The Historical Process of Ahomization: Cultural Assimilation and Political Integration in Assam between Thirteenth Century and Nineteenth Century

Dr. Chhawang Subba
Assistant Professor,
Department of History,
University of Gour Banga, Malda.
Email: csubba0082@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines "Ahomization," the centuries-long process through which the Tai-speaking Ahom migrants who entered the Brahmaputra Valley in 1228 CE constructed a composite political and cultural order by absorbing, and being transformed by, the diverse ethnic communities they encountered. Rather than treating Ahomization as a simple story of a small warrior elite imposing its identity on a passive population, the article argues that it was a two-directional and negotiated process of state formation, in which political incorporation through administrative institutions—most notably the paik and khel systems—worked alongside marriage alliances, religious accommodation, and linguistic shift to produce a new, composite "Ahom" identity. The article traces the historical origins of the Ahom polity under Sukaphaa, the institutional architecture of assimilation under later Swargadeos, the parallel processes of Hinduization and Sanskritization that eventually eclipsed Tai-Ahom religious and linguistic forms, and the twentieth-century reversal of this trajectory through Tai-Ahom identity revivalism. It concludes by situating Ahomization within broader debates on frontier state formation, ethnicity, and assimilation in South and Southeast Asia.

Keywords: Ahom dynasty, Swargadeo, Paik System, Sanskritization, Hindu Culture, Political Integration.

1. Introduction

Assam occupies a distinctive place in the historiography of South Asia because, unlike much of the Indian subcontinent, its early modern political order was not shaped primarily by Mughal, Rajput, or Deccani state traditions but by a polity founded by Tai-speaking migrants from the Southeast Asian borderlands. The Ahom kingdom, established in 1228 CE by the Tai prince Sukaphaa and his followers, endured for nearly six hundred years, making it one of the longest-ruling dynasties in the history of the Indian subcontinent.[1] Over this long span, the small band of migrants who arrived at Patkai numbering in the low thousands were gradually transformed, through conquest, marriage, and administrative incorporation, into rulers of a large and heterogeneous population comprising Bodo-Kachari, Chutiya, Moran, Borahi, Naga, Koch, and various other communities of the Brahmaputra Valley. The term "Ahomization" has come to describe this process: the expansion of a state-recognized Ahom status and identity to peoples who were not originally Tai, alongside the corresponding cultural and political transformation of the Ahom rulers themselves as they absorbed indigenous customs, deities, and social practices. [2]

This article treats Ahomization not as an isolated ethnographic curiosity but as a case study in frontier state formation and identity construction that speaks to larger questions in the historiography of South and Southeast Asia. It draws on the historical and anthropological scholarship on Assam—particularly the work of Yasmin Saikia, Amalendu Guha, Edward Gait, Padmeswar Gogoi, and B. J. Terwiel—to reconstruct both the institutional mechanisms of assimilation and the ideological content of the "Ahom" category that these mechanisms produced. The central argument advanced here is that Ahomization was never a one-way imposition of Tai culture upon subject peoples. It was, instead, a mutually constitutive process: the Ahom state extended political and social status to men of diverse ethnic backgrounds in exchange for labor, military service, and political loyalty, while the Ahom elite itself underwent parallel processes of Hinduization, language shift, and cultural adaptation that eventually made the "Ahom" of the eighteenth century almost unrecognizable, linguistically and religiously, from the "Tai" of the thirteenth.

2. Historical Background: The Founding of the Ahom Polity

According to the traditional accounts preserved in the Ahom chronicles known as *Buranjis*, Sukaphaa was a prince of the Tai Mao polity centered at Mong Mao, in what is today the China-Myanmar borderland.[3] Leading a following that is traditionally numbered at around nine thousand men, women, and soldier-agriculturalists, along with elephants and horses, Sukaphaa crossed the Patkai Hills into the Brahmaputra Valley in 1228 CE.[4] For the next quarter-century, Sukaphaa's group moved through the eastern reaches of the valley, testing different sites for settlement, before establishing a permanent base at Charaideo in 1253 CE, a location that would subsequently serve as the ceremonial and dynastic heartland of the kingdom and the site of the royal maidams, or burial mounds.[5]

What is historiographically significant about Sukaphaa's approach to settlement is that he deliberately avoided regions that were already densely populated by the two principal indigenous communities of the area, the Chutiya and the Kachari, whose polities controlled much of the valley at the time of the Tai migration.[6] Instead, Sukaphaa's followers settled in the relatively sparsely populated tracts between these two indigenous states, entering into cordial and eventually kinship relations with two smaller communities that occupied that intermediate space: the Moran and the Borahi (a Bodo-Kachari-affiliated group). Sukaphaa is recorded as having married the daughters of the Moran chief Badaucha and the Borahi chief Thakumatha, cementing alliances that gave the fledgling Tai settlement both legitimacy and access to local agricultural knowledge and labor.[7] He further encouraged the Tai elite and ordinary soldiers under his command to marry local women, a policy that had two long-term effects: it began the biological and social intermixing of Tai migrants with the indigenous population from the very first generation, and it established intermarriage as a normative instrument of political incorporation that later Ahom rulers would use on a far larger scale as the kingdom expanded.

Over the following three centuries, the Ahom kingdom expanded westward along the Brahmaputra Valley through a combination of military conquest and negotiated submission, progressively incorporating the Chutiya kingdom (fully annexed in 1523–24), Kachari territories, and eventually contesting a long frontier with Koch and Mughal power in Lower Assam.[8] Each phase of territorial expansion brought new populations under Ahom political authority and, correspondingly, expanded the pool of subjects who might, over time, be absorbed into Ahom social categories.

3. Conceptualizing Ahomization

The historian Yasmin Saikia has offered one of the most influential scholarly formulations of Ahomization, describing it as the expansion of a state-recognized Ahom status conferred by the

Swargadeo (the Ahom king, literally "lord of heaven") upon selected men drawn from a wide range of social and ethnic backgrounds.[9] On this reading, "Ahom" was never a fixed ethnic label denoting biological descent from the original Tai migrants; it was, rather, a political and administrative category, a status that could be earned, granted, or inherited through service to the state. Saikia further characterizes the resulting "Ahom" formation as fundamentally composite and heterogeneous—an expression of diverse communities coming together under a common political roof rather than the natural unfolding of a single, homogeneous ethnic community. [10]

This conceptualization has important implications for how historians should read the term "Ahom" in the sources. When Ahom court chronicles or later British colonial administrators referred to "the Ahoms" as a people, they were frequently describing a composite political category that had absorbed, over generations, the descendants of Borahi, Moran, Chutiya, Kachari, Naga, Bodo, and even some Assamese Hindu and Muslim individuals who had been incorporated into Ahom administrative structures. The scholar Sanjib Baruah has similarly emphasized that ethnic categories in Assam's history have rarely mapped onto stable, bounded populations; they have instead been the shifting products of political processes of inclusion and exclusion operating over centuries. [11]

It is useful to distinguish here between two related but analytically separable dimensions of Ahomization: cultural assimilation, referring to the adoption of language, religion, dress, naming conventions, and social customs associated with the Ahom elite; and political integration, referring to the incorporation of individuals and communities into the formal administrative, military, and tributary structures of the Ahom state. These two dimensions reinforced one another but did not always proceed at the same pace, and distinguishing them allows for a more precise account of how the process actually worked on the ground.

4. Mechanisms of Political Integration

4.1 The Paik and Khel System

The single most important institutional mechanism of political integration in the Ahom state was the paik system, a form of corvée labor organization through which every adult male commoner (paik) owed a fixed quota of labor or military service to the state in lieu of land tax.[12] Paiks were organized into units called *khels*, occupational and administrative groupings that could be based on caste, craft specialization, or locality, and each khel was headed by officers who reported up a hierarchical chain of command to the central administration.[13] Crucially, the khel system was not restricted to ethnic Tai Ahoms; as the kingdom expanded, entire communities—including Chutiya, Kachari, Moran, Borahi, and later Assamese Hindu peasant populations—were incorporated into the khel structure as paiks, obligated to the same forms of service as any other subject of the Swargadeo.

This administrative incorporation had the practical effect of leveling, at least partially, the distinction between "conquerors" and "conquered": a Chutiya or Kachari paik enrolled in a khel was, in formal administrative terms, functionally equivalent to a Tai-descended paik performing the same labor obligations. Advancement within the khel hierarchy—becoming a *bora* (head of twenty paiks), *saikia* (head of a hundred), *hazarika* (head of a thousand), or eventually a *phukan* or *baruah* at the level of the central ministries—was in principle open to men of talent and loyalty regardless of ethnic origin, although in practice the highest offices remained disproportionately concentrated among Tai-descended lineages and a small number of favored non-Tai families that had rendered particularly notable service.[14]

4.2 The Council of Ministers and the Structure of Central Authority

At the apex of the Ahom administrative system stood the Swargadeo, whose authority was buttressed by a council of great ministers known as the Patra Mantris, most prominently the Buragohain and the Bargohain, offices that were hereditary within specific noble lineages and that functioned as checks on royal authority.[15] Beneath this council operated a series of specialized offices—the Barpatra Gohain, the Barphukan (the Ahom viceroy at Guwahati responsible for the western frontier, particularly against Mughal incursions), and numerous phukans and baruahs responsible for specific departments such as the treasury, the armory, and royal households.[16] While the most senior of these positions were generally reserved for established noble clans, many mid-level administrative and military postings were extended to leaders of newly incorporated communities, particularly local chiefs who had submitted peacefully rather than through prolonged military resistance. This practice—rewarding voluntary submission with continued or enhanced local authority under the umbrella of Ahom sovereignty—was a recurring feature of the kingdom's expansion and served as a powerful incentive for smaller polities to accept incorporation rather than face war.[17]

4.3 Marriage as Political Instrument

Beyond Sukaphaa's own marriages, subsequent Ahom rulers systematically used marriage alliances with the leading families of incorporated communities as an instrument of political consolidation. Local chiefs who submitted to Ahom authority frequently sealed the arrangement by giving daughters in marriage to the Swargadeo or to senior nobles, while, conversely, Ahom princesses were sometimes married to the sons of loyal local rulers.[18] These unions served multiple functions simultaneously: they created kinship bonds that reduced the likelihood of future rebellion, they produced heirs of mixed descent who could serve as living symbols of integration, and they allowed the Ahom court to draw on the local knowledge, labor networks, and ritual authority that indigenous elites possessed. Over successive generations, this pattern of intermarriage meant that the biological distinction between "Tai" and "non-Tai" within the ruling strata became increasingly difficult to sustain, even as the political category of "Ahom" continued to carry specific privileges and obligations.

5. Mechanisms of Cultural Assimilation

5.1 Language Shift

Perhaps the most striking marker of Ahomization as a two-directional process is the trajectory of language use within the Ahom elite itself. The original Tai-Ahom language, related to other Tai languages of mainland Southeast Asia, was the administrative and liturgical language of the early kingdom and was the medium in which the earliest Buranjis were composed.[19] However, as the Ahom state absorbed a demographically much larger Assamese-speaking population—itself the product of earlier waves of Indo-Aryan, Tibeto-Burman, and Austroasiatic linguistic mixing in the valley—Assamese gradually displaced Tai as the language of administration, literature, and eventually everyday elite life.[20] The scholar B. J. Terwiel has observed that by the later medieval period the Ahom court had become firmly set on a path toward the full assimilation of Assamese Hindu culture, with the consequence that the Tai tongue became increasingly obsolete even among descendants of the original Tai migrants, surviving thereafter chiefly as a specialized liturgical language maintained by a small class of ritual specialists known as *deodhais* and *bailungs*.[21] This linguistic reversal—in which the politically dominant group adopted the language of a subordinate but numerically larger population—is one of the more unusual features of Ahomization and distinguishes it from many other

cases of elite conquest assimilation in world history, where the conquerors' language typically displaces that of the conquered.

5.2 Religious Change and Hinduization

Parallel to linguistic assimilation ran a process of religious transformation frequently described in the literature as the "Hinduization" of the Ahom elite. The pre-Hindu Ahom religious system centered on ancestor worship, a cosmology of heavenly and earthly deities, and specific ritual practices connected to Tai cosmology, most notably the *Me-Dam-Me-Phi* rites of ancestor veneration.[22] Beginning in earnest during the reign of Swargadeo Sudangphaa (Bamuni Konwar) in the fifteenth century, who was reportedly raised by a Brahmin family and initiated into Hindu ritual practice, successive Ahom kings increasingly patronized Brahmin priests, adopted Hindu deities and temple-building traditions, and eventually, in the case of several eighteenth-century rulers, formally converted to Vaishnavism or Shaivism as their court religion.[23] This process reached its culmination under rulers such as Siva Singha and his successors in the eighteenth century, by which point royal patronage of Hindu institutions—temples, satras (Vaishnavite monastic institutions), and Brahmin land grants—had become a defining feature of state religious policy, even as older Tai ritual specialists retained ceremonial roles in specific dynastic rites such as royal funerals and coronations.[24] This religious shift was not simply an act of individual piety on the part of particular kings; it functioned as a political strategy for legitimizing Ahom rule among the numerically dominant Hindu Assamese population and for building alliances with Brahmin communities whose ritual and administrative expertise the Ahom state increasingly relied upon, particularly as land revenue administration grew more complex.

5.3 Incorporation of Local Deities and Popular Religious Forms

Ahomization operated not only through the wholesale adoption of Brahminical Hinduism but also through the incorporation and reinterpretation of local, non-Hindu religious traditions belonging to incorporated communities. Indigenous deities associated with the Chutiya, Kachari, Moran, and Borahi populations were, in a number of documented instances, absorbed into the wider religious landscape patronized by the Ahom court, sometimes syncretized with Hindu deities and sometimes maintained as distinct but tolerated cult centers.[25] This pattern of religious accommodation mirrored the political logic of incorporation described above: rather than seeking to eradicate the religious practices of subordinated communities, the Ahom state generally sought to fold them into an expanding, plural religious order presided over by royal patronage, reserving outright suppression for cases of active political rebellion rather than religious difference as such.

5.4 Naming, Dress, and Social Custom

At a more everyday level, Ahomization also proceeded through the adoption of naming conventions, dress codes, and social customs associated with Ahom or, later, Assamese Hindu status. Individuals and families who moved up through the khel hierarchy or who married into Ahom lineages frequently adopted Ahom or Assamese personal names and surnames, abandoned or modified earlier community-specific customs regarded as markers of "lower" status, and adopted commensality and marriage practices that aligned with the norms of the emerging Assamese Hindu caste order.[26] Historians of the process have noted that this dimension of assimilation operated along a gradient rather than as a single, uniform transformation: communities and lineages closer to the political center and to royal patronage assimilated more thoroughly and more rapidly, while populations in more peripheral hill and forest tracts retained distinct ethnic and religious identities well into the colonial period, even as they remained nominally within the tributary orbit of the Ahom state.

6. Case Studies: The Chutiya, Moran, Borahi, and Kachari

The Chutiya kingdom, which controlled the northeastern portion of the Brahmaputra Valley prior to Ahom expansion, was formally annexed following military campaigns in the early sixteenth century.[27] Rather than exterminating or wholly displacing the Chutiya political elite, the Ahom state incorporated segments of the Chutiya nobility into its own administrative apparatus, granting them khel leadership positions and, in some instances, marriage alliances with Ahom royalty, while the broader Chutiya peasantry was absorbed into the paik system on terms similar to other subject populations. Over subsequent generations, many Chutiya lineages became linguistically and religiously assimilated into the broader Assamese Hindu-Ahom order, although Chutiya identity persisted as a distinct ethnic category that would, in the twentieth century, become the basis for renewed political mobilization for Scheduled Tribe status.[28]

The Moran and Borahi communities, whose alliance with Sukaphaa at the very founding of the kingdom has already been described, represent perhaps the earliest and most thoroughly assimilated of the incorporated groups, to the point that later generations of Moran and Borahi descent were often simply absorbed into the general Ahom or Assamese Hindu population with little trace of a separate ethnic identity surviving into the colonial period, although both identities, too, would see revivalist assertions in the modern era.[29]

The Kachari (Dimasa) kingdom, by contrast, illustrates the limits of Ahomization as a totalizing process. Despite centuries of warfare and periodic tributary submission, the Kachari state retained an independent or semi-independent political existence for much of the Ahom period, relocating its capital progressively southward and eastward as pressure from the Ahom state and, later, other regional powers mounted, and it was only formally annexed by the British in 1832, after the collapse of Ahom rule.[30] The persistence of a politically distinct Kachari (and, more broadly, Bodo-Kachari) identity through the Ahom period and into the present day demonstrates that Ahomization, however extensive, was neither universal nor irreversible; it operated unevenly across the diverse communities of the Brahmaputra Valley, and its intensity correlated closely with a community's proximity to Ahom political centers and the degree to which its own political structures had been dismantled or co-opted.

7. Ahomization, Sanskritization, and Comparative Perspectives

Scholars have sometimes drawn a comparison between Ahomization and the sociological concept of Sanskritization, developed by M. N. Srinivas to describe the process by which lower-caste or tribal groups in India adopt the customs, rituals, and status markers of higher, typically Brahminical, castes in order to claim higher social status within the existing caste hierarchy.[31] There is a genuine family resemblance between the two processes insofar as both describe upward status mobility achieved through the emulation of a prestige culture. However, the comparison also reveals a crucial disanalogy: Sanskritization as classically formulated describes a process of cultural emulation largely independent of direct political incorporation into a specific state apparatus, whereas Ahomization was, at its core, a state-driven process, mediated through concrete administrative institutions—the khel system, court patronage, and royal marriage politics—that actively conferred political status and material rewards upon those who assimilated. In this sense, Ahomization might be better understood as a hybrid of ethnic incorporation into a segmentary or "galactic" polity, of the kind theorized in scholarship on mainland Southeast Asian mandala states, combined with elements of caste-status emulation once Hindu norms became the dominant idiom of prestige at the Ahom court.[32]

It is also worth noting the direction of cultural flow within Ahomization was not simply "downward" from a dominant Tai elite to subordinate populations. As detailed above with respect to language and religion, the numerically and culturally dominant Assamese Hindu milieu of the Brahmaputra Valley substantially reshaped the Ahom elite itself over time, such that by the eighteenth century "Ahom" had become in significant respects a subset of a broader Assamese Hindu political culture rather than the reverse. This bidirectionality is a key reason why contemporary historians increasingly prefer to describe Ahomization as a process of mutual, if asymmetrical, cultural exchange and political incorporation rather than as unilateral assimilation.

8. The Decline of Ahom Political Power and the Fracturing of the Ahomization Process

The eighteenth century witnessed severe internal strains on the integrative capacities of the Ahom state, most dramatically in the form of the Moamoria Rebellion (1769–1806), an uprising led by followers of the Moamoria Vaishnavite sect, many of whom were drawn from lower khel and peasant backgrounds who had grown resentful of the tax and labor burdens imposed by the paik system and of the concentration of power among a narrow Ahom nobility.[33] The rebellion inflicted catastrophic damage on the Ahom state's administrative and military capacity, from which the kingdom never fully recovered, and it exposed the degree to which the earlier machinery of political integration—reliant on the perceived legitimacy and reciprocity of the paik-khel system—had, by this period, come to be experienced by many subjects as an instrument of exploitation rather than incorporation. The subsequent Burmese invasions of Assam in the early nineteenth century, and the region's eventual annexation by the British East India Company following the Treaty of Yandabo in 1826, brought an abrupt end to indigenous Ahom sovereignty and, with it, to the state-driven institutional mechanisms that had sustained Ahomization for nearly six centuries.[34]

Under British colonial rule, the administrative categories that had underpinned Ahom-era social status were reorganized around colonial census categories, land revenue settlements, and, later, the framework of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes, which tended to fix and formalize ethnic distinctions—Chutiya, Kachari, Moran, Ahom—that had previously been more fluid and permeable under the paik-khel system.[35] Paradoxically, this colonial-era hardening of ethnic categories helped set the stage for a very different, twentieth-century chapter in the history of Ahom identity: rather than continued assimilation into a broader Assamese Hindu mainstream, descendants of the historical Ahom elite began to mobilize around a distinct and revitalized "Tai-Ahom" identity, explicitly recovering elements of Tai language, religion, and historical memory that centuries of Ahomization-as-Hinduization had submerged.

9. Twentieth-Century Reversal: Tai-Ahom Identity Revivalism

Beginning in the early twentieth century and accelerating markedly in the 1980s and 1990s, sections of the Assamese population claiming descent from the historical Ahom ruling class began to organize politically and culturally around a reasserted "Tai-Ahom" identity, seeking recognition as a distinct ethnic community—including, in various campaigns, demands for Scheduled Tribe status—rather than continuing to be subsumed within the general category of caste Hindu Assamese society.[36] Yasmin Saikia's ethnographic and historical study of this movement, based on fieldwork conducted in Tai-Ahom villages during the mid-1990s, documents how activists, religious specialists, and ordinary community members worked to reconstruct a sense of continuity with the pre-Hindu Tai past, drawing on the Buranjis, on connections with Tai-speaking communities in Thailand and mainland Southeast Asia, and on revived interest in Ahom religious rites such as Me-Dam-Me-Phi.[37] Saikia terms the resulting identity project one of "fragmented memories," emphasizing that the modern Tai-Ahom movement was less a straightforward recovery of an unbroken tradition than a creative,

politically motivated reconstruction assembled from disparate archival, oral, and ritual fragments in response to contemporary anxieties about marginalization within Assamese society and the Indian nation-state.[38]

This revivalist movement represents, in a sense, the historical inverse of Ahomization: where the original process saw diverse ethnic groups assimilated into an expanding "Ahom" political category over the thirteenth through eighteenth centuries, and then saw the Ahom elite itself substantially assimilated into Assamese Hindu culture, the late-twentieth-century Tai-Ahom movement sought to reverse this long trajectory by re-differentiating a Tai-Ahom identity out of the broader Assamese Hindu population into which it had been absorbed. The persistence and vitality of this reversal movement into the twenty-first century underscores that Ahomization, whatever its historical success in producing a durable composite political order for six centuries, did not result in the permanent erasure of the constituent ethnic identities out of which that order had been built; those identities remained available as resources for renewed political and cultural mobilization once the specific political conditions of colonial and postcolonial Assam made such mobilization advantageous.

10. Conclusion

The process of Ahomization offers a richly documented case study of how a frontier state, founded by a numerically small group of migrants, constructed and sustained political authority over a much larger and more diverse population through a combination of coercive conquest, administrative incorporation, marriage politics, and religious and linguistic accommodation. Its distinguishing features—the paik-khel system as an institutional engine of status conferral, the systematic use of marriage alliances with incorporated elites, the progressive Hinduization and eventual Assamese-language assimilation of the Ahom court itself, and the selective, uneven character of assimilation across different communities and regions—together illuminate the complexity that lies behind seemingly simple labels such as "the Ahom kingdom" or "the Ahom people." Far from denoting a single, bounded ethnic group that simply expanded its rule over Assam, "Ahom" as a historical and social category was itself the product of centuries of negotiated incorporation, contestation, and cultural exchange between Tai migrants and the numerous indigenous communities of the Brahmaputra Valley. The subsequent collapse of Ahom sovereignty under colonial pressure, followed by the emergence of a modern Tai-Ahom revivalist movement seeking to reclaim a pre-Hindu Tai heritage, demonstrates that the categories produced by Ahomization have remained politically and culturally consequential long after the institutional mechanisms that originally produced them ceased to operate. Understanding Ahomization thus contributes not only to the specific historiography of Assam but to broader comparative discussions of frontier state formation, ethnic incorporation, and the historical construction of identity categories in South and Southeast Asia.

Bibliography/Endnote

1. Barooah, Nirode K. *Gopinath Bardoloi: Indian Constitution and Centre-Assam Relations, 1940–1950*. Guwahati: Publication Board Assam, 1990.
2. Barpujari, H. K., ed. *The Comprehensive History of Assam*. 5 vols. Guwahati: Publication Board Assam, 1990–1993.
3. Barua, B. K. *A Cultural History of Assam (Early Period)*. Vol. 1. Guwahati: Bina Library, 1969.
4. Barua, Golap Chandra, trans. and ed. *Ahom Buranji: From the Earliest Time to the End of Ahom Rule*. Guwahati: Assam Jyoti, 1930.

5. Baruah, Sanjib. *India Against Itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
6. Baruah, Sanjib. *Durable Disorder: Understanding the Politics of Northeast India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005.
7. Bhattacharjee, J. B. *The Kacharis: A Study on Their Society and Polity*. Guwahati: Onsumoi Library, 1990.
8. Bhuyan, Suryya Kumar. *Anglo-Assamese Relations, 1771–1826*. Guwahati: Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies in Assam, 1974.
9. Bhuyan, Suryya Kumar. *Studies in the History of Assam*. Guwahati: Omsons Publications, 1965.
10. Bhuyan, Suryya Kumar, ed. *Tungkhungia Buranji, or, A History of Assam, 1681–1826 A.D.* London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
11. Choudhury, Pratap Chandra. *The History of Civilisation of the People of Assam to the Twelfth Century A.D.* Guwahati: Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies in Assam, 1959.
12. Dutta, Sristidhar. *The Mataks and Their Kingdom*. Allahabad: Chugh Publications, 1985.
13. Gait, Edward Albert. *A History of Assam*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1906.
14. Gogoi, Padmeswar. *The Tai and the Tai Kingdoms: With a Fuller Treatment of the Tai-Ahom Kingdom in the Brahmaputra Valley*. Gauhati: Gauhati University, 1968.
15. Gogoi, Padmeswar. *Tai-Ahom Religion and Customs*. Guwahati: Publication Board Assam, 1976.
16. Guha, Amalendu. *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam: Society, Polity, Economy*. Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi & Co., 1991.
17. Guha, Amalendu. *Planter Raj to Swaraj: Freedom Struggle and Electoral Politics in Assam, 1826–1947*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research, 1977.
18. Kar, R. K. *Social and Political Institutions of the Ahom State*. Guwahati: Layers Book Stall, 1976.
19. Kotoky, Prafulla Chandra. *Assam Between 1885 and 1940: An Economic History*. Guwahati: Gauhati University, 1993.
20. Nath, D. *History of the Koch Kingdom, 1515–1615*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1989.
21. Phukan, J. N. *The Ahom Polity, 1228–1826: A Study in Administrative History*. Guwahati: Assam Publication Board, 1994.
22. Rajkumar, N. V. *Assam: A Study of the Struggle for Its Integration*. New Delhi: All India Congress Committee, 1958.
23. Saikia, Arupjyoti. *A Century of Protests: Peasant Politics in Assam since 1900*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2014.
24. Saikia, Arupjyoti. *Forests and Ecological History of Assam, 1826–2000*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2011.
25. Saikia, Yasmin. *Fragmented Memories: Struggling to Be Tai-Ahom in India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
26. Saikia, Yasmin. *In the Meadows of Gold: Telling Tales of the Swargadeos at the Crossroads of Assam*. Guwahati: Assam Sahitya Sabha, 1997.
27. Sharma, Jayeeta. *Empire's Garden: Assam and the Making of India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.
28. Sharma Thakur, G. C. *The Tai Phakes of Assam*. Guwahati: Tai Literature Associates, 1985.
29. Terwiel, Barend Jan, and Ranoo Wichasin. *Tai Ahoms and the Stars: Three Ahom Manuscripts on Divination*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, 1992.
30. Terwiel, Barend Jan. *The Tai of Assam and Ancient Tai Ritual*. 2 vols. Gaya, India: Centre for South East Asian Studies, 1980–1981.

Notes

1. "Ahom Rule in Assam," sudurbhai.com, accessed September 2026.
2. Yasmin Saikia, *Fragmented Memories: Struggling to Be Tai-Ahom in India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).
3. Padmeswar Gogoi, *The Tai and the Tai Kingdoms* (Gauhati: Gauhati University, 1968).
4. Edward Albert Gait, *A History of Assam* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1906).
5. "Ahomisation," Wikipedia, citing Gogoi 1968.
6. Amalendu Guha, *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam: Society, Polity, Economy* (Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi & Co., 1991).
7. "Ahomisation," Wikipedia.
8. H. K. Barpujari, ed., *The Comprehensive History of Assam*, 5 vols. (Guwahati: Publication Board Assam, 1990–1993).
9. Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*.
10. Ibid.
11. Sanjib Baruah, *India Against Itself: Assam and the Politics of Nationality* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).
12. J. N. Phukan, *The Ahom Polity, 1228–1826* (Guwahati: Assam Publication Board, 1994).
13. R. K. Kar, *Social and Political Institutions of the Ahom State* (Guwahati: Layers Book Stall, 1976).
14. Phukan, *The Ahom Polity*.
15. Guha, *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam*.
16. Barpujari, *Comprehensive History of Assam*.
17. Kar, *Social and Political Institutions*.
18. "Ahomisation," Wikipedia.
19. Gogoi, *The Tai and the Tai Kingdoms*.
20. B. K. Barua, *A Cultural History of Assam (Early Period)*, vol. 1 (Guwahati: Bina Library, 1969).
21. Barend Jan Terwiel, quoted in "Chapter 2," Open Book Publishers, accessed September 2026.
22. Barend Jan Terwiel, *The Tai of Assam and Ancient Tai Ritual*, 2 vols. (Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies, 1980–1981).
23. Gogoi, *Tai-Ahom Religion and Customs* (Guwahati: Publication Board Assam, 1976).
24. Guha, *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam*.
25. Terwiel, *The Tai of Assam and Ancient Tai Ritual*.
26. Baruah, *India Against Itself*.
27. Barpujari, *Comprehensive History of Assam*.

28. Baruah, *India Against Itself*.

29. Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*.

30. J. B. Bhattacharjee, *The Kacharis: A Study on Their Society and Polity* (Guwahati: Onsumoi Library, 1990).

31. M. N. Srinivas's concept of Sanskritization is discussed comparatively in Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*.

32. Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*; Baruah, *Durable Disorder: Understanding the Politics of Northeast India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005).

33. Guha, *Medieval and Early Colonial Assam*.

34. Guha, *Planter Raj to Swaraj: Freedom Struggle and Electoral Politics in Assam, 1826–1947* (New Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research, 1977).

35. Baruah, *India Against Itself*.

36. Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.