CHAPTER IV

MALLIKARJUNA'S RELIGION

According to Sivatatvasaramu

In this chapter, we first discuss Mallikarjuna's religion as revealed in his own work Sivatatvasaramu and then follow it with a discussion of his religion according to Somanatha. From these two sources, we get two different pictures. According to Sivatatvasaramu, Mallikarjuna was not a complete Virasaiva, whereas according to Somanatha he was. At the end of the chapter, an attempt is made to explain the differences.

No Virasaiva terminology

No Virasaiva terminology, like wearing linga or worship of Pranalinga, Shatsthala Siddhanta are to be found in Sivatatvasaramu. We do not find either the word Virasaiva or at least Viramahesvarachara, which was used as a synonym to Virasaivism by Somanatha, in Pandita's work. The latter dealt with Sivadiksha without conveying any clear significance. Hence his use of this term has led to controversies among scholars. Those who argued that it
was **Lingadharana diksha** and Pandita dealt with **Lingadharana** in his work accepted him as **Virasaiva** and an **Aradhya**. The other group of scholars argued that Pandita did not deal with **Lingadharana** and did not accept him as a **Virasaiva** and finding **Pandita** dealing at length with the concepts of **Pati**, **Pasu** and **Pasa**, they described him as a **Pasupata**.

Thus different views have been expressed on the religion of Pandita viz., that he was a **Virasaiva** or a **Pasupata**, or an **Aradhya**.

Lakshmana Rao expressed his own doubts saying that it was not clear whether Pandita meant **Lingadiksha** when he mentioned **Sivadiksha**. According to Prabhakara Sastri there was no mention of **Lingadiksha** and **Lingadharana** in **Sivatatvasaramu**. So Pandita was not a **Virasaiva** and finding some **Pasupata** concepts therein Prabhakara Sastri expressed his opinion that Pandita was a **Pasupata**.

Ramakrishna Sastri at one place stated that Pandita was a **Brahma** of **Virasaiva** literature and his **Sivatatvasaramu** was the **Veda of it** and at another place he said that Pandita was a **Pasupata**.

J Chenna Reddy expressed similar views - that Pandita was a **Pasupata** and a **Virasaiva**.

Mudigonda Nagalinga Sastri, Tammayya, Venkata Rao and Hanumantha Rao opined that Pandita dealt with
Lingadharana Hanumantha Rao says that Basavesvara of Karnataka and Mallikarjuna of Andhra were the chief exponents of Virasaivism. And in course of time, the term Virasaivism came to be limited to the teachings of Basava and while those of Pandita branched off into the distinct cult of Aradhyas. At another place he writes that Mallikarjuna systematised Aradhya Saivism.

Keeping these different opinions expressed by scholars in view, now let us study the religion of Pandita in the light of Sivatattvasaramu.

**Single minded and unflinching devotion to Siva**

Throughout his work, Mallikarjuna dealt with single-minded and unflinching devotion to Siva. Even in dream one should not think of any other god excepting Siva and the worship of Siva should not be given up under any circumstance. He declared the supremacy of Siva and His devotees over other Gods and other devotees respectively.

The worship of Sivabhaktas

He propagated that one should worship the devotees of Siva without taking their caste into consideration.
According to him, Siva exists in **Sivabhaktas** and so they are to be taken as 'moving lingas' or the manifestations of Rudra. Worshipping Siva, without worshipping **Sivabhaktas** or **Sivayogas**, was no use. According to him, one should forget oneself and the outer world while worshipping Siva. But seeing the devotees of Siva one should forget even Siva and worship them. He preached that by feeding one **Sivayogi** one derives the amount of merit or punya equal to the punya of feeding one crore of Brahmins. According to him, caste distinctions should not be observed so far as the devotees of Siva were concerned. Even an out-caste, if he happened to be a **Sivabhakta**, should be looked upon as a Brahmin. One who had **Sivabhakti** should be looked upon as one who had everything. He stated that **Sivabhaktas** like Brahmins should be exempted from capital punishment. Even if they committed murder it was no sin since they were sure of reaching **Sivaloka**.

In this respect, Mallikarjuna differs from Basava who laid so much stress on the moral conduct of the devotees.

**Pandita did not favour Jnanamarga.** According to him, the real **Jnana** is the knowledge of Siva i.e. to know that He is the **Pati** and **jivas** are **Pasus**.

He was an upholder of **Bhaktimarga**. The true nature
of Siva could be realised only through devotion. It is the primary thing that one should have. All the religious observances in the absence of bhakti are said to be useless. One's beauty, wealth, knowledge and high caste—all are waste in the absence of devotion.

Of the various aspects that are dealt with by Mallikarjuna, it appears that he gave the highest priority to unflinching devotion to Siva. He preached that Siva was not pleased with one's vratas. He was not to be won over by one's Japas, Tapas and Upavasas (fasts) and would not be won over by Mantras and Tantras. Nor by taking holy baths, or making gifts or observing silence or (mounavrata) or performing sacrifices. But he would be pleased with devotion only. In this respect, he appears to be a true liberal as he did not insist on any systematic way of observing religious practices.

Mallikarjuna dealt at length with these concepts. According to him, Siva was the Pati or lord of all the living beings including Hari, Brahma and the smallest ant in the universe. Brahmoeka samasta Hari Brahmadri pitolikanta Pasuvulakellan Brahmesvara Rudra miva pati.
difference between Siva and Jiva according to him was like the difference between the whole of the earth and an atom. Siva was the master and Jiva was the servant. Jiva was said to be held in ten different stages like bandha (the grip of the worldly noose) and moksha (release from it). But Siva was above all these stages. So one should not think of the union between Siva and Jiva.

He criticised the Advaitins for propagating the concept of union or Advaita philosophy. He attacked the Advaitins saying that if Jiva happened to be a part of the Supreme soul, how the former could come under the influence of Mithya or illusion. So according to Mallikarjuna, the union between the two was unthinkable even at the final stage of the goal of Jiva.

The concept and the process of 'Moksha'

Mallikarjuna believed that one who worshipped Siva devotedly would be shown mercy by Him. By the grace of Lord Siva, the souls who are Pasus would be released from the state of being the Pasus or the noose of the world which was mentioned as the great ocean of sorrow, qualified by three malas or impurities. But even at this stage the released souls do not become one
with Siva but they shine like Him Trimalakrutha dukkha
samsara mahabdri nimagana jiva rasulu niyuttama karunya
va§ambuna vimuktiula ni^rapole veluguduru Siva

He requests Siva to release him from the ocean of Samsara
and to take him to the midst of the Pramatha Ganas, to carry
out His orders Thus Mallikarjuna appears to be a pure
Dvaita and in this respect he completely differs from
Basava's school of philosophy where the ultimate goal of
Jiva is to achieve the union between Jiva and Siva, which
through the process of the purpose of Satsthala Siddhanta

He appears to have attempted to bring synthesis
between various things He showed reverence and pronounced
victory to Vedas, cows, Brahmins, lanchakshara, Vibhuti Maheavaras
He showed his adherence to Sikha (or the
tuft of hair on the head) and va^napavita (the holy
thread)

He believed that one could develop devotion by
observing Sadachara (approved conduct) in accordance with
the Vedas As a result of it, the souls would be released
of their sins and dharma would be improved and in return
it would promote bhakti The process of promoting bhakti
described by Mallikarjuna suggests that he might have
meant it for Brahmins since the Vedic dharma is being
observed only by them

Guru, Sivadiksha and Sivanirmalya

According to Mallikarjuna, to get rid of Karma, devotees should take Sivanirmalya (that is offered to Siva) and they should not eat or drink anything even medicine without offering it to Siva. But one must become eligible to receive Sivanirmalya by accepting Sivadiksha by which they would be purified from their malas or the impurities. Those who were not purified from the Malas i.e. those who did not receive initiation were prohibited from taking Sivanirmalya.

All the devotees who would receive Diksha from the same Guru should be considered as brothers. He insisted that the priests in the temples should take initiation. He said that one should not touch Sivalinga without Diksha. 'Siva' was said to be the Guru of those who were blessed with the devotion to Siva by birth as a result of their samskara of their previous birth and in that case their Diksha was said to be Sambhavadiksha. This description suggests that Mallikarjuna did not insist on Sivadiksha for all. It appears that, according to Mallikarjuna, if one happened to be a devotee by birth, he need no take
Diksha

The controversy about Mallikarjuna's Sivadiksha

As has been already mentioned, scholars have expressed different views on the aspect of Sivadiksha described by Mallikarjuna - whether he meant it to be Lingadhara-na-diksha or ordinary Diksha. Those who argue that Pandita mentioned Lingadhara in Sivatatvasaramu and Sivadiksha means Lingadhara only derive their support from the following points. According to Mudigonda Nagalinga Sastrī,⁵⁹

1. The whole of Sivatatvasaramu is not available. So it is not justifiable to come to the conclusion that Lingadhara is not mentioned in it.

2. In M P Charitra, Mallikarjuna is described as performing Lingarchana when he was visited by the Jangamas. Then he was said to have had Vibhuti and Rudrakshas (holy beads) on him. If he had not linga on his body it was not possible for him to perform Lingarchana. Because of Lingadhara-diksha only that chapter was named as Dikshaprakarana.

3. In Basavapuranamu, Karasthali Somanathayya was described as a disciple of Panditaradhya. The word
Karasthali (bent to the hand) according to Mr. Sastri is to be taken as suggesting Lingadiksha of Mallikarjuna.

In Sivatatvasaramu, Pandita warned that worshipping Sivalinga without worshipping the Jangamalinga i.e. moving linga, was a waste. This verse clearly shows the Lingadharana aspect in Sivatatvasaramu since one cannot be called as a moving linga unless one has linga on his body.

Pandita described Basava as lingasameta i.e. Basava having linga on his body. So it has to be accepted that lingadharana has been dealt with by Pandita in his work.

Accepting these views, Venkata Rao expressed some more points in support of the same view.

1) According to him, it need not be said that Lingadharanadiksha was not mentioned in M. P. Charitra. In the name of the chapter, Dikshaprakarana itself, the meaning was implied. Without Lingadharana, one cannot perform Lingarchana. Since M. P. Charitra is a kavya, the technical concepts regarding the religious practices were not dealt with in detail. But they were only hinted.
2) In Sarvesvarasataka, it is said that linga is to be found always on the bodies of the devotees. Tammayya approved the views of Nagalinga Sastri arguing that on the [page number].

1) Sivadiksha means Lingadiksha only and according to him was cited in three verses in Sivatatvasaramu of the three, V No 153 (was quoted by Nagalinga Sastri and others also) describes the worship of moving lingas. In another verse, quoted by Tammayya i.e. V No 156 the same expression is used. In the third verse No 220, it is said that those who receive Sivadiksha would be purified from the malas and they could take Sivanirmalya.

2) If Mallikarjunanda Pandita were not a Lingadhari, Somanatha who observed the vrata or vow of not seeing the bhavi, bhavijana darsana sparśanaṭapa vividha dānādana vishayadūraguda, (not to see, touch or think of bhavis) would not have taken up the work of composing M P Charitra.

3) In M P Charitra, Pandita is described as having received Lingadiksha. So it should be accepted that Mallikarjuna dealt with Lingadharaṇa in his work.

Hamumantha Rao does not agree with Prabhakara.
Sastri's view that Pandita and other Aradhyas did not have Lingadharana till the times of Krishnadeva Raya, and stated that Pandita referred to the wearing of linga, twice in V No 153 (the very verse referred to by the rest of the scholars) — speaking about the worship of Jangama lingamu and 433 And Sivadiksha mentioned in VV 224-230 and V 25 was said to have dealt with the practice of wearing linga called Istalinga.

Thus these four scholars tried to support their view both from internal and from external evidences.

Let us first discuss the external evidences they quoted. According to Nagalinga Sastri and Venkata Rao Lingadharana was hinted in M P Charitra by naming the chapter as Dikshaprakarana and referring to Mallikarjuna’s Lingadharana. According to the latter, since M P Charitra is a Kavya the technical terms regarding the religious concepts were not dealt with. These statements are far from the truth. In Dikshaprakarana, it is clearly stated that Pandita received Pranalinga and Lingadharana also is dealt at length in the same chapter. The Brahmins asked Pandita whether he could wear linga and Pandita replied supporting Lingadharana at length. But all these statements are made by Somanatha So it can not be stated in
support of Pandita's Lingadharana according to his own work

The same argument can be applied to Karasthali Somanathayya who was described as the disciple of Pandita by Somanatha. According to Somanatha, Pandita's Lingadharana is not at all a disputable point. In the same way, the mention of it in Sarvesvarasataka cannot be taken in support of the view that Pandita dealt with Lingadharana in Sivatatvasaramu.

All the scholars quoted the verse 153 where the bhaktas are described as movable linga. But Pandita used the expression that the Sivabhaktas were the manifestations of Siva in many verses. He specifically mentioned that whoever smears vibhuti and wears rudraksha should be looked upon as Rudras. He never mentioned or hinted at the practice of wearing linga. So according to him Jangama-lingamu, means movable or moving Sivabhaktas who wear rudrakshas and smear vibhuti, but not-linga Rudraksha bhūtabhūshana mudrānkitu neduruganna mudamuna sāksadrudrudanī talapadēni sivadrōhūdu narakagamī yagunā

In verse No 175 it is said that Rudras from Rudraloka came to the earth as Sivabhaktas for the good of the world.

Pandita described that one should worship the Sivabhaktas who were moving linga, and it is stated in the same
verse that the worship of movable linga is worth than worshipping sthavaralinga. From this statement, it can be said that he did not hint at the practice of wearing linga. As is described in M P Charitra, the worship of the Jangamas has been given more prominence than the worship of Pranalinga in Virasaivism but not the worship of sthavaralinga. The worship of the latter finds no place in Virasaivism. If he meant Lingadharana, and the worship of Pranalinga he would not have said that it was better than worshipping sthavaralinga and would have replaced it by linga or Pranalinga.

In the light of this verse, the argument that Sivatatvasaramu is not a completely extant work and the practice of Lingadharana might have been mentioned in the verses that were lost, also does not appear to be a justifiable one, as Pandita specifically has used the word sthavaralinga, where he ought to have used the term Pranalinga. Moreover he did not believe in the concept of Pranalinga in Virasaivism.

Virasaivas believe that Siva resides in the Jivas in the form of Chaitanya and thus the individual soul is
the Supreme Siva under the influence of Avidya - which can be removed not only by gaining Jnana of the Supreme Self but also by kriya i.e., strict observance of prescribed forms. The Chaitanya form of Siva that resides in the disciple is extracted in the form of linga i.e., Pranalinga, by the Guru and given it to the disciple. The soul that gains the knowledge is automatically freed from Maya or Avidya and becomes united with Siva. Thus it is said that the tendency of Virasatvism as has been revealed in the Vacana smrtis of the 12th century is undoubtedly monistic (Advaita) generally agreeing with the teachings of Sankaracharya.

It appears from the above description that the concept of Pranalinga, that is worn on the body by the Virasatvins does not fit into the teachings of Pandita. He did not approve the theory of Avidya or illusion which makes the soul feel as a separate entity from the supreme being and according to Pandita, unity between the two is unimaginable at any stage. So strictly speaking, there was no provision for the worship of Pranalinga according to the teachings of Mallikarjuna. That must be the reason why he did not mention Lingadharana of the bhaktas when he said so much about vibhutidharana.
and rudrakshadharana. As was stated by Venkannaiah, from Pandita's description of Basava as 'lingasamēta' in his work it can be said that Pandita was aware of the practice of Lingadharana but not that he dealt about it when he referred to Sivadiksha.

Sivadiksha, unless Lingadharana is specifically mentioned in association with it, cannot be accepted as Lingadharanadiksha as was wrongly argued by Tammayya. Visvesvara Sivacharya is called the Dikshaguru of Ganapatideva. But it was obviously not Lingadiksha. In the same way, the example of Sivadiksha that is described in Kumarasambhavam can be taken to mean that Sivadiksha cannot be taken for granted for Lingadharanadiksha unless it is stated otherwise.

According to Tammayya, if Pandita were not a Lingadhari, Somanatha, who observed the vrata of not seeing or talking to bhavi would not have composed the work on Mallikarjuna Pandita. In this argument, he interpreted the word bhavi as one who did not have Lingadharana. But at another place Tammayya only said that the word bhavi had been used to those who were not Sivabhaktas. He said that Somanatha described many devotees in Basavapuram and M P Charitra, but there was no evidence to accept them as
having had **Lungadharana** Thus he has made contradictory statements. But his latter statement can be accepted since Somanatha paid tributes to all the Sivabhaktas whether they were Lungadharas or not. Hence, the argument that Somanatha would not have composed **M P Charitra** if Mallikarjuna were not a Lungadhar, cannot be accepted.

Thus it can be stated that Pandita propagated unflinching devotion to Siva and he gave it the highest priority over everything else. He dealt with *Sivadiksha* but it was not **Lungadiksha**. But he was aware of Basava's wearing *linga*. Though the bhakti aspect of Pandita was very similar to that of Basava's teachings, Pandita differed radically with Basava regarding the relationship between the soul and supreme soul. So, as has been stated earlier, according to *Sivatatvasaramu*, Pandita cannot be claimed as a *Virasaiva* for the following reasons:

1. He did not accept the fundamental principles of *Virasaiva* philosophy i.e., the union between the soul and Supreme soul.

2. He did not mention **Lungadharana** or the worship of *Pranalinga*. 
3 He showed his adherence to Vedas, Brahmins, cows, 
Sikha, Gayatri and yajnopavita which are not accepted by 
the Virasaivas. So the statement of Ramakrishna Sastri 
that Sivatatvasaramu of Mallikarjuna pandita was the Veda 
of Virasaiva literature in Andhra and the author as its 
Brahma cannot be accepted.

Was he an Aradhya?

1 Pandita did not suggest or give any name to his 
teachings. Moreover he did not use the term Aradhya to 
denote the system as it is known today. He used it to 
describe Siva saying that Siva was the Aradhya and the 
devotee was the Ārādhaka. Ārādhyaumārādhaka ārādhaka 
managa lōṇi yadvaita durāchāra krūta sarva sunyākara
sthītu nemiṣcyaga vachhu siva
d Vasudeva

2 The present day Aradhyas accept Lingadharama and the 
concept of the union between the soul and Supreme soul 
and Lingadharama is the most important aspect that differentiates Aradhyas from the other Brahmins. In the absence of that concept, Pandita cannot be said to have been a full-fledged Aradhya. So Hanumantha Rao's view that Pandita systematised the Aradhya system cannot be accepted. But as has been stated by the same scholar elsewhere that
Pandita’s teachings might have branched off into the distinct cult of the Aradhys later on. The followers of Mallikarjuna must have accepted Lingadharana in course of time and must have called themselves or been referred to by others as Aradhya.

Was he a Pasupata?

Prabhakara Sastri was the first to express the opinion that Pandita was a Pasupata. He stated that Mallikarjuna’s religious concepts were very similar to the Pasupata concepts found in Srikanthabhashya. He said that the Pasupata system, known from that Bhashya was associated with Panchakshari, Prasada, smearing the body with the ash, Lingarohana, wearing Rudraksha and the concepts of Pasu-Pati-Pasa and it does not insist on ascetic life. Since all these concepts are to be traced in Sivatatvasaramu, Mallikarjuna Pandita was considered to be a Pasupata. According to S.V. Pathak, Srikantha was the founder of Pasupata system and it is to be noted that ascetic life for the Pasupatas was not insisted in his teachings.

J. Chenna Reddy agreed with Prabhakara Sastri’s views on Pandita’s religion and expressed the opinion that the
religious concepts of Pandita were very similar to those of the Pasupata texts i.e. Vibhutidharana, Rudraksha, Yajnopavita, married life and varnaśrama dharma that are to be found in the work of Gunaratnasuri of 14th century, the commentator of Harabhadra's Saddarsana Samuchchaya. Let us examine the plausibility of the view, whether Pandita was a Pasupata. We find some points in support of it in Śivatattvasāramu.

1. To start with, the suffix 'Pandita' to the name of Mallikārjuna suggests that he might have been a Pasupata. As has been stated earlier, some of the Pasupata and Kalamukha priests of Mediaeval Andhra were known from inscriptions to have the suffix of either Pandita or rasi to their names. Mallikārjuna's father also had the suffix 'Pandita' to his name i.e. Bhimana Pandita.

2. Mallikārjuna Pandita at certain places showed his appreciation of the Pasupatas by mentioning that word. While attacking the advaitins he stated that Brahma, Vishnu, Suras and Munis were all Pasupatas having knotted hair, Rudraksha and Bhasma applied to bodies. This description suggests that Mallikārjuna must have been a Pasupata since he spoke in favour of it while attacking a rival faith. Before tracing and comparing the Pasupata
concepts of Pandita with Pasupata system let us know what this system is.

The Pasupata system, known from different works like Atharvasiropanishat, the Pasupata Sutras with the Bhashya of Kaundinya, the Sarvadarshana Sangraha of Madhavacharya is associated with five subjects, 1) karya or effect, 2) Karana or the cause which is Isvara or Mahesvara, 3) Yoga which is absorption in meditation or the muttering of the syllable Om 4) Vidhi i.e. bathing in ashes, and 5) Dukkhnanta.

The effect or karya is associated with Pasu and cause or Karana is that of Pati. The goal of the soul or Pasu is the total annihilation of all kinds of sorrow or Dukkhnanta, and according to Kaundinya, this can be achieved not by Jnana or knowledge - but by the grace of Siva. The disciple should follow ascetic practices recommended by the lord and then only he attains liberation through grace. Thus according to Kaundinya, the ascetic practices were said to be an important part of this system.

According to Atharvasiropanishat, it is known that for the knowledge of Rudra one should have single-minded devotion and besmear the body with ash for the removal of
the noose and utter Om. Here single-minded devotion and smearing Vibhuti are said to be important aspects of the system.

It is said that the bhasma was given so much prominence in the Pasupata system that it is said to be known as linga or sign of linga. It is however quite interesting to note the information given by A.P. Karmarkar that the Pasupatas besmear their bodies with sand instead of ash.

It is said that the Pasupata system did not accept Anavamala which is said to be responsible for Atman or ignorance. According to Tammayya, Pasupatas were said to have been known for their worship of linga, given to them by their Guru, which they kept either in the hand or on a raised seat (Pitham).

Hanumantha Rao says that the Pasupata worship Siva in the form of linga and wear it on their body especially in their hair.

It is said that according to the belief of the Pasupatas the liberated soul, even at the time of emancipation would not become one with Siva but it could be in perpetual contact with Siva by means of its concentration (or mental steadiness) on Siva. Thus the released...
of the noosd more or less achieve an equal status with Siva and carry out His orders as his representatives.

According to Gunaratna, the Naiyayikas were classified under Pasupatas since they were known to have had similar practices and philosophical attitudes as that of Vaisesikas who were called as Pasupatas. The Naiyayikas had matted locks of hair, smeared their body with ashes and wore holy thread. Their chief mantra was Om Nākām Śivaya. Initiation or (Dikṣa) was recommended to them. They are said to have lived generally in the forests living on roots and fruits. Some of them were Gṛhaśālas and some were not. They performed the sacrificial duties of fire.

To sum up the tenets of the Pasupata system given in the various works, it can be said that this system was associated with five principles, karya, karana, yoga, vidhi and Duhkhanta. They did not favour Jnana marga. The final deliverance of the soul will be achieved through the grace of God. Single-minded devotion, uttering 'Om' besmeared the body with ash are said to be its important aspects. The prominence of bhauma is said to be so much that it was known as linga. Initiation, and worshipping linga was there. Some of the Pasupatas were said to have worn the
The released souls were said to have been gaining equal status with Siva and carrying out His orders as His representatives. According to Gunaratna's accounts, they were known to have had matted locks of hair, applied ash, the holy thread and Panchakshari and sacrificial duties were mentioned in association with them. On the whole, there was no hard and fast rule that one should lead an ascetic life because it was said to be an essential thing in some works and according to some it was not.

In the light of these concepts, it can be said that Sivatatasaramu deals with all the aspects mentioned above. The five aspects Karana or Pati, effect or Pasu, the final deliverance or Dukkanta, yoga or constant meditation and vipaka or bathing in ashes can be found in it. Siva is said to be the Pati or Karana of everything. Siva is said to be the cause of the Universe. Dukkanta is said to be ultimate goal of Jiva in Sivatatasaramu. The released souls are mentioned to have become equal with Siva and carried out His orders. This concept has been stated very specifically in that work. As has been seen Bhasma, Yajnopavita and initiation are a part of the system Mallikarjuna did not accept Jnana marga. He stressed single-minded
devotion. He believed that the deliverance of the soul will take place only because of the mercy of Siva. Thus most of the concepts dealt with by Mallikarjuna very well tally with the Pasupata system.

So he can be considered to be a Pasupata. But there are certain special features of his teachings that do not fit appropriately into the Pasupata sect. Mallikarjuna gave much prominence to unflinching devotion whereas we do not find it so much emphasised in the Pasupata system. Though single-minded devotion is described to be one of the important aspects of the Pasupatas, Mallikarjuna showed his highest regard to Sivabhaktas irrespective of their caste. This spirit of equality among the Saiva devotees is not to be seen in the Pasupata system. These two aspects of Mallikarjuna's preachings were the most important features of the teachings of the Saiva Nayanars of the Tamil country.

K A N Sastri observes that the Saiva Nayanars of the Tamil country evolved a new type of bhakti — a fervent emotional surrender to God. This new bhakti movement is said to have reached its peak in the 7th century. It was characterised by an outspoken hatred for Jainism and from the 9th century it is known for its protest for Advaita.
philosophy. This protest is said to be the core of the bhakti cult since the ultimate aim of the devotee is not to lose his identity in the impersonal Absolute but to attain and enjoy for all times the blissful company of a personal God. 95

Summarising the main aspects of the bhakti movement of the Saiva Nayanaras, O V Narayana Ayyar 96 writes that the life of devotion to Siva is considered as more important than sticking to the duties prescribed for the various castes. It was said that in the opinion of a Saiva, no service to God was high or low in itself. The Bhaktas were to have not only unflinching devotion to Siva but the highest respect for the Sivabhaktas. The real test of Bhakti consisted in two things, first the determination to carry it through in spite of odd obstacles and second the doing of the thing without expectation of any return. The virtue of worshipping Sivabhaktas was regarded ever superior to the worship of Siva himself. This aspect is said to have been illustrated well in the Periyapuram and some Nayanaras are known to have approved violence like cutting noses, hands and even killing the persons that stood in their way. Sometimes they used to indulge in heroic activities like cutting their own limbs. 97
With the background of these aspects of the preachings of Saiva Nayanars, it can be said that Mallikarjuna was their true follower. Like the Saiva Nayanars, he vehemently criticised Jains, Buddhists and Advaitins. He paid tributes to some of the Nayanars who were known for their unflinching devotion and approved their violence. But at the same time, Mallikarjuna showed his adherence to Vedas, Brahmins, Gayatri mantra and Yajnopavita also. From this it can be said that Mallikarjuna was profoundly influenced by the devotional aspect and worshipping of the Sivabhaktas. Towards the end of the 10th century, the Vengi Chalukya rulers came under the domination of the Cholas and from then onwards the contacts between Andhra and the Tamil country increased and thus the preachings of Saiva Nayanars might have slowly found their way into Andhra. Thus it is quite possible for Mallikarjuna to have been influenced by their teachings. Of course, the bhakti aspect of the Nayanars influenced even Basava and his followers. But however Basava did not approve of violence. Nor did he appreciate the heroic deeds of the Nayanars like cutting one's own limbs. It was in the hands of Basava and his followers that the bhakti aspect was given a new treatment with the newly evolved philosophy and
tenets of its own and stress on the moral conduct of the devotees. But Mallikarjuna appears to have accepted the Bhakti aspect of the Nayanars as it was preached without giving up his adherence to the Pasupata principles and other Brahmin practices. Hence it can be stated that Pandita made an attempt to bring about a synthesis between the various religious aspects - the Pasupata system and the devotionalism of the Nayanars without giving up, adherence to Vedas, Brahmins, Siva Yejnopavita and Gayatri. So far we were concerned with the religion of Mallikarjuna as described in his own work Sivatvatasaramu and we also compared his teachings with those of Basava. Now we propose to take up Somanatha’s account of Mallikarjuna’s religion in M. P. Charitra.

Mallikarjuna’s religion according to Somanatha

As has been already stated, according to the account given by Somanatha, Pandita received Virasaiva diksha and had Lingadharana. He is said to have received Pranalinga and Prasada in accordance with Virasaivism from guru Sri-Notipalli Aradhya-devu Virasaivoktavidhi, sadgurubhyo nyedaye ttanaça sakshātbhavu sīvu arīkōtipalli āyāradhya-devu Sripādu kēndivarambalku narpanamācharinchī padaci prānapana prānalingambu, vadaci prasādambu, vadaci
The process of diksha received by Mallikarjuna appears to be very similar to the diksha of Basava's school. The Guru was said to have purified the disciple, Mallikarjuna from malas or impurities, performed hastamastakasamyoga and then given him the pranalinga.

The worship of Pranalinga and Jangamas

He is said to have been devoted to Linga and Jangama and to have been very systematic in worshipping Linga (Jangarchana). And also he was known to have believed in the concept that worshipping Linga is not worshipping the Jangamas but worshipping the Jangamas is worshipping the Linga. As has been said already, when he was visited by the Jangamas, Belideva Vemanaradhya and others he was described to have been performing Sirvarchana. But hearing of the arrival of the Jangamas, he stopped Lingarchana and received the Jangamas.
Maajanamarahinco gamyanabunanu purasanaamma,
jangamamu Belidevi Vemanapanditulunu janudēra
Panditendrudu Jangama vēshambu lingadarpana susangatambai
whthu linga vikriyalvodala lingarcana kanaka,
karamthali lingamunnvādanaka, Harunaku munna simhāsanambaina ka-samu narchana lichchu karamu mōdhi mrokkānga
(When he was doing abhīsheatka to linga the Jangamas came
Pandita took the Jangamas as Linga and without thinking
that he was having linga in the hand, stopped attending to
linga and thus brought his both hands, one - which is
serving as the seat of linga and the other performing
worship together to do pranama to the Jangamas)

The Astavarana

We find the mention of the various aspects of
Astavarana, Guru Linga, Jangama, Praśada, Padodaka
Rudraka, Vibhuti and Panchakshari in association with
Pandita though not under the heading of the technical
word Astavarana

The Panchacara

The five Acharas 1 Lingacara, conduct towards the
Linga, 2 Sadacara - praiseworthy or good character,
3 Bhaktacara - behaviour or conduct towards Siva's devotees
or towards other members of the Virasaiva faith, 4 Sivacara - conduct towards Siva, and 5 Ganacara - conduct towards Siva's band of spirits, which are mentioned to be as important as Astavaranas to the Virasaivas, also can be traced in association with Pandita Pandita was said to have been known for his virtuous character In so many respects he was compared to Siva Himself Thus he was known for his Sadacara, Jangacara and Bhaktacara can be seen in his worship of Janga and Jangamas His unflinching devotion can be taken for his Sivacara and Ganacara is very obviously seen in Mallikarjuna He treated all the Sivabhaktas as Ganas of Siva We find the mention of his paying tributes to Rudraganas and to Sivabhaktas using the terms like Rudraganasankirtanamu, yogacharyaganasankirtanamu, shodasaganasankirtanamu, dasaganasankirtanamu and Trayodasaganasankirtanamu.

Thus we find all most all the Virasaiva concepts described in association with Pandita

**Virasaivism of Mallikarjuna and Basava**

Though the main concepts of Virasaivism of Mallikarjuna are very similar to those of Basava still certain differences can be traced between the teachings of these two
leaders Basava and his followers did not try to show any adherence to Vedas and other Brahmin literature whereas Mallikarjuna tried to derive his main support from various religious scriptures like Vedas, Upanishads, Agamas and Puranas. Though the latter did not accept the supremacy of the Vedas saying that they are not gods, still he was not ready to give up their prominence. He tried to support the various tenets of Virasaivism as pro-Vedic. Even Basava in the words of Mallikarjuna was described to have propagated Virasaivism as pro-Vedic faith. Basavanayu

Though Mallikarjuna preached the principle of equality of Sivabhaktas irrespective of their castes, he appears to have supported the Varnaramadharma. While answering the Brahmins that smearing Vibhuti is completely in accordance with the Vedic practice, he quoted from Atharvans Veda, Rudrapanishat, Bhuragama, Svetasvatranishat, and explained the different ways of applying Vibhuti by different castes saying that Tripundram Brahmano, (for Brahmins it should be smeared in three lines) vartulam niipa Vaishayo.
(the kings and Vaisyas should smear it round) \textit{Ardha-chandram Tuva Sudrana}\textsuperscript{113} (for Sudras it should be a half circle) But the pro-Vedic spirit is not to be found in Basava's \textit{Vacanas}

The \textit{guru} of Mallikarjuna, the Jangamas and his followers were Brahmins and great scholars. Kotipalli Aradhya Deva, the \textit{guru} of Mallikarjuna was a great Acharya of Sivadharma and proficient in Advaita, Nyaya and Vaiseshika philosophies and one who propagated devotion that can be explained in the light of Veda Vedanta Vividhapuranas\textsuperscript{114} Kotipalli Aradhya also was said to have his \textit{guru}, namely Avantara Desika or Pandita. He was described as a scholar of four Vedas, Caturvedarthavetta, and proficient in \textit{yama}, \textit{niyama}, \textit{Sama} and \textit{Dama} practices\textsuperscript{115}

We have seen earlier that some of the Brahmins criticised Pandita for becoming a follower of Virasaivism and the latter convinced them satisfactorily. After that in course of time, a good number of Brahmins appear to have become his followers. Many Brahmins accompanied Pandita to the court of Choda when the former was asked to prove the superiority of his religion \textit{leśṇa lingārohana parulu}, \textit{svadhyāya parulunaichamu mahābrāhmaṇottamulu saduvuchu}, \textit{vedabhāṣyamulu seppuchunu, mudamuna nirudesala mrokkuchu} \textit{naduva}\textsuperscript{116}
From the description of Pranalingarchanaparulu, it is evident that they were the disciples of Pandita. They read out the different works of Pandita like Dakshadhvarambu Vyasastakamu, Ganadambaralu, Sarabhambu, Srutipanchagadhyamulu and other Brahmin literature like Rigvedadi Rudrasuktamulu Yajurveda namaka chamaka panchabrahma smasutaokulu, Samavedanvitamahima, Pramathasuktamulu and Basavasuktamulu and many other works.

Here it should be noted that the Vacanas of Basava also are said to have been read out along with the Brahmin literature and the works of Pandita. This shows that Pandita approved Basava's preachings. In this context, the statement of some scholars, that Pandita turned down the request of Basava to him to come and join him in propagating the faith, saying Bhaktimidivalapu, Brhamnyombutpo pottu payalemu nemu Basavalinga (i.e. 'I can not give up my Brahminism though I love the bhakti aspect) deserves to be examined. None of the scholars pointed out the source from where it is quoted. Probably it might have been said by some of the later writers but not by Somanatha. This tendency is not found in the writings of Somanatha. Somanetha's Mallikarjuna was known to have sent his Jangamaa to Basava to bless him with the Kannada language.
He wanted to see Basava and started on his journey towards Kalyana. But when he came to know of Basava's end he lamented so much saying that he did not find any purpose of his survival without Basava in this world and prayed Srisaila Mallikarjuna to take him also to his world.

Moreover Basava also was described to have propagated Virasaivism as pro-Vedio. So there was no reason for Mallikarjuna to refuse Basava's request to join hands with the latter.

Another difference we find between Mallikarjuna and Basava is the concept of Maya or illusion. Basava accepted the concept of Maya. We come across its mention in his Vacanas, Maya as mother gave me birth. This Maya has undone my life. This Maya has me dancing to her tune. But Mallikarjuna criticised the Advaitins for preaching the same concept. He says that \( \text{Mayanugatamaina vatti nivedavadamul nilupu vedanti} \) and he did not accept the concept of union between Siva and Jiva. He propagated the concepts of Pasu, Pasa and Pati. Even during the process of Lingadiksha received by Mallikarjuna, it was
described that the Guru imparted him the knowledge of these concepts Pasu-Pasa-Pati Jñānadrushti māti velga (i.e., he lighted the knowledge of those concepts) and that must be the reason why the most important concept of Virasaiva philosophy i.e., Satsthala Siddhanta was not described in association with Pandita.

In this way, we find Mallikarjuna as the leader of the Virasaiva movement in Andhra during 12th century but he differed in certain respects that are discussed above from Basava and yet he lived and died as a great admirer of Basava.

Thus we have two images of Mallikarjuna - one according to Sivatatvasaramu, he was a propagator of extreme devotionalism mixed up with Pasupata concepts and the other one according to Somanatha - a Virasaiva.

Somanatha describes not only Mallikarjuna as a Virasaiva but gives a line of gurus - Kotipalli Aradhya-deva - the diksha guru of Mallikarjuna who was actually described to have invested Mallikarjuna with Pranalinga and the guru of Kotipalli Aradhya - Avantadesika or Avantarayya who was described to have taken Sambhavadiksha And this diksha has been identified with Virasaivadiksha by A Veeresalingam.
He says that according to Chandrajnanagama Sambhavadiksha is nothing but a Virasaivadiksha

Vedamanu kriyabhi dikshatrayam sobhitam shadadhva
suddhi charitam surukarunya sambhuratam bhashma rudraksha
srilangadharanatmakamuttanam sambhava vratame taddhiva
veda sastraivodita

Thus Somanatha’s descriptions suggest that Virasaiva practices in Andhra were earlier at least by two generations than Mallikarjuna or otherwise it can be said to be earlier than Basava since both of them were known as contemporaries.

But however Sambhavadiksha mentioned by Mallikarjuna in Sivatatwasaramu does not appear to be a Lingadiksha or Lingadharama diksha. According to him, those who were blessed with the natural devotion were said to have received the Diksha, i.e., Sambhavadiksha and Siva was said to be the guru. Thus strictly speaking by mentioning Sambhavadiksha Mallikarjuna does not appear to have insisted on the necessity of receiving Diksha by those who were blessed by inborn devotion. And also it is too early to find such well developed process of Virasaivadiksha two generations earlier than Mallikarjuna and Basava i.e., earlier than the 12th century. If these concepts were so well developed, earlier
than Mallikarjuna, then why did not Mallikarjuna deal with Lungadharama and worship of Pranalinga in Sivatvasaramu.

The answer is that he was not a Virasaiva. But the devotionalism of Mallikarjuna, his heroic spirit, and devotion to the cause of his religion might have impressed Somanatha so much that the former was made the leader of the Andhra Virasaiva movement.

Sakhare following Venkannayya suggests that Mallikarjuna might have embraced Virasaivism after composing Sivatvasaramu. But it does not appear to be so since we do not find any clearcut Virasaiva concepts in the writings of Annamayya who was posterior to Mallikarjuna and who dealt with the concept of devotionalism and worship of linga. Another point to be noted about Somanatha's Mallikarjuna is that nowhere the latter was described in association with Upanayana Sikha, Gayatri, and the sacred thread in M P Charitra, whereas we find them in Mallikarjuna's Sivatvasaramu. From this it can be suggested that Somanatha might have wanted to describe Mallikarjuna as full-fledged Virasaiva without associating him with the holy thread, Sikha and Gayatri, though he described Mallikarjuna to have quoted Vedas and other Brahmin scriptures in support of his religion as was described...
by Somanatha in the biography of Mallikarjuna the latter might have taken *Pasupata diksha* from Aradhyadeva since it is said to have been an essential aspect of the Pasupata system also and thus the two gurus must have been *Pasupata* teachers as it was too early to expect the formation of *Virasaivism*.

Thus Mallikarjuna must have originally been a *Pasupata* and later on he might have been influenced very much by the devotionalism of *Saiva Nayanars* while describing the process of the *Diksha* of Mallikarjuna Somanatha said that the former was imparted with the knowledge of the concepts of *Pasu-Pasa* and *Pati* But Somanatha might have mentioned it as *Virasaivadiksha* by attributing the *Virasaiva* concepts to Mallikarjuna If *Virasaiva* concepts were followed by Mallikarjuna himself we would have found them in a specified way in the writings of Annamayya as has been stated already *Chandragranagama* where *Sambhavadiksha* is described as a *Virasaivadiksha* might have been a later work So it can be concluded by saying that the *Virasaiva* concepts had not become crystallised by the time of Mallikarjuna i.e. by the 12th century and we do not find them in the *Telugu* literature of that period And it also appears that the *Religion* had
taken a definite shape with all its terminology and its
name of Virasaivism by the time of Somanatha i.e. during the later half of the 13th century
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