

## ***Shivalinga : Symbolism, Typology and a Glance on Licchavi Shivalingas***

**Sandhya Khanal Parajuli (Ph.D).**

Lecturer, Central Department of Nepalese History,  
Culture and Archaeology, T.U

E-mail: sandhya.khanal999@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

*The images that look like a male and a female organ have been discovered around the world and are marked as sacred since the establishment of civilization. What does this image symbolize? Why do Hindus worship it and why is it personified as lord Shiva? The concentration to answer these queries through descriptive analysis of the linga is tried in this article. Lingas are found in various civilizations, including Indus valley, but the perception varies. Its tangible and intangible form and several varieties are its typology. This article is mainly based on symbolism of linga for various societies and for earlier Aryans. Linga, though varies in form, is a phallic symbolism of creation which was not accepted by the Aryans at first due to its nudity and straightforwardness. But after the realization of its core theme that the linga is the composition of prakriti and purush, it made them eager to establish through its reformed reality rather than his anthropomorphic form in honor of their supreme god, the creator and a destroyer, no other than lord Shiva who self-emerged as jyotirlinga. Almost all the typologies including maximum varieties of manmade lingas are found around Kathmandu valley but the choice of Licchavis for the establishment of linga with its specific typology and theme are discussed.*

**Key words :** *Linga, Yoni, Vedi, Prakriti, Purush, Sakala, Niskala, Brahmasutra, Sisinadeva, Veshar, Nagar.*

### **Introduction**

*Lingas made out of stone or mud and circular discs that are alike yoni have been discovered from Mohanjodado and Harrapa. The ancient societies like Greek, Rome, Egypt, Mesopotamia and many other worshiped linga as the representation of reproduction,*

cultivator, amulets, ornaments, saver of phallus etc. Many *lingas* are scattered around our society and are worshiped by people. But why do Vedas not discuss about *linga*? Only the Upanisadh speaks about *linga* and the worship of *linga* is profoundly practiced from Epic and Pauranic period. Why did Vedic Aryans not accept *linga*? When and why at a later period did they accept *linga*? Why is *linga* represented as lord Shiva and not the other God? How are the *lingas* made? What type of *lingas* did the Licchavi society prefer? These statements are identified as the problems in this article. Finding out the solution through the review of literatures and making analysis of Licchavi *lingas* through survey and their judgement through mentioned *pratima lakshan* is the theme of this article.

## **Methodology**

This article is a qualitative research. The research of different aspects of *lingas* is conducted through using primary and secondary sources. Several sites of Kathmandu valley that included *Shivalingas* are visited. Their epigraphs are collected. And their photographs are taken. Like-wise Vedas, Upanisadas, Epics, Puranas and several books, journals, articles published about the *Shivalingas* are reviewed as secondary sources. The review of published as well as unpublished literatures have been done.

*Shivalingas* were observed in order to do analysis of typology of its art, its *pratima lakshan* and material used to make *lingas* through ages. Among the number of *Shivalingas* of Kathmandu valley, Lichhavi *Shivalingas* are focused. Selective samples of Licchavi *lingas* with inscriptions were chosen. Comparing them with the *lingas* without inscriptions, its typology, style of the time, materials selected and its theme are discussed.

Information collected from both sources are analysed and discussed in descriptive manner, in a systematic form. The references taken from secondary sources are mentioned in the content, as per rule of methodology of research along with bibliography. In this way this research article is prepared following scientific research methodology.

## **Symbolism of *Linga* through Ages**

The male organ is known as phallus (*linga*). To worship the symbolic organ that is alike phallus is known as phallicism (*lingopasana*) and the group of people who worship it is known as phallic cult (*linga sampradaya*). *Linga* is the symbolism of reproduction, cultivation and creation. In many societies, it is the symbolism of religion, tradition and culture. People of Neolithic age worshiped *linga* to improve their cultivation (Mishra, 1980: 693). During the excavation of Mohenjodado and Harrapa, *lingas* made out of stone and mud as well as circular discs, similar to a female organ (*yoni*) were discovered (Huntington, 1985: 17). In ancient Egypt, god Min was shown with the erected phallus as a god of fertility; in ancient Greek, god Priapus was considered as the god of procreation and is shown with a huge phallus. In ancient Rome, the phallus was used as a decorative item in architecture and

also as an ornaments and amulets. Babylonians worshiped phallus as the god of cultivation and procreation. While *linga* symbolized different themes to different societies of the world, the matter of concern is the perception of people of Sindhu regarding it. For this, one should concentrate on the verses of Vedas.

The word *Sisnadeva* is mentioned in few verses of Rigveda that symbolizes *linga*. Aryans in the verses 7, 21, 5; 10, 99, 3 and 10, 27, 19 of Rigveda, have requested lord Indra to protect them from the demons or the enemies who are the worshipers of *Sisna* or *linga* and to capture their city (Luitel, 2076 : 551,975). These verses help to analyze that beside Aryans, there were a group of people who were identified as Non Aryans, Dravidians or a group who worshiped *linga*, whom the Aryans hated. Dravidians were the resident of Sindhu, who after the downfall of the civilization migrated to the Eastern and Southern part of India, and were the worshipers of *linga*, while Aryans during the time, were the worshipers of Rudra (Das, 1925:278). Atharva Veda's verses 3, 4, 23; 4,2,25; 7,3,6 explains about the worship of *yonis* and womb of a mother in order to conceive a healthy child (Pandayay,1996: 30,53,101), but is silent about *linga*. Likewise no other Vedas discuss about *linga*, nor do the Brahmanas. In this way Vedic literature lack the verse regarding *linga*.

The age of Upanisadh is known as the analytical age of philosophy, rather than *Havana* (sacrifice). It is Upanisadh, that for the first time explains about the philosophical value of *linga* and *yonis*. Kathopanisadh, Swetaswetarupanisadh, Rudraupanisadh, Rudrahridayaupanisadh explains about *linga* and *yonis* These Upanisadhs define *linga* and *yonis* as a supreme form of lord, the *prakriti* and *purush*, male and female, Rudra and Uma and defines that, "the creation of the world is the product of these two". In Rudrahridayaupanisadh 23, "*Rudrolingamumapitham, tasmaitasyainamonamah:*" or vow is offered to Shiva in the form of *linga* and Uma in the form of *pithika* (Rana, 3 : 11). In the same way, in another statement of same Upanisadh, it is mentioned that, "*Chandals* are the *pran lingis*, they know *linga* very well, so they are not *Chandalas* but lord Shiva", (Rana, 3 : 106). This proves that, Non Aryan's culture of worshipping of *linga* that had been cultivated and preserved since the emergence of civilization, were accepted by the Aryans only during the Upanisadh age. Though philosophically the Aryans accepted the concept, but the practice of worship of *linga* was yet not comfortable for them.

Worshipping and establishment of *linga* were found during Epic period. Ravana was a great worshiper of *linga*. Ram and Hanuman had established *linga*. Likewise, the explanation of importance of *linga* as well as its worship was explained by Upamanyu to lord Krishna. Worship of *lingas* by Kunti, Madri, Arjuna are few of the examples of this period.

Pauranic age gives plenty of explanation of *linga*. Puranas explains about its importance, *pratima lakshana* of making *linga* and *pithika*, *vidhan* of its establishment,

self-emergence of several *lingas*, establishment of *linga* by gods, *ganas* and *ashuras*. Many interesting stories about *linga* are explained in Shivapurana, Lingapurana, Skandnapurana, Vamanapurana, Himawatkhandapurana, Self-emergence of lord Shiva as *jyotirlinga* in front of Brahma and Vishnu to close the discussion about their supremacy, the first worship of *linga* by them, explanation about importance of *linga* and the *linga* as the essential means of salvation rather than his anthropomorphic form explained by lord Shiva, providing of her *yonis* as *aasana* for *linga* by Uma, establishment of *linga* in *Darubana* which had fallen due to the curse of *Rishis* and many more stories explained in Puranas encouraged devotees to further establish *lingas*. But the essential theme of almost all *lingas* (manmade *lingas*) of the earlier period is that, they were implemented originally like a phallus, i.e. *Linga* of Guddimallam (Sunga Period) and Kushana period. Coming to the Gupta period, the structure that resembled like phallic was reformed through the use of *brahmasutra*. This was the best theme chosen by the Aryans, to avoid nudity, openness and straightforwardness of *linga* since the starting of civilization.

### Typology of *Linga*

Lord Shiva is worshiped in two forms: *Shaakaar* and *Niraakaar*.

*Shaakaar* form is the anthropomorphic form of lord Shiva like Shiva, Uma Maheshwor, Bhairav, Nateshwora etc. *Niraakaar* form is the *Linga* form.

*Niraakaar* form of lord Shiva or the *linga* are of various types :

*Chalalinga*: *Linga* that can be moved or settled after its worship. *Achalalinga*: *Linga* that are fixed or cannot be moved (Roa, 1997: 75-76).

*Niskalalinga*: *Linga* that look like phallus or plain *linga* without face. *Sakalalinga*: *Linga* on which anthropomorphic form of Shiva is carved. *Mishralinga*: *Linga* with one to four or five faces (Mishra, 1987:264).

*Linga* varies according to the material chose for making : *Mridmayalinga*: *Linga* made up of mud. *Lauhajalinga*: *Linga* made up of metals like gold, silver, copper, iron etc, *Ratnajalinga*: *Linga* made up of gems like topaz, pearl, ruby etc, *Darujalinga*: *Linga* made up of wood. *Sailajalinga*: *Linga* made up of stone. *Kshyanikalinga*: *Linga* made by honey, rice, sandal paste, flower etc for short period of time (Rao,1997: 75-77).

Further, there are varieties of *Achalalingas*:

*Swoyambhulinga*: *Lingas* which are self-emerged, which needs no repairing, if damaged caused through animals or nature. *Daivikalinga*: *Linga* which is believed to be established by god, which resembles like the burning fire or the *anjali mudra*. *Ganapalinga*: *Linga* which is believed to established by the *ganas* and resembles like cucumber or

marmalos (*bel*). *Arshalinga*: *Linga* which is established by *Rishi* and resembles like coconut (Rao, 1997, 83-86). *Banalinga*: *Linga* which are found in river bank like Gandaki, Varanasi, Narvada, Saraswoti etc and that might be of any shape and size (Shreevastav, 1996 :71). *Manushlinga*: *Linga* made and established by men and are found in maximum numbers.

*Manushlinga* is composed of three parts: *Brahma pith*: the bottom square part that remains under the ground or attached to *pithika/jalahari* and is also known as *Brahma Bhaga* or Lord Brahma. *Bhadra pith*: the middle octagonal part and is also known as *Vishnu Bhaga* or lord Vishnu. And the *Bhoga pith* : the upper cylindrical part, where *puja* is offered and is also known as *Puja Vagha*, *Rudra Bhaga* or lord Rudra (Vishnudharmottarapurana, 1998, 74 : 2-3). On each *Bhoga pith* or *Puja Bhaga*, there must be *brahmasutra* carved as an alternative symbolism of uppermost part of erected phallus. Agama explains that, *Manushalinga* in absence of *brahmasutra* is incomplete and do not deserve worship. Among the above mentioned *lingas*, *Swayambhulinga* is categorized as *uttamottamalinga* or the best, according to Supravedagam and Puranas.

*Manus lingas* are plain as well as with faces. The *linga* with face/faces is called *Mukhlinga*. *Mukhalinga* contains one to five faces. Four faces are carved in their specific directions. *Tatpurush*, *Aghor*, *Sadhyojat*, *Vamadev* from east in a clockwise direction, and are carved on *Bhoga pith* or *Puja Bhaga* of a *linga*. The fifth face is known as *Ishan* and is mostly invisible. Rupmandana recommends to make *linga* with one, three and four faces but not with two or five faces (Shreevastav, 1966: 177) whereas, Rao suggests for five faces (Rao, 1997 : 98). *Lingas* are further more categorized into different varieties as mini size *lingas* are carved on the *Puja Bhaga*. *Astotarsayalinga*: On *Puja Bhaga* of *linga*, one hundred and eight *lingas* are carved. *Sahasralinga* : On *Puja Bhaga* of *linga*, one thousand one *lingas* are carved. *Dharalinga* : On *Puja Bhaga* of *linga*, five to sixty four lines or *lingas* are carved. Likewise *linga* even varies as per its length and width.

The pedestal of *linga* is another essential part of *linga*. It is known as *pithika*, *vedi*, *yoni* or *jalari*, the representation of Uma. *Linga* is incomplete without *pithika*. Various types of *pithikas* are described in different texts. *Lingas* are also categorized according to the structure of *pithika*. They are : *Nagar pithika* : *Linga* with a rectangular *pithika*. *Vesharpithika* : *Linga* with a circular *pithika* and *Dravinapithika*: *Linga* with an octagonal *pithika*.

### ***Linga Pithika Pratima Lakshana***

It is compulsory to follow the rule or *pratima lakshana* while making of image. Images without *pratima lakshana* are mentioned as worthless. Various texts have been described about the lakshans of *linga* and *pithika*. According to *Linga Purana*, *chala linga* must be equal to or more than one *angul* but not less than one *angul* of the person who establish or worship. Whereas, *achala linga* should be equal to twelve *angul* and not less than that of establisher (*Linga Purana*, 2075: 28). Likewise Rupmandana suggests for making

*chala linga* between one to eleven *angul* and *achala linga* equal to one *haat*, and this type of *linga* should not be established at home but at the temple or an open place (Shreevastav, 1996: 162-163). *Lakshana* for making of *lingas* out of different materials and their size are mentioned in Matshyapurana. Rupmandana describes the the *lakshana* of *brahmasutra*. It explains that, *Rudra Vagh* of a *linga* should be divided into sixteen parts and on its tenth part, *brahmasutra* should be carved (Shreevastav, 1996: 170). *Lakshans* for making of one to five faces in specific directions with specific weapons in their hands are explained in Vishnudhormattarapurana, Rupmandana and also by Rao in his book the elements of Hindu Icoography. Likewise different *lakshanas* for *pithika* is also discussed. As the upper part of *linga* is representation of *linga* and the earlier ones were made as a replica of an erected male organ, Likewise *pithika* is representation of *yoni* and have *vidhana* of representing it like a *yoni*. *Pithika* should be made more than triple size of *linga*, and its width should be equal to the width of *linga*. *Pithika* should cover the *Brahma Bhaga* and should touch the end of *Vishnu Bhaga*, according to Rupamanda (Shreevastav, 1996: 174-176). *Pithika* should always be placed facing towards north and the material used for making the *pithika* should be same as *linga*. Matshyapurana further describes about ten varieties of *pithika*.

For the *lingas* which are made to be established in *Shivalaya* (Shaiva temple), its specific *lakshana* is described in Matshyapurana. It explains about its various *pramans* (shape and size), but the *linga* equal to third part of total area of sanctrum of a *Shivalaya* out of its fifth part is categorized as best (Matshyapurana, 2070 : 996). And procedure of establishing the *linga* on a *pithika* inside the *Shivalaya* along with *adhivasana*, *havana* and chanting of specific *mantras* is described in detail in Matshyapurana and Lingapurana.

### **Licchavi Lingas and their features**

The emergence of lord Pashupatinath through *gyotirlinga*, mentioned in Puranas and Mahatmyas proves the antiquity of Shaivism in Nepal. Images like Uma Shiva *sahit chaturmurti* (third century, C.E., Nachghar), Three faced Shiva (third century.C.E., Chikha Mugal), Shiva and Shiva Parvati (third century,C.E. respectively, Ganesh temple Kirtipur), Harihara (third century,C.E., Saugal Patan), Virupakshya (fourth century,C.E., Aryaghat), Uma Maheshwor (second to fourth century, C.E., of Patan Chamunda, Deupatan, Kumveshwor, Sikubahi Patan etc) are the best examples of the earlier or Pre-Licchavi anthropomorphic or *shaakaar* form of lord Shiva ever found around Kathmanu Valley. While many of his *shaakaar* form were established around, very few example of manmade *shivalinga* i.e. *shivalinga* with four faces of Balkhu is found. Whereas sixty-four *Swyambhuva lingas* including lord Pashupatinath as described in Himavatkhandaapurana had its presence much earlier. Before concentrating to the *lingas* of Licchavi period, it must be mentioned, as per the number of *lingas* scattered around us that, Lichhavi as well as the medieval society preferred the *linga* form of Shiva primarily. Secondarily they preferred Uma Maheshwor and Bhairava, where as other form of his images are in shade.

More than hundreds of *shivalinga* of Licchavi period are found around Kathmandu valley. Few of them are along with inscriptions, while maximum lacks it. *Shivalingas* of Naravarma S.388, Kshemsundari S.390, Ratnasanga S.399, Ratnasanga (Pravhukeshwor) S.402, Panchadeval S.410, Jayalamba S.413, Gunawati S. 419, Vijjayavati S.427, Vhasmeshwor S.455, Abhirigomini S.462, Manmati S.467, are some of the *lingas* with inscriptions of Licchavi period (Bajracharya, 2030 : 32, 40, 50, 56, 61,62, 66, 83, 155, 171, 175). Simplicity, flexibility, less use of ornaments and decoration, Aryan face, naturality, selection of bluish black stone, use of special paste (lep), use of transparent cloth, especial use of *mukuta*, *jatamukuta* are the basic features of Licchavi images. In this article, few of the Licchavi *lingas* with and without epigraphic record are selected. The *lingas* without epigraphic record after the analysis of its similarity with the recorded one, along with the style and characteristics of the time mentioned above and its features are discussed below.

### ***Shivalinga* of Gunavati S.419**

This Shivalinga is at Lajimpat at the southern bank of Ikshumati river. It was established by Gunavati, the wife of King Manadeva in S.419 for *punyavidhi* of her deceased father Kinnarvarma (Bajracarya, 2030: 66). It is now in the courtyard of a private house. It is a *niskala linga* (without face) established on a huge Veshar styled *pithika/jalahari*, a replica of a *yonis*. Its *Brahma Bhaga* is inserted inside the *pithika*, where as its *Vishnu*



*Bhaga* is of octagonal shape. The plain *Rudra Bhaga* with some damages on the layer of paste on its top and curved lines as a mark of *brahmasutra* on the *Rudra Bhaga* can be seen.

### ***Shivalinga* of Abhirigomini S.462**

This *shivalinga* is established at the southern part of Pashupatinath temple. It is known as Anuparameshwor *Shivalinga*. It was established by Abhirigomini, the wife of Anuparam or the mother of Bhauma Gupta for *punyavridhi* of her deceased husband in S.462. She also had donated land as *Guthi* to offer daily *snan* (bath), to put on oil and *chandan*, to offer *naivedhya* (food) to lord and for renovation if the *linga* is damaged (Bajracharya, 2030 : 171). It is a *niskala linga* established on a huge *nagar* styled *pithika* above the pedestal. Its *Brahma* and *Vishnu Bhaga* are invisible while a short part of a *Rudra Bhaga* is seen.



### ***Shivalinga* of Chasyalhiti**

This *shivalinga* is in Chasyal *hiti* premise, of Chyasal tole of Patan. It is a *linga* without the epigraphic record and is established in-front of ancient image of Gajalaksmi (1<sup>st</sup> Century B.C.). It is a *niskala linga* attached to a huge *Veshar* styled *pithika*. Its octagonal *Vishnu Bhaga* and a cylindrical *Rudra Bhaga* with *brahmasutra* is seen. The linga has shining paste or *lep* throughout the *linga* and *pithika*. This *linga* resembles like the *lingas* of Gunawati of Lajimpat, Vijayawati of Suryaghat, Natheshwor *linga* established by Manmati at *Mrigasthali* and many other *lingas* of Licchavi period with inscription. The style compared to the above mentioned *lingas*, the *brahmasutra* carved on it and the paste or *lep* applied to it, supports to categorise it as a Licchavi *linga* and can be dated around 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> C.E.





## Ek mukha Shivalinga

This *ek mukha shivlinga* is at Mrigasthali opposite to Pashupatinath temple. Few *mukha lingas* (*lingas* with face/faces) of Licchavi period have been found. It is one of the best example of earlier *shivalinga* with face. The *linga* is established on huge *Veshar* styled *pithika*. The face is carved in between the top and upper part of *Rudra Bhaga* as suggested in *Rupmandana* (Shreevastav,1996 :170). Long Aryan styled nose (which is now damaged when it was attempted to steal in early 1986), three eyes, elongated earlobes, stretched out lower lip, *jatamukuta* with half-moon on his head, hanging down loops of hair back from the ears, single line of *rudrakhya mala* on his neck, folds of skin in the neck along with its simplicity, really attracts anyone's concentration. This *Shivalinga* belongs to 5<sup>th</sup> century C.E. (Bangdel, 1989 : 302). The specially carved *Jatamukuta* on lord Shiva's head with the specific characteristic of Licchavi period and its simplicity proves too.

## Panchamukhi ShivalingaT

*Shivalinga* with four faces are also known as *panchamukhi Shivalinga*. This type of *lingas* of Licchavi period are few in numbers and can be counted. This *shivalinga* was established at the middle of road on the way to Mrigasthali, immediately after crossing the bridge of Bagmati river from Aaryaghat of Pashupatinath. This *panchamukhi Shivalinga* of 5<sup>th</sup> century C.E. was stolen in 1987. So the analysis it is only possible through the picture published in *Stolen Images of Nepal* (Bangdel, 1989 : 207-209). The *linga* stands without *pithika*. Its long octagonal *Vishnu Bhaga* and *Rudra Bhaga* with four faces carved on it help to assume about its long *Bhamha Bhaga* beneath the earth. Four aspects of Shiva in the *linga* is carved with different elaboration of hair as well as *jatamukuta* and expressions. Each hands of *Tatpurush*, *Aghor*, *Sadyojata*, *Vamadev Shiva* respectively from east to north in clockwise directions holds *rudrakshya mala* along with *avaya mudra* and *kalash* (water-pot). As *aagama* describes that, the face/faces of Shiva in the *linga* should be attached to his body and should be depicted till the chest (Rao, 1997: 98). As described in the text, four faces of Shiva in the *linga* are attached to its shoulders and hands out of their chest. The selection of bluish black stone along with polish or *lep*, varieties of elaborated hair style with *jatamukut*, *mukut* and especially small circular knots of hair carved on southern face of Shiva that resembled like the hair style of Rahu of *Vishnuvikranta* image of Lajimpat now in



National Museum, Chauni, single line of *rudrakshya mala* on the neck and its simplicity supports to prove the *linga* to be of early Licchavi period.

## Discussion

After the analysis of few samples of the Licchavi *Shivalingas*, an outline of its features are traced, which are as follows :

Nepalese society of Licchavi period especially preferred niraakar form of Shiva (the *linga* or the composite form of Siva and Uma) rather than his Shaakar (anthropomorphic) form.

Maximum *Shivalingas* of Licchavi period with *Brahma Bhaga* with square part under the ground, *Vishnu Bhaga* along with long octagonal part and *Rudra Bhaga* with cylindrical part with or without face/faces, signifies specific Licchavi character, which gradually vanished after this period.

Licchavi *Shivalingas* with octagonal *Vishnu Bhaga* and cylindrical *Rudra Bhaga* along with carving of *brahmasutra* and the face/faces as suggested in the related texts proves they are made through following *pratima lakshanas*.

*Lingas* that resembles like phallus, as in earlier Indian continent are not discovered.

Almost all the Licchavi *Shivalingas* are either established on a *Veshar* or a *Nagar* style *pithika*. Making of *Nagar pithika* was famous in Northern India and *Dravina* in Southern India, where as *Veshar* style, the mixture of *Nagar* and *Dravina* was famous between these areas (Gurung, 2076 : 8). Nepal during the Licchavi period chose both *Nagar* and *Veshar* style and was very popular. The *pithika* with *Dravina* style are not found in Nepal till the date. The *pithika* with *Veshar* style existed till long period of time, while *Nagar* style vanished after the Licchavi period.

It is the uniqueness of the Licchavi art to choose the huge size of *pithika*. (*Veshar* or *Nagar*).

The texts like *Vishnudharomottarpurana*, *Rupmandana* and many more suggested to make the images of Shiva in *linga*, with specific weapons but Licchavis preferred Shiva with *abhaya mudra* along with *rudrakshya mala* and *kalash* or *kumaba* the most.

Selection of bluish black stone for making of *linga*, application of paste (lep) in *linga as well as in pithika* and the simplicity found in its images proves the continuation of Licchavi art as in other images of the period.

The motive of establishment of *Shivalings* during Licchavi period are various. They are established for the welfare of people and the king. *Punya vridhi* of the person who

established, their parents or the deceased members and most of the *lingas* are established for salvation.

## Conclusion

This article helped to draw the conclusion regarding the the *niraakar* representation of lord Shiva or the *linga*, the symbolism of creation through different ages to different societies as well as to Aryans. It was very hard for Aryans to accept *linga* as phallus, so they accepted in a reformed theme. However, the selection of same theme was chosen by the Licchavis in a typical manner.

While the phallus or *linga*, for the world symbolised fertility, cultivation, amulets and for Dravidians the symbolism of creation, it was a nude and shameful replica of a male organ to Aryans, who not only denied this symbol but hated the people who worshiped it. Even after the realization of its core theme as prakriti and purush, the symbolism of creation or the means of salvation, its straightforwardness still made them hesitate to worship its nudity. So they reformed it through bramhasutra. Natural and Manush *lingas* made through following various prescribed lakshanas are its typology, still the Syowambhuva or the naturally formed ones are the best. But the manmade ones without following the lakshanas are worthless. Licchavi society among various forms of Shiva preferred *linga* the most. Out of its various type, *linga* with Nagar and Veshar pithika with or without face along with following lakshanas and characters of the time are its speciality.

## References

- Bangdel, L.S. 1989 A.D. *The Stolen Images of Nepal*. Kathmandu : Royal Nepal Academy.
- Das, A.C. 1925 A.D. *Rgvedic India*. Calcutta.
- Huntington, S.L. 1985 A.D. *The Art of Ancient India*. New York : Weather Hill.
- Rao, G. N. 1997 A.D. *Elements of Hindu Iconography*. V.II, P.I. Delhi : Motilal Banarasidass Publishers.
- Rao, G. N. 1997 A.D. *Elements of Hindu Iconography*. V.II, P.II. Delhi : Motilal Banarasidass Publishers.
- गुरुङ्ग, जगमान. वि.सं. २०७६. राष्ट्र, राष्ट्रियता र सर्वधर्मसमभावका प्रतीक भगवान श्रीपशुपतिनाथ. *पशुपति दर्पण*. वर्ष.१, अङ्क.१, काठमाडौं : पशुपति क्षेत्र विकास कोष ।
- पाण्डेय, राजबहादुर. (अनु.). सन्. १९९६. *अथर्ववेद*. दिल्ली : डायमण्ड पाँकेट बुक्स ।
- मत्स्यपुराण*. वि.सं.२०७०. गोरखपुर : गीताप्रेस ।
- मिश्र, इन्दुमती. सन्. १९८७. *प्रतिमा विज्ञान*. भोपाल : मध्य प्रदेश हिन्दी ग्रन्थ अकादमी ।

मिश्र, जयशंकर. सन् १९८०. प्राचीन भारतका सामाजिक इतिहास. पटना : हिन्दी ग्रन्थ एकाडमी ।  
राणा, भुवनसिंह. (सं.). (मिती नभएको). १०८ उपनिषद्. (भाग ३), दिल्ली : डामण्ड पाकेट बुक्स प्रा.लि.  
लिङ्गपराण. वि.सं. २०७५. गोरखपुर : गीताप्रेस ।  
लुईटेल, तिलकप्रसाद. (अनु.). वि.सं. २०७६. ऋग्वेद. काठमाडौं : विद्यार्थी पुस्तक भण्डार ।  
वज्राचार्य, धनवज्र. (वि.सं. २०३०). लिच्छविकालका अभिलेख. काठमाडौं : नेपाल र एशियाली अनुसन्धान  
केन्द्र  
श्रीवास्तव, बलराम. रूपमण्डन्. सन् १९९६. दिल्ली : मोतीलाल बनारसीदास ।  
क्षेमराज, श्रीकृष्ण दास. (सं.). (सन् १९९८). विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराण. दिल्ली : नाग प्रकाशन ।