CHAPTER V

SOURCES OF LEGITIMATION OF THE GUHILA STATE:
THE RELIGIOUS DIMENSION

I

Any study of state formation will remain incomplete without an enquiry into the aspect of legitimation of royal power. Early medieval states derived validation of authority from diverse sources. At the core of the legitimation was the relationship between a sacred authority and a temporal power, which for early Indian monarchical organization continued to be defined by the relationship between the brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya. In the early medieval period the temple had emerged as the nucleus of a sacred space and various sects, with their institutional locus in monasteries and temples came to develop close links with royalty. Royal power therefore drew upon ideological and symbolic support in diverse ways. We begin with a discussion on the pattern of the landgrants which were made to brāhmaṇas, as well as their presence in the royal court followed by an analysis of the origin myths of the Guhilas, and finally, a survey of the religious situation in early medieval Mewar, royal patronage of a particular cult centre and the sect associated with it. We will highlight the process through which the Guhila monarchy affiliated itself to the central cult of Ekaliṅga in Mewar and drew legitimation from it and how the protagonists of Ekaliṅga successfully integrated the various local religious traditions and local tīrthas to shape the traditions of Mewar.

Recent literature on legitimation provides some excellent studies on the interdependence of the sacred and the temporal. While Sibesh Bhattacharya discusses the power of the brāhmaṇas vis-a-vis the kṣatriyas with the rise of mahajanapadas leading to the political power of the royal
priests in validating the growing state power, 1 Louis Dumont and J.C. Heesterman highlight the dependence of the priest on the king for subsistence so that the brāhmaṇa trades his transcendental authority to legitimize temporal power in return for material benefit. 2 In a more specific study, Romila Thapar discussing social mobility amongst elite groups in early India, remarks that the rise of the local ruling families to political power was possibly faster in the post-Gupta period when memories of their low caste origins had to be rapidly expunged. 3 Hence, genealogists grew in status with the multiplication of small, regional kingdoms during the period. Consequently, the political rise of the brāhmaṇas can be traced to their absorptions in the court. 4 By the medieval period the office of purohita is not only frequently hereditary but has also been politicized. 5 B.D. Chattopadhyaya in his analysis of the origin of the Rajputs highlights the significance of the changing genealogical claims of the leading Rajput families. 6 The fabrication of genealogies clearly reflects upward mobility.

If the landgrants to the brāhmaṇas ensured the territo-

---


3. "Social Mobility in Ancient India with Special Reference to Elite Groups", in her Ancient Indian Social History: Some Interpretations, op. cit., p.133.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.136.

rrial spread of state-society, the bhakti ideology, by integrating local cults and tirthas into the expansive Puranic fold, made the temple the institutional focus that effectively linked temporal power with the sacred domain in the early medieval period. Such an alliance could be achieved through two possible mechanisms. The King could seek to appropriate the sacred domain through a process of identification with the divinity enshrined in the temple (a practice initiated by the Pallavas and augmented by the Colas and similar to the Devaraja cult of Southeast Asia). The second way was to surrender temporal power to the divinity (like the dedication of the Kingdom of Orissa to the cult of Jagannatha by the imperial GaNgas). Hermann Kulke has worked out details of the royal patronage of tribal deities in the early stage of state formation and patronage of a supra-local cult centre in the later stages of state formation in Orissa.

Modes of legitimation through cult centres continuously changed through different stages of state formation. Orissa in the early medieval period witnessed royal patronage of local or regional cults, deeply influenced by the emergence of bhakti movements with its strong local and regional roots as the genuine popular religion. Legitimation ranged from princely patronage of tribal deities by upcoming monarchs, to construction of imperial temples by rulers of regional kingdoms. During the medieval period royal religious policy shifted its emphasis to patronage of places of pilgrimage

8. Ibid., p.199.
and their cults and sectarian leaders.\textsuperscript{11} The "imperial" temples popularized mythical accounts of founder-kings of the "hoary past" with legendary accounts of former imperial royal donors and descriptions of more recent historical local kings.\textsuperscript{12}

The political purpose served by such mechanisms is obvious. For instance, comparison between Hindu temple cults and the cults of autochthonous local deities certainly induced people to draw comparisons between the status of their earlier tribal chiefs and that of the new 'Hindu' rājā.

But tribal groups were not the only components of the political structure of the states of early medieval times. There were bigger and smaller sāmantas controlling nuclear and peripheral areas beyond the core. The transition from a sub-regional to a regional state meant integration of these areas and incorporation of local sāmantas. In other words, having surveyed the process of horizontal legitimation, we enter into the arena of vertical legitimation as the state attains the status of a regional power. Kulke observes that the Hindu rājās achieved integration of "dangerous feudal forces" by the following three ritual means. Rulers patronized tīrthas of regional and all-India importance within their respective states. There was also systematic settlement of the brāhmaṇas throughout the territorial expanse. Finally, there was the construction of grand new temples. Kulke points out that lack of scholarly attention to these great temples is surprising, for they were built in various regional states precisely in the period of the "heyday of political feudalism".\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Hermann Kulke, "Preface", \textit{Kings and Cults}, \textit{op. cit.}, p.ix.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp.9-10.
\end{itemize}
Kulke has shown that the Gaṅga state in Orissa, ably combined both vertical and horizontal legitimation through their patronage of the sub-regional autochthonous Jagannātha cult. The cult of Jagannātha came to acquire the status of the "King of the Orissan Empire" (Odisā-rajya-rājā)\textsuperscript{14} under whose overlordship (sāmarājya) the Gajapati Kings ruled as his deputy (ravutā) and son (putra) from the early thirteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{15}

An excellent survey of the linkage between the monarchy and cult centres in the state of tribal Bastar was made by the anthropologist Surajit Sinha. It is important to note that many of the local chiefs including Rāj Gonds of Bhopalpatnam are perhaps of earlier origin than the Kākatiya state of Bastar.\textsuperscript{16} For Wilfred Grigson: "All these facts indicate that before Annamdeo's arrival there was a nominal suzerainty of Warangal over most of Bastar, the authority resting with local chiefs, or in the heads of old tribal organisation that was a marked feature of the medieval kingdoms of the eastern Central Provinces and some of the Chotanagpur and the Orissa estates".\textsuperscript{17} In this context the cult of the royal goddess Dantesvari or Mānikesvari (Māoli) becomes central to the legitimation process of state formation in
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\textsuperscript{14} Hermann Kulke, Anangabhīma III, the Veritable Founder of the Gajapati Kingship and of the Jagannātha Trinity at Puri, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.21-22. Here, the concept of empire has been used by the Gajapati dynasty as a symbol of their sovereignty over the entire region of Orissa.

\textsuperscript{15} Idem, 'Early Royal Patronage of the Jagannātha Cult', \textit{Ibid.}, pp.150-55.


tribal Bastar.18

States and cult centres in South India have received wide attention. Research ranges from the study of religious cults and institutions of Deccan, temple cities in Tamilnadu in the Cola period, Kālāmukha and Kāpālika monasteries in Karnataka in the Cāulukya period, to the study of the Sthalapurāṇa Cidambaramāhātmyam. R.N. Nandi's approach towards the study of cults and religious institutions in Deccan remains embedded in the context of "feudal" state in early medieval period. The kings, governors and their officials with their vast resources, patronized local temples and their sects or particular sects, such as the Kālāmukhas of Karnataka, Tamilnadu, and Andhra Pradesh to legitimize increasing extractions in cash, kind and labour.19 In a work of a similar genre but highlighting the validation of monarchical power, Keshavan Veluthat cites the case of the Pallavas, who chose to identify with divine or Purānic figures, with the consecration of kings in the temples.20 David N. Lorenzen in his detailed study of the Sāivite Kālāmukhas and Kāpālikas of early medieval Deccan highlights for the first time the socio-religious importance and popu-

18. Surajit Sinha writes, "The most striking feature about the Bastar State is the completeness of interaction between the cults of the tribals and those of the Raja. The cult of the royal goddess Danteswari, Manikeswari or Mooli has spread over wide areas in Bastar, although when she is worshipped by the local tribal priests, the rituals become necessarily simple with local non-Sanskritic connotations. On the occasion of the Dussehra festival it is customary for all these village priests to bring the emblems of their gods and goddesses, and to assemble these around the emblem of the royal goddess Danteswari at Jagdalpur", State Formation and Rajput Myth in Central India, op. cit., p.69.


larity of these sects, that drew royal patronage.  

R. Champakalakshmi observes changing royal patronage to the temples cities of the medieval south. The city of Kudāmukka witnessed a general decline of Cola temples, but there emerged new centres of religious importance in the post-Cola Vijayanagar-Nāyak periods. A distinct shift is noted in royal patronage from the Saiva to the Vaiṣṇava religious institutions. For instance, new temples of Rāmasvāmi and Cakrapāṇi dotted the landscape of Kudāmukku. Similar royal patronage to the Śaṅkaracārya maṭha and the Vīra Saiva maṭha in the city of Kumbhakonam is recorded from the period of Vijayanagar onwards. Champakalakshmi further contributes towards the study of state and cult in her review-essay of Burton Stein's Peasant State and Society in which she points out the utilization of the cult of Śivalīṅga by the early Colas in legitimizing their power.  

Hermann Kulke in his recent study of Cidambaramāhātm- vam, analyses the political significance of the legend of Hiraṇyavarman and the career of the Cola King Kulottunga I. Kulke observes that we meet with a historical figure in Hiraṇyavarman whose legendary story alludes to a historical  

23. Ibid.  
25. R. Champakalakshmi, Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India: A Review Article in IRSHR Vol.XVIII, Pts.3-4(1981), p.420. "The early Chola temples, ..., systematically used the liṅga mainly due to its assimilative character as the only convenient aniconic form which could incorporate in canonical temples, local and popular cult practices centering round the Kandu or pillar and tree, thus providing constantly widening orbit for bringing in divergent socio-economic and ethnic groups into Saiva worship".  

223
situation. 26

Finally, the linkage between state and cult was not the domain of Purānic sects alone but also permeated the history of heterodox sects. The observation has been made specially in the case of Jainism in early Karnataka. R.B.P. Singh in his detailed research on the growth of Jain monasticism in early medieval Karnataka quotes a number of contemporary records to prove the close links between the Jaina ācāryas and the members of the ruling elite in Karnataka. 27 The Kadambas, Gaṅgās, Western Cālukyas, Rastrakūṭas, later Western Cālukyas, and Hoysāḷās championed the cause of Jainism in Karnataka during the fifth to twelfth centuries.

II

The earliest legitimation of Guhila power seems to have been provided by the brāhmaṇas. The Guhila land-grant charters to the brāhmaṇas, particularly migrating from Ujjain, in the seventh century dominate the pattern of legitimation of the local states. The period also precedes the period of royal patronage to any particular religious sect. Guhila King Bheṭṭi turned the village of Ubbaraka into an agrahāra grant in favour of brāhmaṇa Bhaṭṭināga of Candratrāya gotra and Vājasenaya cārāṇa for the religious merit of Mahārāja Bappadatti (king's father) in A.D. 679-80. 28 King Bābhāṭa granted two plots in the village of Mitrapallikā in Maṇḍalacchaka to five brāhmaṇa brothers, viz., Gopāditya, Gopādyā, Debhāṭa, Debhāṭa Dhondhā and


27. R.B.P. Singh, Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka: C. A.D. 500-1200, Delhi, 1975, p.109. "The Jaina epigraphs as well as the literary texts from Karnataka reveal that some of the Jaina teachers acted as preceptors or instructors to Kings, princes, and feudal lords who ruled over different parts of Karnataka. Pujiyapada, Jainasena, Gunabhadra, Ajitasena-bhattaraka and Vadighangala Bhatta were some of the prominent Jaina teachers who took active interest in the day-to-day activities of the royal courts'.

Gopasvāmin, son of Gopa of Kurāgiri in A.D. 688-89. 29 The fact that three out of five Kiṣkindhā Guhila records were royal landgrant charters to brahmāṇas in the seventh century itself is an indicator of the political role of the migrating brāhmaṇas. These landgrants were made for the performance of such yajñas as bali, cāru, sattra, vaisvadeva, agnihotra, etc., by the donee. 30 The grant consisted of a village (name is lost) in Purāpatṭa viṣaya. 31

If the Pāṣupatas legitimized increasing Guhila power in the growing Guhila state of Mewar, brāhmaṇas validated Guhila power in areas of territorial expansion in the eleventh century. Unālācārya (son of ṛṣyacārya Sāhīya and belonging to the Vatsa gotra and Madhyandinā cāraṇa) from Nāgarādra was settled in the village of Pali (modern town of Pali in Godwar) with substantial land granted by king Vijayasimha. 32 Here is an instance where the brāhmaṇas were sent from the core-area of the state to the new areas of control. The brāhmaṇas had already appeared at the royal court by the tenth century. They furnished the Guhila kings with a long genealogy for the first time and introduced brāhmaṇa status as well as the theme of Guhila origin from Anandapura (Gujarat). 33 The motif of Anandapura might allude to the presence of the Nāgar brāhmaṇas (originating from Anandapura) in the Guhila court of the tenth century.

In spite of drawing legitimation from Ekaliṅga, the royal family made landgrants to the brāhmaṇas in the core-area in the twelfth century. A landgrant charter of King Padmasimha of A.D. 1194 records the grant of land in the domain (estate) of Čāhamāna Rāo Mokaja in Kadmal village to a brāhmaṇa Sīvagūṇa, son of Ārādhara, as a source of liveli-
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30. op. cit., l.15.
31. Ibid., 11.13-14.
33. Āṭpura Inscription, op. cit., v.1-10.
hood. The piece of land is stated to be located in the midst of an araghaṭṭa named Gājana. The village of Kadmal is situated 25 miles northwest of Udaipur. It is significant to note that the grant was made in a domain predominated by the Cāhamāṇa chiefs. The royal links were further strengthened with the same brāhmaṇa family as it continued to receive royal landgrants in the same locality. The Kadmal copper-plate inscription of Tejasīṃha of A.D. 1259 records the grant of land to Trivikrama, brāhmaṇa Sīvaguṇa's son, located in the domain of Cāhamāṇa Rāo Chānd in Kadmal village. It is also situated in the midst of an araghaṭṭa called Gajan and is granted as vr̥tti (livelihood). The fact that this area of Cāhamāṇa dominance stood well integrated with the state by this period is evident from the fact that the Guhila Kings did not have to seek permission from the Cāhamāṇa chiefs to make such royal landgrants. This is to remind us of the contrast in the successive stages of state formation. What is more important to note is the legitimation played by the brāhmaṇa donees in localities dominated by the non-Guhila Rajput chiefs.

The brāhmaṇas also continued to contribute to the process of legitimation by composing Guhila prasāstis and providing legitimizing motifs. In the reign of Samarasiṁha, the Chittaurgarh palace inscription of A.D. 1278 (recording royal grants to Bhartṛipurīyagachchha and building of Śyām Pārśvanāth Vasahī by the queen-mother Jayatalladevī) was composed by a number of brāhmaṇas. Two families were involved in this task and provide their genealogies in this record. It was composed by brāhmaṇa Sādala of Gōgagotra and Divakara lineage, two brāhmaṇa brothers, Khīmaṭa and


35. Ibid.

36. Ibid., p.53.

37. Ibid.

38. op. cit., 11.13-14, "Gāḍajātīyadvijādīvākara Vamsōdbha-vavyāsaratnasutajjyotih Sāḍala'.
Bhīma, sons and grandsons of Bhaṭṭasāda and Vipra Delhana respectively.39

The famous Chittaurgarh prasāsti of A.D. 1274 and Achalesvara prasāsti of A.D. 1285 introducing the legends of Bappa Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga in Mewar, legitimizing Guhila power at Citrakūṭa and whole of Mewar was composed by Veda Sarman of Nāgarjñāti (Nāgar gotra).40 Since both the Chittaurgarh and Achalesvara prasāstitis stand apart as the two most outstanding royal charters of the Guhila in the thirteenth century, Nāgar brāhmaṇas seem to have received royal patronage on a significant scale in the second half of the thirteenth century. If Pāṇḍapa acāryas popularized the legitimizing motifs of Bappa-Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga, Nāgar brāhmaṇa Vedasārma was responsible for officially propagating the same. Since he describes himself as a favourite of Śrī Samadhisā (the cult of Śiva in a royal temple in Chittaurgarh fort),41 he seems to have been a local resident of Chittaurgarh, and not a migrant.

A change takes places in the structure of the local brāhmaṇa-elite and therefore in the royal patronage by the fifteenth century. The Dasāpura brāhmaṇas seem to have replaced the Nāgar brāhmaṇas at the Guhila court. The Chittaurgarh stone inscription of A.D. 1428 can be considered as one of the earliest royal prasāstitis of the Ranas. It was composed by Ekanātha, son of Bhaṭṭa Viṣṇu, of the Dasāpur clan.42 Dasāpura is the ancient Mandasaur (in Malwa), close to Chittaurgarh region.

The Śrīṅgīrīśi inscription of Mokal was composed by one

39. Ibid., 11.14-15, ‘tathā ca Vipra Delhaṇasutabhaṭṭa sāḍā tatputra Dvārābhāṭṭa Khiṃatastadbhṛātrī Bhīma Sahiteṇa ebhirlikhitvā'.

40. op. cit., v.60, ‘Yokārsidekliṅgatribhuvana vidita Śrīsamadhisāca karmaśvāmī-prāśādyrṇinde priyapatutanayo Vedasārmā prasātitī lī tenaiśāpi vyadhāyi sphytagunavid-sādā Nāgarjñātibhāja Vipreṇaṣeṣa vidbajjanaḥharhayāhara citrakūṭasthitenā.’

41. Ibid.

42. op. cit., last additional five verses, v.1. ‘Śrī maddasāpurajñātīḥ bhāṭṭa viṣṇostanudabhavah nāmāikana-thanāmāyāmlikhat kritimujvalam lī'
Yogisvara who bore the epithets Vānīvilāsa and Kavirāja. Clearly he enjoyed a status and position of esteem at the court of Mokal.

These two epigraphic records of Mokal’s reign throw further light on the groups of local brāhmaṇas in Mewar. The Chittaurgarh inscription which records the construction (repairs and embellishments?) of the temple of Samaddhisvara at Citrakūṭa also registers the royal grant of the whole village of Dhanapura for its maintenance. The grant of village Dhanapura for the upkeep of the royal temple of god Samaddhisvara in effect benefitted the priests of the temple. And since Samaddhisvara did not exactly qualify as a Pāṣupata tīrtha, the non-Pāṣupata brāhmaṇa priests must have presided there.

The mention of Rāṇā Mokal’s personal preceptor, Trilochana, in the Śrīṅgīrīśi inscription is significant. His permission was sought by Mokal to consecrate the reservoir built for the spiritual merit of his late Bāghelā queen, Gaurāmbikā. Guru Trilochana possibly was connected with the Samaddhisvara temple. The King must have been inspired by his preceptor to patronize the renovation of the temple. Mokal is specially described as a devotee of Samadhisvara. Secondly, this record specifies that the construction site of the reservoir was the hilly terrain called Śrīṅgīrīśi. And in this context, the inscription provides a prasāsti for this sage Śrīṅgīrīśi as well.

Mahārāṇā Kumbha patronized a number of brāhmaṇa families. These families were undoubtedly locally established brahmana families. Significantly, the earliest land-grant made by Māhārāṇā Kumbha to a brahmana was outside Mewar. The village Cūrī in Ajahari pargana (district Sirohi) was

43. op. cit., v.28.
44. op. cit., vv.72-73.
45. op. cit., v.29.
46. op. cit., v.222.  ‘Nripah Samaddhisvarasiddhatejah Samadhibhājam paramam rahasyam 11 Ārādhya tasyalayamudhas Śrīcitrakūṭe maṇitornamakam 11
47. Ibid., vv.19-21, 24.
granted by Rāṇā Kumbha to a brāhmaṇa Devaprabhā.\textsuperscript{48} The grant of a full village to a local brāhmaṇa in the early period of Kumbha’s programme for territorial expansion in Sirohi region was an attempt to retain Guhila power through brahmanical approval in the newly annexed Sirohi region where the Devadā Cāhamānas were fast emerging as a local Rajput power.

Moreover, as Sirohi controlled the trade routes between Marwar and Gujarat via Mount Abu, it was essential to hold the region to divert resources towards Mewar. The concentration of rich Jain merchants at Dilwara, Mount Abu, etc. had appreciated the revenue-potentialities of the region increasingly over the period. It has already been noted that Mahārāṇā Kumbha exempted the pilgrims (effecting mostly the Jain pilgrims) from payment of a number of taxes.\textsuperscript{49}

It was equally important for Kumbha to renew Guhila links with the brāhmaṇas in the core-areas of Guhila state. Kadiya (Udaipur district) inscription of A.D. 1443 records the construction of a temple of Kṛiṣṇa in the reign of Rāṇā Kumbha in Kadiya village by Tillabhaṭṭa of Bharadvāj gotra, a favourite of Kumbha.\textsuperscript{50} The very mention that Tillabhaṭṭa was a favourite of Rāṇā Kumbha highlights the extent of Guhila patronage of brāhmaṇas of varied sectarian background in the fifteenth century. In all likelihood, village Kadiya in the Ahaḍa belt (Udaipur) had emerged as a centre of the Kṛiṣṇa-cult. The resources required for the construction of the Kṛiṣṇa temple seem to have also come from the state, since it was difficult for an individual brāhmaṇa to bear the cost. Kumbha patronized brāhmaṇas in the Merwara region as well, specially around the newly constructed fortress of Kumbhalgarh. Kaccaḥṛar copper-plate grant (a village in Kumbhalgarh pargana) of A.D. 1453 records the grant of


\textsuperscript{49} vide Passim, Ch.III, Section: Jains and the Guhilas.

\textsuperscript{50} H.B. Sharda, MK, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.173-74, No.5.
Kaśchār village to brāhmaṇa Godhā Gohad by Rāṇā Kumbha. 51 Landgrants in the tribal tract of Merwara (Meda tribe) were essential for obvious political and economic reasons. Such royal grants in the Aravallian regions are likely to have continued the process of bringing cultivable land under agriculture within the spatial limits of the villages, generating more resources for the local economy as well as setting the process of peasantisation of some of the members of the local Meda tribe.

It is equally important to note the language of royal landgrant charters of Kadia and Kachchhar villages. These were composed in the local dialect, the Mewari. This contrasts with the use of Sanskrit in contemporary royal prasāstis and points to royal attempts at effective implementation of religious landgrants at the respective centres at a point of time when the state was forced to recognise the vernacular as a language of administration.

Rāṇā Lakṣmasimha made the following gifts of villages, etc., to the brāhmaṇas: (i) village of Pishpalikā to a learned brāhmaṇa named Jhotinya with all due ceremonies, 52 (ii) a village containing the five temples (Pañcavedalaya) to the west of mount Citrakūṭa to Dhanesvara Bhatta, 53 (iii) and a gift of one lac gold coins to the brāhmaṇas, which amounted to one hundred thousand gold coins. 54 King Rāimalla also made the following gifts of villages to the brāhmaṇas. (i) Being pleased with the poet named Mahesa, he granted him the village of Ratnakhetā which produced (ratnas) jewels, 55 (ii) the village of Prahaṇa to Gopalbhaṭṭa as dakṣīna-village (gift), 56 (iii) the villages of Thūra


53. Ibid.

54. Ibid., v.40.

55. Ibid., v.67.

56. Ibid., v.82.
Guhila Landgrants to the Brāhmaṇas: AD 7th - 15th Centuries

Note: Villages of Pispalikā and Prahana remain unidentified.
(with lakes full of lotuses, fruitful trees, rows of rice-fields irrigated by water, a fine rosary of Mudgas and fields of sweet sugarcanes) to his guru Gopalabhaṭṭā.\textsuperscript{57} Rāimalla issued an injunction to the public as well as to future Guhila Kings that none, even in distress, was to use anything produced from lands donated to the brāhmaṇas by the Guhila Kings.\textsuperscript{58} It is significant that this record, essentially a royal \textit{prasāṭi}, also provides a lengthy \textit{prasāṭi} for a family of brāhmaṇas of Bhrigu clan, associated with the court of Rāimalla.\textsuperscript{59} It is for the first time in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., v.87.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ibid., vv.83-86.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Ibid., vv.127-133.
\end{itemize}
history of Mewar that we have such a long prasāstī for the brāhmaṇa in a royal document. The trend undoubtedly points to the greater role of the brāhmaṇas in the late fifteenth century Guhila court as they provided a new (and pompous) origin-status, Sūryavāṃśa, to the Guhila Kings at a time when the state emerged as one of the biggest regional powers in western India.

III

Since the brāhmaṇas created the origin myths for their Guhila patrons, we shall now try and analyse the origin myths of the Guhilas. A chronological study of the evolution and shifts in the Guhila origin myths helps us in situating the Guhilas in the history of Mewar. Shifts in the Guhila origin myths reveal stages of state formation, and hence the political career of the Guhilas, their territorial domains, their rise to power, and finally the emergence of the Nāgdā-Ahaḍa Guhila dynasty as a formidable regional power in Western India.

The Guhilas of Dhavagarta known from the Dabok inscription of A.D. 644 claim only a simple family name, Guhila. There is no mention of any origin-claim about Guhila Dhanika in this private record of a local kāyastha family. Nor does Guhila Dhanika bear any political title. Instead, this inscription refers to the contemporary Mori king Śrī Dhavalappadeva as Parambhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja - Paramesvara.60 This clearly indicates a difference in political status. The area of control of Guhila Dhanika was obviously limited, given the occupation of other nuclear regions of Mewar by the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Ahaḍa and Kiśkindhā and by the Morīs of Chittaurgarh in the seventh century. Guhila Dhanika was a local chief controlling the area around the village of Dhavagartā,61 including smaller rural settlements. It is also evident that Guhila Dhanika functioned as a subordinate ally of the Morī sovereign; he was probably a local chief and had not attained monarchical status in the period.

...Continued...

dour'.

60. oc. cit., 1.1.
61. Ibid., 1.2.
Reference to his lineage or family name simply as Guhila, without elaboration, proves that the Guhilas of Dhavagartā in the seventh century had a limited political status.

The Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa initially known from the Samoli inscription of A.D.646 and the Udaipur prasāsti of A.D. 661 significantly do not refer to their overlords nor bear any politically subordinate title. Yet they refer to themselves only as Guhilānvaya (belonging to the lineage of the Guhila). 62 Although silence about an overlord may indicate a comparatively independent position, it has already been reiterated that the title of Rāval for the legendary Bappa indicates a politically subordinate status for the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas in the seventh-eighth centuries, as their territorial control was confined to the central parts of Mewar hills, and the hill and forest tract of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa belt. Resources were largely rural-centred and attempts had been initiated to mobilize natural resources and bring land in the tribal tracts of the core area under cultivation. In the forest and hills of the core-area resources were restricted in this early period. Yet it is significant that the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa emphasized upon their lineage identity and eulogised it as a "glorious one" in their seventh century official record. 63 Such attempts definitely reflect a concern to proclaim itself "royal" and distinct from rest of local society. In the absence of a reference to origins, however, we can only infer that these were the beginnings of the process of state formation.

The Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā, known from their five inscriptive records (four official charters and one private record), also do not lay claims to high-sounding ancestry. Similar to the contemporary Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas, they refer to their family as Guhilaputrānvaya 64 or simply Kiṣkindhipurāt Guhila-narādhipa-vamśe. 65 Their limited political status is clearly testified by titles such as Avapta-asēga-mahāśābda, Samādhigata-paṅcamahāśābda and Samupārjitatapānda-
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mahāsābda, usually used by the subordinate rulers. They were evidently controlling a limited territorial unit in the southern Mewar hills, bordering the district of Dungarpur. Although they enjoyed a considerable rural base, resources were still limited in view of the hilly and forested nature of Kiṣkindha. Thus all three Guhila ruling families in the seventh-eight centuries are likely to have functioned as sāmantas of the Moris of Chittaurgarh, even as the Kiṣkindha Guhila project their royal status through association of narāhipa (king) with their lineage-identity Guhilavāṃśa. Similarly the Guhila of Chatsu, known from their Nāgar inscription of A.D. 684, controlling a limited locality in Tonk district under the formal sway of the Moris, also referred to themselves as Guhila and nothing more.

The rise of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila to significant political heights is clearly reflected in the new origin claims made in their tenth and eleventh century official records. In contrast to the simple claim of Guhilānvaya of the seventh century, the Āṭpura inscription of A.D. 977 speaks of the progenitor Guhadatta as a brāhmaṇa belonging to a family of Ānandapura (Ānandapura Vinirgata Viprakulā-nandanoh-MahiDeva, jayati śrī Guhadattah pravavah Guhila vaṁśasya). Ānandapura is identified with present Vadnagar in Idar, north-eastern Gujarat. The Kadmal plate of A.D. 1083 also repeats the same claim. Simultaneously, a long genealogical list of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila also appears for the first time in the Āṭpura record listing Guhila Kings from Guhadatta to Saktikumāra. Thus we find that the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila made claims to brāhmaṇa origin for the first time in the tenth century. The process of legitimation had begun to work. Guhilānvaya was no longer an adequate label, especially with control over more territory (as
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testified by the disappearance of Kiśkindhā Guhilas after the eighth century). The Nāgdā-Āhaṭa Guhilas had evidently integrated southern part of Mewar hills into their kingdom by the ninth century. Not only had their power been enhanced territorially but organizationally also the Nāgdā-Āhaṭa dynasty had consolidated their political hold. If Pratihāras and Hūṇa Rajputs had been inducted into the emerging political structure from outside the state, important local and neighbouring ruling families such as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Hastikunḍī (Godwar), the Paramāras, and Caulukyās had also been integrated by the tenth century.72 Political links were cemented by matrimonial alliances.73 It is significant to note that Guhila king Bharatāja II bears the title of mahārājādhirāja (king of kings) in Pratapgarh record of the reign of Pratihāra Mahendrapāla II.74 Also, a contemporary Rāṣṭrakūṭa record from Hastikunḍī refers to the reigning Guhila King of Nāgdā-Āhaṭa as the "lord of the Gurjaras" and "Āghata (the Guhila capital of Ātpura), the pride of Medapāṭa".75 It was no small military achievement that Guhila Allata had decisively defeated Pratihāra Devapāla (Kanauj).76 Thus the Nāgdā-Āhaṭa Guhilas not only figured in the records of the contemporary Rajput powers for the first time in the tenth century, they were also perceived as the "lord" of Medapāṭa (the entire region of Mewar) and Gurjaras.

If the Nāgdā-Āhaṭa Guhilas claimed brahma-pa origin in the tenth-eleventh centuries, the Guhilas of Chatsu claimed brahmakṣatratvita (brahma-kṣatra) origin and retained their family-name, Guhilavāṃśa in the ninth century.77 The Guhilas of Chatsu had emerged as a significant political ally of the Pratihāras of Kanauj in eastern Rajasthan by this peri-
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od. Their recent political and military growth, extended territorial control and social links with some of the contemporary leading Rajput lineages like the Paramāras and the Cāhamānas, explain their claim to the brahma-kṣattra origin. In contrast, the Guhilas of Māṅgrol (Kathiawar), Unstra (district Jodhpur) and Nāḍol (Godwar) referred to themselves simply as Guhila as late as the twelfth century. The Guhilas of Unstra78 and Nāḍol79 were small local chiefs controlling very limited pockets and resources, whereas the Guhilas of Māṅgrol had risen in their political career in Saurashtra in the dominion of the Caulukyan state. Their political subordination to the Caulukyas of Gujarat is clearly evident in Guhila Mūlaka's title, Saurāṣṭranāyaka. Therefore, the Guhilas of Māṅgrol, in spite of their considerable political power in Saurashtra in the twelfth century, were never the focus of a local state but an integral part of the Caulukyan polity.

In view of the above study it is necessary to review the opinion of D.R. Bhandarkar about Nāgar brāhmaṇa origins of the Guhilas of Mewar (Nāgdā-Āhaḍa).80 This fails to explain either Guhilānvaya status of the seventh century or brahmakṣattra status of the thirteenth century,81 or Sūrya-vamsā status of the sixteenth century for the same family of Guhilas.82 The claim to brāhmaṇa origin made by the Guhilas for the first time in the tenth century should be considered as legitimation of the emerging sub-regional state in the Mewar hills. The motif of Ānandapura may suggest the presence of Nāgar brāhmaṇas at the Guhila court in the tenth century. Hence, the claim to brāhmaṇa origin took place only at one point of time. The theme of migration facilitated the predominance of the Guhilas in an area occupied by

78. Memorial Stone inscription of A.D. 1179-80, op. cit.
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Bhils as well as non-Guhila Rajput chiefs. 83

The thirteenth century marks a decisive stage. The Guhilas now transferred their capital from Nāgdā-Āhaḍa to Chittaurgarh. They claimed brahma-kṣattra status for the first time in the thirteenth century (instead of a brāhmaṇa origin as in the tenth-eleventh centuries). Along with the new origin-status came the new motifs of Bappa-Ḥāritarāṣī-Ekālin-ga-Medapāṭa. If Bappa is called a brāhmaṇa in the Chittaurgarh inscription of A.D. 1274 ("May the city of Nāghardā be victorious... coming from which brāhmaṇa Bappa..."), 84 Bappa is credited with the new status of brahma-kṣattra in the Achalesvara inscription. "Assuredly from brāhmaṇa-like Hārīta, Bappaka obtained, in the shape of an anklet, the lustre of kṣatriya (kṣatriyahood) and gave the sage his devotion, his own Brāhmanical lustre (brāhmaṇahood or merits) he had obtained as a brāhmaṇa'. 85 Thus was legitimized the kṣatriya role of the Guhilas. The transition from brāhmaṇa origin to prestigious brahma-kṣattra is obviously reflective of greater power as sovereigns of Mewar. Although they acquired Chittaurgarh, the political landmark of Mewar, mere fresh territorial possessions could not legitimize the new Guhila political status. It was equally necessary to claim a new social status befitting the newly achieved political and military status. It is the kṣatriya status that legitimizes territorial and military achieve-

83. Romila Thapar generalizes the importance of the theme of migration that facilitated the establishment of new dynasties. See, 'Origin Myths and the Early Indian Historical Tradition' in her Ancient Indian Social History, op. cit., p.321. 'The theme of migration, often disguised as exile, sets the geographical dimensions of the social group and can be used to establish rights and priority of a particular group over a particular region. This assumes significance in periods when new groups are moving in as entrepreneurs in either previously occupied areas or in newly opened up lands.... Those who succeeded in establishing new dynasties would either have to link themselves genealogically with the descent groups, who were already associated with the area or else would have to introduce the idea of migration'.
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ments. Hence, the necessity of *brahma-kśatra* in the thirteenth century. Guhila claims to *brahma-kśatra* status at this stage reminds us of the Pallavas of Kanchipuram and the Karpātas of Mithila who also claimed *brahma-kśatra* status at the height of their political career. B.D. Chattopadhyaya observes,

"when one looks at the different stages in which the genealogies were being formulated, it further appears that for the majority of the newly emerging royal lines, "Brahma-Kśatra" was a transitional status, which once acquired was not however, entirely given up and explanations continued to be given for the supposedly authentic transition from Brāhmaṇa to Kṣatriya status.... It may also well be that the "Brahma-Kśatra" was a relatively open status as can be gathered from its wide currency in India in this period, which was seized upon by the new royal families before they could formulate a claim to pure Kṣatriya origin".

Jaiswal also points out that "the category of Brahma-Kṣatra" seems to have a multiple origin.

The Guhila hold over Chittaurgarh had to be legitimized more elaborately because the Nāgda-Āhaḍa Guhilas never actually conquered the mighty fortress before Jaitrasimha's period. Moreover, the conquest of Chittaurgarh meant Guhila sovereignty all over Mewar. From the legends of "Sri Bappa-ka in Nagahrda", were created the legends of "Bappa, Hārītarāśi and Ekaliṅga in Medapāṭa and Citrakūṭa" in the thirteenth century. It was officially claimed that Bappa, the progenitor of the lineage obtained regality over Mewar through the grace of the Paśupata Ācārya, Hārītarāśi. Finally, it is Bappa, the brahma-Kśatra, and not Guhadatta, who is claimed as the progenitor of the Guhila dynasty and founder of the Guhila royal power in Mewar. Guhadatta appears as Bappa's son in both Chittaurgarh and Achalesvāra inscriptions.
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Brahma-kśatra status for the Guhilas in the thirteenth century served two essential political functions. Having settled at Chittaurgarh, the Guhilas confronted the Rajput chiefs of eastern Mewar (Solaks of Mandālgarh, the Cāhamānas of the former Sākambharī house at Bijolia, Menal, etc., the Paramāras of Abu, and the Sonagirā-cāhamānas in the Godwar region) for the first time in their history. It was necessary to claim a social status higher or at least equal to these immediately neighbouring kṣatriya elites to facilitate matrimonial alliances. Secondly, by the early thirteenth century, they had begun to militarily confront such neighbouring powers as the Paramāras of Malwa and the Bāghelās of Gujarat as well as Delhi Sultans. Rāval Samarsimha’s increasing military career could be further politically supported by the recently proclaimed prestigious social origin that facilitated mobilization for military purpose. The Guhilas had undoubtedly transformed themselves from rulers of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa to kings of Mewar.

The fifteenth century marked a Guhila leap towards full-fledged kṣatriyahood. The Śrīṅgīrīṣi inscription of Rāṇā Mokal proclaims Rāṇā Khetā as a jewel of the Kṣatriya race. ‘...his (Hammīra) son Kṣetra (who was) an ornamental jewel of the Kṣatriya race, the destructive fire to (his) enemies, and worthy well to take up responsibility, went to the abode of gods’. 91 This shows that brahma-kṣatra was politically a transitional phase in the stages of state formation. Kṣatriyahood was proclaimed by the Guhilas in that stage of state formation when they had emerged not only as a leading western Indian power but also forged matrimonial links with those contemporary Rajput powers who too claimed kṣatriya status. For instance, we recall that the Guhilas themselves had referred to the Hāḍās of Eastern Mewar as the kṣatrīs of the east. 92 Moreover, claim to the status of kṣatriyavāṃsāmandanānāṇi certainly facilitated military support from the local Rajput powers that helped transforming the fifteenth century Guhilas into a major

91. Śrīṅgīrīṣi inscription, op. cit., v.5 ‘... Kṣetram Kṣatriyavāṃsāmandanānāṃ pratyarthikalanalam.’
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political power. Later on, Mughal sources such as the Akbarnama and Tuzuk-i-Baburi mention the military career of Rāṇā Sāngā. By the fifteenth century the Guhilas were not only looked upon as a regional power but also perceived as a front-ranking western Indian power.

As kṣatriyahood evolved from brahma-kṣatra, similarly the motif of Bappa of the thirteenth century, the legendary founder of Guhila royal power in Mewar, got transformed into Bappavaṃśā/Bappajavaṃśā by the fifteenth century. By the fifteenth century, the royal family changed its family name from Guhila Vaṃśa to Bappajavaṃśa. Śrīṅgīriśi inscription refers to the Guhila Kings belonging to Bappajavaṃśā (lineage of Bappa). The fact that the new Guhila claim had become widely popular is evident from a contemporary Jain record, the Ranakpur prāśāsti. This begins the genealogical list with Bappa, the King of Mewar (Śrīmedapāṭharājādhirāja Śrī Bappa) and refers to Śrī Guhila as Bappa’s son.

Finally, at the turn of the fifteenth century the Guhilas made their claim even more specific from kṣatriya-hood to Sūryavaṃśā origin. A Jain record, Nāḍlāi Adinath temple inscription of A.D. 1500 refers to the lineage of the Guhilas as Sūryavaṃśīyamahārājādhirāja śrī śilādityavaṃśe. The ruling dynasty must have started claiming sūryavaṃśā status enhanced further by the ancestry of the adityas (solar lineage), before the end of the fifteenth century.

However, some important royal adjustments took place in the latter half of the fifteenth century. The Kumbhalgarh prāśāsti repeats the Bappa-Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga-Medapāṭa legends (Bappa Hārītarāsi Ekaliṅgaprasāda). Bappa is called purāṇapuruṣah, the original progenitor or founder of
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the Guhila dynasty.⁹⁹ Rāval Śrī Guhadatta is retained as Bappa's son.¹⁰⁰ Thus the kings are stated to be named after Bappa's son Guhadatta (sa nripatiḥ Guhilābhidhāno).

By the early sixteenth century Guhadatta's original role as progenitor of the Guhila royal family had been internalized. The Jain Nādlāi inscription lists Guhadatta as the progenitor of the royal dynasty of Mewar while Rāulā Śrī Bappaka follows as Guhila's son.¹⁰¹ In fact, standardization of the tradition of Guhadatta as progenitor and Rāul Bappa as founder seem to have begun by the early sixteenth century, as most of the seventeenth century official sources conformed to this pattern with further enhancement of the Sūryavaṃśa status to Ikṣavāku ancestry (Rāmachandra's lineage).¹⁰²

IV

Cults of both local goddesses and of Śiva had become popular in the seventh century in Mewar. The Dabok inscription of A.D. 644 attests to the and patronage of the cults of Maheśvara (Śiva) and Ghaṭṭavāsinī (the goddess residing in the pot) by a local kāyastha family through land and cash grants in Dhavagarter locality near Chittaurgarh.¹⁰³ At this stage it is important to note that the process of identification of a local goddess, Ghaṭṭavāsinī with Dūrgā, the mother goddess, had already taken place in the seventh century in the upper Banas plain. The direct identification is evident in the inscriptional reference to Ghaṭṭavāsinī nāmā Dūrgādevya (Dūrgādevī by the name of Ghaṭṭavāsinī).¹⁰⁴ Such identification follows appropriation of Ghaṭṭavāsinī by
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the brāhmaṇa priests and its installation in the temple. 105

The record also pays obeisance to goddess Ėandikā (Dūrgā). 106 The cult of Śiva was also patronized by the ruling elite in Upper Banas plain in this period. One of the predecessors of king Māna Morī of Chittaur is called Mahesvāra (Śiva) in his Manosarovar inscription. 107 An inscription from eighth century Chittaurgarh records the erection of the temple of Kukkreśvāra Mahādeva by King Kukkreśvāra. 108 Popularity of the cult of Śiva in early medieval Chittaurgarh is evident from such royal patronage. An ancient temple of Kālikā belonging to the seventh-eighth centuries has also been discovered in the fortress of Chittaur. 109

The cult of Śiva appears equally popular in the hilly-forest-tribal locality of Kiśkindhā. The Guhila King Bhāvihīta describes himself as a Paramamahēśvara (a devout worshipper of Śiva). 110 The earliest direct evidence of royal patronage to the Śaiva sects comes from the Kiśkindhā locality. The Kalyanpur fragmentary inscription of King Padda (early eighth century) records the construction of a temple of Śiva by Guhila Kadacchī's queen Voṇṇa who was assisted in the pious work by her preceptor, a Śaiva, called Kutukkācārya. 111 Royal patronage obviously followed popular precedence of local patronage to the local Śaiva temples. A Śaiva temple of the seventh-eighth century exists in Kalyan-
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pur where Caturmukha Sivalinga is presently worshipped.

In contrast, Mewar hills, the core-area of the Nagdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas interestingly records no inscriptive reference in the seventh century to any temple of Śiva, let alone presence of any Saiva sect. The earliest record of the Nagdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas, Samoli inscription of the reign of King Śilāditya, registers the construction of the temple of goddess Aranyaṇavāsini by a migrating community of mahājanas at Aranyaṇakūpagiri. But unlike the contemporary Dhavagartā tradition, The Samoli record does not refer to Aranyaṇavāsini as a form of Dūrgā. But Aranyaṇavāsini (the goddess who dwells in the forest) presumably the goddess initially associated with the tribal Bhils, was installed in a newly constructed temple. The construction of the temple of Aranyaṇavasini certainly points the penetration of the state-society into the tribal pockets. The Somoli record, which contains a prasāṣṭi of the Guhila King Śilāditya, also supported the royal cause in the Bhil dominion. Popularity of the cult of Viṣṇu amongst the members of the ruling elite in the Nagdā-Āhaḍa state is evident from the construction of a temple of Viṣṇu. Udaipur prasāṣṭi of the reign of King Aparājita is a private record belonging to his commander-in-chief Mahārāja Varāhasiṃha. It records the construction and patronage of a temple of Viṣṇu by Varāhasiṃha's wife, Yaśomati. Thus, unlike Upper Banas plain and southern Mewar hills, Nagdā-Āhaḍa belt of Mewar hills show evidence of popularity of the cults of local goddess Aranyaṇavāsini in the tribal pockets and Viṣṇu in the core-areas of Nagdā-Āhaḍa state.

An important development takes place in the Mewar hills by the tenth century. The Guhila state of Nagdā-Āhaḍa had emerged as an important political power. Now appeared the most crucial mechanism for legitimation, royal affiliation to a local cult centre. Unlike the seventh century, the
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cult of Siva figures on a significant scale in Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila records of the tenth century. The Pāsūpatas, one of the major contemporary Sāiva sects, also appear for the first time in the same royal records. This indicates that the Pāsūpatas (who always had a strong institutional base outside Mewar) had successfully not only established the cult of Siva but also themselves as a locally popular, influential religious sect. However, the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa did not seem to have been in urgent need of legitimation before the tenth century. This point is supported by the fact that the royal temple of Ekaliṅgaḷī (Siva) at the Pāsūpata centre of Nāgdā came to be constructed for the first time in A.D. 971. On the other hand, Pāsūpatas seem to have emerged as an important religious community in the Mewar hills before the mid-tenth century.

The interdependence of the sacred and the temporal is as gradual as any other process of state formation. A number of royal temples of the cult of Siva came to be constructed only from the tenth century onwards, and it is also possible to speculate that the Pāsūpatas were looking for royal support. It is significant that the Pāsūpatas claim victory over the Jains in the Ekaliṅgaḷī temple inscription of A.D. 971 (the very first record from Mewar mentioning the Pāsūpatas). This may allude to their attempts at establishing their superiority over the Jains to strengthen bonds with the royal court. The process culminated in the construction of the royal temple of god Ekaliṅga at Nāgdā in A.D. 971 in the reign of Guhila King Naravāhana. The temple is stated to have been constructed at the instruction of such Pāsūpata ācāryas as Supujitārāśī, Viṃ-
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The Ekaliṅgaḻī temple inscription of A.D. 971 is also the first epigraphical record in southern Rajasthan which contains the Kāyāvarohana episode, the origin story of the Lakulīsa- PASUPATA sect,120 describing Śiva incarnating himself at Kāyāvarohana in Bhṛgukac̄chā. The incarnation evidently refers to Lakulīsa, the founder of the Lakulīsa-PASUPATA doctrine of Śaivism. He was followed by his disciples Kuśika and others. This inscription, which eulogizes the reigning King Naravāhana, significantly states that Śrī Bappaka of Guhila gotra established himself at Nāgahrda.121 The inscription seems to establish the following facts. First, Nāgahrda (Nāgdā) had emerged as a centre of the PASUPATAS. Second, the PASUPATA sect had come to enjoy the patronage of the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa. Third, the royal patronage of the PASUPATA sect and the consequent legitimation of the Guhila power seem to have begun on a significant scale by the tenth century. Therefore the process can be expected to have picked up momentum in the following period, in which the Guhila state integrated Mewar into a single regional power. Fourth, Bappa, the legendary founder of the state of Mewar, not only figures for the first time in the official records of the period but also figures in association with Nāgahrda, the PASUPATA centre. Fifth, Guhadatta of the tenth-eleventh century records is in no way associated either with Nāgahrda or the PASUPATA acaryas. Sixth, neither Bappa nor any PASUPATA ācārya is in any capacity associated with the sovereignty of Mewar at this stage. There is no mention of Mewar in the Ekaliṅgaḻī temple inscription, but there is significant reference to, and prasāṭi of Nāgahrda, the PASUPATA centre. Finally, the PASUPATAS began to link their seat of power, Nāgahrda, with a legendary figure of royal stature, Śrī Bappaka, to claim royal patronage.

Therefore in all likelihood the legend of "Bappaka in Nāgahrda" was the creation of the PASUPATA sect to highlight the ancient association of Nāgahrda, the PASUPATA centre, with a mythical king of the past. In this connection it may
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be noted that early medieval inscriptions of sāmanta ruler Aṃśūvarmā of Nepal also contains the expression Bappa in the meaning of father. The ruler was undoubtedly associated with the Paśupatināth temple and the Pāśupata ācāryas. A mythical king with local roots can certainly be popularized, and Bappa is a generic term. Bappa was not the actual name of any Guhila prince of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa house. It appears in no epigraphical record except in the Ekaliṅgai temple inscription. Bappa literally means father or father-like figure. Since Nāgahrda (Nāgdā) was also the first capital of the Guhilas, any mythical king of the past who, it is claimed, flourished at Nāgahrda was obviously going to be identified with an ancient Guhila king of the region. The very mention of Bappaka in an official record at this juncture would assume that the legend of "Bappaka in Nāgahrda" must have begun to circulate among the different communities of the area and herein lies the legitimising role of the Pāśupata sect.

Legends had begun to be created by the Pāśupatas for legitimizing the rule of their patrons. Since Nāgahrda had come to acquire the status of a religious landmark in the region, it was equally important for the Guhilas to associate themselves with it and its protagonists, the Pāśupatas. Thus, with the legend of "Bappaka in Nāgahrda", the Guhilas began their affiliation to Ekaliṅga and the Pāśupatas. Affiliation to a religious landmark was the most appropriate mechanism to legitimize royal power. As the pilgrimage flow to Nāgahrda continued to increase over the period, the Pāśupata ācāryas had begun to popularize appropriate legends. The part of the popular annals depicting Bāppā Rāval, the Guhila king of ancient Nāgdā, as the disciple of Ekaliṅgai, had already been built up.

The influence of the Pāśupatas in the tenth century is further evident in a stone inscription of Naravāhana (A.D. 971) at the temple of Nātha (near Ekaliṅgai temple): "They [Guhilas] sought the protection of Sāṅkara, lord of Pārvatī... who favoured Bhṛgukac̐cchā... . There came Kusāka and other muṇis, who possessing knowledge and pure bodies

took delight in bhasma [ashes] and put on the barks of trees and crowns of Jaṭā [braided hair].¹²³ In this record the Guhilas are mentioned in direct association with the Pasupatas. The story of the Lakulīsa-Pasupata in fact begins at Bhrgukaccha.

With the royal Ekalīnga temple, there began the period of the construction of temples of Siva by the Guhila rulers. For instance, a marble slab inscription of king Sucīvarman (tenth century) records the construction of the temple of Rahilesvara (other name of Sucīvarman) at Āhaḍa.¹²⁴ The presence of other Pāstrupata maṭhas at Paldi near Udaipur¹²⁵ and at Achalgārh in Mount Abu¹²⁶ patronized by the Guhilas are evident from inscriptive records. The Paldi inscription of the early twelfth century also contains the origin story of the Lakulīsa sect and a list of their chief acāryas.¹²⁷ Some of the Pāstrupa acāryas from Paldi maṭha are listed as follows: Khandaśvara, Janakarāsi, Trilochanarāsi, Vasantarāsi, Valkala and Sivasākti.¹²⁸ A number of images of Lakulīsa have been reported from Bijolia and Menal localities of the upper Banas plain.¹²⁹ Notable examples are of Hajāresvara and Undesvara temples at Bijolia. Both the temples have a number of images of Siva with a lakuta or club in the left hand.¹³⁰ Two four-armed Lakulīsa images, dated around the eighth-ninth centuries,¹³¹ and a standing

¹²³. 'A stone inscription in the temple of Hastamātā, Udaipur (dated in the eighth decade of A.D. 10th century)' in A Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, op. cit., p.73, 1.5.
¹²⁴. ARIE, 1963-64, see Ch. Rajasthan, p.103.
¹²⁵. Paldi inscription, op. cit., vv.11-14.
¹²⁷. Paldi inscription, op. cit., vv.11-14.
¹²⁸. Ibid.
¹²⁹. PRAS, WC, 1905, pp.54-59.
¹³⁰. Ibid.
statue of Lakulīsā\textsuperscript{132} have been reported from Chittaur, while a number of statues of Śiva fashioned in the form of Urddhavaretās have been discovered at ancient Kīśkindhā.\textsuperscript{133} On the other hand, a number of seated four-armed Lakulīsā figures have been found in Kota and Jhalawar districts of Hadoti region, the south-eastern neighbour of Mewar.\textsuperscript{134} Since most of these sculptures have been dated between the eighth and twelfth centuries,\textsuperscript{135} the Guhilas must have patronized some sculptural activity.

The profusion of Lakulīsā images and Pāśupata motifs at Ekaliṅgajī temple undoubtedly speaks for its construction under the instructions of the Pāśupata ācāryas. This reminds us of Devangana Desai's observations on the Lakṣmīmaṇḍapa temple at Khajuraho (a Vaiśṇava shrine). 'Its systematically planned architecture and sculptural scheme indicates the role of a competent architect (sutrādhāra) and also a religious ācārya learned in the Pañcarātra Vaishnava tradition who must have guided the architect'.\textsuperscript{136}

To legitimize Guhila hold on Chittaur, the motif of Pāśupata sage Hārītarāsī was adopted in the thirteenth-century. The popular traditions of Mewar regarding the bestowal of the kingship of Mewar or Citrakūṭa on Bappa (the legendary founder of Mewar state), by Pāśupata sage Hārītarāsī (a devout worshipper of god Ekaliṅga), is officially claimed by the Nāgda-Āhaḍa Guhilas for the first time in the thirteenth century. Both the Achaleśvara and Chittaurgarh inscriptions of Rāval Samarasiṁha in the late thirteenth century claim Hārītarāsī, the preceptor of Bappa, as the bestower of regal fortunes of Medapāṭa desā, facilitated by the favour of god Ekaliṅga. To quote the Achaleśvara inscription, "[The region] which has excelled paradise

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{135} PRAS, WC, 1905, pp.54-59.
itself... bears the name of Śrī Medapāṭa. Here is a large town named Nāgahrda where Hārītarāsi... performed penance.... Hārīta who became united with Śiva..., granted regal fortunes to the famous Bappa in return for services rendered'. Similarly, the Chittaurgarh inscription reads as follows:

May the city of Nāgahrda be victorious... coming from which Brahmā Bappa... worshipped the two lotus-like feet of Hārītarāsi Kuṇi... Hārītarasi gave Bappa five golden anklets which he has got as wonderful fruit of the favour of the lotus-like feet of Ekaliṅga... Bappa now acquired royal fortune by the great favour of Hārītarāsi.

Thus the favour of Nāgdā, the Pāṣūpata sage Hārītarāsi and god Ekaliṅga legitimized the hold of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas over all of Mewar as soon as they acquired Chittaurgarh and integrated the upper Banas plain to the Mewar hills. The hold over Chittaurgarh had to be legitimized because the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas never held Chittaur in the beginning of their career. It is evident from inscriptions that Chittaur belonged to the Morīs when the Guhilas began their career in the seventh century. The Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas had been their subordinate allies in the seventh-eighth centuries. Hence, the need for legitimation for the Guhilas obviously arose in the thirteenth century with the acquisition of Chittaurgarh and consequent sovereignty over all of Mewar. From the legends of "Śrī Bappaka in Nāgahrda", were created the legends of Bappa, Hārītarāsi and Ekaliṅga in Mewar. The expansion of the legends associating Bappa with sovereignty over Mewar, is likely to have begun in the post-tenth century. The Paldi inscription of A.D. 1116 was already claiming the Guhila Arisimha as the `King of the glory of Medapāṭa'. Increasing military success in the period set the precondition for the Guhila claim to the title. But Chittaurgarh was still elusive, a feat achieved only in the thirteenth century.
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It is assumed that the priests of Ekaliṅga temple, the Pāsāupata ācāryas, would narrate temple legends to pilgrims. These would then spread through the villages of Mewar. The temple town of Ekaliṅga and the Pāsāupata centre of Nāgahrda had evolved as a source of highest legitimation of royal authority. Kulke notes, "The political significance of the temple towns was in no way limited to their being occasionally also royal towns. Far more important was their role as cosmic centres and sources of the highest legitimation of royal authority. Very soon the founder kings were included into the temple legends in which they were elevated to mythical heroes of the hoary past." 141

However, we have already discussed that in the case of Mewar, the founder king Bappa was never the actual founder of the Guhila dynasty but was the creation of legitimizing agents. The legend about him seems to have been born in the temple town of Nāgahrda (Ekaliṅgajī). Bappa does not figure as 'the founder king' before the thirteenth century, unlike the situation in Orissa where founder kings were included in temple legends from the beginning. Consequently, it is Bappa and not Guhadatta who is the founder of the Guhila dynasty in the thirteenth century. 143

In a period when the Ekaliṅgajī temple at Nāgdā was emerging as a regional tīrtha in Mewar, the spread of the cult of Sakti was equally pervasive in contemporary Mewar. Local traders made landgrants to the temple of Vāṭayakṣiṇī-devī (goddess residing in the Banyan tree) in the village of Ghontavārṣikā belonging to the Hārīrīgīśvāra matha of Dāsāpura. 144 The temple of Yogēsvārī (Dūrgā) was constructed along with that of Yogēsvāra (Siva) at Chirakupa near Nagda-Ekaliṅgajī by Yogēsvāra, the talarakṣaka of Nāgdā (Tāṁtara-)
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Jagat situated in south-eastern Udaipur district (52 kilometres from Udaipur) bordering Chittaurgarh, had emerged as a dominant tīrtha of Ambikā (Durga) in this period. The popularity of Ambikā is borne out by the Guhila royal grants to her temple. Jagat inscriptions of Guhila King Samantasiṃhadeva of A.D. 1171-72 and Guhila King Jayasiṃhadeva of A.D. 1249 record the grant of suvarṇakalasās to the temple of Ambikā at Jagat. It is significant that the cult of Vindhyavāsinī figures for the first time in records of the thirteenth century. An inscription of the time of Rāval Sīhadadeva of Dungarpur-Guhila family dated in the late thirteenth century, records the construction of the temple of Vindhyavāsinī by one Vijaya, at Vinjhalapura in Dungarpur district. Interestingly, popular patronage of local goddesses continued to appear in the mining centres and hilly terrain. The Kankroli (near Dariba mines) road-station inscription of the reign of Rāval Samarasīṃhā (A.D. 1298-99) records the grant of few dramma coins to a temple of the local goddess.

Thus recorded references to the local goddesses Arajyavāsinī, Ghatṭavāsinī.
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Temples in the Guhila Territory Inscriptionally Located AD 10th - 13th Centuries

**Divas:**
- **Dvatayaksini Devi:** Guhila Grants in AD 942.
- **Dadivara:** Guhila Grants in AD 953.
- **Nnigalvami:** Temple built by the Guhulas in AD 972.
- **Surya:** Private Grants in Guhila Saktikumars reign (late AD 10th century).
- **Kahilesvaara:** Temple built by the Guhlas in the late AD 10th century.
- **Enalinga Mahadeva:** Temple built by the Guhlas in AD 971.
- **Pasupata Matha** and the Guhila Patronage in AD 1116.
- **Ambadevi:** Guhila Grants in AD 1172-73.
- **Samadhiyava Mahadeva:** Patronized by the chief bard at the Guhila court, Vedacharya in late AD 13th century.
- **Achalesvara Mahadeva and Pasupata Matha:** Guhila Grants in AD 1285.
- **Vindhyavasini:** Private Grants in late AD 13th century.
- **Goddess (Unidentified):** Private Grants in AD 1298-99.
Vāṭayakṣinī,\textsuperscript{151} and Vindhyavāsinī\textsuperscript{152} spanning the seventh to the thirteenth centuries in Mewar indicate an overall process of change: incorporation of cults, integration of localities and hence local goddesses into some of these supra-local deities. Chattopadhyaya points out, ‘They do not all develop into major cults, but some do. They function towards the integration of other local cults and become one of the recognizable symbols of the region. The religious and ideological expressions of a region in their varied forms thus become enmeshed in the web of its polity, economy and society’.\textsuperscript{153} Incorporation of local goddesses and their patronage marks the first stage in the ideological support to the process of state formation in Mewar. The fact is clearly revealed by the Ekaliṅgamāhātmam in which Vindhyavāsinī along with her associates Jayā and Vijayā, predominantes its early part,\textsuperscript{154} followed by the second stage of royal patronage of Ekaliṅga and the Pāsūpata ācāryas. The second stage corresponds to the installation of Ekaliṅga by Vindhyavāsinī at Nāgdā and spread of the cult of Śiva.\textsuperscript{155} The third and the final stage seems to relate to the direct appropriation of the cult of Ekaliṅga by the Guhila dynasty.

The religious process of state formation in Mewar seems to have culminated in the fifteenth century, when Guhila affiliation to central deity, Ekaliṅga was sought directly bypassing the medium of Pāsūpata ācārya Hārītaraśi. The process finds its expression in the title of Ekaliṅganijasevaka (the personal servant of Ekaliṅga). The Kumbhalgarh slab inscription of A.D. 1460 calls the reigning king, Mahārāṇa Kumbha, Yasyaikalinganijasevaka (Ekaliṅga's personal servant).\textsuperscript{156} The same title is attributed to Mahārāṇa Kumbha in the Kumbha Prasāsti section of the Ekaliṅgamāhātmam, which describes the relationship between the king of
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Mewar and god Ekaliṅga as that of the servant and master. In the Kṣīresvara māhātmyam section of the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam, Śiva (Kṣīresvara) is also called Kṣetrapāla (lord of the land of the region).

The major local cult that predominates next to Ekaliṅga in Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam as well as contemporary Guhila records is that of goddess Vindhyavāsinī. A temple of Vindhyavāsinī was well-established by the fifteenth century, as the Kumbhalgarh slabs describe the temple and eulogize the goddess. The fact that Vindhyavāsinī represented the goddess tradition of Mewar is evident from her predominance over Ekaliṅga in the early portions of Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam. The centrality of the cult of Vindhyavāsinī in Mewar can be perceived in the fact that in spite of the absence of mother goddess in the central pantheon in the literature of the Lakulīśa-Pāsūpata sect, Vindhyavāsinī remains identified with Pārvatī in the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam. We realize that śāstric injunctions and theoretical compulsions did not always translate into the reality of historical processes. Pārvatī is not worshipped along with Ekaliṅga in the same temple.

The temple of Vindhyavāsinī figuring in the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam seems to point towards an ancient temple of Vindhyavāsa (popularly known as Vanavāsinī) on the slope of the Trikuṭa hills to the north of the rampart of the Ekaliṅgajī temple. This description of Vindhyavāsinī relates more to the popular aspects of Dūrgā (killer of demons and title of Čaṇḍikā) rather than a typical local goddess. Vindhyavāsinī figures along with Ekaliṅga in a Ekaliṅga temple inscription of the sixteenth century (A.D. 1534-5) in which Pāsūpata acārya Śrī Naroharinā figures as the chief acārya of the
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temple, engaged in an expansion of the maṭha. The record also significantly refers to the legendary Pāṣūpatācārya Hārītarāṣṭi. Thus the integration of the traditions of goddesses of Mewar into the central pantheon was accomplished by the Pāṣūpatas. Incidentally, the sixteenth century Ekaliṅga temple inscription also proves that at least till the mid-sixteenth century Ekaliṅga temple was a Pāṣūpata institution.

In Ekaliṅgamāhāṭmyam, Vindhyavāsinī is made to install Ekaliṅga in Nāgahrda. She also instructs Bappa to worship him. Hārītarāṣṭi who worships both Vindhyavāsinī and Ekaliṅga, is instructed by Vindhyavāsinī to invoke Ekaliṅga. Being invoked, Ekaliṅga confers the state of Mewar on Bappa and the abode of Kailāsa on Hārītarāṣṭi. Vindhyavāsinī is eulogized again and again in the Māhāṭmyam and the bija mantra (according to tāntrik system) is imparted to the initiators. The tīrtha of Vindhyavāsinī is known to be situated in the north of the Cakrapuṣkarīṇī tīrtha (Viśṇu and Laksṇa). She is stated to bless the devotees of Ekaliṅga. As expected, her tīrtha is said to be in the forests (Vāṭikā gahraṇye vane). Here, the best of the sages worship her after taking the ritual dip (tatra snātvā munivarō Vindhyavāśam prapujya ca). An entire chapter is devoted in the Māhāṭmyam to her worship on a
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royal scale (rājopcarānkhilān). It is significant to note that "weapons and accessories" of the goddess are also worshipped. Vindhyavāsinī is worshipped on the third day, next to Ekālīṅga, in the fourteen days' annual festival of Mewar, the Caitrayātrā.

It also appears that it is through Vindhyavāsinī that other local cults of mother goddesses were integrated in the fifteenth century. Jayā and Vijayā, the two associates of Pārvatī, are identified with the Banas and Gambhira rivers respectively. These could signify the local goddesses of the territorial expanse between Banas and Gambhira which were identified with Pārvatī's (Vindhyavāsinī in case of Mewar) associates. The assumption is plausible in view of the absence of the local cults of Ghaṭṭavāsinī or Vāṭayakṣinīdevī, in the list of deities worshipped during Caitrayatra (annual yatra to Ekālīṅga temple). Even today, the annual fairs of Kārṇīmātā in Kunwāriyā and Bāmi Mātā (in Deogarh and Kotra tehsils respectively in Udaipur district), and Ghaṭṭarānī Mātājī (in Jahazpur tehsil, Bhilwara district) are important festivals in Mewar. Ghaṭṭarānī Mātājī reminds us of goddess Ghaṭṭavāsinī of the Dabok inscription of A.D. 644.

The identification of the cult of local goddesses with Parvati in Mewar is also evident from the famous festival of
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Gaṇagaur. Gaṇa stands for Śiva while Gaur stands for Pārvatī (also known as Gaurī). But over time the meaning of Gaṇagaur has become limited to Pārvatī. The festival of Gaṇagaur is celebrated especially in Udaipur, Nathadwara and Gogunda. A procession of the image of Gaṇagaur Mātā is taken out for four days in Udaipur. At lake Pichhola, the Gaṇagaur Mātā is ritually worshipped. The convoy of Gaṇagaur is followed by that of Ekaliṅgaji and Ekaliṅgaji is followed by the Mahārāṇā and his sāmantas. There are various traditions regarding the origin of Gaṇagaur. But one of the earliest traditions identifies Gaurī with a maiden of the land. Gaurī in the disguise of a girl tells her friends that the "country" (Mewar) is her father's place. Similarly, another tradition also identifies Gaṇagaur with a maiden of Udaipur (Virāmdas's daughter). Thus the traditions attempt to trace the roots of Pārvatī in Mewar, land of a number of important cults of local goddesses. It is important that in Udaipur, the Gaṇagaur procession is taken out in the name of Ambāmātā as well. Inscriptions have already testified to the popularity of Ambāmātā in early medieval Mewar. Gaṇagaur in Mewar is not only a state festival but is equally a popular festival -- Īsar pūjṇ Pārvatī jī Rāṇyān pūje rāj men māhen pūjṇ evat men.

Perhaps the most obvious indicator of Vindhyavāsinī, also represented some aspects of the goddess worshipped by the Bhils, is the celebration of Gaṇagaur by the Bhils, specially recorded in the case of Gogunda. Each Bhil girl performs a dance with a clay image of Gaṇagaur, dressed like a Bhil maiden, placed on her head. Gaṇagaur is also
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celebrated by the Gerāsiās, the other important tribe in southern Rajasthan. The popularity of the cult of Śiva and Pārvatī among the Bhils is also evident from their traditions and legends. It is already noted that Bhil folklore narrates the marriage of Mahādeva with a Bhil bride. She evidently becomes Pārvatī, the consort of Śiva. The tradition obviously highlights the popularity of the cult of Śiva among the Bhils. It is significant to note that today each Bhil clan has one Mātā, each with a different name such as Dhāras, Ambar, Lemāsh, Māliyā, Kārel, etc. However, more significantly it should be noted that all of them have the same attributes and appear to be manifestations of one Mātā.

The Māhātmyam specifies the assimilation of militant Bhils through Śivabhakti. Such specification definitely indicates the issue of integration of the Bhils to the State of Mewar. Acceptance of the cult of Śiva or the gradual popularity gained by the cult among the Bhils in the medieval period may have a significant connection with the centrality of Vindhyavāsini along with Ekālīṅga in state formation.

Bhavānī or Dūrgā continued to be identified with the local goddesses in Mewar in medieval times. Tradition attests to the construction of a magnificent temple of Bhavānī known as Vijayasenī-Bhavānī. Another contemporary medieval temple of Bhavānī is to be found at Sitoor in the Hāḍā dominion, eastern Mewar. The goddess is popularly
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known as Sitoor-ka-Bhavānī. 194

The next major role of the Pasupatas was the creation of goddess Raṣṭrasenā. She figures for the first time in the Māhātmya. There is no mention of her in contemporary epigraphical records. The literal meaning of Raṣṭrasenā is the "army of the state". She is stated to have been created out of the body of Vindhyavāsinī with war-like characteristics. 195 From the early fourteenth century onwards, Mewar was invaded again and again by the rulers of Delhi, Gujarat and Malwa. Inscriptional and literary sources of the period, including the Arabic accounts of Gujarat, illustrate the military career of Mahārāṇī Kumbha (A.D. 1433-A.D. 1468). 196 The continuous military campaigns and invasions necessitated an ideological support. The support was provided by the Pasupatas in the form of goddess Raṣṭrasenā. In view of the custom of the worship of warlike goddesses, recorded in the Māhātmya, 197 it is possible that they adopted a local war-goddess. The success in foiling repeated military attacks helped establish the popularity of Raṣṭrasenā. The Guhila military successes in defence as well as territorial expansion established her popularity. Thus, through the spread of the cult of Raṣṭrasenā, the loyalty of the masses could be mustered in the periods of military venture. As the literal meaning of her name shows, loyalty to Raṣṭrasenā would have helped in the military mobilization of men, especially tribal militias. The case of Raṣṭrasenā may be compared with the cult of Raṇacanda of the Dimāsā state in Cachar (Assam). In the case of the Dimāsā state, the original titulary deity, Kāchāi Kāṭī, was transformed into Raṇac-
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handî (goddess of war). To quote J.B. Bhattacharjee,

...the hymns and verses were made available by the Brahmans for her worship. As Dimasa were then locked in prolonged wars with the Ahoms and the Jaintias and had to reckon with Mughal invasions, the Goddess of War could easily command loyalty. Further the deity was protected as fierce... The success in repelling the repeated Ahom onslaughts strengthened the belief that Kamachandî was the protectress of the tribe and worshipping her would ensure victory in war.

An entire chapter is devoted to the worship of Rāṣṭrañëa in the Māhātmyam. Whenever Ekalinga is invoked in a crisis to protect the state, Ekalinga instructs Rāṣṭrasena to help militarily and politically restore Citrakuta to the Guhilas. Today, there stands a temple of Rāṣṭrasena (Rāṭhasena) near that of Vindhyavāsinī and Ekalingajī. Besides Vindhyavāsinī, Cāmunḍā, Kālikā, Ambikā and goddesses of villages and hills were also integrated into the pantheon. But they do not figure in the central pantheon. Next to Ekalinga and Vindhyavāsinī, Gañesā, Takṣaka (Takṣakesām Mahēśvaram), Kumāra (Kārtikeya), Bhāskara (Sūrya), Bhairva (malignant form of Śiva), Dūrgā, Dharmeswar (another form of Śiva), Viṣṇu, Lakṣmīnārayana and Kāmesā (Kāmadeva?) are worshipped during Caitrayātrā.
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205. Ibid., pp.162-65, vv.50-90.
obviously tops the list of the tīrthas.\textsuperscript{206} It legitimizes the supremacy of the Pāśupata sect in the region. Sāivite tīrthas, such as Dhāresvāra,\textsuperscript{207} Kṣīresvāra in the land of rivers Chandrabhaga and Gomati (Bhilwara and Udaipur districts),\textsuperscript{208} Gautamesvāra (Godwar region, Pali district, north of Mewar hills),\textsuperscript{209} Takṣaka Mahesvāra,\textsuperscript{210} Kuṭila-kūṇḍa\textsuperscript{211} and Kedārakūṇḍa\textsuperscript{212} make up the list of regional tīrthas. The list of the tīrthas in Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam testifies to the spread of the cult of Śiva.

Patronage for the Pāśupatās was sought again and again through a threat that whenever Ekaliṅga was neglected, Mewar would be attacked by the Mlecchhas,\textsuperscript{213} and relief can only come when help is sought through Hārīta's disciples.\textsuperscript{214} The Māhātmyamhails the Pāśupata system as the best way to achieve spiritual liberation the ultimate goal of man.\textsuperscript{215} At the same time the tīrtha of Vindhyavāsinī at Karaja Kūṇḍa and that of Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa also figure in the list for obvious reasons.\textsuperscript{216} Thus were integrated all the local deities into the pantheon of Ekaliṅga.\textsuperscript{217} The final stage of legitimation was sought through the office of the person-

\textsuperscript{206} Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam, op. cit., p.144, v.40.

\textsuperscript{207} Ibid., p.9, vv.25-27.

\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., ch.15.

\textsuperscript{209} Ibid., p.70, v.123.

\textsuperscript{210} Ibid., p.142, vv.9-10.

\textsuperscript{211} Ibid., pp.141-42, vv.308.

\textsuperscript{212} Ibid., p.144, vv.33-39.

\textsuperscript{213} Ibid., p.134, v.59.

\textsuperscript{214} Ibid., p.133, v.49, 'Hārītasya ca sīṣya te vinayenābhi baddya'cā'.

\textsuperscript{215} Ibid., p.160, v.14, 'Vratam Pāśupatam nāmā Śivalokagatipradam'.

\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., p.143, vv.18, 20.

\textsuperscript{217} Ibid., p.7, v.10, 'Yādṛiśam yasya devasya rūpamāyudhavāhanam l tadṛiśam dārsadīm mūrtīm prāpya pūjya bhavisyatha īl'.
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al servant of the god, Ekaliṅga. The first official appearance of the title Ekaliṅganijasevaka takes place in the fifteenth century.218

As the Guhila king became Ekaliṅga's deputy, the deity assumed kingly attributes and the king underwent some sort of deification.219

The Mahādevas... were increasingly transformed into imperial Lords by fitting them out with all symbols of an earthly maharāja and by assimilating their temple rites increasingly to the palace rites. For, the greater the ostentation of the Mahādeva and his divine court, all the more legitimate was the splendour and power of his earthly representatives and his royal court. This development contributed decisively to the legitimation of the maharāja who, while not really deified, was brought, nevertheless, nearer to the divinity.220

Ekaliṅga was invested with rituals on a royal scale.221 The abhiṣeka of Ekaliṅga seems to have something in common with that of the king. While Ekaliṅga is bathed in pañcam-ṛitam (dadhi, kṣīram, sita, madhu and ghṛtam), the king is bathed in pañcagavya (clarified oil, milk, curd, honey and sugar) during his abhiṣeka (coronation).222

The king is first given bhasmīsnāna (bath in ashes) during the ritual of abhiṣeka. It reminds us of the pasupata ritual of bathing in ashes.224 But what is clearly demonstrated is that the Guhila king is a deputy of Ekaliṅgaji. The king is permitted to rule only with the permission of Ekaliṅgaji. The fact is amply demonstrated by the coronation ceremony. After the Bhils perform the tīka

218. Kumbhalgarh prasāṭi, 4th slab, op. cit., v.239.


220. Ibid.

221. Ekaliṅgamahātmyam, Chs.23-25, 32.

222. Ibid., p.117, v.8.

223. Rajendranath Purohit, op. cit., p.43.

ceremony comes the turn of the chief priest of the Ekaliṅgajī temple to put the tilak. He also garlands the king, and confers on him a stole and other articles. At the end of the long coronation ceremony, the Rāṇā pays a visit to the Ekaliṅgajī temple. The Rāṇā, dressed as the priest, performs the worship of Ekaliṅgajī. The chief priest of the temple, on behalf of Ekaliṅgajī, presents a sword, royal umbrella, chaurī and other insignia of royalty. The king donates a huge amount in the name of Ekaliṅgajī and also a sum to the priest. After the ceremony at the temple, the king takes leave of Ekaliṅgajī and returns to the royal palace.

Alliance with the Śaiva centres was further sought once the political centre of the state shifted from Nāgdā-Āhaḍa to Chittaurgarh. Chittaurgarh had a popular Śaiva tīrtha at Samadhīśvara, close to the royal funerary station and an ancient Kuṇḍa, Gaumukh. There is no reference to Samadhīśvara Mahādeva in the pre-thirteenth century Guhila records. Expectedly, reference to Samadhīśvara Mahādeva start figuring in the Guhila records only from the thirteenth century onwards. In other words, once the Guhilas established themselves at Chittaurgarh, a corollary relationship was extended to the local, popular Śaiva tīrtha of Samadhīśvara. The relationship is revealed gradually. In the beginning, the royal dynasty did not claim any direct alliance with

225. Rajendra Purohit, op. cit., p.46. The fact that the Bhils have the foremost right to put tīkā at the coronation ceremony also highlights the political importance of the Bhils, signifying transfer of power.

226. Ibid.

227. Ibid., p.48.

228. Ibid., p.49.

229. Ibid.

230. Tod, Annals, Vol.I, op. cit., p.600. About the priests of Ekaliṅgajī, Tod also writes, "the Ranas of Mewar as the Deewans or Vice-regents of Siva, when they visit the temple, supercede the high priest in his duties, and perform the ceremonies, which the reigning prince does, with particular correctness and grace".
Samadhīśvara Mahādeva of Chittaurgarh. But the popularity of the cult among the local elite is revealed only by the royal records. Royal priest and court-bard Vedasārmā declares himself to be a favourite of Ekaliṅga as well as Śrī Samadhīśā in Achalesvāra inscription of A.D. 1285. But the popularity of the cult among the local elite is revealed only by the royal records. Royal priest and court-bard Vedasārmā declares himself to be a favourite of Ekaliṅga as well as Śrī Samadhīśā in Achalesvāra inscription of A.D. 1285. A similar situation continues to prevail till the early fifteenth century when the royal artisan Viṣāla declares himself a favourite of Samadhīśā and prays for the eternal existence of the temple of Śrī Samadhīśāmahēśvara in Chittaurgarh (Samadhīśvara temple) inscription of Mokal. The situation significantly changes in the latter half of the fifteenth century when the royal family claims direct relationship with Samadhīśvara indicating the popularity and influence of this tīrtha. Rāpā Kumbha claims to be a worshipper of Samadhīśvara of Citrakūṭa, so also Mokal in the Purāṇic section of the Ekaliṅgagamāhātmyam.

However, Ekaliṅga continued to be the highest source of legitimation, and large-scale land-grants were made to the temple at the end of our period of study.

The Ekaliṅga temple dakiṇadvāra prasātī records the grant of a number of villages to it in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. The list runs as follows: Śīmavallīpura by Hāṃmīra, Pānavaḍapura and Khetanarāṇātha by Kṣetrasimha, cirava by Lakṣāsiṃha, Vādhanaṇḍa and Rāmāgraṇa by

231. op. cit., v.60 'Yokārsīd Ekaliṅgatribhuvana- Viditasrīsamadhīśāca-krasvāmi prasādavinde priyapatunanayo Vedasārmā prasātīh'.

232. op. cit., v.3 and 5 of last part. 'Atiprasās tāiralikhatprasāstimvarnairavarṇena bahih kritairyaḥ 11 Śrīmatsamadhīśāmahēśvara syaprasādata sa cirajīvanostu 11 rucirāksaramutkārṇa prasastiyamuvjvata 11 Lilekha Viṣalāḥ śilpi Śrīsamadhīśāprasādatah'.

233. Kumbhalgarh prasātī, 4th slab, op. cit., v.222, 'Nyipah Samadhīśarāsiiddhatejah samadhībhajam paramam rahasyam 11 ārādhya tasyalayamidd-dhara Śrīcitrakūte manitoronāmākain'.

234. op. cit., p.181, v.111.


236. Ibid., v.32.
Guhila Grant of Villages to the Temple of Ekaliṅgaṭi:
AD Late 14th - 15th Centuries.

Note: Khetarnāth remains unidentified.
Mokal,\textsuperscript{237} Nāgahrda (renewing or granting additional resources), Kathadāvana, Mālakakhetakā and Bhimāna by Kumbha for the worship of Umā-Mahēṣā (in addition to Ekaliṅga,\textsuperscript{238}) and Ratnakhetā by Rāimalla.\textsuperscript{239} This list of villages donated by the royalty is, significantly, repeated in the Mewari (dialect) part of this record. ...Rāi Kedār, Hammīra huo, tīna Śrī Ekaliṅga Caturmukha mūrti dhārāvī, si heta grāma devabhogartha cadavyum, seto... P ānapād grāma... Lākhansena, tīni Ciravograma....\textsuperscript{240} The same list of royal landgrants is attested by \textit{Amarakāvyam}.\textsuperscript{241} Such an extensive network of royally donated villages indicates the renewal of a symbiotic relationship between the Guhila dynasty and Ekaliṅga, particularly in the reign of the Rāpās (post-thirteenth century). This record of Rāimalla repeats the well-known legends of "Bappa at Nāgahrda" and the bestowal of the kingdom of Medapāta on Bappa by Hārītarāśī (of the temple of Trīkūṭaṅgiri, a devotee of Śrī Ekaliṅga).\textsuperscript{242} Repetition of the age-old legitimizing motifs undoubtedly helped stabilize the political situation for Rāṇā Rāimalla. A similar alliance is also echoed by the \textit{Ekaliṅgamahāatmyam} which refers to the renewal of the worship and patronage of the Ekaliṅga temple by Rāimalla after the brief interregnum of Udaiśiṁha I (assassin of Kumbha) and his ally the Delhi Sultan.\textsuperscript{243}

We have seen that sacred domain emanated from a variety of sources in Mewar. The Guhila state patronized brāhmaṇas who provided them with respectable origin in the early phase of state formation. Brāhmaṇas composed and officially

\textsuperscript{237} \textit{Ibid.}, v.46, 'Grāmam Vādhaṇapādam Rāmagrāmam ca Mokalo niṇipatih II Sivabhutagāmsūlkam Sivabhogārtham Samar-pāyāmas'.

\textsuperscript{238} \textit{Ibid.}, v.48.

\textsuperscript{239} \textit{Ibid.}, v.67.

\textsuperscript{240} \textit{Ibid.}, concluding part in Mewari dialect.


\textsuperscript{242} \textit{op. cit.}, vv.11-17.

\textsuperscript{243} \textit{op. cit.}, ch.30,
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propagated legitimizing motifs in the later phases and continued to legitimize Guhila power beyond Mewar and in tribal centres and non-Guhila Rajput localities. But in the peak period of state formation in Mewar, between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries, the Guhila power drew validation from the highest source of legitimation, the cult of Ekatiṅga of Nāgda and the Pāsūpata ācāryas. The Guhila title Ekatiṅganijasevaka in the fifteenth century links the Guhila power directly to the central cult of Ekatiṅga. The surrender of sovereign power to Ekatiṅga, the de jure ruler of Mewar, legitimized rule of the fifteenth century Guhilas in Mewar and hence facilitated massive mobilization for the Guhila state. A general survey of monarchical myths and royal links with cult centres in Orissa, Bastar and South India in the context of state formation in the early medieval and medieval periods confirms our observations.
### CHAPTER V - APPENDIX

**Origin Myths based on Legends (I)**

**The Medieval Tribal Polities in Orissa, Bihar, Bengal, and Assam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Status Claimed</th>
<th>Origin Myth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORISSA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. State of Bonai; possibly</td>
<td>Oral Traditions at Kadam Vaṃśa Rajput</td>
<td>Late Royal Chronicle(^2)</td>
<td>Originating in Ceylon, left under a Kadam tree brought up by a Peacock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhubyan or Bond or Bin-jhal Tribal and chiefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State of Mayurbhanj; Bhanja tribal chiefs</td>
<td>Royal Chronicles(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sūryavamsa Vaṃśa gotra, Claiming origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State of Keonjhar: Bhanja Royal family, Rulers sponsored by the Pabudi Bhubyan, Saonti, Rajkut Bhubyan and Kondh tribes</td>
<td>Local Annals(^6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child prince Jyotibhanj of the Bhanja royal family was stolen from the royal palace by some members of the Bhuian tribe of Keonjhar to redress their grievances, Boy-prince was brought up by the Bhuian as their king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIHAR:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Chhotanagpur: Nāg- Royal chronicles Veği Kṣatriya Nāgvaṃśa Vamsārya royal familial Impor- Ram's Nāg Vaṃsāval counterpart Tribal Partner in State formation of Chhotanagpur are the Mundas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Originating Pundarika Nāga disguised as a brāhmaṇa and married to a brāhmaṇa wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST BENGAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Mallabhum; A.D. 16th Century - End of 18th Century (Major portion of present Bankura district)</td>
<td>Royal chronicles(^6)</td>
<td>Rajput Kṣatriya</td>
<td>Ṭdi Malla, founder of the Malla dynasty, son of a Rajput Kṣatriya rāja, brought up by a brāhmaṇa in a forest. The boy-prince in alliance with an aboriginal prince carved out a principality in the forest territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malla Royal family Bagdis, a low-caste community from Eastern Mālābhum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Status Claimed</th>
<th>Origin Myth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSAM: Ahom State: A.D. 1228-1800</td>
<td>Bagdi chronicles</td>
<td>Bagdi origin of the Malia Kings</td>
<td>First Bagdi child of Śiva and Pārvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahom Royal family</td>
<td>Royal Ahom chronicles</td>
<td>Divine Origin of the First Tai Kingdom came from heaven to bring fellow land under cultivation and stateless people under a stable ruler (indicate superiority of Tai agriculturists over their non-Tai neighbours practising Jhum cultivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimāśa State or Heramba-rajya; (North Cachar Hills and parts of Nowgong district in Assam, Dayung-Dhansiri valley in Nagaland and Jiri Frontier Area in Manipur)</td>
<td>Royal Chronicles</td>
<td>Divine origin</td>
<td>First Dimāśa King Nirbhoya Nārāyaṇa discovered his divine origin through his dharma guru, a brāhmaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimāśa Royal Family descending from Bodo lineage of Tibeto-Burmese origin</td>
<td>Brahmanical Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Dimāśa King Nirbhoy Nārāyaṇa was blessed by war goddess Ranachanḍi, invincibility in battles. Hīmabhīṣa of MahaBhārata, ancestors and Bhīma, (Pandava brother) the ancestor, Ghatotkach Nārāyaṇa, the first Dimāśa ruler and genealogy begins with Bhīma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Ibid., p.79.
10. Ibid., pp.181-182.
11. Ibid., pp.182-183.
### Evolution of and Shift in Rajput Origin Myths Other than Guhila Dynasties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasties</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Political Status</th>
<th>Origin Claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gurjaras of Nandipuri</td>
<td>A.D. 7th Century</td>
<td>Subordinate allies, suggested by such titles as mahā sāmanata, etc.</td>
<td>Descent from Mahāraja Kāpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratihāras of Mandor</td>
<td>Mid-eighth century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descent from the Kṣatriya, implying brahma-śāstrī status. Also claims links with Lākṣaṇa who acted as the Pratihāra (door keeper) of Rāma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Late eighth century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of the brāhmaṇa wife dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratihāras of Rajasthan and Kañauj</td>
<td>Ninth century</td>
<td>Sovereign Power</td>
<td>Descent from the Sun, implying Sūryavarma origin through Lākṣaṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Tenth century</td>
<td>Mentioned as the overlords of the Cāhamānas</td>
<td>Rāghuvarsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurjara-Pratihāras of Rajor (Alwar)</td>
<td>Late Tenth century</td>
<td>Subordinate Allies of the Pratihāras of Rajasthan and Kañauj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāhamānas of Nādol (Godwar; Marwar)</td>
<td>Early Twelfth century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descent from Indra through a person who was born out of Indra's eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cāhamānas of Sākambharī</td>
<td>Mid-Tenth century</td>
<td>Subordinate Allies of the Pratihāras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Late Twelfth century</td>
<td>Sovereign Power</td>
<td>Brāhmaṇical descent, Viprasṛti Vatsagotra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Late twelfth century</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descent from Sun-god, described as the right eye of Viṣṇu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 1191-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descent from the Sun and the Ikṣvāku of the Kṛta age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. EI, Vol.XXVI, pp.84 ff.
21. Ibid., Vol.XXIX, p.179.
### Guhila Dynasties and Chiefly Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Political Status</th>
<th>Nature of claims about the Origin of the family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guhils of Kīrṣkindhā</td>
<td>Vaya</td>
<td>Guhilaputrān</td>
<td>Subordinate allies, suggested by such titles as Śānkaputra, Śamadhigataputra mahārāja, mahārāja, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guhils of Middle of the Chatsu tenth century</td>
<td>Guhilavānśa</td>
<td>Subordinate allies of the Morīs and Pratiharas</td>
<td>Brahma-Kṣatārvīta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guhils of A.D. 66124 Mewar</td>
<td>Guhilānvaya</td>
<td>Although they bear no subordinate political title possibly functioned as subordinate allies of the Morīs</td>
<td>Founder of the family, Guhadatta is described as 'Ānandapura Vīnirgata Viṃprakulāndanaṁ mahādevah' implying descent from a brahma family of Ānandapura (Vadnagar in northeastern Gujarat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.D. 97325</td>
<td>Sovereign in Mewar Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 108326</td>
<td></td>
<td>- do -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 128527</td>
<td>Guhilavānśa</td>
<td>Sovereign in Mewar</td>
<td>Brahmakṣāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 146028</td>
<td></td>
<td>- do -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 150029</td>
<td>Āilādityavānśa</td>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Sūryavānśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>A.D. 156330</td>
<td>Gahilānta</td>
<td>- do -</td>
<td>Sūryavānśa and Ikṣavākavānśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guhila of Māṅgrol (Saurashtra)</td>
<td>Guhilavānśa</td>
<td>Functionary of the Caulukyas title of 'Surastranāyaka'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guhils of A.D. 1179-80 Unstra Jodhpur (Marwar)</td>
<td>Guhila</td>
<td>Small, local chiefs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guhils of A.D. 1138 Nāḍūl (Godwar)</td>
<td>Guhilānvaya</td>
<td>Local chief at Nāḍūl in the Nāḍūl Cāhamāna State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24. Udaipur or Kundagrāma praśāsti of Guhila Aparājita, *op. cit.*
25. Ātpura inscription of Saktikumāra, *op. cit.*
27. Achalesvāra Inscription, *op. cit.*
30. Rāj Praśāsti Mahākāvyam, *op. cit.*
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