Chapter - II

Origin of the Guhilas

Scholars have put forward different views with regard to the origin of the Guhilas. Some favour their indigenous origin, while others uphold their foreign origin. Among those, who believe in their indigenous origin, some assume that the Guhilas were brāhmaṇa by caste, whereas others are of opinion that they were Kshatriyas. The views require to be re-assessed in the light of the available records.

Bardic tradition: Indigenous origin

The bardic tradition about the origin of the Guhilas is recorded by Tod in his Annals and Antiquities of Rajastan. According to it¹, "the rulers of Mewār were kacchuvāmsi section of the Solar race through Sumitra, Kaṇakaseṇa and Silāditya.

the last Valabhi king of Gujrāt. They are ranked as the first of the thirty-six Rajput tribes. Kaṇakaseṇa of the Solar dynasty came to Saurāṣṭra from Loha-koṭa (Lahore in modern Pakistan). He took possession of the kingdom of a Paramāra prince and founded the city of Viranagara in A.D. 144. Four generations later, Vijayasena, founded Vijayapura at the head of Saurāṣṭra Peninsula. In Saurāṣṭra, he founded Vidarbha, the name of which was later changed to Seehore, but his capital was at Valabhi. During the reign-period of Rāja Śilāditya, Valabhi was invaded and destroyed by the barbarians. The records preserved by the Jains give A.D. 524 as the date of this event. All fell in the sack of Valabhi, except Pushpavati, the queen of Rāja Śilāditya and the daughter of Paramāra Prince of Chandrāvatī. She had gone at that time for a pilgrimage to the place of Ambā Bhawānī and remained safe. Taking refuge in a cave in the mountains of Mālliā, she delivered a son, who came to be known as 'Guha' or 'Cave-born'. The child grew up in charge of Kamalāvatī, the married daughter of a brāhmaṇa of Viranagara. At a young age, he was elected king by the Bhils of Idar. During the period of the despotic rule of Nāgāditya, the eighth
prince of the line, the Bhils rising in rebellion killed him. Bāppā, the child of Nāgāditya, was then only three years of age. Under the protection of the descendants of Kamalāvatī, the hereditary priests of Guhila's successors, Bāppā was removed to the hilly region known as Nāgindra (Modern Nāgdā, near Udaipur). While tending cows, he met with Hārīta, a sage and worshipper of god Kalinga. Bāppā became a disciple of that sage and through his favour obtained invulnerability and other supernatural gifts. After the death of Hārīta, Bāppā entered the service of his uncle, the Mori prince of Chitor, the name of whom was Māna. After successfully repulsing a barbarian expedition from Gajni, he dethroned the Mori king and seized the crown. Thus was laid the foundation of the Guhila dynasty in Mewār".

From the above, we may derive the following:

a) There was a connection between the Guhila kings of Mewār and the Valabhi kings of Gujrat.

b) Guha's mother Pushpavatī was the wife of Śilāditya, the Valabhi king of Gujrat and therefore, Guha was the son of Śilāditya, the last Valabhi king of Gujrat.
c) Śilāditya belonged to the Raghuvamśi section of the Solar race through Sumitra, Kaṇakaseṇa etc.

Therefore, Guha belonged to the Raghuvamśi section of the Solar race. As the Guhilas belonged to the Solar race, they were Kshatriyas.

d) Guha's eighth successor Nāgāditya was killed following a rebellion by the Bhils.

e) Bāppā, the child of Nāgāditya, was brought up by their hereditary priests.

f) Bāppā met Hārita Rishi and received his blessings.

g) After the death of Hārita, Bāppā entered the service of his uncle and repulsing a foreign invasion of the Mori king and seized his crown to lay the foundation of the Guhila kingdom in Mewār.

Naiṇsi, a contemporary of Kānā Yasovantasingha of Mārwār, relates in the seventeenth century A.D. the story about the origin of the Guhilas in his Khyāṭā. In his opinion, the ancestor of the Guhilas was a king, who used to worship the Sun-god. But as

---

a Nāgḍā-Brāhmaṇa reared up the child of the king and as the progeny of the king adopted the brāhmaṇical rites and rituals for ten generations, they were called Nāgḍā Brāhmaṇas. The tradition about this indigenous Brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas recorded by Naiṣiṣi is as follows:

"Sisodiās in the early period were known as Gahilotas. Their forefather used to worship the Sun; their kingdom was located in the Deccan towards Nasik-Tryambak. On incantation, the Sun used to present himself in person and no one could win him in the battle. He was a ruler of vast lands. He had no son and to beget one, he prayed to the Sun. On this Sun said that he should promise a pilgrimage to goddess Ambā near Idar and wish a son and this would lead to the conception by the queen. The king promised the pilgrimage and the beloved queen conceived. When the queen proceeded on pilgrimage, the king did not worship the Sun, hence the enemies attacked him. The king was killed in the battle and his fort Bansala was taken by the enemies. The queen reached Nāgḍā on pilgrimage to Ambā, where she received the message of the death of her husband. On a funeral pyre she was to commit sati. To stop
her from doing so, the Brāhmaṇas told her that a woman bearing a child was prohibited to commit satī and the days of her delivery were near. After fifteen days, she bore a child. On the completion of fifteen to twenty days after that she bathed and got a pyre prepared. During this time, the Brāhmaṇa Vijayāditya was praying for a son in the temple of Koṭesvāra Mahādeva. The queen called him and gave him the child. But at the same time the Brāhmaṇa thought that as the child was the son of a king, that is Kājput, who being younger would hunt animals and fight with others and then he would fall in sin and his religion would vanish; therefore, then and there he wanted to hand over the child again to his mother. The queen assured him that if she was a satī, the princes who would be born in his family would follow the Brāhmaṇa dharmā for ten generations and then she became satī. The descendants of that son of Vijayāditya followed brāhmanical rites and rituals for ten generations and were known as Nāgdā Brāhmaṇas. Naiṣṭī states that the son of the same Vijayāditya was Guhiloṭ Somadatta and in his line were born Silāditya and his progeny".
From the account given by Naiṣī, we may derive the following:

a) The Guhilas were Sun-worshippers.

b) Their original home was in Nāsik-Tryambak in the Deccan.

c) A Guhila child (Somadatta) was brought up by a Nāgda-Brāhmaṇa named Vijayāditya as his adopted son.

d) Somadatta and his progeny followed Brāhmaṇical rites and rituals for ten generations, as the word was given by the mother of Somadatta to Brāhmaṇa Vijayāditya.

e) In this line of Somadatta was born Śilāditya and his progeny.

f) The Guhilas were not originally Brāhmaṇas.

If we compare the bardic tradition with the account of Naiṣī, we find both similarities and dissimilarities between the two as indicated below:

**Similarities:**

a) Both relate non-Brāhmaṇ indigenous origin of the Guhilas.
b) Both suggest that the early Guhilas were intimately associated with the Ṛāhmanas.

Dissimilarities:

a) While bardic tradition indicates the origin of the Guhilas from Valabhi in Gujrāt, Naiṇśi's account points to the Deccan as the place of their origin.

b) In the bardic tradition we find mention of the king 'Śilāditya and his queen Pushpavatī whose son was Guha. But in Naiṇśi's account the names of the king and the queen are conspicuous by their absence, although the name of their son Somadatta is found.

c) The son of Śilāditya and Pushpavatī, Guhadatta or Guha, was brought up by Kamalāvatī of Vīrnagar. But Guhila Somadatta is said to have been brought up by Nāgda Ārāhmanā Vijayāditya.

We may next take into consideration two literary sources, Rājavilāsa Kāvya and Virvinod. In the Rājavilāsa Kāvya (composed during the time of Kāṇā Rājasimha, sometime in the 17th century A.D.),
Guhadatta, the originator of the Guhila family, is connected with the royal house of Valabhi. Kaviraj Shyamaldas in his Virvinod has suggested that the rulers of Mewar come from Valabhi, and that the king after whose death, the early rulers of the Guhila line came to Mewar was other than Siladitya. He also suggests that the Guhilas represented one of the thirtysix Rajput clans.

The Ekalingamahatmya (composed during the reign of Rana Kumbha in the 15th century A.D.) describes Vijayaditya, a mythical ancestor of the Guhilas, as Nagara-kula-mandana. The translation of the text from Verse I to Verse 8 is given below:

"Triumphant are the god Sri Ekalinga (Gotra) and the family called Vaijavapa famous in the world, purifying the people on the whole of the earth and of much greatness.

Triumphant is the Brahmana named Vijayaditya, the ornament of the Nagara family in Anandapura, a

god on earth, and proficient in sacrificial and other rites. His son was the best of the Brāhmaṇas, Kesāva by name. His son was Nāga Rāula and then (followed the genealogy) Bhoga Rāula, Āśādhara, Śrī Deva, Mahādeva, and then the ornament of the family was Guhadatta, by whose name this race is still known in the world. Triumph to Guhadatta, who was delighter to the Brāhmaṇa family coming from Ānandapura and the founder of the illustrious Guhila race, which was said by the old poets”.

From the Ekalingamāhātmya it appears that

a) Vijayāditya, the mythical ancestor of the Guhilas, was the ornament of the Nāgara family of Ānandapura.

b) The gotra of the Guhilas was Vaijavāpa.

c) The genealogy of the ancestors of Guhadatta indicates the following order: Vijayāditya, Kesāva, Nāga-Rāula, Bhoga Rāula, Āśādhara, Śrī Deva and Mahādeva.

d) Guhadatta, the founder of the Guhila dynasty, is said to be a delighter of the Brāhmaṇa family that is, he belonged to the Brāhmaṇa family hailing from Anandapura. The Brāhmaṇic indigenous origin of the Guhilas is thus suggested by the Ekalingamāhātmya.

The Rājaprasāasti Mahākavya composed by Pandit Rinachoda gives an account of the kings of the Śūrya dynasty from a very remote period. The genealogy given in the Rājaprasāasti is copied down in two epigraphs of the 17th century A.D. found near Rājnagar in Mewār. It gives the genealogy of the Śūrya dynasty from Vijaya to Guhaditya. The sons of Guhaditya are called Guhiloṭs of whom Bappa was the eldest one. It indicates non-Brāhmaṇic indigenous origin of the Guhilas.

The 'Kasika-Priyā', a commentary on Jayadeva's Gita-Govinda, was composed by Rāṇa Kumbha-Karnā. In it Bappā is referred to as Dvija-punyaga and as belonging to Vaijavāpa gotra. It appears therefore,

8. 'Rāysāgar Talāo Ins. V.S. 1732 (A.D. 1675)' Bhāv. Ins. p. 145 see also 'Rājaprasāasti Ins. of Udaipur, Slab III Canto II', E.I. XXX, p. 93.
Bāppā, belonging to the Guhila line, was a leading brāhmaṇa of the Vaijāvāpa gotra. The gotra Vaijāvāpa is also the gotra of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Ānandapura. It suggests the Brāhmanic indigenous origin of the Guhilas.

In the Tuzuk¹⁰, we find that the early kingdom of the Guhilas was in the Deccan. It is not, therefore, unreasonable to assume that Naṅgiṣi borrowed his data of the Guhilas from Tuzuk.

In the Farīkh-1-Mālwa composed by Munshi Karimuddin in the middle of the 19th century A.D. there is a tradition of the brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas¹¹.

In the 17th century, Thomas Roe¹², Bernier¹³ and other European travellers left their accounts telling us that the Rāṇā claimed descent from Puru who ruled on the bank of the Nīdaspaš at the time of

---

10. Tuzuk I, Tr. Rogers and Beveridge, p. 250.
Alexander's invasion. The accounts suggest non-brāhmanic indigenous origin of the Guhilas.

An analysis of the above-mentioned sources leave no scope of doubt about the indigenous origin of the Guhilas, whether brāhmaṇa or Kṣatriya by caste.

**Tradition of Foreign origin**

Writing in the latter half of the 16th century A.D. Abul Fazl suggested that the Guhila dynasty was descended from the family of Nōshirwān-ī-Ādil, the emperor of Iran. Again, he stated that as a Brāhmaṇa, at the beginning of the history of the Guhilas, nurtured their house, they are accounted as belonging to this caste.

The Persian origin of the Guhilas, as stated by Abul Fazl, is further elaborated by the author of Māsir-UL-UMARĀ. Lakṣmana Nārāyaṇ Sufi Aurangabadi, the author of the Bīsātul Ganāim, also

---

confirmed the view (A.D. 1790). We are told that the Kāṇās of Mewār were the ancestors of Šivājl and they were supreme among the princes of Hind. They deduced their origin from Noshirwān-1-Ādil, who had conquered many parts of Hindustan. Noshirwān married the daughter of Kesar belonging to Rum (Turkey). His son by that wife was Noshizad who came with a large force to India. Later, he attacked his father in Iran but was killed. But his descendants remained in India and were known as the Kāṇās of Mewār.\(^{15}\)

Tod again mentions a different tradition regarding the foreign origin of the Guhilas. He states\(^{16}\) that it was morally impossible that the Kāṇās should have their lineage from any male branch of the Persian house. It is said that Iranian ruler Yezdegird's fugitive daughter Mañabānu married the ruler of Saurāṭra. She might be Subhagaṇa, mother of Śilāditya.

As regards Persian origin of the Guhilas, it is stated in the Opodes Prasad, a collection of

\(^{15}\) AR. I, p. 253.

\(^{16}\) AR. I, p. 257.
historic fragments in the Magadhi dialect, that Subhagāṇa was the only child of Brāhminī Devādit of Kaira in Gujrat. But Tod has identified Mahābāṇu, the daughter of Yezdegird with Subhagāṇa, the daughter of Brāhmaṇa Devādit. It is stated that of the eldest daughter of Yezdegird, Mahā Bāṇu, the Parsees have no accounts, although the books of Hind give evidence of her arrival in that country and hint that from her issue is the tribe Sesodiā.

**Epigraphic evidence: Brāhmin or Kshatriya Origin**

In the light of the epigraphic records, scholars have expressed divergent views in regard to the origin of the Guhilas. While some are of opinion that they were descended from the Brāhmin family, others hold that they were of Kshatriya origin and were descended either from the Solar or the Lunar race. There is, of course, another group of scholars who suggest Brahma-kshatrad origin of the Guhilas. Scholars in favour of the Brāhmaṇa origin of the

17. Ibid. p. 251.
18. Ibid. p. 255.
Guhilas are led by D.K. Bhandarkar\textsuperscript{19}, while those who more or less follow Pandit G.H. Ojha\textsuperscript{20} suggest the Kshatriya origin of the Guhilas, belonging to the Solar or the Lunar race.


Brāhmaṇa origin

The Ātpur Inscription\(^{21}\) (A.D. 977), referring to Guhadatta as Vipra\'lanandana or Vipra\'lanandana, suggests that he belonged to the Brāhmaṇa family hailing from Ānandapura. 'Vipra' should stand for Brāhmaṇa, although it has been taken by some to mean 'sage' or 'wise man'. Again, the expression 'Mahidevaḥ' may reasonably be explained as a Brāhmaṇa instead of a king as suggested by some scholars.

Again, the Chitorghān Inscription (V.S. 1331)\(^{22}\) and the Mount Abu Inscription (V.S. 1342)\(^{23}\) refer to Śāppā as a Brāhmaṇa. The first one describes him as a vipra, hailing from Ānandapura, while the other record suggests the exchange of his brāhmaṇhood for Kshatra-splendour. Besides, in the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1331)\(^{24}\), Ambāprasāda is said to have destroyed the Kshatriyas like Parasurāma (Bṛgupatirivadṛiptah Kshatrasamhārakārī). It implies probably that as Parasurāma was a Brāhmaṇa but discharged the functions

\(^{21}\) I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
\(^{22}\) 'Verses 9 to 11', Bhāv.Ins., pp. 74ff.
\(^{23}\) 'Verses 10 to 11', I.A. XVI, pp. 347ff.
\(^{24}\) 'Verse 50', Bhāv.Ins., pp. 74ff.
of a Kshatriya, so also was Ambāprasaḍa. Similarly, in the Chātsu Inscription\textsuperscript{25} of Guhila Bālāditya of the 10th century A.D., Bhartrīpāṭṭa, the founder of the Chātsu branch, is described as ārahma-Kshatra like Pārasūrama. In the Skaliṅga Inscription (V.S. 1545)\textsuperscript{26} Bāppā is called dvija, that is, 'twice born', generally referring to a Brāhmaṇa. Pandit G.H. Ojha refers to an epigraph (1186 A.D.)\textsuperscript{27} from Pushkar. He notices in it the mention of a Thākura of the Gautama gotra belonging to the Guhila family. 'Thākura' is an epithet generally applied in the case of the most honourable man in the society, that is, in all probability, a Brāhmaṇa.

D.K. Bhandarkar\textsuperscript{28} suggests that Guhadatta, the founder of the Guhila dynasty of Mewār, was a Nāgara Brāhmaṇ from Vādnagar and that he was a Mer of foreign origin. Both the Nāgaras and the Maitrakas of Valabhi are held to be foreigners, who appeared in India along with the Hūṇas in the 6th century A.D. Although it is admitted that the family of the Rāṇās

\textsuperscript{25} E.I. XII; p. 10.
\textsuperscript{26} 'Verse 12', Bhāv. Ins., p. 118.
\textsuperscript{27} Cf. Bhandarkar’s List No. 407.
\textsuperscript{28} JAS\textsuperscript{3} (1909), pp. 167 ff.
was not descended from Silāditya, the last prince of Valabhī, the connection between Mewār and Valabhī dynasties is recognized by Bhandarkar. As pointed out by him, the names of certain Nāgara Arāhmanāc donees end with 'Mitra', while the Valabhī princes are referred to as Maitrakas in their records. 'Mitra' and 'Maitraka' are supposed to be appellations used by allied clans deriving their origin from a common foreign stock. As both 'Mitra' and 'Mihira' denote the sun, the Maitrakas are identified with the Mihirās, a well-known tribe, also known as Meherṣ or Merṣ.

Kshatriya origin

Pandit G.H. Ojha suggests the solar origin of the Kshatriya Guhilas mainly on the basis of the Kālimiṅga Inscription of Naravāhana (A.D. 971) and the gold coin attributed to Sāppā. It is stated in line 13 of Naravāhana's Kāliṇiṅga Inscription:

Yoginah Sapanugrahaḥbhūmāyo Himasaila Vandhojja
Valādāgirāraseto Raghuvamśa Kīrtipịṣunāṭrivraṁ tapaḥ.

30. Line 13, Jhav. Ins., p. 69.
The expression **Raghuvamsa-Klrtipisunah**, Ojha thinks, is applied to the ascetics of Ekaliṅga where the heads of monasteries are called 'the abode of favour and curse', the acclaimer of the fame of **Raghuvamsa** from the Himalayas to Setuandha-Kāmeśvara. Ojha suggests that **Raghuvamsa** in this context stands for the family of Mewār, that is, the Guhila line. Further, the occurrence of the solar symbol on the gold coin of Bāppa is held to be a corroboration of the epigraphic evidence that the Guhila line to which Bāppa belonged was descended from the solar race of Epic and Purānic fame.

In the Ātour Inscription (977 A.D.)\(^{32}\), Naravāhana is referred to as Kshatrakshetra. Ojha thinks that Kshatrakshetra stands for Kshatriyaka utpattisthāna, that is, 'originator of the Kshatriyas'\(^{33}\). In the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1335)\(^{34}\), Simha is called a Kshatriya. In the Śrīṅgi Kishi Inscription of Mokāla\(^{35}\) (V.S. 1485), Kshetra-simha is described as Kshatriyavamsamandanamoni. In

---

32. 'Verse 6', I.A. XXXIX, pp. 191ff.
34. JASB, LV Pt.I, p. 48.
35. S.I. XXIII, pp. 234-237.
the Nāḍīai Inscription of Rāimala \(^\text{36}\) (V. S. 1557), Guhadatta, Bāppā and Khummāna are described as Sūryavamsī Rājās. In another Nāḍīai Inscription \(^\text{37}\) of the time of Rāimala, a Guhila Prince is given the epithet Mṛgāṅkavamsā dyotakāraka. Mṛgāṅkavamsā appears to stand for the Lunar race, to which the Guhilas might have belonged. Mṛgāṅka is also found to be used as an epithet of Mokāla in the Kumbhalgarh Inscription (1460 A.D.) \(^\text{38}\). An early inscription found from Nāgdā dated A.D. 1026 \(^\text{39}\) has a reference of the ruler of the solar race. This epigraph is said to have furnished the earliest evidence supporting the traditional account of the origin of the Guhilas. In the Nāgpur Museum Inscription of 13th century A.D. \(^\text{40}\), belonging to the Guhilot family migrated from Chitor, the Guhilotṣ are referred to as Kshatriyas. In another

---

\(^{36}\) NFP, I, p. 268.

\(^{37}\) RmK, 1931-32, p. 4.

\(^{38}\) '4th slab', E.I. XXI, p. 284.


\(^{40}\) NFP, VI, No. 1, p. 4.
fragmentary inscription of the time of Mokāla, it is stated, that Guhila the 'head of the princes' belonged to the Saptasvamśa (that is solar line)41.

Assessment of the extant theories

The theory of foreign origin of the Guhilas propounded by Bhandarkar, as already referred to, is not beyond criticism. It has been opined on the basis of the Ālina Charters42 that the names of certain Nāgara Brāhmaṇa donees end in 'Mitra'43. Mitra was the name by which the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas were distinguished from other sub-castes of Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, the Vaijāvāpa gotra Nāgara Brāhmaṇas' names end in Āditya, as 'it is learnt from the Ekalingamāhātmya. In the Ālina Charters44, the gotra of the Brāhmaṇa donees was Sarkarākkhi. If the Guhilas were descended from the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas, they can hardly be treated as descended from the Mers, who are known to have formed a well-known

42. I.A. VII, pp. 66ff.
44. I.A. VII, pp. 66-86.
outcaste people of Kātiāwār. Again, if the Guhilas
are held to be of foreign origin, they can not be
recognized as Brāhmaṇas. The law-givers like Maṇu
recognized the Sakas, Yavanas and Pahlavas as
'degraded Kshatriyas' only. Secondly, there is
little ground for believing that 'Maitra' and 'Mitra'
denote allied clans and sprang from the same foreign
tribe. Thirdly, the connection of the Guhilas with
the Maitrakas are based upon a tradition which is
not beyond doubt. There remains some chronological
difficulties in linking the Guhilas with the
Maitrakas.

Bhandarkar theorises that 'there is hardly
a class or caste in India, which has not a foreign
strain in it'. The view questions the foundation
of Indian social fabric itself and diffuses the
distinction between indigenous and foreign stocks.
This is, to say the least, an over-statement in
spite of the widely recognized foreign elements in
the Hindu population.

46. Bhandarkar, D.R., 'Foreign Elements in the Hindu
Population', Journal of Ancient Indian History
The theory of Kshatriya origin of the Guhilas, as stated by Pandit G.H. Ojha, also deserves criticism. Ojha\textsuperscript{47} stresses main emphasis mainly on an expression in Naravāhana's \textit{Ekalinga Inscription} (971 A.D.) and the occurrence of the solar symbol on a gold coin attributed to Bāppā. The expression \textit{Raghuvaṃśa-kīrti-Pisunāḥ}, actually an epithet of Setu (that is, Adam's bridge, regarded in Epic and Purānic tradition as built by Rāma' of Ayodhya), has been supposed to indicate the \textit{Surya-vaṃśa} origin of the Guhilas\textsuperscript{48}. Again, even if the gold coin in question attributed to Bāppā is considered to be genuine, the said solar symbol occurring on it might indicate the personal religious faith of the issuer of the coin instead of the line of his descent.

In the \textit{Ātpur Inscription}\textsuperscript{49} (977 A.D.), Naravāhana is referred to as \textit{Kshtrakshetram} which, according to Ojha\textsuperscript{50}, means 'originator of the Kshatriyas'. It implies that the Guhila family to which Naravāhana belonged was Kshatriya by caste.

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. Sircar, D.C., \textit{op.cit.}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{IA}. XXXIX, p. 191.
\textsuperscript{50} \textit{JR}. I, p. 377.
In the Chitor Inscription (v.s. 1335)\(^{51}\), Simha is simply styled as 'Kshatriya'. There remains doubt about the genuineness of the Nägđā Inscription\(^{52}\) (A.D. 1026) and the Nāgpur Museum Inscription\(^{53}\) of the 13th century A.D. From the epigraphs like the Śrīṇgi Righi Inscription of Mokāla (v.s. 1485)\(^{54}\), the Nāḍlāī Inscription of Kāimala (v.s. 1557)\(^{55}\), it may be inferred that the Guhils began to claim their solar and Kshatriya origin at a late period. But no such claim can be traced in the early records of the Guhilas. In the Śāmoli Inscription of Śilāditya (A.D. 646)\(^{56}\), which is the earliest known epigraphic record of the Guhila dynasty, are to be found the military activities ascribed to Sila in the capacity of a Rājā. But such activities were not unknown in the career of a Brāhmaṇa like Pārasurāma. In the Nāgdā Inscription of Aparājita (A.D. 661)\(^{57}\), we find

---

52. E.I. IV, pp. 31-32.
53. NPP. VI, No.1, p. 4.
54. E.I. XXIII, pp. 234-237.
55. NPP. I, p. 268 fn. 53.
56. E.I. XX, p. 97.
57. E.I. IV, pp. 31-32.
the expression Guhilāṇavya, that is, 'the family or dynasty of the Guhilas', without any specific mention of their caste, Brāhmaṇa or Kshatriya. In the Śrīngi Rishi Inscription dated A.D. 1428 (V.S. 1485)58, Kshetrasimha is only described as Kṣhatriyavamsa-mandanamoni, that is, 'the Jewel of the Kshatriya Race'.

It is true that the Guhila princes established matrimonial relations with other dynasties who were of Kshatriya origin. Mahālakshmi, the queen of Bhartripāṭṭa II, was born in the Rāṣṭra-kūṭa family59. Naravāhana married the daughter of Chāhamāna King Jejaya60. Guhila, the grandfather of Bālāditya of the Chāsu line, had matrimonial relation with the Paramāras, while Bālāditya himself married Raṭṭava, daughter of the Chāhamāna king Śivavājā61. Of course, the matrimonial alliances of

59. 'Verse 4, Ātpur Inscription of A.D. 977', I.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
60. Ibid. Verse 6.
61. 'Verse 24 and verse 33 of the Chāsu Inscription of Bālāditya', E.I. XII, p. 10.
the Guhilas with the dynasties of Kshatriya origin might indicate their caste, although the probability of inter-caste marriages in case of ruling dynasties can not be ruled out. It would not be unreasonable to assume that since the time of Jappā, the Guhilas began to embrace Kshatriyahood by forsaking the Brāhmanical rituals. This is evident furnished by Verse II of the Mount Abu Inscription of V.S.1342\(^62\).

**Theory of Brahma-Kshatraprakrti origin**

In the Chātsu Inscription\(^63\) of Bālāditya, belonging to the Chātsu branch of the Guhilas, we find the expression *Brahma-Kshatra* or *Brahma-Kshatrānvita*. In this record Bhartripattra, the earliest ruler of the line, is described as *Brahma-Kshatrānvita*. The expression *Brahmakshatriya* has been explained differently thus\(^64\):

---

63. 'Verse 6', *E.I.* XII, p. 10.
a) The Brahma-Kshatra is one who was Brāhmaṇa first but afterwards changed his occupation or profession to attain the status of Kshatriyas, that is, exchanged priestly for martial pursuits.

b) The Brahma-Kshatra is a line from which both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas sprang.

c) The Brahma-Kshatriyas were those who sprang from the parents, one of whom was a Brāhmaṇa and the other a Kshatriya.

The first of these three interpretations is found to be endorsed by the epigraphic evidence regarding matrimonial alliances. But since inter-caste marriage-system was not unknown in the early period, the Brāhmaṇas desiring the Kshatriya status might have entered into matrimonial relations with the Kshatriyas.

As regards the second interpretation, it may be pointed out that in the Purāṇas, the Pauravas are certainly regarded as Kshatriyas, but the

descendants of the Paurava king Ajāmīḍha, the Kānvāyanas and the Kausikas, were Brāhmaṇas. In the Chātu Inscription of Bālāditya, Bhartṛipatṭa is called Brahma-Kshatrānvita. The word ānvita generally indicates the relation of both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas.

So far as the third interpretation is concerned, the birth of the Brahma-Kshatriya as a result of inter-marriage between Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas is again supported by the epigraphic evidence.

Of the three interpretations mentioned above, the first one is accepted by D.R. Bhandarkar. Bhandarkar, while examining the Chātu Inscription, observes that in the family of Guhila was born Bhartṛipatṭa, who was powerful and destroyer of enemies like Kāma and was having the virtues of Brahma and Kshatra. Just as Parasurāma was a Brāhmaṇa

67. Ibid. IV, 7.
68. E.I. XII, p. 10.
70. JASB (1909), pp. 176ff.
by caste but performed the martial activities of Kshatriya, so also did Bhartriharita, the Guhila ruler71. This is no doubt a reasonable way of explaining the claim of the Guhilas to the status of Brahma-Kshatra or Brahma-Kshatriya.

Pandit G.H. Ojha72, on the other hand, has examined the relevant Purānic accounts to opine that the Puru-vamsa was responsible for the origin of the Brahma-Kshatra line that combined the qualities of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kshatriya. Again, it is also taken into account that Vishṇuvṛiddha and Harita, belonging to the solar line, attained Brāhminhood, and Visvāmitra and Arītāsena, belonging to the lunar line, attained Brāhminhood, implying thereby the change of one Varna or social status for the other.

The epigraphic records refer to the Senas and the Paramāras as Brahma-Kshatra, implying probably that they were originally Brāhmaṇas but later Kshatriyas by profession. This explanation also

71. E.I. XII, pp. 10ff.
applies to the case of Shartripat̍ta referred to above.

B.D. Chattopadhyay⁷³, while analyzing the origin of the Rājputs on the basis of political, economic and social processes in the early mediaeval Rājasthān, suggests that the Guhilas of Chātsu, who were originally the feudatories of the Mauyas and the Pratihāras, began to claim a Brahma-Kshattra status in the middle of the 10th century A.D. According to Chattopadhyay, Brahma-Kshattra is a transitional status, the transition from the Brāhmaṇa to the Kshatriya status. The following evidences are found relevant in this connection.

a) The Guhilas of Mewār are known from the 10th to the 11th century to have claimed descent from a Brāhmaṇa family of Anandapura⁷⁴.

b) A 13th century record⁷⁵ implies the claim to Brahma-Kshatra status of the Guhila family of Mewār.

---

⁷³ 'Origin of the Rajputs', Indian Historical Review, Vol. III, No.1, July, 1976, Chapter 1 to V, pp. 59 to 82.
⁷⁵ 'Mount Abu Inscription (V.S.1342)', I.A.XVI, p.347.
c) A record of A.D. 1540\(^{76}\) claims that the family belonged to the Śilādityavamsa, that is, Suryavamsa, implying their claim to the solar origin.

As suggested by S.D. Chattopadhyay, if it be accepted on the strength of their relatively later records that the Guhilas were originally of Brāhmaṇa descent, although no claims to such descent have been made in their early records, then the status was being projected in order to legitimize their new Kshatriya role. Brahma-Kshatra was relatively an open status, as can be gathered from its wide currency in India during this period, which was seized upon by the new royal families before they could formulate a pure Kshatriya origin. The verse of the Mount Abu Inscription of v.s. 1342 (A.D. 1285)\(^{77}\), where Bāppā exchanged the Brāhma for the Kshatra splendour, according to Chattopadhyay, marked a period of change from feudatory to independent status. The early Guhilas of Kiṣkindhā and Dhavagarta were feudatories, and Bāppā Rāval, the traditional

\(^{76}\) Bhāv. Ins., p. 141.

\(^{77}\) 'Verse 11'.
founder of the Guhila line in Mewār, appears to have begun his career from a feudatory status which is indicated by the title Kāvāl.

Chattopadhyay's inferences derived from a comparative study of the epigraphic records deserve consideration. It is true that in the early records of the Guhila family there is hardly any claim to the Brāhmaṇa origin. Again, in these records, we hardly find any reference to the Kshatriya origin of the Guhilas. That Brāhma-Kšatra status was open to all and that the change of caste-status from brahmin-hood to Kshatriyahood indicates a change of political status are assumptions which hardly bear scrutiny. In case of the main branch of the Guhilas, the available records, if studied in chronological order, do suggest the change of the Brāhmaṇical Pursuits in favour of the Kshatriya ones. But the change of political status might be incidental having necessarily no correspondence. That Bhātrīpara of the Chātu branch obtained the Brāhma-Kšatra status after having repudiated the suzerainty of his overlord is not clearly evident from the records. It is generally found that a feudatory having Mahārāja
title assumes the title of Mahārāja Mahiraj after the assumption of an independent status. Such indication is not found in the cases of Sāppā or Bhistripaṭṭa.

In fact, we have three categories of records, one referring to the Brāhmin origin, the second one to the Kshatriya origin, and the third one claiming Brāhma-Kshatra status for the Guhilas. The trend of the epigraphic evidence is too apparent to be missed. The chronological arrangement of the available Guhila records indicate that upto a certain period, they claimed the Brāhmaṇa status and later the Kshatriya status. It is known from the Dharma-Sūtras, the Arthasastra and the Smritis that one's Brāhmanahood or Kshatriyahood is known by the functions discharged or the profession adopted by one. The epigraphic records indicate that at one time the Guhilas might be devoted to the Vedic study and sacrifices and other associated Brāhmaṇical rites and rituals, and later, they became involved in military pursuits and wielding political authority. This is evident from Sāppā's exchange of Brāhma for Kshatra splendour. 78.

78. I.A. XVI, p. 347.
The records like the Chātu inscription of Bālāditya⁷⁹ suggest that the Guhilas at a certain stage claimed both Brāhminhood and Kshatriyahood. Incidentally, we may refer to the origin of the Senas of Bengal who have claimed themselves to be Brāhma-Kshatra in their epigraphic records. The remote ancestor of the Senas, as we learn from the Deopāra Prasāsti⁸⁰, were devoted to the Brāhmaical rites and rituals. But, later, the Senas acquired proficiency not only in fighting against their political rivals but also in skilfully administering the kingdom of Bengal founded by them. Another explanation of Brāhma-Kshatra may be sought for the Jodhpur Inscription of Bāuka⁸¹, where it is stated that Harichandra, the ancestor of the Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty, was a Brāhmin by caste. The sons of his Brāhmin wife became Pratihāra Brāhmīns, while the sons of his Kṣatriya wife formed the Pratihāra ruling dynasty claiming Kshatriyahood. But such a clear epigraphic evidence is not yet available in

⁷⁹. E.I. XII, pp. 10ff.
⁸¹. E.I. XVIII, pp. 87ff.
case of the Guhilas so that we can hardly endorse that their Brahma-Kshatra status was the result of inter-caste marriage.

**Ethnic status of the Guhilas**

The Guhilas, who were known as one of the distinguished thirty-six Rājput tribes, had political and social association with the aboriginal tribes like Bhils, the descendants of the Nishādas. That the Bhils fought as soldiers under the Guhila rulers is evident from an epigraphic record. It is stated that the dhilla women fought desperately against the enemies of Allāta. Some of the Bhils also claimed descent from the Guhilas. It is recorded by Tod that Guha was elected king by the Bhils and that Śāppā was protected in his infancy by a Dhil. The Dhil chiefs still claim the privilege of performing the tīkā on the inauguration of the descendants of Śāppā. As Hinduism became orthodox in Rājputāna, the Dhils sank to the position of an outcaste. The Bhil

---

82. Bhāv. Ins., pp. 74ff.
84. AR I, p. 184.
chiefs of Oggā, Panarwā and Jawās regard themselves as of mixed Rajput and Shil descent. Chacha and merā, the sons of Māharājā Mokāl, were born of a lady belonging to the carpenter caste. The rulers and aristocrats sometimes married women of lower caste for personal reasons as falling in love with them or winning a particular class which yields a great deal of political and military influence. The probability of the admixture of the Guhilas with some foreign tribes like the Hūnas can not be ignored. The Ātpur inscription informs us that Guhila Allāta married Hūṇa Hariyādevī (verse 5).
The available evidence, although inadequate, suggests that the Guhilas ethnically represented an admixture of predominantly indigenous and partially foreign elements. The Brāhmīnhood or the Kshatriyahood, as claimed in their records, indicates the process of acculturation that ultimately to their attainment of the position of the ruling class.

87. Khyāta— f. 5a.
89. I.A. XXIX, p. 191.
Original Kingdom of the Guhilas

Ābul Fazl states in the ĀlN-I-Akbari that the ancestor of the Guhilas came to Berar and distinguished himself as the chief of Narnālāh. About eight hundred years prior to the time of Ābul Fazl, Narnālāh is said to have fallen into the hands of an enemy and one Bāpa, a child, was taken to Mewār, where he found refuge with the Chīl chief Mandālik. Jahāngīr writes in his Memoirs (early 17th century A.D.) that the Sisodias have long borne towards the East, that is purāb. After this they came to Deccan and took possession of many countries of Mewāṭ and by degrees got into their possession the fort of Chitor. It is stated by Nāpī that their early kingdom was in Nāsik-Tryambak. The Rājaprasāasti Mahākāvyā of the time of Kāñā Rājasimha states that they went to the south after leaving Ayodhyā.

The traditions regarding the original kingdom of the Guhilas are to be tested in the light of

epigraphic evidence. It is stated in the Ātpur Inscription (A.D. 977) that Guhadatta, the founder of the Guhila family, came from Anandapura. According to D.K. Bhandarkar, Anandapura is to be identified with Vadnagar in Gujrat. This identification is accepted by most of the modern scholars. Anandapura, the settlement of the Nāgara-śrāvānas, is also known from the Vadnagar Prasasti of Kumārapāla. Again, C.V. Vaidya suggests that Anandapura is to be identified with Nāghhrida, modern Nāgapāna near Udaipur. It has been pointed out by C.V. Vaidya that in the Chitor Inscription (V.S. 1331) Nāghhrida is described as

Ilākhandā Avanibhusanaḥ (Verse 8). Jivadi Anandapurān tadina puram ilākhandā saundaryagobhi.

Both Nāghhrada and Anandapura are described as ornaments of Ilākhandā. The word ina indicates, that both the cities were situated in the same part

94. l.A. XXXIX, p. 191.
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97. HMHI. II, p. 337.
98. Ṛāv.Ins., pp. 74 ff.
of the country\(^{99}\) Anandapura was located within Mewār (asti Nāgahradanāma sayam \(\text{iha pattanam}\)). Āhār, ancient Āghāṭa, was known as Anandapura\(^{100}\). Erskine\(^{101}\) also holds the same view. If we study the epigraphic records including Chitor Inscription (v.s. 1331)\(^{102}\), we find in most of the records\(^{103}\) Bāppā's association with Nāgahrada and the seat of the political authority of the Guhilas at both Āghāṭapura (Anandapura) and Nāgahrada.

Guhadatta's migration from Anandapura, as recorded in the Atpur Inscription, and Bāppā's coming from Anandapura, as indicated in the Chitor Inscription, seem to suggest that they moved from Āghāṭa to Nāgahrada, as they are known to have shifted their seat of authority a number of times. Besides, most of the epigraphic records of the Guhilas of Nāgdā-Ānār are found within the boundaries of Mewār, that is in the districts of modern Udaipur, Bhilwārā.

---

100. AR. II, p. 912.
103. I.A. XVI, p. 347.
and Chitor and one in Mewār-Sironi border. Not a single record of this branch was found in Gujarāt. Actually, Nāgahrada and Āghāṭapura formed the nerve centre of Mewār from the beginning of their history. In remote early times their ancestors might have hailed from Anandapura in Gujarāt. Later the Sunilas built Anandapura at Āghāṭapura or Nāgahrada in Mewār to commemorate their ancestral home in Gujarāt.

104. Sāmoli Inscription of Silāditya (A.D. 646), El. xx, p. 97.