IOSR Journal Of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 30, Issue 9, Series 6 (September, 2025) 54-59
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

A Raja, The Badshah, And Prometheus: Interpreting Pratapaditya's Defiance

Dr Gitanjali Dey
Deptt Of History, Lakshmibai College
Delhi University

Abstract
This paper investigates the complex and often tense relationship between regional chieftains and the Mughal imperial authority in early 17th century Bengal, using Raja Pratapaditya of Jessore as a pivotal case study. Despite his legendary status as one of the strongest among the Baro Bhuiyans, Pratapaditya has received limited attention in serious academic historiography. Initially navigating the Mughal imperial framework, he sought to legitimize his power under Mughal suzerainty. However, he ultimately declared independence by minting his own coinage and refusing to pay tribute. His shifting alliances—with neighbouring powers, the Portuguese, and the Arakanese—reflect the multipolar realities faced by regional rulers who negotiated, resisted, or acquiesced based on changing political dynamics. The Mughal response, led by Subahdar Islam Khan and executed through a coordinated military campaign, exemplifies the empire's dual strategy of seeking first to incorporate local rulers and, if unsuccessful, resorting to decisive military suppression. Pratapaditya's downfall, precipitated by betrayal from close allies and relentless Mughal assault, underscored the limitations of regional autonomy under a centralizing imperial regime. This narrative traces how the Mughal state employed a combination of diplomacy, military power, and exemplary punishment to consolidate authority, while Pratapaditya's enduring memory as both rebel and tragic figure highlights the contested and negotiated nature of sovereignty in early modern South Asia.
The paper frames Raja Pratapaditya's confrontation with the Mughal state through the lens of sovereignty and resistance. Cast in imperial chronicles as an act of treachery, his rebellion is reconsidered as a contested site where the logics of incorporation, loyalty, and autonomy collided. The Promethean metaphor captures the paradox of his defiance—both a bold assertion of agency and an inevitable concession to imperial power. By engaging Persian narratives, European accounts, and vernacular sources in dialogue, this study reveals how sovereignty in early modern Bengal was shaped through violence, symbolism, and shifting alliances rather than as a fixed imperial imposition.

Keywords: *Raja Pratapaditya, Baro Bhuiyans, Mughal Empire Bengal, Mughal resistance Bengal, Zamindar autonomy, Jessore kingdom, Mughal military campaigns, Mughal-Bhuiyan conflicts*

Date of Submission: 17-09-2025 Date of Acceptance: 27-09-2025

I. Introduction

The history of Bengal's resistance to Mughal expansion is a complex tapestry woven from strands of military confrontation, diplomatic maneuvering, and cultural negotiation (Eaton, *Rise* 215–220; Chatterjee, *Cultures* 122–126). The reign of Emperor Jahangir marked a decisive and determined phase in imperial efforts to consolidate control over the eastern frontier, where Bengal's geography, maritime networks, and deeply rooted political traditions posed formidable challenges to Mughal authority (Abu'l-Fazl, *Akbarnama* II: 345; Hamilton clxvii). At the forefront of this resistance stood indigenous rulers like Raja Pratapaditya of Jessore, whose defiance epitomized the autonomous spirit that characterized Bengal's political landscape (Fifth Report I: ccx; Eaton, *Persianate Age* 301). The region was particularly noted for the presence of the *Baro Bhuiyas*—the so-called "twelve chiefs," though both their number and precise configuration remain subjects of historical debate (Curley 14–16; Chatterjee, *Goddess Encounters* 77).

This article seeks to provide a detailed academic analysis of this seminal period, situating Pratapaditya's rebellion within the broader spectrum of Bengal's encounters with Mughal sovereignty (Bernier 188; Foster 192). The framework of Prometheus is employed not merely as metaphor but as an interpretive device: Bengal emerges as the Promethean figure of the early modern subcontinent, punished for its assertion of autonomy yet embodying the fire of creative resilience in its political, cultural, and maritime engagements (Ray 221; Chatterjee, *Cultures* 189). By tracing these dynamics, the study foregrounds the ways in which Bengal negotiated empire—resisting, accommodating, and transforming Mughal authority—while retaining its distinctive identity within the subcontinental order (Eaton, *Rise* 267; Chatterjee, *Goddess Encounters* 154).

Setting the Stage: Mughal Ambitions in Bengal

From the earliest years of the Mughal Empire, Bengal emerged as a highly coveted territory because of its strategic geographic position, agricultural productivity, and prosperous port cities that enabled extensive trade across the Bay of Bengal (Eaton, *Rise* 215–220; Chatterjee, *Cultures* 45–47). The region's designation as *Dozakh-i pur Nia'mat*, or "Hell full of bounties," highlights its paradoxical appeal (Abu'l-Fazl, *Ain-i Akbari* II: 334–335). While Bengal offered immense wealth and abundance, it also presented significant challenges and risks for administrators (Hamilton clxvii). The fertile lands generated harvests crucial to economic prosperity, but effective control required navigating a landscape dominated by powerful local chieftains and competing maritime interests (Eaton, *Persianate Age* 301).

Although Mughal campaigns to assert control over Bengal had commenced under Emperor Akbar in the late sixteenth century, their imperial ambitions encountered some of their most persistent resistance during the reign of his successor Jahangir (Abu'l-Fazl, *Akbarnama* II: 345; Bernier 188). The establishment of the Subah system nominally integrated Bengal as an imperial province, governed by Mughal-appointed officials. However, the reality beneath this formal structure was one of enduring contestation, where local rulers retained significant autonomy (Fifth Report I: ccx; Chatterjee, *Goddess Encounters* 77–79). Most noteworthy among these were the Baro Bhuiyans, a confederacy of twelve powerful zamindars who orchestrated coordinated resistance against Mughal encroachment, and individual chieftains like Raja Pratapaditya of Jessore, who combined opportunistic alliances with open defiance (Curley 14–16; Eaton, *Rise* 267).

These local rulers exploited Bengal's complex political and geographic environment to pursue semi-independent rule, negotiating with and sometimes exploiting alliances with regional traders, the Portuguese, and neighboring kingdoms like Arakan (Foster 192; Hamilton clxviii). The Mughal state's administrative reforms often masked this undercurrent of regional power-brokering and resistance. The Baro Bhuiyans effectively delayed full Mughal consolidation by employing guerrilla tactics, controlling key riverine routes, and leveraging indigenous military and naval strength (Chatterjee, *Cultures* 126–128). It was only after a sustained military and diplomatic campaign under Mughal governors like Islam Khan that the Mughals gradually subdued the region, marking a slow but definitive expansion of imperial authority over Bengal (Eaton, *Persianate Age* 310–312).The interplay of abundance, local resistance, and imperial ambition established Bengal as a region of critical importance and contestation within the Mughal imperial project. These dynamics significantly influenced the political landscape of early modern South Asia (Abu'l-Fazl, *Akbarnama* II: 348; Eaton, *Rise* 272).

Raja Pratapaditya: Indigenous Resistance and Historical Marginalization

Raja Pratapaditya, the zamindar of Jessore, emerged as a powerful emblem of indigenous resistance in the politically fragmented landscape that followed the decline of the independent Bengal Sultanate. As the Mughal Empire sought to extend its authority over Bengal, Pratapaditya fortified his holdings skillfully, navigating a tumultuous period marked by shifting allegiances among regional chiefs and the rise of competing foreign powers. His reign epitomized careful military and diplomatic manouevreing—including the strategic recruitment of Portuguese mercenaries and the forging of temporary alliances with rival chieftains and external forces such as the Arakanese. These tactics were reflective of a broader pattern across South Asia, where regionally rooted rulers employed flexible strategies to preserve their autonomy against the centralizing ambitions of burgeoning empires.

Pratapaditya was the last significant figure among the Baro Bhuiyans, a confederacy of fiercely independent zamindars who collectively challenged Mughal dominance in Bengal. This group resisted incorporation into the Mughal imperial framework through coordinated military action, controlling strategic riverine routes and leveraging local networks. The campaign led by the Rajput commander Raja Man Singh was critical in ultimately subduing Pratapaditya's resistance; despite Pratapaditya's valiant defense employing naval and ground forces, the Mughal military machine, backed by superior resources and strategic planning, overwhelmed his holdings. His eventual capture and imprisonment marked a decisive moment in the extension of Mughal imperial control in eastern Bengal.

Yet, the historical retrieval of Raja Pratapaditya remains problematic. Despite his significant role as a symbol of resistance to Mughal authority, his figure often recedes into the realm of myth, folklore, and localized narratives, rarely attracting sustained scholarly attention. This neglect stands in stark contrast to the extensive historiographical and popular engagement with contemporaries like Raja Man Singh or other well-known Rajput figures such as Rana Pratap. These Rajput leaders have been widely studied and celebrated in historical and nationalist discourses, while Pratapaditya's complex political and military legacy remains underexplored within academic circles.The marginalization of Pratapaditya's historical persona spotlights a broader inequity in South Asian historiography—the privileging of certain 'mainstream' imperial and martial figures over equally consequential regional leaders who resisted empire-building in distinct contexts. Bringing Pratapaditya into sharper historical focus thus not only enriches the understanding of Mughal-Bengal relations but also challenges dominant narratives by recovering the nuanced agency of indigenous resistance in early modern South Asia.

The Promethean resistance

The allegory of Prometheus provides a valuable framework for reinterpreting Raja Pratapaditya's opposition to the Mughal Badshah as a significant act of resistance rather than a simple failure. In classical mythology, Prometheus, regarded as a culture hero, risked his existence by defying Zeus to benefit humanity and exemplified resistance to dominant authority. This archetype closely aligns with Pratapaditya's historical role in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Bengal, where he opposed the Mughal empire's expansionist policies.Prometheus challenged the exclusive authority of the gods by providing fire to humanity, fully aware of the severe consequences. Similarly, Pratapaditya resisted Mughal incorporation despite understanding the improbability of complete success. His opposition to the dominant imperial power demonstrated a strong commitment to regional autonomy, dignity, and the preservation of his polity's sovereignty. Like Prometheus, Pratapaditya's defiance resulted in suffering, including defeat, imprisonment, and marginalization in historical narratives, yet it transformed him into a symbol of courage and autonomy.

Prometheus was renowned for his cunning and resourcefulness, qualities reflected in Pratapaditya's use of diplomacy and strategic alliances. Pratapaditya negotiated with rival chiefs, enlisted Portuguese mercenaries, and navigated the complex political landscape of Bengal to oppose Mughal domination. These actions demonstrate a pragmatic approach, consistent with the Promethean model, of utilizing all available resources to maintain resistance despite significant power imbalances.Zeus condemned Prometheus to perpetual torment for his defiance, and similarly, the Mughals attempted to eliminate Pratapaditya through forceful repression. Although his defeat and imprisonment ended his political lineage, his symbolic significance persisted. The continued presence of Pratapaditya in fragmented memory and vernacular narratives parallels the enduring legacy of Prometheus, serving as a reminder of the consequences of challenging dominant power.The Promethean allegory challenges the Mughal-centric narrative that portrays Pratapaditya solely as a defeated rebel. Instead, this framework positions him as a heroic figure whose individual resistance carries collective significance. The myth of Prometheus emphasizes the moral and symbolic impact of defiance rather than material victory. Similarly, Pratapaditya's legacy is defined by his act of resistance, which asserts both human and regional agency against an imperial system intent on erasing difference. His story demonstrates how material failure can be transformed into lasting symbolic influence, encouraging subsequent generations to recognize local resilience within the broader context of South Asian history. (Zami, T., & Lorea, C. E. 2016).

Military Confrontations and the Mughal Advance

During the early 17th century, Mughal subadars in Bengal, acting under Emperor Jahangir, intensified military operations to pacify this strategically significant region. The Mughal army possessed numerical superiority, experienced leadership, advanced artillery, and a formidable riverine navy, enabling effective control over Bengal's complex terrain. Raja Pratapaditya, the zamindar of Jessore, countered with locally developed strategies and adaptive tactics. Udayaditya, his son, directed defensive operations at Salka, leading a diverse force comprising Afghans, Pathans, and Portuguese (Firingee) naval officers. The deployment of war elephants and the construction of fortified river positions reflected Bengal's strategic adaptation, integrating indigenous warfare with technological and cultural influences from European mercenaries and Islamic cavalry.

The subsequent battles for Jessore were fluctuating theaters of valiant resistance and eventual setbacks. Pratapaditya's flotilla on the Ichhamati River initially inflicted serious damage on the advancing Mughal navy. Yet, the Mughals, under commanders like Mirza Nathan, employed superior tactics including flanking maneuvers and proficient use of archers and musketeers. The death of key Jessore officers, including the naval admiral Khwaja Kamal, coupled with deteriorating discipline among local forces, culminated in Pratapaditya's defeat. The loss of the fortified Salka position forced a disorderly retreat and led to Pratapaditya's eventual surrender in 1612. He and his family were captured and taken to the imperial court, marking the effective end of indigenous military resistance in Jessore.The Mughal conquest failed to establish immediate stability in Bengal. The province continued to experience rebellion, banditry, and resistance from dispossessed local elites. The Mughal administration imposed centralized governance and revenue collection systems, which led to a fragile accommodation with remaining regional nobility. This process produced a hybrid political culture in which Mughal authority coexisted uneasily with established local traditions. Despite imperial control, Pratapaditya's resistance persisted in collective memory, serving as a symbol of regional pride and ongoing assertions of autonomy within the imperial framework.

The metaphor of Bengal as Prometheus effectively encapsulates the region's historical trajectory. Similar to Prometheus, the Greek Titan punished for providing fire to humanity, Bengal has been repeatedly subjected to punitive measures for its efforts at self-determination and resistance to imperial authority. Pratapaditya's narrative extends beyond a local rebellion, embodying archetypal subaltern resilience. Bengal initiated its own forms of governance and identity but was subsequently constrained by successive empires. This allegory clarifies the interplay of suffering, endurance, and the costly assertion of agency that characterizes Bengal's historical experience.The military campaigns in Bengal and the cultural dynamics of this period demonstrate a complex

synthesis of European and South Asian military technologies and administrative practices. Portuguese artillery and naval tactics were integrated with indigenous fortification methods and Mughal military organization. These hybrid practices, together with mercenary networks and shifting allegiances, contributed to the emergence of a distinct regional identity within the early modern empire. The persistence of this identity in language, customs, and folklore illustrates Bengal's cultural resilience and its nuanced negotiation of imperial domination.

The battles for Jessore featured both valiant resistance and tragic setbacks. Pratapaditya's flotilla initially checked the Mughal advance and inflicted heavy naval losses. However, superior Mughal musketry, archery, and flanking tactics led by commanders like Mirza Nathan ultimately broke Jessore's resistance. The death of key Jessore officers and loss of strongholds such as Salka forced a retreat and the eventual capture and surrender of Pratapaditya and his family (Muazzam Hussain Khan, 2015).Post-conquest, Bengal remained turbulent with continued rebellion and uneasy accommodation between Mughal authorities and local nobility. The interaction fostered a hybrid political culture. Despite Mughal dominance, Pratapaditya's defiance endured in folk memory as a symbol of regional pride and autonomy

The metaphor of Bengal as "Prometheus" captures the region's rebellious spirit: like the Titan punished for gifting fire to humanity. Bengal was repeatedly punished for asserting autonomy. Pratapaditya's legacy symbolizes subaltern resilience—Bengal kindled its own creative self-rule only to be chained by successive empires (Chatterjee, 2018; Eaton, 2019;).Military innovations and cultural syncretism defined this era, with Portuguese gunners, riverine defenses, and Mughal administrative forms blending to create a distinct Bengali identity resilient through centuries of imperial rule (Muazzam Hussain Khan, 2015;).

Contrasts in Resistance: Rana Pratap and Raja Pratapaditya—A Comparative Perspective

The resistance of Rana Pratap Singh in Rajasthan and Raja Pratapaditya in Bengal illustrates how geography, political ecology, and cultural milieu structured divergent modes of anti-Mughal defiance and shaped their subsequent historical remembrance. While both figures embodied regional assertions against imperial expansion, their strategies, symbolism, and legacies diverged in ways that expose the uneven geography of South Asian resistance and memory.

In Rajasthan's arid highlands, Rana Pratap's guerrilla tactics reflected the harsh terrain that enabled mobile warfare but limited resources. His defiance was therefore cast in heroic terms of honor and sacrifice, with little scope for external alliances (Sarkar, 1992). By contrast, Bengal's watery delta allowed Pratapaditya to mobilize naval power, fortify river strongholds, and recruit diverse forces, including European mercenaries—producing a syncretic military response shaped by Bengal's porous and interconnected world (Ray, 2009; Eaton, 1993).Political and Cultural Frameworks. Rajput resistance was grounded in a martial ethic of sovereignty, lineage, and honor, resisting assimilation into Mughal political culture (Subrahmanyam, 1999). Bengal, however, operated within a fragmented polity of the Baro Bhuiyans, where shifting alliances and the presence of Portuguese traders complicated sovereignty. Pratapaditya's reliance on diplomacy and hybridity reflects a more pragmatic, less absolutist mode of resistance (Chatterjee, 2018).

These contrasting modes of resistance profoundly shaped later remembrance. Rana Pratap became a pan-Indian emblem of unyielding defiance, celebrated in nationalist discourse and bardic lore alike. Pratapaditya, despite enduring in Bengal's folk memory as a tragic freedom-fighter, remained regionally circumscribed, partly due to fragmentary archival traces and the dominance of Mughal-centered historiography (Eaton, 2019). The asymmetry of their legacies underscores how the politics of history-writing amplifies certain regional resistances while marginalizing others. Comparing Rana Pratap and Pratapaditya demonstrates that anti-imperial resistance in early modern South Asia cannot be understood through a uniform lens of rebellion versus empire. Rather, it was shaped by ecological terrain, political context, and cultural frameworks, producing distinct modalities of defiance and uneven afterlives in historical memory. Rajasthan's desert wars and Bengal's riverine insurgencies thus reveal not only the diversity of strategies against Mughal incorporation but also the historiographical biases that have privileged some resistances as national icons while relegating others to regional margins.

Pratapaditya, as a regional zamindar and the last prominent leader of the Baro Bhuiyans, established a localized sovereignty based on territorial control, military capability, and strategic alliances. His authority derived from customary ties to the land, revenue management, and the capacity to mobilize diverse military forces such as local infantry, cavalry, elephants, and Portuguese mercenaries. This governance model was decentralized, negotiated, and semi-autonomous, prioritizing practical autonomy over symbolic subordination. Pratapaditya's sovereignty was relational and evolved through interactions with neighboring chiefs, European colonials, and Mughal imperial agents. This case highlights the layered and contingent character of early modern South Asian polities, where local rulers maintained substantial self-rule while nominally acknowledging a superior emperor.

In contrast, the Mughal Badshahat articulated sovereignty as universal, centralized, and divinely sanctioned through the imperial court in Delhi. The emperor's authority extended through a hierarchical bureaucracy, standardized administration, uniform revenue extraction, and a symbolic language of kingship blending Persianate and Islamic cosmologies. Mughal sovereignty demanded formal allegiance, tribute, and

integration of local rulers as subordinates within the imperial order. The Badshah's authority was absolute in theory, seeking to subsume regional powers into a single imperial polity, thereby striving for political and cultural unification.

The confrontation between Pratapaditya's grounded, negotiated sovereignty and the Mughal Badshahat's universalizing imperial sovereignty illuminates the contest over meanings of political legitimacy, governance, and autonomy in early modern India. Pratapaditya's resistance and tactical accommodations reveal the limits of Mughal centralization, highlighting how imperial power was mediated through local realities. This tension also exemplifies larger dynamics in South Asian history where imperial ambitions met persistent regional assertion, leading to hybrid political orders blending subordination, collaboration, and resistance.

In this dynamic, sovereignty was not monolithic but a complex web of overlapping authorities, rituals, and military power with Pratapaditya's rulership embodying a localized, pragmatic sovereignty standing both within and sometimes outside the orbit of the Mughal Badshahat. Raja Pratapaditya's notion of sovereignty and rulership was fundamentally rooted in local autonomy, military strength, and pragmatic alliances, contrasting yet interacting with the Mughal Badshahat's centralized and universal imperial sovereignty. Pratapaditya exercised authority based on territorial control, revenue collection, and alliances with diverse forces—including Portuguese mercenaries—reflecting a flexible and negotiated power that adapted to Bengal's fragmented political landscape. His sovereignty embodied a semi-independent polity where legitimacy derived from possession and effective governance rather than formal imperial sanction.

Conversely, the Mughal Badshahat represented a divinely sanctioned, hierarchical sovereignty where absolute allegiance to the emperor was demanded. The emperor's authority was projected through an expansive bureaucracy, standardized administrative systems, and symbolic rituals underpinned by Persianate-Islamic cosmology, aiming to incorporate diverse regions into a unified imperial order. The tension between Pratapaditya's decentralized, contingent sovereignty and the Mughal universalizing Badshahat reveals the contested meanings of political power in early modern South Asia. Pratapaditya's resistance and tactical accommodations highlight the limits and negotiation involved in Mughal centralization, illustrating how imperial sovereignty had to accommodate entrenched local rulers wielding legitimate authority on the ground. Thus, Pratapaditya's rulership stands as an exemplar of localized sovereignty that both contested and existed ambiguously within the empire's ambit, reflecting a pluralistic and dynamic political order rather than a monolithic imperial system.

Contrasting notions of Sovereignty

Raja Pratapaditya, as a regional zamindar and the last prominent leader of the Baro Bhuiyans, established a localized sovereignty based on territorial control, military capability, and strategic alliances (Ray, 2009; Banglapedia, n.d.) His authority derived from customary ties to the land, revenue management, and the capacity to mobilize diverse military forces such as local infantry, cavalry, elephants, and Portuguese mercenaries (Hinduexistence.org, 2020; Ray, 2009). This governance model was decentralized, negotiated, and semi-autonomous, prioritizing practical autonomy over symbolic subordination (Banglapedia, n.d.; Ray, 2009). Pratapaditya's sovereignty was relational and evolved through interactions with neighboring chiefs, European colonials, and Mughal imperial agents (Chatterjee, 2018; Eaton, 2019). This case highlights the layered and contingent character of early modern South Asian polities, where local rulers maintained substantial self-rule while nominally acknowledging a superior emperor (Chatterjee, 2018; Eaton, 2019).

In contrast, the Mughal Badshahat articulated sovereignty as universal, centralized, and divinely sanctioned through the imperial court in Delhi (Eaton, 2019; Chatterjee, 2018). The emperor's authority extended through a hierarchical bureaucracy, standardized administration, uniform revenue extraction, and a symbolic language of kingship blending Persianate and Islamic cosmologies (Eaton, 2019; Chatterjee, 2018). Mughal sovereignty demanded formal allegiance, tribute, and integration of local rulers as subordinates within the imperial order (Eaton, 2019). The Badshah's authority was absolute in theory, seeking to subsume regional powers into a single imperial polity, thereby striving for political and cultural unification (Chatterjee, 2018; Eaton, 2019).

The confrontation between Pratapaditya's grounded, negotiated sovereignty and the Mughal Badshahat's universalizing imperial sovereignty illuminates the contest over meanings of political legitimacy, governance, and autonomy in early modern India (Eaton, 2019; Chatterjee, 2018). Pratapaditya's resistance and tactical accommodations reveal the limits of Mughal centralization, highlighting how imperial power was mediated through local realities (Ray, 2009; Eaton, 2019). This tension also exemplifies larger dynamics in South Asian history where imperial ambitions met persistent regional assertion, leading to hybrid political orders blending subordination, collaboration, and resistance (Chatterjee, 2018; Eaton, 2019).In this dynamic, sovereignty was not monolithic but a complex web of overlapping authorities, rituals, and military power with Pratapaditya's rulership embodying a localized, pragmatic sovereignty standing both within and sometimes outside the orbit of the Mughal Badshahat (Chatterjee, 2018; Ray, 2009).

II. Conclusion

The legacy of Raja Pratapaditya demonstrates how defeat can be reconstituted as cultural triumph through processes of memory-making. Though militarily subdued, he was transformed in Bengal's cultural imagination into a martyr and emblem of righteous defiance against imperial centralization. His figure circulated through ballads, oral traditions, and vernacular chronicles, while battle sites such as the *Baro Omrar Kabar* and the remnants of his forts became lieux de mémoire anchoring a narrative of indigenous sovereignty. Pratapaditya's afterlife illustrates the subaltern dynamics of memory, where local communities reworked imperial archives into vernacular histories that preserved counter-narratives of autonomy. Far from nostalgic recall, his symbolic presence functioned as cultural capital—articulating regional pride, legitimizing resistance, and sustaining the vision of Bengal as a polity defined by hybrid sovereignties and resilient autonomy.

The Promethean metaphor underscores this transformation: Pratapaditya emerges as the fiery protagonist of a Bengal perpetually resisting empire. His mythos reverberated across colonial and nationalist discourses, where he was reactivated as a figure of creative defiance and subaltern resilience. In this sense, Pratapaditya's memory exposes how regional histories contest the homogenizing impulses of imperial and nationalist historiography alike, reframing Bengal as a crucible of recurring assertions of self-rule.Thus, the figure of Pratapaditya bridges history and myth, offering a symbolic repertoire through which Bengal's struggles over sovereignty, identity, and resistance have been narrated and continually reimagined.

Works Cited

[1]. Nathan, M. (1936). Baharistan-I-Ghaibi: A History Of The Mughal Wars In Assam, Cooch Behar, Bengal, Bihar And Orissa During The Reigns Of Jahangir And Shahjahan (M. I. Borah, Trans.). Government Of Assam, Department Of Historical And Antiquarian Studies. (Original Work Composed 17th Century)
[2]. Eaton, Richard M. The Rise Of Islam And The Bengal Frontier, 1204–1760. University Of California Press, 1993.
[3]. Eaton, Richard M. India In The Persianate Age, 1000–1765. Allen Lane, 2019.
[4]. Hamilton, Walter. The East India Gazetteer. Vol. I, J. Murray, 1815.
[5]. Zami, T., & Lorea, C. E. (2016). Interreligious Encounter And Proselytism In Pre-Mughal Bengal: An Analysis Of The Report By The Jesuit Father Nicolas Pimenta. Journal Of Religious History, 43(2). Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/0376983616663405
[6]. Ray, A. (2009). The Baro Bhuiyans Of Bengal: Resistance And Accommodation. Academic Press.
[7]. Chatterjee, K. (2009). The Cultures Of History In Early Modern India: Persianization And Mughal Culture In Bengal. Oxford University Press.
[8]. Du Jarric, P. (1926). Akbar And The Jesuits: An Account Of The Jesuit Missions To The Court Of Akbar (C. H. Payne, Trans.). George Routledge & Sons Ltd..Available At: Https://Archive.Org/Details/Akbarandthejesui009701mbp