CHAPTER II
MEWAR AS THE LOCUS OF A STATE

A. CONSOLIDATION OF GUHILA POWER: 10TH-13TH CENTURIES A.D.

The tenth century in Rajasthan may be considered a crucial phase in the history of the Guhila dynasties as it witnessed the crystallization of their state. In order to highlight the integrating role of the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍā in the state formation of Mewar, it becomes necessary to make a brief survey of the contemporary Guhila families. The comparison would bring out the contrasts in the history of different Guhila ruling families in the period. Contemporary with the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhilas were the Guhilas of Unstra (north-west of Bagodia, Jodhpur district), the Guhilas of Bagodia (north-west of Pipar, Jodhpur district) the Guhilas of Nāḍol (Pali district) and the Guhilas of Māṅgrol (Saurashtra, Gujarat).

In the study of political growth of the Guhila dynasty that successfully transformed itself into a regional power by the thirteenth century, we will consider their changing material base, patronage of religious institutions and cults, genealogical structure and new political symbols, and an administrative apparatus.

Finally but not the least, the proliferation of branches of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhila royal family, its impact on the contemporary state of the Mewar hills and other centres of Guhila power beyond Mewar hills will be discussed to emphasize the Rajput kinship structure in a period of state formation and growth.
DISTRIBUTION
OF
THE GUHILA ROYAL AND CHIEFLY FAMILIES: AD 10th – 13th CENTURIES

MÄNGROL GUHILAS
SAURASHTRA
(i) Guhilas of Unstra (North West of Bagodia, Jodhpur district, Marwar region)

Memorial stone inscriptions of A.D. 1179-80 and of A.D. 1190-97 at an ancient Jain temple at Unstra suggest the existence of a pocket of Guhila power in this arid tract of Marwar. The inscriptions record the deaths of Rāṇā Tihunapāla\(^1\) and Rāṇā Motisvara,\(^2\) both of the Guhilautra (Guhila) lineage. The inscription of A.D. 1179-80 also records that Rāṇā Tihunapāla's wives, Pālhanadevī (of the Bodana lineage) and Mātādevī,\(^3\) became satīs. Rāṇā Motisvara's wife, Rājī of the Mohilī lineage, too became a satī.\(^4\)

It seems from the title of Rāṇā and limited territorial control that the Guhila chiefs of Unstra served in the capacity of subordinate allies and seem to have died fighting for the cause of an overlord.\(^5\) An overlord could be a Nāḍol Cāhamāna ruler as an inscription of King Sāmanta Siṃhadeva of A.D. 1202 is found at a nearby site at Bali, Bamnera.\(^6\) The presence of Bodana and Mohil Rajputs also suggests that Unstra was a part of the Cāhamāna state of Nāḍol as Bodana and Mohil are the two subdivisions of the Cāhamāna clan. Unlike the contemporary Nāgdā-Aḥāḍa Guhilas, the Guhila Rāṇās of Unstra make no claim to prestigious
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origin. They simply refer to themselves as Guhilas. This may have been in keeping with a subordinate status.

(ii) The Guhilas of Bagodia (40 miles, North-west of Pipar. Jodhpur district, Marwar region)

The Bagodia Tirthamba inscription of A.D. 1054 points to the existence of Guhila chiefly families at Bagodia, near Jodhpur (Marwar). It is also a memorial stone inscription: it refers to the death of one Dhalavana, son of Alaja Vichārī, a Guhilaputra. It records the construction of a Devalī (temple), further suggesting the association of the Guhilas with this area.

(iii) The Guhilas of Nāḍol (Pali District, Godwar region)

A Guhila base of power at Nāḍūḷādagika, Nāḍol (Pali district) is evident from the Jadvaji Jain temple inscription of the reign of Nāḍol Cāhamāna ruler, Mahārājaputra Rāyapāladeva (A.D. 1137-1138) and the Adinath temple inscriptions of the same Guhila family. Both inscriptions record grants of grains, shares from oil-mills, incense, flowers, etc. by Thakkura Rājadeva, son of Udhāraṇa of the Guhila lineage. The donations were granted from Nāḍūḷādagika. In addition, the grants included parts of the duties levied on pack oxen going to and from Nāḍūḷādagika.
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Thakkura Rājadeva is described as ‘holding Nāḍūlādagika’.\textsuperscript{13} Both these charters suggest the association of the Guhila family as subordinates of the Cāhamānas of Nāḍol.

(iv) The Guhilas of Māṅgrol, Saurashtra, Gujarat

The Sobhadi Vāo stone inscription of A.D. 1146 takes us to a Guhila centre of power outside Rajasthan: Māṅgrol, in Saurashtra. The genealogical list in the inscription eulogises Guhila Sahajīga’s sons as protectors (military officials) of Saurashtra.\textsuperscript{14} In the same genealogical line the contemporary Guhila Mūlaka bears the title of Nāyaka (chief) of Saurashtra.\textsuperscript{15}

The progenitor of the family, Śrī Sāhāra is simply referred to as a Śrī Guhila.\textsuperscript{16} Thus the Guhilas of Māṅgrol seem to have been integrated into Caulukyan polity of Gujarat through a system of distribution of roles and services evident in such administrative titles as Nāyaka of Saurashtra. However, it seems from the absence of any other claim that the Guhilas of Māṅgrol enjoyed territorial and political power limited to Saurashtra. The limited political power is also evident from the political ranking of Guhila Mūlaka in the Thakkura category.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
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The Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhadāand State Formation in Mewar, A.D. 10th Century-A.D. 13th Century

Of the disparately distributed families of the Guhilas, examined, first, with reference to 7th-10th centuries and then to 10th-13th centuries, it was the Guhila family of Nāgdā-Āhadāwhich was directly connected with the rise of a state. It is with the history of this family that we shall be concerned now.

The imperial Pratīhāras held their sway over southern Rajasthan in the ninth century but their continuous military campaigns kept Bhoja I (A.D. 836-892) occupied in the north, with Devapāla of Gauḍa in the east and with Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan for most of his reign.18 There was no direct annexation of southern Rajasthan in the period. Like their contemporary neighbours, the Nāgdā-ĀhadāGuhilas are likely to have acknowledged Pratīhāra supremacy over northern India. But such acknowledgement must have been temporary in their case as is apparent from the decline of the Pratīhāra power in southern Rajasthan by the mid-tenth century. The presence of Pratīhāra representatives at the strategic fortress of Chittaur (as is evident from the Sirur inscription of the time of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarsha I of A.D. 86619 and Karhad Plates of Kṛṣṇa II of A.D. 95920) could not therefore, effectively interrupt the political career of the Nāgdā-ĀhadāGuhilas.


52
The Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa not only consolidated power in their base region but also territorially integrated the central part of the Mewar hills and possibly touched the northern Mahi basin. For this we have circumstantial evidence: the total disappearance of the Guhila house of Kiṣkindhā after the eighth century. The Nāgdā-Āhaḍa house had expanded southwards at the expense of the Kiṣkindhā-Guhilas. It is equally significant to note that of all the Guhilas of southern Rajasthan it is only the Guhila house of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa which figures as political subordinates of the Pratīhāras in Mewar along with a small ruling family of the Cāhamānas at Pratapgarh in district Chittaurgarh bordering Mandasaur (Upper Banas Plain) in tenth century. There is no trace of the Guhilas of Dhavagarta or those of Kiṣkindhā in Pratapgarh inscriptions (A.D. 942-946), the only epigraphical record from Mewar dating to the reign of Pratīhāra Mahendrapāla II. This extension of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila territory was achieved through military superiority. In fact, grants made by Bhartripatīa II at Pratapgarh indicate that the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhilas held some territorial claim in southern part (Pratapgarh) of the upper Banas plain before A.D. 950. The title of Mahārājādhirāja for Guhila Bhartripatīa (II) in the Pratapgarh records (as against the title of Bhūpo or nṛpatī for the Cāhamānas of Pratapgarh) is significant.

21. Pratapgarh inscription of the reign of Mahendrapāla II, EI, XIV, pp.176-188
22. Pratapgarh Inscription, op. cit., Part III, l.27, 'Samastarājāvalīpurvvamgreha mahārājādhirājasrībhartṛi paṭṭāh.'
23. Ibid., Part II, vv.5-6, 'Soyaṁ rājāti rājacakranilayah Sṛī Cāhamānānvayah Govindarāja iti tatra vabhūva bhūpo.'
The consolidation of Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhila power is corroborated by the long genealogical lists occurring in their official records for the first time in the tenth century. The Āṭpura inscription of Guhila Śaktikumāra contains the following genealogy. Śaktikumāra is stated to have obtained the glory of Bhartṛipatā (II) and consolidated his kingdom. The reference to King Śaktikumāra as the prince who consolidated the Kingdom also indicates the point of time (the second half of the tenth century) when the early Guhilas consolidated power in their central area and beyond. This may be taken as the second phase in the growth of the processes of state formation in Mewar. Āghaṭā or Āhaḍa was made the new capital by Śaktikumāra: he is stated to have established himself at Āghaṭapura. Guhila King Bhartṛipatā (II) bears the title of Mahārājādhirāja in the Pratapgarh inscription of Pratīhāra Mahendrapāladeva (II) of A.D. 945-946. It is again Bhartṛipatā (II) who is eulogised in the Āṭpura inscription as the 'ornament of the three worlds'. Thus new political titles and a genealogical list are claimed in the tenth century by the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhilas.

The new heights of political power are expressed in ambitious claims about origins. The records now for the first time speak of the ancestor, Guhadatta as a brāhmaṇa.
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26. Pratapgarh Inscription, op. cit., 1.27.

27. op. cit., v. 3, 'Simghobhavattadanu tadbhriti pi jaiśre Khomāna ityatha sutasyamahāyakobhūt Khomānamātma jatasmāllokatrai katilakajani Bhartripatāh'.
belonging to a family of Ānandapura (Ānandapura Vinirgataḥ Viprakulāhnandanoh-mahīdeva jayati Śrī Guhadattah Guhilavam-sāsyā pravavah). 28 Ānandapura is identified with present Vadnagar in Idar, north-east Gujarat. It is a very significant development when contrasted with the simple expression of Guhilānvaya of seventh century records. The same genealogical list and origin myth are repeated in the eleventh century, as is evident from the Kadmal plates of Guhila Vijayasimha of A.D. 1083. 29

The Pratīhāra power in southern Rajasthan had by this time begun to decline. Pratīhāra hold over the strategic fortress of Chittaurgarh weakened by the second half of tenth century. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasions into northern India had undermined the Pratīhāra power militarily as it is evident by Karhad plates 30 and Deoli plates of Kṛṣṇa III. 31 This was also the period when powerful rulers like Paramāra Sīyaka II, Mularāja Caulukya, and Candella Dhaṅga were making intrusions into the Pratīhāra dominion from central and western India. 32 In the weakening of the Pratīhāra hold over the fortress of Chittaurgarh the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍa are likely to have played a significant role as is evident from an unpublished inscription of the reign of Guhila King Allāṭa (Ālu Rāval of tradition). King Allāṭa is said to have killed on the battlefield a strong enemy named Devapa-

28. Ibid., v.1.
32. D. Sharma, RTA, op. cit., p.198, Chapter: Devapāla.
la33 (identified with Pratihara King Devapala of Kannauj of the late tenth century).34 Thus the extent to which the Nagda-Ahaḍah Guhilas helped in weakening the Pratihara hold over Citrakūṭa remains a matter of conjecture. The fact that the Guhilas of Nagda-Ahaḍahad became a power to be reckoned with is borne out by the Paramāra invasion of Aghāṭa, their capital. The Bijapur inscription of Dhavalā Raṣṭrakūṭa of Hastikundī records that prince Dhavalā gave shelter to the armies of a King whose name is lost and the army of the Gurjaras when Paramāra Muṇjarāja had destroyed Aghāṭa, the pride of Medapāṭa and caused them to flee.35 Thus they figure in the official records of their contemporaries for the first time in the tenth century. Paramāra Muṇja was the contemporary of Guhila King Saktikumāra. As is evident from the Hastikundī record Guhila Saktikumāra was given political refuge by the Raṣṭrakūṭa prince of Hastikundī at the time of the sack of Aghāṭa (Ahaḍa). It was on this occasion that the fortress of Chittaur passed into Paramāra hands. Muṇja Vākpati's nephew Bhoja is known to have resided often at Chittaur. Construction of the temples of Tribhuvana-nārāyaṇa36 (now known as Mokalji's temple) and Samadhiśvara is attributed to Paramāra Bhoja.37 Next to the Paramāras, it was the Cāhamānas who continued to keep up

33. G.H. Ojha, History of Udaipur, I, p.124, fn.3. 'Dur dharamārim yu Devapalam vyādhat Kabandham Vyādhat'.

34. Ibid.

35. EI, Vol.X, pp.20-24, v.10, 'ḥaṁktāghāṭam ghatābhīḥ prakatmiva madam medapāṭe bhatānāṁ janye rājanyajanye janayati janatājame ... raṇam Muṇjarājey i ḫariṇa iva bhīṣa Gurjjareśe Vinaṣṭe tatsainyānāṁ sārayo hāririva s'arāṇe yah Surānāṁ babhūva.'


pressures on the Nāgdā-Āhaḍ Guhilas. Guhila Saktikumāra's son Ambāprasāda is known to have been killed by his contemporary Cāhamāna, Vākpatī II of Sākambharī in an attack on the capital.38

These occasional inroads into Nāgdā-Āhaḍ should be considered as mere setbacks in the political career of the Guhila dynasty without interrupting or affecting the processes of state formation at this point of time.39

Increasing political power had to be supplemented with higher social claims. There were matrimonial alliances with the contemporary Rajput families of different lineages in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Some of these families not only belonged to respectable lineages but were also important political powers. Allāṭa had a queen from a royal Hūna family of central India.40 Hūna princess Hāriyādevī (the name seems to suggest that this Hūna family had already

38. D. Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, op. cit., p.34. Also see, Idem, RTA, op. cit., p.249.

39. The State, 1000-1700, op. cit., p.241. Herrmann Kulke's following observations on Orissa can be compared with the political situation of the Guhila of Nāgdā-Āhaḍ in tenth century. 'The relations with the nuclear areas of neighbouring princes, often separated by extensive forests, created no problems in this early phase. They were mainly limited to marriage relations and sporadic campaigns, which however remained in this early period without any significant long-term consequences. Permanent subjugation and annexation after a military victory were still scarcely conceivable. Considering the power potential at the disposal of the early local principalities, the neighbouring seats of the rulers were still far beyond their sphere of permanent political control'.

40. Ātpura Inscription of Saktikumāra, op. cit., vv.4-5. "Rastrakutākūlodbhūta mahālakṣmīrito priyā i Abhūddya-syābhavattasyaṁ tanayāḥ Śrīmadallaṁ i sa bhūpati-yā Yasya Hūna Kṣonīsavahsāja Hāriyādevī yosō bhāti Harṣa-purahavayam."
been absorbed into the Rajput fold, which facilitated a Guhila-Hūna marriage) is also called the founder or an associate of the town of Harṣapura (Harshuada, district Hoshangabad). The Hūnas may have sought matrimonial alliance with Guhilas of Nāgdā-Ahaḍāto thwart the rising Paramāra power of Malwa. The alliance also secured for the Guhilas a political ally in the Hūnas of Central India against the Paramāra. Bhatṛipatṭa's queen Mahālakṣumī is stated to have been of Rāṣṭrakūta ancestry (most probably Rāṣṭrakūtas of Hastikūndī, Marwar). Naravāhana also had a Cāhamāna queen and Śucivarman (Sāktikumāra's grandson) had a Caulukyan princess, Mahimā (daughter of Caulukya Seḍukā) as his wife. Not only the ruling family but their important functionaries also began to seek matrimonial alliances with respectable Rajput families. Two epigraphical records of A.D. 1000 and A.D. 1008 refer to the two wives of Guhila Mahāsāmantādhipati of Nāgharada (Nāgdā) as Mahārājī Sarvadevī, daughter of a mahāsāmantādhipati of the Sūryavāmśī family and mahārājī Jājukā, daughter of a mahāsāmantādhipati of another Sūryavāmśī family of Bharukachcha.

Territorial extension of the Guhila state occurred in the late eleventh century to the north, beyond the traditional boundary of Mewar, into the Godwar region. Kadmal plates record the grant of the fifth part of the produce of

---
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42. Ibid., v.7. 'nripa Naravāhanah Cāhamānānānavayodbhūtā Śrī Jejayāntīpatmājā'.

43. A stone inscription in the temple of Hasamātā, N.D. around eighth decade of A.D. 10th century, A Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, op. cit., p.73, l.5.

44. ARRM, 1936, p.2.
the village Pallī by Guhila King Vijayasīma to a brāhmaṇa Unānílācārya. The village of Pallī has been identified with the modern town of Pali in the district of Pali (Godwar region). Godwar region was commercially strategic to Rajasthan as the trade route to the sea-coast of Gujarat from northern India passed through it in this period. The credit for annexing Godwar is likely to go to Vairīsimha, father of Vijayasīma, as is evident from eulogies and military exploits of Vairīsimha recorded in the Kadmal plates.

It is likely that enmity with the Paramāras of Malwa continued into the late eleventh century. But by this period the Paramāras were a declining political power and Vairīsimha's military exploits must have put an end to the Paramāra ambition in Mewar. A small Paramāra power which had ruled in Vagod (Dungarpur-Banswara districts) between Arthuna (Banswara district) between the early eleventh and late eleventh centuries does not seem to have existed in Vagod beyond 1100. Arthuna inscriptions of Paramāra Cāmūndarāja dated A.D. 1078 and 1080 seem to be the last of the Paramāra records in Vagod. Therefore, with fast changing political configurations in Western and Central India, the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Ahaḍ entered into matrimonial relation-

46. Ibid.
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ship with the Paramāras of Malwa at this stage of their history. The Bheraghat inscriptions of the Chedi year 907 (A.D. 1155) mention that Guhila King Vijayasiṃha married Śyāmalādevī, the daughter of Paramāra King Udayāditya of Malwa (A.D. 1060-87). This alliance seems to have been utilized as a joint front against the advancing ambitions of Caulukyan ruler Bhīma I (A.D. 1022-1064). The Bheraghat inscription also states that Śyāmalādevī was the mother of Alahanādevī, the queen of Kalacūrī Gayākarna of Dāhāla.

It was in the early twelfth century that the history of Nāgdā-Āhāq Guhilas witnessed a significant development. The Guhilas for the first time in their history identify themselves as the sovereigns of the region of Mewar and hence, an important step towards regional state formation. The Paldi inscription of Guhila Arisimha (son of Vijayasiṃha) A.D. 1116 proclaims the king as the ruling prince of Medapāṭa (Bhūpāle Medapāṭamahīmām). Thus the identification of the Guhila king with the king of Mewar is a proof of the claim of the Nāgdā-Āhāq Guhilas on the region of Medapāṭa at this point of their history.

In spite of brief Caulukyan intrusion into the Vagod region (Dungarpur-Banswara districts, Middle Mahi Basin), as suggested by short inscriptive records of Caulukyan King Bhīmadeva II of Gujarāt of A.D. 1196 and of Siddharāja
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Jayasimha dated to the last decade of the twelfth century, a branch of the Nagda-Ahada Guhilas came to command a major portion of the middle Mahi basin in the late twelfth century. If they held some territorial claims in the southern part of upper Banas plain in the mid-tenth century, they seem to have integrated this territory into their state as is evident from the Jagat inscription of Guhila Sāmantasimhadeva of A.D. 1172. It is significant that unlike the status of the Pratīhāras in the tenth century in the upper Banas plain, the Guhilas in Jagat inscription figure as sovereigns on their own.

The zenith of territorial integration was finally achieved in the thirteenth century. It was then that the ancient political landmark of Mewar, the fortress of Chittaur, was finally occupied by the Nagda-Ahada Guhilas. A number of Guhila records were issued from the period of the reign of Tejasimha from Chittaur. Jaitrasimha is eulogized in the Achalesvara inscription of Samarasiṃha (his grandson) as the protector of the earth through the exploits of his arms and also as the destroyer of Nadula. He is also eulogized as occupant of a throne along with the mon-

54. Ibid.

55. See the last Section of this chapter: Dungarpur Guhilas.

56. Ibid.


arch of the gods, Indra.\textsuperscript{59} As to the age of Jaitrasimha, an inscription of Samvat 1322 from Chittaurgarh refers to the reign of Guhila King Jaitrasimha, who is spoken of as a brother of Padmasimha.\textsuperscript{60} Thus from all the available evidence it seems that Jaitrasimha was the first Guhila King who actually occupied the fortress of Chittaur: whereby the political sovereignty of the Nāgdā-Āhaṇḍa Guhilas over all Mewar was sealed. Chittaur was the ancient political landmark of Mewar. Chittaur which began its career at Nāgarī, the capital of the Sībis, went on to be the political centre of ancient Mewar under the Aulikāras, the later Morīs of eastern Rajasthan and western Uttar Pradesh, came under the control of the Cāhamānas, Pratīhāras, Paramāras and Caulukyas,\textsuperscript{61} before it came to the Guhilas. The special mention of the rooting out of Naḍula by Jaitrasimha implies the occupation of the Godwar region (Pali district) by the Guhilas.\textsuperscript{62} As noted, it is evident from the Kadmal plates that the Guhilas had established their sway over Godwar by the late eleventh century. But because of the rise of the Nāḍol Cāhamānas the Guhilas had to reassert themselves again in Godwar in the thirteenth century. The occupation of Chittaur formally integrated greater part of upper Banas Plain into the Guhila state. The end of the Imperial Cāhamāna power in central Rajasthan (with the defeat of Prithvīrāja III at the battle of Tarain in A.D. 1192) evidently facilitated the conquest of Chittaur. The Cāhamāna occupation of Chittaur and the upper Banas plain in the late

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} PRAS, WC, 1905-06, pp.61-62.


\textsuperscript{62} Achalesvara Inscription, \textit{op. cit.}
twelfth century is evident from Bijolia and Menal stone inscriptions (both in Bhilwara district) of the reign of Prithviraja III of A.D. 1168 and A.D. 1170 respectively. The Achalesvāra inscription of Samarasiṃha proves the sway of the Guhilas over the Mount Abu region (inscription was issued from the temple of Achalesvāra, Mount Abu) as well as much of Godwar, controlling routes to Gujarat sea-ports.

Thus the thirteenth century was the decisive period in the history of the state: Mewar finally came to have its own political identity as a regional state. The Guhila acquisition of Chittaurgarh extended sovereignty over Vagod (districts of Dungarpur Banswara) as well. The fifteenth century official claim that Jaitrasimha ruled over Citrakūṭa, Medapāṭa, Āghāṭa and Vagod, reflects the actual political situation of the Guhilas as they acquired Chittaurgarh.

Thus in contrast to the Guhilas of Kiskindhā and Dhavagartā (seventh-eighth century), the Guhila royal family of Nāgdā-Āhaḍā stands out as the effective sovereign of Mewar. Of all the Guhila ruling families of Mewar and beyond it was the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā family which successfully laid the foundation of a state structure.


65. See Hermann Kulke (ed.), The State in India 1000-1700, op. cit., p.235. It was characteristic for the further early medieval development of the post-Gupta period that the vast majority of early medieval kingdoms did neither arise from the centres of the Gupta empire nor from its provincial capitals. They arose rather in their autonomous peripheral hinterland and in intermediate regions which had not yet been conquered but which already had come under the wide range of influence of the Gupta empire. These were therefore regions in which local princes had the chance.
Inevitably there were also further, new, and prestigious genealogical claims along with claims of sovereignty over Mewar. The Guhadatta legend of tenth-eleventh centuries was dropped from the records and instead the new legends of BappaKa Hārītarāśi̱-Ekaliṅga-Medapāṭa were adopted.

B. Resources of the State

We begin with a brief scrutiny of the strategic importance of Mewar in contemporary western India. Mewar formed an important part of the regional circuit of trade in western India. Between the tenth and fourteenth centuries, the Gujarat coast saw an increasing maritime and coastal trade; this stimulated commercial activities in the hinterland.

Arab settlements in western India are evidenced by Persian and Arabic inscriptions as well as from the accounts of such travellers as Al-Masudi, Al Biladuri, Ibn Batuta and Al-Qulqashandi. Not only foreign trade but an equally vibrant network of internal trade in western India is evident both from literary and epigraphical sources of the period. Merchants in western India traded in both essential and luxury commodities, ranging from grains, salt, jaggery, oil, ghee, textiles, leather goods, metal goods, animals, spices, betel-leaves and arecanuts to saffron, ivory, coral, gold, semi-precious stones such as carnelian, onyx and cat's

...Continued...

to establish their local rule under the influence (or better on the model) of more advanced forms of economic and political development and to consolidate it undisturbed over many generations.'

66. V.K. Jain, op. cit., Ch.IV, p.133.
Some of these commodities found markets in West Asia. The initiative of the local states in helping the trade to thrive can be seen in the political measures undertaken. The kings always ordered the local residents of the land to provide protection to all the merchants and pilgrims passing through their region, and provided them with financial assistance whenever required. In a similar spirit rulers quelled disruptive elements which were impediments to free flow of commercial traffic. In Prabandhacintāmaṇi Merutuṅga describes the defeat of the Bhils in Malwa by Caulukyan King Siddharāja, as they had obstructed a road. It is evident from such texts as Prabandhacintāmaṇi and Tilakamaṇjarī that some rulers and ministers constructed rest-houses, water-reservoirs, charity houses for food, drink, beds and medicines for the needy (mainly pilgrims) at Anahilavāḍa, Pāṭṭana, Stambhatīrtha (Cambay), Sātrunjaya, Ujjayanta (Girnar), Darbhavālī (Dabhoi), etc. Such measures helped the traders too.

The crucial question is how Mewar figured in this western trade network. In this context the importance of Mewar is its location between northern India and western central India. Mewar became critical for the passage of trade and traffic. True, one could bypass Mewar by travelling through the chief artery, the "Palanpur gap" and Mt.

67. Ibid., pp.103 and 133; Al-Masudi speaks of Makran emerald sold in markets of Mecca.
70. Ibid., p.99.
71. Tilakamaṇjarī Kathā of Dhanapāla, Bombay, 1903, p.66.
Abu. This route ran from Anahilapura through Siddhapura, Chandravati, Abu, Bhinmal, Nādol, Jalor, Bali, Pali, Ajmer and Naraina to Mathura. However, in this context, western Mewar becomes very important because it provided the link route to the major artery through passes in the Mewar hills and forests. V.K. Jain points out that another route ran through Āhadā (near present Udaipur, the Āhadā of Nāgda-Āhadā), Pol and Idar, joining the Mount Abu route (the chief artery). Western Mewar provided routes to Malwa and central India as well. The route from Ujjain ran through Dhora, Dohad, Arthuna (district Banswara), Āhadā, Nādlai, Nādol, Pali to Ajmer and Naraina. But what has not been highlighted by V.K. Jain is the strategic importance of eastern Mewar. The route through Chittaur was equally strategic as it linked northern India with central and western India. The Mount Abu route being a popular trade route (on a vast plain and unguarded) was always vulnerable to the threat of Mongol attacks right from the thirteenth century. This seems to be the compelling reason which forced both Sultans Illtutmish and Alauddin Khalji to make a passage through Mewar to Gujarat in the early thirteenth century and central India in the early fourteenth century.

73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
The Chittaur route was defended by the Aravallis and thick forest as it ran through Mewar and Vagod to Gujarat and Malwa. Much has been said about the imperial designs of Sultan Alauddin Khalji in invading Mewar in the early fourteenth century. Undoubtedly he had to contain the ambitious Rajput rulers; but the move to annex Mewar had a strategic importance as well. And it is the same reason which had compelled Iltutmish to ask for passage through Mewar. Alauddin Khalji was not content with the riches secured from Gujarat and with its incorporation into the Sultanate. "Most of Alauddin's other ventures were mainly directed at securing his communication lines against the Rajputs and safeguarding the empire against repeated inroads of the Mongols. The attack on Ranthambhor and Chittor and his invasions of Sewana and Jalor were mainly for this purpose." Mewar continued to command increasing commercial importance throughout the period specially in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. An epigraphic study of exchange centres such as Ghatiyala, Mandor, Hathundhi, Jalor, Nāḍol, Dhalop, Nārlāi, Sevādi, Kiradu, Chandrāvatī, Arthunā, Panahera, Shergarh, Āhaḍa, Khāmnor and Chittaur (the last three in Mewar), as well as prasāstis put up by merchant families, testify to commercial transactions in early

76. Elliot and Dowson, History of India as Told by Its Historians, Vol.III, op. cit., pp.147-48. Ulghu, the grandson of Changiz Khan, with commanders, nobles and families stayed on and provisions for them had been made at Mughalpur in Delhi. The Mongols had crossed Sind in A.D. 1296. Kotwal of Delhi advised Alauddin Khalji to capture Rajput forts not only to subdue the Rajput chiefs but also to close the road of Multan against the Mongols.

medieval Rajasthan.\textsuperscript{78}

The Guhila centres of power had begun their career on a rural resource base in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{79} This material base gradually entered into an age of commercial and urban epoch by the tenth century. The important sites which did not figure in pre-tenth century Guhila records, now figure for the first time. The following is a list of few important sites in the period (i) Āṭpura,\textsuperscript{80} (ii) Ekāḷiṅgajī,\textsuperscript{81} situated 14 kilometres to the north of Udaipur, (iii) Paldi, situated near Udaipur,\textsuperscript{82} (iv) Jagat,\textsuperscript{83} situated on the border of Udaipur-Chittaurgarh districts, (v) Dariba\textsuperscript{84} near Kankroli (famous for zinc and lead mines), Udaipur district and (vi) Chiravā near Āḥaḍā (Udaipur).\textsuperscript{85} Because of the strategic location of western Mewar, a part of the commer-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{78} B.D. Chattopadhyaya, "Markets and Merchants in Early Medieval Rajasthan" in \textit{Social Science Probings}, Vol.II, no.4, 1985, pp.413-440.
\item \textsuperscript{79} Vide Passim, Ch.I, pp.38-44.
\item \textsuperscript{80} Āṭpura inscription of Sakti Kumāra, \textit{op. cit.}, v.10.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Ekāḷiṅgajī temple inscription of the time of Guhila Naravāhāna of A.D. \textsuperscript{771}, Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society, Vol.XXII, pp.151-165. It refers to the construction of temple of Ekāḷiṅga by Pāśupata ācāryas near Nagdā.
\item \textsuperscript{82} Paldi inscription of Guhila Arisimha of A.D. 1116, \textit{op. cit.} It refers to a temple of Siva and a Pāśupata monastery at Paldi.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Jagat inscription of Śaṃantasimhadeva, \textit{op. cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{84} Kankroli Road station inscription of A.D. 1298-99 of the reign of Guhila Samarasiṁha in G.H. Ojha, URI, vol.I, \textit{op. cit.}, p.177. It records the grant of sixteen drammas, to a temple of a goddess at Dariba mines near Kankroli.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Chiravā inscription of A.D. 1273 of the reign of Guhila Samarasiṁha, \textit{op. cit.}, vv.34-40.
\end{itemize}
cial traffic of western India was regularly passing through Ahad. The traffic was either on its way to Nāgod to join the arterial route, or to Malwa through Arthunā (Banswara), or to Gujarat. An idea of the nature and volume of trade passing through Āhaḍa is provided by inscriptions. The Nāgdā-Āhaḍa kingdom was regularly visited by merchants from distant places such as Karṇāṭa (Karnataka), Madhyadesā, Lāṭa (southern Gujarat and northern Konkan) and Takka (Punjab).

Saranesvāra temple inscription of Guhila Alīṭa of A.D. 953 records the grant of a number of commercial cesses levied on these merchants and travellers. Merchants and travellers entering Āhaḍa were asked to pay one dramma per horse and one twentieth of a dramma and two rūpakas per horned animal.

It appears that every item entering the market of Āhaḍa was assessed and duly taxed. Therefore, the state exchequer now came to receive commercial revenue in the form of tolls and customs in considerable amount.

Occupations such as randhanī (a cook meant for a feast), dyūtam dharanam (a gambler) at Āhaḍa also distinguish it as an urban centre, as does the list of grants made by


87. Commentary on the Gaṇitasaaras of Śrīdhara cited in Dasharath Sharma, RTA, op. cit., p.504, gives us an idea of the exchange value of dramma and rūpaka.

5 cowries = 1 Pāvisā
4 Pāvisā = 1 bisā
5 bisā = 1 lōhaṭika
5 lōhaṭika = 1 rūpā (rūpaka)
5 rūpakas = 1 dramma.

different categories of residents of Ahad to the temple of Saranesvara. The list runs as follows: one ghatikā (unit of measurement for liquids) of milk from every confectioner of the city, one peṭaka (amount of money per stake) from each gambler, one pālā (a ladle containing four tolas) of oil from every oil mill, one rūpaka from randhanī (feast held for the entertainment of the members of a family), one chatuhsār (four-stringed garland) from flower-sellers every day, one tulā from the shop of seller of worn-out clothes and one adhaka (a measure of grain containing three-and-half seers) from a haṭṭa (weekly fairs or a market place). Such a list of residents contrasts with those we get from the village settlements in the epigraphical records of the seventh century Guhilas. Grant of a specialised amount of grains from the haṭṭa is indicative of the fact that peasants from neighbouring villages converged on Āhaḍ with rural produce and took back goods from Āhaḍ. Thus Āhaḍ must have accounted for the bulk of the income of the central exchequer both from non-agricultural and agricultural items.

Strangely, this busy commercial scenario is not matched by a commensurate number of coins of the Guhilas. The few finds of the Cāhamāna coins in northern Mewar and Dhoda inscriptions of A.D. 1168 and A.D. 1169 (records that the "silver Ajaya Deva coins" were subjected to careful scrutiny and examination and became legal tender) prove that local transactions seem to have been carried out in Cāhamāna.

89. Ibid., vv.11-13.
90. Vide Passim, Ch.I, see Grants of the Kiṣkindhā Guhilas.
coins. John Deyell rightly states that commerce continued in the more popular denominations in a trans-territorial context.92

The increasing prosperity of Ahāḍa seems to have been the primary reason that prompted the Guhilas to shift their capital from Nāgdā to Ahāḍ during the reign of King Saktikumāra. The direct inscriptive reference to the establishment of King Saktikumāra at Āṭapura93 should indicate the possibility of a fortress being built at Ahāḍa as an administrative centre. The presence of the ruling elite in Ahāḍa must have accelerated further demand for high-value items.94 Therefore, the new political status of Ahāḍa might have been an additional factor in increasing the commercial traffic at this centre. We hear of Ahāḍadurga as an important political and exchange centre in the thirteenth century.95

Mobilization of resources took place from other areas of control such as Pratapgarh in southern part of Upper


93. Āṭapura Inscription, op. cit., v.10, "Śrīmadāṭapura yutalayāṁ yasya vāsa īti sampada padam".


Banas plain.\textsuperscript{96} Ekalingaji, Paldi, Jagat and Dariba with their temples and monasteries were emerging as important religious centres. Occasional fairs and festivals at these centres undoubtedly encouraged periodic markets which contributed to the resource base of the Guhila state. Chiravā was a thriving rural settlement with new temples.\textsuperscript{97} Because of its proximity to Āhada, Chiravā must have entered by the thirteenth century the circuit of commercial transactions centred on Āhada. Finally, continued mining at Zawar, evident from zinc smelting retort dumps dated between A.D. 1025–A.D. 1280, and once again between A.D. 1325–A.D. 1690,\textsuperscript{98} contributed towards the intensification of the commercial transactions at Āhada in our period of study and later.

Territorial extension in the eleventh century expanded the source of land. Northward expansion of the Nāgdā–Āhada, evident from Kadmal plates of Guhila King Vijayasiṁha (A.D. 1083), diverted some of Godwar's resources towards Mewar. The fact that the state was mobilizing resources from the Pali locality is evident from retention of half of the taxes and income from the irrigational channels for the royal donor.\textsuperscript{99}

The accounts of Hiuen Tsang,\textsuperscript{100} Chittaurgarh inscrip-

\textsuperscript{96} Pratapgarh Inscription, op. cit. Extent of agricultural resources from Pratapgarh locality is evident from the boundaries of the donated field Vāvūlika on the bank of river Nandya at the village of Palāsakūpiṇa.

\textsuperscript{97} Chiravā Inscription, op. cit., vv.34-40.

\textsuperscript{98} R.T. Craddock et. al., op. cit., p.56.

\textsuperscript{99} op. cit., 11.26-32.

\textsuperscript{100} Samuel Beal, op. cit., p.271.
tion of King Mān Morī of A.D. 713,\textsuperscript{101} Chittaurgarh inscription of Caulukya King Kumārapāla of A.D. 1151 recording grants at Samaddhisvara temple\textsuperscript{102} and Dhavagarta inscription of Guhila Dhanika\textsuperscript{103} testify to the wealth of the Chittaurgarh and the Eastern Berach basin in the pre-Guhila period. The Ghaghṣa record of A.D. 1265 referring to the building of a Bāvrī (step-well) by a member of Dīndu community in the reign of Guhila King Tejasimha,\textsuperscript{104} Jain records such as the Ghaghṣa prasāsti of A.D. 1265\textsuperscript{105} and the Chittaur stone inscription of A.D. 1267 referring to the ācāryas of the Chaitragacchā,\textsuperscript{106} inscriptions from Menal and Bijolia recording the grant of drammaś to a temple of Mahānāl (Śiva)\textsuperscript{107} and the grant of a village to a Jain temple of Pārśvanāth\textsuperscript{108} respectively point towards the range of economic activities in Chittaurgarh locality in the Guhila period. Mobilization of resources by the Guhila state from the local commercial transactions is evident from the royal dues levied on the Maṇḍapikā (custom houses) in Chittaurgarh.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} \textit{op. cit.} The record proves that Chittaurgarh was the capital town of the Morīs.
\item \textsuperscript{102} \textit{op. cit.}, vv.26-27.
\item \textsuperscript{103} \textit{op. cit.}, 11.5-13.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Ghaghṣa Record (near Chittaurgarh) of A.D. 1265 of the reign of Guhila Tejasimha in G.H. Ojha, URI, Vol.I, \textit{op. cit.}, p.170.
\item \textsuperscript{105} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Chittaur Stone inscription of A.D. 1267 in G.H. Ojha, \textit{Ibid}.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Menal Stone inscription of A.D. 1168 Cāhamāna queen Suhavādevī, \textit{PRAS}, WC, 1905-06, pp.57 and 60.
\item \textsuperscript{108} Bijolia Stone inscriptions of A.D. 1168 and A.D. 1169 of the reign Cāhamāna Someśvara, \textit{EI}, Vol.XXXVI, pp.84-112.
\end{itemize}
Guhila References to the Maṇḍapikās in the 13th Century And Religious Centres Having Occasional Fairs AD 10th - 13th Centuries
belt. The Chittaurgarh inscription of Samarasimha of A.D. 1274 records a royal grant of a few drammas and such items as ghee, oil, etc. which were made from the Mandapikas (custom houses) of Talhaṭṭi, Āghāṭa (Āhaḍa), Khohar and Sajjanpura to a Jain temple of Pārśvanāth. Except Āghāṭa (Āhaḍa, Mewar hills), the other places are all located near Chittaurgarh. Āghāṭa, evidently came to acquire a Mandapika for the first time in the thirteenth century (definitely after the tenth century). Further, increasing mining activities in the Mewar hills and incorporation of important mining centres other than zawar within the commercial network (evident from Kankroli Road-station inscription of the period of Samarasimha110) and control of the Mount Abu region,111 accelerated the process of resource mobilization particularly in terms of commercial revenue for the Guhila state.

In contrast, the two Guhila houses of Unstra and Bagodia (Marwar region) clearly had poorer resources as they operated from a semi-arid locality. Although the grants made by the Nāḍol Guhils consisted of agrarian and commercial levies, the limited area of control restricted their resource base. The Guhila chiefs of Māṅgrol in coastal Saurashtra were evidently able to tap greater wealth from the continuous flow of commercial traffic. The per diem grant made by Guhila Mūlaka to the temple of Sahajigesvāra

109. Ibíd.
110. op. cit.
111. Achalesvara inscription of Samarasimha of A.D. 1285, op. cit., contains a prāsāsti of Mount Abu locality and implies Samarasimha's acquisition of Mount Abu. vv.49-59, 'Arbudo bijayete giriruchchayeva kulacakaratnam yatra sodasavikaravipakairuvah hitokrita tapamsi vajasṭ-hah'.
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comprised one Kārṣāpaṇa from Maṇḍapikā of Śrī Mahāgalapura, one Kārṣāpaṇa from the revenue of Talāra (Talarakṣaka of Maṇḍalapura) and one Kārṣāpaṇa or every mānaka (unit of load) from a pack-bullock, four Kārṣāpaṇas on every cartload of grain, and one silver piece from the transit duties at Maṇḍapikā on the road to Lālhevādā. The mahājanas of Choravād also donated a vāo (well) called Degunā to the same temple. However, the actual control and mobilization of resources was defined by their exercise of political power as Nāyakas of Saurashtra. Their resource base seems to have been essentially confined to Maṇḍalapura.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE AND MILITARY APPARATUS: A.D. 10TH CENTURY-MID 13TH CENTURY

The administrative and military apparatus of the Guhila state evolved in the same period, as the state became complex, and the scope of administrative and military activities widened, as befits a regional (rather than local) power.

Most of the local Rajput chiefs had been integrated into the state structure by the tenth century in different capacities. It is important to locate the chiefs as officials at the strategic points. Thirdly, there was the emergence of various departments of administration. Finally, new offices of military administration and official references to forts have to be considered.

The centres of administrative importance for a local state would be the exchange centres, religious centres, mines, and centres merging into tribal territory. B.D.

112. Sobhadivao Stone Inscription, op. cit., vv.6-8.
113. Ibid.
Chattopadhyaya points out the importance of fortresses as foci of control in the early phase of ascendancy of Rajputs. The exchange centres of importance in the Guhila state, as evident from insciptional records, were Aranyakūpagiri, Pratapgarh, Khohar, Sajjanpura, Talahaṭṭī, Mount Abu, and Chittaurgarh. Inscriptional evidence for important religious centres map out the following sites: Aranyakūpagiri, Ṭhaḍa, Pratapgarh, Mount Abu, and Chittaurgarh.

114. B.D. Chattopadhyaya, Origin of the Rajputs, op. cit., p. 76.
115. Samoli Inscription, op. cit.
117. Pratapgarh Inscription, op. cit.
118. Chittaurgarh Inscription of Samarasiṃha (A.D. 1281), op. cit.
119. Ibid.
120. Ibid.
121. Achalesvara Inscription (A.D. 1285), op. cit.
122. Chittaurgarh Inscription (A.D. 1274), op. cit.
123. Samoli Inscription, op. cit.
124. Udaipur (Kundagrāma) Prasasti of A.D. 661, op. cit., Saranesvara temple Inscription, op. cit.; a marble slab inscription of the reign of Guhila King Sucśivarman (tenth century characters); ARIE, 1963-64; Ṭhaḍa fragmentary inscription of the period of Saktikumāra (late tenth century), PRAS, WC, 1905-06, p. 60.
125. Pratapgarh Inscription, op. cit.
Paldi, Jagat, Chiravā, Chittaurgarh centres of mining were Aranyakupagiri near Nāgdā-Āhada, the copper belt of the Mewar-Hills, Dariba near Kankroli (zinc and lead mines), Zawar (zinc-lead-silver concentrate) (40 km south of Udaipur city). While most of these important centres are in the Mewar hills, the rest lie in the Upper Banas Plain (See Maps). Therefore, the spread of Rajput functionaries throughout the territorial expanse contributed towards integration of these nodes. The points merging into tribal territory of the Bhils, were all concentrated in the Mewar hills (especially the link routes, passes and Zawar mines).

Unfortunately the sources for the period do not throw light on the nature of the Rajputs chiefships in strategic places bordering the Bhil territory. It may be assumed that some of these chiefs were entrusted with special responsibilities of negotiating with the local Bhil chiefs. These chiefs were indeed administratively crucial to the State. The sources of the period throw light on the important offices of administration and nature of personnel at the seat of power, Āhada. The Saranesvara temple inscription of A.D. 953 refers to the members of the gośṭhikas. Gośṭhi-kas were usually the administrators attached to religious institutions. In the case of royally patronized temples, the gośṭhikas seem to have been appointed by the state to

126. ‘Paldi Inscription’, op. cit.
128. Chiravā Inscription, op. cit.
130. Saranesvara Temple Inscription, op. cit., v.7.
administer the affairs of these institutions (Ādivarāha, Viṣṇu, Sūrya, Nānigaśvāmī, and a number of Śaiva temples constructed by the Guhila royal house). Pratihāra and Ḫūṇa Rajputs appear as officials in the goṣṭhikas at the temple of Ādivarāha at Āhaḍa. The other important offices of administration evident from Saranesvara inscription are those of town gate-keepers or door-keepers (Pratihārī) and managers of ecclesiastical affairs (dharma). Pratihāra Rudrāhāsa and Rāhata appear as pratihārīs. Ḫūṇa Kāśṭika and Śrīdhara occupy the office of ecclesiastical affairs. Ḫūṇa Matṭata appears as King Allaṭa's minister (amātya). Thus, important members of the Pratihāra and Ḫūṇa lineages were integrated through important administrative ranks.

Since Guhila Allaṭa had a Ḫūṇa queen from central India, matrimonial alliances of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍa Guhila in the early phase of their rise helped organize a network of power. Ḫūṇa members of goṣṭhikas and Ḫūṇa Matṭata as

133. Āhaḍa Fragmentary inscription of the time of Sāktikumāra, PRAS, WC, 1905-06, p.60, No.2233.
134. Āṭpurā Inscription, op. cit., v.1.
135. A marble stone inscription of King Sucivarman, op. cit.
137. Ibid.
138. Ibid., v.7, "Ḫūṇascā kriṣurājonyah sarvadevopī goṣṭikah kritamāyatanam cedamamātye matṭate sati'.
139. Āṭpurā Inscription, op. cit., vv.5-6.
minister could be kinsmen of queen Hāriyādevī. Similarly members present in the royal court from Rajput lineages such as Caulukyas, Paramāras, Cāhamānas, figuring in Guhila records (in the context of matrimonial alliances) would have been granted administrative and military posts; and thereby co-opted. Although we do not have direct evidence, there is no reason to believe the absence of important administrative posts as recorded in the grants of the Kiṅkindhā Guhilas, as those of Pratisāraka, Sāulkika, gāmāgāmika, balādhikṛta, daṇḍanāyaka, must have been some of the other administrative offices, indispensable to Guhila state in the period. The presence of the office of Sāulkika is indirectly evident from the reference to collection of tolls and customs at Āhaḍā.

Cāhamānas appear as important officials in the eleventh century. It is evident from the Kadmal Plates that a dūta (message) Raṇadhavala, son of Sagamā, was a Cāhamāna Rājaputra. A Solāṃkī Rājaputra figures as an important member of the goṣṭhika in the twelfth century. The Paldi inscription of A.D. 1116 refers to Solāṃkī Rājaputra Śrī Sālakhārana, the son of Rājaputra Śrī Upala. As late as the early thirteenth century, Rajputs continued to occupy the top ranks in administration. It seems from the Chiravā inscription that Bhīmasimha and his son Rājasimha served Jaitrasimha and Tejasimha as ministers (pradhānyam

141. The Grants of the Kiṅkindhā Guhilas, Vide Passim, Ch.I, pp. 43-44
143. op. cit., 11.39-40.
144. op. cit., 11.15-16.
prāpya)\textsuperscript{145} respectively. It is also noted that Bhīmasimha had to die fighting for the state of Mewar against Gujarat (diverged to military function).\textsuperscript{146} There is only a solitary instance of a Kāyastha official, Pālavellaka, the writer of saranesvara inscription of A.D. 953.\textsuperscript{147}

**Local Level Administration**

Given the extensive rural base of the state, local level administrative bodies can be expected to have expanded. However, the term Pāncakulika figures in only one royal record of the period. The scribe of the Kudmal plates of Guhila Vijayasimha (A.D. 1083), Nāgapāla the son of Pandita Unhila, belonged to the Pāncakulika caste.\textsuperscript{148} This stray evidence does not speak for absence of the Pāncakulika throughout the expanse of the territory. The members in such corporate bodies are likely to be the notables of the rural society. Appointments made from amongst local persons ensured continuity of tenures at the local level, irrespective of dynastic change.\textsuperscript{149} The rural notables of the earlier period such as Kūtumbins, Vaṇiks, etc. (e.g. the list of witnesses in the Kiskindhā Guhila grants) may not have necessarily dominated the local administrative bodies in the later period, as pointed out by Chattopadhyaya in the

\textsuperscript{145} op. cit., v.29.

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., v.26.

\textsuperscript{147} op. cit., v.15, 'lekhitārau ca kāyasthau Pālavellakasajñakau'.

\textsuperscript{148} op. cit., l.38.

\textsuperscript{149} Romila Thapar, "Social Mobility in Ancient India with Special Reference to Elite Groups" in *Indian Social History: Some Interpretations*, New Delhi, 1978, p.138.
case of early medieval Bengal. Some other social groups such as mahattaras in early medieval Bengal might have grown powerful and dominated the local, corporate bodies. However, mahājanas make their appearance in rural Mewar as early as the seventh century. However, notables as individual members of rural society (brāhmaṇas, mahattaras, mahājanas, Vanikas, etc.), remained administratively important even in between 1100 and 1300 without a formal Pāncakulika. Even if Pāncakulikas were appointed by the kings for supervision of cesses from araghaṭṭa-fields, transferred lands and araghaṭṭas, the fact remains that the choice fell on the local level notables. Thapar also observes the presence of local persons in Pāncakulas in post-Gupta period. Chattopadhyaya discusses the presence of Pāncakulas in early medieval towns as well, such as Siyadoni in the Gurjara-Pratīhāra realm. However, Goṣṭhikas appear to be important in early medieval towns of Mewar such as Ātpura (Āhaḍā).

Military Apparatus:

The Ātpura Inscription of king Śaktikumāra of A.D. 977, which lists the Guhila queens of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa

150. Aspects of Rural Settlements and Society in Early Medieval India, Calcutta, 1990, pp. 43–44.  
151. Samoli Inscription of A.D. 646, op. cit.  
152. See Chapter IV Section: Local Level Administration.  
154. Romila Thapar, 'Social Mobility in Ancient India with special Reference to Elite Groups', op. cit., p.138.  
156. Saranesvāra temple inscription, op. cit.
of Hastikūṇḍī), Cāhamānas, Caulukyas, Paramāras, Hūṇas, evidently indicates the presence of these Rajput chiefs in the Mewar hills. However, the most obvious support that the Guhilas received from these local, Rajput chiefs was military. B.D. Chattopadhyaya points out similar military support from the Cāhamānas, Caulukyas and minor Pratīhāra lineages to the Gurjara-Pratīhāra royal family in a much larger territorial context. The settlement of external Rajput elements not only indicates political integration of the local chiefs but also a system of checks against the local chiefs. Matrimonial alliances with Rajput royal families from Hastikūṇḍī and central India are likely to have drawn some affinal kin to Mewar, facilitating organization of a network of Guhila power. However, kinsmen of the royal family evidently occupied higher posts in the military apparatus. The point is supported by two epigraphical records of A.D. 1000 and A.D. 1008. They speak of a Guhila Mahāsāmantādhipati (chief of the lords of the sāmantas) of Nāgahrda (Nāgda). If Guhilas occupied the posts of mahāsāmantādhipati, non-Guhila Rajput chiefs were the other sāmantas. Secondly, unlike the simple reference to the chief leader (apparently commander of troops) in the seventh century record, Nāgdā-Āhaḍā records refer to the formal title, mahāsāmantādhipati for the first time in the late tenth and early eleventh century.

The other significant facet of the military apparatus would be the chain of fortresses newly constructed, fortified or captured to guard both the core-area of the state as

157. op. cit., vv.4-7.
158. ARRM, 1936, op. cit.
159. Kundagrāma prasāsti of Aparājita, op. cit.
well as the peripheral belt. Āṭapura, the newly constructed capital town at Āhādāin tenth century\(^{160}\) must have necessitated a chain of fortresses particularly in its northern, north-eastern and southern directions (the western side was guarded by hills and forests). Unfortunately, the lack of direct evidence except for the presence of Kiṣkindhāpur in the Chappan area, deters us from mapping out such centres. It is the presence of newly-inducted Rajputs such as the Hūṇas (central India) or Rāṣṭrakūṭas (Hastikunḍi) that indicates the presence of fortresses. The repeated fall of Āhādāin late tenth century to Cāhamāna and Paramāra incursions possibly indicates that the military system was still not strong. Yet the state territorially expanded in the late eleventh century, and some of the local strongholds were definitely annexed in the Godwar region to hold strategically and commercially important Pali.\(^{161}\) Nāḍol (seat of Nāḍol Cāhamānas) was captured by Jaitrasiṃha in the early thirteenth century\(^{162}\) which apparently extended the line of defence particularly for the Nāgdā-Āhādābelt. Finally Jaitrasiṃha's capture of Chittaurgarh evidently brought a number of neighbouring local fortresses under Guhila control.

D. POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS SYMBOLS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH GUHILA MONARCHY

Āṭapura inscription of King Sāktikumāra claims Guhila

\(^{160}\) Āṭapura inscription of Sāktikumāra, \textit{op. cit.}, v.10. The description that King Sāktikumāra settled at Āṭapura implies construction of a royal fortress at Atapura in the second half of tenth century.

\(^{161}\) Kadmal Plates, \textit{op. cit.}.

\(^{162}\) Achalesvara inscription, \textit{op. cit.}, v.47. 'Nāḍūlamūlam-kaśa bāḥulakṣmīstu rūṣkasañyāryavakumbhoyonih īl asmin-surādhīsahāsanasthe rarakṣa bhūmimatha Jaitrasiṃbha'.
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progenitor Guhadatta as a son of a brāhmaṇa family which had emigrated from ānandapura (Ānandapura Vinirgatah Viprakulāh- nandanoh-mahīdeva jayati Śrī Guhadattah pravah Śrī Guhila vaṁśasya). The Kadmal Plates of King Vijayasiṃha of late eleventh century also repeated the tenth century claim to origin status of the Guhilas. Now the question is why it was necessary to invent a myth of migration from Gujarat to Mewar. We must remember that the Guhilas never associated themselves with ānandapura or Gujarat in before 900. The answer lies in the desire to legalize the hold of the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhilas over their immediate territorial acquisition.

The details of the answers are hidden in the popular annals of Mewar. The transition of power from the Bhils to Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhilas recorded in the traditions of Mewar have already been mentioned. It was obvious for the state to officially ignore the fact of conquering of the Bhils as they had been made subordinates in their own land. Secondly, the Guhilas had also established their predominance over a number of non-Guhila Rajput chiefs of the locality by the tenth century. Hence, introduction of a migration myth linking the Guhilas with the prestigious ānandapura brāhmaṇas furnished the task of legitimation of Guhila power over the entire sub-region of the Mewar hills. Legitimation was sought by association with a respectable brāhmaṇa family from ānandapura in Gujarat officially proclaimed for the first time in Āṭpura inscription of A.D. 977. The annals claim that Guhadatta, the founder of the ruling lineage, was

163. Āṭpur Inscription, op. cit., v.1.
164. Kadmal Plates, op. cit., v.2.
165. vide Passim, Ch.I pp.42-43.
166. op. cit., v.1.
the posthumous son of the last Maitraka King Śilāditya of Valabhi. This not only lends respectability to the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā Guhils but also helps in tracing migration roots from outside Mewar hills. It is interesting that legends also claim that Guhadatta was brought up by a brāhmaṇī of Birnagar (Kamlavatī) of Nāgar gotra. She was instructed to bring him up as a brāhmaṇa, but to be married off to a Rājputānī.\textsuperscript{167}

**Religious Symbols**

Just as it was necessary for the Nāgdā-Āhaḍā state to take recourse to political symbols to legitimize power in Mewar hills in tenth century, it was equally expedient to associate itself with a religious landmark of Mewar hills. Royal affiliation to a religious landmark signalizes beginnings of religious process of State formation (utilization of religion for state functions). The Guhilas sought affiliation with Nāgahrda, an emerging Pāsūpata centre in Mewar hills and through patronage of their cult, Ekaliṅga.

The construction of the royal and magnificent temple of Ekaliṅga is recorded in its inscription, A.D. 971.\textsuperscript{168} It was constructed in the reign of Naravāhana at the instruction of Pāsūpata ācāryas such as Supujitarāśi, Viṃśchitarāśi, etc., on the Trikuṭā hills at Nāgahrda.\textsuperscript{169} This inscription mentions the famous Kāyāvarohana episode (the story of Śiva's incarnation at Kārvāna, Gujarat), the origin story of the Lakulīśa Pāsūpata sect.\textsuperscript{170} The episode is a


\textsuperscript{168.} *op. cit.*


\textsuperscript{170.} *Ibid.*, vv.9-11.
description of Śiva incarnating himself on the earth at Kāyāvarohana in Bhṛgukacchā (Broach district, Gujarat). This incarnation evidently refers to Lakulīśa, the founder of Pāśupata sect of Śaivism. He was followed by disciples Kusīka and others. The inscription also records a very significant statement. It states that Śrī Bappaka established himself at Nāgarḥda. For the first time in history that the Bāppā Rāval of the legends figures in official records of the Guhila. And he figures in association with Nāgarhd, a Pāśupata centre in tenth century. Another stone inscription of King Naravāhana at the temple of Nātha (A.D. 970-71) repeats the Kāyāvarohana episode: "They (Guhilas) sought the protection of Saṅkara, the lord of Pārvatī..., who favoured Bhṛgukacchāḥ... There came Kusīka and other munīs, who possessing knowledge and pure bodies took delight in bhasma (ashes) and put on the barks of trees and crowns of jaṭā (braided hair)." The physical descriptions undoubtedly are those of Pāśupata sages.

Political and Religious Symbols: Thirteenth Century

The acquisition of Chittaurgarh bestowed the political sanctity on the Guhila royal family as the sovereigns of Mewar. As noted, Chittaurgarh had evolved into a symbol of political eminence in southern Rajasthan since the beginning of its career as nāgarī, the capital of the ancient sībis. With its annexation and integration into the expanding Guhila state, the Guhilas could legitimately call

171. Ibid.
172. Ibid., v.5.
174. vide Passim, Ch.I., p.30.
themselves the kings of Mewar. And thus was completed the process of territorial unification. So it is with the Guhila acquisition of Chittaurgarh that the region of Mewar could identify itself with the Guhila royal family of Nāgḍā-Āhaḍa.

The culminating phase of this process finds echoes in the new political and religious symbols. It is in the thirteenth century that the Guhilas acquired new political and religious symbols. They were no longer the Guhilas of Nāgḍā-Āhaḍa; they were now legally transformed into Guhilas of Medapāṭa (Mewar).

With new territorial acquisitions the point of reference for legitimation was no longer just the Mewar hills, but all Mewar. A significant turn in genealogical structure in thirteenth century changed the political and religious symbols. The Chittaurgarh (A.D. 1274)\textsuperscript{175} and Achalesvāra inscription (A.D. 1285) of Samarasimha claimed Bappa and not Guhadatta, as the founder of the royal house of Medapāṭa.\textsuperscript{176} Guhila (Guhadatta) merely appeared as his son.\textsuperscript{177} Thus Guhadatta of the tenth-eleventh century was dropped from the thirteenth century records as founder of the royal family. The records claimed the bestowal of the state of Mewar on Bappa by the Pāśupata sage Hārītarāsi with the favour of Ekaliṅga.\textsuperscript{178} The sage also gave Bappa, a brāhmaṇa

\begin{itemize}
\item 175. \textit{op. cit.}, vv.10-11.
\item 176. \textit{op. cit.}, vv.10-12.
\item 178. Chittaurgarh inscription, \textit{ibid.}, vv.10-11; Achalesvāra inscription, \textit{Ibid.}, vv.10-11.
\end{itemize}
by caste, a golden anklet 179 and Bappa got his brāhmaṇhood exchanged for Kṣatriyahood which was obtained by favour of god Ekaliṅga, who was happy with the devotion of the Pāsūpata sage, Hārītarāsi. Thus the new political and religious symbols of the thirteenth century revolved around the legends of Bappaka-Hārītarāsi-Ekaliṅga-Medapāta and the status of Bramha-Kṣatra (brāhmaṇa Bappa receiving kṣatriyahood from Hārītarāsi).

**Kinship Structure, Proliferation of the Branches of Nāgda-Ahadī-Guhilas, Expansion of Nāgda-Ahadī-Guhila Power in Vagod (Middle Mahi Basin) and Emergence of Centres of Power in Upper Banas Plain and Vagod claiming Guhila Lineage:**

The first evidence of segmentations of the Nāgda-Ahad Guhila royal family comes from a late eleventh century record, the Kadmal Plates of Guhila Vijayasimha (A.D. 1083). The list reads:

```
Guhadattah
Bhoja
Mahendra (I)
Nāga
Sīla
Aparajita
Mahendra (II)
Kālabhoja
Khummāṇa (I)
Mattata
Bhātrīpiṭṭa (I)
Simha
Khummāṇa (II)
Mahoyaka
Khummāṇa (III)
Bhātrīpiṭṭa (II)
Allāta
Mahipāla
Vairāta
Hamsapāla
Vairisimha
Vijayasimha. 180
```

---

Branches of the Nāgḍā-Āhaḍa Guhils Inscriptionally Located 11th - 13th Centuries
In contrast to previous rulers, the relation of each succeeding prince with his immediate predecessor gets mentioned from Siṃha (the twelfth ruler) onwards.\textsuperscript{181} For instance, Siṃha is Bhartṛipaṭṭa (I)'s son [Siṃho = bhava... daku(nu)va(ta)sya suto = thā(tha) yaje].\textsuperscript{182} It is significant that instead of Naravāhana of tenth century records, Allāṭa is succeeded by Mahīpāla in the present record. Naravāhana, the successor of Allāṭa, is not mentioned by the above record. Therefore, it is obvious that both Naravāhana and Mahīpāla were sons of the same father, Allāṭa. Naravāhana being the eldest, succeeded to the throne in regular succession after Allāṭa. This is the main reason why all the known epigraphical records of the Guhila of Mewar mention Naravāhana. Now the question arises as to why this particular record omits the mention of Naravāhana and instead proclaims Mahīpāla as son and successor of Allāṭa. The question becomes important in view of the fact that Mahīpāla never succeeded to the throne of Nāgdā-Āhaṭa in the tenth century. None of the Guhila records except Kadmal plates mention Mahīpāla as a Guhila prince. The answer perhaps lies in the fact that only if Vijayasimha (the Guhila King issuing Kadmal plates) belonged to a branch of the Guhila ruling family other than that of Naravāhana's, would Vijayasimha have mentioned his immediate ancestors (rather than Naravāhana). In other words, Vijayasimha belonged to a junior branch of the ruling house. Evidently, this junior branch originated with the younger son of Allāṭa, Mahīpāla. This is evident from the fact that Vairāṭa who precedes Hāṃsapāla in the genealogy had obtained rulership elsewhere outside his paternal place (anyatra labharā-

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid., 1.7.

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid., 11.5-6.
jyasya). The fact is corroborated by third slab of Kumbhalgarh inscription, which states that the progeny of Yogarāja (who figures in the main list of the rulers), the predecessor of Vairāṭa, did not attain regal status, though he himself fully enjoyed it, and that the lot finally fell on Vairāṭa who was a descendant of a branch of Allaṭa's lineage. The above genealogical variations as culled from all important records are presented below.

### Allaṭa (V.S. 1010 = 953 A.D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Senior Branch)</th>
<th>(Junior Branch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Naravāhana (V.S.1028=971 A.D.)</td>
<td>1. Mahīpāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Śālivāhana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Saktikūmāra (V.S.1034=977 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ambāprasāda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Śucīvarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Naravarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anantavarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yasovarman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Yogarāja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vairāṭa (V.S. 1083=1026 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Kumbhalgarh slabs, the second major segment of the ruling house which branched off with Yogarāja's son in


184. Raja Varṇana section, third slab of Kumbhalgarh slabs, A.D. 1460. Ibid., Chittaurgarh Inscription (A.D.1274) and Achalesvara Inscription of (A.D. 1285) Samarasiṃha, op. cit.
the early eleventh century is mentioned. Since Yogarāja's son could not succeed to the throne, the scion of the immediate junior branch, Vairāṭa was the next legal claimant. Thus Vairāṭa succeeded Yogarāja. A fragmentary inscription of A.D. 1083 (1026 A.D.) preserved in the Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur can probably be assigned to the reign of Vairāṭa (the major portion containing the name of the ruling prince and other details are lost). 186 It is important that neither a fifteenth century literary source like the Ekaliṅ-gamāḥatmya (Section: Rāja Varnana) nor a seventeenth century epigraphical or literary source such as Rāja Prasasti and Amarakāvyam provide any clue to early junior branches. The question arises as to what necessitated these segmentations of the royal family that led to proliferation of its junior branches. A.K. Vyas is probably right when he points out that it may have been a case of some internal family feuds. 187 But this analysis does not explain the political structure of the Guhila state in this period (tenth-eleventh centuries). Formation of new branches seems to have been the most plausible consequence of the ranking system which was the basis of political integration. Since the very system of ranking was open-ended, political mobility was implicit. Since the basis of territorial and political hold was not static, rank was not static either. In fact, even inadequate studies available so far would suggest that ranks held by individual families underwent changes that ranks varied from one generation to the next and that aspirations for higher ranks were operative within the individual polit-

187. Ibid., p.240.
The formation of Mahipāla's house is a good instance of competition for higher ranks by junior members of the Nāgdā-Āhada-Guhila royal family resulting in formation of junior branches. However, it is very important to note that Mahipāla's house did not remain a separate branch along with Vairāṭa's accession to the throne in early eleventh century.

A new junior line branched out from Yogarāja's successor in early eleventh century. In both the cases, the records are silent about the actual geographical location of their domain. Therefore, it is difficult to locate these new areas of control. Nor can it be expected to be mentioned by the official records of the Guhila state. However, formation of new branches would inevitably locate new areas of control on the map. Only one expression refers to the new locality of control by Yogarāja's successor, anyatra labdha rājyasya (Yogarāja's successor obtained rulership elsewhere outside his paternal kingdom). This expression is perhaps significant enough to tentatively locate these new areas of control. The expression explicitly points towards a locality outside the tenth century Guhila state. If ranking was the basis for political mobility, aspirations for higher ranks could not possibly operate within the given Guhila domain. It was not possible to assign a higher rank to Mahipāla in preference to his elder brother Naravāhana: the only option was to form a new domain in the mid-tenth century elsewhere.

Much has been stated recently about the impact of formation of junior branches on the paternal kingdom. R.S.

188. B.D. Chatopadhyaya, Political Processes, op. cit., p.45.
189. Kadmal Plates, op. cit., l.10.
Sharma points out that the junior branches always contributed to the fragmentation of central political authority.190 Is concept of political fragmentation at all relevant for the Guhila state, in view of evidences cited above for the tenth-eleventh centuries? Could newly founded small principalities at the periphery of the state contribute to fragmentation? The new centres of power at peripheries are in fact likely to have contributed towards formation of a chain of immediate allies. Secondly, in the tenth-eleventh centuries there were still ample space available in the periphery to settle, and initiate a new dynastic order. Finally, if the junior branches had equal political rights vis-a-vis the Guhila king then would not Vijayasimha have mentioned his immediate predecessors between Mahipala (the founder of junior house) and himself in his official record, Kadmal plates. The very fact that Vijayasimha, a member of the junior branch, remained silent about his immediate predecessors in a royal charter even after becoming king (and presented a single genealogical list of the Guhila dynasty) is indicative of the actual power and status of the junior branches. The fact is further corroborated by Paldi inscription of Arisimha (Vijayasimha's son and successor) which mentions Vairisimha, Vijayasimha and Arisimha in succession along with a prasasti of the Guhilas.191 Arisimha does not even mention Mahipala, founder of the house, in his official record. He names his grandfather Vairisimha. Even Vairatapa, an actual ruler of the Guhila throne who probably happened to be Arisimha's great grandfather does not find a place in the Paldi inscription.


191. op. cit., vv.2-7.
The fact that expansion of kinship networks leading to formation of junior branches became phenomenal in this period is evident from the following expression in Paldi Inscription: Ḥārivistārisākhah Prājyaiḥ Patrai Guhilanripatera [Śrī] totāpahārī (the expanding branches of the Guhila Kings). B.D. Chattopadhyaya writes, ‘channels open for diffusion of such tension would not have been many. Expansion of kinship network, itself encompassed by the system of ranking... could only create new loci of power’ Thus new centres of power did not disturb the process of state formation initiated by the main line; instead expansion of the kinship network caused rivalries, rather than diffusing them.

Pratapgarh Guhilas from Nāgehrda

Expansion of kinship network in the period witnessed emergence of Guhila centres of power in south-eastern part of upper Banas plain. Localities in Pratapgarh region of Chittaurgarh district (southern-eastern part of upper Banas plain) were held by members of Nāgdā-ĀhaḍaGuhila royal lineage. It is evident from the three inscriptions of Guhila Vigrahapāla of V.S.1053, 1065 and 1066 inscribed on the chattri-pillar of Mahārāvat Bhānasiṅha (Bhāna), a ruler of Deolia-Pratapgarh. The find-spot of these inscriptions is Jiran in Neemach tahsil of district Gwalior. Guhila Vigrahapāla proclaimed himself Mahāsāmantādhipati of

192. Paldi Inscription, op. cit., v.2.
193. B.D. Chattopadhyaya, Political Processes, op. cit., p.221.
The claim to both "Guhila" and "Nāgahrda" along with the rank of Mahāsāmantādhipati suggests that the settlements of Guhila kinsmen proliferated. These Guhila chiefs might have been incorporated into the Guhila state in the mid-tenth century as is evident from their rank of Mahāsāmantādhipati. Guhila king Bhartṛipatta's territorial rights in Pratapgarh and his title of mahārajādhirāja before mid-tenth century seem to support our suggestion. However, G.H. Ojha opines that Pratapgarh Guhilas of early eleventh century were probably the subordinate allies of the Paramāras of Malwa. This suggestion is plausible in view of Paramāra incursions into southern Rajasthan in the late tenth century and occupation of Chittaurgarh.

**Bhartripattābhidāna  Guhilas of Vagod**

The emergence of a Guhila kingdom in the Vagod region by 1100 A.D. is evident from the discovery of a series of inscriptions. These Guhila kings also originated from the Nāgdā-Āhāḍa Guhilas. Guhila Vijayapāla of Vagod in his Ingoda (Malwa) inscription of A.D. 1133 declared himself to be of Bhartripada (Bhartṛipatṭa) branch, "Samastarājā vallīvirājitabhartṛipadābhidānah mahārajādhirājaparamesvaraśrī Vijayapāladevena". Thakardā (district Dungarpur) inscription of Guhila Surapāladeva of A.D. 1155 provides the following genealogical list: in the line of Bhartṛipatṭa, Śrī Pṛthvīpāladeva, son Mahārāja Śrī Tribhuvanapāladeva, son Mahārāja Śrī Sura-

195. Ibid.
196. Ibid.
197. IA, Vol.VI, pp.55-56, 1.2.
pāladeva and Mahārājājakumāraputra Śrī Anāṅgapāladeva.\textsuperscript{198} Virpur village (Gator, near Jaisamand, district Udaipur) inscription of Guhila Amṛitapāla of A.D. 1185, recording the grant of an araghaṭṭa and two halas of land to a Rayakvāḷ brāhmaṇa, Thakkura Madana, declares the King to be of Guhila lineage in the line of Bhartṛipaṭṭa (Śrī Guhiladattavaṁśa Śrīmadbhartṛipaṭṭābhidhānamahārājādhīrāja Śrī Vijayapālasuta mahārājādhīrāja Śrī Amṛitapāladeva).\textsuperscript{199} This inscription also significantly designates Amṛitapāla a Sāmanta in the reign of Caulukya Bhīmadeva,\textsuperscript{200} indicating Caulukya sway over Vagod in late twelfth century. This was however short-lived.

**The Guhilas of Dungarpur**

A major house of the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Āhaḍ that was born in late twelfth century was that of Dungarpur. This branch, known to have originated with Guhila Samāntasimhadeva continued to hold the whole of Vagod as a separate kingdom throughout the medieval period. G.S. Ojha in his monumental work, *History of the Dungarpur State* arrives at the following genealogical table on the basis of epigraphical records, legends and Gazetteers of the colonial period.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{198} IA, Vol.XVI, p.226, 11.2-7.
\textsuperscript{199} IA, Vol.LVI, p.225, 11.2-5.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{201} DRI, op. cit., pp.35-38.
### Kṣema Siṃha (King of Mewar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vagod Branch</th>
<th>Mewar Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāmantasīṃha (Previously King of Mewar &amp; later King of Vagod) (V.S. 1228-36)</td>
<td>Kumārasīṃha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayatasīṃha</td>
<td>Mahanāsīṃha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīhadādeva (v.s. 1277-91)</td>
<td>Padmasīṃha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayāsīṃhadeva (Jayāsīṃhadeva) (v.s. 1306-1308)</td>
<td>Tejasīṃha (v.s. 1317-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapāladeva</td>
<td>Samarāsīṃha (v.s. 1330-58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṭāsīṃhadeva (v.s. 1343-59)</td>
<td>Ratnāsīṃha (v.s. 1359-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jagat (A.D. 1172) and Soloj (Dungarpur district) inscriptions (A.D. 1179) show that Sāmantasīṃha ruled in Mewar and Vagod respectively in the eighth decade of twelfth century. Now how did he acquire Vagod? Was it territorial extension of the Guhila state of Nāgḍā-Āhāḍ or another case of segmentation of the royal family due to kinship pressures? To answer these questions we shall examine the evidences of two royal sources, Achalesvara inscription of A.D. 1285 and Kumbhalgarh prasāṭī of A.D. 1460. Achalesvara inscription states that Sāmantasīṃha snatched away everything from the sāmantas and that Kumārāsīṃha had to win back the royalty for his ancestral kingdom which had been lost to the enemies. Kumbhalgarh prasāṭī states that Raṇasīṃha
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was succeeded by Kṣemasiṃha, the younger brother of Māthanasiṃha who evidently predeceased his father and then Sāmantasiṃha became the ruler of Mewar. It records further that Sāmantasiṃha was succeeded by his brother Kumārasiṃha who turned out of Mewar a person called Kītū who had somehow taken hold of the country. He also made Āghāṭapura his own by acquiring the favour of the ruler of Gujarat. Thus some external factor seems to have characterized the political history of the reign of Sāmantasiṃha and accession of Kumārasiṃha.

It is also from some other near contemporary source outside the house of Guhilas, that light is thrown on the history of Sāmantasiṃha's reign. The Luṇavasahī temple inscription of A.D. 1230 (record of the Paramāras of Abu) states that Prahlādan, younger brother of Paramāra King Dhārāvarṣa, saved the life of a ruler of Gujarat when he was badly defeated by Sāmantasiṃha. Since Paramāras of Abu were the subordinate allies of the Caulukyas of Gujarat, they must have joined forces against Guhila King Sāmantasiṃhadeva. Ojha identifies Ajaypāla (Kumārapāla's successor) as the Caulukya contemporary of Guhila Sāmantasiṃha. Therefore, Guhila Sāmantasiṃha must have defeated Caulukya Ajaypāla in the battlefield. In 15th Canto of Surathotsava Kāvyā composed by Gurjaresvāra Purohita, Somesvāra (composer of Luṇavasahī Inscription) states about one of his ancestors, Kumara, "who cooled the many wounds of King Ajaypāla
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caused at raṇakheta'.

Ojha places the defeat of Caulukya Ajaypāla by Guhila Sāmantasimha around A.D. 1174. It is obvious from both the Luṇa Vasahī inscription and Surathot-sava Kāvyā that although Sāmantasimha had inflicted a crushing defeat on the Caulukyas, the Caulukyas soon avenged themselves and Guhila Sāmantasimhadeva was forced to abdicate.

However invasion by the Caulukyas of Gujarat (combined with cliques of their Sāmantas) seem to have been the determining factor in the ouster of Sāmantasimha in the 1180s. Thus lineage fission/segmentation during the royal house political turmoil helped the consolidation of royal power while opening up Guhila centres of power beyond the frontiers.

However after the abdication, Sāmantasimha sought his fortunes in Dungarpur locality of Vagod. Ojha places the defeat of Sāmantasimha by the Caulukyan forces around A.D. 1175. Finally, as noted, the Achalesvara inscription says that in his abdication, the local sāmantas of the Guhila state played an important role by projecting his younger brother, Kumārasiṃha as their candidate. Kumārasiṃha seems to have consolidated Guhila power in a period of turmoil with the help of Guhila sāmantas. Details of history of external invasions juxtaposed against Guhila inscriptive evidence throw significant light on the political process of state formation in which local sāmantas contributed to the preservation of the Guhila throne in Mewar.
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A Guhila-Caulukya clash during Sāmantasiṃha's period is easily understandable in view of Caulukyan sway over the whole of Mewar. This fact is already noted from Kumārapā­la's Chittaurgarh inscription of A.D. 1151. Their continued sway over Mewar hills till early thirteenth century is also evident from Āhaḍa copper plate grants of Caulukya Bhīma II of A.D. 1207. It is also obvious from Virpur village inscription of Bhartṛipaṭṭabhidhāna Guhila Amṛitapañ­la that the previous Guhila rulers of Vagod (Bhartṛipaṭṭabhidhāna Guhilas) acknowledged their Caulukyan overlords. Thus Sāmantasiṃha could only have a short rule in Vagod as he seems to have been defeated by the Caulukyas between A.D. 1179 and A.D. 1185. However, his short rule was succeeded by kings who came to be identified as the Guhilas of Dungarpur.

The above chapter traces the stages of state formation in Mewar on the basis of the political career of the Guhila ruling families in the period. Godwar and Saurashtra Guhilas functioned merely as political components of Nāqol Cāhamāna and Caulukyan states respectively. In contrast, the Guhila dynasty of Nāgdā-Āhaḍā successfully laid the foundation of a state structure in Mewar. The Mewar hills emerged as the locus of a sub-regional state by the tenth century. Political, economic, social and religious process­es of state formation are amply borne out by the beginnings of political integration of both Guhila and non-Guhila chiefs into administrative structure and military apparatus, an expanding resource base, advantageous matrimonial al­liances, politico-religious symbols and patronage of a
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locally popular sect. Interestingly, as the state grew by territorial integration and incorporation of Guhila and non-Guhila chiefs, the royal family witnessed fissioning necessary to readjust under pressure in an open-ended polity. Increasing power of the Guhilas is evident from their claim of sovereignty over all Mewar. The acquisition of Chittaurgarh in the mid-thirteenth century and new politico-religious symbols identifying the Guhila dynasty as the sovereign of the whole of Mewar marked the climax of the integrative process of territorial incorporation and transformed the Guhila state of sub-region of Mewar hills to regional state of Mewar.