CHAPTER-II

THE BACKGROUND
THE BACKGROUND

This chapter attempts to set the background by studying various factors such as physical geography, historical geography, political and religious conditions related to rock-cut Buddhist caves in the western Deccan. These conditions are equally important contributory factors for their growth in the region. The geographic factors have a lot of implications in the historical process because it is the human mind which formulates its strategies against the given physical conditions. Locations of settlement and rock-cut caves have bearings on their subsistence pattern. The physical conditions are the long-duree factors. It may also be added that in the medieval period many forts were constructed above the hilltops of the early historic caves, which show how important the locations of the cave-sites are. The social and political factors are man made and generally confined to the geographic boundaries. They keep changing and altering. Therefore the historical geography becomes important in the study of the location of the cave sites and the dynamics involved in a particular region along with the proliferation of the cave-sites. The other factors that are discussed here are political and religious conditions. Political history has its own significance and as already discussed in the previous chapter, it has dominated the interpretation of the caves and their chronology. An attempt has been made to look into the political history afresh. The chronology of the Satavahanas, the Traikutakas and the Konkan Mauryas will be discussed in detail in relation to their chronological implication on the Buddhist caves. Certain details are unavoidable because of its relation with the factual data and its historicity. However, due to lack of sources, religion has been discussed very briefly.

Physical Geography of western Deccan:

Three basic regions broadly divide the Indian subcontinent i) The Deccan peninsula ii) the Indo-Gangetic plain and iii) the Himalayan ranges. The eastern and western sides of the Deccan peninsula are covered by the sea. The eastern and western boundaries are marked by the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea, respectively, whereas the southern part is covered by the Indian Ocean i.e. Hind Mahāsāgar. As noted earlier, the Arabian Sea covers the western side. The Sahyādri ranges divide the region into two
distinct parts I) the coastal region which is known as Konkan and ii) the Deccan plateau. The Konkan region consists of a long coastal strip whose eastern boundary is marked by the ranges of Sahyadri. The Deccan plateau is of volcanic origin. It is the western part of the peninsular plateau, which comprises the Indian mainland. The eastern end of the plateau is marked by hills, which are low and discontinuous. Western Deccan has mainly black soil, which has high moisture retentivity whereas eastern Deccan has alluvial soil, which is good for rice cultivation. These geographical features make the western Deccan a unique region.

As stated above, the mountain ranges of Sahyadri are a dividing line between the sub regions of western Deccan. The Sahyadri ranges are very high at the northern end and gradually the height decreases towards the southern end. Sahyadri ranges start from the south of the Tapi River. There are several offshoots of the Sahyadri ranges in the plateau-they are Ajanta-Satamalā ranges, Harischandra ranges, Mahādeo ranges etc. The mainland has numerous rivers like the Tapi, the Purna, the Godavari, and the Bhima Krishna. River Tapi flows westwards into the Arabian Sea whereas other rivers in the region like the Godavari, the Krishna flow eastwards into the Bay of Bengal. These rivers also form main river valleys in the region. The Tapi and the Purna form one valley, which largely lies below the Vindhya-Mountains, located on the northern most part of the region. The Godavari valley i.e. upper Godavari lies between the Sātamalā-Ajanta and Harischandra ranges. The Bhima valley lies between the Harischandra and Mahādeo ranges and the Krishna valley lies below Mahādeo ranges. River Bhima is a tributary of the river Krishna.

On the coastal side, a number of rivers originate from the Sahyadri ranges, flow westward and meet the Arabian Sea. These rivers are the Ulhas, the Vaitarna, the Gandhari, the Savitri, the Ghod Mandad etc.

**Natural Passes:**

The Sahyadri ranges have natural gaps known as ghats, which form important means as routes of communication between the coast and the mainland. A number of such ghats exist in these ranges such as Thalghāt, Borghāt, Telbailyaghāt, Kusurghāt,
These ghats serve as important routes between the coast and the mainland. Several Buddhist cave sites are located in close proximity to these natural passes as well as important coastal and main land centers. Kondivite, Kanheri, Kondane, Virar, Ambivali, Uran, Nenavali-Khadsamala, Chaul, Pali-Sudhagad, Thanala-Nadsur, Kuda, Mahad, Khed, Chipun, Panhole-Kaji and Lonad are the Buddhist cave sites located in the coastal region. Several port centres are also located on the seacoast such as Sopara, Kalyan, Chaul, Dabhol, Jaigarh and Vijaydurg. These seaports are mentioned in the *Periplus*.

On the other hand, an equal number of Buddhist cave sites are also located on the main land. They are Ajanta, Aurangabad, Pitalkhora, Nasik, Junnar, Karla, Bhaja, Bedsa, Shelarwadi, Shirwal, Karad, Tamakan, Wai, Pohale and Yerphal. Other important inland centers are Paithan, Bahal, Tei, Nevasa, Kolhapur etc.

The coast and inland region are connected through natural passes. The caves are located around the natural passes which serve as channels of communication. The caves of Kondane are connected with Karla and Bhaja through the Borghat; Thanala-Nadsur, Pali-Sudhagad with Bedsa and Shelarwadi through the Tail-Bailya ghāt; the caves of Chipun are connected with Yerphal, Karad via the Kumbharli ghāt; Junnar is connected via the Naneghāt whereas Nasik with the coastal centre through the Thālghat. These are several major routes of communication. However these routes are further connected with the inland centers from Nasik to Bahal and Ajanta, from Junnar, Karla, Bhaja and Ajanta and go towards Paithan, from Karad towards the south like Sannati and elsewhere. The other smaller centers are located either on the major routes or in close proximity to the ghāts. The caves of Shirwal are located on the route between Junnar and Karad. Ajanta and Pitalkhora are located en route to Paithan from Bahal.

In the Konkan region, many of the caves are located either near seaports or on the routes towards the ghats. Caves of Virar, Kanheri and Kondivite are close to Sopara and Kalyan seaports. Caves of Lonad are situated between Kalyan and Sopara. Caves of Kondane are situated on the entrance to the Borghat. Ambivali is located to the north of Kondane but close to the Bhimashankar ghat, which is still being used by the local population. However, climbing is very high from this point. Caves of Chaul are located near Chaul itself, which was once an ancient seaport. Kuda caves are located near the Rajapuri creek. Nenawali-Khadsamla caves are located near Pali-Sudhagad. The route from Pali-Sudhagad goes via the Telbailiya ghat where the caves of Thanala-Nadsur are located. However, it may also be noted that Thanala-Nadsur is located on the ranges of Sahyādri and is away from the Telbailiya ghat. Mahad is located near the Varanda ghat and Kamathaghāt.

The geographical distribution of the cave sites shows that the coast as well as inland centres have numerous cave centres that are located on the routes of communication, near seaports and also near the natural passes. Their distribution pattern in the river valleys also indicates the widespread communication network as well as the preferences of the location.

**Historical Geography:**

Peninsular India is first mentioned as Dakṣiṇāpatha in the *Aitṛēya Brāhmaṇa* dated to the pre-Buddhist times. Dakṣiṇāpatha is also mentioned in several Buddhist texts. Reference to a region in the ancient texts is an indication of the knowledge of that region in a particular historical situation. Cultural contacts between northern and southern India are signified in such instances. Dakṣiṇāpatha is identified as the region south of the Narmada River. The *Viṭāya Pitaka* uses the term Dakṣiṇāpatha in a narrow sense and refers to it as a region confined to the remote settlements of the upper Godavari. The *Suttanipāta*, which is considered as one of the oldest texts of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* refers to the Dakṣiṇāpatha in the story of Bavari who sent his disciples to Sravasti to meet the Buddha. It also refers to two countries of the Dakṣiṇāpatha i.e. Aśmaka and Mulaka. Aśmaka is also mentioned as one of the sixteen *Mahājanapadas* in the *Anguttar Nikāya*.
It is also mentioned in the Chullakalinga Jñātaka\textsuperscript{15}, the Digha Nikāya\textsuperscript{16} as well as in the Brahmanical texts like the Brihatsamhitā and Marceṇḍeya Purāṇa\textsuperscript{17}. Other regions are also mentioned in the Buddhist texts, which are placed in the Dakṣiṇāpatha. The Milind Panho\textsuperscript{18} talks about the region Sunāparāṇa whereas the Apanaṇaka Jñātaka\textsuperscript{19} mentions Aparāṇa. Chronologically, Āśmaka is mentioned in both the texts of the Suttanipāta and the Anguttar Nikāya in the context of events relating to the time of the Buddha. In the fourth century BC the account of the second council (supposed to have been held 100 years after the death of the Buddha) as given in the Cullavagga mentions Avanti as a part of the Dakṣiṇāpatha\textsuperscript{20}. Thus Dakṣiṇāpatha was a larger geographic area and comprises several units that are termed as desa i.e. country. In one of the rock edicts of Aśoka (in the third century BC) the Cholas and Pandyas are known to have been mentioned as Dakṣiṇātyas\textsuperscript{21}. Inscriptional evidence belonging to the early centuries of the Christian era in western Deccan shifts the identity from generic to the more specific units of the Dakṣiṇāpatha. Generally the largest division was known as the Janapadas which was divided into desas and then comes the division known as Āharas\textsuperscript{22}. Political units may be taken as roughly corresponding to the physical geographical units.

Thus the following discussion is focused on several units of the Dakṣiṇāpatha and their physical location. The pre-Mauryan Buddhist texts mention only Āśmaka, Avanti, Mulaka as the countries of the Dakṣiṇāpatha. The post-Mauryan period i.e. early centuries of the Christian era mentions several other desas of the Dakṣiṇāpatha. The Nasik inscription of the time of Puḷumāvi refers to Assika, Assaka, Mulaka, Kukur, Aparāṇa, Anupa, Vidarbha, Benakataka as desas of Dakṣiṇāpatha. Another inscription from Sannati mentions Uparigiri, Jayasi, Chakara, Dakhava and Damandeśa.\textsuperscript{24} Aparāṇa is also mentioned in the inscriptions of Junnar\textsuperscript{25} and Junagarh\textsuperscript{26}, which are later in date to the Nasik inscription.

Assika is also written as 'Asaka,' which is identified with the region in Nagpur district especially the region around Adam. On the basis of a textual references which have not been specified, Mirashi placed this region in the Khandesh i.e. Jalgaon-Dhule districts of Maharashtra.\textsuperscript{27} On the other hand, the Hathigumpha inscription and an
inscribed seal found at Adam suggest its location in Nagpur district. The Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela mentions in line 4-

_Dutīyecha vasē achita yita Sātakaṇi pacchipa-disa_  
_Hatha gaja-nara-ratha-bahul danda pathapyapti._

_Kaṇhabena-gatayacha senaya vitasiti Assikanagara._

i.e. the army of Kharavela marched till the _Assikanagara_ near (the rivers) Kanha and Bena. A seal unearthed from the excavation at Adam mentions _asakasa janapadasa_ Kanha is a river near Adam and a tributary of the Wainaganga. Its present name is Kanhan whereas Bena is identified with the river Wainaganga. Thus it is evident from these inscriptive records that the region mentioned as Assaka and the Assikanagara is the region around Adam.

_Aśmaka or Pali Assaka and Mulaka: according to the Suttanipāta- so assakasa viśaye, alakassa samasane. Vasi Godāvari kule.....i.e, the river Godavari divides the two regions of Aśmaka and Mūlaka._ This region includes the area around south of Upper Godavari valley and Bhima valley. V.V. Mirashi identifies Aśmaka with the present day Ahmadnagar and Beed districts of Maharashtra whereas B.G. Gokhale associates it with the area of Nanded-Nizamabad-Aurangabad districts of Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. Mulaka then would be the area north of Godavari and is likely to have been till the Satpura ranges. Pratiṣṭhāna i.e. Paithan on the northern bank of Godavari, is an important centre in the Mulaka region. The _Suttanipāta_ also mentions-alakasya Pattiḍhāna.....i.e. Paithan of _Alaka_. Kukura is the region north of Narmada. Aparānta is the Konkan region and more specifically northern part whereas southern part is mentioned as Śūnapaṛānta in the Buddhist texts. Anupa is identified with the region around Mahishmati, which is located on the bank of the Narmada River in Nemad district of Madhya Pradesh. The region falls between the ranges of Arāvali and Satapurā. Benakataka is the region around Pauni. Bena is the river Wainaganga and Pauni is situated on the bank of Wainaganga only. Vidarbha is then likely to be the region excluding the Wainaganga River or Assika and Benakataka. It consists mainly of the upper Wardha valley and Painaganga valley in the present day Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. Akaravanti is the ancient name of Mālavā region. Uparagiri, Jayasi
Chakora, Dakhava are yet to be identified\textsuperscript{41}. Damandeśa is likely to be the region of Daman in the northern part of the Konkan.

The Nasik inscription also mentions Govardhana āhāra\textsuperscript{42} where as Karle inscription mentions the Māmala āhāra\textsuperscript{43}. The former is an area around Nasik and the latter is area of Mavāl Taluka in Pune district of Maharashtra. Even during the time of Marāthā rule, the region was being called Mavāl. Geographically it comprises the area of the upper Bhima valley. Karhātaka is referred to as the place name of modern Karad in several inscriptions of Barhut\textsuperscript{44} and Kuda\textsuperscript{45}, but it is also mentioned as Karhātaka viśaya in 959 AD Karhad copper plate inscription\textsuperscript{46}. Therefore, it is likely that Karad being an important centre in the early historical period must have been an area, which comprises the upper Krishna valley. Thus in the ancient times, it is referred to a historical region. In the subsequent period, the identity of several regions such as Avanti, Aparaṇta, Aśmaka remained the same. However Nasik region is called ‘Trikuta’ in later times.\textsuperscript{47} Thus it may be observed that historical regions in western Deccan nearly get overlapped on the river valleys. The distribution of Buddhist cave sites according to historical regions are:

1) **Aparānta**-Virar, Kanheri, Kondivite, Ambivali, Kondane, Uran, Chaul, Pali-Sudhagad, Nenavali-Khadsamla, Gomashi, Thanala-Nadsur, Mahad, Kol, Khed, Chiplun, Panhale-Kaji and Lonad.

2) **Mulaka**- Ajanta, Aurangabad, Pitalkhora, Ghatotkacha (Gulivada), and Ellora.

3) **Govardhana**- Nasik

4) **Mavāl**- Junnar, Karla, Bhaja, Bedsa, Shelarvadi

5) **Karhātaka**- Karad, Yerphal, Tamakane, Wai and Pohale, Shirval.

It is evident that Konkan area has the largest number of cave sites whereas other historical regions have fewer cave sites. The rock cut cave activity began simultaneously in all the historical regions but got limited to the Aparānta and the Mulaka region from third century AD onwards. Reasons for this change in later times lie in the prevalent political and economic conditions in the respective regions, which will be discussed in the subsequent analysis.
POLITICAL

Major political rulers in the western Deccan were the Sātavāhanas, Abhiras, Traikuṭakas, Konkaṅ Mauryas and the Vākātakas. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, political history and chronology of these dynasties has been the basis for the chronology of the caves. In the present analysis political history has been discussed in the light of the historical geography of the region and an attempt has been made to study the relevance of chronology of political history to arrive at certain common reference point for determining the possible date brackets of the caves in relation to the sculptural and architectural language of the western Deccan caves, which will be discussed in chapter IV and V on Art and Architecture.

The Mauryas in the third century BC were the dominant political force and were ruling from Magadha in the northern India. Considerable area was under their control including the western Deccan. The presence of several Aśokan inscriptions in the western Deccan indicates that the area was under the control of king Aśoka of Maurya dynasty. The Aśokan inscriptions are found at Sopara, Sannati et al. Asokan rule ended in the 232 BC. Though the Sungas replaced the Mauryas in north India, there is no evidence of their presence in the western Deccan. The next powerful dynasty is the Sātavāhana who ruled for a very long time in the western Deccan.

SATVĀHANAS:

The beginnings of the Sātavāhana rule have not been determined precisely. However, there is a general agreement among scholars that the Sātavāhana rule ended in mid-third century AD. It is also significant to note that some of the early rulers of this dynasty are mentioned in the inscriptions of Naneghat, Nasik, Karla and Kanheri in the western Deccan. The question of chronology of the Sātavāhanas has been approached in multiple ways. The main argument revolves round the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule in the western Deccan, which has resulted into three conclusions—1) the Sātavāhana rule began as early as 240-230 BC, 2) the Sātavāhana rule began in second century BC i.e. 200 BC, 3) Sātavāhana rule began in 30 BC or first half of the first century BC. All
these postulations about the chronology of the Sātavāhanas are based on the evidences that are available in the form of inscriptions, coins and the Purānic lists of the kings. Their application is varied as regards their correlation and interpretations to arrive at chronology. The list of Sātavāhana genealogy along with their years of rule in different Purāṇas like the Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāpada, Viṣṇu, and Bhāgavat have been considered as cardinal evidence in many studies whereas Dehejia rejected the existing assumption about the beginning of their rule. She relied on the evidence of palaeography heavily and suggested the beginning of the rule to 110-120 BC. Her method of analysis is very different from that of others. However, there is no follow up of her argument and so far there is no attempt to synchronise the available evidences with each other and arrive at a more acceptable proposition. Hence, in the following analysis, discussion on the Sātavāhana chronology consists of early rulers and those who are mentioned in the inscriptive records of the western Deccan caves. Certain details therefore are unavoidable in the discussion.

All the Purāṇas state 30 kings belonging to this dynasty but only the Matsya Purāṇa has all the thirty names. The Purāṇas also assign different years for their rule. The other general statement in the Purāṇas is that the dynasty ruled for 456 years. This particular statement of the Purāṇas assumed considerable significance to sort out the question of Sātavāhana chronology. As noted above, the most common point of agreement among all the historians of the Sātavāhana chronology is that their rule ended in the mid-third century AD i.e. either 225 or 250 AD. Therefore, calculating backwards the Purānic rule of 450 years from this closing date (i.e.225 or 250 AD) the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule is assigned to 250 BC. On the other hand, Purāṇas describe the rise of the Sātavāhana power after the Śungas and Kanvas. Thus according to this statement date of 30 BC or 32 BC is obtained as the beginning of their rule. It may therefore be said that the content in the Purāṇas itself is contradictory to the statements it makes. Besides, the date of 250 BC is unacceptable due to the fact that the Asokan rule ended in 232 BC and the Mauryan rule ended in 180 BC. The date of 30 BC too presents several problems to be accepted as the beginning of their rule. On the other hand, those who favoured the rule of the Sātavāhanas to mid first century BC based their argument on the
evidences of coins found in the early historic layers of the excavated sites. All these sets of arguments are so varied that the question has become too complex. Though considerable number of inscriptions mentioning the names of the dynasty are found in the western as well as the eastern Deccan such as at Nasik, Kanheri, Karla, Naneghat, Sannati, Banavasi, Amaravati, Nagarjunkonda, Myakadoni, Malavalli, none are dated in any era. Method of coin findings in the excavation layers is also used to trace the Sātavāhana rule to the beginning of the second century BC. Thus, there is no evidence so far to arrive at a certain fixed date as to the beginning of their rule.

The Purāṇic genealogy is indeed significant evidence. However, its application has to be taken with caution in the context of inscription and numismatic evidences that have come to light in the recent past. Names in the genealogical list in the Purāṇas and overall content of their rule are stated in a very unilinear fashion. For example, the Mauryas were succeeded by the Śungas to be followed by the Kanvas, Sātavāhanas etc. Also the names of the kings of the Sātavāhana dynasty are mentioned one after another in a unilinear way along with their years of rule57. However, the inscriptive and coin evidences do not confirm this phenomenon. Nevertheless, there are certain similarities in their rule in all the texts. At the same time, few inscriptive evidences too are close to the number of years of king’s rule as mentioned in the Purāṇas. But such instances are few. To treat the Purāṇic genealogy in a unilinear way is not at all an accepted proposition as has been done by several historians. Therefore, the names in the list of Purāṇic genealogy need to be seen in a multi-linear way. Besides, there has to be a common reference point to arrive at an acceptable proposition with the help of textual, inscription and coin evidences. Though numismatic evidences are not an index of chronology, they give certain clues to a plausible relative chronology.

Among other textual evidences are some Jaina text, the Periplus of the Erythrean sea, Ptolemy’s Geography, Vatasayan’s Kāmasutra and Gāthāsaptashati where certain names of the Sātavāhana kings are mentioned. They are- Sātakomi, Sundara Sātakārṇi in the Periplus58, Puḷumāvi in Ptolemy’s geography59, Kuntala Sātakārṇi in Kāmasutra, Hala in Gāthāsaptashati50.
Considering the corpus of evidences, let us determine the synchronising points that can be arrived at and then move forward and backward. It may be observed that the relevance of the Sātavāhana chronology has bearing on the dating of a few caves in the western Deccan. However, it has been used in such a way as if the chronology of caves in the region could be solved by determining the Sātavāhana chronology. A number of coins have been unearthed in the region that belong to the Mahārathis and the finding of these coins in the stratigraphic layers (along with the early Sātavāhanas) lead to an assumption that there were local rulers like Mahārathis prior to the establishment of the Sātavāhan's rule. The question of chronology has been made more complicated due to the fact that these sets of evidence are not correlated and, moreover, the assumption that the genealogical list mentioned in the Purāṇas with its unilinear representation has resulted in diverse opinions, less attention is also paid to Naneghat inscription.

The Naneghat label inscriptions mention Simuka Sātavāhana as the Sātavāhana king, his son Sātakarni and his wife Naganika, Princes Bhaya, Hākusiri, and Sātavāhana. Another name Mahārathi Tranakayira is also mentioned. It is evident from this inscriptional record that Simuka’s son was Sātakarni and he had three sons Bhaya, Hākusiri and Sātavāhana. The mentioning of Mahārathi’s name indicates that the Mahārathis indeed were rulers in the region and, therefore, the Sātavāhana family entered into matrimonial alliances. The Purānic list also mentions Simuka as the first king of the dynasty who is followed by Kanha. Naneghat label inscription indicates Sātakarni as a descendant of Simuka. Besides, the inscription mentioning the name of Kanha at Nasik cave 18 reads as Sādavāhana kulē Kanhe rajāni i.e. Kanha of the Sātavāhana family. The Nasik inscription indicates that the ruler belonged to the Sātavāhana family. The Purāṇas mention Kanha as Simuka’s brother. Further the Naneghat inscription of sacrifice mentions two more names Vedisiri and Satisiri. Vedisiri in the inscription is addressed as the ruling king and this inscription is generally attributed to queen Naganika by many writers. But it is difficult to ascertain this as most of the account in the inscription is badly damaged. Besides, the names of Vedisiri and Satisiri are also considered as Naganika’s sons but their names are conspicuously absent in the list of the Naneghat label inscription. Mirashi proposed that name of Hākusiri must have been
Šaktisiri only. But this remains a conjecture due to lack of clear evidences. The Purānic list conspicuously omits the names of Hākusiri, Satisiri, Vedisiri and Kumāra Sātavāhana and Bhaya. Coins of Simuka, Sīri Sātakarṇi, Kanha, Hākusiri, Satisiri and Kumara Sātavāhana are found at many places in Deccan. Satisiri is identified as the Šaktikumar among the Sātavāhana kings mentioned in the Jaina literature where it is mentioned that the region Mālavā was conquered by Sātavāhana king Satisiri, thus making the event in the text as a historical event.

It is important to note that the Purāṇas further say that Sri-Sātakarnin bhavitā tasya putrastu vaidāsa...i.e. Sātakarṇi will become king and he will have ten sons. The term ‘tasya putrasa’ is very significant here and indicates that he will have ten sons. The Purāṇas do not mention his ten sons. The Nanaghat label inscription and sacrifice inscription together with the coin evidence indicate that Bhaya, Hākusiri, Sātavāhana (i.e. Kumāra Sātavāhana), Vedisiri, Satisiri are likely to be among the ten sons as stated in the Purāṇas. But it is also evident that different rulers belonging to the Sātavāhana family must have been ruling over the Deccan simultaneously. For example, Kanha over Nasik region, Satisiri over Mālavā, Vedisiri in the region around Junnar and the last must have been by Sātavāhana.

The next important ruler mentioned in the Purānic list is Sātakarṇi-II who is said to have ruled for 56 years in the Matsya and Vāyu Puran. R.Chanda and Dehejia attributed the inscription in Sanchi to this ruler whereas R. Benerji and Mirashi attributed this inscription to Sātakarṇi-I of Naneghat on the basis of palaeographical similarity with the Naneghat inscription whereas Sātakarṇi mentioned in the inscription of Khārvela, is identified with Satkarni-II of the Purānic list. Coins found at Sannati, Nasik, Nevasa, Paithan, Kolhapur, Pauni, Tripuri, Kotalingala, Kondapur and Hyderabad are attributed to this ruler. The mention of 56 years of rule has given rise to the controversy with regard to the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule. It may be noted that earlier the Sātakarṇi’s rule was read as 10 years, so in order to accommodate the year of rules as mentioned in the Purāṇas, the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule was shifted to as early as mid-third century BC or mid-second century BC.
As far as the coin evidences are concerned, nobody has satisfactorily explained the reason of attributing the coins (i.e. having the name of Sātavāhana) that are found in excavations to Satakarni-II of Purānic list. The reason of stratigraphy of excavation is used for the attribution of these coins to Sātakārṇi-I and Sātakārṇi-II. At Nevasa, coins of Sātavāhanas are found at different stratigraphic layers including some from the medieval period. Therefore stratigraphic finding of coin cannot be always taken as a mark of chronological position of coin. In addition to this, the coin types cannot be taken as a chronological indicator. For example, bull and elephant type coins were issued not only by the king Sātavāhana but also by Satisiri as well as Sātakārṇi.

As noted earlier, inscriptions mentioning the name of Sātakārṇi at Sanchi and in the Khārvela inscription at Hathigumpha, Udayagiri, do not mention any date. But purely on palaeographic considerations, dates of these inscriptions are ascertained keeping in mind the Purānic evidence along with the idea of long chronological position of the Sātavāhana rule. For example, R. Chanda assigned it to 75 to 20 BC and Dehejia assigns it to 50-25 BC. Nevertheless, it is agreed that the Naneghat label inscription, the Sanchi gateway inscription and the Kharvela inscription palaeographically are not very far from each other. According to D. C. Sircar, Naneghat records are later than the middle of the 1st century BC and Hathigumpha inscription is of the beginning of the first century AD. The context of the Kharvela inscription is also very significant. It mentions that the army of Khārvela marched till Assikanagara and destroyed the army of Sātakārṇi. Assika region is the region around Adam and Assikanagar is Adam itself as explained in the historical geography section earlier. No post-Sātavāhana occupation is found in Adam. Furthermore, the inscription of Gautamiputra Sātakārṇi (i.e. No.23rd King of Matsya Purāṇa) of Nasik cave 3 in his 18th regnal year mentions him as lord of Benakataka. Benakataka as has been discussed, is located around Pauni and part of the upper-Wainaganga valley. So it is evident that the Sātavāhanas had lost control over the Assika and Benakataka and regained it later during the time of Gautamiputra Sātakārṇi. This must have been the reason to address Gautamiputra Sātakārṇi as Benakatalkaswāmi in inscription.
The other important evidence in this regard is the *Yakṣa* figure of Pītalkhora and similar type of figure in the Sanchi gateway. The palaeography of the inscription on *Yakṣa* image is close to the palaeography of the Sanchi gateway inscription.\(^8\) Stylistically, the image is dated to the second half of the first century BC\(^8\). The palaeographic dates of these inscriptions too are same, which also corresponds with the date of the Naneghat label inscription as put forward by D. C. Sircar.

Therefore, Sātakaṇṭi-II of the *Purāṇic* genealogy appears to be a fictitious in the *Purāṇic* list. So Sātakaṇṭi mentioned in the Sanchi and the Kharvela inscriptions appears to be one person. By synchronising inscription and art historical evidences it is likely that this Sātakaṇṭi ruled at the end of the first century BC.

The dynasty suffered a political set back for several years. The *Periplus* mentions that at that time Nahapāna was ruling over the western Deccan and the control of seaports and towns like Baryagaza (Bharuch or ancient Bharukaccha), Ujjain, Sopara, Minnagara, Tagara, had come under Nahapāna who diverted the trade that was carried on by the Sātavāhanas to his own market places.\(^8\) It is further stated that Kalyana was an important port at the time of elder Saraganus (i.e. Sātakaṇṭi), but lost importance when it was being ruled by Sandares (i.e. Sundara Sātakaṇṭi). So by the time Sundara-Sātakaṇṭi’s rule began, Nahapāna had captured the western Deccan and brought it under his control. The mentioning of elder Sātakarni under whose power Kalyan assumed considerable importance also denotes how important and effective the power control had been under the elder Sātakarni. This Sātakaṇṭi is likely to be Sātakaṇṭi-I who has been discussed earlier. As the *Periplus* does not mention any other ruler known from the *Purāṇic* genealogical list, it is likely that the other rulers who followed later must have been less important. Nahapāna’s rule is also evident by Nasik *vihāra* cave 10 and Karle *caitya* cave inscriptions of his son-in-law Ušavadatta. Coins and other inscriptions of Sātavāhanas support the textual account of the *Periplus*. For how long Nahapāna ruled over this region is not certain but from inscriptions it is evident that Gautamiputra Sātakaṇṭi over threw him.

The next important ruler mentioned in the western Deccan caves is Gautamiputra Sātakaṇṭi who is mentioned as the 23\(^{rd}\) king of the Sātavāhana family in the *Purāṇas* such
as the Matsya, the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇda, the Viṣṇu, the Bhāgavata. According to the Matsya and the Vāyu, he ruled for 21 years whereas Brahmāṇda mentions 34 years of his rule. Inscriptions at Nasik\(^4\), Karla\(^5\), and Sannati\(^6\) refer to Gautamiputra Satakarni who is identified as the 23\(^{rd}\) king of the Purāṇas. Gautamiputra Satakarni appears to have ruled for a considerably longer time. Nasik cave no.3 and Karla inscriptions record his regnal years as 18. Another record at Nasik itself mentions his regnal years 24. In the Purāṇic texts, 21 and 34 years are assigned to his rule. It is likely that Gautamiputra Satakarni ruled for 24 years or more. Inscriptional evidence therefore is more dependable than the Purāṇic textual evidences. Nasik cave 3 inscription refers him as Govadhanasa Benakatakaswāmi Gotamiputasa Sirisadakanisa.\(^8\) Besides, another record at Nasik cave No.3 which belongs to the time of Puţumāvi mentions him as the Lord of Asika, Assaka, Mulaka, Surattha, Kukura and Aparānta and that he defeated the Ksaharata kula, defeated Śakas, Yavanas and Pahalavas and restored the glory of the Sātavāhana dynasty.\(^8\) It shows that the king had to fight many battles to regain his territories, which were captured by Nahapāna and others. Inscriptional references to him as Benakatakaswāmi also prove that he had consolidated his power over the eastern Vidharbha region i.e. Assika and Benakataka, which were earlier captured by Kharvela.\(^9\) That Nahapāna was defeated by Gautamiputra Satakarni is also supported by coins that are found at Jogalthembhi in district Nasik. Coins of the Nahapānas were re-struck by Gautamiputra Satakarni\(^0\) whose coins are also found at Chanda, Hyderabad, and Brahmapuri.\(^1\) Three portrait coins are also reported from Paithan.\(^2\) The re-struck coins were issued by Gautamiputra Satakarni after his victory over Nahapāna. Prior to Satakarni, Nahapāna had captured parts of the western Deccan such as Aśmaka, Mulaka, Suratha, Kukura and Aparānta. All these regions were regained by Gautamiputra Satakarni and hence he was addressed as lord of Aśmaka, Assika, Mulaka, Suratha, Kukura and Aparānta. However, none of the records is dated. Even regnal years mentioned in Nahapāna's inscriptions are 41, 42 and 45\(^3\) Some have taken it as the śaka era and arrived at the date 119, 120 and 123 AD, respectively.\(^4\) In the inscription, there is no mention of the śaka era at all. In lieu of the dated records, circumstantial evidences should be taken into account and by synchronising these evidences a second common reference point can be established. The Periplus is dated in
first century AD, that too in the second half of the first century AD. Sundara Sātakarṇī who was ruling at the time of Periplus had a short rule as is evident from the Purāṇic accounts. So, the conflict between Nahapāna and Sātakarṇī took place some time in the second half of the first century AD considering the regnal years of Nahapāna that are mentioned in Uśavadatta’s Nasik inscription. On the basis of numismatic evidence, Nahapāna’s rule is dated to 40 to 80 AD and the conflict between the two rulers is likely to have occurred between 60-70 AD. According to Joe Cribb, the dates in the Nasik inscription being in the regnal years of Nahapāna, the only dated records of the Indo-Parthian kings would help in reconstructing the events with the help of Periplus. Joe Cribb reconstructs the events in the following manner:

a) Nahapāna’s coin were overstruck by the Indo-Parthian king Sases and Satvastres from Sind, thus it is evident that Nahapāna was contemporary to both the rulers.

b) Sases rule and his ancestors have more or less precise dates. Sases’s family lineage is as follows:

```
Gondophores
Abdayase
Sarpādanes
Sases
```

c) Kushan king Kujula Khadphises attacked Sases in 122 years of the Azes era. Besides, Gondophores’s inscription in the Gandhara region is dated in the Azes era of 103 year and his 26th year of rule is mentioned. The Azes era is identified with the Vikram era. Therefore, according to this calculation, Gondophores’s 26th year of rule would be 45-46 AD. Thus, Gondophores’s rule began in 20 AD. Kajula Khadphises attacked on Sases in 64-65 AD.

d) Events described by the Periplus are between 40-70 AD and are related to the south Arabian history of the first century AD.

e) If Sases was contemporary to Nahapāna, then Nahapāna was ruling before 64-65 AD. Prior to this conflict, Sases’s rule began in 60 AD. If Nahapāna’s regnal years 41, 42, and 45 are taken into account then Nahapāna’s rule must have began around 20 AD or so. This would make Nahapāna contemporary to Gondophores.
Thus, in the sixth decade of the first century AD Nahapāna was ruling in the western Deccan. Later Gautamiputra Sātakarni regained the territory from Nahapāna.

It may be observed that Gautamiputra Sātakarni’s regnal year 18 mentioned in Nasik inscription also mentions about the continuation of the land grant to the Buddhist Sangha. This land grant was previously made by Uśavadatta who was the son-in-law of Nahapāna. Thus, Gautamiputra Sātakarni must have begun his rule in the fourth or fifth decade of the first century AD.

Jha too proposes the date of Nahapāna between 48-94 AD or 52-98 AD on the basis of coins, inscriptive evidence and Periplus. Though Jha tried to arrive at absolute dating, it cannot be accepted as a viable proposition as he considered years of rule mentioned by the Purāṇas as authentic and correct. As has been stated earlier, the Purānic years of rule of Gautamiputra Sātakarni are different in the texts, so such absolute calculations can not be arrived at. Nevertheless, it is probable that Gautamiputra Sātakarni’s rule began around the mid-first century AD, and ended in the seventh or eighth decade of first century AD.

So, by considering the first common reference point i.e. of Sanchi and Kharvela inscription’s palaeography as well as stylistic evidence of Pitalkhora Yakṣa image with Sanchi Torana’s load bearer, and then the second common reference point of Gautamiputra Sātakarni with Nahapāna, if one goes backward from these tentative dates, it may be observed that the rise of the Sātavāhana might have taken place in the first century BC. Taking into account these common reference points, the Sātakarni-II of the Purānic list appears to be a fictitious personality rather than a historical person. The historical regions mentioned in the Nasik inscription of Puḷumāvi who was the son of Gautamiputra Sātakarni denote that Gautamiputra Sātakarni had control over the western Deccan, Vidarbha, north-western Deccan. The Sannati inscription would indicate Gautamiputra Sātakarni’s control over Kuntala or north Karnataka region and other regions mentioned in the same inscription that have not been identified so far.

The Purānic list refers to Puḷumāvi (No.24th), Sivasri No.25th, Śivaskanda Sātakarni No.26th in successive order. However, inscription records show that all these
were brothers along with one more person Vasithiputra Sātakarṇī who is absent in the Purāṇic list. Inscriptions and legends inscribed on their coins record them as Vasithiputasa. The Nasik inscription of Pulumāvi mentions him as Vasithiputasa Pulumāvi. Considering this expression, undoubtedly all appear to be sons of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇī. Pulumāvi is mentioned in the Matsya, the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas. It is only in the Matsya Purāṇa that Pulumāvi’s years of rule are assigned 28 years. Nasik Cave No.23 inscription records his 2nd and 6th year of rule. The Karla inscription mentions his regnal year 7. Nasik cave No.3 records 19 & 22 regnal years, whereas another inscription at Karla mentions his regnal years 24. It is likely that the Matsya Purāṇa’s reference to his period of rule is correct to a certain extent.

One more Sātakarṇī has been addressed as Vasithiputasa in epigraphic record of Kanheri, whose name is absent in the Purāṇic list. It mentions Vasithiputasa siri Sātakarṇī and his queen (name lost) who is a daughter of Mahākṣatrāpa Rudradaman. Junagarh inscription of Rudradaman mentions that he defeated the lord of Daksināpathaswaṃi Sātakarṇī twice but did not kill him due to close relationship. Historical regions mentioned here are Akaravanti, Anupa, Anarta, Surastra, Shrabhra, Maru, Katccha, Sindhu-souvir, Kukur, Aparanta and Nishada. It indicates that some of the regions, which were under the Sātavāhanas, mainly from the time of Gautamiputra Sātakarṇī who captured those regions from Nahapāna earlier, were now being controlled by the Rudradaman. Ptolemy in his geography recorded that Pulumāvi was ruling from Paithan and Ujjaini was being governed by the Chasthana who was the grandfather of Rudradaman according to the Andhau inscription. The year mentioned in this record is 72 which has been taken as the śaka era by everyone. Though there is no direct mention of the śaka era, considering Ptolmy’s reference to Chastana and other numismatic evidences together with Gautamiputra Sātakarṇī’s tentative period, the śaka era is a most likely possibility in this case. So it is evident that as long as Gautamiputra Sātakarṇī and later Pulumāvi were ruling, Rudradaman could not capture their regions. Nevertheless it appears that there was a continuous conflict between the two political dynasties over the control of these regions. This may have happened purely from the economic point of view.
mainly to get control over the trade economy. So the Sātavāhanas and Kṣatrapas entered into a matrimonial alliance after Gautamiputra Sātakarni and in all probability during the time of Puḷumāvi or soon after him. But prior to 150 AD, Rudradaman established his control over some of the regions of the western Deccan when Vasithiputra Sātakarni was ruling. So in all probability by the beginning of the second century AD, Puḷumāvi might have come to the throne.

The next important ruler in the context of the western Deccan cave is Yajiia Śiri Sātakarni (No.27 of the Purānic list). He is mentioned in the Matsya and the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgyvata Purāṇas. The Matsya Purāṇa and the Vāyu Purāṇa provided him 29 years of rule whereas one manuscript of the Vāyu Purāṇa and the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa gave him 19 years of rule. Yajiia Śiri Sātakarni’s inscriptions are found at Nasik cave No.20 and Kanheri cave No.21 where regnal years 7 and 16 are mentioned respectively. Another inscription in cave No.3 of Kanheri mentions his name. Inscription at Chin (district Krishna in Andhra Pradesh) recorded his year of rule 27. He seemed to have ruled for a considerably longer time and controlled not only the western Deccan but also the Eastern Deccan. His coins have been found at Tarhala, Chanda, Kolhapur, Nagarjunkonda, Pedugupedu and Guntur. After Yajiia Śiri no other epigraphic record has been found so far in the western Deccan. He might have come to power in the late 2nd century AD and continued to rule till the early 3rd century AD. The importance of his years of rule lies in the fact that Kanheri cave 3 was excavated during his rule and for the first time the Buddha images were carved on the front courtyard pillars in the western Deccan caves. These particular images are of great help in studying the development of the Buddha image in the region, which will be discussed in the chapter on Art and Architecture.

It may be concluded that the genealogy of the Purānic account can not be taken in a unilinear way and inscriptive sources are more dependable. Evidences of coin can not be taken as an index to finalise the chronology merely on the basis of their occurring in stratigraphic layers. Sātakarni-I was a very important ruler and he had ten sons according to the Purāṇas. At least inscription evidences provide a few names like Hākusiri, Bhaya, Sātavāhana, Vedisiri and Satisiri. Sātakarni-II who according to the Purāṇas ruled for 56
years but no numismatic or insciptional evidence can be attributed convincingly to this ruler. Whatever the available evidences, it is observed that the textual reference is related to other evidences, which appear less convincing especially in the case of Sanchi and Hathigumpha inscription of Khārvela. Coins were being issued by the rulers in their name. At the same time the Mahārathis too were allowed to issue coins in their name as is evident from the archaeological excavation at Kolhapur in Maharashtra and Dhulikatta and Kotalingala in Andhra Pradesh. In recent times, C. Soma Sundera\textsuperscript{112} while working out the chronology of the early Sātavāhanas, considered 28 BC as beginning of their rule and does not agree that Sātakarṇi-I and II are separate persons and attributes 56 years of rule to Sātakarṇi-I itself. Sundara accepted the date of *Periplus* as 40-70 AD and hence assigned the date of the Gautamiputra between 60 to 89-90 AD.

Assigning the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule to 28 BC is solely based on the Purānic statements. In order to prove his contention, he skipped the in-between rulers and only considered Āpilaka, Hala, and Sunder Sātakarṇi as important rulers. On the other hand, Meghaswāti is known by coin, Kuntalswāti is mentioned in the *Kāmasūtra*. So he does not take into account their historical possibility and is determined to prove 28 BC as an authentic date for the beginning of the Sātavāhana rule. However, it may be observed that Purānic evidences can not be taken as cardinal and most reliable set of evidences; so emphasis should be given more to inscriptional and numismatic evidences. The present analysis shows that Simuka appears to have come to power in the first century BC. No exact date can be ascertained due to lack of dated inscriptions. Nevertheless, the common reference points as discussed can be useful for the study of chronology of a few caves and moreover how the patronage was extended to the Buddhist caves especially at Nasik and Karla by the Sātavāhanas and the son-in-law of the Nahapāna is very significant. This aspect will be discussed in the next chapter on patronage.

**POST-SĀTAVĀHANA:**

The post-Sātavāhana political history in Western Deccan resulted in the rise of many rulers within the region. The last known king of the Sātavāhanas is Yajña Śri Sātakarṇi whose inscriptions have been found at Kanheri and Nasik. At Kanheri cave no. 74, an inscription mentioning 8th regnal year of Madhariputra Śakasena is found.\textsuperscript{113}
Mahad, the epigraph states that the cave is a gift by Kumāra Kanbhoja Vhenupalita. So Kanabhoja Vhenupalita appears to be a ruler of the region. This is a clear indication that after the Śatavāhanas, numerous local powers established their control over their respective regions. These two rulers are confined to the Aparānta region. In the Nasik region, Ābhiras took over the political power from the Śatavāhanas. An inscription of Ābhira Isvarsena is recorded in cave no. 10 of Nasik. The Purāṇas state that the Ābhiras were successors of the Śatavāhanas, who ruled for 67 years. However, no Purānic account provides names of the Ābhira Kings. They are mentioned as the servants of the Śatavāhanas but epigraphic records do not support this contention. Inscription records, on the other hand, mention them as royal officers or some important functionaries of the Kṣatrapas.

So far only two records have been found mentioning the Ābhira king, one at Nasik and another at Nagarjunkonda. Nasik cave no. 10 has numerous records of the son-in-law of Nahapāna. In the same cave, an inscription belonging to the time of Ābhira king Isvarsena along with the mention of year 9 is found. According to the epigraph, Isvarasena is son of Sivadatta. Nagarjunkonda inscription of year 30 records Abhira king Vasusena. Mirashi argues that the years mentioned in many of these inscriptions after the Śatavāhanas in Western Deccan including the Mālavā and Gujarāt region are likely to be of the Cedi-Kalachuri era, which is also termed as the Ābhira era. Mirashi placed the commencement of this era sometime in 248-49 AD. Mirashi further observes that the Traikutakas too mention the Kalachuri era and accordingly all the Traikutāka inscriptions were dated. There is no clear evidence as to when really this era started. Nevertheless if we calculate according to Kalachuri era, the dates obtained are 248-9+9 = 257-8 and 248-9 + 30 = 278 - 89 at Nasik and Nagarjunkonda respectively. Considering the fact that the Śatavāhana rule ended by the mid third century AD and Isvarsena rose to power in the last quarter of the third century AD in the Krishna Valley of Andhra Pradesh, their dates suggested by Mirashi coincide with the post-Śatavāhanas but this remains a conjecture due to lack of known era in their inscriptions. Mirashi’s observation is based on the idea that the use of śaka era is abandoned in the western Deccan and Gujarāt. The question of possible dates with regard to the Cedi-Kalachuri era will be discussed later. However, the
Abhiras remained in the western Deccan especially in Nasik and Khandesh area at least till the mid 4th century AD, because the Allahabad (in Uttar Pradesh) pillar inscription of Samudragupta, a Gupta king, mentions Abhiras as one of the frontier rulers. So till Samudragupta (340-380 AD), the Abhiras were ruling in the Khandesh area.

THE KONKAŃ MAURYAS & THE TRAIKUŢAKAS:

So far the Konkana Mauryas were regarded as successor of the Traikutakas in the Aparânta region. But epigraphic evidences have put both these dynasties as contemporary rulers in western Deccan. Bandora plate mentioning Maurya Anirgitavaramas is dated to 6th-7th century AD on the palaeographic ground, whereas Aihole inscription of Pulakesin-II dated Śaka 556 i.e. 634 AD mentions that Kadambakas, Mauryas were destroyed by his father Kiritvarman. Kiritvarman's rule is dated to 566/7- 597-8 AD. So, till the mid 6th century AD the Mauryas of Konkana were ruling in the Aparânta region. The earliest known king belonging to this dynasty has come to light through the inscription at Vada near Thane in the Aparânta region. The epigraph mentions Maurya Suketuvarman along with the date śaka 322 i.e. 400 AD. Thus there is clear evidence to the fact that the Konkana Mauryas ruled from 4th century AD to early 6th century AD.

The Traikutaka copperplates have been dated to the Kalachuri-era by Mirashi on the basis of its palaeography. Shobhana Gokhale too considers them to the Kalachuri era and has dated Matavan plates accordingly. There are altogether four copper plates that are attributed to the Traikutakas. They are Surat, Kanheri and two from Matavan. Years mentioned in these copper plates are 241, 245, 256 and 284 respectively. So the dates obtained are 241 + 248 - 49 = 489 - 90 AD, 245 + 248 - 49 = 495 - 95 AD, 256 + 248 - 49 = 505-06 AD and 284 + 248 - 49 = 533 - 34 AD according to the Kalachuri era. Date mentioning yr. 256 of Madhyamsena, claimed to be a lord of Aparânta, will be discussed later. What is important in this case is that the Konkâ region in 7th century AD came under the control of Chalukya king Pulakesin-II. Prior to that the Kalachuri had captured most of the part of Western Deccan in the second half of the sixth century AD as evident from the coins found at Elephanta and cave 21 of Ellora. Thus, the Konkâ Mauryas must have been ruling the region not only in the 4th century but also
in the fifth century AD, and in the second half of the 6th century AD, they might have lost control over the northern Konkan but managed to retain the southern part of Konkan, which later they lost to Pulakesin-II of the Chalukya as revealed by Bandora plate.

Jha observes that the coins of Traikutakas have close similarity with the coins of Ksatrapas and this is possible only when the Ksatrapas were succeeded by the Traikutakas. Therefore, the dates mentioned in all the Traikutaka grants should be regarded as belonging to the śaka era. Harish Thosar too pleads that the years mentioned in all the Traikutaka copper plates be regarded as of the śaka era instead of the Kalachuri era and further adds that the Ābhiras and Traikutakas were the same. It is evident from inscription records that the Traikutakas and Abhiras were two different dynasties. Harish Thosar also quotes the reference from Chandravalli inscription that the Kadamba king Mayurvarman had a conflict with the Ābhira and Traikuta kingdom. Mayurvarman ruled in 325-60 AD. Harish Thosar accepted the reading of this record and argues that this (i.e. according to Chandravalli inscription) places the Ābhiras and Traikutakas as contemporary rulers in 4th century AD. Mirashi too accepts this reading and puts Traikutaka rule accordingly and place them as rulers in the Aparânta region. However G. S. Gai disagrees with this reading of the inscription. According to him Chandravalli record states that Kadamba Mayurvarman renovated a tank and made it more beautiful, and the place was established as a tourist centre (Vanavasakam). Thus the reading is completely different from the previous reading and therefore the content of the inscription becomes controversial. So for a time being, as it is a controversial reading, let's keep this set of evidence aside.

Coining back to the Traikutakas, Surat and Matvan plates, record the place names in Surat and Nasik district and another Matvan plate records places around the Thālghat. This is where Traikutaka king Madhyamsena issued the grant and claimed to be the lord of the Aparânta. But it is evident that the regions in these copper plates are in Nasik and Surat districts. Thus the very control of this region was under the Traikutakas. If śaka era is considered then the dates obtained are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surat</td>
<td>241 + 78 = 319 AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanheri</td>
<td>245 + 78 = 323 AD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matavan  
\[256 + 78 = 334\, \text{AD.}\]
\[284 + 78 = 362\, \text{AD.}\]

Thus we arrive at the date of 4th century AD of all the copper plate grants.

So, as stated earlier, in the third century AD Madhariputra Śakasena was ruling over the Aparânta. In the fourth century AD, Aparânta was under the control of the Konkaṇa Mauryas as revealed by the Vada inscription in Thane, Khandesh was being governed by the Ābhiras. Considering the geographical locations of the Traikuṭaka rulers according to their inscriptions i.e. mainly Surat and Nasik district areas and also observation made by Jha with regard to the coin types of the Traikuṭakas, the dates mentioned in Traikuṭaka copper plates are likely to be of the Šaka era rather than of the Kalachuri era. But again this remains another conjecture due to lack of direct evidence related to the possible era mentioned in the inscription. Discovery of the Vada inscription of the Konkaṇ Maurya dated 400 AD would indicate that the Aparânta region was under their control. The Traikuṭakas then should be considered prior to them, thus the date of fourth century AD for the Traikuṭakas appears more appropriate and therefore the dates in Traikuṭaka inscriptions may be regarded as of the śaka era. It may also be noted that the name Traikuta refers to the geographical area, which is found mentioned in the Anjaneri plates of the Harischandriya king Bhogashakti, which shows that Traikuta was the name of hill ranges bordering the Nasik district on the west.134

The Kanheri copper plate records the date 245 i.e. 323 AD. But it does not mention the name of the ruler. It simply states ‘in the augmenting kingdom of the Traikuṭakas, in the great monastery at Krshnagiri (ancient name of Kanheri), Buddharuchi a resident of village Kanaka, included in the Sindhu Viśaya has erected this caitya (in front of cave no. 3).’135 Interestingly, king Madhyamasen's Matavan plate records yr. 256 i.e. 334 AD and he calls himself as lord of Aparânta. It shows that by the year 323 AD the northern part of the Aparânta was under the control of the Traikuṭakas, which they must have obtained either from the Konkaṇ Mauryas or Madhariputra Śakasena.
Another set of copperplates issued by the Traikutaka ruler Vikramse~a mention the year 284 i.e.362 AD. So, by the time of Vikramse~a, the Traikutakas had captured the entire northern Konka~ area. In 400 AD Maurya Suketuvarman established his power over the Konka~ region by over throwing the Traikutakas. The importance of Kanheri copper plate lies in the fact that it is considered as the beginning of the second phase of rock-cut cave activity (mainly the Mah~Yana phase) according to Marlyn Leese. The palaeographic similarity in few inscriptions with the Traikutaka inscription at Kanheri as has been studied by Shobhana Gokhale will be applied for the study of the rise of the Mah~Yana caves in the region. However it must be noted that neither the Konka~ Mauryas nor the Traikutakas patronised the Buddhist rock-cut cave activity.

Situation in the Mulaka region too was no different after the S~tav~ahanas. It is likely that the Abhiras exercised controlled over large region but their rule lasted a short period of time at least till early 4th century AD. Ajanta inscription of Upendragupta-II in caves no. 17 and 20 records name of Upendragupta who was a feudatory of the V~kataka king Hari~ena and patronised the excavation of cave 17-20. Upendragupta’s predecessors might have served either as feudatory to Abhiras or gained independent control in the Mulaka region.

THE V~KATAKAS:

The V~katakas rose to power sometime in the third century AD. The exact date is unknown as the inscriptions do not refer to any specific era. Very few inscriptions found on stone surface have survived. Till the finding of the Pune plate of Prabhavati Gupta, the V~katakas on the palaeographic grounds were placed between the fifth and 8th century AD. However, after the discovery the of Pune plate, the chronology of the dynasty was put on solid foundation. The V~katakas were contemporaries of the Guptas of the northern India. According to the Pur~nic account Vindhya~akti was to come to power after Kilaka and all those kings are mentioned after the S~tav~ahanas. Chronology worked out by Mirashi is tentative and is accepted very widely. Mirashi on the basis of the Pur~nic account put the date 250 AD as the beginning of the V~kataka rule.
The largest number of Vākātaka copper plates found are those of Pravarsena-II. Almost in all the copper plates genealogy is mentioned. Similarly, Ajanta cave 16 inscription too mentions the genealogy of the Vākātakas. However, none of the inscription records any known date except one inscription of Hisse Borala, which mentions  śaka era i.e. 458 AD  All other inscriptions record only their regnal years. From the available evidence of copper plates and Ajanta inscription, the Vākātakas were ruling from two centres, one situated in the present eastern Vidarbha and another located in the western Vidarbha. They are known as rulers of Nandivardhan branch (present Nagardhan in Nagpur district) and rulers of Vatsagulma branch (present Vashim district).

The genealogy of Vashim branch is found mentioned in Ajanta cave no. 16 inscription 142 where Pravarsena-II son's name is lost, but according to Thalner Copper plate it is Sarvasena-II. 143 As stated earlier, the only dated inscription of the Vākātakas is Hisse Borala inscription of king Devasena where the  śaka year 380 is mentioned. Accordingly the date we arrive at is 458-59AD. 144 Devasena's son is Hariśeṇa. During Hariśeṇa's rule Ajanta caves no. 16, 17-20 were excavated. According to M.J. Sharma, Hariśeṇa's son was Sarvasena-III. 145

Mirashi assigned Hariśeṇa's period from 475 AD onwards. On the basis of date recorded in the Hisse Borala inscription i.e.458-59 AD and content of Ajanta cave 16 inscription which mention that 'so also, on account of his (Devasena) being a well-wisher of the world as well as by his happy and excellent rule, he was indeed always dear and accessible (to the people) like (their) father, mother and friend.

-------- The king having entrusted (the government of the kingdom) to him, became free from care and engaged himself in the enjoyment of pleasures, acting as he liked -------- then his son became king Hariśeṇa'. 146 Walter Spink proposed the date of Hariśeṇa's rule to 465 AD. 147 Ajanta inscription further states that:

Hariramharasmarzukanti Harišeṇo harivistratramapratapha
Sa kuntalavantiklinga kosal trikut latandhra-----jānimāna. 148

These verses are translated by V. V. Mirashi as follows:-

He (conquered), Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosala, Trikuta, Lāṭā Āndhra. Shobhana Gokhale read the missing word after Latāndhra as Aparānta 149 Walter Spink
accepts this reading of Mirashi and argues that Hariśeṇa must have conquered these regions. However, Spink accepts this evidence without examining the dynamics of historical geography of the region. For example, Kalinga and Kosala are situated on the eastern side of Vidarbha thus Hariśeṇa had to conquer the area under the Nandivardhana branch of the Vākātaka family whose last king Prithvisena ruled at least for 17 years according to Mahurjhari copper plate¹⁵⁰ where his regnal year 17 is mentioned. Thus his rule must have gone at least till 487 or 490 AD, which is quite contrary to the content of the inscription of Ajanta. It may be observed that the context of the inscription is completely missing and word such as vijitya i.e. conquered or won is also not there as the word has been used in the verse 8 of the same inscription.

Mirashi¹⁵¹ while writing about the last years of Vākātaka history, draws evidence from the Daśakumaračarita to add that the 10th chapter must have been a true record of historical events and these must be the events leading to the downfall of the Vākātakas. It was Mark Collins who postulated this idea first to date Dandin.¹⁵² The story in the Daśakumaracarita narrates that several regional/feudatory kings came together and fought against the Vidarbha king.¹⁵³

Mirashi proposed the following identifications:

Punyavarma is identified with Hariśeṇa and Anantavarma with his son.

Vasantabhaílu of Aśmaka = the king of Aśmaka who is mentioned in the Ajanta inscription of cave no. 26. Ajanta cave 17 inscription also records that the feudatory king Upendragupta defeated the Aśmaka king, which is the basis of this identification. Rishika is the country consisting of Khandesh region of the Maharashtra.

Avantideva of Kuntala = Rashtrakutas ruling over the country of Kuntala parallel to Vākātaka and their capital was Manapura, modern Man on the Man river in Satara district.

Ekavira of Rishika = the king of Khandesh whose ancestor's inscription is recorded on the walls of caves 17 and 20 of Ajanta.

Nāgapāla of Nāsikya = belongs to the royal family on the Traikutakas probably Vyāghrasena.
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Kumārgupta of Konkan = the independent ruler and by AD 494 Konkan was under the rule of the Traikutakas.

Virasena of Murala = country of Murala may have been situated not far from the bank of the Godavari, but no knowledge of any dynasty ruling there is available/traceable.

Chandravarman of Mālavā = ruled by a very powerful ruler who may have been Yasodharman of Ujjyani, the famous vanquisher of Huna king Mirirakula.

Bhānuvarman of Vanavāsi = Vanavāsi was the capital of Kadambas and it is identified with Ravivarman (a Kadamba king)

However, these proposed identifications pose a number of problems in reconstructing the historical events. As stated earlier, the context in the Ajanta cave 16 inscription is missing and the word at the end of the verse i.e. jānimān is significant. This word does not indicate the conquest but merely indicates to take notice to these things. The kings mentioned in the Daśakumārcharita are feudatory kings but none of the inscriptions assigned to those so-called feudatory kings give any indication that they were feudatory to the Vākātakas except the Aśmaka king. For example, as stated earlier, the Traikutakas were in power in Nasik and Surat region and some part of Aparānta in the fourth century AD. At the same time the Konkaṇ Mauryas too were ruling and could hold their control till Pulakesin-II. Besides, the Traikutaka grants do not mention them as feudatory to anybody. Rishika is situated in the Vidarbha region itself i.e. region around Adam in Nagpur district where the rulers of Nandivardhana branch of the Vākātaka dynasty were in power. One of the Kadamba inscriptions mentions that the Vākātaka king helped the Kadamba king to get back his political power and the date assigned to this king is 490-517-28 AD. The Vākātaka king is identified as Sarvasena-III i.e. the successor of Hariśeṇa. The region Murala has not been identified but simply conjectured as a region near Godavari which appears very doubtful. Kale identifies the region Murala with Kerala, as river Murala is the principal river of Kerala on the basis of Kalidasa's Raghuvaṃśa. Furthermore, place of battle mentioned is the river Varada or Narmada. Even if both the readings are accepted, it appears very imaginary because (i) the river
Varada is Wardha in the Vidarbha region and not very far from Pravarpura i.e. Pavanar near Wardha, from where several grants of Nandivardhana branches were issued. Nandhivardhana branch had control over the entire Wardha river as indicated by their land grants. (ii) to fight battle on river Narmada is practically impossible for the king of Vanavasi owing to the geographical distance and the region between Vanavasi and Narmada. There are two other regions mainly the Aśmaka and Mulaka which were being controlled by the Vākāṭakas. A similar logic too is applicable in the case of the Wardha river. Identification of the Mālavā king with Chandravarman appears not very convincing. His Mandsor stone pillar inscription states that his empire extended over a wide country extending from the Himālaya and the Brahmaputra in the north to the Arabian sea and the Mahendra mountain in the south. This account is far from historical reality and therefore the tradition of writing ‘prasasti’ in this period needs to be seen in the context of representation of a political-cultural phenomenon. Ajanta cave 16 inscription too is an example in this category.

Walter Spink accepted all these identifications in toto and proposed further identification of Maharaja Subendhu of Mahishmati with Viśruta who later started the Kalachuri dynasty from Mahishmati. Mirashi dates Subendhu's inscription of Barvani copper plate to Kalchuri era whereas K.V. Ramesh has proved it to be a Gupta era, thus the date of Barvani copper plate of Maharaja Subendhu is 167 + 320 = 487AD. Furthermore, Walter Spink accepted Traikutaka dates in the Kalachuri era, and accordingly Kanheri plate would give the date of 494-95 AD. With Shobhana Gokhale's reading of ‘Aparānta’ a missing word in Ajanta cave inscription, Spink put 490 AD as the terminating year of the Vākāṭakas political rule. So in order to accommodate the rule of Sarvasena-III along with 487 AD Subendhu's rule in Mahishmati, Spink put c. 477 AD as the death of Hariṇeṣa and writes ‘Hariṇeṣa dies without warning’. Sarvasena-III becomes king but is overthrown by the Aśmaka's conspiracy.

As has been mentioned earlier, Traikutakas were ruling in the 4th century AD but no records trace this dynasty to the of 5th century AD. So the date of 495-95 AD of Kanheri plate is not correct. Subendhu and other rulers of Mālavā region were independent and there is no evidence to link Subendhu with Viśruta of Daśakumārcharita. Besides if
the Kadamba king's accession to his political power is 490-517-26 AD is believed to be correct, then it proves that the Vākātakas were ruling till early sixth century AD and the region came under the control of Kalachuri's Krishñaja in 550 AD. So, all the events as reconstructed by Spink are not viable as historical events. No king would indicate his death as no body knows when it will come, so writing an expression like 'Hariśeṇa dies without warning' is again an unacceptable proposition. To sum up, the account mentioned in the Daśakumāraçarita can not be taken as a historical reality but may be the reflection of the political situation which was prevailing during that time. The story is a fiction and characters are dramatised on the basis of certain historical accounts. The narrative is constructed by keeping in mind all the possibilities of the unification of many events to put in as one major event. So to keep over reliance on the Daśakumārçarita is not a very good proposition, instead inscriptive evidences should be taken into account and be emphasised.

The reconstruction of Mirashi's and Walter Spink's narrative is based on the Ajanta cave no. 26 inscription where one Asmaka king is mentioned. No other details are mentioned. It may be said that the Asmaka king might be a local ruler but at the same time the inscriptions account nowhere mentions about the Vākātakas. Therefore to relate the Asmaka raja (king) with that of Daśakumācarita's a character of Asmaka king Vasantbhanu is not viable. Ajanta cave 26 inscription itself proves a kind of political unrest in the region as no Vākātaka king's name or Asmaka king's name is mentioned. Harish Thosar proposes the identification of Bhāviraja in cave no. 26 inscription of Ajanta with the Sātavāhana king Yajña Śri Sātakarni, which needs to be probed further. Therefore his identification remains a conjecture; moreover it creates problems in accepting Harish Thosar's date to such an early period i. e. third century AD because the sculptural style of cave 26 does not follow the genre of the third century AD. It may also be observed that the local king like Upendragupta, and Varahdev who was the minister of the Vākātaka king Hariśeṇa, financed that excavation of the caves at Ajanta. The political patronage and the community patronage are discussed in the subsequent chapter.
BUDDHISM:

Scholars have given divergent opinion with regard to the spread of Buddhism in the region. V. V. Mirashi, Nagaraju, Gindallian, assigned the date of the spread of Buddhism during the time of Asoka. M. G. Dikshit, B. G. Gokhale and S. K. Meshram assigned an earlier date i.e. 5th-4th centuries BC. Both the contentions are based on the references in the Buddhist texts. The Ceylonese chronicle Dipavamsa mentions that Asoka sent missionaries to various parts including the western Deccan region. This has been treated as key evidence to postulate that Buddhism in this region was introduced during the time of Asoka. The Suttanipata, a Pali text and part of the Khuddaka Nikaya of the Tripitaka, mentions that the sage Bavari who was residing on the bank of Godavari sent his disciples to meet the Buddha. It also mentions Aśmaka and Mulaka as the two regions of Dakṣīṇapatha. The disciples came back as converts to the Buddhist Sangha. This evidence is treated as key evidence to date the introduction of Buddhism to as early as the life time of the Buddha himself. Reference in the Suttanipata hints at the long distance travel and cultural contacts between the western Deccan and the northern India.

Among the other important texts is the Thergatha which refers to the monks from western India. These are Punna, Isidinna and Vaddha. Punna was from Sopara in Aparanta and travelled to Sravasti along with the merchants and was converted (as Buddhist monk) by the Buddha himself. Punna came-back to Sopara and established a Buddhist Sangha. Puunna is also mentioned in the Samyukta Nikaya and Majjim Nikaya. Isidinna was from Sunāpranta i.e. south Konkan and joined the Sangha at Sopara. The third monk Vaddha was from Bharuch, who joined the Buddhist Sangha. Vaddha is mentioned as the son of a merchant. These are the textual references which mention directly about Buddhism in the region. However, to arrive at the possible date for the spread of Buddhism in the region, it is important to look at other sets of evidences that are helpful in this context along with the archaeological evidences.

The Cullavagga records that the monk of Avanti-Dakṣīṇapatha participated in the Buddhist council at Vaishali which was held hundred years after the death of the Buddha (i.e. 383 BC). The Mahavagga tells us that during the time of the Buddha, there were
few monks in Avanti-Dakṣināpatha as indicated by the story of Mahakaccana and Soma Katikanna. These two accounts show that Buddhism reached Avanti-Dakṣināpatha prior to the second Buddhist council. It may also be noted that Avanti and Aśmaka are mentioned among the sixteen Mahājanapadas. This indicates that the region had a good contact with the north India. In the archaeological excavations NBP shreds are found at Nasik, Paithan, Maheshvar and Ter. This also signifies that the region indeed had established contacts with the Gangetic valley. NBP is dated to 6th-5th century BC in the Gangetic valley. Sankalia dated NBP in western Deccan to 400-300 BC. At Nasik, miniature terracotta stūpas along with pot-shreds, NBP and inscribed copper coins are found, which have been assigned to 400-200 BC. In the Mahishmati stūpa all the early historic deposit in the trenches-I, II and IV are characterised by the black and red ware, NBP and early coins. On account of the association of NBP and early coins, this period has been dated to 400-100 BC. Mahishmati is also mentioned in the Suttanipata. At Pauni (in the Vidarbha region) the earliest layer of the stūpa is dated to the pre-Āśokan period. The textual and archaeological evidences show wide-spread contacts between the western Deccan and the Gangetic valley. Thus it may be inferred that by 383 BC Buddhism had spread in the Avanti region and that it is likely that it must have reached western Deccan subsequently. Hence it may be presumed that by 400 BC, Buddhism was present in the western Deccan.

Many of the early sites in the western Deccan are considered as Hinayāna centres. The criterion applied in this case is absence of the Buddha image and wherever the Buddha images are carved, it is generally considered as the Mahāyāna Buddhist centres. Though by 400 BC a schism had developed in the Buddhist Sangha, their differences were more at a philosophical level of interpretation than in terms of sectarian and ritual practices. The first schism resulted in the formation of two schools i) Mahāsaṅghikas who refused to accept the conservative committee of 8 monks and ii) the Sthaviravādi (Theravāda) who agreed to the conservative rulings. Later the Mahāsaṅghikas developed into several sects, mainly Ekavyarāharika, Lokottaravadin, Kaukulita, Bahursrutiya, Prajnaptivadin, Caitika, Aparāśaila, Uttarāśaila. The Sthaviravādin too
branched off into many sects such as Dharmottariya, Bhadrayāniya, Sammatiya, Sannagrika, Dharmaaguptaka, Kasyapiya and Sautrantika.\(^{178}\)

In the case of western Deccan, nothing is known about the sectarian developments. Nevertheless, several inscriptional evidences mention the names of sects. All these records belong to the first, second century AD. Six Buddhist sects are known from donative inscriptions. They are Mahāsanghikas, Dharmottariya, Bhadrayānikas, Caityakas, Aparaśailas and Sammitiyas. Dharmottariya were at Junnar\(^{179}\) and Sopara\(^{180}\); Bhadrayānikas at Nasik\(^{181}\) and Kanheri\(^{182}\), Sammitiyas at Junnar.\(^{183}\) All these sects belong to the Theravādins. Whereas Mahāsanghikas are mentioned at Karla\(^{184}\), Caityaka at Junnar\(^{185}\) and Nasik\(^{186}\), and Aparaśailas at Kanheri\(^{187}\), all of which belong to the Mahāsaṅghikas. The distribution pattern suggests even the existence of two sects belonging to the Theravādins as well as Mahāsaṅghikas such as at Nasik and Junnar. It further suggests that the doctrinal differences never erupted in the cave-monument activity. The best example in this regard is a donation by a monk from Sopara who belonged to the Dharamottariya, but made donations at Karla where the Mahāsaṅghikas were also present.\(^{188}\)

How and when exactly the Mahāyāna Buddhism emerged in the western Deccan is difficult to ascertain. Generally the presence of the Buddha image does not seem to have been exclusively associated with the Mahāyāna alone. The Chinese traveller Fa-hsien in 399 AD described three types of temples that he had found on his journey, Hinayāna, Mahāyāna and temples in which both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna Buddhism were practised.\(^{189}\) It is amply clear that the monasteries of both types were present. The Sarvāstivādins were conservative but by 100 BC the Buddha images were associated with them.\(^{190}\) Thus, the presence of the Buddha image cannot be taken as a criterion for determining the difference between the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. The Mahāyāna Buddhism is generally associated with the Boddhisattva cult.\(^{191}\) The concept of Boddhisattva very much exists in the Pali canon.\(^{192}\) Gradually, the Boddhisattva doctrine assumed importance, which resulted in the emergence of the Mahāyāna Buddhism. Nirvāṇa was the final goal for the Hinayānist whereas for Mahāyānists it is the extinction
of body and mind, and further it is argued that the practitioner was to attain an active nirvāṇa in which he did not remain quiescent.¹⁹³

In the case of the western Deccan, it is only at Ajanta, Kanheri, Nasik, Ellora, and Lonad, that the images of the Bodhisattvas are found. As these figures are associated with the Mahāyāna tradition, they may be considered as indicative of the existence of the Mahāyāna Buddhism. The images of Buddha first appeared on Kanheri cave no. 3 pillar in the sculpted form whereas in the painted form, they occurred not only at Ajanta but also at Karla, Bhaja and Pitalkhora subsequently. Kanheri cave no. 3 records donation during Yajña Sri Sātakarni’s period, thus we get the date of late second century AD or early 3rd century AD. So, by the third century AD Buddha images appeared in the western Deccan. Similarly, the painted images at Karla and Ajanta cave no 10 & 9 are very different from the painted images found in the 5th century AD caves of Ajanta. Hence they may be dated to the third century AD. Bodhisattva Vajrapāni and Padmapāni are shown as attendant figures in Ajanta cave no 9, which are datable to later part of the third century AD or third-fourth century AD on the stylistic grounds. Thus by this time, Mahāyāna Buddhism in the western Deccan had gained strong roots.

The above discussion shows that the Buddhism reached this region in the fourth century BC, after which the Stupas and vihāras were made. The rock cut excavation was a lengthy process but it was more durable than the structural monasteries. The Sangha was functioning independently. Schism in the Buddhist Sangha is evident from the inscriptions of the western Deccan caves of early centuries of the Christian era. It may also be noted that many of the cave sites are located on the main routes of communications from the inland centres to the port towns. Their location also suggests proximity with the nearby habitations. The historical regions in the western Deccan roughly correspond to the river valleys. The largest number of cave sites are located in the historical region of Aparānta and Karhātaka, which indicates proliferation of cave monasteries and strong support to the Buddhist Sangha. The identity of historical region remained the same except the name Govardhana āhāra which was changed to the Traikutaka during the Traikutaka’s rule. As far as the political conditions are concerned, after the Mauryan rule, the region was being controlled by the Mahārathis and
subsequently the Sātavāhanas rose to power in the first century BC. In the mid-first century AD Nahapāna had a control over the western Deccan for a brief period of time. But Gautamiputra Satakañi defeated Nahapāna and regained control over the lost territory. This power shift also resulted in the patronage activity to the Buddhist Sangha. The later rulers like the Traikūtakas, Konkaṅ Mauryas and the Vākātakas had control over parts of the western Deccan and during their rule the rock cut cave activity was confined to only a few historical regions and that too to very few sites. So this brings up the important question of patronage, which will be discussed in the next chapter.
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