CHAPTER VI

PERCEPTIONS OF THE GUHILA STATE:
LITERARY REPRESENTATIONS

This chapter consists of five sections. The first or the introductory section briefly discusses the sources and their reliability - the methodological issues. The second section probes the self-perception of the state based on royal inscriptions from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, *Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam*, the sthalapurāṇa, the royal inscription of the seventeenth century; Rājapraśāsti and a text, *Amarakāvyam* of the seventeenth century. The third section discusses the perception of the influential, non-Rajput social groups engaged in the functioning of the state: the Tāṃṭaraḍās and the Jains, between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries. We then probe popular perceptions of the Guhila state, represented by bardic literature such as Cāran Gīḍhara's *Sagat Rāso* and Nainsī Rī Khyāt of the seventeenth century, and Col. James Tod's *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* of the nineteenth century. We conclude with a brief discussion of the general trends and standardized motifs representing the Guhila state. The chapter will be appended with the genealogical lists from the *Nainsī Rī Khyāt*, the *Sūryavāṃśāvalī* and *Rājabali Bahī*.

Methodologically, our sources would be utilized to analyse the contemporary situations. The royal inscriptional records between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries situate the Guhila rulers in the context of their contemporary political and territorial achievements and problems. The analysis would relate to the Guhila attempts in projecting particular images in specific situations. Rāṇachoḍa Bhaṭṭa's Rājapraśāsti Mahākāvyam and *Amarakāvyam* undoubtedly reflect the royal perception in the seventeenth century. Rāṇachoḍa Bhaṭṭa, patronized by the royal court, was obviously presenting an exaggerated accounts of the Guhila Kings of Mewar to the elite in the royal court and to a similar audience beyond Mewar in contemporary Rajasthan. The Jain sources between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries are one of our best historical sources as they are least mediated. They are composed by the Jain acāryas and reflect their perception of the Guhila state.
Nainsī, a seventeenth century official and an historian of the royal court of Marwar wrote about the Guhila state in Marwari while the cāran poet from Mewar, Girādhar Āsiā, composed *Sagat Rāso* in Mewari. Unlike the Bhāts who are essentially genealogists, the Cārans are specialists in compositions and recitations of family traditions and histories. They are the primary preservers and transmitters of family tales.¹ They are rewarded just like the Bhāts with grants of land called sāsan held in perpetuity.² If Nainsī Ri Khyāt was meant for a larger audience beyond the royal court in the seventeenth century, *Sagat Rāso*, although patronized by the court of Mewar, was certainly directed at a popular audience in Mewar in the same period. What emerges out of a juxtaposition of the royal-accounts, Khyāt and Cāran traditions of the seventeenth century is the parallels and the contrasts in the different perceptions. Finally, we have the account of Col. James Tod, an official of the East India Company, who learnt Sanskrit and Mewari dialects from a local Jain Ācārya. He widely travelled throughout Mewar, met various Rajput chiefs and collected the local bardic traditions. His claim of presentation of the Rajput traditions therefore seems to be doubly mediated, as local annals were interpreted first by the elite members of the local society before they were interpreted by Tod. Our purpose is to compare and contrast nineteenth century perception of the Guhila state with those of the seventeenth century, to assess whether changes occurred in popular perceptions or whether the general perception of the Guhila state had become standardized. Our suggestion can also be attested by some of current popular idioms and songs from Mewar.

II

Our discussion of the royal perception of the state of Mewar begins with the late thirteenth century as the Guhilas attained regional statehood (through integrative processes) in this period. The Guhila state of Nāgdā-Āhāda, which had graduated from a local state (seventh century) to a sub-

---

regional state of Mewar hills (between the tenth and thirteenth centuries) and finally to the regional state of Mewar (late thirteenth century) projected magnified self-image for the first time in the late thirteenth century. We have discussed the legitimizing motifs of Bappa-Hārītarāsi-Ekālīṅga medapāṭa that legalized the exercise of power by a local dynasty over the whole of Mewar. But it is equally important to discuss the self-projection of the Guhila state, which should be distinguished from the problems of legitimation.

In view of their recent territorial expansion and consequent political integration, the Guhila dynasty was attempting to claim local roots to popularize its image in the late thirteenth century. The Guhilas drew legitimation from the Pāṣupata sect and the cult of Ekālīṅga through the legendary king Bappa; what was being actually attempted was utilization of the same legends to claim their long association with a locally popular sect as well as the regional cult. Legendary Bappa who had obviously attained a popular image by the thirteenth century was straightaway appropriated as the founder of the Guhila dynasty. Similarly, sage Hārītarāsi, regional tīrtha at Nāgdā and its cult Ekālīṅga had been appropriated to project ancient linkages with the local and popular religious motifs and landmarks.

A chiefly family from Chittaurgarh having succeeded to the throne of Mewar possibly in the late fourteenth century was faced with essentially two political problems. It had to go through a process of identifying itself with the Guhila dynasty. The other problem pertained to the tackling of the recurrent inroads from the neighbouring sultanates of Malwa and Gujarat and consequent territorial expansion of the Guhila state. Hence, the fifteenth century kings of Mewar made every attempt to match up to Guhila glory and traditions. Hammīra, a legendary prince, (alluding to an early scion of the family) was claimed to be the conquerors


4. Ibid.
of the enemies on all sides. Hammīra is attributed with all the kingly attributes, who happens to be the best of the kṣatriyas. The fact that Hammīra was legendary and never sat on the throne of Mewar is evident from the legends woven around him.

That Hammīra possibly alludes to an early prince of the Rāṇā branch of the Guhilas has been already discussed and the situations described pertain to the early phase of the ascendancy of the Rāṇā Guhilas. But political exigencies demanded the projection of a self-image asking that an equally legendary figure like that of Bappa be claimed as the founder of the royal house. Such an image was necessary not only to highlight their political and military power but also to claim kinship connections with the Guhila dynasty. However, an interesting phenomenon can be observed with the coming of Hammīra in the lives of the fifteenth century Guhila kings. The importance of the legendary Bappa seems to be transferred to Hammīra. The saga of prince Hammīra is elaborated throughout the fifteenth century. Because it was Hammīra and not Bappa who was to expand the rule of the chiefly family that had succeeded the actual Guhilas.

The self-image of the state was important at the beginning of the military career of the fifteenth century Guhilas and even more so at its peak. Rāṇā Mokal began eulogizing Hammīra in the early part of the fifteenth century, and Rāṇā Kumbha further elaborated upon Hammīra’s attributes. Increasing self-image was the definite need of the hour for political consolidation.

6. Śṛṅgīrīṣi Inscription, Ibid., v.5.
8. vide Passim, Ch.III, Section: King and Kinsmen in the 15th century.
With Hammira began Mewar's battles with the Sultans and the fifteenth century Guhilas projected themselves as the 'saviour of the community' from the yoke of mlecchas. However, it is important to probe into the antecedents of the title of Hammira. Interestingly, the word hammira, hamīma or hamvira appears to be a corruption of the Arabic word amīr (commander) derived from the root amīr (command). 11 It is evident from the coins and Sanskrit inscriptions that Sultans like Mu'izzuddin (Muhammad bin Sam) and some other sultans of Delhi including Balban, were given the title of Sri Hammira. 12 Hence, the status of Amīr or Hammira seems to have been internalized by Rajput society, and Rajput princes were given the title Hammira from the thirteenth century. Whether it is Cāhamāna Hammira of Ranathambhor of the late thirteenth century-early fourteenth century or Guhila Hammira of Mewar, the status attached to the legendary Hammira by the fifteenth century Guhilas also testifies to the percolation of the courtly standards of Delhi into Rajasthan.

The process of image-building equally demanded that the fifteenth century kings claimed a comparatively ancient rulership over Mewar. Hence, prince Arisimha, Hammira's father, was "lord of Medapāṭa" in the early fifteenth century 13 and occupied a significant position in the royal genealogy at the end of the fifteenth century. 14 In fact, Arisimha too never actually sat on the throne of Mewar and just like the other early princes of this family seems to be a legendary figure. 15

The problem of repeated incursions from the neighbour-

ing sultanates and maintenance of the self-image seems to have been tackled by the Guhila state in the early period through motifs of 'liberator of the holy tirthas'. The Guhilas claim to be the 'liberators' of the holy tīrṭha of Gaya from the yoke of the Yavanas in the first half of the fifteenth century. "May the famous line of that prince Lakṣ̪aṇa ever rejoice (in this world) by whom Gayā was freed from the burden of tax for a considerable number of years, by paying lofty horses and heaps of gold to the lord of Gaya, and for which (whose) ancestors gone to the upper world, gratified as they are, even now confer (on him) genuine benedictions". 16 It is significant that the role of "saviour" of the tīrthas is only confined to Gayā in the early part of the fifteenth century. Such limited claims perhaps reflect upon the actual results of early incursions from Nagaur and Gujarat in which the losses for Mewar might have been substantial.

By the second half of the fifteenth century the royal claim to liberate Gaya gets magnified into the liberation of the holy tristhalī - the tīrthas of Gayā, Prayāg and Kāshī, all in the Gangetic plains. The Guhilas were obviously utilizing a sacred motif to enhance their credibility in the face of external threats. It is indeed worth noting that the more it got involved in the military campaigns against the sultanates of Malwa and Gujarat, the more the state dwelt on this theme. Such claims were aimed at a popular appeal. The scale on which Rāṇa Kumbha undertook his campaigns, called for massive mobilization. Without claiming to be the 'liberator of the tīrthas' it was difficult for the state to effectively mobilize the local populace in the campaigns, especially against Malwa and Gujarat. The fact that mobilization was the need of the hour is also evident from the creation of the goddess Rāṣṭrasena in more or less the same period. 17 A definite indicator that the state had to orient its self-image towards campaigns against Malwa and Gujarat, as is evident from the high-sounding titles of Kumbha as the conqueror of Malwa and its sultan (Śrī Kumbho Mālavambodhīnāthmanthalumahīdhārāh and mahamma-

16. Śrīṅgīrīṣi Inscription, op. cit., v.l1.
17. vide Passim, Ch.V, pp.
lord of Gujarat and the conqueror of Malwa and its sultan (Sphurjodgurjaramanḍalesvaramsau Kārāgrihe Vivasat and rānapahritakumājarairmitagurjaradhiśvara). Till the end of our period, Rāṇā Lākhā continues to be credited with the liberation of Gaya in the royal records. victory over the 'sākas' (the Khaljis) was a central theme: Raimalla is claimed as the 'lord of Gyāsaśāka' (Giyasuddin Khalji of Malwa) pervading Citrakūṭa. The Guhilas in the fifteenth century in their prasāstis do not simply eulogise their victories over the sultans by singling out their names but always append the term 'saka' to such defeated Kings. This would have further enhanced their image as protectors of the brāhmaṇical sacred centres and hence those of local society. Such an image is extended upto the Delhi Sultanate. Rāimalla is claimed as the 'uprooter of Delhi power', and victory over Malwa is equated with victory over the Yavanas. It is significant that by the end of our period the scope of the royal perception of the state of Mewar extends beyond Western India and the Yavanas. It takes the Guhilas to the realm of conquests of distant countries like Kashmir, Karnataka and Andhra. Rāṇā Rāimalla is described as the

21. Ibid., v.68, 'tanvānam tamulam mahāsihatibhih śrī citrakūṭe galadgarvam gyāsākesvaram Vyārcayat Śrī Rājmallo nṛpah'.
22. Ibid., v.80, 'Māṇḍyanmaṇḍapacananbdhurahaharirdhilli dridhon mulan apraudāham-Kritiriddha sindhu dharānipāthodhimanthā calah'.
23. Ibid., vv.77-78. "...Śrī Rājmalladora Gyāskṣonipateh Kṣanannipatita mānnonatāmaulayah 11 Kheravaḍatrūn Vidārya Yavanaskandhān Vabhidyāsibhiranddadandamālavajān-balādpaharan bhindanscā Vaṃsānidvipām 11 Kārtermanḍalumucakairvyārcayat Śrī Rājmallo nṛpah 11"
`Sun of Gurjara-manḍala' and conqueror of Kashmir, Karnataka and Andhra. 24

Thus, by the end of the fifteenth century, the Guhilas attempted to project an inflated military image for themselves. A chronological study of such claims from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century clearly establishes the stages by which a self-image is built. Starting with the region of Medapāṭa, the claims graduated to military conquest of both the Yavanas and the regions almost from the crown of the subcontinent to its feet.

Finally, to enhance their political image, their epithets get further elaborated by the second half of fifteenth century. The epithets expanded from simple Kṣitisa and Bhūpati 25 to Mahārājādhirāj Rāirāya Rānerā Mahārāṇā for Kumbha (Ṣrī Kumbhakarṇa). 26 It is significant to note such developments in royal epithets in the same record, the Kumbhalgarh prasāṭi. This projectd the gradual rise of the dynasty to power, its zenith being Kumbha's period. However, one of the most significant developments at the end of our period is the reiteration of the old popular motifs of Bappa-Hārītarāśī-Ekaliṅga 27 that supported their claim of belonging to the Guhila dynasty and hence the popular mandate for their sovereignty over Mewar.

The process of building of self-image by the royal house continued beyond our period of study. The Puranic section of the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam, believed to have been composed immediately after this period, introduces new royal motifs. Two mythical figures, Māhāp and Rāhap, figure for the first time. The legends about Māhāp and Rāhap pertain to the problems of identification with the Guhila dynasty. Rāhap, who is simply stated to have belonged to another

24. Ibid., v.80, 'Sphurjjadagurjjara candramangalaraviḥ Kāṃṭakāṃkṣayutah Kāṃṭhandhakādhārjāṭirvijāyate Śrī Rājmalle nṛpiḥ il'.


branch of the Guhilas, is and to have become the king after obtaining the title of Rana. 28 It clearly implies that the Rāṇās went in for invention of new myths to project their legitimacy over the throne that had belonged to the erstwhile Rāval Guhilas. By assigning Rāhap to the Sīsodā, a distinction from the Rāval is maintained too. 29 The problems of identification with the erstwhile Guhila rulers as well as maintaining its own distinction as a separate family of the Guhilas possibly became acute in view of series of assassinations of the Rāṇā kings in the fifteenth century. 30 In an open-ended polity, where any chiefly family could uphold its claim to the Guhila throne, political assassinations reveal the vulnerability of the royal family. Hence, it became necessary for the royal family at the end of the fifteenth, or in the early sixteenth century, to elaborate upon its military origin through the legend of Rāhap obtaining the kingdom by acquiring of the title of Rāṇā. Arisimha, Hammīra, etc., are replaced by some more mythical kings such as Narapati, Gajapati, Cātrapati, etc., as descendants of Rāhap.

The claim to Ādityavāṃśa (Sūryavāṃśa) is further modified in the Ekaliṅgamāhātmya by introducing the Guhila kings as descendants of brāhmaṇa Vijayāditya of Nāgarvāṃśa and Vaijāvāpā gotra hailing from Anandapura. 32 Perhaps it was an attempt at reiterating the kinship links with the Rāval Guhilas who had claimed Brahma-Kṣatra status at the end of this career in the late thirteenth century. Moreover, by assigning each chapter of the Sthalapurāṇa including that of the royal genealogy (Rājavarṇana) to the Vāyupurāṇa, 33 religious sanctity is lent to the entire story of the foundation of the Guhila state. However, once again the foundation story of the Guhila state revolving around Bappa-

28. Ekaliṅgamāhātmya, op. cit., p.175, v.63, "Rāṇātvam praptah san prithvīpati Rāhapo bhūpah".

29. Ibid., v.65.

30. Vide Passim, Ch.IV, Section: Military Apparatus, p.61.

31. Ibid., v.63.

32. Ibid., p.171, vv.1-2.

33. Ibid., Ch.26.
Hārītarāśī-Ekālīṅga is repeated in the Sthalapuruṣa to draw the ultimate popularity from the regional cult of Ekālīṅga.

With the emergence of the Mughal Empire in the second half of the sixteenth century, the political situation certainly changed for Mewar. From a position of political pre-eminence in the early sixteenth century, Mewar seems to have found it difficult to adjust itself to that of a vassal state of the Mughals. That change in the political situation was drastic is evident from the Mughal accounts themselves. Babur in his Tuzuk-i-Baburi describes Rāṇā Sāṅgā as follows.

'Although there were many small and inconsiderable Rais and Rajas in the hills and woody country, yet there were the chief and the only ones of importance. Afghans, Bahrah, Sultan Muhammad Muzaffar in Gujarāt, Bahmanis in Dekhin, Sultan Muḥmud in Malwa and Nuzrat Shah in kingdom of Bengal.... The most powerful of the Pagan princes, in point of territory and army, is the Raja of Bijanagar (Vijaynagar). Another is Rana Sanka, who has attained his prasasti, high eminence, only in these later times, by his own valour and his sword. His original principality was Chitur. During the confusion that prevailed among the princes of the kingdom of Mandu, he seized a number of provinces which had depended on Mandu such as Rantpur (Ranthambhor), Sabangpur, Bhilsan and Chanderi'.

The fact that an empire-builder from Central Asia considered his contemporary Guhila king as a powerful Rajput chief testifies to the politico-military power enjoyed by Mewar.

In contrast, Abul Fazal in his Akbar-Nama portrays a different picture for Mewar. He looks on Udaisimha II as merely an arrogant Rajput chief with substantial territorial control who prided himself on his past only. 'It has already been mentioned that the Rana's arrogance was swollen by the fact of the glory of his line of ancestors who were in ancient times were rulers of Indiā. The strength of his position, the extent of his territory, and the large number of his Rajputs who would sacrifice life for honour, cast a

34. H. M. Elliot and John Dowson (eds.), op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 259-61.
veil over his vision. He did not perceive the marvels of the Shahinshah's fortune, and abandoned obedience and went astray.35

Moreover, Mewar did not any longer enjoy the strategic predominance in the later half of the sixteenth century as it did in the time of the Delhi Sultanate. The very fact that the Mughals reached Malwa to contain the recalcitrant chiefs via Dholpur and Gwalior36 and that Mughal forces reached Gujarat without forcing passage through Mewar,37 indicates the loss in the strategic importance of Mewar. Finally, the recently founded Rajput states of Rajasthan, specially the Rāthaur states of Jodhpur (Marwar) and Bikaner and the Kacchawaha state of Jaipur had begun to legitimize their power and political pre-dominance in the western India through their Mughal connection.38 Economically too, Mewar declined in the sixteenth century.39 There then appeared new understandings of the Guhila state as it struggled to retain pre-eminence amongst Rajput states.

The clash between Rāṇā Pratap and Akbar was not particularly important as Mewar was not strategically important for the Mughals in the late sixteenth century. It is evident from Abul Fazal that Akbar seems to have taken Chittaurgarh to control the recalcitrant Rajput chiefs.40 But the magnitude of Rāṇā Pratap's struggles against Akbar in Rajput bardic lore41 clearly indicates the attempts to magnify an image in a situation of confrontation with a far greater power of that of the Mughals and the consequent, diminishing

39. Ibid.
military image of the Guhila state. Long poems were composed by Cāran poets of sixteenth century Mewar to highlight Rāṇā Pratap's resistance to Akbar. For instance, a poem of three hundred lines, composed by Sārdū Mālā, his contemporary, eulogises Rāṇā Pratap's victory over the Mughal army at the battle of Khamnor. It is significant that Sārdū Mālā calls Akbar Dīlī desā nāresa (King of Delhi).

The clash continues to be perceived in epic terms in the royal records of the seventeenth century. Both Rajaprasāsti and Amarakāvyam eulogise Pratap as the epitome of pride and power who never bowed down to Dillīpati.

It is well known that Col. Tod in his Annals has also immortalized the Bhil-Pratap alliance against Akbar. It is significant that a popular theme in Bhil songs continues to be the Rāṇā fighting the king of the East and the ultimately winning with the help of the deities of Mewar. Although the theme is supposed to refer to the coming of the Britishers into Rajasthan from the east, the theme is known to have been older than the nineteenth century. Since the Mughals were situated to the East of Rajasthan, the theme might have originated in the days of the Pratap-Akbar clash.

Hence, Sūryavamsā origins get further magnified into that of Ikṣavāku, the lineage of the epic hero, Rāmacandra by the seventeenth century. Raṇachoḍa declares that since King Bāspa is Sūryavamsi, the account of Rāṇā Rajasimha (the Guhila King contemporary to Raṇachoḍa Bhaṭṭa) would be pre-

43. Ibid., p.58, v.5.
46. Giridharlal Sharma, Bhīlon Kī Geet, Vol.II, op. cit., pp.115-20, ‘dev to sāne laqāī lāge hāī re Pūrbiā rājā nava lākhe dev to dhūlo udāve re Pūrbiā rājā bhūriā vālī fauje re Pūrbiā rājā Mevād no rājā jiti gio re Pūrbiā rājā devatā hele āāo re Pūrbiā rājā'.
ceded by that of Sūrya vamsa. 47 Thus the motif of Sūrya vamsa of the early sixteenth century is further consolidated by connecting the Guhilas to the Ikṣavāku lineage of Rāmacandra. The Guhila genealogical account is compared with that of the Sūrya vamsa in Rāmāyaṇa. 48 Then begins a detailed genealogical account of the Ikṣavāku lineage originating with Caturmukha Brahmā, the god of the universal creation and ending with Rāṇā Rājasimha via the line of the Āditya kings. 49

King Vijay is stated to have received heavenly instruction that he should give up the title of 'Rājā' and adopt the title of 'Āditya' for generations to come. 50 Vijay was followed by Padmāditya, Śivāditya, Haradatta, Sūjasāditya, Sumukhāditya, Somadatta, Śilāditya, Kesāvāditya, Nāgāditya, Bhogāditya, Devāditya, Āsāditya, Kālabhojāditya, and Grahāditya. The sons of the last prince came to be known as "Gahalot". The eldest of the Gahalots was Bāspa, the able one and born out of Pārvati's tear-drop. 51

Borrowing from the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century traditions, Raṇachoda Bhaṭṭa in the Rājaprasāsti declares the Ekalingamāhātmyam to be the sixth chapter of Medapāṭa. Khaṇḍa of Vāyupuraṇa. 52 The foundation story of the Guhila state of Bāspa (Bappa)-Hārīta-Ekalinga-Pārvatī-Medapāṭa is borrowed from the Ekalingamāhātmyam without much elaboration. Here is a repetition of Pārvatī's lamentation that her tear-drop would be born as King Bāspa. Bāspa would acquire the Kingdom and later on heavenly abode by worshipping the lord of the earth (Jagannātha) at Nāgahrda tīrtha. She is stated to have cursed one of her lesser associates (named Cśaṇḍa) to become Hārīta in Medapāṭa. He would also

48. Ibid., v.28.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., 2nd Canto, 3rd Slab, pp.21-27, vv.3-38.
51. Ibid., 4th slab, pp.29-30, vv.2-9.
52. op. cit., p.18, v.19.
attain heavenly abode by worshipping Śiva. 53

The loss of politico-military status became worse with Aurangzeb's inroads into Mewar, and Mughal attempts at direct annexation of the Rajput states in the seventeenth century. A crucial question as to why the seventeenth century court of Mewar produced two of the most important and longest royal records is perhaps partly answered in their attempts to compensate for the loss of political status.

In fact, the Rājaprasāsti is the first royal record from Mewar that claims Bappa's victory over the ancient Moris of Chittaurgarh. Bāspa (Bappa), having received immense strength from Harița, attained the prasāsti meant for sage Agastya. 54 Then begins the legend of Bāspa's military victory over his contemporary Moris of Chittaur. Being supported by other kings, Cakravartī King Bāspa is stated to have defeated King Manū of the Morī family, and to have acquired Citrakūta as his capital.

King Bāspa adopted the title of Rāval, RaṇachoḍaBhaṭṭa offers a new and a very significant analysis of the formation of this title. It is stated that 'Rā' stands for Rājyātipurṇatva (sovereignty), 'Va' for Varatva (greatness) and 'La' for Lakṣmīmatva (wealth). 55 An actual political title was magnified to glorify the Guhila dynasty rather than reveal the historical facts. Rāval Bāspa is followed by Khummāṇa, Govinda, Mahendra, Ālū, Siṃhavarma, Sāktikumār, Sālīvāhana, Naravarāhana, Ambāprasāda, Kīrttivarma, Naravarna, Narapati, Uttama, Bhairava, Puṇjarāja, Karṇāditya, Bhavasimha, Gotrasimha, Hamsaraj, Subhāyogarāja, Tejasimha, and Samarasiṃha. 56 Interestingly, Rāval Samarasiṃha is stated for the first time to be the husband of Prithvīrāja Chauhān's sister Prithā and attained heavenly abode in a battle against Sahabuddin Ghori while assisting the ruler of Delhi,

53. Ibid., v.24.
54. Ibid., vv.15-17.
55. Ibid., v.19.
56. Ibid., vv.20-24.
It can be seen that neither the above names of Guhila kings nor Samarasimha’s marriage to Cāhamāna princess Prithā can be historically attested by the contemporary official records. They are instead borrowed from the bardic literature. Raṇachoḍa Bhaṭṭa does mention in this context that he quotes Rāṣā literature (he seems to mean Prithvīrāja Rāṣa).58 Incorporations from the bardic literature reflect royal attempts to appropriate the popular imagination. It also emphasizes upon the Guhila social-links with another ancient Rajput dynasty.

The legendary figures of Māhap and Rāhap borrowed from the Ekāliṅgamāhātmyam also expand into new areas with elaborate trappings. It was the Rāṇā branch that still ruled Mewar in the seventeenth century. Samarasiṃha was succeeded by Karṇa, the twenty sixth Rāval. Karṇa was succeeded by sons Māhap and Rāhap. The eldest son, Māhap became the King of Dungarpur. Rāhap, the younger one and more daring, defeated Mokalsī of Māṅgōr and brought him to the feet of Rāval Karṇa. Karṇa is stated to have deprived Mokalsī of his title Rāṇā and conferred the same on his favourite Rāhap. Thus just like the title Rāval, history of the title of Rāṇā is shrouded in the glory of military achievements.

Ideological support is sought by bringing in the Paliwāl brāhmaṇa Śārasālya who is stated to have blessed Rāhap with the Kingdom of Citrakūṭa. Here, an attempt is made to draw parallels with the legendary Bappa Rāval, the first of Rāval Kings who received the Kingdom of Citrakūṭa from Ekāliṅga with the mediation of sage Hārītarāṣṭī. Hence, mere affiliation to the Guhila dynasty does not seem to be sufficient in the seventeenth century to claim control over Chittaurgarh. The recurrent fall of Chittaurgarh to the Mughal army after about 1550 seems to have caused repercussions on the hold of the Rāṇās over Chittaurgarh. Hence, a popular appeal similar to the legends of Bāppa-Hārītarāṣṭī, was made through the myths of Rāhap, the founder of the Rāṇā branch and Śārasālya, the Paliwal brāhmaṇa. Clearly the Paliwal brāhmaṇas (originating from Pali, Godwar) enjoyed patronage in the royal court of Mewar in the seventeenth

57. Ibid., vv.20-27.
58. Ibid., v.27.
century. Rāhāp was called Sīsodiā as he hailed from the town of Sīsodā (again borrowed from Ekalingamāhātmyam). As he acquired the title of Rāṇā, all his successors came to bear the same title. It is further asserted that Rāṇā Rahāp was a Nārāyaṇa. Similar to the etymological formation of Rāval, the title of Rāṇā was formed by the first two letters of his two epithets, 'Rājendra' (the great king) and 'Nārāyaṇa' (the universal god of preservation). Thus the actualities of the political structure are shrouded in a mystical garb to create a new perception of the Guhila state in the seventeenth century.

Interestingly, the importance of the bardic traditions seems to have been heightened by the seventeenth century. It appears that even affiliation to the Ādityas and the Ikṣavākus was not sufficient to ensure the popular image of the state. The motifs of "Ādityas" and "Ikṣavāku" were to enhance their social status amongst the Rajput states of western India. Yet they must surely have lost esteem in the eyes of the populace at large. How far could the epic and the Puranic motifs appeal to the popular mind? Incorporation of a popular tale of Guhāditya's birth in the context of Gujarat in the Amarakāvyam seems to indicate that the epic motifs were not sufficient to appeal to the popular imagination.

Having introduced a royal genealogical list similar to Rājaprasāstī (Sṛī Amarakāvyam Vaṃśāvalīgrantho yamasyatī), Amarakāvyam takes the birth-story of Guhāditya to a popular realm. The history of the Guhila family and its arrival in Mewar begins with the coming of Kamlāvatī, queen of Śīlāditya, and her daughter-in-law to Mewar during the Arab invasion of their Kingdom. The Daughter-in-law was expecting her first child. They decided to stay on in Mewar as Silāditya was killed in battle. Śīlāditya's daughter-in-law (belonged to Rāṭhaur lineage) gave birth to her posthumous son, entrusted him to a brāhmaṇī named Lakhmāvatī, and became Sati. Lakhmāvatī's husband was Vijayāditya Śarmā. He named the baby boy, Kesāvāditya and identified his gotra as Vaijavāpāyan. The brāhmaṇa brought up Kesāvāditya as his

59. Ibid., vv.28-34.

60. Amarakāvyam, op. cit., p.299, last line of the text.
son. Thus Kesāvāditya came to combine the best qualities of a brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya. He settled down in a village of olden times called Anandīpura near Citrakūṭa, (presently known as Āroṇodā in Chittaur district) and founded his own Kingdom at Anandīpura. Being endowed with magical power, he turned the statues of Vindhyavāsini and Rāṣṭraseni of the hills into gold. He ruled for one hundred and nine years, five months and nine days. Kesāvāditya was followed by Kings Nāgāditya, Bhogāditya, Devāditya, Āsaditya, Kaibhojāditya and Grahāditya. This ruling family came to be known as Guhila after King Grahāditya. With Grahāditya ends the list of the fourteen Āditya kings and begins the account of the Rāvals (vamsyamo Rāvala atha).

The story of invasion by the Arabs, satī, as well as posthumous status of Kesāvāditya, a refugee and the 'Āditya' progenitor of the royal Guhila family certainly drew sympathy. The other significant point in the above description is the location of Anandīpura near Citrakūṭa. It has already been noted that the Guhilas did claim migration from Anandapura as early as the tenth century. But Anandapura has actually been located in north-east Gujarat (Vadnagar). Nor did any early medieval royal record from Mewar ever claim that Anandapura lay near Chittaurgarh. The purpose of identifying present Āroṇodā of Chittaurgarh district with Anandīpura in the seventeenth century was to accomplish the mission of aligning the Guhilas with the political landmark of Citrakūṭa as far back as possible.

The text borrows the story of Bappa, (not introduced as Bāspa in Amarakāvyam) from Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam and Rājapraśāsti as far as his birth from Pārvatī's tear-drop is concerned. It introduces the popular story of Bappa's marriage to twenty six local princesses in frolic (the game of swinging). The marriage is stated to have been officially solemnized. Young Bappa is depicted as a shepherd. Here again is repeated the story of Bappa meeting Hārīta and pleasing Ekaliṅga through his services. Here is an incorporation of legends from the thirteenth century royal prasāstis, Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam and folk-lores of Mewar. He is stated to have worshipped both Ekaliṅga and Vindhyavāsini and became a disciple of Hārīta. Bappa was blessed with the Kingdom of

61. Ibid., 2nd Canto, pp.77-84.
Mewar and lordship of Citrakuṭa by sage Hārīta, favoured both by Ekaliṅga and Vindhyavāsini. Bappa built a temple of Ekaliṅga, the patron deity and made arrangements for its worship according to the Pasupata traditions. In the battlefield, he killed the Mori King Māturāja and snatched the fort of Chittaur and the Kingdom from him. Bappa installed Samaddhisvara on Citrakuṭa. He came to bear the title of Rāval as he excelled in the possession of kingdom (rājya), greatness (varatva) and prosperity (Lakṣaṇa) (same as Raja-praśāsti).

This account of Bappa in the Amarakāvyam proves that the legendary figure of Bappa which remained popular as late as the seventeenth century continued to be appropriated by the Guhila state by making Bappa's out to be a pan-Indian king. To ascertain control over Chittaurgarh, Bappa is shown to be militarily superior to the ancient Moris of Chittaurgarh. Finally, to create a political aura Bappa is made to extend his Kingdom from Mewar to Bay of Bengal on the east and river Indus on the West. Mewar is made to include Central Asia and Kashmir as well. Here is an attempt to project Bappa Rāval as a Cakravarti, King of all of India. This strengthens our suggestion that the status of the Mughal emperors with their original home in Central Asia influenced the Guhila perspectives even though they tried hard to conceal it. If Raja-praśāsti emphasised social links with the ancient Cāhamānas, Amarakāvyam highlights their connections with the Rathaurs. Depicting Bappa's queen as a Rātha princess indicates that the Guhilas acknowledged the socio-political importance of the Rathaurs in the seventeenth century. It is already noted that the Rathaurs enjoyed an advantageous socio-political status through their connections with the Mughals. Rathaurs' pre-eminence in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries is evident from the Guhila claim of matrimonial alliance with the Kanyakubja Rathaurs for the legendary Bappa Rāval.

The story of the two brothers, Mahapat and Rahap is narrated with a little elaboration; Rahap, the younger

brother, is depicted as more courageous and a successful military general who even marched towards Delhi. Māhāp is intentionally portrayed in dark colours so that Rāhāp, the younger brother can legitimately become the ruler. This justifies the supersession of the Rāvalas by the Rāṇās. A very interesting anecdote is narrated regarding Rāhāp's rise to power. The story reflects the political structure of Mewar in which the Bhils too are mentioned. Politically subordinate position of the Bhils in the Guhila state of Mewar is clearly evident in the story.

III

Having discussed the royal perception it becomes essential to examine the perspective of the Jains who participated in the functioning of the Guhila state of Mewar. It is important to find out in which period the Jains began to recognize the Guhilas as the rulers of Mewar. This examination becomes significant in view of their long association with Chittaurgarh. Since Chittaurgarh had been held by a number of political powers before the Guhilas, the Jain references to the Guhilas as Kings of Citrakūṭa/Medapāṭa

63. Ibid., Canto, vv.1-23.

64. Ibid., vv.10-15. Rāhāp witnessed a fight between a hare and lion in the forests of Sīsodā. He wondered about the strength of the hare. A local magician advised Rāhāp to eat the whole of that wonderful hare and not share it with others or leave any part of it. Rāhāp killed the hare and cooked it in his kitchen. But he is stated to have partially forgotten the magician's advice. He ate some of its meat and distributed the rest of it amongst the Rajputs such as Khakharos, Chandanos and others. The Bhils ate up its bones. It is clearly claimed that Rāhāp acceded to the throne of Mewar at Chittaur because of this episode. The Rajputs who shared the meat as well as the Bhils also got established in Mewar. And that is why, the Bhils and the Kṣatriyas (Rajputs) cannot abandon Mewar simply because they shared in this feast. The above episode clearly demonstrates the fact that in the process of their rise to power, the fifteenth century Guhilas acknowledged the locally powerful political components including the Bhils. The social distinction between flesh and the bones reflects upon the subordinate social and political situation of the Bhils in a Rajput state.
becomes important. On the other hand, impressions of the Jains were undoubtedly valuable for the royal family to forge political links with the wealthiest of the local communities, the Jains.

It is significant that pre-thirteenth century Jain inscriptive records of Mewar do not mention the Guhila Kings. This is important in view of the bulk of the pre-thirteenth century Jain inscriptions coming from Āhaḍa-Udai-pur locality, the core area of the Guhila royal family. The first three inscriptions listed from Sitalnath temple of Udaipur are such instances. It is the thirteenth century Jain inscriptions which refer to Guhila rulers for the first time. These inscriptions belong to the most elite Jain families.

The earliest significant inscriptive reference to the Guhilas as kings comes from a Jain inscription of A.D.1267. It refers to the reign of King Tejasiṁha, who is known to have been the first Guhila king to have made Chittaurgadh the capital. King Tejasiṁha also figures in a short Jain inscription of A.D.1260 from Ghaghsa, Chittaurgarh.

The Jain texts of the thirteenth century similarly acknowledge the rule of the Guhila rulers. The Jain manuscript Dasāvaiṅkālikādisutrapatrika, patronized by Mahāmātya Śrī Jagatsimha, prime minister of King Jaitrasimha. The work was composed in the fortress of Āhaḍa/Āghāṭa. It refers to the Guhila king Jaitrasimhadeva as Mahārajaḍhirāja. The Pakṣikasutravṛtti of Yasodevasūri, patronized by two Jain personalities of King Jaitrasimha's court refers to his reign as ‘Samvat 1309 Varṣe ... tatpaṭṭavibhūṣana
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rajasrīte Jayasimhavijayarājye. 69 Śrāvakapratikramanāsutra-
cūrṇi of Vijayasimhasūri refers to the reign of Guhila King Tejasimha with the titles of Mahārajādhīrāja Paramesvarapa-
ram bhaṭṭāraka Umāpativaraladbhapraudapratāpa Samalankṛita. 70 Kharataragacchālaṅkar section of Kharataragacchā-
trā-hṛiṣṭ puṛवāvali refers to the reign of Guhila King Samarasiṃha in the context of celebration of great festivals, congregation of a large number of people from various backgrounds and the installation of the idol of Śrī Neminātha. In fact, it is an important reference as the description pertained to Śrī Citrakūṭa Vihāra. 71

However, it is important that the Guhila claim to power through the legends of Bappa-Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga find no mention in the thirteenth century Jaiś records. Nor do they acknowledge the long genealogical traditions claimed by the contemporary Guhila kings. The contrasts indicate the fact that if the Guhila dynasty had adopted the legitimizing motifs of Bappa-Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga in the recent past, the Jains, particularly from Chittaurgarh, cannot be expected to accept so new a legitimizing tradition.

The very first fifteenth century Jain inscription, from Zawar (A.D. 1421), refers to the reigning Guhila King modestly, Rājādhīrāja Śrī Mokaladeva Vijayarājye 72 However, the importance of the record lies in the fact that it came from a local, Jain merchant family of the Prāgvaṭa lineage Sah Nana was a rich and influential local merchant. 73

The next batch of Jain inscriptive records come from the reign of Mahārāṇā Kumbhakarṇa. It is significant that it is only in Kumbha's reign that the Jains start referring

69. Ibid., p.125.
70. Ibid.
72. op. cit., l.1.
73. vide Passim, Ch.III, see Section: Political Linkages with the Jains.
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to the detailed genealogies of the Guhila Kings for the first time. Such a development in the fifteenth century speaks for the late acceptance of the royal Guhila claims by most of the elite Jain families. Hence, internalization as well as acknowledgement of the Guhila genealogy comes late.

Perhaps the best instance of Jain tribute to the Guhila Kings in the period is the Ranakpur prasāsti of A.D. 1439. In fact it is one of the earliest fifteenth century records from Mewar that gives a detailed genealogy in the Guhila version. It is the first Jain record to specify the Guhila as the rulers of Medapata and the Guhila founder of power, Bappa.

This very development is indicative of a gradual process of incorporation of the Jains, into the political structure. The longer the association, the deeper was the percolation of the Guhila claims into the Jain community.

Bappa not only gets mentioned for the first time in this Jain record but Guhila kings are also acknowledged as the descendants of Bappavamsā. There is also an elaborate prasasti for Mahāraṇā Kumbha in which he is referred to as Śrī Kumbhakarṇa, an epic figure from Mahābhārata as well as compared with the epic heroes, Rāma and Yudhiṣṭhira.

Finally, it is significant that this record comes from a Jain merchant family, Dhārana Shāh of Sirohi, and not from the Jain state officials. The record contains the following genealogy and prasāsti of the Guhila.

---

75. Ibid., 11.18, 12-18.
76. vide Passim, Ch.III, p.61.
77. Ibid., 11.2-18, Śrīmedapāṭarājādhirāja Śrī Bappa, Śrī Guhila, Bhoja, Śīla, Kālabhoja, Bharṭṛibhaṭa, Simha, Mahāyaka, RājñIsutaysutasvasuVarṇatotalaka-Srīkhummaṇṇa, Śrīmadālāṭa, Naravahana, Saktikumāra, Suchi Varma, Kirttivarma, Yogorāja, Vairāṭa, Vamśapāla, Vairisimha, Viṟāsimha, Śrī Arisimha, Cūḍasimha, Vikramasimha, Kumārasimha, Maṭhanasimha, Pāḍasimha, Jaitrasimha, Tejasvisimha, Samarasiṃha, Cāhumāṇā Śrī Kītukanripasī Allāvadhasuratrāṇajaitra Bappa Vaṁśa Śrī Bhuvanasiṃha, Suta Śrī Jayasimha, MāḷavesāgogadevaJaitra Laksṇamasimha, putra Śrī Ajayasiṃha, bharṭṛ, Śrī Arisimha, Śrī-
that the Jains standardize the title of Kumbhakarna, for Rāṇā Kumbha, comparing the Guhila sovereign with an epic figure. However, it is important to remember that what the Guhilas could not erase from the knowledge of the Jains in early fifteenth century is the actual political history of Chittaurgarh. The inclusion of Sultan Alauddin in the royal genealogy points towards the Jain recognition of the former hegemony of the Delhi sultanate over the Guhila state of Mewar.78

Srīnāgar Chāvanī (Chittaurgarh fort) inscription of A.D. 1448 refers to the reign of Rāṇākumbara as that of Srī Kumbhakarṇa along with his genealogy.79 The fact is equally evident from Jain inscription of A.D. 1437 from the temple of Sāntinātha.80

Kumbha also figures in the contemporary Jain literature in a similar style. Rāṇā Kumbha figures as Kumbhakarṇa in

77. Ranakpur Prasasti, op. cit., 11.11-18, 'Kulakānanapānga{n}sya Sāraṅgapuranāpapura merūmanḍoramandalakara Bundī Khālucāṭa māhadūrgalīla mlecchācapālavālacakravāla prabalapāramakramānādhittimandala gujarātra Suratrā

The last of the Jain records under discussion, the Nāḍāḷai inscription from the temple of Adinath of A.D. 1500, is perhaps our most important document for it is the earliest source to speak of the Sūryavamsa origin of the Guhilas. It is clear that the Jains were one of the first non-Rajput

...Continued...

78. Ranakpur Prasasti, op. cit., 11.11-18, 'Kulakānanapānga{n}sya Sāraṅgapuranāpapura merūmanḍoramandalakara Bundī Khālucāṭa māhadūrgalīla mlecchācapālavālacakravāla prabalapāramakramānādhittimandala gujarātra Suratrā

79. Vir Vinod, I, op. cit., p. 410. 'Rāṇā Srī Lākhāputrarāṇāsirīmokalanandanaśri Kumbhakarṇa'.
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social groups to acknowledge the latest claim of the Guhila kings to Sūryavamsā. The record not only mentions the 'Sūryavamsā' status but also traces the Guhila Kings from King 'Śilāditya'. Bappa is readjusted as Guhadatta's son, keeping the 'Guhila' nomenclature of the royal family intact. Therefore, the royal claims to 'Sūryavamsā' and 'Śādityavamsā' can actually be traced back to the late fifteenth-early sixteenth centuries, when such royal claims seem to have been internalized at least by the Jains.

Unlike the Jains, the Tāmṭaraḍā family from Nāgdā was possibly the first non-Rajput social group of Mewar to acknowledge the genealogical origins of the Guhila kings. They not only identify the Guhila kings as members of the Guhilavamsa but also accept Bappa as the first King of the same dynasty. The Tāmṭaraḍās, unlike the Jains of Chittaurgarh, came from the core area of the Guhila state, Nāgdā. Hence their long-familiarity with the Guhila dynasty speaks for their early acceptance of the Guhila kings as the sovereigns of Mewar as well as the royal claim of Bappa being the ancient king. Perhaps such familiarity explains the contrasts between their representations of the Guhila kings and those of the Jains in the thirteenth century. Because of the late entry of the Guhila kings into Chittaurgarh, the Jains were reluctant to acknowledge them at the outset. Since the Tāmṭaraḍās came to Chittaurgarh almost with the Guhilas, acquisition of Chittaurgarh by the Guhilas held no special criterion for the Tāmṭaraḍās to acknowledge a local dynasty that was seven-hundred year old by the

82. Nāḍlāi Inscription of the reing of Rāṇā Rāimalla, op. cit., 11.12-13, 'Atthea Śrīmedapātadesē I śrī sūryavamśa mahārājādhirāja.'

83. Ibid., 1.13, Śrī Śilādityavamsē Śrī Guhadatta.

84. Ibid., pp.424-425, 'Rāula Śrī Bappaka Śrī Khummaṅḍima-hārajanvaye 1 Rāṇā Hamīra Śrī Khetasiṁha Śrī Lākhamsim-haputra Śrī Mokalmpīṅkavamsōddypta karakapratāp asamudra-mahāmaṇḍalakhanaḍa-atulamahābabalarāṇāsŚrī-Kum-dhakarpaputrapaṇā, Śrī Raimallavijayamānaprājrājrājye 1 tatputramahākumārasŚrī Prithvirājasānasāna.'

85. Chiravā Inscription, op. cit., v.3, 'Guhilāṅgajavamsā- jah purā kṣaṅtipālotra babhūka Bappaka-prathamah paripanthipārthivadhavajinidhvānsan layah 11'.
We now discuss the essential points of two seventeenth century bardic traditions, Nainsī Rī Khyāt and cāran Gīndhar Āsiā's Sagat Rāso to probe into the popular perception of the Guhila state. As this literature was composed in the vernacular, it may be considered a part of popular tradition. It is of interest to compare the royal accounts and Khyat and Caran traditions of the seventeenth century.

Muhatā Nainsī, a seventeenth century official and a historian from the royal court of Marwar, wrote Sīsodiān Rī Khyāt (a part of Nainsī Rī Khyāt), a historical account of the Guhila state. Nainsī is also popularly known as Abul Fazal of Rajasthan. His accounts of historical Rajasthan, is considered authentic. He is known to have consulted both the official records and local, bardic traditions. His Sīsodiān Rī Khyāt provides us with some clues to the prevalence of the royal perception in the rest of Rajasthan. Nainsī repeats the legends of Bāppā Rāval-Hārtarāśi-Ekaliṅga-Medapāṭa while assigning Dīta-brāhmaṇa (Āditya brāhmaṇa) origin to the Guhila kings of the seventeenth century. Nainsī narrates that Bāppā Rāval served Hārtarikhi (Hārttarāśi) for twelve long years while the latter served both Śrī Ekaliṅgajī and goddess Rāṭhāsenā. Hārtarikhi complained to Rāṭhāsenā for having ignored his disciple Bāppā and prayed for a kingdom for Bāppā. Rāṭhāsenā asked him to serve Śrī Mahādeva as acquisition of a kingdom was not possible without his favour.86 Hārttarikhi soon devoted himself to the service of Mahādev and since both Mahādev and Rāṭhāsenā were pleased with him they granted the state of Mewar to Bappa. Bāppā was blessed.87 Hārttarikhi further

---


87. Ibid., `rāj tahāro avicala rahasi'.
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instructed Bāppā to win Chittaur from its king Morī. 88

Thus both the thirteenth century official motifs of Bappa-Hārītarāśī-Ekaliṅga-Medapāṭa and the seventeenth century royal claim that Bappa, the conqueror of Mān Morī and Chittaurgarh, had traversed Mewar into Marwar in the contemporary times. The Guhila version seems to have been received well by the elite in Marwar and presented to a larger audience as the khyāt was composed in Marwari language.

Similarly, the Guhila claim of Āditya (Sūryavāṃśi) origin is repeated in Sīsodiyān Rī Khyāt. The genealogical list begins with Brahmā followed by fifty-eight kings of Vaijavāpāṇ gotra and titles of Śarmā 89 and fifty-five Āditya kings with Grahaditya (Guhadatta), third in the list 90 via an account of the mythological king Pārikṣīt, it ends with Bāppā Rāval's descendants, the Sīsodiā kings (Rāṇās), of the seventeenth century. It is important that Nainsī designated the Guhila kings as the 'Āditya-brāhmaṇas' highlighting the thirteenth century Guhila claim of brahma-kṣattra origin. However, the only contrast between Nainsī's story of Bāppā Rāval and that of the seventeenth century Guhila record is the shift that seems to have taken place in the importance of goddess Rāṭhāsenā vis-a-vis goddess Vindhyavāsinī. The role assigned to Vindhyavāsinī in the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam and the seventeenth century Guhila records in conferring royal power on Bāppā Rāval along with Ekaliṅga had shifted to Rāṭhāsenā (Rāṣṭrasenā of Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam) indicating both the military significance of the foundation story of the Guhila state of Mewar and popularity of a militant goddess than the benign Vindhyavāsinī.

Sagat Rāso was composed by cāran poet Girdhar Āsiā in A.D. 1673. It is an account of Saktisīṁha, younger brother


89. Ibid., p.9.

90. Ibid., p.10.
of Rāṇā Pratāp and the Sāktāvats, who fought against the Mughals. It is important to note that Cāran Āsiā was patronized by Rāṇā Rājasiṅgha.

Cāran Girdhar Āsiā too designates the Guhila as Sūrya-vamsī who are claimed to be perfectly trained to carry out the duties of Kṣatratva (warriorhood). He elaborates upon their Kṣatriya status. The Guhilas are eulogised as creators of an excellent model of Kṣatratva on earth to be followed by the rest of the world. The Sīsodiās, powerful and charitable, are placed at the head of the twenty-four branches of the Guhilas. It is significant that the seventeenth-century Cāran poet continues with the motif of King Hammira, which had assumed significance for the royal house as early as the fifteenth century. Hence, Āsiā repeats that Mahārāṇā Hammira of the house of Mewar is a powerful Hindupati (lord of the Hindus). Hammira increased the glory of the twenty-four branches of the Sīsodiās and responsible for saving Chittaur. In addition, Hammira's lineage is simply termed as 'The House of Mewar' (Mewāḍī gharānā).

What is interesting in this Cāran account is the continuation of the fifteenth century royal attempts at magnifying the Guhila leadership of the local community vis-a-vis the sultans. Hammira was assigned with such popular titles as 'general of the Hindus who increased the glory of Mewar house', 'Kedār Rāi for uprooting the scandals', 'Prayāg-Rāj' washing the sins of the Sinners, 'Visīṣṭha Vārāṇasī', for liberating the killers, and 'Gaṅgā and Mahēśā' for the alcoholics, etc. Rāṇā Hammira, the chief of the Hindus,


92. Ibid., v.3, 'Kahī māhī Sāhī Gahalot Kula Vāpāḷā ṇatha Kodivarīs Sāhu Sirahāra Sesaudīa, Sasa avara chauvīs'.

93. Ibid., v.4, 'Chauvīsain jala chādiva dhara Mevār Sādhi- ra Citrakoṭa Ch'ala Uddhārana, Hinduā Ch'at Hammira'.

94. Ibid.
meditates on the land of Mewar. In that lineage of famous Hammīra was born Rāṇā Khetā. He was so powerful that he drove away Sultan Amīsa by inflicting a defeat in the battlefield. If Mokala adorned Gaṅgā and Maheśā on his head (accepted Gaṅgā and Maheśā as his ideal), Kumbha came to be known as lord Kṛiṣṇa's incarnation and endowed with supernatural qualities. He bore wounds on the battlefields but led his army to victory and captured eightyfour forts. Saṅgrāmsīṁha remained unrelenting in war, defeated and captured two Sultans as lord of Chittaur, and brought Chanderī under the sway of Chittaur through sheer military superiority.

Tod's Annals of Mewar:

We conclude this section with a brief note on the Guhila state perceived by Tod, an officer of the East India Company, who travelled extensively in Rajasthan in the early nineteenth century. He repeats the story of Guhadatta, the posthumous son of the last Maitraka king of Valabhi Śīlādītya, and brāhmaṇī Kamlavati of Birnagar (Nāgar gotra) bringing him up as a Rajput prince. Since this version of the origin of the Guhila dynasty reflects the royal perspective of the seventeenth century, the early part of Tod's work certainly points to continuity and percolation of the royal perspective to the ranks of the local elite. The rest of Tod's version can be briefly summed up as follows.

95. Ibid., v. 5, "Hinduā chhat pratāpai Hamīra, Nagendra vamśa Chaḍiva niral Kalakīyān Rāi Kedār Rāṇā l Pāpīyan Rāi Prayaga pramāṇa l Vāraṇaśa bātiyārān Visēśa l Maduānā rāṇā Gaṅgā Mahēśā l Dhuraisya Vīrāda Uddhārana dhīra. Hinduā chhat pratāpahamīra l l'.

96. Ibid., v. 6, "Jina Hammīra ghara janamiau cho Setala rāṇā l Jina bhaggo padhārāī, Sāh Amī Suratānā'.

97. Ibid., v. 7, "Setala Lāso janamio, nara nikalaṅka naresā l Jina, Mokalśī janamio, muggata Gaṅgāmaheśā'.

98. Ibid., vv.8-10, "Mokalarāṇā Mokala Kumbho janamio, Kahī avatāra Kīśāṇa lārī chaurā sī Gaḍha liā, Vāpra chaurāśī vana, Sunnahipura Samūhī, ani navalāsī ana.'

99. Ibid., vv.11-12, "Rāṇā Kumbha ghara Rāimala, tehā tano Prthīśalla, Lālāu mārī Todau liā, pauha Udānoapalla lī Achala bandhava Saṅgrāmsī, Sāhī be Suratāna l Chanderī Chittor galī, peho bandhī Saṅgāpana'.
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Guhadatta, although brought up as a brāhmaṇa, associated with the Rajput boys, hunted wild animals, and at the age of eleven became uncontrollable. In the words of the legends, "How should they hide the ray of the Sun?" At this period Idar (north-east Gujarat) was governed by a Bhil chief, Māṇḍalīka. The young Guhadatta frequented the forests in company of the Bhils and soon became a favourite with the Vanaputras (Bhils), who resigned to him Idar with its hills and forests.

One day, the Bhils having determined in sport to elect a king, the choice fell on Guhadatta. One of the young Bhils cut his finger, applied the blood as the tīkā of sovereignty to his forehead. What was done in sport was confirmed by the old forest chief. What follows is Guhadatta's treacherous act of slaying his benefactor, the old Bhil chief, and seizing power. The Bhils, tired of alien rule, assailed Nāgāditya, the eighth Guhila prince, and deprived him of life and Idar. The infant Bāppā, son of Nāgāditya, three years old, was taken to the fortress of Bhandar, where he was protected by a Bhil of Yādu descent. Then follows the account of Bāppā and his marriage to the Solankī princess of Nāgdā and his subsequent flight into the interior hills of Nāgdā valley. "The companions of his flight were two Bhils: one of Undri, in the valley of the present capital, the other of Solankī descent, from Oghna Panarwa, in the western wilds. Their names, Baleo and Dewa, have been handed down with Bāppā's, and the former had the honour of drawing the tika of sovereignty with his own blood on the forehead of the prince, on the occasion of his taking the crown from the Mori. It is pleasing to trace, through a series of ages, the knowledge of a custom still "honoured in the observance." The descendants of Baleo of Oghna and the Undri Bhil still claim the privilege of performing the tika on the inauguration of the descendants of Bāppā."

In the wilds of Nāgdā where rose the Trīkūṭa hills, was the abode of Mahādeva and brāhmaṇas who performed the yaj-
In this retreat passed the early years of Bappa, the shepherd. What follows is the all too familiar account of Bappa, and Hārītarāṣā, who initiated the former in the rites of Śiva. By the hands of the sage, who became his spiritual guide, and bestowed on his pupil the title of "Regent" (Diwan) of Ekalingaji. Bappa received a lance, bow, quiver, and arrows, a shield and a sword from goddess Bhavānī and a double-edged sword from the famous sage, Gorakhnath. With this, was opened the road to fortunes leading to the throne of Chittaur. Then follows Bāppā's enrollment in Mān Morī's service, leading the local Sāmantas against a foreign foe, extension of the campaigns to Gajni, winning the esteem of the chiefs who transferred to him their services and homage, and Morī was ousted. Hence, Bāppā became the "mor" (crown) of the land and obtained by universal consent the title of "Sun of the Hindus" (Hinduā Śūraj), "precepts of princes" (Rāja Gurū), and "Universal lord" (Chakravartān). Bāppā is further attributed progeny who continued as powerful chiefs in Saurashtra as late as Akbar's reign.

The essential difference between the seventeenth century royal perspective and Tod's version lies in the appropriation of the popular motifs such as "shepherd" for legendary Bāppā. Extension of Bāppā's expedition to Gazni and receiving of weapons from Bhavānī and Gorakhnath certainly mystified the status of Bāppā in the eyes of the local society.

Similar magnification of Bāppā's image can be perceived from another local version of Bappa's expeditions to west Asia. Tod reports to have collected an old volume of historical anecdotes, belonging to the chief of Delwara, which states that he became an ascetic at the foot of Menī, where

102. Ibid., p.181.
103. Ibid., p.184.
104. Ibid., p.185.
105. Ibid., p.186.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid.
he was buried alive after having overcome all the kings of the West, as in Ispahan, Kandahar, Kashmir, Irak, Iran, Turan, and Kafiristan; all of whose daughters he married and by whom he had one hundred and thirty sons, called the Naushahra Pathans. His Hindu children were ninety-eight in number, and were called Agni-upasi Suryavansi, or "Sunborn" fire-worshippers.

The story of Bappā's campaign, victories and social links with Central and West Asia is likely to have been influenced by the Mughal chronicles. Since the ancestors of the Mughals came from Central Asia and as they happened to be the emperors of the entire subcontinent, providing the first Guhila King of Mewar with a similar background undoubtedly leant prestige. Propagation of such a magnified image of Bappa in nineteenth century Rajasthan certainly contributed to the process of making of historical traditions of Mewar.

In conclusion, we may recapitulate the essential points of perspectives of the major social groups discussed above. The royal perspective has been understood in the contemporary political contexts between the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries. The Guhila state confronted a larger society in the second half of the thirteenth century as it came to exercise power over the whole of Mewar from Chittaurgarh, the ancient political landmark of Mewar. Hence, the state constructed and appropriated some of the local popular myths such as those of the Bappa-Haritarasi-Ekalinga-Medapaṭa to popularize its political image. What Bappa did for the thirteenth century Guhilas, Hammira did for the fifteenth century Guhilas. What is significant is that if the Guhilas redeemed their image through magnification of status by claiming victories over the sakādhipatis (referring to the Sultans of Nagaur, Gujarat and Malwa) and liberation of the holy tirthas of Gayā, Kāshī and Prayāg, they also appropriated the title of Hammira for one of their early ancestors, a title so popular amongst the Sultans of Delhi. Hence, images of royalty of the Sultanate of Delhi continued to influence the Guhila projection of self-image.

108. Ibid.
109. Ibid.
indicating not only the internalization of the title of Hammīrā within the Rajput Society but also the problem of redeeming self-image in front of a powerful adversary. The confrontations with the Mughal emperors and consequent political crisis between the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries certainly influenced further magnification of the Guhila status from kṣatriya-Sūryavamsī in the early sixteenth century to Ikṣvāku lineage in the seventeenth century.

If the Tamṭaraṇadas acknowledged Bappa as the progenitor of Guhila vamsā, the Jains at Chittaurgarh only accepted the Guhila as their kings, without elaborate claims. It is only in the fifteenth century that the Jains acknowledged Bappa as the progenitor of the Guhila dynasty with inclusion of Alauddin Khalji in the royal genealogy.

The bardic traditions of the Khyāts, Rāsos and Tod's Annals between the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries repeat many a royal motif and perhaps reflect the percolation and standardization of the royal claims. The story of Bappa receiving the state of Mewar along with Citrakūṭa from Ekaliṅga, the titular deity of Mewar via the medium of Pāṣupata sage Hārītarāsī, favoured by Ekaliṅga's consort Bhavānī, takeover of crown from Mān Morī and projection of Bappa as the best of the Sūryavamsī-Kṣatriyas and leader of the community "Hinduā-Sūraj" came to be an integral part of the historical traditions of Mewar. If the current folk-songs and idioms are any indication of the popularity of such royal figures as Bappā and Kumbha,110 the royal bhaṭ-


``Morī mār lio Mevāqe, bhāme bhujā tana
gaja bhīm
Rām lihā kim lope rāval, sāt samand
bachā kidī sīmā
Nyāya Sāsatra lopio nājāve, khatriān
gurūtaya adag khāmī
Bāpe lidhī āp bāha bal,
jojon koḍa pachās.
``

Translations: Rāval Bāppā, who killed Morī to conquer Mewar, was very powerful. If he wished, he could have taken his arms on the other banks of the seas. But he
The Caran poets, historian Nainsī and Col. James Tod, amongst others, contributed to the making of such traditions.

...Continued...

did not like to transgress his ancestor Śrī Rāmacandra's orders. Therefore, in spite of his great arms, he did not extend the boundary of his kingdom beyond these banks of the seas. Rāval Bāppā considered himself as powerful as Bhīma. Bhīma used to topple the elephants with his own hands. But Rāmachandra's prestige could not be transgressed. And that is why he defeated could not be transgressed. And that is why he defeated Chitraṅg Morī and confined the boundary of his kingdom upto the midst of the seven seas. The Rajputs having adorned (borne?) the arms have never deviated from the path of justice. Therefore, Bāppā Rāval also extended his territorial sway over fifty crore yojana of land on his own. When powerful Bappa of the Guhila lineage (Vamsā) brought the distant forts and kings under his control, everybody eulogized him by declaring that if Bāppā disregarded Rāmacandra's prestige then he would have definitely extended his sway beyond the seas.

For Kumbha see Laxmilal Joshi, Mevāḍ Ke Kahāvaten, Ajmer, 1978, p. 144.

Kumbha:

Kāl pare to Kumbha dhanī, meha
barṣe to majuri ghanī.

Translation: Mahārāṇā Kumbha was so good a ruler than his subjects did not fear even in the time of crisis. Because once it rained good, the state used to offer employment liberally.
Ancestors of Bappa Raval are listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindu Gods (Adityas)</th>
<th>Roman Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bramhā</td>
<td>Pītasārma, Hemvarṇasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaipān</td>
<td>Bṛhaddevasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devasārma</td>
<td>Rājasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnyasārma</td>
<td>Galavdevsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaipāma</td>
<td>Galavsaśrma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khomsārma</td>
<td>Rikhīsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rikhsārma</td>
<td>Jagsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagsārma</td>
<td>Nasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasārma</td>
<td>Gajsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajsārma</td>
<td>Jajsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jajsārma</td>
<td>Vāsusārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsusārma</td>
<td>Keśavāsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśavāsārma</td>
<td>Rājasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasārma</td>
<td>Virājśārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virājśārma</td>
<td>Harakpahśārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harakpahśārma</td>
<td>Picasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picasārma</td>
<td>Vedāsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedāsārma</td>
<td>Hṛddiśārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hṛddiśārma</td>
<td>Narsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narsārma</td>
<td>Harsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsārma</td>
<td>Dhārmaśārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhārmaśārma</td>
<td>Visvasārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visvasārma</td>
<td>Vardevsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardevsārma</td>
<td>Kampatisārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampatisārma</td>
<td>Narnathsārma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narnathsārma</td>
<td>Aditya-brāhmaṇa Kings¹¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹¹. op. cit., p. 9.

¹¹². Ibid.
Samarasimha Raval (Rajya Citrakuta)  Solaṇkhnī Ramā Bāī
Karaṇa Rāval (Rajya Citrakuta) Cāhamāna Prithā Bāī
Rāgo Rāhap (Rajya Citrakuta)  Solaṇkhnī Kōgamade Bāī
Narapati Rāgo (Rajya Citrakuta) Paramār princess
Dinakara Rāgo (Rajya Citrakuta) Pratīhār Nāraṅgde Bāī
Jāgakarapā Rāgo (Rajya Citrakuta)
Nāgappāla Rāgo (Rajya Citrakuta) Paramār Jammādo Bāī
Puraṇappāla Rāgo  Pratīhār Bāgavatī Bāī
(Rajya Citrakuta)
Praṇīmala Rāgo  Solaṇkhnī Purābāī
(Rajya Citrakuta)
Bhunāsīmha Rāgo  Yādav Bāī Māmmati
(Rajya Citrakuta)
Bhīmaśīmha Rāgo (Rajya Āhāda) Bāṭavāṇī Purā Bāī
Jaisimha Rāgo (Rajya Citrakuta) Paramār Gahāde Bāī
Līkhamṣi Rāgo  Rāgo Kailvāde Rāṭhod Lāl Bāī
Ārsī Rāgo (Rajya Kelvāde)  Tomār Dhana Bāī
Ajesīrāgo (Rajya Kelvāde)  Rāṭhod Dīnā Bāī

Rājāvalī Bāhī

Queen Mothers

Rājā Sīri Padmādatī  Jādav Jevatā Bāī
Rājā Sīri Savādatī  Rāṭhod Sūraj Bāī
Rājā Sīri Harīdatī  Cāhuvaṇ Rāj Bāī
Rājā Sīri Surāṇīdatī  Patāmde Paramārade Bāī
Rājā Sīri Smādatī  Jādav Jamāde
Rājā Sīri Salādatī  Kanakāvati Bāī
Rājā Sīri Kesāvadatī  Kamalāvati Bāī; Queen Yādav Māmmati; Son Nāgādatī Yādav Māmmatī Bāī
(Rājya Nāgā)
Rājā Sīri Nāgādatī  (Rājya Nāgā)
Rājā Sīri Bhoqa datī  Morāndemāde Bāī
Rājā Sīri Devadatī  Pādhār Śavatī Bāī
Rājā Sīri Aṣādatī  Paṇacīr Sāvatī Bāī
Rājā Sīri Kālabhojakā  Solākhnī Sōbhagvatī Bāī
Rājā Sīri Garadātī  Mokhaṇā Rātnāvatī Bāī

Rājya

Rāval Bāpoji  Vāṃ Ghāse  Paramār Patamde Bāī
Rāval Sīri Khumānhī  Khāmpor  Rāṭhod Rāj Bāī
Rāval Govindī  Gogunda  Paramār Pēmā Bāī
Rāval Mahindrāji  Machīdgarh  Jādav Ramā Bāī
Rāval Sīri Aṇūji  Cātikakoṭ  Solākhnī Sāla Bāī
Rāval Sīri Śihaṇji  Rāṭhod Rātnāvatī
Rāval Sīri Kālabhojakā)
Rāval Sīri Gogunda  v.s.562 Cātikakoṭ
Rāval Sīri Nārāvahanī  Devāḍī Sambā Bāī
Rāval Sīri Matrakhjī  Paramār Kodāmde
Rāval Sīri Śalāvahanī  v.s.487  Rāṭhod Jaivatā Bāī
Rāval Sīri Nārāvahanī  v.s.618 Cātikakoṭ
Rāval Sīri Aṇūji  Chāvan Sōbhagde Bāī
Rāval Ambāprasādī  v.s.686 Cātikakoṭ  Jādav Rātnāvatī Bāī
Rāval Kīrībhramājī  v.s.691 Cātikakoṭ  Paramār Manbhāvatī Bāī
Rāval Sīri Nārāvahanī  Bhamrajī
Rāval Sīri Khemarājī  Chāhan Sōbhagde Bāī
Rāval Sīri Narbejī  v.s.743 Cātikakoṭ  Tāvār Nāgarde Bāī
Rāval Sīri Bhavāsimhājī  Sōlanākhnī Sabā Bāī
Rāval Sīri Utamjī  v.s.779 Cātikakoṭ
| Rāval Śrī Bhairavī v.s.796 Citrakoṭ | Padīhār Padmāvatī Bāi |
| Rāval Kanadejī | Rāstoḍ Lachūṁī Bāi |
| Rāval Śrī Kiratsimhajī | |
| Rāval Śrī Hasarājī | |
| Rāval Śrī Jomādrājī | |
| Rāval Śrī Vīrājī | |
| Rāval Śrī Vansirājī | |
| Rāval Śrī Teja- v.s.1066 Citrakoṭ | |
| Rāval Śrī Jasvāranjī | |
| Rāval Śrī Surbhanjī | |
| Rāval Śrī Haspalīj | |
| Rāval Śrī Bajesimhajī | |
| Rāval Śrī Arasijī | |
| Rāval Śrī Barbājī | |
| Rāval Śrī Depālīj | |
| Rāval Śrī Bajesimhajī | |
| Rāval Śrī Bhāchudījī | |
| Rāval Śrī Dugārsimhajī | |
| Rāval Śrī Pūjōjī | |
| Rāval Śrī Partādjī | |
| Rāval Śrī Samarsijī v.s.1106 Citrakoṭ | |
| Rāval Śrī Karaṇ- v.s.1155 | |
| Mahārājā Śrī Rābjī v.s.1201 Citrakoṭ | Solaṅkhñī Koḍāmde Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Narapājī | Paramār Surde Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Dinkaranjī | Padīhār Araṅgde Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Jaskaranjī | Solaṅkhñī Jaimāta Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Nāgαpalīj | Puvār Jivānde |
| Mahārājā Śrī Purpapalīj | Padīhār Bhāṅvatī Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Prathipalīj | Solaṅkhñī Purā Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Bhurunsimhajī | Jādav Bāṅvatgi Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Bhūmasimhā | Bhāṭāṁī Purā Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Javasimhā | Paramār Gaṅgāde Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Gadalakhamansimhā | Rāstoḍ Queen mother |
| Mahārājā Śrī Arsijī | Tāvar Dhana Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Ajesimhajī | Rāstoḍ Danade Bāi |
| Mahārājā Śrī Hamirasimhā | |
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