

CANḌA AND THE SACRIFICIAL REMNANTS.  
A CONTRIBUTION TO INDIAN GASTROTHEROLOGY

« Opfern heisst die Götter speisen »<sup>1</sup>. To feed the gods is a central element of Hindu *pūjā* ritual — it may even be called *the* central element<sup>2</sup>. The offering of eatables (and other substances; water, flowers etc.) for the consumption and enjoyment of the gods is, however, just one aspect of the food transactions that constitute a sacrifice. There are leavings from the meal of the gods, remainders to which a great ritual value is ascribed. Such leavings are ambiguous — at the same time dangerous and beneficial. They cannot be simply ignored but must be taken care of in some way. Thus a great amount of ritual rules have been created from Vedic times onwards, which regulate the handling of sacrificial leavings<sup>3</sup>. One way to dispose of these remainders is to (re)sacrifice them, to dedicate them to some suitable superhuman (non-human) being. In the present article I will discuss the Hindu divinity Canḍa (Canḍeśa, Canḍeśvara) who acts as the recipient of the remnants from sacrifices to Śiva.

---

1. L. FEUERBACH, *Das Geheimnis des Opfers oder Der Mensch ist, was er isst*, in « Sämtliche Werke. Zehnter Band », Stuttgart, 1911, p. 50. The article was originally published in 1862.

2. Cf. L. A. BABB, *The divine hierarchy: popular Hinduism in Central India*, New York and London, 1975, pp. 31-67.

3. The rules on how to treat sacrificial remnants are discussed e.g. in J. GONDA, *Atharvaveda* 11, 7, in « Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou », Paris, 1968, pp. 301-36, CH. MALAMOU, *Observations sur la notion de « reste » dans le brahmanisme*, in WZKS, 16 (1972), pp. 5-26, and A. WEZLER, *Die wahren « Speiseresteesser » (Skt. vighasaśin). Beiträge zur Kenntnis der indischen Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte*, I, in « Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur », Mainz, 1978, nr. 5, Mainz & Wiesbaden, 1978.

*Cantecuranāyaṇār*

In the Śaiva hagiography of the Tamil tradition one of the 63 saints (*nāyaṇār*) is called Caṇṭi, Caṇṭica or Caṇṭecuranāyaṇār in Tamil; in Sanskrit his name is Caṇḍa, Caṇḍeśa or Caṇḍeśvara. The 63rd saint, Cuntarar (8th-9th Cent.), enumerates his predecessors among the Śaiva devotees in his catalogue-hymn *Tiruttoṇṭattokai*. Caṇṭi is mentioned as the 20th in order. The same order is later followed by Nampī Āṇṭar Nampī (9th-10th Cent.) in *Tiruttoṇṭar Tiruvantāti* and by Cēkkiḷār, the author of the *Periyapurāṇam* (12th Cent.)<sup>4</sup>. In Nampī Āṇṭar Nampī's and Cēkkiḷār's works the stories of the « Holy Slaves » are expanded and the amount of biographical details increases. The core of the Caṇṭi myth, however, is present already in the *Tiruttoṇṭattokai* and other hymns of the *Tēvāram*. In a hymn by Campantar the central part of Caṇṭi's story is summarized:

« He made /a/ *liṅga* of sand and poured milk over it. His mind was concentrated on it. Realizing this wasteful act, his father came to prevent it. The saint dashed against him. The Lord made him Caṇṭica and gave him a bunch of flowers »<sup>5</sup>.

In other hymns of the *Tēvāram* we are told that Caṇṭi's *pūjā* of the sand *liṅga* included sacrifice of *ghī* and garlands of laburnum flowers (Tam. *koṇṇai*, Cassia fistula — the *koṇṇai* flowers are known already in the « Sangam » literature to be « specially appropriate and sacred to Śiva »<sup>6</sup>). According to Cuntarar Caṇṭi « threw the axe at the leg of the father »<sup>7</sup>. Śiva showed his appreciation of Caṇṭi's devotion by giving him food and a garland of flowers as a symbol of the leadership conferred upon him<sup>8</sup>, i.e. by returning the gifts brought to him by Caṇṭi.

This episode is put within its biographical context in the *Periyapurāṇam*. There it is told that a boy called Vicāraśarman was born as the son of the Brahmin Yajñadatta and his wife Pavitrā living in the town of Cēyñālūr in the Cōḷa country. Vicāraśarman became a devotee of the Lord Śiva while still a young boy. When he once saw a herdsman maltreating a cow, he persuaded the Brahmin owners of that herd of cows to let him take care of it. Having made a temple and a *liṅga* out of sand on the bank of the river Maṇṇi, Vicāraśarman took some of the milk flowing spontaneously in abundance from the udders of the grazing cows entrusted to him and used it together with some flowers to make

4. Concerning these texts cf. K. V. ZVELEBIL, *Tamil literature*, in « Handbuch der Orientalistik », Zweiter Abteilung, 2 Band, 1 Abschnitt, Leiden, 1975, pp. 131-35.

5. Quoted in M. A. DORAI RANGASWAMY, *The religion and philosophy of Tēvāram*, book II, in « Madras University Tamil Department Publication Series », no. 21, Madras, 1959, p. 963.

6. N. SUBRAHMANYAN, *Pre-Pallavan Tamil index*, in « Madras University Historical Series », no. 23, Madras, 1966, p. 331.

7. M. A. DORAI RANGASWAMY, *op. cit.*, p. 964.

8. M. A. DORAI RANGASWAMY, *op. cit.*, pp. 963-67.

*pūjā* to Śiva. When the Brahmins owning the cows, which they kept for ritual needs<sup>9</sup>, heard the rumour that Vicāraśarman, their herdsman, poured out the milk on the sand at the riverside, they angrily called his father Yajñadatta. The next morning Yajñadatta followed Vicāraśarman stealthily to the river and watched him worshipping the sand *liṅga*. Furious at the sight of his behaviour, Yajñadatta attacked him and started to beat his pious but wasteful son with a stick. As that attack was not even noticed by Vicāraśarman, absorbed in his devotion, Yajñadatta kicked at the pot of milk used in the *pūjā* and overturned it. At this sinful act Vicāraśarman picked up a stick, which in his hands was transformed into an axe, and as he struck at his father's legs they were chopped off. Thereafter he was able to continue the *pūjā* ritual undisturbed. Śiva then manifested himself and praised Vicāraśarman's devotion. The god promised to be the new father of his devotee and gave to him a flower(garland) from his own head. This was a token of Vicāraśarman's new title and position as « Caṇḍeśa », i.e. commander-in-chief and leader of all Śiva's servants. As such he was also entitled a share in the food and the flowers sacrificed to Śiva<sup>10</sup>.

The apotheosis of Vicāraśarman/Caṇḍeśa became a common motif in the Śaiva iconography of the Tamil area. A relief on the wall of the Dharmarāja *ratha* and the Somāskanda relief on the back wall of the shrine-cell (i.e. probably the original cult image) of the Mahiṣamardīnī cave temple at Mahābalipuram (both from the latter part of the 7th Cent.) might depict this motif. Another Pallava relief representing the same subject is found in the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāñcī (early 8th Cent.)<sup>11</sup>. In the Śaiva Āgamas this manifestation of Śiva is known as the Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti; iconographical rules are formulated for its presentation. These iconographical conventions are followed in the Cōla sculptures depicting the Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti. The most famous specimen is the 11th Cent. relief on the wall of the Bṛhadiśvara temple at Gaṅgāikondacolapuram. Śiva is shown as winding a garland of flowers round the head of his faithful devotee Caṇḍeśa<sup>12</sup>.

Now, what is the message of the Caṇḍeśa myth, its meaning to South Indian devotees of Śiva? It is obvious that the story follows a

9. The milk is a ritual necessity, e.g. in the *agnihotra* performed twice daily. Cfr. P. V. KANE, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. II, part II, Poona, 1974 (2nd ed.), pp. 998-1008.

10. Cf. H. V. SCHOMERUS, *Sivaitische Heiligenlegenden (Peryapurāṇa und Tiruvā-tavūrar-purāṇa)*, in « Religiöse Stimmen der Völker. Texte zur Gottes-Mystik des Hinduismus », Band II, Jena, 1925, pp. 104-7.

11. Three possible interpretations of the relief on the Dharmarāja *ratha* are given by C. SIVARAMAMURTI, *Mahābalipuram*, New Delhi, 1978 (4th ed.), pp. 12-3. On the Mahiṣamardīnī cave temple see K. R. SRINIVASAN, *Cave-temples of the Pallavas*, in « Architectural Survey of Temples », 1, New Delhi, 1964, p. 153. J. N. BANERJEA, *The development of Hindu iconography*, Calcutta, 1956, p. 260, mentions the Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti relief at Kāñcī.

12. Cf. J. N. BANERJEA, *op. cit.*, p. 485.

widely spread pattern in Tamil hagiography. Many parallels to the structure and the central elements of the story can easily be recognized within the corpus of *nāyaṇār* legends as represented by the *Periyapurāṇam*. One main theme of course is that sinful acts, abominable deeds, or just expressions of a lack of good manners, are transformed into meritorious, saintly achievements if executed within the context of Śiva worship and if the actors' intention is to honour him. This theme is quite compatible with the strong antinomian tendency in Śaiva tradition. Śiva is himself described as an outsider and a breaker of ritual rules: he is the naked ascetic, the bearer of the skull, the murderer of Brahmā etc. The theme of transformation of sinful acts into saintly deeds is not, however, restricted to Śaiva tradition. It is present also in Vaiṣṇava legends, as the scepticism towards orthodox (Vedic) ritualism is common to both the main branches of the South Indian *bhakti* movement. Thus Periyālvār makes Viṣṇu say:

« My devotees cannot commit any sin. Even if they do so, it is not a sin. Virtue is what I like. So when I like what my devotees do, even if it is a sin, it becomes a virtue »<sup>13</sup>.

In the myths of the *bhakti* gods and their devotees the humiliation of too ritualistically inclined Brahmins is a motif often used to illustrate the idea that loving devotion to god is more important than the outward forms of ritual and social convention. This is what has been called the spirit of « social negativism » in Tamil *bhakti* literature<sup>14</sup>. Even an extremely polluted gift is accepted by the god, when offered in worship by one of his true *bhaktas*. The motif of the unclean sacrifice graciously accepted by the god can be exemplified by the story of Ćiṛuttoṇṭar, Śiva's « little servant », who slaughtered his own little son to prepare a meal for Śiva masquerading as a Bhairava ascetic. The god looked upon this horrible crime as a pious act, because it was done unselfishly and out of excessive love<sup>15</sup>. Another example is the myth of Kaṇṇappār (or Tiṇṇaṇ), the hunter. He made *pūjā* to Śiva's *liṅga* and as food offering he sacrificed meat from wild animals that he had killed. To be able to select the best bits for the god, he chewed the meat before sacrificing any of it to the *liṅga*. A horrified Brahmin witnessed Kaṇṇappār's *pūjā*, but was later convicted of the hunter's piety and Śiva's benevolence

13. Quoted in K. K. A. VENKATACHARI, *The Maṇipravāla literature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas*, in « Anantacharya Research Institute Series », no. III, Bombay, 1978, p. 103.

14. K. V. ZVELEBIL, *The smile of Murugan*, Leiden, 1973, p. 193.

15. See G. L. HART, *The Little Devotee: Ćekkīlār's story of Ćiṛuttoṇṭar*, in « Sanskrit and Indian studies », edited by M. Nagatomi, J. M. Masson and E. Dimock, « Studies of Classical India », vol. 2, Dordrecht, 1980, pp. 217-36; and H. V. SCHOMERUS, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-72, for the story of Ćiṛuttoṇṭar. Cf. G. L. HART, *The nature of Tamil devotion*, in « Aryan and non-Aryan in India », edited by M. M. Deshpande and P. E. Hook, Ann Arbor, 1979, p. 29. There is a close similarity to the story of Sibi as told in the Mahābhārata (3.198, not in the crit. ed.).



towards him<sup>16</sup>. In this story pollution is transmuted into purity, when Śiva accepts what technically is the leavings of the devotee's meal, i.e. the *ucchiṣṭa*. This is of course a complete reversal of the normal ritual pattern, which is paradigmatically described in the Caṇḍeśa myth: as a devotee, Caṇḍeśa receives a share of Śiva's leavings, the left-overs of the sacrifice, which symbolizes the god's grace (Tam. *aruḷ*, Skt. *prasāda*) towards him<sup>17</sup>.

A close parallel to the story of Kaṇṇappar's sacrifice is found in the Vaiṣṇava tradition concerning Śabarī. This pious woman of a forest tribe received Rāma as a guest and offered him wild fruits to eat. But before she handed them over to him, she ate herself (to see which of them were ripe). Thus Rāma received the remainder of Śabarī's meal and gave her his blessing (*aruḷ*)<sup>18</sup>.

Another similar legend is told about Āṇṭāl, the only female *ālṅvār*. In Parāśarabhaṭṭa's introductory Sanskrit stanza (*taṇiyan*) to Āṇṭāl's *Tiruppāvai*, he praises the poetess as the one who enjoyed Kṛṣṇa after having enchained him by force in a garland which was her own leaving (*ucchiṣṭa*):

*svocchiṣṭāyām sraji nigalitam yā balāt kṛtya bhūṅkte*<sup>19</sup>.

« ... who, forcibly having made (him, i.e. Kṛṣṇa) imprisoned in the garland which is her own leaving (*ucchiṣṭa*), enjoys (him) ... ».

According to Vaiṣṇava tradition Āṇṭāl was an orphan, but she was taken care of by Periyālṅvār (Skt. Viṣṇucitta) and helped him to make garlands for Viṣṇu. But before the flower garlands were given to the god she put them on her own hair and looked into the mirror. After she had used them, the god gladly accepted them, bearing the fragrance of her

16. See H. V. SCHOMERUS, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-94, for the story, and cf. D. D. SHULMAN, *Tamil temple myths. Sacrifice and divine marriage in South Indian Saiva tradition*, Princeton, 1980, p. 135.

17. Cf. D. D. SHULMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

18. This is not told by Vālmīki, though Rāma's visit to Śabarī is mentioned, nor by Kampaṇ in the 12th chapter of the *Āraṇiya Kāṇṭam* which deals with the Capari-episode. The commentator of the edition of U. V. Sāminātaiyar Nulnilaiyam (Madras, 1959), however, refers to this variant of the tradition: *avaḷ uṇṭu mītvaittiruntavarrai irāmapirāṇ uṇṭaruḷiṇāṇ* (commentary to v. 1190d. I wish to thank Carl Suneson for his help with this quotation). Cf. A. K. RAMANUJAN, *Hymns for the drowning. Poems for Viṣṇu by Nammālṅvār*, Princeton, 1981, pp. 148-49. The motif is well-known to later Vaiṣṇava literature. See e.g. the *Tilaka* commentary on Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* 3.74.17-18; Priyādāsa's *ṭikā* on Nābhāji's *Bhaktamālā* 35-37; Sūrdās' *Sūrasāgara* 1.13 and 9.67; cf. also V. ELWIN, *The religion of an Indian tribe*, Bombay, 1955, pp. 21-4, on modern oral tradition.

19. Cf. J. FILLIOZAT, *Un texte tamoul de dévotion vishnouite. Le Tiruppāvai d'Āṇṭāl*, in PIFI, no. 45, Pondichéry, 1972, pp. XVIII-XIX, and E. AF EDHOLM and CARL SUNESON, *The seven bulls and Kṛṣṇa's marriage to Nīlā/NappiNNai in Sanskrit and Tamil literature*, in « Temenos », 8 (1972), p. 40. See also D. HUDSON, *Bathing in Krishna. A study in Vaiṣṇava Hindu theology*, in « Harvard Theological Review », 73 (1980), pp. 548 ff.

hair. This can be read in Garuḍavāhana Paṇḍita's *kāvya* on the lives of the *ālvārs*, the *Divyasūricarita*:

*srajaṃ svapitrā nihitāṃ samarpanāt purā hares sā viniveśya kuntale /  
vilokya vaktraṃ gṛhakuḍyadarpaṇe vimucya tāṃ pūrvapade 'karot  
punah //*  
*yathā tadyālakabhuktapūrvayā srajā mudam prāpa murārīr  
anvahaṃ /*  
*tathā na tasyā janakapradīṣṭayā purā na vā mālyakṛtopanīṭayā //*  
*upetya divyopavanāntam anvahaṃ navinapuṣpāny apacītya sā hareḥ /  
vidhāya mālām adīśat pituhkare svakeśaleśapratipanna-saurabhām //*<sup>20</sup>

42. « The garland, which was deposited by her father before (its) presentation to Hari, she (i.e. Godā) put on her hair. Having looked upon (her) face in the mirror on the wall of the house and having taken it (i.e. the garland) off, (she) placed it on (its) former place.
43. Such delight as Murārī (i.e. Kṛṣṇa) daily attained through the garland previously enjoyed by her locks, such (delight) he did not (attain) through that (garland) which was granted by (her) father, nor formerly by the one offered by the garland-maker.
44. Having daily gone to the divine forest she gathered fresh flowers for Hari. Having prepared a garland, she placed it, (which was bearing) the fragrance resulting from obtaining small particles of her hair, in her father's hand ».

The marriage of Āṇṭāl (Skt. Godā) to Viṣṇu as Śrīraṅganātha is the climax of the *Divyasūricarita*. In the Tamil tradition Viṣṇu's acceptance of Āṇṭāl's garland is connected with this marriage: according to an old custom a girl gives a garland of flowers to the man she chooses for her husband<sup>21</sup>.

Just like the stories of Kaṇṇappar's sacrifice and of Śabarī's hospitality, the legend of Āṇṭāl, who gives her used (*ucchiṣṭa*) garland to the god, is a reversal of the story of Caṇḍeśa. To summarize, Caṇḍeśa is a representative of the « normal » devotees who honour Śiva and his *liṅga* through *pūjā* worship. The central element of the *pūjā* is the sacrifice of food (in this case milk) and flowers. Caṇḍeśa represents the *bhaktas* also as a recipient of the remnants of sacrifice, the left-overs from the

20. *Divyasūri Caritam*, by GARUḌA VĀHANA PAṆḌITA, edited by T. A. Sampath Kumaracharya and K. K. Venkatachari, in « Anantacharya Research Institute Series », no. II, Bombay, 1978, 9.42-44. Concerning the date of Garuḍavāhana see B. V. RAMANUJAM, *History of Vaishnavism in South India upto Ramanuja*, Annamalainagar, 1973, pp. 13-4 (16th Cent).

21. See J. FILLIOZAT, *op. cit.*, p. VIII.

meal of the god and the flowers that the god has worn. The devotee's offering to god is reciprocated and surpassed by the god's immensely more valuable gift to the *bhakta*, the residue of the sacrifice (*nirmālya*). This gift from god to man is also called the *prasāda*, as it is a token of god's grace. In the ordinary *pūjā* cult the transformation of the sacrificial substances into residue is said to take place at the moment when the deity is dismissed from the place of sacrifice:

*arvāg visarjanād dravyaṃ naivedyaṃ sarvaṃ ucyate /  
visarjite jagannāthe nirmālyaṃ bhavati kṣaṇāt //*<sup>22</sup>

« Before the dismissal (*visarjana*) the sacrificial materia (*dravya*) is in toto called *naivedya*. When Jagannātha is dismissed it becomes *nirmālya* instantaneously ».

After the dismissal (*visarjana*) of the god the former *naivedya* is known as *nirmālya* or *prasāda*. The devotee puts the *nirmālya* on his head:

*nirmālyaṃ mūrdhni gṛhṇīyād dharmakāmārthasādhanaṃ*<sup>23</sup>  
« ... one should take the remains of the offerings on one's head, which brings success in *dharma*, *kāma* and *artha* ».

*nirmālyaṃ dhārayed bhaktyā śirasā pārvatīpateḥ /  
rājasūyasya yajñasya phalaṃ āpnoty anuttamam //*<sup>24</sup>

« Out of *bhakti* one should carry the *nirmālya* of Pārvatī's husband on (one's) head. (In that way) one obtains the unsurpassed fruit of a *rājasūya* sacrifice ».

Śiva's Caṇḍeśānugrahamūrti can be interpreted as an illustration of this ritual prescription: Śiva puts his used garland as *nirmālya* on Caṇḍeśa's head<sup>25</sup>.

### Caṇḍeśvara as a parivāradevatā

Caṇḍeśa is not only known as a *nāyaṇār*, whose myth illustrates the fundamental structure of *pūjā* worship. In the myth Vicāraśarman is given the name « Caṇḍeśa » as a title. To be Caṇḍeśa is to uphold an office as the leader of the god's servants, as his commander-in-chief and

22. *Agnipurāṇa* (AAS 41) 196.14.

23. *Kālikāpurāṇa* (Jaikrishnadas-Krishnadas Prachyavidya Granthamala 5) 57.172cd.

24. *Saurapurāṇa* (AAS 18) 66.8.

25. The devotee puts a flower on his head (*Agnipurāṇa* 74.38). Cf. A. ÖSTÖR, *The play of the gods. Locality, ideology, structure and time in the festivals of a Bengali town*, Chicago and London, 1980, p. 114: « ... the devotee places a *mānsik phul* (a votive flower) on the *līṅga* and addresses a wish or a vow to the god, beseeching Śiva to give back the flower should he look upon the request favorably. ... When the flower falls he tries to catch it, shouting the names of Śiva in jubilation ».

as the manager of his earthly property. In this capacity Caṇḍeśa/Caṇḍeśvara is classified as one of Śiva's *parivāradevatās* <sup>26</sup>. The minor deities are given their own shrines in early Cōḷa Śiva temples. Caṇḍeśvara's shrine is usually located in the north-eastern quarter. He is depicted holding his main attribute, the axe (with which he cuts the legs of his father). At the Bhairavakoṇḍa cave temples (end of the 8th Cent.) Caṇḍeśa is placed to the north and Gaṇeśa to the south of the temple entrances <sup>27</sup>. Many of the old Caṇḍeśvara shrines of the Śiva temples in Tamilnadu seem to have been destroyed. Comparatively early shrines are, however, still to be seen e.g. in Cidambaram and Tañjāvur (in the Rājaraṇeśvara temple) <sup>28</sup>. At these and other « imperial » Cōḷa temples of Śiva the shrine of Caṇḍeśa is located close to the *praṇāla*, i.e. it has been lifted out of the former series of *aṣṭaparivāra* shrines.

As the manager of Śiva's property Caṇḍeśvara is the representative of Śiva in his economic and legal relations to other gods (or their managers) and to men. This aspect of Caṇḍeśvara's position quite naturally is very prominent in one important type of historical source material: the temple inscriptions. He is mentioned there as the *ādidāsa* and as he is formally the keeper of Śiva's treasury, the economic transactions of the Śiva temples are in many cases made in *his* — not in Śiva's own — name. To quote just one example, we can read in a Cōḷa inscription in the Kailāsanātha temple at Kāñcī that the villagers of Meṇalūr

« ... have received from Ādidāsa Caṇḍeśvara (*in*) the holy stone temple at Kāñchipuram eighteen *kaṇṇjus*, three *mañjādis* and one *kunṇi* of gold. From the interest of these eighteen *kaṇṇjus*, three *mañjādis* and one *kunṇi* of gold, we shall pour out daily, as long as the sun and the moon exist, (*for*) one *nandā* lamp, one *uṛakku* of oil... » <sup>29</sup>.

### *caṇḍadravya*

The *parivāradevatā* Caṇḍeśvara/Caṇḍa occupies an important position in the regulations of Śaiva temple cult. A garland of flowers is taken from the *liṅga* and given to Caṇḍa in the north-eastern quarter already in the preliminary part of the Śiva *pūjā* according to the *Agnipurāṇa*:

26. Cf. S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAM, *Early Chola temples*, Bombay etc., 1971, pp. 327-29.

27. See K. V. SOUNDARA RAJAN, *Cave temples of the Deccan*, in « Architectural Survey of Temples », 3, New Delhi, 1981, pp. 298-312.

28. Cf. T. SATYAMURTI, *The Nataraja temple. History, art and architecture*, New Delhi, 1978, p. 26, and S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAM, *Middle Chola temples*, Faridabad, 1975, p. 25; K. R. SRINIVASAN, *Temples of South India*, New Delhi, 1971, p. 123. Cf. also M. DHAKY, *Caṇḍeśa in North Indian tradition*, in JAS, Bombay, 12 (1970), pp. 103-09.

29. E. HULTZSCH, *South Indian Inscriptions*, vol. I, Varanasi and Delhi, 1972 (reprint), p. 116.

*brahmapaṇcakam āvartya mālyam ādāya liṅgataḥ /  
aiśānyāṃ diśi caṇḍāya hṛdayena nivedayet //<sup>30</sup>*

« Having turned around the *brahmapaṇcaka* (and) having taken the garland from the *liṅga*, one should offer it in (one's) heart to Caṇḍa in the quarter of Śiva (i.e. in the north-eastern quarter). ».

It is easy to recognize Caṇḍeśa, the receiver of Śiva's garland, described in the myth. The main task of the divinity Caṇḍa is to receive the *nirmālya*, the remnants of the food and other substances sacrificed to Śiva.

The rules given in the Purāṇas and the Āgamas on how to handle the residue of sacrifice are not compatible, but do often contradict each other. That has of course created problems for pious ritualists, as their wish to systematize those rules and follow *all* of them is frustrated<sup>31</sup>.

One fundamental rule of Śaiva ritualism is that what has once been given to Caṇḍa, the *caṇḍadravya*, should not thereafter be used by any human. The devotees may only take part of and enjoy those remnants to which Caṇḍa is not entitled:

*caṇḍādhikāro yatrāsti tad bhoktavyaṃ na mānavaiḥ /  
caṇḍādhikāro no yatra bhoktavyaṃ tac ca bhaktitah //<sup>32</sup>*

« Where Caṇḍa is authorised that (i.e. the *nirmālya*) should not be partaken of by men. Where Caṇḍa is not authorised that (i.e. the *nirmālya*) should be partaken of by those who have *bhakti* ».

As the things sacrificed (*naivedya*) are not transformed into remnants (*nirmālya*) until the god to which they are offered is bidden to depart through the *visarjana* ceremony, the main sacrifice of *nirmālya* to Caṇḍa cannot take place until the end of the *pūjā* of Śiva<sup>33</sup>. The leftovers dedicated to Caṇḍa as the concluding part of the worship of Śiva consist not only of remnants of food, but also of leavings of the other substances sacrificed to Śiva (betel, garlands, ointments etc.):

*lehyacoṣyādyannavaraṃ tāmḃūlaṃ sragvilepanam /  
nirmālyaṃ bhojanaṃ tubhyaṃ pradattaṃ tu śivājñayā //<sup>34</sup>*

« That very best food which is licked, sucked, etc., (and) the betel, the garlands and the unguents — (that) *nirmālya* is given to you as food on Śiva's command ».

30. Agnipurāṇa 74.41.

31. Cf. H. BRUNNER, *De la consommation du nirmālya de Śiva*, in « Journal asiatique », 257 (1969), pp. 213-63.

32. Śivapurāṇa. Vidyēśvarasaṃhitā 22.16.

33. Cf. the *caṇḍapūjā* as described in the Agnipurāṇa 76.

34. Agnipurāṇa 76.11. This śloka is quoted as « unidentified » by H. BRUNNER, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

One problem is how much of the sacrificial remnants is to be given to Caṇḍa. If all of the remnants was to be dedicated to him, nothing would remain to Śiva's devotees who are also entitled to a share in the *nirmālya* which is also known as the « great blessing » (*mahāprasāda*):

*śivādīkṣānvito bhakto mahāprasādasamjñakam /  
sarveṣām api līṅgānāṃ naivedyaṃ bhakṣayec chubham //*<sup>35</sup>

« A devotee who has undergone the initiation of Śiva should eat the auspicious *naivedya* from all *līṅga*-s, (the *naivedya* which is) known as the great blessing (*mahāprasāda*) ».

Thus the initiated *bhaktas* are recommended to take part of the remnants. Even to look at the sacrificed substances delivers from all sins and to take part of them is a great merit which leads to communion with Śiva:

*drṣtvāpi śivanaivedyaṃ yānti pāpāni dūrataḥ /  
bhukte tu śivanaivedye puṇyāny āyānti koṭīśaḥ //*  
*alam yāgasahasreṇāpy alam yāgārbudair api /  
bhakṣite śivanaivedye śivasāyujyam āpnuyāt //*<sup>36</sup>

4. « At the mere sight of Śiva's *naivedya* all sins go far away, but when Śiva's *naivedya* is eaten, crores of merits do arrive.
5. Away with even thousands of sacrifices, away with even oceans of sacrifices! When Śiva's *naivedya* is eaten, one will obtain union with Śiva ».

*pādodakam ca nirmālyaṃ bhaktair dhāryaṃ prayatnataḥ /  
na tān sprśanti pāpāni manovākkāyajāny api //*<sup>37</sup>

« The water of the (washing of Śiva's) feet and the *nirmālya* is to be kept zealously by the devotees. The sins originating from mind, speech and body do not touch them ».

The sacrificial remnants may not be treated disrespectfully — the offender is reborn as a *cāṇḍāla*:

*nirmālyalaṅghanāc chambhoś cāṇḍālaḥ so 'bhiḥyate*<sup>38</sup>

« Out of neglect of Śambhu's *nirmālya* one is reborn as a *cāṇḍāla* ».

The *nirmālya* is forbidden to the non-initiates and may not be given to them even if the initiated *bhaktas* are unable to consume all the leavings<sup>39</sup>.

Sometimes the articles which during the *pūjā* of Śiva are placed directly on the *līṅga* are mentioned as a separate category of *nirmālya*.

35. *Śivapurāṇa. Vidyēśvarasamhitā* 22.11.

36. *Śivapurāṇa. Vidyēśvarasamhitā* 22.4-5.

37. *Saurapurāṇa* 66.16.

38. *Saurapurāṇa* 66.12ab.

39. Cf. H. BRUNNER, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

Those articles are supposed to be dangerous and not to be partaken of by the devotees:

*liṅgopari ca yad dravyaṃ tad agrāhyaṃ muniśvarāḥ /  
supavitraṃ ca taj jñeyaṃ yal liṅgasparśabāhyataḥ //*<sup>40</sup>

« And that sacrificial materia which is upon the *liṅga*, that is not to be taken, oh Lords among *muni*-s! And that which is beyond contact with the *liṅga*, that is known as *supavitra* ("a good means of purification") ».

What has been in direct contact with the *liṅga* is to be handed over to Caṇḍa (as we might expect from the Caṇḍeśa myth). Caṇḍa has no claim, however, on the *nirmālya* from certain kinds of *liṅgas*, e.g. the « natural » ones, or from cult images:

*bāṇalīṅge ca lauhe ca siddhaliṅge svayambhuvi /  
pratimāsu ca sarvāsu na caṇḍo 'dhikṛto bhavet //*<sup>41</sup>

« In the case of a *bāṇaliṅga*, a metallic (*liṅga*), a *siddhaliṅga*, a natural (*svayambhu*-) (*liṅga*) and in the case of all images (of Śiva) Caṇḍa is not authorised ».

*liṅge svayambhuve bāṇe ratnaje rasanirmite /  
siddhapraṭiṣṭhite liṅge na caṇḍo 'dhikṛto bhavet //*<sup>42</sup>

« In the case of a natural (*liṅga*), a *bāṇa* (*liṅga*), a jewel (*liṅga*), (a *liṅga*) made of mercury (or) a *liṅga* installed by Siddhas Caṇḍa is not authorised ».

The prescription that the human devotees of Śiva shall eat the remnants from the god's meal, with the exception of those dangerous parts to which Śiva's divine devotee Caṇḍa is entitled, must be seen in a wider ritual context. It is in fact a general ritual rule in the Hindu tradition that *all* food eaten by a pious man should consist of sacrificial remnants. A true *bhakta* should only enjoy what he is given directly by his god. According to Periyālvār he and other *bhaktas* « ... are servants in such a manner that we wear the yellow garment which you /i.e. Viṣṇu/ wore and discarded, eat out of your vessels, and adorn ourselves with the *tulṣī* that adorned you and which you then discarded »<sup>43</sup>. Everything the devotee uses is first sacrificed to god and then returned to the worshipper as a gift of grace. In this form the general ritual rule to eat only what

40. *Sivapurāṇa. Vidyeshvarasaṃhitā* 22.20.

41. *Sivapurāṇa. Vidyeshvarasaṃhitā* 22.17.

42. *Saurapurāṇa* 66.15, cf. 68.5.

43. Quoted in F. HARDY, *Ideology and cultural contexts of the Śrīvaiṣṇava temple*, in « The Indian Economic and Social History Review », vol. XIV, no. 1 (January-March 1977), p. 134. On this ritual rule cf. S. STEVENSON, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-40, S. S. WADLEY, *Shakti. Power in the conceptual structure of Kāṛimpur religion*, Chicago, 1975, p. 155. Cf. the polemics in Yāmuna's *Āgamapṛāmāṇya* (J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, *Yāmuna's Āgama Pṛāmāṇyam*, Madras, 1971, transl. pp. 12 ff. and 113 ff.).

remains after a sacrifice might seem extreme, as it can only be practised by limited number of devotees living in the close vicinity of a temple with regular *pūjā*. The rule as such has, however, a much more general validity. It has its background in the Vedic tradition<sup>44</sup> and thus far antedates the South Indian *bhakti* movement of the *ālvārs* and the *nāyaṇārs*. It is clearly stated in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Manusmṛiti* that it is a sin to prepare a meal only for oneself, as the only legitimate food is what remains after a sacrifice:

*aghaṃ sa kevalaṃ bhuṅkte yaḥ pacaty ātmakāraṇāt /  
yajñaśiṣṭāśanaṃ hy etat satām annaṃ vidhīyate //*<sup>45</sup>

« He who prepares food for himself (alone), eats nothing but sin; for it is ordained that the food which remains after (the performance of) the sacrifices shall be the meal of virtuous men ».

Thus every meal must be preceded by a sacrifice that turns the food into sacrificial remnants, *yajñaśeṣa*, also called *amṛta*<sup>46</sup>. This prescription presupposes of course that the gods have roughly the same eating habits as their human devotees, or to quote the *Rāmāyaṇa*:

*yadannaḥ puruṣo bhavati tadannās tasya devatāḥ*<sup>47</sup>.

« That which is the food of a man, is the food of his gods ».

The gods are treated in the same way as other honoured guests<sup>48</sup>. The daily sacrifices that turn the food of the householder legitimate include not only the entertainment of the gods (and other non-human beings) but also the *nṛyajña*, i.e. the feeding of human guests and members of the household<sup>49</sup>. The eating householder is also himself obliged to leave some remnants of his meal to his servants, his slaves or his wife<sup>50</sup>.

Because the remnants of a sacrifice are considered to be the leavings of a meal, they are connected with the concept of pollution like all

44. Cf. P. V. KANE, *op. cit.*, pp. 745, 755, S. LÉVI, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*, Paris, 1966 (2nd ed.), p. 83.

45. *Manusmṛiti* 3.118, BÜHLER's translation; cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 3.13, *Mahābhārata* 3.2.50-58, and Rāmānuja's *Gītābhāṣya* 18.7 (see R. C. LESTER, *Rāmānuja on the Yoga*, in « The Adyar Library Series », vol. 106, Madras, 1976, pp. 70-1).

46. *Manusmṛiti* 3.285, *Mahābhārata* 3.2.58, *Amarakośa* 2.7.28cd, cf. A. WEZLER, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-79.

47. *Rāmāyaṇa* 2.95.31cd. Cf. D. F. Pocock, *Mind, body and wealth. A study of belief and practice in an Indian village*, Oxford, 1973, p. 65: « "Those who eat meat, offer it", a Bareia said, trying to explain his theology to me ». The eating habits of South Indian gods have been described and analysed by G. EICHINGER FERRO-LUZZI, *The logic of South Indian food offerings*, in « *Anthropos* », 72 (1977), pp. 529-56, *Ritual as language: the case of South Indian food offerings*, in « *Current Anthropology* », 18 (1977), pp. 507-14, *Food for the gods in South India. An exposition of data*, in « *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* », 103 (1978), pp. 86-108.

48. Cf. A. ÖSTÖR, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

49. Cf. P. V. KANE, *op. cit.*, pp. 748-56, A. WEZLER, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-93.

50. Cf. P. V. KANE, *op. cit.*, p. 769, J. GONDA, *op. cit.*, p. 305.



other remainders of what someone has eaten. The symbolic use of the *nirmālya* within *pūjā* worship is part of a more comprehensive system of ritual handling of food in traditional Hindu culture. Everyday food transactions are not only of practical and economic importance — they are also a medium of ranking, as they are used to express claims to different degrees of ritual purity. To give and to receive food in different forms are highly significant acts<sup>51</sup>. Food can be classified into several categories in accordance with how efficiently pollution is transmitted from the giver to the recipient. The category of remnants of a meal, which is very polluting to the receiver, can be further sub-classified. What is left on a plate or a leaf used to serve the food is extremely impure, as it has been in direct physical contact with the eater's saliva. Other leavings of a meal (in pots etc.) are less polluting<sup>52</sup>. This distinction is also made in the *pūjā*, where the substances which have been actually sacrificed (*nivedita*) are looked upon as a separate category of leavings, which must be treated differently from other remnants (*śeṣa*); only a devotee who identifies himself as a slave of the god will eat the *nivedita*<sup>53</sup>. The special rules for the remnants which have been in direct contact with the *liṅga* have already been mentioned.

To intentionally partake of the leavings of another person's meal is a very strong expression of submission, which has been called « respect pollution »<sup>54</sup>. It is characteristic of some relations of great inequality. We have already seen that a master can give his leavings to his servant or his slave and that a husband can let his wife eat the remnants of his meal. A pupil might eat his teachers food leavings<sup>55</sup>. Respect pollution appears in other forms too, e.g. when the submissive person brings the purest part of his own body, the head, in contact with the feet of his lord or with some unclean belonging of his. It is not a mere coincidence that Caṇḍeśa is depicted receiving the *nirmālya* in the form of a flower garland on his head, or that the devotees are advised to put sacrificial remnants on their heads. Caṇḍeśa is the « first slave » (*ādidāsa*) of Śiva and the devotees are the servants or slaves of the god or look upon him as a lover and husband.

The « servant », or « slave » of the god (Tam. *toṇṭaṇ*, *aṭiyāṇ*) eats the remnants of his lord's meal in the same way as a Śūdra servant is

51. Cf. M. MARRIOTT, *Caste ranking and food transactions. A matrix analysis*, in « Structure and change in Indian society », edited by M. Singer and B. S. Cohn, Chicago, 1968, pp. 133-71, L. A. BABB, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-61.

52. Cfr. A. WEZLER, *op. cit.*, p. 78, V. S. AGRAWALA, *India as known to Pāṇini*, Varanasi, 1963 (2nd ed.), pp. 115-16.

53. Cf. H. BRUNNER, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

54. See E. B. HARPER, *Ritual pollution as an integrator of caste and religion*, in « Religion in South Asia », edited by E. B. Harper, Seattle, 1964, pp. 181-83.

55. Cf. CH. MALAMOU, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-5. According to the legend Rāmānuja in vain tried to get the opportunity to eat the remnants of Tirukacci Nambi's meal, see J. B. CARMAN, *The theology of Rāmānuja. An essay in religious understanding*, Bombay, 1981, pp. 30-1.

supposed to partake of his Brahmin master's leavings (*ucchiṣṭa*)<sup>56</sup>. In this like in many other ways the *bhakta* manifests the submission connected with the idea of « service » (Tam. *toṇṭu*, Skt. *kairṅkarya*, *sevā*), which is of fundamental importance in the *bhakti* religiosity<sup>57</sup>. At the same time the remnants of a sacrifice are a blessing from god that cannot be refused. Even vegetarians might eat meat from animals sacrificed to the goddess<sup>58</sup>.

The ambiguous nature of the *nirmālya* is strengthened in the case of Śiva, who in his essence is an ambiguous god. Rudra/Śiva is associated in Vedic and later Hindu tradition with those aspects of sacrifice that are dangerous and polluting. According to a series of Vedic myths Rudra is the god who « kills » the sacrifice, which is personified as Dakṣa, Prajāpati and Brahmā<sup>59</sup>. This makes him entitled to a part of what is sacrificed, viz. that very dangerous part which symbolizes the place where Rudra hits his victim. Rudra also claims the sacrificial remnants as his property: he owns what is left on the place of sacrifice (*vāstu*) according to the myth of Nābhānediṣṭha<sup>60</sup>. After a meal is finished, the leavings are sometimes sacrificed to Rudra<sup>61</sup>. Rudra's role as consumer of the dangerous part of the Vedic *yajña* is probably reflected in the later mythological tradition of the churning of the ocean to obtain the drink of immortality (*amṛtamanthana*): Śiva drinks the *hālāhala*-poison and thereby neutralizes that dangerous by-product of the quest for immortality<sup>62</sup>.

Caṇḍa's position in Śaiva ritualism seems to be a parallel case to the role of Rudra in the Vedic sacrifice. He absorbs and neutralizes the dangerous part of the sacrifice primarily identified with those remnants which have been in closest contact with the ambiguous god Śiva. The dangerous substances, the *caṇḍadravya*, are isolated and removed when

56. Cf. H. BRUNNER, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

57. Cf. H. HARDY, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-35, J. B. CARMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-57, K. V. ZVELEBIL, *The smile of Murugan*, pp. 193-95.

58. Cf. J. J. PRESTON, *Cult of the goddess. Social and religious change in a Hindu temple*, Delhi, 1980, p. 65.

59. Cf. J. DEPPERT, *Rudras Geburt. Systematische Untersuchungen zum Inzest in der Mythologie der Brāhmaṇas*, in « Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung. Südasien-Institut. Universität Heidelberg », 28, Wiesbaden, 1977, S. KRAMRISCH, *The presence of Śiva*, Princeton, 1981, E. ARBMAN, *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus*, Uppsala, 1922.

60. Cf. S. KRAMRISCH, *op. cit.*, 51-70.

61. E. ARBMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

62. See J. B. LONG, *Life out of death. A structural analysis of the myth of the « churning of the ocean of milk »*, in « Hinduism. New essays in the history of religions », edited by B. L. Smith, Leiden, 1976, 171-207, cf. E. ARBMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 302-3. The drinking of the poison is not, however, known to the oldest versions of the myth. Cf. V. M. BEDEKAR, *The legend of the churning of the ocean in the epics and the Purāṇas: a comparative study*, in « Purāṇa », 9 (1967), pp. 7-61, and K. RÜPING, *Amṛtamanthana und Kūrma-Avatāra. Ein Beitrag zur puranischen Mythen- und Religionsgeschichte*, Wiesbaden, 1970.

they are sacrificed to Śiva's servant Caṇḍa, and the Śaiva devotees can thereafter without fear receive the beneficial leavings of the god's meal. Caṇḍa/Caṇḍeśvara represents the fierce aspect of Śiva himself, and the name Caṇḍeśvara is also used as a designation of Śiva<sup>63</sup>. Caṇḍa/Caṇḍeśvara is a mediator who represents the devotees in their relation to the god, but who at the same time is a manifestation of the god himself.

### *Caṇḍeśvarī and Viṣvaksena*

If this interpretation of Caṇḍa/Caṇḍeśvara's character is correct, i.e. if the logic of sacrifice, especially the sacrifice to a fierce god, makes it probable that some divinity will have to neutralize the dangers unleashed by the sacrifice and receive its remnants, then we could expect to find the equivalents of Caṇḍeśvara in the cult of the goddess and — to a lesser degree — in the Vaiṣṇava ritualism.

Such an equivalent to Caṇḍeśvara is quite easy to identify in the ritual of the goddess. She is known as Caṇḍeśvarī, but several other names, among them Nirmālyadhārīṇī, are also used. According to the *Kālikāpurāṇa* the *pūjā* of the goddess is concluded by the sacrifice of the remnants:

*aīsānyāṃ maṇḍalaṃ kuryād dvārapadmavivarjitam /  
visarjanārthaṃ nirmālyadhārīṇyāḥ pūjanāya vai //  
pādyādibhiḥ pūjayitvā dhyātvā nirmālyadhārīṇīm /  
nikṣīpya tasmīn nirmālyāṃ mantrēṇa tu visarjayet //*<sup>64</sup>

« One should make a maṇḍala without gates and lotus, in the north-eastern region in order to invite the Goddess to depart and to worship Nirmālyadhārīṇī.

After one has worshipped Nirmālyadhārīṇī with water for washing the feet, etc., and after one has meditated on her, one should throw the remains of the flowers (*nirmālya*) in it (i.e. the maṇḍala) and invite the deity to depart with the mantra: ... ».

*yonimudrāṃ pradarśyātha nirmālyāṃ diśi śūlināḥ /  
caṇḍeśvaryai nama iti nikṣīpya ca visarjayet //*<sup>65</sup>

« ... and after one has shown the *yonimudrā* and has thrown the remains of the offerings away in the direction of Śiva with the words: "Honour to Caṇḍeśvarī", one should dismiss (her) ».

63. This fact easily leads to confusion. H. KULKE, *Cidambaramāhātmya*, in «Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie», 3, Wiesbaden, 1970, p. 43, interpretes Caṇḍeśvara's shrine in the Cidambaram temple complex as « a little temple of Śiva ».

64. *Kālikāpurāṇa* 57.167-168, cf. K. R. VAN KOOLJ, *Worship of the goddess according to the Kālikāpurāṇa. Part I: A translation with an introduction and notes of chapters 54-69*, in «Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina», Leiden, 1972, p. 22. Translation, p. 88. Cf. *Mahānirvāṇatantra* 6. 184, 184 etc., and R. NAGASWAMY, *Tantric cult of South India*, Delhi, 1982, p. 121.

65. *Kālikāpurāṇa* 65.48. Translation by VAN KOOLJ, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

The Vaiṣṇava counterpart to Caṇḍeśvara is called Viṣvaksena, the commander of Viṣṇu's army (*senāpati*). That is illustrated e.g. in a Cōḷa inscription from Kīlayūr, which registers an exchange of lands between two temples: « The exchange was effected in the names of Śrī Sēnāpati Ālvār asd Chandēśvara on behalf of the gods of the Viṣṇu and Śiva temples respectively »<sup>66</sup>.

Originally Viṣvaksena seems to be the name of a Vṛṣṇi hero, but it is also used as one of Viṣṇu's names e.g. in the *Mahābhārata*. In later Vaiṣṇava texts, however, it designates a separate divinity, who, as we have already seen, is the manager of the finances of Viṣṇu's temples and the god's commander-in-chief. He is also the door-keeper of his master, Viṣṇu. Viṣvaksena's shrine is normally placed in the north-eastern part of the temple. Sometimes he is the object of independant worship, as was the case at Tirumalai<sup>67</sup>, but far more important is the part he plays in the cult of Viṣṇu. Iconographically Viṣvaksena is hard to distinguish from Viṣṇu (his images lack the *śrīvatsa* and the *yajñopavīta*). He is present in sculptures of Śiva's Kaṅkālamūrti and the corresponding myth is told in the *Kūrmapurāṇa*. Viṣvaksena is described there as an *aṃśa* of Viṣṇu. His task in the myth is to be pierced by Śiva's *triśūla* and then carried to Vārāṇasī, where he is revived; he is the faithful door-keeper of Viṣṇu<sup>68</sup>.

Viṣvaksena is the receiver of the remnants of the sacrifice to Viṣṇu as it is said in the *Agnipurāṇa*:

*viṣṇunirmālyam akhilaṃ viṣvaksenāya cārpayet*<sup>69</sup>.

« And Viṣṇu's *nirmālya* one should offer in toto to Viṣvaksena ».

Usually he is not receiving all of what has been sacrificed. According to Pāñcarātra rules he obtains one fourth of the *nivedita*:

*viniveditacaturthāṃśaṃ viṣvaksenāya kalpayet /  
viṣvaksenanivedyaṃ tu jalamadhye vinikṣipet* // <sup>70</sup>.

« One fourth of the offerings (*vinivedita*-) one should deliver to Viṣvaksena. Viṣvaksena's *nivedya*, however, one should throw into the water ».

66. T. N. SUBRAMANIAM, *South Indian Temple Inscriptions*, volume III, part I, in « Madras Government Oriental Series », no. CXXXI, Madras, 1955, p. 1239.

67. Cf. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRY, *Report on the inscriptions of the Devasthanam collection with illustrations*, in « Sri T. T. etc., Devasthanam Epigraphical Series », Madras, 1930, p. 60.

68. *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.31.79-109, cf. *Sivapurāṇa*. *Satarudrasaṃhitā* 9, *Matsyapurāṇa* 183, and *Padmapurāṇa* 5.14, where Viṣvaksena is not mentioned in the telling of the same story.

69. *Agnipurāṇa* 24.57cd; thus he is called *nirmālyadhārīn*, *Paramasaṃhitā* 31.61.

70. *Nāradyasaṃhitā* (Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series 15) 12.52.

Other parts of the remnants are eaten by the devotees; nothing is to be given, however, to the non-initiated<sup>71</sup>.

Viṣvaksena figures prominently not only in Pāñcarātra but also in Vaikhānasa Āgamas<sup>72</sup>. Compared to Caṇḍa/Caṇḍeśa/Caṇḍeśvara he still seems rather pale and impersonal. It would be in line with the interpretation of Caṇḍa in this article to explain the less colourful personality of Viṣvaksena by the difference between the mild character of Viṣṇu and the fierce nature of Śiva<sup>73</sup>.

---

71. *Nārādīyaśaṃhitā* 12.58.

72. Cf. H. D. SMITH, *A descriptive bibliography of the printed texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama. Vol. II: An annotated index to selected topics*, in « Gaekwad's Oriental Series », no. 168, Baroda, 1980, p. 103, T. GOUDRIAAN, *Vaikhānasa daily worship according to the handbooks of Atri, Bhṛgu, Kāśyapa, and Marīci*, in « Indo-Iranian Journal », 12 (1969), pp. 176, 190, 191.

73. Cf. M. BIARDEAU and CH. MALAMOU, *Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne*, Paris, 1976, p. 104.

S. GUPTA's important article, *Viṣvaksena the divine protector*, in WZKS, 20 (1976), pp. 75-89, remained unknown to me until the present article was completed. Gupta points to the offering to the *nirmālyadevatā* as a part of the structure of *pūjā* and shows the structural resemblance between Viṣvaksena and Caṇḍeśa.