

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The early history of the Kāmatā-Koch kingdom, like that of many other kingdoms of medieval India is shrouded in obscurity. However, we get from the Āṣm̄ Burañī and the Guru Carita that one Durlabhanārāyaṇa (c. 1330-1350 A.D.) ascended the throne of Kāmatā.¹ Guru Carita records the constant warfare occurred between Durlabhanārāyaṇa and Dharmanārāyaṇa, the latter who is said to have ruled over the region bordering the river Mahānandā in North Bengal.² Peace was later on concluded between them resulting in the division of the Kāmatā Kingdom, in which the whole of the eastern part of the Kingdom went to Durlabhanārāyaṇa. After this division of territories, Durlabhanārāyaṇa took the title the Kāmatāśvara and Dharmanārāyaṇa styled himself as the Gauḍeśvara,³ the title perhaps attributed to the latter for the reason that he annexed certain territory from the Kingdom of Gauḍa.⁴ It is said that during Durlabhanārāyaṇa's reign, there were occasional Bhutan raids in the north-eastern part of his kingdom. The king, however, strongly opposed the Bhutiyās and ultimately ousted them from the Kāmatā Kingdom with the help of Caṇḍīvara.⁵

Indranārāyaṇa (c. 1350-65 A.D.), son of Durlabhanārāyaṇa succeeded to the throne.⁶ On the basis of a coin dated 759 A.H. (A.D. 1357-58) minted at Chavlistān alias Kārup of Sikandar Shāh,

the Bengal Sultan, it is suggested that Sikandar Shāh led an invasion to Kāmarūpa in 1357 A.D.⁷

After the middle of the fourteenth century the history of Kāmatā is most uncertain.⁸

The first Kāmatā kingdom of which we possess any connected account is that of the Khyan or Khen dynasty.⁹ In the first half of the fifteenth century, a new line of kings known as Khyan or Khen dynasty ascended the throne of Kāmatā.¹⁰ Hunter¹¹ is of opinion that the Khen dynasty succeeded the pāla dynasty in the government of Kāmarūpa. According to the Kāmatesvara Kulakārikā of Śrutidhara Hīpanārāyaṇa, the ruler of Kāmatā originally belonged to the Vardhana family¹² took shelter at Kāmatā and became famous as Rājavanśis. Incidentally, D.C. Sircar identifies Vardhanakṣṭa with Bardhankot and makes it a part of the Nivṛti country.¹³

Nīladvaja, the founder of the Khen dynasty, is said to have become into eminence from an humble position.¹⁴ His capital was at the city of Kāmatānagara on the bank of the Dharīā.¹⁵ It is likely that Nīladvaja occupied the city which was already in existence and afterwards, he made certain innovations. R.D. Banerjee, while commenting on the Khen dynasty perhaps rightly pointed out that these mongoloid people only utilised the fortification which had been built several centuries ago.¹⁶

The Gosanīmāngala, while describing the building of the Capital by the celestial architect Visvakarmā in a very short time, actually, perhaps referred to the fortification of the existing forts like Kāmatāpura.^{16a}

Nīlādhvaja was succeeded by his son, Cakradhvaja on the throne in C 1460 A.D. We learn from Risalatunah Shuhada, a later Muslim work that there was a campaign against the king of Kāmatā led by Bengal Sultan Barbak Shāh¹⁷ who perhaps could not make much headway against the ruler of Kāmatāpura.¹⁸

Nīlāmvara who succeeded his father in 1480 A.D. is said to have extended his kingdom from the Karatoyā in the west to Badnadi on the east.¹⁹ Gait says that Nīlāmvara conquered some north-eastern territories which were previously under the muslim occupation.²⁰ Nīlāmvara is credited to have constructed the long route stretching from Kāmatāpura to Ghorāghāt (Rangpur), remains of which may be found in the present Diphata-Mekhligani Road.²¹ However, his rule came to an end in 1498 by an attack from Hussain Shāh, the Sultan of Gauda (1493-1519). The Kāmatā king was defeated and the city of Kāmatāpura was captured.²² Hussain Shāh reduced the country as far east as Badnadi and erected a pillar of victory at Malda (dated 1501-2 A.D.)²³ But no sooner had Hussain Shāh left Kāmatāpura, the Bhuyāns some of whom already surrendered to the Sultan²⁴ rose into revolt and killed Denial or Dulal gāji, the successor of Hussain Shāh.²⁵ Asām Burañji gives the name Masandar Gāji, stated to be the

son of Dulal Gāji¹⁴⁰ conquered this region. And after his reign, Sultan Ghius, possibly the general of Hussain Shāh was said to have attacked Kāmatā. He perhaps built a mosque at Hājo and was buried there. This graveyard is commonly known as 'Pea Mecca' or (one fourth of Mecca).²⁶ After his death the Bhuyāns were said to have asserted their independence.²⁷

The rise of Visvasimha at this hour, perhaps, put an end to the period of greatness of the Bāro Bhuyāns. According to the Akbarnāmah the founder of the new dynasty was Bīsa (i. e. Visvasimha).²⁸ It appears from the Darrang Rāja Vamsāvalī²⁹ that Visvasimha was the son of one Hariyā mondala, Chief of the twelve Koch tribes.³⁰ As a matter of fact, Visvasimha was a man of unusual enterprise and courage, and he soon established his position by defeating the Bhuyān chiefs³¹ one after another till he made himself the master of the dominion extending as far as the Karatoya in the west and the Badnadī in the east.³² He described himself as Kāmatesvara (i. e., lord of Kāmatā, possible in imitation of the tutelary deity of the country known as Kāmatesvarī, and his capital was Kāmatānagara.³³ In the contemporary records also Visvasimha has been described as the lord of Kāmatā.³⁴ During his period of coronation,³⁵ Sīmī, his elder brother held the Royal Umbrella on his head which was the duty of a vassal.³⁶ His campaign against the Ahom is said to have proved abortive and he had to retreat.³⁷ But Visvasimha's victory over the ruler of Gauḍa has been mentioned in the

Rājopādhāyana, and Yoginī Tantra. 38

At the time of Visvasimha's death in C 1555 A.D., his two eldest sons, Malladeva and Śukladhvaja, were at Vāṇasī, where under a learned Brāhmaṇa named Brahmānanda, 39 Narasiṅha, one of the elder sons of the deceased king ascended the vacant throne. 40 The two brothers returned to Koch Bihar immediately and defeated the latter who fled from the kingdom. 41 Malladeva then ascended the throne and assumed the name Naranārāyaṇa. 42 He appointed Śukladhvaja the Yuvarāja (heir-apparent) under the name of Saṅgrāmasimha (Śukladhvaja). 43 He is said to have made an extensive conquests of eastern Indian territories including the whole of the Brahmaputra valley, the Khāsi and Jaintia Hills, Manipura, Tripura and part of Sylhet. 44 In this great campaign his brother Śukladhvaja, who was also known as Cilārāi or 'the Kite king' because of his 'Blitzkrieg' tactics, displayed great generalship. 45

The territory over which Naranārāyaṇa is said to have established his permanent conquest has been narrated in the Akbar-nāmah: "on the east is the river Brahmaputra, on the north is lower Tibet and Assam, and on the south Ghoraghāt, On the west is Tihut". 46

Naranārāyaṇa's nephew Raghudeva at the instigation of some officers left the Koch Capital and settled near Barnagara on the banks of the Manās river and constructed there a fort. 47

Further, it is interesting to note that Raghudeva fought with his uncle not engaging himself in the war but dressed his one hundred and twenty wives as soldiers and sent them to oppose his uncle.⁴⁸ The king Naranārāyana was ashamed of it and left the battle field. The king made over to Raghudeva the region to the east of the Sankosa river. Raghudeva was said to have agreed to pay annual tribute to the king.⁴⁹ The region lying to the west of the Sankosa upto the Karatoya river continued to be the kingdom of the original line of the Koch dynasty. As regards the reason why Naranārāyana divided the kingdom and allowed Raghudeva to rule over to that tract lying to the east of the river Sankosa, nothing more is known from any source. It appears, however, that Naranārāyana was not merely moved by emotion but also from the political exigencies. It is possible that the hostility of the Ahoms and the rising power of the Mughals from Bengal prevailed upon him to take such a decision and thereby putting his rebellious nephew in charge of the territory adjacent to kingdom of the Ahoms and making it a buffer zone between the main Koch territory lying to the west of the Sankosa and the kingdom of the Ahoms. Again, in order to keep in tact an extensive empire, the state had to employ a vast army in addition to the maintenance of the huge administrative apparatus which would cause much pressure upon the state economy.

These considerations also perhaps induced Naranārāyana to take a decision regarding the division of

the kingdom.

After Naranārāyaṇa's death Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa succeeded to his father, ~~Naranārāyaṇa~~, in 1537 A.D. He has been described as a very ineffective ruler. Raghudeva declared himself independent and struck coins in his own name. He also refused to acknowledge the vassalage of the Koch Kingdom of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa.⁵⁰ Consequently, war began between Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa and Raghudeva. Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa sought help from the Bengal governor Mānsiṃha. They met each other at a place named Ānandapura (probably a Koch frontier town in the vicinity of Ghoraghāt region).⁵¹ The Mughals agreed to help Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa. On the other hand, Raghudeva allied himself with the pāthan chief Īsā Khān of Bhāti.⁵² Raghudeva then attacked the Koch King Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa and Bāhirbund was annexed to the former's kingdom. At this situation, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa appealed to Mānsiṃha for help. The Bengal viceroy, sent the army without delay. Raghudeva fought bravely but was thoroughly routed. Hearing this news, Īsā Khān rushed to Raghudeva's help. But the army of Īsā Khān could not proceed far as Mānsiṃha combining with the force of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa made a bold attack on Īsā Khān's stronghold. Īsā Khān, however, fought hard and drove back the enemy with great loss.

But this victory of Īsā Khān made the vanquished Bengal Viceroy conscious for making a strong ~~next~~ defence against the Koch-Mughal onslaught. Parīksit, son of Raghudeva also pursued his father's policy against Koch Bihar. Here also,

the combined attack of the Koch-Mughal armies brought ultimately Parīkṣit to Mughal subjugation. Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa was temporarily put in charge of the eastern "part of Kāmarūpa". But with the change in Bengali Government, Qāsim Khān, the new Bengal Subādār brought Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa in confinement to Dacca. It may be pointed out that Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa's territory extended upto Ghoraghāt on the south,⁵³ Saṅkosa on the east, and Karatoyā on the west.

But during the time of Vīṅṅārāyaṇa,^a the extent of Koch kingdom became limited. And the Bhutiyās also did not recognise the loyalty of the king. It is easy to infer that he (Vīṅṅārāyaṇa) continued to remain under Mughal Vassalage, paying regular tributes to the Mughal Emperor. The then Bengal viceroy, Qāsim Khān, was an energetic and able man, and Vīṅṅārāyaṇa^a dared not turn away from the path of faithful obedience even if he had desired it.

The long reign of Prāṅṅārāyaṇa (1632-1665 A.D.) is worth mentioning for more reasons than one. It was because of the energy and shrewdness of the king that Koch Bihar shook off foreign yoke and regained its independence for nearly seven years. Afterwards, Koch Bihar turned into a vassal state of the Mughals. After Prāṅṅārāyaṇa's death a series of weaklings appeared, under whom the kingdom slowly met with its doom. During his last days, the boundary of his kingdom as mentioned in the Alangirnāmah⁵⁴ was extended over 600 square miles. Tajhat,

Bāhirband parganā were on the south, Puskarapura near Khontaghāt (in goalpara district) on the east and Patganw in Morāng was on the west of Kingdom.

After Prānanārāyana, there were three rulers viz. Modanārāyana (1665-80 A.D.), Vasudevanārāyana (1680-82) and Mahīndranārāyana (1682-93 A.D.) during whose reign period there was spread of mutual strife within the kingdom.⁵⁵ The Bhutiyās began to interfere in the sovereignty of the Koch territory. But it is to be noted that there was no Mughal hold on Koch Bihar during this period.⁵⁶ After the death of Mahīndranārāyana, Yajñanārāyana, the Nāzir usurped the throne and declared himself king on the ground that he was the oldest of the near (sapindā) relations of the deceased. After his death, Rūpanārāyana, the descendant of Mahīnārāyana (the first Nāzir Deo) and the nephew of Yajñanārāyana then became the ruler of the Kāmata Koch kingdom. With him the main lineage of the Koch dynasty was changed⁵⁷ and the period of rule from among the members of the Nāzir Deo family started. It was during his time that the Chaklajat Estates viz. Bodā, Pātgrāma and Pūrvabhāga were ceded to the Imperial dominions although the zemindary right was allowed to be enjoyed by the king on the condition of payment of an annual tribute to the Bengal Nawab.⁵⁸ The subsequent rulers Upendranārāyana and Devendranārāyana ruled only for a few years.⁵⁹ During Upendranārāyana's regime Saiyad Ahmed, the Fanjdar of Rangpur led an invasion into the former's kingdom in aid of Dīnanārāyana, son of Satyanārāyana, the Dewan Deo, who

was aspired for the throne. With the help of the Faujdar Dīnanārāyana could usurp the throne for eight days only.⁶⁰

During the reign of Dhairyaendranārāyana, the feud between the king and the Dewān on the question of succession became prominent.⁶¹ Bhutiya's sustained interest in the affairs of Koch Bihar throughout the 18th century centred on ensuring her hold on the fertile region known as the western Duars.⁶² In 1769 A.D. the boundary between Koch Bihar and the territory of the Company was demarcated. Some tāluks of Gitaldaha and Batrishāzari parganā~~s~~ were separated from Chākā Kakinā and included in the kingdom of Koch Bihar.⁶³

Koch-Bhutiya Relation

Bhutan proper lies within the inner Himalayan zone. Dalton (1872) observes that the conflict between the Koch and the Bhutanese had taken place "three hundred or four hundred years ago".⁶⁴

In the main stream of Indian history, Bhutan had earliest links with the kingdom of Kāmarūpa. The Yoginī Tantra, as mentioned earlier, has shown the extent of Kāmarūpa which included Bhutan. Gait also cites the authority of the Yoginī Tantra ^{and} says that "in ancient times, Bhutan seems, occasionally at least, to have formed part of the kingdom of Kamarupa".⁶⁵ Hiuen Tsang during his visit of Kāmarūpa placed the

circumference of the country at 10,000 li (nearly 1700 miles). On the basis of above account Cunningham pointed out that the Kāmarūpa comprised "the whole of Brahmaputra valley as well as Cooch Behar and Bhutan".⁶⁶

It is said that the Tibetan settlers displaced the persons belonging to the tribe called Tephoo from Bhutan. Bhutan was ruled by this tribe for more than two centuries. They were generally believed to have been people of Koch Bihar.⁶⁷ Gait has referred to the statement of Shihāb-ud-din Tālish, who accompanied Mir Jumla in 1661 A.D. in the Koch Bihar campaign, and who said that the people of that country (Bhutan) then spoke a dialect allied to that of the Koches.⁶⁸ It is important to notice that the rise of the Koch dynasty to political pre-eminence with their metropolis at Kamatāpura roughly coincided with the expulsion of the Koch tribe from Bhutan by ^{Tk}Tibetans under the first Dharma-Rāja. The Koch Chronicler asserted that Prince Narasiṅha, the brother of Naranārāyana went to Bhutan and made himself ruler there.⁶⁹ However, the historic fact of long struggle between the Koch and the Bhutanese for supremacy over the plains of the Duars run in continuation of the earlier confrontations between them.

The Shahdang of Bhutan was called Dharmarāja. The European scholars used to call him by the latter term. Regarding the term Dharmarāja it is presumed that it in all likelihood was in vogue among the people bordering Bhutan long before Ralph Fitch's visit to Cooch Behar in 1583. "There is," he says, "a

country four days' journey from Couche..... which is called Bottanter and the citie Bottia, the King is called Dermain".⁷⁰ While Bottanter is admittedly Bhutan, Dermain can be no other than caecella's Dromarāja (1626) or the Dharmarāja of Bhutan.⁷¹ Surgeon Rennie compared the legend collected by Krishna Kanta Bose (1875) with that of 'the traditional account furnished to Eden by Cheboo Lama' (1864) and observed that the two accounts helped to 'specify the people of Cooch Behar as those who originally possessed Bhutan' and to indicate Tibet as the place from which the first Dharmarāja came.⁷² The first Dharmarāja came to Bhutan "two to three hundred years ago" and took possession of Punākha ousting the Koch Prince. He then took measures for "introducing law in lawless Bhutan". The Dharmarāja sent 'armed men to roam over mountains and forests, rocks and caves' to stop robbery and theft.⁷³ Instead of ascending the throne and exercising temporal power, he brought a Tibetan from Lasha⁷⁴ and appointed him Prime Minister who, according to a later authority, came to be known as Devarāja.⁷⁵

The Rajonākhyaṇa⁷⁶ records that Viśvasimha sent a letter addressed to the Devarāja and Dharmarāja through an envoy asking them to acknowledge submission and to pay tribute to him. The Devarāja insulted the envoy. At this, Viśvasimha waged a sanguinary battle against the Bhutias and conquered the territories upto foothills of the Himalayan range. Next, he planned to attack the capital of Bhutan. Just on the eve of his attack, the Devarāja appealed to Viśvasimha for a treaty.

A treaty was concluded between the two parties. The Devarāja agreed to pay an annual tribute at a stipulated rate and also agreed that he would render military assistance to the Koch King at the time of war.

During the reign of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, son of Narānārāyaṇa, Stephen Cacella (1627 A.D.), a Christian missionary, journeyed to Bhutan through the kingdom of Kāmata. He has written that several years before the uncle of king Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa travelled to the hilly country of Bhutan. He was arrested there and made to plough land and king Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa was so angry on learning this news that he ordered all the Bhutiya subjects of his kingdom to be imprisoned. These reprisals continued until the Bhutiyas released his uncle.⁷⁷

During the reign period of Viṣṇunārāyaṇa, the Koch kingdom became weak. The Rāikats discarded the Koch suzerainty.⁷⁸ They stopped paying annual tribute to the Koch Rājās.⁷⁹

After the death of Mahārājā Prānārāyaṇa, four sons of Mahīnārāyaṇa, the Nāzir Deo, tried to get the throne.⁸⁰ And when they were engaged in disputes Modanārāyaṇa, son of Prānārāyaṇa, ascended the throne. He ceased the power of Nāzir Deo and offered the post of Prime Ministership to a man of royal blood. He sentenced to death some of the officers who sided with Mahīnārāyaṇa and banished others. This policy culminated in open war. Jagatnārāyaṇa the eldest son of Mahīnārāyaṇa who had created much unrest within the kingdom, was killed under the

orders of the King,⁸¹ and at last Mahīnārāyaṇa was also sentenced to death. The other sons of Mahīnārāyaṇa allying with the Devarāja of Bhutan fought against the king but it was of no avail. Subsequently, the unrest was somewhat subsided with appointment of Yajñanārāyaṇa, son of Mahīnārāyaṇa, as Chatra Nāsir.⁸²

With the help of the Bhutiyās the three sons of Mahīnārāyaṇa tried to get the throne. And the news was sent to Baikānthapura. Having heard this news, the Rāikat brother Bhuja Deva and Jaga Deva marched towards Koch Bihar at the head of a large army and drove out them from the kingdom.⁸³

Vasudevanārāyaṇa, the third son of Pranānārāyaṇa, was placed on the throne by the Rāikats. When they left for Baikānthapura, Yajñarāyaṇa ungratefully put Vasudevanārāyaṇa to death.⁸⁴ He ascended the throne for eight days and declared himself king. No sooner the news of the king Vasudevanārāyaṇa's death had reached Baikānthapura than the Rāikat brothers rushed to Koch Bihar and a heavy fighting took place between Yajñanārāyaṇa and the Rāikats on the left bank of the Mānsāi river.⁸⁵ Yajñarāyaṇa managed to escape to the hills.⁸⁶ Afterwards Mahīndranārāyaṇa became king in 1682 A.D. During his reign, the king courted friendship of Yajñanārāyaṇa who was appointed as the Nāsir. The Bhutiyās also began to render help to the king Mahīndranārāyaṇa.⁸⁷ After Mahīndranārāyaṇa's death, there was no living descendant of Mahārāja Virnarāyaṇa. The kingdom was rendered powerless. Taking advantage of it, Yajñarāyaṇa, the Nara Deva again asserted independence and declared himself king. He was

said to have assisted by the Pāthāns who were opposed to the Mughals. Following this, the Raikats again appeared on the scene. They resumed struggle against Yajñanārāyaṇa. In a protracted battle between 1700 to 1702 A.D., the Raikats were killed. Yajñanārāyaṇa also died near Pātgrāma.⁸⁸

During the reign period of Upendranārāyaṇa, the Bhutiyās were said to have extended their territory upto a portion of the plains. The king could not oppose them. Moreover, when the Mughal Faujdar of Rangpur attacked the western portion of the Koch kingdom, Upendranārāyaṇa found no other alternative than to conclude a treaty with the Bhutiyās with whose help, king Upendranārāyaṇa defeated the Mughals and the faujdar escaped towards Rangpur in 1737 A.D.⁸⁹ The influence of the Bhutiyās this increased with the king's dependence upon them in fighting with Mughals. The influence of the Bhutiyās was more felt during the period of Upendranārāyaṇa than any period of the earlier rulers. One of their representatives was stationed at Koch Bihar⁹⁰ with some soldiers and it was necessary to take his assent in certain matters of administration.⁹¹ The Subā of Burā Duar (Bakshā Duar) used to come every year to Chēkākhatā with the Chief Bhutiya Officers to present Nazar to the king. They offered horses, Kochin and Debānga Cloths, Śvatamālā, Bhotmālā, musk, white cowries, walnuts, Bhot ghee, Bhot plums etc.⁹² The king also proceeded there accompanied by the Nazir and the Dewān, and presents with double those brought by the Bhutiyās, were offered as Inām (Khilāt). In addition to the

above, the Bhutan representatives were regaled with a feast arranged by the Koch king.⁹³ And when the king Devendranārāyana was assassinated by Rati Sarmā at the instigation of the royal priest Rāmananda, the Bhutiyās rendered death punishment to Rāmananda.

During the period of Dhairyendranārāyana⁹⁴ there occurred a battle with the Bhutiyās on the issue of death of Rāmanārāyana, the Devan Deo, who had been appointed with having the consent of the Bhutiya.⁹⁵

→ The Devarāja of Bhutan was then determined to depose Mahārāja Dhairyendranārāyana. He sought approval of the Lāma of Tibet.⁹⁶

In 1770 A.D. Dhairyendranārāyana and Surendranārāyana the Devan were imprisoned by the Bhutiyās at the usual gathering mentioned above and were carried off to the hills, appointing his brother, Rājendranārāyana as Rāja in his place.⁹⁷ On the death of Rājendranārāyana shortly afterwards, the Nāzir placed Dharendranārāyana, son of Dhairyendranārāyana on the throne. The Bhutiyās had on their side appointed Rājendranārāyana as Rāja of Koch Bihar, the son of the captive Rāja's eldest brother, each party supported their respective candidates and the Nāzir Deo, being wasted and driven out of the country, applied to the East India Company for assistance. The East India Company which had been carefully observing the growing power of the Bhutiyās in Koch Bihar, responded to the appeal forthwith. They came and

ousted the Bhutiyās from Koch Bihar.⁹⁸ A Treaty No. (XXXIII)⁹⁹ was concluded on the 5th day of April, 1773 A.D. between the East India Company and Nāsir Deo Khagendranārāyana on behalf of ^{King} Dharendranārāyana who was minor at that time. The Rājā agreed to acknowledge subjection to the British Government to allow Koch Bihar to be included within Bengal and to make over to the British Government one-half of the annual revenue of Koch Bihar for ever.

Koch and Sannyasī Revolt

In the wake of the decline of the empire of the Mughals, Koch Bihar along with the plains of the Duars like many parts of northern India were exposed to the deprivations of wandering bands known as the Sannyasīs.¹⁰⁰ The Koch monarchy founded by Visvasimha early in 16th century, had already lost its vitality and was torn by division, and internecine shifts. In the year 1713 A.D. Darpadeva, the Rājā of Baikantapura, with the help of some bandits from Morāng hills (Darjeeling ^{and} Nepal Terai) called Sannyasīs and in collaboration with the Bhutiyās continued attack in the territory of Koch Bihar and East India Company's properties.

Captain Stuart was sent to subdue the rising. He defeated both Darpadeva and the Sannyasīs and took possession of the town of Jalpaiguri.¹⁰¹ Partly Chiefs like the Raikats of Baikantapura were virtually independent and made a bid to

settle old scores by capturing the metropolis, Cooch Behar'.¹⁰² The king of Koch Behar who sought the help of the British was instructed by the latter to remain firm in their allegiance to the British Government, who, on the other hand, bound themselves to assist the Rājā with troops whenever he might require them for the defence of the country, ^{provided that} the Rājā ^{would} bear the expense. Captain Jones with a small force of Sepoys then proceeded to Koch Bihar, dispossessed the Bhutanese, and pursuing them to the hills compelled them to make terms with the British Government. A Treaty¹⁰³ was concluded with Bhutan in 1774 and in accordance with one of its articles Rājā Dhanendranārāyana was released from confinement.

In settling the frontier, great favour have been shown to the Bhutiyas probably with a view to gaining their friendship for commercial advantages.

Koch Relations with the Ahoms and the Mughals

According to the Darrang Rājavanśāvalī¹⁰⁴ Visvasinha led an invasion of the Ahom territory,¹⁰⁵ but was compelled to retreat due to hardships experienced during the journey and difficulty for obtaining supplies.¹⁰⁶ On the other hand, a few Burmese inform us that Ahom King Suhungmung sent in 1533 A.D. an army in aid of one fugitive Kāmata king (whose name has not been mentioned) in order to re-instate him in his own kingdom.¹⁰⁷ After establishing him, the Bargohain (i. e.

Commander-in-Chief) advanced as far as the Karatoya river where their commander is said to have erected a temple and dug a tank.¹⁰⁸

It is most probable that on his way back to Assam from this expedition, the Ahom General marched against Visvasimha who acknowledged the supremacy of the Ahom King and gave various presents to the Bargohain. As Visvasimha's power was not consolidated, he found no other alternative than to tender his submission to the Ahom king without fighting.¹⁰⁹ Visvasimha is said to have led an invasion of the Ahom kingdom in 1537 A.D. But before a battle was fought, he was probably compelled to abandon the expedition due to various difficulties. He established friendship with the Ahom King Suhungmung by exchanging presents.¹¹⁰ Gait, however, observes, 'The Ahom Chronicles merely relate that in 1537 A.D. he (i.e. Visvasimha) paid a friendly visit to the Ahom king and exchanged presents with him'.¹¹¹

During his reign there were hostilities more than once between the Ahoms and the Muhammadans and it is possible that Visvasimha played a significant part in driving out the Muhammadans from Kamarupa, although no account of such warfare fought by Visvasimha against the Mughals is available.¹¹²

In course of his fight against the Ahoms Naranarayana, son and successor of Visvasimha along with his brother Sukladhvaja (alias Cilarsai) advanced through Goalpara and Kamarupa over a road called Gohain Kamala Ali built by Gohain Kamal,¹¹³ another

son, ^{of} Visvasimha. The Koch army fought a fierce battle on the bank of the river Dikrāl or Dihong and Darrang Rāja Varisāvalī states that the battle lasted for seven days and ended in the defeat of the Ahoms.¹¹⁴ It has been suggested by Gait that Koch army was afterwards defeated by the Ahoms under Suklengmung who entrenched himself on the bank of the pichalā river and cut off their supplies.¹¹⁵

This defeat led to a cessation of hostilities for some years. In 1555 A.D. Naranārāyaṇa sent six envoys [Infra, Appendix I (Administration)] to the Ahom King Sukhāmpā, Khorā Rājā (1552-1603 A.D.) with presents and a letter referring to the old friendship existed between Visvasimha, his father and the Ahom king, Suhungmung (1497-1539 A.D.). He desired to maintain similar friendship with the Ahom ruler. In his letter, however, he regretted for murder of the three Koch princes viz., Dīp Simha, Hemadhara and Rāmacandra.¹¹⁶

Bargohāin who received the envoys on behalf of the king remarked that there was nothing wrong in the murder of the Koch princes in a battle, since this was in agreement with the practices among the Kṣatriyas.¹¹⁷

He (Bargohāin) considered the articles brought by the ambassadors as most ordinary. In his reply, the Ahom king wrote that he was happy to learn that Koch King has mentioned about cordial relation that subsisted between them. The Ahom King indicated that he would remain as cordial as he was before.

Lastly, he mentioned about the articles despatched to him and said a bit sarcastically that such things would (naturally) appear proper to those who were accustomed to use them. The Ahom King in return sent two pieces of Nara cloth, four elephant tusks, two ganthian (fragrant roots of a tree) along with a letter to the Koch king Naranārāyaṇa.¹¹⁸

Having received a detailed report from the envoys after their return from Ahom kingdom and the letter from the Ahom King, Naranārāyaṇa proceeded to prepare for war. In 1562 the King along with his brother Cilarāi marched against the Ahoms. On the way the Bhuyān Chiefs acknowledged the supremacy of the Koch king. The Bhutiyās and the Daflās also offered their submission and joined the ranks of the Koch army.¹¹⁹ Śuklādhvaja (Cilarāi) planned to attack Assam simultaneously by land and river. A large flotilla of boats under the naval Commanders Bhaktamālā and Tepu advanced by river and a force of fifty two thousands men by land route under the Generals Bhunvala and Vāhuvala pātra. In a naval engagement on the mouth of the river Dikṣu the Ahoms were defeated.¹²⁰ It is interesting to note that the infantry of the Koches under Cilarāi came upto Nārāyaṇapura. In such a critical situation, the Ahoms dressed up their soldiers as Brāhmaṇas, each wearing a sacred thread and seated on a cow. They knew that the Koches did not kill Brāhmaṇas and cows. Cilarāi, considering them to be real Brāhmaṇas desisted from the war.¹²¹ Later on, he understood the real motive and advanced with a strong force

upto the capital of Gadgaon in 1563 A.D. War ensued between the Koches and the Ahoms. Ultimately the capital Gadgaon fell into the hands of the Koches. The Ahom monarch had to retire to the hilly forests of Namarupa and to sue for peace.¹²² A considerable tract north of the Brahmaputra was ceded to Naranarayana and a good number of sons of some nobles were given to Gilarai as hostages. A heavy war indemnity was also paid to the Koch king.¹²³

However, the Ahom king came back to his capital and took vigorous steps to restore his position. After a short while, places like Narayanapura and Sala were re-occupied and two forts were erected there.¹²⁴

We have already noticed that Naranarayana did not stop his conquest with only vanquishing the Ahoms. He led military campaigns against many other royal dynasties of eastern India and as a result of that Koch Bihar became the most powerful kingdom in Eastern India in the later half of the 16th century.

Most of the Yaisavalis and Assam Buraonis narrate that the attack on Gauḍa by Naranarayana was made after the conquest of the Ahom territory and before the construction of the temple of Kamakhya (1566 A.D.). It has been suggested that Naranarayana attacked Gauḍa in retaliation of the destruction¹²⁵ of the temple of Kamakhya, although the Nilacala inscription of Sukladhvaja¹²⁶ does not give us any indication of the rebuilding of the temple, nor this event has been supported by any Muhammadan historian. Some, however, described this venture of Naranarayana

as an expression of his ambition for the expansion of his authority further west. We, however, know very little about the details of the Gauda king Sulaimān Karṇi's encounter with Naranārāyaṇa, which, in its outlines at least, appears to be a genuine historical episode. It is said that the Koch army was defeated and Sukladvaja, the Koch Commander-in-Chief was made captive. But the victory obtained by Sulaimān Karṇi was to all intents and purposes a pyrrhic victory.¹²⁷ The exigency of such a situation influenced Naranārāyaṇa to make friendship with the Ahoms, particularly when he got a letter secretly sent to him by his brother Cilārāi advising him to obtain friendship of the Ahom king by releasing the Ahom hostages and to avert an attack from them (i.e., the Ahoms). Naranārāyaṇa accordingly decided to release the Ahom hostages who were brought to Koch Capital in 1563 A.D. But he made a good deal of plan to conceal his real motive by arranging a dice-play with Sundara Gosāin, the leader of the hostages, so that Naranārāyaṇa's weakness could not be exposed to the Ahom king. The king played with Sundara Gosāin and willingly courted defeat. He then released the hostages according to the terms of the aforesaid game.¹²⁸

A similar manner appears to have been adopted by Sulaimān Karṇi with the help of his mother, who with a show of her motherly affections to Cilārāi, brought about his immediate release. Because the Bengal Sultan also was eager for making friendship with the ruler of the Kāmatā-Koch Kingdom

in order to face a threat of invasion from the Mughal conquerors of Delhi. ¹²⁹

It is said that inspite of abovementioned friendship between Koch king and the Ahoms, Naranārāyaṇa sent a fresh naval expedition under Teṇu, ¹³⁰ to effect recovery of the territories like Nārāyaṇapura and Sālā which were recovered by the Ahom king Svargadeva immediately after Naranārāyaṇa's departure from there in ^{later} his earlier campaign as given above. The Koches were defeated with loss of soldiers, many ships, guns and other things. ¹³¹ The attack was renewed and an intense fighting took place between the two parties on the mouth of river Dhānsiri (Nāntimā) in which the Koches were defeated. With that victory the Ahoms reinstated their position on the north bank of the Brahmaputra river. ¹³²

During Sulaimān's Koch enterprise, Bengal was open to threat from the Delhi Emperor. And Mughal authority was established in Bengal on the ruins of the pāthān rule and with their appearance there opened a new era in the history of Muhammadan relation with Kāmarūpa and Kāmātā-Koch Kingdom. Naranārāyaṇa realised the necessity of making friendship with the Mughals and thus sent an emissary in 1574 A.D. to Akbar's Court with various presents and also refused asylum to the Afghan rebel, Mankālī of Ghoraghāt. ¹³³ The Mughal Emperor appears to have been highly pleased by this friendly gesture on the part of the

Koch king and heartily reciprocated it. A peaceful and defensive alliance (1578 A.D.) was established on equal terms between Koch Bihar and Mughal India.¹³⁴ As regards this treaty S.N. Bhattacharyya,¹³⁵ rightly observes, "the distracted political condition of Bengal in general, and of Ghoraghat region in particular, explains to a great extent the pacific disposition of the Mughal Emperor towards Koch Bihar. The necessity of maintaining good relations with the Koch King, in order to deprive the Afghan rebels and the disaffected Imperial officers of a safe asylum in his state, must have been brought home to Akbar". Naranārāyaṇa also considered it as a good defence against the Ahoms.

The Koch king is said to have sent his own war-boats in aid of Mughals in 1583 A.D. in pursuance of the newly concluded treaty. In November of the same year, there was an insurrection led by Maṣūm Kābuli in the vicinity of Tandā. The Koch navy co-operated with the war-boats of the qaqshāls on the banks of the Ganges in suppressing the rebel Maṣūm Kābuli who ultimately fled to Bhāti through Ghoraghat.¹³⁶

About this time an event occurred, which greatly affected the history of the Kāmata-Koch Kingdom and also served to give a new turn to the Mughal North-East frontier policy. It is the division of the state into two parts and subsequent emergence of two independent kingdoms i.e. Kāmata-Koch Kingdom to the ^{west} east of the Sankōṣa under Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa and Kāmārūpa kingdom under Raghudeva to the ^{east} west of the said river.¹³⁷

During the reign of Naranārāyaṇa, Raghudeva acted as the governor of the territory to the east of Sankosa, although, as noted above, he (i.e. Raghudeva) assumed the title Kamarūnēsvara in the Hayagriva Temple Inscription at Hājo.

~~As Mahārāja Naranārāyaṇa demanded tribute~~

After the death of Naranārāyaṇa, Raghudeva fought with his son Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa. Raja Raghudeva was defeated, and he returned to his territory, leaving behind his umbrella at Bihar. Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa detained this insignia of royalty as a souvenir of his victory over Raghudeva. The defeated prince now conferred with his kinmen, Sil Khān, Fateh Khān, the king's son-in-law, Purandara Lakṣara, Nitāi Candra Nāzir, Thākur Panthananda, Kavindrapātra, Gadādhara Barua and other Barās and Buruks and then made preparations for an invasion of ^{Kāmati-Koch} Bihar. 138

He formed an alliance with Isā Khān, the enemy of Mughals, as a counterpoise to Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa's treaty of friendship ¹³⁹ with the Mughal Emperor and decided on an expedition to west of the Bāhirband parganāh from the Koch Bihar kingdom.

It appears that Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, as we have discussed earlier, offered formal submission to the Mughal sovereign at his meeting with Rājā Mānsiṅha in 1596 at a place called Anandapura near Ghoraghāt. ¹⁴⁰ Raghudeva attacked Bāhirband (then in the kingdom of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa) and captured it. ¹⁴¹

At this hour of crisis Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa appealed to Rājā Mān Siṃha for help. The latter took the earliest opportunity to nip the neo-Koch-Afghan alliance in the bud. Accordingly, Mān Siṃha sent a chosen force under two Afghan generals and in fierce battle that ensued Raghudeva was defeated and compelled to leave Bāhirband. ¹⁴²

In 1597 A.D. Raghudeva as noted earlier made extensive plans to attack Kāmata with Masūm Khān and Īsā Khān Kābuli. When the Mughal General Durjan Siṃha joined Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa the combined Mughals and Kāmata forces were routed in the battle of Katrabhū. The imperial admiral Durjan Siṃha, son of Mān Siṃha, was slain with many other soldiers including Koch Pāiks. Some men were taken prisoners and some escaped. ¹⁴³

After the death of Raghudeva, his son Parīkṣit-nārāyaṇa became king of Kāmarūpa and he also following in his father's footsteps, annexed the Bāhirband ^{parganāh.} ~~parganāh.~~ Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa went to war with him but was defeated. ¹⁴⁴

The Captive Kārjis bowed down to Parīkṣit. ¹⁴⁵ During that time Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa sought help from the Ahom king and, being refused, solicited the assistance of the Mughals in subduing the refractory Parīkṣit.

The Mughal viceroy Islām Khān, however, promised help on condition that he completely surrendered to the Mughals.

Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa submitted to the Mughals by agreeing to pay tribute to the Emperor and his submission sounded the deathknell of the independent kingdom of Koch Bihar. ¹⁴⁶ Parīksit had meanwhile arrested and detained the members of the family of Raghunāth, zamīnder of Susang, a feudatory of the mughals and the latter lodged complaints to Islām Khān of Parīksit's highhandedness. ¹⁴⁷

On the prospect of ruling over the United realms of Koch Bihar and Kāmarūpe, on the fall of Parīksit, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa induced Mughal viceroy to attack his ^(Parīksit's) realm and ^{agreed} gladly offered to render personal service in an attack on the latter's state. ¹⁴⁸ The Mughal viceroy in an attempt to subjugate Kāmarūpa, immediately responded to this suggestion of the Koch King, ¹⁴⁹ and accordingly sent a large army against Parīksit, in the winter of 1612. The Mughal campaign lasted for about nine months (C. November, 1612 to July, 1613) and ended in the conquest of Parīksit's kingdom. ¹⁵⁰

Islām Khān despatched a large army under the leadership of Shykh Kamāl and the guidance of Rājā Raghunāth, while the Chief Command was given to Mukarram Khān. ¹⁵¹ In fulfilment of his promise, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa rendered good service to the Mughals. ¹⁵² Soon after the capture of Parīksit's great stronghold of Dhubri (C April, 1613) ¹⁵³ the regions of Bhitārband and Bahīrband were brought under control by Mīrṣā Nathan and the Zamīndars surrendered to him and presented

themselves before the imperial officers according to the orders of Mīrzā Nathan, ¹⁵⁴ Parīksit being defeated at Dhubri sued for peace, ¹⁵⁵ Nawab Islām Khān demanded his submission in person as well as the ^{cession} cession of Hājo to the Mughals, ¹⁵⁶

Parīksitnārāyana now found to the Ahom king Pratāp Siṃha for assistance to which the latter agreed on condition that the Koch Prince would undertake to rule on the north bank allowing the Ahoms to rule on the south, ¹⁵⁷ Parīksit did not agree to the proposal and continued his hostilities single handed. In 1614, he was once more attacked by the Mughals and Lakṣmīnārāyana, ^{asid} he surrendered himself with all his possessions, ¹⁵⁸ As to the cause of hostility, the native chronicles, are almost unanimous in referring to the Kāmarūpa king's relentless aggressions against Lakṣmīnārāyana, ¹⁵⁹ We have, however, noticed earlier that Lakṣmīnārāyana also had an ambition for ruling over the United Koch territory.

Parīksit was then taken to Dacca from where he was sent to Delhi. At this stage, Ibrāhīm Khān Fathjang pleaded with the Emperor Jahāngir to restore him (Parīksit) to his kingdom after he had paid the promised sum of seven lakhs of rupees (probably as war indemnity), ¹⁶⁰ The life of the Kāmarūpa King, subsequent to his release, however, appears to have been obscure. It may be said that the disappearance of the Kāmarūpa monarchy and its subsequent absorption in the Mughal Empire brought 'the Ahom State within the pace of Mughal foreign policy, which now attained full scope in the north-eastern frontier'.

We learn from the Bahāristān-i-Ghaybī that Mukarram Khān, the Chief Commander of the Mughals wrote to his brother 'Abdu's-Salām to come to Gilhanay, placing Laksmīnārāyana in the administration of the ^{conquered} territory of Kāmarūpa. ¹⁶¹ Laksmīnārāyana was then staying near Khantaghāt, 'Abdu's-Salām sent Rājā Raghūnāth to bring Laksmīnārāyana before him with the assurance that he would be invested with the territory of Kāmarūpa. Laksmīnārāyana also thought that his position in the territory of Kāmarūpa would be confirmed. Rājā Raghūnāth came and consoled the Rājā ^(Laksmīnārāyana) with encouraging words and afterwards Laksmīnārāyana was brought to Qāsim Khān, the Bengal Governor. ¹⁶² And the king Laksmīnārāyana was kept under surveillance under the orders of the Bengal Subadar. ¹⁶³

An uprising was witnessed in Koch Bihar and Kāmarūpa following confinement of both the kings : Parīksitnārāyana and Laksmīnārāyana. ¹⁶⁴ A strong detachment was sent from the new headquarters at Jahāngīrābād to put down the revolt. A fortified post was installed at Dalgāon and from there the Mughal army moved to Gumā Duar (occupying the western part of Parīksit's realm).

The army then crossed the river Sankosa and entered into the Koch Kingdom. The fort of Jaipur to the north-east of the Koch Capital was full of jungles and was the stronghold of the rebels. Naturally, the Imperialist army attacked the fort and stormed it. The Imperialist army and cavalry

successfully put down the rebellions altogether (1614 A.D.).¹⁶⁵

In 1617 Ibrāhīm Khān replaced Qāsim Khān as Subādār of Bengal and at his intervention Emperor Jahāngīr set Lakṣmīnārāyana free and gave him among others, an 'Irāqī horse, a magnificent elephant, a turki horse, a special sword and a jewelled rosary.¹⁶⁶ But he was not in a position to rule the country of Koch Bihar once again. On his return he was sent by the Subādār to Kāmarūpa to help the Mughals in controlling the revolts and administration of Kāmarūpa. He remained in Hājo and engaged on the emperor's behalf upto 1626 A.D. He probably died in 1627 A.D.¹⁶⁷

Lakṣmīnārāyana also aided the Mughal administration in the task of gradual consolidation of their authority in Uttarkula and Dakhinkula regions. He appears to have placed his troops at the disposal of his colleagues, particularly Mīrzā Nathan, the thānādār of Dakhinkula, with whom he was on friendly terms.

At the time of encounters with king Balīnārāyana in 1619 and again in 1620, Lakṣmīnārāyana is said to have assisted the thānādār Mīrzā Nathan with large contingents of troops in each time.¹⁶⁸

The advent of the rebellious Prince Shāhjahān in Bengal and the defeat and destruction of Subādār Ibrāhīm Khān Fathjang at the hands of his victorious army created confusion in Kāmarūpa and affected the fortune of the Koch King

Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa who had continued to stay at Hājo. Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa along with Mīrzā Nathan and other prominent local officers is said to have gone over to the side of victorious rebels forsaking the cause of lawful Emperor Jahāngīr.¹⁶⁹ Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, however, received a farman in commemoration of his services to the rebel cause.¹⁷⁰

After Shāh Jahān's defeat at the battle of Tons in November, 1624, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa went back to the side of Jahāngīr and continued to stay at Hājo.¹⁷¹

Vīṅhārāyaṇa, son of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa had carried on the administration of Koch Bihar as heir-apparent¹⁷² during 'honourable' exile at Hājo after his release from Delhi, apparently under his father's instruction. It is said that he ascended the throne of Kāmata-Koch Kingdom after his father's death in 1627. Recently a few full and half Nārāyaṇī coins of the time of Vīṅhārāyaṇa have discovered.¹⁷³ Vīṅhārāyaṇa died in c 1632. Though he was not a very competent administrator, but he appears to have patronised the cause of learning and education in his kingdom.¹⁷⁴ It is most likely that he continued to pay tributes to the Mughal emperor.

While the Emperor Shāhjahān cultivated a policy of peace, harmony and goodwill with Koch Bihar he continued a policy of unabated hostility towards the kingdom of Kāmarūpa. It has been suggested that the vassal state of Koch Bihar commanded the line of communications with Bengal. 'The Mughals could hardly fail to realise that in the almost incessant conflict

with the most powerful Mongoloid state, as Assam was, a friendly and contended Koch power was the best guarantee for the imperial success'.¹⁷⁵

When Prānanārāyaṇa became king of Kāmatā-Koch Kingdom, he was in no mood to deviate from the path of traditional loyalty. The Mughals in Bengal too, were then fully preoccupied with their own problems. Hardly had the Europeans in Hughly been put down, the imperial authority in Kāmrūpa was seriously challenged by the wily Rājā Balinārāyaṇa of Darrang, aided by the Assam (i. e. Ahom) king.

Prānanārāyaṇa readily responded to the appeal of Islām Khān to help him in his campaign against Balinārāyaṇa and the Assamese (1636-38). He joined the imperial army with a detachment of his own troops. At first they suffered a series of reverses; their commander was captured, and the fortified thanas, including Hājo, fell into the hands of the enemy. With the arrival of re-inforcement from the Bengal Subandār, they slowly recovered their lost ground. The tide of fortune soon turned back; the Assamese gradually got the better of the invaders again, and Prānanārāyaṇa along with his Mughal ally was compelled to retreat down the Brahmaputra.¹⁷⁶

After their victory the Ahoms reoccupied Kajali, but the continuous warfare made a great loss to the Ahom resources and thus the Ahoms looked for a treaty with the Mughals and the

latter also desired the same at that moment. It is said that a treaty was concluded between the two parties.¹⁷⁷ As a result of the treaty, the Mughals got the territory west of the Badnadi on the north bank of the Brahmaputra and the Asurar Ali on the south bank, while the Ahoms' possession of the rest of the kingdom formerly ruled by Pariksit (i.e. the country between Badnadi and Bhoroli rivers) was left undisturbed.¹⁷⁸

The long-drawn warfare, however, soon came to an end. For about twenty years to come, there was no open conflict between the Mughals and the Assamese. Prānanārāyaṇa during this interval engaged himself in various activities and his multiferous cultural pursuits. He continued in his path of loyalty and faithfulness till the war of succession among the sons of Shāh Jahān and paved the way for a new chapter in Koch Mughal history. Prānanārāyaṇa, however, realised the futility of siding with the Mughals against the Ahoms. He decided to restore friendliness with the Ahom king Jayadvaja Simha and sent to him an envoy named Gokul Chandra for ensuring peace.¹⁷⁹ But the Ahom king did not welcome the proposal as he remembered of the previous happenings.

Prānanārāyaṇa is said to have initiated a further move for reconciliation with the Ahom king through mediation of one Banamālī Gosāin of Madhapura (within Koch Bihar), a former resident of Assam.¹⁸⁰

In 1657 A.D. the Mughal Emperor fell seriously ill. At this, an internecine quarrel began among his four sons for the

throne of Delhi. Chaos and confusion prevailed in the Mughal empire.

Taking advantage of the weak state of the Mughal frontier in the north-east, Prānanārāyana now openly bade defiance to the Mughals, stopped payment of tribute and set himself up as an independent ruler.¹⁸¹

The king (i.e. Prānanārāyana) also made overtures to Durlabhanārāyana, Zamindar of Budhanagara and a vassal of the Mughal Emperor, to make common cause with him in overthrowing alien government in Kāmrūpa. But Durlabhanārāyana did not listen to it and as a result of which the king sent his minister-general Bhabanāth Kārji to capture Durlabhanārāyana who, however, fled to the court of the Ahom King.¹⁸²

As a result of this, most of the territories under jurisdiction of the kingdom of Koch Hājo went to Prānanārāyana. Mir Lutfullāh Shivāji, the Mughal Faujdar of Kāmarūpa (Koch Hājo) sent his son to oppose Bhabanāth Kārji. But the Mughal army was defeated and had to retreat to Gauhati. At this juncture, the Ahoms also assembled a vast army, threw two bridges over the Kalang and proceeded towards Gauhati.¹⁸³ Mir Lutfullāh being hardpressed from both sides, left Gauhati. The Ahoms then took over the charge of Gauhati, Pāndu and Sarālgāt in February, 1659,¹⁸⁴ while the Koches took possession of Hājo.

Prānanārāyana sent his minister Bhabanāth Kārji to

the Ahom king for an offensive and defensive alliance against the Mughals. The Ahom king rejecting the belated Koch proposal, decisively defeated the Koch army near Hājo and then compelled Bhabanāth Kārji to vacate the place and to go beyond the Manās by the month of March, 1660. ¹⁸⁵

Prānanārāyana had an ambition to effect recovery of the ancestral dominion to the east of river Sankosa in Kāmarūpa. But that idea was becoming a day dream at a time particularly when he was confronted to manifold troubles arising out of the denial of the Mughal suzerainty, the loss of sympathy of his near relatives and the quarrel with the neighbouring Ahom Kingdom.

Rājā Prānanārāyana now appeared once again on the scene, and attacked the brother of the Mughal commandant of Kāmarūpa who had taken refuge in Dhubri. The latter fled, but the Ahoms soon ousted him from Dhubri, which was then occupied by them. In an engagement at Fort 'Kunga', the Koches were defeated and were soon driven across the Sankosa to their own kingdom, leaving Kāmarūpa at the mercy of Ahoms, who soon stretched their power upto Hāsilah. ¹⁸⁶

As Governor of Bengal Mirjumla wanted to chastise the insubordinate rulers of Kamatā Koch kingdom and Assam in the cause of maintaining imperial prestige and securing safety of the Imperial dominions. By the Mughal-Ahom treaty of 1639 western Assam from Gauhati to the Manās river had passed under the Mughals.

The accession of Aurangzeb and the appointment of Mirjumla as the governor of Bengal (June 1660)¹⁸⁷ naturally indicated that the punishment of Koch and Ahom rulers was inevitable.

It is believed that Mir Jumla was prompted not only by imperialistic designs, but as his trusted Waqi'a-navis tells us - also by a desire for, 'a holy war with the infidels of Assam.....'¹⁸⁸

It appears that both the Koch and the Ahom kings longed for peace. But these overtures of peace appeared only a clever means on the part of kings of Assam and Koch Bihar to gain time for completion of preparations. Rashid Khan who was deputed by Mir Jumla to take delivery of Kamarupa from the Ahoms had to halt at Rangamati before advancing further against the well-equipped Ahoms. Raja Sujan Singh, who was also deputed against the Koches could not advance beyond Ekdwar in 1661 owing to the advent of the rainy season.¹⁸⁹

Resolving to conduct the war in person, and to take the revenge first against Koch Bihar, and then against Assam Mir Jumla made several administrative arrangements in Bengal before setting out on the expedition.¹⁹⁰

There were three routes to the territory of Pranarāyana. Of these, two routes¹⁹¹ had been blocked (by the defenders) in various ways, but due to shortage of time

and a (false) sense of security owing to its overgrown trees and difficult passes, the inhabitants had not protected the third route. And this route passed through thick jungles full of snakes and of poisonous trees, that raised their heads to the sky. Mir Jumla selected this unfrequented route.¹⁹²

At the news of advance of the Imperial general together with Sujan Sinha near the ai or embankment, the boundary of Koch Bihar, the Koch soldiers fled away (13th Dec., 1661 A.D.).¹⁹³ At the instruction of Mir Jumla, Saiyyid made complete prohibitory regulations so that no soldier could resort to any harrassment to the inhabitants of the place and the violation of the said promulgation would amount to deterrent punishment. Thus Mir Jumla tried to pacify the people and to secure the property of poor people.¹⁹⁴ The Rājā in the meantime fled to Kānthālbāri at the foot of the hills of Bhutan and the minister went to Morāng.¹⁹⁵

The Kingdom was annexed to the Mughal empire, coins were struck in Aurangzeb's name, and the name of the city was changed to Alanginagara.¹⁹⁶ It appears from the account of Shihābuddin Tālish that Mir Jumla after installing Isfandiyyār Beg to garrison the capital of Kāmātā-Koch Kingdom, he proceeded to conquer the territory of Assam in 1662 A.D. But Mughals could not remain in the Koch territory for long.

It is said that after the departure of Mir Jumla the Mughal officers sought to introduce an innovation in the

time-honoured Land revenue system of the country. This system, however, was not accepted by the local people who ultimately rose into rebellion. The imperial garrison at the capital city was in danger with advent of the rains, the Mughal army in Assam was reduced to a precarious condition. During this period of confusion, the Koch king came back to his capital and was given a warm welcome by his subjects.

The Imperial officer at Kānthālbāri was killed, and all supplies to the garrison at the capital were cut off. As a result, Isfandiyār compelled to leave Koch Capital and fled to Ghoreghāt. Askarkhān reached there but was unable to recover the country.¹⁹⁷

Thus the foreign domination was now removed, and Koch Bihar again got back its independence in 1661. The plans of Mir Jumla to recover it proved to be futile.

Askar Khān was instructed by Mir Jumla to renew the attack to recover Koch Kingdom as the King Prānanārāyana failed in keeping his engagements and paying tribute.¹⁹⁸ But a ~~small~~ great change came in the Bengal Government at the death of Mir Jumla. His successor Daud Khān, officiating Viceroy of Bengal could not send a strong reinforcement which was urgent at that moment. 'All that Askar Khān was able to do was, "to confirm his possession of the Chakla of Fathpur outside the wall (al) of Koch Bihar, which had been seized by the Mughals early in the war".¹⁹⁹

The next Viceroy Shaistā Khān appointed in 1664 wanted to make a successful conclusion of the half-finished work of Mir Jumla. In the month of March, the new Sūbadār reached Rājmahala and designed to conquer the territory of Koch Bihar on his way to the capital.²⁰⁰

Prānanārāyana's last days, as noticed earlier, were in numerous problems and he thought it wise to offer submission to the Mughal Emperor in order to save his kingdom. He had to pay a sum of rupees five lakhs and a half in a few instalments to the Bengal Viceroy as war indemnity. Shaistā-Khān, on his part, had a plan to attack Arākān. The terms offered by the Koch king appeared to the Bengal Sūbadār as welcoming, particularly prior to such a venture. The Mughal army accordingly was ordered to withdraw from Koch frontier as soon as the instalments of money were paid.²⁰¹ Thus after a short spell of independence, Koch Bihar once again turned into a vassal state.

Both the Koch and the Ahom kings realised the necessity of friendship between them particularly after their defeats at the hands of Mir Jumla. Had there been any united move against the Mughal invader Mirjumla, the results of the war might have been different. Prānanārāyana was thus said to have sent a messenger to the Ahom king Jayadhaja Simha in February, 1663 enquiring after his welfare.²⁰² The defeat of both the parties by Mir Jumla thus put an end to the traditional hostility between the two kingdoms since the days of the Koch king Naranārāyana (1555-1587 A.D.)

Prānanārāyana is said to have made two more attempts at obtaining friendship with the Ahom kings - one by sending a letter to the Rājā Sasur Rāj Mantri or Prime Minister of Jayadvaja Simha along with letter to the ~~Ahom King~~ and the other by sending one Rāmacandra Katakī (i. e. envoy) to Cakradhvaja Simha about the middle of 1664 A.D. informing him of the news that the Mughals were enjoying his wealth and capturing elephants in the forests.²⁰³ The Koch king in his letter to Jayadvaja Simha praised the political wisdom of the Ahom king and requested him to consolidate friendly relations between them. In his reply, the Ahom king referred to the long existing friendship since the days of Visvasimha. He communicated his desire to make a common cause in making a joint attack against the Mughals.

Chakradhvaja also replied to Prānanārāyana regretting for the aforesaid loss at the hands of the Mughals and suggested him to tide over the problem.²⁰⁴ It is interesting to note that both Cakradhvaja Simha and Prānanārāyana were prepared to fight with the Mughals. Cakradhvaja Simha in a letter addressed to Prānanārāyana in February, 1666 welcomed the latter for supplying the Ahom king with the news that some of the provincial Governors had risen against Aurangzeb, and that the Prānanārāyana had made preparations to attack the Mughals.²⁰⁵

After a few months Prānanārāyana died and his son Modanārāyana also continued the friendship with the Ahoms. The

Koch king sent two envoys named Nanda and Bhima with a letter addressed to the Ahom ruler in January, 1667.²⁰⁶ Prior to this in 1666 A.D. Rāmacaraṇa and Bhaktacaraṇa, the Koch emissaries were sent to the Ahom king who received them cordially but on their way back, they were said to have been killed by the Gāros of the Pānbāriā Rājā (under the supervision of the Delhi emperor).²⁰⁷

In 1667, Cakradhvaja Siṃha before his attack on the Mughals at Gauhati sent a letter to the Koch King requesting him to make a simultaneous attack on the Mughals in the border areas.²⁰⁸

However, despite his friendly relation with the Ahoms, the Koch king Modanārāyaṇa was said to have assisted the Mughal army of Rāma Siṃha in his invasion of Assam by supplying 15,000 archers. A few officers viz. Kavikisore Baruā, Sarveśvara Baruā, Manmatha Baruā and Ghenaśyāma Baksī from Koch Bihar, led this army.²⁰⁹

King Mahīndranārāyaṇa is also said to have made an attempt to revive the friendship with the Ahoms. He wrote a letter to Garhgayan Sandikoi Barphukan of Gauhati conveying the news that the son of the Bengal Nawab had come to him with many presents in order to effect an alliance with the Mughals and to mediate between the Mughals and the Ahoms. But the king (i.e. Mahīndranārāyaṇa) himself could not accept the proposal, as the Mughals had demanded ten lacs of rupees as war indemnity from the Ahoms. The Koch king rather stressed upon the

friendship between the two kingdoms and branded the Mughals as their common enemy. The Koch king further suggested the Barphukan to attack Mughal garrison at Rāngāmāti taking permission from the Ahom king and then to proceed to Dhākā via Ghoraghat.²¹⁰ It is presumed that the above letter of Koch king might have written by his ministers in his name because Mahīndranārāyana was only five years old when he ascended the throne as suggested by S.N. Bhattacharyya.²¹¹

During his period an invasion by Bhabānī Dāsa, son of Todar Mal is stated to have launched a campaign against Koch Bihar. But the Chatra Nāzir Yajñanārāyana with the help of the Dharmarāja (spiritual head) of Bhutan repulsed the attack of the Mughals and suppressed the internal turmoil.²¹² The Koch king appraised the Ahom Barphukan of the happenings and requested him to attack the Mughal garrison at Rāngāmāti. He also stated that the Mughals were searching for an opportunity to attack Assam. In his reply, Barphukan expressed his sorrow for the discomfiture of the Koch King. This letter, however, could not reach Koch Bihar for some difficulties.²¹³

Rūpanārāyana (1704-1714 A.D.) also came into contact with the Ahom kingdom. He also wished to exchange friendliness between Koch Bihar and Assam. In reply to the letter of Barphukan in May, 1714 A.D. Rūpanārāyana wrote to him that the envoys could not be sent to him owing to bad communication.

During his reign period, the relation between the

Koch king and the Mughal Faujdar was not at all cordial. S.H. Askari supplies us with a good number of interesting letters appeared to have been written by Ali quli Khān, the Faujdar of Koch Bihar²¹⁴ who acted during the period of Azim-us-Shah's vice-royalty of the eastern provinces. The letters addressed to the Viceroy by the Faujdar, inform us regarding the relation as existed between the Mughals and the Koch people in the first quarter of the 18th century A.D. The contents of the letters No. 2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 20, 25, 26, 31 and 65 reveal two things : one that the Faujdar was sincerely following the instructions of the 'Huzur'(i.e., the Viceroy) from time to time. It included the imposition of imperial orders or prohibitions as well as the punishment meted out to the miscreants of the refractory Koch people who, at the connivance of the Afghan Chiefs often created disturbance to administering the Sarkar Bihar by the Mughal Faujdar Ali quli Khān and his deputy Afrasyah.

The other thing which emanates from the above letters is that the Mughal hold on Koch Bihar was not very strong. It is evident from these letters that the Faujdar of Sarkar Koch Bihar required more money, force, food-stuffs, war-equipments in order to combat the evil designers who attempted to oust the Mughals from the region. The Faujdar repeatedly mentioned of the grudge fomenting among their soldiers for non-payment of arrear dues. Thus the Faujdar appealed to the

higher authority for providing him with sufficient money and re-inforcement. However, it speaks of its victory, particularly in reducing the strength of the rebels. Ali Quli Khān credited himself for undertaking different hazardous ventures producing immense fruit even advancing near the Koch Bihar Territory, although it could not be finally brought under subjugation.

We learn that Rūpanārāyaṇa, the Koch king became engaged in war with the Faujdar of Rangpur.²¹⁵ An intense fight took place between the Mughals and Rūpanārāyaṇa along with the Pāthān chiefs. But in course of continual war the Koch Bihar army was being exterminated. As such, the Koch king concluded a treaty with Nawab of Bengal. The possession of three Chāklās of Bodā, Pātgrāma and Pūrvabhāga were given to the Koch Bihar king while, Chāklās of Kājir Hāt, Kārinā and Fatepur were included within the Imperial dominions.²¹⁶

However, the treaty provisions were not accepted by the Mughal authorities. The terms of the treaty were changed (1713 A.D.) and the Mughal got possession over the Chāklās of Bodā, Pātgrāma and Pūrvabhāga.²¹⁷ It is interesting to note that Rūpanārāyaṇa sent an ambassador with a nazar and peshkash²¹⁸ to Murshid Quli Khān who appointed to the joint offices of the Sūbadār and the Dewān. This friendly relation with the Bengal Sūbadār continued during the period of his son Upendranārāyaṇa (1714-1763 A.D.). But it did not exist during the tenure of the next incumbent.²¹⁹

Notes and References

- 1 H.N. Dutta Barua (Ed.), Guru Garits, Nalbari, 1955, pp. 11-23;
Gunabhiram
H. Barua, Assam Bharsani, Gauhati, 1972, Reprint, pp. 35-38;
On the basis of the Bāro Bhuyān legends which mentions Durlabhanārāyana as a Rājā of Kāmata, Gait also observed that Durlabhanārāyana ~~was~~ ~~seem~~ seemed to have ruled at the end of the thirteenth century over the country between Badnadi and the Karatoya. See A History of Assam, p.44.
- 2 N.N. Acharyya, The History of Medieval Assam, New Delhi, Reprint, 1984, p. 158.
- 3 H.N. Dutta Barua, op.cit., p. 16.
- 4 N.N. Acharyya, op.cit., p. 157.
- 5 H.N. Dutta Barua, op.cit., pp. 42-46.
- 6 While writing on Indranārāyana, son and successor of Durlabhanārāyana, N.N. Acharyya has referred to the work entitled Jayadratha Vada where it is mentioned that Indranarayana would be the Pancha Gauḍa through the blessings of Śiva, See op.cit., p. 162.
- 7 Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Vol. II
Coin No. 38, p. 152.
S.N. Bhattacharyya also suggests that Sikandar Shāh attacked Kāmarūpa in 1357 and advanced as far east as the region between the Manās and Badnadi (i.e. Kāmarūpa proper), refuting the contention of Stapleton (J.A.S.B. 1910, p. 622) that Sikandar Shāh's exploits were confined only to Mymensing

District. Bhattacharyya further states that Sikandar Shāh also issued coins which were minted at Kāmarūpa.

See A History of Muchal North East Frontier Policy, Calcutta, 1929, p. 63.

J. N. Sarkar (History of Bengal (Muslim period) Patna, 1973, p. 110), however placed the date of Sikandar Shāh's invasion in 1356 A.D. instead of 1357 A.D. on the ground that the Bengal Sultan had to fight against the Delhi Sultan in 1357 A.D. on his (Sikandar's) accession to the throne of Bengal.

N. N. Acharyya has rejected the views of both the earlier Scholars. He agreed to K. L. Barua's statement that 'the conquest of Kāmarūpa by Sikandar as recorded in the coin of 759 A.H. is an empty boast' (Early History of Kamarupa, Shillong, 1933, pp. 233-35) and stated that Sikandar Shāh ascended the throne in 1357 A.D. and not in 1356 as suggested by Sarkar. Acharyya^{has} remarked that in 1357 A.D. on his accession Sikandar had to fight with the Sultan of Delhi. Hence, in the same year as noted by Acharyya 'it was impossible for the Bengal Sultan even to think of the invasion of such a distant country, not to speak of its actual undertaking'.

See op. cit., pp. 162-164.

- 8 Gunabhiram Barua, op. cit., p. 28; Haliram Dhakial Phukan, (Assam Burañii, (Bengali) Gauhati, 1369 B.S.), pp. 9-10 and Jenkins (J. A. S. B., 1940, pp. 766-67) supply us with the names of a few rulers such as Arimatta, Fengua, Gajanka, Suranka,

Mrgānka etc., who continued their reign upto the emergence of the Khen dynasty in the Kāmatā kingdom.

Also see N.N. Acharyya, Op.Cit., pp. 164-71.

9 Gait, op.cit., p. 44.

N.N. Vasu draws out attention to the fact that Gait has relied on Gunabhiram Barua's rendering based on a legend (Assam Burāñji, pp. 33-35) which lacks support of contemporary history. Vasu referred to the *Riyās-us Salātin* (tr. by Maulavi Abdus Salām) pp. 132-33, which described Husain Shāh's invasion of Kāmarūpa without mentioning anything about the Khen dynasty and of its rulers.

He further suggested that all the Bhuyāns asserted their independence (the Bhuyāns had since long been in Kāmarūpa) only after the death of Durlabhanārāyana and ruled in Kāmatā until they were subdued by the rising power of Visvasinha, the founder of the Koch dynasty.

See Social History of Kamarupa, Vol. I, New Delhi, First Reprint 1983, pp. 23-33.

It may be noted in this connection that it has been clearly mentioned in the Kāmarūpa Burāñji of the three rulers viz. Nīladhvaja, Cakradhvaja and Nīlādhara. They ruled over the tract stretching from Singimari ^{in the} (present district of Rangpur) upto the bank of the Brahmaputra opposite Hājo, with their capital at Kāmarūpa. However, the following text does not refer to any legend.

S.K.Bhuyan (ed), Kamarūpa Burañi, Gauhati, 1930, p. 99.

10 S.K.Chatterjee, Kirāta-Jana-Kṛti, Calcutta, 1974, p. 115.

11 W.W.Hunter, Statistical Account of Bengal, Vol.X,
1876, pp. 368-69.

S.K.Chatterjee, however, says that Nīladvaja, the founder of the Khen dynasty, fought and overthrew the last scion of the Pāla family of Bengal, See op.cit., p. 115.

Cf. Bardhanakota of Rangpur.

Maheśwar Neeg also suggests that Nīladvaja defeated the last degenerate descendant of the Pāla family and became the king of Kamarūpa with his capital at Kamāpura. See Sankaradeva and his Times, Gauhati, 1965, p. 45.

Gunabhiram also supports that the Pāla dynasty of either Kamarūpa or Bengal was supplanted by the Khen dynasty. See op.cit., p. 33.

From B.Chakraverty (A Cultural History of Bhutan, Vol.2, Chittaranjan, 1979, p.25). We learn that the Khens lived in Central Bhutan. 'A Khen Chief overthrew the degenerate descendant of the pala dynasty of Bengal with the help of an influential Brahmana and established a Khen dynasty which rules for ^{three} their generations'. On the other hand, it is learnt from Asm Burañi that there prevailed a chaotic condition after the death of Mrgāñka, the last ruler of the line of Arimatta. See Haliram Dhakianol Phuken, op.cit., p. 10.

Kamarūpa Burañi states that after the line of

Arimatta, there emerged a new dynasty consisting of three kings, Nilādhvaja, Cakradhvaja and Nilāmvara who ruled over the kingdom of Kāmatā.

S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), op.cit., p.99.

12 The work is said to have been composed in the 16th century A.D.

A. Khan Chowdhury, Koch Biharor Itihasa (Bengali)

Cooch Behar, 1936, p.39.

13 D.C.Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and

Medieval India, 2nd ed., pp.100-101.

14 Hamilton described Niladhvaja as belonging to the Khyen (Khen) dynasty : Martin, The Eastern India, Vol.III, London, 1838, pp.408-9. The Kamarūpar Burāñi (p.99) mentions that king Niladhvaja was of Koch Origin. The Gosānīmangala composed in 1828 A.D. refers to a legend according to which Kāntesvara (the lord of Kāntā, Kāntā or Kānākhyā) after becoming king from a humble position (i. e. Shepherd boy) bounded the city of Kāmatāpura after the Goddess Kāntesvari or Kāmatesvari, also known as Candī, Bhavānī or Gosānī. Niladhvaja may be identified with the Kāntesvara of the Gosānīmangala. It mentions the rule of one ruler which came to an end owing to the Muslim invasion. But it is given above that there were three rulers of which Nilāmvara, the last ruler was defeated by the Muslims.

Gunabhiram Barua gives us the legend which resembles mostly with the above account, See op.cit., pp.33-35.

- 15 Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol.XV, p.32.

'Buchanan estimated the circumference of Kamatapura at 19 miles; the palace as in the case of Burmese and Chinese towns, stands in the Centre. See H.Blochmann, Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal, Calcutta, 1968, p.33. A.Khan Chowdhury (op.cit., p.40) mentions that as a result of huge number of Brāhmanas the kingdom of Niladhvaja was known as 'Brāhmaṇa rājya'.

- 16 Cf. 'Gosaimari' by R.D.Banerjee in J.A.S.B., Vol.XIX, 1977, p.20.

Gunabhiram Barua also informs us that Niladhvaja repaired the old city and made Kāmatāpura as his capital and assumed the title Kāmatasvara. See op.cit., p.34.

N.N.Acharyya, again observes that Niladhvaja rebuilt and extended the city of Kāmatāpura by repairs and new constructions. ^{See op.cit., p.172} Also see N.N.Vasu (op.cit., Vol.I, p.31) see op.cit., p.172. He suggests that Kāmatāpura was built long before Nilāvara, if, however, he at all existed. The city was built at about 10th century A.D.

- 16a N.N.Paul(ed.) Gosaimangala, pp.19-25 (text).

- 17 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.65.

He ascribes this warfare between Barbak Shāh, the Bengal Sultan and Nilāvara, the third Kāmatā King. K.L. Barua (op.cit., p.263), however, informs us that the invasion took place in the reign of Cakradhvaja.

N.N.Acharyya (op.cit., p.175) also disagrees with Bhattacharyya.

- 18 The expedition was probably sent in order to take back the territory to the west of the Karatoyā which was overrun by the Kāmarūpa forces (J.N.Sarkar, op.cit., p.134, N.N.Acharyya (op.cit., p.173) also supports this view). Initially the Kāmatā king took lead of the war and defeated and destroyed the Bengal army. Later on, Ismāil Ghāzi, a general of Barbak Shāh is said to have changed the course of the war by his magical powers and the Kāmatā king surrendered to Ismāil and embraced Islam.

S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit. p.66; Gait does not, however, tend to believe the tradition of Ismāil's alleged victory over the king of Kāmatāpura for absence of any corroborating evidence. See ^{Martin,} op.cit., p.410.

- 19 Martin, loc.cit.
 20 Gait, op.cit., p.45.
 21 Khan Chowdhury, op.cit., p.43.
 22 Gait, op.cit., p.45.

From Riyāz-us-Salātin (pp.132-133) we come to know that Hussain Shāh laid seize to Kāmatā or Kāmarūpa after his conquest of Orissa.

Gosānīmangala refers to a legend that the downfall of Nīlāmvara was accomplished for the treachery of his Brāhmana minister.

See N.N.Paul (ed.) op.cit., pp.53ff.

- 23 P.N.Bhattacharyya, Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvalī, p.31 fn.
- 24 The Bhuyāns subdued by Hussain Shāh were Mal Kunwar, Rūpnārāyana, Gasa Rakhan and Lakamīnārāyana, Abdus Salam, op.cit., p.132.
- 25 Mīrzā Muhammad Kāsim, Alamgirnāmah, Eng.tr. by H. Vansittart, Calcutta, 1838, p.72.
- 26 Haliram Dhekial Phukan, op.cit., p.11; H.Blochmann, op.cit., pp.108-09.
- 27 Haliram Dhekial Phukan, op.cit., p.11.

Gait also says that after departure of the Muhammadans, there were no king of the whole of the Kāmata Country which was ruled by a number of petty chiefs. See A History of Assam, p.46.

Again, M.Neog suggests the rule of the Bāro Bhuyāns immediately after the fall of the Khen dynasty of Kāmata Kingdom.

See op.cit., p.46.

We, however, get from N.N.Acharyya (op.cit., pp.178-79), Mohini Saikia (Assam-Muslim relation and its cultural significance, Golaghat (Assam), 1978, pp.90-94), the names of a few rulers viz., Durlabha or Durlabhendra, Sucharuchand etc. The rulers were said to have subdued by Viśvasiṅha, the founder of the Koch dynasty and his son Naranārāyana respectively.

- 28 Abul-Fasl, Alamgirnāmah, Eng.Tr.by H.Beveridge Vol.III, First Indian Reprint, New Delhi, 1973, p.1067.

It is mentioned in the original manuscript of the Rājopākhyāna (about 1823 A.D.) that Hīrā and Jīrā were the wives of Haridāsa (Hariyā mandala). Hīrā was the mother of Śisū and Viśū by Mahādeva (Śiva), and Jīrā of Candana and Madana by Haridāsa. Candana became the king in 1510 when the Rāja Śaka was introduced. (See B. Das (ed.), Rājopākhyāna (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1935, p. 15).

W. W. Hunter (Statistical Account of Bengal, 1876 Vol. X, pp. 406-07) says that Candana and Madana were the two sons of Jīrā, the wife of Hariyā Mandala. Candana became the king in 1511 A.D. and reigned for thirteen years and he was regarded as the first king of the Koch dynasty.

But the names of Candana and Madana do not occur in the three genealogical table of the Royal family (written in 1839 A.D.) which was preserved in the State Council, Cooch Behar.

See Ghosal, op. cit., pp. 107-08.

Scholars like Robinson (A Descriptive Account of Assam, p. 152), Gait (A History of Assam, p. 46) and F. Buchanan (J. A. S. E., p. 1838, No. 73)^{p10} state that two brothers Candana and Madana ruled for eight years at a place Maralavās, about thirty miles north from Kāmatāpura.

Scholars like Gait and others have also suggested

that there was no sufficient evidence for assuming that Candana and Madana belonged to the family to which Visvasinha belonged.

29 N.C. Sharma (ed.), op.cit., pp. 11-12.

30 The Origin of the Koch tribe has been discussed in Chapter I on People.

31 From the Darrang Rājya Vaisāvalī, we get the names of following Bhuyāns who were brought by Visvasinha under subjugation : Bāra Bhuyān, Saru Bhuyān, Auguriyā Bhuyān, Chuti Bhuyān, Kusuma Bhuyān, Dighala Bhuyān, Kaliyā Bhuyān, The Bhuyān of Jhārgayā, Kailāsa Bhuyān and Karnapura Bhuyān.
N.C. Sharma (Ed.) op.cit., p. 16, VV. 89-122.

32 Gait, op.cit., p. 49.

33 The following verses from the writings of Pītāmbara, a contemporary of Mahārājā Visvasinha are worthy of notice in this connection :

.... mahārājā Visvasinha Kāmatānagare |
tār putra bhoge tulya nahe purandare ||
Mārkendeya purāna, Patra 1
Kāmatānagare Visvasinha naresvara |
Pracanda Pratāpa rājā bhoge Purandara ||
Ibid., Patra 35.

Again, the Darrang Rājya Vaisāvalī (N.C. Sharma ed. p. 22) refers to Behar as the capital of Visvasinha. Here, the term Behar possibly indicates the whole of the territory in which

the capital Kāmatānagara was built by Visvasimha.

34 Cf. Kāmatā Īśvara Vando Visvasimha Nṛpaṅgava

Durgādāsa, Bhulā nākhyaṇa (in Bengali)

quoted by N.N.Vasu, op. cit., Vol.II, p.46.

Also see J.N.Sarkar, The History of Bengal, Muslim period, Patna, 1973, p.184.

- 35 A good deal of confusion arises regarding the date of birth of two Koch Kings, Visvasimha and Naranārāyaṇa. Scholars like S.K.Bhuyan (Anglo-Assamese Relations, Gauhati, 1949, p.260), J.N.Sarkar (A Short History of Aurangzeb, Chap.VII, 3rd ed. Calcutta, 1962, p.115), H.C.Ray (Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol.II, Calcutta, 1936, p.265) and N.N. Acharyya (The History of Medieval Assam, Delhi 1966, Reprinted 1984, p.193), together consider 1515-1540 A.D. as the reign period of Visvasimha.

Again, S.K.Chatterjee (Kirāta-Jana-Kṛti, Calcutta, 1974, p.118) suggests that Visvasimha ruled from 1496 to 1533 (or 1540 A.D.) M.Neog also assigned Visvasimha's reign from C 1496- C 1533 (or 1540) See Sankaradeva and His Times, Gauhati, 1965, p.61.

But the works like Biswanath^{Das} (ed.), (Rājōnākhyaṇa (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1985, p.22) Hunter, (Statistical Account of Bengal, Vol.X, 1876, p.407) and H.N.Chowdhury, (The Cooch Behar State and its Land Revenue Settlement, 1903 p.230) inform us that Naranārāyaṇa, son and successor of

Viśvasiṃha, ascended the throne in 1556 A.D. This date of accession has further been strengthened by some of the coins issued by Harenārāyaṇa bearing the date Śaka 1477 or 1555 A.D.

The Darrang Rāja Vasāyali, as already observed, states that Viśvasiṃha ruled for a period of 25 years. On the basis of this evidence, S.N. Bhattacharyya, (op.cit., pp.76-77) perhaps rightly been suggested that Viśvasiṃha started his rule from 1529-30 A.D. This may be a more plausible explanation from the point of Candana's reign ending 1524 A.D. as postulated by Hunter (op.cit., p.407). Hunter, as noticed above, mentioned that Candana became the king in 1511 A.D. That Candana started his rule from this period may well fit in with the fact that Hussain Shāh's hold^{over} the Kāmātā Koch region till that period, as evident from his coins bearing date 1513 A.D., might have stood on a dwindling position. From this period till the rise of Viśvasiṃha, there was possibly an interregnum of 5 or 6 years which witnessed the consolidation of power by one Koch chief Hājo and his son-in-law Hariyā Mondala at the cost of the Bhuyāns who were, however, finally subdued by Viśvasiṃha.

36 Biswanath Das (ed.), op.cit., p. 16.

Śiśyasīṃha was the stepbrother of Viśvasiṃha who gave the title of 'Rai-kot' (Chief of the fort or

the Commander-in-Chief) to the former. Sīsyasiṃha then founded his dynasty in the Parganāh of Baikānthapura near Jalpaiguri.

See Ghosal, pp. 284-90.

The Rājās of Baikānthapura were said to have paid tributes to the Mahārājā of Koch Bihar and held the Royal Umbrella at the coronation upto the reign of Lakṣmīnārāyana of Koch Bihar. C. Sanyal, The Rajbansis of North Bengal, Calcutta, 1965, p. 7.

But we learn from the report of Mercier and Chauvet (The Cooh Behar Select Records, Vol. II, 1788, pp. 19, 20, 169) that the Rāikats performed the Umbrella ceremony during the installation of five kings from Viśvasiṃha and that Mahārājā Modasanārāyana appointed Mahīnārāyana and his son Yajñanārāyana successively as Nāzirs.

37 N. C. Sharma, op. cit., pp. 41-42.

38 Biswanath Das, op. cit., p. 16; Yoginī Tantra (First part of Trayodasa Patala).

39 N. C. Sharma (ed.), op. cit., pp. 52-53.

40 Ibid., p. 59.

41 Ibid., pp. 60-61.

42 N. N. Acharyya, op. cit., p. 194.

43 Cf. Āpun bhrātr̥k yuva Nṛpati pātīlā |

Ānandate Saigrāma siṃha je nām dilā ||

N. C. Sharma, op. cit., p. 64.

- 44 Ibid., pp. 72-97.
 45 Ibid., p. 69.
 46 Akbarnāmah, Vol. III, p. 1067.
 47 S. Ghosal, op. cit., p. 152.
 48 Loc. cit.
 49 Gait, 57.

But this theory has not been accepted by S.N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit., p. 105. He says that Raghudeva did not assume sovereign power till the death of Naranārāyaṇa, and nowhere either in Vaiśāvalis or in the Burañjis it was mentioned that Raghudeva was obliged to pay tribute and acknowledge vassalage. Further, it is proved from the inscription engraved on the temple of Hayagrīva Mādhava (1505 Saka, 1583 A.D.) that he became already the 'Lord of Kāmarūpa'.

- 50 S.N. Sen, Prācīn Bānglā Patra Saikhalana (a collection of old Bengali letters), Calcutta University, 1942, p. 3.
 51 Abul-Fazl, Akbarnāmah, Vol. III, Eng. tr. by H. Beveridge, First Indian Reprint, New Delhi, 1973, p. 1068.
 52 S.N. Bhattacharyya, op. cit., p. 118.
 53 S.K. Bhuyan (ed.), Bahārīstān-i-Ghaybī, Vol. I, p. 40.

Before conquest of the Mughals, Ghoraghāt was included in Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa's kingdom. Later on, the Mughals, as we have already discussed in the introduction, seized Bhitārband and Bahīrband from Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa's territory. And Ghoraghāt was also captured during the course of their

conquest. It formed an Imperial outpost.

- 54 Alamgirnāmah quoted by Blochmann in J.A.S.B., 1872, pp. 65-66;
Ghosal, op.cit., p. 208.
- 55 Dinesh sen, Vrhat Vanga, Vol. II, 1341-42 Bengali San, p. 1075.
- 56 Mr. Gladwin, A Narrative of Bengal, (Eng. tr. from original
persian), 1788. Gladwin says, "Before the time of Moorshed
Kuley Khan, the Rajas of Tipperah, Coatch Bahar, and Assam
preserved an entire independence. They refused all obedience
to the Court of Delhy, used the imperial Chetr, and coined
money in their own names".
- 57 The Cooch Behar Select Records, Vol. II, p. 130.
- 58 Biswanath Das (ed.), Rājopākhyāna, p. 40
- 59 Loc. cit.
- 60 Mercer and Chauvet, op. cit., p. 169.
- 61 Ibid., p. 243. The relation between Dhairyendranārāyana
and the Bhutiyās will be discussed at length in
the following pages.
- 62 R.B. Pemberton, Report on Bookee, 1898, Reprinted,
Calcutta, 1961, p. 29. He says that there were eleven
Duars(gates) on the Bengal Frontier.
- 63 B.C. Chowdhury, Sambhu Vaśīṣa Garita, Kalkina, p. 12.
- 64 E.T. Dalton, Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, 1872, p. 96.
- 65 E. Gait, A History of Assam, pp. 11, 51.

66 S.N.Bhattacharyya, A History of Mughal North East Frontier Policy, p.48.

67 Eden's Report on the State of Bhutan, Part III, Bengal Secretariat, p.108.

68 Gait, op.cit., p.51.

69 N.C.Sharma (ed), op.cit., pp.61-63.

Gait also holds that 'although there is no confirmation of this statement, the occurrence is not altogether impossible'.

See op.cit., p.51.

A.C.Banerjee, (The Eastern Frontier of British India, 1964, p.2)

however, says that 'no definite evidence is available in support of this tradition'.

70 J Horton Ryley, Ralph Fitch, England's Pioneer to India and Burma, London, 1899, p.133.

→ C. Wessels, Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia,
71 The Hague, 1924, p.140.

72 D.F.Rennie (Surgeon), Bhutan and the Story of Door War (1866), p.42.

73 Charles Bell, People of Tibet (1908), p.145

Quoting from Bhutanese history lho-hi-ehhojung.

74 Ibid. Loc.cit.

75 Krishna Kanta Bose, Some Account of the Country of Bhutan, Asiatic Researches, Vol.XV, p.129.

76 Biswanath Das (ed.), Rājanskhya, p.16.

Also see A.C.Campbell, A Comprehensive Archaeological, Biographical and Pictorial History of Bengal, Behar and Orissa, Vol.I - Chapter on 'Glimpses of Bengal', tr. of the portion on Cooch Behar in Bengali by N.N.Paul, Calcutta, 1336 Bengal San, p.10.

- 77 S.C.Ghosal, History of Gooch Behar, p. 126.
- 78 Dinesh Sen, Vrhat Vanga, Vol.II, p. 1072.
- 79 A.C.Campbell, op.cit., p. 12.
- 80 Ibid., p. 13.
- 81 Mercer & Chauvet's Report, Vol.II, Calcutta, 1787,
Vol.II, pp. 19, 20, 169.
- 82 Ibid., p. 19.
- 83 Ghosal, op.cit., pp. 215-16.
- 84 Mercer and Chauvet, op.cit., p. 169
- 85 Campbell, op.cit., p. 15.

The name of the Rāikats have been mentioned here as
Bhujadhara and Jagadhara.

- 86 Ghosal, op.cit., p. 216.

Mercer and Chauvet, on the other hand, record that
Yajñanārāyana fled from the capital after receiving the news
of advent of the Rāikats with a vast army. See op.cit., p. 169.

- 87 B.Das (ed.), Rājōnśkhyāna, p. 38.
- 88 Ghosal, op.cit., p. 219;

The Rājōnśkhyāna, however, does not refer to such
a battle fought between Yajñanārāyana and the Rāikats.
Moreover, it says that at the beginning of Mahārāja
Mahēndranārāyana's reign, Rāikat Jagadeva was dead and
Bhujadeva was seriously ill.

See op.cit., pp. 38-39.

- 89 Campbell, op.cit., p. 16; S.N.Sen, op.cit., p. 5.
- 90 Mercer and Chauvet, op.cit., p. 233; Also see S.N.Sen, op.cit.,
p. 5.

91 It may be mentioned in this connection that in the first half of the 16th century the Devarāja of Bhutan acknowledged the supremacy of Visvasimha. But afterwards during the period of Vasudevanārāyana the Bhutiyās took away with them the Royal Umbrella, the Elephant Tusk, Throne and Tarabari (sword). S.N.Sen, op.cit., p.5.

92 S.C.Ghosal, op.cit., p.234; S.N.Sen, op.cit., p.6.

93 S.N.Sen, op.cit., p.6.

94 A detailed discussion regarding the family feud followed followed after the death of king Devendranārāyana has been dealt with in S.C.Ghosal's, op.cit., pp.235-37.

95 Campbell, op.cit., p.17.

It is said that Dhairyendranārāyana had a dispute regarding succession with his brother Rāmanārāyana who had an ambition for the throne. Rāmanārāyana appealed to the Bhutiyās and was re-instated by them. Rāmanārāyana was, however, subsequently put to death by Dhairyendranārāyana who was very much sceptic about the motives of his brother.

96 Ghosal, op.cit., p.246.

97 Mercer and Chauvet, op.cit., p.171; S.N.Sen, op.cit., p.6.

98 Ghosal, op.cit., pp.409-11.

99 See for details of the Treaty between East India Company and the Māhārāja of Koch Bihar. C.U.Aitchinson, A Collection of Treaties, engagements and Sanads, Bengal and Cooch Behar, Calcutta, 1930, Kravis Reprint, II Cooch Behar, 1973, p.189.

- 100 A.N.Chandra, The Sannyasi Rebellion, Calcutta, 1977, pp.71-74.
Also in Journal of the American Oriental Society, 98,
(1978).

Warrior ascetics in Indian History

D.N.Lorensen, p.73.

In the early 1770s some Sannyasis who worked as mercenaries engaged them in free lands in plundering in Bengal. Their most important involvement, however, was in the struggle for succession to the Throne of Koch Bihar in extreme north eastern Bengal. In the complex dispute which flared up periodically between about 1765 and 1790 the Sannyasis usually were on one side and the English on the other.

- 101 C.Sanyal, The Rajpranis of North Bengal, p.8.
102 A.Deb, India and Bhutan
Bhutan and India, p.74.
103 S.C.Ghosal, op.cit., pp.259-60;

"The fertile tracts of Maraghat and Chamurchi became a bone for contention between Cooch Behar and Bhutan and alienated these neighbouring states. The most peculiar transaction which sheds light on the character of the Commercial diplomacy of the time was the cession to Bhutan of the territory known as Ambari Falakata and Jalpesh. Alexander Hamilton, who led two mission to Bhutan in 1776 and 1777, recommended the cession of these ^{tracts} treaty so that he could "induce the Deb Raja to fulfil his agreement with Mr. Bogle and only to buy moderate transit duties on merchandise". The Renunciation of Jalpesh and

Ambari-Falakata were territorial concessions to Bhutan made in the interest of the Tibetan trade". A. Deb, Kailash, on the Himalayan Journal, Vol. I, 1973, pp. 83-84. C. U. Aitchinson, A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, Calcutta, 1930, Reprint, 1973, pp. 189-90.

104 N.C. Sharma (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 41-42.

105 It may be mentioned here that Visvasinha already extended his kingdom upto Gauhati on the east and the Karatoya on the west.

See Gait, *op.cit.*, p. 49; R.C. Majumdar, The History of Bengal, (Medieval period), p. 156 and S.N. Bhattacharyya, *op.cit.*, p. 75.

106 Khan Choudhury Amanatulla Ahmed, Kuch Biharar Itihās, p. 89.

107 H.C. Goswami (ed.), Purāni Assm Burañi, Gauhati, 1922, pp. 61-63;

S.K. Bhuyan (ed.) Deodhāl Assm Burañi, Gauhati, 2nd ed. 1962, p. 107.

However, the date 1533 A.D. given in the Purāni Assm Burañi has been accepted by Lakami Devi in her book 'Abom Tribal Relations, Gauhati, 1968, p. 211. She has mentioned that the expedition which was sent under the Commander-in-Chief Chankham or Tankham became Bargohāin in 1532 A.D. (Harkanta Barua, Assm Burañi, S.K. Bhuyan (ed.), Gauhati, 2nd ed. 1962, p. 25).

108 Lakmi Devi, however, remarked that the compilers of Burañjis have confused the incident with the second expedition sent against Turbak which took place in 1532-33 A.D. See op.cit., p. 212.

109 Ghosal refers to such an expedition of the Ahom General Chankhem against Visvasimha. But he mentions the date of 1483 A.D. which, however, seems to be untenable.

See op.cit., p. 110.

Lakmi Devi contends that Visvasimha was made a tributary Rājā of the Ahom king.

110 See N.C. Sharma (ed), op.cit., pp. 41-42. As regards the cause of the war it is learnt from G.C. Barua's Ahom Burañji, Shillong, 1930, p. 77 that Visvasimha accompanied by his brother Sisyasimha came to the Ahom Court to offer their annual tribute consisting of horses and many other valuable things to king Suhungmung. They declared them as slaves to the Ahom king and requested him to render help when necessary. The Ahom King in return gave them some cows and buffaloes.

Harkanta Barua

From another Burañji (Assam Burañji, S.K. Bhuyan (ed.), 2nd ed. Gauhati, 1962, pp. 30-31) we learn that Visvasimha did not pay the stipulated amount of tribute as settled earlier and as a result, the Ahom King sent an envoy to enquire about the matter which irked Visvasimha. For this reason Visvasimha possibly resolved on the aforesaid invasion.

- 111 E.Gait, op.cit., p.50.
- 112 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.74.
- 113 N.C.Sharma (ed.), op.cit., p.65; Gait, op.cit., pp.52-53.
R.C.Majumdar (ed.), op.cit. pp.156-57 and P.G.Barua,
op.cit., p.126.
- 114 R.C.Majumdar (ed.), op.cit., p.157.
- 115 Gait, op.cit., p.53.
- 116 Ghosal, op.cit., pp.130-33; L.Devi, op.cit., p.215.

Ghosal mentions of the gifts presented to the Ahom king along with the letter. The things were : two ghuris (a kind of cloth or petti coat), one bow, a pair of ceng fish, one pillow, one jakoi (a fishing implement made of bamboos), five saris (cloths worn by females), gom cheng (china silk), five chitts (a kind of cloth), ten ghāgris (wearing apparel), 20 black cowries and 10 white cowries.

- 117 L.Devi, op.cit., p.215.
- 118 Ghosal, op.cit., p.133.
- 119 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Assam Bursāni (SM), Gauhati, 1945, pp.38-39.
- 120 Gait, op.cit., 53; M.Neog, Sankaradeva and His times, Gauhati, 1965, p.61.
- 121 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Assam Bursāni, H.K.Barua, p.32; Gunabhiram Barua, op.cit., Reprint, p.44.
- 122 N.C.Sharma, op.cit., pp.73-76.
- 123 M.Neog, op.cit., pp.62-62.
- 124 G.C.Barua, op.cit., p.38.

- 125 There is a good deal of controversy as regards the destruction of the Kāmākhyā temple by Kālāpāhāra, the General of Sulaimān Karrāni (1565-72 A.D.), the Bengal Sultan. No specific information has yet been received to form an idea that the aforesaid temple was destroyed by Kālāpāhāra. Here, it seems needless to go into details. The issue has been discussed elaborately in the following works : S.N. Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.79; J.A.R.S. Vol.XXV, Gauhati, 1979-80, pp.1-8.
- 126 M. Neog, Prācya Śāsanāvalī, p.2
- 127 According to Akbarnāmah Vol.III, tr. by Beveridge, p.1068), 'the ruler of Kuc did not pay his respects to the Hakim (Governor) of Bengal, and Sulaimān Karrāni proceeded to make war upon him, and returned after failure'.
- 128 S.K. Bhuyan (ed.), Assam Burañi (SM), p.45.
Gunabhiram Barua, op.cit., p.45.
- 129 J.N. Sarkar (ed) The History of Bengal (Muslim period), Patna, 1973, p.185.
- 130 G.C. Barua, op.cit., p.90.
- 131 L. Devi, op.cit., p.220.
- 132 Ibid., p.221.
- 133 Akbarnāmah, Vol.III, pp.349, 1067, 170.

The Akbarnāmah (Vol.III, p.1067) states that Naranārāyaṇa, Grandson of Bīsa or Viśvasimha (obviously a mistake for son) made various presents and offered his submission to the Mughal Emperor (Akbarnāmah, Vol.III, p.349).

In this context, S.N.Bhattacharyya's observation is worth mentioning.

He has remarked that both Gait and Stewart were mistaken by relying on the wrong translation of the Akbarnāmah (J.A.S.B., 1972, p.52) and its ^{repetition} ~~repetition~~ is annotations to the Ain-i-Akbari (Vol.I, p.331) by Blochmann in the event of Naranārāyaṇa's submission to the Imperial Court.

He has criticised Gait for his comment which was based on wrong translation of the Ain-i-Akbari mentioned above (See A History of Assam, p.56)

Again, Bhattacharyya, (A History of Mughal North East Frontier Policy, p.98 fn) said that 'Stewart has misconstrued the import of both the statements and has been bold enough to assert that "Khan Jahan compelled the Raja of Cooch Behar to pay a tribute and to acknowledge himself a vassal of the empire" (History of Bengal, p.106).

Bhattacharyya suggests that 'there was no acceptance of formal supremacy of the Mughal Emperor on the part of the Koch king. The latter did not personally wait upon Akbar, but simply sent an envoy, with an adulatory letter containing professions of friendship and goodwill, besides some presents, probably silk and musk with which his domain abounded. There is no mention of tribute, territorial concession or any other symbol of political tutelage anywhere'.

134 Ibid., pp. 349, 1067.

Here again, Bhattacharyya contends that "in view of the troublous political situation in Mughal Bengal and the relatively advantageous position of the Koch Bihar State of this period, it seems improbable that there was a formal acknowledgement of political supremacy by the Koch king. A friendly alliance, as is natural between two independent neighbouring states, was now established. This simple event, dressed up in Abul Fasl's florid style, misled Stewart and he read it an act of definite political submission". See op.cit., p. 99.

135 S.N. Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 101.

136 S.N. Bhattacharyya, Akbar-nāmah, Vol. III, tr. by Beveridge, p. 621.

S.N. Bhattacharyya states that the 'Narsin', the Land holder (buni) as shown in the Akbar-nāmah Vol. III, p. 621, is the same as Naranārāyana or 'Mālgosain' as is called by Abul Fasl. He further says that the prefix 'Nara' might have omitted owing to inadvertence or ignorance or with a view to brevity.

137 Supra, ref. no. 43(a)

As regards the date of the event, the Vaisāvalīs are silent. However, we get from Gunabhiram Barua (Āṣā Barua, p. 47) that the incident took place in 1503 Śaka (1581 A.D.). This date has also been supported by Gait, op.cit., p. 57. He says, 'This was in A.D. 1581. Muhamadan writers refer

to the two kingdoms as Koch Bihar and Koch Hajo respectively, the former name of course still survives, but the only trace of the latter is in the town called Hajo, a few miles north of Gauhati'.

138 H.C.Goswami (ed.), Purāni Assam Burañji, Gauhati, 1922, pp. 125-26.

139 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 110.

140 Cf. Akbarnāmah, tr. by Beveridge, Vol.III, p. 1067.

Stewart (History of Bengal, 1813, p. 119) and Gait (op.cit., p. 66) also observed on the authority of the above source that Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa offered his submission declaring himself as a Vassal of the Mughal Empire in 1596 A.D.

141 Akbarnāmah, Vol.III, 1081.

142 Ibid., p. 1082. Also see The Ain-i-Akbari, Vol.I, Abu'l Fazl-Allami, tr. by H.Blochmann, Calcutta (Reprinted from 2nd ed. 1927), Delhi, 1977, pp. 362-363.

143 Akbarnāmah, Vol.III, pp. 1093-94.

Katrābhū is said to have been situated on the bank of the Lākṣya (Sitalākṣya) river near Khejarpur to the south-east of Daoca. (Dhakar Itihāsa, Vol.I, p. 448). In the Map of Van ^{den} Broucke (1600 A.D.) Katrābhū has been shown in the same locality. Akbarnāmah locates Katrābhū Six Kos (12 miles) from Bikrampur. The Koch Chronicles and, ~~however~~, the Burañjis, however, do not mention about this incident.

- 144 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., pp. 125-26.
- 145 S.K.Bhuyan, Annals of the Delhi Bahshahate (tr. from Pādshāh Burāñjī), p. 137.
- 146 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Baharistān-i-Ghāybi, Vol.I, p.40;
The Ain-i-Akbari, Vol.I, tr. by Blochmann, p.362;
The Tuzk-i-Ishāngiri, tr. A.Rogers ed. by H.Beveridge,
Vol.I, 2nd ed., New Delhi, 1968, p.443.
- This event as suggested by S.^N.Bhattacharyya (op.cit., pp.126-27), is of immense significance in the annals of Mughal north-east frontier policy. It "symbolised the completion of the process which had begun with the political subjection of Koch Bihar in the winter of 1596 A.D. and which was soon to affect the states of Kamarupa and Assam as well".
- 147 Abdul Hamid Lahori, Pādshāhnāmāh in The History of India Vol.VII tr. by Elliot and Dowson ed., First Indian Edition, Allahabad, 1964, p.65.
- 148 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Baharistān-i-Ghāybi, Vol.I, p.40.
- 149 N.C.Sharma, (ed.), op.cit., p.149.
- 150 R.C.Majumder (ed.), The History of Bengal (Mediaeval period), p.159.
- 151 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), op.cit., p.222.
- 152 Ibid., p.242.
- 153 Ibid., pp.237-38.
- 154 Ibid., pp.230,31.
- 155 Ibid., pp.240-41.

- 156 Ibid., 241; S.K.Bhuyan, Anglo-Assamese Relations, Gauhati 1949, p.260.
- 157 Loc.cit.
- 158 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Kāmarūpar Burañi, pp.13-14.
- 159 N.C.Sharma (ed.), op.cit., pp.147-48.
- 160 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.147.
- 161 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Baharistan-i-Ghaybi, Vol.I, pp.287-88.
- 162 Ibid., p.288.
- 163 Ibid., p.290.
- 164 K.L.Barua (Studies in the Early History of Assam, M.Neog(ed.), Gauhati University, 1973, pp.9-10) describes this rebellion although in a very limited scope, yet he stressed particularly on the idealism of this insurrection. He referred to Koch hero Sanātan who gave a strong fighting against the Imperial power. He also gave the names of a few other rebels such as Sumarood (Samudra Kāyeth of Rangjuli, Parsurāma of Solmāri and Mānu Govinda of Beltola etc. Barua has mentioned that the rebels were influenced by the lofty ideals of Patriotism which provided them with an immense impetus to fight against the mighty Mughals.

Also see S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.178; But the real cause of this uprising as assigned to the treacherous confinement of the Koch and Kāmrūpa rulers-Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa and Parikṣitnārāyaṇa respectively was not, perhaps, limited

only to that extent. It had far deeper root. The oppression meted out to the inhabitants of this region by the Mughal Faujdars or the Karori (Revenue collector) probably provided the cogent reason for this. Thus the Koch Chief Sanatan organised a strong force of rebels to fight against the Mughals. A revolt was broke out under his leadership. Sanatan put the Faujdar Ibrahīm Karori to great strait. He also foiled the joint attack of Abdul Bāqī and Bābā Aba Bakr under the leadership of Mirzā Nathan (See S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), Daharistan-i-Ghaybī, Vol.I, pp.353-54). Subsequently, Mirzā Nathan sued for peace. Accordingly, Sanatan was informed of the proposal. He (Mirza Nathan) assured him that the Ibrahīm Karori would be punished. But Sanatan rejected it. Then, war was renewed in which Sanatan though initially fought relentlessly, however, could not come out successful later on and finding no other alternative, took refuge in Jutiā fort (S.K.Bhuyan (ed.) op.cit. Vol.I, p.381).

165 S.K.Bhuyan (ed.), op.cit., pp.293-322.

166 Ibid., p.521; The Tuzuk-i-Jahāngiri, Vol.II tr. by A.Rogers, ed. by H.Beveridge, 2nd ed., New Delhi, 1968, p.2.

167 S.K.Bhuyan ed. op.cit., ^{vol. II} p.521.

168 Ghosal, op.cit., p.130ff.

169 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p.161.

170 Loc.cit.

171 Ibid., p.251.

- 172 Stephen Cacella calls the prince Gabur Shah
(Gaburra) C. Wessels, Early Jesuit Travellers
in Central Asia, 1603-1721, pp. 126, 127, 131.
- 173 Journal of Numismatic Society of India, Vol. XXXI II, pp. 129-31
The Numismatic Circular, London, 1981, pp. 115ff.
- 174 Ghosal, op.cit., p. 191.
- 175 S.N. Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 251.
- 176 H.C. Goswami (ed.), Purāni Assam Burañi, p. 113.
- 177 S.K. Bhuyan (ed.), Kāmarūpar Burañi, p. 40.
- 178 L. Devi, op.cit., p. 236.
- 179 S.K. Bhuyan (ed.) Assam Burañi (SM), Gauhati, 1945, p. 87.
Also see Amanatulla, op.cit., p. 156.
- 180 Amanatulla, op.cit., p. 157.
- 181 S.N. Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 299.
- 182 H.C. Goswami (ed.), op.cit., p. 115.
- 183 S.K. Bhuyan ed. op.cit., pp. 89-90; H.C. Goswami, op.cit.,
pp. 115-17, S.K. Bhuyan ed. Kāmarūpar Burañi,
pp. 52-53.
- 184 The date is given in Kāmarūpar Burañi, S.K. Bhuyan
(ed.), p. 53.
- 185 J.N. Sarkar, The Life of Mirisula, 2nd ed., Delhi, 1969, p. 289.
- 186 H.C. Goswami, op.cit., pp. 117-18.
- 187 J.N. Sarkar, op.cit., 2nd ed., p. 285.
- 188 Ibid., p. 287.
- 189 Ibid., p. 305. *S.N. Bhattacharyya, op.cit.*

190 J.N.Sarkar, op.cit., p. 287.

Cf. On the night of 1st November, 1661, Mir Jumla and Dilirkhān started from Khispur with a powerful army of 12,000 horse, and 30,000 foot, together with a vast flotilla of war-boats numbering at least 323. The most powerful of them were the Ghurabs or floating batteries in charge of the Dutch, each towed by 4 Kusas (long row-boats) and carry 14 guns and a crew of 50 or 60 men.

See J.N.Sarkar, ^{Loc. cit} op.cit., p. 287.

Many other sailors and gunners accompanied him.

J.N.Sarkar (ed.), The History of Bengal, p. 346.

191 S.C.Ghosal, op.cit., p. 335.

The book supplies us with the names of three routes - Morang, Bākdwar and Raṅgāmati each entering into the Koch Bihar Capital.

192 Annes Zahan Syed, Aurangzeb in Muntakhab-al-lubab, Bombay, 1977, p. 182.

193 J.N.Sarkar, The Life of Mir Jumla, p. 287.

194 Annes Zahan Syed, op.cit., pp. 184-85.

195 J.N.Sarkar, op.cit., p. 288;

J.N.Sarkar (ed.), History of Bengal, p. 346.

196 Khāfi Khān, Munta Khebu-l lubab, in the History of India, Elliot and Dowson, Vol.VII, First Indian Ed, 1964, p. 265.

J.N.Sarkar, The Life of Mir Jumla, p. 289.

197 J.A.S.B., Vol.41, 1872, pp. 80-81.

198 Khāfi Khān, op.cit., p. 268.

- 199 Fathiyya, Continuation, p.110 as quoted by
S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 309 fn.
- 200 Loc.cit.
- 201 Ibid., p. 310.
- 202 L.Devi, op.cit., p. 241.
- 203 Ibid., pp. 242-43.
- 204 Ibid., p. 243.
- 205 Ibid., p. 244.
- 206 Ghosal, op.cit., p. 210.
- 207 Loc.cit.
- 208 L.Devi, op.cit., p. 244.
- 209 Ghosal, op.cit., pp. 210-211.
- 210 L.Devi, op.cit., pp. 247-48.
- 211 S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 12.
- 212 Ghosal, op.cit., p. 217;
S.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., p. 312; L.Devi, op.cit.
p. 248.
- 213 L.Devi, op.cit., p. 249.
- 214 S.H.Askari, An Unknown Phase of Mughal-Koch Relations,
Published in the Indian Historical Records Commission,
Proceedings Vol. 17(1940), pp. 139-48. However, in the
period when these letters are assigned to have been
written, we do not find the appointment of a Faujdar
entrusting on him to look after the administration ^{of} the
Koch Bihar kingdom. If the letters were written in the
first phase of the 18th Century, then it will fall in

The reign period of Rūpanārāyaṇa (1704-14) A.D.)

which however does not prove by other sources. It may be stated that Rūpanārāyaṇa fought against the Faujdar (obviously of Rangpur, See Ghosal, *op.cit.*, p.222) and following the former's defeat a treaty was concluded between them. As treaty provisions, the *Chāklās* of Bodā Pātgrāma and Pūrvabhāga were ceded to the Muslim in 1711 A.D. But the Zamindary right was retained by the Rājā of Koch Bihar on payment of annual tribute as stated earlier.

215 Ghosal, *op.cit.*, p.222.

216 *Loc.cit.*; S. N. Bhattacharyya, *op.cit.*, p.315.

217 Ghosal, *op.cit.*, p.223.

218 *Ibid.*, p.226.

Ghosal says that possibly the aforesaid nazar and Peshkash were given in connection with the Zamindary of the king under the Mughal dominion, comprising the three *Chāklās* of Bodā, Pātgrāma and Pūrvabhāga. 'Rajah Rupanarayana of Cooch Behar held three pargannahs as Zamindar under Mughalraj; hence the Peshkash (tribute)' *Ed. A Narrative of Bengal*, p. fn 33.

219 Nikhilmath Ray, *Murshidabad Itihāsa*, p.357.

.....