History of the Region:

A historical account of the region may be summarised as follows to serve as background for the study proper. It is as given by the Gazetteers, and well known scholars like Bhandarkar, Yazdani, Altekar, Desai and Mirashi.

The region under study is a part of the ancient Apāranta referred to for the first time in Kautilya's Arthasastra (Shamasstry, Yr; 1956). Though Ratnagiri region is not historically famous, its long coastline and convenient harbours together with its comparative nearness to the Arab Coast made it known to the earliest travellers. It contained several places of trade known to the earliest European writers. The Konkaṇa finds mention in the Geography of Ptolemy (C.150 A.D.) and in the Periplus of the Erythrean sea (66 - 240 A.D.). Ptolemy refers to the Aparanta or Konkaṇa tract as Ariake Sadinon and refers to a place called Balatipaṭṭana which is Balipaṭṭana or present day Khārepṭāṭ. The other trade centres that Ptolemy mentions are Suppāra (Sopara), Goaris, Dounga Bendas and Semylla. Dounga in Salsette
is Doungri facing Bassein. In the time of Ptolemy and Periplus, Soparā carried on most of the Indian trade with foreign countries.

In Periplus it is mentioned that from Bhorukachcha, Paiṭhaṇ was situated at a distance of twenty days journey and in the east, Tagarapūrā was situated at a distance of ten days journey.

It also mentions the following places along the Koṅkaṇa coast. Sōpā (Sopara) and Kaliyeṇa (Kalyāṇ), Semylla (Chaul), Maṇḍagora (Bāṅkoṭ on the mouth of the Sāvitrī river), Palaepatmae (Dābhōḷ), Byzantion (Vijayadurg), Toparum or Toparon (Devgarh), Tyrannoboas or Aurannoboas (Mālvaṇ), Sesecreienae (Veṅgurlā). In Tavernier, the trade route between Sūrat and Goa through Dābhōḷ, Rājāpūr and Veṅgurlā is traced. (Majumdar, ed, 1960)

The region of Ratnāgiri district was known as Taṅkoṅkaṇa. This region was an important stronghold of Buddhism at the beginning of the Christian era (B.C. 200 - A.D. 50) as seen from the numerous caves found here. eg. Kheḍ, Chiḷ-nil, Panhāle-Kāzi. An attempt is made to discuss the history of the region from the earliest times on the basis of the pattern of the archaeological remains particularly the Buddhist monuments. The Buddhists had one of their biggest monastic settlements on Sālsette. And caves are
also found at Chiplūṇ, Khed, Dābhōḷ, Saṅgameśvara, Gavhāṇi-Velgaum and Vāde Paĝel. The Buddhist legends in the Pāpañc-Sudāṇi and Sarathappakasini record the conversion of Koṅkaṇa to Buddhism as early as the life time of Gautama Buddha (B.C. 560 – 487). These were one of the earliest centres of Buddhism. Chiplūṇ, Kol and Dābhōḷ caves indicate that some of them were donated by sārthavāhas or caravanmen. The Kānherīvihāras flourished from 2nd C. B.C. to the medieval period. There are well over 100 inscriptions among the numerous stupas vihāras and chaityā-layas. However in the region and period under study, there is only one inscription which refers directly to the construction of a temple for Buddha. (Mirashi, 1974, p.250, s 1033 – 1110 A.D.) Yuan chwang records that in Koṅkaṇa there were 100 monasteries, but heretics were numerous. However the strength of Buddhism in the Deccan, lay in its religious establishments. The Buddhists, among the lay population were always in minority. This is borne out by the accounts of Fa-Hsien and Yuan-chwang. Fa-Hsien did not visit the Deccan because he was told that the people there were subscribing to bad and erroneous views and did not follow the āramaṇas and the law of the Buddha. (Altekar, 1934 p.p. 270 – 71). Altekar surmises that the total Buddhist population in the Deccan around C 7th C. A.D. could not have been more than 10,000 and continued to decline in the medieval period.
In the Sātārā district the earliest known place is Karāḍ or Karhāṭaka or Karhakaḍa in the inscriptions of about 200 B.C. These inscriptions have recorded gifts of pillars by Karāḍ pilgrims at the Bhārhut stupa near Jabalpur in Madhya Pradesh. At a distance of 5 km. from Karāḍ, is a group of Buddhist caves, one of which is associated with an inscription dating about 1 C. A.D. Buddhist caves at Shirval and Wāi in Jāvīḍ also indicate settlements. Besides these caves there are a group of caves and Vihāras of Buddhist or Brāhmaṇical origin at Bhosa in Tāsgaon at Malavāḍī and Kuṇḍal in Khānaṟūr, at Pāṭṭan in Pāṭṭan taluka, and at Pāṭeśvara in Sātārā (Dr. Burgess Antiquarian list 58-59).

Wāi is locally believed to be Virāṭnagarī where Paṇḍavas lived in the 13th year of their exile (Gazetteer of Sātārā dist.). It may be incidentally noted that there are many places in the Lower Deccan described as Virāṭnagarā in the prevailing local legends, e.g. Hāṅgal in Dharwad dist. These legends just indicate the immense popularity of the Mahākāvyas and people's eagerness to associate their place with the great personalities of the Kāvyas. It is therefore at this stage not correct to speak of the high antiquity of the place as these legends might otherwise indicate.

Mahābalesvara, at the source of the Krishnā, is a holy place from very early times. This may be due to a unique natural phenomenon. Mahābalesvāra is the source of
five rivers viz. Krishṇa, Yeṇṇa, Śāvitrī, Koynā and Gāyatriti which are believed to be holy rivers.

Asoka in the 16th year of his reign had conducted the 3rd Buddhist council and sent out missions for the propagation of Buddhism to distant countries.

Mahāraṅgaśita was sent to Dakṣiṇapatha which included the present Mahārāṣṭra. (Age of Imperial Unity, 1968)

As ancient Buddhist monuments are found at Karāḍ, Bṛhamapuri, Khēḍ, Chiplūn and Pannalē-Kāzi, Dakṣiṇapatha referred to above appears to have included Sātārā, Kolhāpur and Ratnāgiri districts. Kolhāpur city itself is very ancient. During excavations in 1877 the foundations of a large stūpa were turned up and in the centre of the mound was found a square stone box, with, on the inner face of its square lid an inscription of about the 3rd C. B.C. recording "The gift of Bāmha made by Dhamagupta". The date of the inscription is now revised to 1st C. A.D. (Sankalia, 1952) (JBBRAS XIV, pp. 174-154, Bombay Arch. Survey, separate No. 10 page 39).

The Buddhist caves of Pāṇḍava Dārā ( — ) and the Pavalā caves near Jyotibā's hills may be dated to the 1 C. A.D. or a little earlier.

The region was included in the Nānda empire and subsequently in that of the Mauryas. The conquest war
probably effected in the days of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatrū and was maintained by their successors. When the Nañdas were overthrown this country passed on to the Mauryas.

Āśoka's empire extended far into the south and certainly included Mahārāṣṭra and Aparānta.

After Āśoka's death his empire began to disintegrate and province after province fell out and became independent. A branch of the Satiyaputas who are mentioned in Āśoka's edicts took advantage of this opportunity and founded a kingdom in Mahārāṣṭra. Their dynasty is known as the Sātavāhana dynasty. From Purānic accounts and the Hathigumpha inscription of Khāravela it is argued that the approximate date for the foundation of the Sātavāhana rule, could be 220 B.C. However, the recent view, in the light of subsequent discoveries is that the dynasty was established around 30 B.C. (Desai, 1981 pp. 51)

These Sātavāhanas belonged to Marāṭhwāḍā having their capital at Pratisthāna (Paithan) and ruled over the entire Mahārāṣṭra upto 250 A.D. The Sātavāhana's had many able kings, the most famous among them being Sātakarṇi I.

Their kingdom extended as far as western Māḷvā and Ujjain. A large number of yaznas were performed and huge dakshinas were paid to the priests on the occasion. But
later on their kingdom was restricted to Southern Mahārāṣṭra. In the Brahmāpurī excavations in Kolhāpur, coins of vāsiṣṭhiputra Vilivāyakura, his successor Māghariputra Sivalakura, and the latter’s successor Gautamiputra Vilivāyakura have been found (Sankalia et al. 1952, pp 39-52). Kolhāpur was a big city of well built brick houses when Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi ruled in the Deccan about 106 – 130 A.D. The beginnings of this city were probably laid in the preceding one or two centuries. At that time, several contemporary, and probably related ruling families—Sātavāhanas, Cutṭus, Kuras and Maharathis existed here.

The Western coast including Ratnāgiri district was a bone of contention between the Śakas and Sātavāhanas who maintained the feud for at least a hundred years with varying success. The Śakas subsequently defeated the Sātavāhanas and added the Koṅkaṇa coast to their kingdom. A half century later the Sātavāhanas under vilivāyakura II or Gautamiputra Sātakarṇi reconquered the coastline only to loose it to the Satraps after another generation. In about 78 A.D. the Satrapas were exterminated and the era founded.

However it has to be noted that the coastal region was under Rudradāman in 130 – 150 A.D. The constant wars between the Śakas and the ŚakaPallavas in the north—west weakened the Śakas and in a decisive battle, a deadly blow to the supremacy of the Śaka Pallavas in Ratnāgiri region.
was inflicted, and thence forward for about a century this part continued under the Śātavāhanas.

After the fall of the Śātavāhanas this region passed successively into the hands of the Chutus, the early Kadambas, the Traikūṭakas, the Vākāṭakas and then the early Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

About the middle of the 6th C. A.D. kings of the Maurya, Kalachūri and Naḷa dynasties appear to have been ruling in the Koṇkaṇa. The Chālukyas, Kīrtivarman, Maṅgaleśa and grandson Pulakēshī had to relinquish them when they conquered Southern Mahārāṣṭra. After Pulikēshi I the area around Savantwādī was governed by his son Chaṇḍrāditya and later by his daughter-in-law Vijayabhaṭṭārikā. This region continued to be under their sway till the Rāṣṭrakūṭas attained supremacy there. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas came to prominence in the region around 710 A.D. and remained dominant for the next 200 years. They first established themselves in Southern Mahārāṣṭra from where they expanded their kingdom. The reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas yields one of the first inscriptive evidence for the existence of the Mahālakṣhmī temple. The Sanjan plates (î 793=871 A.D.) speak of the sacrifice of his left finger by Amōghavarsha I (814-878 A.D.) to Goddess Mahālakṣhmī to avert a national disaster. This Mahālakṣhmī is believed to be the Kolhāpur Mahālakṣhmī.
The Rāṣṭrākūṭas waged wars frequently and had alienated all their neighbours. The Paramāra ruler, Śiyak, penetrated into the Rāṣṭrākūṭa capital Mālkhed and sacked it in C 972 A.D. This heralded the weakened state of the Rāṣṭrākūṭas and encouraged some of their vassals to rise against them. It also meant the end of their direct political sway over this region. In A.D. 973-74 they were overthrown by their vassal Taila II, who claimed to be a remote descendant of the Chālukyas of Badami.

The Rāṣṭrākūṭas were themselves great patrons of the arts. With their reign begins the temple building era in Southern Mahārāṣṭra. They were tolerant in their religious attitude and patronised Śaivism, Vaiśnāvism and Jainaism.

They introduced excavation of rock temples in Mahārāṣṭra. This temple building trend begun by the Rāṣṭrākūṭas was inculcated and imitated in full measure by their feudatories especially the Śilāhāras.

Though the measure of independence enjoyed by their feudatories was not uniform the Śilāhāras seem to have enjoyed a large amount of internal autonomy since they could create their own sub-feudatories. This may be largely due to the fact that all the branches of the Śilāhāras served their masters faithfully and throughout their rule show no inclination
to over-throw the Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy. (Altekar, 1934)

Another note worthy feature of this period is, in spite of the revival of Brāhmaṇism, Jainism did not suffer. In fact we find it prospering in the Kolhāpūr-Sātārā region. This may be because it was fortunate to acquire state patronage under the early Kadaṁbas, Chālukyas and Western Gāṅgas and then the Sīlāhāras themselves. Many of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings were themselves Jains and so were many of their feudatories and generals. The second cause was the influence of the work and achievements of a number of Jain saints and writers like, Sāmantabhadra, Akalāṅkādeva, Vidyānānda, Māṇikyaṅanaṅdi, Prabhāchandra, Jīnasēna, Guṇachandrā and Pampa.

**The Sīlāhāras:**

Inscriptional evidence suggests the existence of 6 Sīlāhāra dynasties ruling over areas now in Mahāraṣṭra or Karnāṭaka. Out of the 6 families 2 ruled in Southern Mahāraṣṭra (1) Sīlāhāras of South Koṅkaṇa (2) The Sīlāhāras of Kolhapur. (Mirashi, 1974)

1. **The Sīlāhāras of South Koṅkaṇa:**

Information about this dynasty is available to us from the three copper plates (Mirashi, 1974) issued by its...
rulers viz.:

1. Paṭṭanaṇakūḍī copper plate issued by Avasara II in Ś. 910.
2. Khārepāṭaṇ copper plate issued by Raṭṭarāja in Ś. 930.
3. Balipāṭṭañ copper plate issued by Raṭṭarāja in Ś. 932.

The genealogy given in the copper plate of Raṭṭarāja is as follows. It varies slightly from the one given in Paṭṭanaṇakūḍī copper plate.

Sanaphulla (765 - 785 A.D.)
Dhammiyar (785 - 820 A.D.)
Eyyaparāja (820 - 845 A.D.)
Avasara I (845 - 870 A.D.)
Adityavarmā (870 - 895 A.D.)
Avasara II (895 - 920 A.D.)
Indrarāja (920 - 945 A.D.)
Bhima (945 - 970 A.D.)
Avasara III (970 - 995 A.D.)
Raṭṭarāja (995 -1024 A.D.)

This dynasty arose during the reign of Raṣṭrakūṭa Krīṣṇa I when he appointed Saṇaphulla as the governor of South Koṅkana, Saṇaphulla was at that time already ruling as governor of Goa.

His son and successor Dhammiyar is stated to have
established Balipatana. But since this Balipatana is mentioned by Ptolemy, Dhammiyar, more probably, enlarged it and fortified it. Balipatana is identified with the present Kharepatan in Ratnagiri district.

The only known incident in the reign of his successor Eyyappa, was his regaining of Chandor the erst-while capital of the Silhara of S. Konkan. To proclaim his victory he had an abhisheka with coconut water performed over himself.

Nothing much is known of the succeeding two kings, Avasara I and Adityavarma. Avasara II, the successor, tried to extend his influence and exert his hegemony by helping the rajas of Chemulya and Chandrapur in their rebellion against their overlord. This was the first step taken to gain back their lost territory in Goa. The action was complete in the reign of his grand son Bhima, who conquered Chandramandala and included it in his kingdom. Bhima's son Avasara III is the king, who issued the Pattanakudi copper plate in 910 (988 A.D.). It mentions a grant of 40 dinars. The gold coin went out of circulation later on, so its mention is rather important. The Silhara were the feudatories of the Rastrakutas. The Rastrakuta dynasty were out of power in Circa 974 A.D. and by Circa 982 A.D. its last king Indra IV was dead. Tailapa (K. Chalukya) was the new overlord. But the Silhara do not seem to have accepted Tailapa's, overlordship
even in A.D. 988, as we find them giving the Rāṣṭrakūṭa genealogy in their inscriptions. The K. Chālukya supremacy was accepted, but only grudgingly by Avasara’s son Raṭṭarāja. In his inscription of S' 932 he gives the genealogy of the Chālukyas only after giving the Rāṣṭrakūṭa genealogy and mentions in the concluding lines that they were ruling over Raṭṭapādi (territory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas). Raṭṭarāja was the last king of this dynasty. The Kalyāṇa Chālukyas had been considerably weakened because of their repeated wars with the Chōlas. Knowing this, Raṭṭarāja seems to have thrown off his grudging acceptance of the Chālukyan supremacy. His overlord, Jayasimha in 1024 A.D. punished him for this by finishing off the dynasty and seizing all his wealth.

**The Silāhāras of Kolhāpūr**: (Mirashi, 1974)

This dynasty was ruling over the Sātārā, Sāngli, Kolhāpūr and Belgaum areas.

They seem to have supplanted the Sindas who were ruling in this region some time in the 11th C. A.D. The kings of this dynasty are referred to as "Karahatadhipati" in inscriptions as also in literature. This probably suggests that their capital was at Karhāṭ at least in the first few years of the existence of this dynasty. But since no inscription has been found at Karāḍ and all the inscriptive find-spots are located in and around Kolhāpūr, they probably
shifted their capital to Kolhāpūr soon after.

This family too gives its ancestor as Jimutavāhana and they had Garūḍa on their flags. Since they originally hailed from Ter they bore the biruda Tagarapura-vaṛādhiśvara. Their Kuladēvatā was the Kolhāpūr Mahālakṣmī.

Their capitals were at 1) Khiligila 2) Pranalaka or Padmanāla 3) Kshullakapura or Kollāpura, Vallawāḍ (Valiwāḍa 5 miles east of Kolhāpūr) and we find the Silāhāra kings issuing their grants from one of these places.

**Genealogy of the Shilāhāras of Kolhāpūr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jāti</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>(940 - 960 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nayivarman</td>
<td>(960 - 980 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaṇḍra</td>
<td>(980 -1000 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāti</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>(1000 -1020 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goṅka I, Guvala I, Kirtiraja, Chaṇḍrāditya
(1020-1050 A.D.)

Goṅka I (1020 - 1050 A.D.)

Mārasimha (1050 - 1075 A.D.)
Known year 1058 A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guvala II</th>
<th>Gonka II</th>
<th>Ballala</th>
<th>Bhaja I</th>
<th>Gaonjaraditya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1075 - 1100 A.D.)</td>
<td>(1100 - 1105 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1105 - 1140 A.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Known years
1110, 1115, 1118, 1128, 1135 A.D.

Vijayaditya
(1140 - 1175 A.D.)

Known years 1143, 1153 A.D.

Bhaja II
(1175 - 1212 A.D.)

Known years
1178, 1187, 1190, 1191, 1194.

This dynasty arose under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. However they do not give the genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in their inscriptions. Firstly, because they arose during the declining period of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and secondly, the inscriptions of the first kings of this dynasty have not been found so far.

Jatiga I was the founder of this dynasty. However he did not rule in Southern Mahārāṣṭra. He was the governor of a Gōmantha/fort which seems to be in Karnāṭak. This view of
Mirashi does not agree with that of Altekar who thinks that Gomantha fort was near Kolhāpūr (Sankalia, 1952; pp 8). Jatiga was the maternal uncle of Gāṅga Permāṇaḍī (Mārasimha).

Jatiga II conquered South Mahārāṣṭra and established his capital at Karāḍ. He next conquered Pannaḷa-dūrga and extended his kingdom.

The first known inscription of this family is the Miraj copper plate of Mārasimha dated Ś 980 (1058 A.D.). Jatiga seems to have attempted friendly relations with his neighbours. A jewelled gift had been sent to the Kalyāṇa Chālukya king Chāmuṇḍarāja. The date of this gift falls in the reign of Jatiga II.

By the time of his son Gōṅka’s reign the Śilāhāra kingdom had extended over Karhāṭ, Kuṇḍi, Mēriṇja and the entire Koṅkaṇa. The genealogy suggests that Gōṅka was succeeded by his brother Gūvala I, Kīrtirāja and Chaṇḍrāditya. None of them have left any inscriptions behind nor were they succeeded by their sons. It is more probable that all three had been appointed as governors of different parts of the Śilāhāra kingdom, and hence have been referred to as rājā.

Gōṅka was succeeded by his brother Mārasimha. In his Miraj Copper Plate (Ś 980 = 1058 A.D.) he calls himself but Mahēmāndalēśvara does not name his suzerian.
This indicates that though he did not declare independence he had become quite strong.

He was the first to adopt the biruda Rūpanarāyaṇa- which was later on adopted by many members of his family. He was a great devotee of Mahālakṣmi. He gave patronage to the Pasūpatas. However his queen Nāgaladevi was on ardent Jain. Mārasiṁha had 5 sons, out of whom Guvala II, Ballāla and Gaṅḍarāditya came to the throne. However only Ballāla has been referred to as Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara. Bhōja does not seem to have come to the throne. However he had been engaged in wars with Sīndas of Yelburga, and later on with Kalīṇa Chālukya Vikramāditya VI, Ballāla was succeeded by Gaṅḍarāditya. His rule extended over Miriṇja, Saat Kholla and Konkana.

Religion and architecture received a great impetus during his reign. In the Tāḷāle Copper plate he says that he gave food to one lakh Brāhmaṇas at Prayāga which is at the confluence of Kāśāri, Bhogāwatī and Paṁchagaṅgā. Gaṅḍarāditya also built a Jinālaya at Ajurikā and called it Tribhuvana tilak. His minister Niṃbarasa built the Rūpanarāyaṇa Basadī in Kolhāpur. Both Tribhuvana tilak and Rūpanarāyaṇa were Gaṅḍarāditya’s birudas. He also constructed a tank at Irukuḍī i.e. Iraiḍī and built temples for Hindu, Baudhā and Jain deities. He also commenced the construction of the Koppēśvar temple in Khidrāpūr. Gaṅḍarāditya’s reign was quite
peaceful. However under the commandership of his son, Vijayaditya he had helped Aparaditya, the king of the Silahara branch of Northern Konkan to regain his throne from Kadamba Jayakesi. (Mirashi, 1974)

Vijayaditya succeeded Gandonaditya in about C. 1140 A.D. He too acquired many birudas and had the right to the Pañchamahāsabdas. He had taken a leading part in dethroning Kalyana Chalukya Tailapa II and installing Bijjala who had as a prince, been governor of Karahad 4000 (Vañasaṅg insc. 1142 A.D.). However Vijayaditya did not accept the suzerainty of Bijjala and was not subservient to him. So Bijjala probably invaded the Silahara kingdom and somewhere near the Koppēśvara temple there was a fierce battle in which Vijayaditya's daṇḍanāyaka Boppaṇa showed great valour. In this battle Bijjala was probably defeated. Vijayaditya does not mention Bijjala in his inscriptions. Vijayaditya's son and successor was powerful and seems to have attempted independence. The Kalachuris were unable to subdue him though a few of his inscriptions refer to him as Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara. Later on he called himself Rājādhirāja, Paramēśvara, Paramabhattāraka, Paschimachakravarti etc. Deccan was in those days dominated by the Yādavas who did not tolerate this competition. Yādava Singhaṇa invaded the Silahara kingdom and again at Khidrāpūr a fierce battle was fought in which Bhōja's general Bannes was killed. Bhōja was captured and imprisoned in the Panhālā fort. (1212 A.D. S' 1136) Singhaṇa seems to
have put an end to the Silahāra dynasty and annexed the kingdom to Yadava domain. From this time onwards the Yadava inscriptions appear in this region.

The Yadavas of Devagiri:-

The Yadavas who ruled over Khāndesh, Nasik, and Ahmadnagar districts were initially vassals of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mānyakhetā and the Chālukyas of Kalyana for a period of over 300 years. Drīḍhāprahara who hailed from Dvārāvatīpura or Dvarakā founded the family sometime in the first half of 9th C. A.D. and had Chaṇḍrādiṇyapura or Chaṇḍōr (Nasik dist.) as his capital. His son Seuṇaṭhāṇḍra founded a city called Seuṇapura and also gave the name Seuṇādeśa to the country. His successors began to style themselves Seuṇas.

A remote descendant of this Seuṇaṭhāṇḍra I, Bhillama V was the first independent king of this dynasty. Bhillama ascended the throne in 1185. This was a time of a great upheaval in the Deccan. The Chālukyas under Someśvara IV had grown weak and this emboldened Bhillama in bidding for paramount power, with the aid of his able generals he wrested tracts, including Kalyāṇa from Someśvara IV.

According to Hemādri, Bhillama founded the city of Devagiri. He probably also made it his capital. Bhillama during the closing years of his reign had to fight with Hoysaḷa Ballāḷa II. Bhillama's son Jaitugī had been associated with the governing of the kingdom from 1191 A.D.
Though he was unable to dislodge Ballala his kingdom extended up to the confluence of the Krishna and Lungabhadra. The Kakatiyas were also defeated. Jaitugali was succeeded by his son Sivghana in 1210 A.D. He was certainly the most distinguished member of the family. He put an end to the Kolhapur Silaharas. With the exception of the Hoyasalas, Sivghana was able to assert supremacy over all the southern kingdoms. Sivghana's empire extended from Khandesh in the north to Shimoga and Anantapur districts in the south and from the west coast included north Kanara up to the eastern parts of Hyderabadd and Birar.

Sivghana was succeeded by his grand-son Krishn in 1247 A.D. and continued Sivghana's policy of expansion in all directions. Krishn was succeeded by his brother Mahadeva in 1261. Hostilities with the Hoysalas and the Silaharas of N. Konka, Vaghelas of Gujarat, the Paramaras of Malwa and Kakatiyas of Telengana continued during his reign. He was unable to subdue the Hoysalas. Krishn's reign ended by 1270 - 71 A.D. and the kingdom was weakened by civil war between his sons Amma and Rama. Rama treacherously captured and killed Amma.

Rama in the early years of his rule made frantic but unsuccessful efforts to curb the Hoysalas. He did gain successes in the north. However he was unable to save
his capital from being plundered by Allauddin Khilji in 1296 A.D. Hereditary enemies now pressed hard on the Seuṇas. And though Rāmachaṇḍra, his son and successor Śaṅkaradeva and later son-in-law Harapāladeva managed to maintain the kingdom of Devagiri for some years, it finally decisively passed into the hands of the Muslims in 1318 A.D.
Social conditions:

In the medieval period as in the preceding and subsequent periods the society was divided into 4 Varṇas, which degenerated to castes: Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiṣya and Śūdra. These castes were further divided into several sub-castes. The Brāhmaṇa however occupied a position of honour.

The smritis list the 6 duties of a Brāhmaṇa:

1. Adhyayana
2. Adhyāpana
3. Yajan
4. Yājan
5. Dāna
6. Pratigraha.

He is expected to lead a clean life and spend his time in religious and educational pursuits. Rules were laid down to prevent him from pursuing wealth. For eg: A brāhmaṇa was not supposed to accumulate wealth. He could store commodities sufficient for a maximum period of twelve days.

Ahimsā, truthfulness, moral purity, restraint, dāna, kindness were expected of every one but they were especially necessary in a Brāhmaṇa. The ideals set for them were high and those who would maintain them received great respect in society.
Kings took care to see that those Brāhmaṇas selected to receive dāna were highly learned and deeply religious. Yājnavalkya (Mirashi 1974 p.89) says only that Brāhmaṇa is eligible to receive a dāna in whom both these requirements are found. Inscriptions refer to some Brāhmaṇas as Mahābrāhmaṇas (Mirashi, 1974, p.69, line 38), or else as Parabrāhmaṇa (Mirashi, 1974, p.95 line 60).

Some of them are described as kramavid (Mirashi, 1974; p.21 line 72-73) dvivedi, (Mirashi, 1974; p.168 line 69) chaturvedi, (Mirashi, 1974; p.276 line 39). As yet these suffixes had not been transformed into hereditary surnames. These names indicated their vedic learning. Such brāhmaṇas engaged themselves usually in performing their 6 duties or obligations (Mirashi, 1974; p.69 lines 37-38).

They are referred to in the plural. It is interesting that those Brāhmaṇas who were not learned are referred to in the singular (Mirashi, 1974; p.276 lines 39-41).

The Brāhmaṇas were invited to receive dānas from as for as Muṇjasthāna (Central India) (Mirashi, 1974; p.124 line 62) and Vārāṇasi (Mirashi, 1974; p.168 line 67).

Rudrabhaṭṭopādhyāya of Vārāṇasi mentioned in the Panhale copper plate of Vikramadītya (S' 1061) has been described as Sōmayāji and Brahmadyānī. He was an expert in two Vedas and had become pure with the dāsana of Gāṅgā and by bathing in it (Mirashi, 1974; p.168 lines 67-68).
The later inscriptions however do not give such detailed descriptions of the Brāhmaṇas. The prefixes added to the names of the Brāhmaṇas indicate the antiquity of the various sub-sects of the Brāhmaṇas eg. Sahavasi, Karhāde, Senavai etc. to the Medieval times. Majority of the Brāhmaṇas mentioned are Rigvedins (Mirashi, 1974; p.107 line 61); Taittiriya and Krisṇa Yajurvedi Brāhmaṇas are few (Mirashi, 1974; p.95 lines 60-61). Sāmavedi Brāhmaṇas are also mentioned (Mirashi, 1974; p.41 lines 71-73).

The Brāhmaṇas occupied important positions like that of Mahāpradhāna, Mahāmātya etc. The lipikāra of the Kaseli copper plate of Bhoja II was also a Brāhmaṇa (Mirashi, 1974, p.93). Texts like Yājñavalkya Smṛiti spell out what was expected of the Kṣatrīya and of his position in the society. The chief duty of a Kṣatrīya king was to rule over his subjects with justice and by it he acquired 1/6 of the puṇya of his subjects (Mirashi, 1974; p.93). By undertaking foreign invasions too, the King acquired similar puṇya.

During the medieval period the Kāyasthas came to be recognised as a separate caste. Some Kāyasthas were writers or authors, eg. Soddhala, the author of Udaya Sundarī Kathā, was a Kāyastha from Vallabhi (Vala in Sourastra). At the beginning of his work Soddhala gives a story outlining the origin of the Kāyastha community. It is either traditional or else imaginary.
The Vīra-Vaṇanja was the merchant guild of traders who had interstate or interprovince commerce. They were the residents of Aihole as well as Ahichchatra in the north. They claimed to be the descendants of Vāsudeva khaṇḍalī and Malabhadra and that they were the residents of 32 sea shore towns, 18 paṭṭaṇas and 64 Ghaṭikāsthāns. This last mentioned claim of theirs is widely believed to be an exaggeration. It need not be so, since it is quite possible for the guild to have its branches in 114 towns (32 + 18 + 64 = 114).

The Vīravaṇanjas were a broadminded, generous, cosmopolitan type of people who patronised the Hindu, Buddhist and Jain temples with equal generosity. In pursuit of their trade they undertook both land and sea travel.


2. Vijayadityas Miraj inscription, S'1065=1152 A.D. lines 1-12 shed light on the sabhās of the merchants. The merchants would gather and grant taxes to the temples. They could impose taxes on articles sold in the markets. The Śrēṇis were independant in the management of their trade. They had an army which looked after their safety. At times the kings could take the help of this army. (Mirashi, 1974)
Traders and farmers were grouped among the Vaiśyas. The traders grouped themselves into guilds or śrenis and exercised considerable weight in economic, religious and social matters. Inscriptions very often show them as prominent members of temple management, committees or trusts (Mirashi, 1974, p.51 line 64). Ayyāvole and Āhichchatra were great centres of trade and the head quarters of the guilds bearing their name (Mirashi, 1974, p.282 lines 24-32). The branches of these guilds were spread all over South India and they were represented in all the important towns. These guilds met on market days, taxes were imposed on articles to be sold in the local markets and this income was given to the local Brāhmaṇa and Jaina temples. Since the Vaishyas had come to possess and control a major portion of the wealth in the society we find them slowly assuming a dominant position in religious and social matters. They were the main temple builders, sometimes outdoing the kings themselves. They then made provision for the maintainance, i.e. Pūjā, naivedya etc. by imposing taxes on merchandise.

The Śudras were supposed to provide manual labour to the society. Apart from this they were expert artisans, sculptors etc. (Mirashi, 1974, p.94).

The Yajnavalkya - Smriti sheds light on the medieval society. We find the society slowly becoming
rigid. Yājnavalkya denounces the increasing use of mantras for black magic, gohatyā for Madhuparka, widow marriage and Śūdrakanyāvivāha which had been recognised by the sāstras and had above all gained legitimacy through long usage. Yājnavalkya advises the rejection of these practices. On the question of gōhatya Yājnavalkya points to Mārkandēya Purāṇa which offers a way out by suggesting that gold should be given as dāna on the occasion of Madhuparka instead of beef. (Mirashi, 1974, p.96).

The society in general was becoming more caste conscious. Yājnavalkya does not refer to untouchability but Aparārka in Haritasmrīti prescribes bath after contact with painters, washermen, hunders, butchers and actors. (Mirashi, 1974, p.96). During this time the condition of women seems to have improved since they gained rights over hereditary property. Yaj bestows hereditary rights on widows too. (Mirashi, 1974, p.96) Manu was generally not in favour of hereditary rights for women. But he made an exception if the widow was chaste. If otherwise, property devolved on the parents or brothers of the man dead.

Some of the inscriptions of this period state that property without any heirs should be given to the brāhmaṇas to whom the village has been given.

The term used is "aputradhana". Aputra should most probably be interpreted as without son. Yājšnavalkya
does not mention satī. Aparārka discusses the different opinions of the various smṛitis in this matter and endorses the opinion of the Viṣṇusmṛiti i.e. a Brāhmaṇa widow may commit satī for the sake of Dharma but not due to sorrow (Mirashi, 1974, p.97). The inscriptions of this region do not shed any light on the existence of such a practice. We may surmise that this practice was not widely prevalent.

During the Śilāhāra reign, the western coast had Arab settlements. The Raśtrakūṭas had friendly relations with them. There was an Arab settlement in south Konkan, though its exact location is not known. These Arabs had friendly relations with the Kadambas of Goa. After the death of Mummuni, the Kadambas invaded north Konkan. At that time these muslim Arabs, as soldiers, had created havoc by harassing the Brāhmaṇas, but they were chased out (Mirashi, 1974, p.140-141 lines 52-55).

**Economic conditions:**

Trade and commerce was in the hands of the guilds (śreṇis). The śreṇi was the union of people who belonged to the same caste and had the same profession. The union of the goldsmiths, blacksmiths, carpenters was called Hayyamān. The merchant guild was called Nagara.
People preferred the śrenis to deposit their money. The rate of interest at the beginning of the Śilāhāra rule can be known from an inscription at Kāñherī. A devotee, in order to get an interest of 29 drammas had deposited 200 drammas.

Out of the 29 drammas, 20 were to be utilised for the pūjā of the Buddha, 3 drammas for the repairs of the Vihāra, 5 drammas for the clothes of the Bhiksus and one dramma for their texts. So the rate of interest is $14 \frac{1}{2}\%$ per annum. Since inscriptions are essentially concerned with donors, donations, and the recipients, it is not possible to get a fair idea of the economic conditions of the various sections of society. However, since the Brāhmaṇas were recipients in considerable numbers, some light can be thrown on their economic condition. Since the lands they received were their only source of income, their economic position must have been tight, for they on an average received not more than 3nivartanas of land. This roughly is equal to $6\frac{1}{4}$ acres which is quite small. Houses too were given as dāna which were usually of 12 hastas i.e. roughly $18 \times 18 = 324$ Sq. feet. which is the size of a medium sized house.

Coinage: Dramma, most probably a silver and a gold coin, was widely prevalent. Dīnār was a gold coin which was
still in usage in this region. Some other gold coins used in this region were honna, paṇa, gadyāṇa and Dharaṇa (purāṇa). The dharaṇa or purāṇa was made of silver too.

The copper coins in usage were-visa, paṇa and haga. The visa was 1/20 of a dramma. The 'Gadhiyā kā Paisā' is a thick Sassanian type of silver coin. On the observe is a crude picture of the king and on the reverse the words "Śrī Chittarājasya", Gadhiyās do not usually bear any inscription. So this is an interesting feature.

As elsewhere this coin was called dramma in the Konkaṇa (JRAS for 1900, p.118).

The Kolhapur Śilāhāras refer to paṇam and bīṣige in their coins (Mirashi, 1974, insc S'1058, lines 27-28). Paṇam was a small coin and it was called 'Mudrāpaṇa' when there were any markings (tankas) on it. The bīṣige was probably 1/20th of a Paṇam.

Religious conditions:

Though many sects and cults have been widely prevalent in India, they can be broadly grouped under Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism, excluding certain local and regional cults from very early periods.

There was amity among the different religions and castes during the medieval period. The Kadambas patronised
both Hinduism and Jainism, the Chalukyas personally worshipped Śiva, Viśnu, Sūrya etc. However they were liberal in their patronage to Jainism. Many of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings were ardent Jains, but court patronage was liberal to all sects.

This policy of religious tolerance was followed by the feudatories too. The narrow minded intolerance, which led to savage frictions between Śaivas, Vaiṣṇavas, and Jainas (eg. 1) Persecution of the Vaiṣṇavas after the fall of Hampi. 2) Persecution of Vaiṣṇavas and Jainas in the Chola Kingdom in other parts of India and which later on laid the foundation for the Hindu-Muslim divide just did not exist in the medieval period in this region.

In the region under study there are clear indications in the form of inscriptions, temples etc, that Bauddha, Śaiva, Jaina and Śākta cults were prevalent in various degrees. Buddhism flourished in Deccan right from the 2nd C. B.C.

In the subsequent years, Buddhism declined while other sects like Śaiva, Jaina continued to flourish. Remains of this Buddhist phase survive today in many of the Buddhist caves along the Western Ghats, chief among
which are the Kanheri caves. Here are found numerous chaityālayas, stūpas, vihāras with more than hundred inscriptions.

Literary works too refer to the existence of Buddhism in this region in the medieval period. Sodghala, the author of Udayasundarīkathā, (Latter half of 11th C. A.D.), described in his work a chaitya located somewhere in the Khandesh. Its exact location however is not given.

The Kanheri caves are again mentioned as late as latter half of 12th C.A.D. in the Prabandhachintāmani of Merutunga.

Merutunga says that Ambāḍa the minister of Chālukya Kumārapāla had invaded the territory of Konkaṇa Mallikārjuna, but was defeated in the battle. So he spent sometime in the Krīṣṇagirī caves wearing black cresses (Mirashi, 1974, p.77).

In the region under study, there is only one inscription, so far known, which mentions the construction of a temple for Buddha. Śilāhāra Gandarāditya gave grants to a temple for Buddha on the banks of a tank called Gaṇḍasāgara which he had got constructed. (Mirashi, 1974, p.256). There are evidences upto 12th C.A.D. of the existence of Buddhism in the area just below the region under study.
For Eg: Balligave (Shikaripur Tk, Shimoga District)
Koliwad near Hubli (Dharwad District) and
Dambal (Mundargi Tk, Dharwad District).
are some of the places in North Karnataka where vajrayana
form of Buddhism was followed. So it can safely be
said that Buddhism existed in Southern Maharashtra as
late as 12th - 13th C.A.D.

Hinduism was as its zenith during this period.
Although there are no direct references to the prevalence
of Vedic rituals, they were practised by the Brähmanas
who were either Vaiṣṇavas or Śmārthas. The state of
Hinduism during this period is reflected in the Smṛti
and the various Commentaries on them. They do not endorse
the yajna yāgas. Instead Panchamahāyajnas are stressed
upon. The Panchamahāyajnas comprised of the:

1. Bali (annadāna to living animals).
2. Vaiśvadeva (Pūjās to gods).
3. Agnihotra (Keeping the fire burning, according
to traditional śāstras).
5. Chāru (giving food to gods).

The inscriptions indicate that the religious activity of
the kings, their ministers as well as the common man
concentrated on constructing temples, making arrangements
for elaborate pūjās, lighting lamps, providing for munis
and their students etc. As Vedic Hinduism declined Purānic Hinduism gained ascendancy, and the worship of the Purānic gods became all pervading. Indra, Varuṇa, Agni are totally relegated to the back ground.

As far as my survey of the temples in Southern Mahāraṣṭra is concerned temples constructed in stone prior to the Rāṣṭrakūta period have not been found. It looks as though that it was during the period of the Rāṣṭrakūtas, that temples in stone were constructed for the first time. However whether this observation is a fact, is to be verified by further intensive exploration. The Śilāhāras, in the wake of this trend, were responsible for the construction of this work.

Śiva, Viṣṇu, Āditya, Brahma, Mahālakṣmi, Jogesvari and Bhagavati were in worship by large sections of the society. However, Śaivism appears to be more popular. Magnificent temples were built for Śiva. The best examples are the Kailāsa temple at Ellora got excavated by Rāṣṭrakūta Kṛiṣṇa I. Ambarnāth temple at Ambarnāth, (the construction of which was commenced under the reign of Śilāhāra Chittarāja (1020-1035 A.D.) and ended in the reign of his brother Mummuṇirāja (1045-1070 A.D.) & Koppēsvara temple at Khidrapur etc. Temples were built for them, elaborate
pujās were performed and lamps were kept lighted. The temples had maṭhas attached to them, where the āchāryas and their students could board and lodge. The kings made elaborate arrangements for this set up and gave large donations for the maintainance.

It was usual for the common people to build temples in their own or an intimate relatives name. eg. Vyomasiva, the rājguru and minister to Śilāhāra Aparāditya II, got built a Śiva temple and called it Vyomeśvara, (Mirashi, 1974, p.79).

Though the Mahālakṣmī temple finds mention in inscriptions from early medieval period, architecturally the temple can be dated to Late 10th or Early 11th C.A.D. Though no temples were exclusively dedicated to Gaṇeśa during this period, he is almost invariably depicted on the lalāṭabimba of the Hindu temples. He is also frequently depicted on walls and pillars of temples eg. (Koppēśvara temple, Khidrapur). Gaṇeśa’s brother Kārtikeya is however not so popular. Though in Kolhapur a dilapidated temple is now popularly believed to be that of Kārtikēya, it is extremely doubtful if the icon in the garbha griha is really that of Kārtikēya.

Throughout my field survey in the 4 districts, I did not come across any temples dedicated to Viṣṇu, with the exception of the Lakṣmī Nārāyaṇa temple at Khatau in Satara district.
Jainism was flourishing during the medieval times, in Kolhapur, Satara and Sangli area. Until recently it was believed that Jainism was not widespread in Ratnagiri district. But the large Jaina sculptures which I came across in Penjur near Kanakavali prove that there was a big Jaina temple there.

There is no reference to Jainism in the inscriptions of the Chalukyas in Ratnagiri or in those of subsequent rulers. However the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were patrons of this sect also. The Śilāhāras of Northern and Southern Konkan do not mention Jainism in their records.

However the Śilāhāras of Kolhapur (1000-1212 A.D.), patronised, Jainism and mention it in their records quite often. During the medieval period Kolhapur and its surrounding region became a stronghold of Jainism.

Kolhapur was the centre of Jainism and we find a hectic temple building activity in Kolhapur city itself, and also in the neighbouring areas which is discussed below. It was during this period that Kolhapur became the "temple city" that it now is.

Temple were constructed for Tīrthankāras especially Pārśvanātha, Ādinātha, Nēminātha and Šāntinātha. During this period Padmāvatī the Śāsanadevātā of Pārśvanātha
tīrthankara too gained popularity so much so that Nimbarasa, the Sāmanda of Śilahāra Gaṇḍerāditya calls himself 'Padmāvatīdevi Ladba Varaprasāda' (Mirashi, 1974, p.280, line 9).

During this period Kolhapur mainly, and the neighbouring Jain centres, had many illustrious Jain āchāryas like Māghanandi Siddhāntadēva, Arhanandi Siddhāntadēva, Māghanandi Siddhāntadēva was the Āchārya of Deśiya gaṇa and pustaka-ga-chcha of the Mūlasamgha (Mirashi, 1974, p.305, line 19). The names of the Jain munis are accompanied by Samgha, gaṇa, Gachcha and ānvaya.

The most important among these sub divisions is the Samgha. It's branches are called gaṇa, gaṇa branches, as gachchas, the branches of which in turn are called ānvaya. The Dīgambaras believe that Mūlasangha is the only real sangha.

Though there was no difference of opinion in terms of philosophy, each division had a specific basadi to itself (Chidananda-murti: 1966 p. 86-87). So it seems that the Jain munis were of the Dīgambara sect, and hence the population too must have been predominantly of the Dīgambara sect.

The medieval rulers especially the Śilāhāras of North and South Konkaṇa were Śaivas. They had invited Śaiva munis to their kingdoms and given land grants to them (Mirashi, 1974, p.41 lines 53-56).
Rattarāja of South Konkaṇa had granted a village to Atreya the Śaiva Āchārya Ambojasambhu of the Karkarōṇi branch of the Mattamayūra Śaiva sāmpradāya (Ś 930) (ibid) These Śaivas and paśupatas seem to be very influential and occupied several important secular positions too.

Dnyānasūtra was the āchārya of Bhaiyapaśvara temple (Mirashi, 1974, p.83 line 58) Vedaśiva was first the Rajguru of Mallikarjuna and later on became his minister (Mirashi, 1974, p. 183, line 9).

Vyomasūtra was the Mahāpradhāna of Aparāditya II. However these Śaiva sects were looked down upon by orthodox people of the other sects, and their opinion finds reflection in the Aparārkatikā a commentary on Yādnyavalkyasmrīti. (Mirashi, 1974, p.82)

Some of the characteristic practises of these sects for eg. addiction to alcohol and human sacrifice have been severely criticised in this work and it advises that only those practices which are not in direct opposition to those prescribed by the Vedic texts should be followed: (ibid)

The daily pūjās to Śiva and other Purāṇic Gods comprised of the Angabhōga which included water bath offering of chandaṇa, flowers, akṣatā, dhūpa, dipa, naivedya and āśāmbula and Rangabhōga comprising of song, music and dance. One inscription mentions dārika. They very probably were dēvadās-
-is attached to the temples (Mirashi, 1974, p.231, line 58). The Śaiva munis lived in the Śaiva temples. The expense of clothing and food was met through income of the donated villages. The Mahālakṣmī temple at Kolhapur had a matha attached to it (Mirashi, 1974, p.321, line 23). And here arrangements were made for the residence of some Karhāṭaka and Sahavāsi Brāhmaṇas who were appointed for the pūjās of the Dēvi (ibid, line 24). Many temples also had pāṭhasālās where the sacred texts were studied. (EPI. C Vol.VII SK. 99).

An inscription mentions panchmahāmathas. Its exact nature is not known. This word is mentioned elsewhere too. Some scholars believe that, Brahma, Viṣṇu, Mahēśvara, Buddha and Jina were worshipped in these mathas. Mirashi is sceptical about this view doubting the existence of temples of Buddha and Jina in the Konkapa. But it has been pointed out above that there were Jaina and probably Buddha temples in this region.

The religious life of the common man had become ritualistic. People during this period strove to acquire puṇya by two means: the performance of Vedic Yajnas, Yāgas and dāna dharma. The former could be performed by the higher three varṇas (Mirashi, 1974, p.85).

The inscriptions of this period mention innumerable tanks, wells, ponds, temples, vāṭikās etc., being built and donated by common people. The temples and mathas had a
annasatra attached to it for the benefit of the munis and their students (Mirashi, 1974, p. 299, line 46).

Dānas were given to Brāhmaṇas to achieve puṇya. Grants were made for the repair of temples, the regular pūjā, a nandāḍīpā in the garbhagriha, upkeep of the munis, guests and students in the school. Provision would be made for the regular utsavas to be celebrated. Dānas were given to Brāhmaṇas on the occasion of an eclipse. Sankrānti, dvādaśī etc., were considered auspicious days and were recommended for giving dāna. On the occasion of an eclipse the king bathed in the sea, worshipped the sun with flowers and gave the dānas (Mirashi, 1977, p. 86). Sankrānti days too were considered to be immensely sacred, especially Makara (Uttarāyaṇa) and Karkaṭa (Dakshināyaṇa). However there are instances when dāna was given on Meṣa Sankrānti and another on Vrischikā Sankrānti (Mirashi, 1974, p.247 line 46, p. 327).

The tithis too were important and certain tithis were especially favoured, according to the personal religious leanings of the kings. Eg: the Silaharas of North Konkana being Śaivas, considered Māgha Vadya Chaturdāsi (Śivarātri) as very sacred day (Mirashi, 1974, p. 204 lines 5-6).

Another important tithi was Vaiśākha tritiyā (Akṣaya tritiyā). On this tithi Māllikārjuna appointed Supraya as the daṇḍādhīpati of Pranālaka dēśa (Mirashi, 1974 p.182 line 4). This tithi occured on a Tuesday and the naksatra was Mrigasiras.
Bhoja II had given a dāna on Āśvin Śukla Pratipadā which is the first day of Navarātri of Mahālakṣmī (Mirashi, 1974, p.325).

Paurnīmā too was considered an auspicious tithi eg. The dāna mentioned in the Kharepatan inscription of Raṭṭarāja (Mirashi, 1974, p.230, line 42). was given on Jyeṣṭha paurnīmā and the one in the Mandvi inscription on Māgha Paurnīmā (Mirashi, 1974, p.200, line 2). The Thane inscription of Aparāditya II (Mirashi, 1974, p. 193, line 11-12) says that Chaiṭra Paurnīmā is auspicious for the worship of Śiva.

Aparāditya had given his Vāḍavalī grant (Mirashi, 1974, p.1149, line 56) on Kārtika Paurnīmā. The tithī on which corals were offered to the Iṣṭadēvatās was called 'Pavitrika'.

The tithī on which corals could be offered to Śiva as per the Thane inscription of Aparāditya II, (Mirashi, 1974, p. 193 lines 11-12) are Aṣṭāmī or Chaturdāsī of any pakṣa. The best tithī was in Āśvin, better if in Śrāvaṇa and good if in Bhāḍrapada (Mirashi, 1974, p.87).

During this period Ėkādaśī was not as much strictly observed. This is but natural as the society at large during this period was Śaiva. There is a lengthy discussion in the Aparāikāṭīkā as to whether a person should or should not observe Ėkādaśī. In the end the advice is given that it should be observed by people who have no sons and not by those who have sons (Mirashi, 1974, p.88).
The vratas and dānas assumed a lot of importance during this period eg: tulādāna, getting brāhmaṇas married in holy places, food for a lakh of brāhmaṇas, keeping the nandādīp.

Two vratas which are mentioned in Gaṇḍarādītya’s inscriptions are noteworthy:

1. Panchalāṅgala vṛata: (Mirashi, 1974, p. 256, line 32)

For this vṛata, five ploughs of wood, 5 of gold, ten bullocks and enough land for them to till was given as dāna.

2. Agnistikā: (Mirashi, 1974, p. 256, line 36)

This was to be performed during the Hemanta and Śīśirāṣṭī. On an auspicious tithi in Margaśīrṣa a fire was lit accompanied by chanting of appropriate mantras. Food was given to brāhmaṇas; and people, sitting round the fire, discussed political, social and religious issues.

The above rapid critical survey indicates the following:

The rulers and their subordinates, the rich and the common were deeply motivated with religious fervour as in the other parts of the country. They strongly desired in accruing merit by constructing tanks, wells, temples etc.
And this prompted them to construct more and more temples, to donate rich gifts for the proper maintenance of the temples and to promote arts such as music, dance etc. on the occasion of festivals. On the one hand, and learning on the other, political stability, prosperity through trade and agriculture would sustain their interest, with the result the whole region in course of time was replete with temples, tirthas of architectural and iconographic merit through the ages.