

King Naranarayan's power consolidation and state formation:

Biswa Singha had nominally founded the Koch kingdom in the lower Brahmaputra valley of sub Himalayan region comprising the present districts of Kamrupa, Goalpara, part of Nowgong of Assam, Koch Behar and Jalpaiguri (part) districts of present west Bengal and Rangpur district (except Ghoraghat) of Bangladesh. This nominal state had been transformed into a well organized 'formal sovereign kingdom' with the beginning of the reign of his illustrious second son and successor Naranarayan alias *Malladeva*. With his brother-cum-general Sukladhvaja alias Chilarai, he not only established a sovereign kingdom but also extended the Koch hegemony all over the whole north-east India. The importance of his reign in political affairs and socio-economic-cultural transformation process in the northeast India largely depended on the exploration and all-round construction of king Naranarayan. Instead of his father's guerrilla warfare policy and trick tactic, he started a policy aggressive warfare policy to fulfill his ambitions of being the ruler of northeast India at beginning of his reign and in later part, he followed defensive policy to stabilize the kingdom. He stuck coins in his own name, which was the main medium of exchange almost all over of northeast.

Date of Naranarayan:

The DRV, the main genealogical text of the Koches is completely silent on the dates of the different incidents of the dynasty including the birth of the Kings and their dates of their accession to the throne of the dynasty, although it recorded the genealogical order of the kings. However, other literary sources thrown indirect light on different dates of different events and depending on these sources, some modern scholars fixed different dates of different events. In this connection, it would be better and easier to start from Biswa Singh as he was the nominal founder of the dynasty and considered as the first king of the dynasty. If the dates of Biswa Singh's

becoming king and his death can be identified, than it will be easier to fix the date of Naranarayan's accession to the throne of Koch kingdom, he became king immediately after the death of his father and a short conflict his elder brother Nara Singha.

According to *Rajopakhyan*, Biswa Singha became king in the year 1510¹ AD and ruled 25 years upto 1534-35 AD². According to Khan Chaudhary A.A, the reign of Biswa Singha ended in about 1533-34 AD, which is very close to the former view³. Therefore, according to these opinions, Naranarayan ascended the in between 1533 to 1535 AD. According to some modern scholars, king Naranarayan had issued coins at his coronation in 1555 AD, as all coins of king Naranarayan, so far discovered bear only frozen date 1555AD and tried to identify the date as the date accession to the throne as well as coronation of Naranarayan⁴. However, other contemporary sources and happenings did not support both these views. According to the Ahom Buranji⁵, Biswa Singha made a treaty with the Ahom king Suhungmung Dihingia Raja (1497-1539) in 1537AD, which led to the conclusion that Biswa Singha died after 1537AD. In the same way, according to some other Buranjies⁶ King Naranarayan led his first campaign against the Ahom in 1546AD and according to the *Katha-Guru-Charita*⁷, Sankaradeva the Neo-Vaisnavite saint, settled in the territory of king Naranarayan in about 1546AD, and started his 2nd pilgrimage from there in about 1550AD. Under this situation, it seems to us that the date of accession of King Naranarayan to the throne of Koch Behar and date of his coronation, (when he issued coins) might be different dates. The Mauryan king Asoka, who ascended the throne in about 273 BC and coronation happened in about 269 BC, after four years of his ascension. It might have happened to king Naranarayan too. Thus, it might be the fact that king Naranarayan's coronation happened in 1555AD with minting of coins but he ascended the throne of the Koch kingdom long before of that date. He might have ascended the throne of the Koch kingdom even before 1546AD. Because, another Buranji named '*Sri Sri Svarganarayandeva Maharajar Janmcharita*' recorded that in the 1543AD (Saka 1465), Dip Singh, Hemadhara and Ram Singh, the three brothers of Naranarayan were at Sala with three thousand men to guard the eastern frontier of the kingdom⁸. In the Buranji, the use of the term 'brothers of Naranarayan' instead of 'Sons of Biswa Singha' indirectly indicated that Naranarayan was the Koch king at that time. Biswa Singha, his father died after

1537AD as we mentioned earlier. Thus, it is cleared that Naranarayan ascended the throne after 1537AD and before 1543AD. Considering this situation, modern scholars fixed the date of the accession of Naranarayan to the throne of the Koch kingdom 1540AD and ruled the kingdom, a period of nearly 50 years upto 1587AD⁹, which is most probably acceptable.

Although Biswa Singha selected his second son Naranarayan as his successor previously by drawing a lottery, yet Naranarayan had to fight for the throne¹⁰. At the time of Biswa Singha's death, Naranarayan and Sukladhvaja were at Benaras prosecuting their educations there under a learned Brahmin Brahmananda. In their absence, Nara Singha the elder son of Biswa Singha ascended the throne of the Koch kingdom with the support of some courtiers. However, he could not hold his position for a long time. On receiving the news of political situations in the capital, both the brothers rushed to the capital, raised an army and defeated Nara Singha, who then fled to the Morung country, the eastern part of Nepal along with his family¹¹. Due to Matrimonial relations between Biswa Singha and Nepal (Morung country)¹², Nara Singha got shelter in Morung (Nepal). However, Naranarayan and Sukladhvaja defeated Morung king and Nara Singha again fled from Nepal to Kashmir and eventually came back in Bhutan and established his control in a territory of lower Bhutan as per instruction of his father Biswa Singha¹³. After the incident, Naranarayan ascended the throne amidst pomp and grandeur in 1540 AD, and declared himself as the king Naranarayan and Sukladhvaja was appointed as general of the Koch army named him as *Sangram singha*¹⁴. King Naranarayan introduced a '*Chap*' (seal), known as '*Singha-Chap*' on this occasion with his name 'Sri Sri Naranarayan' inscribed on one side and an image of lion on the side thereon¹⁵, and stuck coins named '*Narayani Tanka*¹⁶.

He took aggressive warfare policy for the establishment of fully sovereign Koch kingdom and its expansion in the beginning of the 4th decade of the 16th century and followed this policy upto the end of 6th decade of the century and there after, he took the policy of defensive warfare policy, considering whole situation. Simultaneously, he institutionalized his leadership, centralized the administration and consolidated the

Koch power on permanent basis, and he took steps for the development of various intra-human aspects that will be discussed in the succeeding chapters.

The external policy of King Naranarayan would be discussed under two main heads; **A)** the period of aggressive warfare policy for expansion of the kingdom (1540-1568 AD) and **B)** the period of defensive warfare policy (1568-1587AD) to stabilize his position.

A) The period of aggressive warfare (1540-1568 AD):

During this period, King Naranarayan followed the aggressive warfare policy for the expansion of his kingdom towards north-east which started with the Koch-Ahom relations and ended with his war with Sulaiman Karrani of Bengal in about 1568AD. The wars and happenings of this period can be elaborately explained in the following ways;

The Koch- Ahom relations and wars 1540-1568:

The Koch-Ahom relations during the period up to the 1568 would be discussed under three main heads in the following ways:

First phase: Koch- Ahom hostilities on the Koch Sovereignty (1540- 1549):

After his accession to the throne of Koch kingdom, king Naranarayan in 1540 came into a long conflict with his contemporary Ahom ruler, Suklenmung or Godegaunraja (1539-52). Biswa Singha could not reconcile himself to his subordination and advice his sons at deathbed to remove the slur of Ahom over lordship¹⁷. It was due to his political ambition on one hand and on the other hand, his father's advice at deathbed. Naranarayan therefore, immediately after his accession to the throne took steps for a show down against the Ahoms¹⁸. In spite of that, it appears from varied accounts that the offensive was taken by the Ahom king Suklenmung or Godegaunraja, who in 1543 attacked and drove away Koch soldiers stationed at Sala, guarding the eastern border outposts of the kingdom on the south bank of the Brahmaputra¹⁹. Three brothers of king Naranarayan, Deep Simgha, Hemadhar and Ram Chandra, who along with their families and 3000 soldiers on a pilgrimage to Brahmakunda, had reached Sala by this time and on hearing the

incident, wanted to take revenge on the Ahoms. On the ground of, they captured a boat with five boatmen belonging to the Bar- Sandikai, an Ahom officer on the Sala River due to their encroachment of the boundary and carried on illegal trade²⁰. As a result, Ahom Bar- Sandikai and Deka Raja attacked the Koch garrison stationed there. But they themselves, were defeated and compelled to make a retreat and Bar- Sandikai was seriously injured by Hemadhar. Many Ahom soldiers were killed and their heads were piled up at Bhomoramukh²¹. With this initial success in 1546 and its victorious spirits, the Koch army advanced farther east and reached as far as Changinimukh on the south bank of the river Brahmaputra. No proper arrangements were made and as a result, they were defeated. Three brothers of Naranarayan were fallen in the field and wife of deep Simgha was taken a prisoner. The Ahoms captured 14 elephants and were able to spread wide panic in Koch camp, for which some Koch soldiers of the camp, fled to forests while many were killed²². After this incident, Koches alerted and became serious about their Ahom policy. Up to this period, they were engaged skirmishes with the Ahoms. But, with the loss of three brothers, Naranarayan became angry and get ready to sent an all-round expedition against the Ahoms.

In course of expedition, three battles were fought. The first battle held on the north bank of the Brahmaputra at the mouth of the Dikarai River in Darrang district. The Ahom army was under the command of Thaomung Banglung, Thaopim and others officers. The Ahom army crossed the river and attacked the Koches but failed and a number of soldiers including Thaomung Banglung and some other important officials were killed, and others were forced to retreat at a place called Karanga and then to Kaliabar²³. The second and the third battles were fought on the south bank of the Brahmaputra at Kaliabar and Sala respectively. The Ahoms army suffered a crushing defeat at Kaliabar in the hands of the Koches, who had pursued them and forced them to retreat farther to Sala. The victorious Koch army followed them and again defeated them at Sala with heavy losses. But within a short time, the Ahoms organised their elephantry, and engaged famous generals and as a result, they inflicted a serious defeat on the Koch army, who then retreated through the Brahmaputra up to Narayanpur (in the district of Laksmipur) and constructed a fort on the north bank of the river there²⁴. The Ahoms also constructed forts at Pichala, on

the south bank of the Brahmaputra and stationed army for future hostilities with the Koches²⁵.

In the year 1547, the Koches again advanced up to Narayanpur fort, from where they attacked Pichala fort of the Ahoms on the opposite bank of the Pichala River. But they were seriously defeated by Ahom king Suklenmung's brother with huge losses in cash and kind²⁶. It is said in the Burunjis²⁷, that more than 5000 Koch soldiers were killed; their heads were piled and cremated at Mathadang, a place in the Sibsagar district²⁸. By the year 1549 AD, Koch army was completely washed out from the east²⁹.

Second phase: Diplomatic War and Peace Proposals of Naranarayan to the Ahoms (1555-56):

It is clear from last paragraph that, in spite of many skirmishes and wars with the Ahom, there is no evidence of peace discussion and communication between them and meanwhile, the new king Svargadeo Sukhampha alias Khora Raja (1552-1603) ascended the throne of the Ahoms. In this situation, Naranarayan before taking up aggressive policy again, decided to send a diplomatic peace mission to the Ahoms court in Saka 1477 (1555 AD.). The idea was to collect information about the Ahom attitude towards the Koches. The mission included ambassadors like Satananda Karji, Ramesvara Sarma, Kalaketu Sardar, Dhuma Sardar, Udbhanda Chaonia and Syamray Chaonia with other 22 Dhekari kings³⁰.

The Mission reached the Ahom capital 'Godegaun' and presented the gifts and a letter sent by king Naranarayan for the Ahom king Sukhampha. The letter contained the following message:

"Let there be auspiciousness to Maharaja Sri Sri Svarganarayan of great prowess, whose virtues are sung by nymphs in all the universe, who is an ocean of learning, of fortitude and glory; whose pure body is sanctified by the waters of the heavenly river of gods; whose fame is spotless like snow, the necklace of Siva, laughter Kasa and Kailasa and which fame is spread by wind fanned by the ears of all Dik elephants... So be it written, I am well and I always wish your welfare. The seed of good feeling between us will germinate if pleasing letters be now exchanged between us, and under our efforts friendship will blossom and bear fruit. I am prepared to do my part and you should do yours. There is nothing more to write. You

know the result if you do not do so. I am sending Satananda Karji ... Hear all news from them and send them back without delay. Further, these things have been sent with the Ukil... The Month of Asar Saka 1477"³¹.

The gifts includes : two ghuris (petticoats), one pillow, one bow , one pair of cheng fish , one Jakoia (fishing implement made of bamboos), five pieces of Saris , one piece of Gomcheng , (Chinese silk), five chits (a kind of cloth), Twenty pieces of black and ten pieces of white Chowries (hides) and ten pieces of Ghagaris (wearing apparel)³². Aikhek Buragohain received the Mission. Ambassadors of the mission reminded him; "friendly relationship subsisting between Assam and Behar from the time when, during the reign of the father of the present king, such relationship had been established in presence of the ruler of Gauda" They remonstrated to the Ahom king that their three princes had been killed in unfair fighting³³. Aikhek Bura Gohain replied in this way:

"Where have you seen friendship subsisting between Kshatriyas? Lips are beaten by the teeth. Should we, therefore, cause an infringement of the old bonds of friendship? Everything will be accomplished if he is intent on continuing friendly relations with the Svargadeo"³⁴. About the gifts, Buragohain said that 'they were quite ordinary and unfit for exhibiting in a royal court' and in some way 'insulting'³⁵.

The letter, the gifts and approach of the ambassadors seems to be quite polite except the sentence "You know the result if you do not do so", which convey some sort of threat. The gifts were seems to Koch culture oriented. However, Aikhek Buragohain on behalf of the king showed his dissatisfaction about the language of the letter, about the gifts and his aggressive and insulting attitudes during his conversation with the ambassadors of the Koch Mission. He also wrote an unfriendly letter, full of insinuations and humiliating comments to the Koch court through two Brahmin Kakatis (messengers) Sri Chandivar Sarma and Sri Damodar Sarma. The letter contained the following message:

"Let there be auspiciousness to king Sree Mallanarayan of generous character who shines as the sun causing the lotus of his family to unfold its petals , whose fame is white as the waves of the river of snow , who is the ocean of honour , gifts , prowess, fortitude , gravity and generosity , who is like a bee drinking the honey from the golden leaves of the feet of the destroyer of Tripura (Mahadeva).

This is written – All is well here. I am greatly delighted to learn of your welfare. You have written that the tree of good feeling will grow and blossom and bear fruit to our delight, but you know the basis of our amity. If that remains, the tree may blossom and bear fruit. I am as before.

However, the things, which you have sent through your Ukil, are not fit to be shown in a (royal) court. Such things would (naturally) appear proper to those who are accustomed to them. You yourself best understand what you meant by sending these things by messengers.....These presents are sent for you , -two pieces of Nara cloth , four elephant tusks , two ganthian (fragrant roots of a tree)10th Ahar Saka 1478³⁶

On reading the report of his ambassadors and contents of the letter of the Ahoms, King Narayanarayan realized the mentality and the attitude of the Ahom court. He also realized the fact that his peace mission has failed and the Ahoms were not ready to accept the Koch sovereignty over the lower Brahmaputra valley. In this situation, king Narayanarayan started thinking of alternative way and that of aggressive wars against the Ahoms and asked his brothers to prepare for war. From his previous experiences, he also realized the problems and difficulties faced during wars. For which he thought well-planned war preparation on long-term basis.

Third Phase: the period of war preparation, reprisal and Koch Victory over the Ahoms 1561-68 AD:

During the war preparations, King Narayanarayan remembered points in his mind from previous experiences. These were the problems of transportation and obtaining of support from local tribes and petty local rulers. His father Biswa Singha was forced to retreat during his war with the Ahoms in 1537 due to the problems of food supply and transport ³⁷, and he himself faced these types of problems during the wars in 1546-47 with the Ahoms. First, to solve the problem of transport, he engaged one of his younger brothers Gohai Kamal to construct a road for the easy passage of troops, ammunitions³⁸. And accordingly , he build a 350 km long connecting road from Koch Behar to Narayanpur in the present Lakhimpur district³⁹, through the Koch-Bhutan border on the north bank of Brahmaputra in 1561 AD⁴⁰. The road is

also known as 'Gohai Kamal Aali' (road) as it was constructed under the supervision of Gohai Kamal and the parts of this road are still known by this name. He also excavated many tanks by the side of the road at equal distances to remove water scarcity. Secondly, to obtain support from local tribes and pretty rulers through out the road, followed moderate and friendly policy that would be discussed later.

After the completion of construction of the road in about 1561, Sukladvaja as Commander-in-Chief of the Koch army, set out against the Ahom with a force of sixty thousands⁴¹ men through the new road and reached Narayanpur. King Naranarayan himself with his consort Bhanumati also joined the expedition. Meanwhile, on their way of the expedition, King Naranarayan halted at a place on the bank of the river Sankosh, organized all the Mech-Kachari people of the Mongoloid origin, and obtained their support by arranging a dance party⁴². The Bhutiyas, the Daflas and some local Bhuyans of the locality offered their submission to king Naranarayan and joined the Koch army⁴³. Naranarayan established a Durga temple at Chandikabehar in the present Mongaldoi subdivision near Bhairavkunda (during his halt at the place) for cultural assimilation of tribal and Brahmanic rites and appointed a Kachari priest for the worshipping the goddess Durga. He also introduced a cultural code for the people of the tribal origin, and Brahmanical fold, according which the Mech, the Kachari and the Koches of tribal fold to the north of the Gohai Kamal Aali will follow their tribal customs to worship and the southern territory of the road as far the Brahmaputra will follow Brahmanic customs to worship⁴⁴. From their halt at Chandikabehar, the Koches advanced to the next halt at Singri, and then reached the river Bharali. All the Vansavalis of the Darrung line stated that the Koch Commander-in-Chief Sukladvaja crossed the Bharali River by jumping over it on his horseback and attained the nickname 'Chilarai'⁴⁵. At this time the descendants of the dethrone Chutiya line, came and prayed for protection to king Naranarayan against the Ahoms. The king considered their prayer with great sympathy and gave them land in a village named Basnbari in the Present Darrung district and they became a great ally of the king⁴⁶. According to one Buranji ⁴⁷, some Brahmin Bhuyans of Narayanpur also offered their support and one of them gave an elephant to king Naranarayan and joined his forces. From Singri, the Koch army finally reached Narayanpur and used it as their base camp. It should be mentioned here that the Koch forces through out

their journey to Narayanpur proceed in two divisions .The naval division of eight thousands men, proceeded under the command of Bhaktamala and Tepu through the Brahmaputra and the infantry division of fifty two thousands men, under the command of Bhimbal and Bahubal proceeded through the '*Gohai Kamal Aali*'⁴⁸ . Both the divisions met at Narayanpur and prepared for attack.

In this way, Naranarayan obtained wholehearted support of the people of all castes and communities of the territory extending up to Narayanpur on the both sides of the road. He not only obtained their support but also they joined with the Koch army and made it multi-caste and multi-lingual force. It is cleared from above discussion that all these acts were guided by his diplomatic knowledge, which helped him to make strong back ground for direct war against the Ahoms.

From their base at Narayanpur , the Koch forces had been waiting for some time ,and in the year 1562 , the naval forces under the command Bhaktamal and Tepu sailed up the Brahmaputra and reached Sala and then to Marangi without any opposition from the Ahom side⁴⁹ . By conquering the adjoining territories, the navy further proceeded up to the mouth of the Dikhu River and constructed a fort there⁵⁰ . This time the Ahoms took offensive and their naval force, under the command of Charingia Raja advanced to fight the Koches through the Dikhu. The king himself with Aikhek Buragohain and Tipariya Raja were waiting on the bank of the Sisa and ultimately a devastating naval war was fought on the mouth of the Hariya, in which the Ahoms were defeated , and some generals were killed one was taken prisoner⁵¹ . On the land, Chilarai advanced to the mouth of Dikhu and, encamping there plundered the Morangi territory. To stop Chilarai, the Ahoms also build up a fort on the other bank of the river and have stationed at the mouth of the Sisa river⁵² . But the Ahoms realized the invincibility of Chilarai's army and the weakness of them and they devised a treacherous way to defeat the Koch general Chilarai. According to some Burunjis, the Ahom king Sukhampha sent some Sudras / soldiers disguised as Brahmins with their sacred threads raised on their ears and their sacred marks making prominent on their foreheads and seated on cows and placed them at the front line of his forces⁵³ . Seeing this and considering them as 'real Brahmins', Chilarai ordered his soldiers to withdraw from the war field, in the fear of the consequence of killing Brahmins and cows⁵⁴ .

Meanwhile, the Ahoms started evaluating the whole course of the war and their defeat at the hands of the Koches, at the battles of Sala, Marangi and on the Handia River. They identified some crucial problems like weakness of the navy, old and traditional war techniques, the joining of the Chungis with the Koches⁵⁵ and the most crucially the betrayal of some courtiers including the king's brother Tamulnokhowa who had joined the Koches⁵⁶. In this situation, the Ahoms king Sukhampha consulting with Charing Raja immediately decided for a peace treaty with the Koches and accordingly, three dignified courtiers: Langidam, Lechailung and Langikhun were sent to the Koch king Naranarayan, who being a good man cordially received and in reply, he sent an envoy named Ratikara (Ratikanta?)⁵⁷ to the Ahoms court with the following message:

“আমিও এতিয়ার নহওঁ, সিবোলাকো এতিয়ার নহয়। বিশেষতঃ স্বর্গীরজা ইন্দ্রর সন্তান, আমিও সদাশিবর সন্তান; এতেকে তোমারে আমার হৃন্দ-কন্দল করা উচিত নহে। পূর্বতো তোমারে আমারে অধিকাধিক প্রীতিগোট চলি গৈছে; এই জানি তোমার আমার দুই রাজ্যে কুশলে যেনেৰূপে রহিব, সেইৰূপে আপুনি সীমনা নিবন্ধ করি রাজ্য লওক, আমাকো দিওক। এই কথা শুনি যেমনে সৰ্বজনে প্রশংসা করে, তাকে আচরিব”।⁵⁸

However, in the same context, D. Nath, Referring to the DAB (p-62) mentioned a different message:

“We are in friendly terms for a long time. We are descendants of gods as our fore fathers were sons of gods. We are living as brothers. In the ancient time a girl was offered to us by the king of Assam. This friendship of ours should continue to our descendants. It is not proper to be in hostility. So the king of the east should arrange to settle the affairs in such a way so that both the countries may enjoy peace and prosperity”⁵⁹

Anyway, in spite of this type of differences about the subject matter of the message, it is crystal clear that the attitude and the mentality of Naranarayan was quite cordial and friendly, and not influenced by his advantages achieved in the wars and even not by his past experiences of his 'Peace Mission' in 1555 AD⁶⁰. Ratikara (Ratikanta) came back to the Koch camp and the best wishes and presents were also exchanged. But the war renewed again on the ground that “Chilarai who

somehow came to know how he was tricked by the Ahom king to avoid fighting , soon reorganized his forces and renewed conflict in January,1563"⁶¹. The Koch navy under the command of Tepu and Bhaktmal in May 1563 started from their base camp on the bank of Hariya and reached the mouth of the Dikhu River, plundering through out their journey. In addition, on land Chilarai himself advanced with a large force up to the mouth of the Dikhu and inflicted a crushing defeat on the Ahoms in about April 1563 AD⁶². Both wings of the Koch force advanced eastward through the Brahmaputra to attack the important strategic fort of the Ahoms at Dihing and forced them to retreat further east at Abhaypur. The DRV mentions a story, that the Ahom king consulting with his courtiers, planned another trick and sent a messenger to the Koch king with a 'he-goat'(pantha) made of iron and proposed that if the Koch king was able to cut the goat in a single blow of his sword , they would surrendered to the Koch king . However, king Naranarayan successfully performed the task with the blessing of the goddess Gosani, gave the head of the goat to the messenger, and angrily ordered him to offer it to his master⁶³. In this reverse situation, the Ahoms lost their military and mental strengths to further resistance, the king Sukhampha along with some of his courtiers, fled from his capital at Garhgaon to a placed named Charaikhorong in the Naga hills⁶⁴. The victorious Koch force occupied the capital of the Ahoms and king Naranarayan advanced to it from his stay at Majuli. Some nobles, Bhuyans, Ahom subjects and even one of the king's brothers were present to welcome them⁶⁵.

At Charaikhorong in Naga Hills, the Ahom king started thinking for a term with the Koch king, and after consulting with his courtiers, he sent an important officer named Aikhek Buragohain with two gold vessels, two silver vessels and a silver jar as presents to the Koch king Naranarayan at Garhgaon⁶⁶. In spite of his dissatisfaction, king Naranarayan, agreed to a peace treaty on the conditions:

Aikhek Buragohain, " you better tell the king of the east that he must send your son ,the son of Thaomunlung , the sons of Shengdang and the son of Khamshong to me and I shall go back to my country leaving all here"⁶⁷.

Or

"Please tell the king of Udaygiri (the east) that he must give me the sons of the three Gohains as well as of Sudang and Khamsen (two Ahom commanders). Only then, I shall return leaving the kingdom of the Svargadeo unmolested"⁶⁸.

According to some scholars, the Koch king also demanded the best elephant, 'Khamring', the swiftest horse 'Pakhiraj', war indemnity and valuables from the Ahom king⁶⁹ and Aikhek Buragohain came back to the Ahom king at Charaikhorong in Naga hills, informed him about the treaty conditions. King Sukhampa immediately accepted it, as he had no alternative. Accordingly, he sent four sons of his very important courtiers and his own brother Chao Sungam alias Sunder Gohain in place of Thaomunglang's son, as hostages⁷⁰ and the best elephant 'Khamring', the swiftest horse 'Pakhiraj' as tributes in July 1563 AD⁷¹. As war-indemnity, the Ahom king also gave king Naranarayan sixty elephants, sixty pieces of cloth, sixty beautiful maidens, three hundred men and a huge amount of gold, silver, and above all a red royal umbrella as the symbol of acknowledging his supremacy and ceded the whole territory on the north bank of the Brahmaputra river⁷². The triumphant Koch king organized proper administration of the territory under the supervision of his brother Kumar Kamal Narayan as Uparaj (king's representative) and appointed three officers; Ujir Bamun, Tapaswi Laskar and Malamulya Laskar with the responsibility of various departments⁷³.

Conquest of other Northeastern states:

Thus, the giant (the Ahom) of the upper Brahmaputra valley was defeated by its long-standing feudatory, the Koches under its prominent ruler Naranarayan, who established the Koch hegemony over the whole northern bank of the Brahmaputra and the giant, once their nominal master was forced to become a feudatory of the Koches. This defeat made an overwhelming reaction among all the rulers (both independent and semi-independent under the Ahoms) of the whole of the northeast India and as a result some rulers voluntarily accepted the Koch supremacy by offering annual tributes⁷⁴, some started war preparation to save themselves from the aggression of the victorious Koches.

Kachhar:

Now Chilarai, supreme commander of the Koch army set out to conquer the others states of northeast. If we accept the chronology of his conquests, as given in DRV, Chilarai first advanced against the Hidimba country, the kingdom of the Kachharis with Kavi Indra Patra (Kavindra Patra), Raj Indra Patra (Rajendra Patra) Damodar Karji and, Megha Mukudum as generals and only twenty Cavalries, reached the capital of the Hidimba country (Kachhar) at Moibang⁷⁵. The Hidimba king submitted without giving any battle, the king presented a number of valuables including gold, silver and elephants⁷⁶ and agreed to pay an annual tribute of 1,000 gold mohars, 70, 000 Silver mohars and 60 elephants⁷⁷.

Manipur:

Chilarai's next target was Manipur, the country of the Meithies. Before sending the army, he sent a messenger to the king of Manipur demanding submission and tribute. The king of Manipur agreed to the demands, and immediately presented the Koch king Rs. 20,000 (silver coins), 1,000 gold coins and 40 elephants, as first installment⁷⁸ and also agreed to send by a messenger an annual tribute of 10 elephants, 300 gold coins and Rs. 20,000 in future⁷⁹.

Jayantiya:

The Napoleonic advancement of the Koch army under Chilarai continued one after another. Next, they attacked the kingdom of Jayantiya and Chilarai himself killed the king. On submission, Naranarayan placed the son of the deceased king on the throne of Jayantiya, who immediately presented 10 horses, 1,000 gold coins Rs. 10,000 (silver coins), 100 'Khangra' (special type of sword, also known as Nakoi-deo) and others valuables⁸⁰. The king also agreed to send by a messenger an annual tribute of 70 selected horses, Rs. 10,000 (silver coins) and 300 swords in future⁸¹. In this situation, the Jayantiya king again requested his Koch master for special permission to mint coins in his name. But the minting of coins in one's own name "being followed by independent rulers only, the Koch sovereign permitted him to mint coins with the mention of his capital" only,⁸² not with the name of the king. It is also proved by the fact that until 1731, the Jayantiya kings minted coins with the legend of "Ruler of Jayantiya", instead of giving the name of the kings⁸³.

Tripura:

According to the DRV, Chilarai after the conquest of Jayantiya advanced against Tripura with a large army of 40,000 men and in a fierce battle, the Tripuri king was defeated and killed with 18,000 soldiers. The brother of the deceased king, sued for a peace with the Koch king Naranarayan with some presents including 30 horses, 100 gold coins and 10,000 silver coins King Naranarayan placed him on the Tripuri throne on condition of paying an annual tribute of 9,000 gold coins⁸⁴. Kamrupa Burunji and Deodhai Assam Burunji also mentioned the Tripura expedition of the Koches⁸⁵. Khan Choudhary A. Ahmed⁸⁶ stated that Naranarayan had stationed a regiment of soldiers there and constructed a fort near Brahmapur, which was then named as 'Kochpur', later corrupted into as 'Khaspur'. He also builds rampart and excavated tanks⁸⁷. However, all the Chroniclers of Tripura including the *Rajamala*, the dynastic history of Tripura, do not mentioned this expedition and its succeeding events. Others Burunjis of the northeast India also do not mention the events, although they recorded the Koch expedition to the other kingdoms of the northeast India. On these grounds, Colonial historian Gait has expressed his doubt about the authenticity of the Koch expedition to Tripura and its succeeding events. He stated that the information "is not sufficient to establish it as an historical fact"⁸⁸. In this situation, we have to consider the opinions modern scholars to conclude the fact. N .R. Raychoudhury⁸⁹ mentioned that the Tripura kings Deva Manikya (1520-32), Vijay Manikya (1532-63) and Ananta Manikya (1564-1567) were the contemporaries of Biswa Singha and Naranarayan. The northeastern conquests of the Koch were carried out in between 1562-1568AD and it partially covered the reign of two Tripuri kings; Vijay Manikya (1532-63) and Ananta Manikya (1564-1567). Vijay Manikya with a long reign of 32 years was a powerful king and if the Koches defeated him, it must be recorded as a painful end of a great king in the history of Tripura. The Koch expedition of Tripura must have happened as after the 1564, the end of Vijay Manikya⁹⁰. Therefore, it may be accepted that, his son and successor Ananta Manikya, was a very weak king who ruled the country only for a short span of three years. According to D. Nath,⁹¹ he was "an unworthy son of a worthy father who suffered defeat along with loss of his life at the hand of the Koches" and he also places the event in the early part of 1567 AD⁹². So it is cleared that most of the modern scholars have accepted the authenticity of the Koch expedition and its

succeeding event. The Tripura chronicles, did not record it, most probably, due to their humiliating defeat and this type of incidents are not rare in Indian History⁹³.

Khairam:

Viryavanta, the king of Khairam, a hilly tract to the north of the Jayantiya kingdom, with its capital at Nongkhree⁹⁴, is said to have voluntarily made his submission to the Koch king. He gave presents of 20 horses, 40 elephants, 1,000 gold coins and 40,000 silver coins⁹⁵, in order to avoid the fate that had been faced by other kings of north-east. Besides these, he also agreed to pay 30 elephants, 50 horses, 900 gold coins and 15,000 silver coins annually as tributes⁹⁶. On request of the Khairam king, he was given the permission to mint coins, but not in the name of Khairam king; in the name of king Malladeva (Naranarayan), for which he was also presented a mint⁹⁷.

Dimarua:

After the conquest of Tripura, according to DRV, the Koch Naranarayan and his brother-cum-general Chilarai decided to retreat, and on their way back to their naval halt at Hajo through Gauhati, attacked Pantheswara, the king of Dimarua, who claimed himself descendant from Mrigakanka⁹⁸. In the battle, the king was defeated and made a prisoner, but he purchased his freedom by agreeing to pay an annual tribute of 7,000 silver coins⁹⁹. However, according to some modern scholars the Dimaruas formally were a tributary of the Kachharis, and during the advancement of the Koches against the Kachharis, they prayed for help to king Naranarayan against the Kachharis oppression. As a result, after the conquest of the Kachharis, Naranarayan made Pantheswara (Dimarua chief) a vassal and established him as a warden of the Jayantiya border, who also agreed to pay annual tribute to the Koch king¹⁰⁰. Soon Chilarai attacked the Dimarua kingdom because its king had stopped paying their agreed annual tributes¹⁰¹. Anyway, during the course of the return of the Koches, Naranarayan had established a fort in a village named 'Baha' and excavated a canal to straighten the curved-course of the Brahmaputra near Pandunath on the right bank¹⁰².

Sirath (Sylhat):

The DRV also stated that king Naranarayan had sent an expedition against the Padshah of Sirath (Sylhat) which laid to the south-west of Jayantiya on the north of the river Kusiara. He was a powerful kingdom having a large force consisting of elephants, camels and horses¹⁰³. However, there are controversies among the modern scholars about the time and authenticity of the Sylhat expedition of the Koches and they think that the DRV could not maintain the sequence of the events. Accordingly, to D. Nath holds the view that immediately after the conquest of Tripura, the Koch force had attacked the Padshah of Sirath (Sylhat) and then Chilarai decided to retreat, and on their way back to their naval halt at Hajo, through Gauhati, attacked Pantheswara, the king of Dimarua¹⁰⁴. Accordingly, he again mentioned in his book, the Sylhat expedition first and then the Dimarua case¹⁰⁵. Khan Choudhury A. Ahmed, the distinguished scholar on the Koch kingdom, did not even mention the incident of the Sylhat expedition in his book, although he had collected most of his information from the DRV. It seems to us that Khan Choudhury did not consider the information of the DRV as true in this case¹⁰⁶. Gait did not accept the invasion as true due to the lack of confirmation from other sources¹⁰⁷. On the other hand, S.L Barua considered the Koch invasion of Sylhat 'as a myth'¹⁰⁸. He also questioned that why Sylhat was not conquered immediately after the conquest of Tripura and why the expedition against Sylhat was sent after the return of the army all the way from Tripura through an extremely difficult kingdom¹⁰⁹. Although, most of the scholars had showed their confusion about the invasion we would like to proceed with the information of the DRV. According to DRV, the Padshah of Sirath (Sylhat) was a powerful king who gave a hard resistance to the forces of Chilarai, who had to adopt new and more powerful war technique to defeat the Padshah and ultimately he was defeated and killed including 1,00,000 soldiers¹¹⁰. Asibai, the brother of deceased Padshah surrendered to Chilarai with presents of 100 elephants, 180 horses, 3,00,000 silver coins and 10,000 gold coins¹¹¹. Chilarai pardoned and took him to king Naranarayan, who made him the Padshah of Sylhat, on the condition of an annual tribute 100 elephants, 200 horses, 3,00,000 silver coins and 10,000 gold coins for future¹¹². If we go through the amount of presents and commitments of annual tributes, it seemed to us that Naranarayan's war with the Padshah of Sylhat was a hard war.

After defeating and conquering Sylhet, Koch army advanced towards their naval halt at Hajo through Gauhati, Naranarayan found that the Brahmaputra had a very curved course shaped like a bangle near Pandunath and therefore he ordered his soldiers to excavate a canal to divert the river to flow straight from the east to the west. The Brahmaputra then took the course of the canal and this new current of the river thenceforth came to be known as Khargosrota, possibly because it was dug with the help of armed soldiers¹¹³.

The Koch army under the command of Chilarai conquered the whole of the north-east India within a short period of about 7 years (1562-68). However, it is also to be noted that the Koches did not directly annex the conquered kingdoms of the north-east considering practical problems such as the long distance, communication problem, geographical difficulties and sufficient machineries to do so and were satisfied with tributes and formal submission of the kings. This realistic and innovative policy could only be comparable with the policy of great Gupta king Samudragupta's southern campaign in fourth century AD, who due to such problems, did not annex the Southern states of India. These acts also indicate the political farsightedness of king Naranarayan who realized the practical situation of the area and adopted comparatively a realistic policy¹¹⁴.

King Naranarayan's relation with Kararani ruler of Gauda and the Koch defeat:

Highly ambitious with the repeated success in the northeast, the Koches turned their attention towards the west, to the kingdom of Gauda ruled by Suleiman Kararani. But it is difficult to identify the fact that who was the aggressor. Many informations and views on the matter have given by contemporary and modern writers. The Persian sources like *Akbarnamah* and *Riyaz-us-Salatin* make the sultan of Gaur Sulaiman as aggressor and it was a part of Sultan's aggressive and expansionist policy¹¹⁵. Modern Scholar like D. Nath also argued in favour of this view but from different angles. He stated that Naranarayan "had invested a large amount of money and materials in his eastern campaigns and his soldiers also were tired of protracted conflicts"¹¹⁶. He also raised question with the information from DRV that why a strong believer of astrological calculations, king Naranarayan who suspended the rebuilding of the temple of Kamakhya on the pretext of his being under the influence of evil stars, will take an aggressive policy against a more powerful enemy

under the same circumstances? It is impossible to take an aggressive policy by king Naranarayan under these situations. So he identified Sulaiman as aggressor and explained the incident in this way "Thus at a time when Naranarayan was repairing the material losses of his kingdom and had decided not to undertake any serious expedition owing to the influence of the Saturn, Sulaiman Karrani, a master of diplomacy, led his aggressive arms against the growing Koch kingdom"¹¹⁷.

On the other hand, most of the local chronicles like the *Buranjies*, *Vansavalies* depict different picture that it was the Koch king who some time after his conquest of the north-east, proceeded to fight against the Gauda (Bare Bangala), where the Koch army was defeated and Chilarai was taken as a prisoner¹¹⁸. Modern scholars like Gait and Khan Choudury A. Ahamed also accepted the view of local chronicles that king Naranarayan was the aggressor¹¹⁹. Under these circumstances, it is very hard to identify the real facts. But if we carefully examine the informations and opinions of modern scholars, it seems to us that most probably king Naranarayan took the offensive and the information of the *Akbarnamah* and *Riyaz-us-Salatin* is not clear and it seems to be very general in description. Both the *Akbarnamah* and *Riyaz-us-Salatin* never mentioned that Sulaiman 'first' took offensive. It might mean that he was disturbed or attacked by Naranarayan, and then Sulaiman "Set out for conquest"¹²⁰. It is clear from the above discussion that, the Koch army was defeated in the war and Chilarai was taken as a prisoner. The victorious Muslim army then proceeded up the Brahmaputra as far as Tezpur, devastating certain Koch territories and some Hindu temples including those at Kamakhya and Hajo, besieging the Koch capital, but had to return abruptly owing to the outbreak of a rebellion in Orissa in 1567-68 AD¹²¹. The opinion of D. Nath is also not suitable to explain the actual situation. Sulaiman Karrani was aware of the consequence of a supposed Mughal invasion, for which he was eager to create a ring of feudatories and was not in a position to take offensive against the Koches. Nath's argument: Naranarayan "had invested a large amount of money and materials in his eastern campaigns and his soldiers also were tired of protracted conflicts" is not appropriate, for the Koch army was victorious in the northeast and had become ambitious with huge amount money and materials collected as tributes. J.N. Sarkar rightly explained the fact in this way: "Encouraged by long successive victories in the north-eastern corner, the Koch king invaded the dominions of Sulaiman Karrani"¹²². So there is no question of being

defensive from the Koch side and notably Naranarayan was offensive. Anyhow, although Naranarayan proceeded to attack Gaud, but in the war, his army was defeated and his brother Chilarai was taken prisoner, who was then kept in captive by the king of Gaur and he himself managed his escape from the battlefield¹²³. But the Muslim historians make no mention of the capture and imprisonment of Chilarai¹²⁴. Sulaiman Karran army did not remain satisfied but set out to conquer North-East India under the command of one Kalapahar¹²⁵, preceded up the Brahmaputra as far as Tezpur. However, the Muslims could not stay long in the northeast to establish their permanent authority, but hastened back to Bengal to subdue an insurrection on Orissa in about 1568AD.

The situations after the defeat were confusing and some ways controversial due to many versions of information in local Chronicles and Persian writings. According to one local legend, that during his escape, Naranarayan took shelter in a house where he revealed his identity and asked for food. But the householder did not show any respect Naranarayan as king and offered only 'Katha' of rice. Humiliated by the behaviour of the householder, the king left the house without having the rice and promised not to take rice until he became able to free his brother Chilarai. From then the king had been living on, only milk and engaged himself in various types of propitious ceremonies¹²⁶. However, the sources say nothing about the where about of the king. On the other hand, Chilarai, after passing about one year in captivity in Gaur and finding no hope of his release, sent a message to Naranarayan to release the Ahom hostages and to establish friendly relations with the Ahom king¹²⁷, for a precaution against any future Muslim attack. In the DRV, it is stated that meanwhile, Chilarai obtained the favour of Sulaiman Karrani by curing Padshah's mother (or wife) from snake-bite¹²⁸. It is stated that the Padshah even gave his daughter in marriage to Chilarai with five north-eastern *Parganas* –*Bahirband, Bhitband, Gayabari Sherpur* and *Dasakaunia* (present Rangpur and north Mymensing district of Bangladesh) as dowry¹²⁹. According to another view, Naranarayan advanced with an army to release Chilarai, who having a secret understanding with his brother, who obtained the favour and permission of the Padshah to take his (Padshah's) army under the pretence of fighting against Naranarayan, who had deprived him from his share of the kingdom. As per plan, Chilarai then joined with his brother and suddenly attracted and subjugated Gauda, in

changing situation, Padshah fled from his capital city and for this victory, Chilarai assumed the nickname Sangram Singha¹³⁰. It may be the real cause for the transfer of Sulaiman Karrani's capital from Gauda to Tanda¹³¹. But from the above two views, it seems to us that the earlier one more reliable, for most important source the DRV said nothing about the later view and the treatment of snake-bite traditional indigenous way was widely prevalent in the area.

B) The period of defensive warfare (1568-1587 AD):

The crushing and humiliating defeat of the Koch army in the hands of Sulaiman Karrani marked many remarkable changes in Naranarayan's external and internal policies. The traditional policy of 'aggressive warfare' had ended. He introduced the policy of 'defensive warfare' and the policy of peaceful co-existence, by which he tried to establish cordial relations not only with the all conquered states of the north-east India, but also with the Great Mughal emperor Akbar. The maintenance and security of the conquered territories and consolidation of kingdom had motivated the Koches to move towards 'defensive warfare' against the probable and traditional enemies i.e. the Ahoms and Bengal. The first step to this new policy was to release the Ahom hostages and to normalize the Koch-Ahom relations. According to the *Assam Burunjis* and other sources, Chilarai secretly sent a message from his imprisonment in Gaud to his brother king Naranarayan to release the Ahom hostages and prisoners taken from the Ahom kingdom at the time of their victory in 1563 AD¹³². His desire was to establish friendly terms with the Ahom king in order to get his assistance in case of another Muslim invasion. King Naranarayan agreed with the message of his brother but the king thought that it would not be good policy to do this openly, so he was engaged in a pre-planned game of dice with one of the hostages, on the condition of the liberty of the all hostages. The king intentionally lost the game according to his plan and released all the hostages to fulfill the condition of the game. He also sent with them Gaja Singha and Patal Singha Karji as ambassadors with a beautiful princess. In return, the Ahom king also sent his own ambassador Ratna Singha Kandalia to king Naranarayan¹³³. On the other hand, towards the Bengal, Naranarayan established friendship with the great Mughal Akbar to control the Afghans. The most important thing is that all the Burunjis of northeast completely silent about the payment of annual tributes and their relation with the Koches. It

seems that Naranarayan followed the policy of non-interference considering the situation and the rulers of northeastern states had stopped the payment of annual tributes. However, the policy of king Naranarayan did not realize any advantage in the eastern frontier i.e. the Ahoms and as a result, he turned his attention towards south west i.e. the Mughals that would be discussed in appropriate places.

Final Phase of the Koch-Ahom relation under king Naranarayan:

In spite of the release of the Ahom hostages and immediate exchanges of ambassadors and others, the defensive policy of king Naranarayan in eastern frontier became fruitless. In favored situation, the Ahom king Sukhampha alias Khoraraja freed him from the Koch subordination and recovered his lost territories by repulsing the Koch officers appointed by Chilarai and dismissed the Koch administration. He introduced his own administration under his own officers. As a result, hostile relation between the Koches and the Ahom again came into existence and the Koches had to lead two naval expeditions against the Ahoms under the leadership of Tepu, in October 1566 and 1571 A. D to re-establish the Koch supremacy. However, the Ahoms repulsed both of these naval expeditions and a Koch officer named Mohan was captured. The Koches also lost some men, materials and the all conquered territories from the Ahoms to the north of the Brahmaputra River. In this situation, the Koches had decided to avoid further clashes with the Ahoms and therefore remained indifferent in this reverse situation and in 1571 AD, the Ahom king ultimately succeeded in regaining his independence¹³⁴. In 1577AD, a rebellion is said to have occurred against the Koch king under the leadership of three men named Bar Dado, Gabha Naik and Bar Katu. They were defeated by the Koch king and fled with 14,000 of their followers to Ahom territory and asylum was given by the Ahom king Sukhampha¹³⁵. The Koch king this time also remained indifferent due the fear of Mughal extension towards the east and some internal problems.

The Koch –Mughal relations during the reign of king Naranarayan:

In the meanwhile, great political changes were taking place in proper Bengal. Sulaiman Karrani, although was an independent ruler of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in the mid sixties of the 16th century, but diplomatically he acknowledged the formal suzerainty of Akbar by reading 'Khutba' in his and sending him tribute. Sulaiman

Karrani died in 1572 AD, and was succeeded by his second son Daud, who declined formal suzerainty of Akbar and declared his independence by reading Khutba in his own name. He foolishly followed aggressive policy and destroyed the Mughal fort Zamaniya by attacking the eastern border of the Mughal territory. The Mughal Emperor Akbar sent Munim Khan to crush Daud Karrani and to conquer Bengal. King Naranarayan who had been humbled by Daud's father and who was in dread of the growing Ahom power on the eastern side seized this opportunity to establish friendly relations with the Mughal Emperor. However, informations in the Koch chronicles and the Persian writings contradict about the question who took the initiative to establish relationship between king Naranarayan and Akbar. The Koch chronicles as the DRV stated that, Emperor Akbar took the initiatives and addressed a letter to Naranarayan seeking his help and friendship to fight the Afghans of Bengal and also proposed a part of Bengal after its subjugation¹³⁶. It is also recorded in the DRV that king Naranarayan immediately accepted the proposal of friendly alliance and sent letters with a plan to take offensive from eastern side of Bengal¹³⁷. Accordingly, the forces of both the rulers (King Naranarayan and emperor Akbar) then invaded Bengal from both the sides i.e. the Koches from north-eastern side and the Mughal from western side, and defeated the *Padsha*, occupied Bengal and then divided it between themselves¹³⁸. On the other hand, the Persian writing like the *Akbarnamah* and *Ain-I-Akbari* stated that king Naranarayan had taken the initiative and begun friendly overtures by writing a letter to the Mughal emperor Akbar. The *Akbarnamah* states that "one of the occurrences was the arrival of presents from Bengal and Koc (Kochbehar) Rajah Mal Gosai (Naranarayan), the Zamindar of Koc, also again made his submission,including 54 noted elephants" to Akbar¹³⁹. The *Ain-I-Akbari* described the incident in this way that Naranarayan "renewed his demonstration of obedience to the Imperial throne ...sent tributes and 54 elephants"¹⁴⁰, with valuable presents from his country.

From the above evidences, it seems that the relations between king Naranarayan and Akbar no doubt was very cordial and based on equality and the king did not make friendship with Akbar as a subordinate ally. But the informations of the *Akbarnamah* and the *Ain-I-Akbari* somehow, indicate that the relation was not based on equality, but made the Koch king mere 'a *Zamindar* of Koc' who made his

submission to Akbar as subordinate ruler again. The word 'again' denotes 'what had already happened or renewal of an earlier event'.

After considering all the informations of the Koch chronicles and the Persian writings, most of the modern scholars had given their opinions in favour of equality of relationship. S.L Barua described that "Naranarayan did not make friendship with Akbar as a subordinate ally for there was no acceptance of formal supremacy of the Mughal emperor on the part of the Koch king"¹⁴¹. S. N. Bhattacharyya elaborately had given same in this way "There is no mention of tribute, territorial concession or any other symbol of political tutelage anywhere.....It need not be emphasized that the alliance was purely defensive in nature , contracted between two sovereign states, and peace, amity and good-will were its essence"¹⁴². D. Nath also had given same view from different angle and with explanation. He points out that "...there is no indication of treating Naranarayan as a vassal of the Mughal emperor" and he explained it as "....the relations between the two rulers were established as a result of their reciprocal longings and it was based on equal terms"¹⁴³. He also explained that "Abul Fazl's remark about the Koch king as a 'Zamindar of Koc' was motivated by the idea of raising his patron king always above others"¹⁴⁴. From the above discussion, it is established that the relations between Naranarayan and Akbar was based on equality and necessitated by the both the parties. From the Mughal side, it was because, although Bengal was formally annexed to the Mughal Empire after the battle near *Rajmahal* in about 1576 AD, yet a large part of eastern and southeastern Bengal remained outside the periphery of the Mughal rule. This large part of Bengal became the citadel of the Afghan fugitives and other prince lets of Bengal, who were waiting for opportunity to decline the Mughal rule. So in order to have an effective control over this part, an effective blockade from the east to where they repeatedly ran for shelter, was an urgent necessity for Akbar to establish friendship with the Koch king¹⁴⁵. On the Koch side, King Naranarayan felt an urgent necessity of recovering his lost prestige after his defeat at the hands of Sulaiman Karrani in 1568 AD¹⁴⁶, and his urgency to have an alliance with the Mughals in a time when the Ahoms in the east had shaken off the Koch vassalage and for their aggressive attitudes¹⁴⁷. King Naranarayan refused to give shelter to the fugitive Afghans rebellious, who were repulsed by the Mughals in 1575, to make a suitable situation for a formal alliance with Akbar. The Koch- Mughal friendship had established surely

after 1568 and before 1575 AD, and formal relations Naranarayan and Akbar had taken place definitely before 1576, by which date Daud Karrani was defeated and killed by the combined forces of Naranarayan and Akbar. Therefore, it can safely be concluded that the alliance was both offensive and defensive in nature and both of the rulers used it to save guard their states.

The Koch-Mughal alliance was a landmark in the Socio-political history of Bengal and Koch Behar, not only during the reign of king Naranarayan but also after his death in 1587 AD. However, the outcome of the alliance was more fruitful to the Mughals than to the Koches in the political field. On the Mughals side, the alliance gave an advantage to the Mughals to establish their effective sway over Bengal and to subdue the rebellious Afghans. They also obtained the help of Koch naval force against Masum Khan Kabuli, the rebellious Mughal officer at Tanta, who was defeated on the Ganges and forced to flee¹⁴⁸. On the Koch side, with the alliance the Koches became a part of all Indian politics, local Afghans chiefs of the eastern Bengal not dare to disturb the Koches and also to uplift their social status. But after the death of king Naranarayan, the alliance could not last long. With the strength of this alliance, Naranarayan's son and successor Lakshminarayan obtained Mughal help by acknowledging the formal supremacy of the Mughal emperor Akbar. He also fostered friendship with the Mughal Subedar of Bengal Raja Man Singh by giving his sister in marriage to him, to fight his cousin Raghudeva, son of Sukladvaja, who in the meanwhile, established friendship with /sa Khan, the powerful Afghan chief of the eastern Bengal to fulfill the desire of becoming the king of the undivided Koch kingdom¹⁴⁹. Although Raghudeva was defeated in the hands of Koch-Mughal alliance and the Mughals were always in search of opportunities to realize their imperialistic ambitions in northeastern India ignored the alliance within few days and established Mughal suzerainty over both the Koch kingdoms: Koch Behar the western one and Koch-Hajo the eastern one¹⁵⁰.

The political hegemony and the extent of the kingdom of Naranarayan:

The kingdom established by his father Biswa Singha and extended by him with the help of his illustrious Brother-cum- general Chilarai, reached its zenith in the 7th decade of the 16th century. No doubt, king Naranarayan at his peak period, established his political hegemony, directly or indirectly, over the whole North-East

India up to Burma border and Northeastern part of Bengal up to Tibet border. On the south and the West, he extended hegemony up Ghoraghat and Mithila or *Tirhut* border respectively¹⁵¹. H. N. Chaudhury in the beginning of the 20th century following the view of Gait¹⁵² observes that his conquest comprised "almost the whole of Northern Bengal, Bhutan and Assam as well as the modern States of Kachar, Jaintia, Manipur and Tripura, extended up to the coast of the Bay of Bengal"¹⁵³. But this type description is full of exaggeration and not suit to realize the actual situation of the facts. To understand the extent of Naranarayan's kingdom and his hegemony over the areas properly, we have to proceed systematically and carefully investigating all happenings throughout his reign. The territory, which was inherited and conquered by Naranarayan, can be discussed under three main heads: A) the extend of the territory, which was under his direct administrative control, B) the extend of the territory, which was his tributaries, and C) the territory, which was under his direct control after the division of the kingdom in about 1581AD. It is accepted by all modern scholars that the territory under the direct administrative control of Naranarayan however was much smaller than that of the territories on which his command worked for a certain times and the extension of the kingdom changed from time to time.

At the time of his accession to the throne Naranarayan inherited his father's kingdom comprising the Lower Himalayan region, the whole of the present districts of Kamarupa, Goalpara and a part of Nowgong of present Assam, Jalpaiguri and Koch Behar districts of present West Bengal and Rangpur district of present Bangladesh. It was extended in the east up to the Barnadi on the north bank of the Brahmaputra, up to the Karatoya in the west. On the south, it was extended up to the river *Kapili* in the present Nowgong of Assam and on the north up to Rangamati (Joygaon) in the Indo- Bhutan border¹⁵⁴. According to the DRV, he also conquered Bhutan from his brother Nara Singha¹⁵⁵. This inherited dominion was under his direct control. In the North-East India, out of many conquests, Naranarayan obtained the whole territory from the river Suvarnasiri lying to the north of the river Brahmaputra as the condition of peace treaty with the Ahoms in about 1563AD and introduced his own administrative arrangements¹⁵⁶. But Ahom king Khora Raja recovered the lost territories very soon and introduced his own administration by dismissing the Koches.

King Naranarayan also obtained the five Parganas: *Bahirbandh, Bhitarchand, Goyabari, Serpur and Daskaunia* i.e. the Riparian portions Rangpur and north Mymensing from the Padshah of Gaud as dowry of Chilarai's marriage for which the Koch kingdom extended up to the river Karatoya¹⁵⁷. It is also proved by the information of the *Akbarnamah*, that the western boundary of Naranarayan's dominion touched the Mughal dominion at Tirhut and in the south; it was extended as far as Ghoraghat¹⁵⁸. On the north, the Koch kingdom touched lower Tibet i.e. the lower Himalayan region covering present Indo- Bhutan border, as far as Rangamati (Joygong) of present Jalpaiguri district of West Bengal¹⁵⁹.

From above discussion it can safely be concluded that the undivided Koch kingdom under its direct administrative control at its peak, extended as far as the Suvarnasiri river/ Narayanpur¹⁶⁰ on the north bank of the Brahmaputra in the east for some times and the Karatoya river in the west. But within a short period, the Koches were forced to retreat from the Suvarnasiri river/ Narayanpur to the Barnadi on the north bank of the Brahmaputra and finally Barnadi remained the eastern border of the kingdom till the division of the kingdom. In the south and south-west, it was extended up to Tirhut and Ghoraghat covering the areas like a part of present Nowgong district of Assam and the Riparian portions of Rangpur and north Mymensing of present Bangladesh. On the north, the lower Himalayan region covering Present Indo- Bhutan border, as far as Rangamati (Joygong) of present Jalpaiguri district of West Bengal.

Beyond the above mentioned areas which were directly administered by Naranarayan, he also conquered almost all kingdoms of the north-east India but these kingdoms were not directly annexed to his Kingdom. They were allowed to enjoy their autonomy by agreeing to pay annual tributes and by accepting Koch over lordship. In the year 1563AD, the Ahoms who were almost invincible in the eastern Brahmaputra valley were defeated and became a feudatory of the Koches, by ceding the territory mentioned earlier and agreeing to pay annual tributes and thus the Koches established their hegemony on the valley¹⁶¹. According to the DRV, at the defeat of the Giant power of the valley, Kingdoms and small principalities of the northeast like Kachhar (Hidimba), Manipur, Jayantiya, Tripura, Khairam, Dimarua and Sirath (Sylhat) were either voluntarily or by force accepted Koch suzerainty and agreed to pay annual tributes¹⁶². The rulers of these areas were under the Koch

hegemony only for few years. Though the Ahoms declined the Koch supremacy and declared independence in the year 1571AD¹⁶³, and the Tripura chronicles like 'Rajamala' completely silent about the Koch conquest of Tripura and the Koch supremacy over Tripura, but some other chronicles and evidences have proved that the formal the Koch suzerainty over the major parts north-east continued for a long time. Gohain Kamal, the brother of Naranarayan formerly had been a feudatory of the Koches at Khaspur in Kachhar for a long time¹⁶⁴. The king of *Dimarua* (present Nowgong district of Assam) was a feudatory of the Koches till the time Parikshitnarayan, the grand son Chilarai and the kings of Jayantiya struck coin under the orders of Naranarayan with the name of the capital of the kingdom, but not with the name of the king till 1731AD¹⁶⁵. But it is not clear how, long the other defeated rulers paid their agreed tributes and committed respect to the Koches as their over lord. Actually, the conquests of Naranarayan were based on military power and the defeated rulers kept the terms of agreements due to the fear of the sword of Chilarai. Therefore, at the defeat of Chilarai in the hands of the Padshah of Gauda, they all (except Khaspur, Dimarua and Jayantiya) declined the Koch suzerainty and stopped paying tributes.

S. N. Bhattacharyya, opines that " the result of this expedition does not appear to have been nothing more than a lip-deep acknowledgement of political vassalage and a hollow promise of payment of tribute on the part of the defeated chiefs and as such seems hardly commensurate with the time, energy and resources spent thereon"¹⁶⁶. But it seems to us that the opinion of S. N. Bhattacharyya is not fully correct. Firstly, these conquests enabled king Naranarayan to establish his political influences (may not be suzerainty) over the whole North-eastern India, for which the names of king Naranarayan and his brother Chilarai spread like wild fire among the masses and contemporary rulers of the whole India as great warriors, for which they were respected and feared. Even great Mughal emperor Akbar did not hesitate to establish friendship with king Naranarayan on equal status considering his position. Secondly, the material gains, such as booties, tributes and few successive annual installments of tributes enabled him to continue aggressive warfare, to establish standing army, to introduce navy, and to carryout proper administration and construction. It also enabled him to mint huge coins from the collected gold and silver^{that} greatly gave impetus to the developments of trade and commences.

Thus, it is fact that the political hegemony might be formal and temporary over the conquered kingdoms without permanent political suzerainty but the political influences and others materials gains enabled king Naranarayan to carryout many innovative activities, for which he would be remembered forever in the history of the whole north east India. However, at the death of Chilarai, King Naranarayan forced to divide the kingdom between him and his nephew Raghudeva, fixing the Sankosh River as boundary between the two divisions, which would be discussed in details in the next chapter.

Notes and references:

1. The *Rajopakhyan*, records that Biswa Singha became king in 1510AD, by defeating the Kotwal , at the age 9 year old accompanied by some playmates and being helped by divine power. Cited in Khan Chaudhury A.A, op cit., p.389.
2. According to the DRV (v.273), Biswa Singha ruled 25 years; M. Martin, *The History, Antiquities and Statistics of Eastern India*, Vol., I, reprint Delhi, pp. 540ff, fixed the date of the accession of Biswa Singha as 11509AD.
3. Khan Chaudhury A.A, op cit., p.389;
4. N. G. Rhodes and S. K. Bose, *'Coinage of Cooch Behar'*, Dhubri, (Library of Numismatic Studies), 1999 ; Sutapa Sinha, and Pradip Kumar Mitra (ed.), *'Coins of Mediaeval India'*, Books & Books, Kolkata, 1997; and Bhattacharyya, S. N., *'A History of Mughal North East Frontier Policy'*, Calcutta, 1929, reprints ed., M/s. R. N. Bhattacharyya, Calcutta, 1994 and Spectrum publication, Gauhati,1998; all of them mentioned the 1555AD as the date of accession of Naranarayan.
5. G. C. Barua, Tr. *Ahom Buranji*, Calcutta, 1930p.77, cited in D. Nath, op. cit., p. 27
6. Deodhai Assam Buranji, p.41; G. C. Barua, Tr. *Ahom Buranji*, Calcutta, 1930, p.77, cited in D. Nath, op. cit., p. 51.
7. The *Katha Guru Charita*, p. 58; M. Neog, op. cit., pp. 115-17.
8. *'Sri Sri Svarganarayandeva Maharajar Janmacharita'*, p. 25. (Henceforth, SMJC).
9. Different scholars mentioned following period as the reign of King Naranarayan: S. L. Barua, op. cit., pp.206 &215, reign, 1540-1587; D. Nath, op. cit., p. 47, reign 1540-1587; Khan Chaudhury A.A, op cit., p.101, reign 1533-4-1587; K. L. Barua,

op. cit., pp. 194 & 201, reign 1540-87; Assam Burunji of Gunabhiram Barua, pp-42 & 47, reign 1529-1584; Gait, op. cit, pp, 46-47, reign 1540-84. In this situation, the information of numismatics may be considered acceptable. Raghudeva and Lakshminarayan issued coins in 1588 and 1587 AD, respectively, most probably on their coronation to the throne as independent kings after the death of Naranarayan, might have occurred in 1587.

10. DRV, vv. 255 -264 and 295.
11. Ibid, v., 296.
12. Present Tarai region west of the river *Mechi* in Indo-Nepal border. *Encyclopedia Asiatica*, Vol. VI, N. Delhi, 1974, p.987. Queen Ratnavali, the mother of Nara Singha was from Nepal, DRV, vs. 231 and 240.
13. Ibid, vs., 255 and 295-301.
14. Ibid, v. 313.
15. Khan Chaudhury, A. A. op. cit. p. 101.
16. Dvija Ratikanta, '*Kharga Narayan Vansavali*', Ms. (unpublished), p.20; '*Kamarupavansavali*', cited in Khan Choudhary, A. A. op. cit. p. 101. How over, no such coins yet discovered. Large numbers of coins of King Naranarayan with one single date i.e. 1555 AD have been discovered from different places of the region, which would be discussed in appropriate places.
17. DRV, v. 318; *Kamarupa Burunji*, p.11f; ABSM, p.11; S.K. Bhuyan (ed) *Satsari Assam Burunji*, G.U., 1969,p.71.
18. DRV, v. 319.
19. *The Guru Charita* of Daityari Thakur, p. 25.
20. Ibid. pp. 25 and 29.
21. Ibid. p.25.
22. Ibid. p.25.
23. *Assam Burunji*, p. 80.
24. Ibid. p. 80; Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.103. There is controversy about the actual time of construction of the fort. According to Khan Choudhary, it was constructed by Koch generals after their retreat from Sala in 1546 and used it to invade pichila fort of the Ahoms in 1547. On the other hand, according to *Assam Burunji*, it was constructed in 1547, during their advancement for the Pichila war.
25. Ibid, p.81. and D. Nath , op. cit. p.51 .

26. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.103.
27. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.103; *Assam Burunji*, p.81; SMJC, p.25.
28. The 'Mathadang' is an Assamese word. 'Matha' = head, and 'dang' =heap, that is a heap of heads Rudra Simgha Burunji, p.52, cited in Khan Choudhary A. Ahamed , op. cit. p.103;. It is also stated that the name of the place came to be known as such from the incident. See, ABSMJC, p.25.
29. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.103.
30. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.104; and Historical Letters of the Ahom Period, a collection of 44 letters exchanged between the Koch and the Ahom kings, Transcripts no. 18, Vol. V, Part VI, DRAS, Gauhati.
31. Ibid. Also see the '*Koch Beharer Itihas*' of Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, Eng Trns. by S.C. Ghosal (ed) by H. Nag, Reprint, 2005, Siliguri, W.B., p.116.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid, p.115.
34. SMJC, p.30.
35. Ibid. p. 30; D.Nath, op. cit. p-53. ; '*Koch Beharer Itihas*' of Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, Eng Trns. by S.C. Ghosal (ed) by H. Nag , Reprint ,2005, Siliguri, W.B., p.116 .
36. Ibid, p.117 ; Historical Letters of the Ahom Period , a collection of 44 letters exchanged between the Koch and the Ahom kings , Transcripts no. 18, Vol. V, Part VI, DRAS, Gauhati
37. DRV, vv., 317 &323.
38. Ibid, v. 319.
39. DRV did not mention the length of the road and eastern end of the road. But Kamarupa Burunji (p-12) and Assam historians like S.L. Burua and K.L.Barua mentioned the length of the road as 350 km and identified the eastern end of the road at Narayanpur in the present Lakhimpur district. D. Nath also gave same information, op. cit. P.54. but Khan Choudhury identified the 32 eastern end of the road at Parasukunda, op. cit. p .106.
40. DRV did not mention any date of the construction of the road. S.L. Burua and K.L.Barua indirectly stated that it was constructed immediately after Koch-Ahom conflict in 1546-47AD. Gait also gave same view (p. 53). On the other hand, Khan

Choudhury and D. Nath identified the date after the failure of the Peace Mission of 1555 AD, and immediately before 1562 AD.

41. SMJC, p. 30.
42. DRV, vv. 326-328.
43. SMJC, p. 32; DAB, p. 59.
44. *Samudranarayaner Vamsavali*, p.41, cited in Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.107.
45. According to another view, he gained this nick for his swiftness of attack like *Chila* (kite of Eagle family).
46. DRV, vv. 372-373.
47. SMJC, p. 32.
48. According to the ABSM, p. 32, total strength of Chilarai is 60000 men, and 'of Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, p.106, mentioned the strength of the infantry of Chilarai's 52000. So the strength of navy will be (60000-52000) =8000 men.
49. Assam Burunji, p. 85; Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.108.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid, and D. Nath, op. cit. p.56.
52. Khan Choudhary A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.108.
53. SMJC, p.32; Assam *Burunji* of GRB, Assam Publication Council, Gauhati, 1972, p.77; Assam *Burunji* of HKB (ed) S. K. Bhuyan, DHAS, Gauhati, 1962, p.32. Kamarupa Vansavali, p.56; SMJC identified the 'disguised Brahmins' as soldiers; AB of GRB and KV as Sudras.
54. It was due to their '*Kshatriyaisation* of Brahmanical fold, who always respect the Brahmin and cows, and considered that killing of Brahmins and cows is a great sin. The Ahom king knew the fact the Koches were orthodox Hindus.
55. A section of the Horan people, who used to catch and train elephants for the Ahoms, now they started the same for the Koches. D. Nath, op. cit. p.57.
56. D. Nath, op. cit. p-57; ABSM, p.33.
57. The original version of DAB in Assamese language Edited by S.K. Bhuiyan, DRAS, Gauhati, (p.45), is as follows:

পাচে চাৰিং-ৰজাই ডাঙ্গৰীয়াসকলেৰে আলচ কৰি ৰজাদেবলৈ জনাই, ফুংখামৰ পিতেক লাঙ্গিডাম ১, লেচাইলুং ১, নাঙ্গিখুন ১, এই তিনিক কোঁচৰ ৰজাৰ ঠাইলৈ গ্ৰীতিৰ কাৰনে পঠাই দিলে । কোঁচ ৰজাও মিত্ৰ কৰিবৰ নিমিত্তে ৰতিকৰা নামে ভাল মানুহ এটা পঠাই দিলে । কোঁচ ৰজাই এই বুলি কৈ পঠাই দিলে ।

(Deodhai Assam Buranji p. 62).

58. Ibid,

59. D. Nath. op. cit. p.57; Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p.109, also mentioned the same message.

60. The Ahom's attitudes were fully negative and humiliating.

61. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 57.

62. SMJC, p.39; *A Comprehensive History of Assam*, S.L Barua p. 209 .

63. DRV, vv., 341-356.

64. DAB , (ed) SKB, DRAS., Gauhati, 1932,p.46 ; *Satsari Assam Buranji*, (ed) SKB, G.U,1960, p.72 ; AB, p.87 .

65. It was due to their dissatisfied with the Ahom king, for which they were providing their supports to the Koches from the long before of the incident. SMJC, p. 33.

66. DAB, op. cit. pp. 46-7; AB, p. 87.

67. Original text in Assamese (p.64), from DAB, (ed) SKB, DRAS, Gauhati, 1932, p.47; Also in AB, English trans. G .C. Barua, p.87.

“ভ্যৰাইখেক বুঢ়াগোহাঁই, তুমি উদয়গিৰি ৰাজাত এই কথা যাই , তিনজনা গোহাঁইৰ পুতেকক দিব, চুদডাঙ্গৰ পুতেকক, খামচেনৰ পুতেকক ; এইবোৰক যদি দি পঠাব স্বৰ্গী ৰাজাৰ ৰাজ্য মই কুশলে থৈ যাম”।

68. Second version of the English Trans from D. Nath, op. cit. p.58.

69. Ibid, p. 58; *A Comprehensive History of Assam*, S.L Barua p. 209.

70. It is stated in the Buranjis that Nangbakla Gabharu, aunt of the king (daughter of Suhungmung Dihinga Raja) and wife of Thaomunglung Bargohain refused to send her son as hostage to the Koch king saying, “I will not allow my son to be sent to the Koch country. Tell the king what he and the ministers are for when they have yielded to the enemies? Why should he reign when he is unable to save his subjects from the enemies?”She also said to her husband “Let me have your head-dress, girdle, belt and sword. Though I am a female, I shall fight with the Koch and

let him know how a female can fight with the male " AB, English trans., G .C. Barua, p.87; DAB, op. cit. pp. 47-48. so bound to sent his brother.

71. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 58; S.L Barua, op. cit. p. 209.
72. 'Koch Beharer Itihas' of Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, Eng Trns. 'A History of Coochbehar' by S.C. Ghosal, (ed) by H. Nag , Reprint ,2005, Siliguri, W.B., p. 20 ; Gait, op., cit.
73. DAB, p.49; S.L Barua, op. Cit. p. 209.
74. Manipur and Khairam, DAV, vv. 406- 408, and 432-33.
75. DRV, vv. 389-90.
76. Ibid, vv., 398-99.
77. Ibid, v., 401.
78. Ibid, v., 409.
79. Ibid, v., 413.
80. Ibid, vv., 415 -18.
81. Ibid, v. 420.
82. D. Nath, op. cit. p.62.
83. Gait, op. cit. p-54; The Jayantiya coins has a close similarity with the Koch coins. The legend Jayantiya coin runs as:
"Sree Sree Siva Charana-kamala-madhukarasya" , on reverse, and
"Sree Sree Jayantipura-Purandarasya Sake 1592", on obverse.
JASB, Vol. LXIV, PT-1, 1695; National Library , Kolkata ; J.A.S.B., Vol. , VI, No. 4 , p.159 , cited in 'Koch Beharer Itihas' of Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, Eng Trns. 'A History of Coochbehar' by S.C. Ghosal, (ed) by H. Nag , Reprint ,2005, Siliguri,W.B., p.123; A .W. Botham, 'Catalogue of the Provincial coin Cabinet's, Assam, Allahabad, 1930, p-544. Cited in D. Nath op. cit. p.79fn.
84. DRV vv., 424-428.
85. *Kamrupa Burunji*, p.12; DAB, p.51.
86. Khan Choudhary, op. cit. p.112.
87. DRV v. 431.
88. Gait, op. cit. p.54 .
89. N. R. Raychoudhury, 'Tripura through the Ages', Agartala, 1977, p. 33.

90. In July 1563, the Ahom sent the five sons of the chief Ahom nobles to the Koch camp at Narayanpur as hostages (AB, p. 87) and they must have taken minimum three to four years to conquer other kingdoms before their Tripura expedition.
91. D. Nath, op. cit., pp. 63-64.
92. N. R. Raychaudhury, op., cit., p. 33.
93. The example of Ramagupta of The Gupta Dynasty is the most important one
94. D. Nath, op. cit., p. 64.
95. DRV. , vv., 432-34.
96. Ibid. vv., 441-42.
97. Ibid, vv., 438-39.
98. Ibid, v., 445. Most probably the Kamta king Mriganka of 15th century. However, some modern scholars stated that the Dimarua has claimed themselves descendant from Naraka-Bhagadatta-Arimatta's family without mentioning their source of information. Gait op. cit. p.55; S.L Barua, op. cit. p. 211; D. Nath, op. cit. p. 66.
99. DRV, v., 461; there is also a story of 'Ghog' birds. See DRV. vv., 453-58.
100. H. Barbarua, '*Ahomar Din*', Gauhati, 1961 p. 93 ; S.L Barua , op. cit. p. 211 ; Khan Chaudhury A.A., op. cit., p.12 ; D. Nath , op. cit. p. 66.
101. H. Barbarua, op. cit. p. 92.
102. DRV, vv., 447-450 & 452.
103. Ibid. vv., 465 & 466.
104. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 66.
105. Ibid., pp. 64-66.
106. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, '*Koch Beharer Itihas*'. He had mentioned all the expeditions of the Koches towards the northeast except Sylhat.
107. Gait, op. cit. p. 55.
108. K.L Barua, Lawyers Book Stall, Gauhati, 1988, p.197.
109. Ibid.
110. DRV, vv., 474-476.
111. Ibid, vv., 478.
112. Ibid, vv., 482-487.
113. Ibid, vv., 459-460. Also in Gait, op. cit. p. 61.

114. The great Gupta king Samudragupta (c 335-376AD) had followed the same type of policy towards his south Indian conquest .In south India his policy known as 'Dharma Vijay'. He defeated the kings of the south but they were re-established in their respective positions as his vassals.
115. *Riyaz-us-Salatin*, (Eng. Trns), p. 152. The book states that Sulaiman "himself set out for the conquest of the country of Kuch Behar. He had subjugated its environs and outlying parts and whilst he was besieging its capital he got of an insurrection in Orissa, and so abandoned the siege". *Akbarnamah*, (Eng trns.) , p. 1068 states that the "ruler of Koch Bihar did not pay his respect to the Hakim of Bengal, and Sulaiman Karrani proceeded to make war upon him and returned upon failure".
116. D. Nath, op. cit., pp. 67-68.
117. D. Nath, op. cit., p. 68.
118. DRV, vv. 494-496., Kamrupa Buranji, p. 12.
119. Gait, p. 55, Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, . p.125.
120. *Riyaz-us-Salatin*, (Eng. Trns.), p. 152.
121. S. L Barua op. cit. p. 212, Rai K. L Barua Bahadur, op. cit. p.198., J. N. Sarkar, *History of Bengal -1200-1757AD*. p. 184
122. J. N. Sarkar, op. cit. p.184.
123. DRV, vv. 503-507.
124. Rai K. L Barua Bahadur, op. cit. p. 198.
125. The word *Kalapahar* does not denote his name but a term of the redoubtable Brahman renegade and iconoclast, which is widely known in Assam as the destroyer of Kamakhya temple and Hayagriva Madhava temple in Assam. Kalapahar also sacked the temple of Jagannath in Puri in about 1568 AD.
126. *Khargrnarayan Vansavali*, p.37. *Kamarupa Vansavali*, p. 21. Cited in Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, '*Koch Beharer Itihas*', op. cit. p.114.
127. SMJC, p.34.
128. DRV, vv. 519-534.
129. Gait, op. cit. p. 56.
130. SMJC, p. 36.
131. P. Gogoi, '*The Tai and the Tai Kingdoms*', G.U., 1968, p. 326.
132. SMJC., op. cit. p. 36, ABHB, p. 35, also in '*Koch Beharer Itihas*' , op. cit. p. 115.
133. *Ibid*, p.115.

134. Ibid, p. 115.
135. DAB, p. 50 , Gait , op. cit. p. 104 , and also in D. Nath , op. cit. p. 72 .
136. DRV, vv. 565-568.
137. Ibid, vv. 570-575.
138. Ibid, vv. 578-584.
139. Abul-Fazl, 'The Akbar-Namah', Eng. Trans. By H. Beverage, p. 349 .
140. Abul-Fazl, *The Ain-I Akbari*, Eng. Trans. By H. Bloemann, p. 50.
141. S. L. Barua, op. cit. p. 213.
142. S. N. Bhattacharyya, '*A history of Mughal North-East Frontier Policy*, pp. 98fn, and 103.
143. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 74.
144. Ibid. p. 74.
145. Ibid. p. 73 .
146. S. N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit. p. 102.
147. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 73.
148. *The Akbar-Namah*, part-III, pp -620fn; S. N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit. p.103.
149. S. N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit. pp. 109f; D. Nath, op. cit. p. 74.
150. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 74.
151. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p-123.
152. Gait, op. cit. pp. 58-59.
153. H. N. Chaudhary; '*The Cooch Behar State and Its Land Revenue of Settlement*, Cooch Behar, 1903, p. 232.
154. D. Nath, op. cit. p. 35.
155. DRV, vv., 302.
156. Gait, op. cit. p. 58; Khan Choudhary A. Ahamed, op. cit. p. 110.
157. SMJC, p. 33. , Gait, op. cit. p. 56. He stated that Chilarai obtained the favour of the Padshah of Gauda by saving the life of the Padshah's mother from snakebite. The Padshah released Chilarai and even gave his daughter in marriage with above mentioned territories as dowry .The mothers of the Padshah declared the river Karatoya as the western boundary of the Koch kingdom. , The DRV, vv. 519-536, gave us same information except the marriage and dowry. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p. 114. Stated that the mother's of the Padshah accepted Chilarai

as her son and he was not married with the daughter of the Padshah but with five noble-born-daughter of that country.

158. *Akbarnamah*, Part-III, p. 1067.
159. *Akbarnamah*, Part-III, p. 1067 ; S. N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit. p-96 fn and C. Wessels , 'Early Jesuit Travelers in Central Asia, The Hague, 1924, p-122 , Portuguese traveler , Stephen Cacella who visited western Koch kingdom (after division) had stated that the farthest limit of the Koch country to the was Renate (Rangamati / Joygong quoted in D. Nath, op. cit. p. 75 .
160. Narayanpur was the eastern most military outpost of the on the north bank of the Brahmaputra, connected with the Koch capital at Koch Behar by the road named *Gosain Kamal Ali* .
161. *Assam Buranji*, p. 88.
162. DRV, vv., 389-479.
163. Durgadas Majumder has written in the *Vansavali* that in the *Saka* 1493 the Ahom King succeeded in regaining his independence. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p. 115.
164. Khan Chaudhury A. Ahamed, op. cit. p. 124.
165. *Ibid* ; on submission , the Jayantiya king was instructed not to mint coins in his own name in future, but on request of the Jayantiya king, special permission was given with the condition that the Jayantiya kings would be allowed to mint coins with the legend of "Ruler of Jayantia", instead of giving the name of kings. This tradition continued till 1731 AD.; D. Nath, op. cit. p. 62.
166. S. N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit. p. 77fn.

:-