CHAPTER IX

Relations of Prāggyotisa-Kāmarūpa with Puṇḍravardhana

Relation of Prāggyotisa-Kāmarūpa with Puṇḍravardhana is an important phase in the history so far the extension of Kāmarūpa is concerned. Geographical areas of Kāmarūpa and Puṇḍravardhana are the subject matters of study to find out their territorial locations.

As we find that Vedic Aryans did not come beyond the Yamuna or in the east of the Ganges. So in the Yajurveda there was no reference of any ancient tribe of Kāmarūpa or Bengal. But in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka there is reference of “Vaṅgabagdhascherapādā.” ‘Vagdha’ is probably a variant of Magadha. In the Aitareya Āraṇyaka the language of Vaṅga and Vagdha (Magadha ?) people were compared with the language of the birds ‘Bayāngshi.’ The people of Vajjabhūmi as depicted in Jaina Āchāraṅga Sutta\(^1\) were very rude in behaviour. It ap-

---

1. No definite reference is made to Prāggyotisa-Kāmarūpa in the early Buddhist canonical literature. The Dighanikāya and the Samyuttanikāya contain the episode of Lohicco Brāhmaṇa. The word Lohicco (skt. Lauhitya) means the region of river Lauhitya. Brahmaputra was not referred in the early scriptures, it speaks of the river Brahmaputra. Lauhitya and Prāggyotisa are two different countries as we find in Brhatasamhita. The Vedic Aryans speak eastern India as a Mleccha country.
pears from the Vedic language and culture that both Bihār and Bengal area were not palatable to the Aryans. The people of Aryandom visiting this area were to perform certain religious rites to atone for sins accrued from the visit of this region inhabited by untouchables.² In the *Mahābhārata* also there is reference to the people of this area, i.e. the sea-shore area people who were called as Mlecchas. Bhīma’s conquest of Puṇḍras, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas and Sea-shore people amply reflects this contention. In the *Ārya Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, the language of Gauḍa, Puṇḍra Baṅga, Samataṭa were told as the language of the Asuras. The *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rājaśekhara places the Puṇḍra country in the east along with Prāgjyotiṣa and Tāmraliptaka. Puṇḍras³ are also mentioned as Pauṇḍras, Pauṇḍrakas or even as Puṇḍrikas. *Mahābhārata*⁴ sometimes used them as same or sometimes as having distinction. As per Pargiter they are two different people. Pauṇḍras are linked with the Vaṅgas, Kirātas⁵ and Aṅgas. It

---

² It is uncertain that pure Aryans entered Assam from the west. The Vedic literature contain no reference to the introduction of Vedic culture in Assam or Eastern India.

³ *Baudhāyana*

⁴ *Puṇḍras* were referred to first in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and then in the *Baudhāyana Dharma-sūtra*. In the former the Puṇḍras are described as a tribe of bandits and in the 2nd they are described as untouchables. The Vaṅgas and Kaliṅgas are neighbours.

⁵ *Mahābhārata*, Bhīṣma parva, IX.; Sabhāparva, PL 11

⁶ *Mahābhārata*, Sabhāparva, XIV
appears that they occupied some intermediate position in between Aṅgas and Vaṅgas\textsuperscript{6} and the hill countries of the Himalayas, broadly Mālādh, portions of Pābna, east of Kośī and parts of Dinājpur and Rājsāhi. The Puṇḍras linked as they were with the Udras, Utkalas, Mekalas, Kaliṅgas and Andhrs\textsuperscript{7} occupied modern district of Sāntāl parganās, Bīrbhūm and northern portion of Hāzāribag. But in later references these distributions were not maintained. But it appears that they covered a very wide area having Kāmarūpa and Nepāl in the north and Tāmralipīta and Odra-Kaliṅga in the south. The capital of the Puṇḍras were at Puṇḍanagala mentioned in a fragmentary Maurya Brāhmi inscription of 2nd century B.C. discovered at Mahāsthān, 7 miles north of modern town of Bogra. Puṇḍranagara is thus identified with Puṇḍravardhana or Mahāsthān. Hiuen Tsang described location of Po-Shi-Po monastery in Puṇḍravardhana.\textsuperscript{8}

Vaṅga was the name of the area. Later on it acquired a geographical conotation. Vedic Aryans were also acquainted with the name Vaṅga. In the \textit{Aitareya Brāhmaṇa} we first get the reference of the group of Birds. They are referred as Dasyus. In the \textit{Aitareya Brāhmaṇa}, the Vedic Aryans nurtured hatred against

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} Sabhaparva-XIV
\item \textsuperscript{7} Bhīṣmaparva, IX; Droṇaparva, IV
\item \textsuperscript{8} Watters,
\end{itemize}
the peoples of Eastern India. This attitude was prevalent up to the period of the Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra which further says that the Puṇḍras had their settlements in north Bengal and the Vaṅgas probably at the eastern part of Bengal. But later on in the Mahābhārata itself the Puṇḍras and Vaṅgas were depicted as Kṣatriyas.

Prāgjyotisa king in the Mahābhārata, Bhagadatta, was styled both as the Parvatapati and Pūrva-sāgaravāsin. It is evident that Bhagadatta was having his followers, the Chinas and the Kirātas inhabiting in the hilly region of the north and marshy region near the sea. It may be held that his kingdom included not only portion of South-East Bengal, but also portions of Nepal and Bhutan and to the confines of Nepal and China as is evident from the description of Rājasūya sacrifice (of Yudhiṣṭhira) in which Bhagadatta is said to have sent presentation of ivory tasks, rhinoceros’s horns (Rhinoceros is still the living animal of Assam including elephants which are available in large numbers in the jungles of Assam).

His kingdom included eastern Indian and Himalayan territories of the north and also the land watered by the Lauhitya as well as the eastern areas; to be precise the northern part of Bengal Delta where there were the dwellers of the marshy region and
also the Kirātas since the Kirrhadae of the Ptolemi’s *Geographika* (c.140 A.D.) certainly occupied the low lying region of Tripura, Noakhali etc.

The foundation of Prāgjyotiśa by Amurarāja, son of Kuśa, probably grand-father of Viśvāmitra, who performed his austerities on the bank of the river Kauśika, is another significant tradition. Prāgjyotiśa lay close to the Dharmāraṇya. It is probable that the kingdom of Prāgjyotiśa extended upto the river Kauśikā. All these references led the scholars to think that the kingdom at that time included the greater portions of modern Assam along with Kochbihar, Jalpaiguri, portions of Patna and probably, a portion of Nepāl. This covers the relations of Prāgjyotiśa with Puṇḍravardhana upto 1st century A.D. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* there is reference of Vaṅga. In the *Manava-dharma-śāstra* Bengal was stated to be within Aryāvarta and Puṇḍras were declared as the degraded Kṣatriyas. In the *Mahābhārata* 9 Puṇḍras were styled as *sujāta* Kṣatriyas along with Vaṅgas who were also referred as Aryans in Jaina *Upāṅga Pannabāṇa (Prajñāpana)*. Rārḥ was also same. It further appears that Puṇḍra Vāsudeva, the king of Puṇḍras, united the Kirātas, Vaṅgas and Puṇḍras into one country and Yādava Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva had to fight the joint army of

9. *Mahābhārata*, Udyogaparva (ch. 48, 80-85)
Puṇḍraka Vāsudeva and Jarāsandha, the Magadhan king. This is evident from the *Mahābhārata*.¹⁰ Thus it appears that part of Kāmarūpa was probably under Paundra Vāsudeva. But Śrī-Kṛṣṇa installed Bhagadatta as the king of Kāmarūpa probably after defeating the confederacy of Puṇḍraka Vāsudeva, Jarāsandha, Naraka and Bāṇāsura. The story of conquest of Karṇa, Bhīma and Śrī-Kṛṣṇa, depicted the re-united resistance of the Puṇḍras, Vaṅgas, Kāmarūpa, Kirātas etc. against the Aryans. The legend of the marriage of Bhānumatī, daughter of Bhagadatta, with the king of Hastināpura appears to be ficticious as at that time Bhagadatta was very old; as shortly after, i.e. during *Mahābhārata* war he has been described fighting with Arjuna binding his eyelids with cloth. But it may be a fact that Bhagadatta helped the Kuru king Duryodhana with one Akṣauhiṇī of Chīna and Kirāta soldiers.

Some places of Puṇḍradeśa, e.g. Karatoyā and Sāgarsaṅgama or Suhmmadeśa were considered later as pilgrimage.

Gradually the Aryan language of north Gangetic zone with its culture extended to Puṇḍradeśa, Bengal and Kāmarūpa. Aṅgas (North Bihar), Puṇḍras, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas, Andhras, Śavaras and Pulinḍa tribes were known as Asuras, and belonged to one lin-

¹⁰ *Mahābhārata*, Udyoga. p. 4.11
guistic group. The historians of Alexander refer to a people called the Gaṅgaridae. According to evidence of Pliny, Ptolemy and many classical writers the people in question occupied the country of the lower Ganges and its tributaries. The Jaina and Buddhist sources connect the name the great Mauryas with Puṇḍravardhana. Thus Chinese pilgrim found Aśokan monumens in Puṇḍravardhana. The location of Puṇḍranagara in the Maurya epoch at Mahāsthān in Bogura district of Bangladesh is proved by the discovery of an inscription in Brāhmī script of about 3rd century B.C. at Mahāsthānagar at Bogra district. There are references of two locations, viz. Suvarṇakuḍya and Pāralauhitya which according to some scholars were located in Prāgjoytiśa kingdom.

Records of the Chinese writers place the territory of Puṇḍravardhana in North Bengal. Same is the case with Gupta

11. According to Divyavadāna Puṇḍravardhana was the eastern boundary of the middle country (Div., pp 21-22). In the Sumagādhavadāna Kalpalatā (chap. 93, v 10) Puṇḍravardhana is described to be 160 yojanas (or 640 miles) to the east of Śrāvasti.

12. Reference is to the Epigraphia Indica, Historical Quaterly and of the Journals where the inscriptions were published. There is reference of Po-Shi-Po monastary in Puṇḍravardhana. (Watter -11, p. 184). Yuan Chwang. Stūpas were built by Aśoka in Puṇḍravardhana and also in Karṇaśuvarṇa.

records. After the Mauryas and Suṅgas in the west we find in the east Prāgjyotisa-Kāmarūpa the rise of Varman dynasty under Puṣyavarman.

Beginning with 4th century A.D. it appears that the Prāgjyotisa kingdom shranked upto the east of the Lauhitya loosing Puṇḍravardhana to the Guptas. Puṇḍravardhana came under the direct administration of the Guptas and formed a regular ‘Bhukti’ of the Gupta empire; while, as indicated by the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta, Kāmarūpa became a frontier state like Samatata and Davāka.

In the Raghuvanśa, Kālidāsa in narrating the exploits of king Samudragupta states that Raghu entered Kāmarūpa crossing Lauhitya. But with the decline of the Guptas both in Magadha and Gauḍa during the middle of the 6th century A.D., the kingdom of Prāgjyotisa-Kāmarūpa made its rise and again expanded. It included Sylhet and portions of south-east Bengal. The Bargaon inscription indicated the inclusion of Davāka within the Prāgjyotisa-Kāmarūpa kingdom.

Gauḍa was the capital city of kingdom in Śaśāṅka’s time. Sylhet was then in Samatata in south-east Bengal.

Hiuen Tsang observes thus: “Travelling from west to east, he (Hiuen Tsang) crossed the Ganges and then after a journey of
above 600 li reached the Pun-nā-fā-tān-nā (Puṇḍravardhana) country. This country was above 4000 li in circuit and its capital was more than 30 li. In circuit, Po-shih-po\textsuperscript{14} Buddhist monastery was twenty li west of the capital. Near it was an Ashoka tope at the place where Buddha had preached for three months." (On Yuan Chwāng, LI, 184-85).

Bhūtivarman of Varman dynasty not only extended the boundary of Kāmarūpa in the west, he had also brought Cachar, Tripurā and Sylhet under the sway of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa. As a mark of victory he performed a horse sacrifice and donated land to 205 Brāhmaṇas in Puṇḍravardhana in North Bengal.\textsuperscript{15}

This situation continued up to late 6th century A.D. Four rulers ruled between Bhūtivarman and Bhāskarvarman roughly between A.D. 555 and 596. Assam's fortune fluctuated during this period. In the Doobi grant Chandramukhavarman is given the credit of the extension of the kingdom up to the sea-shore.

This extension might have led to the clash with Kumāragupta-III or his son or Īśānavarman Maukharī. In the Haraha inscription Īśānavarman and Upagupta claims victory over the Andhras, Sulikas and the Gauḍas and for the first time he assumed the

\textsuperscript{14} Mrgaśîkhāvana
\textsuperscript{15} Bargāṅgā Rock Inscription

made of Apshad Inscription of Ādityasena. Mahāsenagupta claimed victory
imperial title Mahārājādhirāja. Īśānavarman might have come into conflict with Kumāragupta-III as opined by Dr. Ray Choudhury. The struggle between the Later Guptas and the Maukharies was carried to the time of their successors as a result of which the supremacy over Magadha seems to have passed into the hands of the Maukharies. It is proposed by Dr. Choudhury that Susthitavarman’s victory in the Maukhari-Gupta struggle for supremacy culminating in the performance of the second horse sacrifice by A.D. 580 may have prompted Mahāsenagupta to invade Kāmarūpa during the reign of Susthitavarman.

Mahāsenagupta,16 a king of (the Eastern) later Gupta dynasty of Magadha became very powerful. Gauḍa (Bengal) came under his sway. He defeated the Maukharies of Kanauj in west and revived the lost glory of the Guptas. He, further, marched up to North Bengal (Punḍaravardhana) and declared war against the Kāmarūpa king Susthitavarman or Sthitavarman as per Nālanda clay seal of Bhāskara and Mrgāṇka of Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhatta.

16. Mahāsenagupta, a king of the later Gupta dynasty of Magadha, defeated Susthitavarman, the king of Kāmarūpa. In this regard reference may be made of Apśhad Inscription of Adityasena. Mahāsenagupta claimed victory over Susthitavarman. Susthitavarmana’s victory in Maukhari-Gupta struggle for supremacy culminating in the performance of the second horse sacrifice by A.D. 580, may have prompted Mahāsen to invade Kāmarūpa.
He succumbed to death and the fame of Mahāsenagupta was sung on the bank of Lauhitya.

Susthitavarman left his two sons Supratisthitavarman and Bhāskaravarman. Both the young princes gave stiff and united resistance fearlessly but got arrested due to wound and by their diplomacy they got back the lost area probably purchasing mercy. Supratisthitavarman although ascended the throne but very early he left his last breath due to wound in that battle. The Gauda king who attacked Kāmarūpa may be Mahāsenagupta, but under the generaligimo of Śaśāṅka, the Mahāsāmanta of Karṇasūvarṇa, who had his constant rise from the Sāmantaship of Rohtasgarh. Supratisthitavarman was succeeded by his brother "Bhāskarvarman", who, says K. L. Barua, "was perhaps the most illustrious monarch of Kāmarūpa". He was also called Kumāra Rājā. The Doobi grant, Nidhanpur grant, the three Nalanda clay seals, Harsacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa and the accounts of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang furnished materials regarding him. At that time the political condition at Northern India was full of turmoil. The later Gupta (Western Branch of Later Guptas) king of Malwā had his enmity with Grahavarman Maukhari, the king of Kaṇauj, whose mother was the sister of the wife of Mahāsenagupta of Magadha. At that time due to
political vicissitudes Mahāsenagupta of Magadha died at the hand of Devagupta of Malvā. The king of Thāneswar Prabhākarvardhan, gave his daughter Rājyaśrī in marriage with Grahavarman Maukhari of Kaṇauj and there was Puṣyabhūti-Kaṇauj alliance against the later Guptas of Malvā. Devagupta of Malvā established his friendship with Śaśāṅka\textsuperscript{17} of Gauḍa who became more powerful in Gauḍa after the death of Mahāsenagupta. The struggle between the dynasties followed immediately. Prabhākarvardhana was succeeded by his son Rājyavardhana at Thāneswar at 600 A.D. Devagupta then invaded Kaṇauj and killed its king Grahavarman. Rājyavardhana then marched against Devagupta of Malvā. But on the way Devagupta having died suddenly his friend Śaśāṅka advanced against Rājyavardhana and the latter had to succumb to death at the hand of Śaśāṅka. Being lured to marry Śaśāṅka’s daughter he accepted the invita-

\textsuperscript{17} Some scholars think that Śaśāṅka started his political career as a Manāsāmanta under Mahāsenagupta and led his master’s expedition with a vast navy against Kāmarūpa when Bhāskara and his elder brother were mere minor boys, defeated them and took them captive though he later on set them free. But the elder brother soon died and Bhāskara ascended the throne of Kāmarūpa. This incident in turn made Bhāskara to be stern enemy of Śaśāṅka in later years. However, Śaśāṅka then took advantage of death of Mahāsenagupta and usurped his Gauḍa territory and became the independent monarch of Gauḍa with his capital at Kānasuvarṇa. Then his support was extended towards Devagupta of Malvā, who killed Grahavarman, the Maukhari king and son-in-law of Puṣyabhūti royal family of Thāneswara.
tion of feast and got brutally murdered. This made Śaśāṅka the absolute power from Malwā in the west to Gauḍa in the east.

The sudden death of Rājyavardhana made his younger brother, Harṣa, very restless and in that situation Haṁsavega, the ambassador from Kāmarūpa met Harṣa with presentations at Kājaṅgala sent by Bhāskarvarman, the king of Prāgjyotiṣa-Kāmarūpa. The situation was similar for both and the common enemy was the king of Gauḍa, Śaśāṅka. The reception was very favourable and the term of Bhāskara's friendship was accepted by Harṣa. Leaving Śaśāṅka to be dealt with in the hand of Bhandi, his general, and Bhāskarvarman, the king of Kāmarūpa, Harṣa left to perform his immediate duty to search out and rescue his widow sister Rājyaśrī who was found and saved from committing suicide at the forest of the Vindhyas.

After that Harṣa started his conquest and conquered the five Indies. In this regard the army of Kaṇauj was of great help to him. The nature of alliance between Bhāskara and Harṣa was friendly. Although there is an air of subordiation on the part of Bhāskara and that is apparent from the wordings of correspondences between Harṣa and Bhāskara that accrued over the meeting of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang who was at the court of Kāmarūpa king Bhāskarvarman. But that the intensity was ex-
pressed by both the kings to get the companionship of the learned Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang is visible from the correspondences.

The feeling of friendship and mutual respect between the two great kings got further expressed, when Harṣavardhana celebrated the quinquennial ceremony of Kaṇauj and for offering homage to Buddha dressed himself as Indra and Bhāskaravarman as Brahmā being senior to him in age at the presence of the Chinese pilgrim. In that ceremony Harṣa donated to the people all his belongings and wealth including his loin cloth (and sought another from his sister). Hiuen Tsang was accompanied by Bhāskara at his return journey to the court of Harṣa from Kāmarūpa.

Hiuen Tsang was assured to give proper protection in his journey if he undertake the same through Bengal. Bhāskaravarman and his subordinate kings kept Tāmralipti under their occupation. The writers of the *Life of Hiuen Tsang* referred to Kumāra Bhāskaravarman as the king of "Eastern India". Chinese version of five Indies were North India, Western India, Mid India, South India and Eastern India. The Eastern India indicate undivided Prāgjyotiṣā-Kāmarūpa, Sambalpur, Orissā, Ganjām and the entire Bengal including the Bengal Delta of the Ganges as the kingdom of Bhāskara.
In the books 'Life' of Hiuen Tsang' and in 'Si-yu-ki' are given separate references of Puṇḍravardhan, Samataṭa, Karṇaṣuvarṇa and Tāmralipti, but those did not mean that those areas were independent. In these books the name of the subordinate kings were not referred to. There is reference to the king of Kāmarūpa. Probably those kings were subordinate to the king of Kāmarūpa.

In the Nidhanpur Inscription reference of Sāmanta kings under Bhāskaravarman is found. In this regard reference may be made of Rājabhaṭa of Samataṭa who may either be a Sāmanta of Bhāskara or a king of Samataṭa.

In the Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskaravarman the celebration of his triumphant entry into the capital of Karṇaṣuvarṇa after his victory over hundreds of kings is mentioned. This grant was made from his victorious camp. The conquest of this part of Gauḍa appeared to have happened either in Śaśāṅka’s time when he switched over his attention and field of exploits from Bengal and Bihar to Kaliṅga and Orissa and beyond due to joint attack of Bhanaḍi and Bhāskarvarman. The joint force of Bhanaḍi, the general of Kaṇauj and Bhāskaravarman made Śaśāṅka, the king of Gauḍa to flee towards Ganjām area from Karṇaṣuvarṇa where from Bhāskara issued the Nidhanpur grant to the Brāhmaṇas of
Panchakhaṇḍa on Kośika of Śrīhaṭṭa as the later research has confirmed. Hārṣa allowed Bhāskara to rule over Kāṇasuvāraṇa and Gauḍa and at Magadha the son of Mahāsenagupta Śrī-Mādhavagupta was established as subordinate king. Dr. Rakhaldas Banerjee stated that due to the joint attack of Hārṣa and Bhāskaravarman, Śaśāṅka was probably defeated, but it was a fact that after the battle that ensued Śaśāṅka was ousted from Kāṇasuvāraṇa. He then lost his hold at Bengal and continued as king of Orissa only. Sāmanta king Shambhuyasa and the Dattas of Daṇḍabhukti, viz. Somadatta and Bhāṇudatta were kings of Utkala under Śaśāṅka. The Datta dynasty came to an end by 642 A.D. probably after 625 A.D. After death of Śaśāṅka Harṣavardhana might have conquered the area.

So the opinion of Vincent Smith about the occupation of Kāṇasuvāraṇa by Hārṣa after the death of Śaśāṅka appeares to be a fact. In about 610 A.D. Śaśāṅka was ousted from his kingdom and Hārṣa's coronation ceremony took place at 612 A.D. as opined by P. C. Choudhury. But in Medinipur Inscription of Sāmanta Mahārāja, Somadatta and Mahāpratihāra Sumakīrti Śaśāṅka was referred to as Adhirāja. Probably it happened before 637-38 A.D. when Śaśāṅka died, as, during that time Hiuen Tsang coming to travel in that area heard the death of Śaśāṅka. Further Shailodbhava
king of Orissa was the Sāmantas under Śaśāṅka by 619 A.D. After the death of Śaśāṅka Sailodbhavas declared independence. After Śaśāṅka's death fight between Pulakesin-II and Harṣavardhana ensued over the control of the area of Kaṅgoḍa-Bhalabhi to Daṇḍabhuksi Maṇḍala. The control of Chālukyas over Kośala and Kaliṅga was not permanent by 634 A.D. Emperor Harṣavardhana advanced upto Orissa and Koṅgoḍa in 634 A.D. Thus it appears that probably Śaśāṅka died sometimes after or before 634 A.D. and Orissa was not occupied by Harṣa so long as Śaśāṅka was alive.

In *Indian Historical Quaterly* a writer has pointed out that Harṣa's kingdom did not touch Bengal and Śaśāṅka's kingdom went to Bhāskara. Otherwise, Bhāskara could not have controlled the route to China and would not have allowed Hiuen Tsang to proceed through that road.

At the time of issuing of the Nidhanpur grant Bhāskaravarman was in the possession of Karṇasuvaraṇa, the capital of Śaśāṅka, whose death, according to Dr. Ray Choudhury, took place sometimes between A.D. 619 and 637. B. P. Sinha suggests 625 A.D. as the date of death of Śaśāṅka. According to Dr. Ray

18. Pandit Vidyavinod has expressed in *Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvalī* that Śaśāṅka was ousted from Karṇasuvarṇa by the joint attack of Harṣa and Bhāskara. But the fact of temporary occupation of Karṇasuvorṇa by Bhāskara may not be true.
Choudhury the king overthrown by Bhāskaravarman might have been Jayanāga (*nāgarājo samāhvayo gauḍarāja*). The king of Gauḍa was named Nāga, successor of Somākhya or Śaśāṅka whose name is disclosed by Bāppāghosabāta Inscription (*EI*, XVII, p. 60A). (*Ārya Maṇjuśrī Mūlakalpa*).

The Gauḍas did not tolerate the loss of their independence and they continued to remain as a thorn19 in the side of Kaṇauj and Kāmarūpa. The hostility towards these two powers were inherited by the Pāla and Sena, successor of Śaśāṅka. (Reference: *The Occupation of Bengal by kings of Kāmarūpa* I.p. 37ff.).

Dr R. S. Tripathi pre-supposed Bhāskara’s occupation of Karṇasuvāraṇa after Arjuna’s usurpation of Kaṇauj when Bhāskara helped the Wang-heuen-ste Mission. His assertion is that Harṣa would not have allowed Bhāslaravarman to take possession of such fertile land and thereby to increase his power. Whereas this view of R. S. Tripathi was contended by Dr. Mazumder that Bhāskara occupied Kaṇasuvāraṇa after Harṣa’s death, and made him Master of Eastern India. He stressed that Bhāskara has felt that Harṣa treated him as his vassal. While Dr. Basak contends that there is no evidence of the existence of ill-will between the two rulers until the end of their careers. Dr. B. N. Puri opined

that two facts are very clear from epigraphic records, the con-
quest of Karṇasuvārṇa, which was included in the kingdom of
Kāmarūpa and the existence of Śaśāṅka definitely till A.D. 619
is evident from Ganjām plates. It appears that the joint alliance of
Harṣa and Bhāskara diverted the expansionist zeal of Śaśāṅka
from North and East to the South. The common adversary’s
reference to the extention is nowhere available. Bhāskaravarman
occupied Gauḍa only after Śaśāṅka’s death and probably not
before as Harṣa proceeded towards Ganjām after 639 A.D. If
Śaśāṅka died in 625 A.D. the lapse of 14 years is a big gap and
we don't find any reference to the movement of either Harṣa or
Bhāskaravarman towards Orissa after 625 A.D. Further, if Śaśāṅka
was defeated by the joint force of Harṣa and Bhāskara why this
arch enemy was not pursued to be finished before the coronation
of Harṣa. It appears that part of Gauḍa came under the occupa-
tion of Bhāskara after seige of Karṇasuvārṇa when Nidhanpur
grant was issued, and the rest of the part of Karṇasuvārṇa came
under the full occupation of Bhāskara after Harṣaā’s death, and
the expansion of Kāmarūpa kingdom towards the south and the
west happened after the trial of strength between Harṣa and
Pulakeshin-II. The extent of Harṣa’s empire left out Bengal and
parts of Bihār. That area was left for the occupation of
Bhāskaravarman.

The issue of Nālandā clay seal west of Gauḍa could not have been issued in the capacity of a pilgrim in friend’s territory but most probably the area was occupied as it appears during or just after the seige of Karṇasuvṛṇa and after the issue of Nidhanpur grant. So his participation on behalf of the pilgrim along with the forces sent from Nepāl and Tibet against the Tirhut chief Arjuna was quite natural. He could not tolerate the expanding power of the usurper Arjuna. Bhāskaravarman helped the other two powers in avenging the massacre for various reasons, viz. respect for the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang, his self-esteem and reputation in the Eastern world and also the political consideration not to allow the menace any further to expand upto his territory.

Bhāskaravarman also appears to be the ‘Bṛhat Parameśwara’ of the eastern Indian king of Samatāṭa, e.g. Jīvadhāraṇa Rāṭa who is stated to be the prāptapañcamahāśabda under the Adhirāja. Probably the Adhirāja was the king of Gauḍa as evident from the Kailan copperplate inscription of Śrīdhāraṇa Rāṭa, the son of Jīvadhāraṇa. Although they were Sāmanta but ruled like a king independently taking advantage of the weekness of the Gauḍa king after his defeat at the hand of Harṣa and Bhāskaravarman.
Similar is the case with the Khadgas; as per the Deoteri Inscription Khadgas were the ruling kings of Vaṅga, initially of Dhaka but not the kings of Samatata. They were Khadgadyom, Jātakhaḍga, Devakhaḍga and Rājavata or Rājbhāṭa. The Mallasarıul seal and the coins were issued during the time of Devakhaḍga. During Rājavata one ‘Brhatparameśwara’ issued land in his kingdom.

Probably, like the Ratas, the Khadgas also were half independent Śāmantas. In the book Gaudavaho of Bakpatirāja, there is reference of the Gauḍa kings ruling in the 1st half of eighth century A.D. after Śaśāṅka. The defeat of the Gauḍas to Harṣa and Bhāskara in the mid seventh century A.D. is a fact to be reckoned with. In both the cases the Brhatparameswara appears to be Bhāskaravarman. In this regard reference may also be made of one Lokanātha who was born in Brāhmaṇa family of Bharadvāja Gotra and was known as Karan Lokanātha. His great-grand-father was an Adhimahārāja but his son was a great Śāmanta. But in the Comilla inscription of Lokanātha there is reference of his relation with Jivadhāraṇa, the king of Samatata. Lokanātha was a Śaiva. In the battle with one Jayatuṅgavarṣa many of the soldiers of his Brhatparameswara got dead. But Lokanātha showed his proficiency in that battle. Due to his power Jivadhāraṇa Rāta
purchased the friendship of Lokanātha having one Parganā or Viṣaya as gift as is evident from Tripura Inscription, from Jīvadhāraṇa. The fact that Lokanātha was sent against Jīvadhāraṇa and Jayatuṅgavārṣa, as they were independent loving people by their overlord or Brhatparameśwara. Lokanātha was successful and for that he got a Viṣaya as prize crumbling Jīvadhāraṇa.

There is reference also of Śīlabhadra in the account of Hiuen Tsang who referred to the former as a Brāhmaṇa prince. Probably he was a scion of Rāta dynasty and took up the name Śīlabhadra when he adopted Buddhism.

Thus, Bhāskaravarman’s empire included not only part of South-West and Northern Bengal but even portion of Bihar and his authority extended over other states. This explains the ring of feudatories in the Nidhanpur inscription. It is however difficult to fix the time when he extended his conquest as far as Nālandā but finding of the Nālandā clay seal is not an accident. The evidence of the vastness of Kāmarūpa kingdom from Sadiyā to Karatoypā again in Yowginiṭantra contains truth.

That is why it is suggested that after the return of Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang envoys were exchanged between China and Kāmarūpa which was representing India. Liyi-piao and Wang-Huen-tse, the two envoys visited India from 643-646 A.D. and
cultural contact was established between the two bordering countries. Assam came out of political oblivion due to this relation with the neighbouring states of Tibet and Nepal and finally with China. The material progress achieved by Kāmarūpa is evident from the list of presents sent by this ruler to Harṣa. He is rightfully called the king of Eastern India by the Chinese. He breathed an air of toleration and broadmindedness.

With the death of Bhāskaravarman sometimes in 650 A.D. the Varman line of kings in Kāmarūpa was ended. The next dynasty was established by Sālastambha. He was a leader of the Mlecchas but belonged to the Bhauma-Nāraka family. *Haragaurīsambāda*, a late text, mention a prince named Mādhava who came from the west and established a new dynasty comprising twenty one kings. I-tsing in his *Kow-Fa-Ka-Sang-Chuan* written sometimes between 700 and 712 A.D. mentioned a king named Devavarman who was the ruler of Eastern India. He was holding sway over Nālandā. The identification of Devavarman and his association with Bhāskaravarman are also to be considered. Śrī N. N. Dasgupta consider him to be a lineal descendent of Bhāskaravarman. P. C. Choudhuty suggests that Devavarman was installed by Bhāskara over Nālandā region towards the end of his reign perhaps after the departure of Hiuen Tsang.
The Bargaon grant mentions Sālastambha as Mlecchādhinātha. The Hāyunthal grant and the grant of Harjaravarman designated the future progeny of Sālastambha as Mechas. In the Paśupati epigraph of the Nepalese king Jayadeva-II his wife Rājyamatī, the daughter Harṣadeva, a successor of Sālasthambha is described as hailing from the Bhagadattarāja family. Other kings of Sālastambha family like Prālambha, Harjara, Vanamāla and Balavarman trace their origin from Bhauma family.

Haragaurī-Samvāda speaks of the western home of Sālastambha who after consolidating his position at the Bihar region came in Kāmarūpa and occupied the throne. Either during his time or during his successor Vijaya, the Bihar region is lost. Vijay is also vanquisher of enemies. The expansion started during Harṣadeva. The inscription of Nepal king Jayadeva-II mention his father-in-law Harṣadeva as the conqueror of Gauḍa, Odra, Kaliṅga and Kośala and other lands crushing, the head of hostile kings. He probably also conquered Puṣṭravardhana (North Bengal) lost by the weak successors of Sālastambha. It is also

---

20. The Paśupati epigraph was of the Nepal king Jayadeva-II which mentions one Śrī-Harṣadeva as the conqueror of Gauḍa, Oḍra, Kaliṅga and other lands (gauḍodrādi-kaliṅga-kośalapati) and as the father of Rājyamaṭī who was married to Nepal king Jayadeva-II. Rājyamaṭī is referred to as Bhagadatta-Rāja-Kulajā and daughter of Śrī Harṣadeva. Some scholars inclined to identify this Harṣadeva of Paśupati epigraph as the Kāmarūpa king of the family of the Sālastambha.
said that his empire included portions of Magadh, the northern part of Madrās State, and south Kośala; the empire of Śrī Harṣadeva, according to the Nepalese inscription, extended from Sadiyā in the east to Ayodhya (Oudh) in the west, and from the Himalayas in the north to the Bay of Bengal and Orissa in the South-West. It included therefore Assam, Gauḍa, a large part of Orissa and Bihar. Although Edward Gait does take it to be exaggeration but Śrī K. L. Barua and other historians on the other hand consider the vast conquests of Śrī Harṣadeva to be probable. During his time Kāmarūpa boundary extended to the maximum limit.

But during the later year of his reign Yaśovarman, the king of Kaṇauj marched against him and in the battle Śrī Harṣadeva was defeated and killed sometimes after 748 A.D. Subsequently there is an onslaught of Lalitāditya of Kashmir who arrested one Gauḍa prince and killed him and to avenge the wound a band of Bengal soldiers in disguise went to Kāśmir and accepted heroic death at the temple of Parihāsakeśava. This heroic tale has been narrated in the Gauḍavaho of Vākpatirāja. Some take the arrest of this Gauḍa king to be Harṣadeva from the clutches of Yaśovarmā. But the fact is not yet established. Harṣadeva was
the king of Gauda mentioned in the *Gouḍavaho-kāvya*.21

After the death of Śrī-Harṣadeva his empire fell. The whole of Gaur (Bengal), except a small stretch of territory in Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal), passed out of the hands of Kāmarūpa king; though the glory of Kāmrūpa declined for a time, but proper Kāmarūpa not affected by the invasion of Yaśovarman.

The Paśupati epigraph was of the Nepal king Jayadeva-II which mentions one Śrī-Harṣadeva as the conqueror of Gauḍa, Odra, Kaliṅga and other lands, *(gauḍodṛḍi-kaliṅga-kosalādhipati)* and as the father of Rājyamati who was married to Napal king Jayadeva-II. Rājyamati is referred to as *Bhagadatta-rāja-kulajā* and daughter of Śrī Harṣadeva. Some scholars inclined to identify this Harṣadeva of Paśupati epigraph as the Kāmarūpa king of the family of the Sālastambha.

The next important king was Sālambha. The Pārbariya plates described him as the destroyer of enemy heroes. It is quite likely that Sālambha participated in the struggle to weaken the power of his Gauḍa adversary who was engaged against the Pratihāra ruler of Kaṇauj. It was purely a matter of ‘Balance of Power’ and political alignments happened during

---

21. *Gouḍavaho* of Vākpati
Bhāskaravarman.

The role of Assam in the affairs of the north continued during Sālambha’s successors. His brother Ārathi, fire to the enemies as per Parbatiya plates, was followed by Harjaravarman, Mahārājādhirāja Parameśwara Paramabhaṭṭāraka, an affliction to his enemies. His records are the Hāyunthal grant and Tejpur Rock Inscription. The Tejpur grant dated in the G.E., i.e. 510, i.e. A.D. 829-30 notices a śāsana issued by him to his feudatories in connection with settlement of a dispute. Hāyunthal grant speaks of the presence of the defeated kings at his consecration. Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇāśaḷa of Gauḍa speaks of the acceptance of the Gauḍa supremacy by the Kāmarūpa ruler. But this appears not applicable in case of Harjaravarman.

Harjaravarman was succeeded by Vanamālavaran, the empire builder of Assam. Like his father he carried some royal titles attended by feudatories as evident from the Tejpur grant and Parbatiya plates found near Tejpur. The former was issued in the 19th year of his reign. The limits of his kingdom are described as extending to the lines of forests and bordered by the ocean. This implies, if not an exaggeration, extension both in the north and south-east probably including Samatāta. The Tejpur grant mention the donation of land situated to the west of the Trisrotā
and to the north-east of Chandrapur roughly the same area donated by Bhūtivarman. The weakness of the Pāla rulers might have led to this expansion of the Kāmarūpa kingdom probably bounding the river Karatoya in the west including South-East Bengal, and Puṇḍravardhana in North Bengal.

His son Jayamāla alias Virabāhu bearing epithets like Raṇastambha symbolised his war-like activities. Next king Balavarman-III was the last important ruler of the family. The Uttar Barbil grant issued in the 5th year and Nowgong grant issued in the 8th year of his reign accounts for his reign. The distress and weakness of the Pālas of Bengal in the wake of Tripartite struggles\(^{22}\) when during the reigns of two weak kings Vigrahapāla and his son Nārāyaṇapāla\(^{23}\) the Rāṣṭrakūṭas defeated the Pāla rulers. (Sirur Inscription, dated A.D. 860, IA, XII. 218).

\(^{22}\) Tripartite struggle was for dynastic supremacy over Northern India fought initially between Gauḍa king Dharmapāla (A.D. 794-814) and the Gurjara Pratihāra king Nāgabhaṭṭa-II. Tārānātha speaks of the subjugation of Kāmarūpa by Dharmapāla, but it is not proved by Dharmapāla’s Khalimpur grant, nor by any Pāla epigraph. It is not known whether after the death of Harṣadeva, Sālambha ever undertook any campaign against the Pālas of Bengal. Sālambha was the king after Balavarman-II, the successor of Harjaravarmadeva. If there were any such campaign then by this time Puṇḍravardhana was the bone of contention between the Pālas of Bengal and Sālambha of Kāmarūpa. It is, however, true that Sālambha tried to revive the lost prestige of the kingdom and also succeeded in establishing a comparatively peaceful reign after a few decades of disorder that prevailed in Kāmarūpa under the previous rulers.

\(^{23}\) Bhāgalpur grant
The Pratihāras triumphed under Bhoja and Mahendrapāla while king Harṣa and his successors in Assam has assumed imperial titles\(^{24}\) signifying political status. Regarding Harjjara\(^{25}\) it is already mentioned. Now Balavarman-III made fresh inroads and exterminated his enemies and conquered all quarters by his own arms. These enemies remain unidentified. The find spots of his inscriptions suggest that his kingdom extended to the west of Teesta or Karatoya in Puṇḍravardhana. He assumed imperial titles,\(^{26}\) Mahārājādhirāja-Parameśwara-Paramabhaṭṭārka. He was the last in the series of imperial rulers of the Sālasthambha line followed by an obscure period, with Tyāgasimha as the 21st in the list until the foundation of the new dynasty by Brahmāpāla as learnt from Bargaon grant of Ratnapāla, his son.

Brahmapāla was chosen by the kindred of Tyāgasimha to be the king. This is confirmed by the Khanāmukhi grant and Śubhaṅkarapāṭaka and the Puṣpabhadra grants of Dharmapāla. The king is described to have dealt single-handed with the enemies, may be some Pāla rulers. It is proposed by N. N. Vasu that the clash referred to between Jātavarman of the Belava (Dacca

\(^{24}\) Tejpur grant
\(^{25}\) Hayunthal grant, v. 12, found in Kapili Valley, (then in Nowgong district, now in North Cachar & Mikir Hills district).
\(^{26}\) Uttar Barbil grant
Dist.) inscription of Bhojavarman with the Kāmarūpa ruler who was defeated by him along with Aṅga. But this appears unlikely. Another family of Chandra kings of Bengal is associated with Puṇḍravaradhana, where Śrī-Chandra donated lands, probably at the close of the 10th century A.D. or the beginning of the 11th century A.D. Epigraphic evidence tends to show that Assam and East Bengal had a couple of kingdoms constantly warring and more or less are equal in strength where one cannot defeat the other. Depending on the personality of the rulers and circumstances fate of kingdom either of Vaṅga or Assam fluctuated. Ratnapāla then succeeded Brahmapāla as learnt from his two grants, viz. Baragaon and Suālkuchi. The former is dated in the 25th and the latter in the 26th year of his reign, a long reign. His war-like activities are learnt from his own inscriptions and from those of his descendants that Ratnapāla was the mighty crusher of enemies. Gauhati grant refers to the discomfiture caused to the lord of Deccan. The reference to the contemporary powers—Śakas, Gurjaras, Gauḍas, Keralas, Bāhikas and Tāhikas and the ruler of Deccan causing their discomfiture led some scholars to form the opinion that the statement might have bearing on contemporary events. The late Ray placed Kerala king Rājendra Chola (A.D. 1013-44), the lord of Deccan with the Chālukya
Vikramāditya -VI (1076-1126), the Gurjaras with either Rājayapāla or Trilochanapāla (1019-27). Ray has also traced the reference to an invasion of Kāmarūpa by Vikramāditya during the reign of his father Someśwara (1040-1069) in the *Vikramāṇika-devacarita* of Bilhana. The Taikas and the Vāhikas are considered to be the Turkish invaders. It is strange how so many powers could converge upon Kāmarūpa. It is opined that the entire references are rather poetic imaginations. The reference of Gauhāti grant in this regards appears more reasonable and makes Ratnapāla a political entity. He was a force to be recognised as he maintained the balance of power. It was likely that there were some minor clashes between Kāmarūpa and Gauḍa where the former was having an upper hand. The other powers’ reference are incidental. Indrapāla, the grand-son of Ratnapāla, the next important king, was the holder of imperial titles. He had hold over portions of Bengal as is evident from land grant made to a Brāhmaṇa of Savatthi (Śrāvasti) in Bengal, a part of Puṇḍravardhana. The reference Iśvaraghōṣa, a Mahāmāṇḍalika ruling at Dhekeri, made a grant of land at Gallitipyaka-visāya be

27. *Vikramāṇika-devacarita* is the character literature available on Vikramāditya Chāluṣka written by Bilhana. It was Harsadeva who was involved in the war with Vikramāditya Chāluṣka. Contemporanity of Chāluṣka king Vikramāditya with Ratnapāla appears doubtful.
bathing in Jatoda river at Piyolamaṇḍala. He is a feudatory of Ratnapāla ruling in Coochbihar-Jalpaiguri region for more than thirty five years. Indrapāla’s reign may be fixed in the third quarter of the eleventh century A.D. He was probably contemporary to Kālachuri king Karṇa and Jātavarman who probably conquered Aṅga and Kāmarūpa.

Vijaysena’s exploits are supposed to have taken place in the first quarter of twelfth century A.D. There was no further major event during Indrapāla and the loss of a part of Puṇḍravardhana might have happened during Gopāla or Harṣapāla who were learned as polished and moderate kings. The latter figured in the Kavindravacanasamuccaya as the composer of verses. This was for a short duration. Vikramaditya of Bilhaṇa who is said to have overran Magadha, Aṅga and Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa might have caused anxiety to Kāmarūpa. But this Chālukya expedition did not adversely affect the integrity of Kāmarūpa. The next important king Dharmapāla as learnt from his two grants,— the Śubhaṅkararpāṭaka and the Puṣpabhadrā found at Northern bank of the Brahmaputra near Gauhati, speak of the extent of his kingdom described as ‘girdled by the ocean.’ He is also praised as the vanquisher of enemy horses. His reign was eventful. The Khanāmukhi grant dated in the 1st year of his reign records the
donation of land adjoining Dighalāndi in the Puraji-visaya. Another grant, the Subhaṅkaraptaka grant, dated in the 2nd year of his reign records the grant of land at Kanjia within Dijjina-visaya. This might be identified with modern Dinajpur in Northern Bengal. The donee was a Brāhmaṇa from Sāvathi (Śrāvasti); this is also mentioned in the Guākuchi grant of Indrapāla and in the inscription in which Jayapāla of Kāmarūpa offered to Brāhmaṇa Prahāsa a Tulāpuruṣa gift of 900 gold coins. The grant was made at Silimpura. Dharmapāla seems to have wrested Puṇḍravardhana from the Gauḍa rulers to the west of Karatoya. This area was earlier lost in the time of Gopāla or Harṣapāla. In the south-east empire extended up to the sea. He was the Prāgjyotisadhipati ruling from Kāmarūpanagar whose location is likely to be at Guwahati and not Rangpur.

The last king of this dynasty was Jayapāla who is mentioned in a Silimpur stone slab inscription. The name also occurs in the Chandogyaparīśīṭtā-prakāśa mentioning this ruler giving donation of a Mahāśrāddha to Umāpati, the chief of the pañḍitas. The land granted to Prahāsa by this ruler at Śrāvasti in Puṇḍravardhana suggest the continuance of Pāla hold over por-

28. Dijjina (Dinajpur) was probably a division of Kāmarūpa. Land mentioned in the Subhaṅkaraptaka grant was donated by Dharmapāla. The extension of Kāmarūpa was at that time up to Dinajpur in the west.
tions of northern Bengal. Jayapala is supposed to have ruled from about 1120-1138. His decline was soon noticed.

The ascending Gauda power Rāmapāla defeating Bhīma, the Kaivarta chief occupying Varendri tightened his grip over the Varmans and with the suggestion of Harivarman sent his chief Tiṅgadeva to conquer the countries in the east. He conquered Kāmarūpa and he was made the governor of the country. The Rāmacharita of Sandhyākaranandi describes the reign of the Vaṅga-Pāla ruler. The next Vaṅga king Kumārapāla appointed Vaidyadeva to rule the country in place of Tiṅgadeva being dissatisfied with the activities of Tiṅgadeva. This is as per information received from the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva who crumbled down the revolt of Tiṅgadeva. Vaidyadeva set up his own line in Kāmarūpa, independent of the Pālas of Bengal who themselves got engaged in troubles with weak rulers from Kumārapāla onwards. Vaidyadeva took up imperial titles of Paramamāheśwara-Paramavaiṣṇava-Mahārājādhirāja-Parameswara-Paramabhaṭṭārka established a Brāhmaṇa dynasty in Kāmarūpa as learnt from Kamauli grant issued in 4th regnal year of his reign. Kamauli grant speaks of donation consisting of two villages with a revenue of 400 and situated in the Viṣaya of Bāḍā in the Maṇḍala of Kāmarūpa and the Bhukti of Prāgjyotiṣa. The
inscription refers to the ancestors of the donor who served as the minister of the Pāla kings of Bengal. From the inscription it is evident that Vaidyadeva killing Tiṅgadeva consolidated his position over the Kāmarūpa kingdom which alone was probably conquered by Tiṅgadeva on behalf of Rāmapāla. With his occupation of power in Kāmarūpa he ruled independently and he was known as Ārimatta and is credited with erection of many fortification in Kāmarūpa, Viśwanātha and Ratanpur in Mājuli.

The next king was Vallabhadeva as learnt from his Assam Plates (1185 A.D.= S.E. 1107) from Tejpur. It revealed the genealogy of next group of rulers as Rayarideva, Udayakarna and Vallabhadeva.

The first one Rayarideva traces his descent from the line of kings of Bhāskara’s race. Bhattasali wants to identify with Bhāskaravarman. All these above kings do not trace any relation with Vaidyadeva. According to the Deopara epigraph of Vijaysena he impetuously assailed the lord of Gauḍa, put down the prince of Kāmarūpa and conquered Kaliṅga. The Madhāinagar grant of Lakṣmaṇasena credits him with the subduing of the king of Kāmarūpa. It appears from these two Sena inscriptions that the

29. There is possibility of Rayarideva or Rajarideva, a feudatory in the eastern region, during Vaidyadeva.
Sena expeditions were in the nature of punitive ones aimed at political domination rather than extermination of the Kāmarūpa royal family.

While Pāla rule at Bengal has been ceased by the Senas to rule, Kāmarūpa maintained its independence and retained its existence as a strong political force. It is evident and likely that these expeditions were sent during Vaidyadeva and Vallabhadeva.\(^{30}\) Rāyārideva and Udayakarna, the intervening rulers, were not strong enough to bear the brunt of such expeditions which, however, did not materialise to any substantial loss to Kāmarūpa.

Although in the trial of strength Lakṣmaṇasena got some upper hand against Kāmarūpa ruler Vallabhadeva but against the Turkish invader Bakhtiyar Khilji it was the Kāmarūpa king Vallabhadeva who gave a successful fight and turned the corner in the struggle against the Sultanate and its forces in 1202 A.D. Ray and Bhattasali hold that the campaign led by Muhammad Bakhtiyar in 1202 to Tibet was annihilated in Assam either by Vallabhadeva or his successor. K. L. Barua holds that the the Kāmarūpa ruler who faced Muhammad Bakhtiyar Khilji was

\(^{30}\) Vallabhadeva, Udayakarna and Rāyārideva were not the direct successors of Vaidyadeva; probably they were feudatory king of Kāmarūpa and have ruled between Vaidyadeva and the date of the inscription of Vallabhadeva from Tejpur (A.D. 1194).
Bārtu or Prṭhu. This victorious incident was recorded on a stone slab at Kānāibadaśī east of northern Guwahati in the following words:

\[
\text{śāke turaga yugmeśe madhumāsa trayodaśe} \\
\text{kāmarūparī samāgatiya turaśkāh kṣayamāyayuh //}
\]

"On the thirteenth of Caitra in the Śaka year 1127 (corresponding to the 7th March, 1206 A.D.) the Turks coming to Kāmarūpa were destroyed." (Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvalī, Intro., p. 44; Bhattasali’s article, ‘Muhammad Bakhtiyar’s Expedition to Tibet’, IHQ, IX, pp. 49-50)

The Gachtal (Nowgong) inscription records another expedition in the Śaka year 1149 (A.D.1224) when the invaders went as Marauders to this region caused damage to a Śiva temple which got repaired by one Chandrakānta under orders from king Viśvasundaradeva. According to Bhattaśāli these mlecchas were those Muslims who accompanied Ghiasuddin Balban in his campaign against Kāmarūpa and Bang in 1226 A.D. Viśvasundaradeva might be the son and successor of Vallabhadeva. It is presumed that he is identified with Prṭhu or Bārtu,\(^{31}\) as well as Jalpeśvara of the Yoginiṭantra. He is credited to have created one Śiva temple at Jalpaiguri.

---

\(^{31}\) Bārtu or Prṭhu offered stiff and fierce resistance to the Muslim aggression, killing more than lakh of Muslims. According to Bhattasali Prṭhu must have been a man from Avadha.
Kāmarūpa thus faced dangers from the west from Bengal from Muslims as well as from the east from the Āhoms and these threatened its political integrity. The four Muslim invasions, viz. Baktiyar Khilji, Sultan Giasuddin, Nāsirudin and Ikhtiyār Uddin all failed to win over Kāmarūpa and faced discomfiture about the middle of 13th century A.D. The Gurucarita of Rāmcharan Thākur refers the defeat of the Yuzbak at the hands of the then ruling king of Kāmarūpa named Sandhyā. The glory of Kāmarūpa kings did not last long, but continued till the Ahoms from Burma established themselves in Assam in 1268 A.D. This ended the ruling of Hindu dynasty of Bhauma-Nārakas at Kāmarūpa.