

RELIGION IN ANDHRA DESA

M.A. (HISTORY) I Semester Paper -V



Prof. V. Venkateswarlu

M.A., M.P.S., M.S.W., M.Phil., Ph.D.

Professor

**Centre for Distance Education
Acharya Nagarjuna University
Nagarjuna Nagar 522 510**

**Ph: 0863-2346222, 2346208
0863- 2346259 (Study Material)
Website www.anucde.info
E-mail: anucdedirector@gmail.com**

CONTENTS

S.No	TITLES	PAGE No
1	Historian with a Righteous Vision	3-15
2	Vajrayana	16-24
3	Contribution of Andhra Thinkers to the Development of Buddhist Thought	25-49
4	Buddhism	50-65
5	Shaivism	66-69
6	VedicReligion-	70-77
7	Vaishnavism	78-83

Historian with a Righteous Vision

'The most essential element in history is not what happened in the past,
but what people thought about what happened, and what they said about it.'

- Renowned Historian D. Devahuti

1

A Quest for Comprehensive, Scientific Indian History Writing Before we delve into this small book, 'Andhradesam - Religious Developments' (1989), written by the late B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao, let's examine the kind of discussion about history writing that was prevalent in India at the time of its composition.

The modern era in Indian historical writing began with the assertion that Indians lacked a historical perspective, and that reliable evidence about their past was scarce. With the intention of filling such a void, foreign historians, especially British historians, began writing the history of India in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and a model history of India began to emerge.

The early modern historians of India's past, Voltaire, William Jones, Hegel, and Marx, in their respective philosophical limitations, spoke about India in ways that unknowingly laid the groundwork for two distinct trends. While Voltaire and Jones focused on Indian culture and its spiritual significance, Hegel and Marx, based on their limited knowledge, explained India's economic and political developments, theorizing that the history of India was merely the history of its conquerors.

The European arrogance, implicitly present in this, reached its peak in James Mill's 'History of British India' (1817). Mill believed that Indians could not be 'modernized' or 'educated' unless they were liberated from their culture. The Indian history constructed by Mill was a poisonous seed sown in the socio-cultural history of India.

Mill's 'History of British India' proves how much adverse effect a book can have on a nation for generations. Its adverse effect was not limited to historical writing. Its influence is clearly visible in Macaulay's proposed 'Minute on Indian Education' (1835). In fact, in 1857, Indians revolted only against the British Company. But it must be said that from then on, the entire national movement was waged against the history of India constructed by Mill and the education policy proposed by Macaulay.

Who should truly speak about the history of a nation? Who can speak? Is history only literary and archaeological evidence? Or is history only memory, tradition, and literary beliefs? The history writing that continued in India from Mill until the end of the twentieth century was not actually intended to tell what happened in history. When it tells us that something happened,

what the historian is telling us is a very important point. Because behind the speculation, theory, and interpretation he is proposing, based on that historical evidence and trace, he has a purpose. It could be his personal interest, or the collective interest of many institutions and ideologies supporting him.

For example, when Mill undertook the periodization of Indian history, he made a broad division into the Hindu era, the Muslim era, and the British era. History has proven with great sadness that this division was not only artificial but also malicious. Today we can easily dismiss it, because the intentions behind it are clear to us now. But what were the intentions behind Indian historians, who wrote Indian history after Mill, dividing history into ancient, medieval, and modern eras? Is there even such a periodization? Don't we know that by the end of the twentieth century, many aboriginal tribes in India had not even reached the medieval period? Can we even use the term 'medieval period' as far as they are concerned?

Behind the use of such concepts, we have a European model. Europe has a history of its own. More precisely, European man constructed a history for himself. To be clear, he credibly fabricated a history for himself. But we have become accustomed to considering that historical writing as an ideal method of writing for any country or any human group. In the same way, we tried to write our history.

In a way, this is an imperialist historical writing trend. It has two facets. On one side, we rejoice in our culture and our antiquity. We become emotional. This trend, started by William Jones, is now recognized globally as 'Orientalism'. As a historical writing, it is not only a highly unreliable writing trend, but it is also like wanting to remain a child forever, hoping that others will kiss it.

Edward Said, who meticulously examined this Orientalism, explains that this trend has now entered electronic, film, and television media from historical writing, and that it views and portrays the world as two different poles, with the East being more immature than the West.

The second trend in imperialist historical writing views history as an evolution, and in that evolution, Europe (now America) is ahead of the rest of the world, and that the rest of the world is behind it, and that they too must pass through various stages to move forward. This trend, which began with James Mill, is referred to as 'Anglicism' in Indian historical writing. It believes that only England-Europe-America have the scientific, technological, and technical capabilities necessary to construct modern history. It repeatedly states that India too must acquire such technical wealth and weaponry.

According to both imperialist trends, only political forces, economic forces, and gunpowder are given importance in the construction of history. For example, this historical trend tells us that the reason America and Britain won the Second World War was the British naval power. These same historians also told us that the reason Purushottam was defeated by Alexander in the past was that his elephant herd did not cooperate with him. What is surprising if children,

when taught such history in classrooms, feel that they too need such resources to construct their own history?

The Marxist historical perspective, which significantly influenced Indian historical writing, outwardly appeared anti-imperialist, but at its core, it carried the same European arrogance. In their haste to apply European standards to India, Marxist historians underestimated Indian socio-cultural characteristics. The Indian Communist-Marxist movement suffered the most from its consequences. Instead of fulfilling their intention to build a future for India, all their energy was spent on constructing history books.

These histories constructed by foreigners received unprecedented and unique responses in India. Their writings are no less than any other excellent historical writings in the world, whether in scientific reasoning, in corroborating archaeological evidence, or in evaluating evidence found in literature according to internal evidence within the same literature. But most of them, like Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh, Tagore, Nehru, M.N. Roy, were not primarily professional historians. As part of their social and political movements, they produced such distinctive works during the brief respite provided by a prison life. Moreover, the differences in their perspectives were also reflected in the way they viewed history. That is why, as Ranajit Guha said, 'the historical writings that emerged as part of the national movement could not rise above the level of the spiritual biographies of those leaders' (Subaltern Studies - Part I, 1982).

In fact, a national history should have emerged by carefully evaluating those writings and perspectives, and by separating their essence even from the most subtle individual elements within them. But instead of such a broad perspective and scientific reasoning flourishing, a complete 'national history' perspective began to flourish.

This trend, which began with V.D. Savarkar's 'Hindutva' (1923), culminated in the Ram Janmabhoomi dispute as a completely narrow-minded trend. Savarkar's approach of examining Indian history solely on a religious basis made the great poet Iqbal utter the word Pakistan (1930). This trend did not end with the partition of the country. It has continued to haunt independent India at every step.

The consequence of James Mill's division of Indian history into Hindu, Mohammedan, and British eras did not spare Indian historical writing either. However, it has manifested itself repeatedly as viewing history on a Hindu or Mohammedan religious basis, or from a foreign perspective (including the Marxist perspective). Ultimately, even historians who interpret Indian history from a post-colonial, postmodern perspective must be said to be trying to understand their country's history based on foreign standards in some way.

Viewing Indian history with an imperialist perspective is a direct involvement of the imperialist trend, while reading history with a religious perspective is its indirect involvement. Both trends are not truly Indian trends. In fact, we need to understand and construct the history of India using an Indian method of reasoning. We need to know what Indians think about their

past. To know what their countrymen think about their past, a historian needs detachment. Impartiality is necessary. Nothing should be paramount to him except the welfare of his nation's people.

The renowned historian D. Devahuti, in her compiled work 'Problems of Indian Historiography' (1979), rejected both these trends and emphasized the need for a third alternative. She wrote:

'The most essential element in history is not what happened in the past, but what people thought about what happened, and what they said about it is important to us. As far as the history of India is concerned,

The most important thing is what Indians, whether common people or elite, thought and said about the events related to them and their feelings. That definition they give themselves is the measure of their perspective towards history. If, because of that perspective, they ultimately reject history itself as a fabricated story, or despise it, then so be it. If they retain only myths and symbols instead of history, then so be it. Only by understanding the process in which those philosophers, those kings, those social reformers, those artists, those artisans, those farmers constructed history, can we comprehend their attitude towards history. This provides us with Indian frameworks for Indian history. Perhaps those frameworks may not have similarities between one person's understanding and another's. Their attitudes may differ due to the influence of their respective country, time, and external circumstances...'

She concluded by saying:

'Until now, the history of India has been viewed from various perspectives.

Among them are imperialist perspectives, nationalist perspectives.

Just as there is narrow foreign perspective, there is also narrow domestic bigotry. There are religious perspectives, and there is a Marxist perspective.

Indian history has been reviewed so far from various perspectives, whether from a religious perspective or solely from the perspective of economic forces, as a series of epochs, or as histories of various tribes, or as family histories, or as histories of those with linguistic dominance, or in an introspective trend, or as giving utmost importance to external events and regions, or emotionally unrelated to the historical levels they are explaining, or in a pessimistic trend. But what we need today is

Introduction

Religion

Religion did not originate with man. Even if one accepts the existence of a creator, it can be confidently said that he did not create man and religion at the same time. Archaeological research clearly shows that there was no mention of religion in the primitive era of human history. Even then, there are no traces of the creator's memory in primitive man. Even today, scientists say that there are tribes in the Pacific Ocean islands who live without the concepts of soul and afterlife, which are important to all religions. This means that 'religious civilization' has not yet polluted the lives of those tribes. From the above, we understand that man is the creator of religion. Religion is one of the many institutions man built for social peace and tranquility. However, many institutions have risen and fallen in history. But religion, like a banyan tree, spread and took root in human life. In the primitive stage, man was in various helpless states and ignorance. The nature that surrounded him caused fear, anxiety, and wonder. Natural forces were beyond him. He could not control them, and their cause was beyond his primary thinking ability. But man possessed thinking ability and curiosity, which other creatures lacked. With these tools, man imagined nature, which was incomprehensible to his mind and impossible for his power, as superhuman deities. At one time, he gave equal status to various natural forces and worshipped them separately (Henotheism). Such a concept appears in the early part of the Vedic age. Gradually,

The idea of a single force being the cause of the universe emerged. Just as a father is the cause of his children and cares for their joys and sorrows, Prajapati is also the cause of creation and sustenance, and with the belief that his love and affection are the support for his development, he began to pray to Prajapati and offer him gifts. Therefore, religion was born and spread in human rationality, observation, and the ability to coordinate cause and effect.

As society grew and social relations became complex, man's attention shifted from nature to society. At first, society, like nature, appeared terrifying. In the primitive stage, due to meaningless selfishness, humans became enemies of each other. Those were the days when the individual conflicted with society, and society with the individual! This was described as the 'State of Nature' by political thinkers like Hobbes. In that situation, religion and God helped to correct human behavior - that is, by instilling the knowledge that selfishness is not about attacking others, but about cooperating and being friendly with others, thereby creating interest in 'morality' and achieving peace and order in social life. The above two stages of religious evolution, the individual stage and the social stage, are also seen in Vedic religion. Aryan sages prayed to the gods to destroy the Dasa-Dasyus and transfer their crop fields, cattle, and other wealth to them. They offered gifts in the name of sacrifices. But due to new developments in society during the Atharvaveda period, there was a change in perspective. Social relations strengthened, and social peace became necessary. This change is expressed by the following Atharvaveda hymns:

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

The only force that caused the universe was conceived. Just as a father is the cause of his children and cares for their joys and sorrows, Prajapati is also the cause of creation and sustenance, and with the belief that his love and affection are the support for his development, he began to pray to Prajapati and offer him gifts. Therefore, religion was born and spread in human rationality, observation, and the ability to coordinate cause and effect.

As society grew and social relations became complex, man's attention shifted from nature to society. At first, society, like nature, appeared terrifying. In the primitive stage, due to meaningless selfishness, humans became enemies of each other. Those were the days when the individual conflicted with society, and society with the individual! This was described as the 'State of Nature' by political thinkers like Hobbes. In that situation, religion and God helped to correct human behavior - that is, by instilling the knowledge that selfishness is not about attacking others, but about cooperating and being friendly with others, thereby creating interest in 'morality' and achieving peace and order in social life. The above two stages of religious evolution, the individual stage and the social stage, are also seen in Vedic religion. Aryan sages prayed to the gods to destroy the Dasa-Dasyus and transfer their crop fields, cattle, and other wealth to them. They offered gifts in the name of sacrifices. But due to new developments in society during the Atharvaveda period, there was a change in perspective. Social relations strengthened, and social peace became necessary. This change is expressed by the following Atharvaveda hymns:

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"The most essential element in history is not what happened in the past, but what people thought about what happened, and what they said about it is important to us. As far as the history of India is concerned, the most important thing is what Indians, whether common people or elite, thought and said about the events related to them and their feelings. That definition they give themselves is the measure of their perspective towards history. If, because of that perspective, they ultimately reject history itself as a fabricated story, or despise it, then so be it. If they retain only myths and symbols instead of history, then so be it. Only by understanding the process in which those philosophers, those kings, those social reformers, those artists, those artisans, those farmers constructed history, can we comprehend their attitude towards history. This provides us with Indian frameworks for Indian history. Perhaps those frameworks may not have similarities between one person's understanding and another's. Their attitudes may differ due to the influence of their respective country, time, and external circumstances..."

Introduction

Religion

Religion did not originate with man. Even if one accepts the existence of a creator, it can be confidently said that he did not create man and religion at the same time. Archaeological research clearly shows that there was no mention of religion in the primitive era of human history. Even then, there are no traces of the creator's memory in primitive man. Even today, scientists say that there are tribes in the Pacific Ocean islands who live without the concepts of soul and afterlife, which are important to all religions. This means that 'religious civilization' has not yet polluted the lives of those tribes. From the above, we understand that man is the creator of religion. Religion is one of the many institutions man built for social peace and tranquility. However, many institutions have risen and fallen in history. But religion, like a banyan tree, spread and took root in human life. In the primitive stage, man was in various helpless states and ignorance. The nature that surrounded him caused fear, anxiety, and wonder. Natural forces were beyond him. He could not control them, and their cause was beyond his primary thinking ability. But man possessed thinking ability and curiosity, which other creatures lacked. With these tools, man imagined nature, which was incomprehensible to his mind and impossible for his power, as superhuman deities. At one time, he gave equal status to various natural forces and worshipped them separately (Henotheism). Such a concept appears in the early part of the Vedic age. Gradually,

The only force that caused the universe was conceived. Just as a father is the cause of his children and cares for their joys and sorrows, Prajapati is also the cause of creation and

sustenance, and with the belief that his love and affection are the support for his development, he began to pray to Prajapati and offer him gifts. Therefore, religion was born and spread in human rationality, observation, and the ability to coordinate cause and effect.

As society grew and social relations became complex, man's attention shifted from nature to society. At first, society, like nature, appeared terrifying. In the primitive stage, due to meaningless selfishness, humans became enemies of each other. Those were the days when the individual conflicted with society, and society with the individual! This was described as the 'State of Nature' by political thinkers like Hobbes. In that situation, religion and God helped to correct human behavior - that is, by instilling the knowledge that selfishness is not about attacking others, but about cooperating and being friendly with others, thereby creating interest in 'morality' and achieving peace and order in social life. The above two stages of religious evolution, the individual stage and the social stage, are also seen in Vedic religion. Aryan sages prayed to the gods to destroy the Dasa-Dasyus and transfer their crop fields, cattle, and other wealth to them. They offered gifts in the name of sacrifices. But due to new developments in society during the Atharvaveda period, there was a change in perspective. Social relations strengthened, and social peace became necessary. This change is expressed by the following Atharvaveda hymns:

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

Introduction

Religion

Religion did not originate with man. Even if one accepts the existence of a creator, it can be confidently said that he did not create man and religion at the same time. Archaeological research clearly shows that there was no mention of religion in the primitive era of human history. Even then, there are no traces of the creator's memory in primitive man. Even today,

scientists say that there are tribes in the Pacific Ocean islands who live without the concepts of soul and afterlife, which are important to all religions. This means that 'religious civilization' has not yet polluted the lives of those tribes. From the above, we understand that man is the creator of religion. Religion is one of the many institutions man built for social peace and tranquility. However, many institutions have risen and fallen in history. But religion, like a banyan tree, spread and took root in human life. In the primitive stage, man was in various helpless states and ignorance. The nature that surrounded him caused fear, anxiety, and wonder. Natural forces were beyond him. He could not control them, and their cause was beyond his primary thinking ability. But man possessed thinking ability and curiosity, which other creatures lacked. With these tools, man imagined nature, which was incomprehensible to his mind and impossible for his power, as superhuman deities. At one time, he gave equal status to various natural forces and worshipped them separately (Henotheism). Such a concept appears in the early part of the Vedic age. Gradually,

The only force that caused the universe was conceived. Just as a father is the cause of his children and cares for their joys and sorrows, Prajapati is also the cause of creation and sustenance, and with the belief that his love and affection are the support for his development, he began to pray to Prajapati and offer him gifts. Therefore, religion was born and spread in human rationality, observation, and the ability to coordinate cause and effect.

As society grew and social relations became complex, man's attention shifted from nature to society. At first, society, like nature, appeared terrifying. In the primitive stage, due to meaningless selfishness, humans became enemies of each other. Those were the days when the individual conflicted with society, and society with the individual! This was described as the 'State of Nature' by political thinkers like Hobbes. In that situation, religion and God helped to correct human behavior - that is, by instilling the knowledge that selfishness is not about attacking others, but about cooperating and being friendly with others, thereby creating interest in 'morality' and achieving peace and order in social life. The above two stages of religious evolution, the individual stage and the social stage, are also seen in Vedic religion. Aryan sages prayed to the gods to destroy the Dasa-Dasyus and transfer their crop fields, cattle, and other wealth to them. They offered gifts in the name of sacrifices. But due to new developments in society during the Atharvaveda period, there was a change in perspective. Social relations strengthened, and social peace became necessary. This change is expressed by the following Atharvaveda hymns:

"May all our minds and hearts be united, without any animosity, may we love each other as a cow loves her calf.

May the son follow the path of the father, may the minds of the mother and son be united, may the wife please her husband with peaceful and sweet words!

"The most essential element in history is not what happened in the past, but what people thought about what happened, and what they said about it is important to us. As far as the history of India is concerned, the most important thing is what Indians, whether common people or elite, thought and said about the events related to them and their feelings. That definition they give themselves is the measure of their perspective towards history. If, because of that perspective, they ultimately reject history itself as a fabricated story, or despise it, then so be it. If they retain only myths and symbols instead of history, then so be it. Only by understanding the process in which those philosophers, those kings, those social reformers, those artists, those artisans, those farmers constructed history, can we comprehend their attitude towards history. This provides us with Indian frameworks for Indian history. Perhaps those frameworks may not have similarities between one person's understanding and another's. Their attitudes may differ due to the influence of their respective country, time, and external circumstances..."

Introduction

Religion

Religion did not originate with man. Even if one accepts the existence of a creator, it can be confidently said that he did not create man and religion at the same time. Archaeological research clearly shows that there was no mention of religion in the primitive era of human history. Even then, there are no traces of the creator's memory in primitive man. Even today, scientists say that there are tribes in the Pacific Ocean islands who live without the concepts of soul and afterlife, which are important to all religions. This means that 'religious civilization' has not yet polluted the lives of those tribes. From the above, we understand that man is the creator of religion. Religion is one of the many institutions man built for social peace and tranquility. However, many institutions have risen and fallen in history. But religion, like a banyan tree, spread and took root in human life. In the primitive stage, man was in various helpless states and ignorance. The nature that surrounded him caused fear, anxiety, and wonder. Natural forces were beyond him. He could not control them, and their cause was beyond his primary thinking ability. But man possessed thinking ability and curiosity, which other creatures lacked. With these tools, man imagined nature, which was incomprehensible to his mind and impossible for his power, as superhuman deities. At one time, he gave equal status to various natural forces and worshipped them separately (Henotheism). Such a concept appears in the early part of the Vedic age. Gradually,

Kotturu, Dhulikatta, Chandavaram, Tekkalapadu, Jaggayyapet, Timmavaram, Aduru, the main center for the Mahasanghika sect is Dhanyakataka in Andhra Desa. Its branches, the Chaityakas, Purvasailas, and Uttarasailas, are mentioned in literature and inscriptions. Along with these, the sect flourished. Chaityas gained great respect and became a large sect. Later, they branched out into Purva and Aparasailas. This is an indication of a geographical epicenter. Dhanyakataka is primarily geographical, and they referred to themselves as Eastern and Western (see Chapter 15, Map 7).

Buddhist monasteries spread throughout Andhra Pradesh in the early centuries AD. This happened mostly due to the support of the people and merchant classes, rather than royal patronage. Geographically, this spread was concentrated most in the Krishna Valley and Kalinga region (Kalinga is famous for Buddhist centers). The expansion of Satavahanas in Andhra Desa and the shifting of the capital to Dhanyakataka were important developments in the 1st century AD. The Andhra coast becoming a Roman trade center, and the merchant community analyzing Tamralipi and Southeast Asian countries from the Andhra coast are the reasons for this. Due to these developments, wealth increased. Buddhist Sanghas emerged in the Satavahana capital Dhanyakataka and along the trade routes in the hinterland. Local rulers also supported this. Ghantasala, Chebrolu, Buddham, Vijayawada, Nandayapalem, Karlapalem, Bapatla, Garikapadu, Pedamadduru, Penumaka, Sitanagaram, Vaikunthapuram, Velpuru, Nagarjunakonda in Krishna district; Pedavegi, Arugolanu, Kodavali, Pithapuram, Adurru, and other areas in Godavari valley; Thotlakonda, Srikakulam, Jami, Ramatheertham, Kalingapatnam, etc. in Sharada-Vamsadhara valleys; Dhupadu, Kukkatlapalli, Manikeswaram in Gundlakamma valley; Ramatheertham, Adapur, etc. in Penna valley; Konathur, Damirayi in Kalinga-Swarnamukhi valley; Kotilingala, Paishagam, Fajiri in Central Godavari valley; Gajulabanda, Tirumalagiri, Kondapur, etc. in Musi river valley are among them (see Chapter 15, Map 7).

The growth of monastic sites, as seen above, occurred due to domestic and maritime trade; merchant guilds, as well as individual Gahapatis, merchants, and great navigators, generously donated to these Sanghas (Hanumantha Rao 1993: 64-70). Hanumantha Rao explains with much information that Buddhism gained immense popularity in Andhra Desa. He emphasizes that "Buddhism flourished on its own" without royal patronage. In addition, the concept of "Dana" gained great acceptance. As H.P. Ray (1994: 195) commented...

The phrase used for donating gifts to the Sanghas also became distinct due to transformation and change. The word Karitam was used before the Christian era along with the donated item. In the Satavahana and Ikshvaku inscriptions of Andhra Desa found at Bharhut and Sanchi, the word Dana frequently appears in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD. The two words Dana and Deya Dhamma were complementary to each other. The donated item was considered to be a noble gift.

Changes in 'Dhamma' - Mahayana, the placement of Buddha statues, Bodhisattvas - brought people closer to the Sangha. The concept of Avalokitesvara as a protector from the eight dangers during travel attracted merchants and navigators (This is also a source: page 153).

During the Ikshvaku period in Andhra Desa, the capital Vijayapuri became the nerve center for Buddhist activities. Many sects like Avarasailiyas, Chautiyas, Bahusrutiyas, Mahishasikas, and Sthaviras emerged. The connection of Acharya Nagarjuna with Sree Parvata, and the popularity of Mahayana, were prominent reasons for the flourishing of Buddhist activities in Vijayapuri and Goli. The royal patronage of Chamitisri and Kodubalisiri, and the support of common devotees and merchants, were reasons for the prominence of Buddhism in

Vijayapuri. From the 4th century AD onwards, in the post-Ikshvaku period, Vishnukundinas came to the north of the Krishna River, Pallavas came to the southern region, and Gangas came to the northern coastal region. Due to this, the flourishing of Brahmanism, the loss of royal patronage, and the decline of Indo-Roman trade, Buddhist centers became stagnant.

The prominent centers in this period, along with Dhanyakataka and Vijayapuri, are: Guntupalli, Salihundam, Alluru, Ghantasala, Sankaram, Nelakondavalli, Kalingapatnam, Indravalangara, Paslapudi, Buddhham, Tadipudi, Ramatheertham, Chaitanyapuri (Hyderabad), Jaggayyapet (see Chapter 15).

Moreover, from around 400 AD, similar to North India, the temple emerged as a center of socio-economic activity in Andhra Desa. In this period, the focus was primarily on agricultural development. Many Brahmadeyas were granted. The Bhakti movement, based on the incarnations of Rama and Krishna, influenced the growth of Saiva and Bhagavata worship in Andhra. The inclusion of Buddha as an incarnation of Vishnu undermined the distinctiveness of Buddhism. Hanumantha Rao and others (1993: 25) are of the opinion that most of the Vishnukundinas were Vaishnavites, and their Sree Parvataswami was an incarnation of Narayana Vishnu, the Buddha. Stone inscriptions from the Vishnukundina period indicate that Buddhism received royal patronage. An inscription from 400 AD near Chaitanyapuri, Hyderabad, mentions the Govindaraja Vihara. Puddhehagiri, near Pushpagiri in Kadapa district, was a residence for Theravadins (JES I xi: 95).

Vishnukundina Govindavarma I is said to have constructed Viharas in Indrapura. A Vihara constructed near Ranapashapuram was dedicated to Ceylonese Buddhist monks. The Mahayana Chaitya and Viharas near Sankaram were as prominent as the Buddhist monasteries in Guntupalli. The Mahayana Buddhist Sangha that emerged in Nelakondapalli in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD was a major center for learning. The epithet 'Uttavadgita Mahabodichitta' used for Govindavarma I in the Tummalagudem inscription indicates the essence of Mahayana teachings. According to the teachings, anyone who achieves "Bodichitta" (enlightened mind) for the welfare of all beings will eventually become a Buddha. The three principles mentioned in the text, Dashabala, Chaturvaisharadya, and Ashtavenikadharma, describe the definition of Buddha. This is what Mahayana Buddhism teaches. Other characteristics of Buddha are also mentioned, including compassion and thirty-two Mahapurusha Lakshanas (characteristics of a great being). In addition, there is a reference to the concept of 'Dharmashunyata' (Shankara Narayana 1978: 142-43). The most distinctive aspect of that period, related to "Vihara," is reflected in the Tummalagudem inscription. It indicates not only the three types of "Yanas" followed in the Dharmasangraha tradition but also that these three types of Buddhist monks resided in the Indrabhattaraka Mahavihara (same source). It was a period when religious developments were dynamic. In such a context, performing rituals like Ashwamedha Yajna, believing in the concept of Bodichitta, and donating to Buddhist monasteries as an act of ensuring safety for all beings were natural for kings. The first Vikramandhra inscription dates back to 488 AD. It mentions a

donation made to the Mahavihara Sangha of Asanapura. Asanagudem near Jeelakarragudem has been identified as this place (Sen et al. 2004: 172).

Vajrayana

Tantric Buddhism, in all its forms, emerged from Mahayana. This is Vajrayana. Tantric religion generally involves the worship of Mantras, Dharanis, Martas, Devis, and Devas, mixed with Yogacharas like Maithuna and Madya. L.M. Joshi (1967) believes that Andhra Desa was an ancient and popular center for Vajrayana. Combining information from many Buddhist traditions, Dhanyakataka was a Vajrayana center. There, Buddha explained the "Kalachakra" system. Dhanyakataka itself was Dharanikota, the fort of Dharanis. As that literature states, Sree Parvata - Dharanikota was a dwelling place for Tantric practices. Siddha Nagarjuna resided in Sree Parvata and Dhanyakataka. He worshipped the goddess Tara and obtained the Mahakala and Kurukulla Tantras. He achieved Rasasiddhi and Vajrayana Siddhi. Hanumantha Rao and others (1993: 126) are of the opinion, based on the Jaggayyapet inscription of the 6th century AD, that Siddha Nagarjuna actively carried out activities in Sree Parvata Dhanyakataka, and that Tantric Buddhism gained strength from the 6th century AD.

Buddha is one of the greatest historical figures in India. He was born in Kapilavastu in 563 BC. That was the center of the Magadha Mahajanapada. It is located on the India-Nepal border. In that period, Brahmanism held sway over the country's religious and philosophical ideas. Lokayatas, who were fearless and had freedom among them, resisted the Vedic religious traditions and their use in society. These two extreme trends flourished side by side. They always contradicted each other. The Brahmajala Sutta and Digha Nikaya state that there were 64 different philosophical theories in that period.

Conditions in Andhra at the time of the advent of Buddhism

Andhra Desa came under the influence of Aryan thought at least by the beginning of the first millennium BC. In this period, Andhra Desa followed megalithic customs. Dead bodies were either left exposed or cremated. Later, important skeletal remains were collected and buried in deep pits or placed in stone coffins. Around that pit, or around the coffin, large stones were arranged in a circle. These were the customs of that time. In fact, the method of preserving Buddha's physical remains in a certain way reminds one of the megalithic customs prevalent at that time.

In Mahayana Buddhism, there is a greater focus on stupa worship. In this, Buddha's physical remains or relics are preserved. The practice of enshrining physical remains in stupas, as practiced by Buddhists, was not a new custom that emerged in South India in the pre-Christian

era. The remains of the deceased are enshrined in Buddhist stupas and megalithic tombs. They are intended for offering worship to the departed. Both have circumambulation paths around them.

Language, Script

All ancient Hindu sacred texts - Vedas, Brahmanas, Upanishads, Sutras, Puranas - were composed in Sanskrit. It was difficult for common people; they could not access or understand it. In the post-Sutra period, especially after Manu, the study of Sanskrit became limited to the "Dvija" varnas. Consequently, the majority of Hindu society became alienated.

In the 3rd century AD, Mauryan Emperor Ashoka brought about a great revolution by standardizing the Brahmi script and propagating it in Prakrit/Pali languages throughout the country. All Buddhist literature was initially in Pali. That was the language of the people. As many local language words as possible were incorporated into it. This created a close bond with local languages. In the 6th century BC, Mahavira and Buddha preached in local languages in Eastern India. In the 3rd century BC, Mauryan Emperor Ashoka, and two centuries later Kharavela, used Pali in public relations. Buddha spent most of his life in Magadha. He taught his doctrines in the language of that region. Therefore, it is natural that the earliest Buddhist texts were published in Magadha Pali, the language in which Buddha communicated with the people.

Buddhist Sects in Andhra

Buddhist texts mention that differences of opinion and schisms arose within the Buddhist Sangha during Buddha's lifetime (Dattu 1945: 34-47). The first major schism occurred at the Second Buddhist Council held in Vaishali. This happened 116 years after Buddha's Mahaparinirvana, during Ashoka's time. It is said that this council became necessary because Buddhist monks from Ujjayini were engrossed in ten new practices - Dashavattu. These were not accepted by orthodox monks. However, there is another view that this was not the reason, but that the council was organized to discuss the Panchasutra proposed by Mahadeva. This is supported by Bhavya, Vasumitra, Vineetadeva, and the Tibetan historian Taranath. "Dashavattu" is purely disciplinary, while Mahadeva's Panchasutras are theoretical. These two types of opinions can be explained similarly. The practice began with disciplinary principles, and soon theoretical differences emerged. The Mahasanghikas were ready to re-examine the guru's doctrines at the Mahasangiti (Dattu IHQ vi: 640).

Mahadeva proposed five principles related to "Arhats" at this council. They caused the Sangha to split into two branches: Mahasanghikas and Sthaviravadins. The monks of Vaishali, who strongly supported Mahadeva's proposals, separated from the assembly of Sthavira elders. They started a new sect and named it the Mahasanghika sect. Emperor Ashoka organized the Third Council in Pataliputra (Lamotte 1962: 272). In that council, Theravadins (or

Vibhajjavadins) gained dominance. It was presided over by Moggaliputta Tissa. The rest were expelled from the Sangha.

The Sthaviravadins later split into eleven branches, and the Mahasanghikas, while remaining followers of Hinayana, split into seven branches. Gradually, they abandoned Hinayana doctrines. In this way, Mahayana Buddhism was formed. The author of the "Bhikshu Varshagra Prichcha" text, Vineetadeva, compiled the names of eighteen sects. In this, Sthaviras and Mahasanghikas are mentioned as these divisions (same source: 530).

Purvasailiyas, Aparasailiyas (Nagarjunakonda Aparamahalin Sailiyas), Haimavatas, Lokottaravadins, Prajnaptivadins are among the Mahasanghikas.

- Mahasarasvatavadins, Kashyapiyas, Mahishasakas, Dharmaguptas, Bahusrutiyas, Tamaranatiyas are among the Sarvadhivadins.

Kurukuviyakas, Avantikas, Vashtiputriyas are among the Sammatyas.

- Jethavaniyas, Abhayagirivasinas, Mahavihara Vasinas are among the Sthaviras.

Taranath states that the Chaityaka and Purvasaila sects belong to the Mahadeva sect (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1973: 78). Since Chaityakas and Purvasailiyas are found only in Andhra, Mahadeva, who was a contemporary of Ashoka, might have had a connection with Andhra. The Mahasanghika sect further subdivided into two branches: Mahasanghikas and Chaityas (or Lokottaravadins). The "Kathavatthu" commentary states that the Rajagirika, Siddharthika, Purvasailiya, and Aparasailiya sects are Andhaka sects. Chaityaka or Chetiya (same source: 79-80), Purvasailiya, and Aparasailiya also originated from the Mahasanghika sect. Out of all eighteen Buddhist sects, nine are from Andhra Desa (same source: 75). They are:

1. Mahasanghika or Arya Sanghiya (Nagarjunakonda)
2. Purva Sailiya (Amaravati, Alluru)
3. Aparasailiya (Nagarjunakonda, Ghantasala)
4. Rajagirika (Amaravati)
5. Chaityaka (Amaravati)
6. Bahushrutiya (Nagarjunakonda)
7. Mahashasaka (Nagarjunakonda)
8. Uttarasailiya (Bavikonda, Thotlakonda, etc. in Kalinga region)
9. Siddharthika

Let's look at their main centers and the specific doctrines of these sects.

Mahasanghikas or Aryasanghiyas: The Mahasanghika sect emerged during the Second Council. This must have come directly from the Mulasanghika. It came to Andhra Desa from North India, through Pataliputra and Orissa. From it, the Andhra branches originated. There is a pillar inscription at Nagarjunakonda (EI XX: 17). It dates to the eighth year of the reign of Sirivirapurushadatta Bhadanta Anandaraja. This king was the president of the Mahachaitya restoration program of the Avarasaila sect. The inscription states that he was a disciple of the Arya Sangha Desika. Inscriptions mentioning Aryasanghiyas have been found not only near Nagarjunakonda but also at Salihundam in Srikakulam district and Guntupalli in West Godavari district (Hanumantha Rao 1998: 118).

From the beginning, the Mahasanghika sect was popular in Andhra. An inscription found at Nagarjunakonda mentions "Arivahaghana" (Aryasangha) (same source: 112). The Kattu Cheruvu inscription mentions the Arya Bhikshu Sangha. Pottery fragments were found on the Salihundam hill. There is an inscription on them, which reads Aryanaaghana, Hanasa, Naghana. Based on paleography, it must belong to the period between the 1st and 3rd centuries AD. In Sanskrit, Aryasangha means Mahasangha.

Chinese titles of Vinaya texts abbreviated the term Mahasanghika to Sanghika (Dattu IHQ vi). An inscription found at Dhanyakataka (Burgess 1887: 105) reads "Hamghigruhavativratas Dusikasi". Dusika was a common lay worshipper, and the word "Gahavativuta" indicates this. He was a 'Hamghi', meaning a member of the Sangha. The Mahasanghika sects provided a place for laypeople in the Sangha. Therefore, Dusika must have been a Mahasanghika.

From the Amaravati and Nagarjunakonda inscriptions, it is known that Andhra Buddhists had their own religious doctrines. The Amaravati stupa contains the words 'Vinayadhara' and Mahavinayadhara (same source: 162). The second word suggests that the Mahasanghikas referred to their "Vinaya" as Mahavinaya. The Nagarjunakonda inscriptions mention "Apara Mahavinayasailiyas" who followed Mahavinaya. The Nagarjunakonda inscription also mentions Dighahajniya

Nikayadhara, Panchamatikadhara (EI XX: 19). Pali generally belongs to Theravada. It mentions Dharmadhara, Vinayadhara, Matikadhara, but not Nikayadhara (Dattu IHQ vii: 636).

When classifying Buddhist monks, Buddhamedha divided them into Dighachanaka, Majjhamachanaka, Samyutta Chanakas, Anguttara Chanakas, but does not mention Nikayadharas (same source). Therefore, Nikayadhara in the inscription should be considered as belonging to a Buddhist sect not of the Theravada branch. Thus, it must be the Mahasanghika sect.

Huan Tsang wrote that the Mahasanghikas had their own Abhidhamma, but it was in five parts (Panchamantika) (same source). Their "Vinaya" also had five parts (Watters 1961: 216-

217). The proper place of "Vinaya" is after the "Nikayas." Therefore, Panchamatika in the above inscription means only the Vinaya of the Mahasanghikas.

There are two important theoretical differences between Theravadins and Mahasanghikas. Firstly, Theravadins believe in Ashtadipa and Ashtasharagi, meaning self-control (same source: 649). The Andhakas promoted the concept of transferring merit. Inscriptions confirm this (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1993: 77). Secondly, "Kathavatthu" (EI XX: 19) states that the Andhakas believed "Nirvana" to be a positive, definite state, and spoke of "Nirvana Sampatti Sampadaka." This is completely unacceptable to Theravadins, who believe Nirvana is self-realization and not an object that brings ultimate bliss. Therefore, only the Mahasanghikas, and no other sect, would declare "Nirvana Sampatti Sampadaka."

Amaravati, Nagarjunakonda, Indrapalanagara, Adurru were centers of Mahasanghikas. In some places, especially Amaravati and Nagarjunakonda, evidence has been found stating that Mahasanghikas were present, and the administration of the monasteries was under the control of Chaityavadins, Purvasailas, Aparasailas, or Aparamahavanasailas. The idea that Chaityavadins, Purvasailas, and Aparasailas originated from Mahasanghikas seems reasonable. Among these, Chaityavadins are the oldest sect, and the Saila branches are local variations. This opinion is supported by an important source: the Chinese translation of Vasumitra's eighteen sects. Chapter fifteen states:

Followers who supported Mahadeva's anti-Dharma doctrine took monastic vows and settled in Mount Abu Chaitya for about 200 years. Three other sects originated from the Mahasanghikas: Chetik, Aparas, and Uttara Saila sects. Chetik were known as Sailiyas and Andhaka sects (Beal 1886: 299-302).

Mahishasaka Sect: The Mahishasaka sects became famous after the first Buddhist council held in Rajagriha (either 483 BC or 487 BC). This means that this sect originated even before the Mahasanghikas. The Mahishasaka "Vinaya" gave special prominence to a person named Purna (Kullavagga XI: i ii). He led his followers as the Mahishasaka sect. He was among the disciples sent by Bavari to meet Buddha (Parayanavagga, Suttanipata). Bavari sent sixteen disciples to meet Buddha. Only Pingiya returned. What happened to the rest is unknown. Purnashrivasti must have settled there. Later, he must have gained prominence in that hierarchy. He founded a sect with many followers. He must have named it after his region, Mahishasaka. The previous sect went to Ceylon. It must have passed through Andhra Desa. The Mahishasakas mentioned in the Nagarjunakonda inscription (EI XX: 1244) must be the successors of that sect.

The Guntupalli donation inscription mentions the donation of a Bhalagoma Mandapa. This person was Sirisada Rayasagadu, a Mahameghavahana king of Kalinga Mahishan. R. Subrahmanyam (1968: 21) states that the Buddhist monastery in Guntupalli might have been Vidhundanagara. Its mention is found in a copper plate donation inscription from the time of Ikshvaku king Ehuvala Bantamu (3rd century AD). It was recently found near Pantagandigudem.

This is a suburb of Kalla Cheruvu, near Guntupalli. Guntupalli and its surrounding areas have rock-cut Buddhist stupas and viharas complexes. These must have been part of Vidhundanagara (Ptolemy's Pidyunda), the capital of the Mahishasakas. Kharavela, a follower of Jainism, razed it to the ground and plowed it with donkeys. The Mahanagara mountain near Guntupalli, mentioned in the Puranas, might be the same. This might have been the main city of the Mahishasakas.

The Mahishasakas oppose the Sarasvatavadins' "Sabbamatti" doctrine. They say that only the present exists. They say that all conditioned phenomena perish at that moment, and that entering the womb is the beginning and end of human life. They say that sensory material organs, as well as mind and mental factors, undergo change. In other words, there are no real elements.

They do not doubt Buddha's qualities. Perhaps, like Theravadins, they consider him an ordinary human being. Vasumitra says that these doctrines are similar to those of the Mahasanghikas, and that even if it is a Sarasvatavadin sect, they are one and the same. The doctrines they teach are:

1. Even if Buddha is part of the Sangha, donations made to the Sangha are more meritorious than gifts offered to Buddha. (This view of the Mahishasakas is different from that, and also different from what the Dakkhinavibhanga Sutta says - even if Buddha told Mahaprajapati Gautami to give the robe offered to him to the Sangha).
2. Donations made to stupas are meritorious (this is contrary to the view of the Sāṃvāsa sects).
3. Shravakayana and Buddhayana liberation (moksha) are the same. However, the paths to reach it may be different. (This agrees with the Sarasvatavadin doctrine).
4. A heretic cannot achieve the five supernormal powers.
5. The Arhat's body is pure (anāsava).
6. The realization of truth (abhisamaya) is not gradual, but instantaneous (this is contrary to the Sarasvatavadin view, but agrees with the Theravada doctrine (EI XV, No. 55: 274; Luders 1912: Brahmi Inscriptions 1244)).

Chaityaka Sect: Inscriptions from Amaravati, Ajanta, Nashik, and Junnar confirm that the Chaityakas flourished with great prominence throughout Dakshinapatha for some time (Hanumantha Rao 1993: 78). It is said that this sect emerged two hundred years after Buddha's Mahaparinirvana (Bapat ed. 1956: 117). A second Mahadeva is said to be its founder. He is different from the proposer of the Panchasutras that led to the first schism (same source). But the Chaityakas and their subdivisions accepted almost all the Panchasutras (same source: 118). Some scholars say that Mahadeva, the founder of this sect, is the same Mahadeva whom Ashoka sent to Mahishamandala (Sivaramamurti 1942: 7).

The main principle in Chaityavada is the worship of Chaitya. Hence the name. Ramachandran (1939) says that the name "Chaitya" came from the Chaitya or Mahachaitya enshrined in Amaravati. It is well known that stupas were built over Buddha's relics after his Mahaparinirvana. The construction and worship of Chaitya have been part of ancient worship for a long time. The Yakshas of Andhra Desa were such worshippers. They were the earliest Buddhist followers. The term Chaityaka flourished in Andhra from its inception. Some of the earliest Mahachaityas on this land include those near Amaravati and Bhattiprolu (Hanumantha Rao 1998: 79).

Saila Sects: The Chaityakas subdivided into Saila sects. Since their Chaityas were located on hilltops, they are referred to by names like Purvasailas, Aparasailas, Uttarasailas, Rajagirikas, etc. (Watters 1961: 64). They called themselves Sailas because they worshipped large Chaityas, and these large Chaityas are said to resemble those in Rajagriha. This opinion is supported by the use of the word Saila as a synonym for Chaitya in literature. Vasumitra used the terms Uttara Chetiyas and Aparas Chetiyas. Bhavya called these Purvashila and Aparashila. Therefore, the words Saila and Chaitya were used synonymously (Rhys Davids 1970: xlii pages).

According to "Mahavamsa, Dinavamsa," the Purvasaila and Aparasaila sects emerged in the second century after Buddha. Probably around 340 BC. Gradually, Amaravati and Sree Parvata became their centers. They called themselves those from the East and West of Dhanyakataka. Dhanyakataka was probably the capital of the Satavahanas. It was the center of Chaityavada, and it originated there. The Buddhist monks of Dhanyakataka and Sree Parvata gradually referred to each other as Aparasailas and Sarvasailas. Over time, those names became fixed. "Manjushri Mulakalpa" mentions these two great Buddhist centers (EI V 794-96).

The Chaityakas believed in the transfer of merit. In this way, relatives and friends can benefit from the merit earned by one person. Merit can be acquired by enshrining and worshipping a stupa. Many inscriptions mention donations made for the merit of the recipient's relatives and for the welfare of the entire universe.

The sect got its name because the Chaityas were established on mountain peaks, their founder Mahadeva resided there, and they were strict about their establishment, decoration, and worship (Bapat: 117-18). In Western India, this sect is mentioned in the Nashik cave. It states that a lay worshipper excavated that cave, and he belonged to the Chautiya sect (Chautiyupasaka). The Mahachaitya in Dhanyakataka (Amaravati) is entirely the property of the Chautiya sect. If Mahadeva was indeed the founder of this sect, he must have resided in Dhanyakataka. Here, the Mahachaitya is on a plain, not on a hill. Initially, Mahadeva was near Mahanagara mountain, then moved to Dhanyakataka. There he formed his own sect. This hypothesis is reasonable if Mahadeva, whom Mauryan Emperor Ashoka sent to Mahishimandala for religious propagation (Mahavamsa XII: 1-8), is the same person.

Vasumitra said that these three Saila sects had the following principles (Dattu 1978: 115-16):

1. Bodhisattvas are ordinary people. They can also be born in lower realms.
2. Offerings made to Chaitya are not necessarily highly meritorious.

These principles are completely different from the principles of a branch of the Mahasanghikas and the principles of the Purva Saila or Chaityakas. In Vasumitra's view, only the later Saila sects existed, meaning Aparasaila, Chaityasaila, and Uttarasaila, and Purvasaila did not exist.

Kukkuṭika Sect: The Kukkuṭikas are also known as Gokulikas (Kathavatthu). Their view is that the whole world is burning (like a Kukkuḷa, meaning a burning coal or ember). Therefore, they believe it is full of suffering (Hanumantha Rao 1998: 42-43). A large part of the opinions of this sect are found among the Andhakas (Andhra), as attributed by "Kathavatthu." They are a strong branch among the Mahasanghikas. Bapat (1956: 98) is of the opinion that the Mahasanghika sect split into various practical, supramundane, and Kukkuṭa (Gokulika, Bahushrutiya, Prajnaptivada, after which the Saila sects emerged after some time) branches in the second century after Buddha.

Bahushrutiya Sect (Bahuliya according to Pali sources): Paramartha says that the Bahushrutiya undertook to reunite both the Shrivakayana and Mahayana branches of Buddhism. This is supported by their main doctrinal text, Harivarman's "Satyasiddhi Shastra." This is a mixture of ancient and new doctrines and beliefs. Harivarman followed the concepts of Buddhakaaya and Dharmakaaya. He did not recognize the complete transcendence of Buddha. However, he believes in special powers like Dashabala and Vaisharadya (four profound beliefs). These are also accepted by the Sarasvatavadins.

Their monastery has two Chaityagrihas. They accept the concept of Chaityagriha but initially opposed idol worship. Later, they also built a cylindrical shrine. The front part was adorned with a pillar. It resembles a flagstaff. A seated Buddha image is in that shrine. In this way, they followed the path of the Apra Mahavanasailas.

The Nagarjunakonda inscriptions mention a later branch of the Mahasanghikas (EI XX: 24, XXI: 62). They are called the forerunners of Mahayana teaching. They incorporated some doctrinal matters from Mahadeva's Panchasutras. The Andhra Saila branches and these have many commonalities. They gained fame as successors between the traditional and Mahayana branches. However, Nilakantha Dattu (1978: 70) compares the Bahushrutiya with Harivarman's Satyasiddhi sect. This sect dates back to roughly the 3rd century AD. If the Bahushrutiya were predecessors of Mahayana teachings, they must have emerged in the pre-Christian era. Harivarman must have revived that ancient religion.

However, "Kathavatthu" does not mention the specific doctrines of the Bahushrutiya sect. Vasumitra says that although this sect belongs to the Mahasanghika group, it accepted many of the Sarasvatavadin views. Vasumitra also says that this sect considers Buddha's teachings like

Anittata (impermanence), Dukkha (suffering), Sunya (emptiness), Anatma (non-self), Nirveri (ultimate goal) to be supramundane, and other teachings not mentioned above to be mundane.

Teachings and practices associated with "Maggala" and "Palala" are generally considered supramundane in Pali texts. The rest are considered mundane.

Prajnaptivadins: The doctrines of the Prajnaptivadins are:

1. Skandhas are not associated with suffering.
2. The twelve ayatanas are not real.
3. Even if you achieve the Aryan path, or death occurs, they happen according to karma.

It states that Buddha's teachings, as contained in the "Pitakas," should be viewed as nominal (prajnapti), conventional (samvriti), and causal (hetuphala). This sect differs from the Bahushrutiyas. However, it aligns more with the views of the Mahasanghika sect than with the Sarasvatavadin views.

Rajagirika Sect: The Amaravati inscription mentions a resident of Rajagiri named Buddharakshita (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1998: 52). He was probably a supervisor of restoration (Vedika Navakamakasha). Some say this Rajagiri is Gudivada in Krishna district. However, its ancient name was Gridhravatika.

"Kathavatthu" contains some specific doctrines attributed to the Rajagirika and Siddharthika sects. These are not mentioned in Vasumitra's account.

1. There is no quality that is connected to or follows another. For example, oil in a mustard seed, experience in perception, etc., "Natthi chetasi dhamma kehi chi dhamma chisangahita" or "Sampayutta" (VII-2).
2. There is a continuation of the previous view. The mind (citta) alone performs its function. There are no other mental states connected to it. "Natthi chetasivodhammo" (VII-3).
3. It is not material. The intention to give is the real giving. "Chetasikodhammodananti" (VII-4).
4. Merits accumulate. The accumulated fruits are experienced in the afterlife. "Ito dimena tata" (VII-6).
5. Merits continue to increase (due to repeated donations of robes and other items to monks). "Paribhogamaya punnam" method (VII-5).
6. Arhats should not be subject to death, meaning their death is also a result of karma. "Natthi arhat akalamachchu" (XVII-2).

7. Everything is subject to karma, "Sabbam idam kammato" (XVII-3).
8. If it is destined to live forever, it will live so. The one who causes schism in the Sangha is like one who has attained a state of liberation from sin.

"Kappardhakappam tiyya

Contribution of Andhra Thinkers to the Development of Buddhist Thought

◆ M.V. Ramakumaratnam ◆

In the last chapter, we reviewed Buddhism. We examined the contribution of Andhra thinkers to the development of Buddhist philosophy. The Kathavatthu commentary states that Rajagirikas, Purvasailiyas, and Aparasailiyas were Andhra branches. Chetiya or Chetiya (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1993: 79-80) Purvasailiyas, Aparasailiyas are also branches that came from the Mahasanghikas. There are eighteen sects in Buddhism. Nine of them belong to Andhra Desa. Renowned Acharyas flourished in Andhra for the development of Buddhism. Below, we will briefly review the specialties of these Acharyas and their service to Buddhist philosophy.

Distinguished Buddhist Acharyas of Andhra Desa Huan Tsang says that Acharya Nagarjuna (2nd century AD) was a Brahmin and was born somewhere in the Vidarbha region. However, Lankavatara Sutra states that he was a resident of Vedali in Dakshinapatha. Vedali must have been an Andhra village. In fact, there are still Andhra Brahmins with the surname Vedula. It is generally believed by scholars that Nagarjunacharya lived during the Satavahana period and was probably a contemporary of Gautamiputra Satakarni (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1993: 104-05).

It is said that Nagarjuna recovered the Mahayana texts, Avatamsaka, Prajnaparamita, and Saddharmapundarika, from the Naga world (the mouth of the Krishna River was referred to as Nagaloka in the country and in contemporary foreign literature). It is said that the Saila sects in the Krishna valley emerged with the development of Prajnaparamita.

Nagarjuna was an exceptionally brilliant dialectician in the world. He had a realistic view of the state and needs of Buddhism in his time. He examined the literature that existed at that time. He also linked religious practices to it. With that, Buddhism was revived.

Nagarjuna's philosophical teaching avoided the extremes of existence and non-existence - existence and non-existence. It does not say that there is a fundamental element or soul (not the soul mentioned in Bhagavad Gita, but the inner self of an individual, here it means), nor does it deny its non-existence. It states that everything that exists should be critically examined, and what exists should be known as it is. This is the Middle Way or the Middle Doctrine - neither realism nor idealism. However, it is not a negative doctrine. Nothing has an independent existence; nothing exists in independent being. Everything is related to something else. "Bhavah svatantra nasti" (Things do not exist independently). Moreover, nothing has perfect existence. The objects we perceive, the objects we deal with, are composed of "dharmas." These ultimate constituent parts also do not have being or the concept of "self." They have neither permanence nor क्षणिकता (momentariness). All things are interdependent and related. This interdependence and interrelationship make them what they are. The nature of all things depends on what caused

and conditioned them - their emptiness, the feeling of nothingness or detachment, arises from their interdependence - emptiness in that way is not only that everything is existentially determined by relation, but also that one cannot say that anything has a specific, unique nature, or that its essence is this. This is "Naisvabhavya," meaning lack of inherent nature (own existence). The world is in constant motion. Everything is constantly changing. They have a cause and a factor. They cause action and are subject to action. They come into existence and also cease to exist. Therefore, nothing has its own existence in itself or in the whole world, no inherent essence, no permanent unique nature of its own. Thus conditioned, objects that have existence interdependently are not real. The interdependent arising of objects is called "Samvriti" (appearing form). Religions form the world. But relationships are not understood. A relationship is neither similarity nor difference, nor can it be abandoned. Related things are neither mixed nor separate. Our classifications, the concepts we deal with, are self-contradictory and defy explanation.

The main point in Nagarjuna's teachings is that all visible objects in the world are illusory. We are deluded into believing them to be real. The ultimate truth is to realize that all things are "empty." Nagarjuna used this dialectical tool of emptiness to strongly refute the doctrines of his opponents. He showed the distinction between two truths: "conventional" and "ultimate." If the first is realized, the second is revealed. Nagarjuna argued that due to mutual relation and interdependent nature, nothing has its own nature or independent existence. Therefore, non-inherent existence or emptiness is their underlying reality. This can be understood by avoiding the extremes of existence and non-existence. Similarly, what exists in the phenomenal world is neither permanent nor existent, nor impermanent nor non-existent.

Nagarjuna's ethics and political theory are also important. Compassion and truth should be the motivators for all conduct. Truth alone brings all welfare to others. He preached politics based on morality and principles of justice mixed with compassion. Those who violate the law, the guilty, and sinners should be reformed in all ways, for no one is beyond redemption; punishment should never be harsh or inhuman. It should always be aimed at reforming the guilty and improving their conduct. These were his arguments. Even a monk completely dedicated to spiritual life cannot fully fulfill all that morality dictates; it is impossible for a worldly person, Nagarjuna writes in *Suhrullekha* (page 118). However, no one needs to despair or be depressed by the feeling of being morally flawed; there is no need to worry by comparing oneself to ideal perfection. Everyone should sincerely follow moral duty to the best of their ability. One should appreciate the virtues and excellence of others and strive for Buddhahood.

He preached that those who violate the law, the guilty, and sinners should be reformed in all ways, for no one is beyond redemption; punishment should never be harsh or inhuman. It should always be aimed at reforming the guilty and improving their conduct. These were his arguments. Even a monk completely dedicated to spiritual life cannot fully fulfill all that morality dictates; it is impossible for a worldly person, Nagarjuna writes in *Suhrullekha* (page 118). However, no one needs to despair or be depressed by the feeling of being morally flawed;

there is no need to worry by comparing oneself to ideal perfection. Everyone should sincerely follow moral duty to the best of their ability. One should appreciate the virtues and excellence of others and strive for Buddhahood.

Nagarjuna expounded the Madhyamaka school in Buddhist philosophy. It gained popularity not only in India but throughout East Asia. Among the most important texts attributed to him are: Prajnaparamita Shastra, Madhyamaka Karika, Dashabhumivibhashastra Suhrullekha, the last of which means "Letter to a Friend" and was addressed to his patron, the Satavahana king of Dakshina Kosala. The Chinese traveler I-tsing, during his visit (around 700 AD), wrote that children were memorizing this letter and elders were engrossed in its study.

The Madhyamaka Karika contains rhetorical devices, in twenty-three chapters (400 verses). These laid the foundation for the Madhyamaka school. This single work is enough to grasp Nagarjuna's intellect and brilliance. To understand how much he shone with unique splendor among the scholars of this country. Nagarjuna is said to have revived the Mahayana sutras contained in texts. He is said to have recovered texts like Avatamsaka, Prajnaparamita, and Saddharmapundarika from the Naga world. Saddharmapundarika means "Lotus of the Good Dharma." It is praised as being like a pond for the thirsty, a warm fire for the naked, a leader for a merchant caravan, a boat to cross a river, and a light that pierces darkness. He wrote many texts (Subrahmanyam 1932: 56). Twenty of them are available. Among them are Prajnaparamita, Prajnamula Shastra, Prajnapradipa Shastra, Mula Madhyamaka Shastra, Shunyasaptati, Madhyatanugamashastra, Dashabhumivibhashastra, Dvadasanikayashastra, Vivadasamanashastra, Upayakashalya Hrudayashastra, Vighrahavyavartinikarika.

Aryadeva (c. 170 – 270 AD): Aryadeva is renowned as a leading philosopher in the Madhyamaka school. As Nagarjuna's chief disciple, he was also known as Deva, Kanadeva, and Nilnetra. Kumarajiva and Xuanzang say he was a Brahmin and from South India. Available evidence suggests he was from the Krishna-Guntur region, possibly Srikakulam or Dhanyakataka. It is undisputed that Andhra Desa was his sphere of activity. He was probably from the 3rd century AD.

Aryadeva wrote many texts. The most famous among them is "Chatuhshataka Shastra Karika," which contains 400 verses. It is considered one of the foundational works of the Madhyamaka school. Hastabala Prakarananama, Aryaprajnaparamita Mahaparipruchchanama, Sthalitapramadhanayuti Hetusiddhi, Jananaranasamuchchaya, Madhyamaka Bhramamata, Shatasastra are his other works. In Shatasastra, he severely refutes the Samkhya and Vaisheshika doctrines. In the Chittavishuddhi Prakarana of this text, he criticizes the blind faith of Hindus in the purity of the Ganges River.

He is said to have sat meditating in the forest and said: Everything is false - where are oppression and harshness? Who is a friend, who is an enemy? Who is the killer, who is the killed? If one observes the nature of all things, there is no killer, no killed.

Aryadeva further advanced the Madhyamaka philosophical perspective. Supporting Nagarjuna's Sunyavada, he refuted the doctrines of his opponents, both Brahmanical and all Buddhist sects. He criticized the Samkhya and Vaisheshika doctrines and established the Madhyamaka philosophical perspective. He stated that the true nature of all things is emptiness. He made this argument by declaring that the emptiness of one thing reflects the emptiness of all things. Another great writer, Dharmatrata, is said to be a disciple of that deity. Vasudeva wrote a commentary on Aryadeva's Shatasastra.

Buddhapalita (c. 470 - 540 AD): Buddhapalita was the founder of the Prasangika Madhyamaka Buddhist school. His native place was Dantapura. This has been identified as Dantavarapukota in Srikakulam district. Here, a Buddhist Sangha existed in the 2nd and 3rd centuries BC.

It is said that this was a great center of learning. The Buddhist Sangha in Dantapura was very famous. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, Buddhist monks from Dantapura were sent to Sri Lanka for religious propagation. It is said that they contributed to the spread of Buddhism in Sri Lanka. It is also said that they translated Buddhist texts into Sinhala. This is mentioned in the Mahavamsa (c. 1980: 186).

A great Buddhist monk named Buddhapalita, who lived in the 5th and 6th centuries AD, was a prominent figure in the Madhyamaka school. He was a disciple of Aryadeva. He wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Buddhapalita Vritti. In this, he explained the Prasangika method. This method is a unique method of argument in the Madhyamaka school. It is said that Buddhapalita's commentary was influential in the development of the Madhyamaka school.

Bhavaviveka (c. 490 - 570 AD): Bhavaviveka was a prominent figure in the Svatantrika Madhyamaka school. He was a contemporary of Buddhapalita. He also wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Prajnapradipa. In this, he criticized Buddhapalita's Prasangika method and advocated for the Svatantrika method. It is said that Bhavaviveka's commentary was influential in the development of the Svatantrika Madhyamaka school.

Chandrakirti (c. 600 - 685 AD): Chandrakirti was a prominent figure in the Prasangika Madhyamaka school. He was a disciple of Buddhapalita. He wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Prasannapada. In this, he defended Buddhapalita's Prasangika method and criticized Bhavaviveka's Svatantrika method. It is said that Chandrakirti's commentary was influential in the development of the Prasangika Madhyamaka school.

Dharmakirti (c. 6th century AD): Dharmakirti was a prominent Buddhist logician and epistemologist. He was a disciple of Dignaga. He wrote many texts on logic and epistemology. Among his most important works are: Pramanavartika, Pramanavinishchaya, Nyayabindu,

Hetubindu, and Vadanyaya. It is said that Dharmakīrti's works were influential in the development of Buddhist logic and epistemology.

was present. (See Chapter Fifteen). While residing in Dantapura Vihara, he gave many discourses on the Madhyamaka doctrine. Taranatha says that he practiced Guṭikāsiddhi. This was probably a Tantric ritual. He successfully practiced it. He attained "Pravrajya" (monastic ordination). He acquired excellent scholarship in religious texts. He studied Acharya Nagarjuna's मूलग्रंथ (root texts) under the guidance of Acharya Sangharakshita, a disciple of Nāgāmṛta. He acquired supreme knowledge by performing severe penance regarding Āryamañjuśrī (Taranath 1980: 186).

Referring to his predecessors Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, the Tibetan scholar Khai-dub says that Buddhapālita considered "Prasaṅga" (reductio ad absurdum) as the authentic method, and that his gurus believed it to be the true vision (This is the source: 388). Buddhapālita and Candrakīrti are considered the main proponents of the Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka school. Buddhapālita wrote a commentary on the Madhyamaka treatise, which earned the name "Madhyamakavṛtti" (Murthy 1955: 95). His view was that adopting an unwavering dialectical method is the essence of the Madhyamaka school. He says that ultimate truth (paramārtha satya) is incomprehensible through experience, and can only be affirmed by continuously refuting relative truth (saṃvṛti satya). In the "Madhyamakavṛtti" text, Buddhapālita developed a new method. This involves leading the opponent to an absurd position through mutual argumentation, thereby proving him wrong.

Bhavaviveka (c. 490 - 570 AD): Bhavaviveka was the founder and chief proponent of the Svātantrika Madhyamaka school. Xuanzang says that he was a contemporary of Dharmapāla, who was the immediate predecessor of Śīlabhadra. He resided on a mountain peak south of Dhānyakaṭaka, the capital. He was born into the Malayagiri Kshatriya lineage. This Malayagiri is said to be today's Mangalagiri. It is 20 miles from Dhānyakaṭaka. He studied general Mahayana texts, especially Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka texts, under the tutelage of Sangharakṣita. After ordination, he lived most of his life in Dhānyakaṭaka.

Bhāvaviveka, a great proponent of Madhyamaka philosophy, rejected the Prāsaṅgika method. Many scholars say he was from the sixth century. He was a prolific writer - Mahāyāna Karatāratnaśāstra, Madhyamaka Hṛdaya Tāraka Jvālā, Prajñāpradīpa, and other works - in which he defended Madhyamaka philosophy. He argued that one should not only defeat critics of Madhyamaka philosophy by relying solely on dialectics but also defend Madhyamaka philosophy with independent arguments. Accordingly, this method became the Svātantrika school.

The works attributed to Bhavaviveka are: (Taranath: 401) Pradīpedhyatana Nāmaṭīkā, Pañcakrama Pañjikā Nāma, Prajñāpradīpa Madhyamakavṛtti, Madhyamaka Ratnapradīpa Nāma,

Madhyamaka Hṛdayakārikā, Madhyamaka Hṛdayavṛtti Tārakajvālā, Madhyamaka Artha Saṅgraha, Niyābheda Vibhāṅga Vyākhyāna.

He reinterpreted Nāgārjuna's philosophical perspective with logical rationality and independent arguments, and refuted Buddhapālita's Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka viewpoint. In logic, he was a critical realist, and in philosophy, a transcendent philosopher. He enriched Buddhist Sanskrit literature in the sixth century AD through these works. Mahāyāna Karatalaratnaśāstra, Madhyamakārtha Saṅgraha, a commentary on Prajñāpradīpa Madhyamakaśāstra, and Madhyamaka Hṛdayakāraka. The last one is his own commentary on the famous Tarka Jvālā. In addition to these, there are four Tibetan works. Tarka Jvālā provides an elucidation of various schools of Indian philosophy.

Like Dignāga, Bhavya was also influenced by Sautrāntika doctrines and psychology. Hence, the Tibetan tradition calls him a Madhyamaka Sautrāntika. Khai-dub calls him a Svātantrika Madhyamaka Sautrāntika, along with Jñānagarbha, another independent Madhyamaka author of "Madhyamaka Satyadvaya."

Differing from Buddhapālita, Bhavaviveka put forward an argument. He says that one should not only make the opponent's arguments absurd but also put forward one's own logical arguments to silence them. Bhavaviveka interpreted the Mūla Madhyamaka perspective through the syllogistic method. He argues that emptiness is not merely "the denial of something being absolutely existent" but should not be mistaken for "affirming the non-existence of things." While showing a tendency to recognize relative knowledge, Bhavaviveka criticized the Prāsaṅgika school's viewpoint. Therefore, he declared that the "ultimate" in phenomena is inherent.

Not only does he rely on the excellence of logic, but his works also unequivocally state, based on Chinese and Tibetan accounts, that he accepted the reality of the experience of external phenomena (tattva saṁvṛti). In works like "Karatalaratna," he rejected phenomenal existence from an immeasurable perspective.

Followers of the Prāsaṅgika school, like Candrakīrti, often criticized Bhavya. They criticized him for his adherence to logic, for his acceptance of relative truth, and for adopting a positive doctrine. In his work "Prasannapadā," Candrakīrti severely faults Bhavya for failing to precisely formulate the Prāsaṅgika position. Candrakīrti believes that the Svātantrika school did not reject the phenomenal world from an immeasurable perspective, because the immeasurable, due to its transcendent nature, cannot have any connection with the former.

Like other great Buddhist ācāryas, Bhavya was also a devout follower and worshiper of the Buddhist deity Vajrapāṇi. Xuanzang wrote that Bhavya visited Dhānyakaṭaka, where

Vajrapāṇi was enshrined, and recited "Vajrapāṇi Dhāraṇī" for a long time, doing so for divine vision and for the removal of doubts.

Maitreya Nātha: Buddhist logic flourished due to ācāryas like Maitreya Nātha, Asaṅga, and Vasubandhu. They built the edifice of the logical system on the firm foundations laid by Dignāga, Dharmakīrti, Śāntarakṣita, and Kamalaśīla. They wrote many texts. Among them, Maitreya Nātha is the originator of the Yogācāra Buddhist school. He lived around 270-350 AD. He was born in Potala or Paudanyapura. This is said to be Bodhan in Nizamabad district. According to Buddhist tradition, Maitreya gave the secret Yogapanthā initiation to his disciple Anaṅga. He is said to have written the Mahāyānottara Tantrasāstra and Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṅkāra texts. Maitreya Nātha made a significant contribution towards the emergence of Tantra by incorporating esoteric doctrines, such as sexual esotericism, the concept of innate or natural body, and the use of mystical or twilight language. Buddhist Tantric philosophy and religion followed from this.

Buddhaghoṣa: Sumaṅgalavilāsinī and other works indicate that Buddhaghoṣa was from Andhra Desa. His accurate description of the geographical features of Andhra Desa is evidence for this. His description of the Godavari mid-island in the "Suttanipāta" commentary confirms this. In "Sumaṅgalavilāsinī," he mentions Asmaka and Alaka (Mūlaka is this). He writes that the Godavari forms the boundary between the Asmaka and Alaka regions. These are the Asmaka and Mūlaka regions. The Godavari valley, north and south, corresponds to the Nirmala and Balaghat ranges. Asmaka is today's Nizamabad district and Nanded district in Maharashtra. Alaka or Mūlak is the region between Daulatabad and the Godavari river. All the contemporaries and associates mentioned by Buddhaghoṣa were from the South. The vihāras where he and Simhagiri (present-day Sri Lanka) lived earlier were all in South India.

Buddhaghoṣa described the Andhakas (Andhras) and the Damiḷas (Dravidians or non-Aryans or Mlecchas). He said that Māgadhi is an Aryan language, and that it is different from Oḍḍu (Oriya), Kirāta, Andhaka (Andhra language), Yavana (literally, the language of foreigners in India), and Damiḷa (Dravidian or Tamil language). In the "Aṅguttara Aṭṭhakathā" text, he specifically pointed out that the Dravidian, Kirāta, and Yavana languages have a richness of consonants. He describes a strange Telugu custom of anointing human skeletons.

He mentions Dhānyakaṭaka on the Krishna river bank and Dantapura. Since he resided in Mayūrasutta city and Kanchi, and from his description of Tāmraparṇī, it can be said that he was from Dakṣiṇāpatha.

In the colophon of "Visuddhimagga," he calls himself a resident of Moranda Bhautika (Vattācena). The colophon of the Majjhimanikāya Aṭṭhakathā states that he stayed in Kanchipuram, present-day Kanchi, for some time, and in Mayūrasutta city (present-day Mylapore in Chennai) for some time. R. Subrahmanyam (Bapat 1956: 188) says that Moranda

Bhautika, Buddhaghoṣa's native place, might be Kottanemalipuri (Mayūrapuram in Sanskrit, Komata) or Guṇḍiyāpuri in Palnadu taluka, Guntur district.

The contemporary name Morakanda Bhautika corresponds to these two names. The Telugu word 'nemali' (peacock) is equivalent to the Prakrit word 'mura' and the Sanskrit word 'mayūra'. The Telugu word Guṇḍla or Guṇḍupāli is equivalent to 'aṇḍa' or 'aṇḍam'.

There are abundant Buddhist remains in the Kottanemalipuri and Guṇḍiyāpuri regions, but they are in ruins. These are 51 miles from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and 53 miles from Amarāvātī. Both are Buddhist centers in Andhra. Indeed, the influence of these two great centers of Buddhist thought must have been on Buddhaghoṣa. Based on the above evidence, it can be said that Buddhaghoṣa was an Andhra and must have been a follower of Buddhism during his travels. Mahādeva went to Ceylon from Palnadu much earlier than Buddhaghoṣa. He took a thousand bhikṣus with him. He went at the invitation of King Devānāṃpiyatissa of Ceylon for the consecration of a stūpa in Anurādhapura.

Before Buddhaghoṣa translated the Sinhala commentaries into Māgadhī, his knowledge and intellectual abilities were tested. As a demonstration of his scholarship, he composed the great work "Visuddhimagga." It is known from the internal evidence of those texts that he thoroughly assimilated the Sinhala commentaries, deeply understood the contemporary perspectives of the ācāryas, especially those related to "Mahāvīra" (famous for the author's library), and then composed his works. Immediately after "Visuddhimagga," he wrote commentaries on the four "Nikāyas." After that, he wrote commentaries on the seven Abhidhamma texts.

He wrote "Visuddhimagga" at the request of Saṅghapāla. He wrote "Sumaṅgalavilāsinī" among the four "Nikāyas" at the request of Datthabena, who belonged to Sumaṅgala Vihāra. "Papañcasūdanī" and "Mayūrasuttavattanā" were composed at the request of Buddhāmitta. He wrote "Manoranjanī Purāṇi" at the instigation of Jotīpālakona Hillura. Abhidhamma commentaries were written at the request of an unknown bhikṣu or ascetic. This ascetic is identified as Culla Buddhaghoṣa. Thus, Buddhaghoṣa's literary life concluded with Abhidhamma commentaries.

His concept of 'Nāmarūpa' is similar to the Sāṃkhya concepts of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. He uses the same analogy of the blind and the lame to explain these two concepts. There is no doubt that Buddhaghoṣa formulated his concept based on the authority of earlier Buddhist philosophers, especially Nāgārjuna and Aśvaghoṣa. Indeed, based on all available evidence, one cannot but agree with M. Oltramare (Rhys Davids 1932). That is, the Buddhist concept of Nāmarūpa has certainly been tending towards the Sāṃkhya concepts of "Puruṣa and Prakṛti" from earlier times. This unique trend in Buddhist thought is found in Buddhaghoṣa's writings. It influenced his philosophical perspective. His Abhidhamma doctrines, Jñānodaya or Jñānājṛti,

are products of Buddhist influence. The entire Buddhist philosophy, including religion, is based on a psychological foundation. However, in Buddhaghosa's words, it is masked as a psychological advancement (same source). Buddhaghosa expounded his psychology in five forms (skandhas): material qualities, feelings, sensory perceptions, complex mental formations or their associations, and consciousness itself. Let's briefly review Buddhaghosa's views on Buddhist philosophical concepts.

He was a great commentator on the Tripiṭakas. He wrote his first work "Jñānodaya" when he was with his guru Revata. His next work was Aṭṭhasālinī, a commentary on "Dhammasaṅgaṇī." At his guru's suggestion, Buddhaghosa went to Ceylon. He stayed with "Granthakāra." This is the monastic tradition of Variveṇa monastery near Anurādhapura. He successfully completed the task of translating the Sinhala commentaries into Māgadhi.

Among his other works (Subrahmanyam et al. 1958: 278-84) are Sāmantapāsādikā, a commentary on 'Vinaya,' Saṅkhavittara, Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, Papañcasūdanī, Manorathapūraṇī, a commentary on Suttanipāta, and Dhammapada. He is said to have written commentaries on Abhidhammapiṭaka, Sammohavinodanī, and Pañcaprakaraṇārthakathā. The opinions discussed in the introduction to Buddhaghosa's commentary on Kathāvatthu, especially those of the Mahāsaṅghikas who migrated from the South and settled in the Amarāvātī-Nāgārjunakoṇḍa regions of Andhra, are predominant, says Nalinaksha Dutt (1930). These include the Pūrvasailīyas, Aparasailīyas, Siddhāntikas, Rājagirikas, and Caityakas.

Bhadanta Nāgārjunācārya: Besides being a Madhyamaka philosopher, there are literary and epigraphic evidences that three other Nāgārjunas existed in Andhra. A Sanskrit inscription near the Buddhist stūpa in Jaggayyapet, Krishna district, states that a person named Candrabhāva installed a Buddha image after attaining Buddhahood. This person was a disciple of Jayaprabha ācārya. This person was again a disciple of Bhadanta Nāgārjunācārya. Based on paleography, this inscription belongs to the 6th century AD. Bhadanta Nāgārjunācārya must have lived two generations before the date of this inscription. That is, in the last quarter of the 5th century, or at least two hundred years after ācārya Nāgārjuna. The title 'Bhadanta' was usually adopted by the Vibhajyavādins and Prajñaptivādins. The Prajñaptivādins used to call themselves Bahuśrutīya Prajñaptivādins. One of the schools at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa was the Bahuśrutīya school.

Siddha Nāgārjuna (c. 6th century AD): Gaurana wrote a text called "Navanāthacaritra." This is a Telugu poem. It dates to the 15th century AD. This work states that Siddha Nāgārjuna was born to the daughter of the King of Mālavā and a prince of the Candravamsa, Narendrajitāka. He became a disciple of Gonenātha. He studied all sciences. Prince Nāgārjuna trained a disciple named after himself. He taught him various medicinal preparations. He also taught Vajrayāna, Yogaśāstra, and the Navasiddhis. These siddhis include Aṇimā, Laghimā, Garimā, Mahimā, etc. He also taught Rasavāda (alchemy).

The currently available *Rasaratnākara*, based on internal evidence, must be a work from the 7th or 8th century AD. It discusses chemical processes in the form of a dialogue. This dialogue took place "between the revered Nāgārjuna, resident of Śrīśaila, endowed with all prosperity and fortune, and well-wisher of all living beings, and King Śālivāhana" (Murthy 1971: 36).

Siddha Nāgārjuna was proficient in alchemy. He gained worldwide fame as a great alchemist by producing gold. Accompanied by his disciples, he set out to find a suitable place for establishing a laboratory and reached Śrīparvata. Finally, he settled near Elleśvaram. This city has nine forts; there are nine bathing ghats; Navabhairavas and Navanandis are enshrined on the western bank of the Krishna river. It is surrounded by abundant forests. He must have established his laboratory here. He must have started preparing medicines. He must have started converting mercury into gold. He must have carried out these activities with the help of his disciples.

Dignāga (c. 400-485 AD): According to Tibetan tradition, Ācārya Dignāga, the father of Buddhist logic, was born into a Brahmin family in Simhavaktra in the South. Simhavaktra has been identified as Simhācalam in Visakhapatnam district. There is a famous Varāhanarasimhasvāmi temple here. There are many ancient Buddhist sites around it.

Taranāthas (Beal 1986: 217-20) say that Dignāga received "Pravrajyā" from Nāgadatta, who belonged to the Vātsīputrīya school, and that Nāgadatta was a "Śaivaka Tripiṭaka" scholar. Later, Dignāga left Nāgabandhu and went to Vasubandhu. Under his tutelage, Dignāga mastered the Sūtras of both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna schools. He also mastered "Dhāraṇīs." He is said to have learned the Vidyā Mantra (which bestows knowledge and intellect) from Jātāntrikācārya and to have had a direct vision of Āryamañjuśrī. Initially, Dignāga and his guru Vāsiṣṭhīpurīya were Hīnayāna followers. Dignāga's guru, a Vāsiṣṭhīpurīya bhikṣu, expelled him. Later, he embraced the Mahāyāna school. He became a disciple of Ācārya Vasubandhu. He became a follower of the Mahāyāna school and dedicated his entire life to logic and the propagation of Yogācāra doctrines. Xuanzang wrote that Dignāga was from Andhra Desa, and that this famous logician studied and lived in Vengi, the capital of the Eastern Cālukyas. He is said to have written "Pramāṇasamuccaya" on a solitary peak of the Vengi southwest hill. It is his famous logical treatise. It is true that there were Buddhist sites in Vengi, but we can agree with Longhurst's opinion that Xuanzang's description corresponds to present-day Guṇṭupalli in Andhra Pradesh. There are rock-cut caityas and viḥāras here (Murthy 1980: 23).

Dignāga was the founder of Buddhist logic. He re-analyzed Buddhist doctrines. He composed great works on logic. Along with *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, he wrote *Ālambanaparīkṣā*, *Trikālaparīkṣā*, *Hetucakradamaru*, *Nyāyamukha*, and *Prajñāpāramitā Piṇḍārtha*. Dignāga extensively traveled in Maharashtra and Orissa. He refuted the arguments of Tīrthika opponents. He criticized the Nyāya logical doctrines with his logical acumen. He converted a minister of an Orissa king to his side and established sixteen Mahāvihāras.

Dignāga's contribution to Buddhist logic is immense. He laid strong foundations and developed it. He conducted a scientific study of Pramāṇas (principles of knowledge acquisition). Dignāga was a Yogācārin and a Vijñānavādin. His Vijñānavāda philosophy is reflected in works like "Ālambanaparīkṣā." With his affinity for the Sarvāstivāda Abhidhamma philosophy (which he cites to support the two-Pramāṇa empiricist view), his philosophy shows a blend of Sarvāstivāda realism and Yogācāra idealism. Dignāga's realist logic is critical and dialectical in nature. He states that there are only two sources of knowledge (Pramāṇas): direct perception (pratyakṣa) and inference (anumāna). Direct perception is independent of pre-conceived notions. It is not associated with names or categories. That is, the knowledge gained through direct perception is pure. Unqualified apprehension has no specific characteristics. However, inference is twofold: inference for oneself and inference for others. The first is knowledge gained about an object. It can be obtained through any of the three signs: effect, nature, or non-apprehension (i.e., without sensory apprehension). Dignāga first examined the "Apoha" (exclusion) theory in "Pramāṇasamuccaya." He considered it to be pure negation.

The doctrines of ultimate non-duality, idealism, and critical realism are strangely blended in Dignāga's works. While doing so, he admits that Dharma is not a matter that falls within the scope of logical rationality. The purpose of logic is limited. It is only a tool to correct realists and to rectify errors in arguments. Dignāga believes that logic and dialectics are necessary to convince opponents about the validity of truth and the omnipresence of Buddha, and to strengthen them. He clarified that ultimate truth cannot be attained through logical reasoning, because it is uncertain, and its scope is limited to empirical and traditional truth. He argues in "Prajñāpāramitā Piṇḍārtha" that the transcendent ultimate is the pinnacle of intellect. This intellect is beyond thought, and it is free from all faults and arguments. It recognizes the Tathāgata. He says that Tathāgata and Prajñā are two aspects of that ultimate truth.

Dignāga was initially a Hīnayāna follower of the Vāsiṣṭhīputrīya school (Taranāth: 181). Later, he became a Vijñānavādin. He developed a philosophy that blended Sarvāstivāda realism and Vijñānavāda idealism. Dignāga was one of the Mahāyāna writers who chose Sanskrit as his medium. He attained an excellent position as the founder of Buddhist logic. He became famous as the father of medieval jurisprudence.

Works attributed to Dignāga (Taranāth 400): Miśrakastotra, a commentary on Ratnadāsakṛta Navaparyantastotram called Guṇaparyantastotraṭīkā; Āryamañjughoṣaṭīkā, Āryaprajñāpāramitā Saṅgrahakārikā, Yogāvatāra, Sāmantabhadraṭīkā, Prañidhānarāja Saṅgraha, Abhidharmakośa, Pramāṇasamuccaya, Ālambanaparīkṣā, Ālambanaparīkṣāvṛtti, Lokālyaparīkhyanyāya Praveśanāma Pramāṇaprakaraṇa, Nyāyapraveśa Nāma Pramāṇaśāstra, Hetucakradamaru.

Dharmakīrti (c. 580-650 AD): Dharmakīrti was a renowned proponent of Buddhist logic. Tibetan Buddhists say he was a South Indian Brahmin. He was born in Tirumalai in the kingdom of Chūḍāmaṇi. This has been identified as today's Tirumala, Tirupati (Taranāth: 225). He was the son of Korunanda. He lived in the latter half of the 7th century AD (Joshi 1967: 427). Dharmakīrti was the nephew of the famous Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila. Dharmakīrti defeated Kumārila in a debate and converted him and his disciples to Buddhism (same source: 429). He wrote works like *Pramāṇavārtika* and *Nyāyabindu*. Dharmakīrti was unique in his clarity, critical logic, and confident analysis, and no one could match him, even his opponents agreed. In short, Dharmakīrti is a symbol of the pinnacle of Buddha's enthusiastic doctrine.

Vasubandhu initiated him. He studied *Vijñānavāda* under Ācārya Dharmapāla. He studied *Pramāṇasamuccaya* under the guidance of Īśvarasena. Tibetan historians like Bu-ston, Taranāth, and Saṃpaṅkhan say that Dharmakīrti was a contemporary of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Tibetan historians and literary figures like Mādhava Ācārya's Saṅkaradigvijaya describe how Dharmakīrti defeated Kumārila in a debate. His work *Pramāṇavārtika*, in its colophon, describes how Dharmakīrti exposed the flaws of Tīrthikas.

Dharmakīrti was a great proponent of Yogācāra doctrine and unparalleled in critical rationality. Hence, Dharmakīrti surpassed even Candragomin in grammar. He made Āryaśūra seem inferior in poetry. Dharmakīrti became famous as the Indian Kant. Seven major works are attributed to him. *Pramāṇavārtika*, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, *Nyāyabindu*, *Hetubindu*, *Saṃbandhaparīkṣā*, *Vādanyāya*, *Samtānāntarasiddhi*.

In *Pramāṇavārtika* (a commentary on Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*), he explained Dignāga's doctrines in four chapters. After explaining, Dharmakīrti speaks about the main points of logic, the validity of knowledge, i.e., the ascertainment of apprehension. It is a concise text that explains the main points of Buddhist logic. *Pramāṇaviniścaya* summarizes the contents of *Pramāṇavārtika*. *Hetubindu* classifies logical reasons. *Saṃbandhaparīkṣā* discusses relations. *Samtānāntarasiddhi* discusses the reality of other minds and criticizes the view that one is everything.

From a logical perspective, Dharmakīrti was a critical realist. From a philosophical perspective, he was a transcendent idealist. His view is that valid knowledge is that which is not contradicted by experience. This is knowledge that is non-constructive (*kalpanāpoḍha*) and non-erroneous (*abhrānta*). Valid knowledge is of two types: direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) and inference (*anumāna*). Again, direct perception is of four types: sensory perception, mental perception (*manovijñāna*); self-consciousness (*ātmasaṃvedana*); and mystical or yogic intuition. Among these four, the first is cognitive, arising through sensory apprehension. It is pure experience, arising in the first moment of apprehension. It is non-conceptual, non-constructive. His definition of sensory apprehension shows the influence of Dharmakīrti's Sautrāntika logical reasoning. Mental perception follows this. The third, i.e., the operational method, becomes the basis of self-consciousness. The fourth is related to yoga. This is unique due to immediate, clear

perception of truth attained through special spiritual training. The "unique specific entity" (svalakṣaṇa) is the object of this direct perception. The immeasurable, unique specific entity is called "Nyāya vastu." It is a transcendent reality. We cannot specifically reflect it by saying, "This is so and so." This is fundamental to all empirical realist views. According to Dharmakīrti, all existing reality is capable of producing results - the essence of an instantaneous reality is only its capacity to produce results, he says in "Nyāyabindu." The incomparable reflects the ultimate reality. Hence, the unique specific entity is the specific object of direct perception. In contrast, the object of general (universal) indirect knowledge is inference.

Dharmakīrti's logical doctrines are a synthesis of Sautrāntika and Vijñānavāda. Like Vijñānavādins, he believed in the theory of self-cognition; he believed so while logically proving the reality of external objects. Dharmakīrti's Yogācāra Madhava's Saṅgraha mentions many verses from his Pramāṇavārtika that support the "Vijñāptimātra" (consciousness only) doctrine. Similarly, he supports the "svasaṃvṛtti" (self-knowledge) of citta or consciousness. Dharmakīrti particularly emphasizes the commonality between the object that apprehends and the object that is apprehended. His argument is that the duality of apprehending and apprehended is illusory. The diversity in phenomena or external objects is due to the impressions of the individual, due to ignorance, which causes such an illusion. Therefore, he says that consciousness, cognition, and mind are analogous to cognition.

Among Dharmakīrti's seven works (Taranāth: 407), there are three main works and four appendices (seen above). The following works are also attributed to him. Pramāṇavārtikavṛtti, Saṃbandhavārtikavṛtti, Jātakamālāṭīkā, Buddhaparinirvāṇastotra, Hevajra Mahātantrarājasya Pañjikānetravibhāṅgastotra, Sarvadurgatipariśodhanā Marahomamaṇḍalaupadīya, Vakradākasyastava Daṇḍaka. His literary works are a symbol of the pinnacle of experience-based thinking in later Buddhism.

Andhra was a strong base for Buddhism. It contributed greatly to Buddhist doctrines and training. However, it is unfortunate that sufficient evidence is not available to estimate the greatness and extent of its contribution. The Nāgārjunakoṇḍa Buddhapālana inscription states that Buddhist bhikṣus were highly intelligent, adept at interpreting the meaning of Buddha's ninefold teachings, and had internalized the traditions of the four classes of Buddhist bhikṣus. We have already seen how great Buddhaghosa's service was to Theravāda. Vinaya Piṭaka, Abhidhamma Piṭaka, Dīgha Nikāya, and Majjhima Nikāya were very popular among Andhra Buddhists. Xuanzang's testimony is evidence of the scholarship of the Amarāvātī ācāryas in the Abhidhamma Prajñāpāramitā literature of the Sāla schools.

Along with religious and philosophical studies, ācāryas also showed interest in secular subjects like logic, administration, and grammar. Ratnāvalī (attributed to Ācārya Nāgārjuna) discusses many administrative matters. The author specifies the qualifications of a minister. The author requests the ruler to show compassion and sympathy towards prisoners. He says that the

king should care for the needs of the poor, the sick, and the weak. He asks for the abolition of capital punishment. Indeed, Nāgārjuna envisioned a welfare state.

An inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, said to be from around 450 AD, has been found (Ramachandran 1939: 28). It describes how a "Dharmakathika" (preacher of Dharma) should be. He should be virtuous, firm, and have an unblemished character like fire. He should strive hard in logic, statecraft, and grammar. His beliefs should be based on traditional doctrines, religious texts, initiation, texts, and commentaries. He should perform all his prescribed duties according to tradition. He should be highly skilled in explaining or expounding Dharma. He should be a gem among other commentators. He should be proficient in "Jātaka Cakranirmāṇa" or "resolution" in "Hariṣṭaketana" or those who have acquired abundant initiation. This is generally how Buddhist ācāryas should be in character and conduct.

Contribution of Andhra Buddhist Schools to the Development of Buddhist Thought

The contribution of Andhra schools to Buddhist thought can be assessed through the study and analysis of the Pali text "Kathāvatthu." In this section, let's examine the debates and discussions on various issues in this text.

Concept of Arhat: The Andhakas supported the Mahāyāna view that an Arhat can be afflicted by faults.

1. An Arhat should not fall from Arhatship: Buddhaghosa, Vasumitra, Bhavya, and Vinītadeva discussed the Arhats becoming faulty. These doctrines are said to apply to the Mahāsaṅghikas and their followers. Buddhaghosa identified the Sāla schools as these subdivisions. The four problems here are: 1. He can fall anywhere, 2. Always, 3. All Arhats can fall not only from Arhatship but also from the experience of the four kinds of pleasures. Arhats can only decline to the level of stream-entry in the realm of desire. Furthermore, this decline is limited to Arhats who are "samaya-vimutta" (temporarily liberated). The Sammatiyas and Pūrvaśailas believe that Arhats can fall due to past karma. For example, after attaining Arhatship.
2. Impurity of Arhats: The discussion centered on the "tainted discharge" (bījasthāna?) of Arhats. Buddhaghosa says this doctrine belongs to the Pūrvaśailas and Aparāśailas. He observed such discharge incidents among those aspiring for Arhatship. Vasumitra, Bhavya, and Vinītadeva say this doctrine belongs to all Mahāsaṅghikas, Pūrvaśailas, and Aparāśailas. These schools say that Māra-devas (demons) conveyed such impurities to Arhats.
3. Arhat has Accumulation: Vicikitsā (doubt) and anusaya (latent defilements) are attributed to the Arhat. He has no doubt about the eight factors. The teacher (sattā), doctrine (dhammā), monastery (saṅgha), etc. Instead, he believes that one cannot make a definite conclusion about certain aspects of a person, whether male or female, their name, family,

etc. One can distinguish between two types of Arhats: Saddhamma-kusala Arhat (one who is skilled in his own field) and Paradharma-kusala Arhat (one who is skilled in other matters). The above statement about doubt relates to the first type of Arhat. Furthermore, the Andhakas say that there is a fundamental difference between the seven-fold classification and its public manifestation. That is, it is not "sabbannatanaya" (omniscience), but "paradharmānana." This is an intellectual power attained by Arhats, which enables them to know external things that do not belong to them. In this way, the Andhakas say that the "vimutta" Arhats may be ignorant of other things and qualities that do not belong to them.

4. Knowledge of Arhats: Here, there are two theories related to this. First, an Arhat may have ignorance, meaning ignorance. Second, he may be confused. Buddhaghōṣa says this doctrine belongs to the Pūrvaśailas. Bhavya, Vinītadeva, and Vasumitra say this doctrine belongs to the Mahāsaṅghikas.
5. Others can surpass Arhats: The Pūrvaśailas assert that others can be superior to Arhats. Vasumitra, Bhavya, and Vinītadeva also say this doctrine belongs to the Mahāsaṅghikas. The Theravādins show that an Arhat is free from delusion and has attained the Dharma-kacchaṭṭha. Therefore, he does not need the guidance of others. These schools argue that Arhats have developed faith in the Three Jewels. They say that this faith is not self-generated but developed through teachers. Therefore, Saddhamma-kusala Arhat needs external guidance, but Paradharma-kusala does not.
6. Liberation of Arhats: The liberation of Arhats was discussed. Buddhaghōṣa explained the Mahāsaṅghika's stance on ignorance and doubt. An Arhat cannot acquire all Buddhist knowledge. The Theravādins say that an Arhat can perceive things without the help of others and attain 'Bodhi'. The nature of Bodhi is Cātumaggañāṇa, not Sabbannacūtañāṇa - the Bodhi of Buddhas. The proponents argue that their doctrine holds true because the Arhat lacks "jñeyatā" (knowability), which comes with complete prior knowledge of the Buddha. The Andhakas agree that as the four truths are revealed, defilements are gradually overcome.
7. Attaining Arhatship: The Andhakas proposed that attaining Arhatship means removing all bonds "simultaneously." The Theravādins say that all bonds are destroyed gradually, not only in the Arhat-magga.
8. Arhat accumulates merit: The Andhakas believe that an Arhat accumulates merit. An Arhat accumulates merit by performing many good deeds even during his "sariṇibbuṇa" (final existence). He accumulates it and passes away with "kusala citta" (wholesome consciousness). According to Theravāda analysis, the Arhat's consciousness is beyond good and evil, wholesome and unwholesome, and karmic results. Therefore, it is wrong

to say that they acquire merit or demerit. The Mahāsaṅghikas differ from the Andhakas and support the Theravādins.

A doctrinal doubt arises from the Andhaka view. If there is wholesome consciousness during the moment of knowledge, does it only produce a limited result? The reason for this doctrine might be the Andhaka's temple worship.

9. Arhats and untimely death: The Rājagirikas and Siddhārtikas say that an Arhat does not suffer an untimely death. This is because he must experience the results of his karma before his existence ends - otherwise, his death would be untimely. However, the Theravādins say that an Arhat can suffer an accidental death through an "Arhat-ghaṭikā" (a specific karmic condition). That is, an Arhat's body can be affected by poison, weapons, or fire, just like anyone else. The main issue is the extent of the influence of past karma on an Arhat. This is based on the belief that an Arhat does not undergo rebirth. Therefore, an Arhat does not die without completing the fruition of his karma.

10. Consciousness of Arhats at the time of death: The Andhakas believe that an Arhat is morally conscious because he is in a state of freedom from attachment (arāga), freedom from hatred (adveṣa), and freedom from delusion (amoha) at the time of death. He perceives things as they are. That is, he is always in a state of clear consciousness, perception, and awareness. Even at the time of death. The Theravādins point out the belief of those proponents who say that consciousness is latent, and that his cognitive process is the reflection of the last movement, thereby believing that Arhats are morally neutral. However, this is not intended to show the emergence of morally wholesome thought.

Praising Buddha:

1. Buddha's ordinary speech (vohāra) is supramundane: Buddhaghōṣa says that the Andhakas accept this doctrine. Rhys Davids and Aung (1915) translated the word "vohāra" as "speech in debate," and generally as related to worldly matters. This implies that some schools considered it supramundane. The above statement implies that Buddha's speech was only for supramundane beings, not for worldly individuals. Furthermore, it is implied that only devotees, not ordinary intelligent people, respond to it. The Andhakas said that Buddha used supramundane speech to discourse on both worldly and supramundane doctrines.

Vasumitra said that the Mahāsaṅghikas believe that Buddha's discourses are complete in themselves (nītārtha). He discoursed only on Dharma. Therefore, they are related to ultimate truth, not conventional truth. Furthermore, Buddha can expound all doctrines in a single discourse.

2. Buddha never lived as a human being: The Andhakas argued that Buddhas are supramundane/transcendent (*lokottara*), and that they were so even in their activities during their earthly life. Buddha achieved perfection in every aspect. Therefore, he is not bound by the ordinary limitations of human life on earth. Earthly life is full of wickedness and suffering. Therefore, Buddha never lived as a human being.
3. Buddha's powers: The Andhakas believe that Buddha's powers are shared collectively by his prominent disciples. His beloved disciples share in his extensive powers. Furthermore, in the ten insights, not only the last one (insight into the destruction of defilements) but also the preceding nine are understood. However, the Mahāsaṅghikas say that there should be a distinction between Buddha's powers and the powers of his disciples. They say that the Andhakas cannot adhere to this doctrine because they believe in Buddha's transcendent nature. The Mahāsaṅghikas believe that the divine powers of the Tathāgata are immeasurable.
4. Dispute over donations to Buddha: The Vaitulyakas opposed the idea that anything offered to Buddha brings immense merit. According to them, Buddha does not experience anything, he only appears to do so; and this is a worldly manner, and he appears so accordingly. Therefore, not offering anything to him is truly beneficial to him.
5. Buddha's manifestation in the human world: The Vaitulyakas say that Buddha was born and lived in Tuṣita heaven, and that he exists in this world only in a specially created form.
6. Buddha is omnipresent: Buddhaghōṣa attributes the following doctrines to the Mahāsaṅghikas. Buddha exists in all four dimensions of time (above, below, and in all directions). He is so simultaneously. Any change in him or his surroundings occurs simultaneously in every aspect of existence.
7. Buddha's incarnation in the human world: The Vaitulyakas say that it is not correct to say that Buddha himself taught the Dharma. It is stated that the established Buddha image taught the Dharma to the venerable Ānanda. The Supreme Being resides in Tuṣita heaven. He created and released that form. The Mahāsaṅghikas and Vaitulyakas are supporters of Buddha's Lokottaravāda (transcendent) doctrine. The Vaitulyakas maintained the concept of Buddha's Sambhogakāya (enjoyment body) in their doctrines.
8. Buddha's extraordinary power (*iddhi*): The Andhakas propose that a Buddha and his disciples have the power to do anything with complete transcendent power. The Theravādins reject this doctrine. Buddhaghōṣa's view is that "iddhi" occurs only in certain specific circumstances. It cannot prevent "anicca" (impermanence), "anatta" (non-self), or other laws. It can transform one thing into another and prolong its existence in its own nature. The Andhakas say that "iddhi" can be practiced according to one's will. The

Mahāsaṅghikas say that through this, anyone can live for a "kalpa" (aeon) (until the end of the kalpa or deluge; anantareta).

9. Buddha's compassion: The fundamental view of the Mahāsaṅghikas is that the body is formed of imperishable dharmas. Therefore, a Buddha does not have compassion. If so, how can a Buddha approach compassion, which is merely a worldly feeling? Buddha's compassion is transcendent Mahākaruṇā; it is not like "sarvaka" compassion. This Mahākaruṇā belongs to the Dharma-ā lambana.
10. Buddha's uniqueness: The Andhakas believe that anything belonging to Buddha is fragrant. They believed that to elevate Buddha's unique personality, his excretions would also surpass all fragrances.
11. Differences among Buddhas: Buddhaghosa says that Buddhas differ from each other only in physical, age, and radiance-related aspects in a given period. The Andhakas say that they also differ in other qualities. Buddhaghosa explained that Buddhas differ from each other in some other qualities, apart from the attainment of Nativatana, Nammappadhama, etc. Traditional schools say that Buddhas may differ in terms of body, age, and radiance (prabhava), but not in terms of practices as mentioned above.

Bodhisattva Ideal:

1. Bodhisattva's Life Discipline is Self-Directed: The Andhakas confirm this theory; the Bodhisattva took on hardships and miseries. For example, he fell prey to 'evil fate'. He entered the mother's womb. He performed arduous tasks and deeds. He atoned with foreigners. All this was by his own will and desire. The Andhakas accepted this belief, which arose from the 'Chadanta' or Shat Danta Jataka tales and other tales. Vasumitra said that the Chaityasailiyas, Avarasailiyas, and Uttarasailiyas, according to the Jataka tales, could not escape falling into misfortune in the transmigration of souls. Vinītadeva says that Bodhisattvas are not free from falling into evil births.
2. Entry into the Path of Fearlessness: Disputes arose over the statement "One who is morally firm about liberation has entered the path of fearlessness." The Pūrvaśailas and Aparasailas accepted this concept. They understood 'fearlessness' without any difference in designation. They believed that a Bodhisattva would be worthy of differentiating into a being in his final birth. Therefore, his liberation was already established.

Spiritual Stages, Hierarchy:

1. Concept of Unparalleled Faith: There are four kinds of fruits. These are overcoming the stream, returning once, never returning, and Arhatship. In religious life, all four can be attained through a single path. This is the principle proposed by the Andhakas. They have unwavering devotion to Buddha. For that reason, they believe that Buddha attained the

four kinds of fruits through a single noble path. He did not have differences in four stages. They called each of the stages a path.

2. **Maintaining Unique Intellectual Abilities:** A person practicing to attain Arhatship will have stable unique abilities and will possess the three fruits that existed before: stream-winner, once-returner, and non-returner. The Andhakas believe that a person who has attained these three fruits (Pattadhammivasena) will possess that quality.
3. **Path Only in Five Ways:** The Mahishasakas say that before attaining the Aryan path, one must purify one's speech, actions, and livelihood. Therefore, this path is actually a five-fold path. Their observation is based on the premise that speech, action, and livelihood are not stages of consciousness like the other five.
4. **Inward Gaze of the Disciple:** The Andhakas strongly state that the disciple can gain knowledge about the attainment of what is desired. They also showed a tendency to bridge the gap between "Sarvaka" and Buddha. Through practice, the disciple can gain knowledge about the stages of the "path" and the fruit that accrues, thereby comprehending the true nature of things. His knowledge about the real state will be more comprehensive and sharp.
5. **Path, Culture, Senses:** Based on the principle "Even if one sees an object with the eye, one cannot grasp it in thought" (Anattarani Nama pages 103-104), the Mahasanghikas proposed that they can develop the path while experiencing sensory perceptions.
6. **Higher Life with Deities:** The Andhakas believe that deities have self-control. Moreover, Ruparaga and Aruparaga are elements of Rupadhatu and Arupadhatu.
7. **Arhatship from the Eighteen Individuals:** A person in the eighth stage will be free from evil thoughts and doubts. The second is the five controlling powers - faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom (Samyutta Nikaya

iv copies 174-75) will be lost in him. The Andhakas believed that a person who has entered the first stage of the path will be in the process of attaining the eighteen individuals, but will not yet have attained these powers.

8. **Jhana, Samadhi:** The Mahasanghikas say that there are no intermediate stages between one Jhana and another. Buddhaghosa says that there is no need for a Nannaha (Upachara) stage. The Mahasanghikas advocate a four-Jhana plan instead of five Jhanas. The Andhakas stated that Jhana is enjoyable (Anaddeti) and that it is the fruit of desire (Nikanti). The statements Annadra Nikantajhana are supported by Dharmashastras.

9. **Cessation:** In this regard, there are two formulations. Is the cessation of perception and feeling worldly (lokiya) or supramundane (lokottara)? Rationalists formulate that it becomes a cause for rebirth in non-percipient beings. However, it is implied that

cessation is inherently worldly (lokiya). The traditional perspective rejects classifying cessation as either worldly or supramundane. It considers it a positive stage that suppresses four mental "aggregates." The Rajagirikas argue that a person in the stage of cessation of perception and feeling may die because there is no rule about death. The Theravadins say that in death, the operation of related factors and mental events are implied, so one can be in a state of complete indifference in that context. The Andhakas say that Jhana about a material object gradually evolves into meditation about a concept, and such Jhana creates illusion. This opinion is actually an important philosophical synthesis. If the Andhaka opinion is logically reduced, all conceptual and deterministic knowledge becomes flawed. This is a state supported in the Mahayana view. This can be compared with the definitive, fundamental theories attributed to the Rajagirikas and Siddhantikas. They emphasize that it is impossible to classify all different things under a single generic concept. Knowledge grows from the empirical beliefs of ordinary people. It incorporates relative existence. It naturally grasps ultimate truth (paramartha).

10. Spiritual Acuity (Yana Patisambhida): The Andhakas seem to question this common duality. They said that all knowledge is 'Patisambhida' and that truth is its goal even in common knowledge. These propositions clearly show that the Andhakas had a strong tendency to challenge prevailing beliefs and differences. In the first statement of these two, the Mahasanghikas say that a person who has attained spiritual insight and removed spiritual ignorance by focusing sharply on the path, which is a broad problem related to the relationship between spiritual insight and ordinary knowledge in the Arhat's mind, cannot simultaneously experience ordinary sensory perception. The Purvasailas went a step further and proposed that the Arhat's spiritual acuity and ordinary consciousness must be interdependent. The Andhakas also proposed another solution - when the Arhat has sensory perception, his spiritual insight should be considered aimless. The Purvasailas also suggested that the twelve elements of the four noble truths become the twelve supramundane acuities (lokottarayana).
11. Extraordinary Knowledge: The Andhakas say that only pure mind or Vinnana (consciousness) exists, and Buddhaghosa's commentary explains that distant thought transmission falls within the scope of operating without a sensory medium, and that they reject the Sampayutta Dhammas (associated mental factors) of the mind. Even if this is not a fault perceptible by touch, it completely marginalizes the Andhaka theory. Moreover, the possibility of knowing the future arose. Considering Buddha's famous prophecy, the Andhakas seem to be in a new style. However, the Theravadins raised the difficulty of knowing the near future, which is completely unclear. Foretelling the immediate future might be in their concept. (Anantare Ekantini Yevanam Nalgi) This is because related causes and conditions are not available. The Theravadins might be advocating a kind of rational probabilistic knowledge. It is uncertain in immediate situations, but becomes certain in the long run. Anyway, their opponents must have had

nascent knowledge in their minds. This discussion seems to have turned towards direct introspection. The Andhakas said that such insight existed. Since it is a temporary phenomenal element, insight must have a goal.

Differences among Buddhas: Buddhaghosa says that Buddhas differ from each other only in physical, age, and radiance-related aspects in a given period. The Andhakas say that they also differ in other qualities. Buddhaghosa explained that Buddhas differ from each other in some other qualities, apart from the attainment of Nativatana, Nammappadhama, etc. Traditional schools say that Buddhas may differ in terms of body, age, and radiance (prabhava), but not in terms of practices as mentioned above.

Bodhisattva Ideal:

1. Bodhisattva's Life Discipline is Self-Directed: The Andhakas confirm this theory; the Bodhisattva took on hardships and miseries. For example, he fell prey to 'evil fate'. He entered the mother's womb. He performed arduous tasks and deeds. He atoned with foreigners. All this was by his own will and desire. The Andhakas accepted this belief, which arose from the 'Chadanta' or Shat Danta Jataka tales and other tales. Vasumitra said that the Chaityasailiyas, Avarasailiyas, and Uttarasailiyas, according to the Jataka tales, could not escape falling into misfortune in the transmigration of souls. Vineetadeva says that Bodhisattvas are not free from falling into evil births.
2. Entry into the Path of Fearlessness: Disputes arose over the statement "One who is morally firm about liberation has entered the path of fearlessness." The Purvasailas and Avarasailas accepted this concept. They understood 'fearlessness' without any difference in designation. They believed that a Bodhisattva would be worthy of differentiating into a being in his final birth. Therefore, his liberation was already established.

Spiritual Stages, Hierarchy:

1. Concept of Unparalleled Faith: There are four kinds of fruits. These are overcoming the stream, returning once, never returning, and Arhatship. In religious life, all four can be attained through a single path. This is the principle proposed by the Andhakas. They have unwavering devotion to Buddha. For that reason, they believe that Buddha attained the four kinds of fruits through a single noble path. He did not have differences in four stages. They called each of the stages a path.

2. **Maintaining Unique Intellectual Abilities:** A person practicing to attain Arhatship will have stable unique abilities and will possess the three fruits that existed before: stream-winner, once-returner, and non-returner. The Andhakas believe that a person who has attained these three fruits (Pattadhammivasena) will possess that quality.
3. **Path Only in Five Ways:** The Mahishasakas say that before attaining the Aryan path, one must purify one's speech, actions, and livelihood. Therefore, this path is actually a five-fold path. Their observation is based on the premise that speech, action, and livelihood are not stages of consciousness like the other five.
4. **Inward Gaze of the Disciple:** The Andhakas strongly state that the disciple can gain knowledge about the attainment of what is desired. They also showed a tendency to bridge the gap between "Sarvaka" and Buddha. Through practice, the disciple can gain knowledge about the stages of the "path" and the fruit that accrues, thereby comprehending the true nature of things. His knowledge about the real state will be more comprehensive and sharp.
5. **Path, Culture, Senses:** Based on the principle "Even if one sees an object with the eye, one cannot grasp it in thought" (Anattarani Nama pages 103-104), the Mahasanghikas proposed that they can develop the path while experiencing sensory perceptions.
6. **Higher Life with Deities:** The Andhakas believe that deities have self-control. Moreover, Ruparaga and Aruparaga are elements of Rupadhatu and Arupadhatu.
7. **Arhatship from the Eighteen Individuals:** A person in the eighth stage will be free from evil thoughts and doubts. The second is the five controlling powers - faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom (Samyutta Nikaya

iv copies 174-75) will be lost in him. The Andhakas believed that a person who has entered the first stage of the path will be in the process of attaining the eighteen individuals, but will not yet have attained these powers.

8. **Jhana, Samadhi:** The Mahasanghikas say that there are no intermediate stages between one Jhana and another. Buddhaghosa says that there is no need for a Nannaha (Upachara) stage. The Mahasanghikas advocate a four-Jhana plan instead of five Jhanas. The Andhakas stated that Jhana is enjoyable (Anaddeti) and that it is the fruit of desire (Nikanti). The statements Annadra Nikantajhana are supported by Dharmashastras.

9. **Cessation:** In this regard, there are two formulations. Is the cessation of perception and feeling worldly (lokiya) or supramundane (lokottara)? Rationalists formulate that it becomes a cause for rebirth in non-percipient beings. However, it is implied that cessation is inherently worldly (lokiya). The traditional perspective rejects classifying cessation as either worldly or supramundane. It considers it a positive stage that

suppresses four mental "aggregates." The Rajagirikas argue that a person in the stage of cessation of perception and feeling may die because there is no rule about death. The Theravadins say that in death, the operation of related factors and mental events are implied, so one can be in a state of complete indifference in that context. The Andhakas say that Jhana about a material object gradually evolves into meditation about a concept, and such Jhana creates illusion. This opinion is actually an important philosophical synthesis. If the Andhaka opinion is logically reduced, all conceptual and deterministic knowledge becomes flawed. This is a state supported in the Mahayana view. This can be compared with the definitive, fundamental theories attributed to the Rajagirikas and Siddhantikas. They emphasize that it is impossible to classify all different things under a single generic concept. Knowledge grows from the empirical beliefs of ordinary people. It incorporates relative existence. It naturally grasps ultimate truth (paramartha).

10. Spiritual Acuity (Yana Patisambhida): The Andhakas seem to question this common duality. They said that all knowledge is 'Patisambhida' and that truth is its goal even in common knowledge. These propositions clearly show that the Andhakas had a strong tendency to challenge prevailing beliefs and differences. In the first statement of these two, the Mahasanghikas say that a person who has attained spiritual insight and removed spiritual ignorance by focusing sharply on the path, which is a broad problem related to the relationship between spiritual insight and ordinary knowledge in the Arhat's mind, cannot simultaneously experience ordinary sensory perception. The Purvasailas went a step further and proposed that the Arhat's spiritual acuity and ordinary consciousness must be interdependent. The Andhakas also proposed another solution - when the Arhat has sensory perception, his spiritual insight should be considered aimless. The Purvasailas also suggested that the twelve elements of the four noble truths become the twelve supramundane acuities (lokottarayana).
11. Extraordinary Knowledge: The Andhakas say that only pure mind or Vinnana (consciousness) exists, and Buddhaghosa's commentary explains that distant thought transmission falls within the scope of operating without a sensory medium, and that they reject the Sampayutta Dhammas (associated mental factors) of the mind. Even if this is not a fault perceptible by touch, it completely marginalizes the Andhaka theory. Moreover, the possibility of knowing the future arose. Considering Buddha's famous prophecy, the Andhakas seem to be in a new style. However, the Theravadins raised the difficulty of knowing the near future, which is completely unclear. Foretelling the immediate future might be in their concept. (Anantare Ekantini Yevanam Nalgi) This is because related causes and conditions are not available. The Theravadins might be advocating a kind of rational probabilistic knowledge. It is uncertain in immediate situations, but becomes certain in the long run. Anyway, their opponents must have had nascent knowledge in their minds. This discussion seems to have turned towards direct

introspection. The Andhakas said that such insight existed. Since it is a temporary phenomenal element, insight must have a goal.

12. Liberation: The Andhakas believed that only a mind with attachment attains liberation (Naragam Chittam Nargatavimutti). In traditional theory, attachment originates in an early stage. If liberation is the final stage, then liberation from rebirth, traditional theory shows the difference between the two. The Andhaka theory does not seem to make a technical distinction between "Anagami" and Arhat. They presented the theory simply and beautifully. Liberation is the removal of desire from the mind, just as dirt is removed from cloth. The Andhakas said, "Half of liberation is in the knowledge about liberation." Buddhaghosa said that Vimuttinana indicates four 'nan's: Vipassana, Magga, Phala, Vachchavettana. Among these, Vipassana is Vimutti Nana, because there is no permanent object in it. Magga means freedom from evil. Therefore, it is Uchchheda Vimutti. Phala is peaceful rest, therefore it is Patipassadhi Vimutti. Vachcha Sekhana is reflective knowledge about liberation. Therefore, these four are Arhant Vimutti (Nippariyayena). The Andhakas do not divide into these differences. They consider all Vimutti Nanas as Vimutti or liberation.

Buddhist Sangha:

1. Sangha Accepting Gifts: The Vaitalikas believe that in the ultimate sense (paramartha), Sangha means the path and its fruits. This is an immeasurable concept. Therefore, gifts should not be accepted. They also say that the Sangha should not be considered to purify gifts. Their argument is that a gift earned for the Sangha should not be said to provide a great reward.
2. Nature of Dana: The Rajagirikas and Siddhantikas say that giving is a mental state. Giving should not lead to undesirable or unacceptable consequences. Moreover, it happens in reverse. Therefore, it is a mental state.
3. Measure of Merit: The Rajagirikas and Siddhantikas say that merit increases with greater use.
4. Result of Giving: The Rajagirikas and Siddhantikas declare that the result of giving here is seen somewhere else. Whatever purpose is served here, its result will be in the afterlife. This is an ancient belief in India. Buddhists make donations for the welfare and merit of their relatives.
5. Schism, Punishment: The Rajagirikas say that those who cause schisms will be punished until the end of the kalpa.
6. Signs of Negligence: The Andhakas and Vaitalikas say that sexual relations can be had with unified intention. Buddhaghosa explained that this nature of decision is 'karma' or

the intention to have a combined family. In the Bodhisattva's story, the word 'karuna' (compassion) was used. He relaxed his vow of celibacy out of compassion for a woman.

Buddhism

M.V. Ramakumar Ratnam

In Andhra Desa, Buddhism received patronage from ruling dynasties and merchant classes from before Ashoka until the 6th century AD. The renowned Chinese traveler Xuanzang, who visited Andhra Desa in October 641-2 AD (Yazdani 1960: 218) during the reign of Kubja Vishnuvardhana, accurately described the state of Buddhism in the 7th century. At that time, Mahayana Buddhism was somewhat better off in Andhra Desa. Buddhist monks in Dhanyakataka were studying the Abhidhamma of the Mahasanghikas. Xuanzang stated that the original Abhidhamma texts and commentaries of Andhra Desa were clearly contrary to the Theravada tradition of Sri Lanka (Krishna Rao 1973: 92).

Buddhism during the Vishnukundina Period

The Vishnukundina king Govindavarma constructed a Vihara in Indrapura. Prince Harivarma, son of Prithvimula, constructed a Vihara in Gunapashapuram and dedicated it to Hinayana Buddhists. The Tummalagudem copper plates mention the prevalent Mahayana Buddhism of that time, and also mention the three Yanas of the Dharmasangraha tradition. Dharmasangraha is a traditional literary process. It is a compilation related to classification and terminology. Prince Harivarma constructed a Vihara here for Buddhist monks from Sri Lanka. During the Vishnukundina period, Buddhist sites where additional constructions were made include Sankaram, Ramatheertham, Guntupalli, Gunapashapuram, and Jaggayyapet (Rajendra Prasad 1980: 60-1; Aloka Parashar Sen, ed. 2000: 176-80).

After the Vishnukundinas, and especially with the strong patronage of the Vengi Chalukyas, the revival of Brahmanism began. A new form of Brahmanism emerged by incorporating some Buddhist philosophical doctrines. This mixture led to the development of Vedanta. Although Vedanta adopted many Buddhist beliefs and practices, it was opposed to Buddhism. Traditional Vedantins adopted the theory of two truths from Madhyamaka to establish the primary characteristic of Advaita. They also added the system of donations, vows, and pilgrimages.

During the reign of the third Vishnuvardhana, Brahmanism and Jainism received patronage and tolerance. At the same time, Buddhism was rapidly disappearing from the country. Unlike before, Buddhism no longer received royal patronage as a state religion. Prithvi Srimularaja (5th, 6th centuries AD), who came to power in the northern coastal region after the Vishnukundinas, patronized Buddhism. The copper plate inscriptions issued by Prithvi Srimularaja from Kondavidu mention many donations made to various Buddhist Sanghas (Krishna Sastry 1992: 2-3). The first inscription mentions a donation made to the monks of the Arya Bhikku Sangha residing in the Vardhamana (present-day Vaddaman near Amaravati)

Mahavihara for their daily activities of meditation and study. The second inscription states that the same king established a Mahavihara in Tadikkonda. In the 6th century AD,

It also states that various Buddhist Sangha branches like the Arya Bhikku Sangha and Shakya Bhikku Sangha were active in Andhra Desa. It also states that an officer named Navakammika (in charge of restoration programs) residing in Nagarjunakonda, meaning Aparasailam, was appointed for the restoration programs of the Mahavihara near Gunapashapuram. The above evidence suggests that the Buddhist center in Nagarjunakonda flourished until the fifth and sixth centuries AD. The third inscription mentions a donation made to the Ashtadashadala Bhikku Sangha residing in the famous Vihara established by the same king on a hill to the east of Gunapashapuram. This inscription also mentions the details of some villages donated by the king to this Mahavihara to meet the daily needs of the monks, such as food, beds, seats, and medicines (Krishna Sastry 1992: 1-5, 12-13, 20-22).

After the Vishnukundinas, Buddhism declined, mainly due to the lack of royal patronage. As a result, many Buddhist monasteries became deserted. Xuanzang confirmed this fact. Xuanzang stated that although there were many Buddhist monasteries in Dhanyakataka, only twenty of them were habitable, and about a thousand monks belonging to the Mahasanghika sect resided in them. Xuanzang (Rhys Davids 1961: 198, 214) described the religious conditions in the Kalinga and Vengi regions, stating that only five hundred Mahayana students were worshipping various Buddhist idols in the Vihara there.

The Mattavilasa Prahasana, written by Pallava Mahendravarman, vividly describes the reprehensible lives of contemporary Buddhists (David Gordon White 2001: 80-96). Extensive efforts were being made to create Shaktis (consorts) for Bodhisattvas. This led to a mystical sexual symbolism and objectionable, unethical practices. For these reasons, many Viharas lost their importance and sanctity. This is why later people called these deserted habitations 'Lanjadibbalu' (mound of prostitutes).

Nevertheless, Buddhist centers like Dhanyakataka, Guntupalli, Jaggayyapet, Shankaram, Salihundam, Gummadiduru flourished until the medieval period under the patronage of local minor dynasties like the Kotarajas of Dharanikota (B. Subrahmanyam 1998: 16). The Bekkallu inscription of Chalukya Tribhuvanamalla Deva (c. 1100 AD) from Bekkallu in Janagama Taluka, Warangal district, mentions the construction of temples for Shiva, Vishnu, Jina, and Buddha (B. Subrahmanyam 1998: 16). The Korny copper plate inscription of Anantavarman Choda Ganga Deva (c. 12th century AD) describes the Buddhist site at Salihundam (Mundu Marru) as a famous place for Mundiya monks (B. Subrahmanyam 1998: 16). The Gadaladeniya inscription in Sri Lanka states that some restoration work in Dhanyakataka was undertaken by a Theravada monk named Dhammakirti from Sri Lanka. The Nagari script found on clay tablets at Gummadiduru, dating to the late medieval period, indicates that Buddhism continued in Andhra Pradesh until the 14th and 15th centuries.

The Chinese traveler Xuanzang visited Dhanyakataka when Buddhism was in decline. He referred to Dhanyakataka as Te-na-ka-che-ka in Chinese (Rhys Davids 1961: 214-5). In the Mahandhra Desa, there are many Buddhist Viharas in Dhanyakataka state, but only in twenty Viharas do monks of the Mahasanghika sect reside. Monks used to visit Purvasaila and Aparasaila Viharas. These Viharas were used as rainy season residences. gave importance. This process paved the way for the dissolution of the distinction between the two religions - Hinduism and Buddhism. For common people, the difference between Vishnu - Buddha, Shiva - Avalokiteshvara, Tara - Parvati disappeared.

Brahmin-Kshatriya Conflict

Buddha expounded the Dhamma-Sasan. He said that governance should be done with a new ideal - considering the welfare of the people. Thus, Buddhism attacked the divine right of Kshatriyas. As a result, Kshatriya kings who supported Buddha became opponents of Buddhism. They felt that Buddhism was challenging their very existence as a class; the oppressed people, encouraged by the ideal of equality, began to revolt (Ram K 1983: 23). Ambitious Brahmins conspired with Kshatriyas and became their chief ministers and advisors. To seize political power, these groups formed an alliance against Buddhism.

To re-establish their dominance, Brahmins accepted the authority of Puranas that ridiculed Buddhism. The Vishnu Purana states that God is not pleased with a person who does not follow his caste and ashrama dharma. It was declared that non-Vedic texts lead astray and cause misfortune. The story of Vena was told to show that a person who does not follow Varna-Ashrama Dharma will die like Vena.

Bhakti Marga (Path of Devotion):

According to scholars, the roots of Bhakti are in Buddhism. Temples were built over Buddha's relics. Buddhist monks and common people showed their devotion and reverence there. Therefore, Saddha, meaning devotion, gained importance in Buddhism (Ram K 1983: 32).

From its inception, Buddhism did not take the form of an urban institution. It spread within the Sangha. Sangha means a group of monks. The entire focus of Buddhism was on the Sangha. Common people used to rely on the Sangha for religious guidance. This method worked well as long as people's faith was on the rise; when faith declined, it also withered.

In later days, Buddhism gave importance to rituals and worship; its religious doctrines seemed closer to Brahmanical religious doctrines than to the teachings of Gautama Buddha. The complex philosophical Madhyamaka and Yogachara schools within the Mahayana branch of Buddhism gradually abandoned their opposing tendencies and began to adopt the worship of primitive tribal deities and new superstitions. Buddhism, mixed with the evil elements of these primitive tribal beliefs, evolved into Tantric Buddhism; this also contributed to the decline of the

Sangha. Buddhism became impure with the entry of Bodhisattvas and their female counterparts. The Sangha became disorganized; over time, it became a hotbed of corruption.

Influence of Tantra/Kalachakrayana

Based on literary evidence, scholars like Rahul Sankrityayan believe that Mantrayana and Vajrayana originated in the Dhanyakataka and Sree Parvata regions of Andhra Desa. According to Sekoddeshatika, a commentary on the Sekoddasha section of Kalachakra, Buddhadipankara first expounded Mantrayana, and Shakyamuni Buddha followed it for our era (S.R. Goyal 1993: 247).

It is known that King Suchandra, at the request of Sambhala, Buddha convened an assembly in Sridhanyakataka, performed the third turning of the Wheel of Dharma, and delivered a discourse on Mantrayana (S.R. Goyal 1993: 247).

Special Mantras, rituals - prayer methods accelerate the highest knowledge system of Buddhism; the path of meditation that enhances knowledge and good qualities through this method is called Vajrayana. This ritual - meditation method is based on the insights developed in the common Mahayana philosophical tradition.

Vajrayana mysticism is Madhyamaka; it chooses the middle path between two extreme views of existence. One is realism; it attributes inherent existence to objects. The second is nihilism; it denies the causal efficacy of objects. An object has no inherent existence; its nature is emptiness. However, it arises from causes and conditions.

By controlling the mind through yoga, Vajrayana understands the Madhyama Pratipad or the Middle Way. In the state of samadhi, the mind is attracted by and arises in the illusory forms of the world. This is the stage of production - action; it uses the creative power of the mind to generate a new divine vision of reality. This imaginary vision or the transformation of knowledge of Mandala yogis; here, the ordinary form of the self and surroundings transforms into an ideal world where deities reside. The deification of the original Buddhist mental philosophical forms is the symbolism of the Mandala, and the Mandala deities are phenomena; by realizing their emptiness, the practitioner's personality attains purity. In the production stage, the practitioner first merges ordinary consciousness into empty knowledge. After that, within this empty knowledge, the practitioner's mind manifests in the form of a Mandala. Through Mandala practice in the production stage, the yogi establishes himself and gains a deep understanding that phenomena do not have independent inherent existence and are mental constructs.

The production stage, by applying imagination, creates an alternative view of conventional reality. However, in the second stage of the Vajrayana path, the arising - stage, the yogi's mind recognizes only the ultimate nature. In the perfect stage, Tantric yoga brings about the cessation of sensory knowledge and concepts. As soon as these crude forms of mental activity cease, the mind's natural luminosity (light) appears. Through the yogic form of

organization, this subtle mental form can be awakened so that the mind realizes its emptiness. This special direct knowledge of emptiness, which is limited to Vajrayana, is called the attainment of Mahamudra. Mahamudra is spiritual knowledge; this knowledge is the realization of mental emptiness in a non-dual, non-conceptual form. Emptiness imprints on the mind; the mind imprints on emptiness.

In a yogi practicing Mahamudra, the mind as agent (spiritual knowledge) and the mind as object (mental empty form) both merge into one, making it impossible to distinguish knowledge from the object of knowledge. This knowledge is called Akshara Shubha Jnana - Chitta (David Gordon White 2001: 587-594).

When Xuanzang (Walters 1961: 215) visited Andhra Desa in the mid-7th century AD, he stated that Dhanyakataka had already become a center of Vajrayana and Dharanis. Pallava inscriptions (SII 1: 25-8) also state that Buddhists in Andhra Desa were practicing Tantric methods of Vajrayana. Tantric method is a complex system involving the recitation of Mantras, Dharanis, practicing Mudras, worship of deities, and sometimes Yogic practices involving sexual relations.

According to many scholars, the Tantric method originated from the blind beliefs and ancient practices of primitive tribes and became a prominent, India-wide movement; it became part of the history of Indian religious thought. The period between the seventh and thirteenth centuries is called the Tantric age by L.M. Joshi (JOI VI: 232-32). Indian and foreign sources state that Andhra Desa was an ancient and popular region for Vajrayana. Traditional or literary sources are evidence for this (B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao 1993: 124).

From the time of the early Chalukyas, Brahmanism appears to have fully regained its dominance. From the time of Kubja Vishnuvardhana, Brahmins proficient in one, two, three, or all Vedas were granted agraharas, meaning completely tax-exempt villages, or brahmadeyas, meaning tax-exempt lands. These donations were given to encourage the study and teaching of Vedas, sacrificial rituals, Upanishads, Mantras, Itihasas, Puranas, Dharmashastras, and many other sciences. Brahmins engaged in the six duties of Dana (giving), Pratigraha (receiving), Yajana (performing sacrifices), Yajana (causing sacrifices to be performed), Adhyayana (studying), and Adhyapana (teaching), and Brahmins who constantly performed the five great sacrifices of Bali, Charu, Vaishvadeva, Agnihotra, and Havana were encouraged. The historian E.J. Thomas stated that after the eighth century AD, Buddhists worshipped deities that were not very different from Hindu deities, and that there was no major distinguishing principle between Hinduism and Buddhism (B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao 1993: 136).

The Vengi Chalukyas themselves were Vedic scholars and proficient in many sciences. Jayasimha I, Vishnuvardhana II, and Prince Manggi were scholars who had mastered all sciences; they encouraged religious debates in their courts, with both sides placing bets; they fostered Brahmanical religious education. Prince Manggi was proficient in Anvikshaki (logic), a

great logician. The Vengi Chalukyas do not appear to have tolerated the existence of Buddhism. Although they did not openly punish its followers, they invited them to their courts and subjected them to defeat in open debates. They encouraged such discussions and debates. According to ancient practice, the defeated were compelled to become disciples of the victors. The victors were necessarily Brahmins. Thus, the defeated had to either become disciples of the victors or lose their lives, or if the person was the head of an institution, they had to hand over the property. Shankaracharya dealt a death blow to Buddhism in Andhra Desa through his debates with Buddhist scholars.

Philosophical Trends

Mahayana Buddhism emphasized intellectual maturity and philosophical inquiry. With the spread of education and the development of logic, the value of intellectual foundation and philosophical perspective increased. Dignaga told Buddhist scholars that they should focus on philosophical reciprocal discussion and the development of logic as a necessary subject. To answer the questions of Brahmanical followers, they had to develop the art of debate. Thus, in Buddhist texts, intellectual churning was given more importance than spiritual quest. Buddhists used rational arguments to explain and defend truth.

Buddhist scholars explained the rules of debate in detail. They meticulously distinguished valid inferences from invalid ones. They discussed not only logic but also philosophical matters and criteria of knowledge. Related to these philosophical problems was the theory of meaning or the theory of world meaning.

In the field of truth inquiry, Buddhist scholars of that time relied solely on logic to raise explanatory arguments in support of Buddhist doctrines; on the other hand, they refuted the truth inquiry theories of their opponents with rational logic and theoretical arguments. Ultimately, the victory of Buddhist doctrines in public debates was desirable for them. Thus, not only was physical existence confirmed, but resources also became available for the Buddhist system.

According to scholars, at least nine out of the total eighteen Buddhist sects have evidence in Andhra Desa. These nine are - Mahasanghikas or Arya Sanghiyas (Nagarjunakonda), Purvasailiyas (Amaravati, Alluru), Aparasailiyas (Nagarjunakonda, Vengi, Ghantasala), Rajagirikas (Amaravati), Chaityakas (Amaravati), Bahushrutiyas (Nagarjunakonda), Mahishasakas (Nagarjunakonda), Uttarasailiyas (Kalinga or Northern Coastal Andhra), Siddhantikas, and then smaller branches like Arya Bhikshu Sangha and Shakya Bhikshu Sangha. The Kathavatthu states that the Rajagirika, Siddhantika, Purvasailiya, and Aparasailiya sects belonged to the Andhaka region. It is interesting to know from the donation inscription made by Prithvi Srimula Maharaja that all eighteen sects flourished in Andhra Desa in the fifth and sixth centuries AD. The king's third inscription made in Kondavidu states that the Bhikshu Sangha of the eighteen sects resided in the world-famous Gunapashapuram Mahavihara, referring to them as 'Sri Loka Vikhyata Maha Vihara Nivasinam' (V.V. Krishna Sastry 1992: 21).

By the mid-6th century AD, the Madhyamikas split into two: Prasangikas and Svatantrikas; Buddhapalita expounded the viewpoint of the Prasangikas, while Bhavaviveka was the founder of the Svatantrikas. The difference between these two sub-branches lies in the method of presentation. Buddhapalita adopts an infinitely subtle method of reduction. For him, the essence of Madhyamaka doctrine lies in continuous dialectics. Bhavaviveka criticized this view. He believed that independent argumentation finds support in logical reasoning. Kajiyama stated that the problem that divided the Madhyamikas was whether the phenomenal world, the system of conventional knowledge - even if it is always illusory from the ultimate perspective - is rationally or irrationally recognized (L.M. Joshi 1977: 173).

Since the Prasangikas argued that ultimate truth can be clarified by continuous rejection of conventional truth, Buddhapalita did not need his own theory. Bhavaviveka criticized this view. Bhavaviveka believed that there is a need to recognize the rationality of conventional knowledge, and that ultimate truth is inherent in conventional truth (L.M. Joshi 1977: 173).

Furthermore, the Madhyamikas and their opponents - both tried to establish truth (probabilistically) through arguments that accepted the existence of rational cognitive tools. On the other hand, the Prasangikas introduced a dimension that was not desired by the opponent through an argument. That argument had three parts: subject, justification, and false proposition; they had to be acceptable only to the opponent.

The Madhyamaka philosophers Chandrakirti and Shantideva criticized the Theravadins on three points: 1) the authority of scriptural texts, 2) dharmas, and 3) causality (L.M. Joshi 1977: 176).

The Sunyavada doctrine states that the knowledge of the emptiness of all dharmas is truth. The Sarvastivadins challenged this. There are also disputes among the Vijñanavadins regarding the theory of the mind or consciousness as self-cognition. The Ratnachuda Sutra states that a sharp knife cannot cut itself, fingertips cannot touch themselves, and similarly, the mind cannot see itself. An entity cannot be both action and agent at the same time. The knower and the known cannot be the mind at the same time. It is not possible to attribute two different qualities to the same entity at the same moment. Therefore, the mind's self-identity cannot be truly proven.

Kumarila's Criticism of Buddhist Thought

Kumarila Bhatta, the Mimamsa philosopher, rejected Vijñanavada and Madhyamaka in his Shlokavartika. He refuted the Buddhist view that Buddha is omniscient (Lokottaravada), the doctrine of non-self (Nairatmya), the doctrine of momentariness (Kshanikavada), the doctrine of self-characteristics (Svalakshana), and the doctrine of conventional truth (Samvriti Satya). He worked to assert the eternality of sound and the infallibility of the Vedas. He called Vijñanavada 'Niralambanavada', meaning a doctrine without external support (justification) for true ideas. Vijñanavadins say that only thought is real existence, and the external world with all its forms belongs to convention, that it is a false truth, and that clinging to this truth is futile.

Kumarila said that the theory of two truths is not justifiable. Since conventional truth is not a form of truth, it cannot be truth at all. If it were truth, how could it be conventional? If it is conventional, how can it be truth? Truth is not contradictory, being both false and real. Furthermore, when the external world is empty, how does consciousness conceive it? This means that everything that exists is true, and what does not exist is false; a subject must be either completely true or completely false; thus, the theory of two truths is not justifiable.

Rejecting the Sunyavada proposed by the Madhyamikas, Kumarila said that the idea that the knower and knowledge are one is not true; because we cannot show any example of such a dual characteristic for an object - for an existence. This is because - fire, etc., illuminate vessels, but they are not illuminated, nor do they wait for something to illuminate them.

When they come into recognition, they are recognized through the sense organ; thought recognizes the sense organ. Another thought recognizes this thought; in such a situation, do objects become both the knower and the knowledge? Furthermore, when recognizing an organized form like blue, we do not encounter a concept that has a form of recognition (which recognizes it).

Shankara's Views on Buddhist Thought

In his Brahmasutras, Shankara considered Buddhism a system of total destruction. It recognizes three main systems of thought: Sarvastivada, Vijnanavada, and Sunyavada. According to Sarvastivadins, everything, both external and internal, is true. External means object or material, and internal means mind or mental.

Shankara opposed this dual classification. These categories are irrational. They do not act on their own; they lack freedom because their actions are meaningless. Shankara also found a flaw in the doctrine of momentariness. He said that there can be no causal relationship between two momentary objects. This is because the second momentary object does not come into existence until the existence of the first momentary object has ceased. The previous object

It is said that this was a great center of learning. The Buddhist Sangha in Dantapura was very famous. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, Buddhist monks from Dantapura were sent to Sri Lanka for religious propagation. It is said that they contributed to the spread of Buddhism in Sri Lanka. It is also said that they translated Buddhist texts into Sinhala. This is mentioned in the Mahavamsa (c. 1980: 186).

A great Buddhist monk named Buddhapalita, who lived in the 5th and 6th centuries AD, was a prominent figure in the Madhyamaka school. He was a disciple of Aryadeva. He wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Buddhapalita Vritti. In this, he explained the Prasangika method. This method is a unique method of argument in the Madhyamaka school. It is said that Buddhapalita's commentary was influential in the development of the Madhyamaka school.

Bhavaviveka (c. 490 - 570 AD): Bhavaviveka was a prominent figure in the Svatantrika Madhyamaka school. He was a contemporary of Buddhapalita. He also wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Prajnāpradīpa. In this, he criticized Buddhapalita's Prasāngika method and advocated for the Svatantrika method. It is said that Bhavaviveka's commentary was influential in the development of the Svatantrika Madhyamaka school.

Chandrakīrti (c. 600 - 685 AD): Chandrakīrti was a prominent figure in the Prasāngika Madhyamaka school. He was a disciple of Buddhapalita. He wrote a commentary on Nagarjuna's Madhyamaka Karika. This commentary is known as Prasānnapada. In this, he defended Buddhapalita's Prasāngika method and criticized Bhavaviveka's Svatantrika method. It is said that Chandrakīrti's commentary was influential in the development of the Prasāngika Madhyamaka school.

Dharmakīrti (c. 6th century AD): Dharmakīrti was a prominent Buddhist logician and epistemologist. He was a disciple of Dignāga. He wrote many texts on logic and epistemology. Among his most important works are: *Pramānavartika*, *Pramānaviniśchaya*, *Nyāyabindu*, *Hetubindu*, and *Vādanyāya*. It is said that Dharmakīrti's works were influential in the development of Buddhist logic and epistemology.

Market Socialism - David Miller

Attempts to intervene will not be successful. The argument that production should respond to needs rather than desires is also considered.

Distributive Justice:

Some egalitarians, such as G.A. Cohen, have questioned whether a market economy can produce outcomes consistent with standards of distributive justice. Similarly, it was proposed that markets should control production but not distribution. They rely on moral incentives to motivate producers. But this seems unrealistic. Instead, the question arises whether a properly designed market can provide the income people desire, as measured by their productive contribution. The concept of 'Economic Desert' has been elaborated by considering various challenges to this proposition.

Exploitation:

Marx understood exploitation in terms of the unilateral transfer of value, from the perspective of how exploitation occurs in the establishment of markets where other individuals benefit. Steiner and Roemer understood it in terms of price exchange made against the background of an unjust distribution of resources. Contrary to these views, it has been argued that exploitative transactions are exchanges that occur at equilibrium prices. Due to information asymmetry and bargaining power, this perspective on exploitation allows one to understand why

capitalism is inherently exploitative. However, in market socialism, exploitation occurs only under specific conditions.

Alienation and Welfare:

Socialists attacked market economies for creating personal relationships rather than religious ones. Taking Marx's theory of alienation as a primary reference, it explores various potential sources of alienation, separating resources specific to the market. Nevertheless, Marx praised capitalism for freeing individuals from the social inequalities experienced in pre-capitalist societies. In market socialism, economic relations have a dual role. If production equipment and competitiveness are at one level, human cooperation and plans are at a second level. Through these, alienation can be overcome.

The Politics of Democratic Socialism:

This section analyzes the model of the socialist state. It elucidates aspects such as the ideas of national society as the basis of citizenship, politics as a form of dialogue among citizens, the integration of people with different cultures and minorities into a single community, and the justification of constitutional limitations on majority rule. We can see these in this section. Some aspects are examined here accordingly.

The ideas of national society, politics as a form of dialogue among citizens, the integration of people with different cultures and minorities into a single community, and the justification of constitutional limitations on majority rule, as explained in previous studies, are elucidated. We can see these in this section. Some aspects are examined here accordingly.

Market Socialism:

Market socialism is an economic system in which the means of production are not owned privately or centrally planned. They are mediated solely by the market. In this system, the means of production are owned by both the state and the people. Therefore, there is a cooperative distribution system here. The market structure determines how distributed profits are to be distributed. Profits are distributed as wages to employees, as benefits to society, and as social dividends to the general public.

Resistance to Change:

Neoliberalism's resistance to change has extended not only to the economic sector but also to electoral politics, education, and the media, which influence public perception. Capital globalization has resulted in the weakening of national and state ruling classes. Market socialist principles have been pushed aside due to actions such as limiting the electoral system's ability to influence change, the failure of the left to identify another alternative outside the ruling and political classes, the decline of labor movements, and the traditional working class losing its existence, which caused socialist movements to lose their influence. With current austerity

policies and rising unemployment, it is a good time to revive market socialist principles. Although such policies have some disadvantages, they also have some advantages.

Market Socialist Perspective:

According to British political scientists Julian Le Grand and David Miller, market socialism preserves the market mechanism while socializing capital ownership. The key tenet of this social democratic approach is that markets not only increase efficiency but also freedom and democracy, making them politically attractive.

'Social ownership' is defined in many ways. A group of individuals is most favorable to ownership. Employees defined capitalism as a situation where they do not own their own production equipment and businesses.

Organizations have the right to use and profit from their assets in many variations. However, investment systems hold capital and make strategic management decisions. However, every business has a democratic form, and one of them is under employee control. Companies that are not clearly in public responsibility are socialized as a result of the market socialism strategy. Currently, banking, energy, and rail transport industries are examples of this.

To restore growth and employment, economic reforms can be implemented within the capitalist framework. This allows for the introduction of innovative plans that increase public control.

Market Protection:

When sharing property, this approach largely retains the appeal of market capitalism and reduces clear socialist flaws. This proposition benefits from the subtle spread of socialist ethics in retaining the current market links of productive companies.

James Anchor, an American economist, established this line of thought. He emphasized how 'practical market socialism' reduces inequality while maintaining the current consumer culture. He recognized that some investors, whether current or former entrepreneurs, have a legal right to profit as a reward for their efforts. However, the vast majority of capital wealth is an illegitimate reward related to inheritance and financial capital market speculation. Such incomes are economically necessary but not morally necessary. In his opinion, all established large business enterprises should be publicly owned.

Market Socialism - Feasibility:

Profits or bankruptcies continue as a result of market competition. Market socialism aims to increase the level of equality in the allocation of capital assets. The income from capital assets and its unequal distribution is the moral responsibility of the government. Many individuals, including political philosopher Christopher Pierson, believe that the feasibility of 'market

socialism' will lose the scope and purity of the socialist agenda. The economy can be socialized and implemented, resulting in an artificial society.

Limitations:

When viewed as an ultimate goal, market socialism has many shortcomings. The capitalist ideals of competitiveness and profitability are still in force, and the socialist characteristics brought about by social ownership may be defeated. Such programs may be a type of democratic capitalism with socialist overloads. Many on the left have rejected levels of inequality. Market socialists are likely to simplify their plans for a hybrid economic structure. Autonomous businesses seeking market efficiency will need incentives, and their success will be measured in terms of profit. This will not only lead to inequalities but also threaten socialist values. Even in the case of public ownership, market forces cause economic instability. The rich benefit at the expense of the poor.

The market must also be understood in the context of the global capitalist economy. This complicates the implementation of market socialism country by country. The national state loses its economic coordination powers. Even if compensation is paid, if nationalization is faced, international organizations will not hand over ownership of their assets to the state.

Conclusion:

Market socialism explores contemporary prominence as a political ideal. Miller's market socialism questions whether the benefits offered by market socialism are actually the benefits people desire or if it indicates needs that are contradictory in practice.

In Andhra - Karnataka region, Jainism truly reached its peak during the Rashtrakuta period, as revealed by literary and epigraphic sources. During this period, many Jain writers composed invaluable works.

Jains living in Mallikarjunapalli, Sadashivapet (Medak district) taluka, received the patronage of Amoghavarsha I. An inscription from 846 AD states that Permanadi Devarayya of Pippara made a gift to a Jinalaya in Munipalli village. The word Muni is generally added to the names of Jain ascetics. Similarly, it seems this Munipalli came into existence (IAP-Medak 2001: XXVI).

Krishna II, son and successor of Amoghavarsha, was also a devout Jain. Although there are no records of Krishna II donating to Jain centers in Andhra Desa, he might have extended his patronage to the Jain centers maintained by his father. Indra III (c. 913-922 AD), successor of Krishna II, was also a great patron of Jainism. During his time, Bodhan in Nizamabad district and Danavulapadu in Kadapa district flourished as excellent Jain Tirthas.

Govinda III and Govinda IV, other kings of this dynasty, were also influenced by Jain principles. They constructed Jinalayas and made donations for their maintenance. Krishna III, the last great king of the Rashtrakuta dynasty, and his feudatories were also patrons of Jainism.

Andhra scholars, Gajankusha, and poets like Ponna were present in Krishna III's court at Manyakheta. The last king of this dynasty was Indra IV. We know that he embraced death in March 982 AD through the Jain vow of Sallekhana (N. Venkata Ramanayya 1953: 92-98). It is surprising to know that the victorious Rashtrakuta generals - Bankeya, Kundave, Sri Vijaya - were devout Jains.

Like their overlords, the Vemulawada Chalukyas were also great patrons of Jainism. Bodhan, the early capital of the Vemulawada Chalukyas, was a great Jain center. An inscription at Sravanabelagola states that there was a 525-bow-high Bahubali or Gomata sculpture in Bodhan, and that Chamundaraya was inspired by seeing it to erect the Gomateshwara statue at Sravanabelagola. The Deval Mosque in Bodhan was a Jinalaya during the Rashtrakuta period. There are Jain idols on its pillars (Haripriya Rangarajan, ed. 2001: 328).

Among the Vemulawada Chalukya kings, Arikesari II (c. 930-955 AD) was a noteworthy personality. He patronized Pampa, the first great Kannada poet and author of Vikramarjuna Vijayam. Pampa was the son of Bhimapayya and Abbannabbe; Vangiparra in Venginadu was their ancestral home. We learn these facts from the Kurmyala inscription (HS XVIII: 42-43). The main purpose of the inscription is to record the religious activities of Jinavallabha. This Jinavallabha was an unknown brother of the Kannada poet Adi Pampa. Like his brother Pampa, he was also a follower of Jainism and constructed a Jinalaya named Tribhuvana Tilaka by carving idols of all Tirthankaras and Chakreshvari on Bommalagutta hill in Kurkyala village, Karimnagar district. Like Pampa, Jinavallabha is also said to be a great poet.

The last great king of this family was Baddega. He was very inclined towards Jainism. An inscription on the pedestal of a Jain idol found in the Rajarajeshwara temple complex in Vemulawada, Karimnagar district, tells us that Baddega II constructed a Jinalaya named Shubhadhama Jinalayam in his capital Lembulavataka (present-day Vemulawada) for his guru Somadevasuri, who belonged to the Gauda Sangha (G. Jawaharlal 1994: 260-64). Baddega's

son, Arikesari III (c. 966-973 AD), was also a Jain. His Parbhani copper plates, dated Saka 888 (IA IV: 49-53), tell us that Arikesari III donated the village of Vanikattupulu, located between Repaka-12 and Sabbi-1000, to Somadevasuri, the head of the Shubhadhama Jinalaya monastery. Indeed, Somadevasuri was a renowned scholar. He was also the author of many Sanskrit works like Yashastilaka Champu, Nitivakyamrita, and Syadvadopanishat. He held the titles of Tarkika Chakravarti and Kavikularaja.

During the Rashtrakuta period, Kolanupaka emerged as a Jain center. The Mahavira and Neminatha temples might have been early temples. It was the center of Meshapasha Ganagachcha and Kanuru Gana (G. Jawaharlal 1994: 112).

There is a brick Jinalaya in Alvanpalli, Gangapur Mandal, Mahabubnagar district. It is partially in ruins. It belongs to the 10th century AD. Two temples were excavated near this structure in 1971. These consist of a sanctum sanctorum and a nave mandapa built on a sub-

basement. A headless Mahavira idol, seated, belonging to the 10th century AD, was found there (Haripriya Rangarajan, ed. 2001: 245-9).

It is noteworthy that cave temples were recently discovered in Yellakonda, Chevella Mandal, Ranga Reddy district. Jain sculptures are found in the cave temples on the hill. They are said to belong to the 10th century AD. The standing Parsvanatha idol in the sculptures is particularly relevant.

There is a ruined temple with Jain idols in Singavaram, Vipinagandla Mandal, Mahabubnagar district. Among these, the Parsvanatha idol in Kayotsargasana, with a charming Naga Raja behind it, is said to belong to the 10th century AD.

Thus, Jainism flourished for a long time in the Telangana region with the generosity and liberal patronage of the Vemulawada Chalukyas. Great Jain scholars (like Pampa, his brother Jinavallabha, Somadevasuri) flourished in their courts and under their patronage. Undoubtedly, many Jain monasteries became prominent educational centers.

Jainism flourished under the Rashtrakutas, Gangas, and feudatory families like the Nolamba Pallavas.

The Jain centers in Tirumalai and Vallamalai (Chittoor district) in Banavadi shone as great centers. The Vallamalai inscription of the 9th century mentions the prominence of Ajjanandi. He carved the sculptures of his gurus in Vallamalai. Jain rock dwellings, some temple structures, and some Jain sculptures in places like Kannikapuram, Nagari, Irikimpattu, Tumburu, Nindra, Nallatturu, Chandragiri, and Arangolam in Chittoor district indicate that Jainism was practiced here during the early medieval period (G.S. Shashidhar Reddy; in Haripriya Rangarajan, ed. 2001: 287-92).

Many Jain followers used to come in groups to the sacred site of Danavulapadu (Kadapa district) in Renadu to witness the Sallekhana vow (ARSIE 1946-7: No. 158). An inscription (EI X: 147 ff) states that Sri-Vijaya, a great general of the Rashtrakuta dynasty, took sannyasa and ended his life here. A rock dwelling - Sanyasi-Gundu (the rock got its name from the ascetics) - in Penikelapadu, Jammalamadugu taluka (Kadapa district) has a Jain inscription carved on it. It states that a great guru named Vrishabha, described as a cloud for crops, noble, and unperturbed by opponents, resided on this hill (EI XX: 122).

Some inscriptions belonging to the Rashtrakuta period are carved on the pedestals of Jain idols in Rayadurgam, Anantapur district. Furthermore, a Chauvisi idol, a sculpture panel (Nishidhi), an inscribed memorial sculpture, and an idol of Parsvanatha were found in Rayadurgam fort (same source: 123).

The Jain Vidyalaya on Rayadurgam hill in Anantapur district, which flourished during the Rashtrakuta period, is worth mentioning. There are four caves on the slopes of the hill; they have

rock-cut doors; Siddha idols are carved on them. An inscription states that it was a center of the Yapaniyas, and mentions Chandrabhuti of the Mulasangha and Chandrasena of the Yapaniya Sangha; the names of sculptors are also mentioned. Carving the Vidyalaya on the rocks is a unique sight there. It is very interesting that the blocks of books, and the images of students and teachers, are carved on rocks in three different areas. There are also women among the students. The Yapaniyas also admitted women and taught them Jain principles. Jain Tirthankara images are also carved on the rocks. Based on ancient paleography and art characteristics, this center can be said to belong to the 9th century AD (Haripriya Rangarajan, ed. 2001: 137).

Many rock dwellings are carved on the hill in Mylavaram Dam, called Nemalla Tippa. Tirthankara images, and many pictures - Chakra, Swastika, Tirthankaras, Shasanadevi, etc. - are noteworthy. All these reveal that these rock dwellings were Jain habitations from the early historical period. With the development of Danavulapadu during the Rashtrakuta period, mutual relations between these natural shelters and habitations flourished (EI XX: 136).

During the Nolamba Pallava period, the Madakasira region became a flourishing center for Jainism. The chief leaders of that family - Mahendra I, his son Ayyapa, Irungola II, and his queen Alupadevi - were liberal patrons of Jainism. The Hemavati inscriptions (G. Jawaharlal 1994: 219) state that Mahendra and his son Ayyapa donated a Basadi for the feeding of ascetics. The old Sivaram inscription (B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao 1993: 188) states that when King Bhogadeva Chola Maharaja of the Nolamba Pallava family was ruling from Kenjeru (present-day Hemavati in Anantapur district), a famous Jain guru, Padmaprabhamaladhari, resided there. He wrote a commentary on Kundakundacharya's Niyamasara. Under the patronage of the Nolamba Pallavas, Chippagiri in Kurnool district, Hemavati, Amarapuram, Sivaram, and Tammadahalli in Anantapur district flourished as great Jain Tirthas.

Consulted Texts:

Aloka Parashar Sen, et al. (ed.) (2004), *Kevala Bodhi: Buddhist and Jaina History of the Deccan*
Bhattacharya, B.C. (1974), *The Jaina Iconography* (Delhi).

Desai, P.B. (1957), *Jainism in South India*, Jaina Samskriti Samrakshaka Sangha (Sholapur).

Ghosh, A. (ed.) (1974), *Jain Art and Architecture* (New Delhi).

Gopalakrishna Murthy, S, (1963): *Jaina Vestiges in Andhra* (Hyderabad).

Hanumanta Rao, B.S.L. (1993), *Religion in Andhra* (Hyderabad).

Rangarajan Haripriya, et al. (ed.) (2001), *Jainism, Art, Architecture, Literature and Philosophy*":
(Delhi).

Jawaharlal, G. (1994), *Jainism in Andhra* (Delhi).

-(2007), Studies in Jainism (New Delhi).

Nandi, R.N. (1986), The Social Roots of Religion in Ancient India (Calcutta).

Sastry, C.A.P. (2007) 'Two Jaina inscriptions from Rayalaseema', Daccan Studies, Vol V.
PP 116-125.

Sharma, S.R. (1962), Jainism and Karnataka Culture (Delhi).

Soundara Rajan, K.V. (1998), Cave Temples of the Deccan (Delhi).

Venkataramanayya, N. (1929), Trilochana Pallava and Karikalachola (Madras).

(1953), The Chalukyas of Vemulavada (Madras).

Chapter Eighteen

Shaivism

D. Kiran Kranth Chowdary

Pashupatism

Among the branches of Shaivism, the oldest is Pashupatism; the others are Kalamukha, Kapalika, and Shaiva Siddhanta. It is also the spiritual mother of the Kalamukha branch. Pashupata and Kalamukha inscriptions reveal many similarities. Both branches worship the ancient guru Lakulisha; ascetics also adopt the same names. Although some try to equate Kalamukhas with Mahavrata and Mahapashupatas, many sources state that Kalamukhas and Pashupatas are distinct. Pashupatism is first mentioned in the Mahabharata. Lakulisha is generally accepted as the founder of the Pashupata sect. The Linga Purana and Vayu Purana consider Lakulisha an incarnation of Shiva. The name Lakulisha, also called Nakulisha, Lakulesha, Lakulin, Lakulishvara, is said to be derived from the words Lakula, Laguda, or Lakuta, meaning a stick. The lord is a staff-bearer; in fact, the symbol identifying Lakulisha texts is a cudgel (see chapter on art). The earliest mentions of Pashupatism are found in the Mattavilasa Prahasana of Pallava Mahendravarman. The Vishvakarmavatara - Vastushastra states that Lakulisha sculptures should be shown in Padmasana, with his phallus erect, holding a matulunga fruit in his right hand and a staff in his left. Early Lakulisha sculptures confirm this. After the Gupta period, Lakulisha sculptures are found throughout India. By the end of the tenth century, more Lakulisha sculptures and mentions in texts are found in South India - especially in the Karnataka region. Lakulisha devotees might have migrated to this region from different northwestern parts of India. Karohana, Amardaka, Kadambauna, and Terambilu in the north are prominent Pashupata centers.

In Andhra Desa, epigraphic evidence suggests that the Pashupata system was in practice from the 8th century AD. Copper plate inscriptions from the time of the Vengi Chalukya king Vishnuvardhana III (c. 718-52 AD), found in a village near Eluru, West Godavari district, mention two Shaivacharyas - Vamashiva and Purushashiva, disciples of Terambi Brahma Shivacharya. They might have been the heads of the Shiva temple in Vasanthur; they might have migrated to Andhra Desa from Terambi. It seems reasonable to consider them Pashupatas.

In the early Chalukya period, along with the Shaiva tradition, the Bhagavata tradition also gained popularity. With the advent of Vikramaditya I (c. 654-680 AD), there was a significant religious change. Many Shaivacharyas are mentioned in inscriptions, but among them, Sudarshanacharya was prominent. In the fifth year of his reign, Vikramaditya received Shivamandala Diksha from Guru Sudarshanacharya with his blessings. The Talamanchi copper plates state that the king's personal guru was Meghacharya. The Nausari inscription of Vikramaditya I, dated 671 AD, describes him as a supreme Maheshvara meditating at the feet of

Sri Nagavardhana. It can be inferred that Pashupata religion gained popularity in the western parts of Andhra Desa due to the influential Shaivacharyas present in that region.

The names of Shaivacharyas like Sreeshaiva (to) Mamuni, Sri Kanthacharya, Machcharippo - Ramashwaran are carved on the temple walls of Alampur; they belong to the period of Vikramaditya I. The presence of Lakulisha idols in niches indicates that Pashupatism was prevalent in Alampur. Along with the construction of Shiva temples in Alampur, a Pashupata monastery might also have been established. We can reach this conclusion from the inscription of Vijayaditya, dated 713 AD, which states that the head of the monastery, Ishanacharya, constructed the temple premises flawlessly. Continuous royal patronage contributed to the development of the Pashupata religion and the growth of religious art there. An inscription from 781 AD mentions Somadibhattu, the head of the Brahmeshwara monastery. The Pragatur inscription near Alampur, dating to the early 10th century, mentions offerings made to Lakulisha Deva, thus proving the popularity of the Pashupata branch. Other temples in places like Kudaveli, Siddheshwaram, Mahanandi, Panyam, and Satyavolu were also centers of the Pashupata branch. Some stone inscriptions found here indicate the worship of Pashupati in these regions. The Bhairavakonda inscription in Kurnool district mentions Lakulisha as Dandishwara. The prayer verses in the Renadu Chola inscriptions describe Shiva as Lakuta Pani (staff-bearer).

Some sources from the Perumbanawadi region indicate that Gudimallam, Tondamanadu, Srikalahasti, and Yogimallavaram were influential Shaiva centers. Among these, an inscription from Tondamanadu, near Srikalahasti, reveals that it flourished as a center of Mahavratas in the first half of the 10th century. An inscription from 940-41 AD records a donation for the feeding of a thousand devotees. Among those thousand, there were 500 devotees of different religions, 300 Brahmins, and 200 ascetics from six religious sects including Mahavratas. It is also stated that Mahavratas resided in Adityeshwara temple Palli Padai (cremation ground), also known as Kodanda Rameshwaram. The donor of the gift, Vagishwara Pandita - Bhattarar, appears to be the leader of the Mahavratas. It is stated that these ascetics belonging to the unspecified Shashta Samayas were part of these Mahavratas. By specifically mentioning other devotees of some religions, it is certain that the Shashta Samayas refer to the internal divisions within Shaivism, and Mahavratas were among them.

Based on some evidence, there is some confusion among scholars. They mistakenly equated different Shaiva branches with each other. Some Karnataka inscriptions from the 12th and 13th centuries appear to identify Kalamukhas as Mahapashupatas and Mahavratas, and Kalamukha priests as Mahavratas. Since Kalamukhas are closely related to Pashupatas, it is possible to associate Kalamukhas with Mahapashupatas, but not with Kapalikas, Pashupatas, or Mahavratas. It is difficult to resolve why these branches referred to themselves as Mahapashupatas. However, the Vamana Purana seems to mention Mahapashupatas as a form of Shiva for the spread of Pashupata doctrine. Furthermore, Shaivas, Pashupatas, Kalamukhas, Mahavratas, Nirashrayas, and Mahapashupatas were also mentioned as different groups.

The Tondamanadu inscription from the time of Parantaka I mentions the Shashta Samayas as Mahaprati, Vama, Bhairava, Pashupati, Kalamukha, and Kapalika. The Aditya temple, also known as Kodandaram, has been identified as the temple of Aditya Chola I; he is known to have died in Tondai Man Arur. This temple was built over the relics of Aditya I; hence it is called Palli Padai. In this context, it should be remembered that the Palli Padai temple in Pallimandalam, Ramanathapuram district, is called Sundarapandya - Ishwara. The inscription of this temple dates to the mid-10th century; it mentions the Mahavrata monastery that managed the temple. Due to the spread of Shaiva branches like Mahavratas, the custom of building temples over relics might have emerged.

Kalamukhas

The Kalamukha branch had a significant influence in the Karnataka and Andhra regions. This is proven by the many inscriptions that record donations made to Kalamukha temples and monasteries. Their existence is seen in two divisions - Shakti Parishad and Simha Parishad. The Simha Parishad division gained popularity in various parts of Andhra Desa, especially in Bezawada and Amaravati. The Tadikkonda copper plate inscription issued by the Vengi Chalukya king Ammaraja II (c. 945–970 AD) mentions Simhaparishad. It states that Tadikkonda and three other villages were donated to Umamaheshvara Deva in the Samasta Bhuvanashraya temple in Vijayavati, present-day Vijayawada. After mentioning the boundaries of the four villages, the inscription praises the Kalamukha priests belonging to Simha Parishad. Since the inscription provides the spiritual lineage of the priests, we can determine the arrival of Kalamukhas in Andhra Desa; these priests might have been in charge of the institution. Among them, the first was Lakusipu Pashupati, and the last was Prabhutarasi; they were the recipients of the donation. It can be inferred from the Bezawada inscription that his predecessor Vidyashwara received the donation. If we allow twenty years for each generation of gurus, Lakusipu Pashupati must have lived a hundred years before Prabhutarasi, who was a contemporary of Ammaraja II. This can be considered the period of Vijayaditya Narendramrigaraja. He was the founder of the Samasta Bhuvanashraya temple. He was Vijayaditya II of the same dynasty (c. 806-846 AD). The first Pashupati temple might have been the first chief priest. Thus, he might have been one of the earliest Kalamukha priests known to us; he might have been a contemporary of Ishvaradeshu, a Kalamukha priest from Nandi Konda, Kolar district, Karnataka. Kalamukhas are found in Tamil Nadu in later periods. The inscription states that many Munishwaras appeared in the world in different eras, starting with Sri Lakulishwara. They incarnated on earth as propagators of Dharma. They are the self-manifestations of Rudra. On earth, they are self-born, proficient in Vedas, and worthy of the respect of rulers. Furthermore, the inscription states that the lord benefited this Simhaparishad place by these Munishwaras. Munipalakasippu or the first Pashupati emerged in the lineage of these Kalamukhas who resided in many ancient temples like the Amaravateshwara temple in Amaravati. It is stated that he was the lord of Sri and proficient in all Agamas. He lived only on water, vegetables, milk, fruits, and roots. This clearly confirms that the members of Simha Parishad were Kalamukhas, and that they derived their lineage from

Lakulisha. They worshipped Shiva, were proficient in Vedas - Agamas, and lived on grain-free vegetarian food.

The Amaravateshwara temple in Amaravati is a famous center for Kalamukhas. The Hombale inscription from Dharwad taluka in Karnataka states that the famous guru Bonteyamuni, called Kalamukha-Munishwara, visited places like Srigiri, Kerhada, and Kataka (Dhanyakataka). The Krishna River bank and its vicinity appear to be natural resting places for pilgrims, tourists, and merchants.

It is said that Prabhutarasi III constructed a beautiful stone temple and a three-storied monastery in the presence of his guru Vidyashwara II. For this, he received three villages and a thousand female goats from the king. The inscription concludes by stating that the king was the donor, Vidyashwara was the creator of the inscription, and the leader of Kataka was the executor of the inscription. This indicates that Vidyashwara II was the royal guru of Ammaraja II. There is no doubt that the king considered it appropriate to make generous donations to Prabhutarasi III, who succeeded Vidyashwara II as the chief abbot in 958 AD. During this period, Kalamukhas were very active in the Guntur region.

From the 9th century onwards, Kalamukhas were very influential in the Alampur and Papanashi regions. They also established monasteries. Alampur became the western gateway to Srisailem, a great Kalamukha center. The Pancharamas appear to be Kalamukha centers. Rameshwara Pandita, the head of the Draksharama temple, might have been a Kalamukha. Mukalingam is also an important center for Kalamukhas. They gained great popularity and respect due to their devotion and scholarship. After the 10th century, Kalamukha ascetics gained great influence in Andhra Desa. Kalamukhas constructed their temples and monasteries not only as places of meditation and worship but also to expand the social role of their branch. Furthermore, their urban-based centers also spread to rural areas.

Consulted Texts:

Hanumatha Rao, B.S.L. (1993), Religion in Andhra (Hyderabad).

Lorenzen, David, N. (1972), The Kapalikas and Kalamukhas (New Delhi).

-(1972), 'A Paradox of Kapalikas in the Mattavilasa' in David Gordon White, 2001.

Tantra in Practice (Delhi).

Nandi, R.N. (1973), Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan (Delhi).

Rajendra Prasad, B. (1983), Chalukyan Temples of Andhradesa (New Delhi).

Sampath, M.D. (1980), Chittoor Through the Ages (Delhi).

Timma Reddy, K. (ed.) (1994), Saivism (Hyderabad).

Vedic Religion-

Sagunopasana(Worship of the Formed God)

K.S. Kameswara Rao

In this chapter, we have examined the reasons for the flourishing of Buddhism as a popular living faith in the sections reviewed so far. We have learned about the role played by royalty, laypeople, artisans, merchant classes, and women in patronizing and developing Buddhist Sanghas and their monasteries. We have also learned about its role in promoting a new social system and state formation. Compared to Buddhism, Jainism did not penetrate as deeply into the masses. However, its influence should not be underestimated. This section will examine Brahmanical religion. It will cover the transformation from Vedic rituals to Puranic religion and that unique stage. It will also examine the background for this, and the reasons why different religious beliefs and groups adopted a religious perspective that strove for mutual respect and peaceful coexistence in this historical process.

Religion is one of the oldest social systems created by humanity. Its purpose is to act as a bridge between this world and the other. In some form of rituals, religion is a living force in all societies. Religion has many facets. One aspect is its role in the early historical period and in the historical process of Andhra. We can understand the historical process of any religion only by studying the diverse elements and forces that shaped life trends, values, and cultural ethics. Traditional scholars adopted chronological, descriptive, and systematic approaches to study religion. However, Marxist historians studied material culture. This involves a special focus on the socio-economic background to understand religious teachings, practices, and symbols as part of that cultural and historical process (Kosambi, 1962; 1981; 2002).

In the pre-historic period, in the Andhra region, nature worship, totemism, and animal-form deity worship coexisted. There was a transition from Buddhism and Jainism to Sanatana Dharma or Vedic religion. In this stage, tribal groups and then the Satavahana kingdom emerged from pre-state societies. There is undeniable evidence that pre-Satavahana tribal groups patronized Buddhism and Jainism.

By the time the Satavahanas established their political power in Andhra, the Andhra region had become a hotbed of Vedic rituals and the influence of Buddhist and Jain religions. The Satavahana kingdom was established at a time when the tradition of Vedic sacrifices and other rituals was being revived in North India. Along with Vedic rituals, there was also the worship of local tribal deities like Vinayaka/Ganesha, Hanuman, and Narasimha. Furthermore, village deities enshrined under a banyan tree near a tree-grove or at the village entrance were

worshipped (H.K. Narasimhaswamy, EI xxix: 137). Among these local deities, the most popular was the Mother Goddess tradition, represented by Lajjagauri.

The Satavahanas patronized Vedic religion. Before examining this, let's look at the emergence of Vedic rituals in Andhra. Dharmashastras like the Brahmanas and the Ramayana stand as evidence for the spread of Vedic religion from Aryavarta to Dakshinapatha. The sage Agastya, the epic hero Sri Rama of the Ikshvaku dynasty, and later Apastamba played key roles in the spread of Vedic religion. The "Bhimasena Jataka" also states that Vedic religion was firmly rooted in Andhra Desa (Cowell ed. 1937: 203). Through a process of conciliation, adjustment, and gradual assimilation, Dakshinapatha was Aryanized. This led to a unique religious and cultural pluralism in Andhra culture and society. Even though Vedic religion developed in this region, it did not gain popularity until the Satavahana period. It gained some popularity in the post-Satavahana period. However, a question now arises. Why did the Satavahanas and Ikshvakus patronize Vedic religion instead of Buddhism, which was popular among the masses? Was it because they needed social acceptance and legitimation for their rule, or was it due to their Vedic beliefs?

Was it because of their Vedic beliefs? The literary sources, inscriptions, or coin evidence do not specifically state anything about the fundamental rituals and social status of their original beliefs. However, a close examination of the available evidence suggests that the Satavahanas were an ancient tribe, primarily agriculturalists, and initially followed Jainism, and then entered the ruling class (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1993: 156; JBBORS XVI: 200-20). They established their authority in the process of transformation from a tribal republic to a kingdom. At that time, the Varna-Ashrama Dharma model of Vedic rituals had not yet taken root in the South. The amalgamation between caste and class was in progress. Therefore, most inscriptions mention only their profession, not their caste or gotra. It is difficult to determine the caste of the Satavahanas. It was a period when mixed castes were emerging. Dharmashastras indicate this. It was a period of crisis. This crisis arose due to the arrival of foreigners. The Shakas, Pahlavas, and Yavanas were these foreigners. They came as a new political elite. They tried to become Indians by adopting either Vedic or Buddhist religions (Hanumantha Rao 1995 A: 102, EI xxxiv: 197). All the above-mentioned facts form the background for the emergence of the Satavahanas as a political power.

Yajna was a primary component of Vedic rituals. Along with this, the Bhagavata religion emerged. This focused more on the path of devotion for attaining liberation. The Sanskrit root of the words Bhakti and Bhagavata is 'bhaj', meaning to worship. Bhagavata and Bhagavat can be interpreted as "to worship someone" and "one who worships the adorable." The Bhagavata religion spoke about the bond between the devotee and the Supreme Lord. It states that the devotee manifests only through the worship of God, and not through sacrifices and other rituals. Although the Upanishads did not reject Vedic rituals, they stated that performing sacrifices alone is not sufficient for attaining liberation. In that way, the Upanishads say that the individual soul should unite with the Supreme Soul, meaning the formless Brahman. The seeds of the Bhagavata

religion are found in the Svetashvatara Upanishad and the Bhagavad Gita. The Bhagavad Gita states that the formless Brahman of the Upanishads and the Supreme Deity Narayana Vishnu are one and the same. This Narayana Vishnu became the center of the newly emerging theistic worship. This happened especially in the avatar of Vasudeva Krishna (Jaiswal 1981: 324-25). What is interesting is that Krishna Vasudeva, the founder of the Bhagavata religion, was a Yadava, considered a Kshatriya. The Bhagavata religion is a religion that states there is only one God. Krishna Vasudeva stated that the Supreme Soul is immeasurable, eternal, and full of compassion. This is evidence for it. Proximity to the Supreme Soul brings eternal bliss and liberation.

Over time, the Bhagavata religion transformed into Vaishnavism. This is a branch of Hinduism. Furthermore, the last part of the twelfth book of the Mahabharata, the Narayaniya, the Bhagavata Purana, and the Bhagavata Vadas are recognized as sacred literature by the Bhagavata Vadas. Moreover, the Bhagavata Purana and the Narayaniya, the twelfth book of the Mahabharata, are considered sacred texts by the Bhagavatas. In later times, this Ekaantika Bhagavata religion transformed by incorporating the avatars of Vishnu. With that, its nature and content changed, and it became polytheistic worship. In that way, it became part of the Puranic doctrine. Krishna Vasudeva and Sankarshana Baladeva became analogous to Narayana Vishnu, the Vedic deity. This analogy is a very important point to note. This indicates that the fundamental aspect continued uninterrupted. It recognized the changing understandings in view of the emergence of a new socio-cultural life. The followers of Vedic religion believed that the Bhagavata religion was a suitable vehicle for propagating Brahmanical ideology related to collective morality among the masses. In this stage, epics like the Mahabharata and Ramayana attained the status of Dharmashastras. They became sacred texts. The transformation of the Bhagavata religion into Vaishnavism is an important event in the evolution of Brahmanical religion. Suvira Jaiswal is of the opinion that this new movement contributed to the formation of a broad cultural framework by incorporating tribal worship and local and regional worship. The resulting coexistence changed the very nature of Brahmanical religion. This is because it was based on worshipping the chosen deity with devotion (Jaiswal 1981). In view of the changing social system and the problems arising at the religious level, "Bhakti" emerged in the Vedic tradition in this context. Furthermore, Brahmanical religion involves rituals, and in this, the pantheon of deities multiplied. This is the result of Brahmanical religion incorporating equally responsive cultural traditions. Due to this, the masses

In this chapter, the reasons for the flourishing of Buddhism as a popular living faith in the sections reviewed so far have been highlighted. The role played by royalty, lay people, artisans, merchant classes, and women in patronizing and developing Buddhist Sanghas and their monasteries has been understood. Its role in promoting a new social system and state formation has also been understood. Compared to Buddhism, Jainism did not penetrate as deeply into the masses. However, its influence should not be underestimated. In this section, Brahmanical religion will be examined. It will cover the transformation from Vedic rituals to Puranic religion

and that unique stage. It will also examine the background for this, and the reasons why different religious beliefs and groups adopted a religious perspective that strove for mutual respect and peaceful coexistence in this historical process.

Religion is one of the oldest social systems created by humanity. Its purpose is to act as a bridge between this world and the other. In some form of rituals, religion is a living force in all societies. Religion has many facets. One aspect is its role in the early historical period and in the historical process of Andhra. We can understand the historical process of any religion only by studying the diverse elements and forces that shaped life trends, values, and cultural ethics. Traditional scholars adopted chronological, descriptive, and systematic approaches to study religion. However, Marxist historians studied material culture. This involves a special focus on the socio-economic background to understand religious teachings, practices, and symbols as part of that cultural and historical process (Kosambi, 1962; 1981; 2002).

In the pre-historic period, in the Andhra region, nature worship, totemism, and animal-form deity worship coexisted. There was a transition from Buddhism and Jainism to Sanatana Dharma or Vedic religion. In this stage, tribal groups and then the Satavahana kingdom emerged from pre-state societies. There is undeniable evidence that pre-Satavahana tribal groups patronized Buddhism and Jainism.

By the time the Satavahanas established their political power in Andhra, the Andhra region had become a hotbed of Vedic rituals and the influence of Buddhist and Jain religions. The Satavahana kingdom was established at a time when the tradition of Vedic sacrifices and other rituals was being revived in North India. Along with Vedic rituals, there was also the worship of local tribal deities like Vinayaka/Ganesha, Hanuman, and Narasimha. Furthermore, village deities enshrined under a banyan tree near a tree-grove or at the village entrance were worshipped (H.K. Narasimhaswamy, EI xxix: 137). Among these local deities, the most popular was the Mother Goddess tradition, represented by Lajjagauri.

The Satavahanas patronized Vedic religion. Before examining this, let's look at the emergence of Vedic rituals in Andhra. Dharmashastras like the Brahmanas and the Ramayana stand as evidence for the spread of Vedic religion from Aryavarta to Dakshinapatha. The sage Agastya, the epic hero Sri Rama of the Ikshvaku dynasty, and later Apastamba played key roles in the spread of Vedic religion. The "Bhimasena Jataka" also states that Vedic religion was firmly rooted in Andhra Desa (Cowell ed. 1937: 203). Through a process of conciliation, adjustment, and gradual assimilation, Dakshinapatha was Aryanized. This led to a unique religious and cultural pluralism in Andhra culture and society. Even though Vedic religion developed in this region, it did not gain popularity until the Satavahana period. It gained some popularity in the post-Satavahana period. However, a question now arises. Why did the Satavahanas and Ikshvakus patronize Vedic religion instead of Buddhism, which was popular among the masses? Was it because they needed social acceptance and legitimation for their rule, or was it due to their Vedic beliefs?

Was it because of their Vedic beliefs? The literary sources, inscriptions, or coin evidence do not specifically state anything about the fundamental rituals and social status of their original beliefs. However, a close examination of the available evidence suggests that the Satavahanas were an ancient tribe, primarily agriculturalists, and initially followed Jainism, and then entered the ruling class (Hanumantha Rao et al. 1993: 156; JBBORS XVI: 200-20). They established their authority in the process of transformation from a tribal republic to a kingdom. At that time, the Varna-Ashrama Dharma model of Vedic rituals had not yet taken root in the South. The amalgamation between caste and class was in progress. Therefore, most inscriptions mention only their profession, not their caste or gotra. It is difficult to determine the caste of the Satavahanas. It was a period when mixed castes were emerging. Dharmashastras indicate this. It was a period of crisis. This crisis arose due to the arrival of foreigners. The Shakas, Pahlavas, and Yavanas were these foreigners. They came as a new political elite. They tried to become Indians by adopting either Vedic or Buddhist religions (Hanumantha Rao 1995 A: 102, EI xxxiv: 197). All the above-mentioned facts form the background for the emergence of the Satavahanas as a political power.

Yajna was a primary component of Vedic rituals. Along with this, the Bhagavata religion emerged. This focused more on the path of devotion for attaining liberation. The Sanskrit root of the words Bhakti and Bhagavata is 'bhaj', meaning to worship. Bhagavata and Bhagavat can be interpreted as "to worship someone" and "one who worships the adorable." The Bhagavata religion spoke about the bond between the devotee and the Supreme Lord. It states that the devotee manifests only through the worship of God, and not through sacrifices and other rituals. Although the Upanishads did not reject Vedic rituals, they stated that performing sacrifices alone is not sufficient for attaining liberation. In that way, the Upanishads say that the individual soul should unite with the Supreme Soul, meaning the formless Brahman. The seeds of the Bhagavata religion are found in the Svetashvatara Upanishad and the Bhagavad Gita. The Bhagavad Gita states that the formless Brahman of the Upanishads and the Supreme Deity Narayana Vishnu are one and the same. This Narayana Vishnu became the center of the newly emerging theistic worship. This happened especially in the avatar of Vasudeva Krishna (Jaiswal 1981: 324-25). What is interesting is that Krishna Vasudeva, the founder of the Bhagavata religion, was a Yadava, considered a Kshatriya. The Bhagavata religion is a religion that states there is only one God. Krishna Vasudeva stated that the Supreme Soul is immeasurable, eternal, and full of compassion. This is evidence for it. Proximity to the Supreme Soul brings eternal bliss and liberation.

Over time, the Bhagavata religion transformed into Vaishnavism. This is a branch of Hinduism. Furthermore, the last part of the twelfth book of the Mahabharata, the Narayaniya, the Bhagavata Purana, and the Bhagavata Vadas are recognized as sacred literature by the Bhagavata Vadas. Moreover, the Bhagavata Purana and the Narayaniya, the twelfth book of the Mahabharata, are considered sacred texts by the Bhagavatas. In later times, this Ekaantika Bhagavata religion transformed by incorporating the avatars of Vishnu. With that, its nature and

content changed, and it became polytheistic worship. In that way, it became part of the Puranic doctrine. Krishna Vasudeva and Sankarshana Baladeva became analogous to Narayana Vishnu, the Vedic deity. This analogy is a very important point to note. This indicates that the fundamental aspect continued uninterrupted. It recognized the changing understandings in view of the emergence of a new socio-cultural life. The followers of Vedic religion believed that the Bhagavata religion was a suitable vehicle for propagating Brahmanical ideology related to collective morality among the masses. In this stage, epics like the Mahabharata and Ramayana attained the status of Dharmashastras. They became sacred texts. The transformation of the Bhagavata religion into Vaishnavism is an important event in the evolution of Brahmanical religion. Suvira Jaiswal is of the opinion that this new movement contributed to the formation of a broad cultural framework by incorporating tribal worship and local and regional worship. The resulting coexistence changed the very nature of Brahmanical religion. This is because it was based on worshipping the chosen deity with devotion (Jaiswal 1981). In view of the changing social system and the problems arising at the religious level, "Bhakti" emerged in the Vedic tradition in this context. Furthermore, Brahmanical religion involves rituals, and in this, the pantheon of deities multiplied. This is the result of Brahmanical religion incorporating equally responsive cultural traditions. Due to this, the masses (1957: 321). This is because it is based on the worship of the chosen deity with devotion. In view of the changing social system and the problems arising at the religious level, "Bhakti" emerged in the Vedic tradition in this context. Furthermore, Brahmanical religion involves rituals, and in this, the pantheon of deities multiplied. This is the result of Brahmanical religion incorporating equally responsive cultural traditions. Due to this, the masses

The Satavahanas were an ancient tribe, primarily agriculturalists, and initially followed Jainism, and then entered the ruling class. They established their authority in the process of transformation from a tribal republic to a kingdom. At that time, the Varna-Ashrama Dharma model of Vedic rituals had not yet taken root in the South. The amalgamation between caste and class was in progress. Therefore, most inscriptions mention only their profession, not their caste or gotra. It is difficult to determine the caste of the Satavahanas. It was a period when mixed castes were emerging. Dharmashastras indicate this. It was a period of crisis. This crisis arose due to the arrival of foreigners. The Shakas, Pahlavas, and Yavanas were these foreigners. They came as a new political elite. They tried to become Indians by adopting either Vedic or Buddhist religions (Hanumantha Rao 1995 A: 102, EI xxxiv: 197). All the above-mentioned facts form the background for the emergence of the Satavahanas as a political power.

References

Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy (1969).

Ayyangar, M.S.R. (1988), Studies in South Indian Jainism (Delhi, reprint).

Ayyangar, M.S.R. and Seshagiri Rao (1922), Studies in South Indian Jainism, Vol. I-II

(Vijayanagaram).

Banerjea, J.N. (1966), *Puranic and Tantrik Religion* (Calcutta).

Bapat, P.V., ed. (1956), *2500 Years of Buddhism* (New Delhi).

Beal, S. (1886), 'The Age and Writings of Nagarjuna - Bodhisattva', in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XV, pp. 353, 356. [Beal thinks Kanishka's Council met in AD 70 or 75].

Bhattacharya, B. (1932), *Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism* (Oxford University Press).

—(1958), *The Indian Buddhist Iconography* (Calcutta).

—ed. (1929), *Two Vajrayana Works* (Baroda).

Burgess, J. (1882), *Notes on Amaravati Stupa* (Madras).

—(1887), *Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta* (London).

Chowdhary, Kiran Kanth (1998), 'Saivism in Early Andhra', Dr G.R. Chowdary Memorial Lecture (RamachandraPuram).

Chowdhary, Kiran Kanth and P. Hima (2004), 'Advent of Jainism in Andhra', in Aloka Parasher Sen et al.(eds.), *Kevala Bodhi: Buddhist and Jaina History of the Deccan* (Delhi).

Conze, E. (1967), *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies* (Oxford).

Cowell, E. ed. (1937), *The Jataka* (London).

Cunningham (1874), *Ancient Geography of India*, edited by S.N. Majumdar (Calcutta).

Debala Mitra (1971), *Buddhist Monuments* (Calcutta).

Deo, S.B. (1956), *History of Jaina Monasticism* (Poona).

Desai, P.B. (1957), *Jainism in South India and some Jaina Epigraphs* (Sholapur).

—(1968), *Basavesvara and His Times* (Dharwar).

Dutt, Nalinaksha (1930), *Aspects of Mahayana Buddhism and Relation to Hinayana* (London).

—(1945), *Early Monastic Buddhism* (Calcutta).

—(1978), *Buddhist Sects in India* (Calcutta).

Eliot, Sir Charles (1957), *Hinduism and Buddhism*, 3 parts, third edition (London).

Gaurana (1984), Navanatha Charitra (Hyderabad).

Geiger (1912), Mahavamsa (London).

Ghosh, A., ed. (1974), Jaina Art and Architecture (Delhi).

Vaishnavism

O Sambayya

Due to its geographical location, Andhra Desa was influenced religiously and culturally from both the northwest and the south. Bhagavata religion entered from the north; subsequently, Andhras were also influenced by the discourses of the Alvars from the south. Sangam compilations Ahananuru and Purananuru contain many references to Vishnu (Mal). From the 8th century AD, the Alvars composed thousands of hymns about Vishnu and his different incarnations with great devotion. Their Vaishnavism was universal; many of them came from the lower strata of society; they gained popularity in a very short time; the reason for this was their preaching in Tamil - the language of the people. From the 10th century AD, with Srirangam as their center, Vaishnava Acharyas tried to develop Vaishnavism according to Brahmanical methods. This process reached its peak with the activities of Ramanuja.

Alvars

Alvars means those who are immersed in praising God or those who are immersed in divine love or those who are madly in love. They said that one should worship any one of the many forms of Vishnu, especially Mal, i.e., Krishna, with great devotion, complete faith, total surrender, and by leaving all mental actions to him. The early Alvars considered Mal (Krishna) not as an abstract Brahman, but as the complete God residing in Vaikuntha (Friedhelm Hardy 1983: 294-300). Among the incarnations of Vishnu, Vamana - Trivikrama, Rama, and Krishna come forward as prominent; the Puranic tales about Krishna were prevalent in their thoughts. The characteristic of the devotion of the early Alvars was to lament for the experiences of Krishna's activities and Puranic forms. Krishna's Rasaleela (divine play) is surrounded by enchanting beauty, and it pervades the devotion of the Alvars.

The religion of the Alvars was mainly temple-centric (same source: 256-61). They placed high importance on the worship of the installed idols of the Lord in temples. Their worship method included water, flowers, incense, lamp, and finally prostrating before the Lord. The hymns of the early Alvars often mention offering beautiful flowers and prostrating before God.

In S.K. Aiyangar's words, the Alvars were the first to give a new form to the path of devotion (1952:73). They traveled from one place to another in Tamil Nadu, singing about the forms of Vishnu in villages.

Twelve Alvars are identified (Friedhelm Hardy 241-473; 173-680); they flourished in the 8th and 9th centuries. Poygai Alvar is believed to have composed Mudhal Tiruvandadi in Nalayira Divya Prabandham. Bhutam or Pudatta Alvar expounded the doctrine of self-surrender. Tirumalisai Alvar tirelessly worked for the spread of Vishnu Bhakti.

He introduced the use of Tirumani as a symbol of Vaishnavism. Nammalvar (literally, our Alvar) is said to be the greatest among all Alvars; he is called by different names like Maran, Sathagopan, Parankusan. He was a great scholar and a prolific writer. His most famous work is Tiruvaimozhi (oral tradition). Nammalvar emphasized the concept of self-surrender or Prapatti in his works. More than the writings of other sages and rishis, Nammalvar's works shaped the conduct and faith of South Indian Vaishnavites. It is said that the fundamental principles of Vaishnavism prevalent today were taught by him. Madhurakavi Alvar popularized Nammalvar's hymns. His immortal message: Guru Bhakti is equal to Bhakti (devotion to God). Periya (elder) Alvar or Vishnuchittar composed Tirumozhi. Tiruppallandu is his famous work.

Alvar Vishnuchittar was greatly attracted to the Vamana and Rama avatars. His adopted daughter was Andal. She can be called the Southern Mirabai; she can also be recognized as an Alvar due to her devotional hymns. The same devotional fervor and anxiety are seen in those hymns. Kulasekhara Alvar, a former ruler of Tiruvankur, composed Perumal Tirumozhi and Mukundamala praising Vishnu (Friedhelm Hardy 1983: 484). Tondar Adippodi Alvar or Vipranarayana sang praises of Lord Ranganatha enshrined in Srirangam. Tiruppan Alvar belonged to the low caste Panamnaku; people of that caste used to travel through villages singing songs. He was a great devotee of Ranganatha. He also received a gift for that. The last of the twelve Alvars was Tirumangai Alvar. He seems to have gained great fame among all Vaishnava devotees; he composed a large number of hymns (1361) praising Vishnu. He considered Venkateswara as Krishna and Trivikrama, and prayed for the Lord's mercy and protection. He spent a lot of money to build the fourth prakaram (enclosure) of the Srirangam temple. It is said that he personally visited 108 Divya Tirupatis, Vaishnava shrines from the Himalayas to Kanyakumari.

Acharyas

The era of Vaishnava Acharyas begins from the mid-9th century AD. The Acharyas, who were commentators on the works of the Alvars, worked as propagators of Srivaishnavism throughout their lives. They represent the intellectual wing of Tamil Vaishnavism; the Alvars represented the emotional wing. Their main objective was to provide a philosophical basis for the worship of a personal God and to foster faith in His compassionate glances. The first among the Acharyas was Nathamuni; his successor was Pundarikaksha or Uyyakkondar (protector of the new Dharma system); and after them came Srirama Mishra and Yamunacharya. Among these four, the first person was the foremost among the Acharyas. Ramanuja flourished after these four Acharyas.

Nathamuni (c. 824 - 920 AD)

Nathamuni, the first guru of Srivaishnavism, was a sage of brilliance and intellectual maturity. He is also called Ranganathacharya, Srinathamuni. He is the true patriarch of the message of Prapatti (self-surrender). Nathamuni was the predecessor of the great Vaishnava

gurus who came later, Yamunacharya (who was also his grandson) and Sriramanujacharya. In the words of his famous grandson, Yamunacharya, he was a treasure trove of divine knowledge and renunciation; a deep ocean of devotion. He laid the foundation for the Visistadvaita philosophy.

Nathamuni was born into a family of great spiritual leaders and scholars from Tirunarayanapuram or Kottamannar Koil, near Chidambaram in South Arcot district of Tamil Nadu. He was born into a Brahmin family.

The family is believed to have migrated south from the Ganga valley (J.B. Carman 1974: 24). However, many Brahmin families migrated from Vengi and Karma Rashtra to what is now called Tamil Nadu, and received villages as grants from Nandivarman Pallavamalla. They are described as Chaturvedis (masters of four Vedas), Trivedis (masters of three Vedas), Shadangavidus (masters of six angas of Vedas), Kramavidus (masters of Vedic recitation methods), and Bhattus (scholars). The names of the villages where they settled largely resemble village names in Andhra Desa (SAI II: 517-535). Interestingly, many villages in Tamil Nadu are under the control of Srivaishnavas. Nathamuni's family were experts in Vedic knowledge. They must have come from such a family. Another interesting point is that the suffix 'Bhattu' is present in Nathamuni's father's name. Srivaishnavism created a favorable environment for popular Vaishnavism within the Vedic system. The presence of a large number of Vedic scholars who performed rituals and worship might have been the reason for this.

Nathamuni's father, Ishwara Bhattu, was a Pancharatrika. He was also the progenitor of the great Tatacharya family, who played a significant role in the religious history of South India. Ishwara Bhattu had a great interest in Vedic studies; his son became proficient in Vedas, Vedangas, and Shastras. Nathamuni is said to have visited places like Madurai, Ayodhya, Varanasi, Puri, Simhadri, Ahobilam, and Tiruvengadam. He succeeded his father in the Srirangam temple; his work there was Srikaryam (temple administrator). He passed away in 920 AD (same book: 25).

Nathamuni was the true proponent of the Ubhaya Vedanta school. He was a pioneer in propagating Srivaishnava philosophy in the South through his Sanskrit works (M. Narasimhacharya 1971:2). Unfortunately, none of his three works, Nyayatattva, Purushanirnaya, and Yogarahasya, are available. He reformed the entire Nalayira Divya Prabandham (Divya Prabandham of four thousand hymns). Following the model of the Vedas, he divided the work into four sections. Each section contains approximately a thousand hymns. He is also credited with setting them to music for the first time. Its recitation was introduced as part of the worship program in Srirangam. This custom gradually spread to other temples in South India. It also became part of the daily recitation of devout Vaishnavites. He elevated his hymns to the level of Sanskrit sacred texts, making the Alvars immortal. By giving the Prabandham the status of Vedas in temple festivals, Nathamuni proved that Tamil texts are in no way inferior to Sanskrit texts; he sanctified Tamil texts. The immediate result of this great reform was the emergence of extensive religious literature in both Sanskrit and Tamil in South India. The purpose of this literature was

to interpret this Tamil Veda and to reconcile it with the Prasthanatraya. Like the Vedas, the Prabandham also became an inseparable part of Srivaishnava education.

Nathamuni also introduced the tradition of appointing spiritual leaders called Acharyas to guide and instruct monks and householders on issues of devotion. This is a testament to his great administrative ability and foresight. He was responsible for installing Sriranganatha in the Srirangam temple and establishing the idols of the Alvars. For the first time, he scientifically propounded the theory of self-surrender or Prapatti; this became a key tenet in Srivaishnavism. He is also remembered as the last great guru in the ancient Indian Yoga tradition. He said that liberation can be achieved through a strict regimen of mental and physical discipline (J.B. Carman: 24). In this way, he organized the Srivaishnavas and made their worship popular.

Vaishnavism

229

85

Early Medieval Andhra Pradesh

He also arranged (TTDES I: 8) two-day festival celebrations for Samavayi Manavalapperumal and another nine-day festival in Purattasi. In the same year, 966 AD, she made arrangements for Manavalapperumal to have two processions daily for seven days before Mukkoti-Dvadasi. She bought 4176 kulis of wet land and donated it to the temple for the expenses of these festivals (same source: 9). Thus, in the 10th century AD, a Brahmotsavam was held once a year from the beginning of the Purattasi month. An inscription from the sixteenth regnal year of Chola king Rajaraja I states that Parantakadevi Amma, queen of Parantaka II, offered a crown studded with rubies, diamonds, and gems to Venkateswara (same source: 14).

By the 8th century AD, the belief in the sanctity of the hill temple had increased among kings, ministers, and commanders. Many inscriptions from the 9th century onwards are available as evidence for this. A local inscription of Vijayaditya (c. 830-850 AD) of the Bana dynasty states that the hill deity Tiruvengadattu Perumanadigal (Venkateswara) established a perpetual lamp in the temple. This tells us that a regular temple had already been established there. Approximately a year later, Viranarasinga (c. 968-1000 AD) of the Yadava dynasty is said to have renovated the hill temple.

Members of the Rashtrakuta family also appear to have been patrons of the Tirumala temple. An inscription states that in the nineteenth regnal year of King Kannaradeva, Queen Gangamahadevi's maid offered a lamp to the Yaksha on Tirumala (B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao: 254). In the latter half of the 9th century AD, Tiruchanur near Tirupati developed into another small Tirupati. A Tiruchanur inscription states that Tiruvilankoyil (a replica of the temple on the hill) was built by installing a replica of the hill deity (N. Ramesan 235). Tiruvilankoyil might

have been built for those who could not climb the Tirumala hill and have darshan. However, such was the devotion to the Tirumala deity that this replica temple built in the plains became useless within a few days. Even though climbing the hill was difficult and dangerous, devotees preferred the hill deity. After the 10th century AD, the temple underwent further changes.

Ahobilam

Ahobilam in Allagadda Mandal, Kurnool district, is one of the important Vaishnava shrines in Andhra Desa. The Narasimha temple in Upper Ahobilam is an ancient Vaishnava shrine; it is famous as Nava Narasimha Kshetra. The nine Narasimhas are: Prahlada Varada or Lakshmi Narasimha, Chatravata, Karanda, Yoga Nanda, Guha, Krodha, Malola, Jwala, and Pavana Narasimha (N. Ramesan 196: 25). Although there are no early inscriptions, literary sources confirm the antiquity, sanctity, and popularity of this temple in South India. The hymns of the Alvars mention Ahobilam 75 times. Tirumangai Alvar worshipped Narasimha (Singavel Kunram - young lion king mountain) and composed 10 hymns in his great work Periyatirumozhi (ARE 1915: para 17). In them, he extensively described how difficult it is to climb the hill and how impenetrable the surroundings are. He says that the place is accessible only to deities, not to others. Nathamuni, the first Srivaishnava Acharya, visited Ahobilam, was enchanted, and sang the extraordinary strength and beauty of the Lord with certainty:

234

Early Medieval Andhra Pradesh..

90

Oh, what valor! Oh, what bravery!

Oh, what great prowess!

Narasimha is the supreme deity

Ahobilam, Ahobilam

The Lakshminarasimha Stuti of Adi Shankara reveals that this temple existed in that period (P. Sitapati 1982: 6-7). He appears to have praised this deity in two poems. They are Srilakshmi Narasimha Karavalamba Stotram and Srilakshmi Narasimha Pancaratna Stotram. All these literary references indicate that by the 7th and 8th centuries AD, Ahobilam had become a famous Vaishnava shrine and was counted as one of the 108 Divya Tirupatis.

Consulted Texts:

Banerjee, P. (1973), *Early Indian Religions* (Delhi).

Banerjee, J.N. (1974), *Origin and Development of Hindu Iconography* (Delhi).

Basham, A.L. (1963), *The Wonder That was India* (Madras).

Bhandarkar, R.G (ed.) (1965), *Vaishnavism, Saivism and other Minor Religious Systems* (Varanasi).

Bhattacharya, H. (1983), *The Cultural Heritage of India, Vol IV - The Religions* (Calcutta).

Bhattacharya, N.N. (1999), *History of the Tantric Religion* (New Delhi).

Carman, John Braisted (1974), *The Theology of Ramanuja* (New Haven).

Friedhelm, Hardy (1983), *Viraha Bhakti, The Early History of Krishna Devotion in South India* (Delhi).

Gonda (1954), *Aspects of Early Vaisnavism* (Utrecht).

Hanumantha Rao, B.S.L. (1973), *Religion in Andhra* (Guntur); (1995), *Socio-Cultural History of Ancient and Medieval Andhra* (Hyderabad).

Jaiswal, Suvira (1981), *The Origin and Development of Vaisnavism* (New Delhi).

Krishnaswami Aiyangar, K. (1935), *Early History of Vaisnavism in South India* (Madras).

Narasimhachari, M. (1971), *Yamuna's Contribution to Visistadvaita* (Madras).

Narasimhacharya, M. (1994), *Basic Concepts of Srivaisnavism* (Madras).

-(1989), *History of the Cult of Narasimha in Andhra Pradesh* (Hyderabad).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. (1996), *History of South India* (Oxford).

Ramesan, N. (1981), *Tirumala, Tirupati Temples and Legends of Andhra Pradesh* (Bombay).

Sitapati, P. (1982), *Sri Ahobala Narasimhaswami Temple* (Hyderabad).

Subrahmanya Sastri, Sadhu (1932), *Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphical Series (TTDES)* (Tirupati).

Vira Raghavacharya, T.K.T. (1977), *History of Tirupati Vol. I* (Tirupati).

-(1979), *History of Tirupati Vol.II* (Tirupati).

-(1982), *History of Tirupati Vol III* (Tirupati).

