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ERRATA

Page iii (Messages) L. 18 Read identify

8 L. 25 Read persuasion

30 Last line—Read full breasts; omit some

31 L. 31 Read sādhaka

45 L. 3 Insert Reference No. 8 after maṇḍapam

50 L. 28 Read Ādipurīśvara

54 L. 14 Read tānattār

59 Ll. 7–9 The sentence should read: In its earliest application, Kāmakōṭṭam referred to independent shrines such as those of Durgā at Kāñchī, and of the Yakshi at Sāttamaṅgalam.

[The reader's forbearance is requested in regard to these errors and others, if any, that may have escaped the proof reader]

A paper entitled *Tirukkāmakōṭṭam* read by Mr. K. R. Srinivasan of the Government of India Archaeological Survey, at the All-India Oriental Conference, Nagpur Session (1946), sets a new direction to the study of the evolution of South Indian temples. His conclusion, which has since been accepted by scholars, is that the construction of shrines to Dēvi (Amman) represented as the divine consort to the principal deity, started late in the 11th century and has continued right up to our own times. The Amman shrine is referred to in the inscriptions as Tirukkāmakōṭṭam.

Again, in his Sankara-Parvati Endowment lectures, Mr. Srinivasan points out, among other things, that Kamākshi in Kāñchi "was worshipped as a form of Durgā", and "the Ādi-pīṭha Paramēśvarī temple in the vicinity of the modern temple of Kamākshi ....was perhaps the original site where the Sakti pīṭha was installed, after the reformation of the worship by Saṅkara".

This book, which is an elaboration of these conclusions, sets forth in proper historical perspective, documents, literary and epigraphic, which throw light on the history of the two temples of Kamākshi in Kāñchi, one older in time but now shrunk into comparative obscurity, and the other of a later age,
grown into All-India importance, both of which rose over the debris of centuries—old Jain and Buddhist institutions.

The evolution of a large temple-complex in South India is the resultant of several factors. Dynastic changes were reflected in its reshaping and enlargement in conformity with the political power and military might of the kings and their great achievements, and the affluence of merchant and trade guilds coupled with the cultural maturity of the age and the artistic and architectural norms which it established. The interaction of religious movements led to complexities in ritual worship, to the multiplication of āgamas and other treatises on rituals, and to the considerable additions to the pantheon, evidenced in the set-up of the parivāra deities.

This book indicates the impact of three main movements of Śaivism, which have relevance to the two Kāmākṣī temples in Kāñchi. The earliest was the Lakulīśa (Pāṣupata, Kālāmukha etc.) cult. Then came the Lakṣādhya yi-Gōlaki movements which established monastic centres, the heads of which wielded enormous influence in the royal courts, which they used to bring about radical changes in the organisation of temple rituals. The āchāryas of the Gōlaki santānams, adopted Vedic rites of worship and claimed that their teachings contained 'the essence of the Vēdas, Purāṇas, Samhitās and Āgamas'. The reforms they brought about completed Śaṅkara's work of modifying the extreme forms of Kālāmukha
worship. Even today there are Śivāchāryas of the Gōlaki santānam. The Śākta section of this santānam was strengthened by the migration to Kāṅchi of several families from the banks of the Narmadā; an important section of them, who came to be known as Kāmakōṭṭiyar, attached themselves to the present Kāmakshī temple and served as archakas and tānattār, adopting a special kalpa of Śrīvidyā. All this illustrate but one phase in the growth of a complexity of monasticism on the one hand and ritualism on the other of the Śaiva, Vaishṇava and Advaita persuasions in the socio-religious history of South India from about the 13-14th century. Here is a fascinating field of study for scholars to pursue.

Correspondingly, on the popular side, there grew up a vast body of legendary literature, with a large admixture of myths, under the name of Sthala Purāṇas, relating to the provenance of temples, their gods and goddesses, their trees and tanks and to the modes of worship and the schemes of festivals.

I am convinced that one’s faith in temple worship as a help to spiritual sādhana should not conflict with any purposeful endeavour to make the vestiges of the past tell their true story. Every movement or institution that has for its object human uplift is an expression of a Divine purpose which manifests itself at all times—in the present no less than in the recent or hoary past. It is not age that lends sanctity to a temple but the dynamic faith and piety of its saintly votaries. Ideas such as these partly underlie the genesis of this little book.
To receive messages of generous appreciation from Indologists and savants of the standing and eminence of Prof. K. A. N. Sastri, Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. T. P. Meenakshisundaram and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan is a highly rewarding experience. I offer them my respects. To all those who helped me with photographs and pictures with permission to reproduce them in this book, and particularly to the well-beloved scholar friend who gave me photographs from his private collection, I express my sense of obligation. The Sri Vani Vilas Press has actively cooperated with me in the elegant production of the book and thanks are due to them.

Tiruchirappalli-8,

K. R. Venkataraman.

3. Published by the University in the Journal of the Madras University Vol. XXXII No 1, July 1960.

In this edition, I have made some additions. I had occasion to peruse the script of a monograph, rather an assortment of diverse topics, which might be grouped under the heading ‘Kanchi and Samkara’. I was not interested in any of them except the part which carried some superfluous comments on Dēvi Kāmākshi in Kānchi. To answer them I had to elaborate some of the data in this book, and occasionally digress from the main topic to provide suitable elaboration wherever necessary. To ascertain when Ādi Piṭhēśvari or the old Sākta Kāma-kōṭṭam originated I felt it necessary to determine the period of the three great Nāyanaśars—Appar, Sambandar and Sundarar and discuss my conclusion at some length.

I am happy to acknowledge the collaboration of my brother, Mr. K. R. Srinivasan, who carefully read through the manuscripts, added appropriate notes and saw the book through the Press. The valuable assistance given by Mr. J. Subramania Aiyar of Gobichettipalayam was a great source of encouragement. Out of respect for his innate sense of modesty, I content myself with a meagre expression of gratitude. I should thank Mr. C. Rajam and the scholars associated with him who helped me with correct references to some of the Tamil passages reproduced in this book.
I may be permitted a personal note. I belong to the Attiyur (Kañchí) group of Ashṭasahasram families who originally migrated from the banks of Narmada (See pp. 53 and 54). Leaving Kañchí after some generations had lived there, my immediate ancestors settled in the Tiruchirapalli and Tanjavur Districts, but I still continue to be a chip of the old Kāmakōṭṭiyār block. An inquiry into the history of Kāmakōṭṭam cannot fail to have a nostalgic interest for me.

Madras – 28 March 1973

K. R. Venkataraman.
MESSAGES

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastry,  
Director,  
Institute of Traditional Cultures,  
South East Asia–(UNESCO),

“Nilesvar”  
Edward Elliot’s Road,  
Madras-4.  
10th January, 1968.

Sri K. R. Venkataraman, formerly Director of Public Instruction, Pudukkottai State, compiled a three Volume Gazetteer of the State and he is also known for other works of a historical nature. It is a pleasure to see him continue his activities even now. The present work of his with 11 sections contains copious and up-to-date references, both from Sanskrit and Tamil sources and is a searching analysis of the significance of Tirukkāmakōṭṭam, a part of present Kāñchipuram, the Kāmākshī temple area of a later date. He discusses the various meanings of the terms, Kachchi, Kāñchi and Kāñchittānam in the light of the extensive sthalapurāṇas and ancient literature. Kāñchi was a centre of both Jainism and Buddhism. The name Jīna Kāñchi is even now prevailing in the neighbourhood. The remnants of some of the idols found in Kāñchi are traced to those of Mahavira, Buddha, Tārā and Jaina Yakshi. With the decadence of those religions consequent upon the Hindu renaissance in South India in the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., the Tāntric Saktism developed there. The pace of its rapid spread was quickened due to the influence of Śrī Saṃkarachārya and the Saivite and Vaishnāvite Teachers. The author traces three stages
of its growth and emphasises that most of the panels found in the temples there underwent suitable changes consequent on such a religious revival. With the advent of sthānattār or Brahmīns of Kauṣika, Kauṇḍinya and Paurukutsa Gōtras into the area, the cult was perfected. The history of the two temples of Kāmākshi and of Ekāmbaranātha is vividly sketched. This unbiased and fully documented account bears evidence of the sincerity and depth of knowledge of the author and of his earnestness to produce a truly historical sketch. The retrospect in the last section (Section XI) is a good resume of the entire work.

K. A. Nilakantha.

Dr. R. C. MAJUMDAR,
Formerly Vice-Chancellor.
Dacca University.

4, Bepin Pal Road,
P. O. Kalighat, Calcutta-20.
9th January, 1968.

... ... I have read your booklet, Dēvi Kāmākshi in Kāñchi, with great interest and profit. You have done a great service to Indology by a scholarly treatment of the two temples of Kāmākshi in Kāñchi by utilising the available literary and epigraphic sources. It is an interesting and important contribution to socio-religious study in so far as it delineates the absorption of the main features of a decaying cult into those of a renascent period. I am sure the value of your study will be appreciated by the scholars as well as the general public.

R. C. Majumdar.
It is with great interest that I went through the historical study on the Devi Kāmākshi, written by Thiru K. R. Venkataraman. It has utilised all the available literary and epigraphical evidences, and therefore the book is a fully documented socio-religious historical study. The word Kāñci occurs in Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya, and it is a Tamil word denoting a particular kind of a tree from which the place had received its name. Kāmākṣi, the well-known Deity of Kañci, is popular all over India. “Kāmak kaṇṇi” which is a Tamil equivalent of Kāmākṣi is also the name of a famous poetess of the caṅkam age (Akam 22 and 98). Mother worship is very old in the world and especially in South India. Ancient Tamil works like Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai identify all these forms of mother worship with the worship of the Sakti in the temple. This shows the importance and popularity of mother worship ... ... ... ...
... ... ... ... Kāñci, which was famous for its Buddhist and Jain traditions became as a result of the development of Kāmakkōṭṭam, the real centre of a pan-Indian culture absorbing all that was living in the vanishing cultures of Buddhism and Jainism. Traditions refer to the influence of Śankara in reforming and re-establishing the non-Sanskrit culture and worship into a well-harmonized Indian culture. The Sakti cult at Kāñchi thus repesents
the quintessence of the various cultures which were once supreme in this part of the country through its various fortunes. This book brings together all the relevent data for this kind of study and I have great pleasure in congratulating the author.

T. P. Meenakshisundaran.

---

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan,
Former President of the Indian Union

“GIRIJA”
30, Edward Elliot Road,
Mylapore, Madras-4.
March 8, 1968.

... ... ... ...

Thank you for sending me your publication ‘Devi Kamakshi in Kanchi’. It is a very learned and well-documented piece. I enjoyed reading it.

... ... ... ...

... ... ... ...

S. Radhakrishnan.
ABBREVIATIONS


(This abbreviation is usually omitted and the number of the inscription and the year of the report alone are given: e.g., 355 of 1955—6.

I. A. — Indian Antiquary.


S. I. I. — South Indian Inscriptions.


TRANSLITERATION

ä, ę, î, ô, and ü are the long forms of a, e, i, o and u respectively.

† and ateur stand for ट and ड.

l for ल - ल, ʃ for श - श, n for न - न, य for यु - यु, न for न्य - न्य, and s for श.

In kh, gh, ch, th, db, ð, dh, ph and bh the aspirate should be stressed.

Transliteration marks are not given to words much too common in modern use.

r for ṛ and ṭ
DEVĪ KĀMAKŚHI IN KĀṆCHI

(1)

Kachchi (கூச்சி) is the original name of the city now known as Kāṇchipuram, and it occurs in all the Saṅgam works, in the Divyaprabhandam of the Ālvars and frequently in the Tēvāram hymns. The epic Maṇimēkalai has a chapter entitled Kachchimēnagār-pukka kādaī wherein occasionally the form Kāṇchi also occurs. By about the 14th century Kāṇchi had become the prevalent name of the city though the old form Kachchi still continues to be used in Tamil works.

Kāṇchi reads like a Samskrit word, and scholarly ingenuity derives it from the root Kaṅch (कञ्च = to shine), and popular fancy invested it with several legends, one of which is that the city got this name because it is the navel of the world. This legend cropped up from one of the meanings of the Samskrit word Kāṇchi, a waist-band.

The word would however appear to have a Tamil origin. In the Tirukkurippu-t-tondar purāṇam, Sekkilar mentions Kāṇchittānam as a place full of kāṇchi trees, and another verse begins with the words தன்னைச்சின்னைச்சின்னைச்சின்னை (taṅkāṇchimensinai). It is therefore likely that the place got its name from a particular tree which grew there in such abundance that ‘the fields were fenced with them’. The
commentator\(^4\) says that käñchi is the mango tree. In later Tamil works the place is called \textit{Ekāmbaram}, after the \textit{liṅga} in the big temple, under a mango tree.

\textit{Ekāmranaṭha}, the present form of the name of the Śiva liṅga, has an interesting story. The original name was \textit{Ekamban}, or simply \textit{Kamban} which would suggest that this symbol of worship was a stele or pillar, which in this case, must have been originally of wood but later altered into a mound of earth and then as an \textit{ashtabandha}—a fabrication of eight ingredients. This is a Śaivite version of the \textit{E-kamba} or the flaming 
\textit{triśula} representing the \textit{triratna} pillars, or of the \textit{āyaka} pillars associated with Buddhist worship. ‘\textit{E}’ in the word signifies \textit{lofty}. The Nāyānārs refer to the God here as \textit{Ekamban} or \textit{Kamban}, and the \textit{Tēvāram} occasionally refers to \textit{Periyakamban}, the Tamil equivalent of \textit{Ekamban}. From literary and epigraphic evidences it is clear that this divine symbol was called \textit{Ekamban} or \textit{Kamban} till about the 12th century. By the time of Sēkkilār, the divine symbol, taken in association with the mango tree, came to be called \textit{Ekāmbara} (Sams: \textit{Ekāmra}), though the old form still continues to be used especially in Tamil works.\(^5\)

The legend associated with Kamban forms the material part of the Śaivite version of the \textit{Sthala Purāṇa}. Umā is said to have come down to the world of the mortals to expiate for a sin by worshipping Śiva in the form of a liṅga. She heaped handfuls of sand in the bed of the Kambai stream and worshipped it according to Āgamic rites. To test the
constancy and depth of Her devotion Śivā caused a roaring flood in the stream which threatened to wash away the sand līṅga. Prompted by Her instinct, Umā held the līṅga in close embrace imparting on it the marks of Her breasts and wristlets. Pleased with Her devotion Śiva granted Her several boons. Closely associated with this is another legend. Once in sport Umā covered Śiva’s eyes with Her hands. Lo! the universe was shrouded in impenetrable darkness. This brought on Her a curse and the golden-hued Umā became dark in complexion (Kālī). One of the rewards that She won from this worship was that She would regain Her bright complexion after a period of penance. These legends represent a mixture of floating traditions and legends common to several places in South India to all of which the Kāṅchi story added the adventitious aid of a flood. Earlier versions of the legend like the one narrated by Sundarar do not mention the presence of a mango tree in the vicinity which was a later addition. When Ṣekkilār wrote the Periyapurāṇam the legend was complete.

Shorn of all mythical covering, the fact remains that to an earlier worship of Kālī was later added the worship of a goddess of a brighter hue. We get the Śaṅkta version of this in the Kāmakshilā-prabhāvam (ch. VII) which narrates that the Devī as the dark Bhairavī slew Bhanḍaka and then, assuming the form of a golden-hued girl of five, commanded the gods to cast an idol representing Her new form which, when finished, was worshipped as Rāja Rajēśvarī.
NOTES

1. *Silappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai* belong to a time much later than the Saṅgam age—about A. D. 800.

2. V. 75

3. V. 86


   The āṟṟupūvaraṇu (அற்றுப்புரணு) —Fam. Malvaceae, is also called kāṇchi.

5. For a fuller treatment of this subject see V. Ramanatha Aiyar., *Development of the Name and Composition of a Divine Symbol at Kanchi* published in the Adyar Library Bulletin.

6. Paṇchadasi, said to be a part of Sanaṅkumāra Samhita of the Skānda Purāṇa, and Śatādhīyāyi, said to be based on the Brahmāṇḍa, and Śīva Purāṇas, constitute the Śīva Kāṇchi Māhātmya. They have been translated into Tamil (18th century). An examination of the original Samskrit Purāṇas shows that these do not occur in them. (See V. Ramanatha Aiyar: *Op. cit.*). The Kāmākshililāprabhavam also is a late work.

There is a Vaishnava version of the Māhātmyā which does not tally with either the Śaiva or Sākta versions. All these are full of sectarian bias.

* * *

Scholars are of the opinion that the name Kāṇchi came to be applied to Kachchi sometime in the sixth century A. D. The name, says T. G. Aravamuthan, “is a migration from somewhere to both the Krishna and Pāḷar regions”. He quotes fourteen examples of places in different parts of the country in the names of which Kāṇchi is an element. From about the middle of the
fourth century there existed a Kāñchi “immediately to the south of the Krishnā as it reaches the sea” and about the middle of the sixth century the name was applied to Kachchi on the Pālār basin. In both regions “the name is that of the capital of the early Pallavas—of the earlier members of the line in the northern region and of the later members in the southern region”.


Villages bearing the name Kāñchi are mentioned in some old Tamil works. (e.g.) Kāñchhiyūr in Aagam, and Kāñchhiyūran (the man from the village of Kāñchi) in Kurundogai. These places were named after the kañchi tree. Noyyal in its upper course from the Veilimalai up to Pērūr (Coimbatore) was called Kāñchi, and thereafter till it joins the Kāvēri Noyyal. Was it because there was a groove near its source? Sekkiṭār calls Pērūr, Kāñchhiyāipērūr. (Pērūr on the Kāñchi.). The Tēvāram mentions the flower of the Kāñchi tree (II. 115–5). Kāñchi has several meanings, but Kachchi refers generally to a place. It is an example of what is called ‘இழுக்குறிப‐peyar’ (idukurip‐peyar). It may well be that Kachchi came to be named Kāñchi because of the occurrence of the tree of that name in the city; and by this seemingly Samskrītised name it became well‐known all over India. Kachchi and Kāñchi are both Tamil words.

(2) The basic matrix of the Sākta tradition in Kāñchi is the worship of the Dēvi first as Kāli and then as Rāja Rājēśvari. The spot associated with this tradition is called Kāmakōttam in Kāñchi. Kōttam is an old Tamil word for a Temple of God. Kōil or Kōvil occurs for the first time along with Kōttam in the Silapadikāram.1 Kāmam (காமம்), short for Kāmamaram sometimes means
a mango tree. 2 Kāmakōṭṭam may then mean 'the temple in the mango grove'. Kāma, as an adjective in Tamil conveys the idea of endearment or loveliness. Kāmakadavul in old Tamil works means 'the God one loves or cherishes'. Similarly Kāmakōṭṭam is a much cherished temple.

An old verse 3 mentions, Kāmakōṭṭam, a temple which enshrined a deity 'wearing bangles and a breast-band' and was guarded by Sāttan (Yaksha or Sāsanadēvata of Sītalanātha, the tenth Tīrthaṅkara. He was also called Brahmadēva Yaksha).

An inscription 4 from Sāttamangalam, a renowned Jain centre of old, dated in the 14th year of Pallava Nandivarman II. (c. A. D. 745) records an endowment for the feeding of Jain ascetics. The Ur (village assembly) takes the responsibility of administering the charity. The imprecatory formula invokes upon the violator of the terms of the charity the sin of causing the destruction of Kāmakōṭṭam!! !This Kāmakōṭṭam enshrined a Yakshi, and was part of a Jain temple called Vimala Sripaḷī. The name Kāmakōṭṭam is associated with Jain Yakshis and may therefore be of Jain origin which Sāktās must have adopted later.

The word Kāmakōṭṭam does not occur anywhere in any context in the Sangam works or even in the post-Sangam epics-Śilappadikāram and Mañimēkalai; nor in any of the manuals on Āgama, Vāstu or Śilpa in its Samkriticized form Kāmakōśṭham. It occurs in much later works, Mānasāra and Mahāviṣvākarmiyam
—even there only in the appended chapters. The verse quoted by the commentator Ādiyārkkunallār must have been composed after the post-Sangam period—the period of the two epics, and the Sāttamangalam inscriptions and before the time of Ādiyārkkunallār, who cites this in his commentary.

Kāṇchi was important to both Jains and Buddhists. Hieun Tsang (c. 642) noted that several Buddhist places of worship in Kāṇchi were giving place to Jain Digambaras. In the 6th and 7th centuries the Jains enjoyed royal support in Kāṇchi. It would appear that before the 9th century a Sākta temple had risen in close proximity to the Jain Kāmakōṭṭam. Places of worship relating to the Jains, Buddhists and the Sāktas must have lain cheek by jowl. The earliest literary reference to this Sākta Kāmakōṭṭam is in Sundarar’s padigam 5 sung in the Ōṇakāntan temple in Kāṇchi. According to him this shrine to the Devi was established before his visit to the city (Kalăpoṭṭam uṇdāha; uṇḍāha—‘now that it has come into existence’.

NOTES

1. V. 11; 171-2.

2. The Jubilee Tamil Dictionary

3. கான்சி முக்கோட்டத்தில் கரை வரலாற்றுக்குத் துறை நாடிய முதலிலும் தமிழ்க் கலைக்குறிக்கும் கரைகள் காணப்பட்டது அம்மகள் குடியேற குழுவாக்கப்பட்ட கரையில் முதலிருந்து கிளைக் கேட்டது.

quoted by Ādiyārkkunallār in his commentary on Silappadikaram, V, ll 93-95. The verse says that the cheṇḍu (horse whip)
with which Karikālachola lashed and churned or twisted (tiritt) the ruddy golden hill (Himalaya) was (in its might) equal to that of Mey Śāttan or Brahmādeva Yaksha, the guardian of Kāmakōṭṭam in Kachchi which enshrined the goddess wearing bangles and the breast-band (kuchabhandha),— or the cheṇḍu of Karikāla was (in its might equal to) that of Mey Śāttan, who in appreciation of the protection of Kāmakōṭṭam by the goddess that wore bangles and brassiere abided there. The lashing of Mēru with the cheṇḍu is attributed to others in the Tiruvilaiyādāl purāṇam— டிருவிலையத்துறானம் சூன் என காள்வா. The fortuitous association of the words Kachchi, Kāmakōṭṭam, Kamba, and Karikāla in this anonymous old verse of unknown context has, perhaps, led interpreters to assume that Kachchi referred to Kāñchi, and its Kāmakōṭṭam in conjunction with the Karikāla legend that 'of his conquest of Kāñchi and settlement of agrarian colonies in Toṇḍaimāṇḍalam'. "This story and other elements in the Karikāla legends", according to Prof. K. A. N. Sastri (Cōlas, 1965, p.36) "find no support from the earliest authorities on his reign and it would seem that Toṇḍaimāṇḍu was ruled by Toṇḍaimāṇ Iḷantiraiyan in the days of Karikāla and there is no satisfactory evidence in support of the suggestion either of the chieftain Iḷantiraiyan having been Karikala's grandson or at least of his being appointed viceroy in Kāñchi after its conquest by Karikāla". In the light of the evidence of a Kāmakōṭṭam of Jaina persuasion in Sāttamangalām (discussed below) there is a possible alternate explanation. The first word Kachchi of this verse may not perhaps mean Kāñchi. Possibly the commencing word Kachchi would according to the nigaṇṭus, mean the broken half shell of the nut of the Palmyrah fruit (பல்மிரா நிகாண்டு காச்சி) or the half of the cocoanut shell (கோழிக்கொள்ளை) here referring to the shape of and standing for the adolescent breasts of Kannis or a girl in her early teens (koḍi) that were encircled (vaḷai) by the kachchu or breast-band. The second kachchi in the context would mean the wearer of such a kachchu. Taken thus the lines would mean only the kāval (or protection, guard) of Kāmakōṭṭam (as its presiding deity) by her who is adorned by the kachchu encircling
her young breasts. Durgā forms are always shown as in girlhood and Her diverse forms are characterised by the provision of the kuchabanda in their sculptural representations or portraiture. Other forms of Dēvis lack this, except in cases of divine groups of gods of later times flanked by two consorts, such as Vishṇu, Subrahmaṇya, Aiyānār etc., where one of the two Dēvis is distinguished, as a matter of the iconographer’s convention, by the provision of a kuchabanda. For instance, again, Nappinnai in the protective hug of Kroṣṇa in the Gōvardhana-dhāri sculpture scene in Mahabalipuram (Pallava) is distinguished from the rest of the gōpis by being invested with a kuchabanda. Likewise is Lakshmi, with Vishnu as the givers away of the bride, Umā, in the Vaivāhika groups of Kalyānasundara bronzes and sculptures of the Chola and later periods. Durgā or Mahishamardini or Vindyāvasini etc., is always depicted with kuchabanda vesture.

The small shrine of Śattan or Brahmādeva Yaksha, usually built outside the enclosure wall of a temple, as in the north-west corner of the Vaṭakkunnāthan temple in Trichur (Kerala), or of a walled city Durgam or citadel (kōṭṭam), is aptly called Pūrampāṇaiyān Paḷḷi (See Śilappadikārām IX, l. 10), and one of the names of Śastā or Āriyan is Pūrattavan (See Nīgaṇṭu). A first century, A. D., panel from Mathura, illustrated by A. Coomaraswamy (Eastern Art, Vol. II, plate III, fig. 7) depicts such a temple, apsidal in form, outside the city gates of the walled city of Kusināra. Such an association of Śastā with Piḷāri (Durgā, Kāli, Ellaiyamman, Ur-piḷāri etc.) as presiding and guardian deities of a place are well-known from literary sources as well as from extant occurrences in many places, too numerous to catalogue. The verse under discussion may merely refer to one such and not particularly to Kāṇchi, if this interpretation is correct. ‘Kāval’ is used here in the same sense of ‘guarded precincts’ or ‘preserve’ even as ‘Kāvu’ is in Malayalam usage—for instance Āriyan-Kāvu—‘the Kāvu of Āriyan.—Śastā or Śattan.

D. K. 2
4. Lines 8 to 10 of the inscription read—

... ... ஏமுறு வரையன்
முடி; குறான் [தசுரதின்] காண்டிக்
சுப்பிருந்து பாறையும் ... ...

(Seminar on Inscriptions 1966 p. 158 published by the Tamilnadu Government; edited by R. Nagaswami). Re-edited text is given on p. 122 Damiica—
முடி "Journal of the Tamilnadu State Department of Archaeology" No. 1. Dec. 1970. The revised reading is given inside square brackets. It should be noted here that Chalukya Vikramaditya after his conquest of Kañchi in A. D. 731 and while making endowments to the Kailasanath Temple there has a different imprecation that states "that whoever harms the endowment will commit the sin of murdering the holy Brahmans of the Ghaṭika" which appears to have been of greater local importance for the purpose. He does not mention Kāmakōṭṭam while invoking the curse.

5. (a) காசிசிகீர்த்தம் கண்டு காண்டிக் வரையனால்
சுருக்கிய காண்டிக் வரையனால் கூறு
சுருக்கிய முடி முடியாம் கூறு
சுருக்கிய பலகைந்து இருக்கட்டே இருக்கின்.

—Sambandar: II 36; 4

"Why should Isā, united as He is with Kāmakōṭi (Umā), carry a begging bowl on His head?" The reference is to the Bikshātana aspect. Here Kachchi does not necessarily mean Kāñchi; it may mean 'She who wears a breast-band (Kachchu—கச்சு). This hymn was sung in Irumbūlai—
சிருக்கத்தை (Ālangudi), Thanjavur District and contains no explicit reference to Kāmakōṭṭam.

(b) கிருத்தவர்களின் வில்லியம்பு காண்டிக்
சுருக்கிய காண்டிக் வரையனால் அமையப்படு
சுருக்கிய கூறு ... ...

—Appar: VI 4; 10

In the temple of Tiruvadigai Appar recalls the legend of Siva embraced by the 'creeper'—Umā. Kāmakōṭṭi is
generally taken to mean 'She of Kāmakōṭṭam'. But Kōṭṭi or Koṭṭi means a water-creeper and hence Kāmakōṭṭi is not different from Kāmakōḍi in the excerpt (a) above. If it is read Koṭṭi (கோட்டி) which means a creeper or water-plant, the combination would have the same meaning as Kāmavalli or Kamalatā that entwines Siva (the Kolu Kombu—அருள் கோம்பு).

(c) குமாரன் வாசனை மோடுவியல் விதிகள் விளக்கம் அர்ப்பனியுடன் ... ... —Sundarar: VII 5; 6.

Sundarar exclaims why Siva should go about begging while Kāmakōṭṭam has come into existence. This hymn was sung in the Īnakkāntan temple in Kāṅchi, and may refer to the Kāmakōṭṭam in that city.

(3)

There are three stages in the evolution of the concept and worship of Dēvi in Kāṅchi. The earliest relates to the concept of the Dēvi in union with Her lord—Kamban, either embracing Him in the course of worship or coalesced with him in the Ardhanārī form. The Dēvi was of a shining dark colour (நீலிருந்து நெய்துருள்—meytaṅkaritu peritumā)¹—the colour of the clouds (முதல் முனையானம்—mudira maṅgai).² Sambandar calls Her Kāmakoḍi.³ Koḍi like valli means a creeper. She is the 'loving creeper' that entwines Siva. Kamban is likened to the சுருள் சுருவு—Kolu Kombu or supporting column round which the creeper entwines.

The short O (◻) does not occur in Sanskrit. Though spoken Tamil has both the short and long forms, in writing till about the 17th century, the short form did duty for both the short and long forms. The symbol for the short form when used before a
consonant was a hook rising from a tiny circle at the bottom ꞑ. Beschi is said to have introduced a symbol for the long form ꞑ for the type case in printing Tamil. In the word Kāmakōḍi, the short ‘O’ was gradually forgotten and the long ‘Ō’ came to prevail. Kāmakōḍi (with the long ‘Ō’ makes no sense in Samskrit, and was therefore pronounced Kāmakōṭi. As could be expected an ingenious explanation was given to this Samskritised term, as signifying that the Goddess bestows a kōṭi (crore) of boons.

What is of particular importance to our thesis is that koḍi is one of the names of Durgā, the dark Goddess, described as a girl of nine or, according to some authorities, of twelve years. Durgā in a temple to the north of Thañjavūr is referred to as Tirunilai Koḍi, and the rock-cut cave-temple of the times of Narasimavarman Māmallā at the northern end of the hill dedicated to Durgā in Mahābalipuram is even today called Koḍikkal maṇḍapam (the stone maṇḍapam of Koḍi). One of the principal names of Kāńchī in Tamil works is Kannikkāppu, the city protected by Kannī or Durgā. The original meaning of Kāmakōṭi was therefore Durgā or Kāli. Kāmakōṭi is more popularly known as Kāmākshi (or Kāmakkaṇṇi in Tamil) which also means Durgā. It may perhaps be necessary to expatiate on this at some length. In Assam there is the famous shrine of Kāmākshi (Kāmākhya). The Dēvi Bhāgavata (VII 30) and the Matsya Purāṇa (XIII) mention that in the Sakti pīṭha of Gandhamadana, Durgā is worshipped as Kāmākshi. An inscription of Gōparadēva near
Sāraṅgarh in Chitturgaṇḍh (M. P.) mentions Kāmākṣī as one of the forms of Durgā. In the Sarasvati temple at Manguesh (Maha-Giriśa) in Goa are different forms of Durgā, one of which is Sānta Durgā and another Santeri Kāmākṣī. The Kāmākṣī temples in the South, known from epigraphy, are in Chunḍi (Nellore District) and in Dharmapuri. Kāmākṣī is sometimes the village Goddess Kāli or Durgā as in some villages in the Madurai and Tiruchirapalli Districts. Also at the Parāśarāsvaram in Jōgimallāvaram (Chittoor District) and in the Nagari hills are shrines to Kāmākṣī. Kari Māriman at Tiruvērkādu near Madras is said to be one of the aspects of Umā, another being Kāmākṣī, both variants of Durgā. The naked Bhairavī standing next to Svarṇāmbikā in the cave temple on the Sivagaṅga hill (Mysore State) is called Kāmākṣī.

A mūrti need not have any specified iconographic features to be called Kāmākṣī, and several mūrtis worshipped in different temples spread all over the land which are known as Durgā, are also called Kāmākṣī. The Goddess first consecrated in Sākta Kāmakōṭṭam and further sanctified by Saṅkara must have been worshipped under the name of Kāmākṣī also.

NOTES

1. III. 14–10 (Sambadae Tevāram)

("Kāmakōṭṭam Aṭṭh Yoṣṭhakavibhih Abhivide"

('Kāmakōṭṭam Aṭṭh Yoṣṭhakavibhih Abhivide' in Tamil, which means 'Kāmakōṭṭam is the place where the Goddess was consecrated. Kāmakōṭṭam is worshipped as Durgā; Kāmakōṭṭam = Kāmakōṭṭam; Yoṣṭhakavibhih = Yogiki))
‘iruruvāhavē āru meitar karitu peritumē’. The twin forms of Sakti and Siva, when united in Thy form, the aspect of the Sakti form is dark in colour and effulgent. The reference is to the Ardhanārī form.

2. III. 114-7

(Commentaries in the Dharmapuram Maṭh Publications)

3. II. 172-4 (Sambandar Tēvāram)

The Ardhanārī form of the God of Kachchi and Kamakoṭi is referred to in a padigam sung at Irumbūlai (Alangudi).

4. Navarāṇi Mātērī Purū Śrī
girlhood in Tamil is called koṭippāruruvam.

5. That Kanni or Durgā was considered the most powerful Kāval deivam or Kāvaṟkaṭavu, - the ‘guardian and protector of a place’ is clearly brought out by Kamban in his description of the fort wall of Ayodhya and its defensive strength as ‘Kamba Rāmāyanam Bālakāndam 3, Nagar paṭalam. verse 8, line 5. The same is echoed in Kulasekhara Ḑīvar’s Kākutian tāḷāṭu as ‘Divyaprabhāndam Perumāl-tirumoli 8, verses 719 and 729. ‘Kalai-ūr-Kanni’ refers to Durgā whose mount is the stag or antelope.


7. Kāmaṭi Gaṇḍhāravē
8. Pājāripalli Inscriptions. (c. A. D. 1150)


10. Kāmāṭchi, as in its Tamil form, if it can be split as Kā-māṭchi would mean the beauty or pride māṭchi of the Kā-forest, grove or garden—cf. the names Kāḍukāl Kāmarśelvi etc., for the goddess.

(4)

The Tantras give a list of fifty (or fifty-two?) Sakti pīṭhas and the names of the presiding God (Bhirava) and Goddess (Bhairavī) of each. The Tantrachūḍāmāṇi, which is an epitome of the older Tantras, assigns to Kāṭṭhi, the Goddess Dēvagarbhā as the presiding Goddess.¹ The Dēvi Bhāgavata (VII—38) calls Her Kīrtimati presiding over the Ŗkāmrakshetra. These were obviously the other names of the Hindu Goddess consecrated in Kāmakōṭṭam. The form of this Dēvi (Dēvagarbhā-Durgā-Kāmakōti) occurs in a temple adjoining the present Kandakōṭṭam (Subrahmanya shrine). She sports in Her two upper hands pāśa (noose) and aṅkuśa goad; in the left lower hand She holds a kapāla² (or skullcap) and the right hand is held in the abhaya pose. Seated in the ardhapadmāsana pose, She wears a jaṭā makuṭa. There are three crowned heads in low relief on the plinth below, probably a Kālāmukha motif or, as is commonly believed, representations of the Trūmūrtis. She is Brahma-Viṣṇu-Sivaṭṃikā.³ In front of Her is a circular bowl-shaped receptacle scooped out in stone with a hollow depression very much like a big sauce-pan, within which an yantra
had been inscribed but is now defaced. The bowl resembles the trough in the present Kāmākṣi temple, which contains a Śri yantra, but is much smaller. During his visit to Kānchī, Saṅkara must have re-consecrated this mūrti, installed the yantra and changed the Kālāmukha (Kaula) form of worship into the Samaya form. This yantra soon attained the status of an all-India Śakti pīṭha under the name of Kāmakōṭi pīṭha. The addition of the Saptamātrika group must have been in response to the ritualistic needs of the age.

On the high authority of Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvati, this aspect of Kāmākṣi-Dēvagarbha-Durgā may be said to represent Kāmēśvari. Gīrvāṇa’s description of Kāmēśvari fits in with the aspect of the Goddess here—

पाषांकुसामय कपालवशंकित चतुहस्ता
चन्द्रकलावलस्मी निग्रेश्रां ... ... ....

The Dēvi in this temple is still called Ādi Pīṭhēśvari or Ādi Pīṭha Parmēśvari (the Sovereign Lady of the ancient or original Pīṭha).

This temple, datable in the eighth century has, in the subsequent centuries, undergone several modifications both in architecture and iconography the latest being the transformation wrought in the early Vijayanagar style indicative of the motivation with the spread of Vijayanagar rule in the south, starting with Kumara Kampaṇa’s campaigns in the Tamil country. It still contains vestiges of
the past in some parts of the structure and the mutilated idols lying about. The gopura is of an early type.

Now we may pass on to the consideration of the next stage in the evolution of the Devi concept in Kāñchi.

NOTES

1. काढीदेशे च कंकालो मैरवो रस्तामकः।
देवता देवगमिक्या .......

The Hindi commentary on this verse says:—
शिवकाशी में काळीमन्दिर है।

Dēvagarbhā or Dēvamātā is one of the hundred names of Durgā (V. 5.)

2. Kapāla (Skull) is said to represent the universe and the Tantra describes it as the ‘lotus which represents the universe’.
<br>प्रपन्धामुब्रुज हस्तला च कपाळिन्युष्पतेपरा। (इति रघुवरगमे)

The Supreme Goddess who holds the lotus which represents the universe is called Kapālinī. Again,
<br>प्रपन्धा मुब्रुज हस्ते यथा इति कपालिनी।

3. Hence perhaps called Dēvagarbhā, the Progenitrix of the three Gods. This motif occurs in some other temples also. One in Hampi has a sculpture of a Goddess over a plinth on which are carved three heads.

4. The Durgā in the Somāsvara temple at Kūnigal (Tumkur District)—a Gāṅga sculpture, datable C. 800, is reported to have been installed by Samkara, (M. A. R. 1938 p. 16).

One should take note of the prevalence of Durgā or Mahishāsuramardani sculptures in the monuments of Mahābaliapuram, in Rajasimha’s temple in Kāñchi and in the vicinity of D, K. 3
this city. Umā—Pārvatī occurs only in Ardhanārī sculptures Saṅkara may have been motivated by this.

5. The commentary on the mantra कामकोटि-निलय (Kāmakōṭi nilayā) reads पण्णवलिपीठेशु मधये कामकोटि: श्रीचक्रमित्यर्थः।

—ललिताब्रजशति (Lalithā Trisati)

The shrines where Saṅkara installed the Śrī Yantra were distinct ones with an individuality of their own, and not included within any Śiva temple unit. Such were, to mention a few, the Kāmakōṭṭam, the Mūkāmbikā shrine in Kollūr and the Sāradā and Śārikā shrines in Kashmir. In these places the yantra changed the ugra (terrific) aspect of the Goddesses. After the 11th century mantrik adepts installed this yantra in several other shrines. In Śrīṅgārī, Saṅkara established a new pitha with Sāradā as the presiding Goddess seated on a Śrī chakra.

6. The Selliyanman temple in Ālambakkam (Tiruchi Dist.) erected by Dantivarman Pallava (A. D. 796—846) and the Vaṭṭapparai Amman shrine in the Tiruvotriyur temple of about the same period have by the side of Durgā or Chandi-Chāmuṇḍa, the principal deity, the other maṭṭkas. Such iconographic parallels are many.

(5)

The Buddhist cult flourished in Kāṇchi for several centuries. The early growth of this city may, in a sense, be said to have been bound up with the fortunes of this faith in Tondaimandaḷam. Kāṇchi produced Buddhist scholars and philosophers whose fame and activities extended beyond the confines of India. Diṅnāga was a native of Kāṇchi. Dharmapāla was head of the Bhaṭṭarāditta Vihāra. Hieun Tsang saw 100 monasteries in this city with 10,000 brethren of the Sthavira (Thēravāda) school where Diṅnāga’s yōga was taught.
Remains of a Buddhist stupa, and of votive stupas belonging to the third or second century B. C. and of the fourth century A. D. have been discovered very near the present Kāmākṣī temple. Further excavations are expected to reveal many more of such remains.1

Later came into prominence the Mūlasōma Vihāra and the Sad Vihāra. Every Vihāra had at least one Buddhāgaram (shrine for the Buddha). In the site where the present Kāmākṣī temple stands, and well within its enclosure, T. A. Gopinatha Rao discovered in 1915 a standing Buddha sculpture, 7' 10" in height of about the 7th century. "The circumstances", writes Rao, "that this figure was...... discovered in the innermost Prākāra of the Kāmākṣī Amman temple in the town raises the question whether originally this temple was dedicated to this Buddha itself. Perhaps there was a Buddhist temple dating from a period earlier than 600 A D."2 The occurrence of a standing sculpture of the Buddha presupposes the obvious existence of a seated sculpture. One such was discovered. It is not relevant to our present purpose to enumerate the Buddhist finds elsewhere in the city.3

"On the pillars of the maṇṭapa near the māna-sthambha" and "on some of the pillars of a definitely late period lying in the (present) Kāmākṣī temple are engraved the sculptures of a Goddess who is recognised as Tārā",4 a prominent Dēvi of the Buddhist pantheon. To the south of the gateway of the eastern gōpuram is a sculptuae of Hayagriva. It
will be clear to students of Buddhist iconography that where Tārā and Hayagrīva are found, there must have been a sculpture of Lōkanātha, whose attendants they are. One of the mutilated sculptures lying in the vicinity must be Lōkanātha.

The Jain cult also had considerable following in Kāśchī, which, according to old Jain writers, was one of the four Vidhyāsthanas in South India. A sculpture of Vardhamāna discovered within this temple enclosure is now worshipped in the Chandra-prabha temple at Jina Kāśchī (Tiruparuttikunṭam). The sculpture of Dharmadevi, the Yakshi of Nēminātha, the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara, which is now in worship in Jina Kāśchī, was removed there from the present Kāmākṣhi temple about the 13th century. It is now worthwhile recording that according to the present Kāmākṣhi temple tradition, one of the names of Svarna Kāmākṣhi is Dharmadevi—the name of the Jain Yakshi also called Ambikā. The original name of the tank within the present Kāmākṣhi temple was Nēmitatam (named after the Tīrthankara Nēminātha). On the top of the māṇasthambha is the figure of a Jain Yaksha. (Brahmadēva Yaksha or Sattan).

Buddhist and Jain vestiges that have been found in the site of and within the enclosure of the present Kāmākṣhi temple, some of which belong to even such a late period as the 13-14th century, lead to the obvious conclusion that in this particular locality crowded with Buddhist and Jain places of worship, there could not have been a temple of a Devi of the Śākta pantheon.
NOTES

1. Excavations conducted by the Madras University Department of Ancient History and Archaeology.


3. When the outer walls of the Ekāṃrēśvara temple were rebuilt in 1799 some outlying Buddhist sculptures were built into them. In the Patna museum there is a collection of inscribed bronzes collected from the Gaya District, and those bearing numbers 129 to 150 record the names of the donors who all belonged to Kāñchi. (A. R. E. 1955-6. p. 5)


A careful study of the early extant stone temples in the Tamil country will reveal that in none of them was a separate shrine to the Devī (Amman—to use the Tamil form) as the consort of the Śivalinga or idol in the principal sanctum within the same temple unit. Temples to Durgā and other forms of Śakti, such as the Saptamāṭrikās and Jyēshṭhā there were, but they did not then form such an integral part of equal importance in the Śiva temple unit.

Siva temples of the period 7-9th centuries A. D. had subsidiary shrines in the peristyle which contained only different aspects of Śiva. The temples of the early Chōla period (9-11th centuries) consisted
of a main shrine enclosed by a group of sub-shrines, generally eight in number, housing the ashtaparivarāra (eight subsidiary) deities—Nandi, Saptamāṭrkās, Gaṇapati, Jyēshṭhā, Chaṇḍīśa, Āditya and Yama (or Chandra in some temples). Pārvatī was not one of the parivaradēvatas. There were later modifications of this scheme in some temples of this period. The Mūvarkōvil at Koṭumbālur had sixteen sub-shrines, but Pārvatī was not included in any of them. Śiva in the sanctum was invoked generally in the Ardhanārī form as several padigams in the Tēvārām indicate.

It should be remembered that several factors contributed towards the complexity of Śaivism in the South which had a bearing on temple evolution. In the 9th century, the Pāṣupatas, Kālāmukhas and kindred sects continued to play a predominant role with their worship of Bhairava and Bhairavī. Later spread the tenets of the Gōlaki-Lakṣādhyāyi santānams which reflected some important features of Kashmir and North Indian Śaivism. The new philosophy and rituals had Śiva and Śākta aspects, both well-defined. While asserting non-differentiation between Śiva and Sakti, who together constitute the Ultimate Reality, the Śiva or Prakāśa aspect of the Reality was differentiated from the Sakti or Vimarśa aspect; the former was pure ‘subjective illumination’ and the latter ‘objective experience of Himself’ (Śiva). In His lilā of creating, preserving and dissolving the universe, Sadāśiva functions with and through His Sakti Manōnmaṇi. Since Sadāśiva tattva comprises both Sadāśiva and Manōnmaṇi, the need was felt for representing the two separately, but
within the same temple unit, and this led to the creation of a separate sanctum for the Dēvi (Amman). Up to now Amman shrines were independent and not related to Siva shrines, but from after the 11th century the twin shrines of Siva and Amman of equal prādhānya (predominance), generally built within the same temple complex, came to represent the dual aspect of Siva-Sakti.

As a first step the ‘ugra’ (fierce) Dēvi mūrtis nearby were converted into ‘saumya’ (benevolent) mūrtis and attached to Siva temples. Where this was not possible, new sculptures were prepared and installed within the Siva temple unit. The temple came to have two principal shrines, the Tirumalai (Kailāsa) or Mēru or Ponmalai by which term the Śiva shrine is referred to in the inscriptions, and the Tirukāmakōṭṭam by which name the Dēvi shrine is designated.2 During the time of Sundarar, the Kāńchī Śākta Kāmakōṭṭam (Kāmakshi-Dēvagarbha-Durgā-Ādi Pīṭhēśvari shrine) had come to be looked upon as the temple of the consort of Ėkamban—why of all the Siva murtis in Kāńchī. The name Kāmakōṭṭam came in handy to designate all the Amman shrines all over the South after the 11th century.

Kāńchī and Chidambaram were two of the sacred places which the Chōla emperors venerated. The Tillai Kāli in Chidambaram, though referred to in the Purāṇas as Śiva’s consort, is housed far away from the principal temple, and a new Pārvatī shrine (that of Śivakāmavalli or Śivakāmakōṭi) was erected within the temple unit. Inscriptions refer to this
Goddess as Tirukāmakōṭṭa Periyānāchiyar. The Silappadikāram describes the old Goddess in Madurai as wearing a jata with the crescent moon, holding a lotus in the left hand and a sword in the right. Her left side is of a dark hue while the right is crimson (Śiva's hue). On the left leg is a Silambu (anklet worn by women) and on the right a Virakalal (anklet worn by men or heroes). This form representing the Ardhanāri concept has since given place to the present saumya form of Minākshi within the Śiva temple unit. This transformation is reflected in the legend of Tatātaka, the warrior Goddess, becoming Minākshi who again is referred to in the inscriptions as Tirukāmakōṭṭattu Aludaya Nāchiyar. These instances will suffice to show how the Kāmakōṭṭam in Kāṇchi provided the inspiration for the establishment of Kāmakōṭṭams in the South Indian temples. Not one of these Amman shrines within the Śiva temple complex is older than the late 11th century. Their dates may be verified from inscriptions.

Again about the 11th century when Baudhapaḷlis and Jīnapaḷlis decayed in the heart of Kāṇchi city, particularly within the enclosure and in the vicinity of the present Kāmakshi temple, as elsewhere in the South, the Gods and Goddesses of the pantheons of these 'heretical' sects were incorporated with the 'orthodox' (Śiva or Viṣṇu) pantheon. The consummation of this transformation is the coming into existence of the present Kāmakshi temple.

Some Scholars are generally of opinion that the idol of Kāmakshi in the new Kāmakōṭṭam was
originally a ūṛm of Tārā. But there is the inescapable tradition that Dharmādevi, the Yakshi of the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara Neminātha was worshipped in the sanctum here. Consequent on the conversion of the temple, the idol of Dharmādevi was removed to Tiruparuttikunṭam and enshrined there in the Vardhamaṇa or Trailokyanātha temples a fact attested to by the temple records at Tiruparuttikunṭam. The temple tank Nemitāṭam was named Ulakāṇi (Ulakāli?) or Chakratirtham. The transformation of a Jain shrine into a Hindu shrine was complete. What adds certitude is the retention of the tall māṇastanṣṭha with the figure of the Jain Yaksha—‘Sattan’ on top.

The present idol was fashioned after the dhyāna ślokas or descriptive verses from the works of an important school of the Kādimata of Śrīvidyā, which is prevalent in the South. This Goddess represents the aspect of Lalitā Rāja Rājēśvari red in colour like the hibiscus flower.

NOTES

1. Inscriptions in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam mention Kālāmukha priests belonging to the Gomaṇḍam family. ‘They were of Simha and Śakta parishaḍs’.


2. For a fuller exposition of this subject see K. R. Srinivasan: Tirukāmakōṭṭam (Proc. A. I. O. C., Vol. XIII. Nagpur Session; Section ‘Archaeology’—pp. 50-6, and his Śaṅkara Pārvati Lectures reproduced in the Madras University Journal Vol. XXXII, No. 1. pp. 154-8).

D, K, 4
3. *Silappadikâram*: 23; Ll. 1-10. According to another reading the weapon in the right hand is battle-axe or scimitar? (*Koţuvâ†*).


5. The name Dharmadâvi is perhaps responsible for the continuing tradition that the Goddess of Kâmakottam is the dispenser of thirty-two boons.

   cf. ‘앉습니까 CotãGm âUtã jã’t’
   — (Sekkilâr; op. C. V. 83)

The present street name Aṟappanaḵkârateru, in Kâñchi, near the temple is possibly a corruption of ‘Aṟampurappâval.’

Nandivarman Pallavamalla’s queen Dharmadâvi or Dharma-
mahâdâvi, was perhaps named so after the presiding deity—the
goddess or Dharmadâvi Yakshi of Kâñchi. The Muktesvara
(Śiva) temple, opposite the Kâmakshi temple beyond the main
street, a later Pallava structure, is called in its inscription
‘Dharmadâvisvaramâram’ after the queen’s name.

It will be tendentious to draw historical conclusions from
a mass of fantasy that constitutes the *Sthalapurâṇa*; nevertheless
stripped of all its mythological vesture, the Kâmakshi-lilâ-
Prabhâvam exhibits some coincidences that may be set forth here
for what they are worth. According to the *Purâna*, a king by
name Vikramacholâ cleared Kâñchi of all wild growth and set
up a shrine for Kâmakshi. A Vikrama chôla ruled between
A. D. 1063 and 1069. According to the *Tiruvâlangâdu* plates
Vikramacholâ was also one of the surnames of Râjendra chôla I
(1012-44). The *Purâna* further gives the date which begins;
Savitri Kalpa, Svâyambhuva Manu-Tâmasa Kalpa, Kritayuga
etc. Discarding all these impossible data, we come to the year
Strimukha, the solar month of Kumbha (*Phâlguna-Ba.* 1), Friday,
Pûrvaphalguni. These astronomical data fit in with February 17,
1033, except that the week day is Saturday, not Friday. The
earliest date that epigraphy furnishes for the setting up of Kāmakottams or Amman shrines in Śiva temples is 1039, the 27th year of the Rājendra I. (Records were then dated in the regnal years of kings, but this Purāṇa being a much later work cannot be expected to conform to that historical tradition. The setting also is mythological, not historical).

It is a further coincidence that Harihara II constructed the Vimānam of this temple in another Srimukha year (1393).

There is yet another statement in this book. It is said that Dēvi exhorted Brahmā to install Dēvi images in all the Śiva temples to enable him to worship both Śiva and Dēvi (within the same temple unit). Here is the relevant passage in the Tamil version.

... ... கோவில்களிலும் குட்ட்டை கடை முட்டிவிட்டு குரோண்டை குறிப்பிட்டு குறிப்பிட்டு ஒம்பிட்டம். நான்கிலும் குறிப்பிட்டு குறிப்பிட்டு நான்கிலும் போராடை ரயிலிட்டு வித்திரும் குறிப்பிட்டு வித்திரும் குறிப்பிட்டு குறிப்பிட்டு ஒம்பிட்டம் ஒம்பிட்டம் ஒம்பிட்டம் ஒம்பிட்டம் கர்மாயிரமாக கர்மாயிரமாக கர்மாயிரமாக கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டு கொண்டး... 

Brahmā then installed the Dēvi in all Śiva temples both in Kāñchimandalam (the province of Kāñchi) and elsewhere.

... ... இரண்டிருந்திருந்தே காயத்திலிருந்தே கொலையாறியே கேலையாறியே உலகாயியே பிரதையே கொலையாறியே அம்மமாயியே உலகாயியே இரண்டிருந்திருந்தே காயத்திலிருந்தே கொலையாறியே கேலையாறியே உலகாயியே பிரதையே கொலையாறியே அம்மமாயியே உலகாயியே இரண்டிருந்திருந்தே... 

These are obviously significant statements pertinent to our study. Incidentally it may be mentioned that such Amman or Nāchiyār shrines in Saiva and Vaishnavite temples are characteristic of the Tamil country alone, and they are not to be found in the composition of temple complexes elsewhere in India, except in places to which the Tamils had migrated and settled down or which had come under their cultural influence after the 11th–12th century A. D.
Sekkilar (12th century) speaks of both the old Sākta Kāmakottam and the new one. In verse 79 of the Tirukkuṟippu-t-Toṇḍar Purāṇam, he mentions the ‘tamarind tree that does not produce any fruit’ in the temple of the Goddess whose countenance resembles the dark cloud.\(^1\) Verse 83 speaks of the yōga piṭha resorted to by saints and yōginis intent on meditation\(^2\) and the bhōga piṭha in the temple of the Dēvi who ‘dispenses and fosters āram or dharma’.\(^3\) The context would indicate that the former is the old temple, and the latter, the new one.

A recent commentator says:—“Adjacent to the (present) Kāmakottam, there is a temple of Kāli (old Kāmakottam) who for covering the Lord’s eyes with Her hands became dark in complexion, and at this place She performed penance. Then the dark form changed, and She was established (in the new Kāmakottam)”.\(^4\) The Sthala Purāṇam (Kāmākshi lilā prabhāvam) also says the same thing.

Centuries elapsed before the new Kāmakottam became popular enough to dislodge the old temple from its position of importance. Saint Aruṇagiriyār (15th century) refers to the Dēvi of the Kāmakottam in his Kāñchi padigams as the Durgi of a dark (emarald) complexion\(^5\) wearing wristlets of serpents,\(^6\) who, when a flood appeared, clung to Kamban and in the contact changed His red complexion into dark on the left side, and who in Her supreme grace took Her residence in this temple to bless the ardent devotees who are attached to Her feet. He says that Subrah-manya ( DriverManager−Indirar perumān) is in the
temple of this Dēvi, Kandakōṭṭam, the temple of Subrahmapya, is just adjacent to the old Kāmakōṭṭam. He also refers to the Sṛi Chakra in front of the Dēvi. In the 15th century there was no Sṛi Chakra in the new Kāmakōṭṭam; as we shall see in a subsequent section; and only the old temple had it. Aruṇagirirāy had obviously not taken any notice of the new Kāmakōṭṭam.

"The dispenser of boons to Her satisfaction, 'the creeper (kōdi) of emerald hue', who is one half of Siva and whose breasts fed Her younger child (Subrahmapya) adorned with a garland of vetchi flowers"—this is how poet Villiputturār (C. 1400) describes Kāmākshi of Kañchī; kōdi, as has been pointed out before, means also Durgā, who is here said to be dark—of the colour of emerald. This description applies only to the goddess in the old temple and not to Lalitā Rāja Rajēśvari in the new temple.

Mūka kavi who lived in the 16th–17th century, after a Sṛi Chakram had been installed in the new temple, and when it had become famous, did not forget the old temple. Several verses are in praise of the dark complexioned Goddess. He sings of Her as having robbed the dark iron of its colour; as of the hue of the blue lily, the emerald and the rain-bearing cloud. He addresses Her as Chaṇḍikā holding a skull, Katyāyani, Kapālini, Durgā etc. Occurring as they do in several verses, they cannot be dismissed as just passing references to the different forms of the Dēvi. Old memories die hard.
NOTES

1. கடவைக் குறிப்பிட்டுக் கூறுபவை கூறு பலர் கண்டுபிடித்தோம்.

2. குறிப்பிட்டு குறிப்பிட்டு பலர் கண்டுபிடித்தோம்.

3. அத்தில் அத்து பரப்பின் தற்கால் பரப்புப் புறக்காலம்.


5. குறிப்பிட்டு—பரப்பின் புறக்காலம், பண்ணுக் குறிப்பிட்டு கூறு புறக்காலம் எளிய காலத்தில்... ... etc.

6. புரூரு வாணு.


8. குறிப்பிட்டு கார் கடவைக்கு.

9. *Maha-bharata: Aruchchunan Tirittayittirai Sarukkam V-II-13*

(Mahābhārata: Aruchchunan Tirittayittirai Sarukkam V-II-13)

Note the reference to Devi as *Kachchat-peru-mulaiyāl*—the wearer of the breast-band over full-some breasts.
10. *Stuti Satakam*: काठागशर्वितरकरी तथुशाचि (V. 15)
नीलोलस्त्रभ्रम्या (V. 22) कुबठयमयी (V. 65)
मरकतर्थां (Vv. 31, 37, 42 and 56)
लाविष्ट्नूष्मां: (झुमी: ) (Vv. 47 and 64)
निरुद्धानानां कार्निनिज्ञकेरि विचलसुच्चारां (V. 43)
रश्णजलदर्शयामः (V. 26) काठामोदग्रहसुष्मां (V. 62)
र्वा भोययमोघश्चेली (V. 63) घनश्यामा (V. 100)

See also *Arya Sataka*. Vv. 78, 79 and 94. These references have been selected at random.

While on the subject of literary references we may mention the *Lalitopakhyana*, which is said to form part of the Brahmanāda Purāṇa, but is not found in most of the recensions of the Purāṇa. It must be a late work but is popular and held in veneration. *Adhyāya* 26 of the *Upākhyāna* describes the battle between Dēvi Lallītā and Banāśasura, wherein are references to the battles described in the *Chaṇḍī Saptasati* which is an integral part of the *Mārkandeya Purāṇa*. The *Upākhyāna* deals with the incarnation of Dēvi Lallītā, Her victories, Her union with Kāmāśvara and installation as the Sovereign Matrix, and elaborates, in the form of stories, the significance of the names of Dēvi Lallītā enumerated in the opening verses of the *Sahasranāma*. As is usual with the Purāṇa stories, this work is an exposition in the form of anecdotes of a profound mystic truth, viz., the arousing of the *Chit Śakti* in the microcosm by destroying the *vrittis* of the mind and the ego, and uniting Her with Śiva in the *sahasrāra chakra* which marks the attainment of the stage of final Beatitude. The work has no historical value. It is an exposition of a form of the *upāsana* of Śrī Vidyā imported into the south and developed in Kāṇchī and many other South Indian centres. It is thus of great importance to the *sādaka*.

To this work has been added a much later supplement dealing with the greatness of Kāmākṣhtī. It is full of fanciful
The structure of the present Kāmākṣī temple which rose on the ruins of the Jain Kāmakōṭṭam dedicated to a Yaktshīṇī like the one in Sāttamangalam, is not older than the 14th century. After its foundation as a Hindu temple in, and not earlier than, the 12th century, for about three centuries, the temple must have been a simple cell amidst the walls of the old Jain and Budhhist temples which it supplanted and a complete vimānam was put up only on July 1393 (Śaka 1315, āśāda S. 10) by Harihara II who also covered it with copper, even as the superstructure of the Ānanda Nilaya Vimāna of Śrī Venkaṭēśvara on Tirumalai (Tirupati) was encased in Vijayanagar times with embossed copper plate that was gilt with gold. The sanctum within the Gāyatri maṇḍapam faces south-east.

The eastern gopuram, though of the Vijayanagar period, has in its lower stone part some Pāṇḍya features of the 14th century, such as kūḍus on the kapōta and Pāṇḍya type of corbels. The other gopurams belong to the 14th and 15th centuries. The Navarātri maṇḍapam with its pillar complexes is a typical Vijayanagar structure. The Vasanta maṇḍapam (Āmai maṇḍapam), another Vijayanagar structure, contains bas-reliefs on pillars which have attached columnettes. Krishnārāya Chakravarti Sivaṇḍār built a maṇḍapam where food was offered to the Goddess,² and Achyuta Rāya donated a village in A. D. 1539 to
meet the expenses of the food offerings. In A.D. 1556 in the reign of Sadasiya Raya several repairs and renovations were made. Kalingarayan, also called Adittadēvar of Kappalūr, in Mutturukūṭam got the Utsava manḍapam constructed. The Chitra manḍapam was paved with stone by Sripati, a minister of Vēnkaṭapati Raya (1586–1614).

On the west wall and at the base of the Utsava manḍapa are two very significant inscriptions which state that Narasimhādhvārī of the Dattanamaṇḍchi family installed the Kāmakūṭi pīṭha (the Śrī chakra before the Goddess). One of these inscriptions which is incomplete, states that the pīṭha was laid (installed) during the reign of Liṅgama Nāyak of Vellore, a subordinate to Emperor Vēnkaṭapati II (1586–1614). It may be recalled that Liṅgama was the son and successor of Chinnabomma Nāyak, who was the patron of Appayya Dīkṣhitendra. The other one mentions that Narasimhādhvārī, who had performed several yajñas and was ‘the crest jewel’ of the Dattanamaṇḍchi family ‘implanted’ (installed) the Kāmakūṭi pīṭha over a broad space and surrounded it with an ‘armour’ of vertical stones of brilliant hues with the Lakṣmī figures carved on them. This practically completed the process of the growth of the new Kāmakūṭtam extending from about the 11th to the early 17th century.

The earliest epigraphical references to Kāmakṣṭambā are from Godlagāṭṭu (A.D 1259) and Tripurāntakam Kurnool District. Both mention a chief, Pallava Immaḍi Bāsava Saṅkara Allāda D. K. S
Premaya Dēva ‘Lord of Kāñchi and devotee of Kamakōṭyambikā.’

Within the present Kamakshī temple there is no record earlier than the 12–13th century referring to this Dēvi temple. The earliest among them are grants by or during the reigns of Maduraṇtaka Pottāppichōla,9 Telugu Chōda-Vijayaγanḍagōpāla,10 a Kākatiya king11 (A.D. 1316), Rājanārāyaṇa Sambuvarāya,12 and Kulaśekhara Pāṇḍya.12

Kāñchi was pillaged and the temples desecrated by the invasions of Malik Kafur (1310) and Muhammad Gawan, the Bahmani general; and the divine services in the temples were suspended for some decades until Kumara Kampāṇa of Vijayanagar, who carried his victorious arms into the south, restored them. He and his father Viṇa Bukkaṇa made tax-free grants of villages in A.D. 1366 to Ėkāmrāṇāṭha and the two Dēvi temples.14 Kampāṇa also ratified some previous gifts.15 Gifts dated in the reigns of the Vijayanagar emperors Dēvarāya (1438),16 Mallikārjuna (1457)17 and Bhūpati Udaiyār18 are recorded in the inscriptions. Krishṇadēvarāya seems to have visited Kāñchi several times; a grant of his is dated 1529.19 His successor Achyutarāya celebrated a tulābhāram in this city and marked the occasion with making magnificent grants to temples; this temple got eight villages besides another gifted in 1539.20 His attendants also made gifts.21 In Sadāśīva’s reign there were two grants of villages (1543 and 1556),22 and a renewal of an older grant, (1565).23 There are records mentioning Sūrappa Nāyaka of Seṇji24 and another,
engraved in characters of the 16th century, mentioning Krishṇappa Nayaka, Periya Vīrappa Nayaka, and Bommi Nayaka.25 There are some others of the Vijayanagar and Nayak periods which are either incomplete or scrappy. The inscriptions earlier than those reviewed here belong to the period when these precincts belonged to the Jains; one of them, (9th century) refers to the temple of the ‘arivar’ (Arhat).26

NOTES


Ll. 4 and 5. Śrīvīmaṇe laṅkāvyam vyāvahṛt changed the form of or veiled (vyāvahṛt) the Sṛi Vimānam by covering it over with copper. In all the contexts in the inscriptions from the 9th century A. D. and in the Silpa and Āgama texts, Sṛi Vimānam refers to the entire structure from the foundation to the finial (upānam to stūpi) and occasionally in much later usage it denotes the pyramidal superstructure over the garbhagriham. It may therefore be stated without fear of contradiction that Harihara considerably remodelled the entire structure (or Śrī Vimānam).


Dattanamañchi Narasimhādhvāra’s Sanskrit inscriptions in Telugu characters:

A

निहितप्रमाण परिभटमहसामुद्रानां
मटानं नागानं पश्चिमपथ्युतमां
करणांसंगते लिंगमुपे पीठमाणमा-
मेधामहत कर्तमति: श्रीनृतिहार-ँ

c\(\text{rest built in}\) (No. 350)

Ll. 1–3 mention King Liṅga and his praṇāstī.

3–5 mention that the wise Śrī Nṛsimha, the best of *adhvaryus*, made (installed) with precision the *piṭha* (आदि may mean pre-eminent—the Śrī yantra *piṭha* is among *piṭhas*, the pre-eminent).

B

रक्षित: करणाहप्रण्या
लिंगबोधी बिल्डीज़ाषः
नरसिंहाद्वारी पीठी
कामकोटीमजीघटत श्री
मातुः परीतसांबोधः

c\(\text{rest built in}\) (No 349)

Ll. 1–2 reference to King Liṅga.

Ll. 6–8 *praṇāstī* of Narasimhādhvāra.
L 4. अजीघटत अरिस्त of प्रद्र = to accomplish, form, fashion, shape He shaped the *pitha* (Kāmakōṭī).

L1. 8-10. He constructed (निमित्त) the broad abode or receptacle (पद्म विस्तीर्ण) and surrounded it (वर्मिलं = furnished with armour) with stones of different colours. उपरूः भी suggests the presence of reliefs of the *Ashṭalakshmi* on the stones.

See also K. R. Srinivasan's article in the *Kalaikaḷañjīyam* (Tamil Encyclopaedia) Vol. 9; p. 534.

7. Nellore Inscriptions No. 18.

8. 217 of 1905. Tripurāntakam temple was built in 1255 under the orders of Kākatiya Gaṇapati (169 and 171 of 1905). The chief mentioned in the inscription was probably administrator of Kaṇchi under Gaṇapati.

9. 318 and 324 of 1954-55
10. 309, 310, 314 of 1954-55
11. 323 of 1954-55
12. 311 of 1954-55
13. 345 of 1954-55
15. 356 of 1954-55
16. 301, 320 and 332 of 1954-55
17. 315 of 1954-55
18. 317 of 1954-55
20. 303 and 304 of 1954-55; also 335 of 1954-55
22. 319 and 322 of 1954-55
23. 333 of 1954-55
24. 334 of 1954-55
25. 337 of 1954-55
26. 360 of 1954-55 dated in the 18th year of Narasinga Pottaraiyar which is in the characters of the 9th century either refers to a later Pallava chief or is a reinscription of an earlier one of Pallava Narasimhavarman II.

* * * * *

In July 1780 when Haidar Ali’s army marched into the Carnatic plains, the British suffered an ignominious defeat. For two years when armies marched and countermarched Kāñchī temples suffered severe damage. Haidar started renovating them. Later Tipu ordered their completion. “He invited the Shankaracharya of Shringeri to be present at Kāñchī to supervise the rites of worship .... He expended large amounts of money to set up new gold idols in Hindu shrines ....” (See G. S. Sardesai:— New History of the Marathas Vol. III, pp. 189-190). The Kāmākshi temple also must have benefited by the gifts of Tipu.

(२)

All over South India when Buddhist and Jain monasteries and temples fell into desuetude, the buildings were used as Hindu temples, and the idols were given the names of the Gods and Goddesses of the Hindu pantheon. Wherever necessary the idols were ‘re-sculpted’ to chisel out the lāñchanas and other special markings and make appropriate changes in the features. In a village in the Coimbatore District a Tīrthaṅkara and his two attendants are now worshipped as Tīrmūrti; and the hill in which they stand is now the Tīrmūrti hill; Brahmayaksha of the Jains is now Sāstā or Aiyanār in several places, and one of his Tamil names is Paramar. Pārśvanatha in Nagercoil is Anantālvār. Yakshi Padmāvatī is now Bhāgavatī in Chitral. The Maṅgalā Dēvi temple in
Mangalore and the Mañjunāth temple in Kadri have still Jain vestiges including bronzes which indicate their transformation into Saivite temples.² Buddha came to be acknowledged as an avatār of Vishṇu.

Scholars have for long opined that the idol now worshipped as Saṅkarāchārya in the present Kāmākṣī temple, originally represented the Buddha. According to the texts on Buddhist iconography and Mānasāra, the seated Buddha is represented with lobed ears, long and broad eyes, protuberant forehead, fairlyshaped chest, round belly etc. One of the forms depicts him as seated in the samapāda padmāsana, the left hand kept on the crossed legs, palm upward with open fingers and the right hand held in chinmudra or abhaya mudra, and clothed in diaphanous yellow robes with wave-like folds exposing the right shoulder. This description applies to this idol in the Kāmākṣī temple. The similarity in portraiture, pose etc. to the other seated Buddha images in places in and round Kāñchī is too marked to be missed. On the pedestal are six standing figures in low relief. This is by no means a rare occurrence. To give some examples:—On the pedestal below the cross-legged Buddha in Sārnāth exhibiting the dharma chakra pravartana mudra, the wheel and the deer in the centre are flanked by three human figures on either side, making six pupils of the Master. A sculpture from the Amarāvati collections represents the Buddha exhibiting the chinmudra in the right hand and resting the left hand with palm facing upward over the crossed legs (as in the idol of the Kāmākṣī
temple) and shown with six attendant figures. There are similar sculptures in places as far apart as Barabudur in Java and Takht-i-Bāhi near Peshawar. This group of six represents the Buddha’s disciples, Koṇḍañña, Bhaddiya, Veppa, Mahānāma and Assaji, and a wealthy merchant of Vārāṇasi named Yasa who joined later. The sculpture in the Kāmakshi temple must have undergone ‘re-chiseling’ and reshaping to endow the principal figure and four others with the danā so as to make them appear as Saṃkarāchārya and his four sanyāsi disciples. Such alterations are not confined to this temple alone. The modern images put up over the entrance to this particular shrine are designed to impart the necessary touch of verisimilitude.

A sculpture in low relief on the inner wall of the gopuram represents a Haṭha yōgi standing on one leg with the other bent and tucked up. Some recent publications would have us believe that this figure also represents Saṃkarāchārya. A label inscribed underneath the figure in late Tamil Grantha characters reads:—Śrimat Kāmakshiśvara Bhārati Śripādaṅgalu svarūpam—obviously a Haṭha yōgi sanyāsi of the Bhārati order. A similar sculpture in another place reads Kāmaṅkshidēva Śripādaṅgalu.

To help us to identify some of the other so called ‘Saṃkarāchārya’ sculptures in and near Kāṁchī, it is necessary to digress a little. Śaiva Āgamas came into vogue in the early centuries of the Christian era. One of its founders, Lakulīśa, born in Kāyāvatāra or Kāyāvarōhaṇa³ (modern Karvan) was considered an
avatāra of Śiva. He had four disciples namely Kuśika, Garga, Mitra and Kaurushya (or Rushṭa)—a tradition corroborated in stone inscriptions. The disciples founded the four branches of the Pāśupata cult. The Mathura pillar inscriptions (A. D. 380) mentions three of the successors of Kuśika. Perhaps the earliest representation of Lakulīśa is the figure on the coins of Wemokadphises II. Sculptural representations of Lakulīśa were common even before the 7th century in Khandēsh and Gujarat, and they spread all over the west, then to Kaliṅga and Southern India and gradually even to Jāva. This process was hastened because Pāśupata āchāryas were Rājagurus. In Toṇdaimanḍalam, Tiruvvoorriyur and Kaṅchī were two prominent Pāśupata centres, and here, as well as in the other parts of Tamilnād, this Pāśupata Āgama cult was very much in evidence till the later Saiva schools came into prominence, and in Karnātak till the rise of Vīrasaivism.

Lakulīśa sculptures occur with two or four of his disciples and sometimes with a liṅga or any other appropriate form of Śiva by the side. In some specimens his membrum virile is shown erect. His distinguishing symbol is the lakula or daṇḍa. He often takes the place of Dakshiṇāmūrti who is also represented with four disciples. With the daṇḍa, and with or without the four disciples, his sculptures in Kaṅchī and its neighbourhood are easily mistaken for Saṁkarāchārya. The later āchāryas of the Pāśupata schools were also represented in temple sculptures. The sculpture, now in the Madras Museum, of
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Vidyārāśī mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷur Māvarkovil inscription which stood originally in Tagadūr is represented as a Siva yōgi worshipping a liṅga.

In the Śaiva Āgamas, there is basis for every shade of philosophical thought from realism to idealism, and in practices from ritualism, pure or gruesome, to sublime meditation. This accounts for the variety in the ascetics plastically represented in the temples in Kāñchī and elsewhere. Thus in contrast to the mild Siva yōgins, were the Kālāmukhas and the Mahāvrathis including those of the Bhairava Saṅgam whom Sekkilār has portrayed in gruesome details.⁴

Ascetics of the Mattamayūra sect, originally of the Haihaya kingdom of Tripuri, who spread all over the country as Lakshādhyāyi or Gōlaki santānams, about whom there is no dearth of Tamil inscriptions, mark yet another stage. They claim to belong to the parampara of Dūrvāsas. On one of the walls of the Utsava mūrti enclosure in the Kāmākshī temple is a sculpture of Dūrvāsas, and embedded on a wall in the interior is that of an ascetic of one of these santānams, which again is wrongly identified as Saṅkarāchārya. The right hand of this ascetic held in chinmudra touches the heart indicative of contemplation on the Āṭma liṅga and there is a danda also. The pose is certainly too odd to be associated with Saṅkarāchārya.

While hundreds of inscriptions during the centuries of Chōla rule refer to endowments to Śiva yōgins, there is hardly one referring to Advaita sanyasins. It
was only in the eighteenth century that the Upanishad Braharendra math, "the first Advaita math in the South", was founded in Kāñchi. The Vijayanagar penetration and the pioneering efforts of Vidyāraṇya to multiply maths were responsible for the flow of Advaita sanyāsins and scholars to the south. The efforts of Govinda Dikshitār, known as Advaita Sthāpanachārya hastened the process.

A small but important detail to be remembered: the danḍa of an Advaita sanyāsin of the Saṅkara order must be of the height of the person who carries it (pāḍādhimastaka prāmāṇam) and of the thickness of the thumb or one of the prescribed fingers. A shorter danḍa marks a different persuasion not any of Saṅkara's.

We may digress to consider a sculpture in the mandapam near the Nāchiyar (Devi) shrine in the Varadarāja temple in Vishnu Kāñchi. The figure occurs in two different but adjacent panels; in one of which it is unattended while in the other it has an attendant. It has been erroneously said that the latter panel represents Vyāsa (seated) and Saṅkara (standing); an expression of humility is writ large on the face of the latter. It should be apparent that, in an age of sectarian animosities when Vaishṇava āchāryas were having the upper hand in the court of the Āraviṇḍu emperors of Vijayanagar and in those of their subordinate chiefs, and when the polarisation of the two sects had developed unhealthy features the builders of a mandapa in an important Vaishṇava shrine under the influence of a
line of *jiyars* (heads of *Vaishnava maths*) would never think of engraving the figures of *Vyasa* and *Saiva*. The plump seated figure with *sikha* and *yajnopavita* represents a *jiyar* who can easily be identified as *Alagiya manavalar*, who is mentioned as *srikaryam* (manager) of the *Vishnu* temple. In another inscription* he is extolled as 'the builder of several *prakarams* and *manadapams* and as a great *yati*, the ornament of *Kaichi*, in whose mind which is full of the nectar of *Sribhaskya* (*Ramanuja's bhaskya*) *Madhava* is ever sporting*. He was an outstanding personality and wielded influence in the *Tirupati-Tirumalai* temples. The veteran scholar *Kandadai Ramanuja Aiyanagar* and *Yatiaja Jiyar*, the director of temple affairs (*Periya Koyil kelvi*) in the *Tirumalai* temple were his disciples. The monastery in *Kaichi* over which he presided continued up to the eighteenth century. What can be more appropriate than to represent this *jiyar* in relief in one of the *manadapams* he had erected. In the panel he is represented with lobed ears and as wearing *yajnopavita* and a rosary of rounded *tulasi* beads. He has a book in his left hand and in the right hand displays the *suchi mudra*, signifying command and warning. He wears a detachable head gear, the strands of which, usually stuffed with a silk covering, are worked into a definite pattern. It is too sophisticated to be mistaken for matted locks of natural hair bound together on top. A shorter length of this kind of material is wound round the head during certain rituals in *Vishnu* temples—a practice which continues to the present day.
The standing figure must be Śankaradāsa, a devotee of the jiyyar who under his master’s commands erected a maṇḍapam. Śankaradāsa belongs to a family, who were originally officers under the Gajapati, but later transferred their allegiance to Krishṇadēva Rāya. He donated his fief to the Tirumalai temple and became the jiyyar’s disciple. The stout short stick-baton, to be more precise, with a piece of ochre cloth tied on top probably marks the insignia of the priestly authority of his master.⁹

In his elaborate and fascinating description of Kāmakōṭṭam in the Tirukkuripputtonḍar puṟāṇam Śēkkiḷar does not mention any statue of Saṁkara because there was none in the temple when he wrote the purāṇam.

The only idol that Śēkkiḷar mentions other than Kāmākṣhi is Sāstā.¹⁰ There seems to have been no other idol in this temple in his time.

Suvarṇa Kāmākṣhi, now worshipped in a temple in Taṅjavūr was formerly the utsava mūrti in the Kāṇchi temple. One of the names of this deity, according to the temple legend, is Dharmadēvi. This idol stands in the tribhaṅga pose, the left hand is hanging loose while the right carries a flower or bud. Suvarṇa (Baṅgāru) Kāmākṣhi is the metallic counterpart of Dharmadēvi now installed in Jina Kāṇchi after its removal from the Kāmakōṭṭam.

There is an interesting account relating to the removal of Suvarṇa Kāmākṣhi from Kāṇchi to
Tañjāvūr. Kāñchī passed through troublous times during the closing decades of the 17th century. "The authorities of the pagodas (of Ėkāṃrēśvara, Kāmākshī and Varadaraīa)...... determined to protect the idols from their apprehended desecration by the fanatical zeal of the invader. They were accordingly conveyed away disguised as corpses and, followed by funeral processions, were carried off to the Uḍayār-pālayam jungles in the Tanjore11 District. The image of Kāmākshī was of gold and is said to have been taken possession of by the Rāja of Tanjore".12 The sequel to this event which Charles Stewart Crole describes was:—‘In compliance with an order of Śrīnivāsa alias Attān Tiruvēṅgaṇa Rāmānuja Jiyar, his pupil, the chieftain Rājā Śri Lālā Tōḍārmallā brought back the idols of Varadaraīa and his consorts from Uḍayār-pālayam and set them up in the temple at Kāñchī".13 The Śaiva idols were brought back by Ćellām Bhaṭṭar. Dakshiṅāmūṛti Sāstri, the chief priest in charge of Suvarṇa Kāmākshī, first took the idol to Jīñji, before it was taken to Uḍayār-pālayam where the local chief offered all facilities for its regular worship and made a land grant. Dakshiṅā-mūṛti Sāstri's son Aiyyā Sāstri and some others later took the idol to Aṅakkuḍi, then to Nagore and Sikkīl before it reached Tiruvārūr where it was kept in worship for some years. The chief priest then was Vēṅkaṭādri. In 1763 was born his grandson Vēṅkaṭa-subrahmaṇyan renowned as Śāmā Sāstri, the great musician and composer. In 1781 when Śāmā Sāstri was eighteen years old, his father Viśvanātha removed the idol to Tañjāvūr at the earnest solicitation of
Rājā Tuljāji (1763–87) and finally installed it in its present temple in the west main street. The transit of this idol from place to place till it reached its present destination and the meticulous care bestowed on its protection and uninterrupted worship are admirable feats that do credit to the resourcefulness and devotion to duty of the priests.

The sculpture that people in their ignorance call Tapas Kāmākshī (Kāmākshī in the posture of doing penance), whose left leg is firmly placed while the right leg is tucked up so that the heel may press the navel, left hand in the lōla pose and right hand raised above the head, is that of a yōginī. This figure of a yōginī with the accessories of worship is an improvement upon the figure of a Jain yōginī depicted in different poses of adoration in the gōpuram of the Vardhamāna temple in Tiruparuttikunṟam—it is that of Agnīlā doing penance before she became Dharma-dēvi or Ambikā

The liṅga (Kāśi Viśvanātha) in the prākāra of this temple is said to have been installed by Liṅgappa, a rent collector under the Government of the Sultan of Gōlcoṇḍa.

What is described as Arūpa Lakshmi is a disfigured sculpture of Jyeshṭhā Dēvi marked by a groove cut vertically from the face down to the folded legs. There is a curious practice in this temple. Worshippers who get the Kumkuma prasādam in the Kāmākshī shrine throw it on the lap of this Jyeshṭhā, then collect it and mark the forehead with it. This
is a relic — perhaps the only lingering instance — of an old ritual of getting prasādam from the lap of Jyeshṭhā which Āḻvār Tōṇḍaraṭiṉoḻi condemned.15 Vārāhī belongs to both the Jaina and Śaktā pantheons. She is one of the Saptamātrikā group, and in a temple of Lalitā (Kāmākṣhī’s aspect in this temple) she is an important parivāra goddess. The other equally important parivāra goddess is Mātaṅgi or Śyāmalā represented by the eight-armed statue in an adjoining cella. Annapūrṇa and Lakshmi are also represented among the parivāra deities, and the eight armed Śyāmalā serves as Sarasvatī also. These are all late sculptures. Bhairava and Mahishamardini are the prominent sculptures exhibited in the shrines attached to the eastern gōpuram.

The idol of Vishṇu16 in the inner prākāra originally belonged to Kaḻvanār temple in Kāṅchī, now, ruined. The idol is called Kaḻvar and was deposited in this temple. A modern three-storeyed structure overlooking the tank enshrines a different form of Vishṇu on each floor.

NOTES


2. A. R. E. 286 of 1955-56

3. There is little need to point out that temples in the South called Kāyārōhana are associated with the Lākuliśa cult.

4. Siruttonḍa Nāyanār Purāṇam (VV 25 to 35) and Mānak-kañjāra Nāyanār Purāṇam (VV. 22 to 25).

5. A. R. E. 495 of 1919 dated S. 1475 (A. D. 1553)
6. A. R. E. 13 of 1921

7. श्रीमाण्यामुनपुराणपारितमयः प्रक्षेत्रस्माचकः श्रीकारामुरूसैवैद्यिकः .......

8. वेलानुदतयत्वचर्चोपमुदिते[:]
ि ओरम्यागामाति:
आहून च यम्नियहःताः
संक्रियः मण्डपे |
श्रीमत्त्रुरदसासनामविशिष्टाः
मण्डल कार्तिपुरे
...
...
...


10. cf කාලියාමාසේ මතිය හරිකයින් මෙහෙය පිළිතුරිම
    උප්පසිය අධිකයින් නොපැළකින්;
...
...
...

11. Uḍayārpālayam is now included in the Tiruchirāpalli District.


15. சுமபை மகாப்பூண்டு
    குன்று மாசுவிக்க
    குன்றும் பால் தங்கு
    பலவை பார்க்கி கொண்டு!

(Toṉiraraṭhippoḍi: Tirumālai 10),

D. K. 7
The Saptamāṭkā and Jyēṣṭhā cults were much in vogue till the 12th century after which they fell into desuetude. (See K. R. Srinivasan: *Op. cit.*). Sculptural vestiges of these cults are seen in the old Kāmākshi temple.

16. *Pāṣuram* No. 4 of Tirumāṅgai’s *Tiruneṭutāṇḍakam* is an omnibus invocation to Vishṇu enshrined in seven temples in Kāṇchī. Two of them, those of Ūrakam (Ulagāḻandaperumāḷ temple) and Veṅkā are now in worship and are flourishing. The rest have been completely ruined and the principal idols that were in them are now housed in the neighbouring temples; those of Kārakam, Kārvaṇam and Nīrakam in the prākāra of the Ulagāḻandaperumāḷ (Ūrakam) temple, that of Nilāṭtiṅgāḷṭuṇḍam in the prākāra of the Ēkāmrāṇātha temple and Kaḷvar of Kaḷvanūr in the Kāmākshi Amman temple. The idol of Veṅukkai is now left uncared, half immersed in an irrigation tank.

**

During the Chōḷa times sculptures of Āḻvārs and other Vaishṇava āchāryas and of Nāyānārs and other Śaiva āchāryas were installed in temples. The icons of the Śaiva saints are found sculptured in the Airāvatēśvara temple in Dārāsūram built by Chola Raja Raja II (1146-68). Those of Laṅkulaṇa and of the āchāryas of his sect were in worship from much earlier times. Perhaps the earliest known representations of Saṁkara are found in an inscribed stele and on the panels of the Vidyā Saṁkara temple (14th century) in Śrīṅgerī but none of these were worshipped. There is no evidence from epigraphy or literature of the installation of Saṁkara’s image for worship till very recent times. There is a late sculpture of Vidyāraṇya in Hampi. The Idol of Saṁkara in the Ādiputiśvara temple at Tiruvoṛṭiyur was set up very recently. The consecration of Saṁkara’s statues is a recent development, perhaps two centuries old, to make the devotees ‘Saṁkara conscious’ and kindle devotion to the Master. The memory of an advaita saint or āchārya is usually honoured by installing a īṅga or growing a bilva tree or tulsi plant over his saṁādhi.
The Vardhamāna temple in Tiruparuttiṅṟam must have come into existence late in the 11th century roughly corresponding to the period of the rise of the present Kāmākṣṭhī temple. Of Čhōla origin, this temple was considerably enlarged during the Vijayanagar period and gradually enriched with statues collected from the dilapidated Jain temples in Kāñchī, including the present Kāmākṣṭhī temple. Tiruparuttiṅṟam, which then became the centre of Jain faith, came to be known as Jīna Kāñchī. We find this name mentioned, for perhaps the first time, in the inscriptions of Rāja Rāja III. "The shrine dedicated to Dharmadāvi, the Yakshi of Nāminatha, is situated to the south of the Vardhamāna shrine and is totally different from the other two shrines, in that it is very small and square instead of being apsidal. According to local traditions the image of Dharmadāvi appears to have been introduced into this temple, according to one version, in the thirteenth century A. D. from the Kāmākṣṭhī temple at Conjeevaram, and according to another in the ninth century soon after Saṅkarāchārya established the Kāmakoti pīṭha in the Kāmākṣṭhī temple, both versions regarding Kāmākṣṭhī temple as having originally been a Jaina shrine dedicated to Dharmadāvi, the Yakshi of Nāminātha.... Little care seems to have been bestowed upon the small shrine in which the image is housed, nor have any of the adjoining shrines been used as its model. Like them however it is of brick. It has been joined to the Vardhamāna-ardhamanḍapa by making a very narrow opening on its west wall." 

(T. N. Ramachandran *op. cit.* pp. 19–26)
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The movement of clans and families of Brahmins, including bhāṭṭars or priests, āchāryas and sānyāsīs started at different periods much anterior to the time of Rāja Rāja Chōla I. The settlers in the south kept up contacts with Āryadēśa, Vārāṇasi, Gūjaradēśa and Kāshmir.
The Śiva and Kūrma Purāṇas enumerate twenty-eight avatāras of Śiva. From Śvetāchārya to Lakulīśa, each of these twenty-eight avatāras had four disciples, making up a total of one hundred and twenty eight āchāryas. The Kāłamukha section had two divisions, each with several sub-divisions. Their paramparas fanned out all over the land, and some of the monastic heads took the surname Lakulīśa to mark their affiliation to the founder of the cult. They exercised considerable influence over temples, and the maṭhas and in royal courts. Pāśupata was Āgamānta Saivism with a considerable Āgama literature.

The development of post-Saṃkara Saivism in the north, especially in Kashmir, was marked by the dispersal of bands of āchāryas bent upon propagating their cult. Mayūranātha, named after his place of birth Mattamayūra (Kadwaṅha near Ranod in Gwalior), established several maṭhas, the āchāryas, of which could be distinguished by their name-endings—Śiva or Śambhu, while the Pāśupata name-ending continued to be Rāśi. The Kalachūris of Chedi were their earliest disciples and at Bhērāghat, near their capital Tripuri, there was erected a great hypethral temple to Gaṇapati and the sixty-four yōginīs. This temple which was circular (gōla) became the centre of the Mattamayūra clan of Saivites. Acquiring ‘three lakh’ villages the clan took the designation Lakṣhādhyāyi Bhikṣhā Maṭha or Gōlaki Maṭha. To Āgamic rituals the Lakṣhādhyāyis added vaidik and śmārtha rituals, and their studies included Uttrāmīmāṃsa or Vēḍānta. Wherever they went they
established maṭhs and temples, satras or feeding houses, Vyākhyāna śālas or halls for discourses and flower gardens. Some of their portrait sculptures represent them as meditating on the heart centre with the right hand fingers displaying the chinmudra and pressed against the heart. From the Dahala country (Chēdi) they spread over the Rādhā country (Varāndra in Bengal), Kaliṅga, Andhra and the Tamil country and Kerala. They were the Rājagurus of the Kākatiya, Chōla, Pāṇḍya and Karnāṭaka kings. In the Tamil inscriptions they are mentioned with the honorific titles of Śvāmidēvar and Mudaliyār. It is interesting to note that during the same period they were Rājagurus to the kings of Kambuja (Comoodia). The Lakṣādhhyāyis trace their guruparampara to Dūrvāsas and call their lineage Dūrvāsaparampara. We have made mention of the existence of a sculpture of Dūrvāsas in the present Kāmakshī temple at Kāṇchī.

A line of the Śaṅkta section of the Lakṣādhhyāyī āchāryas was associated with the Dēvi temples while the Saivite line was associated with the Śiva temples in and around Kāṇchī.

Tradition speaks of the settlement in Kāṇchī of thirty families from the Narmadā valley; ten of Kaṇḍīṇya gotra, ten of Kauśika gotra, and ten of Paurukutsa gotra, who were all adepts in the Vaidik and Āgama lores. Fifteen of these families were grouped under the Ashtasahasra sub-clan and the rest under the Vaḍama sub-clan, and they came to be known as the Kāmakōṭṭiyār. Later several of these
families left Kāñchī and settled in the Telugu and Tamil Districts. 4

Over the centuries the Vaḍama Kāmakōṭṭiyār were the tānattār (stānattār or sthānīkas) of the Kāmakshi temples. The temple properties were vested in them and they had the sole right of receiving or making grants. They exercised control over an army of temple servants and regulated the performance of the sandhis or ‘divine services’. Their authority was subjected to periodical inquests by royal officers, sometimes by the king himself, into the management and affairs of the temple. An inscription, 6 recorded during Kampaṇa’s administration, states that the tānattār conferred the kāval kāṇiyāṭchi (right of watchmanship) on one Vijayıṅgīḍēvar. In another case 7 they ratified a similar right previously bestowed on one Ālagiya Tiruchchirambala Uḍaiyar. A gift of villages 7 for food offerings was made to the tānattār by Krishṇama Nāyakar to secure merit for Krishṇadēva Rāya. Another gift 8 to the Goddess was entrusted to Kāmakoḍi Bhaṭṭar and Kambattār, both tānattār; Kambattār’s, son Poreṟru Nāyanār, figures as the donee in a grant 9 by Rāma Bhaṭṭar to secure merit for Achyuta Rāya. Gifts of villages by Narasappa Nāyakar and Rāma Rāja Chinna Tirumalaiya Dēvar of Avukkai (Auk) to the tānattār Poreṟru to secure merit for Sadāsiva Rāya are recorded in two inscriptions. 10 A record 11 dated 1584 in the reign of Śrīraṅga Rāya I mentions that the tānattār gave lands to several people in exchange for those already received as archanā vrīttā. A royal
order by Dēvarāya restrained the officers from misappropriating the temple properties (administered by the tānattār).

The grantee in the Uḍayārpāḷayam grant was tānattār Dakshināmūrti Sāstri, a descendant of Tiruvēkambabhaṭṭa mentioned in some earlier inscriptions. One branch of his descendants continued in Kāñchī, and another settled in Tañjavūr to manage the affairs of the Suvarṇa Kāmākshi temple there. We learn from the records that in 1837 Anṇakuṭṭi Sāstri, Subbarāya Sāstri and Nilakaṇṭha Aruṇāchala Sāstri were the tānattār.

Under Regulation VII of 1817 of the East India Company "the temples were placed under the charge of the Board of Revenue who managed them through the Collectors, but subsequently this responsibility ceased; and the pagodas were made over to the care of committees, to whom or to their assignees the fixed allowances made by Government were now paid .....". Since this system also led to mismanagement, the Madras Government constituted the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Administration Department (H. R and C. E. Adm.) and passed several acts to regulate its working. This department now controls the temples.

To revert to Kāñchī: While in 1842 committees were appointed to manage the Ekāmranātha and Varadarāja temples, the present Kāmākshi temple alone was entrusted at his request to the management of the ‘Saṅkarāchārya of Kumbakonam’. In one of
the communications on the subject the following statement appears: Name of Pagoda—Camatchy Umman; Name of Trustees—Sankaracharya; Occupation—Priest of the Mathum of the religion to which the Pagoda belongs. The trusteeship was created with a stipulation "restricting the power to alienate, transfer, or otherwise dispose of any part of the property, movable or immovable, and to alienate or transfer the trust and subject to the furnishing of security". The Saṃkarachārya took over in January 1843. The tānattār appealed in vain (16—12—1842) against the order alleging that 'the Sankarāchāriar is in no way connected with this church, is an entire stranger to the country, an inhabitant of Cumbakonam in the Tanjore Zillah".

Previous to this arrangement this Saṃkarāchārya had requested Government to be allowed to perform the kumbhābhishēkam of the temple, which he did in 1839. This event he caused to be engraved on stone.¹⁵

After about a century, the present Āchārya resigned the trusteeship. In 1960¹⁶ the H. R. and C. E. Department again appointed "Śri Kāṇchi Kāmakōti Peethadhipati¹⁷ Jagadguru Śri Saṃkarāchārya Swāmi Mutt", trustee to administer the temple and its properties with an Executive Officer invested with the powers conferable on him by the provisions of the Act”.

NOTES


2. In the Tamil edition of Kāmākshīlīpaprabhāvam, the translator K. A. Alalasundaram Pillai acknowledges the help that
he received from Bhairava Sivacharya, a descendant of Pañchakshara Sivacharya of the Gōlaki math. The book was published in 1906.

Vibhāgaratnākarā (Ms. No. R. 1739 in the Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library) traces the history of some Brahmin families from Mandaraka on the Ganga who settled in Kāñchīmaṇḍalam.

It may be interesting to note here that the current use of the honorific prefix S'ri-La-S'ri (SrīLaSrī) to the diksha names of some Tamil Saiva pontiffs is reminiscent of the Lakshādyāyi Santānam—the letter La between the two S'ri’s standing as an abbreviation for Lakshādyāyi. The Akhilaṇḍāśvari temple in Jambukāsvaram (Tiruvānaikāval) was for long under the Gōlaki or Lakshādhyāyi Santānam as part of the Akhilaṇḍāśvari-tirumāḍam.

3. The late Sāśādri Svāmi, who was universally revered as a siddhapurusha, belonged to the ashtasahasra sub-clan of Kāmakōṭṭiyār.

Even today one branch of this sub-clan is called the Aṭṭiyūr (or Kāṇci) group, and another the Aruvāppādi group.

4. In a learned review in ‘the Hindu’ of Madras dated Jan. 8, 1967, of a copper plate grant discovered at Mallavaram dated 1116 when Parāntaka was viceroy of Veṅgi in the reign of Kulōttunga I, N Ramesan draws pointed attention to a Brahmin from Kāñchi called Kāmakōṭi Sahasra who, along, with some others, evidently from such places as Srirangam, Kumbakōnum and Tirupati, figures as a donee Kāmakōṭi Sahasra must be one of those who, leaving Kāñchi, settled in Andhra lured by the gifts of the rulers there.


D. K. 8
13. dated August 30, 1784.
17. ‘The Saṃkarāchārya of Kumbakonam’ has now assumed this style.

A short retrospect is now necessary.

Kāmakōṭṭam is purely a Tamil tradition, and the construction of Dēvī shrines inside the Siva temples as part of the complex containing the benign forms of the Dēvī with local appellations (also by extension to Vishṇu temple complexes) came into general vogue from the 12th century in the Tamil country and it spread to the peripheral regions which came under its influence particularly during the Vijayanagar and later times, when much of South India was under a single rule. Though Kāmakōṭṭam was first mentioned in 1035, in the reign of Rājendrachōla I, in the great temple built by him in Gaṅgaikōṇḍachōlapuram, he, perhaps, did not put up a separate Vīmānam. Atleast there are no traces of one having been built. The central Vīmānam is flanked by two lesser Vīmānams the Uttara and the Dakshiṇa-Kailasa shrines. At a much later time was the former converted into a Dēvī shrine. Nor did he build a Tiru-Kāmakōṭṭam in the Ādipuriśvara temple in Tiruvorriyūr which he rebuilt.
in stone. Nor again did the Śivāchāriar, who built in his honour the Gaṅgaikōṇḍachālōśvaram temple in Kūlampandal, build a Tirukāmakōṭṭam. The process of providing Kāmakōṭṭams to all the shrines in the South which began after him continued till the thirteenth-fourteenth century.

In its earliest application Kāmakōṭṭam referred to independent Durgā shrines as at Kāñchi and Sāttamaṅgalam. It is rather noteworthy that the Tamil concept of Kāmakōṭṭam (that is Dēvi shrines attached to Śiva and Vishṇu temples) has not even today spread into Kērala where the original Bhagavatī cult along with that of Śaśtā prevails. In Kērala again along with the Bhagavatī cult, the Saptamāṭṛkā cult also prevails as one could always see the seven pedestals disposed in the open court (ක. ද. ය. අ. ප. අ. ප. අ. ප. ) round the sanctum of the Śiva temple representing the 'Seven Mothers or Śaktis'. These take the place of their sculptural representations, which were prevalent in the Tamil country till early Chōla times (11th century) and in the Chāḷukyan temples from early times till about the 12th century. Hailing from Kērala, Saṅkara, when he came to Kāñchimaṅgalam where the worship of Durgā under different names and in different forms prevailed, must have been attracted by the original Śakta Kāmakōṭṭam or Durgā temple that had then come into existence in Kāñchi (the equivalent of the Bhagavatī temple of Kērala) where obviously he installed the yantra. Perhaps in the original Durgā form, the Ādi Piṭhāsvari was associated with the Māṭṛkaṣ and Jyāṣṭhā, and this
must have led to the incorporation of some of these sculptures, amongst others like Sāstā, in the present Kāmākṣī temple.

Judging from the various associated objects—vestiges of the Buddhist, Jain and even Ājīvika cults, the present temple complex must have incorporated into it the debris of old temples of these sects—for example the Buddha images in the round, Buddhist reliefs on the pillars, the Māṇastambha with Brahma-Śiva Yaksha, which still stands in situ and the Jain sculptures.

The Kāñchī Kāmākṣṭṭam (old and new) is unique in that it has only one sanctum and only one mūlabhēra—and that for the Dēvi; and this necessitated the formulation of a distinct code of rituals—different from what is adopted in the Amman shrines within the Śiva temple complex elsewhere which are largely governed by Śaiva Āgamas. Vidya-raṇya in the 14th century standardised the Dēvipūjā paddhati when associated with the Sīri Chakra. Adepts in the succeeding centuries elaborated the kalpas and paddhatis with long commentaries, and the worship of Rāja Rājēśvari Lalitā Tripurasundāri became the norm for Sīri Vidyā sādhana. The new Kāmākṣī temple, enshrining Kāmākṣī in the aspect of Lalitā, naturally evolved a paddhati of its own much in conformity with Śri Vidyā sādhana. The worship is threefold; the highest is the worship of the Dēvi in the hṛdayākāśa, worship in Her formless aspect in the region of the heart; the next is the worship of Her subtle form represented by the chakra; and the third
is the worship of the image in Her gross anthropomorphic form. In the sanctum of this temple is conceived a bilākāśa, 'the ethereal abode in a cave', and there are the chakra and the idol—all these constitute the three aspects. The maṇḍapa in front of the sanctum has been named the Gāyatri maṇḍapa and the essential parivāra (subsidiary) deities of Laliṭā such as Vāśi, Mātaṅgi, Sarasvatī, Lakshmi and Annapūrṇā were provided. The evolution of the temple, particularly from the 16th century when Narasimhādīvarī installed the Śrī chakra, kept pace with the growing ritualistic requirements.

* * *

The ancient temples in Vāraṇaśī, Mathurā and other holy places, all citadels of our faith, were demolished by iconoclasts, and the new temples that have been re-built by princes and princesses and other enlightened philanthropists are now held in no less reverence. Temples in Mangalore, Nagercoil and the Ārāmas in Āndhra, originally temples of the 'heterodox' sects are now Hindu temples and are worshipped with reverence. It does not detract either from the sanctity or the importance of a temple that it is either of recent growth or has been transformed into its present character as a Hindu place of worship. "A block of granite chiselled into an idol becomes by proper saṁskāra Siva Himself capable of conferring worldly boons and deliverance at the end".

(पाणिनि शिष्यसंस्कारात् मुक्तिमुक्तिप्रदो भवेत्। पाणिनि शिष्यवर्तो याति ...)
Will not then a sculpture irrespective of the fact that it once represented a deity of another pantheon become worthy of worship as a Hindu god or goddess after the proper sāṁskāra has been made by adepts in Vaidik or Āgamic rituals? All that is required of the worshipper is the proper approach with faith and devotion.

* * *

The worshipper, while passing through the halls and corridors of a temple progressively leaves behind the perception of this world of flux (Māya), and standing before the sanctum experiences the grace of the deity and has the vision of the 'Unchanging Reality'. This is the significance of temple worship. This mystic truth, the two Dēvī temples in Kāñchī convey with an unmistakable clarity, but with a slight change in the idiom.

Kāmākṣī—Ādi Pīthēśvari—Durgā is the all-pervading Mother of the Universe; hence She assumes a dark-blue colour. The pāśa (noose) and the aṃkuṣa (goad) that She carries in two of Her hands symbolise the forces of attraction and repulsion that underlie the universe of phenomena, and also for attachment and hate in individuals. The kapāla is said to be the prapañcha kamala, the "lotus of the universe", and stands for the samāṣṭi or aggregate of the universe.

The Sovereign Matrix, that Kāmākṣī—Lalita is, She disports with the sugarcane bow and five arrows, the former representing the mind (cosmic and individual) and the latter, the tanmātras—the five
primordial bases of the world of senses, which together
denote the categories, diverse (vyāshṭi) in their
function. The Mother in Her grace releases the Jīva
from the meshes of these categories; and then Jīva
becomes Siva.

“No more for him, the gifted ‘knower of the Truth’, who
meditates upon the pāśa and arhkuṣa in the Mother’s hands, the
bonds of attachment and hate. No more for him, who meditates
on the bow and arrows, which the Mother displays, the blind fall
into the treacherous depths of sense-experiences”.

पार्श्वानुष्ठान तव करें परिचिन्त्य राग-
ि जयन्ति परमार्थविद्ध घन्या: ।
एकत्र चापितश शरं च मल्ला
व्यावर्तयति हृदयं विषयान्यत्रपातु ॥
— नीलकण्ठदीक्षितः

NOTES

When Kāmakōṭṭams were provided to temples all over the
south, adepts installed in several temples Yantras in the Dēvi
sanctums or adjoining them. The old Durgā or Kālī temples
which were not made saumya, and to which Āgamic or Vedic
Kalpas (or modes of worship) were either discontinued or not
prescribed at all, continued to be worshipped as grāmadēvatās,
such as Piḍāri, Jakkamma, Yakshamma, Ellaiyāmman, Ponni-
amman, Aṅgālamman, Gaṅgamma, Māramma, Māriyamman,
Selliyammāl or Sellāyi (from Sēlvi meaning sister — the sister of
Vishṇu — a concept as old as the Saṅgam period in Tamilnadu)
etc. Inscriptions furnish numerous instances of such temples
receiving royal and private grants. Of particular interest is a
very long inscription of Vīrārājendra Chōla from Gaṅgaikaṇḍa-
chōlapuram, recording in detail, the royal orders of his
predecessors, Rājādhirāja and Rājendra I regarding lands in
different parts of the empire granted to both Vishṇu and Śiva
temples. Significantly enough were included temples of Kālī,
Durgā etc., not neglecting those to Aiyanār.
ADDENDA

A new look at the chronology of the Nāyanārs is necessary to enable us to determine the approximate date of the origin of the old Kāmakoṭṭam (Ādi Piṭheśvarī temple). Our main sources are the Tēvāram hymns and Sekkīlār's Tiruttōṇḍar Purāṇam (Periya Purāṇam).

The fancied identity of Guṇabharan, a title of Pallava Mahendravarman I, with Guṇadharā in the name Guṇadharichchuram of the sanctum of the Śiva temple in Tiruvadigai (Sekkīlār's Periyapurāṇam, Tiru Nāvukkaraśu Nāyanār Purāṇam, verses 115–146) has conjured up a whole sequence of conclusions that are held sacrosanct. Publishers of repute have, in the recent editions of the text of Sekkīlār, printed Guṇabharā correcting the old form Guṇadharā.

The place where Maruṇikki — the original name of Appar — was tortured for his apostasy from the Jain faith was the coastal town of Tiruppādirippuliyūr (Tiruppāpuliyur—Cuddalore) which included Pāṭalipuram with its Jain monasteries. Maruṇikki was tortured in several ways and was finally thrown into the sea, but he was miraculously washed ashore in that part of the town which now bears the significant name of Karai-ēṭa-viṭṭakuppam. If the person who ordered the tortures was Mahēndravarman it could hardly be believed that he came from his capital and, camping at Pāṭalipuram, directed the whole operation to bring about the death of a humble Veḷḷāla boy.
Then the sequel: the ruler himself apostated from the Jain faith, to which allegedly he belonged, put all the Jains of the place to the sword, destroyed their *pallis* and, with their materials, built the sanctum of the Tiruvadigai temple which then came to be known as *Gunaṭhadharicchuram*.

Srinivasan very pertinently points out: "... based on what we know from architectural history of the South Indian temples, there could not have been a stone-built temple (*palli*) or a stone-built monastery (*pāli*) in Pāṭalipuram in the time of Mahāendra I, but only brick-and-timber structures. Only a stone structure, when dismantled, can yield material for rebuilding elsewhere, and not a brick and timber structure, the dismantling of which will yield only useless debris". Inscriptional evidence points to the building of the sanctum in the Tiruvadigai temple only in A.D. 703. The ruler who had such an easy conscience must have been a feudatory belonging to the local Pallava branch, who bore the title *Gunaṭdhara* which means the same thing as *Gunaṭabhara*.

Sēkkilār says that at the age of twelve, Tilakavatī, the sister of Marunikki, was betrothed to Kaliyanār, and immediately after, even before the marriage was formally celebrated. Kaliyanār was ordered to the front to fight against the invading 'northerners'—the Chaṭukyas. The army of Pulakesin II was turned back at Pujlalūr (c. 620). His second expedition was also a failure. The new Pallava ruler Narasimha varman I Mahāmalla led his victorious army to the Chaṭukya capital Bādāmi (*Vāṭāpi*) in 642. If it was...
the first campaign that Kaliyanār fought in, Maruṇākki would then have been in his teens, too young to have become the head of the Paṭalipuram pāli and subsequently converted the ruler. If it was the Bādāmi expedition of 642, he would have been a boy born after the death of Mahāndravarman in 630.

Kaliyanār could not have fought in either of these two campaigns. Between 670-74 Vikramāditya I marched from his camp near Kāṇchī, carried the war right into Tirumunai-p-pādi country and fought his way successfully to the banks of the Kāvērī. This must have been the occasion for the ruler of Tirumunaippādi to send Kaliyanār to the war, and to his death. Tilakavatī was about 12 years of age then and her brother Maruṇākki was younger. It will not be far from the mark if the year of Appar’s (Maruṇākki’s) birth is taken as 665. He was not a contemporary of Mahāndravarman I as is commonly believed.

According to Sekkilār, General Paraṃjōti, who successfully led the Pallava forces and threatened Badami (Vatāpi), retired (c. 680) from military service highly honoured by his sovereign, and retiring to his village Tiruchchēṅkāṭṭāṅguḍi, married and led the life of a model householder, worshipping Śiva and dispensing charity which earned for him the name of Siṟuttoṇḍar. It should be apparent that before being admitted to the ranks of the elect, as a saint, Siṟuttoṇḍar must have led, for several years, the life of a Sivanaḍiyār. At Pugalūr, he joined the company of Appar, Sambandar and other Nāyaṇārs who had gathered in the house of saint Muruganār. The saints’ meet at Pugalūr may be placed in the first quarter of the 8th century.

Scholars are inclined to see in the statement Ṣrī Ṛṣyākṣa Ṛṣayō Ṛṣayō (I. 63-11), in one of Sambandar’s Sīrkaḷi padigams a reference to Pallava Nandi having established his rule among his own people Ṣrī Ṛṣyākṣa (after having overcome all the troubles of adversity caused by the civil wars).

Sekkilār calls the Pāndyan king whom Sambandar converted to the Śaiva faith, Nēdu Mārān who ‘vanquished the kings from the north’. The Pāndya ruler was Māravarman Rājasimha, and his enemies from the north Kīrtivarman II and his feudatory Gaṅga Sripurusha both of whom he defeated at Nelvēli. Sekkilār gives a lurid picture of the battle. (But Nelvēli is mentioned twice in the Udayāndiram copper plates recording success to the Pallava general).
And here a very brief sketch of events will provide the necessary background for understanding the data relating to Sambandar, from the Pāṇḍyan side.

When Chālukya Vikramāditya placed on the Kāñchī throne a rival in the person of Chitramāya, Pallavamalla flew from the capital and was restored to the throne by Rāshtrakūṭa Dantidurga (c. 745). Pallavamalla was later besieged in Nandipura by the 'Dramila princes' among whom was the Pāṇḍya Rājasimha (730–68). After vanquishing his rebellious chiefs and other foes at Koḍumbāḷur and other places, Rājasimha was crossing the Kāvēri. Sambandar, who was then at Mukkiśvaram (Uṟaiyūr), blessed him and his Chōla and Chēra allies — (Tennavan, Sembian and Villavan-II, 120. 9 & 111). Rājasimha's queen was the daughter of the Chōla king. After crossing the river, the Pāṇḍya conquered Maḷakkoṅgam, the chief of which region—Kōḷli Maḷavān had previously entertained Sambandar.

When this particular phase of Pallava-Pāṇḍya confrontation ended, Rājasimha came under the influence of the Jains and in the words of Sēkkilār 'was caught in their wiles'. (என்ன இறைவேய் அருள் கை மனத்துடன்). At the pressing invitation of the queen and the minister, Sambandar went to Madurai, vanquished the Jains who had gathered in the palace, and restored the king to the Saiva faith. Sambandar in his padigam (III: 39: 4) mentions thirty-four Jains. Four of them are known to the inscriptions datable not earlier than the 8th century. They were Pushpa-
nandi, Kanakanandi, Kanakasena and Pavanananandi, all teachers of repute, from the South Pândya country.

The grateful Pândya, the Pândimâdëvi and the minister took Sambandar on a pilgrimage to the holy shrines of the kingdom. At Tiruppûvanam (modern Tirubhuvananam) the three crowned kings (Tennan, Sōlar and Sērar) who had previously gathered at Uṟaiyūr, were again present, and Sambandar blessed them (I. 64. 1 & 5). The saint and his royal hosts visited Tirupparâṅkuṇâram (I. 100–110). The Siva shrine at the time of the visit was perhaps a brick built one at that place. (The cave-temple on the northern side of the hill was remodelled out of an earlier Jaina temple in 773 by a minister Sāttan Gaṇapati and his wife; the cave-temple on the southern side with sculptural reliefs of the Saiva saints, the king and the queen on either flank of its facade was excavated later at the close of the eighth or commencement of the ninth century). Here also the three rulers were present and in a padigam, Sambandar exhorted them not to be misled by the Jains but to praise Siva.

The epigraphical and architectural evidences relating to the first half of the 8th century add a new dimension to our inquiry.

After Madurai Sambandar returned to the Chōla country and at Bhūtamaṅgai, an old Buddhist settlement on the Kāvēri in Taṅjavūr District, which attained greater importance after Narasimhavarman II Rājasimha built the ‘Chīna Buddhist Vihāra’ in Nāga-
paṭṭinam at the request of a Chinese ruler, two Buddhist teachers Buddhanandi and Chārubuddha had a controversy with Sambandar and were worsted.

Sambandar's pilgrimage to Kāṇchī and other shrines in Toṇḍainādu up to Kāḷahasti was perhaps the last of his long tours.

Appar learned of Sambandar's exploits in Madurai and visited the Pāṇḍya country; the ruler afforded him all facilities to visit the shrines that Sambandar had visited. An excerpt from his Rāmeśvara padigam—

\[\text{रामेश्वरपदिगम} \text{ (IV 15-7)}\]

perhaps refers to the Pāṇḍya Rājasimha. Infirmitv set in and the saint cultivated a deep sense of renunciation and passed away at a ripe old age.

The period of hundred years A D. 660-760 may be taken as marking the age of Appar-Sambandar.

It may safely be taken that Sundarar was born at the end of the 8th century and lived through most of the first half of the 9th century. Born in Nāvalūr in the Tirumunai-p-pāḍi country, Sundarar was brought up in his childhood in the palace of the local chief Naraśiṅgamunaiyaraiyar. The chief belonged to a family which continued to be famous till the time of Kulottuṅga Chōla III. The Mīḷāḍu chief Mēypporul Nāyanār, ruler of the Chēdi country from his capital Tirukkōyīlūr, was a contemporary of Sundarar; and so was Pugalṭtuṅai Nāyanār, who for his devoted services to a Śiva temple was canonized. It is tempting to identify him with Pugalṭtuṅaiśaiyaraiyan, who
in the 12th year of Pallava Dantivarman (A.D. 808) redeemed a land mortgaged by the priests of the Pārthasārati temple in Tiruvallikkēṇi (Triplicane). It was not rare for Brahmins to become araiyars (local administrators or chiefs) and even military commanders. Iḷangali, chief of Koḷumbalūr, who is said to be an ancestor of Āditya I—probably the latter’s maternal grandfather—was another contemporary Nāyanār (c. 800).

For twenty years from his regnal year 21 to 49 (817–845) there is no inscription of Dantivarman, and Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam had passed into the hands of the Telugu Chōla Śṛiṅaṭha of the Pottāppi family. He displayed the titles of Toṇḍaiyār Köṇ, Mayilaiyār Köṇ, etc. (Daḷavāypuram C. P.). According to Sēkkilār, Sundarar and his friend Chēramān Perumāl Nāyanār were entertained at Madurai by the Pāṇḍya and his ally the Chōla. They were obviously ŚrīmārāŚrivallabha whose alliance with Śṛiṅaṭha was cemented by dynastic marriages. Sundarar’s Tirupparaṇ-kunṭam padigam also testifies to the visit. In this shrine, the saint says, were then present the three crowned monarchs—Pāṇḍya ŚrīmārāŚrivallabha, Chōla Śṛiṅaṭha and the Chēramān (VII. 2–5—τρὶον ἐπὶ δύο

This visit must have taken place after 820. This conclusion receives further support in Sreedhara Menon’s latest book (Survey of Kerala History). He speaks of the second Chēra Empire under the dynasty of the Kulaśēkharas of Mahōdaya, of which the first ruler was Kulaśēkharra, the Vaishnava Āḻvār
(c. 800–820) and the second ruler Rājaśēkharavarman (c. 820–44) whom he identifies with the Chēramān Perumāḷ Nāyanār of Śekkilār. The Vālapallī inscription, perhaps the oldest in Kerala, dated in the 12th year of Rājaśēkhara's reign, praises him with the title of Paramēśvara Bhattachāraja. The peculiarity of the record is that it begins with the invocation Nama Śivāya instead of the usual Svastiśri. This is an indication of the correctness of the identification since Chēramān Perumāḷ Nāyanār is depicted in the Purāṇa as a devotee who had absolute faith in the efficacy of Śivapañcākshari mantra. The year 844 would mark the last year in the lives of Sundarar and Chēramān Perumāḷ, who together died at Tīruvaṉchikulam, and, in the language of the legend, flew to Kailāsa—an incident which formed the subject matter of temple murals in the succeeding centuries, particularly in the famous Rājarājēśvaram at Tānṭāvarūr, and which was commemorated by the installation of the statues of these two saints in the Tīruvaṉchikulam Śiva temple, even now in worship.

As Menon points out, Saṅkara was a younger contemporary of Kulaśēkhara Ālvār and an elder contemporary of Rājaśēkhara (Chēramān Perumāḷ).

In his Kōyil (Chidambaram) padigam Sundarar lays an imprecation on the Pallava's disloyal feudatories whom the 'Lord of Puliyūr Chittambalam will chastise'. This may refer to the troubles that Dantivarman had from disloyal chiefs which are indicated in the Vēḻūrpāḷaiyam plates of his successor Nandivarman III who 'had to obtain his kingdom
with the prowess of his arm, killing many enemies in
the battlefield. மலரியாரத்து கருணாத்தான் எல்லையை
போன்றபோன்ற கேரளப் பர்வதங்கள் மலரியார் மலரியார்
சென்று வழித்துவாய் பிறுது சிற்புமண்டு கொட்டிபைத்
வரை. (VII-90-4)

Sëkkilâr’s Tirûṭṭondâr Purâṇam (Periya Purâṇam)
is a hagiology composed in charming verses. It is a
useful source of history, but within limits. Sëkkilâr’s
purpose in composing the Purâṇam is to wean his
royal master Kulöttunga II (1133-50) from the
pursuit of ‘impious’ literature like the Jivakachintâ-
maṇi and turn instead to the contemplation of the
lives of Saiva saints. For this purpose he introduced
fanciful legends such as the genocide of Jains at
Pâṭalipuram, and later at Madurai, deforming the
queen of Kâlârchingan, and the aerial flight of
Sundarâr and Chëramân to Kailâsa. In the foregoing
inquiry, we have taken care to utilise only such
incidents from Sëkkilâr as could be related to known
historical data.

The evidence of the archaeologist compels atten-
tion, especially when it is based upon a close study
of the architectural features and the sculptures in
relation to them. The proliferation of Purânic and
Āgamic literature and the multiplication, side by
side of creeds and rituals, introduced new gods and
goddesses, not known to ancient Tamil literature and
forms of religious worship. The new additions to
the pantheon that have found plastic or mural
representation in temples are lauded in the Tëvâram
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and the Vaishnava Divyaprabandam hymns. Srinivasan has brought out this synchronism pointing to the seventh century as the starting point. His conclusion points to the period 650-850 as the age of these three Nayanars and corroborates the other evidences examined above.

*   *   *

The juxtaposition of a Sākta shrine and a Jain shrine was very common in the past. The Pallavas (Mahendra Varman I and his successors) deliberately chose Jain places of importance to excavate their cave temples (e.g., Māmaṇḍūr, Dalavānur, Siyamāṅgalaṃ, Tiruchirāpaḷḷi etc.,). And so did the Pāṇḍyas (e.g., Ānamalai, Tirupparankuṇṭram, Kuḍumiyāmalai, Nārttāmalai etc.,). Jain cave temples were converted into Siva and Dēvi temples (e.g., Malaiyadikuturi, Tirupparankuṇṭram, Lādkovil in Ānamalai and Pillayārpaṭṭi). In Kerala and in Kanyakumari and other districts in Tamilnadu, the same trend is noticeable. Yakshis Dharmadevi, Kūshmāṇḍini, Jvalamālini etc., of the Jains are now Bhagavati, worshipped in some cases by Nambūtiris and Pōttis. Still may be seen by their side reliefs of Tīrthāṅkaras. Tiruchāranaṭṭumalai near Chitrāl, Kallil near Perumbāvūr, Vallimalai (Chingleput District) are prominent examples. In the Kuḍalmāṇikkam (near Iriṅjālakuḍa) temple the idol, now worshipped as Bharata, was according to tradition, formerly worshipped by Jains as their Bharatamuni. The hill called Aiyanarkovil hill in Kālugalumalai (Tirunelveli District) has a large number of Jain images and inscriptions, of the 11th-
12th centuries, besides the natural cavern. On the hill called Bhagavatimalai north of Śiṅgikūlam, the Bhagavatī temple was formerly dedicated to a Jaina deity as evidenced by the presence of a Jaina Tīrthaṅkara in the inner shrine now called Gautama Rishi, and other mutilated Jaina images lying at the foot of the hill. That it was a Jaina temple till later Pāṇḍya times is confirmed by an inscription of Sundara Pāṇḍya. In the Nāgarāja temple in Nāgercoil, Pārśva-nātha Tīrthaṅkara is now Ananta Ālvār or Ādiśesha of Vishṇu. The name Kāvu as a place dedicated to Bhagavatī or Sāstā in Kerala is remeniscient of the term Kāval (guardianship of a place) of Tamil literature and tradition (cf. Āriyan Kāvu—Āriyan is Sāstā or Aiyappan).

Another development also may be noted. Koravai of the ancient Tamils, who was worshipped with bloody sacrifices—including the chopping off by the devotee of his limbs ending with decapitating the head (called navakoonḍam)—was later invested with a saumya or benevolent aspect, and invoked in the form of Ardhanaṛī, which is frequently met with in the hymns of Appar and Sambandar. This largely prepared the ground for Śaṅkara's reform in temple worship.
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I. Gopuram of the Ādi Pīṭhēśvarī Kamakshī temple.

II. Eastern gopuram of the new Kāmākshī temple
(Photos: I & II. Courtesy — Archaeological Survey of India)

III. Aṣāgiyamaṇṇavāla Jiyar mistakenly called Ādi Saṅkara in maṇḍapam leading to Nāchiyār shrine in Varadarāja Perumāl temple, Kāñchī. Courtesy—Dr. K. V. Raman.

IV. An old Dēvi sculpture in the Ādi Pīṭhēśvarī Kāmākshī temple. (not in worship now) (Photo)

V. Ādi Pīṭhēśvarī Kāmākshī (with the receptacle for a Śrīchakra in front) (Photo)

VI. Kāmākshī in the present temple with the receptacle in front containing Śrīchakra.
(Painting: Courtesy—Amuda Surabi)
[V & VI are decked with conventional costumes and ornaments].

VII. Swarna Kāmākshī — (metal—now in Taṇjavūr)
(Painting: Courtesy—Swadesamitrān)
[Also decked with conventional costumes and ornaments]

VIII. Dharma Dēvi — a much weathered granite sculpture, now in the Vardhamāna temple at Tiruparuttikunṭram.
(Photo: Courtesy—Mr. S. Appanda Raj, Trustee of the temple).
[VI & VII are as near an approximation to the original idols as paintings can be].
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