CHAPTER IV

ADMINISTRATIVE AND MILITARY APPARATUS OF THE STATE OF MEWAR MID 13TH-15TH CENTURIES A.D.

The present chapter probes into the exercise of state power through the administrative and military apparatus, between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The crucial questions would essentially relate to the structure of the royal authority and the delegation of royal power in the administration. Locally influential social groups can be expected to have shared administrative and military responsibilities with the ruler. While wealthy Jain families probably had a share in administrative tasks, non-Guhila Rajput chiefs were to maintain the second line of defence for the state of Mewar.

The administrative apparatus in our period saw a series of qualitative changes involving various departments of the administration. These changes undoubtedly are an indicator of the consolidation of the power of the state. Secondly, and more significantly, there is a change in personnel. Non-Rajput social groups such as the Jains, the important local family of the Žłamarađas of Nāgdā, and others from Mount Abu figure as prominent officials. While non-Guhila Rajput chiefs were integrated through the system of ranking and the administrative positions between the tenth and the twelfth centuries, the state retained its power between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries by integrating newly emerging non-Rajput social groups through a similar process. Changes in administrative personnel also reflect the growing military dimension of the state and the martial identity of the Rajputs by the thirteenth century. It is the logical culmination of the process of regional state formations that in their course of territorial expansion over a long period of time they were bound to compete with each other over common resources at points of time and space. The case of
Mewar reveals diversion of the Rajput chiefs towards battlefields from the thirteenth century onwards. Hence, incorporation of the non-Rajput personnel into the administrative structure in the thirteenth century served both the state and the integrative process.

**New Administrative Offices**

Three offices of the administration figuring for the first time in the thirteenth century records are those of the pradhāna, mahāmātya, and talarakṣāka.

**Pradhāna:**

The Chittaur inscription of the reign of Tejasimha (A.D. 1267) is issued by the family of the Pradhāna, Rajputra Kāṅgā.\(^1\) The Chirava inscription (A.D. 1273) records the death of the Pradhāna Bhīmasimha, fighting at the foothills of Chittaurgarh.\(^2\) The presence of the Pradhāna in addition to mahāmātya (chief minister) suggests increase in the administrative responsibilities of the state as a consequence of the growing territorial power of the centre. The expansion of the Guhila state into the upper Banas plain and the transfer of the capital to Chittaurgarh in the thirteenth century brought with it problems of consolidation. Territorial expansion and increasing administrative responsibilities might have necessitated the post of Pradhāna in addition to the mahāmātya.

Dasharath Sharma finds it difficult to distinguish

---

1. *op. cit.*, 1.1, Śrī Tejasimhadevakalyāṇa Vijayī rājā Vijayamāna Pradhānraja Rājputrakāṅgāputraparṇārī Sāho.

2. *op. cit.*, v.26. Besides the official sources of Mewar, contemporary literary texts such *Kharatara-gacṣchā-bṛihadgurvāvalī* mentions the office of Pradhāna. For instance, Rāja Pradhāna Jagaddeva Pratihāra lead armies of Bhīmadeva II (Caulukya) against Sapadalakṣā and Malwa, *op. cit.*, p.34.
between a mahāmātya and a pradhāna. However, he distinguishes the nature of their duties: "...the pradhāna had probably more of military duties than the mahāmātya who was concerned mainly with the transactions of the royal seal." Sharma quotes instances of pradhānas such as Bhīmasimha of Mewar in mid-thirteenth century Mewar, who died fighting at the foot of Chittaur hill. G.C. Sharma in the context of medieval Rajasthan defines a pradhāna as the premier, and the military minister. However, he does not explain the military functions of a pradhāna but simply places him next to the ruler. Somani on the basis of two contemporary manuscripts of Maharana Kumbha's period (Ādināth Stavan and Āvasyakṛtiḥad Vṛtti, where the term pradhāna has been used for Kumbha's mukhyamantri Sajjanapāla Navalakha and the term rājamantri for the same person) argues that pradhāna and mukhyamantri or rājamantri seems to have been the one and the same person. At the same time he argues that since the designation the pradhāna was being used in the plural in contemporary literary sources, the post of pradhāna probably meant ministers, and was occupied by more than one person. But Somani's observations are misleading, because he contradicts himself by claiming that it referred to both the ministers and the chief minister (mukhyamantri) at the same time. The parallel functioning of a pradhāna and a mahāmātya in the thirteenth century Guhila court proves the dis-

4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p.16.
9. Ibid., p.159.
The distinction between the two offices is also corroborated by Kanhađade Prabandha which separately mentions the amââtyas and the pradhââna.10 Keeping with the growth of the office of Pradhââna, it is not unusual that a Pradhââna came to combine the functions of a râjamantri/mukhyamantri by Rââna Kumbha's period in Mewar. It is significant that mahâmââtyas and pradhâanas figure as distinct functionaries in the royal records in the early medieval period. In a copper plate grant of the sîlâhâras of A.D. 1094, mahâmââtya Sîrî Nauvitaka Vâsaïda, mahâpradhââna Pâdhîsena Sîrî Mahâdevaiya Prabhu (translated as the great minister) in the first rank at the Treasury while in the second rank Pradhââna (translated as minister) Sîrî Somanaiya Prabhu appear all together in the administration in the reign of mahâmândalesvara King Ananta-deva.11

Mahâmââtya (Chief Minister):

The office of the mahâmââtya too appears for the first time in the thirteenth century. The office of amââtya is evident from the pre-thirteenth century Guhila records such as the Saranesvara temple.12 But none of the Guhila records of the early medieval period ever mentions a mahâmââtya.

10. Dasharath Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, op. cit., p.245. Meena Sogani and R.M. Khandelwal make a pertinent observation that perhaps best describes the post of Pradhââna in the context of medieval Rajathan. "According to the administrative traditions of Rajputana, the pradhan was next to the ruler. He exercised a number of civil, financial, judicial and military powers. The vast powers of the pradhan carried with them enormous responsibilities of the office. A pradhan in order to successfully perform his duties was expected to be an accomplished courtier, besides having a thorough understanding of the various branches of administration", State Level Personnel Administration in India: A Case Study of Rajasthan, Jaipur, 1987, p.2.


12. Vide Passim, Ch.II, Section: Administrative Apparatus.
This begins only in the early thirteenth century. The evolution of the office of the amatya into that of the mahāmātya is itself a strong indicator of the diversification of administrative duties and the growth of the state-apparatus. The office of the mahāmātya presumes the presence of a number of the amatyas.

Contemporary Jain texts speak of the mahāmātya Śrī Jagatsīnḥa in Guhila Jaitrasiṅḥa's reign and the mahāmātya Śrī Samuddhara in Guhila Tejasīnḥa's reign. A mahāmātya of the thirteenth century seems to have acquired the popular designation of Rājamantri or Mukhyamantri by the fifteenth century in Mewar. The Jain text Avasyakbrihadvrittī refers to Śādhu (Śāhu) Śrī Sajjanapāla Navalakha of the Ukesā lineage (the chief minister in Rāna Kumbha's reign) as Rājamantri. Rāṇā Kumbha in his Saṅgītarāja use the term mukhyamantri for a rājamantri or mahāmātya. It is already noted that Rājamantri Sajjanapāla Navalakha also acquired the title of pradhāna as he presumably combined the duties of both mahāmātya and pradhāna. It is also evident from the contemporary records that the post of mukhyamantri/mahāmātya had become hereditary by the fifteenth century. This indicates that royal power was being increasingly delegated rather than centralized. Rājamantri Sajjanapāla had succeeded his father Rāmadeva Navalakha to

14. Śrāvaka Pratikramanasutracūrṇī, Ibid., p.126.
15. Ibid., p.148.
17. Cf. C.D. Dalal (ed.), Lekhapaddhati, Baroda, 1925, p.2. Lekhapaddhati, a contemporary text from Gujarat, discusses the office of the mahāmātya and not that of the pradhāna.
the chief ministership. Ramadeva Navalakha is known to have functioned as the mukhyamantrī in the entire period of the reigns of Rāṇā Kṣetrasimha, Rāṇā Lakṣasimha and Rāṇā Mokal. 18

A mahāmatya/mukhyamantrī or a rājanmantrī was in-charge of the royal seal. This particular responsibility seems to indicate that stage in the process of state formation when the office of the king had risen above the routine organization of the administration of his territory. The term mudrā (seal) is repeatedly associated with the mahāmatya in contemporary sources. 19 Śrāvaka Pratikramansutrachurnī testifies to the signatures of Tejasimha's mahāmatya Śrī Samudrāhara in all the royal transactions particularly in cash, (Śrīkaranādimudrāvyaparipanthayati). Kanhādeprabandha and Prithvīcandracarita of the fifteenth century mention śrīkaranādhikārī and vyāyakaranādhikārī as functionaries in the departments of income and expenditure respectively. 20 A mahāmatya/ mukhyamantrī seems to have been incharge of not merely governmental income but of expenditure as well. 'The seal was kept in the custody of mukyamantrī who was looked upon as overall in charge of the administrative machinery'. 21 Thus all the royal deeds and grants were expected to carry the mukhyamantrī's signature duly authorized by the royal seal.

19. A thirteenth century Jain text, Tarunaprabhasūri's Samyaktya tathā śrāvana pār vrata refers to the authority of mantri over the royal-seal. cited in, MK, op. cit., p.159. 'Mantri nā āvoi taun māhārī sarvādhipatya mudrā le āvī'.
20. D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, op. cit., p.245; Lekhapaddhati also begins the list of the governmental departments, 'karanaś with Śrīkarana (income) and vyāyagarana (expenditure), op. cit., p.1.
In the same context, the Abu royal charter of A.D. 1449 issued in Kumbha's reign has been quoted again and again by modern scholars to argue for centrifugal processes in the Guhila State. This is because the charter is not duly signed by Kumbha's mukhyamantri, and instead by a local-level functionary, Dośī Ramana. Dośī Ramana is stated to have declared his subordinate status to an higher official Duńgar Bhoja, by assuming praṇamati nitya as a suffix to his name. On the basis of such evidence, Upendra Nath Day observes, "The mukhyamantri generally put his signature on charity grant-deeds, but we cannot definitely state the extent to which his signature was compulsory on such deeds. This doubt arises because we find that deeds executed by some of the sāmanatas do not bear the signature of the Mukhyamantri. The probability is that he used to put his signature on royal grants which certainly enjoyed a higher status than others". Day's generalization that only those royal grant-deeds enjoyed higher status which were duly signed by the mukhyamantri is highly questionable. The record under discussion, the Abu inscription of A.D. 1449, announcing governmental exemptions from a number of local cesses to pilgrims, was undoubtedly a document of immense political importance for the Guhila state, in view of the social (concentration of the Jains), commercial and strategic importance of Mount Abu. It is plausible that since the royal charter was issued from Abu, reasonably distant from the capital Chittaurgarh, the deed was signed by a local functionary (treated equivalent to a sāmanta by U.N. Day). It was not realistic to issue every charter for distant places from the capital, or for the mukhyamantri to travel far to sign a deed. After all, the very function of local officials was to meet such administrative needs. One impor-

---

22. MK, op. cit., pp.159-160, 393, l.18. Also see H.B. Sharda, MK, op. cit., pp.175-176.

23. Ibid.

tant fact should not be ignored that Doshi Ramana addressed the charter to mahan (mahantak, an accountant) Duṅgar dated in the reign of Rāṇā Kumbhakarna (Kumbha). Mahan Duṅgar was apparently a higher revenue-official, possibly associated with the commercial cesses and the toll-tax. The point is also testified by the Delwara inscription of A.D. 1494 which mentions mahan Duṅgar in connection with royal grants made from a number of local cesses. Doshi Ramana followed the official rules of conduct and executed his part of the duty by signing the governmental-deed as he was locally present. Thus, the practices of the administrative convenience should not be misconstrued in support of the centrifugal forces.

Day, discussing the office of the mukhyamantri in the reign of Rāṇā Kumbha, writes: 'The mantris also at times addressed as anātya distributed various duties amongst themselves which included foreign affairs, home affairs'.

**Talarakṣa/Talarakṣaka:**

As already noted, a Tamṭaraḍa family of Nāgdā held the post of Talarakṣa from the end of twelfth century. The Chirava inscription of A.D. 1273 states that Uddyaraṇa of Tamṭaraḍa family was made the talarakṣa of Nāgadrahapura (Nāgdā) by Māthanasiṁha. Yogarāja the eldest son of Uddyaraṇa was in turn made the Talāra in the same city by

---

25. Abu royal, charter of A.D. 1449, *op. cit.*, 1.6, 'Gaḍa-potyāru ṛāṇi Kumbhakarṇī maham Dugar bhojā jogyam mayā udharī jiko jyātri āvi tihirū sarvamu'.


29. *op. cit.*, v.10, 'Yam duṣṭasāsthasik śanrakṣanadakṣhatvatastalāraksam 1 Sri Māthanasiṁhanpatiscākāra nāgadrahadraṅge'.
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King Padmasiṁha. 30 Kgema, the youngest son of Yogarāja succeeded to his father's post at Citrakūṭa by the favour of King Jaitrasiṁha. 31 One of his sons Madana succeeded to the same post at Citrakūṭa through the favour of King Samarasiṁha. 32 The post of talarakṣa or talāra was the post of a police superintendent. 33 Nāgarhdra (Nāgcdā) and Citrakūṭa (Chittaurgarh, the capital town) being the two large towns of Mewar in this period, the talarakṣas of these settlements would have been police superintendents. The presence of police superintendents in turn assumes the existence of a full-fledged police department by the end of the thirteenth century. The fact that police officials are not mentioned in the early records does not necessarily indicate that they did not exist. However, their frequent mention in the thirteenth century may suggest the growing importance of the office. Possibly there was informal policing by the local communities in their respective localities in certain areas in previous times. The chiravā inscription speaks of Uddhāraṇa of the Tāmṭarāḍa family who had gained a reputation for policing the locality of Nāgcdā prior to his official appointment as Talarakṣa of Nāgcdā. If talarakṣa refers to the superintendent of police, then Uddhāraṇa was promoted to a higher rank in recognition of his service. The growing importance of the department of police in the thirteenth century was apparently caused by the growing congestion of these centres due to the ongoing process of urbanization, commercial transactions and transits, and finally, the increasing political importance of towns like Nāgcdā and Citrakūṭa. The importance of a talarakṣa in Mewar might not

30. Ibid., v.12.
31. Ibid., v.22.
32. Ibid., v.30.
33. Lekhapaddhati refers to the talāras, the desatālāras and the grāmatālāras, translated as Kotwāls, police superintendents and foujdārs respectively, op. cit., p.8.
have been confined to the general administration of the local law and order, but might have extended to such specific functions as supervision and protection of the hindipakas (touring revenue officials), officers-in-charge of toll taxes, and volapakas (in-charge of the militiamen, accompanying merchants on their journeys). It is obvious that the state had to provide protection to those administrative and economic activities which were vital for its functioning and growth.

It is evident from the Chiravā inscription that just like the post of the mahāmātya/mukhyamantrī, the office of talarakṣaka had also become hereditary by the thirteenth century.

Revenue Officials:

The growth of the governmental department of revenue in this period is evident from the appearance of a number of revenue officials with new designations in the contemporary records. The process itself indicates a growing revenue-resource base of the state as well as better mobilization. It is significant that the aksapātalika (the chief accountant) no longer figured as importantly in the Guhila records between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries as he did in the tenth century. Instead, a hierarchy of revenue officials appears.

The Bhandagarika or bhāndārī, treasurer, figures for the first time in the fifteenth century, and with a frequency which leaves no doubt that this category of officials occupied the highest rank in the revenue department. The rise of the bhāndārīs as state revenue officials over the former aksapātalikas speaks for the expansion of state control over resources and need for further professionals and specialists as personnel in the revenue department. None could fit the bill better than the local, rich Jain merchant families who were well-educated too.

34. Ibid., pp.8 & 101.
The Śrīṅgār Chāvanrī inscription of A.D. 1448 refers to the family of the bhāndarīs of Rāṇā Kumbha in the context of building of a temple for Śrī Sāntinātha. The list is as follows: bhāndarī Śrī Velaka, son of Sāhkola, and Velaka's sons, bhāndarī Mudharaja, bhāndarī Dhanaraja, and bhāndarī Kurapāla. The genealogical list of this family from Chittaur is also provided by Sātruṇjaya inscription of A.D. 1532 and a Jain text Sātruṇjaya tīrthoddhara. The genealogical list provided by the Śrīṅgār-Chāvanrī inscription proves that like the many others the office of royal treasurer was hereditary, strengthening our suggestion once again that the growth of the royal power ran parallel to the delegation of authority to groups. Hereditary succession ensured smooth succession of personnel irrespective of a change of rulers at the centre. Bhāndarī Velaka, the chief treasurer, seems to have been assisted by his three sons. They are likely to have functioned as assistant treasurers under the supervision of the chief bhāndarī. There also seems to have been a hierarchy of bhāndarīs according to their areas of jurisdiction. The Abu inscription of A.D. 1449 refers to four phadyun (an unit of currency) due to one Śrī Visīṣṭi Bhāndarī. Śrī Visīṣṭi was a local level bhāndarī at Abu. In contrast, the term Kosvyāpārina (the official incharge of transactions of the kosā or treasury) is used for the bhāndarī Śrī Velaka in the Śrīṅgār Chāvanrī inscription. Another designation, Rajadvārika-Bhāndarī, apparently used for a category of Bhāndarīs, figures in contemporary sources such as the Prithvicandra carita of

36. Ibid., 11.1-2.
38. op. cit., 11.13-14...
Manikyacandra Suri (A.D. 1411). [40]

Dasharath Sharma suggests a slight distinction between a bhāṇḍārī and a kothārī in terms of the different commodities supervised by them. [41] Unfortunately, he does not specify the commodities. All the Rajput states had a koshapati who was responsible for treasure. The term continued till Jagat Singh of Mewar (1688-92). He was required to maintain the records of income and expenditure of the state. Soon after, due to Mughal impact the name was changed from Koshtapati to Khazanchi. [42] However, the fifteenth century records from Mewar refer only to the bhāṇḍārīs and not to the kothārīs.

It is evident from the contemporary texts from Rajasthān such as Prithvīcandra carita [43] that the Śrīkarana and the Vyāyagarana were important functionaries in the income and expenditure sections of the central revenue department respectively.

The Delwara inscription of A.D. 1434 refers to four tānkās due to a Selāhathī (official connected with the treasury and the accounts) from the local Maṇḍapikās. [44] This record testifies to the duty of a selāhata/selāhathī who was in charge of the commercial dues from the local custom-houses.

---

40. Ibid.; Also see D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, op. cit., p.245. Kanhaḍadeprabandha lists Koṭhārī (Koṣṭhāgarika) instead of Bhāṇḍārī, in the sense of the chief treasurer.

41. D. Sharma, RTA, p.705. "Koṭhārī was an officer with duties similar to those of Bhāṇḍāgarika or bhāṇḍārī, the only distinction between the two perhaps being that they stored two different sorts of commodities"; Ibid., f.n.1, "Bhān dām koṭhārī jeu, purāi varau rālaguṇī teu".


43. MK, op. cit., p.163.

44. Ibid., p.370, 1.10.
The Delwara inscription of A.D. 1434 and the Abu inscription of A.D. 1449 refer to another official by the name of Mahan Bhoja, in connection with the royal grants from the local maṇḍapīkās and the governmental exemptions to the pilgrims from a number of essential levies. Mahan an equivalent of Mahantak, was an accountant in the department of revenue. Both the records indicate his important official status in the revenue department. Thus, it seems that accountants represented the revenue department at the various important localities. It is also possible that just like the Tāmtaraḍa and the Bhāṇḍārī families of Nāgahṛda and Chittaurgarh respectively, Bhoja, perhaps a influential member of the local society at Abu, or Delwara (near Udaipur) and Dośī Ramana of Abu were incorporated into the administrative apparatus.

The Sūtradhāراس:

Chittaurgarh Inscription of A.D. 1274 of King Samarasīha was engraved by Sajjana. Sajjana is described as a sīlpī (craftsman), employed by the royal court. From his name, it is difficult to ascertain his social background. The Achalesvāra inscription of A.D. 1285 was engraved by sūtradhāra Karmasīha. This name indicates a Rajput background. The fact that some of the kṣatriya families from Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh were taking to the non-traditional professions in the early medieval period is evident from the case of a kṣatriya sūtradhāra, son of a

45. op. cit., 1.12.
46. op. cit., last verse. ʿSajjaneva samukīrṇa praśāstih Silpiṇāmunaʿ.
47. op. cit., v.62. ʿUtkīrṇa Karmasīmhana sutradhārenaʿ.
learned kṣatriya 48 and that of a kṣatriya vaṇik. 49 However, both the cases of the sutradhāra Karmasiṁha from Mewar and kṣatriya sutradhāra from Jodhpur suggest that the profession of architect had attained the status of a skilled profession, practised by people of different social origins. Therefore, the profession of an architect had not crystallized into a separate caste, at least until the thirteenth century in Mewar.

The Chittaurgarh stone inscription of Rānā Mokal of A.D. 1428 records the name of the architects appointed by the royal court to repair the Samaddhisvara temple, and the artisans who engraved the stone inscription. The architect is described along with his genealogy. He was Manā, the son of Vījala 50 He bears titles of both Śilpī and sutradhāra. 51 The inscription was written on the stone by Vīsala, a son of Mana, and engraved by Vīsa, also a son of Manā, and is perhaps identical with Vīsala. 52 The other important architect in the royal court during Mokal's reign was Phanā. The śrīṅgirīśi inscription was engraved by sutradhāra Phanā, son of Hāḍā. He is described as Sūtradhāraragunā, the master of the sūtradhāras, and was fully conversant with literary

---


49. An inscription of the period of the Gurjara-Pratīhāras from Doab, Uttar Pradesh, of the tenth century, EI, Vol. XIX, pp.52-4.

50. op. cit., v.4. According to Shyamaldas's text, he was the son of Vidyādhara, Vir Vinod I, op. cit., Appendix Lekhasaṅgrahā.

51. Chittaurgarh stone Inscription of Mokala, ibid., v.4 of the last 5 verses, "VI [jalasya] sutah silpi Manakhyah sūtradhārakah 11."

52. Ibid. "Manakhyah sūtradhārakah 1 tasyātmajana Vīsena prasāstimuktāt 11 4 11 ruciraśramuktikīra prasāsti-riya mujvala, lilekha viṣalaha silpī samadhīsāprasādat- tah 11 5 11"
works on architecture. Thus, by the early fifteenth century a few select families of artisans came to be patronized by the royal court. They not only supplied the architects for the royal constructions, but also seem to have mobilized the chief artisans from their own families.

The increasing number of towns, and building of the military, civil and religious movements, undertaken by Rāṇā Kumbha gave rise to a select band of court artisans and architects. The following is a brief inscriptional list of the prominent structures other than temples in Kumbha's reign, providing an idea of the range of military architectural projects.

(1) Chittaurgarh Kīrttistambha inscription of A.D. 1453 commemorating the construction of Kīrttistambha by Rāṇā Kumbha and a genealogy of the Guhila Kings.

(2) Chittaurgarh Kīrttistambha inscription of A.D. 1450 recording the construction of a new gate at Chittaurgarh fort.

(3) Chittaurgarh Kīrttistambha inscription of A.D. 1452 recording the date of the construction of the defensive ramparts around the fortress of Chittaurgarh.

(4) Chittaurgarh Kīrttistambha inscription of A.D. 1458 recording the date of the construction of the fortress of

---


54. D.R. Bhandarkar's List No.813, (Appendix to EI, XIX-XXIII). Also see PRAS, WC, 1903-4, p.56.


56. D.R. Bhandarkar, ibid., No.806.
Kumbhamerū (Kumbhalgarh). The extensive size of the Kumbhalgarh fort is a definite indicator of the degree of the involvement of the best artisans and architects of Mewar in royal projects in the fifteenth century.

If the architects contributed to the legitimation of the Guhila state through the building of royal monuments in this period, a select band of the local architects employed by the royal court evidently grew in career through the royal patronage. For instance, unlike Vījāla, his son Manā bears the titles of both śīlpī and sūtradhāra. Similarly unlike Ḥāḍā, his son Phanā bears the title of sūtradhāragurunā.

Apart from the names mentioned above, we also get to know about other contemporary sūtradhāras, such as sūtradhāras Jaitā and his sons Sūtradhāras Nāpā, Puṇja, Pomā, Bhūmī and Cuthī - architects of Kīrttistambha at Chittaurgarh (Kīrttistambha Inscription of A.D. 1453), and sūtradhāra Mandana, the famous architect of the Kumbhalgarh fort. He is likely to have designed the fort of Achalgarh, as evident from the extent of his research-work on the fort-constructions in prāsāda-mandana, a part of his famous work, Rājavallabhamandana. He seems to have trained some of the local, junior architects and artisans in carrying out the massive programme of fortifications and re-fortifications. His work Rājavallabha (famously known as Rājavallabhamandana) also contains instructions for the constructions of horse and elephant stables, indicating increased military requirements of the state in the fifteenth century. The fact

58. op. cit.
59. See next Section: Military Apparatus.
60. Prāsādamandana and Rājavallabhamandalam, Calcutta Sanskrit series No.32, Calcutta, 1948, Ch.9, pp.97-98, vv.24-29.
that Mandana too rose in career in the employment of the state is evident from his clear declaration that he served king Kumbha of Medapāṭa. His son, Isara continued to be in the service of the state as he was the chief architect of Rāmakunda and Rāmasvāmī temple at Zawar.

Revenue:

The increasing list of taxes in the Guhila records of the fifteenth century to point better organization of revenue. It is also significant that the items of taxation change from an earlier period.

The Land-Tax: Bhāga-Bhoga

The largest portion of the state revenue was undoubtedly the land tax, generally termed bhāga-bhoga in contemporary sources. Bhāga was the fixed land tax or the state's share of the agricultural produce; and Bhoga, the customary presents of articles like fruits, milk, vegetables, etc., including the provisions of lodging, bedding, etc. to the king, his officials, and the royal army. In Mewar, an idea of the extent and scale of land-revenue organization can perhaps be best gleaned from an excellent contemporary source, Mandan's Rājavallabha. Mandana describes in detail, the unit of land measurement and system of calculation for working out the area of various plots. The tenth chapter of the Rājavallabhamandana is devoted to the methods of land measurement as well as designs for proper marking of

61. Ibid., ch.14, p.127, v.43, "Śrī Medapāṭe mopa-kumbhakarn-ñastād amghpi-rājivaparagasevi sa Mandanākhyobhūvī śū tradhāroste noddhṛto bhūpati vallabhoayam'.


63. Dasharath Sharma opines that Bhoga, a technical word, went almost invariably with the bhāga. See RTA, op. cit., p.325.
A square or a rectangular plot was encircled by a rope with the help of posts. The entire encircled rope was then measured either by a hand or a stick, made of rakta-chandan or mahuā, or bamboo/gold/silver/copper. This measuring scale had different yardsticks for small, middle and large measurements. For instance, to measure the area of a village or town, the large yardstick was used. It is significant to note that most of the contemporary royal land charters contain the expression grāmoyam svāsāmāpayātām (upto the boundaries of the village). The repetitive reference to this expression also supports the fact that each of the villages was being assessed meticulously. A picture of a measuring scale is inscribed on Kirttistambha, Chittaurgarh fort. It measures approximately twentytwo and a half inches. It is first divided into eight units, the eight into three each, and finally these three into four each. Thus there is a total of ninety-six divisions.

---

64. op. cit., pp.100-103, verses 2, 3, 7 and 18. 'Vyāsena dairghye-guṇite yadaikyam tat Konākṣetrasya phalam pradīṣṭam 1 pinde tadaikyam punareva tadyam khatasya bhitteśayanādisilihin 11 Kāre Karāghne ca Karāpramānām Karaṃgulinām guṇāmeva saṅkhyā 1 syādaṃgulirirangulataditaiśca labdhham phalam jainivbhajītena 11 Vṛtākṣetrē paridhigupītavyāspadah phalam tat Kṣunnam vedairupāri paritāḥ Kandakṣayaiva jalam 1 golāṣyavam tadaipi ca phalam pristhajam vyāsāṣaṭabhirbhaktam bhavati niyatam golagarbhe ghanākhyam Śaṣto Vibhāgopi [ca?] dairgyak-sya tasaiśvā ṣaḥbhāgayuto Vidheyah 1 bahupramāṇam Kāthitam Kalāstre Kṣetre tathāyāṇi vicārya kuryāt 11'.

65. See for instance, charters to the brahmānas, in the following chapter. Also see Mala copperplates of Guhila Vī rasimhadeva of A.D. 1287, op. cit. It records the specific boundaries of both the plot and house donated to a brāhmaṇa in village Mala. [10-12 'Mālagrāme bhūmihal sārdavahalāikasya bhūmiḥ 1 griham I agrevāṭaka pache vāḍakakhala sahitametata sāsanodakapūrvam dharme-ṇa samprāddatam.'


67. Ibid.
Bhāga was generally at the rate of one-sixth or more of the produce. Unfortunately, none of the contemporary inscriptive records from Mewar refers to the amount of land-tax charged. But an earlier reference to the imposition of lāṭa in the Saranesvara inscription of A.D. 953, has led to speculation among scholars like Somani that the rate of bhāga was high in medieval Mewar as lāṭa in medieval Rajasthan meant one-third or even half of the produce. It is necessary to point out that Somani identifies lāṭa with Bhoga, even though bhoga was an additional cess in kind occasionally imposed by the state. Since Somani identifies lata with bhoga, an occasional cess and not the usual land-tax (bhāga), his observations that rate of land-tax was high in medieval Mewar is not very convincing, especially in the absence of contemporary evidences indicating high rates of tax.

The regular collection of revenue-dues is clearly evident from the Kadia village (Udaipur) inscription of A.D. 1443 of the reign of Kumbha as well as Ekaliṅgajī temple ākṣiṇa dvāra prasāti of A.D. 1488. The state-revenue dues were termed as the rājakara. The Kadia village inscription refers to the rājakara in the village of sripājāvī that

68. Idem, Lectures on Rajput History and Culture, Delhi, 1970, p.117.

69. Dasharath Sharma finds it difficult to arrive at the actual figures of land-tax in the Pratīṭhāra empire. See RTA, op. cit., p.324.

70. op. cit., v.9, "drumāmekam karī daddvatturago rūpa Kadavyam drumārdhaviṁśakam sripī lāṭahaṭte tulādkau".

71. MK, op. cit. p.170.

72. Ibid., p.170.
extended up to its boundaries. The Ekaliṅgajī temple inscription of A.D. 1488 of the reign of Rāṇā Rāimalla instructs in the Mewari dialect, that the temples, brāhmaṇas and bhāts of village Varṣasana are exempt from all royal taxes.

None of the contemporary Guhila inscriptions directly mention the gopacara or gocara (grazing tax), unlike the twelfth century inscriptive records of the Paramāras of Abu. However, its prevalence in the Guhila revenue system of our period may not be entirely ruled out. James Tod reports the medieval custom of occasional payment of Khar-lakhar (supplying wood, forage, milk, flour, etc., by individuals to the royal army when the princes of Mewar were on the battlefield). It is obvious that these occasional levies were temporary and find no place in the Guhila inscriptions of our period.

Commercial Revenue:
Mandapikās and Māṇḍvī Tax:

The Chittaurgarh inscription of the Guhila queen Jayatalladevī (A.D. 1278) records royal cash donations from a number of maṇḍapikās to a Jain Vasāthī. The list is as follows: twentyfour dramma coins from the maṇḍapikā at


74. op. cit., concluding part is in Mewari dialect. ‘Deva brāhmaṇa bhāṭa nājkā varṣasana grāmā pūrvajane apani-dedhi tina samasta rājakara mukarar kidhā’.


77. op. cit., 11.9-12. Also see Vide Passim, Ch.III, Section: Guhilas and the Jains.
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citrakūta-talahatī (custom house at the foothill of Chittaurgarh), thirty-six dramma coins from Khohar maṇḍapikā (near Chittaurgarh) and thirtyfour dramma coins from Sajjanapura maṇḍapikā (near Chittaurgarh) besides other donations. But the crucial problem is the precise relationship between local commercial institutions such as the maṇḍapikās and the royal dynasty, as the Guhilas operated from Chittaurgarh for the first time in the mid-thirteenth century. Somani finds it difficult to define the precise nature of a maṇḍapikā, as to whether it was an office/governmental institution or a semi-official institution. Dasarath Sharma defines it as a civic institution where a sūlkasālā (collector of the custom duties) set up his sūlkasālā near the chief gate of the city.

Regarding the relationship between the maṇḍapikās and the state, B.D. Chattopadhyaya argues that although these commercial institutions might have been controlled by local merchant associations or corporate bodies, the concerned political powers ensured their regular share of the commercial revenue by retaining control over the maṇḍapikās. Such royal control represented the governmental mechanism of acquisition of the cash and the kind from the local maṇḍapikās.

---

78. op. cit.
80. RTA, op. cit., p.353.
81. The Making of Early Medieval India, op. cit., p.94.
82. To quote B.D. Chattopadhyaya, “It would appear from the social composition of those who regulated mārgādāya and maṇḍapikādāya that some form of commercial revenue farming was gradually coming into existence. This was true not only of early medieval Rajasthan but of other regions as well. The autonomous character of such bodies is suggested by the phenomenon that local merchant associations or other corporate bodies could impose levies on local communities and on the items of
However, the thirteenth century GUHILA record of queen Jayatalladevi donating dramma coins from the local Manḍapi-kāṣ to a Jain Vasahi, (noted above) does not specify the taxes collected at the manḍapikās. It is only in the fifteenth century that GUHILA records specify all the taxes collected at the manḍapikās. This indicates more meticulous assessment by the state and hence, better resource mobilization. The Delwara inscription of A.D. 1434 of Rāṇā Kumbha records royal donations of a total of fourteen taṅkās (silver coins) from the local manḍapikā and proceeds of the sale of various items for the worship of Dharmacintāmanī. The list is as follows: five taṅkās from māṇḍavī (tax from Manḍapikā), four taṅkās from Māpā (octroi), two taṅkās from Mānāheḍavāṭa (remains unidentified by H.B. Sharda, the editor of the inscription) two taṅkās from Khārīvāṭa (salt tax) and one taṅkā from Pāṭasutriyā (cloth tax) at Delwara. 83 It is evident from this record that the customs-duty collected at a manḍapikā came to be known as māṇḍavī. In other words, everybody entering an exchange centre with goods for sale had first to pay māṇḍavī at the local manḍapikās. All these cash donations were made from the royal exchange. To an extent this may have been so, but the phenomenon surely needs a more satisfactory explanation, and in a political situation where 'bureaucracy' lacked a distinctly identifiable character, one way of looking at it would be consider it a mechanism of control over the acquisition of cash and kind and over their redistribution, assuring at the same time the concerned political powers of a regular return in the form of a share. Of course, this would not apply to ad hoc levies intended as contributions to religious institutions, but then terms such as mārgādāya or manḍapikās cannot be conceived in terms of ad hoc levies alone', in his 'Markets and Merchants in early Medieval Rajasthan', Ibid., p.116.

83. H.B. Sharda, MK, op. cit., p.170. The text of the inscription is also published in Ācārya Vijayadharmanāsūrī's booklet, Devakulapāṭak. However, Sharda does not identify the tax on the item or the institution called Mānāheḍavāṭa.

...Continued...
share of the cash collected as taxes from the *maṇḍapikās*.

By the thirteenth century the Guhila state controlled both the major trade routes passing through Mewar hills, the Abu-Sirohi route and Chittaurgarh in its western, north-western and eastern frontiers respectively. Hence, the amount of the commercial transaction is a matter of conjecture which increasingly contributed towards the formation particularly of the tax called *Māpā* (octroi or toll). The major commercial items of local trade seem to have been salt (an item of transit-trade possibly coming from Sambhar region, Ajmer) and cloth which contributed separately to the state exchequer. This speaks for some state control over their sale. In fact, if cloth and salt were being taxed at Delwara near Udaipur then their passage all along the Abu-Sirohi route would have been similarly taxed. Hence, taxes such as *māpā* (octroi), *Māṇḍavi* (tax from *maṇḍapikā*), *Khārī-vāṭa* and *pāṭasutrīya* were more or less universally collected throughout the state in the fifteenth century.

The case seems to be different with the security tax. The state levied a security tax apparently in places of the pilgrimage outside Mewar. The Abu inscription of A.D. 1449 announces exemption of such levies as *valāmī* and *rāś* (kha) *valī* (tax on policing) for the pilgrims visiting Jain temples at Delwara in Arbudacala.84

Finally, the pilgrimage tax seems to have been another major source of state revenue. This levy is also attested by the above Abu record, which announces exemption of a

---

84. op. cit., 2-9, "Mahārāṇā Śrī Kumbhakaraṇ Vijayrājye Śrī Arbudacale delvārā grāme Vimal Vasahī Śrī Adinātha, Tejāvasahī Śrī Neminātha tathā bije śrāvaṇya (va) ke dehārē dāna muṇḍika valāmī rāśavālī... jyātrī āvī ... iko koi māṅgyā nā lahi' (Mewari dialect) The expression "dānavolāpānādī viśaye" in Lekhapaddhati has been translated as a tax collected by officer-in-charge who led "Volāpaka" men accompanying merchants in their journeys for the safety of their goods. See Lekhapaddhati, op. cit., p.8 and also glossary.
number of taxes including the one on pilgrimage (ācandrāk).\textsuperscript{85} The pilgrimage-tax is likely to have been utilized in the upkeep of the pilgrimage centres, specially on occasions of festivals. In addition, the ad-hoc levies for the expenditures of the daily or special rituals at the temples in many pilgrimage centres was a common practice. The evidence is that of the Delwara inscription of A.D. 1434 recording the imposition of the fourteen tānkās on travellers (entering Delwara every day) for the worship of Śrī Dharmaṃtaṇā at Delwara, Abu.\textsuperscript{86} The early instance of such ad hoc impositions can best be seen in the case of the Saranesvara temple at Ahāda.\textsuperscript{87} The practice extended to Jain temples by the fifteenth century indicating Guhila control over a larger commercial network.\textsuperscript{88} More importantly, ad hoc levies for the upkeep of the temple complexes came to be probably identified as the royal share (grāsa) by the fifteenth century. In other words, it was looked upon as a legitimate right of the state to impose such occasional levies as its own share.\textsuperscript{89}

**Local Level Administration**

Instead of the pañcakulas, thirteenth to fifteenth century records testify to the continuing importance of

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., jiko jyātri āvi tiharū Sarvāmu kābu jyātra Samāndhi ācandrāk lāgi pâyak iko koi māngvā nā lahi' (Mewari dialect).

\textsuperscript{86} op. cit., 11.15-16. ‘Evam Karai tānkā 14 Śrī Dharmaṃtaṇāpiṇḍā nimitta sā sāraṇgi samastasādhi lāgukidhu’ (Mewari dialect).

\textsuperscript{87} Saranesvara temple Inscription of A.D. 953, op. cit., vv.12-18.

\textsuperscript{88} Vide Passim, Ch.III, Section: The Guhilas and the Jains.

\textsuperscript{89} Delwara inscription of A.D. 1434, op. cit., 11.17-18, ‘Ee grāsa jiko lopoi tehārhim rāṇāśrī Hammāra rāṇā Śrīseta rāṇā Śrilāsā rā·Mokal rāṇā śrī Kumbharnānī ana chāi’. (Mewari dialect)
rural people in village administration. There is a possibility that the Pañcakulas came to function at bigger villages rather than at each and every rural settlement by this period. The Kadmal copper-plate charter of Tejasimha of A.D. 1259 records the names of the individual witnesses to the royal grants as follows: Saho Vijiyausa, brahmaṇa Golou Nālau, mantri Chanḍu, Vaṇika Vairāu Villanu, Cāhamāṇa Vāgha-raṇasiṃha, Meharans (mahattaras), Vaijāu cāvāh, Morou, Vaneu, dhābhra, and Kāndhāla. The very fact that each of the witnesses is named speaks for their status in the village Kadmal (25 km north-west of Udaipur). Secondly, the witnesses evidently represented most of the prominent social groups such as the merchants, brahmanas, Rajputs, and mahattaras. It is very much possible that all these witnesses were members of a village-level administrative organization. B.D. Chattopadhyaya observes: 'The existence of a village-level organization, exercising certain rights in the conduct of village affairs is attested by the consent given by mahājanas, the grāmiṇa and the janapada when a document specifying levies for a temple was drawn up'. In fact, the increasing execution of the royal charters in the village in the Mewari dialect in the fifteenth century should also be considered as an important indicator of taking the rural level society into serious consideration by the state-apparatus. It appears that the state was concerned about the incorporation of the rural-level residents as effectively as possible into the administrative-apparatus in which the elite residents in the local hierarchy seem to have played a significant role. However, the absence of a Pañcakulika in the thirteenth century Kadmal village need not


91. *Aspects of Rural Settlements and Rural Society, op. cit.*, p.77. The author makes this observation in the context of early medieval villages in Southeastern Marwar (Rajasthan).

92. See the following section: The Administration and the Language.
necessarily indicate its absence in the contemporary bigger villages in the Southern Rajasthan. For instance, the term pañcasrī figures in a royal charter of the Guhilas of Vagod in this period. The Mala copper plates of Vīrasiṃhadeva of A.D. 1287 recording the royal grant of one and a half halas of land and a house with enclosures at the village of Mala (about three miles from the village Baroda, district Dungarpur) specifically mentions that the writer of the record, Vikama (Vikrama), acted under the verbal orders of the pañcasrī Vāvana.\(^93\) The writer is also called a pañca while pañcasrī is the title for Vāvana. Undoubtedly, Vāvana was the chief of the Pañcakulika while Vikama was one of the five members of the same local body. The village of Mala, close to the centre of power of the Guhilas of Vagod (Vātapadraka), seems to have emerged as a bigger settlement and had grown to become a node among the surrounding rural settlements.

The political significance of such local bodies was evidently immense since the writing of the royal charters had to be ordered by the chief of the pañcakulikas. Some other members of the pañcakulika, like Vikama, apparently a Kāyastha, had to discharge their administrative duty by writing the royal record. The execution of such royal grants continued to be the responsibility of the pañcakulikas in the major rural settlements. Even a Pañcakulika had to take into account the local notables as is evident from the list of the chief witnesses to the announcement of the royal grants. The fact is borne by the expression, Kadū Vīsalasābdena sāksinah, in the concluding sentence of the Mala copper plate.\(^94\) It has been translated as Kadū Vīsala is one, on whose authority the names of the witnesses are

---

\(^93\) op. cit., 11.38-39, ‘Pañcasrī Vāvanasābdena śasanamidam pañcavikamenā likhitam’.

\(^94\) Mala Copper-Plates, op. cit., 1.39.
recorded. It is significant that Kaḍū or Kaḍūā, is one of the two sects of the Kunbī tribe. Thus, Kaḍuvīsala might have been the chief representative of the local Kunbī tribe which might have formed a major portion of the local population. He is likely to have been associated with the local ruling elite and thus a linkage between the Kunbī villages and the Guhila state of Vagod. All the above instances that prove the importance of the local bodies in village administration also suggests dispersal of the royal authority.

The Administration and the Language

The study of the administrative apparatus in the context of state formation remains incomplete without a survey of the official language of communication between the state and the populace. Although Sanskrit remained the predominant language in the official charters, terms from the Mewari dialect appear in the official inscriptions by the late twelfth century. By the fifteenth century, Mewar had official charters in the full-fledged Mewari dialect, particularly the section on business transactions. The use of local dialects instead of the courtly Sanskrit in official charters is an indicator of both the attempt of the state to reach as many social groups as possible at the local society beyond the elite strata, and consequently, the incorporation of the influential local elements into the political structure. Consequently, official charters in full-fledged Mewari dialect of the fifteenth century are a pointer to the political compulsion by which the state was being forced to use the vernacular language and not the formal language. This further strengthens our assumption that the Guhila state grew more by accommodation than by centralization.

Military Apparatus:

The Guhila state had to administer a larger territory

95. Ibid., p.192.
96. Ibid., p.196, fn no.5.
between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries with a varied socio-cultural profile. It also bordered on a number of powerful neighbours. It is significant that the thirteenth century Guhila inscriptions refer to the neighbouring powers for the first time. The other important development is the beginnings of Guhila references to a number of forts. The transfer of the capital to Chittaurgarh brought with it the additional problems of defending the new capital town, a strategic fortress, highly coveted by the neighbouring powers.

The political and military significance of the new capital is evident from such references such as ‘durganutta-ra citrakūṭa nagarasthah’ and ‘śrīcitrakūṭadurge’ in the Chiravā inscription of the Šāmṛāda family of Nāgda and ‘Śrī Citrakūṭamahādurga’ in a Jain inscription of Tejasimha’s reign from Chittaur. To defend Chittaurgarh, a chain of fortresses seem to have been contested by the Guhilas in the thirteenth century. The foothill of Chittaurgarh seems to have been the scene of a number of battles. The location of Chittaurgarh on a major route linking northern India with central and western India made it vulnerable to attacks specially from the Delhi Sultanate in the thirteenth century. The fact is evident from the expression ‘turuskāra-vat’ used for Tejasimha in the Achalgarh inscription. The Guhila reference to the ‘turuskas’ (turks) figures for the first time in the thirteenth century record. The Chiravā inscription refers to the death of Ratna (a member of the Šāmṛāda family) and Bhīmasimha (one of King Jaitrasimha’s minister) in a battle at the foot (talahaṭṭī) of Chittaurgarh. The fortress of Arthuna in Banswara seems to have been crucial in the defence of Chittaurgarh and the Mewar.

99. op. cit., v.46.
100. op. cit., v.26.
hills from the south (Paramāra attacks from Malwa in the
thirteenth century). Madana, another member of Ēmṭarāḍa
family, is eulogized for having proved his valour in the
battlefield of Utthūnaka (Arthuna, district Banswara), while
fighting with Paṅcalagudikā Jaitramalla (Paramāra King
Jayatungideva of Malwa). The fortress of Arthuna, evid-
ently a Paramāra possession in the mid-thirteenth century,
seems to have been wrested by the Guhilas from the Paramāras
at this battle. This fortress must have been coveted by the
Guhilas for a long time ever since they took over Chittaur-
garh.

The former capital, the fortress of Āhaḍā along with
Nāgdā continued to defend the Mewar hills in the thirteenth
century. A Jain text, Śrāvakapṛatipṛamāṇaṁ, of late thir-
teenth century refers to Āhaḍā as "Aghāṭamahādyadurga", (the
great fortress of Aghāṭa/Āhaḍā). The stronghold of Nāga-
drahapura is evident again from a thirteenth century refer-
ence to its destruction by the army of the Suratṛaṇa, Ill-
tutmish. The battle with Sultan Illutmish is stated to
have been fought at Bhūtālā (village Untala, 12 miles from
Nāgdā, near Udaipur). Thus the hills of Nāgdā-Āhaḍā were
no longer obstacles to invaders of Mewar. Yogarāja's
(talarakṣaka of Nāgdā) four sons, Pamarāja, Mahendra, Cham-
paka and Kṣema fought in the battle of Bhūtālā in which
Pamarāja was killed. To deal with the recurrent Caulukya-
an inroads from the south-west, the settlement of Koṭṭadaka
was captured.

102. vide Passim, Ch.III, Section: The Guhilas and the
Jains.
103. Chiravā inscription, op. cit., vv.15-16.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid., v.19.
Guhila References to the Forts: AD 13th Century

- Nāgadrahapura (Guhila Capital before Chittaurgarh)
- Citrakūṭadurgā
- Aghāṭadurgā
- Aghabādurga
- (Baghelīs)
- Kottādaka
- Guhila Control in AD 1285
- Guhila Control in AD 13th Century
- BANSWARA
- DUNGARPUR
- Utthūnaka (Arthunā) (Paramāras)
- KOTĀ
- BHILWARA
- BUNDI
- JHALAWAR
is actually situated at the periphery of the Bhil country bordering Gujarat. Koṭṭadaka is likely to have been a Caulukyan possession in the mid-thirteenth century. With King Jaitrasimha's capture of Koṭṭadaka in his fight against Rāṇā Tribhuvana (successor of Bhīmadeva II in Gujarat), the Guhilas secured a front line fortress against the Caulukyas. To defend Mewar hills from the Caulukyan forces, it was equally important to control the Godwar region. Jaitrasimha is known to have uprooted the Nāḍol Cāhamānas, (Naḍūlamulaṁkaśabāhulakṣmī). Having secured the northern frontier through the fortress of Nāḍol, the Guhilas further blocked the Caulukya passage into Mewar from the north-west by conquering the hill fortress of Abu, a Caulukya possession. Samarasimha in Achalgahr inscription is eulogised as Arbudo bijayate girirūcchahirdevaṇu vitakulūcakalratnam. The Guhila acquisition of Abu by the late thirteenth century secured the north-western boundary of Mewar. Abu controlled the trade-route of Abu-Palanpur gap, strategic for the movement of troops both from the Marwar, the north-western India and the Gujarat.

Military personnel in the thirteenth century continued to be the local Rajput chiefs. It is significant that the Kumbhalgarh inscription of A.D. 1460 describes Rāval Samarasimha, the last Guhila King of the thirteenth century, as the "jewel of all the sāmantas" (the chief sāmanta). In view of the intensifying military activities of in the thirteenth century, the military significance of all the local "sāmantas" seems to be the foremost political factor in

107. Ibid.
108. Achalesvara inscription, op. cit., v.42.
109. Ibid., v.49.
referring to the "sāmantas" in the royal prasāstis. The Achalesvarā inscription certainly hints at the military support coming from the sāmantas in the wake of the Caulukyan invasion in the reign of Guhila Sāmantasiṁhadeva, his abdication of the throne and his younger brother, Kumarasiṁha's succession following sāmantasiṁhadeva's clash with the local sāmanatas.111 It seems true to some extent that the increasing military dimension of the Guhila state in this period was one of the chief causes of the induction of the non-Rajput social groups into the administrative apparatus as more and more Rajput chiefs were essential for the making of the military personnel in the thirteenth century. In fact, non-Rajput social groups such as the Jains also joined the Rajputs at the battle-fields from the fifteenth century onwards.

The territorial integration of Merwara (a hilly-forested tract in north-western Mewar) and the incorporation of its tribal population of the Medas (Mers), possibly took place in phases between the late fourteenth and the fifteenth century. The capture of the fortress of Chelvāṭa (Jilwara, Merwara tract) attributed to Rāṇā Hammīra,112 and those of hilly fortresses of Vardhana (Badnor, Merwara) and Beratgarh (Merwara) to Rāṇā Lākhā113 seems to have begun the process of annexation of Merwara. The annals of Mewar also credit Rāṇā Khetā with subjugation of moutaineers (Mers) of Merwara and its stronghold Beratgarh and the erection of the fortress of Badnor.114 Control of the local fortresses of Merwara was essential to strengthen the royal grip over this

111. op. cit., vv.36-37, "Sāmantasiṁhanāmā Kamādhikasarvasundarasārīrah II bhūpalojani tasmādortasāmantasarvasvah II Khumānsantatīviyogavilāksalakṣmīṁ senāmdṛ-ṣṭavirāhām Guhilāṅvayasya II rājavantīṁ vasumatīṁkarot-kumārasāṁbastato ripugana napahṛtya bhūyah'.

112. Śrīṅgīrīśi inscription, op. cit., v.4.

113. Kumbhalgarh 4th Slab, op. cit., v.212.

newly acquired territory and its resources. Merwara was immensely important for the Guhila state. It was essential to command the fortresses of Merwara to defend Mewar against the sultanates of Nagaur and Gujarat. The fortresses of Merwara were to function as the frontier and Merwara could also function as a safe-retreat for the ruling family in the case of the fall of Chittaurgarh. The Merwara is defended naturally by the hills and the forests. Finally, the fortresses of Merwara could effectively function as a launching ground for the Guhila inroads into Nagaur, Ajmer and Sākambharī regions. In fact, Rāṇā Mokal's repeated references to the defeats of Firuz Shah (the sultan of Nagaur)\(^{115}\) indicate some control of the Guhilas over the northern frontiers, facilitated by the fortresses of the Merwara tract.

Similarly, the claim of conquests of fortresses in eastern Mewar attributed to Rāṇā Khetā in the local annals of Mewar could be early Guhila attempts to control the local Hada fortresses. Eastern Mewar is referred to as "Hāḍāvatī" in the contemporary Guhila records. The fortresses of Manḍalgarh, Bambaoda, etc. could function as a second line of defence for Chittaurgarh, specially against inroads from the northeastern and Malwa fronts as well as the Bundi-Kota region. Finally, they could also function as the hinterland fortresses for Chittaurgarh in case the latter was seized. It is significant that Mokal is eulogised for having gained victory over the best of the forts, citrākuṭa (rājahāṁsai-rāγamyastaddurggam citrākuṭo jayati)\(^ {116}\).

**Rāṇā Kumbha and the Building of Forts and Fortifications:**

Augmentation of the military apparatus reached its zenith under Mahārāṇā Kumbha. Traditions narrate that Kumbha built thirtytwo of the eightyfour fortresses con-

\(^{115}\) Chittaurgarh Inscription of Mokal, *op. cit.*, v.51; Śrīṅgīṛiśi Inscription of Mokal, *op. cit.*, v.14.

structured for the defence of Mewar.\textsuperscript{117} He triumphed over the enemies of his race, fortified his country with strongholds, embellished it with temples, and with superstructure of her fame laid the foundations of his own.\textsuperscript{118} To defend Mewar, Kumbha took three precise steps. The first step was to annexe or re-assert Guhila control over the forts strategic to the defence of Chittaurgarh. The next step was to construct new fortresses or fortify old ones in the captured areas strategic to Mewar. The third programme was to fortify the existing fortresses in the core. This enabled the fifteenth century Guhila state to defend the newly integrated areas as well as the core and secure the frontiers. To enhance the existing military capacity, Kumbha also added structures to the leading fortresses of Mewar. Finally, to project Mewar as a military power and to muster additional resources, Kumbha embarked upon a career of military expansion. But the programme of expansion must have been accomplished in the second half of his reign, for the first three steps of defence listed above were the essential bases for his military career. Hence, the following discussion would unfold in three sections. The first section lists and discusses the forts captured/fortified by Kumbha, strategic to Mewar. The second and the final sections would deal with the forts and military structures entirely constructed/fortified by Kumbha and his claim of the conquest of the forts external to Mewar, respectively.

Forts captured by Kumbha in the upper Banas plain, Vagod, Hāḍāvatī, Jhalawar, Godwar, etc. were:

1. Mandālgarh\textsuperscript{119}: southern Bhilwara district, (upper Banas plain).


\textsuperscript{119} Kumbhalgarh prasāsti, 4th Slab, \textit{op. cit.}, vv.263-64.
(2) Giripur\textsuperscript{120}: Dungarpur, district Dungarpur (Vagod).

(3) Yāgpur,\textsuperscript{121} referred also as Jājpur in Ekaliṅga temple \textit{dakṣiṇadvāra prasāsti}\textsuperscript{122}: Jahazpur in north-eastern district Bhilwara (upper Banas plain).

(4) Vardhamāṇagiri\textsuperscript{123}: Badnor in north-western district Bhilwara (a part of the Merwara country).

(5) Champāvatī\textsuperscript{124}: Chaparani in southern Ajmer district.

(6) Gārgarāṭa,\textsuperscript{125} also referred as Gāgarana in the Ranakpur prasāsti\textsuperscript{126} the fort of Gagraun near Jhalawar town in district Kota.

(7) Hāḍāvatī\textsuperscript{127}: the fortresses of the eastern Mewar such as Bambaoda, etc., and the Bundi-Kota belt.

(8) Śatpura\textsuperscript{128}: Khāṭkar or Khāṭu. This is possibly Khāṭgarh in the north-east of Bundi.

(9) Vṛindāvatī\textsuperscript{129}: the fortress of Bundi, the capital of Hāḍāvatī (district Bundi).

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., v.266.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., v.253; Ekaliṅga \textit{dakṣiṇadvāra prasāsti}, \textit{op. cit.}, v.43.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., v.253.
\textsuperscript{123} Kumbhalgarh Prasāsti, \textit{op. cit.}, v.254.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., v.258.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., v.259.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{op. cit.}, 1.12.
\textsuperscript{127} Kumbhalgarh prasāsti, 4th slab, \textit{op. cit.}, v.264.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., v.264.
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., v.264.
Fortifications in the Passes of the Bhomat Country (Bhils)

Beyond Mewar: South-Western and South-Eastern Rajasthan, and Malwa.
Evidences from Kumbha's epigraphical records amply prove that Kumbha had to reassert the Guhila suzerainty in Hāḍāvatī by capturing Mandalgarh and the surrounding Hāḍā fortresses. It is noted in a previous discussion\(^\text{131}\) that the Guhilas had left Mandalgarh to the Solaṃkīs and the remaining fortresses in the hands of the local Hāḍā chiefs. It has also been discussed that it was not easy for the Guhilas to annexe the Hāḍā fortresses of eastern Mewar. But it was militarily essential to create a chain of fortresses in eastern Mewar, and Kumbha not only secured Mandalgarh in the Upper Banas plain, but also attempted to control the bigger fortresses of greater Hāḍāvatī such as Vrindāvatī (Bundi), the capital-town of the Hāḍās, Khatgarh, and other fortresses in Bundī region. But the fortresses of Mandalgarh and Hāḍāvatī could only defend Chittaurgarh in the immediate north and the north-east. To defend Chittaurgarh from the increasingly hostile Malwa in the south-east, it was essential to hold the formidable fort of Gagraun, strategically situated on a hill overlooking the Kali Sindh.

The strategic situation of Gagraun makes it clear that it held the key to Malwa for Mewar. Attempts to control Gagraun reflect the reality of Guhilas power. It seems that Guhila control over the second line of defence in eastern Mewar was not only tenuous, but the actual hold over Chittaurgarh was equally questionable if the fortresses of eastern Mewar fell to invaders. Hence, by extending the line of the defence towards Malwa, attempts were made to devise a possible mechanism of securing Chittaurgarh. It is significant that a much smaller power, the Khīchīs of Gagraun were indispensable for the Guhilas. The fort of

\(^{130}\) Ibid., vv.264-65.

\(^{131}\) Ch.III Section: Linkages with the Hāḍā chiefs and the Solaṃkīs of Mandalgarh.
Giripur (Dungarpur) could guard the passes to Mewar from an invading Gujarat army: it was militarily indispensable for the defence of Mewar. It was the capital-town of the Guhilas of Vagod (Dungarpur-Banswara districts).

Besides Vagod, it was equally expedient to annex Mount Abu to control trade routes. The Sirohi and Mount Abu belt commanded routes to Godwar, Jalor (Suварнagiri) and Marwar. Increasing hostilities from the sultanates of Gujarat and Jalor created compelling necessities to build the Guhila bastions and control the existing fortresses in the region of Mount Abu and Sirohi. Thus was captured Padmanagar; the fortress of Vasan:tpur or Vasantgarh, an early medieval stronghold of the Paramāras of Abu. It had possibly come under the control of the Devā Cāhamānas by the fifteenth century. Kīrttistambha inscription states that Kumbha repopulated (possibly garrisoned it) Vasantapur (Vasantgarh) and built seven lakes near it in the vicinity of Anhalk Kund of Vaisiṣṭa (increasing water supply for the army) in Sirohi. To convert the Sirohi region into a military garrison, Kumbha built two more fortresses, Vasanti near the present town of Sirohi, and the Achalgarh near Mount Abu. "He fortified the passes between the western frontier of Mewar and Abu and erected the fort of Vasanti near Sirohi'.

Achalgarh:

The fort of Achalgarh was constructed in A.D. 1452. It is situated on a peak and seems to have been built within the ruined fortress of the ancient Paramāras of Abu (Candra-
vatī). "The upper fortress is attributed to Kumbha, but he probably only repaired this, the D'onjon of Achalgarh, which with the interior works, is of the most remote antiquity. There are the ruins of a granary, the Bhantar of Kumbha

132. op. cit., vv.8-9.

The D'omjon of a fortress is its highest 'keep' (the last post). If it falls to the enemy, the campaign is completely lost for the defending power. The Kīrttistambha inscription testifies to the construction of a huge tank, Rāmakunda, and four more tanks as reservoirs by Kumbha near the temple of Kumbhasvāmī in Achalagarh. The long association of Mahārāṇā Kumbha with the fort of Achalgarh is perhaps evident from the presence of a statue of Mahārāṇā Kumbha on horse-back with those of the two other Mahārāṇās and a bigger statue of the Purohit of Kumbha on the descent from Achalgarh to Dilwara. The above evidences along with Kumbha's Abu-inscriptions speak for the annexation of the region of Abu-Sirohi by Kumbha.

**Kumbha and the Merwara:**

Although the seizure of the fort of Vardhamāna-giri (Badnor) have been attributed to Rāṇā Lākhā, but its recapture by Rāṇā Kumbha speaks of the difficulty of holding a Meda stronghold. To ensure its retention, Kumbha is known to have built a new fortress at Vairat near Badnor. The fortresses of Badnor and Vairat were to be utilized in integrating the Merwara as well as in creating a second line of defence for the newly constructed second capital-town of Kumbhalgarh in Merwara. These fortresses were equally important to engage an invading army from the central Rajasthan.

134. Tod, Travels in Western India, op. cit., p.94.
137. Vide Passim, Ch.III, Section C: Kumbha and the Devdā Cāhamānas of Sirohi.
138. Kumbhalgarh prāsāsti, 4th slab, op. cit., v.212, "Medānārādhabhallasādulla sattadēbhārbhārabhārvānavidh vastadhāvīrāyā kāram, kāram yo grahīdurgatiyā dagdhārāti vardhanākhkhyam girindram'.
139. Kumbhalgarh prāsāsti, 4th Slab, op. cit., v.254.
and the Delhi sultanate. They are likely to have been entrusted to a band of comparatively trusted chiefs. In the absence of direct and contemporary evidence, it is difficult to comment upon the posting of the actual chiefs at Badnor and Vairat in the reign of Kumbha. However, there is a possibility that both these strongholds might have been conferred upon those chiefs who were new entrants to the Guhila court. Posting of the new Rajput chiefs in such sensitive peripheral areas would have ensured less trouble for the state. This is because the new Rajput elements could only emerge politically dominant by banking upon their linkages with the royal family. It is important that a contemporary official record refers to Kumbha's Gauḍa queen, the mother of Rāṇā Rāimalla.140 It is also evident from the Badvādevīdān Khyāt that Rajput lineages like the Gauḍas and Tomars were emerging prominent for the first time in Guhila polity during Kumbha's reign. Badvādevīdān lists a Gauḍa and a Tomār queen for Rāṇā Kumbha.141 Therefore, it is not unlikely that some Gauḍa and Tomār chiefs (queens' kinsmen) might have been appointed to take charge of the forts of Badnor and Vairat. Although Khyāts might also reflect the fact that the Rajput chiefly families of the Gauḍas and Tomārs in Mewar are likely to have claimed social prestige later on by tracing matrimonial links with the legendary Kumbha, the absence of their strongholds in the fifteenth century Mewar strengthens our assumption that the Rajput chiefs other than the Hāḍās, Rāṭhaurs, Solarīkīs or Paramāras (local Rajput chiefs) are likely to have been appointed in controlling the fortresses of Merwara. Moreover, contemporary reference to the Gauḍa queen indicates presence of her kinsmen. The subsequent history of Badnor however proves that the military paṭṭās (service deeds) were not necessari-

140. Ekaliṅga daḵṣiṇa dvārapa Prasāsti, op. cit., Mewari part, 1.16 & 19, 'Sri Kumbhakarṇaṁ putra Gauḍarajanya vam-sābharaṁ rāṇi sri Puvādaṁ garbharatna aśva, kalpaṁ-kalpadrum mahāraṁyā sri Rāimalla rājye'.

141. Badvādevīdān Khyāt, op. cit., p.5.
ly hereditary in nature. Mahārāṇā Sāṅgā (early sixteenth century) is known to have conferred Badnor on Duṅgar Simha Cāhamāṇa, a famous official in Mahārāṇā’s army. His sons and nephews all lost their lives in the siege of Ahmadnagar. Muhnout Nainsīt confirms this fact. The case of Badnor suggests that the court never made the office of a fort-incharge, a hereditary post in such militarily and politically sensitive areas as Merwara tract.

Kumbhalgarh:

The greatest Guhila achievement in Merwara was the construction of the Kumbhalgarh fort by Rānā Kumbha. The text Saṅgītarājaja refers to the fort of Kumbhalgarh variously as Agastīpura, Kamesvārigiri, Mahiśmerū and Mahiścāla. The Kīrtistambha inscription eulogises the fort. It was designed and built by Kumbha’s famous architect Mandana. The construction began in A.D. 1443 and was completed in A.D. 1458. It is situated at the top of a hill 914 metres high and is at a distance of 64 kilometres from Udaipur. The location of this fortress overlooking the Godwar region on its north-west and commanding the Merwara belt made it more difficult to approach than Chittaurgarh because of its steep hilly terrain and the surrounding forests. The winding road leads over deep ravines through forests. About thirteen Aravalli peaks surround it and make it impregnable.

Local annals emphasise the association of the Meda tribe with Kumbhalgarh at the early stage of its construc-

142. Cited in Harbilas Sarda, Mahārāṇā Sāṅgā, op. cit., p.80.
143. op. cit., Appendix IV, p.680, sub-page: ṇa.
144. op. cit., vv.126-146.
tion. Local legends claim that these mountain ranges were conquered by Kumbha from a Meda ruler. The vanquished Meda is said to have offered himself as a voluntary sacrifice for the foundations of the fortress. A shrine at the bottom of the fort has been raised over the head of the Meda, and another on the highest terrace of the fort over the body of the vanquished Meda King.\textsuperscript{147} It is relevant to mention the Medas here for they too seem to have influenced the programme of construction of military structures at Kumbhalgarh discussed below. The fact that the very purpose of erecting this fortress was the personal security of the royal family besides a military function, is evident from the following description of its series of defensive walls and gateways. 'In the distance, wall after wall appears. Seven great gates stand sentinel at the approaches, and seven ramparts, one within the other, with crenellated walls, strengthened by rounded bastions and immense watch towers, make this fort strong and impregnable with seven formidable gateways'.\textsuperscript{148} It is known that the fort could support three thousand troops with provisions for a year and provide drinking water through small tanks, spread over the whole fort.\textsuperscript{149} Such vast security arrangements at this fort, which served as a royal residence too, raise interesting questions as to the actual power of the Guhila kings even at their capital Chittaurgarh. Kumbhalgarh was the stand-by capital if Chittaurgarh fell. But what has been ignored is the importance of the personal security realized by Rāṇā Kumbha. Assassinations of Guhila rulers including Mokal and Kumbha\textsuperscript{150} reveal their vulnerability. Intrigues and conspiracies at the royal court left the royal family insecure

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., pp.107-108.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., p.108.
\end{flushleft}
at Chittaurgarh. Both the location and the inhospitable terrain of Kumbhalgarh offered Kumbha a refuge. Hence, he is known to have undertaken a massive programme of building of bastions and gates here. Secondly, the presence of the recalcitrant Medas evident from the Guhila recapture of their strongholds near Kumbhalgarh also necessitated constructions of safety walls at Kumbhalgarh.

Kumbhalgarh was further defended by yet another inner fort, Kātārgarh, on a conical hillock.¹⁵¹ It is well-known that 'The highest monument of Kumbha's military and constructive genius... is the wonderful fortress of Kumbhalgarh or Kumbhalmer, second to none in strategic importance.... It was to this impregnable fortress that the Maharanas of Mewar always turned their eyes, when Udaipur became unsafe and Chittor untenable'.¹⁵² Finally, the association of Kuntipur with Rāṇā Kumbha¹⁵³ indicates that he built another small fortress near Kumbhalgarh at Ranakpur. Kuntīpur of Saṅgītarāja is identified with Ranakpur.¹⁵⁴

In addition, Kumbha is known to have built the fortress of Machan to defend Sheṛā Nallah and that of Devgarh to contain the Medas.¹⁵⁵ Devgarh is situated to the north-west of Kumbhalgarh on the bank of river Khari bordering the districts of Pali, Ajmer and Bhilwara.

¹⁵¹. James Tod writes, 'It would be vain to attempt describing the intricacies of approach to this far-famed abode, ... A massive wall, with numerous towns and pierced battlements, ...the eye ranges over the sandy deserts and the chaotic mass of mountains which are on all sides, covered with the cactus, which luxuriates amidst the rocks of the Aravalli'. See Annals, Vol.I, op. cit., p.670.


¹⁵⁴. Ibid.

The forts of Yāgpur/Jājpur (Jahazpur in the north-eastern part of Bhilwara district) and Champāvatī in the north-eastern part of upper Banas plain were militarily essential to guard the northern frontier, as well as the forts of Badnor and Vairat in Merwara tract, and as a second line of defence to Manḍalgarh and other Ḍāḍā forts in Eastern Mewar. A seventeenth century official source, the Amarakāvyam, ascribes the conquest of Jahazpur to Rāpā Khetā and also mentions that it was a stronghold of the Kheradā Rajputs. However, the fifteenth century Guhila inscriptions cited above show that Kumbha captured Jahazpur possibly for the first time, even as traditions and the seventeenth century official sources indicate that Guhila attempts to control Jahazpur began in the pre-Kumbha period. The fort of Champāvatī, north of Jahazpur, is likely to have functioned as a complimentary stronghold defending Jahazpur.

**Kumbha and the Bhomat:**

Similar to his policy in the Merwara, Kumbha took necessary military steps to defend strategic forts in the central parts and western borders of the Mewar hills against the Bhils. Sporadic and recurrent Bhil revolts characterized the fourteenth-fifteenth century history of Mewar. Kumbha is popularly credited with the building of fortresses to contain the Bhils of Bhomat. "He built various other forts to overawe Bhumia Bhils of Jarole and Panora,..." The association of some of the fortresses of Mewar with Kumbha in the Sangītarāja proves the point. The list is as follows: Kalyāṇapur (ancient Kiṣkindha/Kiṣkindhipur), Maṇipur (Ratanpur near Koṭḍa), Mahadamhamātrikāpur (Yoginī-pura/zawar) and Suklapura (Dhavalapura/Dhuleva near zawar


As evident from the map, these four fortresses are situated almost in a straight line east of Jarole and Panarwa. This chain of fortresses stands as a guard not only against the Bhils of Jarole and Panarwa but also seems to be militarily significant in controlling a major part of the Bhotmat as well as the Chappan, the Bhil countries in the south-west and the southern parts of Mewar, respectively.

Kumbha and the Capital town, Chittaurgarh

Finally, the chain of forts remains incomplete without an examination of the capital, Chittaurgarh. Unlike Gwalior which is mentioned for its strength and invincibility in contemporary Persian works such as Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi, and Al-Badaoni's Muntakhab-i-Tawarikh, Chittaurgarh does not find mention on the same scale in the contemporary Persian works. But, indirect references to its military might and the military support it enjoyed from its hinterland as well as the en-route forts can be gleaned from one of the contemporary Persian texts. The Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi of Ziau-din Barni, gives the following account of Alaud-din's return from Chittaurgarh after his first siege. 'The Sultan now returned from the conquest of Chitor, where his army had suffered great loss in prosecuting the siege during the rainy season... the Sultan had just returned from Chitor, and had had no time to refil and recruit his army after his great losses in the siege...'. The hill-features and its natural fortifications undoubtedly played a very significant military role in defending the fort and had the advantage of functioning as a natural watch-tower for the sur-


rounding landscape. If Bhīṣmapurā (identified as Hammīrapura) of Sangītarāja can be identified with Hammītragarh of the Southern Bhilwara district, it would not be inaccurate to suggest that Kumbha had either built or fortified an old fort on the banks of the Banas with a view to defend the capital-town of Chittaurgarh.

Pre-Kumbha Guhila fortifications at Chittaurgarh are evident from the surviving fragments of the palace attributed to Rāvat Chūṇḍā, the eldest son of Rāṇā Lākhā (the late fourteenth to the early fifteenth centuries) including a watch tower, standing at the north-western corner of a building. In fact, Tillotson points out that such architectural pattern of the fifteenth century palaces at Chittaur is a continuation of a long-established tradition. Contemporary records testify amply to the programme of defence undertaken by mahārāṇa Kumbha at the fortress of Chittaurgarh. The Kīrttisthambha inscription states that in A.D. 1450 Kumbha built a new bastion with battlements at Kumbhalgarh. The same record ascribes the erection of the following gates: Rāmpol (the pol or pratoli means gateway), Hanumānpol, Bhairavapol, Laksūmpol, Chamunḍāpol, Tārāpol and Rājapol to Kumbha. The last four pols are now popularly known as Laksūmānpol, Jāolpol, Gaṇesāpol and

161. B.D. Mishra, op. cit., p.11. Prabhakar V. Begde also observes, "The fort is defended by a formidable crenelated curtain wall. The fort was approached from three sides, north, east and west" along difficult paths with gates at intervals over the ascent, op. cit., p.104.

162. op cit., p.680, sub-page: ṇa.


164. Ibid.

165. op. cit., vv.26, 184, 187.

166. Ibid., vv.184 and 187.
Padalpol. Kirttistambha inscription also mentions that he built the main road up the hill for the smooth passage of carriages. Kumbha also took necessary steps to ensure a regular supply of water to the fort by getting Ramakuṇḍa, several stepped wells, and reservoirs constructed.

An idea of Kumbha's contributions to the making of this fortress as a military focal point of the Guhila state as well as attempting to ensure the security of the royal family can also be perceived from the locational and architectural feature of Kumbha's palace. This was situated on the western side of the fort, mile approached through the two gateways from the east, Bāḍī Pol and Tripoliā. These gates lead to a Darikhānā or Sabhā, a low hypostyle hall which seems to conceal the main entrance in the south facade to the private apartment. A small doorway in the back of the Sabhā gives access to a flight of stairs which leads up into the body of the palace. The north-western corners of the palace is flanked by two towers. The towers had three storeys, each a single square chamber. The central block consisted of two rectangular chambers, and a roof terrace. In front of the whole apartment is a small chowk (courtyard) and the entrance to the apartment is from this chowk. The interior arrangement of this set of towers points to its military purpose. They definitely functioned as the watch-towers.

Having ensured Mewar of a strong chain of fortresses, Rāṇā Kumbha claimed victory over the following forts of neighbouring polities.

168. op. cit., vv.34-35.
170. Ibid., pp.40-41.
171. Ibid., p.44.
Mahoragapura of the *Sāṅgītarāja*\(^{172}\) or Nāgapur of the *Kīrttistambha praśāsti*,\(^{173}\) - the fort of Nāgaur (central Rajasthan) under the suzerainty of the sultanate of Gujarāt, Vedikāgiri of the *Sāṅgītarāja*\(^{174}\) or Hāḍāvatī of the Kumbhalgarh *praśāsti*\(^{175}\) - fortresses of Bundi-Kota region east of Maṇḍālgarh in the possession of the Hāḍās, Śrīpur of the *Sāṅgītarāja*\(^{176}\) - Śrīnagar near Ajmer, possibly a Rāṭhaur possession in the fifteenth century, Saṅgmatī of the *Sāṅgītaraṇāja*\(^{177}\) - tentatively identified with Saṅgāner near Jaipur. Possibly, the Delhi sultanate (Saleeds) claimed suzerainty over this part (north-eastern) of Rajasthan which was emerging as a domain of the Kacchawāhās. The Suvarpa-giri of the *Sāṅgītarāja*\(^{178}\) - the fort of Jalor (Hassan Khan Pathan held Jalor in this period under the suzerainty of the sultanate of Gujarāt), Ajaymerū of the Ranakpur *praśāsti*\(^{179}\) - the fort of Ajmer, a Rāṭhaur possession, Sāraṅgapura of the Ranakpur *praśāsti*\(^{180}\) or Khalji or Kuraṅgagiri of the *Sāṅgītarāja*\(^{181}\) fort of Sārāṅpur in Malwa, south-east of Jhalawar, Mandovarapur of the Kumbhalgarh *praśāsti*\(^{182}\) - the Rāṭhaur fort of Maṇḍor near Jodhpur, Janakacala of the

\(^{172}\) op. cit., p.680, sub-page: ʂa.

\(^{173}\) op. cit., vv.20-22.

\(^{174}\) Ibid., p.680, sub-page: ʂa.

\(^{175}\) op. cit., v.264.

\(^{176}\) op. cit., p.680, sub-page: ʂa.

\(^{177}\) Ibid., p.680, sub-page: ʂa.

\(^{178}\) Ibid.

\(^{179}\) op. cit., 1.12.

\(^{180}\) Ibid.

\(^{181}\) op. cit., p.680, sub-page: ʂa.

\(^{182}\) oc. cit., v.249.
Mahārāṇā Kumbha And Guhila Control of Forts
Beyond Mewar:
( Western, Central and Eastern Rajasthan AD 15th Century)
Kumbhalgarh *prasāti*¹⁸³ - the Khalji forts of Malwa, Mallanārāyaṇapur of the Ranakpur *prasāti*¹⁸⁴ - the fort of Mālaraṇa near Sawai Madhopur (likely to be in the possession of a local Rajput chief), Raṇasthambha of the Kumbhalgarh *prasāti*¹⁸⁵ - the fort of Raṇastambhor near Sawai Madhopur (being close to Mallanārāyaṇapur, Raṇastambha is likely to have been under the same Rajput power) Chāṭsu - the fort of Chāṭsu near Jaipur (possibly a Kaśchīwāhā stronghold),¹⁸⁶ Khāṭu of the Ranakpur *prasāti*¹⁸⁷ - the fort of Khāṭu near Jaipur, a Rāthaur possession, Amardakagiri of the Sangītarāja¹⁸⁸ - the fort of Amradādrī or Amber, the political-seat of the Kaśchīwāhās.

Such massive campaigns undoubtedly reflect a diversion of resources to the Guhila state in the fifteenth century. It is significant that the fifteenth century world of the Guhilas was dominated by the forts, indicating the Guhila dependence on them for the strategic and the economic reasons. The resources diverted from the neighbouring forts undoubtedly went into the making of the massive fortresses and the temple-complexes particularly in the reign of Rāṇā Kumbha.

**The Horse and Military Apparatus of Mewar**

The fifteenth century sources from Mewar clearly indicate the presence of horses and elephants in the royal army. The *Rājavallbhmandana* provides details of the constructions of horse and elephant stables separately in the campuses of

¹⁸³. *op. cit.*., v.256.
¹⁸⁴. *op. cit.*., 1.12.
¹⁸⁵. *op. cit.*., v.261.
¹⁸⁶. Ranakpur *prasāti*, *op. cit.*., 1.13.
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the forts. The Rāîmalla Rāṣā, a bardic account of Mahāraṇa Rāîmalla (Kumbha's son and successor) provides a long list of chiefs and their horses in the army of the Rāṇa in the fight against Zaffar Khan, the Khalji governor of Malwa. The famous battle of Manḍalgarh against the Khaljis is also recorded by the Ekāṅgajī temple Daksīna dvāra prasāṭi. The Rāîmalla Rāṣā also makes a significant mention of control and distribution of horses on the eve of battle. It is stated that Mahāraṇa Rāîmalla himself distributed the horses (indicating royal control over the best horses/the Arabic breed) to all the chiefs on the eve of the battle with the Khaljis.

The bardic texts from Rajasthan such as the Bhagdāvat Devnārāyaṇa Mahāgāthā narrating the tale of a Gurjara community from central and southern Rajasthan claiming Cāhamāna lineage and tracing their history from the Cāhamāna Vīsa-devrāo’s reign (early thirteenth century) throws significant light on the breeding of horses by the Bagdāvats. It is significant that centres in Mewar such as Rupaheli, Badnaur, Bagor, Asind, etc., are repeatedly mentioned in this ballad. The Arabic text, Zafarul-wali-Bi-Muzaffar-wali.

189. op. cit., pp.97-98, for instance see vv.24-29, "turāṅga mānām grihavāṃbhāge sālā catuḥṣaṭṭikara vidheṇa satā- dat madhyamikā ca dairghayu koniyāśī tairdāśabhīrvihīna lī tejohānīmanī hari vidadhate pūrṇaparāsyam nṛnām te yāmyottaratomukhā hī satātaṁ kīrttiyarsō dhānyakam rāgābdhyamgulakaisty vājivijayosītyā tathā bhaieravah saptadha 11 Iti aśvasālā lī Simhadvārām pūrvamānena kāryam syaṭam madhye ldgaḥkau raksanārtham tulāv vāpi sārdhāi 11 bhage daksīṇāvāmade ca karīnām sālā hared- vāritah nagaścinirgadito mando nandaih karairuchchhritah 11 Iti gajasālā'.

190. op. cit., vv.77-78.


narrates an interesting anecdote: merchants complained to the Sultan Mahmud I of Gujarat regarding the seizure of their horses by the King of Abu (Mount Abu) in A.D. 1458-59. Such anecdotes certainly testify to the military importance of horses.

The present chapter discusses the important changes in the administrative and the military apparatus of the Guhila state between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries. The changes essentially relate to the growing importance (qualitative difference) of various administrative offices and a significant change in administrative personnel. Unlike the early medieval situation, increasing royal control over the mandapikās, the items of commerce and taxation directly point towards the growth of state power by the thirteenth century through the incorporation of more and more locally, influential social groups into the administrative apparatus. Instead of the Rajput chiefs in the early medieval period, the members of the non-Rajput social groups such as the wealthy and the influential Jains, Tāṃtāraḍā family of Nāgdā, etc., emerged as the important administrative functionaries between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries. The change in the nature of the administrative personnel reminds us of Henri Stern's observations on the royal court of the Rajput states in which the departments of


194. Norman P. Ziegler in his study of the Rāṭhāur state discusses linkages between the Rāṭhāur land grants to the different Rajput chiefs and the maintenance needs for the horses. These paṭṭā grants were being extensively used in the time of Rāo Gaṅgo to enforce the obligations of the service to the state and to recruit the new Rajputs into the military services. See his "Evolution of the Rathor State of Marvar: Horses, Structural Change and Warfare" in Susan Rudolph, et. al., The Idea of Rajasthan Explorations in Regional Identity, vol.II, OP. Cit., p.199.
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the royal administration are generally directed by the high
dignitaries of the non-Rajput castes such as the brāhmaṇas,
the osvāls and the kāyasthas.\textsuperscript{195} As the political structure
changed in the fifteenth century, so did the Rajput compo-
nents in the military apparatus. Instead of the Paramāras,
Hūnas, Rāstrakūtas and Cāhamānas of the tenth to the twelfth
centuries, the newly emerging Rajput chiefs such as the
Hāḍās, Kherādas, Gauḍas, Tomārs, Solaṅkīs, Sāṅkhīs, etc.,
contributed to the making of military leadership in the
fifteenth century. The increasing Guhila hold over a chain
forts and fortresses beyond the Mewar hills and Chittaurgarh
unlike their early medieval situation proves an extended
line of defence in the fifteenth century. Similarly, the
Guhila state fortified or built the new bastions in the
tribal areas of the Bhomat (Bhils) and the Mewara (Medas)
in the fifteenth century to defend the extended core-areas
and the northern frontiers respectively. The massive pro-
gramme of the construction of the gateways and the addition-
al bastions at Kumbhalgarh and Chittaurgarh secured the
personal security of the royal family amidst court-intrigues
and conspiracies, than act as the mere military structures.
Finally, our study of the administrative and military appa-
ratus of the state of Mewar between thirteenth and fifteenth
centuries reveals that the state apparatus grew in strength
by sharing, accommodating, and delegating governmental power
to the different locally, important social groups rather
than by centralizing state-power.

\textsuperscript{195} op. cit., p.67.