CHAPTER III

MEWAR BETWEEN THE 13TH AND 15TH CENTURIES: KING, KINSMEN AND POLITICAL ALLIANCES

Having discussed the process of territorial integration and emergence of a regional state under the Guhila banner in the thirteenth century our study should have logically ended with the previous chapter. But we had, at the outset, briefly justified our purpose of extending the study of state formation upto the fifteenth century. The purpose is obviously not to repeat the well-known dynastic history of Mewar. Such an extension is necessary for instance, to enquire into the changing political structure, the institution of Guhila kingship and its relation with the royal kinsmen, and the social linkages with the contemporary Rajput powers between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. If findings for the fifteenth century highlight an entirely different political structure than that of the thirteenth century, they certainly highlight political and military problems of the state of Mewar.

Kings and Kinship in the 13th Century

It is significant that the thirteenth century records of the Guhila royal house reveal a situation of consolidation and expansion of Guhila monarchical power with parallel growth in the power of the royal kinsmen. Undoubtedly, the royal titles reflect popular perceptions of the status of the Guhila kings. The earliest thirteenth century record refers to Śrī Jaitrasimha as Mahārājādhirāja,1 A Jain record from Chitttauor of A.D. 1267 refers to Śrī Tejasimha with

divine attributes as Rājabhāga Vannanārāyaṇamahārāja.² One of the most important of the thirteenth century private records from Mewar, the Chiravā inscription, uses significant titles for the Guhila kings such as mahīśvarā and bhūpāla for Padmasimha,³ Ilāpati for Tejasimha,⁴ nṛipatī for Māthanasiṃha,⁵ nṛpā and rājā for Jaitrasimha,⁶ kṣitipatī for Samarasiṃha,⁷ and so on, to distinguish the Guhila Kings from the rest of the Guhila royal family.⁸ Both the Chittaurgarh (A.D. 1274) and the Achalesvara (A.D. 1285) inscriptions tracing the ancestry of the thirteenth century Guhila Kings to Bappa, Purāṇapurusā (primeval man)⁹ magnify his role in the foundation of the Guhila royal power in Mewar. The son born to him was Guhila¹⁰ and the following kings are presented as follows:

---

2. Ibid., p.396.
3. op. cit., vv.4 & 12.
4. Ibid., v.7.
5. Ibid., v.10.
6. Ibid., vv.19 & 22.
7. Ibid., v.8.
8. Ibid., v.3, "Guhilājāvamsājahpurā kṣitipālotra babhūva Bappakah 11'
10. Chittaurgarh Inscription, Ibid., v.13 and Achalesvara Inscription, Ibid., v.12, "Bappakasyatanayo naṇavetta Sambabhuva nṛpatiḥ Guhilākhyāḥ Yasyanāmakalitām kilajātim bhūbhujō dadhati tatkulajātāh 11'.
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Unlike the Kadmal plates of the late eleventh century and the Paldi inscription of the early twelfth century\textsuperscript{12} royal records of the thirteenth century neither acknowledge Mahipala, founder of an important junior branch in the tenth century, nor confine the royal genealogy to a few select preceding kings on the Guhila throne (for instance, Paldi


\textsuperscript{12} Vide Passim, Ch.II, Section: Centres of the Guhila power between the 10th and the 12th centuries beyond Mewar hills.
inscription of A.D. 1116). Not only do royal records attempt to project a unified genealogy, even records of the important functionaries such as those of the Tāmātaraḍa family from Chiravā introduce each King as a son (tanuja) or younger brother of the previous ruler. Presentation of such royal genealogies by the administrative functionaries of the state reveals percolation of the royal perception of its own power at least to the ranks of the elite. However, political importance of the royal kinsmen is not concealed by the contemporary records.

A political hierarchy based on rank is revealed both by the royal and the private records. In fact, when the queen mother Jayatalladevi refers to Guhila King Samarasiṁha as Mahārajakula (Mahārāval), it appears that Samarasiṁha stood at the top of a hierarchy of Rāval (royal kinsmen; immediate kinsmen of the king). A Kāyastha family from Chittaurgarh also refers to King Samarasiṁha as Mahārājaku-la. Hence, both the royal and private records establish the fact that the Guhila Kings at least by the second half of the thirteenth century presided over a number of Rāval or royal kinsmen recognised through their formal political status.

The presence and importance of the royal kinsmen in the political structure of the Guhila state is also evident from royal recognition of the lineage of the Guhila and its branches, in their official charters. The royal records which propagate the legitimizing motifs for the Guhila monarch also significantly eulogize the Guhila lineage and its branches as kuṭhāra-dhārasta brūmahe Guhila Vamśām pārosāk-}

13. Chiravā Inscription, op. cit., vv.4-12.
es)\textsuperscript{16} as well as \textit{\"{s}ākhopa\'a\,kā\,kulitah suparvagupōṣcitah}... Guhilasya vaṃśāḥ (branches and sub-branches of the Guhila royal family are full of fine qualities).\textsuperscript{17} The same records repeatedly refer to the Guhila royal lineage as Guhila Vaṃśa,\textsuperscript{18} prasiddhaham Gauhilyāṃvaṃśa,\textsuperscript{19} Guhilakula,\textsuperscript{20} and sanahpatih Guhilābhidhāno.\textsuperscript{21} Royal references to the royal lineage and its branches undoubtedly indicate proliferation of several branches of the royal family by the second half of the thirteenth century. Secondly, royal concern for their immediate kinsmen is evident from the royal praśāstis of the branches and sub-branches of the Guhila royal kinsmen in the organization of territorial control.

The point is worth considering in view of the recently acquired Chittaurgarh and expansion beyond Mewar. Royal dependence on close kinsmen and failure of the Guhils to enlist the support of non-Guhila chiefs (of the Upper Banas plain and particularly of Chittaurgarh) seems to have increased the power of the royal kinsmen. Unlike the tenth century reference to chiefs of non-Guhila Rajput families, the thirteenth century records do not mention the non-Guhila Rajput families. At least the non-Guhila Rajput families of Chittaurgarh and upper Banas plain could be expected to have been mentioned. On the other hand, the power of the royal kinsmen is evident from the presence of the Rāvals and repeated royal references to the Guhila lineage.

The fact that kings were reluctant to highlight the ranking system can also be perceived in the conspicuous silence on this of two royal praśāstis of the thirteenth

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Chittaurgarh Inscription of A.D. 1274, v.8.}
  \item \textit{Achales\'vara Inscription of A.D. 1285, \textit{op. cit.}, v.5.}
  \item \textit{Chittaur Inscription of A.D. 1274, \textit{op. cit.}, v.5.}
  \item \textit{Ibid., v.13.}
  \item \textit{Ibid., v.60.}
  \item \textit{Ibid., v.13.}
\end{itemize}
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century. Although the Chittaurgarh (A.D. 1274) and Achalesvara (A.D. 1285) inscriptions contain *prasātis* of the branches and sub-branches of the Guhila lineage, they do not refer to King Samarasīṃha as *Mahārāvalī*. Queen mother Jayatalladevī's record which refers to reigning King Samarasīṃha as *Mahārājakula* designates the preceding King Tejasimha (queen Jayatalladevī's husband) as *Medāpatāḍhipati*. Hence, royal attempts at designating the Guhila Kings as the "sovereigns of Mewar" in the midst of Rājakulas shield rather than reveal political realities. In fact, the evidence suggests that King Samarasīṃha who had attained extensive territorial acquisitions was also possibly the first Guhila King to have been designated as *Mahārāvalī*. Such political developments seem to strengthen our view that the Guhila Kings by the second half of the thirteenth century were increasingly depending on their close kin for the consolidation of Guhila power.

We must remember from our study of the proliferation of the branches of the Guhila royal family and creation of the junior houses (Kadmal plates and Paldi inscription) as well as the presence of a Guhila mahāsāmantāḍhipati at Nāgdā (early eleventh century records), that the royal kinsmen were exercising pressure for upward mobility and some of them were moving away from the paternal state without disrupting it. (See the case of King Sāmantasīṃha, ousted by sāmantas as is evident from the Achalesvara inscription, and succession to the Guhila throne by Kumārasīṃha, his younger brother.) The fact that kin pressure might have played a significant role in the military defeat of the Guhilas in A.D. 1303 by Alauddin Khalji, is evident from a long absence of the Guhila monarchy in Mewar for most of the fourteenth century. Moreover, the way the last of the Rāval Kings of Mewar, Ratnasīṃha, is criticized for having failed to protect Chittaurgarh in a major royal record of fifteenth century.

---

century. It also indicates the politics played by the Rāvalṣ in the military defeat of the Mahārāval. However, besides Rāvalṣ, no other political title can be gleaned from the contemporary records.

Having discussed kin pressure and its manifestations in the latter half of the thirteenth century, the royal attempts at projecting the succession of the Guhila Kings in a single line of fathers and sons conceal political tensions and the presence of rival chiefs. It is important to note David P. Henige's observations on Guhila genealogy. "We are asked, for instance, to believe that in the Guhila dynasty of Medapāṭa 32 of 33 successions were of the father-to-son variety, including five ruling generations between 942 and 977 and 18 ruling generations between 942 and before 1168. This extremely narrow royal genealogy is inferred from retrospective epigraphic evidence and from the traditions recorded by Tod. And, given the propensity of the Vaṁśāvaḷīs, Khyāṭs, and other chronicles that portray succession as unremittingly from father to son one need not rely too heavily on Tod's account in this instance." 24

However, the above enquiry has not been made to highlight the centrifugal forces in the Guhila polity in the thirteenth century but to point out the essential problems of the Guhila monarchy in the same period. At a point of time when the dynasty reached its zenith of power its chief political supporters, royal kinsmen, were possibly its worst problems.

The long absence of Guhila rule in fourteenth century Mewar is apparent from the absence of Guhila records with the exception of a solitary private record referring to the reign of Rāṇā Khetā in A.D. 1366. 25 Epigraphic records of


the Khaljis, Tughlaqs and Songirās in Chittaurgarh indicate a change in the political sovereignty in the first half of the fourteenth century. At Chittaurgarh there is an intriguing absence of records between 1350 and 1400. Hence, a study of the fifteenth century royal records becomes an important measure of dynastic continuity.

**Kings and Kinship: A.D. 15th Century**

Disruption of Guhila rule in the fourteenth century is significantly followed by the re-emergence of Guhila kingship in the fifteenth century. This is phenomenal and helps in understanding the establishment of the institution of regional kingship and dynastic traditions of Mewar. It was undoubtedly the result of a long process of regional state formation in which the state of Mewar had come to be identified with the Guhila dynasty.

Importantly, the kings of the late fourteenth and the early fifteenth century were sovereigns of Mewar. They do not acknowledge the sovereignty of any king from outside Mewar. Evidence of their sovereignty is amply borne out by the royal records. Thakkura Dālā refers to the reign of Rāṇā Khetā in A.D. 1366.27 Earliest of the fifteenth century royal records from Mewar, Mokal's Chittaurgarh and Sringirisi inscriptions refer to an early ruler, Arisiśāha,

---

26. At least three fragmentary inscriptions dated in the reign of Alauddin Khalji including one that is dated in 1314 refers to Alauddin Khalji as the ruler of Chittaur have been discovered at Chittaurgarh, ARIE, 1956, Appendix C, No.126. Also see URI, op. cit., p.173. Two more Persian inscriptions dated in the reign of Muhammad bin Tughlaq have been found at Chittaurgarh, EIAPS, 1955-56, pp.67-68. At least three short inscriptive records of A.D. 1338 including two referring to the presence of Songirā prince Vanavīra as in-charge of fort of Muhammad follow those of Muhammad bin Tughlaq at Chittaurgarh, P.C. Nahar, Jain Abhilekha, Vol.II, Calcutta, 1927, p.242.

27. Shodh Patrika, op. cit., 1.1.
as Kṣitipati²⁸ and Hammīra (Arisimha's successor in royal genealogy)²⁹ as Bhūpati. With consolidation of power, titles were magnified; King Mokal was Maharājādhirāja Mahārāṇā Śrī Mrgāṅka; so too his successor Kumbha³⁰ who was also Rāirāyā Rānērā Mahārāṇā.³¹ Not only royal records, but also those of the Jains refer to the reigning King Kumbha in much more pompous tone (Śrī Rāmayudhiṣṭhirādi nareśvaranukra-sya Rāṇa Śrī Kumbhakarna Sarvovāratisār Vabhaumasya Vijayamānarājye).³²

However, the late fourteenth century or early fifteenth century kings of Mewar, interestingly did not trace their genealogy to the erstwhile Guhila kings except for lineage affiliation. They only took to the legends of Bappaja Vaṁśa ³³ and anvayo Guhila narapati ³⁴ in the early fifteenth century. In spite of proclaiming one of their predecessor Hammīra (so far unlisted in Guhila genealogy as a gem in the family of Bappa, ³⁵ Hammīra's kinship linkages to the family of Bappa are not revealed.

The evidence clearly indicates that the early fifteenth century kings, who made no attempts to claim direct kinship relations with the Guhila dynasty of Mewar, were possibly chiefs of local origin from Chittaurgarh. Their rise to power, associated with the fortress of Chittaur, is distinctly evident from the contemporary royal records. The

²⁹. Śrīṅgīṛiśi Inscription, op. cit., v.5.
³¹. Ibid.
³³. Mokal's Śrīṅgīṛiśi Inscription, op. cit., v.3.
³⁴. Mokal's Chittaurgarh Inscription, op. cit., v.5.
³⁵. Śrīṅgīṛiśi Inscription, op. cit., vv.2-3.
Kumbhalgarh praśasti condemns Rāval Ratnaśīma (the last Guhila King with the title of Rāval) for having failed to protect Chittaurgarh and Mahārāṇā Lakṣmaśīma is eulogised for having protected it. Secondly, their local origin is also hinted by a private record that refers to King Khetā (Kṣetraśīma) as a Rāṇā while one of Khetā's grandsons Mokal chooses to drop it. Rāṇā, being a politically subordinate title suggests their mere chiefly status in the beginning. Mokal drops the title of Rāṇā from his records to highlight their royal status.

But the Guhilas were so strongly identified with the state of Mewar that no chiefly family, however strong and powerful, could legitimize exercise of power, without claiming direct kinship with them. Later rulers not only continued to appropriate dynastic affiliation to the Guhilas through the motifs of nripati Guhilābhīdhāno (Kings by the name of Guhila), Bappakhyāh Purāṇapuruṣan and Bāṉpanvata (in the lineage of Bappa) but gradually began to claim direct kinship with them. Vague affiliation to Khummāṇa is hinted in an early fifteenth century record. We recall that Khummāṇa had appeared for the first time as a Guhila

36. Kumbhalgarh praśasti, 3rd slab, op. cit., v.177.
37. Ibid., v.177, Atham Mahārāṇā Śrī Lakṣmaśīvarṇanam 11 Khummaṇāvaṃśa Khaḷu Lakṣmaśīmahastasmin gāte dūrga varam rarakṣa Kulaṣṭhitim Kāpurusai na jātu dhīrāḥ puruṣāṣṭrayajamti'
39. Śriṅgīṛiṣi and Chittaurgarh Inscription, op. cit.
40. Kumbhalgarh praśasti, 3rd slab, op. cit., v.127.
41. Ibid., v.124.
43. Ibid., v.18.
King in the Āṭpura inscription of A.D. 977,\footnote{\textit{op. cit.}, vv.2-3.} which provided the very first genealogical list of the Guhilas of Mewar. Mokal in the Chittaurgarh inscription of 1429 traces back Hammāra to Arisimha, King of Mewar, in the family of the Guhilas.\footnote{\textit{op. cit.}, v.7, \textit{vaṁśe tatrasiṁhah kṣitipatrīrājñā kṣetrāṅkṣtra-lakṣmī viḵšādakṣorupākṣamābahulajarajājanī-dhvāṁsbhāsvadagbhastīḥ īl vindhya-vandhyapradeshasphuradmalakhanivyakta ratnākaratvasphāra Sṛṭ Medapāṭkṣiti valaya valadugdhpadhocandrah īl'}} Both the records of Mokal provide us with a genealogy that runs from Arisimha to Hammāra to Mokal via Mokal's grandfather Kṣetrāṅkṣtra and father Lakṣmāsimha.\footnote{\textit{Sṛṅgīrīga} Inscription, \textit{op. cit.}, vv.2-13; Chittaurgarh Inscription, \textit{Ibid.}, vv.7-44.} What seems to distinguish Mokal's genealogy is the lengthy prasasti for Hammāra\footnote{\textit{Mokal's Chittaurgarh Inscriptionition, \textit{Ibid.}, vv.10-13.}} rather than Bappa.

However, Mokal neither elaborates upon kinship with the previous Guhila kings nor mentions their ranks. Interestingly, a Jain record, the Ranakpur prasasti of A.D. 1439, is one of the first fifteenth century records that refers to the reigning King Kumbha as Rāṇa\footnote{\textit{op. cit.}, 1.20.} and traces the genealogy of Kumbha to Bappāṁśīya kings Hammāra to the thirteenth century Guhila king Samarāsimha\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 1.12-10.} starting with Bappa.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 1.2-10.}

Thus for the first time, the kings of the fifteenth century attempted to trace their descent in continuity from the earliest Guhila king Bappa to the last of the thirteenth century Guhila kings, Samarāsimha. Although the genealogical list is silent about the actual relationship between Samarāsimha and the next succeeding king, the implication is clear. Secondly, the same list also hints at the possibility that Kumbha was the first fifteenth century king to

\begin{flushright}
44. \textit{op. cit.}, vv.2-3.
45. \textit{op. cit.}, v.7, \textit{vaṁśe tatrasiṁhah kṣitipatrīrājñā kṣetrāṅkṣtra-lakṣmī viḵšādakṣorupākṣamābahulajarajājanī-dhvāṁsbhāsvadagbhastīḥ īl vindhya-vandhyapradeshasphuradmalakhanivyakta ratnākaratvasphāra Sṛṭ Medapāṭkṣiti valaya valadugdhpadhocandrah īl'}
46. \textit{Sṛṅgīrīga} Inscription, \textit{op. cit.}, vv.2-13; Chittaurgarh Inscription, \textit{Ibid.}, vv.7-44.
48. \textit{op. cit.}, 1.20.
50. \textit{Ibid.}, 1.2-10.
\end{flushright}
resume the title of Rāṇā for his predecessor Mokal is not mentioned with the same title.\(^{51}\)

Thirdly, this particular genealogical list provides us with four more princes of the royal family between Arisimha and Hammīra (Srī Bhuvanasiṃha, son Srī Jayasiṃha, Lakṣma-siṃha [no kinship term appears], son Srī Ajayasiṃha and brother Srī Arisimha)\(^{52}\) indicating continuity in kinship relations. Finally, the clue as to what possibly accelerated Mokal's successor Kumbha to resume the title of Rāṇā and trace direct descent from the previous Guhila kings of Mewar without any break is also evident from the same genealogical list. It is significant that Sultan Allauddin is introduced between Guhila King Samarasiṃha and prince Bhuvanasiṃha. Since the genealogical list came from the Jains, the elite perception of sovereignty of Mewar and its political history clearly included Sultan Allauddin Khalji in its own world. Perhaps to diminish the importance of the Khalji interregnum at Chittaurgarh and to highlight the political power of the regional kings, Kumbha chose to utilize their erstwhile title of Rāṇā that helped explaining their actual kinship relations with the Rāval Guhilas of Mewar.

Hence, Kumbha elaborated upon his kinship with previous Guhila rulers by claiming Rāval Khummāṇa as a direct ancestor. As already noted, Khummāṇa had always figured in the line of royal succession in the royal records between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries, Lakṣma-siṃha (introduced as Mahārāṇa)\(^{53}\) is said to be a scion of Khummāṇa-vāṃśā.\(^{54}\) Importantly, Rāval Khummāṇa is introduced right after Rāval Guhadatta without specifying the actual relationship.\(^{55}\) The

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 1.11.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 11.8-10.

\(^{53}\) Kumbhalgarh prasāsti, 3rd slab, op. cit., v.176.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., vv.176-177, "'Atham mahārāṇā Srī Lakhaṃsiṃhavarmāṇam 11 Khummāṇavāṃshah Khalu Lakṣma-siṃha.'

\(^{55}\) Ibid., v.134, "'Iti Rāula Srī Guhadattavarmāṇam 11 Atha Rāula Srī Khummāṇa Varmāṇam'."
motif of Rāval Khummnāna gets magnified as he is provided with an elaborate praśasti. Rāval Khummnāna is nāyaka (chief) and not king as the Rājavarnāna (description of the kings) section of the Kumbhaltgarh praśasti begins only after the account of Khummnāna. Hence, the fifteenth century kings gradually affiliated themselves to the erstwhile Guhila rulers by claiming that one of the ancient Guhila kings, Khummnāna, was their direct ancestor. In spite of the implication that the nāyaka status of Khummnāna would hint at their junior political status in previous days, such motifs smoothened their transitory entry into the Guhila royal family of Mewar. But they never referred to themselves directly as a junior branch of the Rāval Guhilas in the fifteenth century. Even in the Purānic section (possibly composed in the post-fifteenth century) of the Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam the Mahārāṇās of the fifteenth century were introduced only as Aparasākhā (Mahārāṇās were the other branch of the Guhilas) and not as a junior branch of the Guhila family. The problem seems to have been tackled by introducing the legends of Mahap, the elder brother and Rahap, the younger brother, in the Purānic section of Ekaliṅgamāhātmyam.

56. Ibid., vv.134-136, "Harṣādyotolayatsvām nijasutagrihi-ṇisamytum Kaṇcanena praḍāttadyācakebhīyah Kanakmiti laṣatkalpavrikṣopamānah 1 Kīrttīṃ Viṣṭārayansvām tu hinadadhisudhakṣirahīrāvadatām sa Śrī Khummpanāma Samabhavadavaner nāyako bhuribhāgya vilanbhaya saka- lam mahītalam digaṇam vāri nidhon girivrajam khummn-rajānyaśiromanesāvasaunarttādbhutakīrttinartakī Aṃgān sampṛāptabhaṅgān samṛabhuvī param dattanāgāh kaliṅga vāṅgā naṣṭākhiḷāṃga sarattihatibhīh pāṭitāṅga strilih- gāh 11 Saurāṣṭra 11 Hara-pratihatātu digjayārtham caudāh samtyaktacūdā raṃparasaptavo drāvidā naiva Gaudāh 11".

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., v.138, "Iti Kālum Śrī Khummnapa varpanam 11 Atha Rājavarṇanam 11 Atha Śrī Rājavamśotra prathyaktaḥ pracy- āte dhunā 11 cīraṃtanapraśasto nāmanakānāmtah-vekṣa-ṇāt".

in which Rāhāp is said to have obtained the title of Rāpā.\textsuperscript{60} Similar legends with elaborate motifs get further extended in seventeenth century royal records such as Jagannāṭhārāya temple inscription of Rāpā Jagatśiṃha,\textsuperscript{61} Rājapraṣāṣṭi\textsuperscript{62} and Amarakāvyam.\textsuperscript{63}

It is significant that Kumbha introduces Mahārāṇā Lakṣhmasiṃha in the royal genealogy right after the last of the Rāvāls, Ratnasīṃha.\textsuperscript{64} Thus, claiming kinship relations with the Rāvāls was only to legitimize power through dynastic continuities. Finally, but not the least, the question as to the importance of the royal kinsmen in the fifteenth century remains to be answered. Undoubtedly, the royal title of Mahārāṇā assumes the presence of rāpās (kinsmen close to the king) in the political hierarchy. But there is a significant absence of royal reference to sākhās (branches) and prasākhās (sub-branches) in the fifteenth century royal records. Unlike the thirteenth century Guhila kings, the fifteenth century kings mention neither branches nor sub-branches of the royal family, nor eulogise their lineage. Hence, the royal kinsmen do not seem to have played as significant a role as their thirteenth century counterparts in the consolidation of the royal power and control of territory. The fact that political and social linkages of the fifteenth century Guhila kings with the non-Guhila Rajput chiefs of Eastern Mewar possibly played a more important role in the retention of Guhila power is amply demonstrated by the contemporary royal references (see following section). Thus, the shift from royal kinsmen to non-Guhila Rajput chiefs of Eastern Mewar in the fifteenth century

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., vv.62-63. \textsuperscript{61} EI, Vol.XXIV; p.66, vv.11-13. \textsuperscript{62} op. cit., pp.35-36, vv.28-34. \textsuperscript{63} op. cit., pp.112-118, Ch.5, vv.2-33 and Ch.6, vv.1-10. \textsuperscript{64} Kumbhalgarh prasāṣṭi, 3rd slab, op. cit., vv.176-177.
focuses on the political-military problems of the Guhila state of Mewar that compelled the state to broaden its social base.

SECTION-II
POLITICAL & SOCIAL LINKAGES WITH NON-GUHILA RAJPUTS AND OTHER SOCIAL GROUPS IN MEWAR

Cāhamānas in Mewar hills:

The Cāhamānas continued to appear as major non-Guhila Rajput chiefs in Mewar hills in the thirteenth century. The Kadmal copper-plate inscription of Mahārajādhirāja Tejasimha of A.D. 1259 records the grant of land to brāhmaṇa Tribikrama, located in the domain of Rāo chānd, Cāhamān Rāo Sihasu's son.65 It is evident from this record as well as Padmasimha's late twelfth century record66 that Kadmal village and its surroundings were essentially the domain of the Cāhamānas of the Mewar hills. The title of Rāo testifies to their political integration into the political structure through ranking in the sāmanta hierarchy. The fact that royal records continued to refer to the location of the royal landgrant as the rājya of Cāhamāna sāmanta indicates the prominence of the Cāhamāna families in Kadmal near Nāgdā-Āhadā. The presence of the Cāhamānas in the Mewar hills core-area becomes an obvious factor in making royal landgrants to brāhmaṇas in the Cāhamāna domain. Since the donee, brāhmaṇa Tribikrama, is Sīvaguṇa's (donee in Padmasimha's landgrant charter) son, the royal dynasty strengthened links with a domain of sāmanta by patronizing the same family of brāhmaṇas through the generations.

Down the hierarchy the presence of lower sāmantas such as Thakkuras in the sāmanta hierarchy is also attested by a late fourteenth century inscription. The Sītaladevī temple inscription of A.D. 1366 from Gogunda village records the


66. Ibid., pp.54-55.
renovation of a temple and installation of an image of Viṣṇu by Īṭhakkura Dālā, Īṭhakkura Śātala's son, in the reign of Rāṇā Kṣetrasiṃha'.

Gogunda is a pass connecting the Nāgdā-Āhaḍbelt with the Abu-Sirohi region, traversing a part of the Bhil country. If Īṭhakkura Dālā was actually located at this strategic point then the possibility of settlement of chiefs by the state cannot be ruled out. It is evident from the record that the family had been politically integrated into the sāmanta hierarchy only in the recent past as the genealogy of the renovator of the temple is limited to his father, and no mention is made even of his grand father. Śātala possibly was the first member in his family to have received the political title of Īṭhakkura. Presence of the Pratīhāra chiefs at Chittaurgarh is evident from the discovery of their solitary record at the temple of Bhojasvāmī (Chittaurgarh) referring to Rājā Dharaśiṃha, son of Rājā Paṭā of the Pratīhāra family in A.D. 1300.

Significant changes in the Rajput components of the political structure are discerned in the fifteenth century. This certainly reflects the problems and preferences of the fifteenth century state of Mewar.

The Hāḍās of Uparmal or Pāṭhār (Eastern Mewar):

Eastern Mewar with the fertile and with well-watered fields thick vegetation, and routes to Central India appears to have been dominated by the Hāḍās in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. The region as far as the Chamīl belonged to Mewar throughout the medieval period, and the Hāḍās are known to have acknowledged the supremacy of the Rāṇās of Mewar. The Annals of the Hāḍās refer to the Guhilas as

67. Ibid., pp.54-55. "Svasti Śrī Rāṇā se (khe) talade rājye Saṃvat 1423 Varṣe aśādhavadī 13 bhāunae aśvinī nakṣatre sobhana yoge ṭha. Śātala suta ṭha. Dālā jir Ṽoddhara prāsāda Viṣṇu mūrti pratiṣṭhitam".

68. Appendix to EI, Vols.XIX-XXIII, p.92, No.649.

‘the lords of Medapāta’. However, the claim of the Hāḍās over this Uparmal region is no less legendary than that of the Guhilas over Mewar. It is significant to note the popular recognition of a small tributary of the Chambal, the Karab-kā-Khāl as the natural landmark dividing the lands of the Hāḍās from those of the Guhilas.70 The Pāṭhār resounds with the traditional tales of the Hāḍās who, in a very early period, established themselves in this region, where they are known to have erected twelve fortresses such as Bumaoda, Rattangarh, Dilwargarh, Kheri, Nimbahara, Nimach, Jawad, Jiran, etc.71 However, the Hāḍās were so very powerful in the Uparmal region that even the local tribal population such as the Bhils well knew their supremacy over Eastern Mewar. Bumaoda still reverberates with the name and chivalry of the legendary Ālu Hāḍā.72 Hāḍā traditions also interestingly narrate the refusal by the Rāṇās of Chittaur of a matrimonial offer of a Hāḍā princess, clearly indicating political rivalry (besides lower social status of the Hāḍās) between the Guhilas and the Hāḍās of Eastern Mewar.73 The Hāḍās claim to have defeated Rāṇā Mokal in the skirmish that followed the Guhila refusal to accept a Hāḍā princess as a Guhila bride. A popular song commemorates the event as follows

"Hāmu Mokal māriyo,  
Lāle Khetā jān,  
Suje Ratan Samghāriyo,  
Ajmal Arasi rān."74

The song says that the bridegroom, at the spring-hunt of Arasi (Aheriā), met Mokal, and both fought to death, Rāo Sujā killed Ratan too.

70. Ibid., p.1691.
71. Ibid., p.1681.
72. Ibid., pp.1681-82.
73. Ibid., pp.1806-1808.
74. Ibid., p.1808.
Besides traditions, discovery of the inscriptionsal records at Menal containing the genealogy and the prasāasti of the Ḥāḍās of Eastern Mewar point to Ḥāḍā predominance in the locality. The most important of the Ḥāḍā inscriptions from Menal is dated A.D. 1390. It begins with a prasāasti of the Cāhamānas, the ancestors of the Ḥāḍās and their presiding deity, Āśāpurāṇadevi before detailing the genealogy of the Ḥāḍās of Bumaoda, originating from prince Harrāj. 75 It also significantly designates Harrāj's successors as 'lords

75. Ibid., pp.1802-04. The text of transcription briefly runs as follows, edited by Tod, 'By Āśāpurāṇa (the fulfiller of our desires) the Kuladevi (tutelary goddess) of the race, by whose favour hidden treasures are revealed, and through whose power, many Chohan Kings have ruled the earth, of which race was Ehanwardhan, who in the field of strife attained the desires of victory. Of his race was the tribe of Hārā, of which was Kooolun, of illustrious and pure descent in both races; whose fame was fair as the rays of the moon. From him was Jypyāl, who obtained the fruits of the good works.... From him was Deva-rāj, the lord of the land,.... His son was Hur-rāj, whose frame was piece of fire; who, in the field of battle, conquered renown from the princes of the land [bhom-eswar], and dragged the spoils of victory from their pinnacled abodes. From him were the lords of Bumaoda, whose land yielded to them its fruits. From Deva-raj was Rit-pal, who made the rebellious bow the head,..... From him was Kelhan, the chief of his tribe, whose son Koontul resembled Dhermaraj: ...a son was born to Koontul, fair as the offspring of the ocean. He was named Mahadeva. He was [in wisdom] fathomless as the sea, and in battle immovable.... The sword grasped in his extended arm dazzled the eye of his enemy, as when uplifted over the head of Uni Shah he rescued the Lord of Medpat, and dragged Kaitah from his grasp, as is Chandra from Rahoo. He trod the Sooltan's army under foot, as does the ox the corn; even as did the Danoos (demons) churn the ocean, so did Mahadeva, the field of strife seizing the gem (rutna) of victory from the son of the King and bestowing it on Kaitah, the lord of men. From the centre even to the skirts of space, did the fame of his actions extend, pure as curdled milk. He had a son, Doorjun, on whom he bestowed the title of Jiva-raj (Jeoraj), who had two brothers, Soobutsal and Kumbhaka-
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of Bumaođa. The political links between the Hāḍās of Menal (eastern Mewar) and the Guhilas can be seen in the Hāḍā claim that Hāḍā Mahādeva rescued the 'lord of Medapatha' (dragged Kaitāh) from the grasp of Sultan Uni Shah.

The Ekaliṅgaji Temple Dākṣina Dvāra Praśāsti of Rāṇā Rāmalla of A.D. 1489 narrates the military victory of Rāṇā Khetā (grandfather of Rāṇā Mokal) over the Hāḍās. 'Khetasimha, who was honest and intelligent, reduced the King of the East who took fines, and whose administration and taxation was very severe. He destroyed active and calm heroes who were between (him and the King of the East) and subdued the land after severe fightings in which the heads of the clan of the Hāḍa-Kshatris were cut off and their trunks wandered about. Here is a contemporary record of the Guhilas of Mewar which directly refers to the Hāḍās as the Kings of East and the subsequent victory over them. In fact, references to the maladministration and unpopular taxation system of the Hāḍās of Eastern Mewar appear as justifications of the Guhila military victory over the Hāḍās and their subsequent political integration into the state of Mewar. The fact is evident from the Guhila reference to the Eastern Mewar as Hāḍā- maṇḍala. The conquest of Hāḍāvati by Mahārāṇā Kumbha (described in the Kumbhalgarh prasāsti) which evidently included the state of Bundi would also indicate the forts held by the Hāḍās in Uparmal. Apparently, Mahārāṇā Kumbha had to reassert the authority of Mewar in

76. Ibid., p.1804.

77. Ibid. Kaitāh has been identified with Rāṇā Kṣetrasimha (Khetā).


79. Ibid.

80. Kumbhalgarh 4th Slab, op. cit., vv.259, 263-64.
the land of the Ḥaḍās during his conquest of Vrindāvantī (Bundi). However, the political sovereignty of the Guhilas over the Ḥaḍās of Eastern Mewar is directly evident in an early fifteenth century Guhila record from Singoli, eastern Mewar. The text of the Guhila inscription runs as follows: ‘Samvat 1477 (A.D. 1421), the 2nd of Asoj, being Friday (Bhriguwar), Maharaja Sri Mokalji, in order to furnish lights (Jyotiswaste) for Vijayaseni Bhavaniji (643), has granted one bigha and a half of land. Whosoever shall get aside this offering the goddess will overtake him.’81 Thus both the contemporary evidences and annals testify to the political incorporation of the Ḥaḍās of Uparmal into the state of Mewar by the early fifteenth century.

Political incorporation of the Ḥaḍās of Eastern Mewar is likely to have necessitated Guhila social links with the Ḥaḍās. In contrast to records of the tenth century, Guhila inscriptions of the fifteenth century (with the exceptions of Baghela and Gauḍa queens) do not mention the lineage of their queens. Possible clues are provided by the bardic traditions. Bardic traditions such as Sūryavaṃśāvalī, Śrī Rāṇājīrī ṇa, Rājavalī Bahī and Badvā Devīdān Khyāt refer to three Ḥaḍā queens of the Guhila Kings of the period, two for Rāṇā Khetā and one for Rāṇā Kumbha82 (Rāo Bāgji’s daughter).83 Possibly, Rāṇā Khetā’s Ḥaḍā queens came from the Ḥaḍā families of eastern Mewar, for social links with the Ḥaḍās were politically far more important for the Guhilas to control the strategic fortresses, east and north-east of Chittaurgarh.

The Solaṅkīs (Pālnotes) of Mandalgarh

Annals of Mewar amply make it clear that Mandalgarh, a fertile tract with mining potential, had been predominated

---

81. Ibid., pp.1680-1681. The inscription is edited and translated by Col. Tod.


83. Ibid., p.5.
by the Bālnotes, a branch of the Caulukyas or Solāṅkīs, in the fifteenth century. The local legends attribute the building of Manālgarh to the Bālnotes tracing ancestry to the Caulukyas of Anhilwara. Their association with Manālgarh is so long that this tract is also popularly known as Bālnote.

Their association with Manālgarh is also suggested by the fact that many other important social groups of Mewar and adjacent regions particularly some of the Jain mercantile families trace their descent from the Bālnotes or Solāṅkīs of Manālgarh. However, more importantly, two inscriptions (unpublished) containing the genealogy of the local Solāṅkīs tracing ancestry from the Anhilwara Caulukyas have been discovered at Kachaura, Manālgarh. These inscriptive records certainly substantiate Solāṅkī claim over the Manālgarh tract.

Actual political integration of the Solāṅkīs (Bālnotes)


85. Ibid.

86. Ibid., p.1724.

87. Ibid., p.1723. Unfortunately these two inscriptions discovered and read by Tod are reported to be mutilated and therefore have not been published.
of Manālgarh seems to have materialized only in Rāṇā Kumbha's reign (latter half of fifteenth century), for Kumbhalgarh Prasāsti refers to Kumbha's conquest of Manālgarh twice\(^{88}\) and the Ranakpur\(^ {89}\) Prasāsti mentions it in the list of Kumbha's conquests. However, the Solaṅkīs of Manālgarh seem to have been confined to a small tract, for the Guhila inscriptions never mention the Solaṅkīs or the Bālnotes in the context of Manālgarh, unlike the mention of the Hāḍās. Manālgarh was perhaps better controlled by the Guhilas than the Hāḍā forts. Although it is difficult to prove the social linkages of the Guhilas with the Solaṅkīs of Manālgarh, it is significant that Badvā Devīdān Khyāt lists two Solaṅkī queens of the Guhila kings of the fifteenth century, one each for Mokal and Rāimalla.\(^ {90}\) Given the strategic importance of Manālgarh, the Guhilas might have made matrimonial alliances with the Solaṅkīs of Manālgarh in the fifteenth century.

**The Paramāras of Bhainsrorganh**

Being strategically situated on the banks of the Chambal (defended by a cliff with a sharp descent to the river) and trade route to Central India,\(^ {91}\) the fortress of Bhainsrorganh could act both as a second line of defence and a line of supplies and provisions to Mewar. The trading importance of Bhainsrorganh is evident from the local popular tales that associate the town with the itinerant traders or banjarās.\(^ {92}\)

A thirteenth century inscription discovered by Tod at

---

88. 4th slab, *op. cit.*, vv.263-64.
89. *op. cit.*, l.15.
90. *op. cit.*, pp.4 & 6. Solaṅkī Rāo Sātaljī's grand daughters appear as Guhila queens for Mokal and Rāimalla. Considering the long gap between Mokal's (early fifteenth century) and Rāimalla's (late fifteenth century) reigns, historiocity of the actual queens are doubtful.
92. Ibid., p.1691.
Bhainsrorgarh points towards Paramāra occupation of the locality, for the land charter is executed in the Paramāra style of Malwa (Śāsan Udayāditya). 93

The predominance of the Paramāras in the Bhainsrorgarh locality in the fourteenth century can be further attested by private and royal inscriptions in neighbouring Sontrā or Sutrawāndurga. A private record of A.D. 1390 records that in the castle of Sontrā (Sutrawāndurga) the Paramār Ooda, Kula, Bhoona, for their cattle, wives, brāhmaṇas, along with the putra Chōga, sold their existence (indicating slavery?). 94 A royal record of A.D. 1314 registers some construction work by a scion of the ruling Paramāras of Sutrawāndurga tracing his ancestry from Dhār, Malwa. 95 But significantly, the Paramār records from Bhainsrorgarh do not appear beyond late fourteenth century (A.D. 1390). 96 It is also important to note that unlike Mandalgarh, the for-

93. Ibid., p.1699. ‘On the Purnima (full moon) of Seoratri (the birth day of Siva), Maha Rae'an Derae Sing Deo bestowed, in the name of Rameswar, village of Tuttagarh in poon (religious gift). These who maintain the grant, will enjoy the fruits resulting therefrom’, ‘samvat 1302 (A.D. 1246)’. This record justifies the popular legend of "Universal Paramār" for the locality of Bhainsrorgarh.

94. Ibid. The inscription is edited and translated by Col. Tod.

95. Ibid. ‘Samvat 1370 (A.D. 1314), the 16th of Asar (Sudi ekum), he, whose renown is unequalled, the King, the lord of men, Maharaja Adheraj, Sri Alla-o-din, with his army of three thousand elephants, ten lakhs of horse, war-chariots and foot without number, conquering from Sambhur in the north, Malwa, Kurnat, Kanor'h, Jhalore, Jessulmer, Deogir, Tylung, even to the shorer of the Ocean, and Chandrapoori in the east, Victorious over all the Kings of the earth, and by whom Sutrawan Doorg, with its twelve townships, have been wrested fro the Pramar Maunsi, by whose son, Beelaji, whose birth-place (oot-pat) is Sri Dhar, this fountain was excavated. Written and also engraved by Sydeva, the stone-cutter (sootrad'har).’

96. Ibid.
tress of Bhainsrorgarh does not even find mention in the fifteenth century Guhila records. Being situated in proximity to Chittaurgarh, Guhila silence over its conquest perhaps suggests its effective incorporation and hence, integration of the Paramara chiefs of Bhainsrorgarh into the political structure by the early fifteenth century. As far as Guhila matrimonial alliances with the Paramaras are concerned, there is once again no contemporary reference in the official records. But it is significant that bardic traditions refer to only one such alliance. Sūryavamsāvalī Rājāvalī Bahī and Badvā devīdān mention a Sānkhlī (a branch of the Paramāras) queen for Mahārāṇā Mokal. 97

Rāṭhaurs in Mewar

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the political structure of Mewar in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries is the growing strength of the Rāṭhaurs in the Guhila court. Sources for the study of the early period of their rise in continue to be medieval texts and bardic traditions, such as Nainsī's Khyāt, Jodhpur Rājya Kī Khyāt, Tod's Annals, etc. 98 Rāo Śīha was the founder of the ruling house of the Rāṭhaurs of Marwar.

Traditions narrate that one of the early Rāṭhaurs of Marwar, Rāo Raṇamal, brought the Rāṭhaurs into Mewar. Accounts seem to indicate kinship pressures that forced Rāo Raṇamal to settle outside his paternal state in the early fifteenth century. 99

97. op. cit., p.4.


99. Pt. Bisheshwar Nath Reu, Glories of Marwar and the Glorious Rathors, Jodhpur, 1943, pp.13-14. Rāo Raṇamal, the eldest son of Rāo Chūṇḍā, is known to have waived his right to the throne in favour of his brother Rāo Kanha to carry out the wish of his father. He left Marwar in A.D. 1408 for Mewar.
Raṇā Lākhā is known to have welcomed him and granted him an estate. Rāo Raṇamal is stated to have reciprocated by leading Raṇā's army and bringing Ajmer under Mewar. Secondly, the Rāṭhaurs could function as an effective check against the locally entrenched non-Guhila Rajput families such as the Hādās of Eastern Mewar. These politico-military factors seem to have directly helped the Rāṭhaurs in gaining quick control and an increasing status in the royal court of Mewar in the early fifteenth century. The Rāṭhaur-Guhila alliance is likely to have been politically significant, for the bardic traditions narrate at length the matrimonial alliance sought by the Rāṭhaurs with the Guhilas in the early fifteenth century. Rāṇā Lākhā is known to have married a Rāṭhaur princess Hansābāī, Raṇamal's sister. The marriage took place on the contract that a son by a Rāṭhaur princess was to succeed to the throne of Mewar superceeding the elder prince. Thus, Guhila-Rāṭhaur marriage led to the famous abdication of the throne of Mewar by its heir, prince Chūṇḍā (Raṇā Lākhā's eldest son) and influx of many more Rāṭhaurs into Mewar. The Annals highlight the importance of the Rāṭhaurs for the early fifteenth century rulers of Mewar in consolidation of royal power by pitting the old Rajput elements including royal kinsmen against the Rāṭhaurs.

At the same time it was equally essential for the Rāṭhaurs in the early stage of their rise to establish close links with the Guhilas of Mewar. The fact that traditions of Mewar also do not list the Rāṭhaur queens till Raṇā Raṇimalla's period except for Lākhā, in itself speaks for the rise of the Rāṭhaurs only in the fifteenth century. It is well-known that Rāo Jodhā (Rāo Raṇamala's son and successor) could found the Rāṭhaur capital Jodhpur only in A.D.

100. Ibid.
102. Ibid., p.224. Also see, Neelam Kaushik, op. cit., p.4.
Raḥhaurs were more in Mewar before A.D. 1459. After their expulsion from Mewar in A.D. 1444 they were acquiring land in the Marwar region. For instance, Jodhā obtained Sojat in A.D. 1455. No Raṭhaur queen is listed for Mahārāṇā Kumbha. But Badvādevīdān Khyāt lists six Raṭhaur queens each for Mahārāṇā Rāimalla and Mahārāṇā Sāṅgā. However, historically known three sons of Rāimal-la, Prithvirāj, Jayamal and Sāṅgā are traditionally asigned to his Jhālī queen Rājdhar Ratankanwar. Although the historicity of the names of the Raṭhaur chiefs, their daughters and their contemporaneity with the Guhila Kings of Mewar are questionable, the list helps in contrasting the number of the Raṭhaur queens of the Guhila Kings of the period with the rest of the Rajput queens.

Dudā, the founder of the Mertiya Raṭhaurs established his seat in the locality of Merta in Marwar region. His son Vīramdeva and grandson Jaimal are known to have united the region under the banner of the Mertiya Raṭhaurs. Beginning at Merta, they brought under their control Parbatsar, Nava, Marot, Jaitarana Kaulia, Daulatpura and held some estate in Nagaur as well. Thus they made their presence felt in a larger part of Marwar. Geographically, they became buffers.

104. B.N. Reu, op. cit., p.17.
105. Ibid., pp.17-18.
107. Ibid., p.6.
between Mewar and Marwar and it became necessary for the Guhilas to establish political and social links with the Mertiya Rāṭhaurs. On their part the Mertiya Rāṭhaurs who were in the process of expansion looked towards bigger powers for political and military alliances. A number of Mertiya Rāṭhaurs are known to have been incorporated into the political structure of Mewar through service-grants. As a result we have the following estates of the Mertiya Rāṭhaurs in the fifteenth-sixteenth century Mewar.

1) Badnor: Mahārāṇā Udaisimha II had granted Badnor to Rāo Jaimal. It continued to be in possession of his son Mukundās and his successors.109

2) Chanod: Mahārāṇā Rāimalla granted Chanod to his grandson (by daughter) Pratāpsimha.110

3) Ghanerao: This locality was granted to Thākur Pratāpsimha’s (Chanod) son Gopāldās by Mahārāṇā Udaisimha (II). It has remained in the possession of his successors.111

The estate of Chanod belongs to our period of discussion (the late fifteenth century) as Mahārāṇā Rāimalla granted this locality to the Mertiya Rāṭhaurs in Mewar. More Mertiya Rāṭhaur personalities figure in the political structure of Mewar in the sixteenth century. Sundardās, son of Mertiya kishansimha (Jaimalot), was granted the estate of Dasalānā.112 Kishansimha died at the battle of Haldīghatī.113 Manohardās, grandson of Jaimal and son of


111. Bānkīdās Rī Khyāt, Ibid.; Murārīdān Rī Khyāt (Hindi tr.), R.P.V.P. Granthankha (Serial No.) 15657, p.549.
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Vīṭṭaldās, was in the service of Mahārāṇā Pratāp.114

The Guhila social links with the Mertiya Śāhārs further strengthened the political advantages that the former derived from a buffer Rajput power. In A.D. 1496, a daughter of Mahārāṇā Rāimalla was married to crown prince of Merta, Vīramdev, son of Rāo Dūdā.115 Mīrābāī, grand daughter of Rāo Dūdā and daughter of Ratnasimha was married to Bhojarāj, son of Rāṇā Sangrāmsimha (sāṅgā).116 Thus by the early sixteenth century the Guhilas had established reciprocal marital exchange (Bevrā)117 with the Mertiya Rāṭhāurs.

Finally, the fort of Jāipur (modern Jahazpur) might have been the stronghold of the Kherādas in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries. Although none of their records contemporary to our period has been discovered, Amarakāvyam refers to conquest of Kherādkula of Jāpur by Rāṇā Kheta.118 It is significant that Rāṇā Kumbha claims the conquest of Yāgpur (Jāpur) indicating that it was a non-Guhila fortress.119

THE JAINS AND THE ROYAL FAMILY IN MEWAR

Since the majority of the western Indian merchants were Jains, the study of political links between the Jains and the Guhila dynasty between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries is essentially a story of the induction of Jain

114. Ibid., p.490.
116. Ibid., pp.71-72.
119. op. cit., v.253.
merchants into the political structure of Mewar. The state depended upon this wealthy community for two obvious reasons. First, the Jain merchants were responsible for generating more and more local resources. Secondly, the Jain merchants were most capable of raising resources for the Guhila wars of this period. Jains were equally interested in seeking state support to carry on with their business.

The state too, created conditions for generating further commercial activities. There is a vast corpus of inscriptiveal and literary sources which throw light on the elite Jain families of Mewar and the extent of their resources. A brief survey of these families and the circuit of the pilgrimage centres becomes necessary to understand the background to the political linkages between the Jains and the Guhilas.

Chittaurgarh was the most popular Jain pilgrimage centre in Mewar. Ācārya Haribhadra Sūri, the great reformer, operated from Chittaurgarh in the eighth century. His literary works indicate the scale of patronage enjoyed by Haribhadra Sūri. The continuing presence of Jain Ācāryas in Chittaurgarh is evident from records that

120. V.K. Jain, op. cit., pp.240-241. The story of a merchant, Caulukya King Siddharāja and Sahaśralinga lake narrated by Merutūṅga is an indication of the concern of the royal families to grow relations with the merchants in early medieval Western India.

121. Ibid., p.224. Jinesvāra Sūri (eleventh century) is known to have advised the Jain merchants that a King could be of great service or disservice to the merchants. A merchant should solicit his help by eulogizing him and paying personal homage at the court.

122. B.D. Chattopadhyaya, Markets and Merchants, op. cit., p.114. One of the factors responsible for the situation of partial monetization in this period was more varieties of demands, including preparations for the endemic wars of the period.


124. Ibid., p.417.
cate increasing patronage by the Jain laity as well as influence of the acaryas. For instance, a Digambar Jain inscription of the reign of Guhila Jaitrasiddha from Chittaurghur contains a prasasti of Ācārya Subhacandra, who was venerated by the Paramāras, the Cāhamānas and the Gurjara rulers.\textsuperscript{125} Citrakūṭa became an important reference point for the Jains and a pilgrimage-cum-institutional centre.\textsuperscript{126} The Kharataragacchā Paṭṭāvalī vividly describes the Ācāryas and training of their disciples at Citrakūṭa.\textsuperscript{127} The same text records lavish grants made by Śrēṣṭhī Dhandhar on the installation of the icons of the Jinas at Chittaurgarh on the occasion of the visit of Jinaprabodh Śuri of Kharataragacchā in A.D. 1277.\textsuperscript{128} Jain merchants Śrēṣṭhī Ralha and Śrēṣṭhī Lakṣmīdhar, are known to have arranged many religious festivities here in A.D. 1231.\textsuperscript{129} Many other Jain religious manuscripts such as Daśavaitālika Pāṣikā Sūtra Pustikā by Śrāvīkā Dhānde in A.D. 1295,\textsuperscript{130} Candraduta Abhidhāna, Nighantuśeṣa, Karma Vipāka etc.\textsuperscript{131} point to the presence and the extent of Jain patronage at Chittaurgarh. Kharataragaccha Bṛihadgurūvāvalī refers to the presence of Jina Vallabha and his Vasahi at Citrakūṭa.\textsuperscript{132} This text

\textsuperscript{125} Ram Vallabh Somani, Jain Inscriptions from Rajasthan, 1982, Jaipur, p.23. Also see ARIE, 1962-63, No.B-836.


\textsuperscript{127} Cited in Ram Vallabh Somani, Jain Inscriptions, \textit{op. cit.}, p.191.

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Ibid.}, p.122.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Ibid.}, p.121.


\textsuperscript{131} Cited in Ram Vallabh Somani, Jain Inscription, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.120-21.

\textsuperscript{132} Jina Vijayamuni (ed.), Kharataragaccha Bṛihadgurūvāvalī, Bombay, 1956, p.12.
also significantly refers to the royal grants made from \textit{Citrakūṭamāṇḍapikā}.\footnote{Ram Vallabh Somani, \textit{Jain Inscription}, \textit{op. cit.}, p.124.} Next to Chittaurgarh, Devakula Pataka\footnote{P.C. Nahar, \textit{Jain Abhilekha}, Calcutta, 1927, Vol.II, pp.245-247, 252-253.} (Delwara, eighteen miles from Udaipur) seems to have been an important Jain \textit{tīrtha} yielding several inscriptions dated between A.D. 1403 and A.D. 1453. These inscriptions mostly record the installation of icons of the Jinas by the śrāvakas and śrāvikāyas, mostly of \textit{Prāgvaṭa} lineage, at Pārśvanātha temple.\footnote{Samvat 1494 varṣeprāgvaṭ sā. Depāl putra Suhādsī bhāyā Suhāda de putrasā. Karana bhāyā cānu putra se Dhanadhā Hemājinapattikā Kāritā pratiṣṭhi Śrī tapagacchanāya Śrī Somasundara sūribhīh. \textit{Jain Inscription}, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.125-126. Also see, MK, pp.333-370-72; P.C. Nahar, Vol.II, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.255-56.} Many Jain sreṣṭhis including Rāmadeva Navalakhā resided at Devakulapataka.\footnote{P.C. Nahar, \textit{Jain Abhilekha}, Calcutta, 1927, Vol.II, pp.245-247, 252-253.} Jain sreṣṭhis patronized the Jain temples through the lavish grant of commercial levies from the local maṇḍapikās. It is interesting to note that Nāgdā, the famous Pāśūpata centre of Mewar, was a centre of Jain pilgrimage too. Temple of the Digambara sect,\footnote{Samvat 1506 varṣe sā.Soma bhā.rudi suta sā.Samadhāreṇa bhṛāṭri phāpha sīdharakūṭumbayutenā tīrtha śrī sātrunįjąjagiriniravatār paṭṭikākāritā śrī Ratnasekhaśi Sūribhīh. \textit{Jain Inscription}, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.126-127.} \textit{Aloka Pārśvanath},\footnote{EI, Vol.XXVI, pp.102-12.} icons installed at the temple of Aloka Pārśvanath by the svetāmbaras of Khara-taragaccha\footnote{Ram Vallabh Somani, \textit{Jain Inscriptions}, \textit{op. cit.}, p.127.} in the fifteenth century\footnote{PRAS, WC, 1905, p.38.} and Tapagaccha Paṭṭāvalī\textquotesingle s references to Pārśvanātha temple\footnote{PRAS, WC, 1905, p.38.} all indicate patronage of Nāgdā by the Jains. Significantly, the Ekāliṅ-
Gajī temple inscription of A.D. 971 mentions a joint session of the Pāsūpatas and Jain ācāryas at Nāgahrda in which Pāsūpatas are claimed to have defeated the Jains in discourse. The temples of Adbhutnātha and Pārśvānātha (built in A.D. 1373) continued to be an important Jain tīrthas throughout the fifteenth century. Āhaṇḍa and Udaipur (built in the mid-sixteenth century by Rāṇa Udaisimha II) also figured in the network of Jain tīrthas, testified by nearly one hundred and five inscriptions recording installations of icons of Jinas mostly by the merchant families of Prāgvāṭa, Śrīmāla, Upakesā and Ukesā (osval) lineages at the temples of Sītalanātha, Vāsupūjya and Gaurī Pārśvānātha.

The Jain Pustaka prasāstis records composition of some of the famous manuscripts such as Śrāvakapratikramaṇasutra-cūrṇī, patronized by mahāmātya Samuddhara (chief minister at the court of Guhila King Tejasimha), Daśāvaikālādi Sutra-patrikā, by Jagatsimha (chief minister at the court of

140. op. cit., vv.15-20.
Inscriptional Location of the Pilgrimage Centres of the Jains in Mewar AD 13th - 15th Centuries
Non Guhila Rajput Chiefs in Guhila State: AD 13th - 15th Centuries

Chirava Tamataradas (Non-Rajput)

SIROHI

PALI

Chandod (Mertiya Rathaurs)

Ghanerao (Mertiya Rathaurs) AD 16th Century

Thakura Dala AD 13th Century

Gogunda (Chamans) AD 13th Century

Kadmal (Chamans) AD 13th Century

Bhainsorgarh

Pratiharas AD 13th Century

Rathaurs at Guhila court

Chittaurga

Mandalgarh (Solaikos)

Jahazpur (Jipur) (Kheradows)

Bhilwara BHILWARA

Badnor (Mertiya Rathaurs) AD 16th Century

Pratiharas Lineage not mentioned

Chirava

Rathaurs at Guhila court

Jhajpur

Nimbahera

Nimbahera

Nimach

Rana Pratap Sagar

Bambori (Bumoda)

Ratangarh

Bhainsorgarh

Kota

BUNDI

HAQAVATI

HATAS OF UPAUMAL

(Eastern Mewar):
Bumoda, Rattangarh, Kheri, Nimbaheera, Nimach, Jawad.

UDAIPUR

DUNGARPUR

BANSWARA

JHALAWAR

R. Chamhal

Chambal

Fortresses of the
Guhila King Jaitrisimha) at Ahadamahādurga. The Composition of these manuscripts was patronized by the grant of cash. Other contemporary tīrthas of the Jains, Dhuleva, Zawar, Bhatevar, Ranakpur and Kumbhalgarh were located within the Mewar hills indicating the circulation of wealthy merchants in the very core-area of the Guhila state. A text, Vagad Pravāsa composed in the fourteenth century refers to Dhuleva as a Jain tīrtha, patronage of the temple of sāntinātha by Nānā of Prāgvāṭa lineage and construction of a new devakulika, and patronage of the acaryas, etc. at zawar (the famous mining centre), enlargement and building of the shrines at Ranakpur temple complex, by the wealthy merchant Dhārana Shāh, the succession ceremonies of the ācāryas at Kumbhalgarh, the beginning of Bhartṛipuriya gac̣cḥa at Bhatevar and composition of manuscripts Saptamaṅga,cūrṇī at village Bara-

144. Ibid., p.116.
145. Ibid., pp.116 and 126. The original expression is 'mudrāvyāparan paripanthayati'
149. Ibid.
grāma and that of Kalpasutra Kālikācāryakathā at the village of Bauna, etc., amply prove the socio-economic importance of the Jains in Mewar between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries.

The earliest direct evidence of Guhila patronage of Jain establishments in Mewar appears in the late thirteenth century. Guhila queen Jayatalladevi, wife of Tejasimha and mother of Mahārāval Samarasiṃha was a staunch Jain. The Guhila queen, at the instance of acārya Śrī Praddyumna Śūri of Bhartripurīyagacchā, got a temple of Śyām Pārsvanāth constructed in Chittaur in A.D. 1278. Such patronage proves the importance of the Jains for the Guhila state once it acquired the most prominent centre of the Jains in Mewar, Chittaur. It is obvious that the Guhila queen patronized a local gacchā, Bhartripurīya. Being a local religious establishment Bhartripurīya gacchā seems to have been one of the most influential Jain institutes in thirteenth century Mewar. The inscription also refers to the grants of land and drama coins from the maṇḍapikās of Citrakūta-talahattī, Āhaḍā, Khohar and Sajjanapura, and those of oil and ghee, etc. by the reigning King Mahārājakula Samarasiṃha. This inscription, interestingly, was not composed by any Jain acarya but by the brāhmaṇas, usually employed by

---


154. Ibid., pp.38-39, 11.1, 17, "Śrīmālavamsīya śrāvaganalekhitā Kalpasutra Kālikācāryakathā pustikā prasāstih Śrī Medapātamandale Vauna grāme pustikā likhitā 11'

155. A Chittaur palace pillar prasāsti, Vir Vinod, op. cit., p.397. "Śrī Bhartripureyagacchā śrī cuḍāmaṇi Bhartripure Śrī Guhilaputravihāra ādisaprātipattau śrīcitrakūṭa Maḍapāṭādhipati śrī Tejāh Śīmharājya Śrījayaṭallādevya śrī Śyām-Pārsvanāth vasahī svasreyase kāritā 11'

156. Ibid.
Because of their vast knowledge, the Jain ācāryas were employed by the non-Jain members of the local society to compose their records. The Chiravā inscription (A.D. 1273) was composed by ācārya Ratnaprabha Sūri of the Chaitragaciṃcha. The Tāṃṭaraḍa family from Chiravā significantly mentions that Ratnaprabhasūri was revered by King Visaladeva (Vaghelas of Gujarat) and Tejahsimha, the Guhila King.

The peak of Guhila patronage to the Jains was undoubtedly reached in Rānā Kumbha's reign. The Abu inscription of Rānā Kumbha of A.D. 1449 records the Guhila order of the abolition of the pilgrimage tax, customs, valvāhī (armed escort) and chaukidārī (security) and cattle taxes levied in Abu. The Guhila order is politically very significant as most travellers to Abu were Jains, and also, Abu was contested between Gujarat and the Devaḍās of Sirohi.

The process of Guhila patronage of the Jain tīrthas ran simultaneously with the process of incorporation of the Jains into the political structure. Firstly, the Jains start figuring as important officials in Mewar by the thirteenth century. The first Jain family formally inducted into the administrative structure was from Āhaḍā. Thus,

157. Ibid.
158. op. cit., v.48.
159. Ibid.
160. H.B. Sharda, M.K., op.cit., pp.175-76. This inscription is engraved in the courtyard between the famous Jain temples of Vimal Shāh and Tejapāla at Mount Abu.
161. Ibid., pp.77-81, 98, 105-106.
Jagatsiṃha of Āhaḍā, who had patronized Daśavaikālikādisutrapatrika, appears as mahāmātya (chief minister) of King Jaitraśiṃha.\textsuperscript{162}

Two more Jains figure as official favourites in the court of Jaitraśiṃha. The Pāksikasutravṛtti mentions that the manuscript was patronized by mahan (mahantak: accountant) Śrī Talhana, Śrī Karana and others who had received the favours of King Jayasiṃha (other name for Jaitraśiṃha).\textsuperscript{163} Influential Jains continued to occupy the post of chief minister in the Guhila court. The ministers of Tejasīṃha (Jaitraśiṃha's successor) Jalhan, Samuddhara and Kāṅga were all devout Jains. In particular, minister Samuddhara seems to have been a man of great wealth and status as he figures in a number of contemporary records. He figures in a copper plate inscription, the Ghagsa inscription of A.D. 1260,\textsuperscript{164} and manuscript of the śrāvaka Pratikramaṇ sutracūrī of A.D. 1261.\textsuperscript{165} Kāṅga figures as Pradhāna Rāja in the administration of King Tejasīṃha.\textsuperscript{166} It is important that he received

\textsuperscript{162} Jaina Pustaka Prasāsti, \textit{op. cit.}, p.116. In fact, Ram Vallabh Somani misses out on this important Jain personality in his work, \textit{Jain Inscriptions from Rajasthan}, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., p.125. "


\textsuperscript{165} \textit{op. cit.}

the title of Rājaputra. This indicates absorption of the influential Jains into the political structure with a status higher than the usual chiefs in the sāmanta hierarchy. Sreṣṭhī Dhandhal and Sreṣṭhī Ratna seem to have been the two most important Jain merchants in the reign of Guhila King Samarasimha. The families of Samuddhara, Kāṅgā, Sreṣṭhīs Dhandhal, Ratna, Rālha, etc., were likely to be influential in the Chittaurgarh belt. In the early fourteenth century, Sreṣṭhī Jījā and Punyāsiṁha of Bāgherwal lineage figure as important Jain families of Chittaur.

From the late fourteenth and the early fifteenth century, the family of Navalakha Rāmadeva of Ukeśa gotra (Osvāl) from Devakulapataka seem to be politically the most important Jain family of Mewar. He functioned as the chief minister of Mewar in the reigns of Mahārāṇās Kṣetrasimha, Lakṣāsimha and Mokal. He had two sons, Sajjana and Sāraṅga. Sajjana succeeded his father to the post of chief ministership of Mewar during the reigns of Mahārāṇās Mokal and Kumbha. A Jain literary work, Āvasyakabṛihadvṛitti composed in Devakulapataka, refers to the reign of Rāṇā Kumbha and his chief minister Sādhru Śrī Sajjanapāla. The status of this family is evident from other contemporary

167. Ibid.
169. Ibid., p.224.
170. Ibid.
171. Ibid., p.225.
sources such as Vignapti-Lekha of A.D. 1374. It mentions the event of a great Dikṣā Mahotsava in Kareda in A.D. 1374, arranged by Rāmadeva.\(^{173}\) Soma-Saubhāgya Kavya refers to the visit of Soma Sundara Sūrī at Devakulapataka who was received by Mahārāṇā Lākṭha, prince Chūnda and minister Rāmadeva.\(^{174}\) Vignapti-Lekha also mentions the installation of the icons of ācāryas Merūnandan and Droṇa by Rāmadeva's wife Melādevī at Devakulapataka.\(^{175}\) The son-in-law of Rāmadeva, Vīsāl, came from the famous family of Śreṣṭhī Vatsarāj of Idar. Soma Saubhāgya Kavya is the source for an account of this family. It shows that a big temple named Manorathakālpadrum was built in Chittaur by this family.\(^{176}\) Vīsāl's wife Khīmā (Rāmadeva's daughter) and sons Dhir and Champaka figure in the inscriptions (A.D. 1437) of the Jain temple at Machind.\(^{177}\) Sajjana, the elder son of Rāmadeva got a Sātruṇjaya Paṭṭa (stone-slab) and some icons installed in Devakulapataka in A.D. 1434.\(^{178}\) An account of his younger brother Sāraṅga is found in an inscription (A.D. 1437) from Adbhutnāthji temple of Nāgdā.\(^{179}\)

The other important office that the Jains came to occupy in Mewar was that of Bhāṇḍāgārīka (treasurer). Inscriptional references to the office begin in the fifteenth century. The Chittaur inscription of A.D. 1448 was issued by a family of Bhandaris serving Maharana Kumbha. This family designates itself as in-charge of the royal treasury (Bhāṇḍārī/Bhāṇḍāgārīka). The record contains the genealogy of the family originating in Sāhakolā and regis-
ters the construction of the temple of Śāntinātha by this family.\textsuperscript{180} The Bhāṇḍārīs are listed as follows: Bhāṇḍārī Śrī Velaka, Bhāṇḍārī Mudharāja, Bhāṇḍārī Dhanarāja, Bhāṇḍārī Kurapāla etc.\textsuperscript{181} They were followers of Kharataragacāya.\textsuperscript{182} Besides Śreṣṭhī Rāmadeva, Devakulapataka had a few more contemporary Jain Śreṣṭhīs as residents. Śreṣṭhīs Nimba, Kelha, Megh, Bīm, Kāṭak, Laksmanaṃ Simha, Hīsa, Dharma, etc. are the important names.\textsuperscript{183} Hīsa and Dharma belonged to the famous Pichcholiya family of Devakulapataka (founder, Devapāl).\textsuperscript{184} Inscriptional records refer to their installation projects including patronage extended to Tapagacāya.\textsuperscript{185}

It is obvious that Kumbha's court reached out to these rich Jain families through Rāmadeva Navalakha. Śreṣṭhī Samghapati Dhārana Shāh of the Prāgvāṭa lineage from Ranakpur and Samghapati Śreṣṭhī Guṇarāja of Chittaur are the two other important Jain personalities in the royal court of the fifteenth century Mewar. Both of them figure in Ranakpur Prasāsti of A.D. 1439. The Prasāsti contains a genealogy of Samghapati Dhārana,\textsuperscript{186} his father, Kurapāla's charitable deeds and more importantly the construction of temple of Śrī Caturmukhayugādiśvara at the instance of Rāṇā kumbha. Dhārana also dedicates the newly constructed temple of Śrī


\textsuperscript{181} Ibid. ˙Samvat 1505 Varṣe Rāṇā Śrī Mokalanandana Rāṇā Śrīkumbhakarṇa Kosāvyāpārina Sāhkolaputraratna bhandārī Śrī Velakena bhāryā Vilhapadevi Jayamān bhāryāratnadeputra bhan Mudharāj bhan Dhanarāj bhan Kurapālādiputra-yutena.'

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{183} Ram Vallabh Somani, op. cit., p.221.

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid., p.222.

\textsuperscript{185} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., 11.26-27, ˙Prāgvāṭa Vaṃśavatansa Samghapati Sāgarsuta Samghapati Kurapāla bhāryā, Kamaldeputrapara-marhava Samghapati Dhārana'.
Caturmukha in Rāṇā Kumbha's name. It is significant that Samghapati Guṇarāja was a favourite of the reigning King Rāṇā Kumbha. The long *Prasāsti* of the Guhila Kings in this inscription shows that the influential Jains reciprocated royal favour. Samghapati Guṇarāja and other Jain personalities such as Samghapati Ratna (Dhārana's elder brother), son Samghapatis Lāṣā, Sānja, Sona, Sālīgā, Samghapati Dhāralde, etc. also figure as prominent men in this record. *Mahāvīr-Prasād-Prasāsti* refers to the family of Śreṣṭhī Guṇarāja. He led the *Samghayātras* to Sātruṇjaya and Rewantak in A.D. 1400 and A.D. 1405 respectively. He is stated to have organized free-kitchens during famines.

The Ranakpur *Prasāsti* refers to his leadership of a *Samghya-tratra* at the instance of Soma Sundara Sūri of the Bṛihad Tapagaccha after obtaining the necessary permission from the Sultan of Gujarat. The family of Rāval Śrī Lāṣaṇa of Nādlāi (Godwar) figures prominently in Mewar of the late fifteenth-early sixteenth centuries. Ram Vallabh Somani misses this important family from his list of Jain families. Inscription of A.D. 1500 from Adināth temple,

187. Ibid., 11.9-30.


189. Ibid., 11.1-20.

190. Ibid., l.28.

191. Ibid., p.224.

192. Ibid.

193. Ranakpur prasāsti, op. cit., l.25.

194. Ibid., l.18. "Śrī Madahammadsuratrāṇadatta phurmāṇ sadhu śrī Guṇarājasamghapatisahācārya".

(Nāḍlāi), which refers to the origin of the Guhila Kings as Sūryavahṣiṣṭya, records the praśāstī of the Śacāryas of Sandherā gac̡ha and the installation-project undertaken by the family of Rāval lāṣaṇa.196 The consecration of (the image of) Śrī Ādisvāra was caused to be performed in the Jain monastery, called Sāyara, which was brought to the city of Nandakulavatī (Nāḍlāi) in Samvat 964.197 It is significant that Lāṣaṇa of Ukesā lineage bears the title of Rāval.198 Thus, this record provides another instance of the incorporation of the wealthy Jains into the sāmanta hierarchy.

The above survey proves that a network of the local Jain families had been gradually integrated into the political structure. The fact is further attested by the instance of Bhāṇḍārī Śrī Velaka whose father is simply referred to as Sāhakolā.199 Thus, the process of gradual absorption is clear as titles differed from generation to generation. This led to the growth of a network of Jain families close to the royal court. A concluding note to this study of Jain-Guhila relationship is our observation that the so-called, most non-violent social group, the Jains, actively associated with the military enterprises of the Rajputs.

Other Communities: Tāmtaradas and Kāyasthas

The Chiravā inscription of the reign of Mahārāval Samarasiṁha of A.D. 1273 is perhaps the most important

196. Vir Vinod, Vol.I, op. cit., p.424-25, 11.17-19. The genealogy of the family and installation ceremony recorded by the inscription reads as follows: the son of Mahan Mayūra, Mahān Sādūla, belonging to the family Dudā, (who was) the son of Rāval Śrī Lāṣana, of the Rayajadari gotra belonging to the lineage of Ukesā (Śrī Ukesāvāmśe) - with their relations Karmasī, Dhārā Lākhā and other members of the family.

197. Ibid., 11.19-20. The consecration ceremony was performed by Devasundara Śuri.

198. Ibid., 1.7, "Śrīukesāvāmśe rayajaḍārī gotre Rāul śrī Lāṣaṇa'.

199. Śrīṅgār Chānvarī Inscription, op. cit., 11.2-3.
record of a non-Rajput and a non-Jain family of Mewar which rose in status with the growth of the process of regional state formation. Besides the royal prasásti, the record is essentially a prasásti and the genealogical list of the Támṭaraḍa family originating from Nágḍā. It rendered invaluable services to the state both by functioning as Talarak-ṣakas (superintendents of police) of Nágadrahapura (Nágḍā) and Citrakuṭa as well as captains in the army. It also records the construction and restoration of the temples of Yogesvāra (Śiva) and Yogesvarī (Pārvatī) and grants to the temples by the same family at Cirakūpa (Chiravā), a village granted to them by Guhila King Padmasimha.

The following is a detailed account of the family provided by their own record: In the Támṭaraḍa family, there was a man named Uddhāraṇa who, being able to protect the good and punish the wicked, was made the Talarakṣa of Nágadrahapura by the King Māthanasimha, and who had eight sons, the eldest of whom was Yogarāja, who in turn was made Talāra in the same city by the King Padmasimha. His (Yogarāja's) younger brother was Ratabhū, whose son was Kelhana. Kelhaṇa's son was Udayī, whose son was Karmaṇa. Yogarāja had four sons, namely Pamarāja, Mahendra, Champaka and Kṣema, of whom Pamarāja was killed fighting the army of Suratāṇa (Sultan) near Bhūtālā, while Nágadrahapura was destroyed. Mahendra had three sons named Bāla (Bālaka), Ahlādaṇa and Vāyaja. Bālaka's son was Peṭhaka, whose son was Sāmanta, a worshipper of Viṣṇu. While Koṭṭadaka was being taken and a battle with Rāṇā Tribhuvana was being fought, Bālaka was killed fighting in front of the King Jaitrasimha.200 His clever wife Bholī, being unable to bear the pains of separation of her husband, became satī. Champaka had a son named Rājasiṁha whose son was Bhachumṛd. Through the favour of the King Jaitrasimha, Kṣema secured the post of Talarakṣa of Citrakuṭa. His son named Ratna was killed along with Bhīmasimha in a battle fought at the foot of the fortress of Citrakuṭa. Ratna's son was Lāla and his brother was Madana. The latter proved his valour in the battlefield of Utṭhūnaka. Jaitra-

malla's son Rājasimha on being made a minister, paid him (Madana) much respect. Through the favour of the King Samarasiṃha, he (Madana) succeeded his father to the post of Talarakṣa of Citrakūṭa,201 when he worshipped Śiva in the temple of Tribhuvanānārāyaṇa built by King Bhoja. Madana's son was Mohana. Surrounded by hills and beautiful sights, the village Ciraḵūpa is situated near Nāgarāda and was given as a gift by the King Padmasimha to Yogarāja serving in his army.202 The latter built there the temples of Yogesvara and Yogosvarī which were restored later on by Madana who granted some land near the lake Kālelāya for the maintenance of these temples.203

Another beautiful temple of Viṣṇu called Uddhāraṇa Śvāmī had formerly been built there by Uddhāraṇa. Vāyaraka, Pāṭaka, Munda, Bhuvana, Teja, Sāmanta, Āriyāputra, Madana and their descendants were urged to preserve the grant fully.204 Here is a clear instance of a process in which a local family of a non-Rajput and a non-Jain, social background attained upward mobility. Functioning as Talarakṣa of Nāgdā in itself is evidence of the family's prior importance in the locality of Nāgdā. The record clearly states that Uddhāraṇa was famous for "protecting the good and punishing the wicked". Appointments by the royal authority served both the Tāṃṭarāṇa family and the state advantageously. The family's career prospects grew in the service of the state as they graduated from the post of Talarakṣa of Nāgdā to that of the capital town, Chittaurgarh, as well as captains in Mewar's army. On the other hand, the state not only strengthened its base by crossing the Rajput-brāhmaṇa-Jain barriers by integrating the locally important families of an entirely different social background through various important administrative and military appointments but also

201. Ibid., v.22.
202. Ibid., vv.34-35.
203. Ibid., v.40.
204. Ibid., vv.41-42.
checked the growing influence of the locally entrenched Rajput families.

The village of Cirakūpa not only took care of remunera-
tions for their services but created an additional base for
the royal family in the Nāgdā belt. During the course of
the thirteenth century, the Tāmātaraḍa family had undoubtedly
emerged as a focus in the local elite network.

The other influential social category in thirteenth
century Mewar seems to have been the Kāyasthas. However,
even if they had already figured as wealthy, local, notables
in the seventh century and as officials in the tenth cen-
tury, we do not have records mentioning any Kāyastha func-
tionary in the thirteenth century. However, their prosperi-
ty in general is evident from the discovery of a record of a
Kāyastha family of Chittaurgarh. A Chittaurgarh pillar
inscription of A.D. 1287 of the reign of Samarasiṁha records
the grant of few dramma coins to the temple of Vaidyanātha,
situated on the bank of Citrāṅga lake, by Vijadā, son of
Kāyastha Pacasīgā. The record is too short to throw
light on Vijadā's ancestral home. We do not know whether he
was a migrant or a member of the local society at Chittaur-
garh. Like the family of Vijadā, a few more Kāyastha fami-
lies might have emerged prosperous in Chittaurgarh by this
period. At least the family of Vijadā must have joined the
ranks of the local elite and thus functioned as a link
between the state and other Kāyastha families. Their status
is evident from the wealth they possessed which seems to
have distinguished them.

The Bhils in the State Formation of Mewar

In our discussion of the Bhil-Guhila relationship
between the seventh and tenth centuries, both the political

Vaisākha sudi 3 addya sritcitrakute Samastamāhārajakula
Sri Samarasiṁha devakalyāṇavijayarājye evam kāle cit-
rāṅgataḍāgamadhyā Srit Vaidyanāthakriṣṭesaka rambatena -
kadi dattam 1 Kāyasthajñātiyam pacasīgasuta Vijadena
Kārāpitam".
implications of the Bhil legends related to the settlement of the early Guhilas in Mewar hills indicating possibly a violent transfer of power and Guhila records suggesting the peasantization\(^{206}\) of the core-area Bhils have been noted.\(^{207}\) The long drawn-out relationship between the Guhilas and the Bhils of the Oghna-Panarwa and the Undri seems to have reached a significant height in the period between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. The latter part of the period seems to have coincided with the incorporation of the local Bhil chiefs into the political structure of the Guhila state. The problems of integration demanded that the Bhil chiefs of the core-area be conferred with a suitable political rank. The prestigious title of Rāpā (status equivalent to the royal kinsmen) was conferred upon the Bhil chief of Oghna-Panarwa. This Bhil chief was one of the autochthonous chiefs.\(^{208}\) The estate of Oghna in Mewar is described as the "sole spot in India" which enjoyed a state of natural freedom.\(^{209}\) "Attached to no state, having no foreign communication, it lived under its own head, a chief with the title of Rana, head of five thousand bows".\(^{210}\) Anthropologists like Robert Deliege seem to have taken this description literally. He observes that since many of the Bhils and Bhilālā chiefs are described as Bhumīās or Girāśiās (derived from girāś, subsistence/a share of the produce of the land) in the literature, the Bhil regions did not actually constitute the normal territories of the Rājās but enjoyed independence.

---

206. Partial deforestation leading to agricultural activities by a few of the core-area Bhils initiating the process of resource mobilization by the state from the Bhil localities.

207. vide Passim, Ch.I, p.41.
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even as they paid tribute. But such an interpretation is highly questionable. It is important to note that not only the Bhils but many Rajputs of Mewar also enjoyed the status of Bhumiā and Girāsiā. Girāsiās are known to have supplied regular troops to the state while the Bhumiās rendered local, administrative service and paid an annual quit-rent on their estates to the state. The crucial issue of tribe and state does not hinge around the direct annexation of tribal territories, but their political incorporation into the political structure. Their incorporation not only accelerated the process of territorial integration and consolidated state power in Bhomat but also mobilized manpower for the state from within the limits of at least Oghna Panarwa and Undri (Bhil chiefs associated with the coronation ceremonies of the Rāṇās).

The strategic importance of the Bhomat country for the state of Mewar has already been noted. The link routes connecting Chittaur-Malwa to the arterial route down the Palampur gap in Gujarat-Sirohi passed through the Bhomat country. Hills and forests tend to restrict the capacity of governments to move men and goods. The Bhil chiefs of the core-area, once integrated, were expected to facilitate communications throughout the Bhil-country because they were guarding the forests, caves, passes and hill routes. They could function as buffers between the nucleus of the state and the rest of the Bhil population of Bhomat. The fact that the local Bhils were always valuable as forest-guides is evident from their popular names such as Vanaputras (the children of the forest), Māirote (born of mountain), Goind

211. Robert Deliege, The Bhils of Western India: Some Empirical and Theoretical Issues in Anthropology in India, New Delhi, 1985, p.64.
213. Vide Passim, Ch.I. See the Map on the Routes.
(lord of the caves) and Pāl Indra (lord of the pass). Recognition of the Bhils as indispensable forest-guards can be seen in the collection of a levy called rakhwālī for the protection of the travellers by the local, Bhil and Rajput Bhumiā and Girāsiā chiefs in their dominion in the latter medieval period. However, the beginnings of this process can certainly be dated back to the period between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The Bhil chiefs in the centre possibly established links with the Gāmetis (village headman) of the Pāls (a village consisting of Bhil hamlets) in territories beyond their jurisdiction. The institution of the Gāmeti was an old feature of the Pāls. 'The institution, however, is indigenous to the tribe, and it carries with it a considerable amount of prestige and importance, besides financial rewards'. The gradual incorporation of the Bhil Pāls and the administrative service rendered by the Bhil Gāmetis is evident from the late medieval records of Mewar. The Dhulev bhāndār of files and bahīs (registers) along with an early nineteenth century inscription reveal some of the traditional duties of the Bhil Gāmetis of Magra locality in Mewar. Magra is another Bhil locality in the Mewar hills, away from the Oghna-Panarwa-Undri belt. These records disclose that the ranks of Gāmeti and Girāsiā were once again bestowed on the former Gāmeti and Girāsiā of village Bilak and Pāl (a village of the Bhils) Bilak enabling them to execute some of the magisterial powers and police duties. Mobilization of the Bhils from Oghna-Panarwa and Undri for construction

215. Tod, Travels in Western India, op. cit., p.39.
work on fortresses, roads and temporary bridges seems to have been the other important requirement.

Mobilization of miners at least from the local Bhil population continued to be an important aspect of state-tribe relationship. The intensive process of mining activities specially at Zawar dated back to twelfth century. At Zawar, by the 12th century A.D. zinc was being produced industrially. Already in the late 14th century, production was on a considerable scale, and perhaps it is not surprising that the first direct historical reference to Zawar occurs in 1380 A.D. when Rana Laksasimha was credited with founding of the mines. Production continued on a major scale for about four centuries before ending during the wars and famine which plagued Rajasthan in the early 19th century, and in the face of western competition. Ironically, the western technology was almost certainly derived from Zawar.219 The celebration of the worship of Zawārmātā among the Bhils is a theme of the Bhil folksongs testifying to their long association with the Zawar mines.220 The local Bhils also seem to have continued to supply the fuel to the Zawar mines. It is evident from the discovery of charcoal retort dumps (smelting) at Zawar particularly between the early eleventh and the seventeenth centuries.221

As noted in Chapter I, charcoal preparation has been one of the major economic pursuits of the majority of the Bhils engaged in non-agricultural activities. If the mahājanas were the entrepreneurs at early medieval Aranyakūpargiri, the social group possibly involved in the organization of mining activities in fifteenth century Zawar is likely to be the Jains. Archaeological and inscriptive evidence points to the presence of elite Jain families in Zawar in the fifteenth century. Today, remains of a number of Jain

---


221. Paul T. Craddock, et. al. (eds.), op. cit., p.56.
temples of the fourteenth-fifteenth century stand scattered in and around Zawar.\textsuperscript{222} The Zawar Jain temple inscription of A.D. 1421\textsuperscript{223} recording the building of the Sāntinātha temple at Zawar by a family of merchants attests to the long association of Jains with the Zawar mines. This association evidently had an economic basis as excavations prove intensive mining activities at this centre of the zinc-lead concentrates especially from the twelfth century onwards. The Jain merchants must have been involved in the entrepreneurship that went into the regular organization of mining and marketing of its products, both raw materials and manufactured zinc, from the local workshops. Thus they are likely to have entered into negotiations with the local Bhil chiefs in mobilizing labour. Similar to Arāṇyakāpuragirī, the presence of the Jain merchants and Jain temples seem to have created a situation for the emergence of an exchange centre in Zawar by the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The state also depended on the local Bhil chiefs for the occasional mobilization soldiers for the state. This statement can at least be true for the territories within the limits of Oghna-Panarwa and Undrī. The chief of Oghna-Panarwa has been significantly described as the 'head of five thousand bows'.\textsuperscript{224} Traditions have preserved accounts of the Bhils fighting for both Rāṇā Hammīra in the fourteenth century and Rāṇā Pratāp in the sixteenth century.

The chivalry exemplified by the Bhils in the battle of Haldīghātī remains a popular theme in Bhil folklore.\textsuperscript{225} Mobilization of armies by the different deities of Chittaur leading to the victory of Mahārāṇās of Mewar, is a recurrent

\textsuperscript{222} Author's field trip to Zawar.
\textsuperscript{223} Vir Vinod, Vol.I, \textit{op. cit.}, pp.401-402.
\textsuperscript{224} Tod, Annals, vol.I, \textit{op. cit.}, p.262.
\textsuperscript{225} P.L. Menaria, Bhīlon Kī Lok Kathāyen, vol.III, Delhi, 1968, p.23 ff.
theme of the Bhil songs. These songs not only reflect the popular image of the Guhila rulers but also Bhil involvement in the Mewar-army. However, such themes seem to emanate more from the ranks of the Bhil chiefs.

All these contributions made by the local Bhil population towards the maintenance of the state ran parallel to the continuing process of peasantization of the Bhils in the nucleus of the local Rajput states. Direct evidence of this process comes from the Mala copper plates of the thirteenth century from Vagod. Two Bhils, Nādhōl and Ralhuā, figure as witnesses to the royal grants made in the village of Mālā near Dungarpur. R.S. Mann in his discussion on religious attributes of Bhils observes that the plough is an implement of occasional worship, possibly since the time the Bhils shifted to a settled agricultural economy and became dependent on agriculture. The importance of agriculture is also reflected in the folk-songs of those Bhils who are settled in villages. Themes such as field preparation, the harvest and protection of crops from animals are common.

However, peasantization seems to have involved very few Bhils in the core of the Guhila state. It must not be forgotten that the majority of them had been practising hunting, gathering and shifting agriculture. The traditional economic pursuit of the majority of the Bhils is reflected in one of their legends which is popular among the Bhils of Gujarat. Once Mahādeva took a Bhil-girl as his bride. Her brothers went to Mahādeva for the bride price. They were offered Nandi, the bull. Pārvatī (in this case the Bhil bride) told her brothers that the hump of the bull contained unlimited wealth-hinting thereby that by yoking the bull

228. N.N. Vyas, R.S. Mann and N.D. Chaudhary (eds.), Rajasthan Bhils, Udaipur, 1978, p.117.
they would be prosperous. But the greedy foresters killed the bull to possess the wealth immediately. This angered the goddess and she cursed the Bhils to perennial poverty. The legend proves the unpopularity of agriculture among most Bhils, but the economic process of state formation (horizontal spread of rural settlements) brought about a transformation in some tribal pockets in which at least a small section of the Bhils emerged as agriculturists.

In spite of Bhil participation in the functioning of the state apparatus, a paradox emerges: in the state's image of the Bhils they were one ethnic group, socially despised. Though the ṭīkā ceremony performed by the Bhil chiefs at the royal coronations is known to have continued at a latter period, there is no such mention in the official Guhila records. The official attitude is clearly expressed in a thirteenth century record from Chittaurgarh: the enemies of King Allatā being impotent to show their contempt (towards him) in the battlefield, treat Bhīllā women disrespectfully and they describe his actions with pleasures in each of the mountains. Secondly, the Bhil residents of the village Mala have been merely designated as "Bhils" without any such titles as Rāul, Rāval, etc., designating a few of the contemporary Rajput residents of the village Mala. An understanding of the official image of the Bhils perhaps reveals the actual situation of the Bhils and highlights the problem of tribal integration in the state. In spite of a close and long Bhil-Guhila interaction, the state had to reassert


233. Mala Copper Plates, op. cit., 11.31 & 35.
itself again and again in the Bhil localities.

The problem is specially evident in the fifteenth century, probably having originated in the long absence of Guhila authority in Mewar for a major part of the fourteenth century. Secondly, the element of egalitarianism, dominant in the Bhil social structure, would have generated problems for the Bhil chiefs (even those of Oghna Panarwa and Undri) in controlling Bhils beyond their limited territorial jurisdiction. Recurrent Bhil revolts have plagued the history of Mewar. Rānā Hammīra is credited with the victory over the Bhils of Jilwara (Merwara tract) in Śrīnārīśi inscription of the early fifteenth century. Rānā Khetā is eulogized in the Amarakāvyam for having conquered and annexed the territories of the Bhils and Minas. In the fifteenth century Mahārāṇā Kumbha fortified many passes to control the Bhils of Panarwa. Every possible step was taken to fend off possible attacks by Bhils. Significantly, Tod observes that Khālisa (royal land) in Mewar was bounded on three sides by wandering, barbarous tribes. In the area between the Bhil tract and the core of the state were estates of Rajput chiefs. Bhil discontent was perhaps responsible for the settlement of a Solāṅkī Rajput chief, Ākṣaya Rāja, in Panarwa in the fifteenth century. One of Ākṣaya Rāja's successors settled in Oghna in the sixteenth century.

---


235. op. cit., p.235, v.4, 'Celaṅkhyam Puramgrahida-rigaṇāni Bhillāṅgugāgehaṅkāṇi (jji) tvatāṅkhilāṇṇihatya ca balāṅkhyāṭaṁśinā saṅgare'.
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century.240 Prior to the Solaṅkīs, a Rajput of Yadu lineage, and a Dudhiā brāhmaṇa Udairāj, are known to have lived in the Bhil areas of Panarwa and Oghna respectively.241 All this had a significant impact on the Bhil chiefs. The presence of Solaṅkī chiefs in Oghna-Panarwa is likely to have been responsible for the Bhil-Solaṅkī marriage in the subsequent period and the claims to the Solaṅkī descent by the chiefs of Oghna-Panarwa. It is well-known that the Bhil chiefs of Oghna-Panarwa claim descent from the Solaṅkī lineage of the Rajputs.242 Similarly, some more Bhil groups of Mewar, of Magra, Kalyanpur, etc., claim descent from different Rajput lineages.243 The Solaṅkī Bhils of Oghna-Panarwa may be the oldest case of "Rajputization" among the Bhils of Southern Rajasthan. The category of Bhils claiming Rajput descent is called the Bhilālās (progeny of Rajput fathers and Bhil mothers).244 They claim a rank superior to the Bhils. Thus the process of state formation in Mewar highlights the process of emergence of differentiation within an egalitarian tribe when it comes in contact with a stratified society. Morton H. Fried makes a similar observation in the context of tribal social formation in general.245 The Bhilālās such as the Solaṅkī-Bhils of Oghna-Panarwa demonstrate the emergence of an elite section among the Bhils as a result of their close interaction with the state-society over a long period of time.

Perhaps the case of the Solaṅkī-Bhils of Oghna-Panarwa

240. Ibid.
241. Ibid.
243. Ibid., pp.194-95.
244. Gahlot and Dhar, op. cit., p.211.
245. "On the Concepts of "Tribes" and "Tribal Society", paper presented at a meeting of the Division, Department of Anthropology, Columbia University (New York), January 24, 1966, Proceedings, pp.527-540. I am grateful to Dr. Maxine Weisgrau, Columbia University, New York, for presenting this article to me.
is one of the best illustrations of the social aspect of the process of state formation. It is relevant to reiterate Chattopadhyaya's observations in the context of Solankī Bhils of Oghna, "The process of caste formation remained the essence of the social processes which drew widely dispersed and originally outlying groups into a structure which allowed them in a large measure to retain their original character, except that this character was defined with reference to the structure...." 246

For the Oghna Bhils of the fifteenth century royal authority was obviously represented by the local Solankī chiefs. Therefore, for the Solankī Bhil chiefs of Oghna Panarwa of the fifteenth-century titled Rānā, the following observations can be partially held true, "Some of these tribal princes found themselves similarly involved in the process of Hinduization and rose to become tributary princes (sāmanta) in the course of further development, while others in their turn could preserve their autonomy for centuries...." 247 The study of even the core-area Bhils in Mewar demonstrates that their formal integration into the political structure, and beginnings of "Hinduization", as well as their recurring revolts, cannot locate them as sāmantas before the fifteenth century.

SECTION III
SOCIAL ALLIANCES AND
RELATIONS WITH CONTEMPORARY POWERS

Social relations of the Guhilas with the Cāhamānas of Suvarṇagiri (Songirā) or Jalor can be seen in the context of Gujarat-Delhi Sultanate imbroglio. The Achalesvāra inscription significantly states that Samarasiṃha (son of Tejasimha) lifted the deeply sunk Gurjara land high out of the

246. B.D. Chattopadhyaya, Political Processes and Structure of Policy, op. cit., p.203.

Turuška sea. Continuing south-western expansion of the Delhi sultanate with its recurrent inroads into Mewar in its attempts to control Gujarat is also evident from Chiravā inscription recording the battle of Bhūtālā near Nāgadrhapura (between Jaitrasimha and Illututmish). It is also interesting that none of the Persian sources mentions Illututmish's ventures into Mewar indicating Illututmish's possible failures in securing the routes to Gujarat through Mewar. Jayasiṃha Sūri's HammTramadamardana referring to the burning of Medapāta in the context of the raids conducted by Milācchikāra suratrāṇa, etc., in Bhāghelā King Viradhavala's (Gujarat) reign and Jaitrasimha as Medapātaprīthivī- latam mandalam Jayatalan, claim by Chiravā inscription that the rulers of Gurjara, Mālava, Jāṅgal (present state of Bikaner in Thar desert and northern part of Mewar) and similarly by an unpublished inscription from Ghaghsa (near Chittaurgarh), the Achalesvara inscription crediting Jaitrasimha with victory over the army of the Turuškas and defence of Mewar, and Jinaprabhasūri's Thīrthakalpa referring to Samarasiṃha's clash with Ulugh Khan, younger
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brother of Sultan Al-`auddin,\footnote{IA, Vol.XXVI, pp.194-95.} prove the Sultanate's interests in Mewar. Hence, the Guhilas attempted to create buffer zones and political allies in their immediate north. Contemporary references to Jaitrasimha as the 'uprooter of Naḍula power'\footnote{Achalesvara inscription, \textit{op. cit.}, v.42.} and control over Abu-Sirohi locality for the first time in the late thirteenth century,\footnote{Ibid., vv.49-52, 58.} point to Guhila attempts to control their north-western frontiers. A political ally in central Rajasthan was created in the Cāhamānas of Suvarṇagiri (Songirā). Songirā princess Rupā-devī, daughter of Cāhamāna Cācigadeva and sister of Cāhamāna Sāmanatasa, was married to Guhila King Tejasimha.\footnote{Burtra inscription of Cāhamāna Sāmantasimha of A.D. 1284, EI, IV, pp.312-14, v.5.} She was the mother of Guhila prince Kṣetrasimha.\footnote{Ibid., p.313.} The Khalji-Tughlaq interregnum in Chittaurgarh in the first half of the fourteenth century is evident from records dated in the reigns of Alauddin Khalji and Muhammad Tughlaq,\footnote{ARIE, 1956, Appendix C, No.126; URI, \textit{op. cit.}, p.173; ARIE, 1956, pp.189, 198, 233; EIPS, 1955-56, pp.67-68; \textit{Ibid.}, pp.67-68; Also see Elliot and Dowson, \textit{Vol.III, op. cit.}, p.171. Ziauddin Barani in his Tarikh-i-Ferozshahi refers to Kotwal's advice to Alauddin in A.D. 1297 to conquer the forest of Ranthambhor, Chittaur, Chanderi, Mahva, Dhar, Ujjain, etc.} and seventeenth century Guhila references to the legendary Padminī\footnote{Mention of the name of Padminī in any Guhila royal source occurs for the first time in the seventeenth century in Rājprāsāsti Mahākāvya, \textit{op. cit.}, Canto 3, vv.3-4; A local bardic text, \textit{Chhitāi Charitra} composed in A.D. 1526, and Malik Muhammad Jayasi's \textit{Padmavat} composed in A.D. 1540. Padmavatī Charitra ChaupaiaHemaratna's Gorā Bādal Charitā cited in \textit{RTA, op. cit.}, p.666; Nainsī's Khyat, \textit{op. cit.}, vol.I, p.14. Ratansi Ajaisiro bhada Lakhamsīno bhāi, Padminire mante Lakh} (and the Alauddin-Padminī episode, more
It is strange that historians such as M.S. Ahluwalia in his *Muslim Expansion in Rajasthan: The Relations of Delhi Sultanate with Rajasthan 1206-1526*, ignore contemporary evidence on the Songiras at Chittaurgarh as Nainsī too mentions the Songiras at Chittaur. The Guhila-Songira marriage recorded in the bardic traditions of Mewar highlights the importance of the Songiras for the Guhilas. Rāṇā Hammīra is stated to have married Songīra Vanavīra's sister, a Songīra Cāhamāna princess. Baṛvadevi-dān Khyāt names a Songīra queen of the legendary Rāṇā Hammīra, and Nainsī, a Songīra mother of Hammīra. The political mileages of such a marriage for the early princes of the Rāṇā branch is obvious in view of the eclipse of the Guhila power at Chittaurgarh in the fourteenth century and the rise of the Songīra Cāhamānas at Chittaur, with their
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ament naū Ratansī, Alāvādī Sulādāne Kāmāyo; Also see Elliot and Dowson, op. cit., pp.176-77. Amir Khusrau in Khazainul-Futuh narrates the sack and capture of Chittaurgarh but never alludes to Padminī.
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territorial hold over Godwar region.268 Political alliances of Guhilas with Songirās seem to have continued as the traditions record marriage of a Sīsodīa (Rāṇā Guhilas) princess Subālī with a Songirā chief Rāo Sāmantasimha,269 and induction of Songirā prince Vanavīra into the royal services of Mewar.270 Although none of the fifteenth century Guhila records refers to any Guhila-Songirā matrimonial alliance, the presence of the Songirās at Chittaurgarh points toward possibilities of Guhila social linkages with the Songirās Cāhamānas.

Social linkages of the fifteenth century Guhilas with contemporary Rajputs such as the Bāghelās and Yādavas of Gujarat and Khīchīs of Gagraun need to be seen in perspective of the rise of Gujarat and Malwa as sultanates and the ensuing problems of defending the western and south-eastern frontiers. Even before the rise of the sultanate of Gujarat, there was a Guhila-Bāghelā clash at the western frontier of Mewar leading to the Guhila capture of a local fortress, Koṭṭadaka (modern kotra).271

Bāghelās too claimed victory over Mewar in the mid-thirteenth century. A Bāghelā landgrant A.D. 1260 refers to the Bāghelā Rāṇā Vīsaladeva of Dholka as 'who resembled a hatchet on account of his cutting the roots of the creeper

268. EI, Vol.IX, pp.62-63. Suzerainty of the Songirā Cāhamānas over Godwar in the mid-fourteenth century is evident from Kot-Solankiya (Desuri-Nāḍol belt) inscription of the reign of Songirā Vanavīra of A.D. 1337; Ibid., pp.63-64, Nāḍlāī stone inscription of the reign of Rana Vīradeva (Vanavīra's son), 'Śrī Nāḍulāi nagare lCāhumānānvaya mahārajađhirāj śrī Vanavīradeva sutarājāśrī [ra]navīradeva vijayarājye.'


271. Chirava inscription, op. cit., v.19, "Bālakah Koṭṭadaka-kagrahane śrījaitrasiṃhatipam puratah Tribhuvanarāṇa-kayuddhe jagām yuddhva param lokom'. Rāṇā Tribhuvana (successor to Bhīmadeva II) Bāghela ruler of Gujarat, was evidently a contemporary of Jaitrasiṃha.
like turbulent government of the Medapāṭa country". It is equally significant that the Bāghelās acknowledged Guhila Jaitrasiṁha as Medapāṭapraphītīvīlalāṭamandalam Jayatalam. The rise of Ahmad Shah I (contemporary of Rāṇā Mokal) in Gujarat leading to repeated incursions into Mewar and Guhila counter-claims of victory and Firuz Shah of Nagaur and Pāṭsāhā Ahmad, and Rāṇā Kumbha's programme of territorial expansion in the northwestern frontiers of Mewar to control the fortresses of Nagaur, Narena, etc. along with his politics of allying with the fugitive Ghurid princes from Malwa (necessitating a Mewar-Gujarat military alliance against Malwa) and a counter alliance by Malwa with Gujarat against Mewar, necessitated close Guhila-Bāghelā and Guhila-Yādava political cooperation which led to the matrimonial alliances with the Bāghelās and the Yādavas. Mokal's Śrīṅgīṛiśi inscription eulogizes his Bāghelī queen, Gaurāmbikā at great length.

Gujarat's continuing attempts in controlling the for-

274. Rāṇā Mokal's Śrīṅgīṛiśi inscription, op. cit., v.14, Kumbhalgarh prāsasti, 4th slab, op. cit., v.221; E.D. Bayley, History of Gujarat, Delhi (Reprint), 1970, p.120. Tabakat-i-Akbari and Tarikh-i-Alfi narrate Ahmad Shah's invasion of Jilwara (Chelvāṭa of Śrīṅgīṛiśi inscription, located in north-western Mewar).
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277. op. cit., vv.23-25 "(for her) who was illuminating to the family of Bāghelās, who had her hand renowned for charities, who was the daughter of prince... nabhnama... who was graced with prosperity.... For (that) Gaurāmbikā, ...this reservoir of water in front of that son of Vibhanda has been constructed by Mokala...."
tresses of the Abu-Sirohi belt and its protectorate, the Sultanate of Nagaur, diverted Mewar towards its northwestern frontiers. A number of inscriptive records issued by Kharataragacchha Vasahi of Abu in A.D. 1458, an image inscription from Caturmukha Viha of A.D. 1461 and the Gau-mukh inscription from Achalgarh referring to the reign of Rāṇā Kumbha, speak for Mewar-Gujarat rivalry over Abu. It is also significant that the Persian sources speak of repeated attempts by Gujarat to seize Kumbhalgarh and Chittaurgarh. Hence, social alliances with local Rajput families of Gujarat became an indispensable strategy against the Sultanate of Gujarat.

If Mokal had a Bāghelī queen, a Guhila princess Ramāvatī (Kumbha's daughter) was married off to Rāya Manḍalīka, the Yādava ruler of Junagarh. The way the Viśṇu temple inscription of Ramāvatī from Zawar (A.D. 1497) eulogizes the


Yādavas, speaks of their political importance for the fifteenth century Guhilas. Even the seventeenth century sources refer to Rāṇā Kumbha's control over Junagarh (Saurashtra). The Guhilas continued to strengthen their social linkages with the local Rajput powers of Gujarat at least up to the end of the fifteenth century: traditions speak of Rāṇā Rāimalla's (son and successor of Kumbha) chief queen, a princess from Idar (Banaskantha region of northeastern Gujarat), and how Rāimalla captured Chittaurgarh from Kumbha's assassin Udayasimha (I) with the help of his father-in-law, the Rajput ruler of Idar.

Malwa's repeated incursions into Mewar, attempted invasions of Chittaurgarh, Kumbhalgarh, Manḍalgarh, Hāḍāvatī and Gagraun throughout the fifteenth century, and Kumbha's claim of defeating a joint army of Malwa and Gujarat resulted in a matrimonial alliance of the Guhilas with the Khīchīs of Gagraun. Traditions record the marriage of Lālbāī (Mokal's daughter) with Acjaldās Khīchī. Since Gagraun commanded a strategic point on the route between Malwa and Mewar, the politico-military significance of the
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social linkages with the Khīchīs of Gagraun can not be underestimated for the Guhilas of the fifteenth century. Undoubtedly, the social alliances with the neighbouring Rajput powers beyond Mewar facilitated Guhila hold, however difficult and tenuous over some of the fortresses claimed by the contemporary records. 287

Guhila attempts at magnifying their own status vis-a-vis the neighbouring sultans (Qutabuddin Mahmud Beghara in Gujarat and Mahmud Khalji and Ghiyasuddin Khalji in Malwa) in their fifteenth century charters 288 also point towards Mewar's military pre-occupation with Gujarat, Malwa and Nagaur. If the claim of the Guhila began with the liberation of Gayā from the Yavanas, 289 indicating a local tīrtha possibly in the central Rajasthan (Nagaur), 290 Kumbha credits the same predecessor, Lakṣasimha with the liberation of tristhalī; the three tīrthas of Kāshi, Prayāg, and Gayā in the Gangetic plains 291 magnifying the Guhila image in the eyes of the local Rajput chiefs. Finally, Mewar was also

287. Ranakpur Prasāsti, op. cit., l.14, claims victory of Rāṇā Kumbha over Gagraun.
288. See for instance, Kumbha's Kīrttistambha prasāsti, op. cit., vv.171-74 and Ekalingajī daksina dvāra prasāsti, op. cit., v.54, "Mādyān Mālavaṁātha murdhani caraṇam datvā raṇe dīdahata Kumbho sṛī sāraṅgapuram sapaurani-karam dharādhiśvarah'.
289. Śrīṅgarīśi inscription, op. cit., v.11, claims Lakṣasimha (Lākhā, Mokal's predecessor) liberating Gayā from the burden of tax for a considerable number of years.
290. [vv.38, 41, 'Nītipṛitibhujārjjitāni bahuśo ratnāni yatrānādayam dāyam dāyamāyaya vyatanuta dhaśāntarāyām gayām 11 tīrthānām Karamākalyaya vidhinā nyatrāpi yukta dhanam prauḍgāravaṇibadhaticārthasarasījāgraddhyasām-bhoruhān 11 Rūdhvāsēga padāmsākāḥhiparavagyārībhavajjīvinām dhīromānucadarjjuṁinvā gayām mayāvivuktaśāṣah 11 dharmāsvāṣa samastalokamahitā kāśṭāṃ parāmāgato nih satvīkṛitadharmmarājavasate padmāḷyāśadmanah 11'
291. Kumbhalgarh prasāsti, 4th slab, v.207, 'Kunasapāsam sakalapāpasthat yastrīsthāl mocanataḥ sākebhyaḥ. Also see Ibid., vv.209-11; Ekalingajī temple daksīna dvāra prasāsti, op. cit., v.38
militarily involved with its immediate Rajput powers such as the Hāḍās of Bundi, the Rāṭhaurs of Mandor and the Devā Cāhamānas of Sirohi to control the fortresses strategic to its eastern, northern and north-western frontiers respectively. Conquests of Vṛindāvatī (Bundi) are twice mentioned in Kumbhalgarh prasāṭi while that of Hāḍāvatī (eastern Mewar extending into Bundi) figures separately. The very first Guhila reference to possession of Vṛindāvatī appears only in the context of Kumbha's conquests. In view of continuing Hāḍā resistance from Bundi, it is significant that Baṅdevīdatān does not mention a single Hāḍā queen for Kumbha. With the emergence of the Rāṭhaurs in Marwar in the latter half of the fifteenth century, Mewar found it difficult to control the fortresses of Mandor, Sojat, etc. Although the Ranakpur prasāṭi claims Kumbha's victory over Merū Mandor, the situation had significantly changed for the Guhilas as Kumbha is later stated to have captured Mandor by killing the enemy family. In contrast, Kumbha's control over the Abu-Sirohi belt does not figure in the Guhila records in such terms as that of Manḍovarpur or Vṛindāvatī. Kumbha's landgrant charters appeared in Ajahari, Sirohi as early as A.D. 1437 while his inscriptions

292. op. cit., 4th slab, vv.259, 263, 'Pratyārthipārthi vāparājya janmahetu Vṛindāvatīpura malidahadesā Vira-hor'.

293. Ibid., v.264, 'jitvā desāmanaka durgaviṣāṇam. Hāḍāvatīm helayā'.

294. Unlike Mokal's records, Ranakpur prasāṭi refers for the first time to Kumbha's conquest of Vṛindāvatī, op. cit.

295. op. cit., 1.12.

296. Kumbhalgarh prasāṭi, 4th slab, v.249, 'Yana Vairīkulam hatvā Manḍovarpurāgarīhe'.

at Abu continued to appear till late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{298} Although local bardic traditions of Sirohi record the name of Devḍā Cāhamāna, Ḍoḍiā Narasiṁha, son of Rāo Sālji, as conqueror of the fortresses of Abu, Vasantgarh, Bhula, etc.,\textsuperscript{299} a local popular song celebrates the conquest of Abu, a Devḍā possession, and building of palaces and lakes there to Kumbha. "Ḍoḍe Rāo Sīrohi dujāḍā dalasajdā par haṁsa diā Ābu girvar Śikhar uparan Kumbhe sarovar mahal kiā" (although Sirohi belonged to Rāo Doḍe, it is Kumbha who gifted the swan-like mount of the Abu with the palaces and lakes).\textsuperscript{300} Such popular traditions reflect Guhila control of the Abu-Sirohi belt for a considerable time in the fifteenth century. Interestingly, Bādvādevīdān lists a Devḍā queen each for the early kings of the Rāṅgā branch like Khetā and Lākhā as well as two Devḍā queens for Rāṅgā Rāimalla, Rāj Kunwar, Devḍā Rāo Gopa's daughter and Champā Kunwar, Devḍā Rāo Lākhā's daughter.\textsuperscript{301} Social relationship with the Devḍā Cāhamānas of Sirohi became politically significant in view of the Mewar-Gujarat clash over Abu. Hence, Guhilas seem to have a better control over the Abu-Sirohi belt than the Marwar of the Rāṭhaurs or Bundi of the Hāḍās.

Finally, but not the least, occasional victory over Rajput forts beyond Mewar undoubtedly brought additional resources, seized during the campaigns. Also commercial wealth accruing from the trade routes that some of these fortresses commanded, was obviously diverted towards the Guhila state of Mewar. A part of this wealth is likely to have contributed towards the making of the massive forts in Kumbha's reign.

We have tried to answer some questions related to the

\textsuperscript{298} Kīrttistambha inscription, op. cit., v.284, refers to Kumbha's conquest of Abu and building of the fort of Achalgarh.

\textsuperscript{299} G.H. Ojha, History of Sirohi, op. cit., p.194; Also see \textit{Idem}, URI, Vol.I, op. cit., p.283.

\textsuperscript{300} Vir Vinod, Vol.I, op. cit., p.332.

\textsuperscript{301} op. cit., pp.2, 3 & 7.
nature of and changes in the political structure of the Mewar state between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. If kinsmen dominated and participated more in the organization and control of Guhila territory in the thirteenth century, socio-political links with the non-Guhila Rajput chiefs of Eastern Mewar seem to have ensured a better defence of Chittaurgarh and hinterland in the fifteenth century. However, the Guhilas had to reassert themselves both in Eastern Mewar and in the Bhil dominion. Their social linkages with Rajput powers outside Mewar between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries also helped them to tackle military problems and retain the Guhila power. Incorporation of non-Rajput social groups such as Jains, the Tāṃṭara-da family from Nāgdā, and the Bhil chiefs into the political structure strengthened the socio-economic and political base of the state. A long process of regional state formation culminated in a dynastic tradition in which the state of Mewar came to be identified with the Guhila royal family, as indicated by attempts by fifteenth century kings of Mewar to identify with the Guhilas.