

The Temple of the Kirata Nepal

Prof. Sudarshan Raj Tiwari, Ph. D.

Contextual Peculiarities of Nepalese Architectural Development:

Historical architecture of Nepal is not only characterized by a remarkable continuity of theoretical principles of design, proportioning of form and consistent use of particular materials and décor but also by a tradition of conservation, involving reconstruction and renewal, perpetuated through the system of '*Guthi*'. The later tradition is singular to Nepal in the region and is of added significance as the materials of construction as well as its situation in an earthquake prone zone demanded continual renewal. Both of these ruling conditions, alive and well until modern times, have been a boon and a bane to the study of history at the same time. These traditions have created difficulties in assigning buildings and styles to specific periods of political history. For, example, the oldest inscribed temple site of Nepal, the Changu Narayana Temple complex, dating from before 465 AD, carries the main temple reconstructed in the mid-sixteenth century¹. Today, in physical terms, except perhaps for foundation of the inner core, plinth beam of the outer core, sections of courtyard paving, inscribed stones, some god-images and their ornaments, we would tend to see it as a manifestation of late Malla Style. Yet there can be no doubt that a Lichchhavi temple existed at the site more than a thousand years before that time. Stylistically too, it may be argued, that this earlier form was similar to the one extant at the site now. Archeological foundations unearthed at Satyanarayana site of Hadigaon (Kathmandu) and inscriptional statements from Lichchhavi times put together reasonably indicate the existence of two tiered 'brick and wood' temples in that period. The same archeological site also shows that use of fired brick in building construction was already in advanced state by second century BC in Kathmandu. That architecture in brick preceded the architecture in stone in Nepal can be fairly concluded. That such was the case in India too can be observed from such archeological finds as the Vishnu temple foundations at Beshnagar².

Given the fact that Nepalese society was characterized not only by a continuous tradition of religious assimilation and harmony but also by non-interference of ruling houses on the religious preference of the masses, the conditioning social factors of Nepal sets it far apart from its closest cultural neighbor India. In India, except for a brief period under the Sungas and the Andhras, buildings and styles can actually be assigned squarely to political or religious periods or even shorter periods particular to some ruler and his preference. Nepalese architecture does not lend to such assignments and the origin of the tiered temples remains untracked in terms of historical-political chronology. It can however be said with certainty that the temple form did not have its beginning under the Mallas. This paper will show that it was already in existence during the Lichchhavi period and its origins are traceable to the popularly called Kirata period of Nepalese history. This gives a such a prolonged continuity of stylistic development for Nepalese architecture that it can be argued to be one of the longest lasting stylistic movements in the world. There are sufficient reasons to believe that the Nepalese milieu has,

consistently and continuously, remained a domain of the indigenous population, which was culturally far apart from the Hindu and Buddhist developments to start with.

Non-Guptan, Non-Kusana and Non-Mauryan basis of Nepalese Architecture:

Whereas the study of religion has clearly brought to the fore the fact that religious thoughts and practices of the non-Aryan group merged together with those of the Aryans into the Hindu religion, as is known to us today, the influence of the aboriginal thoughts on Hindu/Buddhist developments in architecture has not been seriously explored. The tendency of the traditional architectural historian to take 'Indo-Gangatic' plains of the Aryans alone as the sum total of all civilization and development area has led to the belief that anything and everything in South Asia must have originated there only. With most of our art and cultural historians trained in the background of this misconception, they are mostly misled by a chauvinistic assumption that cultural 'exchange' and relationship between India and Nepal was a one-way street. In the case of Hindu and Buddhist architecture of the area, which is now part of North India and Pakistan, architectural tradition of anthropomorphic temples is said to start from the Kushana period for Buddhism and the Gupta period for Hinduism. The tradition of the Buddhist art and Stupa architecture is likewise thought to have started with the Ashokan Mauryans and the Gandhara scythians. That such an approach is clearly faulty can be observed if one considers the Stupas of Tilaurakot, 'Brikshya Griha' of Lumbini or the 'temple' foundations at the archaeological site of Satyanarayana in Kathmandu. Clearly the case of Hinayana architectural manifestations in brick at Kapilvastu and the tradition of the so-called 'Pagoda style' or the Tiered Temples of Kathmandu valley do not fit in to this general view. Others have suggested a climatological explanation to the development of the tiered temples by linking it to timber architecture with large overhangs in Kashmir or Malabar in India. Nothing could be more wrong than thinking of Nepalese architecture as a matter of slope roof with large overhangs resulting out of experiments with rain protection alone. This sort of attitude has been result of the over emphasis on Aryan, Hindu and Buddhist progress, which has tended to neglect and even negate the cultural existence of the non-Aryan stream of people. Particularly when one considers the rectangular tiered temples, it cannot but be ascribed to a different mainstream source of development. These temples even are opposed to the general Hindu design requirement of a dark sanctum or *garbagriha*. It is due to such a context that ancient Nepalese architecture and arts should not and could not be explained as an off-soot and follow-on of these developments in the Gangatic plains.

Mauryan emperor Ashok's preference for stone has often been explained to be a result of his quest for permanency. Such a simplistic explanation can hardly be accepted in the context of his profound decision to declare and support Buddhism as a religion of the State. It appears more of an ideological decision to use a material not associated in any way with Hinduism and other non-Aryan tribal religion of the time. This becomes a very critical issue as much or all of what is known today as antecedents of Indian Architecture is based on the study of rock-cut Buddhist architecture that started with the Mauryans amid such religious fracture and continued for almost a thousand years afterwards. They started with reproductions of ancient architecture based on wood, not so much because

that was the only existing tradition, but more because of their pre-occupation to exclude others. As Hinayana Buddhism tried to be the 'true and pure Aryan', the prototype reference for this architectural tradition remained limited to the early Aryan architecture. Critical observation of the style of the Hinayana caves will make this quite clear that Hinayana Buddhist architects have avoided 'brick architecture', on these very ideological grounds, as it carried 'late Aryan or Hindu' or non-Aryan association. In the first millenium AD, this association of material with particular religious architecture surfaces several times in the Gangatic plains, alternately switching between brick and stone and between Hindu and Buddhist. As the Hindu use of stone increased, Buddhist religious edifices reverted to Brick. There can be little doubt that each religious group was affiliating to styles not in concurrent use of the other religion. For some reasons, Nepal as a country, and Kathmandu valley as its repository, did not face this ideological conditioning. This reason must relate to the overwhelming presence of a third cultural force capable of moderating both the late arriving religious thoughts. It had no reason to discard the brick and both seem to have contributed further to the development of it, instead.

Nepalese religious architecture is based on 'brick and wood' and archeological finds prove beyond doubt that it has always been so, as far back as is known. Religious architecture in brick and timber was flourishing in various parts of Nepal more than, at least, five hundred years before the Guptas. Even the carvings and motifs of the Guptan temple columns and the cave architecture of the Mauryans point to their timber progeny. It follows without much argument that the Guptas and the Mauryans replaced the ancient brick and timber traditions by use of stone and brought the architecture basics to a new start and this was to stay on this path for more than a millenium afterwards in the Gangatic plains. In the area south of the Himalayas, only the Nepalese architecture did not accept the change of material and continued on the more ancient path of development charted by the brick and timber despite the fact that Nepalese society was aware of the changes taking place in the Gangatic plains. Indeed if we analyze the early Nepalese temples in stone, we find several design characteristics in the stone temples of mid-Lichchhavi period that are very close to what was happening in India about the same time. But this induced style of temple architecture in stone failed to stick and develop here. Such failure of the new movement in Kathmandu valley must be argued to have been a result of a more popular and strong architectural tradition of a different order prevailing in the country. We can only ascribe this to a pre-Lichchhavi tradition in the valley. Whereas the Lichchhavi inscriptions more than substantiate the developed presence of a non-Aryan group and tradition in the valley, our chronicles name them as the Kirata. The inscriptions stand testimony to the fact that the aboriginal settlers of Kathmandu valley were much more than a forest based 'animal hunting society' as Kiratas are often made out to be.

The Kiratas and the architecture of Brick and Wood:

The Hindu epics leave little doubt that there were aboriginal groups, who, for almost a thousand year following the arrival of the Aryans in the area, avoided the 'green pastures taken over by the nomads' and made home in the mountains and the forests. The epics call these people Dasas, Dasyus, Asuras, Kiratas and other names, but all the time show

them as a force to contend with. What is now central Nepal was one of the strongholds of these Kiratas. The classical treatise of *Manusmriti* tells us of the later Dasyus, known as the Sakas, who formed themselves into eleven sub-groups, including the Kiratas and the Khasas, two such groups, who made their homes in the Himalayan foothills. Pursuing the groups identified by *Manusmriti* further, we can find traces of architecture based on brick and wood in areas where the other Sakas took hold. For example, the Odras, who occupied the foothills of the Vindhya-chal mountains and later came to be known as Andras, the Dravidas and the Pallavas, who occupied further southern plateau of India and even the Chinas, known today as the Chin dynasty of the Wei valley at the foot of the Chin Ling mountains or the Kambojas of Cambodia, all started their architectural journey in brick and wood. Not only their architecture but also their language was apparently similar. How else would we be able to explain the fact that, in the city of Sian, today, there is a small group of people, whose language is very similar to Newari, the language of the aboriginal Kathmanduites³.

This great dispersal of the Sakas seems to have placed the Khasas, Daradas and Kiratas in the area what is now Nepal. Kiratas most likely formed their kingdom east of the Gandaki River and extended to the area of early Kambojas. As the Khasas consolidated themselves in western part of Nepal and Kumaon area of India, the Kiratas apparently made their state with Kathmandu as their capital region. As the Kirata rule was replaced by Lichchhavi rule about 50 AD, the Kusana movement had just started to gain momentum and they were themselves fleeing from the Kusana inroads. Such a situation and the republican nature of the Lichchhavi rule must have helped in letting the local traditions continue without much interference. The process of fusion of architecture of the Kiratas and those of the later day Aryans, however, must have been set into motion at that time bringing whatever Kusana, Hindu or Buddhist architectural influence of significance into Kathmandu valley. That the builders of Kathmandu were also very selective in absorbing technological changes is seen in the fact that 'Ashokan stone polishing technique' took almost eight centuries to be accepted and occurred after the technology had long since died in the parent area. Similarly, the stone 'mandapa' format temple, possibly introduced after the Guptas in India, did not develop beyond the basics. Only a stronger building tradition, popular in the valley, could have kept the renewed Indian Hindu/Buddhist architectural movement to the bay to the beginning of our written 'historical period'.

The presence of an indigenous society, different from the Aryan group, with sufficient strength in standing up to the Hindu and Buddhist culture as they arrived in Kathmandu, is proven to a great extent by the Lichchhavi inscriptions themselves. From the very sources, we also see that the latter was made to accept many of the aboriginal practices. That these practices included the taxation and administrative structure of the Kiratas leave little doubt that they were a great cultural force in themselves and were also civilized 'beyond being just a forest-based hunting group'. Indeed these 'hunters' were already exporting processed animal hide carpets to the Mauryan court as early as fourth century BC, a point irrefutably proven by the classic treatise, '*Arthashastra*', the political science according to Chanakya.

Such factors in the development of architecture and arts of Kathmandu valley in ancient Nepal, by any thread of argument, would negate and nullify the basic premises of 'the one-way street' comparative approach in general. This is particularly important to consider if we wish to look at the roots and beginnings of Nepalese architecture. It is very much appropriate to look at ancient Nepalese architecture as a case of fairly secluded development.

The Kirata brickwork in Kathmandu Valley:

Historians used to 'written proofs' have a grave problem in dealing with so called 'illiterate' cultures. But illiteracy does not necessarily result in lack of built culture. Built culture has certainly existed in many 'illiterate' ancient societies, such as those of Jericho, Catal Huyuk, Lower Mesopotamia, etc. Despite the evidences from the Lichchhavi period, historians have also remained shy in recognizing the long period of 'illiterate' civilization and rule of the Kiratas, pervading the Kathmandu valley prior to the arrival of the Lichchhavis. The discovery of the inscribed statue of the fourth Lichchhavi King Jayaverma I, clearly dating his death to around 184 AD, sends clear pointer that the organization of the Nepalese Lichchhavi state immediately followed the Kusana inroads into Mathura and the states of the mid-Gangatic plains. Very clearly the statue also proves that the Lichchhavi state of Jayaverma I was 107 years old at the time of his death and the organization of Nepalese Lichchhavi state would have happened around 78 AD. The Italian archeological digs at Hadigaon Satya Narayana has yielded brick building foundations dated to between first and second century BC. This obviously predates the Lichchhavis and we will have to place it as Kirata. On similar ground, the carpet-exporting nation of Nepal must have been the Kirata State too.

It would be of interest to note that architecture in brick is seen at the 'Sakya' area of ancient Nepal also. In Lumbini, recent Japanese archeological digs have brought to light pre-Mauryan brick foundations of a possible '*Brikshya Griha*' temple. The existence of the same 'non-Vedic social group' in both Kathmandu Valley and Kapilvastu appears to have resulted in this commonality of brick architecture.

The Kirata Bricklayer and the Eighteen 'Jaats':

Vedic literature makes no significant mention of the bricklayer and a great respect is given to the carpenter. This is so because their architecture as largely based on timber. Aryans' lack of interest on brick seemingly stayed on for a long period following the destruction of the Indus Valley civilization as they overran it. It took quite some time for them to start using the sun-dried brick even in the sacrificial *vedi*. The Sanskrit word for brick, *Istaka*, derives from this function as '*Ista*' is sacrificial offerings to the fire in the *vedi*. In Hindu architectural treatises, the word is applied in a generic sense to any material used to construct a temple, even wooden members or stone lintels, as every temple is a pile of *vedi* and thus is a receptacle to 'yaj'. Such usage goes to prove that brick was also established as a building material as soon as the '*Chanda-citi*', a *mantra* based imagined altar, found a material substitute. The construction of sacrificial fire altar in brick must have, at the same time, also, put the building role of carpenter on the wane.

It is only later in Pali literature, *Mahavamsa*, in particular, originating from the Sakyas of Kapilvastu that we find mention of the bricklayer. Although the *Jatakas* do mention 'Vaddhaki or Verdhaki', the builder or carpenter, *Mahavamsa* differentiates the bricklayer, 'Itthika-vaddhaki' from the carpenter, the 'vaddhaki or tacchaka'. It can be traced from other sources, such as *Milindapanha* and *Jatakas*, that the society of craftsmen was different from the general *Hindu Varna* system and consisted of eighteen different trades, often grouped as guilds or *Seni*. These trades related to the construction of buildings, temples and cities and the bricklayer was one of them. These eighteen trades were active in Kathmandu valley also and here too they formed a group separate from the *Hindu Varna* social system of the Lichchhavis. This is clearly indicated by an inscription issued by Basantadeva dated 577 AD and located at Ädi-Näräyana. The relevant lines of the inscription translates as follows:

“(King Basantadeva..., having inquired about the well being of Brahman leaders, Brahmungs, Shulhmungs and Tepul(-hmungs?), the chiefs and the village brotherhood of the eighteen craftsmen (or creators), all already resident at Jayapallikagram, decrees In this village of yours only those who have already entered and from those wishing to enter only the Brahmans, the chiefs and the group of eighteen tradesmen shall live here...’⁴

Just as the Vedic literature used the term 'Takshyaka' or cutter of wood for carpenter, so the Lichchhavi terminology '*prakrit*' is a cutter or worker on various materials of building. The inscription also makes it clear that their social grouping was not led by the Brahmans but by 'Brahmungs, Shulhmungs⁵ and Tepul (mungs)' and is clearly not a Vedic Hindu group. This is very similar to '*seni*' referred to earlier and appears as what is understood by '*Jaat*' in the Newar social group in the valley today. Further inferences from other inscriptions can be drawn to show that Jayapallikagrama of the Thankot inscription was also called *Jolpringga*⁶. The suffix '*pringga*' indicates a Kirata settlement from before Lichchhavi times. Thus it may be concluded that the social group of the eighteen trades was Kirata. It may be for this reason only that Basantadeva used the word '*nivasopagata*' to refer to the already settled Kiratas. The word has been used in many other Lichchhavi inscriptions and is generally applied only to those settlements with a majority of non-Brahman-led population.

Some of the Newar Jaats of Kathmandu, particularly the Prajapatis⁷ (Kumvahkara~Kumhara~Kumhale), Maharjans, Dongols, Nayos, Tepehoys, etc., have been said to be descendents of the Kiratas. Specialization over time appears to have added eighteen more trades to the 'astadasa prakrita' of Lichchhavi times, thus creating the '*Char varna and Chhattis Jaat*', (four castes and thirty-six professions) a popular phrase used to refer to the Nepalese society today.

The Rectangular Temple and The Dyochhen:

Several Lichchhavi inscriptions mention existence of temple structures. While the building structures created for housing Siva-lingas and Vaisnava images appear to have been done in stone and most likely followed the newly brought in 'stone mandapa', borrowing more from the Chalukyans⁸ rather than the Guptas, there are several other

temples which apparently housed images belonging to the local tribes. The following are some of them:

‘Sivaka’ temple (Basantadeva, 507 AD), ‘Matin’ temple (Amshuverma, 610 AD), ‘Sa.ndu’ temple (Jishnugupta, 631 AD), ‘Sivagal’ temple⁹ (Narendradeva, 643 AD), Valasokshi temple (? , eighth century), etc.

Contextual association shows that ‘Sivaka’, ‘Sa.ndu’, and ‘Sivagal’ temples are one and the same. Unlike the mandapa temples, the building structure of the above temples is not described even through use of literary adjectives, except in one case. This lone case of material description of a temple extant in the late Lichchhavi period, but a one, which has obviously been standing for some time, is of the temple of ‘Matin’. That this was a ‘brick and wood’ temple is clarified beyond doubt by the inscription itself. The following is a translation¹⁰ of the relevant portions (according to Regmi):

“Now that we have repaired carefully in the temple of Matin all worn out woods constituting the doors, frames, panels, windows etc., which have been entirely destroyed, since long, because through the crevices in the layers of bricks that have fallen a large number of the mice and mongoose had attacked the building, and now to ensure its good condition for a long time to come,...”

This particular inscription, now at the National Museum, was retrieved from wayside site to the east of Sundhara in Patan. The people of Kirata decent even now annually congregate at the temple of Mahalaxmi at Tyagal¹¹, further to the east of the location of the inscription. Since the word ‘Matin’ appears as a degenerate form of ‘Matrinam’ or Mother-Goddesses, the Mahalaxmi Dyochhen of Tyagal is likely to be the ‘Matindevakula’ of the inscription. This is further substantiated by the fact that the area was called ‘Matilam Ksetra’¹² as late as 1497 AD. It is a rectangular two-storied brick and timber temple in Dyochhen format. The terminology used in the inscription ‘*istaka*’ for brick, ‘*daru*’ for wood, ‘*kapata*’ for shutters, ‘*vatayana*’ for windows etc. are standard Sanskrit and there is no interpretative content in the above translation.

Polygonal approximation¹³ of inscription no. DRR- CXLIII has shown that the temple of Valasokshi was located about the temple of Satyanarayana in Hadigaon. We have already discussed the brick archaeological excavations in the area. However, within the excavated area, there are no remains of complete foundations from the period of our concern¹⁴. The site has images of Mother-Goddesses from pre-Lichchhavi period.

There are many rectangular temples¹⁵ in the valley today, mostly those that have renewed in the late Malla period. These temples do not conform to the regular square tiered temples, which use proportioning standards that can be traced to the Vastusastras. The rectangular temples appear to have been adjusted by applying a variation of the proportioning principles¹⁶ during the reconstruction or renewal. These rectangular temples house Bhairava, Bhimsen, Bal-Kumari Ajima and other Mother-Goddesses. As Bhimsen is also revered as Bhairava, rectangular format of temple appears generic to Siva-ganas and Matrikas, both of whom were venerated in Nepal from pre-Lichchhavi

period. Many of such sites also have pre-Lichchhavi or early Lichchhavi images, numinous stones or other remains. The rectangular temples are characterized additionally by odd number of multiple finials¹⁷ or *Gajurs*. The latter is probably a physical reflection of multiple images¹⁸ housed in a temple in ancient times and certainly, in terms of building form, had hip-ended sloping roof.

Oldest known among these are the *Dyochhens* and *piths*. It may be said that, just as the Khasas of Western Nepal have '*Ghar Masto* and *Ban Masto*', the Kirata towns had *Dyochhen* within the town and *piths* outside it. This schema of Kirata towns can still be seen in many Jyapu villages in the valley. In the towns, where there was heightened building activity during the Malla period, some of the piths or Dyochhen has been lost. Almost all of the Dyochhens and pith temples are rectangular in format and can be assigned as a Kirata design domain. Rectangular temples are rare in India¹⁹ and certainly do not form a development from Guptan or Chalukyan stylistic groups.

Whereas, early Hindu design principles would have called for darkness in the sanctum room for the image and rectangular temples, if all they existed in early Hindu thought, would have laid with short-side as frontage. The Gandhara temples, influenced by Greek thoughts, also use short-side as frontage giving a deep and dark room for the sanctum sanctorum. Non-congregational nature of Hindu worship is directly associated with the dark *Garbagriha*. Contrary to this, the rectangular temples of Nepal are always used with the long side as the frontage and earlier ones have almost fully open front and sides. It clearly relates to congregational type of worship. The philosophical adjustment is using the closed front, giving a dark ground floor interior, happened only with the advent of Tantrism and secrecy associated with it. The lack of religious importance of the side axis reinforces the possibility of a different stream of thought than the Vedic.

The Malla period preference for square tiered temples may have caused replacement of some of the rectangular temples by square ones. The Tunaldevi temple itself is a case of this sort of change as its original rectangularity is given away by the shape of disposition of the numinous stone Goddesses in the pith. We have the case of Chabel Ganesh, where even the square mandapa temple in stone has been changed to the square tiered temple. If one watches closely, the stone mandapa temple is still inside intact, although metal sheet works now covers some portion of it.

One very interesting case is that of the Ajima (Bhadrakali) temple outside Jana Bahal in Kel tole, Kathmandu. The temple looks like a standard three-tiered temple from outside. However that it is different from others is already hinted by the two alcoves on the walls of its sanctum floor facing east. In these alcoves are kept two upturned stone conduits with *Makaras*. What is of interest to us is however inside in the sanctum. Here a miniature rectangular temple occupies the center of the sanctum room. Provided with metal work roof, the supporting element is a slab of stone, forming a alcove for the images. The early pit shrine of Ajima, also houses other Siva-gana members such as Ganesh, Bhairava, etc. Along with Kankeswori, Bhadrakali, Raktakali, Mayatidevi, the Ajima of Keltole is also one of the pre-Shakta Kirata site. In Lichchhavi period, Keltole formed the outer fringe of the settlement Yambi, current Indra Chowk. Like the Chabel

Ganesh, the Ganesh inside the Ajima temple is also housed in a later memory of mid-Lichchhavi 'mandapa' type of miniature temple. It would appear that the temple existing there were put inside the tiered temple during late Malla period and the process they were miniaturized. It has a very close relevance to a *Khat*.

The Khat of the Kiratas

In the many festivals of the valley, the God images are carried around town in palanquin like small chariots called Khat. Most of these Khats are in rectangular format and obviously represent the temple of the God or Goddess. One of the oldest known festivals of Kathmandu is the Tunaldevi Festival of Hadigaon. Called Andipringga in Kirata days and Andigrama in late Lichchhavi period, the village Hadigaon has the set of Dyochhen and pith of Tunaldevi, the Goddess of Andipringga or Andipi²⁰. The two define the inside and outside of the village. In this festival, all the participating *Khats*, e.g. *Mane-khat*, *Bhachhen-khat*, *Tunchhen-khat* and *Dyochhen-khat*, are rectangular. The general design of the roof of the reference temple can be concluded to have been lean-to roof with hipped sides. These khats appear to remember the Kirata days since even as the current temple may be square, thanks to 'renewal' of the Malla days, the goddesses still move around in their rectangular palanquins.

Conclusion:

The presence many rectangular temples for Ajimas and Ajjus, the gods and goddesses coming over from Kirata times and the khats used in the festivities of the mother goddesses and their different design philosophy should lead to the conclusion that the rectangular temple tradition precedes the square tiered temples. The square temples have assimilated the design philosophy of the Hindu temple with the material and construction tradition of the Kirata temple of the Mother-Goddesses and the Bhairavas. Their profuse presence must have led the medieval *Tantric* text, *Merutantra*, stanza 808, to present Nepal as a country with millions of Bhairavas and Bhairavis and thousands of *Shakti-piths*. The non-Aryan fair skinned Awales and Kumhales, and others adding up to make, *astadasa prakitin*, the eighteen family trades, must have been venerating these Bhairavis and Bhairavas as Ajima and Ajju much before they were molded into Tantric forces. It is to them and others like them that the tradition of architecture in brick and wood and the rectangular temple in particular owe their origin. In Nepalese architecture, we may, find a continuation of the Saka tradition, a historical trace of the Indus Valley civilization, praise be to *Manusmriti*.

[Illustrations:

- a. Drawing of a Lichchhavi temple from Banepa
- b. Photograph of the Duimaju temple of Bhandarkhal, Patan
- c. The Balkumari of Sasukhel, Patan.
- d. Photograph of the Ajima of Keltola, Kathmandu.]

Notes:

¹ The current temple appears as a reconstruction 'done from foundations up' during the rule of Vishwa Malla. It was successively repaired and restored several times, the last major intervention being the one from 1847 AD.

² In ancient inscriptions of India, such as the one at Bhilsa (second century BC), use of the terminology 'Prasada' has been seen. This does indicate existence of temple structure.

³ They have not got anything to do with Araniko and his group of craftsmen as they resided in Peking. Araniko's route did not take him to Sian city at all. That the language is similar to Newari was reported by D. Micheltore, consultant to UNESCO, who is working at Sian, during the course of his presentations at the International Conference on Conservation, Kathmandu, November 1998.

⁴ The literal reading of the lines relevant to our context (as per Dilli Raman Regmi, Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Volume 1, pp. 20) is as follows:

- (5) Jayapallikagrame Niva[sopagata]n Brahman Purassa-
- (6) Ran Bramhmung Shulhmung Tepula.....Pradhanangrama Kutumvinah
- (7) Sastadasa Prakritin Kusha[lampre]stthwa Samagnyapayati
- (19) Tade Tasmingrame ye Pravistah Pravixiyavascha Brahman Pradhanah Sa
- (20) Sthadasa Prakritayastesamtra Prativasatanna Kenachidamatpadopa...

⁵ Tistung inscription of Amshuverma indicates that these required sacrifice of buffalo possibly as a religious ritual practice. 'Hung' suffix is respect indicating (Cf. Hum in later Lichchavi Inscriptions). The Bramhmung has now become Barmhu (which clearly could not be derived from Brahman, although the term is used in derogatory reference to Brahmins by Newars), Shulhm probably has degenerated to Shalmi (If we not be parochial about Sanskrit and suggest that it comes from Taila-Shala) and Tepul is possibly Tepehoy (those who cultivate Tuki Palunga).

⁶ Cf. DRR no IX and CII.

⁷ The name Prajapati is a later derivative of the creation myth of the Hindus. Alongwith, making pottery their role was also to make god images. The earlier name is Kumvakara, one who pots. The name Kumvakara progressively degenerated to Kumhara, Kumhala and Kumhale. They worship 'Vishwakarma or Bakhuma-dyo', along with 'Harihara'. Similarly Maharjana is derived from Maha(deva)-Archana and Dongol from 'Dungora' (Cf. Dang, Dangora and Dangre of Western Nepal).

⁸ Compare our example with Chalukyan Linga Shrine of Mahamukteswora. Of course by the time of Manadeva, the architectural treatises could have been available, still the adjectives used in the inscriptions to describe such temples are not found in the treatises (Eg. 'Laxmibatara') and 'Prasadasyanurupa', Srimatsamsthana rupam bhavana etc. only repeat standard terms such as 'bhavana', 'prasada', 'samsthana' (as per Mayamata, Samaranganasutradhara, etc) all just indicating a temple structure. Extant examples also show a more developed carving tradition here in Nepal.

⁹ This is the same temple as referred to as 'Sivaka' by Basantadeva. Polygonal approximation of the area of Jolpringga, Sitati-Ka-Tala (principality of Sitati and Kadung villages) and Thencho (Thankot) places the temple at the current location of Chandra Bharateswora Mahadeva. The site is definitely Kirata, as substantiated by the other natural stones worshipped as Bhairava, Balkumari, Ganesh etc., all the early Saiva gods. The Siva-linga also is a natural upright stone.

¹⁰ The literal reading of the lines relevant to our context (as per Dilli Raman Regmi, Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Volume 1, pp. 78) is as follows:

- (5) Rmatindevakulamardhavinipatitataka Pankita Vivara Pravista
- (6) Nakulakulakulitamushika Sarthadura Vighatita Nirava
- (7) Sheshadwarakapata Vatayanadi Jirnadarusanghatam Yatnatah
- (8) Pratisamskarya Tasya Dirghatara Paschatkala Sausthitya Nimittam.....

¹¹ Mary Slusser, Nepal Mandala, pp. 96 and 97. She calls the temple 'Siddhilaxmi'. She suggests locating Matingrama in the Sundhara area itself.

¹² Palm-leaf Land deed document published by Dinesh Raj Pant in Purnima no. 85, pp. 22.

¹³ See author's Pattern of Settlements in the Kathmandu Valley in Ancient Nepal, unpublished dissertation, TU, 1995. Sketch no 12 & 13.

¹⁴ The Jyapus of Hadigaon worship Siplican tree, *Crataeva Religiosa* or *Crataeva Nurvala*. In local Newari language, it is called Valañsi. The tree with the supposed presence of the Mother-Goddess is called Valañsi –Ma, or mother goddess of the tree of Valañ. It may be no wonder if the name derives from 'Valasokshi'.

¹⁵ See author's Tiered Temples of Nepal, Chapter four.

¹⁶ The vedic fire altars were sometimes built in a shed or *Sala*. These sheds were rectangular and its long side was oriented to the east. The plan proportion was 1:3 or 1:2.

¹⁷ Earliest examples probably had only three Gajurs. There are many such miniature shrines in the valley. The temple of Duimaju, housed in a *Pati* at Bhandarkhal within the Patan Durbar Gardens may be typical.

¹⁸ Rectangular (Ayatasra as different from Chaturasra) temples of Medieval period in India also show multiple images.

¹⁹ The Vaital Deul temple in Bhuvaneswora is one of them. It is also dedicated to the Mother Goddess Kapalini-devi.

²⁰ The festival is referred as Andipi Yatra in the Lichchhavi inscription, DRR- CXLIII and the place is called Andigrama in a stone water bowl (Jaladroni) from Satyanarayana Archeological site in Hadigaon.