

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history of the ancient territory known as Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa is to a large extent a history of two distinct regions separated by the mighty river Brahmaputra. Thus as recorded in the inscriptions, to the north lay the Uttarakūla¹ and to the south lay the Dakṣiṇakūla,² evidently taken to be the two broad divisions between the two sides of the river.³ ~~However,~~ Historical materials on which a reliable framework of the history of this region can be reconstructed, are, ~~not only~~ ^{however, extremely} meagre, ~~but also confusing~~. For the prehistoric period we have to depend mainly on some neolithic and megalithic findings. Again, for the historical period we have only a few local epigraphs and scattered literary documents - historical or otherwise. Besides, there are some legendary accounts though varied, confusing and doubtful in their historical authenticity, ~~yet~~ help us considerably to make a sound political history of the ancient land.

In Assam, there are caves in Chera, Syndal (Khasi, Jaintia Hills),⁴ in Mikir Hills⁵ and North Cachar⁶; and even traces of rudimentary paintings and carvings have been noticed.⁷ Bower notices the remains of caves, fortifications and villages of an ancient tribe called Seeml in the Barail area in Cachar.⁸ Scholars are, however, not unanimous in this

respect in view of the absence of any skulls or other remains from such caves⁹.

Interestingly enough, we have references to few neolithic specimens which supply us a good deal of information regarding the early human inhabitations in Präggyotisa-Kāmarūpa. John Lubbock for the first time refers to the finds of jade neolithic implements in upper Assam.¹⁰ In 1870, S.H. Steel reported the find of several jade tools from the villages of Wamsang Nagas.¹¹ The Collection of shouldered specimens discovered at Bistānatha (Darrang) and Kanarpara (Cachar) by Penny has been described by some as the largest series of Neolithic implements so far found in the province.¹²

G. Heggeldin mentions one stone adze in the Naga Hills which is described as one of the rarest types of fossilized wood.¹³ Of the other specimens, six-grooved hammers from Bistānatha are very important. These are taken by some as exceptional of the numerous neolithic stone implements recorded from Eastern India.¹⁴

Some axe type celts were noticed by Lt. Barron¹⁵ in the Naga Hills which are reported to have been found in course of ploughing a field.¹⁶ S.E. Peal also noticed some celts in the same area even now used as hammers.¹⁷ R.D. Banerjee mentioned of an adze in the Padam Abar Village (Naga area) which on examination has been taken to be made of the Abar trap of the type described by Coggin Brown.¹⁸

Besides these, there are a large number of stray finds from different parts of the State, indicating the extent of the neolithic culture in the area. J.D. Anderson mentions a celt from Sadiya and Godwin Austen describes another from the Khasi Hills.¹⁹ H.B. Medlicot refers to a stone hatchet from Dibrugarh²⁰ and S.E. Peal, again, mentions a celt, which is said to have been dug out from a tea factory.²¹

There is sufficient doubt about the existence and use of pottery in Prāgiyotise-Kāmarūpa. Some ancient specimens like plates, pots and jars of various types are preserved in the Gauhati Museum, Assam.²² According to Barua, this 'collection of pottery includes certain specimens which exhibit the ceramic art of a bygone age, may be a very old age, possibly Pre-Aryan'.²³ But no specific date of these potteries have been given so far.

Though the megalithic culture of Assam is said to have belonged to a period of undated history,²⁴ yet a large number of relics found in different places of the country indicate the habitation of the 'Primitive people' and their movement in those areas. Some of the ancient sites, ^{of Khasi-Jaintia hills} are Chera, Jowai, Martiang and Laitlyngkote, where megaliths are found in pairs, menhirs and found in pairs, menhirs and dolmens, circles and in other forms. Most of them are memorials and only a few of the dolmens are associated with the human remains.²⁴ Hutton thus, perhaps, rightly states that 'the whole of the Jaintia Hills

show traces of a once widespread megalithic culture',²⁶

In this connection we may mention some sites from North-Cachar such as Hunglo, Bolasan, Derebora, Kobak etc. which are said to be famous for the megalithic culture.²⁷ Likewise, the ancient Cachari Capital Dimapur is said to be one of the important sites of this culture. J. Marshal²⁸ suggests that the remains of Dimapur are something like the relics of the shifted development of Tibeto-Burman culture. The remains of monoliths from other places like Karomari and Jamguri reveal further specimens of non-Aryan workmanship with Hindu influence. T. Bloch noticed a chessman type similar to those of Dimapur with a hemispherical capital.²⁹

Thus from the above description it appears that long before the advent of the Rgvedic Aryans in the Indian subcontinent the areas under study were humming with busy life and human activities. The aspirants and cultural attainments of the people lived there have been nicely reflected in the various objects from the different cultural levels of a number of sites. Again, the megalithic culture of all the tribes is supposed to be a part and parcel of their whole social and economic existence bound up with their life here and hereafter.

It is interesting to note that the land of Prāgyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa does not appear to have been mentioned in the vedic texts and in the early canons of the Jainas and the Buddhists.³⁰ Even the mention of this Kingdom is

conspicuously absent in the Āṅguttara Nikāya³¹ which gives us a stereotyped list of the Solasamahā-Janapada, i.e. 'the sixteen Great States'. But interestingly enough, the Dīghanikāya³² and the Sāmyuttanikāya³³ contain the episode of a 'Lohicca Brahmano'. We are not, however, definite whether by the term Lohicca, the author had in his view the river Lohitya or the Brahmaputra river of Kāmarūpa.

Another instance where a text is wrongly supposed to refer to the land of Kāmarūpa is provided by a passage of the Sāṅkhyāyana Gṛhyasamgraha.³⁴ But the term 'Prāgjyotiṣa'³⁵ (meaning before the appearance of any light) as mentioned in the text does not appear to refer to the country of Prāgjyotiṣa³⁶ as suggested by some.³⁶

Of the two great epics, the Mahābhārata seems to be more closely and dependably familiar with the situation, surroundings and inhabitants of ancient Assam.³⁷ There are many a Purāṇic works and some secular literature, ^{in which} ~~while~~ only casual references to Prāgjyotiṣa or Kāmarūpa may be found.³⁸ Besides, there are some Tāntric literatures and some connected works like Kālikā Purāṇa, Yoginī Tantra, Hevajra Tantra which are sufficiently corroborative to the other available sources and hence reliable in connection with tracing a past history of this ancient kingdom. ~~BUT it should be recounted that all these sources do not give us any positive hints of political history either~~

we may proceed our study with their help.

It may be noted that the earliest mentioned king of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa was the Kirāta chief Mahīraṅga-dānava who is said to have established his capital at Mairāṅga.³⁹ Mahīraṅga is again described to have been succeeded in turn by direct line by Hatakāsura, Sambarāsura, Ratnāsura and Ghatakāsura.⁴⁰ But we possess very little information of these asura rulers of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa.

It appears from the available informations that the Dānava dynasty of the Kirāta chief Mahīraṅga was put to an end by one Naraka who established himself in Prāgjyotiṣa after killing Ghatakāsura.⁴¹ According to the traditions, this Naraka was born of the earth by Viṣṇu in his bear incarnation and was brought up by Janaka, the king of Videha of North Bihar.⁴² He is again said to have established his capital at Prāgjyotiṣa ^{पुरा} in Kāmarūpa and his kingdom is described to have been extended from the Karatoyā on the west to the Dihou river of Assam on the east.⁴³ The reference to Naraka and his association with Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa is found in different ancient texts⁴⁴ but it is presumed that there existed probably more than one Naraka.⁴⁵

Naraka is said to have been killed by his father Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa) for irreligious activities.⁴⁶ The next king of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa was Dhagadatta. The Mahābhārata⁴⁷ represents Dhagadatta as Pūṭivasāgaratvāsīn (i.e. dwelling in the Eastern Sea) while according to the Rāmāyaṇa⁴⁸ Prāgjyotiṣa ^{पुरा} the city of

Bhagadatta's father Naraka,⁴⁹ was situated on the Varāha mountain in the sea. The Mahābhārata⁵⁰ also represents Bhagadatta as the leader of the Cinas, Kirūtas, Mlecchas and Sāgarānpavāsins. It thus appears very likely that, in course of Arjuna's digvijaya in the north, he is said to have defeated Bhagadatta reading the Cinas, Kiratas and Sāgarānpavāsins⁵¹ while Bhīma in his expedition in the east is said to have reached the Lashitya Valley and defeated the Mleccha rulers and the Sāgarānpavāsins.⁵² Besides, in various sections of the Mahābhārata,⁵³ Bhagadatta is described as one of the heroes of the Kurukṣetra war who ~~not only fought in the battle but also was~~ ^{was, however} killed by the Pāndavas.

We are in confusion about the ruler who might have succeeded Bhagadatta. It has been suggested that it was Vajradatta, son of Bhagadatta, who ruled after his father.^{53a}

The genealogy after Vajradatta is again very much confusing. But in the traditional accounts we come across names of a large number of rulers who ruled Kāmarūpa. Though these accounts do not give names of kings in chronological order, yet they have been fairly been placed as rulers of mythological period.^{53b}

According to a tradition,⁵⁴ the successors of Bhagadatta in direct line of descent were Dharmapāla, Karmapāla, Pr̥thivipāla and Subāhu. Subāhu has been placed in the 19th generation from Naraka.^{54a}

Another important ruler of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa was

Arimatta^{54b} who is said to have been associated with another ruler of Kāmarūpa known as Rāmacandra.⁵⁵ The capital of Arimatta is said to have been in Baidargarh, near Betna in Kāmarūpa.^{55a}

The genealogy given in the Dīpikācandra of Puruṣottama Gajapati,^{56b} mentions a number of rulers including one Haravinda whose capital was at Candraprabha on the Lohita. It is believed that he was succeeded by his son Kuśaranga and had his capital at Ratnapura.⁵⁶

On the authority of the Yoginī Tantra, Gait^{56a} suggests that there was a Sūdra king named Devesvara who was ruling in Kāmarūpa at the commencement of the Śaka era. Mention is also made of Harasaṅkara or Nāgākhya who is believed to have emerged towards the end of the 4th Century A.D. at Pratsargarh in Bidargarh, where the ruins of a fort attributed to him are still the existence.^{56b} We have also references to another four kings namely Misang, Gajang, Sribang and Hrigang who are said to have ruled for two hundred years at Lohityapura of Kāmarūpa.⁵⁷

In canto IV of the Raghuvansā, it is narrated that Raghū crossed the Lohit i.e. Brahmaputra and defeated the king of Prāggyotiṣapura who gave him a number of elephants and tribute.

It may be mentioned here that, in the introduction to Firsihta's history, it is related that Kidara Brāhmana, a

powerful king of Northern India, was overthrown by Saṅkala or Saṅgaldib, who came from Koca kingdom which is supposed to have been no other than Kāmarūpa.^{57a}

It may be mentioned here that we cannot firmly grasp the thread of the dynastic history of Kāmarūpa before the fourth Century A.D.⁵⁸ when Puṣyavarman of the Varman family established himself in Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa. The family is also called Bhanna (i.e. the son of Bhumi, Earth) and also Avaṅkula.⁵⁹ It is stated in the Nidhanpur plates⁶⁰ of Bhāskara-varman that three thousand years after the mythical predecessors Puṣyavarman was born in the family (i.e. of the Varman) and after whom we have an uninterrupted line of rulers of the Varman dynasty upto Bhāskara-varman.⁶¹ The dynasty is described to have ruled from the city of Prāgjyotiṣapura as it had been the capital during the reigns of its ancestors. The epithet Prāgjyotiṣādhipati used by all the rulers of the different families seems to indicate that throughout the ancient period, Prāgjyotiṣapura remained the capital city.

When and how Puṣyavarman occupied the throne at Prāgjyotiṣapura is still uncertain. Only in the Nidhanpur grant (V.7) of Bhāskara-varman we find a mention that "when the kings

of this (Haraka) family having enjoyed the position (of rulers) for three thousand years, (all) attained the condition of Gods, Puṣyavarman became the lord of the world".⁶² According to some, Puṣyavarman, an inhabitant of Central India came to help Samudragupta of ^{the} imperial Gupta Dynasty and ultimately, occupied Kāmarūpa.⁶³ But this assumption does not find any support of the scholars. Equally untenable to connect the ancestry of the Varman kings of Kāmarūpa with those of Trigarta in the Udicyottarapatha or some where in the Punjab as held by B.M.Barua.⁶⁴ There were many varman families ruling at different times in Ancient India before and after Puṣyavarman and in the absence of any definite evidence either in literature or records, it is possible that he rose into eminence in the early centuries of the Christian era.

The first historical reference to Kāmarūpa occurred in the Allahabad Prasasti of Samudragupta.⁶⁵ It appears that Kāmarūpa became one of the frontier (Pratyanta) States of Samudragupta and her ruler acknowledged the suzerainty of the mighty Gupta ruler by paying all (kinds of) taxes, obeying (his) order and coming to perform obeisance.⁶⁶

The Badaganga inscription of Mahā-Bhūti-varman bears a date referable to the Gupta Era, which has been read by N.K. Bhattasali as 334 and by D.C.Sircar as 344.⁶⁷ Following Bhattasali's reading and allowing for each king an average of 25 years some inclines to place the date of Puṣyavarma's accession (as ^{maha} Bhūti-varman is said to be 8th in descent from

Puṣyavarman) in c. 355 A.D.⁶⁸ This in all probability as observed by some⁶⁹ will make Puṣyavarman as contemporaneous with Candragupta I or his son Samudragupta.⁷⁰

In conclusion, it may be said that Puṣyavarman, perhaps, enhanced the position of Kāmarūpa in the political arena of ancient India. The assumption of the title as lord of the world (cf. Nidhanpur inscription V.7) has led some to suggest that he assumed independent status.⁷¹

Puṣyavarman was succeeded by his son Samudravarman (c. 380-405 A.D.) who was "endowed with all good qualities", assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja and like his father, he ruled as an independent king.⁷²

BalaVarman (c. 405-20 A.D.), the successor of Samudravarman possessed a very strong army and his 'force and armour never broke up and his army could easily march against the enemies'.⁷³ According to Gait, he was probably mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription as the ruler of Kāmarūpa.⁷⁴ But we have already noticed that his predecessor Puṣyavarman might have been a contemporary of Samudragupta.

Next ruler was Kalyāṇavarman who 'was not the abode even of very small faults'.⁷⁵ As noted by Gait, he possibly ruled only 20 years from c. 420 A.D. to 440 A.D.⁷⁶

Kalyāṇavarman was succeeded by his son Gaṇapati-varman. In view of the uneventful character of his reign, it

seems to have been short and he may be placed between c. 440 A.D. and 450 A.D.⁷⁷ Nothing important is recorded of his reign, except that he placed his son on the throne in presence of his subjects,⁷⁸ possibly owing to his old age.

After Ganapativarman, came his son Mahendravarmān who was 'a great supporter of sacrificial performances (Yajñavidhānām/Āspadam).⁷⁹ His reign may be placed between c. 450 A.D. and 485 A.D. and thus he seems to be a contemporary of Kumārgupta I (i.e. Gupta ruler) who rules till 455 A.D. The imperial Guptas, it appears, were on the road to decline since the death of Skandhagupta, although Budhagupta (c. 477-96 A.D.) continued to retain his hold over a vast region from Pundāvardhana to Eastern Malwa.⁸⁰ The Guptas hold particularly over eastern India including Bengal gradually dwindled to a great extent which might have encouraged the ambitious ruler like Mahendravarmān to carve out an independent kingdom at the cost of the weakness of the Guptas and other neighbouring powers. Incidentally it may be noted that he was the first Kāmarūpa king to perform the Āsvamedha sacrifice.⁸¹

Mahendravarmān's son and successor was Nārāyaṇavarman (c. 485-510 A.D.) who is reputed to have possessed a high knowledge of military and political affairs (adhigata-sāmyārtha).⁸² According to Gait his reign was as one of comparative peace.⁸³

The accession of (Mahā) bhūtvarmān,⁸⁴ son of

Nārāyaṇavarman, during the middle of the 6th Century A.D. (c. 553-554 A.D.) was a landmark in the history of Kāmarūpa. Both his own Badagangā inscription and the Nidhanpur plates of Bhāskaravarman bear witness to the new vigour that was added to the kingdom, already growing in importance at the cost of neighbouring powers. The epigraph records more that he was terrible to his enemies and like Indra, of renowned power and fame, destroyers of the vanity of ^{the} enemies.⁸⁵

The contention of B.N. Vasu⁸⁶ that Yaśोधरman conquered Kāmarūpa in about 534 A.D.⁸⁷ when he was opposed by Chandramukhavarmā, the son of Bhūti-varman is no longer considered. With the discovery of the Badagangā epigraph of Bhūti-varman (dated c 553-554 A.D.). There is, however, no reason to believe "that Yaśोधरman actually conquered the whole of India from the Himalayas to the Mehendra and from the bank of the Brahmaputra to the Arabian Sea".⁸⁸ In any case, the hypothetical invasion of Yaśोधरman, if it is to be ascribed to the reign of Bhūti-varman perhaps, did not result in any loss of Kāmarūpa territory.⁸⁹

The Nidhanpur plates⁹⁰ of Bhāskaravarman refers to the grant of land made by Bhūti-varman in Mayurasālamalāgrahāra in the Candrapurī-*viṣaya*, bounded by the river Kauśikā in the east and another stream the Ganginikā⁹¹ in the west. Scholars were not so long unanimous about the identification of the land granted by Bhūti-varman and their choices lay between Pañcakhanda in Sylhet (the find-spot of the Nidhanpur plates)

identifying Kausika with the river Kasiara⁹² and the Kasi river of Bihar.⁹³ The discovery of Pascinbhag Copper plates of Śricandra in recent years has, however, put at rest all our speculations and the Candrapuri-Visaya ^{may now well be placed in} the Sri-hatta-mandala (i.e. Sylhet in Bangladesh) within the Pundravardhana-Bhukti^{93a} and the Kausika is identified with the Kasiara of Sylhet.^{93b}

The relation of Bhutivarman with the later Gupta rulers like Jivitagupta and Kumargupta III, or his association with a few States like Davaka, Samatata etc. has been a matter of dispute. Did this Kamarupa ruler perform horse-sacrifice after throwing off the Gupta supremacy as presumed by D.C.Sircar⁹⁴ or was it the welding together of Kamarupa with Davaka into one kingdom with the overlordship of the former that accounted for the performance of the horse-sacrifice as proposed by H.K. Bhattasali.⁹⁵ Bhattasali, however, points out that Samatata including the entire regions enclosed within the lower part of the old Brahmaputra and the hills of Assam and Tripura (i.e. the eastern part of the present Mymensingh and eastern strip of Dacca and the entire Districts of Noakhali, Tripura, Sylhet and Cachar) passed to Bhutivarman soon after 508 A.D.⁹⁶ The statement appears to be an exaggeration in view of the fact that during the 6th century A.D. there were independent kingdoms in Southern Bengal.⁹⁷

The importance of the conquests made, and the extension of the kingdom under Bhutivarman becomes evident from

his Badagahā epigraph which refers to his performance of a horse sacrifice.⁹⁸ An śvamedha sacrifice was very common in ancient India but in the case of Bhūti-varman it had perhaps a special significance. As given in the Nidhanpur grant, the ruler had a circle of feudatories and could captivate the whole of Kāmarūpa by his benign glance (Iksvājita-Kāmarūpa).⁹⁹ D.C.Sircar doubts about the credit of Bhūti-varman to perform horse-sacrifice rather he inclines to ascribe to Nārāyanavarman for two horse sacrifices, one of which was celebrated when that king was too old and his son Bhūti-varman was ruling the country on his father's behalf and that this was the reason why Bhūti-varman is said to be performer of the śvamedha in a record of his reign.¹⁰⁰ If this assumption is based on the Nidhanpur plates, Sircar is right but when the Doobi grant (V, 25) ascribes to Bhūti-varman as a performer of śvamedha sacrifice his contention appears to be wrong. Anyway, his conquests and intention of his kingdom seems to have been achieved when the Gupta power was waning and the local rulers in south and east Bengal were not steady enough to check his growing power or even to present a united front. That also equally accounts for the horse-sacrifice performed by this Kāmarūpa monarch.¹⁰¹

Candramukhavarman, the son of Bhūti-varman ascended the throne in C. 555 A.D. and possibly he continued his rule till C. 565 A.D. He is said to have abdicated in favour of his son.¹⁰² Candramukhavarman is ^(however) credited in the Doobi grant (V, 30) with the extension of the kingdom upto the seashore. This seems to refer to his consolidation of the kingdom with conquests in

south-east Bengal after the defeat of local chiefs alternatively. Thus it is probable that he came into conflict with the Maukharis and the later Guptas who were struggling during this period for supremacy in Magadha and Gauda.¹⁰³

Sthitavarma, the son of Candramukhavarma and Bhogavati is supposed to have reigned from C. 585 to C. 585 A.D.¹⁰⁴ The Malanda Clay seal (line, 7) refers to his performance of the two horses sacrifices (dvirāśvamedha yājīrīsthitavarman).¹⁰⁵ Many conjectural views have been put forward by scholars in connection with his two horse-sacrifices.

Sthitavarma was succeeded by his son Susthitavarma who is called Susthira in the Malandā Seal of Bhāskaravarma¹⁰⁶ and Mṛgārika in the Harṣa-carita,¹⁰⁷ is said to have faced the burnt of Mahāsenagupta's invasion. According to the Apsal inscription of Ādityasena,¹⁰⁸ Mahāsenagupta claimed victory over the illustrious Susthitavarma and his fame was constantly sung on the bank of the Lashitya (i.e. Brahmaputra). It is possible that Mahāsenagupta's invasion took place prior to the Calukya ruler Kirttivarma's expedition (c. 130-33 A.D.) of Āṅga, Vāṅga, Kalinga and Magadha.¹⁰⁹ Puri, however, thinks that the latter event might have been an empty boast or a poetic exaggeration.¹¹⁰ Again it may be noted that the loss of territory which included the land donated by Mahābhūtavarma appears to be a fact since the situation was retrieved by Bhāskaravarma.¹¹¹

The name of Susthitavarma's son according to the

Bidhanpur grant is Suprastīṣṭhitavarman, the elder brother of Bhāskaravarman. It appears that immediately after the death of their father, Suprastīṣṭhitavarman, the king of Kāmarūpa and Bhāskaravarman were involved in a war with the Gaudas resulting in the arrest of two princesses of Kāmarūpa who soon after, however, got an opportunity to return to their kingdom. The leader of the Gauda army, according to Sircar, was the Gaudādhipa Śaśānka or his immediate successor.¹¹³ It is not unlikely that the Gauda-Kāmarūpa battle took place near modern Tezpur in Assam.¹¹⁴ Incidentally, Devahuti holds that Śaśānka directed his expedition if any, to Kāmarūpa sometime before C. 604-5 A.D.¹¹⁵

With Bhāskaravarmana, begins a new age in the history of Kāmarūpa.¹¹⁶ He was a contemporary of Harṣavardhana of Thāneśvara and Śaśānka of Gauda. The complete political situation with changing alliances owing to matrimonial relations call for the review of the then political set up. Mālwa (Mālwa), Thāneśvara, Kānyakubja (Kanauj), Gauda and Kāmarūpa were mainly concerned in these alliances. Mahāsenagupta of Mālwa, who according to the Apsad inscription of his grandson (Ādityasena) is credited with his conquest upto the Lakhitya, had matrimonial alliances with the Thāneśvara family, his sister Mahāsenaguptādevī was married to Ādityavardhan,¹¹⁷ father of Prabhākaravardhan. The marriage of Rājyaśrī with Grahavarma Maukhari probably alienated the relations between the Gupta, of Mālwa and the Pusyabhutis. Devagupta who might have been a collateral, seems to have viewed the alliance with displeasure.

He, therefore, looked for some other quarter for political alliance to stem the power of the Maukharies. The Maukharies appear to have been in hostile with the Gaudas as evident from the Haraha inscription.¹¹⁸ Sasanka of Gauda was the only choice and in consequence the relations between Malwa and Kamarupa took a turn and became strained. On the other hand the wounds received by Kamarupa from Mahasenagupta's inroads was not healed up. It is equally true that Kamarupa's interests also clashed with those of Gauda. Devagupta and Sasanka joined hands in the extinction of Grahavarman Maukhari as well as of Rajyavardhana, their aim was perhaps complete domination of the whole of the Aryavartya region, isolating Kamarupa for the time being. Bhaskaravarman seems to have sensed this danger, anxious for a powerful ally and fortunately he found him in Harshavardhana who succeeded Rajyavardhana, and the two joined hands in breaking the Malwa-Gauda alliance.

Bana's narrative concludes with an account of Harshavardhana's army on the march, the metaphors in the closing paragraph strongly suggesting a violent battle ending in victory for his patron.¹¹⁹ The poetical rhetoric is supported by the Arjya Manu-sri-mula-kalpa ^{Arjya Manu-sri-mula-kalpa}, which says, 'Harsa defeated Sasanka who was forbidden to move out of his country'¹²⁰ meaning ^{which stands} apparently ^{for} Gauda. Curiously enough, the text of the Arjya-sri-mula-kalpa ^{Arjya Manu-sri-mula-kalpa} does not mention Bhaskaravarman's presence as an ally of Harshavardhana. It may, however, be mentioned that the Vidhanpur grant of Bhaskaravarman was issued from the victorious

camp at Karnasuvarna (jaya-sabdārtha-skandhavārātā Karnasuvarna-vāsakāta)¹²¹ the former capital of Gaudādhīpati Śasānka. The scholars are not unanimous regarding Bhāskaravarman's possession of Karnasuvarna. According to some Karnasuvarna was not under any temporary occupation of Bhāskaravarman who after a joint victory (i.e. of Harsavardhana and Bhāskaravarman) over Śasānka spent sometime in Karnasuvarna in celebrating the victory when the above grant was issued.¹²² Others are of opinion that Bhāskaravarman could not probably join his ally personally when the latter marched against the Gauda King (i.e. Śasānka) in his first campaign. At some later date Harsavardhana might have marched a second time against Śasānka's kingdom in the company of Bhāskaravarman and wrested it either from him or from his unknown successor after his death.¹²³ Another group of scholars¹²⁴ is in favour of Bhāskaravarman's direct occupation of Karnasuvarna, because he (the king) passed through it unobstructed with his full retinue to meet Harsavardhana at Kajahala.

All the views referred to above are hypothetical and it becomes difficult to come to a definite conclusion. Equally it is not clear to us to explain Bhāskaravarman's position in Nālandā wherefrom the king got issued some seals. Be it as it may it is fruitless to indulge in controversies over such points in support of which direct and proper evidence are wanting. This much is, however, sure that Bhāskaravarmana was an able and powerful king held in high esteem by Harsa and that their joint expedition against Śasānka of Gauda succeeded in fulfilling their desired object and mission.¹²⁵

The history of Kamarūpa and the reigning period of Bhāskaravarman in particular is highlighted through the accounts of Yuan-Chwang, a Chinese pilgrim who visited India and Kamarūpa during his reign (C. 642 A.D.). This pilgrim has given a clear hint of a route from Magadha to Kamarūpa via Campa (Bhagalpur), Kajangala (Rajmahal) and Pundravardhana (North Bengal).¹²⁶

Yuan Chwang,¹²⁷ left an interesting account about the extension of kingdom of Bhāskaravarman, which, besides Kamarūpa, might have included also parts of South West and northern Bengal and other adjoining areas. Thus the vastness of the Kamarūpa kingdom from the Karatoya in the west to Sadiya in the east as mentioned in the Yonin Jastre might contain some truth.¹²⁸

It may be suggested that Bhaskaravarman, after the death of Harṣavardhana, wielded considerable political influence. After Yuan Chwang's return to his homeland, envoys were exchanged between China and Kamarupa. The two envoys Li-yi-Piao and Wang Hiuwan-tse (C. 643-46 A.D.) visited India and Kamarupa in particular.¹²⁹

The history of Kamarūpa after the death of Bhāskaravarman is shrouded into obscurity.

It-sing mentions a king named Devavarman as a ruler of Eastern India.¹³⁰ D.R. Bhandarkar¹³¹ thought him and his successor Harṣadeva to be the son and grandson of Bhāskaravarman. Incidentally, in some manuscripts of the

Mudrārāksasa a king named Avantivarman occurs who is held to be 'the immediate successor of Bhāskaravarman'.¹³² K.L.Barua¹³³ identifies Devavarman, mentioned above, with Śālastambha, the founder of a new line of kings of Kāmarūpa, who has been described as melecchādhiṇātha i.e. lord of the Mlecchas (which may also stand for the word Mech) in the grant of Ratnapala.¹³⁴ According to him the supposed gap between Bhāskaravarman and Śālastambha was filled by Avantivarman.¹³⁵

It appears, however, that, with Śālastambha began a new dynasty in Kāmarūpa. Very little is known about the immediate successor of Śālastambha. According to the Hāyūthal grant (V.4), Vijaya became the mighty lord of the earth after the death of Śālastambha. Only passing reference to this Vijaya is found in the grants of Balavaman III.^{135a} Vijaya is, however, said to have been followed in succession by Palaka, Kumāra and Vajradeva.¹³⁶ The reign of these rulers probably came to an end by the first quarter of the 3th century A.D.¹³⁷

With Śri Harṣa or Harṣadeva's accession Kāmarūpa entered into a new age of history because his period witnessed remarkable achievements in the history of the kingdom.¹³⁸ His reign is placed between C. 725-50 A.D.¹³⁹

The Paśupati inscription of the Nepāla king Jayadeva mentions one Śri Harṣadeva who is stated as the conqueror of Gauḍa, Odra, Kalinga, Kośala and other lands.¹⁴⁰ The text of the epigraph shows that Harṣadeva of the Bhagadatta family was connected with the royal house of Nepāla by a marriage

alliance. But the identification of Harsadeva as a ruler of Kāmarūpa is disputed and some scholars have suggested the descent of the king and his daughter from the Bhauṅgakarag of Orissa.¹⁴¹ It may be noted here that there are epigraphical evidences which refer to one Kāmarūpa king, variously named as Sri Harisa,¹⁴² Harṣavarman¹⁴³ and Sri Harṣa¹⁴⁴ who seems to be very much associated with Sālastambha line. Interestingly enough, the identification of Harṣa of the Nepālese record with the ruler of Kāmarūpa was proposed by Kihhorn¹⁴⁵ and endorsed by S.K. Aiyangar¹⁴⁶ E.D. Banerjee¹⁴⁷ and others.¹⁴⁸

The Hāyūthal grant (v.7) of Harjavarman mentions Balavarman II as the successor of Harsadeva.¹⁴⁹ The grants of Vananātha, however, terminate the line of Sālastambha with Harsadeva.¹⁵⁰ The grants of Vanamāla, however, terminate the line of Sālastambha with Harsadeva (mentioned as Sri Harisa).¹⁵⁰ From the Hāyūthal grant (v.3), however, we learn about two princess viz. Cakra and Arathi who are ^{sometimes} identified ^{with} Sālastambha (also possibly known as Prālastambha)¹⁵¹ and Arathī of the Parbatiya grant of Vanamāladeva (Vs.7-9).¹⁵²

Some scholars ^{however} do not favour the identification of Sālastambha (or Prālastambha) with Cakra, rather they think that there is a gap between Balavarman II and two Princes Cakra and Arathi.¹⁵³ According to H.C.Ray, the relation between Sālastambha-Harṣa and Prālastambha-Tyāgasimha is uncertain,¹⁵⁴ N.N. Vasu¹⁵⁵ takes Prālastambha as Harṣa's brother, while Bhandarkar¹⁵⁶ identifies Balavarman with Prālastambha.

But it may be mentioned here ^{That the} ~~Bagaon~~ grant definitely mentions that all these were twentyone ruler in the family of Śālastambha.¹⁵⁷ We have already seen that Cakra and Arathi, did not rule the kingdom but both Śālabha and Ārathī appear to have ruled the country. This had led some to believe that Arathi had two sons, viz. Prālabha (or Śālabha) and Ārathī (Aratha) and the sovereignty passed to the elder son. Hence the theory that Prālabha (or Śālabha) established a new line of giccha origin does not arise and he belonged to the Śālastambha dynasty.

Prālabha (or Śālabha) was succeeded by his brother Ārathī (Aratha) whose successor was Harjaravarma.¹⁵⁸ Harjaravarma was one of the greatest rulers of Kāmarūpa carrying the epithets Mahārājādhirāja Paramśvara Paramhātāraka. He issued two records, the Hāyūthal grant and Tezpur rock inscription. The latter is dated in the gupta year 510 = 823-30 A.D. according to the testimony of the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyanapāla (No. 14) it appears that the Kāmarūpa king who was either Prālabha or Harjaravarma accepted the suzerainty of Devapāla.¹⁵¹

Harjara might have ruled till about 835 A.D. and was succeeded by Vanasālavarmadeva who is regarded as the empire-builder of Kāmarūpa.¹⁵² The reference to the extension of this kingdom to the lines of forests bordered by the ocean, is however, very significant. This might imply, unless it is poetic exaggeration, the extension of the kingdom over the hilly regions in the north and east Bengal, including Sylhet, Mymensingh.

portions of Dacca, Samatara and the neighbouring lands;¹⁶³ By his Parbitiya plates, Vanamāla donated lands of village of Haposa (grāma) lying within the mandala of Svalpa-māngoka in Uttarakula.¹⁶⁴ By his Tospur grant, Vanamāla donated lands to ^{one} Indoka, which is said to have been situated in the village of Abhisūravataka, lying to the west of the Trisrota and the north west of Candrapuri.¹⁶⁵

Vanamāla's son and successor was Jayamāla also known as Virabāhu.¹⁶⁶ This is distinctly stated in the Howgong and Uttarbarbil Plates of Balavarman III.¹⁶⁷ According to some he was probably a contemporary of Nārāyanapāla of Gauḍa and his reign may be placed between 865-885 A.D.¹⁶⁸

Like his father he (Jayamāla) is said to have abdicated the throne in favour of his son Balavarman III (c. 885-910 A.D.)¹⁶⁹ the last important ruler of the family. His Uttarbarbil grant was issued in the 5th year of his reign (Pañcama varṣe)¹⁷⁰ while the second one (i.e. Howgong grant) was issued in the 8th year of his reign.¹⁷¹ By the Uttarbarbil grant it appears that Balavarman donated land to Syāmadeva in the Baraṣepattana-visaya.¹⁷² Again by his Howgong grant, the king is said to have granted land to the Brāhmanas in Hensivā, lying within the Dijjinā-visaya, in the same locality, where Dharmapāla about a century later donated lands, ^{as mentioned} in the Subhankara pāṭaka grant. Like his two immediate predecessors, Balavarman

also assumed the titles of Mahārājadhīrāja-Parameśvara-Parambhāṭṭā-raka. He is said to have been the last in the series of the imperial rulers of the Śālastambha line, followed by an obscure period, with Tyāgasinha as the 21st in the list till the foundation of the new dynasty by Brahmapāla.¹⁷⁴

The new family of Brahmapāla tracing its descent from the same Bhama family aligns itself with the preceding one.¹⁷⁵ As suggested from the Bargaoon grant (V.10) when the illustrious Tyāgasinha died without any successor, his subjects chose Brahmapāla among his kindred to be their king.¹⁷⁶ This is confirmed by the Khenaulk¹⁷⁷ and Subhakkara-Pāṭaka¹⁷⁸ and Ruspabbadrā grants¹⁷⁹ of Dharmapāla.

The chronology of this dynasty poses certain problems. The dynasty ~~is~~ was probably established in 990 A.D.¹⁸⁰ A change in the date of foundation of the dynasty of Brahmapāla has, however, been suggested by D.C.Sircar on the basis of recently discovered inscriptions of Kāmarūpa.¹⁸¹ The Bargaoon grant (V.11) gives a hint of the warlike character of Brahmapāla. It has been suggested that one Jātavarman had a clash with a Kāmarūpa ruler, possibly Brahmapāla who was defeated by the former.¹⁸² But the account of the invasion of Kāmarūpa by the Varmanas of East Bengal is not free from doubt.¹⁸³ It may be noted that the fortunes of Kāmarūpa and Vāṅga never remained constant and it depended on the personalities of the rulers, their powers and the force of circumstances. Brahmapāla abdicated in favour of his son Ratnapāla who is supposed to be the founder of the greatness of the family.

We have several records of the reign of Ratnapāla ranging from C. 1010 A.D. to 1040 A.D.¹⁸⁴ His Saratberi grant is said to have been recorded in the 12th regnal year and other two charters viz. Bargaon and Suwalkuci plates are known to have been issued in the 33th and 36th years of his reign.¹⁸⁵ It appears from his Bargaon grant¹⁸⁶ that Ratnapāla used to reside in the befittingly walled city of Durjjayā, in the kingdom called Prāgjyotisa.¹⁸⁷

His warlike activities are known not only from his own records but also those of his descendants — Indrapāla and Dharmapāla. The reference to the contemporary powers like the Sakas, Gurjaras, Gaudas, Karalas, Bahikas and Tāikas and the ruler of the Deccan are interesting to note in this connection.¹⁸⁸ Ray¹⁸⁹ however, identified the Kerala king with Rajendra Cola I (C. 1013-44 A.D.), the lord of Deccan with the Calukya Vikramāditya VI (C. 1076-1126 A.D.), the Gujara with either Rājyapala or Trilocanapala (C. 1019-27 A.D.).¹⁹⁰ It has also been suggested on the basis of the Vikramānkadeva-Carita of Bilhana that there was an invasion of Kamarūpa by Vikramāditya during the reign of his father Somesvara (C. 1040-1069 A.D.).¹⁹¹

H.C. Ray takes the Tāikas and the Bahikas as the Turkish invaders while the Gurjara king was probably either Rājyapala or Trilocanapala.¹⁹² But it is still strange while the Bargaon grant refers to the discomfiture caused to the lord of the Deccan,¹⁹³ the Vikramānkadeva-Carita records the defeat of the Kamarūpa ruler. This has led some to suggest that of the names of the political powers mentioned in the Bargaon grant

have any bearing on the contemporary powers, then the Kāmarūpa ruler Ratnapāla was not a non-entity.¹⁹⁴ It is further held that he might have been a force to be reckoned with in maintaining balance of power.¹⁹⁵ It is also suggested that he might have come into a conflict with the traditional enemy i.e. the Gauda king and the other powers.¹⁹⁶

It has been suggested that Pundarapala^{ra} predeceased his father Ratnapāla who was succeeded by his grandson Indrapāla (c. 1040-1065 A.D.).¹⁹⁶ It is said that Indrapāla's Gauhati grant was issued in the 3th¹⁹⁷ and the Guvakaci grant in the 21st year of his reign.¹⁹⁸ His capital Durjayā is described in the same poetic style as it was described in the records of Ratnapāla.¹⁹⁹ Indrapāla is credited in the Gauhati grant²⁰⁰ as the vanquisher of all his enemies and the performer of many sacrifices¹. He also assumed the high sounding epithet of Parameśvara-Parameḥattāraka-
mahārāṣṭhirāis. By his gauhati grant,^{a piece of} land was donated in the village of Bhaviṣā in Kāśapātaka in the Hapyoma-viṣaya.²⁰¹ The exact location of the land is yet to be traced. Similarly, he granted land to the Brāhmanas of Sāvathi (Sāvasti),²⁰² which has been identified with at least a portion of Pundravardhana.²⁰³ It may be mentioned in this connection that about this time a mahāmandalika named Īsvaraghoṣa was ruling at ḍhekkarī, and he is said to have granted lands after taking his bath in the Jatodā²⁰⁴ river²⁰⁴ in the Gālitipyoka-viṣaya of mandala of Piyolla.²⁰⁵ Incidentally the Varman became powerful under Jātavarman who has a matrimonial alliance with

the Kalachuries, conquered Aṅga and also Kāmarūpa but his struggle with Kāmarūpa had no decisive result.²⁰⁶ Vijayasena's exploits of Kāmarūpa has been placed sometime during the first quarter of the 12th Century A.D.²⁰⁷ The name of the Kamarupa ruler defeated by Vijayasena has not been mentioned in the Deopara inscription.²⁰⁸ It is not unlikely that it occurred during the reign of Indrapāla, though it has not been accepted by all.²⁰⁹

From the grants of Dharmapāla we learn that Indrapāla was succeeded by his son Gopāla (c. 1065-80).²¹⁰ It has been suggested that the Varman King Jātavarman might have invaded Kāmarūpa either during the time of Gopāla or his successor Harṣapāla.²¹¹

Gopāla was succeeded by his son Harṣapāla (c. 1080-95 A.D.),²¹² The Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI (c. 1076-1126 A.D.) is said to have overrun Magadha, Aṅga, Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa.²¹³ If there is any truth in this statement, these conquests might have taken place when the Pālas became weak, and it is possible that Harṣapāla was involved in war with him.

It is said that with the accession of Dharmapāla (c. 1095-1130 A.D.)²¹⁴ the kingdom again regained its prestige. According to some²¹⁵ he was a contemporary of the Gauḍa ruler Ramapāla.²¹⁶ The Subhankara-pāṭaka grant of Dharmapāla records the donation of land to a Brāhmaṇa in Kañjyabhitvi under the Dijjinā-viṣaya.²¹⁷ Though from the description it appears that

the Dijjinā-viṣaya and lay within Kāmarūpa but the identification of this viṣaya and the village (i.e. Krosāñja) is a matter of great dispute.²¹⁸

In some of his earlier grants (i.e. Khanamukh, Subhāṅkarapātaka etc.) Dharmapāla is described as Prāgyotisā-dhipati (i.e. ruler of Prāgyotisā) but curiously enough in the Puspahadrā grant (V. 30) issued towards the end of his reign, he is described to have ruled from a place called Kāmarūpanagara.²¹⁹ Dharmapāla seems to have consolidated his position after his conquests and organised his administrative set up according to the necessities of the time.

The genealogy of the Pāla rulers, as given in the grants, ends the pāla line with Dharmapāla whose successor is therefore, unknown to us. But N.H.Vasu, on the basis of a Rangpur tradition, asserts that Dharmapāla was succeeded by his son Bhavacandra and his minister Gavacandra.²²⁰ But this supposition is not corroborated by any source and in this connection it is held that this Dharmapāla of the said tradition and his son might be, in fact, belonged to entirely different line.²²¹

A Kāmarūpa Nrpati of the name of Jayapāla is, however, mentioned in the Silimpur stone slab inscription.²²² The name also occurs in the Gāndoga Parisiṣṭa Prakāsa,²²³ where one a Jayapāla is said to have made a donation of Mahāśrādha to Umāpati, the chief of Panditas. The relation of this Jayapāla and his association with the Kāmarūpa Pāla line is disputed by

the scholars.²²⁴ This Jayapāla is said to have donated land to Prabhāsa at Srāvastī which has been taken by some as the continuance of Pāla (i.e. of Kāmarūpa) hold over some portions of North Bengal.²²⁵

It is said that with the defeat of Bhīma, the Kaivarta chief, the Varendrī passed into the hand of the Pāla ruler Rāmapāla. After this the Pāla ruler is said to have pressed heavily on the Varmans of East Bengal to settle old scores. With the surrender of Harivarman,²²⁶ Rāmapāla sent an ally or possibly a feudal chief Tiṅgyadeva to conquer the countries in the east. This ally (i.e. Tiṅgyadeva) is said to have been successful in conquering ^{a part of} Kāmarūpa and was made the governor ^{of that city.}²²⁷ The details of this conquest are also given in the Rāmacarita of Sandhyakara Nandī. ^{Afterwards,} Vaidyadeva was appointed by Kumārapāla to rule in the eastern country (evidently Kāmarūpa) in place of rebellious Tiṅgyadeva.²²⁸ Vaidyadeva, however, established his own line in Kāmarūpa independent of the Pālas.²²⁹

The successor of Vaidyadeva are not known. But the Assam plates of one Vallabhadeva²³⁰ dated in the Śaka era 1107 (i.e. C. 1185-86 A.D.) reveal the genealogy of a group of rulers such as Bhāskara,²³¹ Rāyarideva and Udayakarna and Vallabhadeva. If Vallabha is considered as a king of Kāmarūpa it is a problem of accommodating as many as three rulers (viz. Bhāskara, Rāyarideva and Udayakarna) in between Vaidyadeva and Vallabhadeva within a span of only 43 years, i.e. the

difference between (1185-86 A.D.) the given date of Vallabha's grant and 1142, the supposed date of Vaidyadeva's grant (i.e. Kamuli grant). Scholars like H.C.Ray,³³² N.N.Vasu,³³³ H.K.Bhattacharya³³⁴ recognise Vallabha and other three as belonging to ancient ^{The family} Assam as successors of Vaidyadeva. In the Deopara Inscription³³⁵ Vijaya-sena of Bengal is described to have driven away some ruler of Kamarupa (Gandendro, adravad-apakrta-kamarupa bhupān Kalinga-apī yastarasā jigāya). According to R.C. Majumdar this king of Kamarupa was perhaps Vaidyadeva,³³⁶ while H.C.Ray³³⁷ takes him to be Rayarideva. K.L.Barua,³³⁸ however, opines that Rayarideva fought on the side of the Kamarupa king during the hostilities with Vijayasena, the Sena king of Vanga. The association of these rulers with Kamarupa has been shown in the names of the villages granted by Vallabha.³³⁹

Vallabhadeva was possibly succeeded by Udayakarna who was perhaps not so important. His successor Vallabhadeva³⁴⁰ is described in his grant as a great hero. P.N.Bhattacharya³⁴¹ thinks that Vallabhadeva ruled over a small territory somewhere to the south west of Kamarupa on the border of East Bengal.³⁴²

According to some scholars the campaign led by Bakhtiyar sometime in C.1206 A.D. to Tibet³⁴³ was frustrated in Kamarupa by Vallabhadeva or his successor.³⁴⁴ But it is doubtful whether Vallabhadeva whose grant was recorded in C. 1185 A.D. continued to reign till the invasion of Bakhtiyar

Khilji. The reference to his warlike activities in the grant has been explained sometimes by the fact that the supposed invasion of Lakṣmanasena to Kāmarūpa towards the later half of the 12th Century A.D., as stated in the Madhainagar grant²⁴⁵ was subdued by the former. Though the expedition of this Sena ruler to Kāmarūpa is doubtful.²⁴⁶

The successor of Vallabhadeva is not known; but during Bakhtiyār's invasion the name of the ruling king of Kāmarūpa is said to be 'Bartu' or 'Prthu'.²⁴⁷ In the opinion of Wolsey Haig, this 'Bartu' or 'Prthu' was no other man a king who defeated not only Bakhtiyār²⁴⁸ but also Sultan Ghiyāsuddin in 1226 A.D. and was overthrown ultimately by Wāsiruddin, son of Iltutmish in 1228 A.D.²⁴⁹

The second invasion of Ghiyāsuddin Iwaz is perhaps alluded to by an inscription from Gachal in Nowgon indicating that the invaders went upto that region. It was issued in the Śaka Year 1149-1227 A.D. and it records that the King Viśvasundara deva ordered one Candrakānta to repair the temple of Śiva, damaged by the Mlecchas.²⁵⁰ It has been suggested that they were the muslims who accompanied Ghiyāsuddin in his campaign against the ruler of Kāmarūpa and Bāṅg in 1226 A.D.²⁵¹ Viśvasundaradeva was perhaps the real name of 'Bartu' or Prthu as mentioned by Minhāj and has been identified with the son and successor of Vallabhadeva.²⁵² Glazier refers to local traditions which describe Prthu as an important king of Kāmarūpa who built extensive fortifications in the present

Jalpaiguri in West Bengal,²⁵³ (perhaps it was after the expulsion of Bakhtiyār). The erection of a Siva Temple of Jalpesvara in Jalpaiguri is attributed to one Jalpesvara by the Yogini Tantra who has been considered to be a person of the family of Prthurāja (King Prthu).²⁵⁴ In this connection some scholars are of opinion that Prthu, Jalpesvara and Visvasundaradeva were the same king who after the repulse of two invasions of Bakhtiyār and Ghiyasuddin Iwaz was finally overthrown by Nāsiruddin.²⁵⁵

Another Muslim invasion to Kāmarūpa was that of Ikhtiyār-uddin Yuzbak about 1256-57 A.D.²⁵⁶ The reigning king of that time is supposed to have been Sandhyā, who is mentioned in the Guru-Garita of Rāmacarāṇa Thākura, and it was he who defeated Yuzbak.²⁵⁷ Incidentally, Gait refers to one of the legends of Bāro Bhuyāns, according to which Darlahanarāyaṇa, who had been ruling over Kamata towards the end of the 13th Century made extensive conquests from the Karatoyā to the Badnadi.²⁵⁸ Barua, however suggests that during the reign of Sandhyā the capital was shifted to Kānatāpura.²⁵⁹ This was perhaps due to the fear of repeated muslim invasions and also because of the gradual advancement of the Āhoms towards west after the establishment of their rule in upper Assam during the second quarter of the 13th Century A.D.

Besides the Āhom, the other independent principalities that grew up in the Brahmaputra valley after the disintegration of the early Hindu dynasties, were Cacharis, the Kocās, the Khasi-Jayantiyas and others.²⁶⁰ The Āhoms played

the most significant roles in next few centuries in the history of Assam. It is the Ahoms who boldly faced the onslaughts by the foreign invaders, particularly the series of invasions by the Mughals of which the invasion of the general Mirjumla (1661-1662 A.D.) is worthy of mention in this connection.

REFERENCES :

- 1 Ratnapāla's Bargson grant (line 52); Indrapāla's Gauhati grant (line, 35) and also Indrapāla's Guvaimēdi grant (line, 34) (Vide M.M.Sharma, Inscriptions of Ancient Assam, Gauhati, 1978, pp.159, 153, 197).
- 2 Balavarman's Nowgong grant (line, 33).
See M.M.Sharma, op.cit.; p.146.
- 3 Ibid., p.125 n.

Maheswar Neog, while giving a description of the administrative system of Kamarūpa under the muslims shows 'Uttarakula and Dakshinakula' as two parganās. The former was Kamarūpa to the west of the Ahom kingdom and consisted of three parganās, showing a total area of '31,451', while the 'Dakshinakula' parganā comprised Karaibari and two other parganās to the east of the Brahmaputra (See M. Neog, Prācya Sāsangalī, Gauhati, 1974, p.223).

Incidentally, in the Muhammadan history and records, Assam is showed to have been separated by the Brahmaputra into three grand divisions such as 'Uttarakula, Dakshinakula' and Mājuli (cf. W.Hamilton's Description of Hindoostan (Reprint), Delhi, 1971, p.741).

- 4 J.H.Hutton, JASS XXII (New Series) p.341.
- 5 R.M. Nath JASS, VII, pp.19-23.
- 6 Ursula Graham Bower, Naga Path, London, pp.121-129.
- 7 J.P. Mills, JASS, I, pp.3-6.
- 8 Naga Path, pp.121-29.
- 9 P.C.Chowdhary, The History of Civilisation of the People of Assam to the twelfth century A.D. Gauhati, 1959, p.55.

- 10 John Lubbock; The Stone tools of Assam, 1867, p.322.
- 11 E.H.Steel : 'Celts found among the Namsang Nagas, published in the proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1870, pp.267-68.
- 12 Coggin Brown : Prehistoric Antiquities of India, New Delhi (Reprint), 1981, p.130.
- 13 G. Hespeldin : A Naga Hill Celts, JASB, (New Series) XXII, p.133.
- 14 Coggin Brown, JASB, X, pp.107 f.
- 15 JRAI, Vol.I, Note on stones implements from the Naga Hills, appendix, pp.61-63.
- 16 A.H.Dani, Pre-history and Proto-history of Eastern India, Calcutta, 1960, p.41.
- 17 JRAI, Vol. III, p.479.
- 18 P.G.S.I., XVII, p.304.
- 19 P.A.S.B., 1875, p.158.
- 20 P.A.S.B., 1875, p.150.
- 21 P.A.S.B., 1872, pp.135-38.
- 22 S. Kakati, MS. VI., pp.364 f.
- 23 K.L.Barua, Early History of Assam, Gauhati, 2nd edition, 1966, p.119.
- 24 C.V.F. Haimendorf : The Naked Nagas, London, 1939, pp.21f; Hutton, Man in India, VIII, pp. 223-32.
- 25 Godwin-Austen, JRAI, I, pp.123-36; J.D.Hooker Himalayan Journal, Vol.II, London, 1855, Ch. XXIX.
- 26 JASB, XXII, pp.333-36.

- 27 See K.N.Dikshit, ARASI, 1929-30, pp.45; Godwin Austen JRAL, I, pp.122 f; Ursula Graham Bower, Haga Path, pp.122 f.
- 28 ARASI, 1904-5, pp.7-8.
- 29 T.Bloch : A.R.A.S.I., 1906-7, pp.22-24.
- 30 H.C. Ray Chowdhury, Studies in Indian Antiquities, Calcutta, 1968, p.62.

Incidentally Sayana while commenting on the relevant text of the Satapatha Brāhmana (I,IV,1, 14-15) Sacred Book of the East, XII, I, Intro. pp.XLI f, pp. 104 f, Webster Indian Studies, I pp. 170 ff) identifies the river Sadānirā with the Karatoyā of Prāgyyotisa-Kāmarūpa, concludes that the Aryans advanced upto the Sadānirā (i.e. Karatoyā). But this supposition has been discarded and at present it has been taken to be the river Gandak, the boundary between Kosala and Viśvā (Vide, A.L.Basban The wonder that was India, 1963, p.40). Eggling also suggests Sadānirā as Gandak and not as Karatoyā (see Satapatha Brāhmana, 2nd edition, 1966, Introduction, p.104). In the opinion of Sircar, the identification of the Sadānirā so far made is not after satisfaction, see D.C.Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, p.63. Some have, however, inclined to seek the origin of Prāgyyotisa-Kāmarūpa in the Āitareya (I,3,7; Dikshitar, JRL, XXI, pp.29-33) and Śopatha Brāhmana) published in Nos 315-352 of the Bibliotheca Indica series also Bloomfield JAS XIX) and put Prāgyyotisa-Kāmarūpa in the Brāhmana age (Vide P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit.; pp.10,38,112, 115). But this view has been regarded vague and untenable as being based on wrong notion (see H.N.Sharma, JAA, p.0.3 fn.)

- 31 Pali Text Society, Vols. I, 213; IV, 252, 256, 260.
- 32 Dighanikāya, Vol.I, Pali Publication Board, Bihar Government, 1978, pp. 191-98.
- 33 Samyuttanikāya, Vol.II, Pali Publication Board, Bihar Government, 1969, pp. 107-111.
- 34 Cf. tato niskramya prāgyotisaṃ punyadeśaṃ upaganya anudita aditya anjanagandhisurakhim ityanena mantrana udakadharayā pradakṣiṇaṃ pūrvadvāraṃ madalaṃ kṛtvā ----
Ḳaśā durvāca kṣipati.
(Saṅkhyāyana Gṛhyasamgraha by Pandit Vasudeva ed. by Somnath Upadhyaya, Bharata Sanskrit Series, 1908, P.38.
- 35 On the basis of the passage quoted above (see Ref,34) scholars like J.C.Ghosh (J A B S, Vol.4, p.116), P.C.Chowdhury (H.C.P.A. 2nd ed. p.9) suggest that the term Prāgyotisa stands for the country of Prāgyotisa.
- 36 Cf. H.M.Sharma, I.A.A.; pp.0.2-0.3. Sharma, perhaps, rightly suggests that the passage in question has nothing to do with the country of Prāgyotisa and rather it enjoins that "the performer (student) and the precipitor should once again set out to some holy area before the appearance of any light".
- 37 The Kiṅkīṇḍa Kāṇḍa (Ch.42) of the Rāmāyana refers to the city of Prāgyotisa and its king Naraka. The Mahābhārata on the other hand, refers to the Naraka legend in a rather confusing manner, but while referring to Bhagadatta and his sons the epic seems to have more historical worth (i.e. Ch. 26, V.V.7-16; Ch.30, V.26, 27, Ch.34, V.9-10, Ch.51, V.14-16; Ch.5, V.15-16, etc.)
- 38 Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna (58.13; 57.44; 66.8, see Pargiter's Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, pp.331, 357, 411, 431). The Vāyu Purāna (77.95) and also D.R. Patil, Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāna p.298). Brahmāṇḍa Purāna (Ch.27): The Garuḍa Purāna

(81.16a); The Skanda Purāṇa (Kumārīka Khanda, Ch.59).

Among the secular literatures the followings may be mentioned : The Bhatsamhita (Grahabhakti Section 16.1 Dasakumāra Carita, III, Arthasāstra (BK.II, Ch.11) Raghuvamśa (iv, 81-84) etc.

- 39 E.A.Gait, History of Assam, Gauhati, 1967, p.12 and also P.C.Choudhury, op.cit. p.119.
- 40 E.A.Gait, loc.cit.
- 41 Kālikā Purāṇa (ed. by Sri Jiva Nyāyatīrtha) Calcutta, 1334 B.S., Chapters 36-42, and also Yoginī Tantra (ed. by Swami Sarvesvara Nanda Saraswati) Calcutta 1385 B.S. Part I, Patala XII.
- 42 See Kālikā Purāṇa, Ch.38.
- 43 Kālikā Purāṇa, Ch.38 and also E.A.Gait, History of Assam, p.13
- 44 The references to Naraka episode may be traced from the following sources :
- (I) The Mahābhārata, Udyoga Parva, Ch.45, VV:80-85 and Ch. 130, V5. 44-45 of the same Parva.
- (II) The Rāmāyaṇa, Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa Ch.42
- (III) Harivamśa, Viṣṇu Parva, Ch.64-64.
- (IV) Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Bk. V. Ch.29.
- (V) Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Bk.X.
- (VI) The Kālikā Purāṇa (ed. Jiva Nyāyatīrtha) Chs. 38, 39, 40
- (VII) The Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, V5. 111 of.

(VIII) The Garuda Purāna 148, 10a.

(IX) The Agni Purāna 12.30.

(X) Yoginī Tantra Part I, Patala XII.

45 P.C. Chawdhury, op.cit., pp.125, 132.

46 K.P. Ch.40; Gait, op.cit., p.13.

47 V. 4.11; XI 23.10.

48 IV.42, 30-31.

49 The Kālikā Purāna (Ch.40, V.1) states that Naraka had four sons namely Bhagadatta, Mahāsūrya, Madavān and Sumālī. Elsewhere in the same Purāna (Ch.40, Vs. 124-25) it is said that the earth-godless and Narada installed Bhagadatta on the throne of Prāgjyotiṣapura. Some epigraphs of Kāmarūpa also produce reference to Bhagadatta's installation on the throne of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa.

(i) The Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskara-varman (V.5);

(ii) The Tezpur grant of Vanamāla (V.5);

(iii) The Uttarbarbil grant of Balavarman III (V.8);

(iv) The Bargaon grant of Ratnapāla (V.7);

(v) The Gachal grant of Gopālavarma (V.9);

(vi) The Khanamukhī grant of Dharmapāla (V.3);

(vii) The Puṣpabhadra grant of Dharmapāla (V.2).

50. 26.9; 33.9-10.

51 Ibid., ll.26.9; also D.C.Sircar, S.G.A.M.I., p.164.

52 Ibid., ll.30.26-27; also Loc.cit.

53 (i) Udyoga Parva (Ch.26, Vs 15-16a); Dronaparva (four Chapters i.e. 26 to 28); Sabhāparva (26.9, 12-13) etc.

- 53a The Harsacarita (Ch.VII) mentions Puspadatta and Vajradatta after their ancestor. Likewise in the Mahābhārata (Kārpapārva 5.29), there is a mention of certain Krtaprajña, son of Bhagadatta who is said to have been killed in the war by Nakula. Vajradatta also appears to be a son of Bhagadatta in the epigraphs of the Kāmarūpa kings like Doobi grant (Vs. 4-5) and Nidhanpur grant of Bhaskaravarmān (V.6), Gauhati grant (V.8) of Indrepāla. But it is uncertain whether Vajradatta was either the son or brother of Bhagadatta. Because while in the above mentioned inscriptions present him as son, those of Vanamāla (i.e. Tespur grant V.6) and Parbatiya plates (Vs.5-6), Balavarman III (i.e. Nowgong grant V.8) and Ratnapāla (i.e. Dargaon grant V.8) he is described as brother of Bhagadatta. In this position, it is ^{thus} likely that Vajradatta was a son of Bhagadatta like Puspadatta. Moreover, if Puspadatta is taken to be identical with Krtaprajña of the Mahābhārata, it is likely that he might have died as a prince and thus Vajradatta succeeded Bhagadatta (see P.N.Bhattacharyya, K.S. pp.10-11; K.L.Barua, B.H.K. p.23).
- 53b Gait, History of Assam, Calcutta, 1967, pp.10-21.
- 54 KāmarūpanBurañī; P.C.Chowdhury (ed.) Gauhati, 1958, pp.1,3; also Gait op.cit.; p.17; K.L.Barua, B.H.K. p.24.
- 54a K.S. p.3.
- 54b Gait. op.cit., pp.18-19.
- 55 Loc.cit.
- 55a Loc.cit.

- 55b H.C.Goswami; Descriptive Catalogue of Assamese Manuscripts
(No. 42).
- 56 Loc.cit.
- 56a Gait, op.cit., p.17.
- 56b Loc.cit.
- 57 Loc.cit.
- 57a Dowson & Elliot; History of India Vol.VI, p.533 also
Gait, op.cit.; p.19.
- 58 Gait, op.cit., p.22; also P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.132.
- 59 Cf. Vs. 9-10 and 12 in the Bargoon grant and line 51 of
the Saratbari grant of Ratnapala (see N.M.Sharma op.cit.,
pp. 152-173 and pp. O.21-O.24).
- 60 Cf. Nidhanpur plates, V.7.
- 61 The connection between the Bhauha dynasty and the Varman
line is shown in the epigraphs. For example, the Doochi
grant (Vs. 5-6) states that in the lineage of Naraka was
born king of kings, named Pusyavaman, equal to Siva in
honour and fame, equal to Indra in sacrifices and an
annihilator of enemies.
- 62 The same reference is found in the Nalandā Clay seal :
(Śrīman-Naraka-tanayo Bhagadatta-Vairadattanvayo
mahārājādhirāja Śrīpragjyotisendraḥ Pusyavarmāḥ
lines 1f) (see N.M.Sharma, op.cit., p.35).
- 63 R.M.Nath : The Background of Assamese Culture, Shillong,
1948, pp.32-33.
- 64 B.M.Barua : Indian Historical Quarterly, XXI II, pp.200f.

- 65 J.F.Fleet : Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol.III, pp.1f (line 21).
- 66 J.F. Fleet. Loc.cit.
- 67 In the reading of W.K.Bhattachali the date is given as 300 + 30 + 4 ms = the month of Māgha in the Gupta Era 334 = 553 - 554 A.D. (See Journal of Assam Research Society Vol. VIII, No.4, 1941). For his further views, see Epigraphia Indica, Vol.XXVIII 2 (1947-48) pp.18-23; Bhāratavarṣa, B.S.1348, p.90; Indian Historical Quarterly, March 1945, pp.19-23.

The earlier contention of D.C.Sircar was that the figure in the decimal place resembles "𑀘" and not "𑀙" as suggested by Bhattachali. The middle figure, according to Bhattachali, is a 1-type 30 and Sircar contended that it is a 2-type, similar to the 40 of the 'legends on the coins of western Satraps' (see JAS, Vol.X No.3 and 4 p.64). For his (Sircar's) further views see Bhāratavarṣa, B.S.,Chaitra 1338. Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXX Part II April 1953 (printed 1956); IHQ, Vol.XXI, pp.143 f and Vol. XXII, p.113, also D.C.Sircar Indian Museum Bulletin, January, 1969 and Select Inscriptions, Vol. I, p.384 f.

But in his final reading D.C.Sircar has deciphered no date at all and contended that 'the three signs of the so called date are really the aksaras āyuska of the expression āyuskānam, wishing long life (to the king Bhūtivarman), used in connection with the construction of śrāṅga at the site of the inscribed stone by one of the

- king's officer (see JARE Vol. XXII, 1974).
- 68 P.C.Chowdhury op.cit., p.147 and also R.G.Basak, History of North-Eastern India, 1967, p.265.
- 69 R.G.Basak, op.cit., p.265 and also P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.147.
- 70 Incidentally D.C.Sircar inclines to place Pusyavarman as contemporary of Samudra Gupta (see JARE Vol.I No.1-2, 1943, p.66).
- 71 P.C.Chowdhury op.cit., p.147. It is, however, difficult to support B.N.Barua (IHQ, XXIII, pp.200-20) who holds that he made Devaka an integral part of his kingdom.
- 72 Cf. Walanda seals of Bhaskaravarman, line 2. According to the Burmese tradition, referred to by Phayre, an Indian king, 'Samuda' or Samudra was ruling in upper Burma in C.105 A.D. (Cf. Phayre, History of Burma, London, 1833, pp.3-4,5). E.A. Gait thinks that this king "proceeded thither through Assam and so must the Hindus who led the Tchampas or Shans in their conquest of the mouths of the Mekong in 230 A.D. (Cf. E.A. Gait; History of Assam, p.9). Some scholar even identifies 'Samuda' or 'Samudra' with Samudravarman of Kamarupa (Cf. H.N.Vasu : Social History of Kamarupa Vol.I, p.143).
- 73 Nidhanpur grant V.9.
- 74 E.A.Gait, op.cit., pp.23-24.
- 75 Nidhanpur grant, V.10.
- 76 Loc.cit.
- 77 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.153.

- 78 Doobi grant V.17.
- 79 Nidhanpur grant V.12.
- 80 H.C.Ray Chowdhury, Political History of Ancient India (7th Edition), Calcutta pp.522f.
- 81 The performance of two horse sacrifices by Mahendravarman is noticed in the seal attached to the Doobi C.P. of Bhaskaravarman (see H.N.Sharma, op.cit., p.33) while the Doobi C.P. grant (V.2) and the Nidhanpur grant (V.12) of Bhaskaravarman record him as a performer of numerous horse sacrifices. Anyway, in the opinion of D.C.Sircar, the credit should not be given to Mahendravarman but to his son Narayanavarman who performed the earliest Asvamedha in Kamarupa about the middle of the 6th Century A.D. (see Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XXI, pp.143-45). The Doobi grant, however, credits Vajradatta with the performance of many horse sacrifices. This information is doubtful and no definite conclusion may be drawn as to the credit of Vajradatta as the earliest performer of horse sacrifice. B.N.Barua, however, supports Sircar and holds that it is not true that Mahendravarman performed two horse sacrifices and was largely responsible for the distress of the Guptas towards the east (see IHQ, XXIII, pp.200 f). But the text in the seal makes it clear that Mahendravarman performed two horse sacrifices. The power of the imperial Guptas declined long before the 6th century A.D. and their hold in such in Bengal was no longer strong enough to check the rising power of Kamarupa.

^{cf. Nidhanpur plates, V.13; also}
82 ^ H.G.Basak, op.cit., p.262.

83 E.A.Gait, op.cit., p.24.

84 The king also referred to under the name of Bhūti-varman
(Cowell, pp.217-18) and the Nidhanpur clay seal (Line 6).
in the Balaganā grant, Harsacarita, and in the Nidhanpur (v.14) and

D Doobi grant of Bhāskaravarman he is called Mahābhūti-varman.

85 Doobi grant Vs. 23-31 (vide M.N.Sharma, op.cit., pp.23-23).

86 N.N.Vasu, Social History of Kamarupa, I, p.144.

87 The Mandasor Inscription (Fleet, C II, III, pp.142 ff.)
dated in the Malwa Era 530 = 533-34 A.D., describes the
extension of the territory of king Yasodharman to whom
homage was done by the Huna ruler Mihirakula as far as
Lauhitya (i.e. Brahmaputra). SYA HE IS KNOWN ELSEWHERE AS MAHĀBHŪTI
VARMAN (See above Ref. No. 84)

88 D.C.Sircar, Select Inscriptions I, pp.393 f; JRAB,
V, pp.407 f.

89 F.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.157.

90 Nidhanpur plate lines 34 to 54 and lines 135 to 136.

91 According to some this river is the same as Kansika
(Kuslara of Sylhet) which in course of time dried up
and got the name as ganini or ganinika (Copper plates
of Sylhet, p.55) IHQ, Vol.VI, p.64, R.G.Bhandarkar I.C.
Vol.I, No.I (Book Review).

92 Kamala Kanta Gupta, copper plates of Sylhet (1967), p.56;
J.C.Ghosh, IHQ Vol.VI, p.642, R.G.Bhandarkar, I.C. Vol.I,
No.I (Book Review).

93 K.L.Barua, op.cit., pp.33-34.

93a Kamalakanta Gupta op.cit., p.56; IAA p.61, B.N.Morrison,
Political Centres and Cultural regions in early Bengal.
India Reprint, 1980, p.35.

- 93b J.C.Ghosh, Loc.cit., R.G.Bhandarkar, Loc.cit.,
Hence the identification of Kausikā with the Kōśī of
Bihar no longer stand.
- 94 IHQ; 1960, XXXVI, pp.241-46; The Maukharies and the later
Guptas; JRASH, XI pp.69-74; JARS X pp.63-77.
- 95 SI 1947, pp.18-33, also JARS VIII, pp.132-39.
- 96 Loc.cit.
- 97 See D.C.Sircar (IAG XXI pp.143f) who disputes H.K.
Bhattasali's contention.
- 98 E.I. 1947, pp.18-23.
- 99 ^{cf. Nichanpur C. Plates, v.2, see} P.N.Bhattacharyya, Kāmarūpa Śāsanavali, p.112-113
- 100 IHQ XXI, pp.143f.
- 101 B.N.Puri op.cit., p.13, also F.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.168.
- 102 B.N.Puri observes that four rulers may be taken intercede
between Bhūti-varman and Bhāskara-varman roughly between
C. 535 A.D. and C. 595 A.D. (B.N.Puri op.cit., p.13)
- 103 It is possible that Candramukhi-varman came into conflict
with Kāmaragupta III or his son, and Īśanavarman Maukhal
(see H.C.Ray Choudhury, PHAI, pp.603-5,
- 104 Nichanpur grant, V.16. The Doobi grant refers to the
abhiseka ceremony of Sthitavarman (V.33), also known as Sthiravarmā
^{(cf. Nālandā clay Seal of Bhāskara-varman (L.7)}
- 105 It has been suggested that during the early part of his
(Sthitavarman) reign, the feudatories in the eastern fringe
of the kingdom and south east Bengal rose in rebellion,
but he celebrated his victory over them by the performance
of the first Asvamedha in about 570 A.D. The victory of
Kāmarūpa at the cost of the later Guptas under Mahāsenagupta
during the reign of Sthitavarman might have prompted him

- to perform the second horse sacrifice, possibly by 580 A.D. (vide P.C.Choudhury op.cit., pp.170-71).
- 106 See M.M.Sharma, op.cit., p.36.
- 107 Harṣacarita, (Cowell) pp.217-18.
- 108 C.I.I. III, p.202 ff. Bhandarkar's list no.1552.
It has been suggested by P.C.Choudhury that Sasthitavarman's victory in the Maukharigupta struggle for supremacy culminating in the performance of the second horse sacrifice by 580 A.D. might have prompted Mahasenagupta to invade Kamarupa during the reign of Sasthitavarman (P.C.Choudhury op.cit., p.171).
- 109 Cf. Mahākūta inscription, I.A. XII, p.7. Also see P.C. ^{the invasion of Mahāsenagupta took place between} Chowdhury, op.cit., pp.74-75. _{C.I.I. III p.202}
- 110 B.N.Puri, op.cit., p.14.
- 111 Loc.cit.
- 112 It is evident that Bhāskaravarman became king, probably after the premature death of his elder brother and after a rule of a few years by the latter (see P.C.Choudhury, JAS, XI pp.33-38; B.P.Sinha, J.E.O.S. XXV, p.130; D.C.Sircar IHQ XXVI, pp.241f).
- 113 D.C.Sircar, IHQ XXVI, pp.241-46. According to some the leader of the Gauda army was Mahāsenagupta (cf. Classical Age, p.92; P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.178); (P.C.Choudhury, JAS XII, pp.1f)
- 114 I.H.O. Vol. XXVI, pp.94-46. P.C.Choudhury, however, thinks that "the advance of the Gauda army as far as Tezpur is nowhere indicated in the grant (op.cit. p.178).

- Harsa - a Political Study, Oxford, 1970, p. 38
- 115 D. Devahuti, op. cit., p.38. Devahuti further suggests that it was also possible that Jayanāga might have seized an opportunity after the death of the Kāmarūpa king Susthitavarman and succeeded in capturing the heirs to the throne. They were, however, reinstated (loc. cit.).
- 116 The Doobigrant, Nidhanpur grant, the three Nālandā clay seals of this ruler, the Harsacarita and the accounts of the Chinese Pilgrim Yuan Chwang furnish source materials for the life and achievements of Bhāskaravarma.
- 117 The intimate relation between the family of Mahasenagupta and that of Prabhākaravardhana is proved by the Madhavan grant and the Sonpat Copper seal inscription of Harṣavardhana representing Mahasenaguptā-devī as the mother of Prabhākaravardhana cf. S.I.I. I, pp.72; VII, 157 f; S.I.I. III, pp.331-32). The Pusyabhuti alliance of Mahasenagupta according to Raychoudhury, was probably due to the fear of the rising power of the Maukharis, and a new danger threatening from the east that of Kāmarūpa, (vide FIIAI, edition, p.533). Political alliance soon changed. Between Mahāsenagupta and Mādhavagupta, a king named Devagupta is to be placed not as a friend but as an adversary who joined hands with Sasānka. He is mentioned in the Madhavan and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsa described as resembling wicked horses (cf. Buhler, S.I.I., IV. 607 f; Hoernle, J.R.A.S. 1962, p.562). According to the Harsacarita, this villain finding the army leaderless decided to invade and seize Pṭhanesvara as well (Ucchvass, VI, p.193).

118 Īśānavarman Maukhari is said to have caused the Gaudas to remain within their realm (cf. D.Devahuti, Harsa, a Political Study, Oxford, 1970, pp.26 f.).

119 Harsacarita (Cowell) pp.259-60.

120 Āryamañjuśrī-mūlakaḥpa, V.725.

It is described in the text of this book that Harsa in course of his pursuit of the Gauda king came into the beautiful city of Puṅdravardhana (North Bengal) and then having defeated that king (named in this book as Soma = Sasānka), ^{to create the effect of prophecy} Sasanka is called Soma, both names being synonyms of the word; Rājyavardhana is referred to as Ra, and Harsa as Ha (vide, D.Devahuti op.cit., p.29 f.n.) ^{Harsa varchana} whom he forced ^{Sasanka} at least to remain confined within the boundary of his own country so that he might not in future aspire to proceed again towards the west, ^{and} he himself returned leisurely to his country.

121 R.P.I. Vol. XII, p.78, V.2 and also IAA, p.41.

122 P.N.Bhattacharyya, K.S. Bhūmikā, p.16, also 5,6,9.

This views has been challenged by M.N.Sharma (op.cit., p.55) on good grounds.

123 R.G.Basak, op.cit. p.283 f.

It may, however, be mentioned as suggested by R.G.Majumdar, that ^{Bhaskaravarman's} Bhaskar's occupation of Bengal might have completed by 648 A.D. When he (Bhaskaravarman) is referred to as king of Eastern India in Chinese annals in connection the expedition of Wang-Hiuen-Tse (History of Bengal Vol.I, p.78 fn).

- 124 R.C.Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol.I, pp.77-8;
J.A.S.B., IX, pp.311 ff.; IHQ XV, pp.122 ff; K.L.Barua
Early History of Kamarupa, pp.65-6; also see D.Devahuti,
op.cit. p.91.
- 125 P.D.Chowdhury, J.A.S.B. Vol.XI, 1944, pp.3-4, p.35.
- 126 S.Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol.II,
pp.185f.
- 127 ^{Watters,} Op.cit. Vol.II, pp.185f; Beal.op.cit., Vol.II, pp.195f.
- 128 I.H.Q. XXIII, pp.200-220; P.N.Bhattacharyya, K.S. Bhūmikā
(Intro), p.17, also B.N.Puri, op.cit. p.19.
- 129 P.C.Bagchi, India and China, Bombay, 1950, pp.200f
and also P.C.Bagchi (ed.) Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in
India, 1929, pp.114-15.
- 130 Cf. S.Beal; Life of Yuan Chwang. INTRE. pp.XXVI-XXXVII.
See also JHAS 1881 pp.552-72; I.A.: 1881 pp.109-11;
192-193. According to the Chinese Pilgrim, the temple lands
along with the revenue of 20 villages reverted to Devavarma
who was willing to give back the whole endowment in case
any priest came from China. The location of this temple
is, however, disputed.
- 131 E.I. pp. (XIX-XXIII), pp.379-406.
According to P.L.Paul, this prince is to be identified
with Devagupta, son of Adityasena (Cf. I.H.Q. XII,
pp.67-83). R.C.Majumdar (Cf. J.A.S.B. 1923, pp.376-78;
History of Bengal, I.P.37) takes him to be Devakhadga, a
Khadga king. The same view is held by N.K.Bhattachali
(Cf. J.A.S.B., 1914, pp.36-37; also N.K.Bhattachali; Iconography
and Hindu Sculptures in The Dacca Museum, p.6.
of the Buddhist, etc. p.6). But these theories are hardly

- accepted by the scholars. (Vide. P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit. pp.205 f.)
- 132 J.P.A.S.B., XXVI(N.S.), p.214.
- 133 K.L.Barua, S.H.K. p.69.
- 134 Cf. Bargaon grant (V.9) of Ratnapala.
- 135 K.L.Barua argues that there was a Mleccha (i.e. Mech) revolt in Kāmarūpa and Sālastambha, the leader or governor of the Mlecchas usurped the throne by deposing Bhāskaravarman's immediate successor (evidently Avantivarmān (vide loc.cit.)
- 135a Cf. Wālfarbarbil grant of Balavarman III(V.10). In the Nowgong grant of Balavarman III, however, (V.10), Vijaya is mentioned immediately after Palaka.
- 136 Hāyānthā grant Vs. 4-5.
- 137 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit. p.215
- 138 D.R.Bhandarkar identifies this Harṣadeva with the grandson of Bhāskaravarman (vide APP. to S.I. XIX-XXIII, pp.279 f; H.C.Ray seems to identify with Harjara (D.H.H.I. p.192). But it is no longer accepted by the scholars (vide P.C.Chowdhury op.cit., p.215).
- 139 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.215
- 140 I.A. IV, pp. 173 f; J.F.Fleet C.I.1, III, Intr. pp.173f.
- 141 The Bhaṃakaras of Orissa tracing their origin from Naraka Bhagadatta line, led B.C.Majumdar to presume that both Rājyamatī and Harṣadeva might have belonged to Orissa. According to him, there is no reference to any king of

Kāmarūpa named Harsa who could be credited with such brilliant conquests (vide, Bharatya Vidya Bhavan Series, Vol. VI, pp.111-112; History of Bengal, Vol.I, pp. 35 ff.)

- 142 Tezpur C.P. grant of Varnamāla V.8.
- 143 Cf. Hāyūnthal C.P. grant of Harjarsvarman V.6.
- 144 Cf. The Parbatiya C.P. grant of Varnamāla Vs. 8-9.
- 145 J.R.A.S.B. 1898, pp.384-85.
- 146 Journal of the Indian History, Vol. V, p.336.
- 147 Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol.V, pp.43f.
- 148 P.L.Paul, Early History of Bengal, 1939, pp.29-32.
- 149 N.M.Sharma, op.cit., p.92.
- 150 Tezpur grant (V.8), Parbatiya grant Vs. 8-9.
- 151 Cf. Tezpur grant of Vanamāladeva (V.7), IAA, p.97.
- 152 E.I. XXIX, p.149, fn.4.
- 153 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit. p. 236.
- 154 H.C.Ray, dynastic History of Northern India, Vol.1, p.242.
- 155 Social History of Kāmarūpa, Vol.1, p.158.
- 156 E.I., XIX-XXIII, pp.379f.
- 157 J.A.S.B. LXVI(D) V.10, pp.99ff., also IAA p.156.
- 158 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit. p.233.
- 159 Both the inscription of Vanamāla (i.e. the Tezpur copper plates, V.7) and the Parbatiya plates V.7) speak highly of Prālabha or Sālabha's warlike activities.
- 160 Tezpur copper plates of Vanamāla deva Vs.10-11.
- 161 According to the Bhagalpur C.P. when Jayapāla (brother of Devapāla) set out on a conquering expedition the king of Prāgyjotiṣa-Kāmarūpa lived in happiness for a long time

by accepting the order (of Jayapala) to desist from warlike preparations. This has led Majumdar to conclude that the king of Kāmarūpa who was either P-alamba or Harjara accepted the suzerainty of Devapala and was left unmolested (R.C.Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol.I, p.117).

- 162 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.236.
- 163 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.237.
- 164 Cf. Parbatiya Plates, lines 42-51 (vide N.M.Sharma op.cit., p.119).
- 165 JASS, IX, II, pp.766f; also see IAA, p.100. The Trisrotā evidently refers to the Siddha Trisrotā of the Kalikā Purāna (30.4) i.e. Dhirai river lying near Tezpur (Cf.N.M.Sharma op.cit. 63 fn.), the first-spot of the inscription and the Candrapurā appears to be a village situated near about, should not necessarily be identified with the Candrapurā-visaya of the Śrīhatta-mandala mentioned in the Pāścinbhāg C.P. of Śricandra (lines 27-28)
- 166 K.L.Barua, J.A.R.S., III, pp.3-5, SHK p.81.
- 167 Nowgong grant Vs.16-17; Uttarbarbil plates, Vs.17-18.
- 168 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.340. K.L.Barua, however, fixes his date as C.860-875 A.D. (S.H.K. p.85)
- 169 Keilhorn places Balavarman before 915 A.D. (J.B. II, p.509) which seems to be chronologically feasible. P.N. Bhattacharyya places him during the first half of the 10th century A.D. (op.cit. pp.71-85) and K.L.Barua on the basis of the Nowgong grant, places his reign between 875-890 A.D. (Vide SHK, p.85).

- 170 Uttarbarbil grant V.30.
- 171 Nowgong grant, lines 47-49
- 172 The exact location of the land is doubtful, but if this visaya is to be taken as identical with the Bādāvisaya of the Kamali grant of Vaidyadeva (S.P. Ind.II, pp.347-48), it is probable that the region lay near about the present village of Baia in Barpeta subdivision of Assam (Cf. P.C. Choudhury, Assam Sahitya Sabha Patrika (15th year) 111, pp.187f. also see M.M.Sharma, op.cit., p.289 fn.
- 173 According to the Nowgong grant it is situated to the southern bank of the Brahmaputra. P.N.Bhattacharyya places it to the west of Trisrotā or Karatoyā (Cf. P.N. Bhattacharyya, K.S. p.149, fn 2).
- 174 The Saigaon C.P. grant of Ratnapāla - V.10 (Vide M.M.Sharma, op.cit., 156).
- 175 It is interesting to note here that according to an Assamese chronicle named Hara Gaurī Samvāda, P.C.Bagchi, I.H.S. XVIII, Ch.VI-VII, pp.231-60), there is a mention of a king named Jitari. This ruler is taken to be identical with Bramapāla (vide P.C.Choudhury, op.cit. pp.133, 314).
- 176 Incidentally this procedure of election of a king reminds us the selection of Gopala of the Pala line (vide, R.D. Banerjee, Bānglār Itihās (Bengali) Part I 2nd edition, p.151, 162, 171; R.P.Chanda, Gaṇḍa Rājanalā (Bengali) p.21; A.K.Maitraya Gaṇḍa Lokhamalā (Bengali), p.19, fn.
- 177 Khōnamukh grant V.4, see JARS VIII, pp.113-126; JARS IX, 1-3.

- 178 Subhankara-pāṭaka grant V.4, see P.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., pp.146-167,
- 179 Puspakhadra grant, V.3, P.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., pp.168-84.
- 180 H.C.Ray (JHI, I, p.247) places Brahmapāla about 1000 A.D. and K.L.Barua in 925 A.D. (vide BHK, p.95). If Hoernle is right in placing the beginning of the reign of his immediate successor Ratnapāla in 1010 A.D. (JASB, LXVIII, I, p.102) King Brahmapāla's accession to the throne of Kamarūpa may be placed about 990 A.D.
181. JAH Vol.X, 1976-77 (ed) D.C.Sircar, p.1213. D.C.Sircar assigns the date to c.900 A.D. Accordingly, the rule of the Brahmapāla Kings from Brahmapāla to Dharmapāla^{is} c.900-1065. Thus he placed the reign of Ratnapāla in c.920-50 A.D., Indrapāla c.960-990 A.D.
- 182 . B.I. Vol.XII, pp.57 ff. H.N.Vasu, Social History of Kamarūpa I, p.192.
- 183 The Belva grant of Khojavaman (B.I. XII, pp.57 ff) informs that his grand-father Jatsavaman invaded Kamarūpa. This Varman line of Kings was ruling from Vikrampur in East Bengal during the 11th Century A.D. when the Pala rule after Mahipāla declined in Ganda (vide. R.C.Majumdar, History of Bengal Vol.I, p.197). The actual interpretation of the statement of conquering the fortunes of Kamarūpa does not imply the invasion of Kamarūpa of the defeat of Brahmapāla (P.C.Choudhury, op.cit. p.247) also vide B.N.Pari, op.cit., p.36.

- 184 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.251. Hoernle places him between 1010-1050 A.D. (see JASB, LXVII, pp.113-32). K.L.Barua fixes his date between 1010-1030 A.D. (see S.H.K. p.95). D.C. Sircar, however, places him between C.930-960 A.D. (see JAH, Vol.X, p.121).
- 185 JAH, Vol. X, p.113. According to Hoernle, his Bargan grant was recorded in the 25th and in Suvat-Kaci grant was issued 26th year of his reign vide JASB, LXVIII, I, pp.102, 130-135).
- 186 Bargan grant, line 40, I.A., p.153.
- 187 For Durgajaya see below, p. 192
- 188 H.N.Vasu thinks that it refers to an unsuccessful attempt and invasion of Kamarupa by the said powers, during the time of Ratnapala (vide, Social History of Kamarupa, Vol.I, p.157).
- 189 H.C.Bay op.cit., Vol. I, pp.250.
- 190 But the scholars are not unanimous about the identification of the contemporary rulers. Hoernle, commenting that the Kamarupa ruler (i.e.) Ratnapala actually came into a conflict with the said ruler, identifies the Gurjara king with the western Calukya Jayasinha III or So-mesvara; the Kerala king with the Cola ruler Rajaraja. The Ganda ruler is the Mahipala or Nyapala and the Bahikas and the Talikas with the Trans-Indus people of Balkas and the Tasiks (vide JASB LXVII, I, pp.105f). S.L.Katre, however, takes Ratnapala as a scion of the Ganda Palas (see I.C. IV, pp.43-52). It may be taken note of that, D.C.Sircar takes

- Ratnapāla to be a contemporary of Mahipāla of the Palas of Bengal (see JAH (ed.) Vol.X, (ed.) D.C.Sircar, p.131).
- 191 Buhlar (ed.) Introduction to the Vikramāditya Charita 22.37. According to K.L.Barua, it was Harsadeva who was involved in the war with Bilhana's Vikramāditya Calukya VI (BHK, p.142). Ray placed the Calukya invasion in the time of Ratnapāla (op.cit., p.254f), who according to R.S.Tripathi, beat back the Calukya army which then returned by way of southern Kosāla (vide History of Ancient India p.422). The contemporarity of the Calukya ruler with Ratnapāla is doubted by P.C.Chowdhury (op.cit., pp.253f) and he suggests that the ruler was probably Harsapāla.
- 192 H.C.Ray op.cit., Vol.I, pp.250f.
- Incidentally, the yāhikas or Bāhikas are generally supposed to be the people of Punjab. See Mr. P.V.Kane's notes under the example 'Gaurvāhikā' in Sāhityadarpana II. In the Mahābhārata (Karna parva, 44.7)^{my} are distinctly mentioned as belonging to the Punjab region. The Tāyikas also belonged to the same northern region of India. In Hemadendra's Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi (Bhūmikāṇḍa V.4), the Tāyikas are mentioned along with the people of Jalandhara, Trigarta and Kāśmīra.
- 193 Bargaon grant lines 34-36 (Vide H.M.Sharma op.cit., p.157.
- 194 B.N.Puri, op.cit., pp.37-38.
- 195 Loc.cit.
- 196 Loc.cit.

196 The Guwahati grant (V.17) of Indrapāla states that his father having gone to heaven, his (Ratnapāla's) grandson, Indrapāla, became king. This is also confirmed by the Khōnamukh grant (V.6) of Dharmapāla. P.C.Chowdhury fixes the date as C.1040-1065 A.D. (op.cit., p.255) K.L.Barua places him C.1030-1055 A.D. (op.cit., p.95), while B.C.Sircar assigns the date of Indrapāla to C.960-990 A.D. (see above p.56, ibid. p.161)

197 J.A.S.B. LXXVI, I, pp.116-120.

198 Loc.cit.; K.S. pp.116-120.

199 K.S. pp.120-129.

200 Gauhati grant, V.19; JASB, LXVI, I, pp.120 f.

201 Gauhati grant, line 35, IAA, p.123.

202 For Sāvathi or Śrāvasti see below p.

203 P.N.Bhattacharyya, op.cit., pp.130-145, K.L.Barua, JASB, pp.113-115, see also below, p.176f

204 See below p.125f

205 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.217.

It may be noted in this connection as it appears from the Kālika Purāna (Ch.77, vs.3-9) that a river Jaṭodā flows through Kāmarūpa. But the river at present passes through Jalpaiguri and Cooch Bihar. This has led some to suggest that this region was within Kāmarūpa and Īśvaraghoṣa was probably a feudatory of Indrapāla (vide, N.N.Vasu, Social History of Kamarūpa; I, pp.200 f; R.C.Majumder, Struggle for Empire; V, pp.43-45).

206 R.C.Majumder, History of Bengal (3rd impression) 1976, Dacca, p.199.

207 History of Bengal, I, p. 331.

cf. Gopāla inscription IV. 20, See
208 N.G. Majumdar, Inscriptions of Bengal, Vol. III, p. 48

209 For details see R.C. Majumdar, History of Bengal I,
(Reprint), pp. 213 f and also P.C. Chowdhury, op. cit.,
pp. 271-274.

210 Cf. P.C. Chowdhury, op. cit. p. 258; K.L. Barua, assigns
him to c. 1055-1075 A.D. (E.H. p. 95)

H.C. Ray holds that it is doubtful whether Gopāla actually
belonged to the line of Brahmāpāla and was an immediate
successor of Indrapāla (vide, Social History of Kamarūpa, I,
p. 255). The question of succession of Gopāla has now
been put at rest after the discovery of few inscriptions
from Kamarūpa in a recent years and D.C. Sircar does not
subscribe to the view of the date of Gopāla as assigned
by Scholars like K.L. Barua and others. According to his
suggestion, Gopāla may be placed in the first half of the
11th century A.D. (JAHN, Vol. X, pp. 121-22).

211 I.C. VI, pp. 53-59.

212 P.C. Chowdhury, op. cit. p. 259; K.L. Barua, however,
assigns him to c. 1075-1090 A.D. (E.H.K. p. 95).

213 Vikramānkad-vacavita, Ch. III, sloka 74.

214 P.C. Chowdhury, op. cit. p. 260. K.L. Barua
in c. 1090 and 1115 A.D. According to the chronology
adopted by D.C. Sircar both Harṣapāla and Dharmapāla
may be placed in the 11th Century A.D. (JAHN, Vol. X,
pp. 121f.).

- 215 R.D.Banerjee, MASB, V. pp.43-113; JBOBS, 19 28, pp.489-538.
- 216 For other view regarding their contemporaneity CO.I.H.Q. XII, p.630. The period of the Gauda ruler Ramapala is a matter of dispute. While some writers ascribe for line 1057-1102 A.D. (Vide R.D. Banerjee, M A S B, V. pp.43-113; J.B.O.R.S., 1938, pp.489-538), others place him between 1069-1111 A.D. or 1073-1120 (Vide D.C.Bhattacharyya, I.A.A. 1920, pp.189-93; IHQ, 111, pp.571-91) and 1077-1119 (vide, R.C.Majumdar, JPA S B, (New series) 1921, pp.1-6 also H.B. Vol.I, APP. 11 p.177). The most reasonable date for him appears to be the last quarter of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th Century A.D. Smith places Rāmapāla during the 12th Century A.D. (E.H.I. pp.366 ff).
- 217 Cf. Lines 31-32, (Vide M.M.Sharma op.cit., p.244).
- 218 In the Howgong grant (line 33) of Balavarman III also, there is a reference to Dijjinā visaya. In the said grant the visaya is described to be in the Dakṣiṇakula, a term which is taken by us to mean the southern bank of the river Brahmaputra. Most probably the Dijjinā Visayas mentioned in these two inscriptions are identical. P.C.Choudhury (op.cit., p.242) takes it to be identical with modern Dinajpur of North Bengal (and partially Bangladesh). But this identification is questioned by the scholars (vide, M.M.Sharma, op.cit., p.243).
- 219 There is great controversy regarding the identification of Kāmarūpa-nagara and on the point whether it was a capital of the king. (For details see Capitals and Cities Gr.)

- 220 H.N.Vasu, op.cit., p. 265.
- 221 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p. 265.
- 222 E.I., XIII, pp. 289 ff.
- 223 J.A.S.B., III, pp. 21-22; Egging, Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts; I, in the India Office Library, London, p. 925y.
- 224 As the characters of the inscriptions are of a variety of northern alphabet which was especially used in Bengal and Magadha in the 11th Century, and show close resemblance to the letters of the inscriptions of the Pāla King Jayapāla (c. 104-55 A.D.) it is impossible to identify him with Jayapāla, cousin of Devapāla. In view of the proximity of the find spot of this inscription to the frontier of Kāmarūpa and the similarity of its character to those used in the inscriptions of the Pālas of Kāmarūpa it will perhaps be reasonable to accept this prince as belonging to that line. But his position in the order of kings is less certain. It was probably during the reign of these Pāla rulers that the varmans of eastern Bengal invaded the Brahmaputra valley (N.C.Ray op.cit., p. 256). D.N.Mukherjee identified with Jayapāla of Gauda (vide I.C., V, pp. 367-74). H.P.Sastri in his introduction to the Rāmacarita mentions this Jayapāla whom he identified with the cousin of Devapāla (M.A.S.B., III, p. 8, see also R.D.Mukherjee, M.A.S.B., V, p. 58). Incidentally M.N.Sharma inclines to assert this Jayapāla as a grandson if not the son and successor of Dharmapāla (vide op.cit., p. 0.36, fn. 61).

- 225 P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.287; B.N.Puri, op.cit., p.40.
- 226 See for detail R.C.Majumdar, History of Bengal, I, p.160 and p.161 note also R.C.Majumdar Struggle for Empire, pp.30-31.
- 227 The Rāṅgarita of Sandyākara Ḥandī mentions the invasion of Mayana, the general of Rāmapāla (M.A.S.B., V, pp.92 ff, H.P.Sastri, Ibid, III, pp.1, fn. R.C.Majumdar considers Mayana to be a misreading for Jayapāla or Tiṅgyadeva during the reign of Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa History of Bengal (Reprint) pp.160-161, with notes. But P.C.Chowdhury asserts that the invader was Mayana and the contemporary king of Kāmarūpa was Jayapāla himself (op.cit., p.288).
- 228 Cf. Kamsali grant V.13 (M.H.Sharma, op.cit., p.284).
- 229 It is proposed by P.N.Bhattacharyya that there was a division of Kāmarūpa which at that time was extended upto Dījjinā (Dinajpur ?) when the land mentioned in the Subhānkara pāṭaka grant was donated. Dharmapāla was dispossessed of the western part of the kingdom (K.S. p.167). But the theory of the division of the kingdom between Tiṅgyadeva-Vaidyadeva and Dharmapāla-Jayapāla is not supported by any genuine evidence. (See P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.289), P.C.Chowdhury also doubts the conjecture of K.L.Barna (B.K. p.125, also notes) that the whole of Kāmarūpa was conquered by Mayana from the hands of Jayapāla, and that Tiṅgyadeva was placed as a vassal to the central city of Kāmarūpanagara (Cf. P.C.Chowdhury, op.cit., p.270. He, however, wrongly identifies Kāmarūpanagara with

Prāgyotisapura]. It appears to him that the Gauda conquest resulted in the loss of the Bengal portion of the Kamarupa kingdom. During Kumārapāla's reign, when Vaidyadeva killed the revolting vassal Fiṅgyadeva and declared his independence, he probably found the ground ready for his conquest. He began to rule probably over the whole of the Kamarupa kingdom and established a new line (P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.271).

- 230 Hultzsch, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XL, p.42 ff; F.Keilhorn, EP, Ind. Vol.V, pp.181-88.
- 231 It may be of interesting that these rulers trace their origin from the kings of Bhāskara's race of the Caīra-Vamāsa. Particularly, Rayārideva known also as Trailokya-Siṅha, is described as the "frontal ^{line of} ~~organ~~ ^{the family of} of the ^{with} kings of Bhāskara's family (V.5). The identification of Bhāskara in the Bhāskara-varman of the Vamsana family is unlikely as the latter belonged to separate race, namely Bhama (Vide N.K.Bhattachali, JHG, XXII, pp.1-14).
- 232 H.C.Ray op.cit., pp.259-60.
- 233 N.N.Vasu, op.cit., pp.229 f.
- 234 N.K.Bhattachali, JHG, XXII, pp.1-14.
- 235 V.20 Vide N.G.Majumdar, Inscriptions of Bengal Vol.III, p.48. Cf. Gaudendra-śrāvāṇa apakṛta Kamarupa bhupar-Kalingan epi yastarasajigaya
- 236 R.C.Majumdar, H.B.I., p.213 f and notes and also History of Ancient Bengal, p.236.

237 H.C.Ray, op.cit., Ia, p.259 f.

238 K.L.Barua, EHK, pp.129 ff.

239 ~~Vs. 18-19~~ Vide M.N.Sharma, op.cit., p.295).

The name of the villages are as Devunkoñci, Samsrahi-Koñcikā etc. (loc.cit. ~~Vs. 10, 11, p.299~~). It may be noted that place names ending with Koñci or Koñcikā are supposed to be names of villages in Kamarūpa (Cf. B.H.K. p.127; IAA p.300 fn).

240 Loc.cit.,

241 Assam plates, V.10, Cf. IAA p.294.

242 K.S. Bhūmikā, pp.43-43.

P.N.Bhattacharyya argued on the following points :

- (i) We are not sure if the so-called Assam plates were found in any place in Assam;
 - (ii) There is no mention of Kamarūpa or Prāgjyotisa at all in these plates;
 - (iii) The script has more affinity with the scripts of the Bengal inscriptions and not enough affinity with the inscriptions of Kamarūpa.
 - (iv) As the genealogy shows, the founder of the line, to which Vallabha belonged must have been a contemporary of Sharnapāla or Jayapāla.
 - (v) Gait in his History of Assam (^{published in} ~~pub;~~ 1906) did not made any mention of the Assam Plates, presumably because he did not recognize vallabha to be belonging to Assam.
- It is interesting to note that in the Assam plates of Vallabhadeva (V.10), we come across a figure named

Nihseñka Sinha who is credited with as ^{the} a father of Vallabhadeva.

- 243 H.G.Raverty, ^{Tabaqāt-i-Nāsibī, vol.I,} Z, pp.560f; A. Salam, Riyāz-us-Salātin, pp.65-68; N.K.Bhattachali, IHQ, Vol.IX, pp.59-62.
- 244 N.K.Bhattachali, IHQ, XXII, pp.4-6.
- 245 JASB, V (New Series) pp. 467-476.
- 246 See for different views, R.C.Majumdar, H.B.I., p.214.
- 247 Raverty, op.cit., pp.560f. Also K.L.Barua, SHK, C.138.
- 248 The defeat of Bahhtiyār is well stated in the Kasal Baral Boma Rock Inscription (See, E.S.A. (Intd.), p.44 M. Hoogi, Prācya Sāsanaśālī, p.1, Inscription No.1.
- 249 Wolsely Haig, Cambridge History of India, Vol.III, pp.50-54.
- 250 IHQ, XXII, pp.12-14.
- 251 Raverty, op.cit., I, p.594.
- 252 P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.276.
- For details see, K.L.Barua, SHK, p.149 f.
- 253 Report on the District of Rangpur, p.8.
- 254 See Buchanan's Manuscripts (published by the Dept. of Historical and Antiquarian Studies (Gauhati); also Kāmarūpa-Burāñjī - p.98.
- 255 K.L.Barua, SHK, (1966), p.149 and also P.C.Choudhury, op.cit., p.276.
- 256 Raverty, op.cit., I, p.263.
- 257 Cf. K.L.Barua, E.H.K. (1966), p.130.
- 258 B.A. Gait, op.cit., (2nd ed.) pp.42-3 also Cf. P.K.Bhattacharyya's article 'Study of a few Geographical names of North Bengal :

Kāmatā, Kāmatāpura, * p.2, also Cf. K.L.Barua, op.cit., p.178.
* an unpublished article read at the Seminar held at the Centre for Advanced Study of Ancient Hist. & Culture, C.U. in 1979.