Tukkacci, a Royal Cola Temple at the Beginning of the 12th Century

Vincent Lefèvre

HAL Id: halshs-00673144
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00673144

Submitted on 5 Mar 2012

Tukkacci, a Royal Cōḷa Temple at the Beginning of the 12th century

Vincent Lefèvre

Among the many temples built during the Cōḷa period (c. 850 – 1279), four are generally labelled "royal temples" or even "State temples". These are the temples at Tañjāvūr, Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḷapuram, Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam. They have in common some very specific features that set them apart from the remaining architectural production, not to speak of their specific history. But these four buildings may be divided into two groups: on the one hand, Tañjāvūr and Gaṅgai, which were erected during, roughly speaking, the first half of the 11th century, and, on the other hand, Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam, built during, say, the second half of the 12th century. One aim of this paper is to investigate the role of the royal patronage in the meantime. As a matter of fact, some very powerful kings ruled between Rājendra I (1012 – 1044) and Rājarāja II (1146 – 1172) – Kulōttuṅga I (1070 – 1122) being the most famous - but they directed their attention mainly toward the very important sacred centre of Cidambaram.

Only one temple built during this span of time of nearly a century can be characterised as a "royal" or "State" temple: it is the one at Tukkacci, now called Apatsahayeśvarar, not far from Kumbakonam. Tukkacci is not completely unknown, since it has been described by S.R. Balasubrahmanyam in his survey of Cōḷa temples. For the above author, the temple formed the model for Dārāsuram. This view is shared by Françoise L'Hernault and Jacques Dumarçay who wrote an extant study on Dārāsuram. So, Tukkacci has been referred to in some papers, but always in reference to Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam.[1] As far as I know, no specific study has been dedicated to it. This paper is only a first approach and does not intend to give firm and definitive conclusions. We will focus mainly on the very features that can set this structure into the "royal Cōḷa temples" group.

---

[1] In the *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture*, Tukkacci is briefly described but not illustrated (Meister and Dhaky 1983: 325-6).

1

1. Presentation of the Tukkacci temple

The earliest inscription (ARE 6 of 1915) of the site dates from the 4th year of king Vikrama Cōḷa (A.D. 1122) and names the temple *Ten-Tirukkāḷati Madāhevar* and the village Kulōttuṅgaśōḷa-nallūr. *Ten-Tirukkāḷati* means "southern Kaḷahasti", in order to distinguish it from the "true" Kaḷahasti, which is near the border between Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. The next inscription (ARE 2 of 1915) in time dates from the 35th year of Kulōttuṅga III (A.D. 1213): in it, the temple is called Vikramaśōḷīśvaram Uḍaiyar at Vikramaśōḷanallūr. Evidently, from these documents, we can infer that this temple was built during Vikrama's reign as a new complex, even though a previous structure may have existed. Or maybe Kulōttuṅga I was still on the throne when the construction started, since his son Vikrama had been appointed heir-apparent a few years before his father's death.

The temple (fig. 1 and 2) faces east and is surrounded by an enclosure wall (c. 65 x 40 m.) opened in the east by a first *gopura* (fig. 3). The plan is quite similar to Dārāsuram's: the main access to the temple is from the south through a chariot-shaped *maṇḍapa* on which more will be said latter. This structure has unfortunately been damaged. On the one hand, the ground of the courtyard has been elevated, concealing the lowest part of the temple, and, on the other hand, a new structure has been built on the western side of the *maṇḍapa*, since it is obvious that the horse carrying the chariot has been incorporated in the new masonry (fig. 4 and 5). The new wall is plain (except for some reliefs apparently displaced), contrasting with the animated surface of the rest of the temple. Unfortunately, it is difficult to say when it was added. From the chariot-*maṇḍapa*, one enters a pillared hall opening to the east through a veranda. This hall leads to the north to a small shrine dedicated to Devī (Ammaṇ), about which we will return shortly, and, to the west to another pillared hall (*snapana maṇḍapa*) linking the chariot-*maṇḍapa* with the sanctum (*garbhagṛha*). The *vimāna* itself is typical of the 12th century Cōḷa architecture and is topped by a brick-built three storeyed superstructure.

As is usual in the 12th century temple, there is also an Ammaṇ temple in the complex. In Tukkacci, Devī is now called Sundara Nāyakī, even though we don't know if this name is ancient or not, and her temple is in the north-eastern corner of the second enclosure. This temple faces south and is preceded by a quite big pillared hall abutting on the eastern wall of the inner enclosure. Though no inscription can give us a clue about the date of this Ammaṇ temple, I am inclined to believe that it was not part of the original layout. As a matter of fact, this structure is so big that the outer enclosure has been extended to the north in such a way that the outer *gopura*, which is of course in the same alignment with the inner one, is not in

the centre of the eastern wall but is shifted to the south. If it was planned from the beginning, this rather unusual lack of symmetry should be explained. In Dārāsuram either, we do not know the age of the Ammaṇ shrine, which faces east and is paralleled to the main temple, and not perpendicular like in Tukkacci; but it is possible that this situation, at Dārāsuram, is the result of an afterthought (L'Hernault 1987: 16 and 64) and that the temple may have been built slightly later, during Kulōttuṅga III's reign.

Besides, in Tukkacci, there is another shrine dedicated to Ammaṇ: it is the one to the north of the first *maṇḍapa* of the main temple. That it was originally planned to be there can be inferred from the fact that there is a secondary gate in the inner enclosure exactly in the alignment of this shrine: there was then a special entrance for the Goddess (fig. 6). As far as I could observe, there is no reason to believe that this secondary entrance was not part of the original plan. But the shrine itself may not be in its original state. In fact, the two *dvārapālikā* on both sides of the entrance are obviously not in their original location (fig. 7). They are not inserted into the wall but just lean against it. Besides, one of them has been broken. Moreover, an examination of this shrine from outside shows that the walls and notably the pilasters are much more simple than those of the main temple and do not fit stylistically with it, which is rather curious (fig. 8). So I feel that the shrine, in its actual state, is not contemporary with the main temple and was extended later, according to a second thought. Maybe a more careful architectural study could give us a more precise point of view. But, in the meantime, I would suggest that the first Ammaṇ shrine was a simple cell set inside the *maṇḍapa* against its northern wall, in the same axis with the chariot-like porch and the small gate in the southern surrounding wall. As a matter of fact, such a cell does exist in Dārāsuram (L'Hernault 1987: 54-56), though one is not sure when exactly it was built. Since Dārāsuram generally follows Tukkacci's plan, it is not impossible that the inner cell at Dārāsuram was modelled on the lines of Tukkacci. We will return to this question when speaking of the royal characteristics of the temple.

Before leaving this brief architectural description, I would like to insist on the importance to restore this temple which is rather neglected. It would be particularly interesting to excavate the courtyard in order to see what it looked like before the elevation of the ground. As an example, one can have a look at the rear of the *vimāna* and compare it with Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam. At Dārāsuram the *vimāna* is surrounded by a miniature wall with holes which were used to insert lamps. This wall was supposed to retain water in order to

create a reflection of the temple and illuminate it.[2] At Tribhūvanam, it is most probable that such a structure existed: whereas the courtyard has been much transformed, part of this miniature wall remains on the western side of the temple. In the Nāyaka period, a "water mirror" following the same model was installed around the Subrahmaṇya chapel in the courtyard of the big temple in Tañjāvūr. Jacques Dumarçay thinks that one may have existed also in Palaiyārai (L'Hernault 1987: 43, n. 6) in front of the chariot-like *maṇḍapa*, but I am not sure it existed also around the *vimāna*. As far as I know, the earliest remaining structure of this kind is the one at Dārāsuram; since, once more, this temple seems to have been inspired closely but Tukkacci, it would be very interesting to know whether it existed there also, or not. For the moment, the question will remain unsolved.

2. Characteristics of the royal architecture

So far, Tukkacci seems to be the main foundation of king Vikrama. As such, it is a link between Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḷapuram and Dārāsuram, for which it has served as model. To be complete, along with Tukkacci, the temple at Palaiyārai must be cited, since it belongs to what Françoise L'Hernault called the "Dārāsuram school". It shares a lot of features with Tukkacci, the chariot-shaped *maṇḍapa* and the perpendicular Amman temple being the most notable ones. But the epigraphical data from Palaiyārai is scarce and does not allow to establish precisely when it was founded. On merely stylistic ground, it is possible to propose a date between 1130 and 1160, perhaps during the reign of Kulōttuṅga II, Vikrama's successor (Balasubrahmanyam 1979: 200). Because of this uncertainty, and especially the lack of information about its patron, it is difficult to set Palaiyārai within the "State temple" group, in spite of the common architectural features.

But, before going further, if we accept the idea that Tukkacci re-established the custom for the Cōḷa dynasty to erect "State temples", one must raise the question to know why Kulōttuṅga I, who was a very powerful ruler and whose reign lasted for nearly fifty years, did not built a temple of his own. This fact is curious since the king was also a great builder and participated a lot in the extension of the Cidambaram temple. But here may lie, at least in a part, the solution to this enigma. As a matter of fact, Kulōttuṅga did not belong to the main branch of the Cōḷa but was born as an Eastern Cāḷukya ruler of Vēṅgī and both his mother and his grand-mother were Cōḷa princesses. He ascended the Cōḷa throne in a troubled period and it is supposed that his claim for legitimacy could have been challenged. Even his court poet,

---

[2] To give just a famous example, we can have an idea of how it looked like in Angkor Vat, where the two pools in front of the temple on both side of the axial pathway serve exactly the same purpose.

Jayangoṇḍār, in the *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi*, is silent about the reign of the last king of the direct line, Adhirājendra, and declared that Kulōttuṅga was chosen as heir-apparent by Vīrarājendra, a view made impossible by the epigraphical data. Moreover, once comfortably installed on the Cōḷa throne, Kulōttuṅga makes it a point to mention, in his inscriptions, that he obtained the crown by right. This in a way shows that it may not have been so simple (Nilakanta Sastri 1935: 338-358). In this context, to patronise the Cidambaram temple was very important since this temple houses the dancing Śiva, who was the *kūladevatā*, or family-god, of the Cōḷas. In increasing this temple, the king established a link between dancing Śiva and himself and thus legitimised his power. His son, Vikrama, followed his example and became Cidambaram's main patron but one assumes that after the long and powerful rule of his father, the situation was strong enough for him to re-enact the custom initiated by Rājarāja I and Rājendra I.

2.1. The site

The four "State" temples mentioned at the beginning of this paper, besides their architectural features, also have something else in common : they are all built in a place which was not specifically sacred nor linked to the famous Tamil saints, the *śaiva* Nāyaṇmār and the *vaiṣṇava* Āḷvār. In a way, Tañjāvūr, Gaṅgai, Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam had no special religious meaning, whereas Cidambaram, to cite only one example, had. The purpose was then to make a distinction between some important pilgrimage places and those temples which had a more political significance. The same can be said about Tukkacci, a village which was not particularly known before Vikrama's time. On the contrary, Paḷaiyārai, which served as a second capital for the Cōḷas, is mentioned in the *Tēvāram* (Champakalakshmi 1996: 345-6). This point, according to me, is another argument not to place this temple within this group under discussion. We have seen from inscriptions that Tukkacci was first called Kulōttuṅgaśōḷanallūr and then was christened as Vikramaśōḷanallūr: in both cases, the link with the ruling king is obvious.

2.2. The name of the temple

The second point is the name of the temple itself. All the royal Cōḷa temples associate *Īśvara* with the name, or a title, of the king who founded them: *Rājarājeśvara* at Tañjāvūr and Dārāsuram, *Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḷīśvara* at Gaṅgaikoṇḍacōḷapuram and *Tribhūvanavīreśvara* at Tribhūvanam. The same situation prevails at Tukkacci where the temple was called *Vikramaśōḷīśvara*. However, in the oldest inscription the name was *Ten-Tirukkāḷatti Mahādevar*. Maybe this name refers to a previous foundation; or we may suppose that when

the construction began, the temple was not meant to bear a political significance and that this meaning was given a little later.[3] As in the other places, this political name disappeared, probably after the fall of the Cōḷa dynasty. The changing of a name which had political implications is to be noticed.

2.3. The chariot-*maṇḍapa*

Coming back to the architectural features, one may now question the link between the chariot-shaped *maṇḍapa* and the royal foundations.[4] This type of architecture seems to be a creation of the 12th century in the Tamil country, in spite of a possible precursor in Karnataka at the end of the 11th century (Balasubrahmanyam 1979: 125, 171). The first example is probably the Amṛtaghaṭeśvara temple at Melakkaḍambūr, built sometime before A.D. 1113, but, there, it is not a *maṇḍapa* which is patterned as a chariot but the *vimāna* itself. The idea to build a *maṇḍapa* facing south in the shape of a chariot was then a new one at Tukkacci and it was repeated at Paḻaiyārai, Dārāsuram and Tribhūvanam. Of course, another very famous building from the late Cōḷa period adopted this shape: it is the Nṛtta Sabhā in the Cidambaram temple. The dating of this fascinating *maṇḍapa* is a very problematic one. Some believe that it was built during Kulōttuṅga I's reign: to support this view, it is held that the Tērk-kōyil, i.e. Nṛtta Sabhā (*ter* meaning "chariot" in Tamil), was praised in Vikrama's *praśasti* and that the enclosure wall built by this king (*Vikrama Cōḷaṉ Tirumāḷigai*) takes into account this maṇḍapa, closing its southern side on purpose (L'Hernault 1987: 6; Natarajan 1994: 56, 136). But it is more generally held to be a creation by Kulōttuṅga III. We shall not elaborate on this now. If we agree with the idea that it is contemporary with the second enclosure of Cidambaram, then it would mean that it is slightly older or coeval with the *maṇḍapa* at Tukkacci. But we must bear in mind that the two structures are quite different. The Nṛtta Sabhā is an independent *maṇḍapa* facing north, whereas at Tukkacci it is integrated into the temple and faces south. Even if the Nṛtta Sabhā was older, this disposition appeared then for the first time at Tukkacci.

Some years ago, Gerd Mevissen has very convincingly shown that the chariot-*maṇḍapa* at Dārāsuram was conceived as a representation of Tripurāntaka's chariot, with Brahmā as its charioteer (Mevissen 1993: *passim*). The position of the others deities visible on the other parts of the *maṇḍapa* could also been explained that way. The same symbolism was

---

[3] It is possible that in his 4th year, Vikrama was still *yuvarāja*: since his father would have been still on the throne, it would have been logical not to associate his crowning name with the temple at first.

[4] For a general account on chariot-like structures, see Mevissen 1996.

repeated at Tribhūvanam, where we can find also Brahmā, in the central niche on the mouldings of the base, holding a noose (*pāśa*) in order to lead the horses. It is a very well-known fact that, although Naṭeśa was the *kūladevatā* of the Cōḻas, Tripurāntaka had a more political meaning for them, symbolising their powerful policy. At Tañjāvūr, Śiva as Tripurāntaka is depicted on every sides of the first storey of the *vimāna*, a sort of representation of Rājarāja's *digvijaya*. Tukkacci's *maṇḍapa*, once more, stands in the middle between the two groups of "State temples" because it is the first occurrence of the chariot-shaped *maṇḍapa* facing south and integrated in the whole temple but there is no niches housing Brahmā and other deities forming the retinue of Tripurāntaka. It would then mean that this new architectural form had not yet been linked to this mythological and political allusion. At Paḷaiyārai, niches can be seen exactly to the same place as at Dārāsuram but I must confess that I do not know which gods are housed in them, except Brahmā who is in the central niche; so it is a bit difficult to speculate about its exact meaning.[5] But it would suggest that this *maṇḍapa* has a more "advanced" iconography and, consequently, that the temple is definitely later than Tukkacci.

2.4. Śarabha

Another iconographical peculiarity of Tukkacci is the presence of an image of Śarabha. It is now placed on the northern wall inside the chariot-*maṇḍapa*, the left of the Ammaṇ shrine but, originally, it must have been placed outside, on the southern wall of the *snapana maṇḍapa*, into a small chapel (now empty) probably built for that purpose (L'Hernault 1987: 7).

Śarabha is not a very common image of Śiva. The god is depicted as a fantastic bird with a lion face killing Viṣṇu as Narasiṃha whose wrath after slaying Hiraṇyakaśipu was too threatening for the gods who, therefore, asked Śiva to interfere. According to the *Śiva Purāṇa* (*Śatarudrasaṃhitā* 10-12), when implored by the gods, Śiva evoked his emanation as Vīrabhadra. Vīrabhadra approached Narasiṃha and tried to calm him, not without some irony. But Narasiṃha's wrath could not be tamed easily, so Vīrabhadra transformed himself into the Śarabha, caught hold of Viṣṇu, lifted him up and then fell him to the ground. This is the scene depicted at Tukkacci. This episode showing a rivalry between Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas[6] is also

---

[5] Besides it has perhaps been restored in the 15th century (S.R. Balasubrahmanyam 1979: 203)

[6] This "opposition" must nevertheless be balanced: the *Liṅga Purāṇa* actually says: "O base Nṛsiṃha, you are neither creator, nor sustainer, nor annihilator. You are subservient and deluded in mind. You are not independent anywhere. O Viṣṇu, like the potter's wheel you are forcibly induced by Śiva when you take the different incarnations. You are always dependent on him." (*Śatarudrasaṃhitā* 11.47-48), but at the end of the story, Śiva

told in the very sectarian *Liṅga Purāṇa* (1.95), in the *Śakta Kālikā Purāṇa* (31) and also in the *Kuñcitāṅghristava* (125), a poem in praise of dancing Śiva of Cidambaram, written by Umāpati Śivācārya around A.D. 1300 (Smith 1996).[7] Śarabhamūrti in also described in some ritual treatises, like the *Uttarakāmikāgama* (54) and the *Uttarakāraṇāgama* (73). The fact that the use of this kind of image is peculiar to a specific period, namely the 12th century, could be a clue as to the date or at least part of the history of these two *āgamas*.

Śarabha images are also to be found at Dārāsuram and at Tribhūvanam, where there is now a modern shrine dedicated to it and where the cult is still rather important. I have shown above the link between Śarabha and Vīrabhadra, and it is noticeable that the story of Vīrabhadra destroying Dakṣa's sacrifice was almost considered as a *sthalapuṟāṇa* at Dārāsuram, following an Eastern Cāḷukya tradition (L'Hernault 1987: 3). A fourth image is enclosed in the Nṛtta Sabhā at Cidambaram.[8] It raises again the question to know whether it was set up during Kulōttuṅga I's or Kulōttuṅga III's reign and consequently to know which one between Cidambaram's and Tukkacci's Śarabha is the oldest. For the moment, we may just remark that all those foundations are royal ones and, as far as I am aware of, no Śarabha image has been found in a non-royal temple dating from the Cōḷa period. Accordingly, this iconography must bear a specific meaning in this context. All the Cōḷa kings were ardent *śaiva* but it appears that at the end of the 11th century and during the 12th century the relations between Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas, usually peaceful, became quite tense. Kulōttuṅga II, Vikrama's son, is mostly famous for his almost fanatical patronage to Cidambaram where he is said to have removed the image of reclining Viṣṇu and thrown it into the sea. At the same time, a new image of Śiva as Caṭṭainātar seems to have made his appearance in some Cōḷa temple. Caṭṭainātar is a form of Bhairava holding a mace and wearing a coat on his otherwise naked body. This coat is supposed to be the skin taken from the Vāmana *avatāra* of Viṣṇu (Ladrech 2002: 172-182). In the same way, in the *Śiva Purāṇa*, Śarabha is said to have taken the skin from Narasiṃha (*Śatarudrasaṃhitā* 12.35-36).

---

declares: "Just as water poured into water, or milk poured into milk, or ghee poured into ghee becomes one with those things, so also Viṣṇu is merged into Śiva, not otherwise. It was Viṣṇu alone in the form of the Man-lion, haughty and strong, engaged in the activity of annihilating the universe. He shall be prayed and bowed by my devotees aspiring achievements. He is the foremost of my devotees and the granter of boons." (*ibid.*, 12.31-33).
We may add that the Vaiṣṇavas created a response to Śarabha, where Viṣṇu defeats Śiva's emanation, in the Kāñcīmāhātmya (Porcher 1985: 33).
[7] *bhītyā santrāsamāne naraharivapuṣo devatānāṃ samūhe / dhātrā saṃstūyamānaḥ śarabhavaratanuḥ sāluvaḥ pakṣirājaḥ // vegāt taṃ chedayitvā svapadanakhamukhais tattvacālaṅkṛto'bhūd / daṃṣṭrāsaṃdīptalokas taṃ abhilavaradaṃ kuñcitāṅghriṃ bhaje'ham //*
[8] In the Nṛtta Sabhā, Śarabha is associated with Kālī (who witnesses Śiva dancing in *ūrdhvatāṇḍava*). In the *Kuñcitāṅghristava* 126 Kālī is created from Śarabha's forehead eye in order to destroy Narasiṃha.

The presence of Śarabha in the Cōḷa royal temples must be then interpreted as a representation of the royal religious thought. Besides, in the *Śiva Purāṇa* (*Śatarudrasaṃhitā* 12.44), it is said that hearing this story can destroy all the king's enemies. In the *Uttarakāraṇāgama* (73.1cd-2ab), we are told that the setting up of this image will bring victory in battles, kill all the enemies, achieve every success and cure every disease.[9] Bearing this in mind, the presence of Śarabha image at Tukkacci would seem rather logical: it was an auspicious image capable of bringing all successes to the king, as could also the image of Tripurāntaka.

2.5. Devī' shrine

The last point I would like to discuss in relation to the royal status of the temple is the uncertainty concerning the shrine dedicated to Devī. I have already explained why I think this shrine is not in its original shape and that the Sundara Nāyakī temple must have been added later. In the meantime, it is a well-known fact that from the 12th century on, Amman temples were added almost in every Śiva temples (as in Viṣṇu temples). The most famous is surely the Śivakāmī Amman temple, or Tirukkamakottam, at Cidambaram. It is interesting for our purpose to note that it was not built by Kulōttuṅga I but by his famous minister Naralokaviraṇ. When one looks closely at the epigraphical data from the late Cōḷa period, one can see that all Amman shrines or temples were founded by non-royal persons. For example in A.D. 1102, at Tiruveṅkāṭu, which had been an important temple patronised by the royal family in the 11th century, the Amman shrine was added by a local chief, Candraśekaraṇ Pañcanedivāṇaṇ (ARE, 530 of 1918). At Dārāsuram, the Devī temple bears no inscription at all. Of course, one has to be cautious when using such an argument *a silentio*. I am not saying that the Cōḷa kings did have no implications at all in those shrines, but obviously their link with the Devī cult was weak (or, at least, they did not want to insist on it in their documents), whereas a lot of non-royal persons showed their devotion to the Goddess.

Conclusion

To sum up, Tukkacci was built at the end of Kulōttuṅga I's reign or a little later by his son Vikrama. As it is a "royal" or "State" temple, a site without main religious connections was chosen and the king gave his name to the *liṅga* enshrined in it. The building seems to have been rather unitary, except for the small shrine and the temple dedicated to the Goddess which seem to me not to have been planned originally. It inaugurated also new features: the

---

[9] *sarvaśatruvināśārtthaṃ kalausiddhipradāyakaṃ / sarvayuddhajayastaiva sarvapīḍānivāraṇaṃ /*

most notable one is the chariot-shaped *maṇḍapa* which would attain a much greater achievement and symbolism at Dārāsuram. The figure of Śarabha appeared there for the first time, most probably.

Compared to Tukkacci, the status of Palaiyārai is not evident to determine. It is not impossible that it was Kulōttuṅga II's "State temple" but for some reasons we may doubt it. I would suggest that it was in fact the chapel of the royal palace, since Palaiyārai acted as a capital for the Cōla dynasty in the 12th century. But this suggestion would need further research.

As it is, Tukkacci is not the main architectural achievement of the Cōlas. Its importance is more obvious from an historical point of view because it is a landmark in the history of royal patronage. It has sometimes been claimed that Dārāsuram had been partly influenced by Cāḷukya architecture: the main feature of this kind is probably the empty space in the middle of the *maṇḍapa* (Champakalakshmi 1979/1996: 347; L'Hernault 1987: 10). This could be said also about its model, Tukkacci. Since in his youth, Vikrama Cōla had been sent by his father as viceroy in Veṅgī, it could imply that he brought back with him some foreign ideas or even some architects and sculptors from the Cāḷukya country. From a more artistic perspective, Tukkacci was a gateway to Dārāsuram, which, in many ways is much more a masterpiece. So, it is indeed for its significance that this temple was briefly analysed here. But, once again, all this must be seen only as tentative and needs to be researched further.

Bibliography

Annual Report on (South) Indian Epigraphy (ARE), 1887-

Balasubrahmanyan S.R.   1979 Later Chola Temples, Kulottunga I to Rajaraja III. Bombay.

Champakalakshmi R.   1979 Growth of Urban Centres in South India: Kuḍamūkku-Paḷaiyāṟai, the Twin-city of the Cōḷas In *Studies in History*, vol. I, n° 1 (revised as: Imperial Power and Urban Growth: Kuḍamūkku-Paḷaiyāṟai, the Twin-city of the Cōḷas. In: Champakalakshmi R.   1996 Trade, Ideology and Urbanization. South India 300 BC to AD 1300. New Delhi, 331-368).

Gopinatha Rao T.A.   1916 Elements of Hindu Iconography, 4 vol. Madras.

Harle J.C.   1963 Temple Gateways in South India ; The Architecture and Iconography of the Chidambaram Gopuras. Oxford.

Kāmikāgama 1909, 2 vol., edited by Śivañanapota, Śintātiripeṭṭai. Madras.

Kāraṇāgama 1921, 2 vol., edited by Śivañanapota, Śintātiripeṭṭai. Madras.

L'Hernault F. (dir.)   1987 Darasuram, 2 vol. Paris.

Ladrech K.   2002 Bhairava à la massue. In: *Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes*, n° 20.1, pp. 163-192.

Meister M.W. and Dhaky M.A. (eds.)   1983 Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture; South India, Lower Drāviḍadeśa, 2 vol. New Delhi.

Mevissen G.J.R.   1994 Political Geography as a Determinant in South Indian Temple Art ? A Case Study of Tripurāntakamūrti. In: Parpola A. And Koskikallio P. (eds.), South Asian Achaeology 1993. Helsinki, vol. 2, 483-495.

Mevissen G.J.R.   1993 Mythology Meets Architecture: The Stone Chariot at Dārāsuram. In: Gail A.J. and Mevissen G.J.R. (eds.), South Asian Archaeology 1991. Berlin, 539-560.

Mevissen G.J.R.   1996 The Suggestion of Movement: A Contribution to the Study of Chariot-shaped Structures in Indian Temple-architecture. In Mitra D. (ed.), Explorations in Art and Archaeology of South Asia. Essays dedicated to N.G. Majumdar. Calcutta, 477-512.

Natarajan B.   1974 The City of the Cosmic Dance, Chidambaram. New Delhi.

Nilakanta Sastri K.A.   1935-37, 2nde éd. 1955 The Colas. Madras.

Ogura Y.   1998 The Changing Concept of Kingship in the Cōḷa Period : Royal Temple Construction, ca A.D. 850-1279. In: Acta Asiatica 74, 39-58.

Porcher M.-C.   1985 La représentation de l'espace sacré dans le Kāñcīmahatmya. In: *Puruṣārtha* 8.

Sarkar H.   1974 The Kampaharesvara Temple at Tribhuvanam. Madras.

Smith D.   1996 The Dance of Śiva. Religion, Art and Poetry in South India. Cambridge

The Śiva-Purāṇa, translated by a board of scholars, 4 vol., 1970, Delhi

Captions

Fig. 1: Plan of Tukkacci temple (© author, after J. Dumarçay in L'Hernault 1987 : Pl. Introd. I)

Fig. 2: Tukkacci, general view of the temple from the south-west (© author)

Fig. 3: Tukkacci, inner *gopura* (© author)

Fig. 4: Tukkacci, chariot-*maṇḍapa*, eastern horse (© author)

Fig. 5: Tukkacci, chariot-*maṇḍapa*, western horse (© author)

Fig. 6: Tukkacci, view from the south (© author)

Fig. 7: Tukkacci, entrance of the Devī shrine, left female door-keeper (© author)

Fig. 8: Tukkacci, Devī shrine, from the west (© author)

Fig. 9: Tukkacci, Śarabha (© author)