



HAL
open science

“ Who is Caṇḍeśa ? ”

Dominic Goodall

► **To cite this version:**

Dominic Goodall. “ Who is Caṇḍeśa ? ”. Shingo Einoo. The Genesis and Development of Tantra, Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, p. 351-423 + 44 planches, 2009. halshs-02526067

HAL Id: halshs-02526067

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02526067>

Submitted on 9 Apr 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

Edited by

Shingo EINO

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL CULTURE

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, 23

Shingo Einoo is Professor of Indology at the
Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo

© March, 2009, INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL CULTURE,
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
All rights reserved

The authors:

Shingo EINOO	University of Tokyo
Dominic GOODALL	Pondicherry Centre of the Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient
Taiken KYUMA	Mie University
Alexis SANDERSON	All Souls College, Oxford
Francesco SFERRA	Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"
Tsunehiko SUGIKI	Waseda Institute for Advanced Study, Waseda University
Kimiaki TANAKA	The Eastern Institute
Ryugen TANEMURA	University of Tokyo

ISBN 978-4-903235-08-0

Printed in Japan

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	9
<i>Introduction</i>	11
Shingo EINO : <i>From kāmās to siddhis — Tendencies in the Development of Ritual towards Tantrism</i> —	17
Alexis SANDERSON : <i>The Śaiva Age — The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period</i> —	41
<i>The Dominance of Śaivism</i>	44
<i>The Incorporation of Śāktism</i>	45
<i>The Etiolation and Subsumption of the Cult of the Sun-God</i> .	53
<i>The Decline of Vaiṣṇavism and the Rise of the Tantric</i>	
<i>Pañcarātra Following Śaiva Models</i>	58
<i>Royal Patronage of Buddhism</i>	70
<i>The Viṣṇukundīs of Āndhra</i>	70
<i>The Maitrakas of Valabhī</i>	72
<i>The Kārkoṭas of Kashmir</i>	73
<i>The Licchavis of Nepal</i>	74
<i>The Thākuri Kings of Nepal</i>	77
<i>The Bhauma-Karas of Orissa</i>	80
<i>The Candras of South-East Bengal</i>	83
<i>The Khadgas of Samatāṭa</i>	83
<i>The Candras of Arakan and Miscellaneous Other</i>	
<i>Buddhist Kings of Eastern India</i>	84
<i>The Pāla Emperors and the Great Monasteries of Eastern India</i>	87
<i>The Pālas' Engagement with Śaivism</i>	108
<i>Buddhist Kings of Eastern India and their Commitment to Brahmanism</i>	115
<i>Joint Patronage of Buddhism and Śaivism in the Kingdoms of the Khmers, Chams, and Javanese</i>	117
<i>The Development of Tantric Buddhism Through the Adoption and Adaptation of Śaiva and Śākta Śaiva Models</i>	124
<i>The Parallel Repertoire of Rituals</i>	124
<i>The Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi, the Mañjuśriya- mūlakalpa, and Buddhaguhya</i>	128

<i>The Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha and the First Inroads of Śākta Śaivism: Possession, Goddesses, and the Sacralization of Sex</i>	132
<i>The Guhyasamāja: Copulating Deities, Sexual Initiation Rites, and the Sacralization of Impurity</i>	141
<i>The Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kāpālika iconography, the Gaṇamaṇḍalam, and the Beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist Intertextuality</i> ...	145
<i>The Yoginītantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpīṭha Śaivism</i>	156
<i>Chronology and Provenance</i>	158
<i>Śaṃvara / Vajrarudra and Vajravārāhī:</i>	
<i>The Transformation of Bhairava and his consort</i> ..	169
<i>The Rise of the Goddess to Independence</i>	173
<i>The Adoption of the Vidyāpīṭha's Caryā and Yoga</i> ..	179
<i>The Incorporation of Text-passages from the Vidyāpīṭha</i>	186
<i>Converting the Outsiders</i>	220
<i>The Reflux of Buddhist Śāktism into the Śāktism of Bengal</i>	240
<i>The Jains' Adaptation of the Śaiva Mantrasāstra</i>	243
<i>Śaivism in the Brahmanical Substrate</i>	249
<i>The Causes of the Dominance of Śaivism</i>	252
<i>The Early Medieval Process</i>	252
<i>Śaivism and Monarchy</i>	254
<i>Śaivism and the Royal Temple</i>	274
<i>Śaivism and New Settlements</i>	280
<i>Śaivism and Irrigation</i>	282
<i>Śaivism and Social Integration</i>	284
<i>The Śaiva-brahmanical Order</i>	301
<i>Abbreviations</i>	304
<i>References</i>	305
<i>Conventions in the Footnotes</i>	348
Dominic GOODALL : <i>Who is Caṇḍeśa ?</i>	351
Kimiaki TANAKA : <i>Nāgabodhi's Śrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi — The Sanskrit Text Restored from the Vajrācāryanayottama —</i>	425
Francesco SFERRA : <i>The Laud of the Chosen Deity, the First Chapter of the Hevajratantrapīṇḍārthatīkā by Vajragarbha</i>	435
Taiken KYUMA : <i>Superiority of Vajrayāna — Part I: Some Remarks on the</i>	

	<i>Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gñis sel ba)</i>	
	<i>Ascribed to Jñānaśrī —</i>	469
Ryugen TANEMURA :	<i>Superiority of Vajrayāna — Part II: Superiority of the Tantric Practice Taught in the *Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gñis sel ba) —</i>	487
Tsunehiko SUGIKI :	<i>The Structure and Traditions of the Systems of Holy Sites in Buddhist Saṃvara Cycle and Its Related Scriptural Cycles in Early Medieval South Asia — The Geography of Esoteric Buddhism in the Eyes of the Compilers of the Scriptures —</i>	515

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

Dominic GOODALL

Introduction

It has long been commonly supposed that Caṇḍeśvara is a deity exclusively of the Śaiva Siddhānta of whom sculptural representations are found only in the Tamil-speaking South of India. But this is far from the truth: from looking at various sorts of evidence—inscriptions from Nepal, Cambodia and the Tamil-speaking South, Sanskrit Saiddhāntika texts, Tamil devotional hymns and a variety of sculpted images going back to the fourth century—we find that it is a rather jumbled picture of this figure that emerges. This might be because he is an amalgam of more than one personage, or it might be that a single figure has evolved over the centuries and been viewed differently by the followers of the religious traditions in which he played a rôle. (Some might even say, after reading further, that there has never quite been one Caṇḍeśvara, even though there are momentary points of contact between the various figures examined in this article.) We find Caṇḍeśvara (also referred to as Caṇḍikeśvara, Caṇḍīśa, Caṇḍa and, in Tamil sources, as Caṇṭi and Taṇṭi) variously treated as a guardian to Śaiva shrines, as a warrior leader of *gaṇas*, as the consumer of offerings that have been made to Śiva, as the punisher of the transgressions of Śaiva initiates, as Śiva's agent in property transactions, as the transmitter of Śaiva knowledge and as a super-*bhakta* who severed his own father's legs because of his father's impiety. Some evidence suggests that Caṇḍeśvara is a form of Śiva or a manifestation of his anger, but other evidence presents him as a *gaṇa*, as Śiva's chief devotee or as his principal servant.

In this paper, I should like at least to touch upon the various ritual functions with which Caṇḍeśvara is associated and the various identities attributed to him. Caṇḍeśa is a figure that has engaged the interest of a range of very different scholars—I have gradually discovered that quite a number of articles has appeared devoted to one or other aspect of the deity: BRUNNER 1969, DHAKY 1970, GUPTA 1976, EDHOLM 1984, KALIDOS 1988, EDHOLM 1998, and, most recently, ACHARYA 2005—and it now seems to me to be time to synthesise some of these findings (for some of the above authors appear to have been working in ignorance of each other), as well as to add a few ideas of my own. But it is not only my own ideas that I intend to add. In fact I would be hard pressed to state which ideas on this subject, if any, might be truly my own, for I have over the last few years had the good fortune to meet a diverse and numerous group of scholars

who have been remarkably eager to discuss Caṇḍeśa with me.¹ The result is that this article is very different indeed from the paper delivered in Tokyo, at the kind invitation of Professor Shingo EINOŌ, in October 2005. If it is not engaging to read, it is certainly not the fault of the subject matter, which is rich enough to merit a richly illustrated book rather than a mere article.

¹ The first of these was Dr. Erik af EDHOLM, who came and presented something of his research to the Śaiva reading group in Pondicherry several years ago, at a time when all I knew about Caṇḍeśa was what I had read in Saiddhāntika texts. Further discussion took place with the members of that same reading group, together with whom I worked to produce a critical edition of Aghoraśiva's *Pañcāvaraṇastava*, which contains a disproportionately long note on Caṇḍeśa (some of the material in this article is repeated from annotation to the *Pañcāvaraṇastava*: GOODALL et al. 2005:184–190). While this was being prepared, I had the benefit of numerous long exchanges with the members of the EFEO's project on Pallava iconography, namely Dr. Charlotte SCHMID, whose longest e-mail message on Caṇḍeśa runs to eight tightly argued A4 pages, Dr. Valérie GILLET and Emmanuel FRANCIS (Université Catholique de Louvain), who generously furnished me with dozens of photographs. All this stimulus would already have given me the basis for a substantial article. But it happened that in 2004 Dr. Diwakar ACHARYA (Kyoto University) sent me a copy of his then unpublished article on the Mathurā pillar inscription for comments and I discovered that he too was writing on the same theme, but focussing on data that I had known nothing about. When it was announced that I would be speaking on Caṇḍeśa at Professor EINOŌ's Tantric Workshop in Tokyo in 2005, I received an eager message from Charlotte de DE PERCIN-SERMET, a student at Paris IV currently producing a doctorate about Cōla-period images of Caṇḍeśa, with whom further useful exchanges took place. And while preparing the paper, a flood of helpful suggestions reached me from Professor Leslie ORR. Finally, the reactions to the paper when delivered in Tokyo made me change, once again, quite a number of my ideas about the subject. These reactions came principally from Dr. Kimiaki TANAKA, who suggested an unsuspected Buddhist connection, and then, somewhat later, from Professor Alexis SANDERSON (All Souls, Oxford). I was also able to benefit from the advice of Professor Gerdi GERSCHHEIMER on the Khmer inscriptions to which I refer to below, as well as on other inscriptions, to which, in consequence of his advice, I realised that it would be prudent not to refer. For the photographs that are not my own or those of other acknowledged individuals, I have relied on the photo-library of the Institut français de Pondichéry, for access to which I am grateful for the enthusiastic assistance of N. MURUGESAN and K. RAMESH KUMAR. Aside from all the above, I must mention N. RAMASWAMY, also known as BABU, chauffeur of the EFEO, whose tireless explorations in Tamil Nadu have since 2003 been bringing to my attention unusual Caṇḍeśas that I could never otherwise have known about, the first of which was the arresting image from the ruined shrine of Satyamangalam that lies on the Tiruvannamalai-Tindivanam road (PLATE 38).

Finally, in the weeks before submitting the article, I received helpful comments, data and suggestions, as well as corrections of various orders of magnitude, from the following (in alphabetical order): Dr. Diwakar ACHARYA, Andrea ACRI, Professor Hans BAKKER, Dr. Peter BISSCHOP, Professor Shingo EINOŌ, Emmanuel FRANCIS, Professor Kei KATAOKA, Professor Leslie ORR, and Dr. Charlotte SCHMID.

Introducing the three best known types of South Indian images

1. Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti

On the South side of the celebrated early eleventh-century temple at Gaṅgaik-koṅṭa-cōlapuram, near Tanjore in the Tamil-speaking South of India, is a well-known image of Śiva, with Pārvatī beside him, shown in the act of garlanding the headdress of the bowed head of a figure seated below who respectfully presses his palms together in *añjali* (see PLATE 1). This is an example of what several South Indian temple scriptures² refer to as *caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti*.³ Caṇḍeśa, often called Caṇṭi in Tamil poetry, is one of the 63 Śaiva saints or Nāyaṇmārs, who, according to the legend narrated by the twelfth-century *Periyapurāṇam* of Cēkkiḷār, was a brahmin cowherd boy called Vicāraśarman who worshipped Śiva in sand-*lingas* by pouring milk over them. His father, tipped off by brahmins who thought milk was being wasted, observed him, was appalled at the waste of milk, beat his son and kicked at one of the pots of milk. To punish this impiety towards Śiva, Vicāraśarman swiped at his father's legs with his cow-herding stick, which promptly transformed itself into an axe, and cut his father's legs off. For this great and fierce act of devotion, Śiva rewarded him by adopting him as his supreme devotee, giving him the name Caṇḍeśa, and adorning him with his ornaments and garlands.⁴ The whole story can be found depicted together, begin-

² I use this expression to refer to a group of tantras of the Śaivasiddhānta for which no firm evidence confirms their existence before the twelfth century, which are transmitted only in South Indian sources, and which focus on describing what happens in a South Indian temple. (Cf. the remarks of SANDERSON 2004:444–5.) Among the best known examples are the *Pūrva-* and *Uttara-Kāmika*, the *Pūrva-* and *Uttara-Kāraṇa*, the *Ajita* and the so-called *kriyāpāda* of the *Raurava*. For a fuller general account of the Saiddhāntika canon and the division between, on the one hand, the scriptures known to the tenth-century Kashmirian thinker Rāmakaṇṭha and Aghoraśiva, his South Indian epigone, and, on the other hand, the post-twelfth-century temple scriptures, see the essay 'Explanatory remarks about the Śaiva Siddhānta and its treatment in modern secondary literature', printed as the preface to the edition of the *Parākhyantra* (GOODALL 2004:xiii–xxxiv). For more on the relative dating within the pre-tenth-century corpus, see footnote 148 on p. 410 below.

³ Apart from the passages quoted by RAO (1914) on p. 105–7 of Appendix B of Volume II, part II, there are further accounts to be found in *Uttarakāraṇa* 64:2c–9 and in the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, *kriyāpāda* 43:71c–72:

*umāsahitavat kuryāc caṇḍānugrahakam param
varado dakṣiṇakaraś caṇḍeśaśirasītaraḥ
kṛtāñjalipuṭaś caṇḍa āsīno 'dhah śivāsanāt**

*śivāsanāt] conj.; śivāsaṇaḥ Ed.

RAO (1914) recounts a version of the legend and discusses other images in Volume II, part I, pp. 205–9.

⁴ *Periyapurāṇam* 1256:

ning with the worship with milk and culminating with Śiva's adorning Caṇḍeśa with his garland, in the three largest Cōla-period temples,⁵ and there are several less well known examples of the Cōla period elsewhere.⁶

PLATE 1. Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti from the temple at Gangaikondacholapuram (Jayamkondam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.): Śiva, whose back hands bear an axe and a deer, holds Caṇḍa's chignon and puts his own garland upon it. Pārvatī sits behind him. Caṇḍeśa sit-kneels and, clasping his hands in *añjali*, leans forward in deference. As an earring he wears a flower.

Now although this full version of the story is first clear from pictorial representations of the early eleventh century, it seems to accord with the allusions to the story that are made by the Tamil poets of the *Tēvāram*, who are also among the 63 Nāyanmār, and so the story may be as much as four or five centuries earlier.⁷

*cintum poḷutil atu nōkkuñ ciruvar iraiyir rīyōnait
tantai-y-eṇavē-y-arintavaṇ raṇ rālkal cintun takutiyaṇān
muntai maruṅku kiṭanta kōl eṭuttārkk' atuvē muraimaiyiṇāl
vantu maḷuvāyiṭa-v-erintār; maṇ mēl vīntān maraiyōn um.*

While [the milk] was spilling, the child watching it realised that his father was wicked towards God, [and] because his [father's] feet deserved [punishment for] spilling [the milk], he took the stick that was lying just in front of him—that same [stick] went and transformed for him as he took it, by [divine] means, into an axe—and he hurled it. And the brahmin fell upon the ground.

⁵ For the depictions at Gangaikondacholapuram and in the Rājarājeśvara in Tanjore, see PICHARD et al. 1994, photographs 169–72 and for those at the Airāvateśvara shrine (in an upper frieze in bas-relief on the South side of the main shrine) in Darasuram, see L'HERNAULT 1987:100 and photo 73.20 or LADRECH 2007, images DSC_6230.jpg and DSC_6232.jpg.

⁶ One is mentioned, e.g., by SCHMID 2005:61.

⁷ Three examples from the *Tēvāram* should suffice: 1.106:5ab (of Nānacampantar):

*eṇ ticaiyōr makīla eḷil mālai-y-um pōnakam-um paṇṭu
caṇṭi tola aḷittāṇ avaṇ tālum iṭam viṇavil. . .*

If you ask about the place where, in olden times, while the Lords of the eight directions rejoiced, and Caṇḍeśvara prayed for beautiful garlands and food, He who gave, bending down [to give them(?) resides]. . .

And 7.65:2a (of Cuntarar):

aṇikoḷ ātai am pūṇ maṇimālai amutuceyta amutam peru caṇṭi. . .

'Caṇḍeśvara, who receives garlands of jewels and beautiful gold and garments that [He] had taken and worn, [and who receives] the food offering (*amutu*) which has been made nectar [by having been eaten by Him], . . .'

And finally 7.16.3 (of Cuntarar):

*iṇṭaimalar koṇṭu, maṇal ilīnkam atu iyarri,
iṇattu āvin pāl āṭṭa, iṭariya tātaiyait tāl*

Furthermore, there is a narrative panel in niche 35 of the inner *prākāra* of the Kailāsanātha temple in Kancheepuram that belongs to the end of the seventh or beginning of the eighth century which appears to show a large, four-armed Śiva with a garland-like mass dangling above him, a smaller two-armed Caṇḍeśa with an axe leaning over one shoulder, perhaps about to be garlanded, and below him perhaps his father, semi-recumbent and gesticulating with distress below him on the ground, with one of his legs missing or at least not visible.⁸

*tuntam iṭu caṇṭi aṭi aṅṭar tolutu ēttat
toṭarntu avanaip paṇikoṅṭa viṭaṅkanatu ūr viṇavil—
maṅṭapam-um kōpuram-um māḷikai cūḷikai-y-um,
maṇṭai oliyum vilavu oliyum maṛuku niraivu eyti,
kaṇṭavarkaḷ maṇam kavaram puṅṭarikaḷ poykaik
kārikaiyār kuṭaintu āṭum kalayanallūrkaṅ ē.*

If you ask about the place of the beautiful [Lord] (*viṭaṅkanatu*) who sought out (*toṭarntu*) and made into his servant Caṇṭi (*avanaip*)—while the gods (*aṅṭar*) praised Caṇṭi's feet—[Caṇṭi] who after taking lotus-blossoms (*iṅṭaimalar*), fashioning sand into a *liṅga*, bathing [it] (*āṭṭi*) with cow's milk from the herd, had cut to pieces (*tuntam iṭu*) [his] father's legs that had kicked [the milk pots?], it is in Kalayanallūr, where there are *maṅḍapas*, towers, and palace terraces, which rings with the Vedas, which is full of the bustle and sound of festivals, where beauties (*kārikaiyār*) dive (*kuṭaintu*) and bathe (*āṭum*) in lotus-ponds that captivate the minds of those who see them.

I have given references to the poetry of Nānacampantar (Jñānasambandha) and Cundarar (Sundara), but references in the poetry of Appar could be supplied too, for which see NAGASWAMY 1989:212.

⁸ The scene has been identified as a representation of Caṇḍeśa's moment of grace by RAO (1941) Volume I, part II, pp. 208–9. Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has pointed out to me that it is possible that another niche on the North side of the *prākāra*, niche 41, shows the moment in which Caṇḍeśa is about to be garlanded, by Śiva, but as she has also pointed out, it is not unlikely that it should be some other figure receiving a garland, particularly since there are scenes intervening between niches 35 and 41. See also GILLET 2007:36, who supplies an illustration of the scene (Fig. 13) and suggests that it rather shows Rāvaṇa before Śiva. Niches 35 and 41 are both so covered with patchy stucco that they cannot be used as Pallava-period testimony for details of ornament or the like. Earlier still, on a monument from the beginning of the seventh century, a slightly different scene has been identified as the moment of Caṇḍeśa's grace: in niche 15 of the second *tala* of the Northern face of the so-called Dharmarāja Ratha at Mahabalipuram, a four-armed Śiva is seen embracing a two armed figure with a headdress of hanging matted locks (*jaṭā-bhāra*) such as is typical of Caṇḍeśa (but also of other Śaiva forms in the Pallava repertoire, such as Bhikṣāṭana and 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti'). Both are standing, but the two armed figure's entire body expresses deference and devotion, most obviously by being slightly stooped with the head bowed towards Śiva. No axe is to be seen. The identification is proposed by SRINIVASAN (1975:25 and 80 and Plate XIVa), who points out that it is closely parallel to a scene in the same place that shows Viṣṇu with a figure who could be regarded as Viṣṇu's principal devotee, namely Garuḍa (SRINIVASAN 1975, Plate XIVc).

This myth was the starting point of my lecture, for a colleague of mine, Dr. Charlotte SCHMID, asked me how it came about that only one of the 63 South Indian Saints, namely Caṇḍeśvara, came to be prominently represented in almost all Śaiva temples all over the Tamil-speaking South and from a very early date. Others too have remarked on this oddity: ‘Alone of the Nāyaṇārs Caṇḍeśvara receives a niche of his own on the outside of the *garbhagr̥ha*’ (SMITH 1996:210). It seems often to be tacitly or explicitly assumed that Caṇḍeśvara was and has largely remained a South Indian figure whose cult has been integrated into the Śaiva Siddhānta and that he is a divinised devotee in origin. It seems to me that he may in fact not be South Indian in origin and that the South Indian story, although it may appear to be among the earliest attestations to the existence of a Caṇḍeśvara figure, is in fact not our starting point but almost certainly an aetiological myth intended to explain Caṇḍeśvara’s principal function in ritual. In other words, the story was, I suspect, composed in order to account for the existence of a fierce Śaiva ancillary deity who receives whatever has been offered to Śiva and is left over (*ucchiṣṭa*), thereby being rendered dangerously empowered.

2. The seated, axe-bearing receiver of *nirmālya*

There may be several temples which show the narrative panel we have discussed, but it is perhaps not one that commands instant recognition.⁹ But there is a representation of Caṇḍeśvara that is to be found in the vast majority of Śaiva temples in the Tamil-speaking South. PLATE 2 is relatively typical of images that predate the Cōla period. It comes from the larger of the two early temples at Tiruvatikai, near Cuddalore, namely the Vīraṭṭāṇa. In spite of modifications and accretions of many dates, both temples date back to the Pallava period: NAGASWAMY (1989:31) is inclined to date several of the sculptures from them to the seventh century. He does not mention this sculpture of Caṇḍeśvara, but assigning it an eighth-century date would not be impossible. It shows a two-armed figure, with *jaṭābhāra* rather than *jaṭāmukūta*, in other words with matted locks falling down beside the side of the head rather than wrapped up into a chignon above it. He is seated on a raised platform with one leg dropping down in front

⁹ Although it is surrounded by miniature panels recounting the legend, various misinterpretations of the panel in Gaṅgaikkoṅṭa-cōlapuram have been suggested, such as, for instance, that it shows Śiva honouring the patron of the temple, Rājendra Cōla. NAGASWAMY (2006:179) ingeniously suggests that Rājendra Cōla has chosen to have himself portrayed as Caṇḍeśvara and that the panel therefore shows both scenes. This punning possibility cannot perhaps be entirely excluded, but it does not seem to me likely. The representation continues to figure in lists of the standard Śaiva images until at least the late sixteenth century: we find it, for instance, in Pañcākṣarayogin’s *Śaivabhūṣaṇa* 155, and verse 353 of that work gives, by *kaṭapayādi* notation, 1521 śaka (1598/9 AD) as the date of its composition.

and the other folded up close to the body and resting entirely on the platform.¹⁰ One of his hands rests on the thigh of the folded leg and the other holds an axe. He has, as usual, a *yajñopavīta*, prominent earrings, a garland round his neck, a band round the stomach, well above the waist (an *udarabandha*), and some damaged central roundel at the top of his *jaṭābhāra*. Could it have been intended to be a flower? He is placed in a small shrine of his own which is positioned to the North-East of the central *liṅga*. This is indeed the typical arrangement: he is inside the inner *prākāra* (enclosure wall), but in an aedicule that is not attached either to the *prākāra* or to the central shrine. It has only one opening, on its South face: in other words, this seated Caṇḍeśa faces the North wall of the central shrine. In some places, Caṇḍeśa's shrine is as old as his image, as for example at the great Rājarājeśvara temple in Tanjore; in many others (e.g. in the Jalanātheśvara in Takkolam, Arakkonam Taluk), the shrine, is plainly modern. We shall return to this point below.

PLATE 2. Caṇḍeśa in his shrine to the NE of the *liṅga* at the Virāṭṭāneśvara temple at Tiruvadigai (Tiruvatikai), Panruti Taluk, Cuddalore District.

It is clear that this type of image of Caṇḍeśa expresses his chief function in ritual: he is there to receive the *nirmālya*, in other words food and garlands that have been offered to Śiva and thereby been imbued with a dangerous power. His position to the North-East of the *liṅga* appears to be no accident, for it puts him very close to the *praṇāla*, the North-pointing spout that protrudes from the North wall of the shrine and carries away what ever has been poured over the *liṅga*.¹¹ For a discussion of this function of Caṇḍeśa in the context of notions about *nirmālya* and more generally about food and pollution, it would be difficult to better EDHOLM's lucid account of 'gastrotheology' (1984) and I shall therefore say little

¹⁰ It is perhaps worth drawing special attention to this feature, since a number of colleagues have drawn my attention to the similarity in the postures adopted by Caṇḍeśa and in those assumed by images of another South-facing iconographical group, the so-called 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti' figures. It is true that the postures are similar, but they are not the same: in the typical posture of a 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti', one foot actually rests on top of the knee of the other leg. I have not seen a Caṇḍeśa with such a posture. Now it is true also that there is considerable variation in the sitting postures of both iconographical types, particularly in the earliest South Indian representations (which in both cases probably begin with those in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram); but even among these variously seated figures I am not aware of any case of a shared posture. It seems to me that the seated positions of 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti' (unlike those of Caṇḍeśa) are intended to be expressive of regal ease.

¹¹ This positioning of Caṇḍeśa in the North-East is of course not convenient for the receipt of garlands, at least in a large temple, where the wall of the main shrine stands between the *liṅga* and Caṇḍeśa, but in a small shrine, such as the rock-cut shrines that we shall mention below, no wall intervenes.

more about it. Briefly, a fierce and powerful deity is required to neutralise what has been tasted and abandoned (*ucchiṣṭa*) by Śiva and is therefore dangerous. This conception vies with that of ‘respect pollution’, namely the notion that by eating what another has tasted and abandoned one expresses a particularly close connection with that other person, as well as profound submission. The resulting tension has produced a multitude of conflicting injunctions about who may do what and under what circumstances with the *nirmālya* of Śiva; many of these are documented in BRUNNER 1969. Caṇḍeśa’s rôle as the receiver of perishable offerings that have been made to Śiva can be traced, as we shall see below, to the very earliest surviving layer of Tantric Śaiva literature.

Nowadays, Tamilian devotees typically pause three-quarters of the way in their *pradakṣiṇā* around the central shrine in a typical East-facing temple, just past the North-pointing *praṇāla*, at the shrine of Caṇḍeśvara. Here they lean in between the main shrine’s outer wall and the open-face of Caṇḍeśa’s shrine and clap their hands. This may be a practice that has developed from Caṇḍeśa’s rôle of receiving the *nirmālya* or from his rôle of repairing defects in the performance of a ritual; but it is now given a range of quite different explanations: 1) devotees must signal to Caṇḍeśa that they have completed a temple-visit; 2) Caṇḍeśa is often asleep; 3) Caṇḍeśa, unlike other divinities in the temple, is deaf; 4) devotees must signal to Caṇḍeśa that they have nothing in their hands, since Caṇḍeśa is the guardian of temple property.

3. The surveyor of the temple procession

A third type of Caṇḍeśa that is widely known from temple processions and art-history books is Caṇḍeśa as a standing figure cast in bronze. PLATE 3 represents this type: it is a thirteenth-century bronze figure of Caṇḍeśvara from the Pudukkottai Museum. Here a youthful and peaceful looking Caṇḍeśvara stands with hands clasped in *añjali* and with his distinctive axe tucked in the crook of one arm. Instead of a *jaṭābhāra*, he wears a *jaṭāmukūṭa*. This is typical of the standing bronze figures, just as the *jaṭābhāra* is typical of the seated stone ones, at least until the late Cōla period, in which the *jaṭāmukūṭa* may be used also for the seated stone figures.¹² Pressed between his clasped hands is a representation of a flower garland. In other words this is probably a type that intends to allude to the South Indian aetiological myth. Like the typical early stone figures he has a single lower garment, which is not a long dhoti, but rather a short one coming only a short way down his thighs, and it is buckled round his waist with

¹² For example, a cult-image of a seated Caṇḍeśa with *jaṭāmukūṭa* (described by L’HERNAULT 1987:113) occupies the Caṇḍeśa shrine in the Airāvateśvara temple (LADRECH 2007, image 6062-09.jpg: ‘2nd half of 12th century’).

a *kīrtimukha*.

PLATE 3. A processional image (*utsavamūrti*) of Caṇḍeśa now in the Pudukkottai Museum and said to belong to the thirteenth century. Pressed between the hands is a garland. In bronze images, his hair seems invariably to be heaped up into a chignon (*jaṭāmukuta*).

Bronze statues (*utsavamūrti*) are taken out in temple processions, and this is presumably what such standing bronze figures of Caṇḍeśa were created for. They are typically carried at the end of processions of other Śaiva bronze images.¹³ Four beautiful tenth-century bronze processional images of this type are illustrated and described by NAGASWAMY (1983:119–123).

Caṇḍeśa's principal rôle according to Saiddhāntika literature

Thus far we have briefly considered the three best known iconographic types and it is at this point that I should like to begin to introduce the contexts in which Caṇḍeśvara is encountered in Sanskrit literature. I shall begin by quoting and translating here a passage of a Saiddhāntika manual of the twelfth century in which the worship of Caṇḍeśvara is enjoined after the regular daily worship of Śiva. The manual in question is the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśambhu, a South Indian who lived and wrote in Benares, a contemporary of Aghoraśiva, and one of the teachers of the twelfth-century commentator Trilocanaśiva.¹⁴ (The text I shall quote is based on two manuscripts: M₂ = GOML Madras MS 14898, pp.138–9; M^v = ORI Mysore, MS P. 3801). The description of the rite is closely parallel to what we find in the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, and I could therefore have simply referred the reader to Section 5 of SP1; but I have not done so, partly because BRUNNER's translation and annotation are in French and some readers will be happy to have an English translation of such a description, and partly because Jñānaśiva's version is of intrinsic interest, since he appears to be the first of the authors of *paddhatis* to surround his ritual instructions with discussion and with

¹³ See, e.g., FULLER 1984:18; NAGASWAMY 1983:9, plate 36; L'HERNAULT and REINICHE 1999:59–60; DAVIS 2002:57; NAGASWAMY 2006:178. Among South Indian temple āgamas, *Ajīta* 25:3–4, for instance, mentions that the 'best' type of *nityotsava* is a procession of nine images, beginning with that of Vināyaka and ending with that of Caṇḍeśa, and the *Uttara-Kāmika*, in its presentation of *nīrājana*, includes a processional image of Caṇḍeśa (6:253). Cf. also *Pūrva-Kāraṇa* 141:171cd: *sarveṣāṃ pṛṣṭhato gacchet tathā caṇḍeśvaras* (em.; *caṇḍeśvaram* Ed.) *tataḥ*. For pre-twentieth-century visual evidence of such processions, NAGASWAMY (1989, Plate C3) shows a 'mural painting in the Devasiriya mandapa, in the temple at Thiruvarur, Tanjore district, depicting the procession of Saints Sambandar, Sundarar, Appar, Adhikaranandi and Candikesvara in the annual festival. The mural was probably painted during the reign of the Mahratta ruler Shaji I c. 1700 A.D.'

¹⁴ See GOODALL 2000.

scriptural justifications. His account of the worship of Caṇḍa therefore reveals a number of themes that are worth examining, and it appears to be a source for many subsequent discussions of cases in which the worship of Caṇḍa is omitted.

atha caṇḍeśvarārcaṇam ucyate. śivārcakānāṃ samayollaṅghanajānitam¹⁵
yac caṇḍam ugraghoram pāpam tadapaharaṇakartā¹⁶ caṇḍeśvara ity ucyate.¹⁷
bahir īśakāṣṭhāyām ardhacandropamagomayamaṇḍale¹⁸ anantad-
harmajñānavairāgyaiśvaryaapaṅkajam praṇavena vidhāya pūjayed idam
āsanam.¹⁹ om caṇḍāsanāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti. tadupari, om caṇḍamūrtaye
huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti²⁰

mūrtim²¹ nīlāñjanacchāyāñ caturvaktrārkalocanām²²
sarpopavītakeyūrām mukhotthogrānalārciṣam²³
jvalajjvālārdhacandrāḍhyām²⁴ atibhīmām caturbhujām
śūlam²⁵ kamaṇḍaluṃ vāme dakṣe ṭaṅkāḥṣamālinim²⁶
rudrāgniṣṭhāyām dhyātvā mūlenāvāhayet param

om dhūnicāṇḍeśvarāya huṃphaṭ svāhety āvāhanādīsthāpanam vidhāya, om
caṇḍahrdayāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśīrase huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍa-
śikhāyāi huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍakavacāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya
huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti sakalīkṛtya mūlena²⁷ paramīkṛtya dhenumudrayāmṛtikṛtya

¹⁵ samayollaṅghana°] M^y; samayollaṅghanam M₂

¹⁶ yaccaṇḍamugraghoram pāpam tadapaharaṇakartā] conj.;
yaccaṇḍamugraghoram pāpamtapaharaṇakartā M^y; yajet grāmaghoram
pāpamaharaṇakartā M₂

¹⁷ ity ucyate] M^y; ucyate M₂

¹⁸ °kāṣṭhāyām ardhacandropamagomayamaṇḍale] M₂;
°ko _ āyāmardhacandrāḍhyām M^y

¹⁹ vidhāya pūjayed idam āsanam] M^y; vidhāyātha pūjayed idam mānasam M₂

²⁰ iti tadupari, om caṇḍamūrtaye huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti] M₂; iti M^y (eyeskip)

²¹ mūrtim] conj.; mūrti° M^y; om. M₂ (unmetrical)

²² caturvaktrārka°] M₂; caturvaktrām ca M^y

²³ °keyūrām mukhotthogrānalārciṣam] conj.; °keyūramukhotthogrānilārciṣam M^y;
°keyūrāmavorthogrānalārciṣam M₂

²⁴ jvalajjvālārdhacandrāḍhyām] conj.; jvalacandrā _ × dya × javyardhacandrāḍhyām
M^y (unmetrical); jvalajjvālājyamantrāḍhyām M₂

²⁵ śūlam] M₂; śūla° M^y

²⁶ vāme dakṣe ṭaṅkāḥṣamālinim] em.; vāme dakṣe ghaṃṭāḥṣamālinau M^y;
vāmadakṣo ṭaṅkāḥṣamālinim M₂

²⁷ svāhety āvāhanādīsthāpanam vidhāya, om caṇḍahrdayāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om
caṇḍaśīrase huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśikhāyāi huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍa-
kavacāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti sakalīkṛtya
mūlena] conj.; svāhetyāvāhanādīsthāpanam vidhāya, om caṇḍahrdayāya
huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍaśikhāyāi huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍakavacāya
huṃphaṇṇamaḥ, om caṇḍāstrāya huṃphaṇṇamaḥ iti sakalīkṛtya mūlena M^y;
svāhā M₂ (eyeskip)

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

hrdā pādyācamanādikaṃ²⁸ dattvā gandhādibhiḥ bhogāṅgopetaṃ sampūjya
yathāśakti japaṃ kṛtvā nivedya tataḥ praṇavena

gobhūhiranyaavastrādi maṇihemādibhūṣaṇam
vihāya śeṣaṃ²⁹ nirmālyaṃ caṇḍeśāya nivedayet
lehyaśoṣyānnapānādi³⁰ tāmbūlaṃ sragvilepanam
nirmālyabhōjanam³¹ tubhyaṃ pradattaṃ tu śivājñayā³²

iti paṭhitvā śivanirmālyaṃ samarpya om

sarvam etat kriyākāṇḍaṃ mayā caṇḍa tavājñayā
nyūnādhikaṃ kṛtaṃ mohāt paripūrṇaṃ tadāstu³³ me³⁴

iti vijñāpya caṇḍeśam aṣṭapuṣpā³⁵ śivavad visarjayet. tad anu nirmālyam
apanīya³⁶ gomayenopalipya sthānam astreṇa samprokṣyārghyaṃ visrjya
karādikaṃ prakṣālya vidhivad ācamya karāṅganyāsaṃ³⁷ kṛtvā yathāśakti³⁸
śivasamhitāṃ japet. tathā kālottare

aiśānyāṃ³⁹ caṇḍanāthaṃ tu huṃphaḍantena pūjayet
vastrānnagandhapānārghyanirmālyādipavitrakaiḥ⁴⁰
visrjya cārghapātraṃ⁴¹ ca samācamyopasaṃsprśet
nyāsaṃ kṛtvā yathāśakti⁴² japtavyā śivasamhitā
śivārcanaṃ samākhyātaṃ yathāvad anupūrvaśaḥ. iti.

tathā sarvajñānottare

visarjitasya devasya gandhapuṣpanivedanam
nirmālyaṃ tad vijānīyād varjya vastravibhūṣaṇam⁴³
arghayitvā tu taṃ bhūyaś⁴⁴ caṇḍeśāya nivedayet. iti.⁴⁵

²⁸ °nādikaṃ] M₂; °nādi M^y

²⁹ śeṣaṃ] M^y; śeṣa° M₂

³⁰ °śoṣyāna°] M₂; °soṣyāmnna° M^y

³¹ nirmālya°] M₂; nirmālyaṃ M^y

³² *Somaśambhupaddhati* SP1, V:6–7 (= KSTS 296c–298b).

³³ tadāstu] conj.; tatastu M^y; sadāstu M₂

³⁴ *Somaśambhupaddhati* SP1, V:8 (= KSTS 298c–299b).

³⁵ aṣṭapuṣpā] conj.; aṣṭapuṣpā M₂

³⁶ tadānu nirmālyam apanīya] M^y; tadā nirmālyam pānīya M₂

³⁷ karādikaṃ prakṣālya vidhivad ācamya karāṅganyāsaṃ] M^y; karāṅganyāsaṃ M₂
(eyeskip)

³⁸ yathāśakti] M₂; yathāśaktyā M^y

³⁹ aiśānyāṃ] M₂; īśānyāṃ M^y

⁴⁰ vastrānnagandhapānārghya°] M₂; vastragaṃdhānnapānārghyai M^y

⁴¹ cārgha°] M₂; cārghya° M^y

⁴² yathāśakti] M₂; yathāśaktyā M^y

⁴³ vastravibhūṣaṇam] M^y; nirmālyabhakṣaṇam M₂

⁴⁴ arghayitvā tu taṃ bhūyaś] em.; arpayitvā tu taṃ bhūyā M^y; aśvayitvā tu taṃ
bhūyaḥ M₂

⁴⁵ *Sarvajñānottara* 6:44c–45 (in numeration of GOODALL's forthcoming edition).

nanu

bāṇaliṅge cale rohe siddhaliṅge⁴⁶ svayaṃbhuvī
pratiṃsā ca sarvāsū na caṇḍo 'dhikṛto bhavet
advaitabhāvanāyukte sthaṇḍileśavidhāv api⁴⁷

iti kecit; apare punaḥ

ghaṭitasyāpi devasya naiva caṇḍārcanam. iti⁴⁸

tat katham? satyam. etac caṇḍapraṭiṣṭhāniṣedhavadānam, na pūjāniṣedhārtham.⁴⁹
†etan matāntarapraṇītam†.⁵⁰ śaivasiddhānte⁵¹ punaḥ sarvadā sarvatra⁵²
pūjanīyam eveti niyamaḥ. tathā ca kālottare

sthire cale tathā ratne mṛddāruśailakalpīte⁵³
lohe citramaye bāṇe sthitas caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ⁵⁴
siddhānte netare tantre na vāme⁵⁵ na ca dakṣiṇe. iti.

caṇḍadravyaṃ gurudravyaṃ devadravyaṃ tathaiva ca
raurave te tu pacyante manasā ye tu bhujjate⁵⁶

tathā

avyakte vyaktake⁵⁷ liṅge maṇḍale sthaṇḍile⁵⁸ 'nale
cale sthire⁵⁹ tathā ratne maṇicitrādike tathā
gandhānnasambhave⁶⁰ liṅge mṛdbhasmaphalakalpīte
tathā puṣpamaye liṅge caṇḍapūjā niyāmikā. iti.⁶¹

A translation follows.

Next [*scil.* at end of the regular worship of Śiva] the worship of Caṇḍeśvara

⁴⁶ rohe siddhaliṅge] M₂; lohe āṛṣaliṅge M^y

⁴⁷ °leśa°] M₂; °leśe M^y. *Somasambhupaddhati* SP4 III:60c–61.

⁴⁸ naiva caṇḍārcanam. iti] M₂; caṇḍārcanam api M^y (unmetrical)

⁴⁹ tat katham? satyam. etac caṇḍapraṭiṣṭhāniṣedhavadānam, na pūjāniṣedhārtham]
em.; tat katham. sattyam. etac caṇḍapraṭiṣṭhāniṣedhavadānam. na
pūjāniṣedhadhārtham M^y; tat katham sa □ M₂

⁵⁰ etan matāntarapraṇītam] M₂; etan matāntaram. tatpraṇī ×₂ × tam M^y

⁵¹ śaivasiddhānte] M^y; śaive siddhānte M₂

⁵² sarvadā sarvatra] M₂; sarvathā sarvadā sarva° M^y

⁵³ ratne mṛddāruśailakalpīte] M^y; rakte mamṛtāraunyakalpīte M₂

⁵⁴ bāṇe sthitas caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ] em.; nābhau sthiraḥś caṇḍo niyāmakaḥ M^y; bāṇe
sthitacaṇḍo niyāmakaḥ M₂

⁵⁵ siddhānte netare tantre na vāme] M^y; □re tantre na ta vāme M₂

⁵⁶ caṇḍadravyaṃ. . . ye tu bhujjate] M^y; om. M₂

⁵⁷ avyakte vyaktake] M₂; vyaktavyaktādike M^y

⁵⁸ sthaṇḍile] M₂; kuṇḍale M^y

⁵⁹ sthire] M^y; sthite M₂

⁶⁰ gandhānnasambhave] em.; gaṇḍhānisambhave M^y; gandhānasambhave M₂

⁶¹ caṇḍapūjā niyāmikā. iti] M^y; caṇḍa □miketi M₂. *Bṛhatkālottara, caṇḍayāgapaṭala*
15–16 (NGMPP B 25/2, f. 51r).

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

is taught. Whatever fierce and terrible evil may have been generated by transgressing the rules by those who venerate Śiva, the one who is responsible for removing that is taught to be Caṇḍeśvara. Outside, in the North-Eastern direction, in a *maṇḍala* of cow-dung that is half-moon-shaped he should build a lotus[-throne] with [the base] Ananta, [the four throne-legs of] Dharma, Jñāna, Vairāgya and Aiśvarya, [and the seat that is an open] lotus, using the *praṇava* [as a mantra]. He should venerate this throne with [the mantra] ॐ CAṆḌĀSANĀYA HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ. Above that, with [the *mūrtimantra*, namely] ॐ CAṆḌAMŪRTAYE HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ,

he should visualise the form [of the deity] as having the colour of black collyrium, four-faced, twelve-eyed, with snakes for his sacred thread and for his upper armbands, with flames of fierce fire emerging from his mouth, bright with a fiery-flamed crescent moon, very terrible, four-armed, with trident and water-pot on the left and with axe and rosary on the right, arisen from the fire of Rudra[’s anger], and he should then (*param*) invite [Caṇḍeśa] using his root mantra:

ॐ DHUNICAṆḌEŚVARĀYA HUṆPHAṬ SVĀHĀ.⁶² Having thus accomplished the seating of the deity that begins with invitation, he should perform *sakalīkaraṇa* and *paramīkaraṇa*⁶³ with [the *aṅgamantras* of Caṇḍeśvara, namely:]

ॐ CAṆḌAHRDAYĀYA HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ,
ॐ CAṆḌAŚIRASE HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ,
ॐ CAṆḌAŚIKHĀYAI HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ,
ॐ CAṆḌAKAVACĀYA HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ,
ॐ CAṆḌĀSTRĀYA HUṆPHAṆṆAMAḤ.⁶⁴

With the ‘cow-*mudrā*’, he should effect the transformation into nectar,⁶⁵ and with the [above-given] heart-mantra he should offer foot-water, water for sipping, etc. He should venerate [Caṇḍeśa] together with his *aṅgamantras* arrayed around

⁶² In a number of printed sources the principal part of this mantra appears in what is probably a mistakenly ‘normalised’ form: *dhvanicaṇḍeśvarāya*. But we find *dhuni*-elsewhere, for example in the *Sarvajñānottara* (IFP MS T. 334, p. 122, 19:134):

*abhyarcya pañcabhir brahmais caṇḍeśāya nivedayet
dhunicaṇḍeśvarāyeti huṃ phaṭ svāhety anukramāt.*

⁶³ The first of these expressions refers to the laying on of the mantras of the deity, either on to one’s hands and certain body-parts as part of an identification of oneself with the deity worshipped, or, as here, on to the imagined body of the deity. The second expression, a synonym of *ekatva* and *ekīkaraṇa*, refers to the unification of these parts.

⁶⁴ It is possible that the NETRA-mantra has dropped out by accident and should also be supplied here.

⁶⁵ This *mudrā*, of which there is a photograph (No. 8) in Planche 1 of SP1, imitates the udders of a cow and is used for this rite of *amṛtīkaraṇa* (q.v. in TAK 1), of transforming water or other offerings into nectar.

him (*bhogāṅgopetam*) with fragrances and such like [offerings], perform as much recitation as he is able, and then, with [recitation of] the syllable OM he should announce:

Apart from cattle, land, gold, cloths and such, ornaments of jewels and gold and such, all else that has been offered and enjoyed [by Śiva] (*śeṣaṃ nirmālyam*) one should give to Caṇḍeśa. Whatever can be licked, sucked, chewed or drunk, betel, garlands, unguents—all such things that have been offered and enjoyed [by Śiva] are given to you by Śiva's command.

After reciting this, he should offer what has been offered and enjoyed by Śiva, saying

OM. O Caṇḍa, all this ritual, if, because of ignorance, I have performed it deficiently or adding something, then let it be rendered perfect by your command.

After thus addressing Caṇḍeśa, he should invite him to depart with the performance of the eight-flower rite,⁶⁶ just as [one does] in the case of Śiva. After that, one should remove what has been offered and enjoyed, smear the place with cowdung, besprinkle it using the ASTRA-mantra, pour away the guest-water, wash one's hands and such, sip water according to the prescribed fashion, and lay the mantras [of Śiva back again] on one's hands and body parts,⁶⁷ and recite, for as much as one is able, the [collection of principal mantras of Śiva known as the] ŚIVASAMHITĀ.

Thus [the teaching to be found] in the *Kālottara*:

In the North-East, using [his mantras] ending in HUMPHAT, one should venerate Caṇḍanātha with such purifying [offerings] as clothing, food, scents, drinks, guest-water and what has been offered to and enjoyed [by Śiva]. One should [then] pour away [the water from] the guest-water vessel, sip, touch the lips, perform the laying [of the mantras of Śiva back on to one's body] and the ŚIVASAMHITĀ should be recited for as long as one is able. The veneration of Śiva has [now] been taught in due order exactly as it should be.

Thus [the teaching to be found] in the *Sarvajñānottara*:

One should know that those scents, flowers and food-offerings made to the God who has [since] been invited to depart are *nirmālya*. [In other words, everything offered to the God is *nirmālya*] excepting clothing and ornaments. After giving him guest-water, one should once again offer [those offerings] to Caṇḍeśa.

⁶⁶ See TAK 1 s.v. *aṣṭapuṣpikā*.

⁶⁷ Cf. SP1, appendix 1 for a presentation of Aghoraśiva's account of this procedure.

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

Surely

In the case of a *bāṇaliṅga*, a portable one, ones that have risen [from rivers],⁶⁸ one established by a Siddha, a spontaneously arisen one and in the case of all [representational] images, Caṇḍa has no authority. [So too] in the case of one in which there is visualisation of a non-dual [deity such as Bhairava or Tumburu].⁶⁹ And also in the case of rites for the Lord [installed] on the ground.

Others, however, [opine:]

No worship of Caṇḍa [is to be performed] when the [image of] the Lord has been crafted either.⁷⁰

How can [such a view as] that [be maintained]? True. [But] this is [in fact] a prohibition of the installation of Caṇḍa and not a prohibition of his worship. †This is advanced as somebody else's doctrine†. In the Śaiva Siddhānta, however, the rule is that he should always and in every case be worshipped. And this is expressed in the *Kālottara*:

Whether the *liṅga* is stable or portable, or made of precious stone, clay, wood, rock, iron, or is represented in a picture, or is a *bāṇaliṅga*, [the worship of] Caṇḍa remains determined by rule (*niyāmakah*)⁷¹ in the Siddhānta, but not in other tantric traditions: neither in the Vāmasrotas nor in the Dakṣiṇasrotas.

Those who enjoy what belongs to Caṇḍa, what belongs to the guru or what belongs to the God, [even] in thought, are cooked in [the hell called] Raurava.

And

[When Śiva is worshipped] in aniconic and iconic images, in a *maṇḍala*, on the ground, in fire, in a portable or fixed *liṅga*, in one made of precious stones, or in a jewelled picture or the like, or in a *liṅga* made of unguents

⁶⁸ Thus BRUNNER (1998:242 and fn. 152). Alternatively one could adopt the reading *lohellauhe*: 'one made of metal'.

⁶⁹ BRUNNER (1998:242) interprets this *pāda* to mean: 'Il n'y a rien à faire non plus dans les cultes où l'officiant se sent un avec Śiva...', but Professor SANDERSON pointed out to me that such an interpretation is unlikely and his alternative interpretation appears to receive confirmation from a fragment of the unpublished *Vāstuvīdyā* attributed to Viśvakarma, quoted below in the section entitled 'Caṇḍeśa outside Tamil Nadu'.

⁷⁰ This presumably means that the worship of Caṇḍa would be recommended when Śiva is worshipped in a *bāṇa-liṅga* or a *svayambhuliṅga*, but not in a man-made one.

⁷¹ Instead of this interpretation, we could perhaps assume a more regular sense of *niyāmakah*: 'Caṇḍa remains in control'.

or food, or in one made of clay or ash or fruits, or in one made of flowers, the worship of Caṇḍa is determined by rule (*niyāmikā*).

Worship without an image, and the axe and the club

The above passage is rich with material and I shall therefore now attempt, with the following pages, gradually to unpack points that most merit discussion.

Now the first thing which may strike the reader here is that the discussion is about the worship of Caṇḍeśa without any image of Caṇḍeśa present. The worship is to be performed in a space to the North-East, on a crescent-moon shaped *maṇḍala*, a detail that echoes the shape of the blade of Caṇḍeśa's characteristic implement, the axe. This is certainly an ancient detail,⁷² and the axe, furthermore, is not confined to South Indian prescriptive literature, for we find it in the description of Caṇḍeśa as general of Śiva's army of gaṇas (*pramatha*) in the old *Skandapurāṇa* 170:3:

*caṇḍeśvaraś caṇḍavapur mahātmā jvalatpradīptograkuṭhārapāṇiḥ
vyādāya vaktram purataḥ sthito 'bhūd devasya śambhoḥ pramathendravīraḥ.*

The great-souled, fierce-body Caṇḍeśvara was standing there in front with open mouth, a flaming, bright, fierce axe in his hand, the hero-prince of Lord Śambhu's hosts.

And the axe features in the oldest tantric description too, namely that in the *Mūlasūtra* of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*.⁷³ Moreover, we find it in many of the most ancient sculptures of Caṇḍeśa, for instance that shown in PLATE 2, but also in those in the perhaps more ancient rock-cut shrines at Bhairavakona (PLATE 34). It is, however, not a universal detail, for we find many old sculptures from the South in which the implement that Caṇḍeśa holds, whether in his left or his right hand, is plainly a club, sometimes a club around which snakes are twined. Some examples of this early type are PLATES 4–7.⁷⁴

⁷² The *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* too begins its account of the *yāga* of Caṇḍa, chapter 15, with the drawing of a crescent-moon *maṇḍala*. The *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* is one of the scriptures that was known to Sadyojyotiḥ, whom SANDERSON (2006a:76) judges to have been active between 675 and 725 AD. Still older is the mention in the *Uttarasūtra* of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā* (3:14ab): *ardhacandran tu caṇḍīṣe abhicāre trikoṇakam*. 'A [*maṇḍala* with the shape of] a crescent moon for [the worship of] Caṇḍīśa; triangular for [rites of] malevolent magic.' Cf. also *Mṛgendra kriyāpāda* 8:36.

⁷³ *Mūlasūtra* of the *Niśvāsa* 5:22cd: *aparedyur yajed devaṃ caṇḍīśaṃ taṅkadhāriṇam*, 'On the following day, he should worship Caṇḍīśa, who bears the axe'. Cf. also *Kiraṇa* 23:7cd: *tarpayed yajñaseṣeṇa caṇḍeśaṃ taṅkadhāriṇam*, 'He should gratify Caṇḍeśa, who bears the axe, with the sacrificial leavings'. (ACHARYA (2005:214, fn. 25) quotes this verse but mistakenly ascribes it to the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*.)

⁷⁴ See also GOODALL et al. 2005, FIGS. 31–4.

PLATE 4. Caṇḍeśa with a club now installed above the *praṇāla* at the ruined Tirumūlanātha shrine at Perangiyur (Pēraṅkiyūr), Villupuram Taluk, Villupuram District. It is clear that this is not where the image originally belonged. (I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY for drawing my attention to this sculpture.)

It is true that such early club-wielding figures have in a few cases been identified by some as images of Lakuliśa, but I have been convinced by EDHOLM's demonstration (1998) that they represent in fact Caṇḍeśa.⁷⁵

PLATE 5. Detail of Caṇḍeśa with a club at the rock-cut shrine at Devarmalai, Kulittalai Taluk, Karur Dt. Snakes twist about the club. On the top of his head is a curiously shaped flower that may be compared with that in PLATE 6. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

PLATE 6. Club-wielding Caṇḍeśa in the Śrītyāgarāja Temple at Tiruvarur, Tiruvarur Taluk, Tanjore Dt. Snakes twist about the club. Compare the curiously shaped flower with that in PLATE 5. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

Returning to the absence of the mention of any image of Caṇḍeśvara here, the obvious explanation for this is that Jñānaśambhu is not primarily describing what happens in a temple, but rather the private worship of an individual initiate. Nevertheless, this absence draws our attention to the possibility that one of the reasons why there are so many regions of India (and South East Asia) where no images of Caṇḍeśvara have been identified (even though textual references to him exist there) might be that in those regions there was no practice of representing Caṇḍeśa. And we may note that in parts of Karnataka there is a practice of placing a post or *liṅga* in the North-East corner of the inner enclosure of a Śaiva temple for the worship of Caṇḍeśa.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ See also GOODALL et al. 2005:58.

⁷⁶ In the photo-library of the IFP, there is a photograph of what appears to be such a *liṅga* in the Mahābaleśvara temple in Gokarna, Kumta Taluk, North Karnataka (photo 5046-4) and also a photo of a faceted broken stump in the North East corner of the inner enclosure of the Candramaulīśvara temple in Udipi, Udipi Taluk, South Kanara Dt., Karnataka (photo 8050-5). ACHARYA (2005:209) points out that there is a shrine in the North-East corner of the famous Paśupati temple in Kathmandu that is “simply called ‘Caṇḍeśvara’s’ shrine and a small odd shaped *liṅga* is worshipped there”. ACHARYA adds (2005:209, fn.11) “It is highly probable that this shrine was built later when the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu got influence from the South and accepted Saiddhantika ritual scheme. It is sure that Caṇḍeśvara is made the consumer of *nirmālya* only later in Siddhānta Śaivism”. While ACHARYA may or may not be right about the North-Eastern shrine in the Paśupati temple being a relatively recent innovation that post-dates the arrival of South Indian priests there, the relation between Caṇḍeśa and *nirmālya* goes back to what is probably one of the earliest references to Caṇḍeśa, namely the description of his rôles in the *Nisvāsa* (a text that appears to predate the split in tantric Śaivism between the Śaiva Siddhānta and other streams), which we shall quote below.

PLATE 7. Club-wielding Caṇḍeśa (?) inside the enclose to the North-East of the *līṅga* in the Vīraṭṭāneśvara Temple at Kilaiyur (Kīlaiyūr), Tirukoyilur Taluk, Villupuram Dt. The image has received the mistaken label ‘Śrī Jaṭāmuni’. I treat this image as a possible Caṇḍeśa, but, as my colleague Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has pointed out to me, the original position of this sculpture (as is the case of some other club-wielding figures) is unknown. Furthermore she has pointed out to me that the same temple has a set of *saptamātrka* figures of comparable style and that it is therefore conceivable that this figure belongs to that set as the fierce Śaiva deity, who, along with Gajānana, often accompanies the Mothers, and to whom various names (for instance, Vīrabhadra) are assigned. Photo: Emmanuel FRANCIS.

We may also note that some texts that do really appear to be prescribing the worship of Śiva in a public temple also refer to the possibility that Caṇḍeśa may not have his own image and may nonetheless be worshipped. An example is *Pūrva-Kāmika* 4:523–525b:

*aśānyāṃ pūjayec caṇḍaṃ gandhapuṣpādibhiḥ kramāt
tasmai samarpayet sarvaṃ nirmālyaṃ tat prakīrtitam 523
līṅgamūrdhastham ity eke piṇḍikāyām athāpare
aśānyāṃ pīṭhakasthaṃ vā bāhye caṇḍagrhe ’thavā 524*

One should venerate Caṇḍa in the North East with scents, flowers and such in due order. To him one should offer all *nirmālya*—that has been explained. Some say [one should worship] him situated in the top of the *līṅga*, others say situated in the *piṇḍikā* or in the North East of the stand, or outside in a temple for Caṇḍa.

Four-armed visualisations of Caṇḍeśa

The second thing to strike the reader’s eyes as they travel over Jñānaśambhu’s prescriptive account will be the visualisation of Caṇḍeśvara as a fierce, fiery, four-armed and four-faced deity.

PLATE 8. Four-armed and four-faced Caṇḍeśa still *in situ* in the shrine to the NE of the *līṅga* in the somewhat dilapidated but not derelict Maruntīśvara Temple at Kaccūr (Kaccūr), Singaperumalkoyil Taluk, Chengleput Dt. The upper hands bear rosary and spouted water-pot; the lower ones hold axe and trident. I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY for drawing my attention to this image. Photo: N. RAMASWAMY.

Hitherto, we have looked only at two-armed types, which are overwhelmingly more commonly represented in sculpture. In Saiddhāntika literature, however, it is four-armed forms that predominate. Jñānaśambhu’s visualisation of Caṇḍeśa is essentially the same as that of his twelfth-century contemporary Aghoraśiva (see, e.g., *Pañcāvaraṇastava* 101), of the eleventh-century author Somaśambhu

(SP1, V:1–2), of a certain Vairocana (*Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* 17:15–17), who was probably a Nepalese author of the eleventh or twelfth century,⁷⁷ and also of two unpublished *pratiṣṭhāntras* that survive in early Nepalese manuscripts, namely the *Mayasaṅgraha* and the *Mohacūḍottara*.⁷⁸ The *Mayasaṅgraha* cannot be later than the tenth century, for a commentary on it survives by Vidyākāṇṭha II, the son of the tenth-century Kashmirian author Rāmakaṇṭha II (see GOODALL 1998:x–xi).

PLATE 9. Caṇḍeśas of various dates and provenance gathered from neighbouring temples and displayed in a courtyard of the Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvaṭuturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to these sculptures.⁷⁹

Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 10. Four-armed and four-faced Caṇḍeśa in a courtyard of the Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvaṭuturai). The deity's top right hand has a trident; his top left hand, which presumably held an axe, has been broken away. The lower hands hold a rosary (deity's right) and a round object that may be a fruit. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 11. The fourth face on the reverse of the sculpture shown in PLATE 10. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

PLATE 12. Four-armed and four-faced Caṇḍeśa in a courtyard of the Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvaṭuturai). The top left hand has an axe; the top right hand, a trident. The lower hands hold a rosary and spouted water-pot. Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

⁷⁷ See GOODALL et al. 2005:24.

⁷⁸ For the texts of these various passages, see GOODALL et al. 2005:184–5.

⁷⁹ The label 'Dvāparayugacaṇḍeśvara' appears to derive from what is probably a late list of five types of Caṇḍeśvaras which is twice presented in a rather corrupt form (with only 4 names although the text twice says that there should be 5) in *Suprabheda kriyāpāda* 47:3–7b:

pracaṇḍādir viniṣkrāntā pañcamūrtir vidhānataḥ
pracaṇḍacaṇḍaḥ prathamam tato vikrāntacaṇḍakaḥ 3
tṛtīyo vibhucaṇḍas tu vīracaṇḍas caturthakaḥ
evaṃ vai pañca caṇḍeśāḥ pañcabrahmasamudbhavāḥ 4
kṛtayugādhipatyam tu pracaṇḍam idam ucyate
vikrāntacaṇḍanāmā tu tretāyām adhipaḥ smṛtaḥ 5
dvāpare cādhipatyam hi vibhuś caṇḍeśa ucyate
kalau tu vīracaṇḍeśasvādhipatyam prakīrtitam 6
evaṃ vai pañcabhedena caṇḍo nāma vidhīyate

3a pracaṇḍādir] conj.; pracaṇḍādi Ed. • 3d °caṇḍakaḥ] conj.; caṇḍagaḥ Ed.
• 4a vibhuś] conj.; bhuvī Ed. • 4cd caṇḍeśāḥ pañcabrahmasamudbhavāḥ] conj.;
caṇḍeśā pañcabrahmasamudbhavā Ed. • 7b caṇḍo] conj.; caṇḍa Ed.

PLATE 13. The fourth face on the reverse of the sculpture shown in PLATE 12.
Photo: EFEO (G. Ravindran).

We also find an extremely similar visualisation, in the influential eleventh-century *Br̥hatkālottara*,⁸⁰ where it is followed by an alternative four-armed visualisation (*caṇḍayāgapāṭala* 13c–14: NGMPP B 25/2, f. 51r; B 24/59, f. 45r):

śūlatāṅkadharaṃ dhyāyet kamaṇḍalvakṣasūtriṇam 13
mahābhujam mahoraskam bhinnāñjanacayopamam
ekavaktram trinetrām ca ṭāṅkāṅkṣam abhayapradam 14

• 13c śūlatāṅkadharaṃ dhyāyet] B 24/59; śūlāṅkuśakaraṃ dhyāyet B 25/2 • 13d
°sūtriṇam] *em.*; °sūtrikaṃ B 24/59; °sūtraṇam B 25/2 • 14a mahoraskam] B 24/59;
gameraska B 25/2 • 14c ekavaktram] B 25/2; evavaktram B 24/59

One should visualise him holding trident, axe, water-pot and rosary, with powerful arms, a big chest, like a heap of broken charcoal [in colour]. [Or alternatively] one-faced, three-eyed, [holding] axe [and] rosary [and showing the gestures of] *abhaya* and boon-giving.⁸¹

The first of this pair of visualisations does not specify the number of heads, and it is therefore likely that readers would have understood only one head to be intended in each case.

Now all the four-handed four-faced forms, both in literature and in sculpture, appear to be relatively late, the earliest of them being perhaps that of the *Mohacūḍottara*. Furthermore, given how standard four-armed visualisations are in Saiddhāntika ritual texts, and given the widespread assumption that the majority of temples in the Tamil-speaking South have long been in some strong sense Saiddhāntika, it is surprising how extremely rare it is to find four-armed representations in worship. In GOODALL et al. 2005, we illustrated and described at length a four-armed and four-faced image under worship in the Caṇḍeśa shrine of the Uttarāpatheśvara temple in Tiruchchengattangudi (Tirucceṅkāṭṭāṅkuṭi), Nannilam Taluk, Tanjore Dt. (2005:60, FIGS. 37 and 38). Since then, N. RAMASWAMY has drawn my attention to a very much later sculpture that accords more nearly with Jñānaśambhu's prescription and that is still *in situ*: see PLATE 8. One other still in worship is in the Caṇḍeśa-shrine in the best known of all South Indian Śaiva temples, namely that at Chidambaram; but its identity seems now no longer to be recognised, for, because of its four

⁸⁰ The *Br̥hatkālottara* is here assigned to the eleventh-century on the grounds that it appears not to have been known to the tenth-century Kashmirian commentators. The first quotations ascribed to it that we can identify in the work as it is transmitted in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts appear, as far as I am aware, in Jñānaśambhu's twelfth-century *Jñānaratnāvalī*.

⁸¹ The second of these visualisations, with one face, three eyes, axe, rosary, *abhaya* and *varada*, is adopted in the *Prayogamañjarī* of Ravi (20:158).

heads, it is taken to be a sculpture of Brahmā: as YOUNGER remarks (1995:44, fn. 43), ‘The image of Caṇṭēcuvaran in Citamparam is special because it has a four-faced Brahmā with it, and the two images are always worshiped together.’⁸² No other seated four-faced, four armed Caṇḍeśvara is known to me that is still under worship in a shrine to the North-East of a *liṅga* in the Tamil-speaking South.⁸³ But there are indeed other surviving images of this type that belong to the ‘Cōla period’. Among these, we have referred elsewhere (GOODALL et al. 2005: 188) to the four-armed Caṇḍeśvara identified by DE MALLMAN (1963:65–6) in the Musée Guimet, and to the beautiful (though also damaged) stone sculpture from Darasuram now in the Tanjore Museum (identified as a Caṇḍeśa by HARLE, 1963:108, but see also L’HERNAULT 1987:118 and photo 108 or LADRECH 2007, image 6766-08.jpg). Here the axe and water-pot are plainly visible in the deity’s upper and lower left hands respectively, but the implements held in the right hands, presumably trident and rosary, are now broken away. LADRECH, in her description of this image dates it to the second half of the twelfth century and says, following L’HERNAULT 1987:118, that it formerly belonged ‘in a niche of the second gateway’. The reason for his assumption appears to be the inscribed label on the lintel of a niche in the second gateway that reads *ādicāṇḍeśvara-devar* (LADRECH 2007, image 8491-03.jpg). But it may be that this label once belonged to a standing four-armed Caṇḍeśvara such as those to be found in the gopurams of Chidambaram, as described by HARLE 1963:107–8, plates 140–1.

We failed, however, to refer to one other published Cōla sculpture that corresponds to this four-armed, four-faced type, which also belongs to the Airāvateśvara temple in Darasuram and is still there. It has all four implements visible, including the trident and rosary in the top and bottom right hands of the deity respectively, and is to be found in a niche on the North face of the Eastern hall of the main shrine (L’HERNAULT 1987:90–1 and photo 50 or LADRECH 2007, image 47-01.jpg: same as 8488-01.jpg). As L’HERNAULT remarks (1987:91), the image seems, once again, to be rather squat for the niche that it occu-

⁸² This mistaken identification of the four-faced Caṇḍeśvara in Chidambaram as Brahmā may be some centuries old if David SMITH is correct in his interpretation of verse 30 of the *Kuñcitāṅghristava* attributed to the fourteenth-century author Umāpati: see SMITH 1996:95, 189 and fn. 5 on p. 277. The attribution of the *Kuñcitāṅghristava* seems to me doubtful, however; I believe that a handful of authors called Umāpati should be distinguished: see GOODALL 2004:cxv–cxix.

⁸³ Doubtless others exist, but they are rare. A rather crude image of this type that may be under worship in a shrine to the North East can be seen in photograph 445-5 in the photo-library of the IFP, from the Someśvara temple at Andakudi (Āntakkuṭi), Nagapattinam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.

pies.⁸⁴ N. RAMASWAMY has pointed out to me two other four-faced, four-armed Caṇḍeśas displayed in a courtyard of the Tiruvavaduturai Adheenam, presumably gathered together from surrounding temples (see PLATES 9–13). One of these corresponds to Jñānaśambhu’s prescription (PLATES 12–13); the other is perhaps closer to what we find in Tiruchchengattangudi, since, instead of a water-pot, he is holding a round object that may be a fruit. Perhaps it is also a fruit held by the handsome four-armed Caṇḍeśvara in the Victoria Jubilee Museum in Vijayavada (PLATE 14)?

PLATE 14. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Victoria Jubilee Museum in Vijayavada, Andhra Pradesh. The Museum number is ‘VM 495’ and the sculpture, now in the garden of the Museum, bears a label identifying it as a ‘Bhairava’ of the tenth or eleventh century, from Penugonda in West Godavari District. A photograph in the photo-library of the IFP, where it is classed as a Caṇḍeśa, shows it inside the Museum (photo 5984-6). The upper hands hold axe and rosary; the lower hands, *abhaya* and a round object that may be a fruit.

PLATE 15. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Pudukkottai Museum, dated (according to the label) to the tenth century. I have not been able to determine what, if anything, the deity’s upper right hand holds. It displays a *kar-tarīmudrā* as though it should hold something, just as the deity’s upper left hand does, which ‘holds’ a rosary. The lower right hand has the axe and the lower left hand rests on the left thigh. Notice the flat-petaled flower on the expanse of head between the forehead and the heavy *jaṭābhāra*.

PLATE 16. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Candrasekhara temple in Samalkot, Kakinad Taluk, East Godavari Dt. Axe, rosary, *abhaya*, *varada*. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

⁸⁴ As for the use of the label Ādicaṇḍeśvara rather than Caṇḍeśvara, L’HERNAULT (*ibid.*) comments that this manner of creating two names is a conventional way of differentiating between two iconographical variants of the same figure: ‘En réalité ce type de distinction dans les noms paraît être une façon conventionnelle et commode de différencier deux variantes iconographiques d’un même personnage’. Another possibility is that the ‘Ādi-’ element derives from the epithet ‘Ādidāsa’, which is frequently applied to him in South Indian epigraphs (see, e.g., SII, vol. 1 *passim*). All L’HERNAULT’s remarks on the various figures of Caṇḍeśvara, incidentally, seem eminently sensible. She may be wrong, however, to suggest (L’HERNAULT 1987:94) that his four-armed, four-faced form was inspired by the *Śāradātilaka*. (For the probable date and provenance of that work, see SANDERSON 2007, in particular p. 233.) Certainly that is not the ultimate source of this iconography, and it seems more likely that the immediate inspiration too was a Saiddhāntika work. And she may be wrong to state (1987:113) that no representations of the two-armed form of Caṇḍeśa prior to the 11th and 12th centuries show the *āhūyavarada* gesture, since we find this at Punjai (PLATE 27), and that none has his locks wrapped up into a chignon, since we find this feature in the figure that should perhaps be identified as Caṇḍeśa at Arittappatti, for which see EDHOLM 1998.

A handful of Southern images reflect the four-armed, one-headed visualisation represented by the *Bṛhatkālottara*. One is from the Tēvarciṅkapperumāṅ temple, Tiruvalangadu, Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruvallur Dt., for which see FIG. 39 of GOODALL et al. 2005; another is now in the Museum in Pudukkottai (PLATE 15) and the others are in temples in East Godavari district in Andhra Pradesh (PLATES 16–17).⁸⁵

PLATE 17. Four-armed and one-faced Caṇḍeśa in the Kukkūṭeśvara temple in Pithapuram, Pithapuram Taluk, East Godavari Dt. Axe, rosary, *abhaya*, *varada*. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

But there is an entirely different group of one-faced, four-armed sculptures that may represent Caṇḍeśvara from quite the other end of the sub-continent, from Nepal. ACHARYA (2005:213) describes an image in the South-East corner of the courtyard of the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu as having

four hands holding a trident and some unidentifiable object to the left, and a rosary of rudrākṣa beads and a citron to the right. The lower part of the body is clothed in the skin of a tiger, while the upper part of the body is shown naked. [...] this image bears the sacred thread [...] It is represented with the third eye in the forehead, with matted hair on the head and the membrum virile upraised.

ACHARYA goes on to explain (2005:214):

He is represented in almost each and every Śiva temple in this form. No image of him is found in seated posture, and absence of a hatchet is distinctive in Nepalese sculptures of Caṇḍeśvara.

PLATE 18A. Four-armed, one-faced Caṇḍeśa(?) from courtyard of the nineteenth-century Raṇamukteśvara temple in Kathmandu. In this case, the image is found to the North-East of the shrine and facing West. Diwakar ACHARYA has informed me, however, that the standard position for installation of such images is to the South-East of the *liṅga* and facing West, but that when alterations are made, such images may be moved around for convenience. No motivation for any shift in position is evident in this case. The faceted column behind the sculpture supports a *chattra*, perhaps in imitation of the ‘Chattra-caṇḍeśvara’ who stands to the South East of the *liṅga* in the Paśupati temple (for which, see below). A modern *chattra* above the image is supported by the faceted post behind the image. In the back

⁸⁵ The photo-library of the IFP also has photographs that are unfortunately not sufficiently sharp to be reproduced that appear to show a damaged sculpture of a four-armed Caṇḍeśvara with a rosary in the deity’s upper right hand, an axe(?) tucked into the crook of his lower left arm, and with the two lower hands joined together in some sort of *mudrā* that is built into what may be a broken buttress in the South East corner of the Biccavolu temple at Nakkalagudi, Ramacandrapura Taluk, East Godavari Dt.: photos 3544-11 and 3544-12.

hands are held rosary (with the bead known as Meru at the top) and trident; in the lower hands are held a chisel (?) and a water pot. Markings on the thighs suggest that he is intended to be shown wearing a tiger-skin. Around the wrists and upper arms and on the head-dress are strings of what may be *rudrākṣa* beads. A brass plaque beneath the image, added at the time of a festival in 2003, identifies the figure as 'Śrī Kāmādeva'. Photo: Rajan KHATIWODA of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

But is ACHARYA correct in supposing that these Nepalese sculptures are indeed representations of Caṇḍeśa? I think that he may be: there are several factors which explain why, until ACHARYA's article, no secondary literature appears to have identified these figures with Caṇḍeśa. One is that they seem commonly to be placed to the South East of the *liṅga* rather than to the North East, which seems to conflict with all prescriptive literature as well as with South Indian practice; a second is that they are standing and ithyphallic, whereas South Indian representations of Caṇḍeśa are all seated, with the exception of the processional bronzes, and none is ithyphallic; a third is that the Nepalese images do not carry an axe or a club; and a fourth is that the Nepalese images are identified locally as images of Kāmādeva⁸⁶ or Śiva-Kāmādeva.⁸⁷ Let us deal with these problematic points one by one. The first is certainly odd, for the placement of Caṇḍeśa in the North East seems so invariable, not only in his capacity as the receiver of *nirmālya*, but also in his position in the retinue of Sadāśiva when worshipped at the centre of several circuits (*āvaraṇa*) of deities. Many tantric sources include a circuit of Gaṇeśas, namely Devī (N), Caṇḍeśa (NE), Nandin (E), Mahākāla (SE), Bhr̥ṅgin (S), Vināyaka (SW), Vṛṣabha (W), and Skanda (NW), in between the ring of 8 Vidyeśvaras and the ring of eight (or ten) Lokapālas (see GOODALL et al. 2005: FIG. 8). And his place in the North East is known to us not just from Saiddhāntika sources, but also from a work of the *Śivadharma* corpus,⁸⁸ namely the *Śivopaniṣat*, whose description of the Śaiva temple (*āyatanaṃ*

⁸⁶ Thus ACHARYA 2005:216, fn. 35.

⁸⁷ This is the label used by John and Susan HUNTINGTON in their public archive, the 'Huntington Archive of Buddhist and Related Art' <http://huntington.wmc.ohio-state.edu/public/index.cfm>.

⁸⁸ For a brief characterisation of this corpus of texts teaching a lay Śaiva religion, see GOODALL 1998:375–6, fn. 616 and SANDERSON 2005:231. According to both these characterisations the corpus is unpublished, but for one work, the *Śivopaniṣat*; but there is in fact a printed version, apparently based on one late manuscript, to which Professor ISAACSON kindly drew my attention in 2007: the editor (if that is not too flattering a term for the person who has produced the shoddy book) was a certain Yogī Naraharinātha, who had the corpus printed in Kathmandu in 1998 under the misleading title *Paśupatimatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam*. An edition of another work of the corpus, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, is being produced in Pondicherry by Anil Kumar ACHARYA. As the latter has pointed out to me, Caṇḍeśvara is also mentioned in what is probably the earliest work of the

śambhoḥ) contains the following details (2:17c–19b):

tanmahānasam āgneyyāṃ pūrvataḥ sattramaṇḍapam 17
sthānam caṇḍeśam aiśānyāṃ puṣpārāmaṃ tathottaram
koṣṭhāgāraṃ ca vāyavyāṃ vāruṇyāṃ varuṇālayam 18
śamīndhanakuśasthānam āyudhānāṃ ca nairṛtam.

Its kitchen should be in the South East; in the East should be the sacrificial pavilion; the place [of?] Caṇḍeśa is in the North East; and the North is the garden; the store-room should be in the North West; the water reserve in the West; the place for the Śamī[-wood implements used to make fire], of kindling and of *kuśa* grass and also of instruments is South-Western.

But it is not unknown for the prescribed directions of deities to change: in Nepal, the bull is consistently placed to the West of Śaiva shrines, just as we would expect from the bull's position in the above-mentioned *gaṇeśāvaraṇa*, whereas in South Indian temples the bull is consistently placed in the East. Furthermore, as we shall see below (see the section entitled 'Caṇḍeśa and the North East'), the very earliest texts do not in fact associate Caṇḍeśvara with any particular direction. As for the standing posture, this conflicts only with South Indian conventions, but not, apparently, with any of the textual prescriptions. Nothing is said in the texts known to us of Caṇḍeśa's being ithyphallic, but this is a detail that appears to be added to some forms of Śiva in some regions of the subcontinent and not in others. There appear, for example, to be no Śaiva images that

corpus, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* itself, at the beginning of the ninth chapter, in a long list of divine and semi-divine beings who have practised the pious act to which the chapter is devoted. The half-line in question reads as follows in the twelfth-century palm-leaf manuscripts in Cambridge (Add. 1694, f. 27r and Add. 1645, f. 25r)

bhṛṅgi-mātr-mahākāla-caṇḍeśvara-gaṇadhīpaiḥ

(The same unit is also to be found in South Indian sources, for instance IFP T. 32, p. 103, where it appears as follows: *bhṛṅgamātramahākālacāṇḍidāṇḍi-gaṇadhīpaiḥ*.) Although no direction is assigned here to Caṇḍeśa and no information is given about him, his mention is of importance because, as HAZRA has observed, the *Śivadharmaśāstra* 'is totally free from Tantric influence' (1953a:16) and so probably early. HAZRA (*ibid.*) is inclined to date it to 'between 200 and 500 A.D.' The work's sequel, the *Śivadharmottara*, however, 'recognises the authority of the Śivāgamas and the Śivatāntras', according to HAZRA (1953b:46), but there are features in that work too that suggest rather a Pāśupata context, such as its instructions for installing in the upper story of a lecture hall 'an earthen, wooden or stone image of Nakulīśvara Śiva' (HAZRA 1953b:30). HAZRA does not cite the prescription, but in IFP T. 510, p. 26, it reads as follows:

tatra mṛddāruśailaṃ vā sthāpayed vidhivac chivam
sarvavidyāvīdhātāraṃ sarvajñaṃ lakulīśvaram

are ithyphallic in the Tamil-speaking South, whereas in Bengal even Sadāśiva may be ithyphallic (see GOODALL et al. 2005: FIG. 44).

Turning to the four attributes held in the hands, the trident and rosary are to be found in the Saiddhāntika visualisations, and we have already noted that instead of a water-pot, something that could be a fruit is held by the Tirucchen-gattangudi image as well as by those shown in PLATES 12–14. Furthermore, although I have not seen and cannot judge the figure in the Paśupati temple, most of the representations of this figure that I have seen and all of the ones published in the on-line ‘Huntington Archive’ have a gourd-like water-pot (*alābu*) rather than a fruit. Most problematic, however, is the ‘unidentified object’ that is neither an axe nor a club. Perhaps the two-armed visualisation illustrated in the volume of drawings that accompanies the edition of the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* (PLATE 30, and cf. the illustrations in the two manuscripts of that same text reproduced by BÜHNEMANN 2003:91, picture 89) may offer a clue. The word *ṭaṅka*, which appears in several visualisations of Caṇḍeśa, including both of the ones in the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*, can, according to MONIER-WILLIAMS, refer to such diverse instruments as a spade, hatchet, stonemason’s chisel, sword or scabbard. The Nepalese illustrators of the prescriptions appear to have chosen to understand the word to refer to a chisel (see PLATE 30). Perhaps the ‘unidentified object’ is some sort of instrument for chiselling. The figures in the ‘Huntington Archive’ all appear to have a small shield-like object with a knob fixed to its centre. The knob is slipped between the index finger and thumb of the deity’s lower right hand, which hangs down with palm towards the viewer, so that almost all of the shield is hidden by the hand. Now in some cases a round or rounded shield-like shape is clearly part of the object because it covers up something behind it;⁸⁹ but in others it looks rather more like a raised portion of stone whose only purpose is to support the finer detail carved in front of it;⁹⁰ and in some cases the shield-like object seems to be absent altogether (see PLATES 18A AND 18B). This leaves only a knob-like shape between thumb and forefinger, perhaps intended as a sort of handle-less chisel.

⁸⁹ The shield-like disc covers the trident-staff in the HUNTINGTONS’ scan No. 0019412 described as ‘Siva Kamadeva’ from ‘Lhugha Baha, exterior courtyard, north side’, dated to the ‘Three Kingdom Malla’ period.

⁹⁰ In the HUNTINGTONS’ scan No. 0017157, for instance (described as ‘Siva Kamadeva’ situated in the ‘Mahadeva temple, east side, facing temple’ and dated again to the ‘Three Kingdom Malla’ period), the raised portion of stone behind the rosary in the deity’s upper right hand seems comparable with the area of raised stone behind the lower right hand. In this image, incidentally, there is an axe-blade fixed to the haft of the trident, but this probably cannot be taken to be Caṇḍeśa’s distinctive weapon: tridents in Nepal often have an axe blade affixed to them, and in some cases also a *ḍamaru*.

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

PLATE 18B. Four-armed, one-faced Caṇḍeśa(?) from among the many sculptures placed each to the South-East of one of the numerous *liṅga* shrines on an upper terrace the other side of the Vagmati river from the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu. Diwakar ACHARYA has informed me that these belong to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Once again, I take the implement in the deity's lower right hand to be a sort of 'chisel'. Photo: Kei KATAOKA.

It seems to me possible, therefore, that the chisel is the intended original implement and that it corresponds to the *ṭaṅka* of our descriptions. In support of this, one more image may be adduced (PLATE 18C) in which each implement has been given a sort of decorated halo behind it. If one were to study the image's lower right hand in isolation, one would have little hesitation in proclaiming it a shield, and yet it is plain from looking at the other hands that it cannot be intended to be one.

PLATE 18C. Four-armed, one-faced Caṇḍeśa(?) from one of the many *liṅga* shrines on the other side of the Vagmati river from the Paśupati temple in Kathmandu. In the back hands are a rosary (with the bead known as Meru at the top) and a trident, each with a decorated halo behind it, and in the lower hands are held a chisel and a water pot, again each with a decorated halo behind. Photo: Rajan KHATIWODA of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

But there is one further Nepalese image that must be mentioned, for seeing it just before submitting this article allayed a number of my doubts about the presence of Caṇḍeśa in Nepal. The image in question is probably the earliest of those discussed here by a considerable margin, for it stands facing South on a platform a few yards to the North East of the *liṅga* of the sixteenth-century Mahendreśvara temple at Hanumandhoka in Kathmandu (PLATE 18D).⁹¹ Alone among the Nepalese images I have seen, this figure holds an axe in his upraised left hand, instead of a chisel-like object in his lower right hand. He therefore holds exactly the same implements as the four-armed visualisations prescribe and as can be observed in numerous South Indian sculptures discussed above, including those of PLATES 8 and 12–13.

PLATE 18D. Four-armed, one-faced Caṇḍeśa placed to the North East of the four-faced *liṅga* in the Mahendreśvara temple at Hanumandhoka in Kathmandu. The temple was founded by Mahendramalla in the sixteenth century. The deity's upper hands hold a trident and axe, and the lower two hands hold an *akṣamālā* (indistinct in the photo) and a *kamaṇḍalu*. Like numerous Nepalese images of

⁹¹ The temple was constructed by Mahendramalla, who ruled in Kathmandu c. 1560–1574 AD: see SLUSSER 1982:190–1. I am grateful to Dr. Diwakar ACHARYA for guiding me to this temple.

this figure (for instance that at the Raṇamukteśvara temple), he is surmounted by a stone *chatra*, which in this case may be of more recent date than the sculpture. Once again, this may be in imitation of the CHATRA above the sculpture in the Paśupati complex, whose supporting column has the inscription that mentions Chatraçaṇḍeśvara. As I was examining this figure, a passer-by, apparently a local, told me that it was 'Kāmeśvara'. Photo: Kei KATAOKA.

In the above discussion I have been attempting to rationalise the discrepancies between these Nepalese images known as 'Śiva-Kāmadeva' with the four-armed visualisation that is widespread in Saiddhāntika literature; in other words I have been assuming that the images reflect the visualisation. But ACHARYA's assumption (2005:210ff) is the reverse: the prescriptions derive in his view from the sculpture, and perhaps from a particular sculpture in the Paśupati temple. For the image in the South-East corner of the Paśupati temple courtyard, which faces away from the *liṅga* rather than towards it, has its back to a column that supports a stone *chattra* and bears a seventh-century inscription recording a donation to Pāśupata teachers and beginning with an invocation to Chatraçaṇḍeśvara, who is there praised as the supreme deity of the universe (... *jagad idam akhilam yo 'srjad...*). Like several other Nepalese sculptures, this one (which I cannot myself see, since photography and non-Hindus are forbidden there) stands thus 'beneath a parasol (*chatra*) made of stone at the top of a pillar' (ACHARYA 2005:209), and the pillar that supports the parasol is inscribed with what could be assumed to be his name, among other details. According to ACHARYA, the image represents Chatraçaṇḍeśvara, in other words Caṇḍeśvara with a parasol, and, even though the image is 'medieval' and so not of the same date as the original which 'may have been destroyed in some natural calamity or during the Muslim invasion' (ACHARYA 2005:214), nonetheless 'it is possible that the attributes of the original image were copied onto the present image' (*ibid.*).

Now the main focus of ACHARYA's article is actually the so-called 'Mathurā Pillar inscription' of 380/381 AD, edited by BHANDARKAR (1931), in which ACHARYA proposes to read *jayati ca bhagavā[ṇ caṇḍaḥ] rudradaṇḍo [l]gra[nā]yako nityam* (2005:209) where BHANDARKAR had read the palaeographically similar but non-sensical *jayati bhagavā[ṇ daṇḍaḥ]*. . . and proposed to correct, partly on metrical grounds (since he believed this to be a half-line of *āryā*), to *jayati bhagavān daṇḍaḥ sa...* Sculpted on to the pillar below the inscription is a three-eyed figure wielding a club in his right hand and another (but apparently quite different) 'unidentifiable object' almost hidden by his left hand, which is clutched to the left of his stomach. ACHARYA proposes that this figure is 'Caṇḍa', in other words Śiva himself in the form regarded as supreme at this point in time by at least certain Pāśupatas. Furthermore, he suggests (2005:217) that '[t]here is thus all reason to identify the sculptures of figures

previously assumed to be standing figures of Lakuliśa as depicting rather Caṇḍa or Caṇḍeśvara'. He suggests (2005:216) that it is probable that

...Caṇḍa was a pre-Lakuliśa deity accepted in all schools of the Pāśupatas. Afterwards he was downgraded to a minor deity but remained in Śaiva temples as one of Śiva's gaṇas.

In other words, ACHARYA's view appears to be that the various sculptures placed to the South East or North East of Śaiva shrines across Nepal and now popularly known as Kāmadeva, Kāmeśvara, or, to art-historians, as Śiva-Kāmadeva are imitations of a lost seventh-century representation of Chatracaṇḍeśvara in the South-East of the courtyard in the Paśupati temple. This is in turn the ultimate source of a four-armed prescription for the visualisation of Caṇḍeśa in texts of the Śaiva Siddhānta, a religion in which the fierce form of the supreme deity has been relegated to the rank of the receiver of *nirmālya* of a newer supreme deity, the mild, lacto-vegetarian Sadāśiva. As for the mistaken name identity, this is of course not difficult to explain (2005:216, fn. 35): 'the general populace takes the image of Caṇḍeśvara to be Kāmadeva, not recognizing the ithyphallic element as a symbol of yogic achievement'. (Confusion, furthermore, seems easier to account for in the Nepalese context than in the relatively codified world of post-Chola iconography in the Tamil-speaking South, for one becomes accustomed, in Nepal, to seeing a profusion of Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva sculptures of all periods jostling one another in the same compound.)

Now this model, if accepted, might explain how Caṇḍeśa may have entered the tantric tradition and it would account for the Nepalese data, but can it explain the evolution of Caṇḍeśa's iconography elsewhere? There seems to be no absolutely firm reason why even seated forms such as the two-armed, club-bearing Caṇḍeśa that we see in Devarmalai (PLATE 5) should not indeed have developed out of the Pāśupata iconographic tradition that produced the figure on the 'Mathurā Pillar Inscription', and we shall later consider the positions in which such figures appear; but first let us finish speaking of the four-armed form.

Given the prestige of the Paśupati temple, it is not impossible that surrounding temples should have chosen to copy both the iconography and the South-Eastern location of its 'Caṇḍeśvara' image; but is it likely that a variant of this four-armed visualisation should come to be adopted from an image in Kathmandu as the Saiddhāntika standard? Of course there may have been many images in Nepal by the time the iconography came first to be described in Saiddhāntika literature (as mentioned above, the earliest description known to me is that in the pre-tenth-century *Mayasaṅgraha*), but if so, what has happened to those images? All the Nepalese images known to me, have been

dated by others to well after the tenth century. It therefore seems to me not unlikely that the image now next to the seventh-century Chatraçaṇḍeśvara inscription does not reflect the iconography of the seventh-century image, and that it might instead be a ‘medieval’ sculpture influenced by the Saiddhāntika visualisation.

A further problem with the theory is that, even if we accept ACHARYA’s reading of the Mathura inscription, we could nevertheless, as Professor Hans BAKKER has suggested to me (letter of 20.viii.2008), dispute the identification of the figure: *caṇḍaḥ* could be an adjective, ‘fierce’, and the real proper name would then be *rudradaṇḍaḥ*. We could therefore assume the figure to be rather a personified *āyudhapuruṣa* representing Rudra’s weapon, the stick. This is perhaps still more likely if we accept that this is a half-line in *āryā* and insert *sa* before *rudradaṇḍaḥ* to repair both metre and *sandhi*.⁹² But then again, as we shall see below, it is not inconceivable that Caṇḍeśa should have been at certain points in his development an *āyudhapuruṣa*, nor is it impossible that his name should have begun as an adjective.

Yet another weakness in the theory, perhaps, is the assumption that Chatraçaṇḍeśvara was ‘the’ name of a supreme deity. For might it not instead have been simply the name of Śiva installed in a particular temple?⁹³

In short, ACHARYA’s theory is certainly open to criticism at more than one juncture. Even if we accept his identification of the four-armed, standing, ithyphallic figures placed to the South-East or North-East of *liṅga*-shrines in Nepal, the line of development he has suggested does not seem plausible in all its details. I am nonetheless inclined to believe that the four-armed, ithyphallic figures might indeed be Caṇḍeśvaras, as ACHARYA has proposed, since it seems to me possible that their iconography is intended to be an expression of the four-armed visualisation that is widespread in Saiddhāntika literature. As for their being often placed in the South-East, perhaps that is the result of imitation of the Paśupati shrine, in which such a figure is placed next to an inscription praising Chatraçaṇḍeśvara.

Is Caṇḍeśa one of Śiva’s hypostases?

As for ACHARYA’s notion that Caṇḍeśa is nothing but a ‘tamed’ form of what was originally a Pāśupata group’s supreme deity, this seems not inconceivable. SANDERSON has recorded another such strategy of expressing transcendence over Atimārga groups, namely that of incorporating their chief divinities—

⁹² The assumption that it is *āryā* is not unproblematic, for, as BHANDARKAR explains (1931:1), there is no space in which the second half-line could have been inscribed.

⁹³ Cf., for example, the Śiva called Dṛmicāṇḍeśvara or Drimicāṇḍeśvra (BISSCHOP 2006:220).

Dhruva, Kṣemīśa and Brahmanaspati—at relatively lowly levels in Śaiva tantric cosmography (SANDERSON 2006b:199–200). And perhaps the idea receives some support from the various tantric passages that refer to Caṇḍeśa being Śiva himself or as being the manifestation of Śiva’s own anger. Thus, for example, *Somaśambhupaddhati* SP1 V:2ab (KSTS 292cd):

rudrāgniprabhavaṃ caṇḍaṃ kajjalābhaṃ bhayānakam...

... terrifying, collyrium-black, Caṇḍa, born of the fire [of the anger] of Rudra. . .

Mṛgendra kriyāpāda 8:170ab:

caṇḍarūpaḥ svayaṃ śambhur niruṇaddhy api niṣkṛtam

Śambhu himself, taking the form of Caṇḍa, punishes even one who has been made complete [by initiation, if he should transgress the rules].

Older than the above is the account of Caṇḍa’s worship in the *Matāṅga-pārameśvara (kriyāpāda* 9:45b–54):⁹⁴

mataṅga uvāca

śakter yāgāvasāne tu yāgo ’sty atra neti vā 9:45

caṇḍīśasyoddhṛtā mantrāḥ kimarthaṃ parameśvara

parameśvara uvāca

na kevalaṃ purā mantrās caṇḍīśasyoddhṛtā mune 9:46

pūrṇendusannibhaṃ cāsya maṇḍalaṃ paribhāṣitam

sāṅgaṃ tatra niveśyādau caṇḍīśaṃ taṅkadhāriṇam 9:47

sarvaśvetopacāreṇa yāgānte pūjayet sadā

śobhāsya śaktitaḥ kāryā vibhavyānurūpataḥ 9:48

bhakyāviṣṭasya bhagavāṃś caṇḍīśaḥ parameśvaraḥ

prasannaḥ sarvakāryāṇi sādhakasyāmitadyuteḥ 9:49

pradadāti manaḥsthāni stotreṇākṛṣṭamūrtimān

namas te bhūtabhavyeśa śivakāyātmane namaḥ 9:50

mahograrūpiṇe viśvanāthāya parātmane

rudrāyāmitavīryāya pārvatyaṭmabhavāya ca 9:51

śaktigarbhāya caṇḍāya viśokāya mahātmane

jvalatparaśuhastāya daṇḍīne sukapardine 9:52

namas te viśvarūpāya namas te ’gnivapuṣmate

namas te sarvaśarvāya jagataḥ kāraṇāya ca 9:53

stutvaivaṃ varadaṃ nāthaṃ caṇḍīśaṃ caṇḍarūpiṇam

aṣṭāṅgapraṇipātena santarpyāgnau kṣamāpayet 9:54

⁹⁴ The selected apparatus below only gives information where I propose modifying BHATT’s text, or where the readings are potentially significant for our discussion. One difference from BHATT’s text is not signalled: I have consistently adopted Caṇḍīśa where BHATT has preferred Caṇḍeśa. The Kashmirian manuscripts here are Ū and Ṛ, and the oldest source is the palm-leaf Nepalese manuscript C.

Genesis and Development of Tantrism

45c śakter] C; śakti- BHATT • 45d 'sty atra] C; 'nyas tatra BHATT • 47d
ṭaṅkadhāriṇam] BHATT; khaḍgadhāriṇam KH, GH, CH, J • 48a sarvaśveto-] Ū,
Ṛ, C; sarvayajño- BHATT • 54b caṇḍarūpiṇam] C, Ū, Ṛ, BHATT; ṭaṅkadhāriṇam
K; ṭaṅkarūpiṇam O, Ṇ; khaḍgarūpiṇam KH, GH, CH, J • 54d santarpyāgnau
kṣamāpayet] O, K, KH, GH, Ṇ, C, CH, J; pranipatyā visarjayet BHATT (Ū, Ṛ?)

Mataṅga spoke:

At the end of the worship of Śakti, is there or is there not another worship? What were the mantras of Caṇḍīśa raised for, o Lord?

The Lord spoke:

Not only have the mantras of Caṇḍīśa been raised earlier, o sage, but his *maṇḍala*, which has the form of a full (!) moon, has also been described. After inserting Caṇḍīśa, who holds the axe, into that [*maṇḍala*], together with his body-part-mantras, one should invariably worship him at the end of the [other] worship using all white offerings. He should be adorned as far as one is able, in accordance with his power. The supreme Lord Caṇḍīśa, when pleased, and when attracted by this [following] hymn in such a way as to become physically present, grants all results that may be in his heart to the *sādhaka* of infinite radiance who is full of devotion: “Veneration to you, Lord of past and future! Veneration to you who are Śiva’s embodiment, to you whose form is great and fierce, to you who are Lord of the Universe, Supreme, Rudra, to you whose strength is unmeasurable, to you who are the son of Pārvatī, to you who contain power, to you who are fierce (*caṇḍāya*), griefless, great, to you who hold an axe in your hand, to you who hold a staff, to you who have beautifully braided hair (*sukapardine*)! Veneration to you have are the universe! Veneration to you who are have a body of fire! Veneration to you Śarvaśarva, who are the cause of the universe!” Having praised the boon-giving, fierce-formed Lord Caṇḍīśa in this way, after a prostration with eight parts [of the body touching the ground], one should satiate [him by making offerings] in the fire and cause him to forgive [shortcomings].

The above passage is somewhat anomalous in several respects—the stipulation of a round *maṇḍala* (rather than a crescent one), the emphasis on white offerings (cf. *Mataṅga kriyāpāda* 1:57–8), the absence of any mention of *nirmālya*, his bearing both axe and staff (52cd), his being Śiva in form (50d), creator of the universe (53cd) and yet at the same time son of Pārvatī (51d),⁹⁵ his being mentioned explicitly only at the end of the initiation involving the *yāga* of Śakti (which refers in fact to the worship of the VYOMAVYĀPIMANTRA in the *nava-nābhamaṇḍala*) and not at the end of the other varieties of initiation⁹⁶—but I

⁹⁵ Cf. GRANOFF 2006:90–1.

⁹⁶ Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the above quoted verses seems to imply that the worship of Caṇḍīśa is not to be supplied at the end of the other forms of initiation that the *Mataṅga* teaches; but his commentary on *kriyāpāda* 7:36c–37 implies the reverse. There appears to be no clear indication in the tantra of which is intended.

have cited it here not for its anomalies concerning ritual context, iconography and mythology, but rather for the implications that it contains that Caṇḍeśa is Śiva, even if the implications are at once contradicted.

Another indication of Caṇḍeśa's identity with Śiva is to be found in a fragment of the *Parākhya* quoted by Vidyākāṇṭha II in the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* (f. 61v):

*uktaṃ ca śrīmatparākhye
caṇḍarūpaḥ svayaṃ rudro badhnāti samayaḥśatān iti.*

Rudra Himself, in the form of Caṇḍa, punishes those who break the post-initiatory rules.⁹⁷

We find such notions even in later South Indian sources (even though they contradict the well-known South Indian aetiological myth), for example in *Pūrva-Kāmika* 4:525ab:

krodhāṃśaḥ parameśasya caṇḍeśa iti kīrtitaḥ

Caṇḍeśa is taught to be a part[ial incarnation] of the anger of the Supreme Lord.

PLATE 19. Caṇḍeśa in the Satyagirīśvara temple Senganur, Kumbakonam Taluk, Tanjore Dt. Senganur is traditionally the locus of the South Indian legend of Vicāraśarman. Note the skull in the heavy *jaṭābhāra* and the curled leaf as an ornament (*pattrakunḍala*) in the deity's left ear. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

Furthermore, it could be argued that an identity relationship with Śiva seems also sometimes to be hinted at in the sculptures. This is particularly clear in the Nepalese images, which may have a skull and a crescent moon in the headdress (e.g. HUNTINGTON Scan No. 0017157), and which are all ithyphallic. This is much less clear in the South Indian icons, but there are hints: in Senganur, for example, the heavy *jaṭābhāra* is surmounted with a skull (PLATE 19) and the left ear lobe is filled with a rolled leaf ornament (*pattrakunḍala*), as on many South Indian sculptures of Śiva, recalling Śiva's granting Pārvatī the left side of his body (see, e.g., PLATES 1 AND 31). But in fact emblems that are distinctive of Śiva, such as the skull, are often used to indicate not that a figure is Śiva, but rather simply that it is a *gaṇa* of Śiva or in some sense Śaiva, even if the emblems contain allusions to myths now associated with Śiva.⁹⁸ Moreover a deity that is

⁹⁷ One could perhaps translate 'punishes infringements of the post-initiatory rules', but one would in that case expect a neuter; I therefore assume that *samayaḥśatān* is intended to refer to the rule-breakers, which entails either taking *śatān* in the sense of *śatavataḥ* or taking the compound to mean 'diminished with respect to the post-initiatory rules'.

⁹⁸ On the shifting relationship between Śiva and a number of his Gaṇas, see GRANOFF 2006, in particular p. 80, in which she expresses the impression she has received from examining different versions of Śaiva myths in the Purāṇas, particularly the old *Skandapurāṇa*, thus: 'It is my contention that Śaivism represents the culmination

an incarnation of Śiva's anger can as easily be thought different from Śiva as identical to him.

PLATE 20. Caṇḍeśa in the Maṇikaṅṭheśvara temple in Padur (Paṭūr), Tirukkalukkundram Taluk, Chingleput Dt. The image faces South and is to the North-East of the *liṅga*. No aedicule houses the image. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to this sculpture. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

PLATE 21. Detail of the Caṇḍeśa at the Maṇikaṅṭheśvara temple in Padur showing the skull in low relief on top of the *jaṭābhāra*. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

But then there is also the evidence of the mantras of Caṇḍa and the fact it is sometimes prescribed that they should be installed in the image used for the worship of Śiva. Thus, for example, in the *Piṅgalāmata* as quoted by Vidyākaṅṭha II in his *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* (Jammu MS No. 5291, f. 61v) we read:

*uktaṃ ca śrīmatpiṅgalāmate
naivedyāpanayaṃ kṛtvā vidhiśeṣaṃ visarjya ca
nyasya caṇḍeśvaraṃ mūrtau krodhaṃ daivād vinirgatam
yajed iti.*

Having performed the removal of the food-offering [and] the remainder of the rite, [and] having invited [Śiva] to depart, he should install Caṇḍeśvara in the image, [who is] the anger that came forth from the divinity.

In a fragment of the early *Pauṣkara-Pārameśvara* (Cambridge University Library MS Add. 1049, f. '8'r) we find the following:⁹⁹

*sadyojātaṃ samārabhya caṇḍabrahmāṇi vinyaset
sadyojātaṃ paścimena vāmadevam udagdiśi
dakṣiṇāyāṃ aghoraṃ tu prācyāṃ vaktraṃ niveśayet
liṅgamūrdhani īśānaṃ gandhapuṣpādy anukramāt
sadyojātaṃ samārabhya] conj.; sadyojātasamārasya MS*

Beginning with SADYOJĀTA, he should install the CAṆḌA-BRAHMAMANTRAS: he should place SADYOJĀTA in the West, VĀMADEVA in the North, AGHORA in the South, TATPURUṢA (*vaktraṃ*) in the East and ĪŚĀNA in the head of the *liṅga*. [He should offer] incense, flowers and so forth in due order.

Not only are the mantras of Caṇḍa to be installed in the same image that has been used for the worship of the main deity, but those mantras also parallel the

of a development in which the *gaṇas*, originally totally independent figures, gradually became identified with Śiva and absorbed into his larger narrative'. She draws attention to the fact that later versions of certain myths show Śiva arrogating to himself the actions and identities of the *gaṇas* to whom they belonged in earlier versions of the same myths.

⁹⁹ Cf. SP4, III:57ff and *Suprabheda* KP 47:12.

principal mantras of Śiva in that they are BRAHMAMANTRAS. Similarly, in other sources, such as the passages of the *Matanḡa* and *Jñānaratnāvalī* quoted above, although we do not find BRAHMAMANTRAS assigned to Caṇḍeśa, we find instead that he has a set of body-part-mantras, just as the principal deity has.¹⁰⁰

Caṇḍeśa and *nirmālya* in the Śaiva Siddhānta

Returning to the point we had reached in Jñānaśambhu's presentation of the ritual, once Caṇḍeśa has been visualised and worshipped with his mantras ranged around him (*bhogāṅgopetam*), the *nirmālya* is offered to him, he is invited to make good any short-comings in the performance of the ritual,¹⁰¹ and then he is invited to depart.

Now in the early texts of the Śaiva Siddhānta, it is often not made explicit whether or not a Caṇḍapūjā should follow ordinary regular daily Śiva-worship (*nityapūjā*), for Caṇḍa is commonly simply not mentioned. This is the case, for instance, in the shorter recensions of the *Kālottara*, one of which, the recension in 200 verses, was the source on which the authors of all surviving ritual manuals based their prescriptions.¹⁰² Among pre-tenth-century scriptures, the *Kiraṇa*, has a brief mention of offering *nirmālya* to Caṇḍa after regular daily worship,¹⁰³ and so does the *Sarvajñānottara*, a mention which we have seen

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Niśvāsamūla* 5:23 and 6:23–4, where Caṇḍa has the following *bījamantras*: one for his *āsana*, one for Caṇḍa, and five for his *aṅgas*. Cf. also *Kiraṇa* 23:4–5 (*mūlamantra* [CAM] + 5 *aṅgamantras*).

¹⁰¹ This function of making complete a rite may perhaps occur in some contexts without any connection with *nirmālya*, for it seems to appear in an inscription of 1268 AD recording the completion of the construction of a temple to Harihara in a place called Harihar in Davanagere Taluk, Chitaldroog Dt, Karnataka, by a certain Somanātha, a high officer under the Hoysala Narasiṃha III, who was also the founder of the celebrated temple nearby at Somanāthapur (thus NARASIMHACHAR 1917:1). The second half of verse 21, consisting largely in vocative epithets of Somanātha, reads: *vairiśrīhara gāyigovala bhuvi gaṃḍapeṃḍāra te caṃḍiśaḥ śubhavaibhavaṃ vitanutād ācandracaṇḍadyuti*. “O stealer of your enemies' glory, o gāyigovala, o gaṃḍapeṃḍāra on earth, may Caṇḍiśa ensure that the success of your merit should spread for as long as the moon and the fierce-rayed [sun still shine].” Among the images whose installation is mentioned is Viṣvaksena (verse 19), the Vaiṣṇava counterpart of Caṇḍeśvara, who will be discussed below. See *Epigraphia Carnatika* IX (RICE 1903), pp. 44–47 and 74–8 for Dāvaṇagere Taluk.

¹⁰² See SANDERSON 2004:358, fn. 24.

¹⁰³ There is considerable variation between the sources that transmit the *Kiraṇa* at this point in the text, but the purport of the Nepalese and South Indian versions is the same. 14:46c–47b in the Devakottai edition read as follows:

*liṅgamadhyagataṃ dhyātvā devadevaṃ sadāśivam
naivedyaṃ copasamhr̥tya kṣipec caṇḍāya tat punaḥ*

In the Nepalese manuscript of 924 AD, however, this is worded thus (NGMPP A 40/3, f. 30r):

liṅgamadhyagataṃ dhyātvā pūjāṃ kṣipyeśakonataḥ

quoted by Jñānaśambhu. But these brief mentions do not make clear whether a full *caṇḍapūjā* was required at this point: it seems possible that it was not, given the brief treatment of the *nirmālya* at this point in these two works and from the absence of any mention of it in other early sources.

In other words, Somaśambhu's remarks quoted here by Jñānaśambhu about occasions when worship of Caṇḍa was not required perhaps present explicitly what is unexpressed in some early tantras, namely that there were many contexts where there was no *nirmālya* (cf. SP2, III:69, p. 282) and therefore no need of making offerings to Caṇḍa. We should notice that private portable substrates of worship (*cale*) are included among those for which the worship of Caṇḍa is not required.¹⁰⁴ Now if we accept, as BRUNNER firmly concludes after many years of studying the question, that the rituals of the Siddhānta as described by Somaśambhu were those of individual initiates, and not, on the whole, described from the point of view of priests in temples,¹⁰⁵ then this is significant. For it appears as though for Somaśambhu, Caṇḍeśvara is primarily worshipped in fixed, man-made *liṅgas*, i.e. those of temples.

Now the *Bṛhatkālottara*, quoted by Jñānaśambhu just below in the same passage, appears to mark a new development: it prescribes Caṇḍa-worship at the end of Śiva-worship in all contexts in the Śaiva Siddhānta. This text, we reiterate, appears not to have been known to the eleventh-century author Somaśambhu, and the first quotations of it appear to be those of Jñānaśambhu in his twelfth-century *Jñānaratnāvalī*. For some centuries from Jñānaśambhu onwards, at least up to (but not including) Appayadikṣita, the South Indian authors of ritual manuals accept the position of the *Bṛhatkālottara*, thus confirming in the minds of many that Caṇḍeśa is a deity particular to the Śaiva Siddhānta and found in no other tradition (*netare tantrē, na vāme, na ca dakṣiṇe*).

Of course it is not easy to provide textual evidence to confirm that the association is less firm than long supposed, for among the tantric scriptural traditions Caṇḍeśa as the receiver of *nirmālya* really is found almost exclusively in Saiddhāntika literature.¹⁰⁶ And the relation between Caṇḍeśa and the

naivedyādīm tato hr̥tya kṣipe caṇḍasya tat punaḥ.

¹⁰⁴ Thus also SP2, III:69:

*ratnahemādiliṅgeṣu cale citre pradakṣiṇe
guruṣv api na nirmālyaṃ vyākhyāsu pratimāsu ca.*

¹⁰⁵ SP4, p. v: 'Ainsi répondons-nous enfin clairement à une question toujours présente : cette *paddhati* est-elle écrite pour le rituel privé ou pour le rituel public ? Notre réponse est maintenant ferme : il s'agit de rituel privé seulement.'

¹⁰⁶ A handful of counter-examples may be cited nonetheless. In chapter 26 of the Trika

Siddhānta is also difficult to challenge on the basis of South Indian sculptures. For the Southern images of Caṇḍeśa that we know of and that appear to be ancient are either undatable, or they come from a period in which we know that the Siddhānta already had a footing in the South. KALIDOS (1988) has assumed that the late eighth- or early ninth-century Caṇḍeśa in the Śaiva rock-cut shrine at Malaiyadippatti (Malaiyaṭippaṭṭi) is the earliest image in South India, but in fact it is rather the earliest image of which one can assert beyond doubt that it was deliberately placed in the North-East, with the out-flow

scripture, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, we read:

tathā vai caṇḍanātho'pi dvaitādvaiteṣu kīrtitaḥ 59
dvaitādvaiteṣu yad dattaṃ naivedyaṃ parameśvare
taṃ tu devi taducchiṣṭaṃ caṇḍanāthe nivedayet 60

Caṇḍanātha is proclaimed equally (*tathā vai*) in both 'dualist' and 'non-dualist' [cults]: whatever food is offered to the Supreme Lord, whether in cults that are 'dualist' or 'non-dualist', one should offer that, O Goddess, when it has been abandoned by Him, to Caṇḍanātha.

Such *nirmālya*, it is explained, may alternatively be cast in fire or water. Then the tantra remarks:

dravyaṃ caṇḍeśvaraṃ nāma pūrvadattaṃ mayi priye
bhakṣaṇād bandhate devaś caṇḍeśaḥ parameśvaraḥ 63

63b. mayi] conj.; mayā DYCZKOWSKI • 63c. bandhate] conj.; vatvate DYCZKOWSKI

What has previously been given to me, My Dear, is called Caṇḍeśvara-substance; if you eat it, the god Caṇḍeśa, great lord, punishes [you].

I have come across one other plainly non-Saiddhāntika tantric account of Caṇḍapūjā in a stray chapter on ff. 6v–7r of National Archives, Kathmandu, MS 1-1114, NGMPP A 49/5, which Diwakar ACHARYA had kindly drawn to my attention for the fragment it preserves of the *Jñānaratnāvalī*. Its colophon appears to read (suggestion of Diwakar ACHARYA in a letter of 12.ii.2006): *iti śrīmate caryāpādāva(tārite mūlā?)mnāye caṇḍeśvarayāgas tṛtīyaḥ*. The tantra is a conversation between Kubjikā and Bhairava, who is the teacher, and it explains how to install Caṇḍeśa in a *maṇḍala* in the North-Eastern corner of the *yāga*-area in order to give him the *nirmālya*. The visualisation is short and rather different from what we have seen so far (4cd, ff. 6v–7r)

pūjayed gandhapuṣpādyaiḥ ṭaṅkapāṇiṃ triśūlinam

°dyaiḥ ṭaṅkapāṇiṃ] conj.; °dyai ṭaṅkapā×ni×ṇi MS

One should worship him with unguents, flowers and so forth, an axe in his hand, bearing a trident.

Within the *bhairavasrotas* we know that two recensions of the *Svacchandatantra* included Caṇḍeśa: he occurs in chapters on expiation from the *Aghoreśvari-svacchanda* (32:1 and 32:28) and the *Rasasvacchanda* (39:5–6) that are included in Hṛdayaśiva's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*. (The numeration is that of R. SATHYANARAYANAN's transcription, which is to be incorporated as an appendix into a forthcoming edition of Trilocanaśiva's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*.)

from the *liṅga* (there is here no *praṅāla* to speak of) apparently channelled to run round the edge of the cave so as to pass beneath Caṇḍeśa's feet.¹⁰⁷ As EDHOLM rightly points out (1998:54), two images that are certainly earlier are to be found in the North-East corner of the enclosure-wall in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. One of them is in its original location to the North-East of a *liṅga*, but embedded in the enclosure wall. This two-armed, one headed, axe-wielding image is now entirely covered in stucco and its original features can only be guessed at (see PLATE 22A). The other (PLATE 22B) is an extremely weather-worn free-standing image which has lately been moved in front of the fixed one (old photographs reveal that it was not there until recently).

PLATE 22A Concealed behind the disfiguring stucco is what may be the oldest Caṇḍeśa in South India whose position in the North East is indisputable. It is placed facing South, in the North-East corner of the inner enclosure wall of the early eighth-century Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. Directly opposite, in the South-East corner, is its counterpart: a stucco-covered bas-relief sculpture of Vināyaka. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

It seems reasonable to assume that this weathered figure was the sculpture that originally stood in the open, inside the enclosure, to the North-East of the *liṅga*. For although the construction of a miniature temple to house the South-facing Caṇḍeśa in the North-East has become standard,¹⁰⁸ in many early sites such a

¹⁰⁷ The image is illustrated (FIG. 35) and its position and late-eighth-century or early ninth-century date discussed by GOODALL et al. (2005:58–9). We were unaware at the time of KALIDOS' article of 1988.

¹⁰⁸ It might be supposed that the construction of such shrines was a practice influenced by the two largest examples of the genre, the early eleventh-century Caṇḍeśvara shrines in the great temples at Tanjore and Gangaikondacolapuram. But one should of course be cautious about assuming that these unusual temples were models for parochial shrines. And such shrines evidently began to be constructed earlier. We have referred earlier (GOODALL et al. 2005:186, fn. 128) to a tenth-century inscription referring to Caṇḍeśvara on the stone wall of the shrine to Caṇḍeśvara in the Puṭārjunadeva temple at Tiruppuṭaimarutūr, Ambasamudram Taluk, Tirunelveli District (SII, Vol. XIV, No. 68, p. 46). Professor Leslie ORR has now pointed out to me (letter of 19.viii.2008) that much further North an inscription in 'characters of about the 10th century A.D.' records that a certain Śāttukuṭṭi Mādevan, whose initiatory name was Vāmaśiva, consecrated the image of Caṇḍeśvara and constructed a shrine of stone for him in the temple of Tiruttonḍiśvaram-uṭaiya-nāyaṇār at Tirunāmanallūr, now Panruti Taluk, South Arcot District (ARIE 1939–40 No. 241, p. 59). The figure now occupying the aedicule for Caṇḍeśvara, is, according to PARANAN (2006:37), of the twelfth century, but from the photographs of Emmanuel FRANCIS (and according to Emmanuel FRANCIS' judgement after examining the image itself) it seems that it might well be much earlier, in other words that it might be the image referred to in the inscription. But there is what appears to be a yet older image, now displaced to the west verandah, and, as Emmanuel FRANCIS has pointed out to me, a photograph has been published of it by PARANAN (2006:162).

miniature temple is either absent or of very recent construction and early figures of Caṇḍeśa seem often more weathered than the other sculptures of a site. The Kailāsanātha in Kanchipuram is the very temple in which we find (in the inscription round the main shrine) one of the first explicit allusions to the Śaiva Siddhānta in the Tamil-speaking South.¹⁰⁹

PLATE 22B This was perhaps originally placed without covering or shrine in the courtyard to the North East of the *liṅga* in the Kailāsanātha temple in Kanchipuram. If so, it would be one of the earliest figures of Caṇḍeśa sculpted in the round for receiving *nirmālya* for which an approximate date could be advanced. It is true that there is now no trace in the enclosure that shows where the figure might have been placed, nor (as Dr. Charlotte SCHMID and Emmanuel FRANCIS have pointed out to me) is there any clear echo in the iconographical programme that might confirm that it was once there. The hypothesis will probably remain impossible to confirm or exclude. The weapon held in the right arm has broken off, so all that can now be discerned is that he sat in the now typical posture (except that his left leg rather than his right dropped down) and that he wore a heavy *jaṭābhāra* and earrings. Damage and stucco have effaced all other details. Above and behind him in the corner (only a leg is visible) is the figure illustrated in PLATE 22A. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

It is clear from the sculptural record, however, that temples with no connection with the Śaiva Siddhānta nevertheless installed images of Caṇḍeśa. We find a number of such sculptures among the ruins at Kodumbalur (Koṭumpālur), which a ninth-century inscription reveals to have been associated with a *maṭha* of Kālamukhas (*asitavaktra*), and a fine eleventh-century sculpture (PLATE 23) survives at Tiruvotriyur (Tiruvor̥riyūr), which appears to have been controlled by adherents of the Somasiddhānta (see GOODALL et al. 2005, p. 189 and 112, fn. 60).

PLATE 23. Caṇḍeśa in the Śaiva temple at Tiruvotriyur (Tiruvor̥riyūr) in Northern Madras. The style of the image suggests that it was produced at the same time and perhaps by the same hand as the famous skull-bowl-bearing, trident-wielding figure now known as Gaulīśvara (compare Plates 12–14 in KRISHNA MURTHY 1985), whose shrine has an inscription that dates its construction to c. 1068 AD and that calls it the shrine of Paṭampakkanāyakadeva (KRISHNA MURTHY 1985:50). A tenth- or eleventh-century statue with the same iconography as ‘Gaulīśvara’ survives in the modern Kāmākṣī temple in Darasuram and is described by L’HERNAULT (1987:1, photo 3) as ‘Śiva dans son aspect de dieu

¹⁰⁹ For a discussion of a punning Śaiva meaning intended for several words in the verse in question, see GOODALL 2004: xix, fn. 17. Slightly earlier evidence is to be found in the Kūram plates, as mentioned by GOODALL et al. 2005:112–13, fn. 61.

suprême des Pāśupata'. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

The thirteenth-century *Siddhāntasekhara* of Viśvanātha (quoted by BRUNNER in SP4:241) claims that Caṇḍa was considered the chastiser of transgressions for various Atimārga groups and that his worship was therefore common to them:

śaivānāṃ cāpi śāktānāṃ somasiddhāntavedināṃ 232
pañcārthakālavaktrāṇāṃ bhaktimārgajuṣāṃ nṛṇāṃ
śāstā caṇḍeśvaras teṣāṃ svasvācāravilāṅghināṃ 233
caṇḍanāthaṃ prapannā ye na teṣāṃ bhayakāraṇam
tasmāt sarvaiś ca sampūjyaś caṇḍeśas tv avicārataḥ 234

232c. śaivānāṃ cāpi śāktānāṃ] Ed.; tathā dīpte śaivā[g]lāme BRUNNER¹¹⁰ • 233d. °vilāṅghināṃ] BRUNNER; °vilambināṃ Ed.

Śaivas, Śāktas, those who know the Somasiddhānta, Pāñcārthika-Pāśupatas, Kālamukhas, men who delight in the path of devotion—of these Caṇḍeśvara is the chastiser when they transgress their own various rules of conduct. Those who venerate Caṇḍanātha have no reason to fear. Therefore, everybody should worship Caṇḍeśa without reflecting [upon the wisdom of doing so].

Other evidence is furnished by an account of *pañcāvāraṇapūjā* in an undated chapter attributed to the *Pampāmāhātmya* which Vasundhara FILLIOZAT has published (2001:104–18) under the title *Kālāmukhaśivapūjāpaddhati*: the offering of the *naivedya* to Caṇḍeśvara is prescribed in verse 82. But even if we establish Caṇḍeśa's presence in Pāśupata traditions in the second millennium AD, this does not of course necessarily help us to establish that he originated in one of those traditions. It is clear, after all, that the notion of a *nirmālyadevatā* could easily spread horizontally by imitation.¹¹¹

Viṣvaksena and other *nirmālya-devatās*

The best documented parallel case is that of Viṣvaksena as the *nirmālya-devatā* for Viṣṇu in the Pāñcarātra and Vaikhānasa traditions. And here, as GUPTA has demonstrated (1976:84), the parallelism between Caṇḍeśa and Viṣvaksena consists in rather more than their both receiving *nirmālya*.

Here we encounter in the tradition of the Śaiva Āgamas an exact parallel to Viṣvaksena in Caṇḍeśvara. Both are commanders-in-chief and leaders of the *gaṇas* in their respective pantheons. Both function as *nirmālyadevatā* in their respective cults, and in temples both act as supreme custodians.

¹¹⁰ It is not clear to me what the source is for BRUNNER's deviating readings here.

¹¹¹ Since Pāśupata ascetics were themselves supposed to wear the *nirmālya*, it could be argued that it would be unnatural for their tradition to be the one in which a *nirmālya*-receiving deity arose, but see fn. 152 on p. 414.

Further parallels may be mentioned: Viṣvaksena is to be placed in the North East (GUPTA 1976:77); he is a manifestation of Viṣṇu himself (1976:85–6); and his iconography, in which there is some small variation (as to whether he should raise a threatening finger or hold a club, for instance) shows him with two of the most distinctive attributes of Viṣṇu (the conch and the disc) and seated, as Caṇḍeśa most usually is, with one foot tucked up to rest on the platform on which he sits and the other dangling below it. Viṣvaksena, however, seems to have rather little ‘personality’, and this is enough to suggest that he might have been a sort of ‘copy’ of the Śaiva figure contrived by Vaiṣṇavas calquing their ritual system on Śaiva models. There are other factors that suggest this, the most important being the apparent absence of Viṣvaksena in early sources, whether written (GUPTA 1976:75–6) or sculptural. We may note, for example, that Viṣvaksena appears to be absent from the unpublished early Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās* transmitted in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts and currently being edited by Diwakar ACHARYA, such as the *Svāyambhuvapāñcarātra* and the *Devāmṛta*.

PLATE 24. Viṣvaksena from the Varadarājaperumāl temple in Kadalangudi (Kaṭalaṅkuṭi), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam Dt. In some sculptures one finds *varada* or *tarjana* instead of *abhaya*, and on others the axe may be missing. Photo: IFP/EFEO 571-06.

Another minor point that suggests his dependence on Caṇḍeśa is that Viṣvaksena figures flout the rule that ancillary figures in Vaiṣṇava shrines should either be seated or standing according to the stance of the principal image. GUPTA (1976:77) suggests that the fact that Viṣvaksena is always seated may be because of his ‘high status’, but it seems more likely that it is because he is simply calqued upon Caṇḍeśa.¹¹²

Of course Viṣvaksena’s absence in the sculptural record may be an illusion: he bears no implement that would distinguish him from Viṣṇu and so it is only context that enables one to identify sculptures of him. Note that in glossy books of South Indian bronzes now divorced from their contexts in temple life and housed in museums there are often a handful of Caṇḍikeśvara images, but no Viṣvaksenas. And yet, for instance, in the recent catalogue of the Madras col-

¹¹² Cf. TRIPATHI 2004:352: “Caṇḍa is not offered worship in the Pūjā of Jagannātha. His function has been taken over by Viṣvaksena but the expression ‘Caṇḍanaivedya’ has remained which points towards a secondary character of Viṣvaksena, or at least, towards the secondary nature of his function as a receiver of this Naivedya. In the text of the NNP-Krama [*scil.*: *Pūjāpaddhati* of Nilādrinātha], the word Caṇḍa occurs as an adjective to Viṣvaksena which is an effort to bring Viṣvaksena into association with Caṇḍa and to explain the name of this rite.” The mantra which TRIPATHI cites is: OṂ VAṂ VIṢVAKSENĀYA NAMAḤ. DEVAGANĀYA CAṆḌĀYA VIṢVAKSENĀYA NAMAḤ.

lection there are nine seated images identified as Viṣṇu which could as easily be identified as Viṣvaksena (KANNAN 2003:218–225).

PLATE 25. Śiva crowning Caṇḍeśvara on the North face of the *ardhamaṇḍapa* of the Pallava-period (late eighth-century?) Mukteśvara temple in Kanchipuram. Caṇḍa's matted locks are here being coiffed and adorned by Śiva, while Caṇḍa, the supreme devotee, submissively inclines his head and clasps his hands in a respectful *añjali*. It is possible, as Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has suggested to me, that the matted locks—like those of other South-facing Śaiva deities in South India, such as 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti' and Bhikṣāṭana—are symbolic of his fierce nature, and that their being coiffed and groomed is symbolic of his being tamed. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

PLATE 26. Viṣṇu crowning a devotee on the East face of the Vaikuṅṭhaperumāl temple in Kanchipuram. The same submissive posture is used as in PLATE 25. Photo: Valérie GILLET.

Furthermore, a recent publication of LAKSMI NARASIMHAN identifies a panel on the Pallava-period Vaikuṅṭhaperumāl temple in Kanchipuram as Viṣṇu crowning Viṣvaksena with his *nirmālya* (2007:330). FRANCIS, GILLET and SCHMID (2005:599) record that the same interpretation was suggested, evidently independently, by G. VIJAYAVENUGOPAL. They also record, however, that Adalbert GAIL has interpreted the image as Viṣṇu crowning Prahlāda. Now it is clear that there is indeed a relation between the Pallava images showing the crowning of Caṇḍeśa and this Vaiṣṇava image. Indeed much of the narrative iconography of the Vaikuṅṭhaperumāl consists of Vaiṣṇava echoes and reworkings of Śaiva scenes (FRANCIS, GILLET and SCHMID 2005:599–601). But, as they point out, the scene in question might show some other close devotee of Viṣṇu. Given the absence of other comparably early evidence for the existence of Viṣvaksena as a *nirmālyadevatā*, it seems to me unlikely to be a representation of the crowning of Viṣvaksena, but the question remains open: 'Qui Viṣṇu couronne-t-il?' (*ibid.*).

Apart from Viṣvaksena there are other *nirmālya*-receivers, probably all calqued upon Caṇḍeśa, for other deities. A passage in the *Nāradapurāṇa* gives a typical sort of list (1.67:99–100):

*naivedyaṃ ca tato dadyāt tattaducchiṣṭabhojine
maheśvarasya caṇḍeśo viṣvaksenas tathā hareḥ
caṇḍāṃśus taraṇer vakratuṇḍas cāpi gaṇeśituḥ
śakter ucchiṣṭacāṇḍālī proktā ucchiṣṭabhojinaḥ*

He should then give the food-offering to the particular remainder-eater of the god in question. For Maheśvara there is Caṇḍeśa and for Hari there is Viṣvaksena; for the Sun there is Caṇḍāṃśu and for Gaṇeśa there is Vakratuṇḍa; for Śakti there

is Ucchiṣṭacāṇḍālī—these are taught to be the remainder-eaters.

I say that this is a typical sort of list, but some of the names here are perhaps not the best known. GUPTA (1976:81) gives a number of other names, among which Ucchiṣṭagaṇeśa for Vināyaka and Tejaścaṇḍa for Sūrya seem more commonly used. (We have discussed Tejaścaṇḍa and reproduced an image of Tejaścaṇḍa in GOODALL et al. 2005:55, 98–99 and FIG. 23.) GUPTA also mentions Rakta-caṇḍā, Nirmālyavāsinī, Nirmālyacaṇḍikā, Baṭukanātha and Ucchiṣṭamātangiṇī; but she does not mention the next most frequently represented *nirmālyadevatā* after Caṇḍeśa, namely Caṇḍeśvarī, who is not his consort,¹¹³ but rather the *nirmālyadevatā* of the Goddess in South Indian temples. Iconographically, she is like most two-armed Caṇḍeśvaras: her right hand holds an axe, her left arm rests on her left thigh and she sits with one foot tucked up to rest on the platform on which she sits and the other dangling below it. Her hair is wrapped up in a chignon (*jaṭāmukuṭa*), as is Caṇḍeśa's in many post-twelfth-century representations. I do not know when images of Caṇḍeśvarī were first produced, but I do not recall seeing any image that looked earlier than fourteenth-century. Her first appearances in literary sources may be only slightly earlier.¹¹⁴ Her position is quite commonly not to the North-East of the Goddess image, but rather to the South-East. This is because a Goddess-shrine in a South Indian Śaiva temple complex is typically South-facing, has its *praṇāla* pointing East and so, from the point of view of someone circumambulating the shrine, the image of Caṇḍeśvarī is situated just beyond the *praṇāla*, just as Caṇḍeśa is just beyond the *praṇāla* of the shrine to Śiva. She may be shown facing South, like Caṇḍeśa, or facing West into the wall of the Goddess shrine, just as Caṇḍeśa faces South into the wall of the Śiva shrine. EDHOLM (1984:89) quotes a passage of the *Kālikāpurāṇa* which prescribes the offering of *nirmālya* to her.

PLATE 27. Caṇḍeśa in a dedicated shrine at the Naltuṇaiyīśvaran Temple at Punjai (or Keṭāramkoṭṭāṇ Puñcai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam Dt. Notice the flower on the top of his *jaṭā* and the one above his right ear. There appears also to be the trumpet of a *dhattūra* flower (cf. PLATE 31) on the left side of his head above the band that goes round his forehead. He has a *pattrakunḍala* ornament in his left ear. His left hand is either missing something that it once held, or it displays the *āhūya varada* gesture. Beside him in the shrine, but not shown in

¹¹³ Caṇḍeśa is in fact assigned a consort in a very few temples. His shrine in Punjai, for instance, houses not just a statue of Caṇḍeśa (see PLATE 27), but also a much later sculpture representing his spouse.

¹¹⁴ *Pūrva-Kāraṇa* 90:23. In the thirteenth-century *Siddhāntaśekhara* Gaurī's *nirmālya*-receiving goddess, who is to be placed in the North-East, is called Aṃśinī (p. 617). See BRUNNER 1998 (SP4):274, fn. 22.

the photograph, is a much later statue of a female consort.

There is one other domain in which Caṇḍeśa might have been imitated and that is in early Tantric Buddhism. This suggestion was made to me by Dr. Kimiaki TANAKA immediately after a version of this paper was delivered in Tokyo. He suggested several parallels between Caṇḍeśa and Acalanātha (Fudō in Japan), a figure also known by a variety of other names, including Krodha and Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa. He pointed to this figure being seen as an emanation of the Buddha Vairocana, and at the same time the latter's servant, to his consumption of offerings, and to the fact that he is shown, in Japanese iconography, with a flower on the top of his head (cf. Caṇḍeśa in PLATES 2, 5, 6, 15, 38, 39). Acalanātha appears in a number of early Buddhist tantras that no longer survive in Sanskrit, such as the *Trisamayārājantra*, the *Vajrapāṇyabhiṣeka* and the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi*. A brief account of Acala (and of his partner Trailokyavijaya) as he appears in the last of these texts is given by LINROTHE (1999:151ff). LINROTHE observes (1999:153) that *caṇḍamahāroṣana* is a 'probably descriptive rather than titular' element in the *dharaṇī* of Acala, which occurs in a few places in the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi*, and that this element subsequently became adopted as Acala's name (e.g. in the *Caṇḍamahāroṣanatantra*). But if the element in the mantra is indeed ancient, as it appears to be,¹¹⁵ then it could indicate some connection with Caṇḍeśa, just like the element *caṇḍa* in at least one mantra of Caṇḍeśa's Vaiṣṇava counterpart Viṣvaksena (see fn. 112 on p. 391 above).

It is clear that a thorough study of these materials, which is beyond the scope of this article, would be required before pronouncing on the matter. Furthermore, SANDERSON (letter of 12.x.2005) has suggested to me another figure who could be an heir to Caṇḍeśa's principal function in ritual, namely Ucchuṣma, whose rôle in Buddhist and other sources he has briefly characterised in a recent article (2007:196–200). In that characterisation, SANDERSON quotes an enigmatic passage from the *Niśvāsattvasaṃhitā*'s cosmography that implies some sort of link between Caṇḍeśa and Ucchuṣma. The passage in question is a description of the bottommost of the seven subterranean paradises that lie between our earth and the hells below (*Guhyasūtra* 5:4–5) (ff. 54r–55v):

āyasī prathamā bhūmi[h] purī bhasma[vatī]---

¹¹⁵ As Professor SANDERSON has pointed out to me (letter of 8.x.2005, the ACALA-HRDAYA quoted by Śāntideva in his (probably seventh-century) *Śikṣāsamuccaya* also has the element *caṇḍamahāroṣa* (p. 144). Professor ISAACSON has suggested to me that Śāntideva may here have been drawing on the *Trisamayārājantra*, and has pointed out that we find the same DHARAṆĪ in surviving materials related to that *tantra*, such as the *Trisamayārājasādhana* of Kumudākaramati (p. 3).

*[(dhanam)ja]lyasya nāgasya tathā ucchuṣmarudrayoḥ
ucchuṣmeti purī khyātā āyasī harmamālinī
caṇḍīśaṃ pūjayantīha nirmālyapatane gatāḥ*

SANDERSON's quotation (2007:198) cautiously excludes the bracketed text (supplied from the twentieth-century apographs of the early manuscript) and he says that the passage

... makes Ucchuṣmarudra preside in a city of iron that bears his name in the first of the subterranean paradises known as the Pātālas. This, we are told, is the destiny of souls who have allowed the substances left from Śiva's worship to fall to the ground. Here they worship Caṇḍeśa (/Caṇḍeśvara), the ferocious Gaṇa of Śiva to whom such remnants are to be offered in Saiddhāntika worship, in order to remove the danger they pose.

A corrupt version of the same passage occurs in the *Śivadharmaśaṅgraha* (10:6–7, f. 124v), which reproduces the lower levels of the cosmography of the *Guhya-sūtra*.¹¹⁶ A slightly different situation appears to be described there:

*āyasī prathamā bhūmiḥ purī bhasmavatī yataḥ
dhanañjayaśya kāmasya rudrasyocchuṣmasaṃjñīnaḥ 6
ucchuṣmeti purī khyātā āyasī harmamālinī
caṇḍīśaṃ pūjayet tasyāṃ nirmālyapatanaṃ yataḥ 7*

The first level is of iron, in which there is a city Bhasmavatī belonging to the serpent (*kāmasya* a corruption of *nāgasya*?) Dhanañjaya and to the Rudra called Ucchuṣma. [There is also] a [different] city, made of iron, garlanded with palaces and called Ucchuṣmā. There one worships Caṇḍīśa because of [having allowed in a previous life?] the falling down of *nirmālya*.¹¹⁷

Now Caṇḍeśa may have been an inspiration for Acala, or for Ucchuṣma as he occurs in Buddhist tantric contexts, or it may be that the various ritual functions for which Caṇḍeśa is held responsible were shared among a number of deities including Acala and Ucchuṣma, or that some of their ritual functions just happen to be parallel to some of Caṇḍeśa's. Whatever the case, a thorough examination of these interesting questions is beyond the scope of this already too lengthy article.

¹¹⁶ I am grateful to Anil Kumar ACHARYA, currently producing an edition of the *Śivadharmaśaṅgraha* for his doctoral thesis at the University of Pondicherry, both for pointing out the many borrowings from the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* in the *Śivadharmaśaṅgraha*, and for furnishing me with his electronic transcription of the work.

¹¹⁷ Or perhaps just conceivably, as Professor EINOŌ has pointed out to me: 'There, because [it is where] *nirmālya* falls down, one must worship Caṇḍīśa.'

Caṇḍeśa as chastiser of transgressions

Now we have mentioned above that the earliest Siddhāntatantras tend not explicitly to enjoin the worship of Caṇḍa at the end of the worship of Śiva. But that does not mean that Caṇḍeśa was missing from the Śaiva Siddhānta in its earliest surviving phase. For there is one moment in which Siddhāntatantras agree on prescribing the worship of Caṇḍa, and that is at the end of the performance of an initiation rite. Indeed the earliest part of what appears to be the earliest surviving Śaiva tantra (redacted perhaps between 450 and 550 AD¹¹⁸) teaches the worship of Caṇḍa on the following day (5:22cd of the *Mūlasūtra* of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*, quoted in fn. 73 on p. 366 above). At the end of an initiation ceremony, Caṇḍa is installed and worshipped and the initiate is instructed in the post-initiatory rules of the cult (*samaya*), in the presence of Caṇḍeśa, whose duty it is to punish transgressions. Eight post-initiatory rules are alluded to at the end of the account of initiation in chapter 5 of the *Mūlasūtra* of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*, and they are explained in the same work's *Nayasūtra*, in a passage in which the duties of a group of seven Gaṇas, including Caṇḍeśa, are related.¹¹⁹

[de]hapāsāḥ smṛtā hy ete gaṇapāsāni me śṛṇu
labdhānujño [na] saṅkrāme Vidyeśas tena badhyate 1:100
mūlyaṅ kṛtvā vadej jñānaṃ Ṣaṅmukhas tena badhyate
alabdhānujño [va]de jñānaṃ dadāti ca adīkṣite 1:101
siddhiṃ Gaṇapatir hanyāc chidraṃ dṛṣtvā tu sādḥake
parivarttayati yas tantraṃ paśujñānena mohitaḥ 1:102
Nandir badhnāti vai śīghra[m] Caṇḍīśaḥ sa[m]mayāṣṭasu
yo nindati śivam devan tadbhaktan deśikan tathā 1:103
nir[mā]lyabhakṣaṇe vāpi balidānapaśor api
ādatte cārtavisprṣṭam śāstranindām karoti ca 1:104
liṅgacchāyāvilaṅghī ca caṇḍīśo bandhate bhr̥śam
pratiñāvratam ārūḍha[h] punas tyaktvā śivam vratam 1:105
anyattantravrataṅ gr̥hṇed Devī tena nibandhati
śivatanttram adhītvā tu śiva[ya]jñam prakuruvate 1:106
yajate vaidikair yajñaiḥ śivabhaktāmś ca nindate
viprāmś caivānyalingasthām pūjayet stunateti ca 1:107
Hāthakuṣmāṇḍarudras tu taṃ vai badhnāti durmmatim
gaṇapāsāni badhnanti dīkṣitan tu tathā dṛḍham 1:108

101c. vadej jñānaṃ] NW; vade jñānaṃ K • 103b. caṇḍīśaḥ samayāṣṭasu] W;
 --mayāṣṭau N; caṇḍīśa +h+ samayāṣṭasu K • 104c. ādatte] conj.; adatte NKW
 • 105b. caṇḍīśo] NW; caṇḍīśai K • 105d. śivam] NW; śiva° K • 106a. gr̥hṇed]
 NW; gr̥hṇan K • 106b. nibandhati] NW; nibadhyati K • 106d. śivayajñam

¹¹⁸ Thus GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.

¹¹⁹ N₁ is the ninth-century Nepalese manuscript; K and W are the apographs held in Kathmandu and in the Wellcome Institute in London respectively. Text enclosed in square brackets is not legible in N₁ but has been supplied from the apographs.

praku°] K; śi ̣ --- N₁; śivayajñā - W 107d. °tunateti] NW; °tuvateti K 108b. taṃ vai badhnāti durmmatim] *conj.*; ta vai badhnāti durmmatim N; tavaiva prātidurmatih̄ K; tavaiva prātidurmmatim W

These [above] are remembered as the bonds of the body. Hear now from me the bonds inflicted by the Gaṇas. If, having obtained permission to do so, a person does not commit yogic suicide (*na saṅkrāme*),¹²⁰ Vidyeśa punishes him for that (*tena*).¹²¹ If someone sets a price and teaches scripture, Śaṅmukha punishes him for that. If someone teaches scripture without having first obtained permission or (*ca*) transmits it to a non-initiate, Gaṇapati searches for some flaw in the *sādhaka* and destroys his power. Nandi quickly punishes one who, deluded by the systems of thought devised by bound souls, distorts the tantric teaching. In the case of [transgression of] the eight post-initiatory rules of conduct, [it is] Caṇḍīśa [who punishes].¹²² If one reviles the Lord Śiva (i), a devotee of His (ii) or a guru (iii), or in the case of eating the *nirmālya* (iv), or of giving it as *bali* to a bound soul [or perhaps to a beast?]¹²³ (v), or if one takes what has been touched by a menstruating woman (vi),¹²⁴ or reviles scripture (vii), or steps on the shadow of a *liṅga* (viii), Caṇḍīśa vigorously punishes. If someone undertakes a religious observance beginning with(?) a vow and then abandons that pure observance and takes up an observance taught in another work, Devī punishes for that. If someone studies the Śivatantra, performs Śiva-yajña [and] sacrifices with Vedic rites and reviles devotees of Śiva and venerates and praises¹²⁵ Brahmins with other religious affiliations, Hāṭhakuṣmāṇḍa-rudra punishes that wrong-thinking person. In this way the bonds inflicted by the Gaṇas firmly bind the initiate.

This passage is important for a number of reasons. The *Niśvāsa* is now thought of as Saiddhāntika, but it apparently predates a split into the Śaiva Siddhānta

¹²⁰ Third person optatives often drop their final consonant in this text.

¹²¹ *badhyate*, *bandhati* and *badhnāti* appear to be used synonymously here.

¹²² Alternatively, we could accept the pre-correction reading of K and understand: ‘In the case of the eight post-initiatory rules of Caṇḍīśa—...’.

¹²³ Or as Professor EINOØ has suggested to me, this could conceivably be construed to mean: ‘or [in the case of eating] a sacrificed animal given as *bali*’.

¹²⁴ This interepretation assumes that *ārtavi-* is intended as a *vṛddhi* derivative from *ṛtu* and so means ‘a woman in her season’. The conjecture and interpretation are based upon the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhoja, who gives an overlapping list of eight post-initiatory rules, the last of which being that one should not eat food touched by a menstruating woman (SANDERSON *2005): ...*aṣṭau samayān śrāvayet. (i–iv) maheśvaratacchāstragurusādhakādinindā na kāryā. (v) liṅgacchāyām na laṅghayet, (vi) nirmālyaṃ ca. (vii) na tad aśnīyāt. (viii) rajavalāsprṣṭānnaṃ na bhakṣayet.* Assuming that the *bhakta* of our text corresponds to the category *sādhakādi* in Bhoja’s, the list of eight rules is the same, though presented differently, except for one item: while Bhoja’s list forbids stepping on the *nirmālya*, the *Niśvāsa* forbids giving the *nirmālya* to non-initiates or perhaps to beasts.

¹²⁵ *stunateti* is of course irregular, but probably authorial rather than transmissional.

and into other streams of tantric Śaivism, for it contains no allusion to such a differentiation and yet devotes considerable space (much of its introductory book, which is called the *Niśvāsamukha*) to a detailed explanation of the religious context that surrounds it.¹²⁶ We may note, furthermore, that the list of Gaṇas among whom Caṇḍeśa is included is archaic. No circuit of eight Gaṇas such as we discussed above (in connection with the so-called “Śiva-Kāmadeva” figures in Nepal) features in the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*’s accounts of Śiva-worship. Vidyēśa and Hāṭhakuṣmāṇḍa do not figure as Gaṇas elsewhere, and the *Niśvāsa* omits three figures who occur in the later standard list, namely Mahākāla, Bhṛṅgin and the bull (*vṛṣabha*).¹²⁷ The passage links Caṇḍeśa’s function as the chastiser of eight transgressions with his function as the receiver of *nirmālya*, since eating the *nirmālya* is one of those transgressions. And in doing so it confirms that Caṇḍeśa was present in the earliest phase of tantric Śaivism that is accessible to us, before the standardisation of a list of eight *gaṇas* associated with the eight directions.¹²⁸ He continues to be associated with the punishing of those who transgress post-initiatory rules,¹²⁹ but we find occasional evidence that he is thought of as punishing other sorts of crime.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ GOUDRIAAN treats it as though it were not a Saiddhāntika work, even though it presents the earliest surviving version of the list of twenty-eight scriptures that came to be regarded as the twenty-eight primary Siddhāntatantras (GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA 1981:33–6). His discussion of the work concludes with these remarks (1981:36):

The Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā evidently provides a link between the ordinary type of a “Dvaita” Śaiva Āgama and the esoteric Tantras. The esoteric and unorthodox character of much of its contents renders it plausible that the text for this reason could not be accepted by the early Śaiva Siddhānta.

For a presentation of the detailed account the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* gives of the Atimārga, see SANDERSON 2006b.

¹²⁷ In a later part of the tantra (*Guhyasūtra* 16:52) we find another list of *gaṇas*, again explicitly seven of them and not eight, which includes these three (assuming that Kāpāli stands for Mahākāla) but omits Caṇḍeśa: *devī skandañ ca vighneśaṃ nandi kāpālim eva ca/ vṛṣabhaṃ caiva bhṛṅgiñ ca saptāite tu prakīrtitāḥ*.

¹²⁸ For an announcement of a preparation of an edition of this text, as well as mention of a few further indicators of its archaic character, GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007. We have there suggested that its earliest part, the *Mūlasūtra*, might have been composed between 450 and 550 AD.

¹²⁹ See, e.g., TAK s.v. *caṇḍājñābhaṅga*.

¹³⁰ A Khmer inscription may be adduced: K. 195, lines 19–24 (*Inscriptions du Cambodge* VI, pp. 247–250), dated to 963 śaka (=1041 AD). CEDÈS translates: ‘Si le vénérable et les gens qui seront chefs à l’avenir ne se conforment pas à l’ordre gracieux du roi, ils seront condamnés aux peines les plus sévères, soumis aux sept châtiments royaux, jusqu’au séjour de Caṇḍīśvara, avec leurs familles durant mille naissances.’

Caṇḍeśa outside Tamil Nadu

Now if a *nirmālya*-receiving Caṇḍeśa is a pan-Indian figure prominent in the Śaiva Siddhānta from its earliest beginnings, and from before the Śaiva Siddhānta had begun to distinguish itself from other streams of tantric Śaivism, then why do we not find many more representations of him from other parts of the Indian sub-continent? Aside from the Nepalese candidates, we have of course referred to images from Andhra Pradesh, and others in Karnataka may be adduced.

PLATE 28. Caṇḍeśa inside the *ardhamanḍapa* in the disused Rāmalingeśvara temple at Narasamangalam, Chamrajnagar Taluk, Mysore Dt. The date of the temple seems to be a matter of uncertain guesswork. Architecturally, it seems to echo the early Cōla-period Ālanturai (or Brahmapurīśvara) temple at Pullamangai (Puḷḷamaṅkai, Pashupatikoyil, Papanasam Taluk, Tanjore Dt.) by alternating broad aedicules with narrow ones dropped to a much lower level in a way that suggests depth (for Pullamangai, see SCHMID 2007, Fig. 10). Photo: IFP/EFEO.

But these are arguably all within the furthest reach of the influence of the Tamil-speaking South, which has until now been widely considered to be the source of Caṇḍeśa worship. Relatively late South Indian influence cannot, some would say, be firmly excluded even in the case of the Nepalese images, because of the periodic importation of South Indian priests to officiate in the Paśupati temple. The art-historian DHAKY, though he too believed Caṇḍeśa to be an essentially Southern figure, has provided the elements of an answer to this problem. His article on the subject (1970:104) announced the discovery of ‘two medieval works on architecture. . . of the Māru-Gurjara or Lāta tradition’ that prescribe the construction of shrines to Caṇḍeśa to the North-East of the *liṅga*.¹³¹ As DHAKY suggests (1970:103–4):

The loss of *Śaivāgamas* of the Northern tradition, the ascendancy of Vaiṣṇavism at the expense of Śaivism in the late medieval period in North, and the failure so far on our part to recognise—even suspect—Caṇḍeśa figures among the vast assemblages of a variety of iconic figures of the Śaivaite affiliation scattered all over Northern India in the many regional styles are factors responsible for the almost total blackout on Caṇḍa in North India.

But it is evident that CEDÈS is confusing *āyatana* with *yātana* (‘torment’). The Khmer reads: *pādamula nu anak ta khloñ ni pradvann dau vnek ni pi vvaṃ thve rohh vraḥ karuṇā neh nirṇaya toy uttamasāha doñ* [doubtful reading] *rājabhayasaptaka lvoḥ ta candīśvaraṇyātana nu santāna phoñ sahasra kaṃnet*.

¹³¹ He mentions a third treatise, the *Lakṣaṇasamuccaya* of Vairocana, but his quotation of it (1970:109) reveals that it is an extremely corrupt text of Vairocana’s *Pratiṣṭhā-lakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* 17:13–18, to which we have referred above.

A number of the sculptures that we identify as Caṇḍeśa are identified by others as other figures—the four-faced image in Chidambaram is seen as Brahmā, the club-wielding figure at Arittappatti is seen as Lakuliśa, the standing ithyphallic images in Kathmandu are Kāmadeva or Śiva-Kāmadeva—and this illustrates, if even only some of these proposed identifications are correct, that regional and temporal iconographic variations can be utterly bewildering. Now in DHAKY's two works, the *Vāstusāstra* and the *Vāstuvīdyā*, both attributed to Viśvakarman and which he dates, respectively, to the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (1970:104), we find an entirely different iconographic type described. Both texts envisage a Caṇḍeśa concealed from view by his own shrine, placed with upturned face beneath the *praṇāla* to drink the lustral waters that pour from the *liṅga*. It is rather less surprising, then, that no Caṇḍeśas have hitherto been discovered in Western India: not only have large numbers of early temples been destroyed, but the type of image chosen to represent him must have been utterly different from what South Indian types would lead us to expect.

PLATE 29. Caṇḍeśa underneath the *praṇāla* in the Mārtāṇḍeśvara temple at Marttandesvaram, Kalkulam Taluk, Kanyakumari Dt. This is not an ancient image, but it seemed worth including since it demonstrates the existence of a tradition that may echo the one DHAKY (1970) has uncovered: the figure does not have his face upturned, but he is partly concealed in the tank and has been placed directly underneath the outflow from the *praṇāla*. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

DHAKY quotes the relevant passages of both the works he discusses, but in an extremely corrupt form. I quote here just a few lines (missing out the description of the aedicule in which Caṇḍa is to be housed) of the passage from the *Vāstuvīdyā* with normalised orthography and a few suggested corrections:

*tathā vai kārayet*¹³² *prājñāḥ jagatyāṃ madhyasaṃsthitam*
cārusiṃhāsanāsinaṃ nīlameghāñjanaprabham
ūrdhvavaktraṃ sutejādhyam pibantaṃ snapanam sadā
*ṭaṅkapāṇiṃ mahācaṇḍam*¹³³ *praṇālādhovyavasthitam*
*īdrśam*¹³⁴ *kārayec caṇḍam sarvakāmaphalapradam*
*svayambhubāṇaliṅge*¹³⁵ *ca sthaṇḍile maṇḍale 'pi vā*
*advaitamantrasamyukte cale caṇḍo*¹³⁶ *na vidyate*

The wise man should cause him to be made thus, placed in the middle of the *ja-gatī*, seated on a lovely lion-throne, the colour of a dark cloud or of collyrium, with

¹³² *kārayet*] *em.*; *kāryyet* DHAKY

¹³³ *ṭaṅkapāṇiṃ mahācaṇḍam*] *conj.*; *ṭaṅkapāṇi mahācaṇḍa* DHAKY

¹³⁴ *īdrśam*] *em.*; *idaśam* DHAKY

¹³⁵ *svayambhubāṇaliṅge*] *conj.*; *svayambhū bāṇaliṅge* DHAKY

¹³⁶ *caṇḍo*] *conj.*; *saṃyuktaṃ cale caṇḍe* DHAKY

upturned face, full of fierce vigour, at all times drinking the ablution waters [that have been poured over the *liṅga*], with an axe in hand, extremely terrible, situated beneath the water-spout. This is how one should cause Caṇḍa, who grants all desires and fruits, to be made. In the case of [worship of Śiva in] a spontaneously arisen *liṅga*, or *bāṇaliṅga*, or a prepared ritual ground,¹³⁷ or a *maṇḍala* or [in a *liṅga*] in which the mantra of a non-dual [deity, such as Bhairava or Tumburu,] has been installed, Caṇḍa is absent.

DHAKY speculates about waves of South Indian influence that might account for the spread of the South Indian figure of Caṇḍa to the North, but, since we can now show that Caṇḍa was in fact already a pan-Indian figure some centuries before this, another explanation suggests itself: perhaps, after all, various regions independently came up with very different visualisations of Caṇḍeśa, some of them emphasising his character as a fierce chastiser of transgressions (the seated, axe-wielding figures of the South), others his rôle as the recipient of *nirmālya* (an open-mouthed figure drinking the lustral waters of a *praṇāla*¹³⁸), and others again his nature as a fierce hypostasis of Śiva (the standing, four-armed ithyphallic figures of Nepal).

PLATE 30. Two-armed Caṇḍeśvara as depicted in the volume of drawings accompanying the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*. The text's four-armed prescription is not illustrated in that volume and this is instead a realisation of him as he appears among other Gaṇeśvaras in 6:183:

*śvetas tryakṣo dvibāhuś ca jaṭī taṅkāḥsamālikah
pracaṇḍo daṇḍadhārī ca kāryaś caṇḍeśvaro mahān.*

‘Caṇḍeśvara should be made white, three-eyed, two-armed, with matted locks and bearing an axe/chisel/dagger (*taṅka*) and a rosary; and [alternatively] (*ca*) [he may be made] big, fierce, wielding a club/stick.’ The drawing (which interprets *taṅka* to mean chisel or dagger) has no club or stick, as though the second half of the verse had been considered as giving an alternative. The *yogapaṭṭāsana*, represented by a band on the ground, is probably the result of confusion.¹³⁹

The ‘muddle’, if such a word can be used for the resulting profusion of forms, is certainly in part produced by the peculiarities of the dialogue between literature (whether prescriptive or narrative) and visual images. A Sanskrit prescriptive text-passage may travel faster and further than an image, but even an appar-

¹³⁷ For the *sthaṇḍila* and its preparation, see EINO 2005:33–41.

¹³⁸ No such figure has come to light, but it seems reasonable to assume that the works DHAKY quotes from described a real practice.

¹³⁹ BÜHNEMANN (2003:42, fn. 116) remarks: ‘[a]ccording to PLSS 6.181b, the deity is seated with (and not on) the *yogapaṭṭa*’. No doubt she is correct, but 6:181 in fact describes Yogeśvara, another deity.

ently precise and detailed description may retain important ambiguities that may in turn lead to bewildering sculptural representations. Many descriptions use the term *ṭanka* to describe Caṇḍa's most distinctive implement and, since this term may refer to an axe or to a chisel and perhaps also to other instruments, we find this apparently reflected in axes in the South, certainly reflected in a chisel in the illustration of the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* (PLATE 30), and perhaps reflected in a chisel in some four-armed Nepalese figures. I add the qualifications 'apparently', 'certainly' and 'perhaps' advisedly, for, as any one who has ever tried to match Sanskrit prescriptive texts and images knows, the relations are far from simple.

Occasional perfect matches in the case of significant figures of worship are indeed to be found in various parts of the sub-continent, notably from the eleventh century onwards—remaining in the Saiddhāntika milieu, we may point to the four-armed Caṇḍeśvara of PLATES 12–13 in the South, or to the ten-armed Sadāśivas of the Bengal region shown and discussed in GOODALL et al. 2005:62–3, 138–45 and FIGS. 44–5—and they grow yet more common, at least in South India, from the twelfth century. This is in part, I believe, because we have a large body of 'South Indian Temple scriptures', to which we have referred at the beginning of this article, which catalogued what they found in many a Cōla-period temple and presented description as prescription (cf., again, the remarks of SANDERSON 2004:444–5). A concrete example may make this clear: a seated figure of Śiva known as Dakṣiṇāmūrti is the principal sculpture on the South side of the outside of the *garbhagr̥ha* of a vast number of South Indian temples, beginning with the Kailāsanātha.¹⁴⁰ Some variation is found in the implements he holds and in what is arrayed around him, but in a typical sculpture we may expect to see him teaching beneath a banyan tree, surrounded by sage-like disciples, and often with animals beneath his seat. Numerous textual 'prescriptions' can be found (see, e.g., RAO 1914, Vol. II, part II, Appendix B, pp. 137–46), but not one is to be found in an unambiguously pre-twelfth-century work. Moreover, the various textual sources that we know to be pre-twelfth-century—from identifiable quotations in twelfth-century literature, from early manuscripts, from the existence of commentaries—are silent about this figure. So what work prescribed the first representations of 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti' in the early eighth century? If we take 'prescribe' in a literal sense, then perhaps

¹⁴⁰ This article is not the place to treat in full the problematic case of Dakṣiṇāmūrti, which is much discussed in secondary literature (e.g. BAKKER 2001 and 2004) and which will be examined in a forthcoming book about Pallava-period iconography by Valérie GILLET: *La création d'une iconographie śivāite narrative : incarnations du dieu dans les temples pallava construits*.

none did.

PLATE 31. ‘Dakṣiṇāmūrti’ on the South face of the Aṭṭahāseśvara temple in Tiruttani, Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruvalluvar Dt. The back hands hold rosary and flaming torch; in the front hands we see a teaching gesture (index and thumb joined in a ring, with the other fingers extended and the palm turned to the viewer) and a palm-leaf manuscript. A banyan tree rises up behind the figure. Beneath his seat are a snake, two deer and a rat. The left ear only has a *pattra-kunḍala*; above it is the trumpet of a *dhattūra* flower. Dakṣiṇāmūrti more usually rests his left ankle on his right knee.

But once a descriptive literature had begun to grow that couched its descriptions in prescriptive terms, this may in turn have led to an increased readiness to turn to textual descriptions as the starting-points for images, thus expanding the repertoire of sculpted forms to include images that may earlier have existed only in *dhyāna*.

What I am suggesting is that some iconographies appear to have begun in artists’ or sculptors’ minds before becoming the subject of textual prescriptions, while others may have started life as visualisations (*dhyāna*) prescribed as part of private worship. To restate that in concrete terms, the iconography of such figures as Dakṣiṇāmūrti may have evolved amongst artists who were attempting to give expression to a welter of notions (about Śiva and about divinities who face South, for instance), drawn directly or indirectly from other images, from religious practice, from narrative literature or from other sources unknown. This iconography then eventually passed into prescriptive literature. Conversely, the iconography of a four-faced, four-armed Caṇḍeśvara with trident, axe, rosary and water-pot may instead have begun as a prescribed visualisation (*dhyāna*) to be used in the course of Saiddhāntika worship and then passed into the sculptural repertoire. In Nepal, it did so as a standing, ithyphallic figure, but in South India, where a tradition of showing Caṇḍeśa as seated in a certain fashion had already evolved, probably amongst sculptors and artisans, the iconography of the visualisation was blended with existing sculptural conventions for the representation of Caṇḍeśa.

PLATE 32. Caṇḍeśa to the North-East of the *liṅga* in the Gomuktīśvara temple in Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvaṭuturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

PLATE 33. Detail of Caṇḍeśa in his shrine at the Gomuktīśvara temple in Tiruvavaduthurai Adheenam (Tiruvāvaṭuturai), Mayavaram Taluk, Nagapattinam District. Notice the flower, perhaps a reference to Śiva’s *nirmālya*, used to make an unusual earring. N. RAMASWAMY drew my attention to this detail. Photo:

EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

Returning then to the early two-armed, seated Caṇḍeśas of South India, they may appear to reflect prescriptions for two-armed figures, but they may instead have been inspired from an unmappable tangle of factors: half-remembered snippets of legend, the knowledge of his association with the axe, associations that arise from the sound of his name, the appearance of ascetics with matted locks, a knowledge of his association with *nirmālya*, imitation and modification of other South-facing images, and so forth. Some of these factors appear sporadically in the corpus: his association with *nirmālya*, for instance, appears to be expressed by his wearing a flattish open-petalled flower prominently on his head which can be seen both in early images (PLATES 2[?], 5, 6, 15, 38, 39) and in later ones (27), and may in one place be expressed by an unusual flower earring (PLATES 32–3 and cf. PLATE 1). Elements that may be intended to recall Caṇḍeśa's identity with Śiva are also sporadic, such as the *pattrakunḍala* in the left ear (PLATES 19, 23, 27, 32–3), the *dhattūra* flower (PLATE 27) and the skull (PLATES 19, 21). In other details, an early variety is gradually standardised. We may note, for instance, that there is some variation in the posture of the legs (PLATES 2, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 28) before the familiar posture (with one leg resting on the platform on which he sits and the other dangling below it) is adopted as standard (PLATES 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 27, 32). The club and the axe are perhaps equally common among the earliest sculptures, but it is the axe that wins through.

Caṇḍa as watchman ?

We return now to discuss a feature of many of the earliest sculptural representations that we have not until now commented upon. In rock-cut shrines that may all be of the eighth and ninth centuries, Caṇḍeśa often appears outside the entrance of a *liṅga* shrine, paired with Vināyaka.

PLATE 34. A Triśūlapuruṣa as doorkeeper, together with Caṇḍeśa. Both are stationed to the approacher's right of the entrance to the East-facing cave No. 3 (reading from North to East) at Bhairavakona (commonly referred to in secondary literature as Bhairavakoṇḍa), Kanigiri Taluk, Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh. In East-facing Pallava or Pāṇḍya caves, we would expect the watchman on the approacher's left to be the Triśūlapuruṣa and the one on the right to be the Paraśupuruṣa, but their positions are thus reversed in all the eight principal cave-shrines at this site. Caṇḍeśa too is positioned like this in all the principal cave-shrines, in such a way that he is located to the North-East of the *liṅga* and facing a sculpture of Gajānana on the other flank. Note the channel cut into the rock that leads away whatever has been poured over the *liṅga* through the wall

of the shrine, underneath the watchman and then beneath the feet of Caṇḍeśa. Each of the cave-shrines has such a channel, strongly suggesting that, just as at Malaiyadipatti (for which see GOODALL et al. 2005:58–9), Caṇḍeśa is conceived of here as the *nirmālyadhārin* and not simply as a guardian (as was mooted in GOODALL et al. 2005:186, fn. 128).

We find such representations as far North as Bhairavakona, in Andhra Pradesh (e.g. PLATE 34), where Caṇḍeśa and Vināyaka face each other,¹⁴¹ as well as in the South, in the Pāṇḍya country, for instance at Arittappatti and at Devarmalai (PLATE 5), where Caṇḍeśa and Vināyaka face outwards towards the approaching worshipper.

PLATE 35. Caṇḍeśa to the right of the entrance to an unfinished(?) rock-cut cave at Kunnandarkoyil (Kuṇṛaṅṅārḱōvil), Pudukkottai Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. In this case there is no answering figure of Vināyaka. Photo: IFP/EFEO.

In these cases Caṇḍeśa is on the right-hand side of the caves from the perspective of an approaching worshipper. One way of looking at such images might be to consider them as watchmen guarding the shrine. And there are a few instances of another sort of figure that might arguably show Caṇḍeśa in watchman guise. Together, these two types of figure might add another function, that of doorkeeper, to Caṇḍeśa's job-description.

Before we consider these figures, let us first recall that one of the most stable distinctive features in the early iconography of the seated Caṇḍeśas is his mop of matted hair (*jaṭābhāra*); second, we may remind ourselves that among the earliest representations are those of Śiva being venerated by a Caṇḍeśa who submissively inclines his head and puts his hands together in a respectful *aṅjali* (PLATE 25); third we may recall that Pallava-period watchmen, as has been convincingly demonstrated by LOCKWOOD et al. 2001:7ff, are personified weapons of the deity of the shrine they guard. At Pallava sites Śiva's watchmen are therefore commonly a personified trident, or Triśūlapuruṣa (usually to the approaching worshipper's left), and a personified axe, or Paraśupuruṣa. Such personified weapons as watchmen are in fact widespread across South India, for they are to be found at Cālukya monuments in and around Aihole, though this seems not to have been observed to date, and also to the South of the Pallava realm.¹⁴² The various well-known Pallava watchmen that represent the axe do

¹⁴¹ Rock-cut images of Caṇḍeśvara are seen outside six of the Śaiva caves at Bhairavakona (in Kanigiri Taluk, Nellur District, Andhra Pradesh). See PATTABIRAMIN 1971, Plates XXXVII, XLII, XLV, L, LVI, LVIII.

¹⁴² Their presence in rock-cut shrines in the Pāṇḍya country was pointed out to me by Emmanuel FRANCIS and Charlotte SCHMID and we plan to produce together a more detailed demonstration of the presence of *āyudhapuruṣas* as watchmen throughout

not have Caṇḍeśa's distinctive coiffure, but there are a couple of Paraśupuruṣas from further South that are uncannily like him: firstly, they share his distinctive *jaṭābhāra* and heavy jewellery; secondly, they seem submissively devotional (and therefore relatively unmartial) compared with other watchmen; and thirdly, although they carry no weapon at all, they have the blade of an axe incorporated into their headdresses.

PLATE 36. Paraśupuruṣa to the viewer's right of the approach to the East-facing *liṅga* shrine at Kunnantarkoyil (Kuṅṅrāṅṅārkōvil), Pudukkottai Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. Out of the top of this watchman's heavy *jaṭābhāra* protrudes the top portion of the haft of an axe, with part of its blade pointing out towards the viewer. He wears heavy jewellery, not just about the neck and chest, but also earrings, bracelets and upper-arm-bands. His head is slightly inclined, in the manner of Caṇḍeśa as the archetypal devotee, towards the door of the shrine he 'guards'. If one discounts his position beside the door, his crossed arms and watchful look are all there is to suggest his function as a *dvārapālaka*.

PLATE 37. Paraśupuruṣa to the viewer's right of the Satyagiriśvara at the East-facing eighth-century(?) rock-cut shrine at Tirumayam (Tirumeyyam), Tirumayam Taluk, Pudukkottai Dt. For the left-hand watchman, a Triśūlapuruṣa, see GOODALL et al. 2005:55–6 and FIG. 24. Once again, the upper part of an axe, its blade pointing out towards the viewer, protrudes from a heavy *jaṭābhāra*. Once again, the figure wears heavy jewellery about the neck and chest, on the ears and on the lower and upper arms. This time a stomach-band (*udarabandha*) is also visible. The left-hand, hidden behind the cloth, is on the upper left thigh; the figure's right hand gestures to the shrine's opening and perhaps also registers astonishment. A fold of cloth can be seen hanging below the figure's right knee. (A modern image of Skanda as Daṇḍapāṇi stands in front.)

Some sort of mixture of ideas may have produced such a watchman figure and it seems not inconceivable that these watchmen were intended both as representations of Caṇḍeśa and at the same time as anthropomorphised representations of Śiva's axe.

But, setting apart the strange watchmen of the Pāṇḍya country that we have just discussed, there is perhaps no need to suppose that other figures of Caṇḍeśa placed outside *liṅga* shrines should really be watchmen. Their being seated, first of all, might argue against this (though admittedly their typical seated posture could be intended to express watchful vigilance, for it is the posture most commonly adopted by the guardian deities of village boundaries all over the Tamil-speaking South, such as Maturaiṅṅaṅ, Kāttavaraiyaṅ, Periyaṅṅaṅ, Lāracāmi,

Muṇīcuvaraṇ, Ayyaṇār, etc.). Furthermore, in the case of one of the best known, the one at Arittappatti, there is a separate inner pair of more conventional club-wielding *dvārapālakas* standing on either side of the entrance. As for their position outside the shrine, perhaps we should rather say that Gaṇeśa is the figure to be venerated as one enters and Caṇḍeśa, in view of his connection with *nirmālya*, is the figure whom one venerates as one departs. (Admittedly, there are, in the developed Siddhānta, contexts in which Caṇḍeśa is treated as a watchman,¹⁴³ but these are when all the eight Gaṇeśvaras are so treated and are probably not relevant.) In a small shrine, when the essential figures are reduced to just the *liṅga* and Gaṇeśa with Caṇḍeśa, then the latter pair can appear to be watchmen; but in a larger context, such as in the Kailāsanātha, these figures marking entrance and exit (PLATE 22) do not appear in such a light. The positioning of Gaṇeśa and Caṇḍeśa guarding entrance and exit may not last much beyond the period of rock-cut shrines. In constructed temples in South India they are probably not common, for, aside from in the Kailāsanātha, I am aware of only one ruined shrine where they appear, namely at Satyamangalam, in which they were probably so placed. Nothing remains there except what appears to be a late Pallava plinth, a couple of *liṅgas*, and two stone bas-relief panels showing Gaṇeśa and Caṇḍeśa (PLATE 38).

PLATE 38. Caṇḍeśvara on a stone panel beside the plinth of the ruined Śaiva temple at Satyamangalam, Senji Taluk, Villuppuram Dt. The only other figurative sculpture visible in 2003, apart from the elephant heads carved at the corners on the base of the temple (which suggest a date in the late Pallava period), was a matching panel showing Vināyaka. The character of the stone makes it difficult to be sure, but there may be a flower in front of the conical point at the top of his *jaṭābhāra*.

Other evidence, however, for Vināyaka and Caṇḍeśa being installed together with a *liṅga* is to be found at a later date in Cambodia. The following inscription from Prāḥ Phnom, K. 593, appears to record the installation of Caṇḍeśvara, Vināyaka, a *liṅga* and a set of planets in 852 *śaka* (930 AD) (*Inscriptions du Cambodge* III, pp. 119–20).¹⁴⁴

*bhaktim sthirīkartum avighnakāriṇi dvīpañcamūrtau śivasomanāmā
caṇḍīśvaram vighnapatiṅ ca liṅgam grahais saha sthāpitavān subhaktiyā*

¹⁴³ One such context is the *dvārapālapūjā* before *dīkṣā* in the *Kriyākramadyotikā* (p. 151); another is in SP4 II.106. Cf. also *Mataṅgapārameśvara, kriyāpāda* 7:6–8.

¹⁴⁴ CŒDÈS reads, conjectures and interprets the first verse somewhat differently. My alterations to the text are based upon consultation, with Professor Gerdi GERSCHHEIMER, of the estampage n. 479 of the EFEO in Paris.

*bhadraṃ vo 'stu svakaṃ puṇyaṃ bhūyād asmin valādhipaḥ
rakṣantv idaṃ mudā ye hi †candiṇaṃm ṛddhaye† sadā*

bhaktim] bhakti° CÆDÈS • °kāriṇi dvipaṅcamūrtau] conj.; °kāri dvipaṅcamūrtau conj. CÆDÈS; °kāriṇi dvipaṅcamūrto • caṅḍīśvaram] conj.; caṅḍīśvara° CÆDÈS (unmetrical)

In order to make devotion firm to the one who removes obstacles, a man named Śivasoma installed, with true devotion, a Caṅḍīśvara, a Vighnapati, a *liṅga*, together with the planets, in [the year marked by 8] forms [of Śiva], 5 and 2.

May good come to you! May the merit in this [pious act] belong to its author! May those in power (*balādhipaḥ*) at all times joyfully protect this [foundation] for the success †*candiṇaṃm*†.

Now CÆDÈS, not expecting a reference to Caṅḍeśa, has not unreasonably supposed that *candīśvara*° should be interpreted as ‘Caṅḍī and Īśvara’ (retroflex stops and the retroflex nasal are quite commonly made dental in the Cambodian corpus), but the reading he requires for this interpretation (a reading without *anusvāra*), is unmetrical.¹⁴⁵ Furthermore, SANDERSON (2004:437–8, fn. 317) has pointed out that this inscription is not the only one in the Khmer corpus that appears to refer to Caṅḍeśvara. The second case he points to is verse 26 of Face B of K. 278, an inscription of the first half of the 11th century edited by BARTH (1885:97–117). SANDERSON comments (*ibid.*)

I am unaware of any surviving Khmer image of this deity. However, the fact that he is in the company of Gaṇeśa, Nandin and Mahākāla make it unlikely that it is not Caṅḍeśvara who is intended. For these are all deities of the same class, being among the eight leaders of Śiva’s attendant demigods (*gaṇeśvarāḥ, pramathanāyakāḥ*) that are worshipped in the systems of some of the Śaiva Tantras as the deity-circuit outside the Vidyeśvaras, between the latter and the Lokapālas.

SANDERSON did not go on to quote verse 28 of the same inscription (BARTH 1885:108):

*vidhivad adhikakānte 'tiṣṭhipat padmapīṭhe śivaśubhamaṇiṅgaṃ caṅḍivighneśvarau
ca
ya upacaraṇapātraṃ yad dhalānady umendre punar adita sa eṣa śriḱṣitīndropakalpaḥ*

°tiṣṭhipat padmapīṭhe] *em.* BARTH; dhiṣṭhipat padmapīṭhe • °maṇi°] *em.* BARTH
• caṅḍi°] *em.* BARTH; candi°

BARTH translates (1885:117):

¹⁴⁵ CÆDÈS translation of the first verse is as follows (1951:120):

Pour affermir la dévotion, le nommé Çivasoma, écartant les obstacles, dans (l’année marquée par les) (8) formes (de Çiva) – cinq – deux, a pieusement érigé Caṅḍi (Umā), Īçvara (Çiva), Vighnapati (Gaṇeça), un liṅga, avec les images des planètes.

Who is Caṇḍeśa ?

Conformément aux préceptes, il a érigé sur un socle splendide (en forme) de lotus un linga de Çiva brillant de joyaux (et deux images de) Caṇḍi et de Vighneçvara, et il a donné au seigneur d'Umā une coupe de service qui (contient un vrai) fleuve de halā, lui çrī-Kṣtīndropakalpa.

Here, although we do not have other Gaṇeśvaras present (other than Vighneśvara), it seems to me likely that Caṇḍeśvara is again referred to. Two factors, in this case, suggest South Indian influence: the pairing of these two figures beside the *linga* is known to us from the Indian subcontinent only in the South, and the form Caṇḍi recalls the most frequently used Tamil form of the name, Caṇṭi (pronounced Caṇḍi).

SANDERSON refers to one other Cambodian occurrence which is of some importance to us because it belongs to the early seventh century. Although no date is recorded, it names the ruling king, whom CÆDÈS identifies (1951:143) as Īśānavarman I (616–c. 635 AD). This pre-Angkorean inscription, K. 22, records the installation of an image of Harihara in verse 4, and its fifth verse reads as follows (CÆDÈS 1951:144):

*viṣṇucandeśvareśānalingaṃ tena pratiṣṭhitam
ekabhoganivaddhāstu tatpūjety asya niścayaḥ*

He [*scil.* Īśānadatta] installed a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara and a Śivaliṅga.¹⁴⁶ This was his decision: 'Let their worship be connected by enjoyment of the same offerings'.

Now if this is indeed a reference to 'our' Caṇḍeśa, it is significant because it belongs to a period for which there is no evidence that any form of Tantric Śaivism had reached Cambodia (SANDERSON 2004:435–44). It would therefore be not simply a very early Caṇḍeśa, but also a non-Saiddhāntika one.

Caṇḍeśa and the North East

A final speculative observation about the early units consisting of *linga*, Vināyaka and Caṇḍeśa: is it conceivable that these may be the origin of Caṇḍeśa's association with the North East? If, as is often the case, the *linga* shrine faces East, then Caṇḍeśa, being placed on the right (from the perspective of the approaching worshipper), is inevitably to the North-East of the *linga*. No association with any particular direction is evident from the earliest Siddhānta-

¹⁴⁶ This is SANDERSON's proposed translation of the compound (2004:438, fn. 317). He does not enter into the details of the ruminations of BARTH and CÆDÈS (recorded in CÆDÈS 1951:145–6, fn. 5), but briefly comments that it "most probably means 'a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara and a Śivaliṅga' (cf. K. 834, v. 84 *lingam aiśānam*), as thought by CÆDÈS (*IC* III, 145)." This might seem to imply that CÆDÈS understood this to be a reference to the *nirmālya*-receiving Caṇḍa, but CÆDÈS makes clear that he analyses 'Lord of Caṇḍā'.

tantras, namely the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, the 200-verse and 350-verse recensions of the *Kālottara* (which appear not to mention Caṇḍeśa at all), in the chapters surviving from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, or in the surviving fragments of the *Paṣkara-Pārameśvaratantra*.

Of course there are other possibilities that suggest themselves. It may, for instance, be Caṇḍeśvara's position in the North East in the circuit of the Gaṇeśvaras that has led to his being placed in the North East. But this would only push the question to another level: why should he have been placed in the North-East in that circuit? Furthermore, the first attestations of the circuit of Gaṇeśvaras in literature may not predate the first appearances of Caṇḍeśa in the North East. The circuit is absent in the early sources mentioned just above, and the earliest sources in which it appears are perhaps the *Kiraṇa* 20:34ff (almost the entire passage has dropped out from the edition, but is preserved in the tenth-century Nepalese manuscript), in the 150-verse recension of the *Kālottara* (verse 128, f. 6r) and in the *Sarvajñānottara* 5:34–5.¹⁴⁷ The dates of these works are of course not known to me, but I think of them as belonging chronologically in the middle amongst surviving pre-tenth-century Siddhāntatantras.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ *Sarvajñānottara* 5:34–5:

*gaṇeśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsāditaḥ kramāt
devīm caiva tu caṇḍīsaṃ mahākālaṃ ca nandinam 5:34
gaṇādhyakṣaṃ ca bhṛṅgiṃ ca vṛṣabhaṃ skandam eva ca
dhyāyen nityam anudvignaḥ padmarāgasamaprabhān 5:35*

- 34ab gaṇeśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsāditaḥ] conj.; gaṇeśvarān caturthe tu kauce sāmāditaḥ N₁; gaṇeśvarāṃś caturthe tu kauberyāsādiśaḥ T334
- 34c devīm caiva tu caṇḍīsaṃ] em.; devī caiva tu caṇḍīsaṃ N₁; divaṃ caiva tu caṇḍeśaṃ T334
- 35b bhṛṅgiṃ ca] N₁; bhṛṅgiśaṃ T334
- 35c dhyāyen nityam anudvignaḥ] em.; dhyāyen nityam anudvigna N₁; dhyāyet sānnidhyam anudvigna T334 (unmetrical)
- °samaprabhān] conj.; °samaprabham N₁; samaprabhāt T334

In the fourth [circuit] one should calmly visualise the Gaṇeśvaras as ruby-coloured, beginning from the North in due order: the Goddess, Caṇḍīśa, Mahākāla, Nandin, Gaṇādhyakṣa [viz. Gajānana], Bhṛṅgi, the bull and Skanda.

¹⁴⁸ A sketch of my notions of the relative chronology of the pre-tenth-century Saiddhāntika canon may be useful here. (Demonstrating with evidence why I think this rough relative chronology likely must be postponed to another publication.) The very oldest Siddhāntatantras, I now suspect, are those in which there is no mention of souls' impurity (*mala*). In this group we may number the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, the 200-verse and 350-verse recensions of the *Kālottara*, and possibly the *Rauravasūtrasaṃhitā* (see GOODALL, KATAOKA, ACHARYA and YOKOCHI 2008:315); next should be placed the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, in which *mala* features, and which was certainly known to Sadyojyotiḥ in the late seventh century; then follow the 'middle-period' pre-tenth-century scriptures such as the *Kiraṇa* and *Sarvajñānottara*, which Sadyojyotiḥ may not have known; after these, I suspect, follow the more disquisitional or śāstric works, those that attempt to a greater extent to engage with non-Śaiva philosophical traditions, namely the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*,

Others have suggested or implied (see L'HERNAULT 2002:30) that it is Caṇḍeśa's being identified with Śiva (whose direction is the North East) that leads to his association with this direction, or that it is the fact that the North East is the 'end of the circumambulatory circuit' and so the most convenient place for the devotee 'to testify that he does not carry away the possessions of the god' (*ibid.*), or the fact that placing him in the North East puts him near to the spout (*gomukha*) carrying away to the North whatever libations are poured over the *liṅga* (*ibid.*). We cannot rule out the first and last of these suggestions voiced by L'HERNAULT, but we probably can exclude the second, for the notion that Caṇḍeśa looks after all temple property seems unlikely to me to be ancient.

Caṇḍeśa and Temple Property

As EDHOLM (among others) has observed (EDHOLM 1984:82) numerous Cōla-period Tamil inscriptions refer to Caṇḍeśvara as the handler of temple property and the arbitrator in all major property transactions (e.g. IPS 90, 96, 135, 136, 140). In this capacity he may be referred to as the lord's first servant *mūlabhṛtya* (e.g. IPS 96) or *ādidāsa* (e.g. SII, vol. 1, Nos. 84, 85, 89, 110, 112 and 131). The earliest of these that I have noted is IPS 90 of Tiruvilāṅkuṭi, dated to the 28th regnal year of Rājarāja I (viz. 1012–13 AD), but somewhat earlier instances no doubt exist.¹⁴⁹ This appears not to be a function alluded to elsewhere, and it may not emerge until the tenth century. It is possible that it is more ancient, but it seems likely to me that it developed because of the blurring of the categories of property and *nirmālya*. According to the passage of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* that we have seen, various categories of property—cattle, land, gold, cloth, jewellery—are clearly excluded from Caṇḍeśa's domain. But elsewhere we find all varieties of property classed in a potentially somewhat confusing six-fold categorisation of *nirmālya*. Perhaps the earliest attestation is in Bhoja's *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* (electronic edition of SANDERSON 2005*): *nirmālyabhedāḥ kathyante. devasvaṃ devadravyaṃ naivedyaṃ nivedaṃ caṇḍadravyaṃ nirmālyaṃ ceti. devasaṃbandhi grāmādi devasvaṃ. vastrālaṅkāraḍi devadravyaṃ. devārtham upakalpitaṃ naivedyam. tad evotsṛṣṭaṃ nivedam. caṇḍāya dattaṃ caṇḍadravyam. bahir niḥkṣiptaṃ nirmālyam. visarjite 'pi deve piṇḍikāsthaṃ pavitrakādyam nirmālyaṃ na bhavati. ṣaḍvidham api nirmālyaṃ na jighren na laṅghayen na dadyān na vikrīṇita. dattvā kravyādo bhavati, bhuktvā mātaṅgaḥ, laṅghane siddhihāniḥ. āghraṇād vṛkaḥ (vṛkaḥ]*

the *Parākhyā*, and the *Mṛgendra*. The early *pratiṣṭhātantras* I cannot fit into this rough map: their subject-matter is largely so different. An attempt at dating a few scriptures relative to one another on the basis of their accounts of *pratiṣṭhā* has been made by TAKASHIMA 2005.

¹⁴⁹ Professor Leslie ORR has gathered further material on this which I believe she soon intends to publish.

em. [cf. SP2, 3:64d] : *vr̥kṣaḥ* AB), *sparsanāt strītvam*, *ayathādahane caṇḍālah*, *vikraye śabaraḥ*.

The various types of *nirmālya* are explained: *devasva*, *devadravya*, *naivedya*, *niveda*, *caṇḍadravya* and *nirmālya*. [Among these,] *devasva* refers to villages and the like that belong to the god; *devadravya* refers to cloths and ornaments; *naivedya* refers to [food] that has been prepared for the sake of the god; *niveda* is the same as the above once it has been touched and left; *caṇḍadravya* is what has been given to Caṇḍa; *nirmālya* is what is thrown outside. Such things as *pavitraka*-threads that remain on the *piṇḍikā* even after the god has been invited to depart do not become *nirmālya*. One should not smell, step on, give or sell any of the six types of *nirmālya*. If one should give it, one becomes a flesh-eating demon [in one's next birth]; if one should eat it, one becomes an outcaste (*mātaṅgaḥ*); if one should step on it, one loses one's yogic powers; if one should smell it, one becomes a wolf; it one should touch it, one becomes a woman; if one burns it inappropriately, a Caṇḍāla; if one sells it, a hunter.

Nirmālya here, it seems, is a sub-category within *nirmālya*. . . Making Caṇḍeśa responsible for one category must have led to his being held responsible for the others too.

PLATE 39. An old (or perhaps just crudely fashioned) Caṇḍeśa to the North-East of the *liṅga* in the Nāgeśvara Temple at Begur, Bangalore Taluk, Bangalore Dt. For this further evidence of Caṇḍeśa's spread in Karnataka, I am grateful to N. RAMASWAMY. The headdress, which is not a *jaṭābhāra*, appears to be decorated with a large flower. Here it is the right leg which rests on the seat and the left leg that dangles down. The implement in the right hand is an axe; the left hand rests on the left thigh. As often, he wears heavy jewellery (earrings, necklaces, *yajñopavīta*, *aṅgada* and bracelets) and *udarabandha*. Photo: EFEO (G. RAVINDRAN).

Some conclusions

We have now covered so much material that it is difficult to draw together the threads. But we can start to do so by restating the question we asked at the outset: who was Caṇḍeśa originally? and who did he become?

Among the common preconceptions about Caṇḍeśa that we mentioned at the beginning, the notion that he is exclusively or even primarily a South Indian figure seems now quite exploded. But it is indeed in South India, and particularly in the Tamil-speaking South, that Caṇḍeśa's iconographic career has been most long-lived and eventful.

As for whether Caṇḍeśa is fundamentally a Saiddhāntika figure, our answer must be equivocal. ACHARYA's hypothesis that Caṇḍa was at one time and for certain groups a form of Śiva himself certainly seems possible. On the icono-

graphical side, the staff-bearing, standing ascetic shown on the Mathura pillar could, arguably, have evolved into the early seated, club wielding figures that we find in the Tamil-speaking South of India, some of which, like the figure on the Mathura pillar, have also often been mistakenly identified as images of Lakulīśa. (But, as BAKKER has suggested, these figures could be weapon-deities rather than forms of Śiva, and moreover, as EDHOLM has suggested (1998:55), if one is looking to identify a South Indian iconographic type that might be connected with Lakulīśa, a more likely candidate is the teacher ‘Dakṣiṇāmūrti’ (see PLATE 31).) Furthermore, the hypothesis that Caṇḍa was incorporated and ‘tamed’ by the Mantramārga (tantric Śaivism), where he resurfaces as the consumer of a new and higher deity’s *nirmālya* seems conceivable. But while we admit these hypotheses to be possible, they remain only hypotheses. If Caṇḍa is indeed originally Śiva for certain followers of the Atimārga, then we can of course reply that Caṇḍeśa was not originally Saiddhāntika. But it might indeed be that the Caṇḍeśa whom we associate with the consumption of *nirmālya* and with the punishment of transgressions is a figure who developed in the early Siddhānta. We have emphasised that what appears to be the earliest surviving text of the Mantramārga, namely the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, appears to predate the division of tantric Śaivism into Siddhānta, Vāma, Dakṣiṇa, etc. But it is clear nonetheless that the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* ‘became’ Saiddhāntika once that category came into existence. And we have seen that Caṇḍeśa occurs only rarely in non-Saiddhāntika tantric material. Furthermore, we have commented that none of the sculpted figures of Caṇḍeśa can be proven to predate the arrival in the South of the Śaiva Siddhānta. This means that we cannot conclusively reject the possibility that the *nirmālya*-bearing Caṇḍeśa was from the first a Saiddhāntika figure. Nevertheless, it seems to me unlikely that the many early shrines for which Caṇḍeśa was carved were from the first all Saiddhāntika. If temples in South India were really designed primarily as an iconographic expression of Saiddhāntika liturgy and thought, then we would surely expect to find a much better match. And yet, as BRUNNER observes, in an article that deserves to be better known among historians of Śaiva art,

There is no correspondence between the series of sculpted images that a temple houses and the series of Powers that are either invoked (for a finite period of time) in the course of the worship that takes place there or installed (theoretically for ever) in the course of the inaugural rites in particular parts of the building.¹⁵⁰

One of the factors that suggests a non-Saiddhāntika background is the early

¹⁵⁰ BRUNNER 1990:28: ‘Il n’existe aucune correspondance entre la série des images sculptées qu’un temple abrite et la série des Puissances qui sont, soit invoquées (pour une durée finie) lors des cultes qui y prennent place, soit “déposées” (en principe pour toujours) pendant les rites inauguraux, dans telle ou telle partie du bâtiment ou des cours.’

prominence of the club in sculpture. In our literary sources, from the very first, Caṇḍeśa is associated with the axe rather than with the club, and we have come up with no explanation of the gradual transition from the club to the axe in South Indian images. The non-Saiddhāntika South Indian aetiological legend of Vicāraśarman seems to reflect and explain it in mythological terms: as the future Caṇḍeśa grasps his staff to swipe at his father's legs, it transforms into an axe.

It therefore seems more likely to me, that the many undatable but early free-standing Caṇḍeśas that we find in South India are independent of the Śaiva Siddhānta and that Caṇḍeśa has been incorporated into the Siddhānta from an existing tradition. We may recall that for the eleventh-century Somaśambhu, Caṇḍeśvara is primarily worshipped in fixed, man-made *liṅgas*, i.e. those of temples, and not in the context of private worship by Saiddhāntika initiates. His association with the Siddhānta today might therefore be the result of the Siddhānta having gradually appropriated to itself the rôle of decreeing how temple worship should be conducted in South India.

Where then did the tradition come from? Perhaps Caṇḍeśa as *nirmālya-dhārin* was originally part of a culture of temple worship that belonged to none of the theological schools that we know of today. Perhaps a wild-haired and fierce South-facing and typically Southern archetype-deity¹⁵¹ gradually became differentiated into distinct iconographic types, such as 'Dakṣiṇāmūrti', Bhikṣāṭana, dreadlocked door-guardian, and Caṇḍeśa, and the last of these became associated with the receiving of *nirmālya*? Perhaps another Pāśupata cult, rather than the Śaiva Siddhānta, had the strategy of taming the chief deity of a rival school to become a *nirmālya* deity who was then simply adopted into the Mantramārga? Another possibility is that no such 'taming' of a rival group's deity occurred at all: food offerings to the *liṅga* became invested with terrible power and had therefore to be consumed by an especially fierce form of Śiva himself, who was represented with an inherited Pāśupata iconography,¹⁵² or by a fierce *gaṇa*, or by a weapon-deity.

PLATE 40. Archaic axe-wielding Caṇḍeśa to the North-East of the *liṅga* but inside the *ardhamanḍapa* in the Mūlanātha temple in Bahur, Pondicherry. The axe blade here points inwards. Photo: N. RAMASWAMY

I close with a couple of observations about why Caṇḍeśa should have had a flour-

¹⁵¹ For the link between wild hair and wildness, which Dr. Charlotte SCHMID has pointed out to me, see description of PLATE 25.

¹⁵² Less likely, perhaps, is that early figures represented Pāśupata ascetics, for wearing the *nirmālya* was one of the distinctive practices of Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas in their *vyaktaliṅga* stage (*Pāśupatasūtra* 1:5). When they were absent, some sculptural representation might have been supplied to fill their place.

ishing career in South Indian sculpture and not elsewhere. Part of the answer to this riddle is that we can assume, from Cambodian inscriptions and from the Western Indian manuals that DHAKY has brought to light, that in fact Caṇḍeśa was indeed represented elsewhere, and we must suppose that such representations have either been destroyed or have not been recognised because their iconographies were so different. The startlingly different Nepalese icons make this point palpably. Furthermore, I should emphasise that areas other than the Tamil-speaking South and Nepal have received scant attention in this article because of the limitations of my knowledge about them: other sorts of images of Caṇḍeśa may well come to light.¹⁵³ But it seems almost certain that his flourishing in the South was in part a consequence of the popularity of the aetiological legend known to Tamil sources of the transformation of the shepherd Vicāraśarman into the *nirmālya*-receiving Caṇḍeśa, the first servant of the Lord and the archetype of the Māheśvara devotee.

¹⁵³ Both Valérie GILLET and Peter BISSCHOP have independently suggested to me a possible Caṇḍeśa at the ruined late Gupta Śaiva temple in Nāchnā in Madhya Pradesh: see WILLIAMS 1983:105–14 and particularly PLATE 163. Amongst these miscellaneous fragments of sculpted stone, the one in the right of the photograph shows a seated figure with the legs crossed at the ankles, wearing a crown, but also matted locks falling to the side of the head, a band-like necklace, heavy earrings and strap-like sacred thread. I cannot interpret the lower garments and the figure's right hand is broken off, but the left hand holds up an axe.

WORKS CONSULTED

Abbreviations

- ARIE *Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy*
EFEO Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient
EI *Epigraphia Indica*
GOML Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras
IFI Institut Français d'Indologie (name of IFP used in old publications)
IFP Institut Français de Pondichéry/French Institute of Pondicherry
IPS Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State (see s.v. Pudukkottai below)
KSTS Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
NAK National Archives of Kathmandu
NGMPP Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project
SII *South Indian Inscriptions*
SP *Somaśambhupaddhati*
SP1, SP2, etc. *Somaśambhupaddhati* volume 1, volume 2, etc.
T Transcript
TAK 1, TAK 2 *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa* volume 1, volume 2.

Manuscripts

- KĀLOTTARATANTRA in 150 verses. Paper Nepalese manuscript. National Archives, Kathmandu, MS 5-4632. NGMPP Reel No. B 118/7
KIRAṆATANTRA. Palm-leaf manuscript in 'Licchavi' script dated to 924 AD. National Archives, Kathmandu, MS 5-893. NGMPP Reel No. A 40/3.
JÑĀNARATNĀVALĪ of Jñānaśiva. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, MS P 3801 (=M¹). Palm-leaf, Nandināgarī. Also GOML MS R 14898 (=M₂) and its apograph IFP MS T. 231, as well as pp. 13–60 of IFP MS T. 106 (the latter giving the text of what is probably a manual based upon the JÑĀNARATNĀVALĪ, for see GOODALL 2000:209, fn. 11), all paper transcripts in Devanāgarī.
TANTRASADBHĀVA Electronic edition of Mark DYCZKOWSKI based on NGMPP Reel Nos. A 188/22, A 44/1, and A 44/2.
DVIŚATIKĀLOTTARA NAK 5-4632. NGMPP Reel No. B 118/7. Paper, Nāgarī script. The verse and chapter numeration used in our annotation is that of Mei YANG's edition in progress.
NĪSVĀSATATTVASAMHITĀ NAK MS 1–227, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/14. Palm-leaf, early Nepalese 'Licchavi' script. Described by Hara Prasād Śāstri (1905:lxxvii and 137–140). There are two apographs, both in Devanāgarī and on paper: NAK MS 5-2401, NGMPP Reel No. A 159/18, and Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, London, Sanskrit MS I.33. The verse and chapter numeration used in our annotation is that of GOODALL's edition in progress. Diwakar ACHARYA, Peter BISSCHOP and Nirajan KAFLE helped GOODALL to produce the first complete transcription.
[PAUṢKARA]-PĀRAMEŚVARA Cambridge University Library MS Add. 1049 (*codex unicus*). Palm-leaf, early Nepalese 'Licchavi' script. Described by BENDALL (1883:27–8).
PRĀYAŚCITTASAMUCCAYA of Hṛdayaśiva. Cambridge University Library MS Add. 2833. Palm-leaf, early Newari script. Copied in Bhaktapur in the reign of Ānandadeva and dated 1157/8 AD (*saṃvat* 278). Described by Bendall (1888:550–1). Cited from preliminary transcription of R. SATHYANARAYANAN.
BRĤATKĀLOTTARA NAK MS *pra* 89. NGMPP B 24/59. Palm-leaf, hooked Newari. NAK MS *pam* 779. NGMPP B 25/2. Palm-leaf, Nāgarī with *pr̥sthāmātra* vowel-notation.
BHĀVACŪḌĀMAṆĪ Described by Stein (1894) as MS No. 5291 of the Shri Raghunath Temple MSS Library in Jammu (now in the collection of the Shri Ranbir Sanskrit Re-

- search Institute in Jammu). Paper, Kashmirian Nāgarī (*codex unicus*). (A commentary on the MAYASAṄGRAHA by Rāmakaṇṭha II's only known pupil, Vidyakaṇṭha II.)
- MAYASAṄGRAHA. NAK MS 1–1537, NGMPP Reel No. A 31/18 (*codex unicus*). Palm-leaf, Newari script.
- MOHACŪDOTTARA. NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP Reel No. A 182/2. Paper, Devanāgarī.
- ŚIVADHARMAŚAṄGRAHA. Cambridge MS Add. 1645 and Add. 1694. Palm-leaf, twelfth-century Newari script. (An edition, based on several manuscripts, is being prepared by Anil Kumar ACHARYA.)
Also IFP T. 32 and 510, paper transcripts in Devanāgarī.
- SARVAJÑANOTTARATANTRA NAK MS 1–1692. NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12. Palm-leaf, early Nepalese 'Licchavi' script. Described by Śāstri (1905:lxix–lxxv and 85–6). Also GOML MS D 5550 and IFP T. Nos. 334, 760, paper transcripts in Devanāgarī. The verse and chapter numeration used in our annotation is that of GOODALL's edition in progress.
- SIDDHĀNTASĀRAPADDHATI of Bhoja. See SANDERSON 2005*.

Printed Sources

- AJITAMAHĀTANTRA. *Ajitamahātantram. The Great Tantra of Ajita*, ed. N. R. Bhatt, Jean Filliozat, Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts & Motilal Banarsidass, 2005.
- ĪŚĀNAŚIVAGURUDEVAPADDHATI of Īśānaśivagurudeva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, 4 Vols. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1990. (Reprinted, but with a substantial new introduction dated to 1987 by N. P. UNNI, from Trivandrum Sanskrit Series Nos. 69, 72, 77 and 83, Trivandrum, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1925.)
- KARMAKĀṆḌAKRAMĀVALĪ of Somaśambhu. *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo. KSTS 73. Srinagar, 1947.
See also SOMAŚAMBHUPADDHATI and BRUNNER 1963, 1968, 1977.
- KĀMIKĀGAMA, PŪRVABHĀGA and UTTARABHĀGA. No editor accredited. Published by C. Swaminatha Gurukkal. Madras: South Indian Archaka Association, 1975 and 1988.
- KIRANATANTRA, ed. Ti. Rā. Pañcāpagesaśivācārya and K. M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrī. Śivāgamasiddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha Vol. No. 16. (=E_o) Devakōṭṭai, 1932.
———. See also GOODALL 1998.
- KRIYĀKRAMADYOTIKĀ of Aghoraśivācārya with the commentary (PRABHĀVYĀKHYĀ) of Nirmalamaṇi, ed. Rāmaśāstrin and Ambalavānājñānasambandhaparāśakti-svāmin. Chidambaram, 1927.
- TĒVĀRAM. *Tēvāram. Hymnes sivaïtes du pays tamoul, édition établie par T. V. Gopal Iyer sous la direction de François Gros, volume I Nānacampantar*. Publications de l'Institut français d'Indologie 68.1. Pondicherry: IFI, 1984.
Tēvāram. Hymnes sivaïtes du pays tamoul, édition établie par T. V. Gopal Iyer sous la direction de François Gros, volume II Appar et Cuntarar. Publications de l'Institut français d'Indologie 68.2. Pondicherry: IFI, 1985.
Digital Tēvāram, ed. Jean-Luc Chevillard and S. A. S. Sarma. Pondicherry: IFP, EFEO and CNRS, 2007.
- TRISAMAYARĀJASĀDHANA of Kumudākaramati. See s.v. SĀDHANAMĀLĀ.
- NĀRADAPURĀṆA. *khemarāja śrī kṛṣṇadāseṇa sampādītasya mumbāī śrī veṃkateśvara-sīm mudraṇālayena prakāśītasya punarmudraṇam śrīnārādīyamahāpurāṇam. The Nārādīyamahāpurāṇam. dehalīsthena pro. ḍā. cārudevaśāstriṇā praṇīṭayā bhūmikayā sanāthitam nāgaśaraṇasimha sampādītaslokānukramaṇyā sahitam*, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1984.
- PAÑCĀVARAṆASTAVA of Aghoraśiva. *The Pañcāvaraṇastava of Aghoraśivācārya: A*

- twelfth-century South Indian prescription for the visualisation of Sadāśiva and his retinue. An annotated critical edition by: Dominic Goodall, Nibedita Rout, R. Sathyanarayanan, S. A. S. Sarma, T. Ganesan, S. Sambandhaśivācārya. Collection Indologie 102. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO, 2004 (appeared 2005).*
- PARĀKHYATANTRA. *The Parākhyatantra, a scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation, ed. and trans. Dominic GOODALL. Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO, 2004.*
- PERIYAPURĀNAM of Cēkkillār. *Cēkkillār cuvāmikaḷ eṇṇum aruṇmolit tēvar aruḷiya periyapurānam eṇṇum tiruttonḍar purānam (paṭaṅkaḷuṭaṅ) (iraṅṭām pakuti) ilamalinta carukkam – mummaiṅṅal ulakāṇḍa carukkam, ed., with commentary, by C. K. Cuppiramaṇiya Mutaliyār. Cēkkillār nilaiya veḷiyiṭu No. 12. Coimbatore (Kōyamputtūr): Cēkkillār Nilaiyam, 2001 (3rd edition).*
- PRATIṢṬHĀLAKṢAṆASĀRASAMUCCAYA, ed. Dāmodaraśarman and Bābukṛṣṇaśarman. Kathmandu: Nepāla Rājakīya Pustakālaya, 1966 and 1968 (Vikram Saṃvat 2023 and 2025).
A volume of line-drawings accompanies the edition: *Nepālarājakīya- vīra-pustakālayastha-pustakānām anyatamaḥ pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccayaḥ tasyaitasya devatācītrasaṅgrahātmakaḥ prathamō bhāgaḥ, ed. Bābukṛṣṇaśarman. Purātatva prakāśan mālā 10. Kathmandu: Vīrapustakālaya, 1962.*
See also BÜHNEMANN 2003.
- PRAYOGAMAÑJARĪ of Ravi, ed. Si. Ke. Rāman Nampiyār with Ke. Acyutappotuvāṭ. Tripunithura: Sanskrit College, 1953–4.
- MATAṅGAPĀRAMEŚVARĀGAMA, KRIYĀPĀDA, CARYĀPĀDA and YOGAPĀDA, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha up to KRIYĀPĀDA 11:12b. *Matāṅga-pārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI No. 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.*
- MṚGENDRATANTRA *Mrgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṅakaṅṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI No. 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.*
- RAURAVĀGAMA, ed. N. R. Bhatt. 3 Vols. Publications de l'IFI No. 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961, 1972 and 1988.
- ŚIKṢĀSAMUCCAYA of Śāntideva. *Çikshāsamuccaya: a compendium of Buddhistic teaching compiled by Çāntideva chiefly from earlier Mahayana-sūtras, ed. Cecil Bendall. Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. I. St. Pétersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1897–1902.*
- ŚIVADHARMA. *Paśupatiṃmatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam, ed. Yogi Naraharinātha. Kathmandu, 1998 (saṃvat 2055).*
See also, among unpublished texts above, ŚIVADHARMASĀNGRAHA.
- ŚIVOPANIṢAT. Printed on pp. 324–78 of *Un-published Upanishads. Edited by The Pandits of Adyar Library under the Supervision of Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Madras: Adyar, 1933.*
See also ŚIVADHARMA.
- ŚAIVABHŪṢAṆA of Pañcākṣarayogin. *kāñcīpuram śrīpañcākṣarayogikaḷ aruḷic ceyta caivapūṣaṇam kranta marṛum nākara molī mūlam-um tamīḷ viyākkīyaṅam-um, Chennai: Śrī Aghoraśivācārya Trust, 2005.*
- SĀDHANAMĀLĀ. SĀDHANAMĀLĀ VOL. I, ed. Benoytosh Bhattacharya. Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 26. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1968 (First Edition 1925).
- SĀRDHATRISĀTIKĀLOTTARA. *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṅṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI No. 61. Pondicherry: IFP, 1979.*
- SIDDHĀNTAŚEKHARA of Viśvanātha. *ubhayavedānti viśvanāthakṛtaḥ siddhānta-śekharaḥ, ed. Ke. Sītārāma Somayājīn (pradhānasampādakāḥ) with the assistance*

- of Talakāḍu Āgamika Kṛṣṇadīkṣita (*sahasampādakāḥ*). Śrīmanonmanīgrantha-mālā 20. Mysore, 1971.
- SUPRABHEDĀGAMA, printed by Mayilai-Ālakappa Mudaliyār (no editor accredited). Madras (Cintātiripēṭṭai): Civaṇānapotayantracālai, 1908 (Kaliyuga 5009).
- SOMASĀMBHUPADDHATI, ed. K. M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin. Devakōṭṭai: Śivāgama-siddhāntaparipālanasaṅgha, 1931.
- See also BRUNNER 1963, 1968, 1977 and KARMAKĀṆḌAKRAMĀVALĪ.
- SKANDAPURĀṆASYA AMBIKĀKHAṆḌA, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasād Bhaṭṭarāi. Kathmandu, 1988.
- SVACCHANDATANTRA with the commentary (-UDDYOTA) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja. *The Svachchanda-Tantra with commentary by Kshema Rāja* ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, and 56. Bombay 1921–35.
- SVĀYAMBHUVASŪTRASANĠRAHA, ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.

Translations and studies

- ACHARYA, Diwakar, 2005. ‘The Role of Caṇḍa in the Early History of the Pāsupata Cult and the image on the Mathurā Pillar dated Gupta year 61’, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 48 (2005), pp. 207–22.
- ANNUAL REPORTS ON INDIAN EPIGRAPHY (1939–1944). New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1986 (reprint).
- BAKKER, Hans, 2001. ‘Dakṣiṇāmūrti’, *Vidyārṇavavandanam. Essays in Honour of Asko Parpola*, ed. Klaus Karttunen & Petteri Koskikallio, Studia Orientalia Published by the Finnish Oriental Society 94, Helsinki, pp. 41–53.
- BAKKER, Hans, 2004. ‘At the Right Side of the Teacher: Imagination, Imagery, and Image in Vedic and Śaiva Initiation’, *Images in Asian Religions: texts and contexts*, ed. Phyllis Granoff & Koichi Shinohara, Toronto: UBC Press, pp. 117–48.
- BARTH, Auguste, 1885. *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge*. Notices et extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques, faisant suite aux notices et extrait lus au comité établi dans l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome vingt-septième (1^{re} partie) 1^{er} fascicule. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- BENDALL, Cecil, 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BENDALL, Cecil, 1888. ‘Notes on a collection of MSS. obtained by Dr. Gimlette, of the Bengal Medical Service, at Kathmandu, and now deposited in the Cambridge University Library, and in the British Museum.’ in *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Vol. 20, pp. 549–54.
- BHANDARKAR, D. R., 1931. ‘Mathura Pillar Inscription of Chandragupta II: G.E. 61’, *Epigraphia Indica* XXI, pp. 1–9.
- BHATT, N. R., FILLIOZAT, Jean, and FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, 2005. See AJITAMAHĀ-TANTRA.
- BISSCHOP, Peter C., 2006. *Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa. Sects and Centres*. Groningen Oriental Series XXI. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BRUNNER, Héléne, ed. and trans. 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 4 vols: *Première Partie. Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l’Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu*; *Deuxième Partie. Rituel Occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l’Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I : Pavitrārohana, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta*; and *Troisième Partie. Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l’Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II : dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha*; and *Rituels dans la tradition śivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie : rituels optionnels : pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l’IFI No. 25. Pondicherry: IFI.
- See also KARMAKĀṆḌAKRAMĀVALĪ and SOMASĀMBHUPADDHATI.
- BRUNNER, Héléne, 1969. ‘De la consommation du *nirmālya* de Śiva’, *Journal Asiatique* CCLVII (1969), pp. 213–63.

- BRUNNER, Hélène, 1990. 'L'image divine dans le culte āgamique de Śiva. Rapport entre l'image mentale et le support du culte' in *L'image divine. Culte et méditation dans l'hindouisme*, ed. André Padoux. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, pp. 9–29.
- BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun (compiler), 2003. *The Hindu Pantheon in Nepalese Line Drawings. Two Manuscripts of the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*. Varanasi: Indica Books.
- CHEVILLARD, Jean-Luc, and SARMA S. A. S., 2007: see s.v. *Tēvāram*.
- CEDÈS, Georges 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 volumes. Paris: EFEO, 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).
- DAVIS, Richard H., 2002. 'Chola Bronzes in Procession', *The Sensuous and the Sacred. Chola Bronzes from South India* (Vidya Dehejia, with essays by Richard H. Davis, R. Nagaswamy, and Karen Pechilis Prentiss), pp. 45–63, New York: American Federation of Arts, in association with Ahmedabad: Mapin Publishing.
- DHAKY, M. A., 1970. 'Caṇḍeśa in North Indian Tradition', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 12 (1970), pp. 103–9.
- AF EDHOLM, Erik, 1984. 'Caṇḍa and the Sacrificial Remnants. A contribution to Indian Gastrotheology', *Indologica Taurinensia* XII (1984), pp. 75–91.
- AF EDHOLM, Erik, 1998. "The "Lakuliśa" of Aritṭāpaṭṭi" in "Being Religious and Living through the Eyes". *Studies in Religious Iconography and Iconology. A Celebratory Publication in Honour of Professor Jan Bergman. Faculty of Theology, Uppsala University, Published on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, June 2, 1998*, ed. Peter Schalk, co-ed. Michael Stausberg. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 14. Uppsala.
- EINOO, Shingo, 2005. 'The Formation of Hindu Ritual', *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*, ed. Shingo Einoo and Jun Takashima. Japanese Studies on South Asia No. 4. New Delhi: Manohar, pp. 7–49.
- FILLIOZAT, Jean, BHATT, N. R., and FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain, 2005. See AJITAMAHĀ-TANTRA.
- FILLIOZAT, Vasundhara, 2001. *Kālāmukha and Pāśupata Temples in Dharwar*, Chennai: The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute.
- FRANCIS, Emmanuel, GILLET, Valérie, SCHMID, Charlotte, 2005 (appeared 2007). 'L'eau et le feu : chronique des études *pallava*', BEFEO 92 (2005), pp. 581–611.
- FULLER, C. J., 1984. *Servants of the Goddess. The Priests of a South Indian Temple*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GILLET, Valérie, 2005. See FRANCIS, Emmanuel, GILLET, Valérie, SCHMID, Charlotte, 2005.
- GILLET, Valérie, 2007. 'Entre démon et dévot: la figure de Rāvaṇa dans les représentations *pallava*', *Arts Asiatiques* 62 (2007), pp. 29–45.
- GOODALL, Dominic, ed. and trans. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*, Publications du département d'indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/ Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.
- GOODALL, Dominic, 2000. 'Problems of Name and Lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta' [a review article of BRUNNER 1998] in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, Vol. 10, Part 2, pp. 205–16.
- GOODALL, Dominic, 2004. See PARĀKHYATANTRA.
- GOODALL, Dominic et al. 2005. See PAÑCĀVARAṆASTAVA.
- GOODALL, Dominic & ISAACSON, Harunaga, 2007. 'Workshop on the Nisvāsātattva-saṃhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra', *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 3 (2007), pp. 4–6.
- GOODALL, Dominic, KATAOKA, Kei, ACHARYA, Diwakar & YOKOCHI, Yuko, 2008. 'A

- First Edition and Translation of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇayavīrti*, A Treatise on Śiva, Souls and *Māyā*, with Detailed Treatment of *Mala'*, *South Asian Classical Studies* 3 (2008), pp. 311–384.
- GOUDRIAAN, Teun & GUPTA, Sanjukta, 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature. History of Indian Literature* 2.2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GRANOFF, Phyllis, 2006. 'Śiva and his Gaṇas: Techniques of Narrative Distancing in Purāṇic Stories', in *Voice of the Orient (A Tribute to Prof. Upendranath Dhal)*, ed. Raghunath Panda and Madhusudan Mishra. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, pp. 77–103.
- GUPTA, Sanjukta, 1976. 'Viṣvaksena the divine protector', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 20 (1976), pp. 75–89.
- HARLE, James C., 1963. *Temple Gateways in South India. The Architecture and Iconography of the Cidambaram Gopuras*. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer. (Reprinted in 1995 from Delhi by Munshiram Manoharlal.)
- HAZRA, R. C., 1953a. 'The Śiva-Dharma', *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 10 (1952–3), pp. 1–20.
- HAZRA, R. C., 1953b. 'The Śiva-Dharmottara', *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 13 (1952–3), pp. 19–50.
- ISAACSON, Harunaga, 2007. See GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007.
- KALIDOS, Raju, 1988. 'The Malaiyadiṣṭi Cave Temples', *South Asian Studies* IV (1988), pp. 57–69.
- L'HERNAULT, Françoise, 1987 (avec des collaborations de P.R. SRINIVASAN et de Jacques DUMARÇAY). 2 volumes. *Darasuram. Epigraphical Study, Étude architecturale, Étude iconographique*. Publications de l'EFEO, Mémoires Archéologiques XVI. Paris: EFEO.
- L'HERNAULT, Françoise, PICHARD, Pierre, and DELOCHE Jean, 1990. *Tiruvannamalai. Un lieu saint śivaïte du sud de l'Inde. 2. L'archéologie du site*. Publications de l'EFEO 156.2. Paris: EFEO.
- L'HERNAULT, Françoise and REINICHE, Marie-Louise, with a supplement by BRUNNER, Hélène, 1999. *Tiruvannamalai. Un lieu saint śivaïte du Sud de l'Inde. 3. Rites et fêtes. Supplément : Le Parārthanityapūjāvidhi. Règle pour le culte quotidien dans un temple*. Publications de l'EFEO 156.3. Paris: EFEO.
- L'HERNAULT, Françoise, 2002 (ed. Lalit M. GUJRAL). *The Iconography of the Bṛhadīśvara Temple*. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, Aryan Books International.
- HUNTINGTON, John and Susan. 'Huntington Archive of Buddhist and Related Art': <http://huntington.wmc.ohio-state.edu/public/index.cfm>
- KANNAN, R., 2003. *Manual on the Bronzes in the Government Museum, Chennai. A Typological and Descriptive account of the Bronzes displayed in the re-organised Bronze Gallery*. New Series – General Section, Vol. XVII, No. 2. Chennai: Government Museum.
- KRISHNA MURTHY, C., 1985. *Saiva Art and Architecture in South India*. Delhi: Sundep Prakashan.
- LADRECH, Karine, 2002. 'Bhairava à la massue', in *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 20.1 (2002), pp. 163–92.
- LADRECH, Karine, ed. 2007. *Darasuram Architecture & Iconography. In Homage to Françoise L'Hernault*, Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO (CD-ROM).
- LAKSMI NARASIMHAN, K. K. C., 2007. *A Study of Vaikhānasa Iconography*. Anantacharya Indological Research Institute Series No. XXVII. Mumbai: Anantacharya Indological Research Institute.
- LINROTHE, Robert N., 1999. *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*, London: Serindia Publications.
- LOCKWOOD, Michael, with A. Vishnu BHAT, Gift SIROMONEY, P. DAYANANDAN, 2001.

- Pallava Art*. Madras: Tambaram Research Associates.
- DE MALLMANN, Marie-Thérèse, 1963. *Les enseignements iconographiques de l'Agni-purana*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes — Tome 67. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- NAGASWAMY, R., 1983. *Masterpieces of Early South Indian Bronzes*, New Delhi: National Museum.
- NAGASWAMY, R., 1989. *Śiva Bhakti*. New Delhi: Navrang.
- NAGASWAMY, R., 2003. *Facets of South Indian Art and Architecture*. 2 volumes. New Delhi: Aryan Books International.
- NAGASWAMY, R., 2006. *Timeless Delight: South Indian Bronzes in the Collection of the Sarabhai Foundation*. *Utsavamūrtināṃ rasāsvādanā*, Ahmedabad: Sarabhai Foundation.
- NARASIMHACHAR, R., 1917 (reprint of 1977). *The Kesava Temple at Somanathapur*. Karnataka Archaeological Series No. 1. Mysore: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums in Karnataka.
- PARANAN, S., 2006. *Tirunāvanalūr*. Chennai: Tamilnāṭu aracu tolliyal turai.
- PATTABIRAMIN, P. Z., 1971. *Sanctuaires rupestres de l'Inde du Sud, I. Āndhra*. Publications de l'IFI No. 42,1. Pondicherry: IFI.
- PATTABIRAMIN, P. Z., 1975. *Sanctuaires rupestres de l'Inde du Sud, II. Tamilnāḍu et Kerala*. Publications de l'IFI No. 42,2. Pondicherry: IFI.
- PICHARD, Pierre, L'HERNAULT, Françoise, BOUDIGNON, Françoise, & THYAGARAJAN, L., 1994. *Vingt ans après Tanjavur, Gangaikondacholapuram*. Mémoires archéologiques 20. Paris: Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.
- PUDUKKOTTAI. *Inscriptions (Texts) of the Pudukkottai State Arranged according to Dynasties*. No editor accredited. Pudukkottai, 1929. (Reprinted by the Commissioner of Museums, Government of Tamil Nadu, 2002.)
- RAGHAVAN, V., 1956. 'Tiruvorriyur Inscription of Chaturanana Pandita : 20th year of Krishna III', in *Epigraphia Indica Vol. XXVII, 1947-48* (1956), ed. B. Ch. Chhabra and N. Lakshminarayan Rao. (1985 reprint of Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi).
- RAO, T. A. Gopinath, 1914 (reprint of 1997 consulted). *Elements of Hindu Iconography*. 2 volumes, each in 2 parts. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass: 1997.
- RICE, B. Lewis. 1903. *Epigraphia Carnatica IX. Inscriptions in the Chitaldroog District*, Bangalore: Mysore Government Press.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2004. 'The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers (Part I)', *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient* 90-91 (2003-2004), pp. 349-462.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2005. 'Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 (2005), pp. 229-300.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2005*. Unpublished e-text of Bhoja's *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, based upon two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts: NAK 1-1363, NGMPP B 28/29, completed in Samvat 197 (1077/8 AD) and NAK 5-743, NGMPP B 28/19, completed Samvat 231 [ā la 1] (1111/2 AD).
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2006a. 'The Date of Sadyojyotis and Br̥haspati', *Cracow Indological Studies* VIII (2006), pp. 39-91.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2006b. 'The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism', *Indian Philosophical Annual* 24 (2003-2005), pp. 143-217.
- SANDERSON, Alexis, 2007. 'Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The Āngirasakalpa Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālikula, with critical editions of the *Parājapavidhi*, the *Parāmantravidhi*, and the **Bhadrakālī-mantravidhiprakarana*', *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen. Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien,

- 11, *Indologica Halensis*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, pp. 195–311.
- SARMA, S. A. S., and CHEVILLARD, Jean-Luc, 2007: see s.v. *Tēvāram*.
- SCHMID, Charlotte, 2005 (appeared 2007). 'Au seuil du monde divin : reflets et passages du dieu d'Ālanturāi à Puḷḷamaṅkai', BEFEO 92 (2005), pp. 39–157.
- See also FRANCIS, Emmanuel, GILLET, Valérie, SCHMID, Charlotte, 2005.
- SLUSSER, Mary Shepherd, 1982. *Nepal Mandala. A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press (reprinted in 1998 by Mandala Book Point, Kathmandu).
- SMITH, David, 1996. *The Dance of Śiva. Religion, art and poetry in South India*. Cambridge studies in religious traditions 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SOUTH INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS. *South-Indian Inscriptions, Tamil and Sanskrit, from stone and copper-plate edicts at Mamallapuram, Kanchipuram, in the North Arcot District, and other parts of the Madras Presidency, chiefly collected in 1886–87. Volume I*, ed. and trans. E. HULTZSCH. Madras, 1890. Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1991 (reprint of 1890).
- SOUTH INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS. *South Indian Inscriptions Volume XIV The Pāndyas*, ed. A. S. RAMANATHA AYYAR. Mysore: Archaeological Survey of India, 1986 (reprint of 1962).
- SRINIVASAN, K. R., 1975. *The Dharmarāja Ratha and its Sculptures. Mahābalipuram*, Delhi: Abhinav Publications.
- STEIN, M. A., 1894. *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunātha Temple Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir*. Bombay.
- TAKASHIMA, Jun, 2005. 'Pratiṣṭhā in the Śaiva Āgamas', *From Material to Deity. Indian Rituals of Consecration*, ed. Shingo Einoo and Jun Takashima. Japanese Studies on South Asia No. 4. New Delhi: Manohar, pp. 115–42.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA I 2000. *Tāntrikābhidhānaśośa I. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren. sous la direction de H. Brunner, G. Oberhammer et A. Padoux*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 681. Band. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 35. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA II 2004. *Tāntrikābhidhānaśośa II. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren. sous la direction de H. Brunner, G. Oberhammer et A. Padoux*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 714. Band. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 44. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TRIPATHI, Gaya Charan, 2004. *Communication with God. The Daily Pūjā Ceremony in the Jagannātha Temple*, New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts & Aryan Books International.
- WILLIAMS, Joanna Gottfried, 1982. *The Art of Gupta India. Empire and Province*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- YOUNGER, Paul, 1995. *The Home of Dancing Śivaṅ. The Traditions of the Hindu Temple in Citamparam*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.