In the middle of the 10th century A.D., the capital of the Guhilas was probably transferred from Nāgharada (Nāgdā) to Āghāta (Āhār). The Āhār Sārnakṣvara Temple Inscription of Allāta¹ (A.D. 953) yields the information that Āghāta, a centre of trade and commerce, attracted the merchants from different parts of the country. Āghāta might have grown as a mercantile city of importance from the time of Bharṭripātta II and reached the final stage of development during the time of Allāta. The Guhilas at might have considered Āghāta, located at the junction of trade-routes running between Gujrāt and Delhi², more suitable than Nāgharada to be their capital. By the transfer of their capital, the Guhilas seem to have attempted to keep the seat of their power and authority in a more well-guarded secure position,

as Nāgda had been located in a more vulnerable position from military point of view.

The Āhār Inscription (A.D. 943) of Bhartrīpaṭṭa II, the predecessor of Allata, was found at Āhār itself. The records of Allata’s immediate successors were also discovered from Āhār. The epithet Āghāṭapati is found to be associated with the name of the Guhila king Ambāprasāda in the Prithvirājāvijaya. It appears that the capital was shifted sometime before the time of Ambāprasāda. If the discovery of a Guhila record is taken to be an indication, Bhartrīpaṭṭa II’s reign most probably witnessed the transfer of capital.

Bhartrīpaṭṭa II

Bhartrīpaṭṭa II (A.D. 943) for the first time assumed the title Mahārājādhirāja by disavowing

3. RMR. 1914, p. 2.
5. Prithvirājāvijaya, verses 59-60.
the allegiance to the Pratihāras. The Pratābgarna Inscription of Pratihāra Mahendrapāla II (946 A.D.) records that Mahārājādhirāja Bhartṛipaṭṭa granted in perpetuity a field named Vavvulika or Babbulika situated by the side of the river Nandyā in the village of Palāṣa-Kūpikā that is, Pārasia, located about 15 miles south of Māndāsor. The transfer of the capital, no doubt, suggests the growing power of the Guhilas in the time of Bhartṛipaṭṭa II, who is known from the Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977), as an unique ornament of the three worlds (Lokatrayaka-tālaka).

Relation with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas

The Ātpur Inscription furnishes the information that Bhartṛipaṭṭa II married Mahālakṣmil, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess. It is difficult to identify the father of Mahālakṣmil as his name is not recorded in the Ātpur Inscription, nor in the epigraphic

---

records of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The name of Mahālakshmi is also absent in the epigraphic records of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as well as in those of the contemporary dynasties. A branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were ruling in Gujrat (the Lāṭa branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas) lying not far from Mewār. But this branch seems to have come to an end in A.D. 888. Because, Kṛishmarāja of this branch is known to have been on the throne till at least A.D. 888, but no successor of him is so far known. It is more probable that Mahālakshmi was the daughter of Amoghavarsha III (936-939 A.D.), ruler of Mānyakheta (Malkhed) and sister of Kṛishṇa III. Amoghavarsha ascended the throne at the age of 50 and ruled only for three years. During his short reign of three years, the government was entirely carried on by his able and ambitious son Kṛishṇa III (939-967 A.D.). After the death of Amoghavarsha III, he ascended the throne in A.D. 939. It appears on chronological grounds that when Bhartrīpattā II entered into matrimonial alliance with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Kṛishṇa III was still a crown-prince. That Kṛishṇa III had in his mind Kālanjara

and Chitrakūṭa as the future target of the military campaign in the North is attested by the evidences of Deoli¹⁰ and Karhad plates¹¹. Matrimonial alliance seems to have been concluded between the Guhilas and the Rāshtrakūṭas to form a power-bloc against the Pratihāras. When Kṛishṇa III invaded Northern India, his contemporary Pratihāra king was Mahipāla. We may reasonably assume that the disintegration of the Pratihāra empire was the result of the joint efforts of the Guhilas and the Rāshtrakūṭas. In their struggle against the Pratihāras, both the Guhilas and the Rāshtrakūṭas benefitted. The Rāshtrakūṭas fulfilled their long cherished desire to establish their dominance in North Indian politics, while the Guhilas achieved an independent status by completely disavowing even nominal allegiance to the Pratihāras.

Allaṭa

Bhartripaṭṭa II was succeeded by his son Allaṭa sometime in 953 A.D. The mother of Allaṭa was

Mahālakṣmī of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family. Allāta is traditionally known as Ālu-Rāwāl.  

Relation with the Hūgas: The Ātpur Inscription of Saktikumāra (A.D. 977) furnishes us with the information that Allāta's queen was Harīyādevī. The Gaonri Copper-plate Inscription of Vākpati Munja (A.D. 981) yields the information that Allāta's consort Harīyādevī was a Hūṇa princess. It is difficult to identify the father of Harīyādevī of the Hūṇa lineage. Hūṇa Māndala, as suggested by D.C. Ganguly, was situated to the north-west of Mālwā. Because, the evidence furnished by Padmagupta's Navasāhasāṅkhacharita and some of the Paramāra Inscriptions indicate that the Hūṇa principality was not far from the Paramāra kingdom. Gaonri, the findspot of the copper-plates of Vākpati II, which

refer to the village Vañikagrāma existing in the Hūṇa-Mandala, was not far from Indore. Grant C of the Gaonri Plates also refers to the territory in the region between Indore and Mhow. The Paramāra contemporary of Allāṭa was Harsha - Siyaka or Siyaka II, whose date is known from the Hārpālā Copper Plate Grant (A.D. 949).

After the decline of the Pratihāras, the Paramāras in Mālwā gradually grew so powerful as to threaten the Guhilas. It was during the reign of Vākpati Munja, sometime in 974-975 A.D. or sometime later that the Paramāra authority in Mewār was consolidated. However, Allāṭa seems to have been apprehensive of the growing power of the Paramāras in his own time. He probably entered into matrimonial alliance with the Hūṇas to check the expansionist move of the Paramāras.

The relations between the Hūṇas and the Paramāras were not friendly. According to the Navasāhasāṅkhacharita, Siyaka II (alias Harsha)

launched a campaign against the Huṇas, slaughtered their princes and turned their harems into the dwelling place for the consecration of widowhood. The conflict between the Huṇas and the Paramāras, that began during the reign of Siyaka II, continued till the time of Vākpati (alias Munja) and Sindhu-rāja. The Huṇas fought for their existence not only against the Paramāras, but also other expansionist powers like the Chaulukyas, Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Kali-achuris. Whatever that might be, the Guhilas might have attempted to strengthen their position by entering into matrimonial alliance with the Huṇas who had been hostile to the Paramāras.

Allaṭa and Devapāla

Pandit G.H. Ojha\(^{20}\) refers to an unpublished, damaged fragmentary inscription in a small Jaina temple at Āhar near Udaipur, that records Devapāla's defeat and death in the hands of Allaṭa. Ojha\(^{21}\) has identified Devapāla with the Pratihāra ruler of that name. Barnett\(^{22}\) opines that this identification is

---

20. [URI, I, p. 124.]
21. [Ibid.]
22. Cf. [DHNI. II, p. 1170 fn. 2.]
possible but not very probable. Bhandarkar\(^{23}\) is of opinion that Devapāla is to be identified with Mahendrapāla II. It has been suggested by Dr. H.C. Ray\(^{24}\) that though at present there is no definite evidence that the Pratihāra emperor Devapāla was killed, it is certain that he was not a very powerful prince, and like Rājyapāla, he may have also been killed in trying to put down internal foes who were often the feudatories of the Kanauj empire. If due importance is attached with the epigraph referred to by Ojha, it is most likely that Pratihāra Devapāla (A.D. 948-49) is the king mentioned in the record. By defeating and killing him, Allāta proved beyond doubt the growth of Guhila power in contrast with the declining the Pratihāra power.

**Internal Administration**

The Āhār Sārnesvara Temple Inscription\(^{25}\) (A.D. 953) of Allāta refers to a group of state-

---

officials put in charge of different departments, such as Sāndhivigrāhika Durlabharāja, Akshapātalikas Mayura and Samudra, Vandipati Nāga, Bhishagarāja Rudrāditya, Pratihāra Yasōpushpa and Amātya Mammata. The record also furnishes us with the information that merchants from Karnāṭa, Madhyadesā, Lāṭa and Ṭakka visited Āghāta. Karnāṭa is to be identified with the Kānarese-speaking area in the Deccan, Madhyadesā with Upper Ganges valley, Lāṭa with southern Gujrat and Ṭakka with the Punjab. The inscription further refers to the circulation of coins such as Rupaka, dramma and drammadhvimsaka (1/40th of the dramma) in the local market.

Vallaka (alias Allata)

The Unawas Inscription26 (A.D. 959), recently published by R.C. Agarwal, mentions the name of king Vallaka, who is stated to be the son of Mahālakshmī. As Allata is known to be the son of Mahālakshmī from the Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977), he may be reasonably equated with Vallaka. That Vallaka was the

popular name of Allāta is also known from the local tradition and Pradyumna Sūri's Samaśaditya Samkṣhipata, a Jaina work. The Pipāli Inscription (948 A.D.), which is now preserved in the Pratapp Museum, Udaipur, refers Vālakka's reign. The Ambika Temple Inscription of Jagat (A.D. 960) suggests that Samvapura was the son of Vālaka. Samvapura, however, is not mentioned as the son of Allāta in any epigraphic record. Nāravāhana was the son and successor of Allāta. Among other sons of Allāta, mention is made of Gundala, Sodhaka, Siddha and Siluka. Again, the Kadmal Plates refer to Mahipāla as the son of Allāta.

Nāravāhana

We have an inscription of Nāravāhana (A.D. 971) discovered in the temple of Ekaliṅga, 12 miles north

27. Ibid.
of Udaipur. There are 18 lines in the *Ekaliṅga* Inscription of Naravāhana. Nothing can be made out from the first four lines and in line 5 we find the name of Bāppā, who is described as 'a moon among the princes of the Guhila family' and 'a jewel on the earth'. In line 7, it is said that some king had a wife, like a mine of diamonds, whose son was king Naravāhana. In the 9th line, it is recorded that he sought protection of Śaṅkara, Lord of Pārvatī, daughter of Giri, who favoured Bhṛigu Kachha. In the 13th line occurs the name of Ekaliṅgaji who is to be worshipped. It has been pointed out by G.C. Roy Chaudhuri that this epigraph is of special interest as it contains the earliest reference to the god Ekaliṅga, the patron-deity of the royal house of Mewār.

**Chāhamāna Alliance**

Naravāhana married the daughter of a Chāhamāna named Jejaya. The name of Jejaya has not yet

---

32. *HM.*, p. 42.

been traced in the genealogical list of the Chāhamānas. Jejaya, however, might have been one of the members of the Chāhamāna branch of Śākambhārī. It appears that his name was forsaken by the Chāhamāna ruler concerned after his accession to the throne. The matrimonial alliance between the Guhilas and the Chāhamānas is for instance of diplomatic move in the face of the steady growth of the Paramāra power in Central India.

Estimate of Naravāhana

The Ātpur Inscription informs us that Naravāhana was not only 'the destroyer of enemies and forbear of Kshatriyas but also as the support of all arts and abode of knowledge'. It is evident from the Ekaliṅga Inscription of Naravāhana (A.D. 971) that a great debate was held in the court of Naravāhana. The participants were the Jainas, Śaivas and Buddhists. The Śaivas are said to have come out victorious. The inscription also throws light on the existence of the Pāṣupata sect and

34. Verse 6, I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
manifold activities of the Pāśupata Yogis. Ojha has noticed in an unpublished Āhār Inscription mention of the name of Naravāhana’s Aksapaṭaladhisā Śrīpati, son of Mayura, who held the same post in the previous reign. Two important poets namely Amra and Yogarāj also flourished in Mewār in this period.

Śālivāhana

Śālivāhana succeeded Naravāhana. It has been suggested by Pandit Ojha that the Guhilas of Kāthiawār (Saurāśtra) were his descendants. According to him, the descendants of Śālivāhana ruling at Kheḍa later migrated to Kāthiawār.

It is learnt from the Mongol stone Inscription of Guhila Ṭhakkura Mulake (A.D. 1145), found in Junāgaḍh in South Kāthiawār, that Sahajiga was responsible for the foundation of a Guhila line in Kāthiawār. The question arises as to wherefrom

38. URI. I. pp. 126-129.
Sahajiga hailed. Tradition has it that Sahajiga (Sejakji) was the grandson of Mahadāsa and after the killing of his grandfather in the hands of Siaji, grandson of Rāthor Jayachandra of Kanauj, he migrated to Saurāstra about V.S. 1250 i.e. A.D. 1193, and entered into the service of the Chaulukyas of Anahilawārā. Again, it has been claimed that Mahadāsa was the last prince of the Guhila line that had been ruling in Kheḍa on the bank of the Luni in Jodhpur. The Guhila rulers in Bhāvnagar, however, claimed their descent from Śālivāhana of Paithan 39.

G.H. Ojha 40 has put forward the suggestion that Śālivāhana of Paithan is to be identified with the king of that name belonging to the Guhila dynasty of Mewār. As we have only one Guhila king with the name Śālivāhana belonging to Nāgdā-Āhār line, it is but natural to connect the Guhilas of Khergaḍh and later of Bhāvnagar with him. But there are some chronological difficulties. As suggested by D.V. Bhatta 41, Śālivāhana of Paithan ruled in

40. URI. I, pp. 126-129.
41. Bhāvnagar Kā Bālbodha Itihās pp. 5-10, Quoted by Ojha in URI. I, pp. 127-128.
V.S. 134, that is, about A.D. 77. But Śālivāhana, belonging to the Guhila line of Nagdā - Āhār, flourished sometime between 971 and 977 A.D. Śālivāhana has no record of his own. But the record of his predecessor Naravāhana is dated A.D. 971\textsuperscript{42} and that of his successor Saktikumāra is dated A.D. 977\textsuperscript{43}. Besides, Śālivāhana is known to have succeed to the Guhila seat of authority at Āhār, which lay far away from Paithan. It may, therefore, be held that the Guhilas of much later period claiming their descent from Śālivāhana might have made a confusion in equating him with Śālivāhana of Indian tradition. This might have been caused by an attempt on their part to attach with the name of their ancestor remote antiquity and fame of Indian tradition.

We should again consider that Sahajiga made his migration from Kheḍa to Junāgarh towards the close of the 12th century A.D. A branch of the Guhilas of Mewār might have been reasonably founded by the ancestor of Mohadāsa, some 300 years back at

\textsuperscript{42} Bhāv. Ins. p. 69.
\textsuperscript{43} I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
Khedagarh in Jodhpur. In that case, Śālivāhana might be considered as the founder of a branch of Guhila line in Jodhpur, and the question of equating him with Śālivāhana of Paithan would not arise.

A coin of Śālivāhana has been discovered. It is made of silver-plated copper. The legend on this coin occurs is before the bust of the king. It reads śrī Sa. Sa probably stands for Śāli-vāhana.

Śaktikumāra

Śaktikumāra is the last king of the Guhila line known from the Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977). Of the three inscriptions belonging to the reign of Śaktikumāra, the most important is the Ātpur Inscription. It opens with the date and records the erection of a temple of god Nanigasvami. Then we find the genealogy of the Guhila rulers from Guhadatta to Śaktikumāra. It is stated in the inscription that Śaktikumāra possessed three elements of power,

44. JNST. XX, pp. 26ff.
45. I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
namely Prabhushakti (majesty) Mantra Sakti (Counsel) and Utsaha Sakti (energy). Saktikumara appears to have been the ruler of model type as envisaged in Kauṭilya's Arthasastra and Kāmandaka's Nitisāra.

The next inscription of Saktikumara is the Ahar Stone Inscription. This inscription was noticed in the terrace of a Jaina temple at Ahar. It is now preserved in the Pratap Museum, Udaipur. It records the donation of 14 draimmas to the sun-god. It also refers to the name of Aksapatalika Mattata.

The third epigraph is also found in another Jaina temple at Ahar near Udaipur. The inscription is damaged and fragmentary. It highly praises Saktikumara and mentions Mattata and Gundala, the two sons of Akshapatalika Sripati, as the two arms of Saktikumara.

Guhilas and Ghajnivides

It is probably during the reign period of Saktikumara, sometime in the last quarter of the

46. DHNT. II, p. 1173.
47. ASI, WC., 1906, p. 62.
10th century A.D., that the Gajnivides invaded India. M.L. Mathur suggests that Śaktikumāra joined Jaipāla against Sabuktigin, when the latter invaded India. This view is based on the evidence furnished by the Chitor Inscription (v.s. 1331), where it is stated that Śaktikumāra annihilated the enemies of his religion. Firishtā informs us that the rājās of Delhi, Ajmer, Kālanjara, Kanauj and many other neighbouring countries supplied contingents to help the Śāhī king Jaipāl. Sabuktigin came to power in A.D. 977, and shortly after his accession, he undertook the scheme of conquest. The statement of Firishtā is significant enough to indicate that a confederacy of Indian rulers was formed to resist the foreign invasion. It has been suggested by D.C. Ganguly that if Firishtā's statement could be accepted as true, it would go a long way in absolving the Indian rulers of the charge commonly levelled against them that they could not unite even in the face of a common danger threatening the safety of their motherland.

48. JIH. XXXII, pt. II p. 149.
49. Verse 46, Bhāv. Ins. p. 75; I.A. XXII, p. 80.
50. RMP, I. p. 11.
51. Majumdar, R.C. (ed.), The struggle for Empire, Bombay, 1979, p. 3.
52. Ibid. p. 4.
Firishtä mentions three capital cities, those of the Tomaras, Chāhamānas and Chandellās, wherefrom troops were sent in the distress of Jaipāla. Jaipāla was none but the Shāhī king of that name who ruled in Udabhāndapura. He probably ascended the throne in the last quarter of the 10th century A.D. and, therefore, was a contemporary of Guhila Saktikumāra whose date is known from the Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977). A fragmentary stone Inscription has been found on a hill, north of Barikot, in Upper Swat of the reign of paramabhattāraka Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Jayapāladeva. Although Firishtā has not made any specific mention of the Guhilās, they might have been covered by the expression "many other neighbouring countries". It appears that the Guhilās had not yet become so prominent in North Indian politics as the Tomaras. Chāhamānas and Chandellās were. That explains why the Guhilās do not find mention as one of the confederates against the Ghaznavīvīdes in Firishtā's account.

53. RMI. I, p. 11.
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Paramāra Invasion of Mewār

The Bizāpur Inscription of the time of Rāshtrakūta king Bālaprasāda of Hastikundi (A.D. 996) informs us that he gave shelter to the armies of a king (whose name is lost) and of the lord of the Gurjaras, when Munjarāja had destroyed Āghaṭa, the pride of Medapāta, and caused them to flee. The original verse in the inscription is as follows:

Bhanatkaghatang ghatabhīh Prakatamība madang Medapāte bhatānang.
Jalye Rājanyajalye Janayati Janatajanga ranag
Munjarājye

As regards the identification of the Guhila king defeated by Munja, scholars are of divergent opinions. In this connection, we have to take into our consideration the chronology of Vākpati Munja's military campaigns in order to find out the possible date of his Mewār-expedition. Secondly, we have also to consider whether the dark period of the Guhila history is the period when the successors of

56. Verse 10, E.I. X, p. 20; Munja also captured Chitor and the surrounding areas N.P.P. III p.5.
Saktikumāra ruled.

Now, if we keep in view the claims of conquest to the credit of Munja, we may reasonably hold that the Paramāra king overran Rājputānā to put his thrust against Gujrat. But before that, he might have, for the sake of strategy, defeated the Kalachuri king Yuvarāja (975 A.D.) ruling in Dāhala Mandala, now located in the eastern part of Madhya Pradesh. It was quiet reasonable, as the Paramāra king had his kingdom in Mālwa, now located in the western part of Madhya Pradesh. The last part of his reign was spent in his struggle with the Chālukya king Taila II. Therefore, his expeditions to Rājputānā and Gujrat are to be placed between the expeditions against the Kalachuris and the Chalukyas. It appears, therefore, that he did not undertake his expedition to Rājputānā immediately after his accession to the throne. Again, it is also apparent that in his Rājputānā - Gujrat expedition, he first fell upon Mewār which was adjacent to Mālwa. We have

57. It is recorded in verse 15 of the Udaipur Prasasti that Vākpati II defeated Yuvarāja, slew his generals and held his sword on high at Tripuri.

to determine the date of his military contest with the Guhila prince in this background.

Next, it may be argued that Munja (974-995 A.D.) who ascended the throne in the 7th decade of the 10th century A.D. might have defeated Śālivāhana (974 A.D.) or Śaktikumāra (977 A.D.), as the two rulers were his contemporaries. But of these two rulers Śaktikumāra is considered in the light of available epigraphic evidence as one of the most powerful Guhila princes. In that case, it would not be unreasonable to hold that some successor of Śaktikumāra might be defeated by Munja and the said defeat resulted positively in the reduction of the power of the Guhilas. That Munja destroyed Āghāṭa is clearly stated in the Bijapur Inscription (A.D. 996). He seems to have held sway over the Guhila kingdom sometime before the date of the record. It was from the time of Ambāprasadā, the successor of Śaktikumāra, that the Guhilas definitely suffered

58. Śaktikumāra possessed three elements of power (Saktitrjayorjitate, that is, Prabhusakti, Mantrasaktī and Utsāhasakti - Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977) I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.  
decline of power for seven or eight generations, as only one or two epigraphic records assignable to this period, have so far been discovered\(^\text{60}\). On these considerations, it may be suggested that Vākpati II alias Munja achieved his success in Mewār either towards the end of the reign of Śaktikumāra, who had already enjoyed the major part of his reign with power and authority or during the reign of Ambāprasāda, who proved himself to be an ephemeral ruler of the Guhila dynasty.

**Guhila-Chaulukya alliance**

The Guhilas presumably had not obtained sufficient time to consolidate their position in Āghāta. They however, seem to have anticipated the thrust of Paramāra imperialism against Mewār and adopted measures for further strengthening themselves by contracting alliances with the Chaulukyas on the one hand and the Chāhamānas on the other.

\(^{60}\) 'Inscription of the time of Ambāprasāda', *RMR*, 1914 p. 2; 'Hastamāṭa Temple Inscription of Suchivarman', *Bhāv. Ins.* p. 72.
The **Bisāpur Stone Inscription** makes it evident that the ruler of Āghāṭa shared with the Gurjara king the common fate of sustaining military defeat in the hands of the Paramāra ruler and took shelter at the same place. It appears that the Guhila king of Āghāṭa had entered into an alliance with the Gurjara king and made a common cause against the Paramāra invasion. It has been suggested by D.C. Ganguly⁶¹ and Dasaratha Sharma⁶² that the Gurjara ruler defeated by Vākpatī II was the Chaulukya king Mularāja I (941-996 A.D.) of Gujrat. The suggestion is also put forward by Dr. Ganguly that Mularāja was for sometime deprived of his kingdom by the Paramāras. P. Bhatia⁶³ points out that in the 10th century A.D. the word 'Gurjara' was commonly used by the Gurjara - Pratihāras only. It was only in the 12th century A.D. that the Chaulukyas came to be known as Gurjaras, being the new master of Gurjaratrā. Therefore, Vijayapāla, the weak successor of Mahipāla of Kanauj, who ruled

---

⁶¹ Ganguly, D.C., op.cit. pp. 53-54.
⁶² Sharma, D., op.cit. pp. 122-123.
between 959-989 A.D. was the Gurjara ally of the Guhila prince and adversary of Vāıkpati II⁶⁴. It has been further pointed out by Bhatia that Ujjain was under the occupation of the Gurjara - Pratihāras, as it is known from the Partābgarh Inscription of Pratihāra Mahendrapāla II⁶⁵ (A.D. 946), but it definitely came under the control of the paramāras sometime before 973 A.D. as Vāıkpati II issued land grants from Ujjain in 973 A.D. It is concluded by Bhatia that Vāıkpati II after defeating the Gurjara - Pratihāra ruler, occupied Ujjain⁶⁶.

A.K. Mazumdar⁶⁷ suggests that the Gurjara adversary of Vāıkpati II is identical with the Gurjara - Pratihāra ruler. But he does not mention the name of the Gurjara - Pratihāra king. He points out that the Gurjara king must have been killed in the battle field as the Bīzāpur Inscription (996 A.D.)
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uses the word the Vinaste for Gurjara (Gurjarege Vinaste). Mazumdar appears to have confused the meaning of the relevant line of the epigraph: 

(Pra)naṣṭe harināiva bhiyā Gurjarege Vinaste. The purport is that the Gurjara ruler, out of fear, ran like a deer. Therefore, the question of Gurjara lord’s death in the battle-field does not arise.

So far as the beginning of the Paramāra rule in Ujjayin is concerned, there is little evidence to suggest that Vākpati Munja conquered it from the Gurjara - Pratihāra lord. Because, Ujjain could not remain under the authority of the Pratihāras after Mahendrapāla II, when the Pratihāra empire had already disintegrated. Besides, the territory lying between Indore and Mhow was conquered from the Hūṇas by Siyaka II (948-974 A.D.), who is known to have assumed the titles, Mahārajjādhirājpati and Mahāmān-dalikachudāmani. Ujjayin did not lie at such a distance from Indore as to escape the aggressive designs of Paramāra Siyaka. It would be more reasonable

to hold that Ujjain came under the control of the Paramāras most probably during the reign period of Siyaka II and not in the time of Vākpati.

The Gurjara king, referred to in the **Bizāpur inscription**, was none but the contemporary Chaulukya king Mularāja I (941-996 A.D.) of Gujrāt. It was realised by him that Mewār in the hands of the Paramāras would prove to be a dagger thrust into the heart of Gujrāt. So, by extending military help and co-operation, Mularāja I might have intended to win over the Guhilas to his own side and thus resist the expansion of the Paramāras. The identification of the Gurjara king with the Pratihāra ruler of Kanauj appears to be far-fetched.

A coin of Śaktikumāra was discovered. The coin is of silver-plated copper. Only the legend before the bust of the king is Śrī Sa. Sa, it is suggested, stands for Śaktikumāra. With Śaktikumāra, the line of early Guhila kings of Mewār known from the Ātpur Inscription (977 A.D.) came to an end.

---

70. *JNSt.* XX, pp. 26 ff.
Reconstruction of the line of later Guhila rulers

The genealogical and succession list of Guhila rulers after Saktikumāra may be gleaned in the light of the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1331), the Mount Abu Inscription (V.S. 1342), the Rāppur inscription (V.S. 1496) and Kumbhalgarh inscription (V.S. 1517).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Amṛaprasāda</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>Ambāprasāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Suchivarmā</td>
<td>Suchivarmā</td>
<td>Suchivarmā</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Naravarmā</td>
<td>Naravarnan</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>Nṛivarmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>Anantavarmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ...........</td>
<td>Kirtivarman</td>
<td>Kirtivarman</td>
<td>Yasóvarma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. ...........</td>
<td>...........</td>
<td>Yogarāja</td>
<td>Yogarāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. ...........</td>
<td>Vairata</td>
<td>Vairat</td>
<td>Vairata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. ...........</td>
<td>Vamśapāla</td>
<td>Hamsapāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ...........</td>
<td>Vairisimha</td>
<td>Vairisimha</td>
<td>Vairisimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. ...........</td>
<td>Vijayasisimha</td>
<td>Vairisimha</td>
<td>...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. ...........</td>
<td>Arisimha</td>
<td>Arisimha</td>
<td>Arisimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. ...........</td>
<td>Choḍā</td>
<td>Choḍasimha</td>
<td>Choḍasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. .........</td>
<td>Vikrama Simha</td>
<td>Vikrama Simha</td>
<td>Vikramasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. .........</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>Raṇasimha</td>
<td>Raṇasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. .........</td>
<td>Kshema Simha</td>
<td>Kshema Simha</td>
<td>Kshemasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. .........</td>
<td>Sāmanta Simha</td>
<td>Sāmanta Simha</td>
<td>Sāmantasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. .........</td>
<td>Kumāra Simha</td>
<td>Kumāra Simha</td>
<td>Kumārasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. .........</td>
<td>Mathana Simha</td>
<td>Mathana Simha</td>
<td>Mathanasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. .........</td>
<td>Padmasimha</td>
<td>Padmasimha</td>
<td>Padmasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. .........</td>
<td>Jaitrasimha</td>
<td>Jaitra Simha</td>
<td>Jayasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. .........</td>
<td>Tejasimha</td>
<td>Tejasimha</td>
<td>Tejasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. .........</td>
<td>Samara Simha</td>
<td>Samara Simha</td>
<td>Samarasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. .........</td>
<td><em>(End of the line)</em></td>
<td>Bhuvana Simha</td>
<td>Ratanasimha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(The line continues)*
The succession list as well as genealogical list and the chronology of the later Guhila rulers given in any one of epigraphic records appears to be incomplete. Because, we find the omission of the names of some rulers in every epigraphic record. The gaps in one record however, may be filled in with the help of other epigraphic records. For example, in the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1331) only the names of the Guhila kings No. 21, 22 and 23 are found and a long list of rulers from No. 24 is missing. Similarly, in the Mount Abu Inscription (V.S. 1342) No. 21, 24, 26, 28, 34 are not found. In this epigraph, No. 43 is also absent, as the epigraph belongs to No. 42, that is, Samarasimha, who is the last king known from the record. The Mount Abu Inscription fills some gaps of the Chitor inscription. In the Rânpur Inscription (V.S. 1496) No. 21, 23 and 24 are only omitted and the name of Bhuvanasimha (No. 43) appears after that of Samarasimha who is described as the son of Bâppâ and conqueror of Alâuddin Khalji. The Kumbhalgarh Inscription (1460 A.D.) omits only No. 22 and 30. Anantavarmâ (Anantavarman), who is not mentioned in any other record, appears as the ruler No. 24 in the Kumbhalgarh Inscription as
the successor of Nṛivarman or Naravarman. Kṛti-varman (No. 25) of the Mount Abu and the Rānpur Inscription is probably the same as Yasovarman (No. 25) or Yasovarman of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription, as Kṛti and Yasó are synonymous. Vijayasimha (No. 30) of the Mount Abu Inscription appears to be the same as Virasimha (No. 30) of the Rānpur Inscription. In the Kumbhalgarh Inscription, this name is absent, but it is stated that he is a narendra, out of 20 sons of vairisimha. King Jaitrasimha (No. 40) of the Mount Abu and Rānpur Inscriptions may be reasonably equated with Jayasimha (No. 40) of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription. In the Kumbhalgarh Inscription, Samarasimha is succeeded by his son Ratanasimha. But Bhuvanasimha is found to be the successor of Samarasimha in the Rānpur Inscription. Vāṃsapāla (No. 28) of the RānPur Inscription is, no doubt, Hāṃsapāla (No. 28) of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription. Of all the above mentioned records, the Kumbhalgarh inscription, in spite of two omissions, seems to have provided us with a fuller and more dependable list of Guhila rulers.
Ambāprasāda

Saktikumāra was succeeded by his son Ambāprasāda according to the Kumbhalgarh Inscription\(^71\) (1460 A.D.). In the Chitor Inscription\(^72\) (V.S. 1331) we find the name of Amraprāsāda instead of Ambāprasāda. Ambāprasāda might have been known also as Amraprāsāda. The Mount Abu Inscription\(^73\) (V.S. 1342) and the Rānpur Inscription\(^74\) (V.S. 1496) place Suchivarman\(^75\) immediately after Saktikumāra. It appears that in these two records the name of Ambāprasāda has been missed or omitted.

An undated inscription of Ambāprasāda was found at Ahar\(^76\). The inscription records that the queen of Ambāprasāda came of the Chaulukya family. Ambāprasāda seems to have entered into matrimonial alliance with

---

73. I.A. XVI, p. 347.
76. RMR, 1914 p. 2.
the Chaulukyas against his contemporary Chāhamāna Vākpatirāja of Sākambhārī. But we have no evidence that the Chaulukyas were of any help to Ambāprasāda during his fight with the Chāhamāna ruler recorded in the Prithvīrajavijaya 77. In the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1331) Ambāprasāda is described as the destroyer of the Kshatriyas 78. The evidence of the Chitor Inscription clearly suggests that he came into conflict with the contemporary rulers. But it is difficult to assess the extent of his military achievement due to lack of substantial evidence.

No dated record of the time of Ambāprasāda has yet been discovered. We may, however, make an inference from indirect source. The date of the Ātpur Inscription of Saktikumāra (No. 20) is A.D. 977 and the date of the Kadmal Plates of Vijayasimha (No. 30) is A.D. 1083 79. The difference between these two dates is the period of (1083 - 977) = 106 years covered by nine generations.

77. Prithvīrajavijaya. Verses 59-60.
78. Verse 50, Bhāv. Ins. p. 75.
Allowing about 12 years for each reign on an average, Ambāprasadā's reign-period may be placed towards the close of the 8th decade of the 10th century A.D.

In the Prithvirājavijaya Ambāprasadā was designated as Āghatapati, that is lord of Āghāṭa or king of Āghāṭa or Āhār.⁸⁰

Chāhamāna Intervention

It was during the reign of Ambāprasadā that the Guhila power was threatened by the Chāhamāna ruler Vākpati of Sākambhari. The Prithvirājavijaya informs us that Sākambhari Chāhamāna Vākpatirāja sent Ambāprasadā, the lord of Āghāṭa, with his army to the abode of Yama.⁸¹ The move of the Chāhamāna ruler threw a challenge to the authority of the suzerain at Dhārā, that is, the Parmāra ruler. A measure of retaliation was taken. Viryārāma, the son and successor of Vākpati, paid by his life the

---

⁸¹. Prithvirājavijaya, verses 59-60.
penalty for the offence of his predecessor. As it is stated in the *Prithvirājaviṃśāta*, he met his doom at the hands of Bhoja, the Lord of Avanti.

Due to lack of epigraphic evidence at our disposal, we have to depend on the evidence furnished by the *Prithvirājaviṃśāta*. The Chāhānas attempted to take advantage of Ambāprāsađa's weakness. The intervention of the Chāhānas in Mewār was an open challenge to the Paramāras. Because, Paramāra Vākpati Munja had already established his political authority in Mewār. That explains why Viryāma, the son and successor of Sākambhari Chāhāna Vākpāṭirāja, met his death at the hands of Bhoja. The Paramāras were not prepared to suffer the loss of their political authority in Mewār.

Śūchivarman

In the *Chitor Inscription* (v.s. 1331) we find the name of Śūchivarman (or Śūchivarma) after Amrāprasāda, that is, Ambāprasāda. He is duly mentioned in the *Mount Ābu* and *Rāgpur Inscriptions*. 
The Kumbhalgarh Inscription\(^{82}\) (A.D. 1460) omits Śuchivarman and informs us that Ambāprāśāda had three brothers, namely Nṛivarmā (Naravarman), Anantavarmā (Anantavarman) and Yasōvarma, (Yasōvarman) who ruled one after another. But we can not ignore Śuchivarman mentioned in other records\(^{83}\).

The Āhār Hastamāta Temple Inscription of Śuchivarman\(^{84}\) tells us that he was the son of Saktikumāra and brother of Ambāprāśāda. We also come to know from this record that a temple of Rohillesvara was constructed by him. For the reign of Śuchivarman, we have hardly any political event of importance recorded.

A coin of Śuchivarman is found\(^{85}\). The coin is made of copper. The crown and the back of head are distinct. Before the king's face is engraved vertically sacha. The legend śuchi stands for Śuchivarman.

---

82. Verses 141-142, 3rd Slab, **E.I. XXIV**, pp. 304ff.
83. Verse 52, **Bhāv. Ins.** p. 75; verses 23-25, **I.A. XVI**, p. 347.
84. **Bhāv. Ins.** p. 72.
85. **JNSt. XX**, pp. 26ff.
After Suchivarman (998-1010 A.D.),
naravarman, Anantavarman and Yasovarman alias
Kirtivarman ruled in succession. The reign-period
of these three princes may be approximately the
period between A.D. 1010 and A.D. 1040. The period
witnessed an unimpressive political status of the
Guhilas.

Mahmud's Invasion

Sometime in the first-half of the 11th
century A.D. Sultan Mahmud invaded India. According
to Firishta 86, this invasion took place in 399 H.,
that is, A.D. 1008-1009. The rājās of Ujjain, Gwalior,
Kalinjara, Kanauj, Delhi and Ajmer entered into
a confederacy and advanced towards the Punjab with
a vast army to help Shāhī Anandapāla. According to
Pandit G.H. Ojha 87, Govindarāja, father of Vākpātī,
is credited by the Prabandhakośa with a victory over
Sultan Mahmud of Ghajnā. The encounter took place

87. HR. I, p. 439.
sometime between 1010 and 1026 A.D. It has been suggested by some scholars that the Guhilas of Chitor opposed Mahmud with all other powers but not prominently. But at that time the Guhilas were ruling not at Chitor but at Āghāṭa. They might have supplied contingent of troops, aids and weapons to the Ajmer kings of Ujjain, Kanauj, for their use against Mahmud. Therefore, in Firishtā's account the representation of the Guhilas is not recorded. The storm of Ghaznavide invasion might have touched Mewār lying midway between Ujjain and Ajmer. During the period of India's distress the Guhilas evidently did not stand as silent spectators. In defence of their motherland they might have stood against the foreign invasion. But they seem to have been more engaged in improving their position and status.

**Yogarāja**

Yaśovarman alias Kīrtivarman was succeeded by Yogarāja (1040–1050 A.D.) who himself enjoyed royalty but whose progeny did not is known only from

---

the Kumbhalgarh Inscription\textsuperscript{89} (A.D. 1460). A.K. Vyas, the editor of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription, suggests that the text as visible on the slab, although partially damaged, clearly seems to be \textit{tach-chhath} (Kh) \textit{an = 0} (Chhri (Chchhra) Yani qatā (II 20, 21) which clearly shows that the line of this prince was cut off from the throne due to some internal family-feud and the fortune finally fell on Vairāṭa, one of the pregency of Allaṭa\textsuperscript{90}. As suggested by Pandit Ojha, the line of Yogarāja came to an end during his own life time\textsuperscript{91}.

Vairāṭa

The line of Saktikumāra came to an end with Yogarāja, and Vairāṭa, the descencant of Allaṭa, belonging to the junior branch of the Guhilas, ascended the throne of Mewār. It has been suggested\textsuperscript{92}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{89} Verse 143, \textit{Kumbhalgarh Inscription} (1460 A.D.) E.I. XXIV, pp. 324ff.
\item \textsuperscript{90} \textit{Tataścha Yogarājabhūmedapāte Mahipatih ||
\textit{spi rājye sthite tasmin tachhākhī nichhirayang qatā ||
paschād Allaṭa Saśvantāne Vairāṭa - bhūn - nṛsā -
Varah || Tatah. Śrī Hamsapālaschā vairisimha
Nripāgranih || HR. II, p. 443.}
\item \textsuperscript{91} HR. II, p. 443.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Vyas. A.K. (ed.) 'Kadmal Plates' (V.S. 1140), E.I. XXXI, p. 242.
\end{itemize}
that it was Paramāra Bhoja who deposed Yogarāja and appointed Vairāṭa as the ruler of Mewār. Though we have no direct evidence to support this contention, but the possibility of Bhoja's (A.D. 1010-1055) intervention in the internal affairs of Mewār can not be ruled out as he held sway over Mewār. It has been suggested by Naiṣi that Vairāṭa was the son of Yogarāja. But his view seems is not corroborated by the epigraphic records.

In the Kadmal plates (A.D. 1083) of Vijaya-simha, we find the name of Mahipāla as the son of Allāṭa. After Mahipāla, the Kadmal plates snaps the regular line of succession and brings in Vairāṭa who is said to be the 9th prince in chronological order from Allāṭa. The name of Vairāṭa appears in the genealogy occurring in all important records.

Let us compare the list of rulers, from Allata to Vairata, as found in the Kadmal plates with that of other records.

Let us compare the list of rulers, from Allata to Vairata, as found in the Kadmal plates with that of other records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Naravahana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Salivahana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ambaprasada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suchivaran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anantavarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yosavarman alias Kirtivarman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vairata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Kadmal Plates refer to Mahlpala as the son of Allata, Naravahana and Mahlpala seem to have been brothers. The former being the elder son succeeded to the throne of Mewar, while the latter...
was probably granted a territory elsewhere. That might explain why the name of Mahipāla is omitted from the genealogical list of other important records. But the inclusion of Mahipāla in the main line and the omission of Naravāhana in the Kadmal Plates is difficult to understand, although, as suggested by the editor of the Kadmal Plates, it is not without significance.

Vairāṭa was the 10th prince after Allāṭa including Naravāhana of the main line, although the Kadmal Plates refers to him as the 9th including Mahipāla, the younger brother of Naravāhana. The matter is solved by the Kumbhalgarh Inscription which does not include Suchivarman in the list and makes Vairāṭa the 9th prince from Naravāhana. But we can not exclude Suchivarman from the dynastic list of the Guhila rulers as Suchivarman is mentioned in the Chitor, Mount Ābu and Rāppur Inscriptions.

It has been suggested by the editor of the Kadmal plates (A.D. 1083) that the position of Vairāṭa as the 9th with Mahipāla, as mentioned in the grant, appears to reckon him implicitly in combination with Naravāhana and his successors of the senior
branch, while the corresponding rulers or princes of the junior branch headed by Mahipāla are conspicuous by their very absence. It is not known how many princes intervened between Mahipāla and Vairaṭa in the junior branch. The dates of Allāṭa and Śaktikumāra extend over a period of 24 years from A.D. 953 to A.D. 977 covering the reigns of 4 princes with the allocation of an average period of 6 years for each reign. Applying the same average of the remaining 8 princes up to Vairaṭa, the date of Vairaṭa may be fixed as V.S. 1082, that is, A.D. 1025. It is also pointed out that the date of the fragment of an old epigraph preserved in the Victoria Hall Museum at Udaipur is V.S. 1083, that is, A.D. 1026.

G. C. Roychaudhuri 96 has brought to our notice two inscriptions engraved on two pillars of the cenotaph of Rāvāṭ Bhim Singh of Deoli at Jirān in Gwalior state dated A.D. 1000 and A.D. 1008 respectively, where it is stated that Vigrahapāla, born in the Guhilaputra family of Nāgahrada, held the title of Mahāśāmanādhipati 97, which is a clear proof that

96. HM. p. 43.

97. RMR. 1935-36, p. 2.
certain members of the Guhila family accepted a subordinate status under the suzerainty of some other power in the very beginning of the 11th century A.D. We find no Vigrahapāla in the genealogy of the Guhilaputras of Nāgahrada. It seems that Vigrahapāla was one of the members of Mahipāla-Vairāṭa tine.

**Position of Paramāra Bhoja in Chitor**

Chitor formed a separate administrative unit and continued to be a dependency of Mālwā from the last quarter of the 10th century A.D. to the first-half of the 11th century A.D. It is stated in the Tirthakalpa of Jinaprabha Sūri that Bhoja was living in Chitor in 1031 A.D.\(^98\) We also come to know from the Chirwā Inscription of Samarasingha\(^99\) (V.S. 1330) that Bhoja built the temple of Tribhuvanaṁarāyana in the fort of Chitor. It is

\(^98\) HM, p. 43.
stated in the Ujjain copper plate Inscription\(^{100}\) (A.D. 1021) that a grant was made by the king in Nāgadraha-Paśchima-Pathaka, which has been identified with Nāgḍā in Mewār\(^{101}\). The Kumbhalgarh Inscription\(^{102}\) (1460 A.D.) refers to a lake called Bhojasāra and a temple Dhāresvara near that city, which are the monuments bearing the testimony of Bhoja's influence in that territory.

A.K. Vyas, the editor of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription\(^{103}\), opines that the lake Bhojasāra was constructed by Bhoja, an early Guhila chief. He hardly seems to be correct, as we have no evidence indicating the constructive genius of the Guhila prince Bhoja. On the other hand, as Parāśara Bhoja had his authority recognised for a long time in Chitor, temples and lakes might reasonably have been constructed under his direct patronage.

Nāgadraha, referred to in the Ujjain Copper Plate Inscription\(^{104}\) (A.D. 1021) has been identified

\(^{100}\) I.A. VI, pp. 53-54.
\(^{101}\) HM. p. 43, I.A. VI, pp. 53-54.
\(^{103}\) Ibid. pp. 304ff.
\(^{104}\) Ganguly D.C., op.cit. pp. 84-85.
by D.C. Ganguly with the locality around the stream Nāgajhāri near Ujjain. But the identification of Nāgadraha with Nāgahrada or Nāgdā in Mewār is quite tenable.

It has been suggested by Naĩni that Vairata did not humble himself before the rulers of Gurjara and Dāhala. It is known that Paramāra Bhoja had to face a joint attack of Chaulukya Bhima I of Gujrat and Kalachuri Karṇa, king of Dāhala. Mālwā lay bleeding from the injuries and the invaders decided to divide Mālwā among themselves. The aged Paramāra warrior, Rājā Bhoja, made preparation for sustaining a long seige but he fell ill and died. The invaders attacked Dhārā with redoubled vigour and captured it. This event is to be assigned in A.D. 1055, as the first inscription of Bhoja's successor Jayasimha I was issued from Mandhata in Dhārā on the 13th of the

106. DHI. II, p. 869.
dark-half of Āśāṅga of V.S. 1112, that is, A.D. 1055\textsuperscript{108}. The tradition recorded by Naiṣṭa seems to imply that Vairāṭa witnessed the overthrow of Bhoja, the king of Mālwā, but did not submit to the victors\textsuperscript{109}.

There is no evidence to suggest that the immediate successors of Bhoja had any authority in the Guhila principality. There is no evidence at our disposal that after the death of Bhoja passed under the control of Chaulukya Bhima I (1022-1064 A.D.). It is, therefore, not unlikely to hold that following the death of Bhoja, the Guhilas of Āghāṭa sought to recover their independence. There is, however, no evidence to indicate that Chitor that had been under the direct occupation of Bhoja could immediately be brought under the occupation of the Guhilas.

**Date of Vairāṭa**

A.K. Vyas’s suggestion regarding the date of

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. HM. p. 45.
Vairāṭa, referred to above, is not beyond dispute. Basing on the date of Allāṭa (953 A.D.) and Śaktikumāra (977 A.D.), fourth in descent from him, and assigning for each reign an average period of six years he assigns 6 years on an average for each of the eight generations after Śaktikumāra. But the average reign-period of 6 years may not be applicable in all cases. On the basis of 6 years for each reign-period, Vyas fixes the date of Vairāṭa as V.S. 1082, that is, A.D. 1025-26. He further suggests that the fragmentary inscription of V.S. 1083 (A.D. 1026) which was lying in the Pratāp museum, Udaipur, belonged to Vairāṭa. There is hardly anything in the record to suggest that it was a record of the time of Vairāṭa. The names of the rulers in the epigraph are missing. The right-half portion of the inscription is damaged. In lines 5 and 6, the name of a ruler is mentioned, who used to give away gold in charity. His son was quiet powerful and unrivalled like Indra. As it is learnt from the Khyāta of Nāīṣi that Vairāṭa witnessed the overthrow of Bhoja, king of Mālwā.

111. HM. p. 45.
we may reasonably assign the reign of Vairata
between A.D. 1050-1060, which is quiet fitting in
the chronological framework between A.D. 977, the
date of Atpur Inscription of Saktikumara and
A.D. 1083, the date of Kadmal Plates of Vijayasimha.

A coin of Vairata has been discovered\(^{112}\). It
is made of copper. Before the bust of the king the
legend \textit{Sri Vairat} is inscribed. The second letter
Ra is just as the edge of the coin and is not
deeply impressed.

\textit{Hamsapala and Vairisimha}

Vairata was succeeded by Hamsapala and the
latter by Vairisimha\(^{113}\) sometime between 1060-
1083 A.D. The last date of Vairisimha is suggested
by the Kadmal plates dated A.D. 1083, belonging to
his successor Vijayasimha. We have no detailed
information regarding Hamsapala and Vairisimha.
Hamsapala is mentioned as Vamaapala in the Rampur
Inscription\(^{114}\) (V.S. 1496). The \textit{Sheraghat}

\(^{112}\) JNSt. XX, pp. 26 ff.
\(^{113}\) Verse 144, \textit{Kumbhalgarh Inscription} (1460 A.D.),
E.I. XXIV, pp. 304 ff.
\(^{114}\) Bhav. Ins. p. 113, No. 16.
Inscription 115 of Alhaṇadevi (A.D. 1155) yields the information that Hamsapāla humbled the pride of his foes combined. Vairisimha, it is stated in the inscription, displayed conspicuous gallantry while fighting with the enemies. It is difficult to identify the enemies of the Guhila princes. Tod 116 suggests that Bersi, who is probably to be identified with Vairisimha, killed the Ajmer ruler Durlabharāja, apparently the third Chāhāmanā prince of that name. But we are told by the Prithvirāja-vijaya that Durlabharāja III had a tragic and while fighting with the mātāngas 117. It is more probable that the enemies of the Guhilas were the Paramāras, led by either Jayasimha I (1055-1060 A.D.) or Udayāditya (1060-1087 A.D.). It is evident from the Verses 144-145 of the Kumbhalgarh Inscription (1460 A.D.), that Vairisimha erected a fresh rampart having four gates, facing all the four cardinal directions round Āghāṭa-Pattana. The original verse in the inscription 118 is as follows:—

117. Prithvirājavijaya. V. 68.
118. E.I. XXIV, p. 325.
It is also stated in the next verses that he (Vairisimha) had twenty-two meritorious sons of whom one, a 'narendra' was the most virtuous. This 'narendra' is certainly identical with Vijayasimha, who was one of the most important Guhila rulers and raised the status of the Guhila dynasty. The city of Aghaṭa, which had been destroyed by the Paramāra king Munja in the 7th decade of the 10th century A.D., was re-constructed and surrounded by walls on all the four sides in the time of Vairisimha. This seems to suggest that Vairisimha was anxious to ensure the security and protection of his capital-city in view of the continuing aggressive designs of the contemporary political powers. The action of Vairisimha also implies his plan for asserting the independent status of the Guhilas.

We have a coin of Hamsapāla and two of Vairisimha. The coin of Hamsapāla is of silver.

---

120. JNSt. XX, pp. 26 ff.
plated - copper. It is suggested that some traces of silver are still retained on this coin in spite of so many years of circulation. The legend is Śrī Ha. The second letter Ha, artistically inscribed, taken to stand for Hamsapāla.

Of the two coins of Vairisimha, the first is of copper. On this coin a part of the die is impressed. The bust of the king is not visible but Śrī Va is distinctly read. The upper part of Śrī is found to be blurred. The second coin is the same type as the first one.

Vijayasimha

The Bherāghāt Inscription of Alhaṇadevī (mother of Kalachuri Narasimhadeva) (A.D. 1155) informs us that Vijayasimha, successor of Vairisimha, married Śyāmaladevi, the daughter of Paramāra Udayāditya (1060-1087 A.D.) of Mālwā. Alhaṇadevī, the child of the union of Vijayasimha and Śyāmaladevi, was given to marriage with Kalachuri Gayākarna of Dāhala. By this matrimonial alliances friendly

121. E.I. II, p. 12, verses 21-23.
relations were established between the Paramāras of Mālwā and the Guhilas of Mewār. Later, friendly relations were established between the Guhilas and the Kalachuris by the marriage between Alhaqadevi and Gayākarna. The relevant information from the Bherāghat Inscription (1155 A.D.)\(^\text{122}\) may be shown in a table as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guhila</th>
<th>Paramāra Udayāditya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamsapāla</td>
<td>(1060-1087 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vairisimha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayāsimha</td>
<td>= Alhaqadevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1083 A.D.)</td>
<td>= Shyāmaladevi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Kalachuri Gayākarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1151 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Kadmal plates (V.S. 1140; A.D. 1083) refer to Vijayāsimha as Paramabhāttāraka Mahārājā-dhirāja Paramāsvara Māndalika\(^\text{123}\). These imperial titles suggest without doubt, his independent status.

Pandit G.H. Ojha\(^\text{124}\) suggests that the Pāldi Inscription dated V.S. 1173 (A.D. 1116) belonged to

---

124. URI. I, pp. 141-142.
the reign of Vijayasimha. More reasonably, the record belongs to Arisimha, the successor of Vijayasimha, who is described in verses 7 and 8. Arisimha is the last king mentioned in the inscription. The editor of the Pālī inscription is justified in suggesting that the epigraph belonged to the reign of Arisimha.

Vijayasimha’s accession took place at a time when the power of the Paramāras was on the decline and the Chaulukya power on the ascendancy. As pointed out rightly by G.C. Roy Choudhuri, the matrimonial alliances between the Guhilas and the Paramāras and between the Guhilas and Kalachuris suggest that Vijayasimha was afraid of a new danger arising in Gujrāt. It is to be noted that both the matrimonial alliances did not take place at the same time. Alhaṇadevī, the child of the union of Vijayasimha and Śyāmaladevī was given in marriage with Dāhala Kalachuri Gāyākarṇa at a later period. In view of the threat from the rising power of the Chaulukyas, Vijayasimha first contracted matrimonial
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alliance with the Paramāras. Vijayasimha might have later on felt the necessity for further strengthening his position by entering into alliance with the Kalachuris.