

Introduction

The name 'Bengal' does not appear at present, on the political or administrative map of the Indian sub-continent. But it denoted a politically united zone during the British period. In 1947 Bengal was divided into two parts - East Bengal merged with Pakistan and West Bengal included in India. The region has a substantial homogeneity linguistically and culturally. The territory of Bengal, now divided into West Bengal and Bangladesh, is an area where hydrography had been the main factor in determining the limits of geographical as well as administrative division in early and medieval periods. The periodisation of Bengal as well as India is very desirable, as it helps to make accurate sense by analysing the stages in its evolution. While it is not difficult to make broad divisions, the real problems arise when one looks for sharp dividing lines. History is a continuous process; therefore, it cannot be divided into water-tight compartments. Any given trend or institution has a long history before it finally emerges as a recognised form, and likewise it continues to live in some form even after its existence ceased to exist. In this way, one can only approximate fairly roughly the states and should not expect to find specific dates.

It is difficult to say when, why and how ancient history ended and the medieval period began in Indian History. There are several scholarly views on the starting point of the medieval period. The arrival of Muslims in India is generally marked as the end of the ancient period. V.A. Smith (1914) divides Ancient Indian history into three sub-periods: Ancient India (from the earliest times to c. 322 B.C.), Hindu India (c.c. 322 B.C.-647 A.D.) and Medieval Hindu Kingdoms or the Hindu period (c. A.D. 647-1200 or 1300).¹ A similar suggestion is made by C.V. Vaidya (1921) who speaks of three periods in the early history of India, Aryan (c. 4000 or 2000 B.C.-300 B.C.), Aryo-Buddhist or Buddhist (c. 300 B.C.-600 A.D.), and Hindu (c. A.D. 600-1200 or 1300).² The writings on ancient Indian history by renowned scholars like R.D. Banerjee(1924), R.S. Tripathi (1942),R.C. Majumdar(1943), and K.A. Nilakanta Sastri(1950) also carry the narrative up to

around 1200 A.D. However, this position is based on the British scheme of dividing Indian history into Hindu, Muslim and British rules.³ Following this, some scholars try to define the entire period of Indian history from the beginnings until the beginning of the Muslim rule in 1206 AD as ancient India. R.C. Majumdar has taken the beginning of the medieval ages in 1000 AD indicating arrival of Islam and its degenerate culture. He thus remarks, "The onslaught of Islam, accompanied by a marked decadence of culture and the disappearance of the creative spirit in art and literature, seems to mark A.D. 1000 as the beginning of the Medieval Age."⁴ K.M. Munshi (1955)⁵ regards A.D. 997 as an unfortunate year, with which ancient India ended and medieval India began. In that year Sultan Mahmud, son of Sabuktigin, occupied Ghazni. Mahmud's victory led to the ultimate establishment of Muslim rule over northern India. Afghanistan and Punjab were brought under Muslim authority thus paving the way for its rapid extension. But it was only the Mamluk Sultans of Delhi who strengthened and extended the Muslim rule in India. Until the establishment of Mamluk rule in India after a long span of two hundred years of Mahmud's invasion in India, the Muslims did not attempt an effective conquest of India to the east Punjab. Thus considering the establishment of Muslim rule as the beginning of the medieval period, the dividing line should be established between the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century.⁶ Ashok Kumar Majumdar fixes the end of the ancient period at a point towards the last of the 13th century and the beginning of 14th century.⁷ It is thus said that the early 13th century was the beginning of the medieval period which continued for a long time. Thus, ancient India is confused with Hindu India and medieval India with Muslim India. But this line of demarcation between the two is not fair anyway.

The idea that the beginning of the medieval ages in India started with the conquest of Muslim invasion is debatable. There are some realistic obstacles to that theory. If that idea is accepted freely, then the question that would arise is whether the medieval period would not have begun in India the arrival of Muslims did not happen. Also, if the establishment of Muslim rule is taken to

mark the beginning of medieval India, then Turkey, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan and Indonesia, will have to be permanently placed in the medieval period and Hindu Nepal in the ancient period. The purpose of this argument is to make the point that it is not correct to conflate at the beginning of the medieval period with the onset of Muslim rule in India.

Now naturally, the question arises about when and how the medieval period began in India? Needless to say, the issue is very controversial. However, recent historians believe that the medieval period began in India even before the advent of Muslim rule in 1206 AD. It is true that the establishment of the Muslim Turkish rule introduced significant changes in the social, economic and political organisation of the country. But most features such as the feudal state organisation, control of the landlords over production, proliferation of castes, regional identity in art, script and language, *pujā*, *bhakti*, *tīrtha* and *tantra*, which came to the fore in medieval times and continued later, can be traced back to the 6th and 7th centuries. More importantly, land assignments first appeared between the 4th and 7th centuries and became widely prevalent under the Turks and Mughals when they were called *iqta*, *jagir*, *mansab*, *madad-i-maash*, *milk*, *inam*, *lakharaj*, *nazrana*, etc.⁸ Older practices of giving *brāhmottara*, *devottara*, etc., were continued by the Muslim rulers. Further, the old commentarial tradition, which relied on scriptural authority as the main sources of knowledge, was pursued with vigour. The system of law introduced by the Muslims was fundamentally similar to that of the Hindus. Neither system made provision for legislation; only authorities and commentaries were quoted.⁹ It would then appear that between the fourth and the seventh centuries ancient Indian life was in a stage of fermentation and transformation. Momentous changes appeared in polity, society, economy, language, script, art and architecture, and in religion and intellectual life. Thus, Rapson takes the establishment of the Kuṣhāṇa dynasty to mark the dividing line between the ancient and the medieval periods.¹⁰ However, this suggestion ignores the fact that the Gupta period representing the classical period of ancient Indian culture, came after Kuṣhāṇa.

Sir John Marshall¹¹ and F.J. Richards¹² seem to have traced back to the rise of the Guptas as the dividing line between ancient and medieval India. This implies a misconception about the nature of the Gupta period, which was undoubtedly the age of the efflorescence and even some earlier trends. It does not, however, represent any significant transformation from the previous centuries. Some scholars regard the death of Harṣa as marking the change from the ancient to medieval times.¹³ V.A. Smith (1914) also takes the year 647 A.D. as marking an era in the history of India. He observes that there was a general decline in everything from about 647.¹⁴ However, recent research has rejected this view because of the misconception that Harṣa was the last emperor of Indian history, and after Harṣa's death, everything, including prosperity and religion, diminished. H.C. Ray (1931)¹⁵ has adopted 916 A.D. as a line of demarcation between two periods in the history of northern India, as it saw the beginning of the break-up of the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire, the last great empire of northern India. No doubt, no empire developed in northern India after this period which could compare with that of the Pratihāras, though we cannot ignore the imperial families of the Chāndellas, the Paramāras, the Chālukyas etc. Ray himself recognises 916 A.D. as a weak dividing line.¹⁶ According to N.R. Ray (1967),¹⁷ the early medieval period began around 7th century AD, and its characteristic features became prominent in the 8th century. He envisages three sub-periods within the medieval: I) 7th to 12th century II) 12th to the first quarter of the 16th century; and III) first quarter of the 16th to the end of the 18th century.

Judging from the Marxist point of view, most historians have tried to come to the conclusion that the socio-economic process of India has undergone many changes since the Gupta era and its, and from this time some medieval features have been observed. This new phase is what they call the Early Medieval Period.¹⁸ N.R. Ray (1967), B.D. Chattopadhyaya (1994) and R.S. Sharma (2001) are historians who upheld such views. R.S. Sharma gives a strong opinion of the post-Gupta era as being medieval. According to him, the beginning of the medieval period may be thought to have begun in India soon after the collapse of

the Gupta Empire or after its termination. He opines that the medieval characteristics of the transfer of land holders, the emergence of a feudal system, the shortage of coins, the diversion of urbanisation, were evident in India long before that of 750 A.D.¹⁹

L. Gopal (1965) fixes the early medieval period from 700 A.D. to 1200 A.D. which coincided with the establishment of the Muslim rule, and the medieval period proper or Late Medieval Period started with establishment of the Muslim rule. Thus the whole medieval period lasted until the establishment of British rule.²⁰ The period starting from 700 AD has been variously called as the post-Gupta period, late ancient period, pre-medieval period, later classical age and developing medieval period. In recent times the tendency is to take it as the early medieval period. Now the question is - what were the characteristic features of early medieval period and what changes occurred in the Early Medieval Period? It denotes a phase in the transition from ancient to medieval in Indian history. In many respects, the Early Medieval Meriod prepared the ground for the later period, which largely represented a continuation of the earlier one.²¹ The one fundamental difference between these two sub-periods is the presence of Muslims as rulers in the later period. This fact often led scholars to bracket Early Medieval Period with the Ancient Period.²²

The period represents both a chronological phase and a signifier of processes of change which correspond to the phase. It can be seen as a transition where changes occur in almost all institutions and fields of society, polity, culture as well as economy. In the political sphere, the continuation and acceleration of land grants can be attributed to the emergence of small landed estates, the fragmentation or decentralisation of political authority, and the emerging new trends of lord vassal relations. The most interesting phenomenon of this period was the modification of the *varṇa* system, and the proliferation of caste into hundreds of sub-castes and the rigidity of the system.²³ In the class context, there emerged two major classes, one was the landed aristocracy, and another was the large body of subjected peasants. In this phenomenon, the

declining status of former *vaiśyas* and rise of *sūdras* were further developments in medieval India. The most striking development was that the servile *sūdras* were transformed into farmers and indirectly to a large number of producers.²⁴ In the post-Gupta period the *sūdras* no longer appear mainly as slaves, artisans and agricultural labourers; they take the place of *vaiśyas* as cultivators. Hiuen Tsang clearly states that the *sūdras* were agriculturists.²⁵ Alberuni also notes the absence of any significant difference between the *vaiśhyas* and the *sūdras*. They lived in the same towns and villages and mixed freely in the same houses.²⁶ This change is also reflected in some medieval texts, which represent the *sūdras* as farmers and agriculturists.²⁷

Thus, it is widely recognised that the medieval period of India began before the beginning of Muslim rule in 1206 A.D. Thus, what was previously thought to be the beginning of the medieval period from 1206 A.D is no longer recognised. However, when the era began, or when it ended, has not yet been finalised. Indian political, economic, and social processes have undergone many changes since the end of the Gupta period. The influence of regionalism has become apparent in the politics of this period. No such mutual co-existence of political powers has been seen in the entire Indian sub-continent before. In most cases, these powerful forces were characterised by regionalism. There were also small petty groups under their suzerainty. They were particularly keen on securing independence in the face of weakening of power. Therefore the weakness of the central power is the political feature of this era. After all, regionalism has become a staple feature of that period. The impression of this regionalism is evident in literature, sculpture, architecture, and painting. Therefore, after the fall of the Guptas the next few centuries were certainly marked by the special feature of regionalism and its consequent fallouts.

A section of Indian historians believe that the origin and the development of feudalism was the main change which marked the beginning of Early Medieval India. B.N. Datta (1952) was the first to discuss the origin and development of feudalism.²⁸ Later D.D. Kosambi (1956) asserted that feudalism came to be

established in two ways.²⁹ Land grants and *agrahār* system were the first causes of its origin. The second cause seems to be the miserable condition of the peasantry. Taking advantage of their helplessness the well-off peasants purchased their lands and became landlords. But Kosambi did not elaborate his idea of feudalism. R.S. Sharma (1965), Lallanji Gopal (1965), B.N.S. Yadava (1973 & 1979), Devangana Desai (1974), Dasaratha Sharma (1975), N. Karashima (1976 & 1984), D.N. Jha (1979 & 1987), and T.V. Mahalingam (1987) have established it as a central issue in the history of Early Medieval India.³⁰ According to Sharma, feudalism originated between 300 and 600 AD, developed between 600 and 900 A.D. and its fully developed form is noticeable between 900 and 1200 AD.³¹ This feudalism of early medieval India had several salient features. In politics there was decentralisation, regional powers were following separate independent line of politics. A few small principalities and semi-independent feudal states came into being. The contemporary literatures mention the existence of *sāmantas* and *mahāsāmantas*. They were not fully independent but autonomous so far as internal administration was considered. These petty kings and feudal chiefs maintained courts, officials and departments for administration. The officials were granted land in lieu of cash salary. There were innumerable inter-mediaries in the land system. They mediated between the feudal lords and the peasants. The *agrahāra* system was responsible for the spread of feudalism both in the North and the South. The intermediaries took initiative for the extension of cultivation but they imposed illegal levies and forced labour on the peasantry. Indian historians have compared them with the lords and vassals of Europe. Lands under their control were called fiefs.

The other feature of the feudal age was the decrease in crafts production and decline in trade and commerce. There was no money economy, use of coins decreased. The cities and towns based on trade and industry gradually declined giving rise to self-sufficient village economy. In this period, industries, trade and commerce declined due to over emphasis on agriculture. The peasants became landless and transformed into serfs. As a result agricultural production decreased

and closed economy emerged. Due to the shortage of agricultural production, there was no surplus production. Therefore, there was no need to transact the products to other areas. Thus, the commercial transactions were stopped and heavily disrupted. Naturally trade and commerce disappeared from the economic scenario of India affecting trade and urban centres and also the coinage. The scholars describe such situation of North India as feudalism. On the basis of that view it is also a notion that trade and commerce also declined in Bengal along with North India. In the villages, the *jajmāni* system came into being.³² Blacksmith, potter, leather worker, and barber supplied commodities and services throughout the year. At the time of harvest these social groups got a share of the produce. In the feudal system of production the peasants were oppressed and exploited. They became *baddha halla* and *āśhrita hālik* (bonded peasant). They had no freedom, the rate of taxes was high and in addition they had to pay forced labour. Sharma tells us that through feudalism the early historical period entered into the Early Medieval Period.³³

But others such as D.C. Sircar (1966), B.D. Chattopadhyaya (1974 & 1987), Harbans Mukhia (1981), and Ranabir Chakrabarty (2001 & 2002) have not accepted this interpretation. Harbans Mukhia vehemently opposed it. In his view, Indian peasants retained their control over the means of production and produced from the land.³⁴ The landlords had failed to establish absolute control over the land. In the European system, contract was the pivot which was absent in the Indian system. B.D. Chattopadhyaya has shown that in the early medieval period there were several living cities and towns all over the country.³⁵ The handicrafts production system was not destroyed. It produced consumer goods like textiles, silk, oil and sugar. *Haṭṭa*, *haṭṭika*, *maṇḍapikā*, and *nagaram* were spread all over the country.³⁶ There was well-organised transport and communication system. Internal trade was vibrant and brisk. R. Champaklakshmi has argued that the economic life was very much active.³⁷ Foreign trade with western Asia and south-east Asian countries was continuing. Indian merchants traded in the Indian Ocean countries.³⁸ Coins were not as rare as Sharma would

have us believe. B.N. Mukherjee has shown that Bengal had plenty of silver coins. Coins such as *purāṇa*, *dharaṇa*, *kārshāpaṇa* and *dramma* were used in transactions.³⁹ Thus, the theory of feudalism in Early Medieval India is still a debatable proposition. Though a good hypothesis, it is not yet universally accepted.

B.D. Chattopadhyaya has shown that during the Early Medieval Period India saw the rise and development of the regional state and society.⁴⁰ Burton Stein has called them segmentary state.⁴¹ These states were regional, local and free from the control of any imperial power. Chattopadhyaya asserts that this was the age of an increasing scale of local state formation. Several new states came into being. From the seventh century onwards this process of state formation was a historical fact. Nobody can deny it. Between 7th and 10th centuries the Pratihāras in the north and west, the Pālas in the East and the Rāshtrakutas in the Deccan laid the foundations of powerful regional states. Monarchy was the norm of polity; no republics existed in this age. The process of state formation was equally active in Rajasthan. The Ahar branch of the Guhilas set up the Mewar state.⁴² The tribal people turned peasants and formed the basis of new states. Land grants and irrigation system were other factors that facilitated the state formation. In Orissa Coḍa Gaṅga Kings set up a state in the 11th century.⁴³ The Pallavas, Cholas and Pāṇḍyas set up separate states in the south on the basis of extension of cultivation and irrigation system. They had separate identities and systems of administration and culture.

On the basis of the views of the historians, there is an attempt in each chapter of this work to highlight the existence of flourished economy, commercial transactions, trade and urban centres, trade routes, coinage system. In the first chapter, I try to highlight the transformation of geography of Bengal from ancient to medieval period. There is also a discussion on political history delineating the rise and fall of political powers. In any country the geo-political cause always played important role for its economic prosperity. The Gaṅgā-Jamunā-Padmā-Meghnā-Karotoyā and its numerous tributaries make the region

on one hand prosperous, and on the other hand balanced political condition pave the way for economic development.

In the second chapter, I discuss the society and economy in Bengal since ancient times. The caste based society, position of women and other daily activities have taken place here. In the economic side, the agricultural products and industrial items are discussed here.

In the third chapter, crafts and industries are discussed. The fertility of Bengal encouraged surplus production leading to the growth of crafts and industries. The aesthetic sense of people also is revealed from this chapter. The industries of textile, sugar, oil, pottery, stone, brick, metal, wood, bamboo, ship, leather, ivory, glass and terracotta are in this category. This obviously implies the existence of a flourished economy.

In the fourth chapter, circumstances leading to trade and commerce are highlighted. From the beginning, commercial transaction developed in local areas such as *haṭṭa*, *haṭṭikas*, are given here. The littoral tract of Bengal mainly played a leading role in the growth of Bengal trade and commerce. It was vibrant and spread over a large area in South-east Bengal which is proven from the epigraphic and literary sources. The interior part of the region supplied the surplus production and it was carried through the different rivers and its tributaries to the trade centres and ports and then it was traded to different countries through land and sea routes.

In the fifth chapter, the trade centres and routes which formed the backbone of trade and commerce are discussed. In the work, there is a discussion on rise and fall of the trade centres. In this respect, Tāmralipta and Samandar have been given a special importance. The trade centres connected with the interior part of the region mainly collected the surplus production from the producers and sent it to the deficit areas. The land as well as rivers was well connected with area situated far away. On the other hand the overseas routes were also used to transit the products to different countries.

The seventh chapter provides a summarisation of the whole work. Here we refute partially the concept of feudalism affecting sound economy existing in littoral tract of Bengal. In the discussion, it tries to prove the fact that though there existed of the feudalistic features in North Indian Economy; Bengal maintained a distinctive character in economy based trade and commerce.

Thereafter, in the Appendix is discussed the role of the State in the development of agriculture, trade and commerce. Here the initiative of the state for improving the economy has been highlighted. In this respect, the role of guild, its rise, transformation, functions and relation with state has also been highlighted. The means of exchange intimately connected with trade and commerce also has been given special importance. Since, there was trade and commerce in ancient time, it can be assumed that there were surely means of exchange. This chapter, therefore, consists of a study of different types of coins used in ancient times up to the concerned period of study.

¹ Smith, V.A., *Early History of India*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914, p. 358.

² Vaidya, C.V., *History of Medieval Hindu India*, Vol. I, Poona, 1921, Preface, p. 1.

³ There is no doubt that this division was based on religious grounds and the diffusion of sectarianism. There has not been much radical change in the course of history in later studies. Only the ancient times with Hindu India, the medieval ages with Muslim India and the modern age equations with British India were introduced. Mill, James, *The History of British India*, Vol. I, London: Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1817, pp. 91-105.

⁴ Majumdar, R.C., (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. The Vedic Age*, Vol. I, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1951, p. 24.

⁵ Munshi, K.M., *The History and Culture of the Indian People. Vol. IV: The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan .1955, Foreword, pp. VI, XXIII.

⁶ Ghosal, U.N., *Studies in Indian History and Culture*, Calcutta: Orient Longmans, 1944, p. 252ff.

⁷ Majumdar, Ashok Kumar, *Concise History of Ancient India*, Vol. I, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, p. 514.

⁸ Sharma, R.S., *Early Medieval Indian Society: A Study in Feudalisation*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, 2001, p. 43.

⁹ Lingat, Robert, *The Classical Law of India*, tr. And with additions by J. Duncan M. Derrett, California: University of California, 1973, pp. 289-60.

-
- ¹⁰ Rapson, E.J., *Ancient India: From the Earliest Times to the First Century A.D.*, Cambridge: University Press, 1914, p. 147.
- ¹¹ Marshall, Sir. J.H., *A Guide to Sanchi, Calcutta*, Government Printing, 1918, p. 7.
- ¹² Richards, F.J., 'Periods in Indian History', *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. LIX, 1930, p. 33, 61, 84.
- ¹³ Prasad, Iswari, *History of Medieval India*, Allahabad, The Indian Press, 1925, Preface, p. e.
- ¹⁴ Smith, V.A., *op.cit.*, p- 358.
- ¹⁵ Ray, H.C., *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, pp. XXXVIII-XXXIX.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷ This medieval age was marked by the rise of regional states. Their genesis is considered comparable to the emergence of European nation-states. The character of the economy changed from a money-economy to natural economy. Exchange and use of money decreased. Script, language, literature, means of social communications, became regional. Europe also witnessed similar changes. In the field of religion, numerous cults and sub-cults appeared. Art also assumed regional character. Eastern India, Orissa, Central India, Western India and Central Deccan had regional art style. The Cholas and Pallavas had their distinctive art styles. Ray mentioned the feudal process but did not elaborate or give details. Ray, N.R., 'The Medieval Factor in Indian History', *General President's Address*, Indian History Congress, 29th Session, 1967, pp. 1-29.
- ¹⁸ Chattopadhyaya, B.D., *The Making of Early Medieval India*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 5-13.
- ¹⁹ Sharma, R.S., *op.cit.*, pp-16-44; *Light on Early Indian Society and Economy*, Bombay, 1966, p. 52-89.
- ²⁰ Gopal, Lallanji, *The Economic Life of Northern India, c. A.D. 700-1200*, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1965, p. 229.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² We feel that the period roughly from A.D. 700 to 1200 has more affinities with the subsequent centuries than with the preceding ones. There is of course the glaring difference that after 1200 Muslims were the politically dominant class. But even when viewed in the light of the question of the establishment of Muslim rule, the period between 700 and 1200s can be regarded as the necessary prelude to subsequent times. The successful penetration of Muslim arms in India was a gradual process spread over many years. The beginning of the Early Medieval Period roughly synchronises with the first success achieved by the Muslims on Indian soil. The Arab conquered Sind in 711-712. The Early Medieval Period witnessed the persistent effort of Muslims to conquer India and the success achieved in 1206 could not have

-
- been possible without the conquests of Sabuktigin, his son Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni and Sultan Muhammad of Ghor. Thus the story of the establishment of Muslim power has to be traced back to 712; it does not begin abruptly in the year 1206. *Ibid.* pp. 229-30.
- ²³ Niyogi, Puspa, *Brāhmanic Settlement in Different sub-division of Bengal*, Kolkata, 1967, p-55; Jha, V., 'Varṇasamkara in the Dharmasūtras: Theory and Practice', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 13, pt. 3, 1970, pp. 273-288.
- ²⁴ Sharma, R.S., *Early Medieval Indian Society: A Study in Feudalisation*, p. 197.
- ²⁵ Watters, T., *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India 629-645 A.D.*, Vol. I, London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1904, p. 168.
- ²⁶ Sachau, Edward. C., (tr.), *Alberuni's India*, Vol. I, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1910, p.101.
- ²⁷ *Skanda Purāṇa, Nagara Khaṇḍa*, VI. 242. 31; *Abhidhanacintāmani*, III, 554.
- ²⁸ Datta, B.N., *Dialectics of Land Economics in India*, Calcutta, 1952.
- ²⁹ Kosambi, D.D., *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay, 1956, Chs- IX and X; 'Early Stages of Caste System in Northern India', *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XXII, 1946, pp. 33-48; 'The Basis of Ancient Indian History', *Journal of American Oriental Society*, Vol. IXXV, 1955; *Journal of American Oriental Society*; 'On the Development of Feudalism in India', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institution*, Vol. 36, 1956, pt. 3-4,.
- ³⁰ Sharma, R.S., *Early Medieval Indian Society: A Study in Feudalisation*, and *Economic History of Early India*, New Delhi, Viva Books, 2011 and *Indian Feudalism*, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1965 ; Gopal, Lallanji, *op.cit*, 1965; Yadava, B.N.S., 'The Accounts of the Kali Age and the Social Transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages', *The Indian Historical Review*, Vol. 5, Nos. 1-2, 1979, pp. 31-64 and *Society and Culture in Northern India in the 12th Century*, Allahabad, 1973; Desai, Devangana, 'Art under Feudalism in India : c. AD 500-1300', *The Indian Historical Review*, Vol. I, 1974, pp. 10-17 ; Sharma, Dasaratha, *Early Chauhān Dynasties*, 2nd Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975; Karashima, N., 'Nāyakas Lease-holders of Temple Lands', *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol.19, pt. II, 1976, pp. 227-232 and *South India History and Society: Studies from Inscription, AD 850-1800*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984; Jha, D.N., 'Early Indian Feudalism: A Historiographical Critique', *Presidential Address, Ancient Indian Section, Indian History Congress, 40th Session*, Waltair, 1979 and (ed.), *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987; Mahalingam, T.V., 'Genesis and Nature of Feudalism under the Pallavas of Kāñchi', in S.K. Maity and U. Thakur, eds. *Indological Studies, Prof. D.C. Sircar Commemoration Volume*, New Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1987, pp. 89-96.

-
- ³¹ Sharma, R.S., *Indian Feudalism c. AD 300-1200*, Calcutta, University of Calcutta, 1965, p. 101
- ³² Chattopadhyaya, B. D., *op.cit*, p. 11.
- ³³ Sharma, R.S., *op.cit*, pp. 16-44.
- ³⁴ Mukhia, H., 'Was There Feudalism in Indian History?', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 8, No-3, 1981, pp. 273-310.
- ³⁵ Chattopadhyay, B.D., *op.cit*, pp. 130-182.
- ³⁶ Kielhorn, F., 'Khālimpur plate of Dharmapāladeva', *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IV, 1896, p. 243ff; Basak, R.G., 'The Five Dāmodarpur Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Gupta Period', *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XV, 1919, p. 113-145.
- ³⁷ Champakalakshmi, R., *Trade, Ideology and Urbanisation: South India 300 BC to AD 1300*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 175-202.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ³⁹ *Supra*, p. 449.
- ⁴⁰ Chattopadhyaya, B.D, *op.cit*, p. 21.
- ⁴¹ Stein, Burton, *Peasant, State and Society in Medieval South India*, Delhi, 1980, p. 42-55.
- ⁴² Sinha, Nandini, 'The Guhila Lineages and the Emergence of State in Early Medieval Mewar', *unpublished M. Phil dissertation*, Centre for Historical Studies, JNU, New Delhi, 1988.
- ⁴³ Singh, Upinder, *Kings, Brāhmaṇas and Temples in Orissa: An Epigraphic Study AD 300-1147*, Delhi, 1994, pp. 38-47.