adversary).

The Śaka kings divided their empire into several Satrapies for the purpose of administration. We come across the term Sātrap used by Kāpiṣa the son of Sātrap Granavhyaka. From Philoslots, it appapperars that Phratoes enlisted the service of certain Bārbarians to guard his kingdom against other Bārbarians. It is not unlikely that his ultimate aim was to guard his kingdom against an attack from the Kuṣāṇas as from Gondopharnes. The Śāka king was
powerful enough to exercise his suzerainty over the Satrap of the Indus. The Satrap of the Indus was possibly under the change of Indo Sythians. The little Mahāksātrapā has not been traced earlier than in the Lion capital inscription. The Kṣātrapā was usually a designation of subordinate rank under a Mahākṣātrapā have been used here in a loose sense. The king who was called a mahāksātrapā was a commander of the armies. The king had Kṣātrapas or governors under him. The heir apparent was always from the Kṣātrapas. The state of Rudradaman had under him Mati-sachvas and Karman-sachivas and mahādaṇḍnāyaka and large number of Śaka rulers are called Svāmi.

The Sātavāhana kings were called the rājās. We know from the claim of the mother as Gantamiputra Śatakarnī that her son and grand son were mahārāja a title which never adopted by Gantamiputra nor by Vasisthiputra Pulumavi. We come to know from an inscription of Sātavāhana that the wives of the officials and vassals of the Sātavāhanas used the administrative designations of their husband; which indicates that they clamied similar prestige and influence; the title mahāsenapati and mahātalavari were used by them. But fact is that these titles found in the inscriptions do not convey any special
significance. The Sātavāhanas political functionaries provide one of the earliest instances of the use of the title mahā or great which came to be widely associated with the designation of the Gupta princes, officials and Vassals. The Satavahana rulers bore the titles such as, mahāsēnapati, mahārathi, mahābhoja, mahātalavara, etc. which can be the epithets of the feudatories.¹³ The Sātavāhana territory was divided into small provinces each under a civil governor (amātya) and military governor (mahāsēnapati). The latter were permitted to marry into the royal family. Some were even allowed to mint their own coins. When Sātavāhanas power collapsed these governors set themselves up as independent rulers and administration was left to local hands.¹⁴ Land grants formed a significant feature of the Sātavāhana ruler. The Sātavāhana kings started the practice of granting fiscal and administrative immunities to Brāhmaṇas and Buddhist monks, it is also evident from the existing inscriptional records that policemen, retainers and soldiers were instructed not to interfere with the administration of the donated field or village, which was left completely in the hands of beneficiaries. The exemption to the beneficiaries was revealed by Sātavāhana inscriptions.¹⁵
The position of defeated and reinstated kings of Northern India was like that of the vassals owing allegiance to the paramount authority of the Kusana overlord. The obligation of vassals to their lords might have included military service and payment of tribute a feature of feudalism. But we do not find any evidence which proves the development of manorial system during Kuṣāṇa period as was the case with western countries. In view of the extensive use of coinage it is difficult to believe that administrative officers were paid for their service with land grants, but Manu suggests some lands to lords of the villages. In India the Kuṣāṇa ruler was called small chief (Yaurāja). However they started adopting the title of mahārāja and rājātirāja with the passage of time. Both these titles were used by the Pārthian ruler Gandophrnces in the first half of the first century A.D. and first Pārthian king Mithradates II used the title "king of the kings." A Śāhi was established as overlord and this led to the establishment of Śaka dynasty and later on it was adopted by the Kuṣāṇas. They were not independent kings who had been subjected but chiefs who stood in the relation of feudatories to the great lord (Sāmantāhivai). R.S. Sharma argues that the Sahis belonged to the same tribe as the Sātavāhanas and hence
the overlord was only the first among the equals as a natural corollary to this. The allegiance of the Śāhis to their overlord rested on a slender basis and at the slightest provocation, they could withdraw their allegiance from him and seek their fortunes independently. The main obligation of the Sahi was to render military aid to their overlord. But Śāhi and Śāhānuśāhi seem to be Iranian titles borrowed by the Scythians, a nomadic tribes of Central Asia whose basis of property was cattle not land. In fact they had no land system which is the basis of feudalism but they had a kind of hierarchy, a phenomena generally seen in feudal system.

We observe that the provincial governors of the Kuṣānas enjoyed the title Kṣātrapa and Mahākṣātrapā. They exercised their powers through military officers, known as dandaṇāyaka and mahādandaṇāyaka who seem to have occupied an important position in Kuṣāna polity. The two Sātraps ruled over the eastern province of the Kuṣāna Empire with their head quarters at Banaras. The term Dandaṇāyaka and the higher on Mahādandaṇāyaka seem to have formed a link in the Kuṣāna administrative machinery. We find that the Dandaṇāyaka was considered a feudatory authorised to keep a certain amount of royal levy and, administering
seventy one villages. It indicates that dandaṇāyaka and mahādandaṇāyaka discharged their functions as, General, Judge or Police officers and as military governor. The dandaṇāyakas were feudatory chiefs appointed by the Kuśāṇa and rulers and owing allegiance to him who were required to render civil and military help. Sometimes they used to live in the court of the lord. In exchange of their services rendered, the officers were most probably granted an enjoyment of revenues collected from a particular territorial unit. Higher officers seem to be granted with fiefs. Thus, the main characteristics of the Kuśāṇa political system, the organisation of hierarchical feudal system, seems to have been adopted later on by the Guptas emperors. Thus the erstwhile terms and designations of titles, often found in inscription could have worked in different capacities in different periods and with the passage of time the feudal type obligations are usually mentioned in the epigraphic records and finally these titles such as mahārāja, rājan etc. mentioned too in the inscriptions signify the rule of the greater over the smaller. This shows that the power was distributed through the hierarchy of officials too, and not concentrated at the centre.

The second Magadhan Empire was founded by
imperial Gupta in first quarter of the 4th century A.D. But we find that centralised administration was absent under them. A large number of vassal states used to pay tribute and supply troops to the imperial Gupta. It seems that Gupta emperors did not directly administer the country. There were feudal chiefs, as mahāsāṃanta who used the title of mahārāja. Ghatotkacha was simply mahārāja and was semi independent ruler ruling over a small kingdom. But his successors were powerful suzerain. His grandson Samudragupta was a great conquerer and good administrator, he conquered major part of India. He could not bring all the parts of India under his direct control. There were many tributary states, monarchical and republication which enjoyed autonomy after paying tribute. The twelve major states of the Deccan were defeated by him, but they were reinstated after paying homage and money. His successors were also great warriors. They had an army composed of infantry cavalry, chariots, elephant and ship. During war, imperial Guptas empereres took help from feudal militia. We come to the conclusion that the feudal chiefs such as mahāsāṃanta, mahārāja etc., helped Chandragupta II during war. However, under the Kumāragupta I, the subordinate chiefs like the Puṣyamitras of Central India revolted against the
Imperial authority. But sometimes feudal chiefs had their own feudatories. For example mahārāja Hastin had his own feudatories. They assumed the titles of Mahārāja, rājan, sāmanta and mahāsāmanta. This proves such as the symptoms of sub-infeudalism in early India. The feudatory chiefs such as the Ucchakalpiyas and the Parivrājakas acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gupta kings. Thus, feudal hierarchical set up is proved in Gupta age, by the existence of the term and feudal titles, like mahārājādhīrāja, mahāsāmanta, mahārāja, sāmanta-māhārāja, mahāsāmanta-ādhipa, mahāsāmanta, sāmanta, rājan, etc.

The Hūṇas invasion helped the growth of feudalism in India. Invasions, were and migrations caused excessive need for defence and protection of the agricultural lands must have created conginal environment for the development of feudalism. The above mentioned factor made the central authority weak, as a result of which, some concessions were granted to local authority in terms of land and immunities and such generous concessions help the local power to entrench themselves strongly in the possessions. The first stage of the Hūṇa inroads in India, (454-465 A.D) was marked by their issuance of coins which bore the crowns on the portratis. It seems that the absence of
the crown in the changing political senarid enabled the chiefs to struck the coins. These chiefs were governors and had no royal status from the central authority of the Oxes valley. Practical necessity demanded that these local chiefs should issue their own coins. But the title Tigin. meaning governor was accepted by Sung. Yun who came two generations after the event, as the personal name of the chief who established the Ye-thas (Hūṇas) permanently in Gandhāra. We came to know from Eran inscription that Toramāṇa used the titles of mahārājādhīrāja and mahārājādivrāja (Sâha - Jaulāḥ) Toramāṇa, who established an extensive Hūṇa empire in India, and ruled over a considerable part of western and central India. His son and successor Mihirakula was also a great conqueror who imposed his suzerainty over a large part of India extending at least as far as Gwalior in the east and even the Gupta emperor Bālāditya was forced to pay him tribute. The province of Malwā was passing through a troublesome period on account of invasions of the Hūṇas and Vākāṭakas, and the hold of the Gupta emperors might have been considerably weakened in that region. Taking advantage of this situation Yaśadharman, a ex-feudatory of the empire, established independent authority and soon became powerful enough to defeat the Hūṇa chief Mihirakula, freeing Malwā and
other neighbouring regions from the Hūṇas depredations. We came to know that several powerful feudatories such as Mukharis and later Gupta ruling as feudal chief in Bihār and Uttar Pardesh in second half of the sixth century A.D latter ruled over Malwa and Magadha, they declared themselves as independent rulers in their respective regions. However, Yaśodharman could not maintain his authority on stable basis for a long time. It thus led to a general uprising among the feudatories of the Gupta empire and Yaśodharman himself was most probably the victim of this uprising.36 But we should bear in mind that Prabhākara-vardhana was the first Vardhan ruler who assumed the title of mahārājādhīrāja. Earlier his predecessors seem to be feudatory of Hūṇas or the Guptas. His successor Rājavardhan sent many expeditions against Hūṇas. On hearing of the news from a messanger about the death of Graha-varman who was killed by king of Malwā he marched against the ruler of Malwā, with a huge army routed out the Malwā army, but at last he was murdered.37 We must bear here in mind that a well-knit centralised administration was not possible during Harśa’s time. Under Harsa two kingdom of Thanēswar and Kanuj had been united, and there must be military conflicts between the rulers of different dynasties. We find that nṛipa,38 rāja39 and rājānakas40 ruled over different regions and enjoyed
considerable freedom in internal administration. A little lower down in the feudal hierarchy were the mahāsāṃantas and Sāmanta. Some mahāsāṃantas and rājās held important position at the kings court. The designation of rājputra was most probably given to the son of feudatory or vassal chiefs and these ranked fairly high in the hierarchy of officials. We come to know from the Aihole inscription that Harṣa’s army was equipped with hosts supplied by his vassals. It seems that Harṣa, feudatories used to supply troops and were expected to assist their suzerain in time of war. The men and horses for the Harṣa’s army was supplied by the vassals. At the time of march their number was so huge that it amazed him. Such army seems to be a feudal militia, mustered only in time of war and not as standing army. It is very clear that the practice of supplying troops to the overlord made the king dependent on his vassals. But Harṣa could not keep his supremacy alive for a longer period. The war between Harsa and Chalukya ruler Pulakeśin was regarded as a memorable event in Indian history in which Harṣa was defeated by Chalukya king Pulakiśian II and the later assumed the imperial title of Paramēśvara. He too attacked the kingdom of Pallava ruler Mehendran-varman I but his success against the Pallavas was short lived. He was defeated and killed by Narasimha varmana I,
probabably in A.D. 642.

It has been suggested that the slave labour was a regular feature of the daily life; the organised industry and the developed agricultural system was probably manned by slaves during Harappan civilisation too.\textsuperscript{48} The term Dāsa has been interpreted in Ṛgveda as slave, synonymously with Dasya in the sense of enemies of the Aryans. The Aryans defeated the Dasya who were treated as slave. As a permanent division of labour, the vanquished Dāsa or Dasyas seem to have been converted into slave. The establishment of the classes might have strengthened the position of those who advocated a new socio-economic relationship based on the exploiter and the exploited.\textsuperscript{49} We find references to Śūdras who were employed as ploughmen in the field.\textsuperscript{50} Slavery in Vedic period was mostly confined to woman, who were employed in the domestic work. According to the Dharmasūtras the Brāhmaṇa could exchange slave but could not sell them.\textsuperscript{51} It is very clear in one of the Buddhist sources that slaves were treated as property who could be shared and inherited.\textsuperscript{52} We find hosts of references to slave working for land landlords in Pali literature\textsuperscript{53} showing thereby that the slave labour was employed for agricultural work. Thus it is observed that men slave
were employed for productive work during Buddhist time. There numbers went up gradually owing to the new system of production based on iron technology, growth of crafts and commerce, rise of town and use of coins for exchange. It is very clear that even Buddhism did not offer relief. The Buddhist literature shows that failure to pay debts led to the enslavement of the debtors. This not only produced debt slave but also allowed sale and purchase of slave. The concept for manual labour had produced some strange results. The upper class society which survived by appropriating the major part of production achieved by the manual labour of the serving folk had began to look down upon such population as was engaged in real productive work. Thus slave formed a part of the economy in Buddhist period but they were very less.

Kauṭilya too recognises the institution of slavery, and it is seen that in large number of slaves and Šūdras were employed by the state for agriculture operations on the land and for industrial development. Thus, in Mauryan period slavery existed purely in relation to economic factors, as we find them engaged in all type of productive works, such as grinding grain, sorting our cotton and husking rice, spinning, weaving, repairing and building work.\textsuperscript{54} Large
households were in great need of labour, particularly at sowing and harvesting times. Free members of the community who were owners of smaller plots although tilled their land themselves still they needed extra hands in some seasons.\(^5\) Thus, the productive forces were growing at the rapid rate and demanded new production relation. We come to know from the *Arthaśāstra* that slaves were allowed to own and inherit property even after his death; his kinsmen had the priority of claim on his property over the master.\(^6\) But the Mlecchas slaves were kept out of this privileges.\(^7\) Kautilya states that an Aryan slave cannot be forced to do impure work and does not loose his birth right even if enslaved.\(^8\) There were provisions for manumission of slave in *Arthaśāstra*. The modes of manumission were easier in India than in Greece. A slave of manumission were easier in India than Greece. A salve could attain emancipation by paying a ransom money or after serving a fixed period.\(^9\) A female slave could get manumission if she gave birth to a male child from her master, then she along with her child were manumitted and not only she but her mother, sister and brothers were also manumitted, if she choses to live in the house of the master.\(^10\) Thus, Kautilya was the first writer who furnished the evidences of slave being employed for
economic production on large scale.

But Greek writer Megasthenes\textsuperscript{61} denies slavery in early India. However, in the Mauryan period a great diversity of social patterns existed in India. In some areas, tribal relation still prevailed and it is possible that Megasthenes evidence applied only to one of the areas which he visited on his way to the capital or with which he became acquainted later during his stay in India. But \textit{Arrian} speaks of the superintendent of agriculture, who probably performed the function of the \textit{Sītādhyaṅkṣa},\textsuperscript{62} under whom a large number of slaves and hired labourers were employed for agricultural purpose in Mauryan period. Strabo informs us that shepherds, hunters etc. led a nomadic life and they seem to be pressed into the services of agriculture by the \textit{Sītādhyaṅkṣa}.\textsuperscript{63} Thus this indicates that Arrian and Strabo also admit that some slave labourers were used for agricultural purpose under the direct control of \textit{Sītādhayakṣa} (superintendent of agriculture). \textit{Patanjali} says that the rights of the slaves were not the same as that of other citizens.\textsuperscript{64} According to the \textit{Manu}, a \textit{Śūdra} whether bought or unbought should be reduced to slavery because he is created by God for the service of a Brāhmaṇa,\textsuperscript{65} and twice born caste cannot be reduced to salvery. If a Brāhmaṇa compelled men of
twice born castes to work as slave he should be fined 600 pāṇas by the king.66 But *Arthaśāstra* recommends48 panas for enslaving Brāhmaṇa.67 Manu further states that the sale of slave by not real owner is declared invalid68 and slave is not allowed to own any property.69 It shows that during *Manu Samṛti* the salvery was made more rigid. Nārada mentions fifteen kinds of slaves70 who were employed in all kinds of impure work,71 while this practice was confined earlier to the *Mleecha* and no Aryan slave can be forced to do impure work, Nārada discusses the various means for the emancipation.72 According to him one who saves his master’s life in peril is entitled to liberty.73 One who is made captive in fight, on giving a substitute of equal capacity.74 The mode of emancipation was simple, the master sprinkled the slave’s head with water and declared him to be free (bhujissa-adāsa).75

It is also evident from the epics that slaves were treated as property and seem to be an internal part of the masters family.76 In *Mahābhārata* all Śūdras were slaves (Dāsa) of the three higher varṇa and captured soliders, kings and people were enslaved.77 Rājā Yaśīnasena presented 14000 women slaves and 1000 men slaves to his overlord.78 The Rāmāyaṇa refers to many slaves who were presented by many kings to Rāma at
the time of his coronation in Ayodhya. These slaves seem to be employed in the industrial production, while Yājañavalkya states that a man could be reduced to slavery only with his consent and some law givers state that the slavery should take place in the natural order of the varṇas and not in the reverse order, that is to say a slave should be of lower varṇa than his master, but Kātyāyana, however, makes the claim that slavery is provided for the three lower varṇas and not for the Brāhmaṇ. Thus it seems that during Smṛti period the general condition of slaves remained unchanged, they could be beaten up put in fetters. They have no status in the eyes of law and were treated as an item of property to be owned in common. We come to know from the Brāspati Smṛti and from the contemporary inscription about the sale of slaves. But an Aryan child who did not attain the age of eight could not be sold or mortaged but a son of Mleccha was sold in slavery. There was slave trade in girls between India and Roman empire and certain slave markets were in existence in ancient India. We come to know from the Jātakas that 100 Kāhāpāṇas was the conventional price of a slave, 700 Kāhāpāṇas were enough to buy slaves male and female.
Indian history shows quite clearly the trends typical of ancient class societies, the exploiters depriving the immediate producers of their property and even attempting to appropriate their very personality. Both the state and the big private owners tried to expand the scope of exploitation and encompassed even greater sections of impoverished community members and other within it. The economic structure of the ancient society depended on direct relation of domination and subordination. It was precisely during the post Mauryan periods because the primitive community structures were decaying to strengthen slavery.

Thus slavery in early India cannot be negated. Its existence persists through right from early Vedic period. However, one perceives tremendous changes in the nature of slave system and in the numerical proportion of slaves. The existing references in the Vedic literature adverting to slave show that in the vedic period the females were mostly enslaved, whose labour was utilised exclusively for domestic work. This may be because of semi-nomadic and pastural character of early Aryans and a strong notion of private property did not yet gain much support the same was the case with the later vedic period when life was almost permanently settled. We come across the
references pertaining only to female slaves proving thereby that the labour of female slave was not appropriated for production, a thing which was largely done by the family or clan groups. The slave on the other hand remained basically unproductive members of Aryan society.

With the passage of time the introduction of iron technology ushered in new epoch in the economic history of early India. This period of iron technology is generally assigned to 6th century B.C. when the ideology of religion was quite prominent and became a catalytic agent to give a new form and content to Indian society. Meeting the overall demand of economic necessity and change in the means of economic production. The references from Buddhist literature and Dharmasūtra show that both men and women were taken as slaves and were also employed in no less productive work, a complete departure from Vedic Indian slaves system. Untill this period the society held that no Aryans would be recruited as slave and slavery as an institution was largely reserved for the non-Aryans, and the slaves were not entitled to hold private property. But when we come down to the Mauryan period we notice that the slave system was broadened and became flexible that it conceded slave’s right to
private property. Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra has also explicitly demonstrated his preference to take non-Aryan as slave.

During Smṛti period the slave system was made more rigid. They were considered to be private property or clattles. It is said that a slave does not have right over himself hence even can be purchased and sold at the will of his master. Some law givers went to the extent of precluding slaves, the right to property conceded by Kauṭilya. Yājñavalkya seems to be more human and considerate towards the slave. He objects to the enslaving of any person against his will. This may also be take otherwise in that the slave system witnessed a rot during Yājñavalka time. The slave labour was employed on a fairly on large scale field of states owned and large private estates. These features were inherent in the mode of economic production, the peculiar Indian way of development of class society.

Forced labour was an important factor that contributed to the rise and growth of feudal system. The term Viṣṭi was used in the sense of labour, which the villagers were obliged to provide to the king or landlord. During 'Mauryan Age' forced labour was the manual labour for the state given by the labourers,
artisans and slave, instead of paying taxes.\footnote{92} We find in the \textit{Arthaśāstra} that there were two kinds of labour tax - the ordinary tax, paid in the form of the labour (\textit{Simhanika}) \footnote{93} and the additional gratuitous performance of public service (\textit{Viṣṭi}). \footnote{94} However, various types of works were done by means of forced labour like measuring, supervision of grinding etc.,\footnote{95} in royal farms and industries.\footnote{96} But the occasion for demand was perhaps not fixed and it was counted as one of the important resources both for the army and kingdom. If we keep in mind the huge constructions in stone and reservoirs, building and other workers of art. Such heavy construction could not have been possible simply with the help of the regular employes. How common this system of forced labour was? We can understand from the use of terms such as, \textit{Viṣṭipradhana, Kosavisti, Viṣṭirvahana, Karmantoviṣṭi, Viṣṭikarapratikaram} and \textit{Hirangaviṣṭi} etc.\footnote{97} Generally the states of early India demanded labour from their citizen from time to time for the performance of works of public utility. Thus, it was regarded so essential in the Mauryan period that the village and city accountants were instructed to keep an account of men engaged in forced labour.\footnote{98} However, Manu\footnote{99} suggests that \textit{Śūdras}, craftsmen, paid their dues by work and machenics, artisans and others should work for the king
and landlord, one day in every month. But he does not mention whether they were provided with food on the day of work. Only solitary reference in Viṣṇu Śmṛti shows that workers were to be given food on the day of work. During Viṣṇu the condition seems to be much better than Manu period. In Kuśāṇas period so many Stūpas and monastries were built for the huge construction. Forced labour might have sometimes requisitioned in lieu of regular taxes and it can be inferred from an epigraphic record that corvee was demanded for hydraulic construction carried out by the state.

We come to know from the epics that no caste was exempted from the tax of compulsory labour. Like Arthaśāstra the Mahābhārata also tells us that the fighting forces consisted of not only the state chariots and elephants etc., but also the forced labour. Even the Brāhmaṇas were made to work if they were not well versed in the Vedas and those equal to the Śūdras. Sometimes king and high officials demanded forced labour on some special occasions. In the Mudrākṣasa, the carpenter Daruvarman has furnished the main entrance of the palace with magnificent decoration on the occasion of Chandragupta’s coronation ceremony. It indicates that forced labour find
frequent reference in epigraphic along with other taxes which shows that the forced labour was more common and oppressive than in the earlier periods. We come to know from the Chammak Copper plate of Pravaraśena II that the land was granted to the donee entirely free from all obligation of forced labour and Siwani copper plate records the same exemptions. But in the Raypur plate of Sudevarāja, it is mentioned that the inhabitants of the donated village should be obedient to the command of the donees, and in the Ganesgadh plate of Dhraṣṭaṇa I, the Pardi pillar inscription of Dharasena the land grants were made free of all hindrances including forced labour. Some other inscriptions refer to the grants of lands made by the donors to the donees with the right of forced labour such as the Palitansa plate of Dharasena II, the Navalakhi plate of Śiladitya I and Valabhi grant Dhruvasena III. Thus after careful survey of epigraphic sources we come to the conclusion that the forced labour was more strong and oppressive during Gupta and post gupta times than the earlier periods. The elements of oppression might have been more actue in the Gupta and post gupta periods when the king’s right to demand forced labour was transferred to the donees who were the recipients of land grants. Kāmasūtra records that the peasant women were compelled to
perform unpaid work of various kinds, such as filling of granaries of the village headman, taking things in and out of the houses, clearing the houses, working in the fields, purchasing of cotton, wool, flax, hemp and thread and the purchase, sale and exchange of various articles. This must not be taken a direct source of income to the state, but the village headman might have been allowed to keep a part of this payment. The system of forced labour did not escape the notice of the Yuan Chwang. He states that, "individuals are not subject to forced labour contributions-taxation being light and forced services being sparingly used." It is clear from above references that the donees had the right to get his land cultivated by others and could easily replace the old peasants by new ones. They had the right to increase the amount of forced labour at their own will and there was no limitation on the levy of forced labour. It seems that forced labour included all credible sorts of works, for which no special occasion was needed.

It has became now clear that the forced labour in early India was very much formed the part of the society and it continued right from the Mauryans period onwards. But one perplex to perceive tremendous change in the nature of force labour. The existing
reference in the Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra shows that this was the manual labour which was performed by labourers, artisans and slave, to the state, instead of paying taxes. But Manu suggests that Śudras, artisans craftsmen etc., pay their dues by working one day for the state law and in the fields of landlord. Kauṭilya does not suggest any fixed day for forced labour and Viṣṇu states that food should be provided to labourers on the day of work. It is evident from the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana that no caste was exempted from the forced labour not even Brāhmaṇa. It shows that it was very common during epic period. Many inscriptions record the land grants made to the donees free of forced labour, which indicates that it was more strong and oppressive during Gupta and post Guptas periods and king’s right of force labour was transfered to the donees.

The process of conquest by which smaller chiefs were reduced to subordination and sometimes reinstated in the positions provided, they paid regular tributes and homage. We find that early India witnessed the administrative decentralisation, through Sāmantas system. This term is used variously such as Vassal, feudatory, the chief of a district (paying tribute to lord paramount). It is evident from the
Arthasastra and law books that this meant an independent neighbour. But inscriptions of Asoka show that Sāmanta means a neighbouring king. Pran Nath is of the opinion that in post-Mauryana period the collection of share of produce, taxes and fines etc. were collected by the Sāmantas (estate-owner) and not by the king or state. He further argues that the whole of India was under the grip of powerful families of nobles (Sāmantas and the Andhaka-vṛṣṇi) was controlled by the powerful families of Śvāphalka, Caiitraka, Sini and Vāsudeva, etc. The countries of the Licchavi, Vṛji, Malla, Madra, Kukura, Kuru and Pañcāla peoples were under the heel of the nobles (Sāmanta). Thus it indicates that owing to these Sāmanta, the political condition of the country was very unsettled during the Mauryan Age.

The problem before the administrators was how to bring the whole country under the administration of a central government and how to turn these haughty independent nobles into royal subject and render their political power. It seems that Mauryan rulers were against any claim to independence on the part of these Sāmanta. They wanted to reduce all powerful Sāmantas into peaceful, loyal landlords and if possible to bring their property directly under the control of the
central government. If a king were childless he selected his successor from among these powerful Sāmantas. Some times he managed that his wife should have a child by some family Sāmanta. When all methods failed it appears that the administration was continued by the federation of nobles, related to him and already in attendance at the court as countries. Thus the relations of these Sāmantas with the king were based on agreements (Sañdhi) which varied in different cases. A Sāmanta could either (a) provide a fixed number of troops or the best fighting men of his army, whenever or required (ātmāmīsa-saṃdhi) or (b) supply a commander of his army and place his heir in the kind custody as a hostage (puruṣāntara-sañdhi) or (c) March with his army against another country, whenever ordered to do so (adrṣṭa-puruṣa-saṃdhi) or (d) give to the king the ladies of his households and the leading men of his estate as hostages to assure his allegiance (dandopanata-saṃdhi) or (e) pay a certain amount of money in a lump sum every year (parikraga-saṃdhi) or (f) give as much money as could be carried on a man’s shoulders as subsidy (Skandhopanega-saṃdhi) or (g) give an exorbitant amount of money (kapāla-saṃdhi) or (h) cede a portion of territory to the king (ādhiṣṭa-saṃdhi) or (i) cede his whole territory with the exception of his headquarters (Ucchinna-saṃdhi) or (j)
give the produce of his lands (apakraya) (k) give even more than his lands produced (pari-bhūṣana). It reveals from the above rule that it was not so easy for a king to keep these powerful Sāmantas under control. As long as king was strong enough they paid their tribute. Sometimes, they collected their own friends and began to delay payment on some plea or other. It is also known that each Sāmanta began to call himself independent. Thus, we assume that Sāmantas must have been influential and important persons since the Mauryan Age, they were authorised to decide boundary disputes. They might have made their place most important with the rise of their economic, social and political condition, increasing authority of Sāmantas accelerated feudalism in early India.

The Allahabad inscription of the Samudragupta mentions that the conquered and subjugated kings were expected to pay all tribute to their overlord, such as, to carry out royal orders, to give their young daughter in marriage and render homage etc. These obligations seem to be purely feudal in nature on the defeated princes and king who might have reduced to the position of a Sāmanta. The Gupta emperors did not directly administer the whole country which were formally included within the empire. There were feudal
chiefs, as mahāsanta who assumed the title of mahārāja. But by that time the term Sāmanta might have gone under change, a change of meaning and status which indicated a state of subordination. Thus by a process of association the term Sāmanta which originally meant a neighbouring king had come to be applied to those neighbouring kings who had been made subordinate. Certain factors show that the Sāmantas were not petty nobles but rulers of considerable importance in their respective regions. We find in North India the earliest use of the term Sāmanta in Bengal inscription of Barbar Hill cave of Maukhari chief Anantavarman, in which his father is described as Sāmanta Cuḍamanayaḥ (the best among feudatories). The day of Anantavaraman’s father may be put around about 500 AD when the Mauhkaries were the Sāmanta of the Imperial Guptas and important mentioning of the term Samanta is found in the Mandaror stone pillar inscription of Yaśodharman in which he claims to have been subjugated the Sāmanta or feudatories in the whole of the Northern India. But in South India the term Sāmanta was used in the sense of vassal in the third quarter of the 5th century A.D in the time of Santivarman and in the last quarter of the same century, the term appears in some grants of Southern and Western India in the sense of vassal. During the sixth century AD the rulers of
Valabhi bore the title of Sāmanta mahārāja and mahāsāmanta. Gradually the application of the term Sāmanta was extended from defeated chiefs to royal officers, from 597 AD onward rajas and Sāmanta. The smaller Sāmanta was subordinated to bigger one who in his turn accepted the suzerainty of the emperor. Sometimes these sāmantas made some land grants for religious and secular purposes without mentioning the name of their overlord. It shows that they have become enough powerful. In the first half of the seventh century AD Indhrāja granted a village to a Brāhmaṇa in Madhya Pardesh, without mentioning his overlord. It shows that vassal had become stronger and did not bother about their overlord.

The Kādambrī and the Harṣcharita of Bāna also give some ideas of the obligation of the Sāmantas. The former records the five mode of saluting the kings by the defeated kings who were made Sāmantas. The obligation of the sāmanta to pay yearly tribute to the emperor and obligation to pay homage to the king in person is graphically described by Bāna.

Bāna Harṣcharita refers six type of sāmantas such as (1) Sāmanta, (2) mahāsāmanta (3) āptasāmanta (4) pradhānasāmanta (5) Śātrumahāsāmanta and (6)
Among these the mahāsāṃanta was a step higher than the sāmanta, and the sātrumahāsāṃanta was conquered enemy chief. Āpasāṃantas were most probably those who willingly accepted the vassalage of the overlord. Pradhānamahāsāṃantas were the most trusted hands of the emperor who never disregarded their advice and pratisāṃanta was a vassal opposed to the king or merely a hostile vassal. Bāṇa divided the tributary princes into three classes such as (1) Āsatr-mahāsāṃant who rendered different services to the emperor and was treated with respect (2) The mahāpālas who were forced to submit to the prestige of the emperor (3) Members of the third type were attracted to him by their admiration and affection for him. Thus it is clear that the usage of the term Sāmanta was well established and there were as many as half a dozen kinds of vassals as Bāṇa.

Thus we can deduce from the erstwhile evidences that the references to the term Sāmanta was for the first time occurred in Kautilya Arthasastra and Aśokan inscriptions too speak of neighbouring king was none but the Sāmanta of later period. The law givers were also emphatic when they say that the boarder dispute of village can only be solved in the presence of Sāmanta testifying thereby the importance and status.
of *Sāmanta* in the erstwhile political set up. It indicates that the *Sāmanta* system did not develop all of sudden in early India. The term *Sāmanta* was used in different capacity in different period. The suzerain vassal relations have marked the main topic of study right from the oldest period in early India when the supreme (highest authority) delighted to have large numbers of vassals (*Sāmantas*) under him. In course of time it had become fashion to have more and more *Sāmantas* (vassals) under him. During the Guptas and post Guptas periods the *Sāmantas* whenever referred to seen as feudal lords.

Land grant was an important adjunct of feudal system. It was common in early India that the villages and plots of lands were granted to Brāhmaṇs Buddhist monks, religious establishments, such as monasteries, temples and even secular person too. We find very few instances of land grants in later vedic\(^{138}\) and Dharmasūtras\(^{139}\) period land grants were made as a *dāna* (pious gifts) and donors wanted *punya* out of that *Bhudāna*. But Manu recommends land grants to the *ādhipati* of villages. Kautilya suggests land grants to Brāhmaṇs and some state officers.\(^{140}\) Thus we find hosts of references to land grants in literary as well as epigraphic sources. The practice of making land
grants in India was as old as Brāhmaṇa and Buddhist literature. It is used in different manner in different period; earlier it was purely made for religious purposes but in later period it was granted to secular person as reward and to state officers as salary for state services. Issuance of land grants of Brāhmaṇas, monks, temples, monastry and state officers was a striking development in early India, which paved the way for the growth of feudal system or Brāhmaṇas feudatories who performed administrative functions almost independently but under the supreme authority. Thus this help to create powerful intermediaries wielding considerable economic and political power. So a number of land holding Brāhmaṇas went on increasing and some of them gradually left their priestly profession and turned their attention towards the management of land. Now for them secular function become more important than religious one. Thus, the practice of land grants paved the way to decentralisation in political set up of early India. We find hosts of references to land grants in epigraphic souces by kings. The Sātavāhan king Gautamiputra Šātakaṇṭi made a land grant to the Buddhist monk most probably in 124 AD, living in the Triasmi. The grant was made with some immunities which indicates that the ruler abandoned some administrative
right over them and similar exemption are recorded in the Nasik Buddhist cave Inscription of Pulumayi (142 AD), which recorded such exemption as not to be entered (by any royal officer) not to be touched by any of them and not to be dug for salt, not to be interfered with by district police, to enjoy all kinds of immunity. It is very clear that the ruler gave up his control over mines for the production of salt. But from the 5th century onward the ruler gave up his control over almost all sources of revenue, including pasture, hides and charcoal, mine for the salt, forced laobur, and all hidden treasures and deposits. This shows that the ownership over mines went into the hands of donees which was earlier in the hands of suzerain. It is evident from the inscription that the some royal donors conferred upon the donees the right of trying cases in the donated villages. The grant records the term \textit{abhyantarasiddhi}, which may be applied in different capacity and manner. It makes sense if we take it as adjudication of internal disputes of the village, which is thus made completely self dependent i.e. the donated villages was not dependent on other for the decision of law suits etc. The similar idea is expressed by the term \textit{sa-dan\breve{d}a-da\breve{s}-\ddot{a}paradhah} in North Indian grants. But the later limits the grantee’s jurisdiction to criminal cases and the former
extends it to the civil cases. Thus it seems that the
king had the right to punish thieves as a right, which was
transferred to the donees and they decided all cases
whether criminals or civil in later period. Now
generally the donees retained the administrative,
fiscal and judicial right over donated villages. But
R.S. Sharma of the opinion that from the Gupta period
onward the state shifted the part of burden of
collecting taxes to the fudatories, which made it no
longer necessary to maintain a record of households. He has cited the statement of Chinese pilgrims, such as
Fa-hsien and Yuan Chawang in support of his
argument. But Pran Nath is of the opinion that the
share of produce, taxes, fines and other dues were
actually collected by Sāmanta (estate-owner) and not by
the king or ruler or the country (Deśa), as generally
understood. He quoted Arthaśāstra in support of his
argument. It is evident from earlier inscriptions that
administrative, fiscal and judicial rights were
transferred to the donees (which were intermediaries
between the state and the actual tiller of the soil).
Thus the collection of revenue, taxes fines and other
dues by intermediaries from the peasants seems to be
old practice rather than the Gupta period.

Another important factor that contributed to
the growth of feudalism in India, was landowing monastic institutions which were used as educational institutions. We come to know from the kalachuri-chadi land grants, that out of thirty one land grants two were made to Buddhist monasteries, three to Hindu temples and twenty six to the Brāhmaṇas. Fa-hsien states that after the nirvan of Buddha, the king, elders and lay buddhist built monasteries for monks and provided them with houses, garden and fields with husbandmen and cattle to cultivate them. The grant of agrahāras by the king for the religious and educational purposes was an important factor to feudalise monasteries and educational institutions. We notice that grants of one hundred villages (agrahāras) was made for maintaining centres for education out of the income derived from them. Some of the grants seem to be made by imperial Guptas. Yuan Chawang states that the Nālandā Vihāra was maintained out of the revenues of about a hundreded villages granted to this institutions, but in the time of I-tsing its number seem to be risen to two hundreded. Thus it is fair to assume that the richness of the possessions and landed property of the Vihāra in seventh century made them self dependent units which is also attested by I-tsing. Regarding the arrangement of the property of a deceased monk, such
as, land, houses, shops, bed-gear, wollen seats and iron or copper implements were not to be distributed and immovable property became the property of the assembly. Thus, the emergence of the Nālandā mahāvihāra (and also other vihāras and Brāhmaṇas temples) as self dependent economic unit was actually one of the incidental result of the feudalisation of the state structure and administrative organisation of the Gupta and post Gupta period. But during the 8th century AD that the practice of donating villages along with their inhabitants to the monasteries by the kings, princes and chiefs was as common as that of building them by these dignitaries. It indicates that there was no dearth of donations because not only the kings, queens but also the princes and chiefs possessed their own villages and village folk whom they could dispose of them freely. Prince and lesser chiefs probably received grant for their maintenance from his superior lord, seem to be free to make a religious gifts of their own land with the men working on it, and inhabitants were bound to serve the donors as long as they lived under them and to serve the beneficiaries when they were transferred to the latter. Thus by the 8th century AD serfhood became common in India. We notice that the transformation of the organisation of the Buddhist monasteries on feudal lines changed the
system of Buddhist education too. Education in early India seems to be in the hands of private teachers. Even the famous university of Takaśasila was not an organised institution. In fact it was a merely a centre of education where every teacher was an institution by himself. In the earlier period the education in monasteries was intended for monks and nuns only. But with the feudaliation of the monastic life and economy, these educational institutions emerged corporate centres of higher learning where education was important and only to the monks and nuns but for the secular persons too. During the 7th century many grants were made to the Nālandā Mahāvihāra by a Mukhari king (Purnavarman) Harṣa, Bhaskaravarman and Amsuvarman of Nepāl. Thus it seems that these monasteries started emerging as politically independent and economically self-dependent unit. Harṣa himself is said to have "brought the brethren together for examination and discussion, giving rewards and punishments according to the merit and demerit. Those brethren who kept the rules of their order strictly and were thoroughly sound in theory and practice he advanced to the lion’s throne and from these he received religious instruction, those who, though perfect in the observance of the ceremonial code, were not learned in the past, he merely honoured
with formal reverence; those who neglected the ceremonial observances of the order, and whose immoral conduct was notorious, were banished from his presence and from the country.\textsuperscript{166} The king of Kāmarūpa named Kumāra threatened, the Head of the Mahāvihāra that he would destroy the institution if his request for dispatching Yuan Chwang was not complied with and the Kaśmir ruler is seen appointing some monks headed by Bhadonta Yaśa from among the monks to help Yuan Chawang when latter stayed there.\textsuperscript{167} Now the non-religious persons were admitted into Buddhist monastries for gettion education which was earlier only for monks and nuns. The Nālanda Mahāvihāra was the formost one. Thus the feudalised Buddhist monasteries of Gupta and post Gupta period; specially the age of Harsa may therefore be regarded as the forerunners of these corporate educational institutions. But I-Tsing records the old story which tells that the temple was built by Srigupta (Che-Ii-ki-to) Mahārāja for the use of the priests from China. At this time there were some chinese monks, twenty or so in number, who having wandered away from Szchuen by the road known ko-Yang ? came out near the Mahabodhi and there offered their worship. The king moved with reverence on account of their piety, gave them a village of considerable extent where they might remain and finally settle twenty four places in all.
Afterwards the Tang priests having died out, the village and its land attached came into the possession of aliens and now three persons belonging to Mrigavana temple occupy it. This occurred about five hundred years ago or so. The territory now belong to the king of eastern India whose name is Devavarman. He has given back the temple and its land to villagers to avoid expenses of keeping it up as he would have to do if many priests of China came there. However, there is still controversy over the foundation of the Gupta empire. Some scholars are of the opinion that the title Mahārāja was often borne by feudatory chiefs and it has been surmised that Śrīgupta was a subordinate to some paramount ruler. Sometimes independent rulers are known to have used the title Mahārāja. I-tsing who travelled in India during the period 677-695 AD. He places Śrīgupta five hundred or at the most four hundred and fifty years before he wrote. But five hundred years seem to approximate figure. If we accept I-tsing statement, thus it indicates that the feudalisation of Buddhist monasteries started little earlier than Gupta period. Even we come to know from the Nāsik cave inscription of Isvarmansena AD 258, which records the grant that was made to the Buddhist monastery for its maintenance. This also indicates that the feudalisation of educational institution had
already started in pre Gupta period.

The conflicting opinion among the scholars generally noticed, when we consider urban decay in Ancient India and its corollary feudalism. A cursory look about urbanisation in early India can lead us to believe that the Harappan civilisation first experienced urbanisation, a phenomena rarely existed in the contemporary world. However, with the decay of Harappan civilisation and with the coming of Aryan into India the urbanisation went into oblivion, only to be revived much later. It is generally believed that the second phase of urbanisation with its all kind of paraphernalias became prominent in about 3rd century BC to 4th century AD. Some scholars working on ancient Indian history have categorically said the urbanisation which revived in 4th century AD faced rot during Gupta and post Gupta India, then the process of deurbanisation started. This view however refuted by many scholars. The excavation carried out in India shows that the process of deurbanisation accelerated with Hūna invasion. If archeological sources is to be believed, it appears that deurbanisation in India percepeated feudalism. There is still controversy over the deurbanisation in Gupta period. R.S.Sharma, the Champion of the urban decay in India is of the opinion
that the process of urban rot has started from the Gupta period onwards. His arguments are based on the Fa-hsien, Yuan Chwang and all other sources. Hūṇas and post Hūṇas India experienced decay in urban sites and trade. The material remains and structural evidence from the excavated sites belonging to the Hūṇa time unmistakably suggests an overall rot of urban centres. The testimony of the Chinese pilgrims, such as Fa-hsien and Yuan Chwang is quite important of the contemporary towns and monasteries and these accounts are generally corroborated by the archaeological evidences. The numismatic evidence indicates the retrogression in post Kuśāṇa period. Gandhāra economy a situation certainly not cogenial for the urban settlement. Moreover the last series of coin issues from the sites generally belongs to the Sassanian and Indo-Sassanion period, and in some cases to the Hūṇas. Not even a single piece of Gupta currency has been discovered so far? But for this more excavations are needed because we cannot declare this period as decayed period on the basis of single factor or for non availability of coins. During the Hūṇas urban sites received the death below who even burnt some of the religious establishment at Taxila. The site was burnt and the inhabitants were massacred probably by the Hūṇas towards the end of the 5th century AD. Thus
it indicates that by the end of the region of Gandhāra lay in ruins. We find that the Taxila area was littered with numerous Buddhist stūpas. The city of Sirsukh and the monasteries seem to have been deserted by the fifth century AD. John Marshall argues that the Hūṇas destroyed Sirsukh city and Buddhist monuments. He further states that the wholesale destruction of the Buddhist stūpas and monasteries took place in the last quarter of the 5th century AD. However, most of the Taxila Sanghārāmas including the monastery at Kuṇalas Stūpa, which were destroyed by hostile invasion. Thus in Panjāb, Haryāṇa, Delhi, Western Uttar Pardesh urbanism had a short life and there was sharp decline of urbanism in the Gupta and Hūṇas period followed by a break in occupation. Only Ropar and Ahicchatra do not indicate marked decline in the Gupta layers. But regarding Kaśmīr and Jammu, Yuan Chawang noticed certain specific instances of decay as far as the Buddhist establishments were concerned. He refers to the ruins of a five large monasteries on a mountain. At the time of his visit, only a two storyed building in one corner of its compound was inhabited by only a thirty monks a number which was much less comparatively. Similarly, the five Buddhist monasteries at Poonch were all ruined and in a monastery to the north of the capital only a few monks
resided,\textsuperscript{178} and at Rajapura, though there were ten Sanghārāmas only very few monks lived.\textsuperscript{179} The description of Gandhāra area given by Yuan Chawang clearly brings out the decaying condition of the urban settlements of the area. He says that the capital of Gandhāra Puruṣapura was about 40 li in circuit to Kapiśa. The town and villages were disolated and there were only a few inhabitants. He notices that at one corner of the royal capital there were about one thousand families.\textsuperscript{180} All the Buddhist monasteries in the country about one thousand in number, were utterly dilapidated and deserted. Many of the Stupas were also in ruins. The building containing the Buddha’s alms-bowl was also in ruins.\textsuperscript{181} The famous stupas built by Kaniśka was destroyed by fire and this had been restored.\textsuperscript{182} We find that Śrāvasti city was in a bad shape,\textsuperscript{183} and there are very few inhabitants in the city, whose number would not exceed perhaps five hundred families.\textsuperscript{184} But Yuan Chawang found the chief town of the kindom of Śrāvasti ruined and deserted. Mostly in ruins, it had a few inhabitant.\textsuperscript{185} In spite of a few pieces of sculptures, the Gupta India was said to have had wide spread disturbances and was also quite poor.\textsuperscript{186} Generally brickbats structures which suggests deterioration.\textsuperscript{187} Fa-Hsian most probably saw the Ghositarama monastry which he calls the Ghosira-vana-
vihāra. He found this monastery in ruin and noticed congregations belonging to the 'Little-Vehicle.' Yuan Chawang argues that all the ten monasteries were in ruins and deserted. Thus in Madhya Pardesh, Rajasthan and Gujarāṭ urbanisation started in 300 B.C and urbanism became a spent up force by the end of the 4th century A.D. However the situation in Mahāraṣṭra was slightly different. In the early historic period towns appeared in this state around 200 B.C or little earlier except Prakāś, all others disappeared in the 3rd century A.D. Two urban centres such as Vaiśāli and Paṭaliputra of Bihār were also flourishing, are outstanding instances of the decay of town because of the withdrawal of state government. Paṭaliputra started declining from the time of Gupta when the imperial capital came to be establishment at Prayāga. Still Paṭaliputra retained some of its political importance mainly because it was an important seat of provincial administration under the Gupta. But once the Gupta started declining, Paṭaliputra too lost all its political and economic importance. Some part of Karnāṭaka state seems to have been littered with deserted towns in the seventh century A.D. Yuan Chawang noticed a succession of deserted town of rather small village. Excavated sites in South India show some interesting features. Kerala does not provide any
instance of urbanisation in early historic times. Even in Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, town did not appear until the 3rd century B.C. Most urban centres were deserted in the third century A.D.¹⁹⁴

Foreign trade began to decline after the fall of Kuṣāṇa empire. Sharma suggests that international trade through land routes began to decline after the fall of the Kuṣāṇa, Han and Arsacid empire in the middle of the Gupta rule meant security to trade till the end of 5th century A.D or so.¹⁹⁵ Undoubtedly the decline of foreign trade which involved Roman, Chinese, Pārthians Kuṣāṇas and Sātavāhana was an important course of urban decay in the late 3rd century AD and in the 4th century AD.¹⁹⁶ One of the most important articles of the trade was silk exported by India through Persian merchant, the other being the spices.¹⁹⁷ Trade in silk was so important in the Byzantine Empire that in order to regulate silk prices all over the country just in (627-65) enacted that one pound of silk should not cost more than eight pieces of gold and that all the wealth of one who violated this law should be consfiscated.¹⁹⁸ The position changed after the middle of the 6th century AD when Byzanties learnt the feeding of silk warms which obviated their necessity of trade with India.¹⁹⁹ Even earlier we find
an indication in Western Indian from the middle of the 5th century A.D, a guild of silk weaver migrated from the Nausari-Broach region, the hinterland of the Gujrat ports to Mandsor in Malwā where they gave up their old vacation and proliferated into the non productive occupation of archers, story teller, religious expounders, astrologers, warriors and ascetics. Thus it also indicates that artisans and peasants were not attached to the soil as in Europe, they were free to migrate and leave their profession. Urban decline meant loss of income to the state which suffered on account of upheavals in the countryside. Since the standing army ate up major part of the revenue; alternative methods had to be devised to support the solider and maintain the administrative apparatus. Now the state shed away its responsibility of policing many villages by making grant of land to Brāhmaṇas temples and monasteries and secular persons. Thus the Sāmantas were obliged to supply their troops at the time of war. This led to the foundation of feudal polity. Urban decay was a feature of feudal system, marked by a subject peasantry and dominant class of land lords in conditions of languishing trade and predominantly agrain economy. Thus it seems that the Indian experienced rot in urban centres mainly from Hūņas onward although this process of deurbanisation was
started even in Gupta period but we come to know from Yuan Chawang and archaeological sources that the process of urban rot is accelerated with the Hūṇa invasion of India. It archaeological sources is to be believed it appears that the deurbanisation in early India percepated feudalism.

Ancient Indian economy rested on irrigation farming from the oldest time. The *Rgveda* contains references to the well being used for watering the fields. The word *Avata* means a well, we come to know from the later vedic literature, Buddhist texts that water was poured into channel and set to different part of the field. The archaeological evedences tell us that a channel and dockyard with embankment walls, built out of burnt bricks uneathed at Lothal dated c 1500 BC to 1000 BC. In *Arthaśāstra* irrigation is discussed in detail and lays down that irrigation tax (*urḍh- bhāgha*) should be given to the state by the peasants. Manu states that the boundaries of the field should be ditermined by tanks, ponds, channels and other water reservoirs of water. He further lays down that the boundary should be determined by constant flows of water between two villvages. There was a small and shallow reservoir for water in the counrtyard of the apsidal temple at Sirkap, a 'Saka pārthian city
with building of the first century AD\textsuperscript{207} and later part of the same century was ascribed for the tank at Dharmarāji kaat Taxila.\textsuperscript{208} These tanks may have been used by monks and worshippers who paid visits to the sacred shrines of the Buddhists.

The Junagarh Rock Inscription of Rudradaman records how the Sudarsana lake was originally excavated by Chandragupta Maurya with the help of the Vaiśya Raṣṭriya, PuṣyaGupta and then improved by Aśoka’s governor Yavanarāja Tusaspa. Thus dam burst again during the rule of Rudradaman and was repaired under the Supervision of his governor, the Pārthian Savisakha.\textsuperscript{209} A tank was also caused to be dug at a village in Kaithiawad in 181 AD by Rudrabhuti, a general of Rudramishai.\textsuperscript{210} This shows the interest of the Mauryan and Śaka kings in irrigation, the construction of dam and canals. The same lake was rebuilt by Chakarapalita governor of Skandagupta.\textsuperscript{211} The Kuntalgani plates show Ravivaraman’s interest in irrigation as he caused a tank-bund to be made at Variyaka,\textsuperscript{212} and traces of two ancient tanks are found out at Tadikonda which are still used for irrigation a vast area in the locality.\textsuperscript{213} Now the point arise whether irrigation was state affair or private matter. R.S.Sharma argues that the \textit{Arthasastra} of Kautilya lays
down detailed rates to be paid by the peasants to the state for different kinds of irrigation, which makes it clear that irrigation facilities were chiefly provided by the state. He further argues that the position changed during Gupta period where irrigation became a local responsibility.\textsuperscript{214} Sharma refers \textit{Brhaspatiṃśrti} in support of his argument. But his statement does not seem to be correct. We come to know from the \textit{Arthaśāstra} that there were privately own irrigation tanks. There is for example, the rule that the ownership of a tank is lost if it is not used for five years by his owner of the tank was free to soil or mortgage his tank to others.\textsuperscript{215} At the time of new settlements, it is recommended that cooperative effort should be encourged to get new water work built, forcing members if necessary to contribute their share of labour and expenses.\textsuperscript{216} The irrigational works (Setubandhu) are the source of crops, the results of a good shower of rain are even attained in the case of crops below irrigational work.\textsuperscript{217} When a person break the dam or a tank full of water, he was to be drowned in the tank, and if a tank was without water, the owner of the tank was punished with highest amercemnt and if tank was is ruins owing to neglect of. Its owner he was punished with the middlemost amercement.\textsuperscript{218} Thus, in case of tank or well private ownership and right to
sell or mortgage the tank or well, show that during Mauryan time, irrigation was state as well as local responsibility even earlier than Gupta period.

The hereditary character of bureaucracy is an important adjunct of feudal system which further feudalised the administrative set up in early India. We come to know from the epigraphic sources that the post of Sachiva\textsuperscript{219} Mantrin and amātya\textsuperscript{209} were hereditary during Gupta period and same was the case with the post of military governor Bhaṭāraka (a general) belonging to the Maitraka clan was appointed military governor of Surāṣṭra. The post then went to the Dharasena I who was succeeded by his brother Dhonasimha who became very competent that "he had to be installed as Mahārāja by his suzerain." The consequences of such hereditary succession was that "after 467 AD there is no evidence the imperial Gupta had anything to do with Surāṣṭra or the Major part of Western Malwa.\textsuperscript{221} But R.S.Sharma has mentioned about hereditaryship in bureaucracy who enjoyed power for five generations, such as, the first was amātya the second amātya and bhogika, the third bhogika and the fourth and the fifth mahāsāndhivigrāhika, all belonged to the same family.\textsuperscript{222} But on the other hand he admits that the Arthāśāstra suggests that officials (amātyas)
and solders should be hereditary, he qualifies his point by asserting that we do not have any epigraphic evidence to support this. Thus, Sharma precludeds contemporary literature as an authentic sources. Our problem is that we cannot take archaeology as only source of ancient Indian history. If literary sources can be corroborated with other sources, this can be taken authentic. Kautilya’s Arthaśāstra which is considered to be one of the authentic literary source of the Mauryan period shows hereditary bureaucracy. It was very much present in Mauryan period. In such a system of hereditaryship, the merits hardly brought into account during selection, officials occupied their position by virtue of getting royal favour and were not handpicked, a sheer degeneration in administrative set up.

We find marked differences in the settlement pattern of Europe and India during prefudal age. European pre feudalistic society reflects the presence of large sized farms cultivated directly by its owners with the help of slave labourers, whereas in India the references to large sized holdings were very meagre. This conclusively testifies that the manorial system of Europe was literally non existence in India. Another glaring dissimilarity between Europe and India is that
unlike Europe the peasants and artisans were not attached to the soil and they were quite free lot barring a few occasion when they were supposed to discharge duty to the state. Thus the peasants were to work on the fields of their ownm, it may be because of the process of sub-infeudation was not as common as it was in Europe. Hence the real tillers maintained some sort of independence and was probably accountable to the state.

In Medieval Europe the land was granted to the feudal lords for services rendered to the state, but in India such practice categories of feudal lords in Middle Ages in Europe, who held land as vassals of their overlords. These lords did not cultivate their land by themselves, they had peasants to do it for them but in India peasants worked one or two days in a month on the field of landlords, or state. The peasants formed the lowest class in feudal Europe and also largest section of the population.

But some features may find identity with the European system. Foreign invasion played important role in shaping and reshaping the political set up in early India and with the passage of time a typical socio political system emerge to strengthen the feudal
tendencies in India. We notice that the grant of village to the priest can be compared to the practice of giving benefices to the church in Medieval Europe. Church as an organisation had actually become very strong in Europe. But this was not the case with India's priest, who could neither collect nor form an organisation for religious services because India was and has been a country of divergent religions. Thus, religion could hardly play such formidable role in India as it did actually in Europe. The āgrahāras or village granted to Brāhmaṇas bear some resemblance to manors, but there is no indication of hierarchical stage in feudal organisation in India as it was in Europe. Thus we cannot compare Indian feudal structure with European structure.
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