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PREFACE

T. A. G. Rao’s *Elements of Hindu Iconography* (Vols. I and II, published under the auspices of the Travancore State in 1914 and 1916 respectively) has so long been and still is the standard work on the subject. Some other works on it, such as H. Krishna Sastrī’s *South Indian Gods and Goddesses*, B. C. Bhattacharya’s *Indian Images*, Part I, J. Dubreuil’s *South Indian Iconography*, the Brahmanical section of N. K. Bhattachalī’s *Iconography of the Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, etc., have been published since then. Krishna Sastrī’s and Dubreuil’s works, as their names imply, deal with the South Indian images only, while Bhattacharya’s book treats of several North Indian Hindu images of the Gupta and the post-Gupta periods. Bhattachalī discusses the special features of the Brahmanical sculptures found mostly in Eastern Bengal. So none of these works can claim to be as full and comprehensive as the monumental work of T. A. G. Rao. But comprehensive as the latter is, it still lacks certain features which are essential for the study of Hindu Iconography. Rao, no doubt, collected a number of very useful iconographic texts (many of which were then unpublished, some are still so even now) in the appendices to his volumes, and reproduced numerous early and late mediaeval and some modern sculptures, mostly South Indian, to illustrate the same, but the development of the individual iconographic types has seldom been discussed by him. To show this development, it is not only necessary to study critically the extant reliefs and single sculptures of the Gupta, Kushan and pre-Kushan periods, but a careful and systematic handling of the numismatic and glyptic remains of India of the
same periods is also indispensable. When earlier sculptural types of gods and goddesses are not available, ancient Indian coin and seal devices help us remarkably in determining the mode of their representation in the remote past. To refer to one or two instances: The Buddha type on Kanishka’s coins, the Gaja-Lakṣmī device on the coins of Bahasatimita, Azilises and Rajuvula, and the ‘Varāha avatar,’ one on the ‘Ādivarāha drammas’ of the Gurjara Pratihāra king Bhoja I, fully show how they were based on the contemporary representations of the same divinities in Indian plastic art.

Not only the above-mentioned data have not been utilised by Rao, but the earliest monumental and epigraphic ones also have not been fully made use of by him. But his was a pioneer work and it must be said that many of the above materials were not available to him. In the course of long years of teaching the subject to the Post-Graduate students of the Calcutta University, I felt the need of the systematic collection of the above materials and their careful study in relation to Hindu Iconography. The present work is the outcome of years of collection and first-hand study of not only such archaeological data, but also of bringing together many new texts relevant to the subject, which have not yet been fully noticed. This volume, however, mainly deals with the general principles of Hindu Iconography, and the early iconographic types of Hindu divinities as determinable by ancient Indian coins and seals. It is thus complete in itself and I intend to follow it up with two more volumes dealing with the numerous Hindu cult images and their accessories.

In the first chapter of this book, after giving an idea about the subject itself, I have indicated the lines in which the study of Hindu Iconography should be conducted and the varieties of materials handled in its scientific treatment. The second and third chapters contain elaborate discussions
about the antiquity and origin of image-worship in India. In them I have tried to appraise critically the views of previous scholars on the above problems and have given my own based on literary and archaeological data. In the fourth and fifth chapters I have shown how the ancient Indian coins and seal-impressions can materially help us in ascertaining the early iconographic types of a number of Hindu divinities and their emblems, many of which would have otherwise remained unknown to us. In the sixth chapter I have elaborately discussed the technique of the Iconoplastic art in India with the help of a variety of indigenous texts, few of which were critically studied by the previous writers on the subject. I have also discussed there the various factors which contributed to the development of this art in India and the nature and extent of their individual contributions. In the seventh chapter I have been explained the various technical terms and terminologies that are frequently to be be found in iconographic texts, a correct knowledge of which is essential to every student of Hindu Iconography. In the eighth and last chapter the Indian canons of Iconometry have been discussed, a proper understanding of which is necessary for the study of this subject.

In course of this I have instituted a brief comparison of the Indian canons with those followed by the Egyptian and the Hellenistic artists of ancient times. It has been found necessary to add three appendices to my book, in the second one of which I have re-edited the iconometric text entitled 'Pratimāmānālakṣaṇam' with translation and notes. In all these tasks I have often referred to the views of various previous writers; reasons have often been adduced by me, whether I accepted or rejected them. I may submit here that my method in the above studies is mainly objective and I have approached the subject chiefly as a student of history and archaeology. This is the reason why I could not utilise some comparatively recent publications of eminent authors,
which, remarkable as they are, treat Iconography from an angle different from that of mine.

Ten plates are appended to this work, the first five of which contain drawings carefully made by Mr. S. Banerjee, artist, under my supervision, from early Indian coin and seal devices and sculptures; the last four plates are reproductions of the reverse figures of some coins and of a few seal impressions. These mostly illustrate the fourth, fifth and the seventh chapters of my book. Figures 1, 2, 3 in plate No. VI illustrate my observations contained in the last chapter; figure 4 in the same plate shows the broad proportions of the height of a human body followed by modern artists of the West.

A few words about the system of transliteration adopted in the following pages are necessary. I have followed the system recommended in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, with slight modification; for example, I have invariably used ṇ in place of ē to denote an anusvāra. In writing modern place names as well as ancient ones still current, I have usually desisted from the use of diacritical marks. But sometimes, due to oversight, the same name (e.g., Gandhāra) has been spelt with or without these marks; but such lapses, I hope, are comparatively few.

I have prepared a General Index as well as a Bibliographic one for the convenience of my readers. Attempt has been made to make both as full and comprehensive as possible; Sanskrit words of technical import have been incorporated into the former.

It was the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee who first kindly offered me facilities for studying Indian art and archaeology. I take this opportunity to dedicate my book to his sacred memory as a token of gratitude and esteem which I shall always cherish for him. I am also greatly indebted to his worthy son, Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee, the President of the Post-Graduate Council in Arts, for the encouragement
I always received from him in my work, for which I shall remain ever grateful to him. My former teacher and the present head of my department, Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri has taken a keen interest in my work all along and I am much obliged to him for a few suggestions of his, which I have incorporated in the first chapter. Dr. P. C. Bagchi, my esteemed friend and colleague, has laid me under deep obligation by kindly allowing me to use the manuscript copy of 'Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇam' which was brought by him from Nepal sometime ago. Dr. Stella Kramrisch, my distinguished colleague, kindly went through most of the book, while it was being seen through the press. Mr. S. K. Saraswati, one of my former pupils and now one of my colleagues, has obliged me with some practical suggestions in the formal get up of the book and in other matters. I am also much indebted to Dr. N. N. Law, the learned editor of the Indian Historical Quarterly for kindly allowing me to utilise several blocks which were prepared at his expense to illustrate two of my articles published in his Journal. I should also express my obligation to him and to the Joint Editors of the Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art for permitting me to incorporate in this volume a few of my articles published in their respective Journals. I cannot but be grateful to the different authorities of the Indian Museums, especially Calcutta and Punjab Museums, and the authorities of the British Museum, London, for kindly allowing me to reproduce a few of the coins and seals in their collection, all of which have been previously published. I shall remain thankful to Mr. J. C. Chakravorti, the Registrar of the Calcutta University, for his great help in the publication of this volume. My thanks are also due to Mr. D. Ganguly, the Superintendent of the Calcutta University Press, and the members of his staff, for the unfailing courtesy and kind attention which were shown to me while the book was going through the press.
A few errors and misprints in the following pages could not be avoided; certain suggestions relevant to different topics discussed in the book occurred to me when the particular sections had been printed off. The former have been corrected and the latter added in the few pages on Additions and Corrections. Some more printing and other errors might have escaped my notice, for which I crave the indulgence of my readers. No one is more conscious than myself about my own limitations; I can only say that I have made an honest effort to throw some new light, however small and fitful it may be, on the study of Hindu Iconography. It is for my readers to judge how far I have been successful in the attempt.

Calcutta University,  
Jitendra Nath Banerjea

1st December, 1941.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.B.I.A.—Annual Bibliography of Indian Art and Archaeology (Kern Institute, Leyden).


B.M.C. \{ British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of India.

B.M.C.G.S.K. \} 

C.A.I.—Coins of Ancient India (Cunningham).

C.C.A.I.—Catalogue of Coins of Ancient India (Allan).


C.C.G.D.B.M. \} 


C.I.I.—Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.

H.I.I.A.—History of Indian and Indonesian Art.

I.H.Q.—Indian Historical Quarterly.


J.I.O.S.A. \} 

J.N.S.I.—Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.


M.A.S.I.—Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India.
M.I.C.—Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilisation.
M.M.C.—Mathura Museum Catalogue (Vögel).
O.Z.—Ost-Asiatische Zeitschrift.
P.M.C.—Punjab Museum Catalogue (of Coins).
R.V.—Rgveda.
S.B.—Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.
S.B.E.—Sacred Books of the East.
Śvet.Up.—Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.
V.R.S.—Varendra Research Society.
Z.D.M.G.—Zeitschrift Der Morganlandischen Gesellschaft
(Journal of the German Oriental Society).
THE DEVELOPMENT OF HINDU ICONOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

STUDY OF HINDU ICONOGRAPHY

Iconography—the nature of the subject—the importance of iconographic studies from the point of view of the study of religious, general and cultural history—materials for the study of iconography, archaeological: monumental, epigraphic and numismatic; literary data, divisible into several groups such as religious and mythological literature of the early and late periods, accounts of foreign travellers, iconographic and iconometric texts—the nature and importance of these texts—the dhyānas of different deities as aids to iconographic studies—date of various groups of iconographic and iconometric literature—correlation between these texts and extant images.

The term Icon (ikon, Gr. eikon) means a figure representing a deity, or a saint, in painting, mosaic, sculpture, etc., which is specially meant for worship or which is in some way or other associated with the rituals connected with the worship of particular divinities. Thus, though this is not exactly the same as a fetishistic symbol used for their crude ritualism by undeveloped mankind, yet it is not very far removed from the latter; it has attached to it, however, some higher clear-cut conception which is missing in the other term. This Greek word ikon with its above connotation has its close parallel in such Indian terms as arca, bera, vigraha, etc., which definitely denote sensible representations of particular deities or saints receiving the devout homage of their bhaktas or exclusive worshippers. Euphemistically, these are often described in various Indian texts as the very body or form of the gods concerned (tanu or rūpa). These representations are mainly anthropomorphic or theriomorphic in character, but they may also at times be purely symbolic
without any such explicit form. The special branch of knowledge or study which deals with these images is generally known as *Iconography*, a proper understanding of which enables one to be quite conversant about one of the most important aspects of the religious life of certain races of mankind. But this branch of knowledge is not merely concerned with the study and interpretation of the characteristics of the principal ikons or images proper which are enshrined in the main sanctum of a temple or church, but it also deals with the delineation of the special features and the understanding of the true significance of the figure-sculptures, frescoes or such other objects which are executed on different parts of the shrine mainly for decorative purpose. Thus, in its broader sense, the term *iconography* really signifies the interpretative aspect of the religious art of a country, which becomes manifest in diverse ways. Even before the evolution of the image proper representing the principal deity of the cult, when such a divinity is usually represented by various aniconic symbols as in the case of early Buddhism, the monuments (mostly funerary in character) associated with it contain numbers of reliefs illustrative of various mythological stories connected with it. Thus, the early remains of Bharhut and Sanchi, which are really funerary monuments, do not contain any icon of the Master (in the developed sense of an anthropomorphic representation), but contain numerous figure-sculptures, medallions and reliefs which are extremely interesting to any student of religious art of India. A proper interpretation of these scenes reproduced in stone reliefs falls necessarily under the province of a student of iconography and he will do scanty justice to his subject if he fails to take note of them. In another respect, the interpretation of pictures painted on canvas, manuscript covers or such other objects, *e.g.*, the banner paintings (*tañkas*) of Nepal, Tibet and Central Asia, etc., also falls within the scope of this subject when it is conceived in its broader aspect. But,
it must never be lost sight of that, in all these cases, a definite religious character must permeate all such objects, in order that their study and interpretation may come under this branch of knowledge.

The above account of the nature of the subject will fully prove how it is intimately connected with religion. In fact it is nothing but the interpretation of the religious art of man. It has been time and often shown by various scholars that the art of man in its very beginnings is mainly religious in character. Grünwedel observes, "The most important basis for the development of an independent art among any people lies in its religion." Della Setta, in the work on 'Religion and Art' has shown the intimate connection which exists between the art and religion of various nations of the world. This deep association is the more pronounced in the case of the early Indians. Grünwedel has rightly remarked, "The religious character, so deeply rooted in the national life of the Indian races, has also continued the guiding principle in their art."¹ Foucher has in a very striking manner endeavoured to show how the innate religious tendencies of the Buddhists have been mainly responsible for the beginnings and dissemination of the Buddhist art in India.² Thus, this intimate association between the religion and art being clearly demonstrable,

¹ Grünwedel, Buddhist Art in India, p. 1. But he seems to have gone too far when he remarks in the same place that "the architecture as well as the sculpture (of India) which has always been intimately connected therewith, was never and nowhere employed for secular purposes." That there certainly flourished a well-developed secular art which was mainly utilised in the building of royal palaces and in the construction of cities and forts, etc., is clearly vouchsafed not only by the indigenous literary texts, but also by the accounts left by foreign travellers in ancient and mediaeval India. Again, the art of sculpture was employed in the execution of royal statuaries which, though at times endowed with some sacred character, were mainly secular ones.

it is hardly necessary to point out how the study of iconography helps one to understand the nature of religious practices indulged into by some races of mankind. In the very first instance, the discussion about the presence or absence of the practice of image worship among the early Indo-Aryan races in connection with the study of this subject will enable the student of Indian iconography to get hold of positive data for the true evaluation and appraisement of their religion. An intensive and historical study of this subject will throw much valuable light on the gradual changes which were constantly being introduced in certain well-defined religious practices of the Hindus. The ever-increasing pantheon of a particular cult and the constant increase in mythological stories associated with it will find a ready illustration in the iconographic representations which will throw very interesting sidelight on these transformations. Sometimes, a proper and scientific study of this subject will help us in correcting errors made by previous scholars in the understanding of the religious practices of different peoples. Thus, Fergusson, after a close observation of the reliefs of Bharhut, Sanchi and Amaravati remarked that "about one-half of the bas-reliefs of Sanchi, . . . represents religious acts such as the worship of the dagoba or of trees; once or twice the wheel is the object of adoration and once the serpent."1 Now, this explanation of the significance of many of the above reliefs has been proved to be erroneous by the patient researches of subsequent scholars. No student of iconography would interpret them in that way at present; but what he would find in them is that in most cases the trees within railings, with a rectangular seat underneath them, especially when they are adorned with garlands and parasols, are really the tangible emblems of the Master or his predecessors who are not iconically represented;

1 J. Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship in Ancient India*, p. 104.
other trees without these honorific adjuncts are really the rukkha-cetiyas, not usually objects of worship by themselves, but so many objects of veneration because of their being residences of different Yakṣas. The dāgobas or dhātugarbhas, funerary structures, also symbolise the Mahāparinirvāṇa of Sākyamuni Buddha or that of the other Buddhas that preceded him. In the case of the Nāgas, Yakṣas, Yakṣinīs, etc., who can be recognised in the reliefs, it is to be observed that originally they were no doubt objects of worship, but they are depicted on these monuments in quite an opposite role, viz., in that of so many worshippers of the Bhagavān Buddha. Fergusson, even in that early stage of the study of iconography, could partially hit at the truth when he remarked in the same context, "There are also half a dozen scenes that can be identified with more or less certainty as representing events in the life of Sākyamuni"; but his statement that "a considerable number of representations of scenes in domestic life, regarding which it will probably be impossible ever to feel sure that we know who the actors in them were," has been falsified to a great extent in the light of subsequent research.

The study of this subject also throws some interesting sidelight on the presence of rivalry and jealousy between diverse Indian sects. In the whole history of religious developments in India, there might not have been instances of intense hatred and violent strifes between the members of opposite sects as are to be found in the religious history of Europe.¹ But these sectarian animosities of the Indians found vent through the milder channel of concoction of

¹ But, reference may be made to the story of the impalement of the Jainas through the efforts of a renowned Saiva saint of Southern India, viz., Tirujñānasambandha; a less known era used to be current among the Saivas there, the initial year of which dated from this event.
mythological stories and construction of interesting images in illustration thereof. Thus, the story about Siva having incarnated himself as Sarabha for the chastisement of Narasimha (an incarnatory form of Viṣṇu, itself an outcome of sectarian rivalry—Hiranyakasipu, an ardent devotee of Siva was killed by Viṣṇu in this hybrid form, on account of his bitter denunciation and cruel persecution of his own son who was an exclusive worshipper of Hari) was illustrated by the peculiar image of Sarabha, none other than Siva himself in the composite form of man, bird and beast, killing Narasimha with his claws. In the creation of many other images, this characteristic mode of giving vent to sectarian ill-feeling is clearly discernible. Just the opposite tendency is to be marked in the case of other icons which illustrate genuine attempts towards a reconciliation between the principal rival sects. The images of Hari-Hara, Ardhanārīśvara and such others can be distinctly shown to bear traces of this different mental approach to religious problems. In the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, there are several sculptures which emphasise this peculiarity; on the four sides of roughly square Siva-liṅgas are carved the figures of Viṣṇu, Durgā-Pārvatī, Sūrya and Gaṇapatī, which four, along with the central liṅga, symbolise the cult pictures of the five principal sects, viz., Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, Saura, Gaṇapatya and Saiva. Miniature shrines, with the representations of these chief sectarian gods carved on their different sides, mostly of early and late mediaeval period, have been discovered in various places of northern India, especially at Benares which has been the happy home of the different Hindu sects through remote past.

The importance of the study of this subject can also be rightly emphasised from the point of view of its association with artistic studies. Many images of the gods and goddesses are in themselves great works of art and a proper
and careful study of these will enable students of iconography to acquaint themselves with the general character of the artistic achievements of different races. The excellence or decadence of art in particular localities in different time-periods can be easily demonstrated with the help of images found in those places. The study of a Buddha image of Sarnath belonging to the fifth or sixth century A.D. or a Brahmanical or Buddhist bronze or stone image of Magadha or Bengal of the early Pāla period won’t fail to impress on the student of iconography the flourishing nature of the iconplastic art in those places, at those different times. Similarly, a Buddhist or Brahmanical stone image from Bengal of the late Sena period will throw light on the artistic decadence which had already set in there. Thus, these images form the true index of the achievements in the domain of religious art and are, in this manner, very interesting aids to the study of the artistic activities of particular races.

Sculptures or images are sometimes indirectly very useful for shedding light on obscure periods of political or general history of India. The inscriptions which are sometimes carved on their pedestals contain in many cases the names not only of their donors but also those of the sovereigns during whose reign period these were constructed; on some of them again, we can decipher dates which materially help us in the reconstruction of little known periods of history. These images are very often definitely illustrative of the general cultural level of their makers; they are also at times clear indicators of the social traits of the people who made and worshipped them. The conception underlying them illustrate, too, in a remarkable manner the inner workings of the human mind and a proper and scientific study of their different groups very often acquaints us with the psychological factors which lay at the origin and evolution of these images.
The importance of this branch of study having been emphasised in the previous paragraphs, it is necessary to take stock of the different materials which are required for its prosecution. The first and foremost data to be utilised in this connection are evidently of monumental or archaeological character. The extant images or sculptures themselves are to be closely studied by every student of this subject in order to acquire proficiency in it. By a proper and scientific study of them, it will be possible for us not only to trace the gradual evolution of the art of image making and the practice of worshipping these images, but it will also enable us to classify them in ordered groups and understand the underlying peculiarities of the constituents of each of these groups. Besides the images proper, relief-representations appearing on sections of religious architecture or extant painted frescoes and such other objects, as it has been mentioned above, are important data in this connection. Two other archaeological data which have been practically ignored by most of the previous writers on Brahmanical Hindu iconography, but which are extremely important for its study, are of epigraphic and numismatic character. Foucher and Coomaraswamy have no doubt utilised these sources in their scholarly works on Indian art and iconography; but few writers on Brahmanical iconography have cared to avail themselves of these materials. Figures of divinities on the coins of particular localities belonging to different periods will indicate the manner of their representation that was in vogue in different times and places. It is very often the case that we do not light upon comparatively early specimens of images in various localities of northern India; in such cases, the coins discovered in those places are sure to help us in a very remarkable manner to determine the early iconographic types of various gods and goddesses worshipped there. It is needless to remark further that these numismatic depiction
of deities is in many cases really based on the actual sculptural representations of them. Where both the early sculptural type and its numismatic counterpart are extant, we do not fail to find the very close parallelism. Thus, the figure of Buddha belonging to the second century A.D. is well represented in plastic form among the Gandhāra sculptures; when we compare it with the numismatic type appearing on the coins of Kanishka and clearly described by the Kushan die-cutter as CAKAYMO BOΔΔO (Śākyamuni Buddha) we are struck by the great similarity between these two. The figure of a Śiva or a Maḥāśeṇa has not so far been discovered among the extant Gandhāra sculptures of the second or the third century A.D.; but when we find the devices on certain coins of Kanishka and Huvishka delineating the features of either of these divinities definitely described by the die-cutters as such, it will not at all be presumptuous to conclude that these forms are some of those in which the two abovementioned gods used to be plastically represented during the period. It will then be interesting to compare their early features with the same of the extant iconographic specimens of a later period. We find the figure of an enthroned deity with the figure of an elephant or the forepart of an elephant with its trunk upraised in front of it on some coins of Eukratides, Antialkidas and certain other Indo-Greek rulers; on a particular coin-type of Antialkidas, we find the same deity walking by the side of the elephant striding to right with its trunk upraised. On some coins of Maues the same god seated on throne is shown to place his hand on the head of the personified vajra (thunderbolt). It has been proved by me that these coin-devices are nothing but the variant representations of Indra (very easily identified by the Greeks with their Zeus) who was the tutelary deity of Śvetavatālaya or Indrapura, a locality in the neighbourhood of ancient Kapiśā, on the basis of certain
observations of Hiuen Tsang and an explicit statement in the Mahāmāyūrī. This point can be substantiated further by a reference to the coin-types of the Greek city-states; these, when they represented particular Hellenic divinities like Zeus, Heracles, Pallas Athene, Artemis, Nike and others, were actually based on their sculptural representations current in those localities. In many cases they were tutelary deities and cult divinities of such city-states and they made their appearance as such on the coins. In an opposite manner, the devices appearing on the earliest indigenous coins of India shed a flood of light on the problem of symbolic representations of gods and goddesses. Coomaraswamy, while referring to the number of symbols (rūpa) appearing on the punch-marked coins "in general use from about 600 B.C. up to the beginning of the Kushan period or somewhat later," makes the following interesting observation, "... the importance of these symbols, many of which have remained in use to the present day, lies in the fact that they represent a definite early Indian style, amounting to an explicit iconography."

Inscriptions, too, in a remarkable manner, serve as important data for the study of iconography. Many of these not only inform us about the peculiarities of religious cults with which, as we have seen above, our subject is intimately associated, but also record the erection of shrines and construction of images of divinities to be enshrined in them.

1 Indian Historical Quarterly, 1938, Winternitz Number, Vol. I, pp. 95-100.
2 Not to speak of very well-known examples, we can refer to the coin-types of two inland Cretan cities of Rhaeusus and Sybrita. The former state had a cult of Poseidn Hippios. "The god holding a trident stands beside his horse; Dionysus and Hermes were the gods of Sybrita and appeared as obverse and reverse devices of her coins." C. Seltman, Greek Coins, p. 173.
3 Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p. 45.
On some rare occasions, they even contain rough description of the iconographic features of the deities, the erection of whose shrines is being recorded in them. The so-called Ghosundi inscription of the second century B.C. refers to the erection of a pūja-sīlā-prākāra round the shrines of Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva, which presumably contained the images of these gods. Many and various are the Gupta epigraphic records which refer to the creation of shrines of such divinities as Bhavānī, Kātyāyanī, Śiva, Swāmi-Mahāsena, Viṣṇu-Sārṅgin, Buddha, Mahāvīra and others; sometimes there are passages or epithets contained in them which give us a fairly accurate description of these gods and goddesses. Again, the seals which were impressed on the copper-plate records of rulers responsible for issuing those charters often contain the representations of various religious objects which were specially used by different sovereigns as their respective royal insignia (mudrā). Thus, the imperial Gupta ruler Samudragupta who was a devout worshipper of Viṣṇu (Parama Bhāgavata) used Garuḍa as his special rājaṅka on his charters as we know from a passage in the Allahabad pillar inscription (Garutmaṇḍana-svaviṣayabhukti-sāsanayacanādyupāya-sevākṛta, etc., etc.); we know this garuḍa-emblem being depicted on most of the gold and silver coins of the imperial Guptas. The Pāla rulers of Bengal and Magadha who were Paramasaugatas, i.e., devout worshippers of the Buddha used the symbol representing the preaching of the first sermon by the Master as their royal insignia and we very often find this characteristic scene represented in their various charters. The copper-plate grants of the Sena rulers of Bengal, on the other hand, bear in many cases the figure of the god Sadāśiva who was their patron deity and who was utilised as their royal insignia. Again, on rare occasions, the outlines of the figure of some deity can be found on the uninscribed portion of a particular copper-plate charter; thus, the copper-
plate grant of Mahāsāmanta Srimad Dommana-Pāla, who was a local ruler of southern Bengal, contains a very beautiful outline drawing of Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu riding on a chariot and his bird Garuḍa on its reverse side; the iconographic details are interesting.¹ Many and various such instances can be cited which will prove how the extant epigraphic records furnish us with interesting and significant materials for the study of our subject.

The second, though hardly less important, class of materials for the study of our subject is of literary character. These data can be subdivided into various groups. Among them mention may first be made of the general literature of the Indians, both of early and late periods. Their earliest extant literature, the Rgveda, as I shall show fully in the next chapter, contains some very interesting details, both of negative as well as positive character, which will help one to elucidate various points connected with the subject. Not only the general problem of the origin and development of the practice of image-worship among the higher section of the Indo-Aryans is to be discussed on the basis of the evidence supplied to us by this and other early Vedic literature, but also the basic similarity of the later iconographic conceptions of many Hindu deities with the anthropomorphic and sometimes theriomorphic details of their Vedic counterparts is to be emphasised with the help of the early and late Vedic texts. A careful handling of this material will show the significant connection between the Vedic anthropomorphism and subsequent iconism. Several passages of the early Vedic literature, when read between the lines, will enable us to know something about the peculiar religious practices of the original settlers of India,

¹ The copper-plate grant is in the collection of the Asutosh Museum, Calcutta University. It was discovered in the Sunderbans, and presented to the Asutosh Museum by Mr. Devaprasad Ghosh, its Curator.
which will throw light on our subject. The Vedic sūtras, the grammatical works of the pre-Christian period and the dharma- and the artha-sāstras of early date incidentally throw interesting sidelights on this topic. Early literary records of the religious systems like Buddhism and Jainism contain incidental references to the religious practices of the Hindus, which will be specially useful for our study. Epic and purānic texts of early and late period are of pre-eminent importance in this connection; the wealth of mythological lore contained in them require to be very carefully studied in order that we may interpret the significance of various carvings, frescoes and such other objects. As a thorough acquaintance with the early and late Buddhist records enables a student of the Buddhist iconography to understand the meaning of various carvings belonging to early and late Buddhist art, so the innumerable legends incorporated in the above class of Brahmanical literature will help us to throw clear light on the Brahmanical art of different periods. In fact, the study of the mythology of a people is essential for the understanding of its religious art and the importance of that class of its literature which is the repository of such mythological materials can never be over-estimated. Again, incidental iconographic descriptions of divine figures contained in many sections of epic and purānic literature as also iconographic and iconometric canons appearing in some of the early and late purānas are of immense value, nay indispensable, for a proper study of our subject. Another class of literature which throws casual light upon some aspects of our subject is the accounts of foreign travellers who make interesting observations on particular religious practices of the people of India.

But, the foremost place among the literary data for the study of our subject must be given to the iconographic and iconometric texts which have got a direct bearing on it.
This vast mass of literature took centuries to attain their present shape and some idea about their vastness may be hinted by remarking that what is left to us is only a portion of what was actually composed in course of ages. These canons are really the results of the accumulated experience of generations of artists whose business was to construct these images. The Indians of ancient times possessed a common trait of character, which led them to incorporate their own independent achievements into systems and to merge their own individuality into greater corporate wholes in order that their own experiences in particular fields of knowledge would have greater authority and sanctity to rest upon. Thus, to refer to one outstanding example in the domain of literary composition, it is a well-known fact that the whole of the present Mahābhārata was not composed in one time period and by one particular individual. Still, as early as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D., it had attained the character of an epic system, the credit for whose elaboration was given to a mythical sage, viz., Vyāsa. True it is, some late purānic texts like the Devibhāgavata allude to not one but as many as twenty-eight Vyāsas; most of these, however, are mythical figures, and, it is significant to note that the work in its characteristic manner actually refers to a system or institution typified by the mythical sage Vyāsa who, under different names and as different incarnations of Viṣṇu in 28 successive dvāpara ages, was responsible for the composition of the Vedas, Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, etc. In fact, the word vyāsa etymologically means explanator or expounder. Similarly, as regards the iconographic and iconometric texts, it must be observed that attempts were made to systematis...
this floating mass of canons which were the direct outcome of the activities of the image-making artists themselves and were passed off in the names of such mythical sages such as some of the seven ṛṣis, like Bhṛgu, Atri and Vāśiṣṭha or legendary artists like Viśvakarmā and Maya.¹ The Matsyapurāṇa refers to eighteen expounders of the Vāstuśāstras, among whom mention may be made of Vāśiṣṭha, Viśvakarmā, Maya, Nagnajit, Garga and Bṛhaspati.² The Mānasāra (to be noticed later) mentions as many as 32 expounders of this subject, the list of which contains additional names such as Manu, Nala, Mānasāra, Mānabodha and others; that the list is a corrupt one can be proved by the fact that in some cases there is difficulty in understanding whether they are names of persons or titles of works, while in others we find a name and its various synonyms are utilised to enlarge it. The Bṛhatasamhitā (LII, 1) tells us that the knowledge of the Vāstuśāstras came to be imparted through generations of artists from Brahmā, the creator (Vāstuṇānamathātah Kamalabhavānmuniparamparāyātam), and Utpala while commenting on it says that the word ‘sages’ refers to Garga and others (Kamalabhavād Brahmanah sakāśānmunīnān Gargādinām yat pāramparyaena yātām prāptamiti.) The Mānasāra further elaborates the tradition and gives a mythical account of the origin of the various kinds of artists (śilpin) in its section of Silpilakṣaṇa.

¹ The names of these Sapta ṛṣis are invoked in various connections. They were the same as the Citra-Sikhanḍins who were the earliest and best promulgators of the Bhāgavata lore according to the Nārāyaṇiya section of the Mahābhārata.

² Matsya-purāṇam, Bangavasi Edition, Ch. 252, Verses 2-4:—

_Bhṛgratritvaśiṣṭhaśca Viśvakarmā Mayastathā_¹
_Nārada Nagnajiccaiva Viśālakṣaṇa Purāṇdaraḥ ¹
_Brahmā Kumāro Nandīcāḥ Saunako Garga eva ca_¹
_Vāsudevo'ntiruddhaśca tathā Sukra-Bṛhaspati_¹
_Aṣṭādaśaite vikhyātā Vāstuśāstropadesakāḥ ¹
Brahmā, the creator by the grace of Śiva, is the Mahāviśva-
karmā; his four faces are named Viśvabhu (the eastern),
Viśvavid (the southern), Viśvastha (the northern) and Viśva-
sraṣṭā (the western); from the east face was born Viśva-
karmā, from the south Maya, from the north face
Tvāṣṭā, and from the west Manu; Viśvakarmā, Maya,
Tvāṣṭā and Manu married the respective daughters of Indra,
Surendra, Vaiśravaṇa and Nala and became the fathers of
Sthapati (architect), Śūtragrāhin (the draughtsman-
designer), Varddhakī (well-versed in the law of proportions,
the painter) and Takṣaka (the engraver, the stone-mason,
etc.), respectively. Of these four, the position of the first,
i.e., the Sthapati was the most important and he was the
teacher of the other three, the next in point of importance
was Śūtragrāhi who was the preceptor of the remaining two,
and so on. The first was well-versed in all the śāstras, the
Śūtragrāhi in draughtsmanship, the Varddhaki in the rules
of proportions (mānakarmajña) and the Takṣaka was an
adept in chiselling and engraving. The very name Sthapati
shows that he was fit for founding everything (sthāpan-
āyārhaḥ) and as he was sthāpanādhipati, so he was called
Sthapati; Śūtragrāhi and others always worked carefully
under his orders and according to rules laid down in the
Vāstuśāstras. There are four orders of āśīpis, viz., Sthapati
and the other three; of these the first is characterised by
the signs of an ācārya, the second is well-informed about
śruti, the lines and the śāstras, the third is the possessor of
good judgment, versed in the śrutis and citracshāstra (work
of painting, etc.), while the last that is Takṣaka is adept
in his work, cultured, balabandhu and merciful. The
śrutisāstra (treatises about śilpa, māna, etc.) should be
full of all details (sarvalakṣaṇam) and that cannot be acquired

¹ Acharya, Mānasāra, Chapter 68, vv. 5-9; on other occasions the
author refers to his predecessors; Ch. I, V. 2; Ch. 70, V. 58.
in this world by anybody without the help of an artist or a preceptor (vinā śilpi vinā gurum); as the knowledge of this śāstra is unobtainable without the aid of a śilpin, it should be learnt from him. If the knowledge thus acquired is not carried into fruition, (its possessor) does attain neither enjoyment nor salvation. The above, a free translation of Mānasāra (Acharyā’s edition), pp. 3-4, verses 1-19, shows how the author systematises the tradition about the origin and evolution of art through some mythical names, making it contemporaneous with creation itself. The other interesting point to be noted here is the relative importance which is assigned by the writer to the four different orders of artists and the highest position allocated to the architect. Scholars have always observed how the architectural art was the most important branch of all arts in ancient and mediaeval India; thus Grünwedel remarks, “The sculpture of ancient India . . . remained simply decorative and always connected with architecture” (Buddhist Art, pp. 1-2). Coomaraswamy says, “In the Gupta period the image has taken its place in architecture; becoming necessary, it loses its importance and enters into the general decorative scheme, and this integration acquires delicacy and repose” (HIIA, p. 71). In the above passages from Mānasāra we have a textual corroboration of what was known from a careful study of the ancient and mediaeval Indian art forms.

The Vāstuśāstra or the science of architecture and allied arts are dwelt upon in the Matsya-purāṇa just prior to its treatment of the iconographic and iconometric canons and the names of some expounders are similar to those of a few of the reputed authors of treatises on Pratimālakṣaṇa and Citralakṣaṇa. Thus, Varāhamihira, in the Chapter 57 of his Bhatsamhitā (Sudhakar Dvivedi’s edition), while dealing with the characteristic signs of images and their measurements incidentally refers to a few other writers on this subject like Nagnajit and Vaśiṣṭha, who, as we have
seen above are included among the 18 Vāstuśāstropadeśakas. Nagnajit has been cited by him twice and Vāsiṣṭha once and Bhaṭṭa Utpala, the commentator of the Bṛhat samhitā actually quotes passages from the works of these two previous writers in support of his author. This proves that, however mythical might be the nature of these names, śīla treatises were composed and they actually passed current in their names at a comparatively early period; otherwise Utpala who flourished in the tenth century A.D. could not have quoted passages from them. The art treatise, entitled Cītalakṣaṇa, now to be had only in its Tibetan version—its Sanskrit original not being available—which has been edited by Laufer, is ascribed to this Nagnajit; it, as has been remarked by the learned editor, is sometimes referred to as Nagnajīccītalakṣaṇam or simply as Nagnavratam. Nagnajit was also the author of a work, probably, Pratimālakṣaṇa by name. While commenting on verse 15 of Chapter 57 of the Bṛhat samhitā the first line of which runs, "Āsyam sakeśanicyaṁ  środaśa dairghyena Nagnajit- proktam," Utpala makes this interesting comment, "Nagnajitproktam Pratimālakṣaṇe āsyam mukham sakeśa- nicyaṁ  środaśāṅgulāni"; or this Pratimālakṣaṇa might have been simply a section of his other work just mentioned. Further, there were other such works passing current in the names of such mythical sages as Kāśyapa and Agastya, or legendary artists like Viśvakarmā and Maya. Utpala quotes extensively from Kāśyapa in his commentary while many iconographic and iconometric texts passing current in the south pass in the names of both these mythical sages. The śīlaśāstra ascribed to Kāśyapa is called the Kāśyapiya, known also as the Amśumadbheda (or rather forming a part of the Amśumadbheda).1 Agastya is the reputed author of the work entitled Sakalādhiḥkāra about which Ram Raz

1 It has been edited in the Anandasram Sanskrit Series, Poona.
makes this interesting observation "the portion of the work which has as yet come under my own observation, is exclusively on the subject of sculpture as connected with the function of statues; but it is so diffuse that if we suppose the whole work to be written in a similar style it must considerably exceed the volume of Mānasāra, the largest at present of my collection." ¹ A large volume of texts dealing with architecture and allied arts passing current in the name of Maya and edited not very long ago by T. Ganapatı Sastrı in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series fully justifies my remarks made above. Many other texts like Viśvakarmāvatārasāstra contain ample materials for the study of this subject and Gopinath Rao rendered a first rate service to all its students by partially editing relevant portions of these as appendices to his monumental work on Hindu Iconography, when many of them had not been published. Mention may be made here of many other Śilpa works, most of which have not yet been edited; while others are known only from quotations in various known śilpa treatises. Acharya mentions Sanatkumāra Vāstuśāstra, which is known to exist in manuscripts mostly fragmentary. The author of this work owns his indebtedness to pūrvacāryas like Candra, Yama, Bhr̥gu, Āṅgiras, Vyāsa, Manu and others. A Sārasvatiya-śilpaśāstra is referred to in Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum (Vol. I, p. 714). Hemādri quotes from one Aparājita-prcchā which may be the same as Aparājita-vāstuśāstra attributed to Viśvakarmā, one of the 18 authors mentioned above.²

² Devatāmūrti-prakaraṇam, Introduction, pp. 12-15. The writer of the introduction refers to numbers of other texts whose śilpa character cannot be definitely demonstrated. Ram Raz's remarks on the śilpaśāstras of the Hindus are worth quoting in this connection, "It is true that the Hindus were in possession of numerous treatises on architecture, sculpture, etc., which collectively are called the Śilpa-
Extensive anthological works containing texts on architecture, iconography (dealing with the construction of images belonging not only to Brahmanical Hinduism but also to the rival creeds of Buddhism and Jainism), iconometry, the allied arts of bronze-casting and painting were composed and reference can be made to one such work, viz., *Mānasāra*, already referred to, which has recently been critically edited by P. K. Acharya. The name of another such work, though in a less comprehensive scale can be alluded to here which has recently been edited in the Gaekwad Oriental Series; this is *Mānasollāsa*, which is itself a part of *Abhilāṣitārthacintāmani*, a bigger anthology dealing with various topics, said to have been compiled by the Cālukya king Someśvaradeva who flourished in the 12th century A.D. King Bhoja of Dhara who flourished a century earlier is the reputed author of the *Samarāṅgana-sūtradhara*, a work mainly on architecture. Extensive collections of such and other allied texts have been edited by Ganapati Sastri in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series and they are entitled *Mayamata* of Mayamuni (already mentioned above) and *Śilparatna* of Srikumāra which were originally written in Malayalam script.

But, in most cases the original sources of these anthologies on religious art are to be sought in the numbers of Śaṅhitās, Āgamas and Tantras, associated with one or other of the principal Brahmanical sects. These religious treatises, belonging to the Pāñcarātra (Vaiṣṇava) and the Saiva systems, are usually divided into four parts, technically known as pādās, each of which dealt with one or other of śāstra but unfortunately few traces of them remain. There appears to have been, according to some, 32 and according to others 64, standard treatises on the above-mentioned arts. In a series of memorial verses prescribed among the artists are recorded the names of the authors or titles of the above-mentioned 64 treatises. Of these 32 are *mukhya*, the others are *upa* or subordinate."
the topics, viz., Caryā, Kriyā, Yoga and Jñāna. The first part dealt with the rules of conduct to be adopted and actions to be performed by the individual aspirant after salvation, the second one with the varieties of 'making,' which meant everything connected with the construction of temples and images, the third with concentration; all three of which, if properly and systematically worked up, would lead to the attainment of true knowledge, the resultant of which would be salvation. We are here concerned with the second part, viz., kriyāpāda, which is admittedly one of the most important and voluminous sections of these sectarian treatises. Schrader rightly remarks, "Very few Saṃhitās (Pāñcarātra) seem to have actually consisted of these four sections. The proportion of interest shown for each of the four branches seems to be well-illustrated by Pādma Tantra in the edition, of which the Jñānapāda occupies 45 pages, the Yogapāda 11 pages, the Kriyāpāda 215 pages and the Caryāpāda 376 pages. The practical part, Kriyā and Caryā, is the favourite subject, the rest being treated as a rule by way of introduction or digression." Thus many of the Pāñcarātra and Saiva Saṃhitās and Āgamas came to contain important sections dealing with the elaborate rules about the construction of temples and images which were regarded as practical guides by numbers of sectarian devotees. This class of literature may conveniently be compared with portions of the Brāhmaṇa literature which were principally conversant with laying down meticulous details for the correct performances of different Vedic sacrifices. Gopinath Rao mainly drew from the Kriyāpāda of the Pāñcarātra Vaikhānasāgama in order to explain the various characteristic features of the Vaiṣṇava images in his work and he utilised the relevant sections of such

1 Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñcarātra, p. 22.
Saiva Āgamas, as Suprabheda, Kirāṇa, Kāmika and Āṃśumadbheda for throwing light on the Saiva icons. The hitherto unpublished Ḥayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra contains very elaborate details of this nature which, when critically edited, will throw a flood of light on the different branches of Brahmanical Hindu Iconography.

Reference has already been made to the purānic literature, a study of which is essential for proficiency in Brahmanical Iconography. It is not only the mythological lore contained in them which is indispensable for a thorough acquaintance with our subject, but also the multitude of iconographic and iconometric canons which are contained in such Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas of early and late periods as Matsya, Agni, Padma, Viṣṇudharmottara, etc. Many of these Purāṇas, though they profess generally to deal with five principal topics of Purānic lore, such as sarga, pralīsarga, vaṃśa, manvantara and vaṃśāṅucarita, associate themselves prominently with one or other of the few principal sects and contain elaborate details about Pratimālakṣaṇam (sometimes described as Devatārecānu-kirtanam), Pratiṣṭhāvidhi (the mode of the installation of these images), Devaṛghanirmaṇam (construction of temples), etc. Sometimes, a very close similarity is clearly discernible between one or other of such texts and those of the same nature appearing in the relevant sections of particular Pañcarātra Saṃhitās; this probably signifies that the former borrowed from the latter or both drew from the same source. Thus, comparison of the chapters on Bhūparigraha in connection with the Pratiṣṭhā ceremony and the other chapters on Pātālayoga, Prāsādalakṣaṇam, Pratimālakṣaṇam, etc., of the Agnipuruṣa with the similar chapters in the Ḥayaśīrṣa Pañcarātra fully shows that the compiler of this section of the Agnipuruṣa condensed much that was in the latter work. It must be said to his credit that he shows his indebtedness to the Pañcarātra work by introducing his essay with these
words, 'Hayaśirṣah pratiṣṭhārtham devānām Brahmane-
'bravīt.' ¹ In most cases, these topics are incorporated into the general body of the Purāṇa as replies to the questions of the sages put to the Sūta, as most of the other topics in the same are introduced. But in rare instances, the usual order is changed. Thus, the Viṣṇudarmottara which contains the fullest details among the purānic literature, not only on iconography and iconometry but also on painting and architecture, introduces these by way of questions and answers between the sage Mārkaṇḍeya and the king Vajra (a sagotra of Kṛṣṇa), when the latter is the interlocutor and the former the expounder. This Upa-Purāṇa, occasionally given out as a part of Garuda-Purāṇa, and quoted repeatedly by Alberuni as the 'Viṣṇudharma,' is a very useful work of an encyclopaedic character, a great part of Section III of which treats of the canons for the construction of temples and images as also the rules for painting, and other fine arts.

Iconographic and iconometric texts were also allotted some place in some authoritative early Indian works on astronomy and nitiśāstra. Mention has already been made of a particular chapter in the Brḥatsamhitā of Varāhamihira which deals with iconography and iconometry; there are two other chapters, one on the installation of these images, and the other on the selection of material for the construction of images (Chap. 58, Vanasampravesādhyāya, and Chap. 59, Pratiṣṭhāvidhi, Dvivedi's edition) which have got an important bearing on studies in Indian Iconology and which will be discussed in their proper place. All these chapters, with Bhaṭṭa Utpala's valuable commentary on them, are very important for our purpose, because in them we light upon iconographic data which can be dated with some

¹ This fact has not been noticed by the editor of Devatāmūrti-
prakaraṇam (Calcutta Sanskrit Series).
amount of certainty. As regards the iconographic matter in the nitiśāstras, we may refer to the Sukranitiśāra, Chap. IV, section IV of which is of immense use to all students of religious art of India.

Of the many and various omnibus works, generally belonging to the category of Smṛtis compiled at a much later date, mention may be made of the Caturvarga-cintā-māni from the pen of the great compiler Hemādri. The Vratakhaṇḍa of this monumental work contains innumerable extracts dealing with the iconographic features of a really formidable host of gods and goddesses belonging to the pantheon of different Brahmanical sectaries. Hemādri's compilation is extremely interesting and helpful not only from the point of view of its supplying us with such details about less known members of the Hindu pantheon, but also on account of his almost invariably mentioning the source from which he has quoted. This last fact enables us to compare the extracts with the same in their original setting, wherever the original source is extant. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, in his Haribhaktivilāsa, followed in the lines of Hemādri; but as he was pre-eminently a Vaiṣṇava, the divinities whose iconographic details he incorporated in his work were chiefly connected with Vaiṣṇavism. The last three vilāsas (18-20) of his book deal with the construction of images, the installation of the same, various rituals connected with them, the building of temples, etc. Like Hemādri he not only quotes from such previous works as the Matsya, Agni, Viṣṇudharmottara and other Purāṇas, but he also very frequently utilises the Pāñcarātra text Ĥayaśīrṣapāñcarātra. As the last has not yet been critically edited, extensive quotations from this unpublished work furnish us with materials of an authoritative character and we can check the readings of the manuscripts of this Pāñcarātra text with the help of these extracts. Another work of such a character is Tantrasāra of Krṣṇānanda Āgavāgīśa, which contains extensive quotations from
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various Tantras like **Rudrayāmala, Brahmayāmala, Kubjikā-mata, Sāradātilaka** and others; many of these contain the **dhyānas** of Tantric gods and goddesses, which help to explain their iconographic features.

Several works attributed to Maṇḍana, the son of Śri-kṣetra, both of whom flourished in Mewar during the reign of Mahārāṇa Kumbha, are of great importance in this respect. Maṇḍana, a reputed artist of his age, had his own statue as well as those of his two sons Jaita and Saita carved in relief inside the dhvaja-stambha raised under the orders of the said Mahārāṇa, his patron, in honour of the great god Samiddhesvara Siva whose temple was erected by Rāṇā Mokal near by at Chitorgaḍh. Maṇḍana is said to have composed or compiled several works on art and architecture, two of which are specially connected with our subject. These are **Devatāmūrti-prakaraṇa** and **Rūpamāṇḍana** both of which have been recently edited in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series (No. XII). These two texts are evident compilations, the first one mainly drawing from South Indian works like **Mayamata** and **Śilparatna** referred to above; the author of the introduction to this edition has carefully noted the borrowals not only from these but also from such Purāṇas as **Matsya, Brahma, Padma, Skandu** and **Viṣṇudharmottara** and others, in Chapter V of the Introduction. Another interesting fact to be noted in this connection is that, of these two works, **Rūpamāṇḍana** seems to be the more authoritative one, materials from which were freely utilised in the other text.

Our account of the textual data for the study of religious art of India will be incomplete, if we fail to refer to the **dhyāna-mantras** of numerous deities, which are incorporated in the works on rituals connected with the well-known sects. Here, a clear distinction can be made between the **dhyānas** of different deities belonging to various Brahmanical sects and the same (sādhanas) of the deities belonging to the
Vajrayāna Buddhism. The difference lay in the manner of meditating on the deity and in fixing the relationship between him and the individual. In the Brahmancial sectarian systems where love and adoration (bhakti) of a personal god was the outstanding feature, an element of duality was constantly present. But a strictly philosophical Vajrayānist emphasised the eternal unity between the god to be meditated upon and the individual meditating on, and thus an element of spiritual monism is to be clearly perceived there. This observation can be substantiated by referring to two typical dhyāna-mantras, one belonging to sectarian Brahmanism and the other to Vajrayāna Buddhism. One such well-known mantra outlines the conception of Śiva, thus:—

Dhyāyennityam maheṣam rajasatīrinībham cārucandrāvatamsam ratnākalpojjvalāngam paraśumṛgavārābhītiḥastam prasannam l padmāsinam samantāt stutamaraganaṁair-vyāghra-kṛttim vasānaṁ viśvādyam viśvarājan nikhilabhaya-hāram paṇcavaktram trinetram ||

We do not fail to find in these lines a clear-cut concept of the god in which his main iconographic features are fully delineated; it will be needless to add that these followed principally the already established iconographic type of the deity and the whole mantra was a sort of a handy formula for the convenience of the worshipper. Now, if we compare this with a sādhana of any one of the Vajrayāna divinities, we find the difference noticed above. The sādhana of Śīhānāda Lokesvara, one of the varieties of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara runs thus:—“Ātmānām Śīhānāda-Lokesvararūpam bhāvayet, svetavarṇam trinetram jaṭāmukutānām nirbhūṣanām vyāghra-carmapārvtaṁ śīhāsanastham mahārājaṁ candrāsanām candraprābham bhāvayet. Dākṣine sitaphañiveśhitam triśūlam śvetam, vāme nānā sugandhikusumaparipūritapadmabhāja-nām vāmahastāt utthapadmopari jvalatkhadgam” (Sādhana-mālā, Vol. I, p. 63). We can certainly pick out details of an iconographic character from the above extract, which
give a clear-cut outline of the deity (evidently based principally on the Brahmanical god Śiva, cf. the śūla entwined with snake by his side, the matted locks, the half-moon among them, the tiger skin garment, white colour, the absence of ornaments, etc.); but the distinctive feature lies in the fact that the sādhaka meditates on himself as the deity, the portion in the mantra—ātmānāṃ bhāvayet, etc., being significant. Sometimes, the praṇāma-mantra of particular deities also contains their iconographic descriptions, in broader outlines which are helpful. Thus, one such in honour of the goddess Śītalā (Namāmi śītalām devīṃ rāsabhaṃsthāṃ digambarīṃ | Mārijjanikalsopetāṃ sūrpā-laṅkṛtamastakāṃ ||) leaves little to be added to her iconographic description in her dhyāna mantra. The stavaś—eloquent verses sung in honour of respective divinities—also incorporated in them such outlines. But, in all such types of texts, we seldom light upon any new detail which is not already known from earlier real iconographic texts noticed previously, and thus the importance of the former is of a secondary character in the study of Brahmanical Hindu iconography. It is not so in the case of the Vajrayāna Buddhist iconography and the standard works on it by Foucher or Bhattacharya prove how much beholden its study is to these dhyāna- or sādhana-mālās.

It is not an easy task to ascertain the respective dates of the bulk of the iconographic literature referred to above. One can find little difficulty, however, in dating some among them—especially those collected in the works of authors whose dates are otherwise known. Thus, the age of the texts of an iconographic and iconometric character appearing in the Brhatasamhitā can be definitely fixed in the 6th century A.D., as Kern has very effectively settled the age of the work at that period. Similarly, we can ascertain the dates of the compilations of Hemādri, Manḍana and Gopaḷa
Bhaṭṭa. Hemādri flourished in the 13th century A.D. and the other two in the 15th century (Gopāla Bhaṭṭa was a contemporary of Śrī-Caitanya, while Maṇḍana, as we have seen above, was the court architect and sculptor of Mahārāṇā Kumbha of Mewar). But we find ourselves in difficulty when we take up the question of the age of those texts which originally formed part of the Pāncarātra Saṃhitās, the Saiva Āgamas, the Sākta Tantras and some Purāṇic literature which were the sources of these late compilations. The dates of most of these works are not definitely known and it is likely that many of them were composed at different periods, being added to from time to time. Schrader has fixed the age, the 2nd century A.D. to the 8th century A.D., as the period during which some of the most authoritative Pāncarātra Saṃhitās were composed; he, however, enumerated only a few, about 14 or 15 in number, which belonged to this category.¹ But the few Pāncarātra texts which contain iconographic and allied matter, for example the Hayaśirṣa and the Vaikhāṇasa are impossible to be dated with certainty. Gopinath Rao remarks, on what authority we do not know, that the prose recension of the Vaikhāṇasāgama is perhaps the oldest among the Āgamas of the Vaiṣṇavas, assigning a much later date to the metrical form of the same work. It must be observed, here, that the descriptions of Viṣṇuite images given in the former tally in a remarkable manner with the extant Vaiṣṇava images of southern India of the 6th to 8th centuries A.D. The latter, i.e., the metrical version of the same work as it refers to the Drāviḍa-vedas, i.e., the Prabandhas of the Ālvārs, cannot certainly be older than the 9th century A.D. But if we compare the

¹ Schrader, Introduction to the Pāncarātra, p. 20. He distinguishes between the two types of Pāncarātra Saṃhitās, viz., northern and southern.
iconographic portion of the prose version of the Vaikhānas-āgama with the same of the Hayasīrṣa Pañcarātra, we are struck by the fact that the latter lays down the general outlines of the various images of Viṣṇu in a much less stereotyped manner than is done by the author of the former. Stereotyped divisions and subdivisions, as many as thirty-six in number, of the Dhruva-beros or the immovable images of Viṣṇu are scrupulously described in the Vaikhānasāgama. This would suggest probably a later date for it than the Hayasīrṣa, but this alone would not justify us in making a definite assertion. As for the Śaivāgamas, Gopinath Rao is of opinion that the Kānikāgama is the oldest among them; and as in many of the other ones, including the Kāranāgama, reference to the Devāram hymns composed by the Nāyāṁārs or the Śivabhaktas is to be found, they are to be dated later than the 9th century A.D. The Śākta Tantra works, as we have them at present and which contain iconographic and iconometric data, are mostly much later in date than the 9th or 10th century A.D. None can at all be certain about the respective dates of the Purāṇas, when their heterogeneous character is taken into consideration. We can ascertain, however, their relative age from internal evidence; it will be touched in a subsequent chapter. But a comparison of some of the iconographic texts given in several of the Purāṇas with those given in some of the Pañcarātra literature will fully prove the indebtedness of the former to the latter (cf. my remarks about

1 Yoga, bhoga, vira and abhicārika, according to the particular kind of result desired by the worshipper; sthānaka, āsana and sāyana—this division being based on the different modes in which the principal figure is shown; lastly, uttama, madhyama and adhama, according as the number of accessory figures in the composition cluster round the central figure. T. A. G. Rao, Elements of Hindu Iconography, Vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 78-80.

the borrowal of iconographic matter by the author of the Agnipurāṇa from the Hayāśīrṣa text). १०८१०१

A general remark, however, can very justifiably be made with regard to the earlier age limit of most of these canonical texts. If we fix the earlier limit of the oldest among them in the 2nd to the 4th century of the Christian era, we may not be far wrong; but then it is impossible for us to determine which among them are such, and it is a fact that some at least of the iconographic features of many of the Brahmaṇical divinities were based on the partially defined anthropomorphism or theriomorphism of their Vedic counterparts. This limit did not go further back than the early Gupta period. In a subsequent part of this book, it will be shown that the image-making activities attained a great impetus in the early centuries of the Christian era due to various causes, and images belonging to different creeds came to be made in large numbers. Different groups of artists entrusted with this task put their experiences in black and white not only for their own convenience, but also for the convenience of the generations of artists to follow them, and in this way grew up a vast mass of such texts which were being added to from time to time. Thus, images were first constructed according to the specific needs of the varieties of expanding creeds and then the rules for their making were gradually stereotyped; it is just like the evolution of a language and the various grammatical rules appertaining to it. The analogy can be drawn further; as in the case of the grammatical literature of a particular language, development of different schools can be noticed as the language progressed, so here also, with the growth of iconoplastic art in India, different schools of artists came to lay down variant rules for the making of icons. I have already referred to the 18 Vāstuśāstropadeśakas mentioned in the Matsyapurāṇa and have also shown how this information is partially corroborated by the Bṛhat-
samhitā of Varāhamihira. I shall here show further, how this differentiation can first be noticed by proceeding on iconometric lines and how the name of at least one such school can be ascertained from Utpala’s commentary on a passage of Varāhamihira. Thus, Varāhamihira writes with regard to the measurement of the length and breadth of the face of an image in this manner—

Śvairāṅgulapramāṇairdvādaśa vistirṇamāyataṃ ca mukham ∥
Nagnajītā tu caturdaśa dairghyeṇa drāvidān kathitam ∥

Now, Utpala actually quotes from the work of Nagnajit, which is not available now, the following passage on which the above observation of Varāhamihira was based:—

. Vistirṇaṁ dvādaśa mukham dairghyeṇa ca caturdaśa ∥
Āṅgulāṇi tathā kāryaṁ tanmāṇaṁ drāvidān smṛtam ∥

Nagnajit, here, clearly refers to a school of measurement followed in the making of icons in the Drāvida country and we have seen that Varāhamihira speaks of another school of measurement probably followed in the northern country. Gopinath Rao is quite correct when he says, “The author, Nagnajit, quoted by Varāhamihira, must certainly be older than the middle of the sixth century A.D.; the quotation . . . indicates the existence of a school of sculpture in south India then.” But the other remark of his, in this connection, that “the quotation also incidentally informs us that Nagnajit was possibly a Dravidian author on śilpaśāstra” does not bear scrutiny.¹ Had Nagnajit been really a Dravidian author, it is presumable that he would not have referred to this school particularly as Dravidian, in his Pratimāl aksaṇa. We have no means, now, of associating Nagnajit with a particular locality, though Vedic, Epic and Purānic tradition refers to one

Nagnajit as a king in the Gandhāra region; but this king Nagnajit might have been quite a different person from Nagnajit, the author of works on Citralakṣaṇā and Pratimālakṣaṇā.

It is necessary here to discuss briefly the question of the universal or regional character of the texts in relation to the images discovered in various localities of India. Gopinath Rao, while discussing this question, makes this general observation, "From the uniformity observable everywhere throughout India in the arrangement, say, of the individual figures belonging to a subject, it is clear that the rules laid down in the Āgamas and Tantras have had a very general application." He further remarks, "The same rules having been obeyed everywhere in the matter of making images, it is no wonder that the same results have been produced by artists belonging to all parts of the country in so far as the art is apt to be bound down by rules." But, are the rules same everywhere and are the results obtained by the artists of different parts of India always the same? No doubt Rao notes some difference in the images belonging to the various parts of the country; but this, according to him, is "only observable in the outline of the feature and the details of ornamentation." The quotation, 'Deśānurūpa-bhūṣaṇavesālākāramūrtibhiḥ kāryā Pratimā lakṣaṇa-yuktā sannihitā vṛddhidā bhavati' from the Brāhmaṇhitā of Varāhamihira in his support is apt. But in many cases difference lay deeper than that. The treatment of the same type of an image of a divinity can be shown to differ in essential features in widely different regions of India and variant iconographic texts can be utilised to explain them. I have already shown how the Vaikhānas-āgama description of the Dhruva-beras of Viṣṇu closely tallies with the fairly early Viṣṇu images of the South.

But few are the Viṣṇu images of northern India which can be explained by the same text. In the south Indian images of Viṣṇu, his two invariable attendant consorts (except in the Yoga varieties) are Śrī and Bhūdevī holding, beside a fly-whisk, a lotus and a blue-lotus respectively; this characteristic has its textual basis in the Vaikhānas. But the north Indian varieties of Viṣṇu images, on the other hand, has almost invariably Śrī and Puṣṭi or Sarasvatī holding a lotus and a lute in their respective hands; this particular feature of theirs corresponds to the descriptions of such images given in the Matsya, Agni and Kālikā Purāṇas. The Matsya text lays down that Śrī and Puṣṭi holding lotuses should be made by the side of Viṣṇu (Śrīśca puṣṭiśca karttabye pārśvayoh padmasamyute; Matsya, 258. 15); the Kālikāpurāṇa says that Śrī should be made to appear on his right while Sarasvatī on his left (dadhānam dakṣine devinī Śriyan pārśve tu bibhratam ō Sarasvatīṃ vāma-pārśve......); the Agnipurāṇa text, however, closely fits with the actual images when it definitely lays down Śrīpuṣṭi cāpi karttavye padmavīnākarānvite ō Urmātrocchritāyāme... | , i.e., Śrī and Puṣṭi holding a lotus flower and a lute respectively in their hands and shown up to the thigh of the main image in their height should be carved on either side of the figure of Viṣṇu (Agnipurāṇa, Ch. 44). There can be no doubt that the application of the respective texts mentioned above was regional in character, the three latter texts being followed in the north, while the one former in the south. We can further substantiate our point by referring to the two varieties of the images of the Sungod—north Indian and south Indian—and the different iconographic texts describing the Sūrya image. The most important characteristics of a north Indian Sūrya are its udīcyavesa (consisting of the close covering of the body and topboots of the legs—gradually these features were subdued) and its waist-girdle, the vyaṅga or avyaṅga;
these are conspicuous by their absence in the south Indian reliefs of Śūrya. Now, if we study some relevant iconographic texts descriptive of the sun icons we find that they also can be classified into two well defined groups on the basis of the mention or non-mention of the particular iconic features noted above. Of the various texts collected by Gopinath Rao to describe the icons of Śūrya, the Āṃśumadbhedāgama, the Suprabhedāgama and the Silparatna do not at all record the features to be found in the Śūrya images of northern India, while the others, viz., the Bhātamsahiti, Viśvakarmāvatāra-sāstra, Viṣṇudharmottara, Matsyāpurāṇa, Aṅgipurāṇa, etc., do so. We can with a great deal of plausibility assign on this basis the former groups of texts to the southern region and the latter group to the northern. The Pūrvakāraṇāgama, which is also presumably a southern text, contains passages such as Kaṇḍukānicitavigraham and pādau sakaṭakau tasya reminiscent of the northern feature and thus seems to be influenced by the latter group of texts. Thus as a broad division can be made between the Brahmanical images of India into north Indian and south Indian on the basis of important iconographic features, so, the texts also can be generally classified into two groups, those followed in the north and the others in the south. But there can be no denying the fact that sometimes texts belonging to one group showed traces of their contact with those belonging to the other, as undoubtedly varieties of images usually current in one region are occasionally to be found in the other. I have already referred to the Pūrvakāraṇāgama having been influenced by the iconographic texts of the north; similarly, examples can be cited where north Indian texts can be shown to bear south Indian characteristics. This is especially noticeable in the late compilations. Maṇḍana, an artist of Rajputana, in his works draws copiously from both the sources and in many instances his descriptions of particular images are given in the approved
south Indian manner. Thus, the following description of
the image of the sun in his Rūpamandana—Sarvalakṣaṇa-
samyuktam sarvabharaṇabhūṣītam | Ādityasya tvidamb rūpan
kuryāt pāpa-praṇāsanam ||—does not contain the well-
known iconographic traits of the Sūrya images of the north.¹

Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa, a great Tāntric pandit
of Bengal and a contemporary of Śrī-Caitanya, refers to two
dhyānamantras of Sūrya, none of which contains any of
the same.² The omission of these details in the north
Indian compilations may have also another explanation in
this particular case; as these were late works, most of the
traits which had their basis in the non-Indian motifs were
purposefully omitted—a reason which might also have
acted in the omission of the same in their earlier proto-
types (sic) of the south.

While discussing the problem of the correlation between
the texts available at present and extant images, a note of
cautiousness needs to be laid down. Many indeed are the early and
late mediaeval Brahmanical images the iconographic features
of which completely tally with the descriptions of the same
types of the divinities in particular texts; but there are
numerous other images whose features sometimes can only
be partially explained or at other times cannot at all be
accounted for with the help of known iconographic literature.
Similarly, many and various are the textual descriptions of
less known members of the fully-developed pantheon, which
now seem to have had no sculptural basis at all. This

¹ Cf. the details of the Āditya images as given in the Aṃśumad-
bhṛheda and Suprabheda āgamas as quoted by Gopinath Rao, Pratimā-
lakṣaṇāni, pp. 83-84; details of the chariots and seven horses, which are
given in these, are omitted in the Rūpamandana description.

² Both these dhyānas contain descriptions of the four-handed
images of Sūrya; two hands hold lotus flowers while the other two are
shown in the abhaya and varada poses. Four-handed Sūrya images,
though rare, are not absolutely unknown.
The seemingly anomalous fact can be explained by saying that our knowledge both of the actual images and of the extant texts can on no account be said to be complete and perfect. I have mentioned above that the iconographic literature now obtainable, enormous though it is, is only a portion of its original bulk and some new sections of it may yet be discovered in course of time. It is also a matter of common knowledge that Brahmanical images which have so far been discovered are comparatively few when we take into account the numbers of images carved in various materials through many centuries of the flourishing period of the icon-maker's art in India. Untold numbers of images, many of which were probably priceless works of religious art, were destroyed by the vandalism of iconoclasts and thus irretrievably lost to us. The fault of destroying ancient works of art is not always to be laid at the door of the image breakers of alien faith actuated by fanatical zeal; persons belonging to the same faith caused intentional damage to them actuated by utilitarian motive. Numerous are the ruins of ancient and mediaeval India which have been exploited through ages by various classes of people for their own building and other purposes. Beautiful works of art in marble, statuaries and architectural pieces from Amarāvatī were burnt down to supply them with lime to be utilised for their paltry ends. Sometimes, responsible public officials used them in constructions. Innumerable sculptural and architectural pieces from Sarnath, belonging to Brahmanical and Buddhist shrines, were carted away from the site and thrown into the Ganges as mere ballast when the Dufferin Bridge was being built over the river at Benares.

1 The river has since restored some of them. A few of the sculptures in the collection of the līhārat Kalā Bhavan, Benares, were retrieved from the bed of the river near the bridge. Some sculptures of great iconographic interest were found by me in the river bed, not very far from the site of the bridge.
Again, innumerable images were in ancient times made of wood which is extremely perishable in this country; they did not survive for a pretty long period after their construction. All these facts will have to be taken into consideration for explaining apparent discrepancies between the images and the texts. Occasional discoveries of new types of images, sometimes, throw interesting light on this point. Gopinath Rao quotes this description of Śivadūtī, one of the numerous forms of the Devī, from the Matsyapurāṇa:

Tathrivārtamukhi ुष्कक ुष्ककायाविसेषातः Ṣ
Bahubhūyujalā devī bhujagaḥ tudraḥvatītaḥ ||
Kapālamālini bhimā tathā khaṭvāṅgadhārīni ||
Śivadūtī ca kartāvyā śyāgalavadānā śubhā ||
Aḍḍhāsanasmsthānā tathā rājaścaturbhujō ||
Aṣṭakpāṭadharā devī khaḍgaśāludhārā tathā ||
Caturthastu karaṇasāstathā kāryastu sāmisaḥ १ ¹

But he could not illustrate this description of the goddess with the aid of any extant relief. Now, it was Natesa Aiyar who first drew the attention of scholars to a sculpture in the collection of Nagpur Museum, which in a remarkable manner coincides with this Purānic description. It may be noted here that this sculpture does not conform to the other mode of representing the goddess given in the Śrītattvaṇidhi, where her name is shortened into Dūṭī.² Among the numerous Devī icons in the Chaunṣaṭ Yoginī temple at Bheraghat, many of which are in an extremely mutilated condition, this particular aspect of the Devī cannot at present be recognised. But one interesting fact concerning these, which has special bearing on the topic under discussion, ought to be noted here. Most of these images bear identificatory inscriptions on their pedestals; in a few cases,

² Natesa Aiyar, *Catalogue of Archaeological Exhibits in the Nagpur Museum*. 
it is possible to show that the latter (the pithika) did not originally belong to the figure which is placed upon it at present. But in the majority of instances they form an organic whole; and many are the names to be read in the pedestal inscriptions which can not be recognised among the authorised lists of such goddesses in numbers of available texts. No doubt the names of such well-known aspects of the goddess, as Brahmāṇī Māheśvarī, Vārāhī, Vaiṣṇavī, Caṇḍikā, Ṛākini, Jähnavī, Yamunā and others are to be found among them. But, we are yet to get hold of iconographic texts which will give us the descriptions of such figures as Deddarī, Lampatā, Thānī, Ṭakārī Riḍhalī, Sandinī, Audārā, Khemakhī and a host of others. Again, it is interesting to note that some figures among them, easily recognisable from their iconography, such as Mahiṣāsura-mardini and Gaṇesā (Śakti of Gaṇeśa) are respectively labelled as Terambā and Aiṅgintī. Evidently, the sculptors of these images were following the texts current in this region (which are not now available) to meet the requirements of the Śākta devotee who was the original builder of this temple rebuilt by Queen Alhaṇādevī during the reign of her son Narasiṃhadeva in the Kalachuri-Chedi year 907 (1155 A.D.).

1 For a detailed description of these goddesses with or without inscriptions, refer to R. D. Banerjee's The Haihayas of Tripuri and their Monuments, pp. 79-90. The Ranod inscription (Gwalior State) of the 10th or 11th century A.D. mentions the name of Terambipūla, a Saiva ascetic of the Mattamayūrā clan; it means literally "the protector of Terambi." Terambā and Terambī both seem to signify the Goddess Durgā in one of her aspects.
CHAPTER II

THE ANTIQUITY OF IMAGE-WORSHIP IN INDIA

Image proper of a god—its character: not merely an anthropomorphic or theriomorphic representation of a particular deity, but also an object of worship (pujā) by its devotees—iconography deals with the latter class of images—some of the objects found in the prehistoric sites in the Indus valley and a few of the neolithic finds in South India possibly cult objects—their nature cannot be determined with certainty—whether images of gods and goddesses were known in the early Vedic period—different views regarding this question. Vedic religion, its nature—Vedic divinities, the extent of their anthropomorphism and theriomorphism—these gods, not necessarily represented by images proper—thus, the religious practice prevalent among the higher section of the Vedic Indo-Aryans not characterised by the worship of images—references to sensile representations of some Vedic divinities in early and late Vedic texts—our knowledge, however, insufficient for the determination of the religious practices of the lower section of the people and those of the original settlers of India—certain terms such as mārdeva and śīnadeva occurring in the Ṛgveda, of interest in this connection—gradual changes in the Vedic religion—the Upaniṣadic conception of the Vedic divinities not conducive to the growth of iconism—references to temples and images in the sūtra literature.

If has already been pointed out in the introductory chapter that the term icon (derived from Greek eikon) signifies an object of worship or something which is associated with the rituals relating to the cults of different divinities. The English word ‘image,’ derived from old French and Latin ‘imago,’ on the other hand, has got the basic connotation of ‘likeness’; from this it came to be used in the sense underlying the Greek word mentioned above. Image in its primary sense has its close parallel in such Indian words, as pratikṛti, pratimā, vimba, etc., which again like their English counterpart came to acquire the secondary significance. The word vimba means reflection and it is very frequently used in the sense of the images of divinities. *There is a common custom adhered to in Bengal in the time of the annual autumnal worship of the clay
images of the goddess Durgā; it consists of placing a mirror
on a brass or copper bowl in front of the deity in such a
manner as the image is reflected in the mirror. The water
for bathing the deity (ṣnāna-jala) is poured on the reflection
there and thus the bathing of the image is done. This
practice thus emphasises the true significance of the word
vimba; it is also necessary from the practical point of
view. Even when such words as vimbu, pratikṛtī, etc., came
to be used in their secondary sense, they retained their former
usage in comparatively late texts. In the Pratimā-nāṭaka
of Bhāsa, mention is made of the statues (pratimā) of the
departed royalties which, though objects of respect, were not
certainly meant for regular worship. The iron figure
of Bhīma, which was crushed by the blind old Kuru king
Dhṛtarāṣṭra by being hugged close to his body, is described by
Krṣṇa as ‘āyasī pratimā.’" The golden image of Sītā served
as her substitute during the performance of the Aśvamedha
sacrifice by Rāma, when she herself was in exile in
Vālmīki’s hermitage. The word pratikṛti meaning ‘likeness’

1 Water cannot be poured on the clay image with its coating of
paint and other tinsel ornaments without damaging the whole object
of worship. In southern India, substitute images known as snapana-
beras (i.e., images meant for bathing), are made, usually of bronze, and
regularly bathed in place of the principal image in the sanctum.
But in the case of the Śiva-liṅgas, no such intermediary is usually
needed, for they are not generally coated with daubs of paint and
decorated with ornaments. They are, only occasionally (once at
night), endowed with various ornaments and garlands (śringāravēsa)
and this is done long after the bathing is over. Sometimes, gold
leaves in the shape of a crescent (śaṅkha), three eyes or the third eye
(trinētra), etc., are permanently inset into the pūjābhaga of the Liṅga.

2 'Mā ṭuṣc Dhṛtarāṣṭra tvam naiga Bhīmaśtvayā hatah ||
Āyasī pratimā hyesā tvayā rājannipātī || ||
Mahābhārata Śrīparva, Ch. 12 v. 28.

3 Rāma: Kañcanaṁ mama patinīṁ ca dikṣāyajñānēca karmāṇi ||
Agrdāto Bharataḥ kṛtvā gacchaṅvagre mahāyaśāḥ ||
occurs in the Sātra (v. 3.96) of Pāṇini, which reads iva *pratikṛtau* and which can be explained thus,—the affix *kṣaṇ* means also 'like this,' 'in imitation of this,' when imitation or likeness of a person or thing is meant. That images of human beings were made in ancient India is fully proved by many other texts, one of which may be referred to here. The *Sukranitisāra* says that "'images of divinities even if they are without the characteristic signs are beneficial to men; those of mortals, on the other hand, even if they are endowed with them are never so.'" The free-standing sculptures discovered in Patna and Parkham were identified by K. P. Jayaswal as royal statuaries of the Śaśunāga dynasty; few scholars, if any, accepts this suggestion now, and they are almost unanimously described as Yakṣa figures. But numerous references to images of kings and great men are to be found in Indian literature, which, though of special veneration, were certainly not objects of worship. The red sandstone sculptures representing some of the Kushan kings like Wema Kadphises and Kanishka and the Saka satrap Caṭṭana discovered near Mathura are a few of the extant relics testifying to the prevailing practice in those remote times. The Kushan emperors no doubt assumed some amount of divine character as is borne out by their adoption of the title *devaputra* (in imitation of the Chinese royal custom), by such features as 'a halo round the head,' flames issuing from the shoulders, 'the royal bust rising from the clouds, etc., characterising their portraits appearing on coins and by the glorious title such as *Īsvara* used by one of

*Rāmāyana*, Uttarākanda, Ch. 91, v. 25.

Some such word like *pratimā*, *pratikṛti* or *vimba* is to be understood here, though none of them is expressly mentioned.

1 IV. 4, 86:  

    Api ṭreyaskaram nṛpāṃ devavimbamalakṣaṇam ||  
    Salakṣaṇam martyavimbam na hi ṭreyaskaram sadā ||

The use of the word *vimba* should be noted.
them; viz., Wema Kadphises in his coin legends. Still it must be wrong to suppose that their figures commanded the same amount of religious fervour culminating in their ritualistic worship with deep devotion as was roused by the images of the cult-deities which had much earlier made their appearance in India. These royal images were in all probability housed in structures of funerary character and regarded by their living relations and subjects with great veneration, just as pictorial representations and statues of mediaeval and modern Rajput kings and potentates used to be enshrined in chatris or funerary monuments and highly venerated; but, the service and attention offered to them must have been done through the media of divine images which were the objects of proper veneration, as was the custom and is still the custom with the Rajput kings. In the case of the latter, the phallic emblems of Siva usually served this purpose. Under no circumstances, however, they could have enjoyed the same position as was done by the images of cult deities, some of whom, as we shall see later on, were apotheosised human beings.

Words like sandrś, pratimā, etc., might have signified from a comparatively early date symbolical representations of divinities which were not associated with particular cults; such use, in fact, can be found in texts assignable to a period when the cult gods and goddesses had either not made their

1 Antiochus IV, the Seleucid king of Syria, describes himself in some of his coin legends as Theou Epiphanous (Basilios Antiochou Theou Epiphanous, i.e., 'Of king Antiochus the God Manifest'). He identified himself with the great Greek god Olympian Zeus, and on some of his coins, the head of Zeus shows his own features. He went much further than Alexander, the Great, who regarded himself as the son of Zeus; he even married Atargatis, the great Goddess of northern Syria. For all these ostentatious claims to divinity, however, he was regarded by the subsequent historians as vain, silly and theatrical.
appearance or, even if they had done so, had not been assigned any important position in the religious lives of the higher sections of the Indo-Aryans. Thus, the word *sandṛś* occurs in the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad*, II. 3, 9—"he has no form visible to the eye; no one sees him with the eye." The word ‘Sandṛśe’ has been explained by Saṁkarācārya as ‘sandarśanaviṣaye’, i.e., ‘objects visible to the eye.’ It has been interpreted as ‘images’ proper by some scholars; but the utmost that it can signify is some sort of sensible representation which could symbolise the god. The same sense is possibly recorded by the word *pratimā* in the verse 19, Chapter IV of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* which says that “there is no image of him whose name is great glory.”

The word *pratimā* occurs in a verse of the tenth *mandala* of the *Rgveda* in which the hymnist asks about the measure and the image of the sacrifice; he answers his own question in the next verse that the symbol of the sacrifice was the sacrificial fire itself. There is very little justification of taking it here in the sense of the image proper of gods.

The words *pratikṛti, pratimā*, etc., came to denote arccā, i.e., objects of regular worship in course of time. It appears that the former has attained the significance as early as the time of Pāṇini. *Pratikṛti*, in the sense of likeness, has already been noticed in one of his *sūtras* in the fifth *adhyāya* (v. 3, 96); another *sūtra* under it, viz., v. 3, 99—jīvikārthe cāpyaṁe, refers to certain *pratikṛtis* which are jīvikārtha as well as apanya. On the authority of the later commentaries like the *Mahābhāṣya* and the

---

1. *Na sandṛśe tiṣṭhāti rūpamasya na caṅguṣā paśyati kaścanānāṁ* | This part is retained without any alteration in the first half of the verse, 20, in the fourth chapter of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*.

2. *Na tasya pratimā asti yasya nāma mahadīyaśaḥ*; but the word here more probably means ‘comparison.’

3. *R. V., x, 180, 3.*
**Kāśīka** we can assume that these objects which were meant for livelihood but at the same time were not for sale were really the images of gods which were highly venerated by some people of his time. The *sūtra* has been explained thus, in the latter, “That which is bought and sold is called *pānya*; that which is not so dealt with is *apānya*. The rule applies to the images of gods which are made means of subsistence by a low order of Brāhmaṇas, not by selling them but by exhibiting them from door to door.”¹ These images were undoubtedly important as objects of worship, otherwise people would not give alms to their bearers and exhibitors. It will be proved in a subsequent section of this book that the practice of worshipping some divinities has already made its appearance in the time of Pāṇini. Patañjali uses the very word *arccā* in his *Maha-bhāṣya* while commenting on the above-mentioned *sūtra* of Pāṇini. He says that the Mauryas had images of gods (*arccā*) made for obtaining gold (*Mauryairhiranyārthibhiḥ arccā pra-kalpitā*). In the sectarian literature of later times, this word is very frequently used along with the earlier ones noticed above as well as such terms as *vapuh*, *tanu*, *vigraha*, *rūpa*, *bera*, etc., which denoted that these objects of worship were not mere symbolical representations of the particular gods and goddesses, but were their very bodies and forms.

The above discussion shows that some of the Indian words for image had different connotations according to their appearance in texts of early or late dates and to their use in particular contexts. Iconography as a subject for study is chiefly concerned with images or icons having the third significance just delineated, and their accessories: It has very little to do with mere symbols or symbolic representations of gods, whether they are anthropomorphic

---

or theriomorphic. This point will have to be particularly borne in mind while determining the question of the antiquity of image-worship in India in connection with the preliminary considerations regarding our subject. This discussion has gained some new orientation since the discovery of many objects—seals with representations of human and animal figures and pictographs on them, numerous terracotta figurines and a few fragmentary stone sculptures—in course of the excavations of the pre-historic sites in the Indus Valley. Marshall has discussed the nature of many aniconic objects, usually of stone, more or less realistically modelled as phalli, a large number of which have been discovered there; he is of opinion that their ostensible use seems to have been as cult objects. Further notice of these will be taken in connection with the interpretation of the Ṛgvedic epithet Siśnadeva and the evolution of phallicism in India. The three-headed horned figure, represented as seated in a particular yogic āsana (it exactly corresponds to the kūrmāsana of later times in which the heels are placed crosswise under the gluteals), surrounded by such animals as a rhinoceros, a water-buffalo, an elephant and a tiger and crude representations of men, appearing on a seal, has been described by Marshall as the prototype of Śiva-Paśupati of subsequent days. Another seal bears on it a seated human figure having on either side a half-kneeling figure in respectful attitude, above whom a snake is shown with its hood spread; the attitude of the flanking figurines in this seal, even though their hands may not be in the añjali pose, distinctly reminds us of the same in which the attendants of the cult deities are depicted in the later sectarian art of India. ‘‘ Three more seals bear on them representations of nude tree gods standing erect with arms hanging on sides like the images of the Jinas in the kāyotsarga posture and each attended by a half-kneeling votary above whom a serpent spreads its head.’
On the basis of the above data, R. P. Chanda observes, "The excavations at Harappa and Mohenjodaro have brought to light ample evidence to show that the worship of images of human and superhuman beings in Yoga postures, both seated and standing, prevailed in the Indus Valley in the Chalcolithic period." ¹ But whether these and such others appearing on a few more seals of this type can be regarded as definite representations of cult-objects cannot be determined with certainty so long as we are unable to unravel the mystery of the script and language of the highly cultured people of the Indus Valley. Similarly, many of the numerous terracotta figurines unearthed there in course of excavations and tentatively described by Mackay as images of household gods are very difficult of correct interpretation at the present state of our knowledge. ² Similar difficulty confronts us with regard to the definite explanation of the character of a few of the neolithic finds in India which have been described by some scholars as cult objects. The metal mannikin of crude design in the collection of the pre-historic objects in the Indian Museum may or may not represent such a specimen. ³

The nature of the pre-historic remains just discussed cannot be determined with certainty on account of the absence of any literary data throwing clear light on them; but with the help of certain passages occurring in the Rgveda, the earliest extant literature of the Indo-Aryans, it is possible to offer a tentative explanation about some

¹ R. P. Chanda, Mediaeval Indian Sculpture in the British Museum, p. 9.
³ Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, p. 614, Pl. X, Fig. 17.
of them. It may be observed, however, that in India, prior to the advent of the Aryans, image-worship might have been practised by her original settlers. But it is still a matter of doubt and controversy when this was first introduced among the Aryans who migrated into India. From the beginning of the scientific method of the Vedic studies in India this question engaged the attention of scholars. The question 'did the Vedic Indians make images of their gods' was answered in the negative by Max Müller. He said, "The religion of the Vedas knows no idols. The worship of idols in India is a secondary formation, a later degradation of the more primitive worship of ideal gods." H. H. Wilson, in his preface to Viṣṇupurāṇa (p. ii), remarks that "the worship of the Vedas is for the most part domestic worship, consisting of prayers and oblations offered, in their own houses, not in temples, by individuals for individual good and addressed to unreal presences, not to visible types. In a word, the religion of the Vedas was not idolatry." Macdonell has discussed the question further and opined that image-worship was not known to the Indians of the early Vedic period. He observes, "The physical appearance of the gods is anthropomorphic, though only in a shadowy manner, for it often represents only aspects of their natural bases figuratively described to illustrate their activities... The arms of the sun are simply his rays and his eye is intended to represent his physical aspect. The tongue and limbs of Agni merely denote his flames. The fingers of Trita are referred to only in order to illustrate his character as a preparer of Soma, and the belly of Indra only to emphasise his powers of drinking Soma. Two or three gods are spoken of as having or assuming all forms. It is easy to understand that in the case of deities whose outward

shape was so vaguely conceived and whose connection with natural phenomena was, in many instances, still clear, no mention of either images or temples is found in the Rgveda."¹ This long extract very accurately sums up the view-point of those scholars who would answer the question under discussion in the negative.

But, quite an opposite view is expressed by others who, on the basis of certain passages in the Rgveda, suggested that the practice of making images was well-known among the early Vedic Indo-Aryans. The descriptions of many of the divinities given in various hymns, which have been explained away as cases of vague and uncertain anthropomorphism by Macdonell and others, have been made much of by their opponents who find in them definite allusion to images. Bollensen says, from the common appellation of the gods as 'divo naras', i.e. men of the sky or simply as naras, i.e., men, and from the epithet 'urpeśas', i.e., 'having the form of men' (R. V., III. 4, 5.), we may conclude that the Indians did not merely in imagination assign human forms to their gods, but also represented them in a sensible manner. The passage in the Rgveda (II, 33, 9) describes a painted image of Rudra in this manner, 'with strong limbs, many-formed, awful brown, he is painted with shining golden colours' (Sthirebhiraṅgaiḥ pururūpa ugro babhruiḥ sukrebhiḥ pipiṣe hiranyaiḥ); an image of Varuṇa is described thus, "wearing a golden coat of mail, he veils himself in his radiance; spies sit around him" (R. V., I. 25, 13: vibhradṛāpiṁ hiranyayāṁ varuno vasta nirṇijam pari spasso niṣedire); the Maruts appear to be distinguished from their 'gods' i.e., images, in the Rgveda (V. 52, 15), where the hymnist says, "we now pray to the gods of these (Maruts) so as to get to them (nu manvānah eṣāṁ devān

acchā); then such commonly found expressions as vapuh, tanu, rūpa, etc., used in connection with some of the Vedic gods, have particular reference to their images: the word sandrś referred to in a preceding paragraph, is one of the oldest expressions most probably denoting an image. Thus argued Bollensen in support of his contention that the images played a very prominent part in the religious practice of the early Vedic Indo-Aryans.¹ S. V. Venkateswara, another exponent of this view, went still further and adduced more textual evidence in its support. While he was engaged in a controversy with Macdonell about the development of early Hindu iconography, carried on in the pages of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1916, 1917 and 1918, he mentioned, among others, the following passages which contained according to him definite reference to the images of the gods: R.V., I. 21, 3—Indrāgni śumbhata narah (men decorate Indra and Agni); R. V., VIII. 69, 12—sūrmyam susirāmica (like a hollow tube; Ballantyne has rendered this passage as ‘a beautiful perforated iron image,’ cf. his Mahābhāṣya); Indra is referred to in many Ṛgvedic passages as susīpra (having beautiful cheeks and jaws), Rudra as kapardin (wearing braided coil of hair), Vāyu as darśata (striking to the eye, beautiful); R.V., IV. 58, 3—catvāri śrīgā trayo asya pādā deve śīrše sapta hastāso asya (he has four horns, three feet, two heads and seven hands).² But after a long controversy with Macdonell on this as well as other matters relating to the subject, Venkateswara was

² Venkateswara says that this is a description of Agni; for a late sculpture of a deity corresponding to it, now to be found in the east gate of the Chidambaram temple, see H. Krishna Sastri’s South Indian Gods and Goddesses, Fig. 147; Krishna Sastri describes it as Agni, but it should more accurately be described as Yajñapuruṣa one of the minor manifestations of Viṣṇu; cf. T. A. G. Rao, Elements of Hindu Iconography, Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 248-50.
then of opinion that the Vedic evidence was not at all sufficient for deciding whether gods were iconically represented in the early Vedic period or not. In a later contribution to Rūpam, Nos. 42-4, 1930, he was more definite, and he collected numerous additional passages from the Ṛgveda and other Vedas in support of his view; he even used the term iconography in relation to the representation of the Vedic deities. He assigned the foremost place to the well-known verse in the Ṛgveda, IV, 24, 10, which was also noticed by Macdonell and others. The latter thought that it was a late passage probably containing an allusion to some concrete symbol of Indra. It is Ka imaṁ daśabhirmānemadram krīnāṁ dhenuvbhiḥ. Yadā vrtrāṇi jamghanadathamam me punardadat ṛ (‘Who will buy this my Indra for ten cows? When he has slain his foes, he may give him back to me’). Venkateswara remarks about the passage, thus ‘The context shows that there were permanent images of Indra made and hired for what was in probability an Indra festival, and there were apparently images of Vṛtra made for each occasion whence the plural Vṛtrāṇi to be slain by Indra.’ With regard to Ṛ.V., V. 52, 15 noticed above, Venkateswara makes this significant observation, ‘This passage is also interesting in that it shows that there was no idol worship, but that images were used as concrete representations of gods whose real form and existence were conceived as different.’ The existence of two forms of each god, one the concrete and finite and the other the abstract and infinite is clear according to him in a Yajurveda passage (T.S., I. 7. 12; also A.V., VII. 31) which reads svayā tanvā tanum-airayata (‘with your own, i.e., real, body enter this concrete body’). In his opinion, the image is regarded in the Ṛgveda merely as a physical tenement of the real form of the god, while in these texts we have two forms of the god mentioned—that in the image being only an apparent and evanescent form, and that in the universe being the real
and permanent form (svā tanuk). He finds reference to the relationship of these forms, the finite and the infinite, of the god even in the Rgveda (VII. 100, 6) which speaks of Viṣṇu’s assumption of another—the finite form in the battle with Vṛtra where he was a worthy companion of Indra (Yadanyarūpah samithe babhūtha); Indra who used Viṣṇu as his vehicle (Viṣṇuvanuṣṭhitaḥ) asked him to expand into the infinite space (sakhe Viṣṇo vitarāṇi vikramasva) elbowing Vṛtra out of existence till the latter begged to be received into the body of Indra himself. From this Venkateswara concluded that the belief was that the finite cabined in a particular form was not cribbed or confined by this fact but was capable of infinite expansion. He finds distinct references to the fashioning of images in such passages as R.V., VI. 28 6 (aśrīrām cit krṇuta supratikam i.e., ‘make that which was an ugly mass a beautiful image’); R.V., IV. 17, 4 (Indrasya kartā svapīstamo bhūt, i.e., ‘the maker of Indra was a most stalwart being, a most skilful workman’); casting of metal images is also referred to in the Rgveda and other Vedas in such passages as R.V., VIII. 69, 12 (sūrmyām susiram iva, i.e., ‘like a hollow tube’), R.V., X. 184, 1 (Viṣṇuryonim kalpayatu tvāṣṭā rūpāni pimātā | Ā simcatu prajāpatirdhātā garbhām dadhātu te || i.e., ‘May Viṣṇu make the female organ fit; may Tvaṣṭā fix the limbs; may Prajāpati sprinkle and may Dhatā hold your embryo’), R.V., I. 32. 2 (Tvāṣṭāsmai vajram svanīrya tataks i.e., ‘Tvaṣṭā made the thunderbolt for Indra, which could be far flung’), etc. He further finds references to temples (devagṛhas) in such passages as R.V., VII. 56, 14 (Sahasriyām damyām bhāgametam grhamedhiyām maruto jūṣadhvoṃ, i.e., ‘Oh! Maruts accept this your portion offered at the temple’), R.V., VII. 59. 10 (Grhamedhāsa, i.e., the Maruts in the houses are munificent), etc. Venkateswara thinks that this inference from the passages is supported by the finds of images of the storm gods in Babylonia. He even
finds allusion to processions of images in R.V., I. 10, 1 and III. 53, 5-6. "In the la test (Khila) Vedic texts, the goddess Sri is represented as a golden antelope adorned with garlands of silver and gold" (but he does not supply us with the exact reference).

The arguments of the two sets of scholars holding opposite views about the problem under discussion had to be given at some length, in order to assess their proper worth. The whole question, however, revolves upon the correct understanding of the nature of the religion which was in vogue among the higher section of the Indo-Aryans in the Vedic period. The early and late Vedic texts mostly throw light on the customs and practices of this class of people and whatever hypothesis we make is mainly concerned about them; there are certain passages in the texts, however, which may incidentally throw some light on the beliefs and practices of the pre-Aryan settlers of India. The former believed in the divine character of many and various forces of nature which inspired their awe and imagination. Not only these were duly personified and venerated by them, but also various abstract principles were raised by them to the same august position and respected. The ostensible mode of the expression of their regard for these multifarious divinities was by means of the ritualistic performances of various types of sacrifices in which a certain spirit of contract prevailed. The god or gods in whose honour particular sacrifices were to be performed by a king or a nobleman with the help of his priests, really the mediators, were required to fulfil the desires of the sacrificer. He sought to propitiate the divine powers by the process of offering gifts to them, realising fully his comparative weakness and inability to exist satisfactorily without their constant aid. Again, such was the efficacy of these sacrificial offerings, accompanied by regular prayers in the shape of hymns recited and sung with due intonation and emphasis, that
the whole act used to cast a spell as it were on the deities who then condescended to grant his desires. There was no one particular god who was venerated by the hymnist or his client for all times and places, and the same man who was extolling the greatness of a certain god in one hymn and subordinating the other divinities to him might in the next hymn make another the most exalted. Thus, the main trend of the religion as practised by the higher section of the early Vedic Indo-Aryans was polytheistic and henotheistic or kathenotheistic, in which sacrifice played the most important part; in fact, it was the religious practice, par excellence, which was full of ritualistic acts (kriyāviśeṣa-bahula) and which had for its objective the attainment of wealth and enjoyment in this world (bhogaisvarya-gatiṃprati). The other-worldliness was conspicuous by its absence in the thought of the early Vedic Indo-Aryan who felt a real pleasure in living a prosperous and joyful life. There was very little or practically no place for deep meditation in his early rituals, his deities being never to him objects of his dhyānayoga. In such religious practice as briefly outlined above, what conceivable place could be assigned to the images of the Vedic gods? Those scholars who advocate their existence in this period would have us believe that all these sacrificial acts were performed in the presence of these sensible representations. But, in most of the early authoritative Brāhmaṇas which lay down with meticulous details the mode of performing the various sacrifices, there is practically no reference to the idols of the gods which would certainly have been explicitly mentioned if they were found necessary. In the subsequent period of the history of India, when the divine images had come to play a requisite part in the religious lives of her people, they are clearly described as such in the contemporary literature.

Scholars like Bollensen and Venkateswara mainly utilise the anthropomorphic descriptions of many of the Vedic
divinities as contained in the hymns of the Rgveda in support of their theory. But what is the extent of this anthropomorphism? Keith correctly remarks, "Though it would be wrong to ignore the anthropomorphic character of the gods, the Vedic pantheon has none of the clear-cut figures of the Greek, and unlike the Greek deities it is seldom difficult to doubt that the anthropomorphic forms but faintly veil the phenomena of nature." 1 The degree of this anthropomorphism, again, was extremely variable. Such deities like Sūrya, Uṣas, Agni, etc., for example, were intimately connected with their natural bases and thus they could have very little of this element in their character; whereas Indra, Varuṇa and some other Vedic gods, who were considerably freed from their connexion with the phenomena which produced their conception, could possess it to a very great extent. The endowment of the Vedic gods with particular forms in the imagination of the seers has been discussed at length by Yāska in his Nirukta, a work to be dated as early as 500 B.C. This interesting discussion requires to be fully quoted here, as it throws a flood of light on the problem at issue. Yāska writes, "Now follows discussion of the form of the gods (ākāra-cintanām devatānām). Some say, they resemble human beings in form (puruṣavidhāḥ), for their panegyrics and their appellations are like those of sentient beings; and their human limbs are referred to in the hymns......They are also (associated in their hymns of praise) with objects with which men are usually associated......Moreover they are associated with the sort of actions with which men are usually associated. Others say, the gods do not resemble human beings in form (apuruṣavidhāḥ), because those gods that are (actually) seen do not resemble human beings in

form; as, for instance, Agni (fire-god), Vāyu (wind-god), Āditya (sun-god), Prāthivī (earth-goddess), Candramas (moon-god), etc. As to the view that panegyrics of the gods are like those of sentient beings, (they reply) that inanimate objects, beginning from dice and ending with herbs, are likewise praised. As to the view that the human limbs of the gods are referred to in the hymns, (they reply) that this (treatment) is accorded to inanimate objects.... As to the view (that in their hymns of praise the gods are associated) with objects with which men are associated, (they reply) that it is just the same (in the case of inanimate objects)...... Or the gods may both resemble human beings in form as well as may not resemble human beings in form. Or the gods who do not resemble human beings in form exist in the form of Karman (sacrifice'); as for instance the sacrifice performed by the Yajamāna (sacrificer). This is the opinion of those who know the legends.'"  

1 This long quotation fully illustrates the attitude of a person of the 6th century B.C., well-versed in the Vedic lore, to the whole question of anthropomorphism of the Vedic divinities. To this anthropomorphisation, will have to be added the characteristic manner of presenting many of the gods in theriomorphic forms, the latter again in some instances being ideologically connected with the particular deities. Thus, the sun traversing through the wide firmament of the sky could be easily conceived as a mythical bird having beautiful wings (suparno garutman); the fleet-footed horse might also symbolise the sun as a Rgvedic verse indicates

(VII. 77, 3; here the goddess dawn is said to lead a white steed). Sometimes, this connection cannot be easily established. Thus, Agni is very often likened to various animals, "in most cases doubtless with a view to indicating his functions rather than representing his personal form." He is endowed with various animal and other forms such as those of a bull, a calf, a steed, an eagle, a swan and many other things. Two deities which are conceived invariably in animal form are the one-footed goat (Aja Ekapād) and the serpent of the deep (Ahir Budhnya). The former may be the lightning flash coming down to earth in a single streak while the latter would seem to be an atmospheric deity dwelling in the atmospheric ocean. But these and many other such concepts are pure and simple no imageries having actual concrete bases. These theriomorphic and anthropomorphic descriptions, however, played an important part in the evolution of some of the sectarian gods in the subsequent religious history of India. Thus, it will be interesting to refer to two typical cases. Rudra, the Vedic base of the cult god Śiva, is very often mythologically connected with Agni in the Epic and Purānic literature. Agni has been likened frequently with a bull in the Vedic texts and Rudra himself is called a bull in some Vedic verses (cf. R.V., II. 33, 8—Pra bahbrate vṛṣabhaḥ āyō āśītice etc. or II. 33, 6—Unmā mamamda vṛṣabho marutvān etc.); now, on the basis of this very fact, Rudra-Śiva is sometimes primarily conceived in the form of a bull and there are definite numismatic data in support of the representation of Śiva as a bull. But, by a converted mental process of thinking on the part of his worshipper, the theriomorphic form of the deity is assigned the position of a mount of the same god conceived anthropomorphically. Again, in some much later representations, this so-called animal mount of Rudra-Śiva is made to assume the pure human form of the deity himself, with this difference only that its front hands are
shown in the aṅjali pose. Similarly, the Vedic Viṣṇu, one of the constituent elements of the composite sectarian god Vāsudeva-Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu of the Epic and Purānic age is undoubtedly one of the aspects of the sun-god in the Vedic period. The sun-bird, Garutman referred to above, is invariably assigned the position of the mount or vehicle to the above-named cult deity and is represented in the later art as a hybrid creature, part man and part bird (though in the early Buddhist monument of Sanchi, Garuḍa is represented as a mythical bird with kundalas in its ear). But the concrete representations of these anthropomorphic, theriomorphic and hybrid forms make their appearance in the sectarian art of a much later date, and there can be no question of finding any reference whatsoever to such figures in the multifarious descriptions of the early Vedic divinities.

It will be useful, now, to consider in their proper perspective some of the early Vedic texts, already referred to, which are utilised by Bollensen and Venkateswara in support of their views. The whole of the 33rd hymn of the second maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda, the first line of the 9th verse of which is taken by the former to allude to a painted image of Rudra, contains the praises of the god in which he is described in various ways; thus in verse 3, he is addressed as Vajrābāhu (with thunderbolt-like arms); in verse 5 he is characterised as soft-bellied, of good hailing voice, brown and possessing a beautiful nose (Ṛdudaraḥ suhavo...babhrukusūipro...); in verse 8, he is brown and white at the same time (babhrave... śvītice); in verse 10, he is addressed as the worthy god holding bow and arrow, wearing a beautiful and multiformed niṣka garland (i.e., a garland made of niṣkas covered with many forms—Arhanbibhaṛṣi sāyakāni dhunvārhanniṣkam yajatam viśvarūpam); above all, in the line quoted by Bollensen the word pururūpah (having multifarious
forms) shows that the god Rudra was endowed with various forms according to the imagination of the hymnist Gr̄tsamada, and there is not the least justification for assuming that these were based on actual concrete figures. Similarly, the allusion to a probable image of Varuṇa wearing a golden coat of mail with spies sitting around him, in R. V., I. 25, 13, is not at all convincing. Varuṇa, the moral god, sung by the hymnist in various ways, is conceived as covered by a coat of mail and veiled in his radiance, thus being impervious to prying eyes, but himself looking into the secret virtues and vices of the mortals; the hymnist’s idea about his spies is a necessary corollary of this conception about him, for the god sends them to look into the actions of mankind and report to him all about them. As regards R. V., V. 52, 15, Max Müller has translated the whole verse in this way, “If he, after perceiving them, has approached them as gods with an offering, then may he for a gift remain united with the brilliant (Maruts) who by their ornaments are glorious on their march.” He further remarks, “This verse, as Roth says, is very obscure; ... whatever the verse may mean, esām devān cannot mean the gods of the Maruts or prove the existence of idols, as Bollensen and even Muir imagined.”1 This verse is undoubtedly difficult of correct interpretation; it is extremely uncertain whether the particular extract in it at all means the images of the Maruts and one cannot support a theory with the help of this enigmatic passage. The eleventh verse in the same hymn, however, may throw some light on it; there we are told that the Maruts might assume different forms according to their different functions (iti citrā rāpāṇi darśyā) such as protecting the world or collectively supporting it or sustaining from afar (the

1 S.B.E., XXXII, pp. 318, 817-18.
planets, stars and others). The devas in the passage under question may mean these various imaginary forms. In any case, if we read the whole hymn in which it occurs, we cannot but hesitate in accepting the interpretation put upon it by the above-mentioned scholars. Sumbhatā in the passage in R. V., I. 21, 3 explained by Śāyaṇa as ‘nānā-vidhairalaṅkāraḥ sobhitau kuruta’ actually ‘means adorned with various praises,’ which are figuratively taken by Śāyaṇa to mean ornaments. The words surmyam susīram iva in R. V., VIII. 69, 12 cannot unquestionably refer to an image of Varuṇa in that particular context; Ballantyne’s rendering of this passage is based on the similar description of a perforated iron image in later works, which was heated and employed as a sort of punishment for wrongdoers who were compelled to embrace it. But that sense can hardly be applied here. Not much importance can be assigned to the descriptive epithets as susīpra, kapardin, darśata and such others which merely emphasise the anthropomorphic conception of the deities to whom they are applied. The Ṛgvedic verse, Catvāri śṛṅgā etc. (IV. 58, 3), merely presents to us in a metaphorical manner the Vedic sacrifice. Yāska explains the imagery, thus, “The four horns stand for the four Vedas, three legs for the three savanas, viz., the prātah-, mādhyandina- and the ṭṛtiya-savanas, the two heads for the iṣṭis, viz., the prāyaniya and the udayanīya and the seven hands for sapta chāndas or the mantras. Here sacrifice is likened to a bull bellowing, tied in three ways; this threefold binding is explained by Yāska as referring to its association with the mantras, brāhmaṇas and the kalpasūtras; the bellowing of the bull stands for the praising of the gods in sacrifices with Ṛg-mantras, offering oblations to them with Yajus ones and praying to the gods with Sāmun songs. The god sacrifice is said to have entered into human beings for
the purpose of making them offer sacrifices. Such passages as R. V., VI. 28, 6 or IV. 17, 4, which according to Venkateswara contain distinct references to the fashioning of images do not admit of the interpretations which have been put upon them, if they are read along with their contexts. What is the full meaning of the two verses in which the above occur? In the first, cows, probably the clouds alluded to in a metaphorical manner, are exhorted by the hymnist, Bharadvāja, the son of Brhaspati, to nourish him and his people, to make lean and thus ugly-looking bodies beautiful, and to make his and his friends’ houses prosperous; the cows are described as emitting auspicious sounds, the gifts of which are so well sung in the sacrificial assemblies (Yāyam gāvo medayathā kṛṣam cidaśrīrāṃ cithṛnuthā supratīkan | Bhadram grham kṛnutha bhadравāco bṛhadvō vaya ucyate sabhāsu ||). In the second, on the other hand, Vāmadeva Ṛṣi describes Dyaus who was the progenitor of Indra, copiously praised, wielder of good thunderbolt and not fallen from heaven, as being possessed of a valiant son by bringing whom forth Dyaus became a most skilful workman” (Suviraste yanitā manyata dyaurimdrasya kartā svapastamo bhūt | Ya im jajāna svaryāṃ svajramanapacyutam sadaso na

1 Yāska, Nirukta, XIII. 1, 7—Catvāri śrīgā itivedā vā etā uktāstrayo asya pādā iti svarāṇi trīnī dvo śīre prāyaṇiyodayanyiye satpahastāsah sapta chandāmsi tridhābaddhaḥ tredhā baddha mano-trāhmanakalparīṣabho rovātī rovānamasya savanakramena ṛṣbihṛyayurbhissāmbhiryadenamṛghbhirāmsanti yajuribrejyajanti sāmabhiscustwanti mahodeva ityena hi mahān devo yadyajño marthyo āviveshetyeṣa hi Manusyaśāmyāṣati yajanāyā tasyottarā bhūyase nirvacanāya | Reference has already been made to a late sculpture corresponding partly to this description (the figure is human, its mount being the bull) in the east Gopura of the Chidambaram temple. It is Viṣṇu in one of his minor manifestations; in the Brāhmaṇa literature (cf. Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIV. 1, 1, 6). Viṣṇu is identical with sacrifice and here we see the imagery is carried further and given a concrete shape.
bhūma). So, there cannot be the least justification for our taking any portion of these Rk verses to refer to the practice of image-making. Pratīka in the first passage should not be made much of, because the sense of a symbol or an image became attached to it in later texts; as vīgraha meant primarily a body and secondarily it also came to denote an image, so was the case with this word. Very little also can be said in support of the above-named scholar’s method of finding a reference to the practice of casting metal images in the particular passages quoted by him from the Rgveda. The late hymn of the same (R. V., X. 184, 1) is really a mantra uttered in the time of impregnation (garbhādhāna) and there are clear enough indications of the real meaning of the three verses constituting the hymn. As regards the particular passages in such Rg verses as VII. 56, 14 or VII. 59, 10, if these are taken to allude to the temples of the Maruts, numerous others may be collected from the same work which can be assumed to denote them. But the fact is that there is practically no support for the assumption that words like grhamedhīyam or grhamedhāsa even distantly allude to the temples or shrines of such Vedic gods as the Maruts. The characteristic terms, however, used in the grhyasūtras, as we shall presently see, are devagrha, devāgāra, devakula, devāyatana, etc., which in all probability denote the shrines of the gods; but, by the time the latest section of the Vedic literature was composed, images and temples had already been accepted by the higher sections of the Vedic Indo-Aryans. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, description is given of a structure of post and thatch with mat walls, which was discussed by Simpson as denoting a temple; but Coomaraswamy has rightly pointed out that “this was a building for the performance of sacrifices, not a temple in the later sense.” This, again, was a very simple shed of the primitive type and was called prācinavamśa or prāgvamśa (also described as sālā) on account of the top beams which were bamboo ones extending
from west to east; on a different mode of laying these again, the fire chapel was differently designated. In the udicīnavamsa type of structure, also named vimata by Hiranyakesin (Śrutasūtra, 3, 2 and 7, 1) the beams were laid from south to north. In more pompous types of sacrifices performed by kings, also, these types of buildings served as fire chapels. In the Brāhmaṇa literature, again, 'many precise and elaborate details are given regarding the building of altars, generally fire-altars' of various shapes; and it is noteworthy that the rules for the construction of these sacrificial altars, given in the Sulva Sūtras, make use of dynamic symmetry, of which no trace can be recognised at a later period.1 But nowhere in such literature is to be found any reference, however slight, to the mode of construction of temples or shrines, which must have found some place if the images and temples had played some part in the sacrificial religion of the early Vedic Indo-Aryans. The supposed allusion to the processions of the images of Indra in Rgveda, I. 10, 1 and III. 53, 5-6, if carefully scrutinised, will be found to rest on no better data.

It has been found necessary to discuss the views of Bollensen and Venkateswara at some length in the above paragraphs, because their hypothesis was adumbrated with great skill and confidence as well as with the support of elaborate textual data, their presentation of the case being by far the ablest one. Brindavan Ch. Bhattacharya, in the long introduction to his work on Indian Images, Part I, was also an exponent of the view sponsored by the above scholars; but the premises laid down by him in support of his conclusion were more or less the same as have been critically estimated and need not be discussed here in detail. Recently, use has been made by T. N. Ray, of the Rgvedic verse, X. 130, 3, already referred to in a previous paragraph, in order to prove the existence of the worship of images in

1 Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p. 42.
early Vedic religion; but as has been pointed out above that
the verse, if it is read along with the succeeding ones and if
the commentary of Śāyaṇa is properly understood, does not
at all justify us in finding in it an allusion to the making of
images of the early Vedic gods and worshipping them. ¹ The
mere use of the word pratimā or pratika as referred to above
without the proper context will not be sufficient to demon-
strate anything. Venkateswara, as has been pointed above,
expressly remarks with reference to R. V., V. 52, 15, "that
it shows that there was no idol worship." In this connection,
the interesting remark of Bloomfield requires to be quoted at
length: "The mind of the Vedic poet is the rationalistic
mind of the ruminating philosopher, rather than the artistic
mind which reproduces the finished product. It is engaged
too much in reasoning about and constantly altering the
wavering shapes of the gods, so that these remain to the end
of Vedic time too uncertain in outline, too fluid in substance
for the modelling hand of the artist. On a pinch we could
imagine a statue of the most material of the Vedic god Indra;
but it is hard to imagine a statue of the god Varuṇa. As a
matter of fact there is no record of Vedic ikons, or Vedic
temples. In all these senses there is no Vedic Pantheon.²"
The long extract from Yāska's Nirukta, already referred to on
pp. 59-60, ante, dealing with the anthropomorphism of the
Vedic gods, should be noted again in this connection. R. P.
Chanda rightly remarks, in regard to it, "This discussion
clearly shows that up to the time of Yāska which synchro-
nises with the last phase of the Vedic period the Vedic gods had
not been invested with the forms in which they appear in the
Epics and the Purāṇas."³ Non-existence of images and

² Bloomfield, Religion of the Veda, p. 89.
³ R. P. Chanda, M.A.S.I., No. 30, p. 2. The Gṛhyasūtras which
refer to shrines of gods are collectively to be placed much later than
Yāska.
temples or the absence of the practice of image-worship among the higher section of the Vedic Indo-Aryans was not the characteristic of this only old people of the world. Many other nations of the ancient world can be shown to have been aniconists in practice. It is late in the religious history of China and Japan, that any tangible traces of image-worship are to be found. Many of the nomadic tribes of the Semites did not practise it. "Among the Jews, it appeared only in exceptional cases (viz., those of the Golden Calf and Brazen Serpent). Caesar and Tacitus assert that there were neither temples nor images among the Teutons. In Rome, according to Varro, the Romans lived 170 years without representing their gods by images. Even among the Greeks we find scarcely any traces of idolatry in the time of the Pelasgi."1

When Bloomfield very guardedly wrote that one could imagine 'on a pinch' a statue of Indra as he was the most material of the Vedic gods, he had in his mind the verses (R. V., IV. 24, 10 and VII. 1, 5) which had already been noted. Macdonell thus observes in his Vedic Mythology (p. 155), "Material objects are occasionally mentioned in the later Vedic literature as symbols representing deities. Something of this kind (possibly an image) must be meant even in a passage of the Rgveda, in which the poet asks, 'Who will buy this, etc.'" Again, in R. V., VIII. 1, 5, reference to some form of an idol is seen by him. The hymnist says, 'O thunderbolt bearing Indra! We do not sell you even at a large price; o Vajra-bearer, not even for thousands or ten thousands of riches; o possessor of many treasures, not even in exchange of untold wealth' (Mahe cana tvāmadrivah parā sulkāya deyām । Na sahasrāya, nāyutāya vajrivo na satāya satāmagha ॥). Hopkins remarks about these two passages in his Religions of India (p. 150), thus, "That images of

---

1 Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII., p. 113.
the gods were supposed to be powerful may be inferred from the late verses (R. V., IV. 24, 10)—'Who will buy my Indra, etc.' but allusions to idolatry are elsewhere extremely doubtful.' There can be no gain-saying the fact that in these two passages, very likely references to some sensible representations of Indra are made, for these are actually offered for hire by the hymnist. But, even here, if we read these verses along with the context, we feel grave doubt about accepting them as referring to actual images of Indra. As Coomaraswamy remarks, 'Just as the Bodhi-tree and pādukā at Bharhut are called 'Buddha' (bhagavato), so here a symbol may have been referred to as 'Indra' H.I.I.A., p. 42). But, here also the analogy is not complete. In the case of the various symbols aniconically representing the Master in the early Buddhist art of Central India, there cannot be the least hesitation in accepting them as regular objects of worship (pūjā); the use of the word 'bhagavat' in the Bharhut labels, the attitude of the accessory human and animal figures clustering round the central symbol in the bas-reliefs and the very nature of the monuments in which they appear leave no doubt as regards their character. These Indra fetishes, on the other hand, were they mere symbols or images, were certainly not so many objects of worship. Reference has already been made to Venkateswara's remark about accepting these 'permanent images of Indra' used in an Indra festival. But the very context in the former passage and the term 'vṛtrāṇi' used in it definitely give to my mind the clue regarding their character. These were in all probability meant for abhicāra purposes, for inflicting harm and injury on the enemies of the hirer by performing some sacrificial rituals in which they were principally utilised; if this interpretation of their original character is accepted, there remains no ground for Venkateswara's supposition that vṛtrāṇi in the passage
means 'apparently images of Vṛtra made for each occasion, whence the plural vṛtrāni to be slain by Indra.' As Vṛtra was the arch enemy of Indra, the plural of the word in this passage figuratively refers to the enemies of the hirer who were to be harmed or slain through the agency of these Indra fetishes. This is fully borne out by Sāyaṇa in this manner; the commentator says, Tadānīṁ he kṛtāro yuṣmākāṇi madhyā evamapi samayah kriyate | Yadāya- mīndro vṛtrāni tvadīyān satrūn jaṁghanat, etc., i.e., the hymnist says that this Indra of mine when it had killed your Vṛtras, i.e., enemies, etc. References to abhicāra performances, though implicit here, are explicit in many other Vedic, specially Brāhmaṇa, passages and a substantial portion of the Atharva Veda is devoted to it. Thus, there can be no question of placing the above on the same footing with the images of the sectarian gods of the subsequent period, though we shall see afterwards that particular varieties of some of the latter were used also for abhicāra purposes (the rites associated with these acts unquestionably differed in the two periods). The above-mentioned sensible representations of Indra again remind us of various other objects which are mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas as symbolising several Vedic divinities, all these symbols being necessarily intimately connected with the rituals of sacrifice. Thus, 'the wheel is in various ritual performances employed as a symbol of the sun as representing both its shape and its motion. It is thus used in the Vājapeya sacrifice, in the ceremony of laying the sacrificial fire, and at the solstitial festival. Gold or a fire-brand was employed as a symbol of the sun, when drawing water after sunset instead of before, and in piling the fire altar, a disc of gold was placed on it to represent the sun.'

1 Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, p. 155. With regard to the wheel and the golden disc symbolising the sun, Coomaraswamy’s remarks are
But the clearest mention of a sensible representation is in association with the *Agnicayana* ceremony in sacrifice. This ceremony deals with the building of the fire-altar, independently of the ordinary *Agniśādheya* and *Punarādheya* ceremonies (the installation and the re-installation of the sacrificial fires). The *Taittirīya Samhitā* (V. 2, 6, 9) lays down that the objects named below are to be deposited in the foundation of the altar in this particular rite—a lotus leaf, a gold disc, a golden man (*hiraṃmaya puruṣa*), two wooden ladles, a perforated brick, a brick or *dūrvā* grass, a living tortoise, the heads of dead animals including those of a horse and a bull, a mortar, a pan in the middle of which the head of the man is put and the head of a snake. R. P. Chanda surmises that "in such a company the golden man probably represents the human victim originally immolated and buried at the foundation of a sacred edifice." It may be mentioned here *in passim* that in the foundation ceremonies of buildings in many parts of India, one rite consists of drawing in outline with vermillion paint the figure of a man on a full-sized brick which is then placed in the lowermost depth of the foundation trench, it being understood that the particular brick with the outline drawing must not be disturbed in any way during the construction; this figure is described in the ritual texts dealing with *vāstuyāga* as *vāstupuruṣa* to whom flowers, sandalpaste, five jewels (*pañca-ratna*) are offered. The partially sacred character of the golden man, also, has rightly been emphasised by Chanda by referring to a *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* passage (VII. 4, 1, 15) which identifies it with Prajāpati, Agni and even the sacri-

worth quoting, "The wheel which later on becomes the mark of a Chakravartin, the discus of Viṣṇu and the Buddhist Wheel of the Law, originally represented the sun. The disc of gold placed behind the fire-altar to represent the sun may well be the origin of the later prabhāmaṇḍala or śīraścakra (nimbus)."

*H.I.I.A.*, p. 41.
ficer himself in turn. With regard to the mode of representation, the following extract from the same text (VII, 4, 1, 15) deserves careful notice, "As to this they say "Let him make no arms to this golden man, lest he should cause him to be redundant; for these two spoons are (in lieu of) his arms." Let him nevertheless make (him with arms)." ¹ Coomaraswamy offers an apposite comparison of this crude figure which must have been a plaque in human form with the 'little plaque supposed to represent Prthivī found in a burial mound, regarded as Vedic, at Lauriya Nandangarh' (H.I.I.A., p. 42). This may also be compared with the tiny gold-leaf female figure which was found among many other precious and semi-precious objects in the inscribed relic casket at Piprawa, the relics, as the inscription informs us, being associated with Buddha. After a critical consideration of all these data, it can be confidently observed that, even when some reference to symbols or sensible representations are found in the Vedic and Brāhmaṇic texts, this does not necessarily mean that they were the images proper of the respective divinities.

It has already been pointed out that the Vedic and Brāhmaṇic texts mostly furnish us with material evidence concerning the beliefs and practices of the higher section of the Indo-Aryans. Thus, the view here presented to us is palpably one-sided and our knowledge about the same of the vast mass of the people and the original settlers of India is necessarily scanty. Eliot's remark that "We cannot assume that ideas or usages not mentioned in the Rgveda did not exist at the time when it was composed" (Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. I., p. 53) is partially true. The informa-

tion supplied to us by data gleaned from it and the subsequent allied literature, is not merely negative, but also positive with regard to the customs of a certain section of the people; the practice of making images of their gods and worshipping them is not only not mentioned in them, but there is positive evidence, as we have seen above, that, in the type of religion sanctioned by them there could have been no place for it. But was it in vogue among the other vast section of Indian population on whose customs and faith only occasional and fitful light is thrown by the above texts? We cannot be definitely sure in our answer to this question. But in the Rgveda, there are one or two passages which seem to have a direct bearing on it. Certain classes of people are referred to in a deprecatory manner by the hymnists in two of the Rk verses, one in R. V., VII. 21, 5 and the other in X. 99, 3. In the first verse Indra is prayed to in order that the Rākṣasas may not harm the hymnist and he may kill the ferocious animals; the god is also besought not to let the Śiśnadevas approach the sacrifice (Na yātava Imdra jājuvurna na vamdanā śavisṛtha vedyābhiḥ | Sa śardhadaryo viśuṇasya jaṁtormā śiśnadevā api gurītam nahi ||); in the second one, Indra is described as having slain the Śiśnadeva, when he won the treasure of the hundred-gated fort (Anarvā yacchatadurasya vedo ghnaṅchiśnadevā abhi varpasā bhūt). These Śiśnadevas, as they are mentioned along with the Rākṣasas (yātava) in the first, and as they are looked down upon and deprecated, have been taken by many European and Indian scholars to denote the original settlers of India, the word meaning, according to them, those that have the phallus for their deity (śiśnadevah yesāṁ te). It must be said, however, that Śāyaṇa offered quite a different explanation of the term. He took it to mean those people that are addicted to sensual pleasures. The exact words used by Śāyaṇa in his commentary are—Śiśnena divyamti kriḍamta iti śiśnadevah | Abrahmacaryā ityarthah—which means that Śiśnadevas are
those who play with their organs of generation, i.e., those that have fallen from the vow of a Brahmacārī. He quotes Yāska in his support in this manner—Tathā ca Yāskah | Sa utsahatāṁ yo visuṇasya janottorīsamasya mā śiśnadevā abhamacaryāḥ | Śiśnam snathateḥ | Api gurītaṁ nāḥ satyam vā yajñāṁ vā | (Nirukta, IV., 19). While commenting on the second passage (X. 99, 3), he uses the same explanation (Śiśnadevān abhamacaryān) ; but, incidental reference may be made to his commentary on R. V., X. 27, 19, where the word śiśna occurs. The last part of the above Rk is—sadyah śiśnā pramināno navīyān ; Sāyana comments on it thus—Sadyastadānīmeva śiśnā śiśnāni | śiśnam snathateriti nirvacanāt snathitrni tādāyitrni rākṣasādvīrmāṇi praminānāḥ prakarṣena hīṃsan etc. Here in this word he finds an allusion to Rākṣasas, presumably the original settlers of India deprecatingly mentioned. It is just possible that śiśna in this passage and Śiśnadeva in the two other passages quoted above denoted the same people. If this view is accepted, we find here an incidental reference to a particular religious practice of a certain section of the Indian population of the remote times. It can very well be presumed that this consisted of making sensible representations of the human phallus which was conceived as symbolising principally the potent force at the root of creation and worshipping them. The numerous phalli which have been discovered in the Indus Valley and which have been interpreted as the cult-objects of a people who were culturally different from the early Vedic Indo-Aryans go a great length in supporting the above conclusion. This peculiar custom of using the phalli for cult-purposes was not liked by the latter. Even when phallicism came to be inseparably associated with the worship of Rudra-Siva, the orthodox Indo-Aryans who upheld the original Vedic tradition were at first tardy in its recognition. Hopkins remarks with regard to the above Vedic passages, “Phallic worship may be alluded to in that
of the ‘tail gods,’ as Garbe thinks, but is deprecated.’ He is quite correct in this cautious acceptance of an hypothesis put forward by various other scholars; but the other part of his remark, viz., ‘One verse, however, which seems to have crept in by mistake is apparently due to phallic influence (R.V., VIII. 1, 34), though such a cult was not openly acknowledged till Siva worship began, and is no part of Brähmaṇism’ is open to criticism (Religions of India, p. 251). In the Rg. verse to which he refers, there is not the least allusion to anything in support of phallicism; it merely refers to the joy which was expressed by Śaśvatī, the wife of Asaṅga, in seeing her husband restored to full sexual powers as a result of the austerities practised by her. She merely describes her husband’s organ in the verse, incidentally referring to her own feelings: ‘Anvasya sthūram dadṛṣe purastādanastha ururavaramvamāṇaḥ | Śaśvatī näryabhicaksyāha subhadramārya bhojanam vibharsi ||’

Another epithet which is also deprecatingly used in the Rgveda to denote certain classes of beings by the hymnists, is Mūradeva. It occurs as many as three times, viz., in VII. 104, 24, X. 87, 2 and X. 87, 14; in the first of these verses Indra is entreated to kill these Mūrdevas while in the last two, Agni, the killer of the Rākṣasas (Rākṣahā) is asked to do the same. It will be necessary to quote portions of these with Śāyana’s commentary on them in order to estimate the importance of this term. RV. VII, 104, 24 runs—Imd r a jahi pumāṃsāṃ yātudhānām ̣u striyām māyāyā ̣saśadānām | Vigrīvāso mūradeva ḍamantu mā te dṛṣaṁtsūryamuccaraṇtām | It has been commented on by Śāyana in this manner: He Imdra pumāṃsāṃ pumrūpadhārīnām yātudhānām rākṣasan jahi | māraya | Utāpi ca māyāyā vaṃcanaṃ ̣saśadānām hīṃsantīṇi striyām rākṣān ca jātu | Api ca mūradevā māraṇakriḍā rākṣasā vigrīvāso vicchinnagrīvāḥ saṃta ḍamantu | etc. In the two others mūradevān is once explained as mūdhadevān māraṇaevyāpārān-
rākṣasān and at the other place as simply māravyāpārāṇa rākṣasān. So, this term has been consistently explained by Śāyāna as Rākṣasas who are destructive; but presumably on the basis of his commentary on the second of the verses referred to above, Wilson translated it as 'those who believe in vain gods.' A. C. Das, however, observed on this, "it seems to me that the word 'vain' is not the correct rendering of mūra, which may mean 'senseless' like stocks and stones. The word, therefore, may refer to persons who believed in and worshipped 'images' which were lifeless and senseless objects.'" Das is cautious in this statement; but shortly after, he is definitely of opinion 'that there were images of gods in Ṛgvedic times, though their worship was condemned by some of the advanced Aryan tribes.'

We cannot be certain, however, on the basis of the data before us that the word in question definitely meant 'image-worshippers,' and we cannot endorse the view upheld by Das in this connection that the Vedic gods were iconically represented. But, if the first part of Das's view is

---

1 A. C. Das, _Rigvedic Culture_, p. 145. A. P. Banerjee Sastri notes the importance of the term in his article on 'Iconism in India' in _I.H.Q._, Vol. XII, 1936, pp. 335-41. He suggests that Mūrādeva, like the term Ārya may denote ethnic entity; that the Mauryas in the _Mahābhāṣya_ passage (already noted by me) does not refer to the royal Mauryas, but to a tribe of long standing (cf. the Pāli Moriya); that mūrti is derived from Mūra, worshipped by the earliest pre-Vedic people, the Mūrādevas, with whom may be affiliated the Yakṣas and the Mauryas.

2 A. C. Das, _op. cit._, p. 146. He cites _R.V._, VIII. 69, 15-16, as referring to the mounting of an image of Indra on a golden chariot; according to him, the epithets arbhako na kumārakah (like a small limbed boy) applied to Indra can only have reference to the small image of the god placed on the car; the word dampute (householder) also in the same hymn, applied to Indra, probably refers, in his opinion, to the household image of the God worshipped by the Rāj. But all this is based on data of a very uncertain character.
accepted then we find here a probable reference to a section of the original settlers of India who followed this particular custom.

The character of the early Vedic religion, in which, as we have seen, there was no place for image-worship, gradually changed and it will behove us to consider whether it could find a place in its later phases. The age of the Rgveda was succeeded by that of the Brāhmaṇas or sacrificial treatises which were really practical guidances for the correct performance of various types of sacrifices. The Yajus and the Sāma Vedas form a sort of connecting link between these two periods; in the latter period the ceremonious yajña came to be increasingly complicated and was left more and more in the hands of the initiated who had to complete a difficult course of studies in order to take any important part in it. It has already been pointed out that these elaborate ritual literature nowhere makes any mention of the image proper of the gods and the utmost that can be said about it is that they at best refer to some symbols of a few deities (mostly sun) to be utilised in times of particular sacrifices. The speculative section among the Indo-Aryans, however, were not long to remain satisfied with the mere performance of these sacrifices and they tried to assign special mystical significance to them. This was mostly the work of the Vānaprasthas, i.e., those sages that had gone into the forest after completing their lives as householders, and the results of their speculations were incorporated into the Āranyakas, the name assigned to this kind of literature being significant. As this body of literature, or rather the earlier and more authoritative part of it (we should always be careful to exclude the khīlas or supplements, for therein we find some materials concerning the later sectarian gods), is closely associated with the sacrifices— it unfolds before us their meaning (artha-vāda),—there is no
chance of our ever finding in it any allusion to divine images and their worship. These works set a high value, however, on the performance of ascetic practices as acts of practical piety and religion, salvation being attainable by this austere asceticism. The natural sequence of the age of these speculative efforts and ascetic practices was that of the early authoritative Upaniṣads where the pursuit of higher knowledge—the true knowledge about the Brahman, Ātman and the Universe—was the chief desideratum. The teaching incorporated in these works was usually regarded as something secret or esoteric. Deussen has correctly shown that the word Upaniṣad means 'sitting down at the feet of a teacher to receive secret instruction: hence a secret conversation or doctrine'; this element of secrecy is further emphasised by the fact that the word is used in the Upaniṣadic literature with three distinct meanings, such as, (1) Secret word (as 'satyasya satyam', 'tadvanam' or 'tajjalān'—these words variously describing the Brahman), (2) Secret text (in the Taittiriyyaka school a section often ends with the words,—'iti upaniṣad'), and (3) Secret import ('secret allegorical meaning of some ritual conception or practice'—e.g., Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 1. 1. 10—'for that which is executed with knowledge, with faith, with the Upaniṣad, i.e., the secret import of udgītha as om, that is more effective'). In such esoteric literature where the true nature of the Brahman and Ātman is being deeply cogitated, it will be futile to seek for references to concrete representations of deities; the Vedic gods no doubt make their occasional appearances there, but they do so as mere accessories either to illustrate some parable or to stand as a symbol for Brahman-Ātman (as Indra in the Kausīṭakī Upaniṣad). The anthropomorphism which was present to a certain extent in their conception had no need to be emphasised in their present environments and as for Brahman it would be sheer folly to even think of him in terms
of other concrete objects, much less to sensibly represent him (Na sandhye tiṣṭhati rūpasya, na cakṣuṣā paśyati kaścānaśayam; na tasya pratimā asti yasya nāma mahādyāsaḥ). At best, various symbols, all abstract principles such as prānāḥ (vital breaths), praṇjā (intellect), ānanda (bliss) or ananta (eternity), etc., were utilised by the thinkers in their attempts to realise the true nature of the Brahmaṇ; even such terms with intimate associations with sacrifice as uktha and the udgītha, and the sacrificial horse were thus used in the Upaniṣads of the respective schools of the Ṛgveda, Sāmaveda and the Yajurveda.\(^1\) The fundamentally speculative character of this literature, confined mostly to the domain of the intellectual, was certainly not conducive to the origin and growth of iconism.

But, the word of caution previously sounded is worth reiterating. The peculiar mystico-philosophical beliefs which are expressed in this class of literature only confine themselves to undoubtedly a smaller section of the people, obviously the higher intellectuals. Scholars are often prone to generalise and assume that what can be said about these few is applicable to all the Indians of a particular period. Grünwedel makes this observation about the general artistic activities of the Indians of the period to which the Vedas and Upaniṣads belong: ‘Though a religio-mystical element may serve as a scanty foil for fully perfected or decadent artistic efforts, the philosophical-scientific tendency, especially with the practical side which it had in ancient India, is an altogether barren soil for art.’\(^2\)

---

1 Such was the august position to which this literature was raised and such was the respect which was paid to it that even after the evolution of the various cult-deities, treatises were composed in imitation of it, whose main interest and purpose was to glorify one or other of the various cult-deities.

2 Grünwedel, Buddhist Art, p. 12.
have practically no means of ascertaining from this class of literature the religious practices of the other larger section, though we shall see later on that the religious texts of the later heterodox sects like Buddhism and Jainism throw a flood of light on this subject. But, in the latest section of the Vedic literature, the *Khila* (supplements) to the earlier authoritative Brāhmaṇas and Āranyakas, and the Gṛhya-śūtras we have clear and unmistakable evidence about the recognition of the images of the gods and their shrines by the orthodox Vedic Brāhmaṇas (Snātakas and Gṛhausthas). The *Śadvimśa Brāhmaṇa* is a comparatively late addition to the Tāṇḍya or Pañcavimśa Mahābrāhmaṇa, one of the oldest Brāhmaṇas. In that part of the former which is known as 'Adbhuta Brāhmaṇa,' really a Vedāṅga text dealing with miracles and omens, we find reference to the performance of various rites for removing the evil effects of certain omens such as the trembling of the temples, the laughing, weeping, dancing, splitting, perspiring, the opening and closing of the eyes of the divine images.¹ This passage certainly presupposes the partial recognition of the practice of image worship. In the Sūtra literature, the Gṛhyaśūtras (not the Śrautasūtras which are conversant about the rituals connected with sacrifice) which deal with the rites to be performed by the householders, we find this recognition more thorough. The *Pāraskara Gṛhyaśūtra* (III. 14.8) tells us that the student (snātaka) when going in his chariot towards the images of gods (daivatāni), should descend from the chariot before he has reached them; if towards Brāhmaṇas, just before reaching them; if towards cows, when amid them; if towards fathers, when he has

¹ Śadvimśa Brāhmaṇa, X. 5. Devāyatanaṁ kampane daivapratimā hasantī rudantī nṛtyanti sphulantī svidyanti unmilanti. Brindaban Chandra Bhattachāryya cites this as an evidence in support of his theory that image worship was practised by the early Vedic Indo-Aryans. Cf. Indian Images, Part I, p. xxix.
reached them.' The daivatas, Brähmaṇas, cows and fathers are mentioned in such a manner that the first one appears to be the most honoured among them. References also are to be found in this kind of literature to the shrines of the gods and the terms used to denote them are 'devagṛha', 'devāyatana', 'devakula' (its Prākrit form is 'deul'). But even here it is doubtful whether these images and shrines were in any way associated with the well known members of the Vedic hierarchy like Indra, Agni, Mitra, Varuṇa, Uśas, Aditi and others. The connection in which these gods are mentioned in the above texts does not mean that their images are referred to and many are the new names such as Īsāna, Kṣetrapati, Mīḍhuṣi, Jayanta, Śrī, Dhanapati, Bhadrakāli and others, most of which it is presumable had their icons and shrines. The whole of the Āpastamba Grhyasūtra, VII. 20 deals with the carrying about of the images of the bucolic deities like Īsāna, Mīḍhuṣi and Jayanta by the householder and placing them in huts built for them and offering to them boiled rice from the sthālipaka. More about this change of outlook in religion among the Vedic initiates will be discussed in the next chapter.¹

¹ Āpastamba Grhyasūtra, VII. 19, 13; Hīraṇyakṣiṇ Gr. S., II. 3, 8, 2.4; Sāṅkhāyana Gr. S., II, 14, 14, 17, etc., Pāraskara Gr. S., I. 16, 23 furnishes us with a list of the demons and goblins such as Śaṇḍa, Marka, Upavīra, Saunḍikeya, Ulūkhala, Malimluca, Animika, Hantṛmukha, Sarṣapāruṇa, Kumāra and many others who are propitiated with offerings of mustard seeds mixed with rice-chaff.
CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF IMAGE-WORSHIP IN INDIA

Remarkable changes introduced in the religious outlook of the Vedic Aryans—due to culture contact—gradual emergence of the element of Bhakti—its constituent factors—the appearance of some of these in late Vedic literature—clear references in post-Vedic works—sectarianism, the natural corollary of the development of Bhakti—growth and development of the Bhakti cults centering round Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, Śiva, the Yākṣas like Maṇibhadra and others, and the Devī—references to some of these in indigenous and foreign accounts of the pre-Christian period—necessity for some sensible objects of representation for the cult-deities and their accessories—the purpose served by them—their character—these objects not always iconic—iconism and aniconism existing in India side by side.

Evidence with regard to the prevalence of images in post-Vedic India: Literary (indigenous and foreign) and archaeological (epigraphic, monumental and numismatic).

It has already been alluded to in the preceding chapter that the later sections of the Vedic literature distinctly point out to remarkable changes that were being introduced in the religious outlook of the Indo-Aryans. It is true that they did not relinquish the practices which were performed with so much zest by their forefathers, but there cannot be the least doubt that all these were having more re-orientation due to various factors that were in operation from the very beginning of the period when they first set their feet on Indian soil. The most important among these was undoubtedly the close contact which they had to come in with the previous settlers of India. However much they could revile the children of the Indian soil whom they were driving from the more coveted lands into the hills and jungles, with such depreciatory epithets as dāsas, anāsas (noseless ones), yātus or yātudhānas, rākṣasas, śīṅnadevas, mūrudevas, etc., it cannot be denied that these latter people possessed a sort of material culture which was much superior to that of their
victors. It is a pity that we have not before us any literary record of what these people were like, what they believed and practised, what they thought of their conquerors, presented from their point of view; but the remains that have been unearthed in course of systematic excavations in the Indus Valley have brought to light immense evidence regarding the high and developed state of material civilisation with which their forefathers were endowed. The commingling of cultures of the immigrants and the former inhabitants was greatly responsible for the gradual introduction of various elements which are either not traceable or traceable only in faint outlines in the earliest literary works of the Indo-Aryans. Rgveda, or for the matter of that the other Vedas and the early Brāhmaṇas, had practically nothing to say on such topics as the law of Karma, the transmigration of souls and their necessary concomitant—the somewhat pessimistic view of life; but these were gradually being more and more discussed in the different Upaniṣads. The wholesale pessimism of the Buddhists might not have been the characteristic of the latter but 'there cannot be any doubt that the genius of the Upaniṣads is different from that of the Rgveda, however, many ties may connect the two periods.' Again, the pantheism of the former can very well be compared with the belief in the multifarious nature gods of the Aryans as portrayed in the latter. All these new elements can be presumed to have grown in the Indian soil, in the inception of which the earlier settlers in India did not play a mean part. Keith has very cautiously presented the problem in these sentences: 'The Upaniṣads, as in some degree all earlier thought in India, represent the outcome of the reflections of a people whose blood was mixed. We may, if we desire, call the Upaniṣads the product of Aryo-Dravidian thought; but if we do so, we must remember that

1 Keith, op. cit., p. 481.
the effect of the intermixture must be regarded in the light of chemical fusion, in which both elements are transformed.'

The one important element, however, which has got special bearing on our subject and the name of which is to be found in at least one of the major Upaniṣads is Bhakti, primarily the loving adoration of some persons by others but secondarily the deep affectionate and mystic devotion for some personal deity who is the object of worship (in the developed sense of the term, i.e., pūjā). If we briefly trace the history of the gradual emergence of Bhakti in the religious lives of the Indo-Aryans, we cannot but endorse the view just quoted. Among the several constituent factors which make up this element in its secondary aspect, the most important ones are 'belief in one personal god as spiritual being, the faith that his power is sufficient to secure that at the last the good will conquer, and lastly a conception of the nexus that binds together God and his worshippers as mainly moral.' In the later stratum of the Rgveda, we find the struggling appearance of one supreme entity into which all the separately conceived Vedic divinities are merged. Some faint traces of the belief in one moral god who looks after the consciences and works of men are certainly present in some of the Rgvedic characterisations of Varuṇa to whom prayers for forgiveness are offered by the hymnists. Keith has observed, 'The thought of India started from a religion which had in Varuṇa a god of decidedly moral character and the simple worship of that deity with its consciousness of sin and trust

---

1 Keith, op. cit., p. 497.
2 N Macnicol, Indian Theism, p. 7.
3 Cf., R. V., 1., 164, 46: Ṣādhuḥ Mitraḥ Varuṇamagnimāhurātho divyaḥ sa suparno garutman | Ekam sadvipra bahudhā vadantyagnim yamam mātariśvānamāhuk ||
4 Cf., R. V., 1., 25, 1 and 2, and similar other verses.
in the divine forgiveness is doubtless one of the first roots of Bhakti.'

But this kind of worship dedicated to such a god was arrested in its growth and the prominence given to the other gods like Indra, Agni, Soma, and others intimately associated with sacrifice, adversely affected it. Even then in one of the late hymns of the Ṛgveda (X. 125), the goddess Vāc is made to say, 'I give wealth unto him who gives sacrifice;...I am that through which one eats, breathes, sees and hears;...him that I love I make strong, to be a priest, a seer, a sage.' Eliot remarks about this passage, 'This reads like an ancient preliminary study for the Bhagavadgītā. Like Kṛṣṇa, the deity claims to be in all and like him to reward her votaries.'

In the Upaniṣads, on the other hand, the mental attitude of the thinkers to the one supreme entity, viz., Brahman-Ātman gets a character which is, in no very uncertain manner, reminiscent of Bhakti. The growth and development of monotheism, a direct result of the pantheistic conception of the earlier Upaniṣads, was the certain background on which Bhakti was to develop among the intellectual section of the composite population of India. The impersonal-personal Brahman was no doubt ill-suited to play the rôle of the one god of devotion and the strictly monistic character of some of the earlier Upaniṣadic passages was logically inimical to the ideas of loving faith, still there are many passages in some of them, which are significant. We are told in one of them, 'That Ātman cannot be gained by the Veda, nor by understanding nor by much learning; he whom Ātman chooses, by him the Ātman can be gained; the

2 Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. II, p. 181. He says further, "It is true that the 'Come unto me' (māmekam śaranam vraja) is not distinctly expressed, but it is surely struggling for expression."
Atman chooses him as his own.' Here, even though the idea of faith or love is not distinctly present, yet the positive assertion that Atman selects his own and he cannot be gained by proficiency in the Vedic lore and other things does forcibly remind us of the free grace of the personal god.¹ This again seems to be clear in the Kāthaka passage (II. 20) which speaks of the ability of a person to see the glory of the Atman if he is graced by the creator (if the word dhātuḥ prasādāt in this verse is taken to mean 'by the grace of the creator' and not as Śaṅkara explains it). The Svetāsvatara Upaniṣad (III. 20) which contains much that is theistic in nature contains the same passage with an alteration which, though slight, is material.² It is in this Upaniṣad among the major ones, that we find for the first time the mention of the word Bhakti which occurs in the last verse of the work.³ From this time onward references to it become clearer and clearer and Pāṇini in the several sūtras of his Aṣṭādhyāyī lays down rules for various word-formations in which the etymological sense of the word bhakti, viz., 'resorting to and then loving the thing resorted to with faith and devotion' is the central idea.⁴

¹ Indra says to Pratardana who had asked him for a boon "Know me only; that is what I deem most beneficial to man, that he should know me....He who meditates on me as life and immortality gains his full life in this world and in heaven immortality." Eliot remarks about this passage, 'Though the relation of the devotee to the deity here is purely intellectual and not emotional, still the idea that intellectual devotion directed to a particular deity will be rewarded is clearly present'; Eliot, op. cit., p. 181. But he forgets that Indra here symbolises the highest principle discussed in the early Upaniṣāda.

² The last carana of this verse, viz., dhātuḥ prasādānmahimāna-mātmanah is changed into dhātuḥ prasādānmahimānamiśam.

³ Svet. Up., VI, 23—Yasya deve parā bhaktiryathā deve tathā gurau! Tasyaite kathitā hyarthāḥ prakāśante mahātmanaḥ ||

⁴ IV, 95 ff.
The Upaniṣadic Brahman-Ātman when conceived in personal aspect, especially in the theistic Upaniṣads, is usually called not Deva (god), but Iṣa, Iśāna, Iśvara and latterly Parameśvara. But even then, Śvetāśvatara found it necessary to refer to some personal divine entity like Rudra (also mentioned under other names such as Eka deva, Mahān deva, Maheśvara, Māyī and once even Siva—’ jñātvā śivam sarvabhūteṣu gūḍham ’) who was the recipient of the homage of his devotees. In this work which has not cut itself asunder from the general body of the scheme of the early Upaniṣads (‘beneath the characters of theism are discerned, half obliterated, those of pantheism and under the latter, again, those of idealism.’ Deussen), we are told that the knowledge alone of this one god will break up the fetters of death and nothing will be gained by him by the learning of the Rg verses who does not know him (Yastanna veda kimṛcā kariṣyatī). But evidently such mental attitude of the thinkers, though no doubt it bespeaks a great deal of progress towards the development of cult-religions and sectarianism, was not at all truly sectarian in character. Its natural corollary, however, was the growth of the latter in which the element of Bhakti was the main guiding principle. The gods, centering round whom these cults developed, were not recruited from the orthodox Vedic Pantheon, but from quite a different source. Indra, Prajāpati, Mitra, Varuṇa, Yama, Agni and others could never actually serve the purpose as cult deities, though some attempts were possibly made by those of the Vedic way of thinking to foist one or other of them as rivals to the recognised sectarian gods. But these, if they were ever seriously made, were destined to failure, and in the developed sectarianism of the Epic and Purāṇic periods we find several of the more important Vedic deities such as Indra, Varuṇa, Agni, Vāyu, Yama and one of the less important ones like Nirṛiti relegated to
the comparatively insignificant position of the guardians of quarters (Dikpālas), where the highest purpose they could serve was of a mere accessory character. Some of the Vedic gods, again, like Viṣṇu, Rudra and Śūrya came to be merged in the composite sectarian deities at a subsequent period, and this merger was so complete and so important for the sects themselves, that some of the latter came to be designated, optionally at first, but more constantly at a later period, by the names of the Vedic counterparts of their cult-pictures (cf. the part played by Viṣṇu in the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra cult which came to be described as Vaiṣṇava at a later date). But the originals of the sectarian gods were the actual human heroes like Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devaki (cf. Kṛṣṇa Devaki-putra of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 17), Śākyamuni Gotama and Mahāvīra, or mythological beings like Śiva (Rudra-Śiva), the Yakṣas like Maṇibhadra, Pūrṇabhadra and others, and the goddess Umā-Durgā-Pārvatī-Vindhyavāsini.  

1 Pāṇini in his sūtra Vāsudevārjunābhīyāṇi vunī (IV. 3. 98) most probably refers to two sectaries who were the exclusive worshippers of the apotheosised human heroes like Vāsudeva and Arjuna of whom the former was the more honoured and more important. Patañjali’s commentary on this sūtra fully endorses the view; but what is also very interesting that Patañjali refers to a sect called the ‘Sivabhāgavatas’ or devotees of Śiva, the Holy One, who carried in their hands an iron lance as an emblem of Śiva whom they worshipped’.  

The early Buddhist works on many occasions refer to the various kinds of worship that prevailed in India especially in Central

---

1 In my book on the icons of these syncretic gods, I shall show what elaborate use was made of the descriptions of their Vedic counterparts thus, fully substantiating the hypothesis already referred to regarding the composite culture of the post-Vedic period.

2 Mahābhāṣya, under Pāṇini, V. 2. 76.
and Eastern India at a time when Buddha preached his doctrine. R. G. Bhandarkar quotes a very interesting passage from the *Nīdāsa*, which furnishes us with a curious record of the various religious systems and superstitions that prevailed at the period: ‘The deity of the lay followers of the Ājīvakas is the Ājīvakas, of those of the Niganthas is the Niganthas, of those of the Jaṭīlas is the Jaṭīlas, of those of the Paribbājakas is the Paribbājakas, of those of the Avaruddhakas is the Avaruddhakas, and the deity of those who are devoted to an elephant, a horse, a cow, a dog, a crow, Vāsudeva, Baladeva, Punnabhadda, Manibhadda, Aggi, Nāgas, Supannas, Yakkhas, Asuras, Gandhabbas, Mahārājas, Chanda, Suriya, Inda, Brahmā, Deva, Diśa is the elephant, the horse, the cow, the dog, the crow, Vāsudeva, Baladeva, Punnabhadda, Manibhadda, etc., respectively.’ It will be wrong to suppose that this curious jumble of worshippers of particular objects indicates all of them as separate sectaries; what is worth noting, however, is that here is an authentic presentation of a medley in which the sects of Vāsudeva, Ājīvakas and the Nirgranthas are mixed up with the believers not only in the Vedic gods like Indra, Agni, Candra, Sūrya and others, or with those putting their faith in the efficacy of austerities and asceticism (cf. the Paribbājakas and the Jaṭīlas) but also with the superstitious animists. The last group, however, much they might be deprecated by the polished intellectuals of the day, played no mean a part to mould the beliefs and practices of their more advanced contemporaries. Megas- thenes, as quoted by Arrian mentions that Herakles was the special object of worship of the Sourasenoī, an Indian tribe in whose land were the great cities of Methora and Kleisobora (Mathurā and Kṛṣṇapura) and through which flowed

the river Jobares (Jamunā); this is a confirmation from a foreign source regarding the existence of at least one sectary among the several named above in the fourth century B.C. in the Yamunā region.¹ We shall see later on that archaeological data from the 2nd century B.C. onwards substantially corroborate the above facts.

A somewhat elaborate discussion about the origin and growth of the idea of Bhakti has been found necessary because the solution of the whole problem of the origin of image-worship itself principally depends on it. Some sensible objects were found to be indispensable by the various sectarians who required them as so many visible symbols for the various personal gods to whom they rendered their exclusive homage. The symbols and images in their case analogically did the same sort of service as was done by Fire (Agni) in the Vedic ritualism. Fire was specially sacred to the Vedic priests, because it was the carrier of the sacrificers’ oblations to the respective gods; in the case of a sectary, the image or icon or any such visible symbol of his deity was the handy medium through which he could transfer his one-souled devotion (ekātmikā bhakti) to his god. That was the primary purpose for which they were usually intended, though there is textual evidence regarding their being used secondarily for such purposes as abhicāra, etc. (cf. the ābhicārika mūrtis as described in the Vaikhānasāgama). The rendering of one’s homage was done by various acts of pūjā in which images were absolutely necessary; these were abhigamana or going to the temple of the deity with the speech, the body and the mind centred

¹ McCrindle, Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian, p. 201. R. G. Bhandarkar was the first to identify the tribe of the Sourasenoi with the Sātvatas and Herakles with Vāsudeva. The Greek writers appositely designated Vāsudeva Krṣṇa as Herakles, for both these deities were very probably apotheosised human beings.
on him, upādāna or collecting the materials of worship such as flowers, incense, sandal paste, offerings (naivedya), etc., ījyā or the very act of worshipping the Śrī Vīgra ha (the auspicious body of the lord), svādhyāya or the muttering of the mantra usual to particular cult divinities and lastly yoga or meditation.² The last constituent of the act of pūjā has got special bearing on the history of the evolution of the icons. One author tells us that the image-maker should fashion images in such a manner that they would conduce to the success of the dhyāna-yoga.² Many images are known where the deity himself is shown in the pose of a Yogi immersed in deep meditation (cf. the images of Jīna, Buddha, Yogāsana Viṣṇu, Yogadaksināmūrti of Śiva and others). A notice of a very interesting passage in the Mahābhārata which refers to Nārada’s visit to the Badarikāśrama to see Nara and Nārāyaṇa will not be out of place here. Nārada finds the latter engaged in the act of worshipping; bewildered at this (because Nārāyaṇa was himself an object of worship) Nārada asks him about the latter’s object of devotion. Then the Lord tells him that he is worshipping his original Prakṛti, the source of all that is and that is to be.³ Here we have a textual evidence in support of deities themselves being conceived in

¹ Some of the Mantras special to particular deities are (1) the twelve-syllabled Bhāgavata mantra: Om namaḥ bhāgavate Vāsu-devāya, (2) the five-syllabled Saiva one—Namaḥ Śivāya and (3) the seven-syllabled Sakti mantra—Paramesvari svāhā.

² Sukranitiśāra, Ch. IV., section 4:

Dhyānayogasya saṃsiddhiḥ pratimālakṣavāṃ smrtam ।
Pratimākārako mṛttyo yathā dhyānarato bhavet ॥

³ Mahābhārata, Baṅgavāsī Edition, Śaṅti Parva, Nārāyaṇiya Parvā-dhyāya, ch. 384, verses, 14-45. This passage is a curious amalgam of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga. The entity who is the object of Nara’s and Nārāyaṇa’s devotion is described thus: Yattat sūkṣmamāvīgyaṃa-vyaktamacalaṃ dhruvaṃ । Indriyairindriyārthaś ca sarvabhūtaiśca
the dhyāna-yoga and their images depicted in the very pose had the practical utility of aiding the devotee to concentrate the mind on his god. The importance of such images as well as their connection with the ones that were discovered in the Indus-valley has been elaborately discussed by R. P. Chanda in some of his writings.\(^1\) The true significance and purpose of the image proper of the god must be understood in this light and this is fully emphasised by the passages appearing in such late works as Rāmatāpanīya and Jābāla Upaniṣads and Mahānirvāṇa Tantra, even though some of them deprecate the practice of the persons who offer their bhakti to their gods through these media.\(^2\) But these works are mainly written from the position of those who firmly believed in worshipping the highest principle without the aid of any media (nirākāropāsanā) and the attitude of some of them was strictly non-dualist (Sivamātmani pāsyanti).

\(\text{varjitan} \parallel \text{sa hyantarātmā bhūtānāṁ kṣetrajñāsceti kathyate} \parallel \text{Trī-}
\text{guṇavyatirikto vai puruṣāsceti kalpitā} \parallel \text{Tasmādavyaktamutpānāṁ}
\text{trigūrṇāṁ dvijasattāma} \parallel \text{Avyakta vyaktabhāvastha yā sa prakṛtira-
vyāya} \parallel \text{Tāṁ yonimāvayorviddhī yo’sau sadasaadātmakaḥ} \parallel \text{Abā-
bhyaṁ pūjyate so’hi daive pitrye ca kalpate} \parallel \text{This original}
\text{Prakṛti, we are told further on, was none other than Hari.}

\(^1\) This is ably recounted in one of his latest works, \textit{viz., Medieval Indian Sculptures in the British Museum, Ch. I, pp. 6-10.} He suggests that the ‘sudden rise of the cult of the images of the Yogi in northwestern India (Gandhāra and Mathurā) is only a revival of an old cult of the image of the Yogi once prevalent in that region.’

\(^2\) Cinmayasyādvitiyasya niskalasyāśarirināḥ \parallel \text{Upāsakānāṁ kāryār-
thāṁ Brahmano rūpakalpanā (Rāmatāpanīya Upaniṣad); Sivamātmani pāsyanti pratimāsa
ya yogināḥ} \parallel \text{Ajñānāṁ bhāvanārthāya pratimā pari-
kalpitā} \parallel (Jābāla Upaniṣad) ; \text{Evaṁ guṇānusārena rūpāṇi vīvidhāni,
ca} \parallel \text{Kalpitāni hitārthāya bhaktināmaṁpamedhasām (Mahānirvāṇa}
\text{Tantra). The last-named work, thus, derides the efforts of those who want to attain salvation through this method: ‘Manasā kalpitā mūrti
nṛṇāṁ cemokṣasādhani} \parallel \text{Swapanlabdhena rājyena rājāno mānavās-
tathā} \parallel \text{Mrchilāhadutāvādi-mūrti śvarubuddhayaḥ} \parallel \text{Kliśantarastapā}
\text{jañañāṁ vinā mokṣam na yānti te} \parallel
It will be profitable to compare this view-point about the usefulness of the images with that presented in the works of the Bhāgavatas or the Pāñcarātras. We have already mentioned the significance of such words as vigraha, bera, tanu, rūpa, etc.; these are mostly utilised in such literature replete with sentiments of deep loving faith for the lord Vāsudeva and his principal aspects. This manner of describing euphemistically the images after due consecration as the very bodies or forms of the god is fully emphasised therein by the prescription that the cult picture of the deity was one of his five-fold forms, viz., Para, the highest, the Vyāhas, concerned with the emanatory forms, Vibhava, relating to the incarnatory forms, Antaryāmin, the lord as the inner controller of the individual, and lastly the Arcā, the duly consecrated images. This concept of the image is based on its unique sublimation to the very position of the god-head, the object of deep loving adoration to the devotee. The process presupposes a mental preparation, a studied effort on the part of the worshipper which culminates in the attainment of that frame of mind in which an object fashioned by human hands reaches such an august level. A concept similar to the above is essentially one of the characteristic features of most of the religious cults of India in which the Bhakti element was the main guiding principle. The Ālvārs or the Nāyanārs in the south and the Viṣṇuite or Śivaite saints of the north and the Ācāryas of many of the sectarian religious systems of the early and mediàval periods throughout India were no doubt highly cultured people. But their approach to the deity was different and in it the divine image played a very important part. So, T. A. G. Rao’s observation, “the Hindu śāstras prescribe image worship to weak unevolved persons in particular” should have to be modified before acceptance. It is true that the root idea of image-worship can be traced to animism—but so also can the idea of the immanence of the godhead be traced, yet in its
rationalised and developed form there is very little place for crudity or savagery. It has been remarked that, "In dealing with savage ideas of the inanimate, it must be kept in mind that non-living things are worshipped or feared not in any symbolical sense, which is altogether foreign to the lower intelligence, but as supposed home of a spirit, or as in some sense a vehicle of power." This symbolism is further expressed and emphasised by the very characteristic of endowing the mediæval Indian images with many hands, which has been dubbed as a monstrosity by some scholars. Different explanations have been suggested by different scholars with regard to this feature. Macdonell, for example, suggested that it was the direct outcome of the iconographers' necessity to distinguish the image of one deity from the other, when the earlier mode of doing so by the placing of mounts below them was found inadequate due to the gradual increase of the pantheon. He wanted to substantiate his view by referring to one universal feature of the multi-handed images;—their natural hands are invariably to be found in such action-poses as abhaya, varada, etc., whereas the added hands carried different implements which were, according to him, nothing but differentiating marks. But this statement is not universally applicable. The alternative suggestion that the hands and the āyudhas or implements in them portray the attempts to symbolise, however ineffectively, the multifarious activities of the god, is acceptable. T. A. G. Rao says, 'the images of the Hindu gods and goddesses are representations of the various conceptions

1 Edward Clodd, Animism, p. 78. Italicis are mine.

* J.R.A.S., 1916, pp. 127-8. Refer to A. M. Hocart's article on 'Many-armed Gods' in Acta Orientalia, Vol. VII, 1929, pp. 91 ff. Hocart remarks, 'Evidently theological considerations were paramount in deciding the number of arms, and this is far more in accord with what we know of the Indian mind, than Prof. Macdonell's theory.'
of divine attributes. Sculpturally it may be said, the number of hands in an image represents the number of attributes belonging to the deity, and their nature is denoted by the āyudha held in the hand or by the pose maintained by it.' ¹

A well executed image, if it follows the rules of proportions laid down in the Śilpaśāstras and is pleasing to the eye, invites the deity to reside in it and is particularly auspicious to its worshipper. ² But deities were not always iconically represented; over and above their concrete representations, anthropomorphic and rarely theriomorphic, they could also be figured in aniconic manner. The latter mode is undoubtedly reminiscent of an earlier practice. In India, iconism and aniconism existed side by side from a very early period, and these are also present even in modern times. Buddha could be represented by means of such symbols as the Bodhi tree with Vajrāsana beneath it, his footprints, the stūpa, etc., which are directly associated with him; in the Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikōṇḍā sculptures of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., we find him being depicted iconically and aniconically at the same time, though in the earlier Buddhist art of Central India he used to be represented in the latter manner. Similarly, Brāhmaṇical sectarian deities could as well be worshipped in the Śālagrāmas, the Bāna-liṅgas and the Yantras, as in images; but here, however, their association with the symbols was not so direct. Attempts were not wanting to account for this connection by

¹ T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, Part I, Introduction, p. 27. The weapons or attributes in the case of some at least of the Brahmaṇical images, have also their bases in the anthropomorphic descriptions of their Vedic counterprats.

² Abhirūpyācca vimbānāṇi devaḥ sānnidhyamṛcchati (Haṭabhṛṣṭa pañcarātra). Sukranītisāra, IV. 78 Yathoklatavayavaivaṁ punāḥ punyacā sumonohara! Anyathāyurdhanaharaṁ nityaṁ duḥkhavividattadhini
the creation of mythological stories. The Śālāgrāmas, Bāṇa-liṅgas and Yantras are primarily associated with the Vaiṣṇava, Saiva and Sākta sects respectively. Then, there are various sacred stones scattered over different parts of India which are taken to stand for one or other of the sectarian divinities. It has been shown that rude stone monuments consisting of menhirs, dolmens, cairns, and cromlechs distributed over parts of Europe, Western Asia and India are essentially sepulchral in character. The Indian phalli, especially their early specimens, portray this feature to a very great extent. Many instances are known, in India of ancient and modern times, of stones regarded as aniconic representations of the sectarian divinities. The well known Sākta tradition about the severed limbs of Sati falling in different parts of India and about the latter being regarded as so many pīṭhasṭānas, particularly sacred to the Śakti-worshippers, should be noted in this connection. In modern times, the most important objects of worship in many of these shrines are usually stone blocks covered over with red cloth, which are described as this and that limb of the goddess. It is interesting to observe here that Hiuen Thsang records in his Si-yu-ki some useful details about a great mountain in ancient Gandhāra 'which had a likeness (or image) of Maheśvara's spouse Bhīmādevī of dark-blue stone. According to local accounts this was a natural image of the goddess; it was a great resort of devotees from all parts of India. At the foot of the mountain was a temple to Maheśvara-deva in which the ash-smearing Tirthikas performed much worship.' Watters remarks, 'The image or likeness of Bhīmā-devī here mentioned was apparently a dark-blue rock in the mountain supposed to


have a resemblance to that goddess.'

Watters' observation about the resemblance is immaterial; but, what is of importance here is that we find in it an authentic reference to a svayambhūmūrti of the goddess in the 7th century A.D. Now, these images are principally aniconic stones, and numerous textual references to the self-wrought phalli (Svayambhūlinga) have been quoted by Gopinath Rao in his work (section on Liṅgas). It seems that sometimes, these aniconic objects were held in more veneration than the images fashioned by human hands, for the list supplied by Rao proves that claims were set forth on behalf of man-made Śiva-liṅgas to be regarded as Svayambhū ones. Then there are sacred trees and other objects which were also held in high respect on account of their association with certain spiritual entities, and in the subsequent religious history of India, these were specially associated with one or other of the sectarian divinities. Reference may be made to the high esteem in which the bael and tulasī trees were held by the devotees of Śiva and Viṣṇu respectively and also to the sthala-vrkṣas associated with particular shrines; numismatic data, as I shall show afterwards, seem to prove that more or less similar was the case in much earlier times. The association of the Āsvattha (Ficus Religiosa) with Sākyamuni

1 Watters, 'On Yuan Chhwang,' Vol. I, pp. 221-22. The Bhima devi shrine is evidently identical with the Bhimāsthāna beyond Paṅcananda mentioned in the Mahābhārata, Vanaprastha, Ch. 82, verses 84-85, and probably also with Bhīṣanā of the Mahāmāyūrī text. According to the Mahābhārata, there was a Yoni tirtha, a dip into whose kūṇḍa was regarded as highly auspicious in character. These details are important for the religious history of India, the Yonipīṭha is now at Kāmākhyā, near Gauhati, Assam, and the particular Bhairava of the Devi is Umāṇanda on a rock in the midst of the Brahmaputra near by. In the 7th century A. D. there was a similar shrine in the heart of Gandhāra with the adjacent shrine of the Bhairava (Śiva). For detailed discussions about these cf. my article in Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XIV, 1938, pp. 751-3.
Buddha and that of the various other trees like Puṇḍarīka, Sīra, Paṭali, Nyagrodha and others with his predecessors were not particular to the Buddhist creed alone; these Bodhi trees were the direct descendants of the Caitya Vṛśas (rakkhacetiyāni) of more primitive times. The trees and branches appearing so frequently in the numerous seals discovered in the Indus Valley had most probably some cult significance of this nature.

It is time now to discuss some of the literary data with regard to the prevalence of images in the post-Vedic period. Incidental reference has already been made to one or two among them in the first few pages of the second chapter of this work. But, a collected presentation of some of those as well as several others will be necessary for the better understanding of the theme being discussed here. Pāṇini’s Śūtra, Jīvikārthe Cāpyaye (V. 3. 99) as explained by the later commentators is interesting; it gives us positive information about the concrete representations of deities in the 5th century B.C. But from this cryptic sūtra, we have no idea about the kind of deities whose pratikṛtis were made means of livelihood by a certain class of people. It can justifiably be presumed, however, that these were not the orthodox Vedic gods, but were popular objects of worship like the Yakṣas and the Nāgas; they could also be even of Vāsudeva, Arjuna and the Mahārājas (Kubera, Dhrtarāṣṭra, Viśūdhaka and Virūpākṣa, the guardian deities of the Northern, Eastern, Southern and Western quarters respectively—this is A. C. Coomaraswamy’s interpretation and it seems to be the correct one), because Pāṇini under IV. 3. 95 (Yeśāṁ bhaktiṁ yap) lays down rules for the word formations denoting the bhaktas or the

worshippers of Vāsudeva, Arjuna and the Mahārājās (IV. 3. 98—Vāsudevārjunābhyaṁ vūṇ and IV. 3. 99—Mahārājatṭhaṁ). But Patañjali is much more informative on this matter in his comment on Pāṇini’s above sūtra (V. 3. 99). His bhaṣya reads:—apanyā iti ucyati tatredaṁ na sidhyati | Sivaḥ Skandāḥ Viśākhāḥ iti kiṁ kāraṇam—Mauryairhiranyārthibhirccāḥ prakalpitāḥ | bhavet tāsu na syāt | Yāstu ketāḥ sampratipūjārthāsu bhavisyati || This passage is highly important, because it throws a flood of light on our problem. He mentions a few of the gods, viz., Śiva, Skanda, Viśākha whose images were being made for worship at his time (sampratipūjārthā); again, his assertion that the Mauryas devised the expedient of replenishing their royal coffers by the selling of images (it seems from this that they themselves were not worshippers of images) shows that images were in great demand among their subjects; lastly, it is significant that none of the three gods mentioned above can be described as Vedic in character. Such texts as the Arthaśāstra and the Manusāṃhitā also supply to us some valuable data about the subject. Kautilya, in his chapter on Dūrganivesa (Buildings within the Fort) says ‘In the centre of the city, the apartments of gods such as Aparājita, Apratihata, Jayanta, Vaijayanta, Śiva, Vaiśravaṇa, Āśvi, and the abode of the goddess Madīrā shall be made. In the corners the guardian deities of the ground shall be appropriately set up.’¹ These are evident allusions to the shrines of the above-named gods and it is presumable that the images of the latter were enshrined in them; an analysis of the names shows that only one among

¹ Arthaśāstra, translation by R. Shama Sastri, 2nd edition, p. 69. The translator notes that ‘the worship of the Aśvins and Vaiśravaṇa seems to have been prevalent at the time of this work.’ The original text reads:—Aparājītāpratihatojyantavaiyayantakoṣṭhakān Śivavaiśravaṇāvī śrimadiraghāṃ ca puramadhye kārayet | Koṣṭha- kālayet eva yathoddhāṇaṃ vāstudevataḥ sthāpayet ||
them (or possibly two, if Vaijayanta be taken to be a synonym of Indra), viz., Āśvī (the twin gods Āśvins) is distinctively Vedic in character. Vaiśravana is the same as Kuvera, the lord of the Yakṣas, Jayanta is most probably the same as mentioned in the Āpastamba Grhyasūtra (VII. 20. 3)—Jayanta in this passage had no need to be translated as 'the conqueror' as had been done by Max Müller in the S. B. E. series) already noted in the second chapter; the image of Śiva is referred to in the Mahābhāṣya, here, and probably also in the Āpastamba Gr. Sūtra noted above (Īśāna's image is mentioned there and Īśāna is the name of one of the aspects of Śiva); the goddess Madirā may be the same as Mīdhūṣi mentioned in the latter work and in the same context and translated by Max Müller as 'the bountiful one.'

Kauṭīlya also refers to the figures of the ‘goddesses and altars which were to be carved on wooden door frames of the royal underground chamber’ (Vāsaghram bhūmiṃghram vasannakāśthacaityaadevatāvāidhānam, etc., Kauṭīlya on Niśāntapraṇidhiḥ); these figures had most probably protective utility and acted as sorts of charms, and were not meant for worship. In the chapter on Apasarpapraṇidhiḥ Kauṭīlya refers to the images and flags

1 In the Ap. Gr. S., these three deities, viz., Īśāna, Mīdhūṣi and Jayanta are mentioned together; Haradatta explained them as images of the three gods. Hiranyakasīva, Gr. S., II. 3, 8. in connection with the Śūlagava sacrifice meant for Rudra for averting cattle diseases, furnishes us with the interesting fact that the cow (the consort) of the spit-ox (i.e., the ox to be symbolically sacrificed) and their calf are euphemistically described as Mīdhūṣi and Jayanta respectively; the sacrificer then prays to the three gods, viz., Īśāna, Mīdhūṣi and Jayanta to touch the three beasts. If Mīdhūṣi and Madirā be identical then they both are to be regarded as the consort of Śiva; one of the names of Śiva is Mīdhūṣa and Madirā is one of the synonyms of Durgā-Ambikā.
of the gods (devadhvajapratimābhīrīvā) in the guise of which weapons will be supplied by the spies outside to the spies inside the enemy’s fort; in the same section we are told about the procession of gods (i.e., the images of them—dai-vatapretakāryotsavasamājesu), etc., which would be taken advantage of by the spies in harming the enemy. Very great importance is assigned to the images of the gods in Manusmṛti and these various passages in the work which lay down that daivatam (images of gods) are to be circumambulated (IV, 139), that one should not voluntarily step over the shadow of the gods (IV, 130), at the parvans one should go to the images for protection (IV, 153); again ‘he who destroys a bridge, the flag of a temple (really the votive column in front of it), a pole (really a pillar) or images (saṁkramadhvajayaśtināṁ pratimānāṁ ca bhedaka) shall repair the whole (damages) and pay 500 paññas as fine (IX, 285). Manu gives us another interesting information that though images were highly venerated by the people in general, temple-priests, whose duty was to minister to these idols, were greatly deprecated and they are placed in the same class with the Brāhmaṇas who earned their livelihood by medical practice, selling of meat and trading (Cikitsakāndeśevalakāmnāmsavikrayaṁastathā | Vipaṇena ca jivanti varjyāḥ syurhavyakavyayoh ||, III, 152). The same social stigma attaches to the temple-priests in modern times also; it can be explained by the suggestion that it was so because these people prostituted their bhakti by making it a means of their livelihood. The two texts, viz., Artha-sāstra and Manusmṛti, thus furnish us with some important data regarding the prevalence of image-worship in India of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., if not of an earlier period. The Mahābhārata, in like manner, refers often to the images of the gods, especially in connection with various Tirthas (sacred places).
was an image of Viṣṇu named Sālagrāma in the Puṇḍarīka tīrtha (Sālagrāma iti khyāto Viṣṇuradbhutakarmakah, III, 84, 124); in the Jyeṣṭhila tīrtha were the images of Viśvesvara and his consort (Tatra Viśvesvaram ċṛṣṭvā devyā saha mahādyutim | Mitrāvarṇayar lokānāpnoti puruṣārṣabha || III, 84, 134); these, however, might have been aniconic—the former, a Sālagrāma, and the latter, the phallic emblem of Siva, in which Siva and Umā are symbolically represented. Reference to the image of Nandīśvara is to be found in XIII, 25, 21 (Nandīśvarasya mūrtim tu ċṛṣṭvā mucyate kilviṣaiḥ); in the Mātaṅgāśrama near Dharma-prastha was an image of Dharma, touching whom one would attain spiritual rewards, equivalent to those of an aśvamedha-sacrifice (Dharman tatrābhisamapṛṣyā vājīmedhamaśāvānuyāt, III, 84, 102); an image of Brāhma is probably being referred to in III, 84, 103 (Tato gaccheta rājendra Brahmasthānamananuttanaṃ | Tatrābhirāmya rājendra Brahmānaṃ puruṣārṣabha | Rājasūyāśvamedhābhhyāṃ phalāṃ vindati mānavaḥ ||). Numerous such instances can be quoted from other sections also of the epic literature, but what is of special significance, in this connection, is that the results to be attained by a pious person visiting these tīrthas or worshipping the images therein are often estimated in terms of the fruits attainable by the performance of such Vedic sacrifices as Agniṣṭoma, Jyotiṣṭoma, Aśvamedha, Rājasūya, etc. A careful search among the early literature of the Buddhists and Jainas, also sectaries heterodox from the point of view of a Vedic initiate, throws much light on the form of worship prevalent in this period—in which both iconic as well as aniconic symbols played a great part.

It is interesting to note that Quintus Curtius records that an image of ‘Hercules’ was carried in front of the army of Porus as he advanced against Alexander. Coomaraswamy thinks that this may have been an image of Siva or of a
Yakṣa. The Greek author Stobaeus, flourishing in Circa 500 A.D., quotes a passage from Bardasanes who reports the account of an Indian visiting Syria in the time of Antoninus of Emesa (218-222 A.D.). It contains a striking reference to an image of Ardhanārīśvara (the androgynous composite image of Śiva and Dūrgā; Fergusson, H. I. E. A., p. 54). Hiuen Tshang frequently refers to Brāhmaṇical shrines and sometimes also the images worshipped there by the sectaries, in his Si-yu-hi.

It has been shown above how some of the post-Vedic literature of India furnish us with valuable data regarding the prevalence of concretc representations of gods as the objects of worship in India during a few centuries before and after the Christian era. It may be argued that all these passages do not definitely prove that actual images were being worshipped, but they only refer to the aniconic symbols that might have served the purpose as well. Archaeological data now will help us to throw fresh light on this question, and a careful study of these, divisible into three groups, viz., epigraphic, monumental and numismatic, will show that in India of the pre-Christian and early post-Christian period, worship was being conducted by the various sectaries among her people, through the media both iconic and aniconic in character. In some cases, the data supply us with direct evidence while in others with indirect. Before a reference is made to a few inscriptions associated with one particular sect, it will be of interest to refer to the interpretation of one or two passages of Aśoka’s edicts, which have been taken by some scholars as alluding to the representations of divine figures. In the first part of the

1 A. C. Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 42, fn. 5. But ‘Hercules’ in this passage may also have meant Kṛṣṇa; we have seen above that Heracles’ name is mentioned in connection with the Saurasenas and Mathura by Megasthenes. Dionysios is the Greek counterpart of Śiva.
Fourth Rock Edict of Asoka, occurs a passage which has been translated by Hultsch as follows:—"showing the people representations of aerial chariots, representations of elephants, masses of fire and other divine figures." (Vimānadarsanā ca hastidasanā ca agikhamdhāni ca añāni ca divyāni rūpāni dasayitpā janam). He suggests that the figures of elephants stood for the celestial elephants, the usual vehicles of the four Mahārājas or Lokapālas, mentioned above; agikhamdhāni, according to him, may be taken in the sense of radiant beings of another world and divyāni rūpāni (identical in sense with deva in the Rupnath edict, E) means the gods in effigie (i.e., the images of the gods). By exhibition of these objects in large gatherings of his subjects (these samājas were considered meritorious by Asoka), Asoka desired to remind them of the gods whose abodes they would be able to reach by the zealous practice of dhamma. These divine images and other representations had merely edificatory value and were not objects of regular worship in shrines.

Certain pre-Christian epigraphic records, however, like the Ghosunḍi and the Besnagar ones refer to Bhāgavata shrines. The former discovered on the wall of a bāoli (deep masonry well) in the village of Ghosunḍi, originally hailed from Nāgarī, 4 miles to the S. W. of it, in the Udaypur State, in Rajputana; Nāgarī has been correctly identified with ancient Madhyamikā on the basis of numismatic evidence. Further discoveries of two other copies of the same record (the last made as recently as 1934-35 by the Government Epigraphist) have enabled D. R. Bhandarkar to present to us a complete reading of the three line inscription which runs thus:—

(1) Kāritoṣamī rājñā Bhāgavatena Gājāyanena Pārāśarī putreṇas-Sa

(2) rvatātena Asvamedha-yājīnā bhagava (d) bhyām Saṃkarṣaṇa-Vāsudevābhyyām

(3) anihatābhyyām sarveśvarabhyyām pūjāsilāprākāro Nārāyaṇavāṭīkā. It has been translated by him as follows:—

(This) enclosing wall round the stone (object) of worship, called Nārāyaṇa-vāṭīkā (compound) for the divinitics Saṃkarṣaṇa-Vāsudeva who are unconquered and are lords of all (has been caused to be made) by (the king) Sarvatāta, a Gājāyana and son of (a lady) of the Parāsara-gotra, who is a devotee of Bhagavat (Viṣṇu) and has performed an Asvamedha sacrifice.’

Here is an undoubted reference to a shrine of the two gods round which a stone enclosure was built in the 1st century B.C. (that is the date assigned by Bhandarkar to the records, though previous opinion was to place them somewhat earlier); but we are not certain about the nature of the objects which were enshrined there.

J. C. Ghosh suggested that these were two sālagrāma stones (pūjā-sīlā) corresponding to the varieties of Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva as laid down in the Agni Purāṇa. Bhandarkar is justified in criticising this view and in his interpretation of pūjā-sīlā-prākāra; but his own suggestion that the objects enshrined were ‘the footprints of the two brother gods carved in stone’ on the basis of his discovery in the western part of the wall at Hāthibāḍā (Nāgarī) of the inscription Śrī-Viṣṇu-pādābhyyāṇi in characters of the 7th century A.D. is also not very convincing. In course of his excavations at Nāgarī, he found in the western half of the Hāthi-bāḍā enclosure the remains of a brick platform which ran from east to west; he says there is no evidence of any superstructure on it, which fact also led him to arrive at the above conclusion. The superstructure may have been a wooden one, as he himself suggests, or even made of brick, all traces of which may have disappeared in course of time.

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXII, p. 204.
A shrine was thus most presumably on the spot and it is extremely probable that the objects of worship there were the two images of the gods. We shall presently see that there were other archaeological data which conclusively prove the existence of figure sculptures of the gods in this period. The above inscription also incidentally shows the composite character of the religious practice of the higher section of the Indians; the king Sarvatāta, belonging to the Bhāgavata creed and erecting the enclosure round the shrine of his chosen gods, had already performed the Vedic Āsvamedha sacrifice (cf. the practice of the imperial Guptas). The well-known Kambaba pillar inscription at Besnagar of the 2nd century B.C. records the erection of a Garuḍa-dhvaja in honour of devadeva Vāsudeva by 'Bhāgavata Heliodora (Heliodoros), son of Diya (Dion) and an inhabitant of Taxila, who came as an ambassador from the Greek king Antialkidas to king Kāsīputra Bhāgabhadra of Vidiśā.' It can very well be presumed that this Garuḍa column was erected in front of the shrine of Vāsudeva who was to this Greek convert to Bhāgavatism, the God of the gods, the chosen one; the name Garuḍa also shows that by this time, the association of the sectarian god Vāsudeva with the Vedic Viṣṇu (cf. my previous observations about Sun conceived as the bird Garutman and Viṣṇu as one of the Ādityas) had already been established. That there was a shrine (or were shrines) of Vāsudeva at Besnagar is proved by the other fragmentary inscription on the shaft of another octagonal Garuḍa column found in a narrow street of Bhilsa, evidently hailing from Besnagar; it records that 'this Garuḍa column of the excellent temple of the Bhagavat was erected by Gautamiputra..., a Bhāgavata, in the 12th year after the installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata' (Gotamiputena bhāgavatena...Bhagavato prāśādottamasa Garuḍadhvajā kārito dvādaśavasābhīṣite....Bhāgavate ma). So, there cannot be any doubt with regard to the existence of the shrines
of Bhagavat before which these votive columns were erected (this was also a common custom in the mediaeval period and is still pursued). In these excellent temples (uttama prāśāda) must have been enshrined objects of worship which were most presumably images. A few of the seven Brāhmī inscriptions from Mathura and its vicinity, recently edited by H. Lüders in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXIV, have special bearing on the subject at issue (some of these inscriptions were previously edited, but Lüders has suggested improved readings for them). The Mora Well Inscription of the time of Mahākṣatrapa Rajuvula’s son Swami (Mahākṣa- trapa Soṇāsa) records the establishment of the images of the holy pañcavīras of the Vṛṣṇis in the stone shrine...; these images are called ‘five objects of adoration made of stone radiant, as it were, with highest beauty...’ The part of the original, translated here, reads—‘(i) Mahākṣatrapasa Rājuvula- lasa putrasya svāmi...(ii) bhagavatāṁ vṛṣvināṁ pañcavīrānāṁ pratināṁ sailadevagri...(iv) ārcadeśāṁ sailāṁ pañca jvalata iva paramavapusā...........’. Here, we find the use of the words pratinā and ārcā used to denote the stone images of the five Vṛṣṇi heroes, who have been tentatively identified by Lüders with the ‘five great heroes’ (Baladevapūmokkhā pañca mahāvīrā) of the Jain canonical list, viz., Baladeva, Akrūra, Anādhṛṣṭi, Śārāṇa and Viduratha.’ Lüders even suggests that the images of three male persons actually found at Mora, probably of a considerably earlier date than the Kushan period are three of the five statues whose installation is recorded in the inscription.1 The second inscrip-

1 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXIV, pp. 104 ff. Reading the second line as Bhagavoṭa Vṛṣṇeḥ pañcavīrānāṁ pratināḥ, R. P. Chanda understood ‘the line as referring not only to the images of the five Pāṇḍavas but also to an image of the blessed or divine Vṛṣṇi, i.e., of Krishna-Vāsudeva, who belonged to the Vṛṣṇi branch of the Yādava tribe.’ The inscribed stone slab was, according to him, ‘one of the pavement slabs of a big temple in which the images of Krishna
tion of a very fragmentary character, which has been edited by Lüders in this series, belong to the time of Kanishka; it contains the only legible words in the third line *Toṣāye patimā* interpreted by him as an image of Toṣā, perhaps the same as Toṣā of the other record just referred to (line three of which reads—*yas-Toṣāyāḥ sailam śrīmadṛhamatulam-udadhasamadhāra*); he tentatively suggests that this image of Toṣā which is certainly about a century later than the first inscription, was erected by some one of her descendants at her shrine (*cf.* line 3 of the 1st inscription just quoted) as an act of posthumous honour, about a hundred years after her death.¹ If Lüders' interpretation of the inscribed statue is accepted, then we have here a further epigraphic as well as a monumental evidence regarding the erection of secular statues which were objects of honour; reference has already been made by me to the Mat statue of the Kushan king Vima Kadphises in a previous chapter. Inscriptions Nos. V and VI, edited by Lüders, further strengthen the view that the custom of erecting portrait statues was much in vogue among the foreign chiefs at Mathura during the Kushan period; the former incised on the pedestal of an image from Ganeshra refers to the image of the great general Ulāna (*Mahadamḍanāyakasya.....Ulānasya paṭimā*) while the latter alludes to...*rnasya pratiṃā*. The last inscription in this list, found incised on the door-jamb from Mathura and at first edited by R. P. Chanda in the *M.A.S.I.*, No. 5, pp. 168-73 and plates XXV-XXVI, also fragmentary in character, records the gift of a *toraṇa*, *vedikā* (railing) and a third object (restored by Chanda as *Catuḥśālam*; Lüders, however, suggests *devakulam* or *sailam*) in the

and the five Pāṇḍava brothers were enshrined.' R. P. Chanda, *Archaeology and Vaishnava Tradition*, *M.A.S.I.*, No. 5, pp. 166-67.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 200-02. He has recourse to this explanation for there is absolutely nothing to show that the statue was meant for a goddess or a Yakṣī or a Nāga woman. 
Mahāsthāna (a large temple or sanctuary, Lüders) of Bhagavat Vāsudeva, during the time of Mahākṣatrapa Soḍāsa. Lüders suggests the possibility of this inscribed door-jamb originally belonging to the Bhagavata sanctuary referred to in the Mora well inscription; if we assume with him that the temple mentioned in the Mathura door-jamb record was enlarged or embellished during the reign of Soḍāsa by a person, a Hindu high official in the service of the Mahākṣatrapa (the treasurer of Soḍāsa mentioned in the inscription No. 82 in Lüders' list of Brāhmi inscriptions was a Brāhmaṇa), then it further increases the age of the Vāsudeva shrine in the locality. The Mora well record also, as we have seen above, refers to the Vāsudeva shrine there having been adorned with the images of the Pañcavīras of the Vṛṣṇis. It will be needless to collect further epigraphic data at this stage to prove convincingly the existence of shrines, erected by various sectaries not only Brāhmaṇical but also Buddhist and Jain in the centuries just preceding the Christian era and succeeding it and it is not presumptuous to contend that many, if not all, had divine images enshrined in them. Thus, here we find a remarkable corroboration from this branch of archaeology about the nature of the far-reaching changes which were being introduced in the religious practice of the Indians.

Several monuments of the pre-Christian and early post-Christian periods furnish us with valuable data regarding our subject. From the so-called Vedic Śmaśāna mound at Lauriya Nandangarh excavated by T. Bloch long ago, was found among other objects a very small gold-leaf with the figure of a female carved on it. Bloch described it as a representation of the Vedic Earth goddess (Prthivi) to whose care were assigned the remains of the dead by his relations. He ascribed a great antiquity to these remains; but recent criticism as well as excavations conducted by the archaeological department at the locality have disproved
certain conclusions of the earlier archaeologist. I have already referred to the interpretation of the gold plaque by Coomaraswamy and if we accept his suggestion, then it seems to have been some sort of a cult object. Reference may also be made here to the unique gold plaque in the collection of R. K. Jalan of Patna; K. P. Jayaswal recognised in the two figures—one male and other female—standing side by side, the two cult deities Hara and Pārvatī. He was of opinion that it ought to be dated in the Maurya period.¹ Several of the animal figures carved on the capitals of the Aśokan columns have been taken by some scholars to stand for gods in animal form; a suggestion has been made that the figures of the elephant, bull, lion and horse appearing on the abacus of the Sarnath lion capital represent the cult gods in theriomorphic forms.² It is not certain whether this suggestion is correct; if it is so then they are not objects of worship in their present setting, their rôle having been changed from that of the worshipped to the one of the worshippers. It has been shown what use was made by Aśoka of the divine figures (divyāni rūpāni) in inculcating the law of dhamma among his subjects; the devas in animal forms are particularly associated with the wheel which symbolises the wheel of Law (Dharmacakra). But certain other well-known figures, the free-standing statues, some of them belonging to the Maurya or the Sūṅga period as their technique and the polish attaching to them show, were undoubtedly

² According to T. Bloch these four figures symbolise the divinities Indra, Siva, Dūrgā and Sūrya whose vāhanas these animals are, indicating their subordination to the Buddha and his Law; Z.D.M.G., LXII, 1908, pp. 653-6. B. Majumdar thinks that they represent the four principal events of Buddha’s life; A Guide to Sarnath, p. 81. Bell found these animals carved on some moonstones in Ceylon and on certain pillars at Anuradhapura; Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, 1896, p. 16,
venerated by a large section of the Indian people. The inscriptions on the back of the two Patna statues, exhibited in the Indian Museum, are difficult for correct decipherment; attempts by Jayaswal to read the names of two Śaiśunāga kings, Udayī and Nandivardhana, were not upheld by many scholars and few now accept his interpretation of the above two and of another inscribed one from Parkham. The inscription on the latter statue is also fragmentary and very difficult for correct reading; but the character of these three as well as some other uninscribed ones like the Besnagar and the Didarganj female figures and the head and torso of a colossal sculpture, all fully in the round, has been disclosed by the clear inscription on the pedestal of another similar statue of a slightly later date (1st century B.C.), which was discovered by M. B. Garde at Pawāyā, in Gwalior State, Central India. There cannot be any doubt that all the above figures, both male and female, belong to the same category and if we can find a clue to the identity of one among them, the others will also be identified with its help. The part of the inscription on the Pawāyā sculpture, which is the required clue, reads: ‘Gauṣṭhyā Māṇibhadrabhaktā garbhasukhitāḥ Bhagavato Māṇibhadrasya pratimā pratiṣṭhāpayantu’ (the image of Bhagavān Māṇibhadra is being established by the guild of the worshippers of Māṇibhadra). Certain Buddhist and Jaina texts clearly lay down that Māṇibhadra was the name of a Yakṣa; Samyutta Nikāya (I, 10, 4), for example, refers to the Maṇimālā Caitya in Magadha as the haunt of the Yakṣa Māṇibhadra; and ‘the Sūrya Prajñapati, an ancient Jaina text, tells us that a Māṇibhadra Caitya stood to the north-east of the city named Mithilā, the ancient capital of Tirhut.’

1 R. P. Chanda, M.A.S.I., No. 30, p. 7. He further informs us ‘In the Vedic literature, the term Yakṣa does not occur as the name
us the names of the tutelary divinities of particular cities and places of India, Purṇabhadra and Maṇibhadra, two brother Yakṣas are described as the particular objects of worship in Brahmavatī.¹ Maṇibhadra in the above inscription is distinctly described as Bhagavat which shows that he was an object of worship; it has already been shown above that an early Buddhist text, viz., the Nīdesa commentary refers to the worshippers of Purṇabhadra and Maṇibhadra among other deities. The name Kunika, unanimously read by scholars on the pedestal of the Parkham sculpture, has also been found on the so-called statue of Manasā Devī at Mathura, which is described in the inscription as Yakṣī Lāyāva, whose image was made for the sons of Sa, by Nāka, pupil of Kunika.² The last-named Mathura image is probably to be of a class of superhuman beings and Kuvera Vaiśravaṇa (the king of the Yakṣas according to the Buddhist and post-Vedic Brāhmaṇic literature) is the king of the Rakṣas.' But Coomaraswamy says that the word occurs several times in the Rgveda, Atharvaveda, the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads; in these early allusions, a dual attitude is recognisable one of fear and dislike, the other of respect. The first reflected merely an Aryan dislike and distrust of aboriginal deities, while the second from the association of the idea of the tree of life, presents in certain Vedic passages, with the Yakṣas who are primarily vegetation spirits, guardians of the vegetative source of life; Yakṣas, Pt. II, p. 1-2.

¹ Journal Asiatique, 1915, Mahāmāyūrī, edited with introduction and notes by Sylvain Lévi, p. 38. Maṇibhadro Brahmavatyaṁ Purṇabhadraśca bhrālara. The location of Brahmavatī is unknown. Lévi suggests that the city might have been in the region of Varnu and Gandhāra.

² The pedestal inscription was read and interpreted by R. P. Chanda in A.S.I.A.R., 1922-23, p. 165. If this reading is correct, then both Nāka and Kunika appear to be the names of two early Indian sculptors, like Amrita and Indranilamaṇi, two Gauḍian sculptors of the mediaeval period; the latter will be referred to again in Chapter V of this book.
dated in the Maurya or in the early Sunga period. Coomaraswamy refers to another Yakṣa figure found at Deoriya, also of the same age in his *Origin of the Buddha Image*, Boston Museum Art Bulletin, 1927, pl. 4, fig. 47. The fact, however, that some of these Yakṣa statues (one of the male ones from Patna in the Indian Museum and the Didarganj Yakṣinī) hold *chaurīs* (fly-whisks) in one of their hands has led R. P. Chanda to conclude that all of them ‘were evidently intended for decorative purposes’ and were originally attached to *Caitya* trees or *stūpas* (ibid., p. 37). He wants to substantiate his view with a reference to the ‘disposition of the images of the Yakṣas, Nāgas and Devatas on the railing of the *stūpa* of Bharhat and on the old railing round the Bodhi tree at Bodh-Gaya.’ But this conclusion can hardly be accepted; to think of these huge stone figures, in the round, as mere accessories, when we find Maṇibhadra being described as Bhagabat and when we see that these divinities, ardently worshipped by their *bhaktas*, are given the roles of accessories only in the Buddhist monuments, where they themselves are the worshippers of the Master, is unjustified. The Deoriya figure wears a turban and is sheltered by an umbrella; Coomaraswamy does not exclude the possibility of its being a royal statue. But so striking an affinity exists among these sculptures, that there can be very little doubt about their all being regarded as Yakṣas, who were the cult deities of a large section of the Indians. The yak-tail is not perhaps a distinctive mark of secondary rank in these early statues; it became so in much later reliefs connected with the cults recognised by the orthodox section, where it is placed in the hands of some of the accessory figures of the central cult image. Among the various auspicious signs mentioned in the Jaina *Kalpa-sūtra*, yak-tail is one, and it is sometimes regarded as an attribute of a Cakravartin. The Maṇibhadra statue also seems to have held a yak-tail in its right hand,
while the water or nectar vessel in its left hand is a common attribute placed in the hands of many cult deities like Śiva and the future Buddha Maitreya. Coomaraswamy has amassed a wealth of textual evidence in support of their intimate association with the element of bhakti and pūjā in Indian religion.⁠¹️ He has also collected a number of texts containing references to the shrines and temples of the Yakṣas, the former sometimes meaning no more than a sacred tree or a tree with an altar while the latter referring to structural buildings with images enshrined in them. He rightly observes that the existence of image (and Yakṣa images are few of the oldest known images in India) in every case implies the existence of temples and a cult; as regards the Maṇibbadra figure he remarks that 'this must have been housed in some kind of structure.'²

The Yakṣas and Yakṣinīs that are represented and labelled with identificatory inscriptions by the artists of Bharhut are Supavāsa, Virūḍhaka, Gaṅgīta, Sūcīloma, Kupira (Kuvera), Ajakālako, Sudasanā and Cadā; the devatās that can be recognised there with the help of the inscriptions are Sirimā, Culakokā (Kṣudrakokā) and Mahākokā; we can also definitely identify with the artists’ aid the Nāga king Elāpatra (Erakaṭptra) in his two forms, first as a serpent and secondly as a human being with serpent hoods attached to the back of his head. B. M. Barua has collected mythological stories from the Pāli Buddhist literature referring to the particular occasions when one or other of the above had come in contact with the Buddha and received his blessings.³ In the other early Buddhist monuments like Sanchi and Bodh Gaya, we find many of these figures, though they cannot be clearly distinguished in the absence of descriptive

³ B. M. Barua, Bharhut, Vol. II, pp. 57-74
labels by their side. The Hellenistic artists of Gandhāra, in the approved Buddhist tradition, do not fail to portray elaborately the same class of figures in the numerous reliefs that decorated the various sections of the stūpas and vihāras. The frequency with which they appear in these monuments, though here in a secondary position, does not fail to impress one about the hold which they had on the religious lives of the people. Several Nāga figures, snake coils and hood attached to the back of their human bodies, are in the collection of the Mathura Museum. The inscribed life-size statue from Chhargāon (C. 13. in the Museum) of the time of Huviṣhka (40th year), standing in a spirited attitude with his right hand raised above the head, shows that this object of worship was installed 'at their own tank by two friends Senahasti and Bhonuka for the propitiation of the worshipful Nāga (Priyattī Bhagavā Nāgo).’ The Sculpture No. C. 28 in the same Museum representing a corpulent male and a female figure seated to front side by side has an inscription in Brāhmi characters of the Kushana period, which reads Priyati Sidha (ḥ) (May the Siddha be pleased).1 Relief No. C. 8. and Sculpture No. C. 12 there, regarded as similar to the above by Vögel and iconographically akin to Kuvera and his consort (in No. C. 12 the female is shown with a child on her left knee) may properly be described as Siddhas, a class of worshipful beings, the denizens of the antarīkṣa region, belonging to the category of the Gandharvas, Vidyādhāras, Kinnaras, etc., also represented in early and later art. All the various images just mentioned are mostly those of the gods that are described in the early Jaina literature as vyantarā devalās, i.e., 'intermediate gods' (are they also intermediaries in a sense between the mortals and the new formed higher sectarian

gods the objects of their worship?). The images of the early Vedic divinities are few and far between—in early Buddhist art Sakra and Brahmā are no doubt introduced as accessories, but their independent figures as objects of worship (bhagavat) are not likely to be found; iconic representations of the new-formed sectarian gods like Vāsudeva and Śiva are also rare in the early period.

The above-mentioned data collected from a somewhat summary study of the extant early Indian monuments lend support to the view that the higher section of Indo-Aryans, at the time we are speaking of they have become for all intents and purposes Indians, owed their inception to this practice of making images and worshipping them, to their culture contact with the lower mass of the people and the earlier settlers of India. The evidence of the early Buddhist monuments like Bharhut and Sanchi fully proves that when the higher sectarian god Buddha was not being represented in an iconic form, these folk gods and goddesses were being iconically represented. I shall presently show with the aid of numismatic data that the deities belonging to the orthodox Brāhmaṇical sectaries like Śiva and Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu seem to have already come to be iconically represented in the 1st and 2nd centuries B. C. if not earlier. The iconic representations of these cult-objects, however, was probably a direct outcome of the gradual incorporation of most or all of the lower divinities in the ever-expanding Brāhmaṇic pantheon and their association with and absorption into particular cults. The Kāliya-damāna episode in the mythology of the Vāsudeva sect should be profitably

---

1 For some details regarding the Vidyādharā motif in early Indian art, refer to my article on 'Vidyādharā' in J.I.S.O.A., Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 52ff. Lüders has recently published a long article on 'Vidyādares in Indian Art and Mythology,' in Z.D.M.G., 1988. The article is full of interesting information.
compared in this connection. The other stories connected with this cult, such as the killing of the ass demon Dhenuka, the bull demon Arisṭa, the horse demon Keśin and the destruction of the twin Arjuna trees occurring in the post-Christian Bhāgavata literature and illustrated in art as early as the 4th century A.D. (if not earlier), perhaps portray the mythologists’ attempts to refer to the subjugation of some of the lower cults by the higher one which was soon to be accepted as authoritative by the orthodox Vedic section of the people. Coomarasmway has collected plastic evidence to show how the iconography of the lower gods influenced the same of the higher cult deities; his remark in this connection is worth quoting: ‘In early Indian art, so far as cult images are concerned, one iconographic type stands out predominant, that is the standing figure with the right hand raised, the left on the hip... Of this type are the early images of Yakṣas, and Yakṣīs whether independent or attendant. And it is also this type which provided the model for the cult images of other deities, such as Śiva or Buddha, when the necessities of Bhakti determined the appearance of all deities in visible forms.’

1 We have already seen the etiology of the Yogi motif of some of the cult-images; here, we get a clue to the origin of the other mode. Vögel has also rightly observed ‘modern idols of Baladeva manufactured here are exact copies of the ancient Nāga figures.’

2 It may be added that in ancient and mediaeval times also, images of Baladeva (Samkarṣana, the elder brother of Vāsudeva) were directly copied from the hybrid Nāga figures and this iconographic association has led to the creation of the confused myth that he was an incarnation of the world-snake Ananta Nāga or Śeṣa Nāga.

1 A. C. Coomarasmway, Yakṣas, Part I, p. 29.
2 J. Ph. Vögel, op. cit., p. 89.
It will not be out of place here to put in a few words about a practice which is intimately associated with that of worshipping images in shrines. This is the custom of the erection of the dhvajas or votive columns in honour of various sectarian deities like Vásudeva-Viṣṇu, Saṃkarsana, Pradyumna, Kubera, Skanda Mahāsena and others, before their temples. These dhvajas remind us not only of the memorial columns, one of whose early prototypes was the wooden sthūna of the Vedic burial mounds, but also of the Yūpastambhas which were erected by kings and noble men of yore in commemoration of their performance of the various Vedic sacrifices. The Garuḍadhvaja that was discovered at Besnagar has already been referred to. But it will be of interest to note here that two other capitals of columns, whose shafts have unfortunately not been discovered, are shaped one as a tāla (fan palm) and the other as a makara (crocodile) and there can be no doubt that these, when they were whole, served as the votive

---

1 For Vedic sthūna cf. R.V., X. 18, 13. For the Yūpastambhas, refer to Mahābhārata, III, 198, V. 10; I, 94, V. 28-29; Raghuvamśa, VI, 86; Isapur stone one with a Brāhmi inscription of the time of Vāsbiṣka, the successor of Kanishka, in the year 24 of the Kushan era, J. Ph. Vögel, op. cit., p. 189; three recently discovered stone Yūpas at Badva in Kotah State (Rajputana) of the Kṛta year 295, E.I., XXIII, p. 42 ff. and pls; the Bijaygadh sacrificial post (yūpa) with an inscription of the Kṛta year 428, Fleet, C.I.I., III, p. 253. Reference may also be made to the Aśokan columns; they are really Sāsanastambhas (cf. the word Sāsanastamba used in the Motupalli pillar inscription of Ganapatideva, E.I., XII, pp. 195-97), but are described as 'Silāthambhas' in the edict; it is interesting to note that Aśoka in directly refers to the existing custom of erecting free standing stone pillars in India, cf. Rupnath Rock edict, lines 4-5. The erection of Indradhvajas, usually wooden ones, specially associated with royalty, is frequently referred to in the epic and purānic literature; the Bṛhatāṣṭhaṁhitā devotes a whole chapter on Indradhvaja lakṣyam.
columns dedicated to the two vyāhas, viz., Saṃkarṣaṇa and Pradyumna (the former is Tāladvajā and the latter Makara-ketana) of the Bhāgavata or the Pāñcarātra cult.\(^1\) D. R. Bhandarkar's suggestion that the makara, itself the pinnacle of the capital, was originally surmounted by a crowning piece, another garuḍa capital discovered at Besnagar, is *a priori* unlikely; for the discovery of the separate tāla, garuḍa and makara capitals proves the probability of all the three of the four vyāhas, viz., Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha having been enshrined in the locality. The two small holes behind the eyes of the makara, which led Bhandarkar to make that suggestion, were probably meant for the insertion of painted banners or flags. It is very likely that the Besnagar site contained also a shrine of Aniruddha, which had within its precincts a ṛṣyaḥvajā (ṛṣya is a white antelope), ṛṣya being his special lāṅcchana; unfortunately no such dhvajā has been discovered at Besnagar or in its environs. The capital of a stone column shaped like a cluster of palmyra leaves to be dated approximately in the 1st century B.C., discovered by Garde at Pawaya in Gwalior State, curiously enough substantiates the old practice of erecting tāladvajas, in honour of Saṃkarṣaṇa.\(^2\) Reference ought to be made in this connection to the capital of a stone column, in the form of 'a banyan tree represented as a Kalpa-vṛkṣa, yielding abundance, enclosed by a plaited rail and rising from a square railed base' which was discovered by Cunningham at Besnagar. Bags and vases overflowing with coins are shown beneath the branches of the tree; a conch-shell and a lotus flower 'similarly exuding coins found on the other side of the tree,' have correctly been identified by Coomaraswamy with the two of the 'nidhis'\

\(^1\) A.S.I.A.R., 1913-14, pp. 188-91, pl. LIII and LIV.
of Kubera, *viz.*, *Saṅkha* and *Padma*. This banyan capital which is usually dated in the 3rd century B. C. must have been originally placed on the top of a column standing in front of a shrine of Kubera-Vaiśravana, whose special cognisance was a bag or a vase full of coins.¹ Not very long ago were discovered some interesting stone objects at Lala Bhagat, a small village in the Dehrapur Tehsil of the

¹ Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*, Pt. II, p. 72, pl. 1. The original is in the Indian Museum, Calcutta; I have counted the number of objects coming in a downpour as it were from the Kalpadruma and have found in all there are 8 such:—a conch-shell, a lotus, two vases all exuding coins and four more or less similar bags or purses, their necks tied round by strings, the idea being that they are also containing treasures. Coomaraswamy enumerates 9 treasures of Kubera, *viz.*, *Padma*, *Mahāpadma*, *Saṅkha*, *Makara*, *Kacchapa*, *Mukunda*, *Nanda*, *Nila* and *Kharva* which are nearly water-symbols according to him. But the list is not the same in all the texts; the above list does partially agree with the one quoted in the *Sabḍakalpadruma* from Hārāvali, the names of the last three being put in as *Kunda*, *Nila* and *Varcca*. *Kunda* seems to be a mistake for *Nanda* and *Varcca* or *Kharva* are evidently later additions; for the same lexicon quotes from Bhārata—"*Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇe tu varcca iti hitvā aśāveva uktāḥ:—Padmini nāma yā vidyā Lakṣmīṃśa-yādhidevatā | Tadādhūrāsca nidhayastān me nigadataḥ śṛṇu || Tatra Padmamahāpadnān laihā mukarakacchāpān | Mukun-danilānandāsca śaṅkhascaivaśāstamo nidhi || Satyāmṛddhyām bhavantyete sadbhiḥ saha bhavantyamī || Ete hyaśātu samākhyaṁātā nidhayāstavā kroṣṭuke ||"

So we see there is no uniformity about the number and we can suggest that the eight objects descending from the banyan capital symbolise the *aśāṇidhis* of Kubera. Mediaeval representations of Jambhala, the Buddhist counterpart of Kubera show the god seated on a couch beneath which is a row of *eight* coin jars, on the upturned one of which exuding coins, the god’s right leg rests; one of his hands holds a mongoose vomiting jewels; the purse is the usual cognisance of the Brāhmaṇical Kubera. The number of coin jars beneath the seat of Jambhala should be noted in this connection.
Çawnpore district, U.P.; these consisted of a red sandstone cock carved in the round and a broken red sandstone pillar square below and octagonal above.¹ The latter bears among other figures the one of Gaja-Lakṣmī flanked by a pilaster emerging from a pot resting on the head of a Yakṣa and crowned by a cock; the stone cock must have originally served as the capital of a column, perhaps the very column whose carved shaft was found some distance from it, as it still bears a tenon projecting from its bottom. The cock as well as the peacock is the particular emblem of Kārttikeya and is especially associated with various aspects of the deity; thus on the coins of the Kushana emperor Huvishka, Mahāśena and Skanda, two of the different aspects of the same god are shown holding in their hands standards surmounted by a bird which is presumably a cock or a peacock.² Skanda Kārttikeya is described in the texts as Barhiketu (Skanda Kumārarūpāḥ saktidharo barhiketuṣca, Bhṛhat Samhitā ch. 57), and so there can be no doubt that these Lāla Bhagat finds are connected with the cult of Kārttikeya whose shrine existed somewhere near their provenance in the 2nd century A.D. On one class of the Yaudheya coins, Skanda appears accompanied by a peacock and on the peacock type coins of Kumāragupta I, he rides on the bird. Some mediæval sculptures of this god are known, where a cock is placed in his hand. The Viṣṇudharmottara enjoins that kukkuṭa and ṣhaṇṭā should be placed in his right hand, while vaijayanti patākā and śakti in his left. The Mahābhārata associates cock with him (Tvam kriḍase

¹ A.S.I.A.R., 1929-30, pp. 132-33, pl. XXXI. The objects are to be dated in the 2nd century A.D. and not B.C. as wrongly put down by M.S. Vats; the editor of the Report corrects the mistake. The inscription on the face of the pillar reads: —Kumāra vara........., in characters of the 2nd century A.D.

² Gardner, B. M. C. G. S. I., pp. 138, i49, pl. XXVII, 16, and XXVIII, 22. See pl. IX, figs., 7, 8.
sanmukha kukkuṭena yatheṣṭa nānāvidha kāmanarūpi, III. 281, 16). One other interesting fact worth noticing about the pillar fragment is that the prominence given to the figure of Sūrya among the carvings on its side supports the suggestion of some writers that Kārttikeya had some solar connection; Skanda is sometimes regarded as one of the attendant divinities of the sun god in some iconographic texts where he is both named as Daṇḍa and Skanda (cf. T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, Part II, pp. 303-04, where he quotes from Viśvakarmā-śilpa and Bhavisya Purāṇa).

The Numismatic data are so very interesting and important especially for determining the early types of Brāhmaṇical deities and they have been so little systematically treated that I have reserved a separate chapter for discussing them.

¹ These points were raised and discussed by me in fuller details in an article on ‘Indian Votive and Memorial columns’, published in J. I. S. O. A., Coomaraswamy Volume, pp. 13-20.
CHAPTER IV

BRAHMANICAL DIVINITIES AND THEIR EMBLEMS ON EARLY INDIAN COINS

An iconic tradition of the early Indo-Aryans supported by the evidence of the earliest Indian coins (punch-marked and cast)—explanation of the symbols appearing on them, somewhat conjectural in character—symbols and devices on tribal coins admit of surer interpretation—Yāga on coins—Lakṣmī on the coins of indigenous and foreign rulers of India—her different types.—Appearance of sectarian gods on early coins—Siva in animal form—his emblems—Siva in human form on Ujjain coins—on some coins of the Indo-Scythian, Indo-Parthian and Kushan kings—A unique representation of Siva on a coin of Huvishka.—Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu, rare on early coins—on those of the Pāncāla Viṣṇunātra and on a Kushan seal—a few of his emblems probably recognisable on some coins—Godesses other than Lakṣmī on some indigenous and foreign coins of India—Uma on Huvishka’s coins—Sūrya not anthropomorphically represented on early indigenous coins—his early forms: Spoked wheel lotus, rayed disc on altar, etc.—and Subrahmanya, Skanda Kumāra, Viśūkha and Mahāsena on coins—Indra—Agni—Yaksas and Nāgas on Indian coins—Some general remarks on the above representations—Contemporary art conditions how far reflected by the above coin-devices.

The way in which the ancient Indian coins and seals can be utilised for the study of Indian iconography has already been indicated in the first chapter. The value of the earliest Indian coins in this respect has also been briefly assayed.¹ The one substantial fact which is supplied to us by them, if we accept the view sponsored by

¹ For a somewhat detailed discussion about the significance of some of the symbols appearing on them, refer to Coomaraswamy, H.I.I.A., pp. 43-45. D.B. Spooner at first suggested that many of the symbols were particularly Buddhist in character, the so-called solar symbol stood for Dharma-Cakra, the tree, for Bodhi tree, etc., A.S.I.A.R., 1905-06, pp. 151 ff. But later he discarded this view in favour of second one, viz., that many of them were Zoroastrian in nature; thus, the solar symbol stood for Mithra, the tree for haoma tree, etc., J.R.A.S., 1915 pp. 411-18. D. R. Bhandarkar supposed that
several scholars that many of the symbols are religious in character, is that they fully corroborate the conclusion already arrived at with the help of textual and monumental evidence with regard to the earlier aniconic tradition of a large section of the Indians. Even when iconism had come to be accepted by the majority of the Indian people, they continued the earlier practice. Some of the animals appearing on them may stand for theriomorphic representations of deities while others on mountain symbols, three; five or six arched ones, may also have some cult significance; the wheel, lotus and rayed disc may well be accepted as depicting the Sun god; the tree within railing may stand for vīksa caityas or sthala-vīksas; we find even a human figure holding a staff and a vase in his two hands, depicted almost in the same manner as on the coins of Ujjainī where we can justifiably identify it as Śiva; the three-arched mountain symbol with a crescent above it may typify the aniconic representation of the same god (he is sometimes described as triśrīṅga parvata, cf. many of these can be explained as the various ways of representing the seven jewels (saptā ratnāni, such as hasti, aśva, ratha, mani, stri, grhapatī and parināyaka), the insignia of an Indian Cakravartin empowered to strike coins, A.S.I.A.R., 1913-14, p. 211. Durgā Prasad has recently tried to explain the significance of these symbols with the help of some late texts and has suggested that most of these are Tantric in character, thus describing the circular cluster of dots as vindumandala, a variant of the so-called Taxila symbol as śaḍara cakra, etc., J.A.S.B., 1934, Numismatic Supplement No. XLV, pp. 16-55. J. Allan in his latest publication—Catalogue of Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum—has justifiably refrained from putting forth any suggestion about their character and has gone to the length of drawing most of these for referring to them in his description. P. N. Bhattacharyya in his Memoir (of the Archaeological Survey of India, (No. 62) on a hoard of silver punch-marked coins from Purnea, has very carefully noted the multifarious symbols and their variants appearing on them; he also has not attempted to explain any of the marks.
Coomaraswamy, O. Z., 1927-28, p. 179) with the lunar crescent on his crest, Śaśāṅkaśekhara (Pl. I, figs. 1-4); some others again as the second from the top on the left column of page 300 of Allan’s Catalogue may be taken to depict schematically a garuḍa or a makara dheaja. But all these suggestions are by their very nature, conjectural in character and no certainty can be arrived at, in the present state of our knowledge. It seems, however, there is a great resemblance between some of them and others appearing on the pictographic seals of the Indus Valley, and if we can ever recognise the exact significance of the latter, then more light may be thrown on the former. But this uncertainty and hesitation disappear to a very great extent when we take up the study of the local and tribal coins. Some at least of the figures appearing on them can be explained with much greater confidence and when this is done it will appear that these are associated with particular religious practices or cults. Thus, the bull standing before a symbol (Pl. II, fig. 2) differently represented (Allan, op. cit., p. 307, Nos. 3—6) on the earliest coins of the Ārjunāyanas and the Yaudheyas (collectively to be dated in the 2nd—3rd century B.C.) may very well represent the bull before the yūpa, i.e., the sacrificial post. Allan has offered two suggestions for the symbol—a linga or a yūpa, the latter of which is acceptable. He has noticed this symbol on the reverse of one round copper coin of Viṣṇumitra, collected by Prinsep from Kanauj; he correctly remarks that, ‘The reverse has a horse apparently before a sacrificial post (yūpa) and may commemorate an aśvamedha sacrifice.’ One can compare the representation of this

1 J. Allan, Op. cit., pp. XCV, 147, Pl. XIX, 13. An elaborate form of the same symbol appears on the Aśvamedha type coins of the Gupta emperors, Samudragupta and Kumāragupta I. I have referred to this symbol, though it does not represent an icon, for showing how Vedic ceremonial religious practice is being portrayed by a few at least of these tribal coins. In my paper on Devices on some tribal coins,
Vedic yūpa with figures appearing on some other early coins in the tribal series, which were certainly based on plastic types and which were also cult objects. Stone yūpas belonging to the third century A.D. have been discovered at Badva, Kotah state, Rajputana; their shape, supports my contention to a great extent (for some symbols appearing on punch marked, local, tribal and other coins of ancient India, refer to Plates I and II).

One of the earliest devices, frequently found on tribal coins, is Gaja-Lakṣmī, i.e., Lakṣmī standing (rarely seated), being bathed by two elephants (Foucher recognises in it, the nativity scene of the Buddha). It appears on an uninscribed coin from Kausāmbi (3rd century B.C.), coins of Viśākha-deva, Sivadatta and probably also of Vāyudeva of Ayodhyā (1st century B.C.) and uninscribed coins of Ujjayinī (2nd-3rd century B.C.); nay such was the popularity of this device that many alien rulers of northern India like Azilises, Rajuvula and Sodasa adopted it on their coins.¹

¹ J. Allan, *Op. cit.*, pp. 131-4, 149, 187, 190-1, 256 and corresponding plates; R. B. Whitehead, *Punjab Museum Catalogue*, Vol. I., p. 135, Pl. XIII, fig. 333. The reverse device of some copper coins of Maues and Azes (*P.M.C.*, Vol. I., pp. 100-101, 122; *B.M.C.*, pp. 70-71, 89) has been described as a ‘female figure standing to front between trees’; Whitehead says that it may be a Bacchante among vines, while Gardner asks whether it may be a Maenad standing between two vines. Coomaraswamy in his article on Early Indian Iconography (*Eastern Art*, Vol. I, p. 178) refers to three varieties of Lakṣmī, the third one described by him being Padmavāsini, Kamalālayā type, in which she is surrounded by flowering stems and growing leaves, and very often she holds one of the flowering stems in each hand. The above coin device of Maues and Azes (*cf. Pl. VII, fig. 2*) may be a Hellenised version of the 3rd variety of Lakṣmī. Coomaraswamy
(Pl. VII, fig. I). Relief carvings illustrating this motif are found on the early monuments of Central India; here is a close approximation of the numismatic and sculptural representations. The motif, as it typifies the Indian idea of prosperity, frequently appears on coins and sculptures of later day and is still portrayed by the Hindus. Goddess Lakṣmī again, without the attendant elephants, either seated on a full-blossomed lotus or standing with a lotus flower in her hand, or standing on a lotus with the same flower in her hand, very often appears on the coins of Ujjayini, on those of the Hindu kings like Brahmamitra, Drḍhamitra, Sūryamitra, Viṣṇumitra, Puruṣadatta, Uttamadatta, Balabhūti, Rāmadatta and Kāmadatta of Mathura, on the coins of the Satraps of Mathura like Sivadatta, Hagamasa, Rajuvula and Sodasa, on the coins of the Rājanya Janapada and on the coins of Bhadrarghosa of Pāñcāla.¹ The so-called ‘dancing girl wearing long hanging ear-rings and oriental trousers’ on the coins of the Indo-Greek kings Pantaleon and Agathokles, dubbed as ‘a strictly Hindu type’ by Gardner, has been recognised by Coomaraswamy in his article on ‘Early Indian Iconography’ as Śrī-Lakṣmī, with a great deal of justification. I myself hesitatingly suggested that the female figure on the

illustrates the motif as represented in the early Indian art of Central India, and the similarity is very striking.

¹ J. Allan, op. cit., pp., 252, 259-67, 270-71, 273-84, 210-12, 279-97 and corresponding plates. The figure of the goddess on the Mathura coins was sometimes wrongly identified as that of Kṛṣṇa, Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, p. 526. For a detailed study of the early iconography of Śrī-Lakṣmī on the basis of textual, monumental and numismatic data, refer to A. C. Coomaraswamy’s article on ‘The Early Indian Iconography, in Eastern Art, Vol. I, pp. 175ff. The coins which are noticed above can collectively be dated from the 2nd century B.C. to the 1st century A.D. Some of these figures however, may also stand for Durgā-Gaurī, as will be shown later on.
above coin with a very long equine head may stand for Yakṣinī Aśvamukhī (Pl. VII, fig. 3). ¹ The city deity of Puṣkalāvatī on the unique Indo-Scythian gold coin described by Gardner (B.M.C., p. 162) may very well be identified as Lakṣmī with a lotus in her hand, as has been suggested by Coomaraswamy in the above article. It may be argued that the numismatic and sculptural representations of Lakṣmī do not prove much with regard to the iconic representations of deities associated with different Brahmanical cults like those of Śiva and Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu, because, Lakṣmī, as the Indian goddess of wealth and prosperity, was respected by the Indians in general. But here also early Indian coins do not fail us. The appearance of the cult-gods on them may not be as frequent as that of this particular goddess, but their figures are undoubtedly met with. The reason of the comparative infrequency is obvious; Lakṣmī could very appositely be used by the issuers of coins (units of wealth), to whatever creed they might belong; but such could not usually be the case with the sectarian gods or goddesses.

With regard to the representation of Buddha and Śiva on the coins, the following observation of Coomaraswamy is worth noticing, ‘In Buddhist art, we find at Bharhut and Sanchi the tree, wheel, etc., on or behind an altar, clearly designated in the inscriptions as Buddha (Bhagavato) and worshipped as such... Later on the figure of a human teacher takes its place upon the throne, the old symbols being retained as specific designations... In the same way with Hindu types; thus we find at first the humped bull alone, then a two-armed, and finally a four-armed figure accompanying the bull, once the representative of the deity, now his vehicle, while other

symbols are held in the hands as attributes.'\(^1\) As regards Buddha, no certain representation of him appears on coins before the time of Kanishka; the seated figure on certain coins of Kadaphes cannot be definitely recognised as Buddha on account of the hammer-like object placed in his raised right hand, while those seated figures on certain copper coins of Maues and a few hailing from Ujjaytin are of uncertain character (cf. Coomaraswamy, _The origin of Buddha Image._\(^2\) In the case of Siva, it is true, there cannot be much doubt in identifying the bull appearing on many indigenous coins as well as on those of the alien rulers of India as representing him theriomorphically. Thus, the humped bull, represented on the reverse side of the unique gold coin of an uncertain Indo-Scythic king, bearing legends in Greek and Kharoṣṭhī script, _Tauros_ and _Uṣabhe_ (Vṛṣabha), most presumably stands for Siva; this reminds us of the same device appearing on the coins of the white Hun ruler Mihira gula with the legend _jayatu vṛṣah_ in the script of the period.\(^3\) But, as it has been shown above that the bull before a particular symbol on certain coins may also have represented the sacrificial bull.

Before I pass on to the anthropomorphic figures of Siva on early indigenous and foreign coins, I shall refer to a symbol which appears on an uninscribed cast coin, (provenance unknown). It seems to be a somewhat realistic representation of the _lingam_. If the interpretation of this symbol is correct, then we have here an emblem intimately connected with Siva-worship. In fact, Allan

---


2. The seated figure on the coins of Kadaphes may stand for Siva; the head seems to bear on it a _krobylos_ (jaṭāmukūla), but the object in the raised right hand is not distinct.

has definitely described it as 'liṅgam on square pedestal'; the tree in railing on left of the same coin may stand for the sthala-vr̥ksa in association with the particular Saiva emblem. Allan thus describes its obverse: 'Building(?) on 1.; tree in centre; on r. female figure to 1.' There can be no doubt about the inter-relation of many of these symbols appearing on such types of coins and on the basis of Allan's description as supported by his plates, one is tempted to find in the obverse and reverse devices of this coin, the cult object, the sacred tree associated with it, the shrine (?) as well as the votary all together (Pl. I, figs. 14-15). Though Allan has not named another symbol appearing on the obverse of two square copper coins probably to be attributed to Taxila, its very appearance seems to connect it with the other one just described, the pedestal here being somewhat summarily represented (Pl. I, fig. 9). But liṅgams with or without elaborate pedestals are known to have existed in ancient times (for example, the Guḍimallam Liṅga, one of the earliest one, rises abruptly from the floor of the shrine); in fact, in the early specimens the latter mode was usually followed. Now, the reverse of these coins has a hill with trees growing from its two sides and an honorific parasol like emblem on the top. Here again, these symbols, taken together seem unmistakably to point to their cult connection. A Śivaliṅga on a pedestal placed between two different trees in side railings is also represented on the obverse of var. c of class I coins hailing from Ujjain. As for the association of the tree with the phallic emblem of Śiva reference may be made to the terracotta seal in the collection of Dhir Singh Nahar, having on it a Śivaliṅga with subdued realism, described as Pādapeśvara in

1 J. Allan, op. cit., p. 85, No. 2, Pl. XI, 2; P. 238, Nos. 154 and 154a, Pl. XXXV. 5 and P. 248, No. 19, Pl. XXXVI, 15.
Gupta characters. Even now many of the important Śivaliṅgas worshipped in India have their particular trees; the celebrated Ap-liṅga of Jambukeśvara near Srirangam and the tradition associated with it should be noted here. Numerous textual references can be cited to show Śiva’s connection with hills and mountains; notice should be taken here, however, of the extremely realistic phallic emblems of Śiva shown above or beside a hill exactly in the manner in which the latter symbol is drawn on the Taxila coins, and inscribed in Brāhmī characters of the Gupta Period, on some Terracotta seals from Bhita (A. S. I. A. R., 1911-12, p. 46, Nos. 15 and 16; Pl. X, fig. 4). The three coins noted above can with some confidence be dated in the 2nd-3rd century B.C., if not earlier. Coomaraswamy remarked with regard to the symbols on punch marked coins, before the publication of Allan’s Catalogue that the ‘marks which we might expect, but which are not found, include the liṅgam etc.’ (H. I. I. A., p. 45). If the above suggestion is accepted and there is every reason to accept it, we find here perhaps the earliest representation of phalli on some local or tribal coins of the historical period (for the phallic emblems of Śiva on an Ujjain coin, see Pl. 1, fig. 10).

A few other symbols appearing on the indigenous as well as the foreign coins of India must have to be interpreted as so many Saivic emblems. The reverse side of the coins of the Pāṇcāla king Rudragupta bears a device which has been described by Allan as ‘railing with three pillars above; uncertain objects at top of each.’ Two of these coins are illustrated on Plate XXVII (Nos. 1 and 2) of his book; the reverse of No. 2, I think, discloses the identity of this device. The central object is a trident (trīśūla) placed inside a railing and the side ones are pillars similar to the two shown on either side of Agni standing over a basement on the coins of Pāṇcāla Agnimitra. The associa-
tion of the issuer's name Rudramitra with the well-known attribute of Rudra-Siva will have to be noted here. In fact, Allan in his Introduction (p. CXVIII-CXIX) puts forth the same suggestion; he writes, 'Rudragupta has on his reverse a trident between two pillars (e.g., Pl. XXVII, 2), the emblem of Rudra-Siva. On other coins (e.g., Pl. XXVII, 1) the object appears to be a star or a kind of double trident with prongs below as well as above.' If we compare the central object with the same on the reverse of a coin doubtfully attributed to Taxila we find that both of them are identical. The latter has been described by Allan as 'Tree in centre; standing figure on either side' (op. cit., p. 237, No. 2, Pl. XLV, 1); but there are only three prongs and these are placed on the top of the long staff issuing out of a basement. The two figures on either side of this enshrined Triśūla emblem may simply represent the votaries before the object of their devotion. The central object on the obverse of the next coin reproduced in Allan's Plate XLV may show a tree as several branches issue out of the central stem; whatever may be its significance, it is also an object of worship. But this time it is so possibly to other gods; one in his animal form; cf. Allan's description of the whole device—'Tree in railing in centre; on left, figure on elephant to right; on right, lion right with a solar symbol above; at top the hill with crescent, the taurine, swastika and an uncertain object' (p. 237). It can be suggested that some sacred tree associated probably with Siva is being shown here as an object of veneration. Cunningham describes the reverse of a coin of the Pāṇcāla Dhruvamitra as 'Trident on basement of Buddhist railing' and remarks 'Dhruva is the north Polar Star, but as it is also a name of Siva, I conclude that the trident refers to him' (C., C.A.I., p. 81, Pl. VII, fig. 3). Allan, however, writes about the same device, 'The object in question, which stands on a platform in the position usually occupied by the deity bet-
ween two pillars with cross-bars at top is, however, not a trident. On No. 53 (Pl. XXVII, 5) it looks like a battle-axe, but on No. 55 (Pl. XXVII, 6) and others the shaft is clearly bent. It must be a symbol of Dhruva, the pole-star' (cxviii). I am not sure about the nature of the device from the respective plates, but even if it be a battle-axe at all, then that would also connect the symbol with Siva; its being a particular emblem of the polar star, however, should not also be discounted, especially with regard to the coin No. 55. In any case, I shall presently show how the combined trident-battle-axe was sometimes used by itself as the obverse or reverse device on coins. Mention may be made in this connection of a symbol appearing on some of the uninscribed cast coins described by Allan in the pages (87-91) of his book; (Pl. I, fig. 5). When observed along with the above devices, it is highly probable that it represents as played trident with broad flattened prongs, issuing out of a railing which contains also two parasol-like objects on its two sides (a comparison with the side parasols of railings enclosing Bodhi-tree and other Buddhist symbols, as represented in Bodh Gaya and Amarāvati reliefs is suggested). The combined trident and battle-axe placed before the tree in enclosure on the reverse sides of the Audumbara chief Dharaghoṣa should be noted here (Allan, op. cit., p. 124, Pl. XIV, 14). This combined symbol with undoubted Saiva association appears on the obverse of Wema Kadphises’ coins, where the king, a Māheśvara by faith, puts offerings in honour of his deity on the sacrificial fire (Whitehead, P.M.C., Vol. I, Pl. XVII, 36). The same symbol is present on the coins of Vāsudeva and Vāsu; when Samudragupta issued some of his gold coins in evident imitation of the late Kushan money, he had to replace the trident-battle-axe standard of the prototypes of his coins with the Garuḍa emblem sacred to Viṣṇu, as he was a Parama-bhāgavata (a devout Bhāgavata or
a Vaishnava). The replacement of the hill symbol with crescent above, possibly a Shaiva emblem, with Vasudeva-Vishnu's Garuda, by Chandragupta II in his silver issues struck in imitation of the silver coins of the Western Satraps after he had overthrown them, may also be explained in the same manner.

Siva appears for the first time in an anthropomorphic form on the many coins hailing from Ujjain and its environs. The single standing figure on many of these coins can be definitely identified with him. Cunningham was not certain about its identification; but the attributes in the hands, viz., a staff—not a sun standard, as he described it, for the solar symbol does not seem to be joined to the staff—in the right and vase in the left clearly disclose the identity (Pl. I, fig. 7). Any doubt whatsoever is set at rest by the testimony of another variety of the same series of coins which shows a bull slightly prancing up and looking up at the deity (cf. the Matsyapurana passage which enjoins that Vishakha the mount of Siva should be in the attitude of looking up at the god, devavikshanataparak; Pl. I, fig. 13). Moreover, the three headed standing figure on the obverse of a third variety of the Ujjain coins, carrying the identical attributes further strengthens my hypothesis (Pl. I, fig. 8). Cunningham, no doubt, identified the latter as Mahakala, but his statement that 'this coin may be accepted as a single evidence of Brahmanism at Ujjain' is unjustifiable. Allan is in doubt about the identity of this figure; he proposes that this figure and its variants may stand for both the deities, viz., Siva Mahakala and Skanda Karttikeya (in the body of the Catalogue, however, he invariably describes them as Karttikeya or simply as deity). The three heads of the figure on some Ujjain coins have been taken by him to partially represent the six heads of the latter divinity. But we have six-headed figures of Karttikeya in indigenous coins
and three-headed Śiva figures are known from Kushan coins.¹ On the obverse of the Audumbara chief Dharaghoṣa’s silver coins, we find the figure of Viśpamitra (Viśvāmitra) as described by the Kharoṣṭhī legend across the figure; but on the reverse there occur two symbols which are intimately associated with Śiva, viz., combined trident-battle-axe on a pedestal and a tree within railing. What is further of interest in the case of the copper coins of the Audumbara chiefs, Śivadāsa, Rudradāsa and Dharaghoṣa, is that they almost invariably bear on their reverse sides the representations of structural shrines (‘domed pavilions,’ Coomaraswamy, and two-storied domed stūpa, Allan) with the trident-battle-axe standards almost invariably placed before them (Pl. I, figs. 16-17). The latter unmistakably prove that the structures are not stūpas, but Śaiva shrines which must have contained images or phallic emblems of Śiva. The coins can be dated in the 2nd-1st centuries B.C. On certain copper coins of the second century A.D. issued by an anonymous ruler of most probably the Kuninda tribe, we find the standing figure of Śiva, holding in his right hand a trident-battle-axe, his left hand from which hangs some thing (? tiger skin) resting on hip; his head is adorned with jatās arranged in the jatābhāra manner, as we find the same arranged on that of Śiva carved on the shaft of the Śiva-liṅga at Guḍimallam; on some specimens, however, he seems to be standing under an umbrella (Pl. I, fig. 21.). The legend on these coins reads ‘ Bhagavata Chatresvara mahātmanalḥ,’ i.e., of the

¹ Cunningham, C. A. I., pp. 97-9, pl. x, figs. 1-6; Allan, op. cit. Introduction, pp. cxxiii, 245-52. The object in the right hand of the figure is invariably described by Allan as spear, but it is nothing but a staff or a standard; the spear in the right hand of the definitely recognisable Kārttikeya on several varieties of the Yaudheya coins can rightly be distinguished from the staff above.
holy or worshipful one, the noble-souled lord of the Chatra (one of the Indian insignia of sovereignty). ¹

Among the coins of the early foreign rulers of India, Siva has been recognised on certain billon coins of Gondophares. He stands facing with his left leg slightly advanced and head bent a little towards the left, clasping a long trident in his right hand and a palm-branch in his left which rests in the approved Indian iconographic manner on the hip (kaṭiḥasta). Faint traces of jaṭā are to be found on his head. E. J. Rapson described another variety of the deity with his right hand extended and a trident in his left hand (J.R.A.S., 1900, pp. 285-6). Figure 9 in Pl. XXII of Gardner's Catalogue shows this second variety of Siva on Gondophares coins. The stance of the god in this type is exactly similar to the one of Siva (undoubtedly so) on some gold coins of Wema Kadphises, where the deity is depicted without his mount, though there is a little difference in the placing of attributes (Pl. I, fig. 19). Thus, the object held in the right hand of the latter figure is not simply trident but trident-battle-axe combined (as in the Kuniṇḍa coin noted above) and the object hanging down from the left arm is the skin garment, the palm branch being absent. But the extreme similarity of the slightly bent pose of the body, just suggestive of the dvibhaṅga, is a very important consideration and the possibility of

¹ For the above Audumbara and Kuniṇḍa coins, refer to Allan, op. cit., pp. 122-25 & plates; pp. 167-68 & plates. Does this class of Kuniṇḍa coins show that the tribal state of the Kuniṇḍas at one time was dedicated to the Lord Siva in the 2nd century A. D., and the coins were issued in his name in the capacity of its sovereign ruler (the title Chatreśvara is significant)? We can cite a modern analogy; the real ruler of the Travancore state is Lord Padmanābha and the ruling chief acts as his substitute. In mediæval times, the Kingdom of Mewar was also sometimes dedicated to the Lord Ekliṅgaji, its patron deity.
its being the Greek deity Poseidon because that god too has a trident as his attribute and the palm-branch is a Greek insignia, can be discounted. In the other variety noticed by Rapson the palm-branch is absent. The epithet devavrata applied to Gondophares on most of his coins may be significant; it is likely that deva here does not simply mean 'god' but means the god Siva as in several passages of Hiuen-Tsang's Si-yu-ki (cf. his statement, 'Outside the west gate of the city of Puṣkalāvatī was a Deva-temple and a marvel-working image of the Deva; ' Watters, On Yuan Chwang, I, p. 214). Considering all these facts one must be careful about accepting Tarn's statement that Siva 'does not appear in person on coins till those of the Kushans.'

On a round copper seal discovered at Sirkap in the year 1914-15, Siva appears with trident in left hand and club in right; it is bисcriptual, bearing the legend 'Śivarākṣitasa' in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī characters of the early first century A.D. The standing pose of the figure is slightly dissimilar to that of the same god on the coins of Gondophares and Wema Kadphises just discussed; the left leg is placed in the same manner but the right one with the bent knee is stretched forward. But the club on the right hand is specially noteworthy, because it greatly resembles the knotted club in the hands of Herakles appearing on some Indo-Greek coins. The treatment of the whole figure is undoubtedly Hellenistic, though the subject itself and part of the motif is purely Indian (cf. the loin cloth and the turban on the head; Pl. VIII, fig. 3).

1 W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 402. For the above coins of Gondophares and Wema Kadphises, cf. Whitehead, op.cit., p. 151, Pl. XV, Fig. 43 and p. 183, Pl. XVII, Fig. 33. Tarn evidently was unaware of the presence of Siva in his personal form in much earlier indigenous coins of Ujjain, just noticed.

2 Sten Konow, C. I. L., Vol. II, p. 102. Pl. XX, 11. The name of the owner of the seal, Śivarākṣita, is interesting; it means one
The same god appears on the obverse of some square copper coins of Maues. The type on the British Museum specimen has been described by Gardner as ‘male figure 1., chlamys flying behind; holds club and trident’ (B.M.C., p. 71, Pl. XVII, 3); but Whitehead describes it on a Punjab Museum specimen of the same variety of Maues’ coin as ‘male deity striding to l. with flowing draperies, holding club in r. hand and long spear or sceptre in l.’ (P.M.C., Vol. I, p. 101, Pl. X, 25). A comparison of the plates in the two catalogues will show that both the specimens belong to the same variety of Maues’ square copper coins and Gardner’s description, though short, is quite correct. In fact, the peculiar knotted club in the right hand and the trident held over the left shoulder in the left and the particular stride leave no doubt that the god is identical to the one on the seal of Sivaraksita, where the very name. ‘One protected by Siva,’ shows that the god is Siva. Thus, this is an undoubted representation of Siva on a coin of Maues and we can now say that Siva makes his appearance on some coins of alien rulers of India, much earlier than those of Gondophares (Pl. VIII, fig. 1). Attention may be drawn in this connection to the obverse of Maues’ coin (No. 13 in Cunningham’s Coins of the Indo-Scythians, p. 30, Pl. II, Fig. 13) which has been described by Cunningham as ‘Male figure to front, with elephant goad over l. shoulder’; elephant goad as an attribute of Siva appears on the coins of Kanishka and Huwishka and it is very probable that this particular figure also represents Siva (Pl. VIII, fig. 2). ‘Those figures on Maues’ coins which carry only a trident in their hands and sometimes trample protected by Siva, i.e., Siva was his patron deity. On this analogy, the name Terambi-pāla, referred to in the end of the first Chapter may mean ‘one protected by Terambi.’ Terambi or Terambā may be the feminine form of Tryamba or Tryambaka, a name of Siva.
on a dwarfish figure are to be identified as Poseidon, as he appears on certain coins of Antimachus Theos. But the composition reminds us of the Indian one in which Śiva tramples on Apasmāra-Puruṣa. The bronze seal No. 12, unearthed at Sirkap, Taxila, is described by Marshall in *A.S.I.A.R.*, 1914-15, p. 33, Pl. XXIV, 50, as Herakles trampling down a bull-shaped dragon; the Kharoṣṭhī legend in it was tentatively read by him as *Tidusa Vibhumitrasa* (?). Konow definitely reads it as *Baṭusa Viṣpamitrasa* and translates it as ‘Of the Young Brahman Viśvāmitra’ (*C.I.I.*, Vol. II, p. 102). Does this figure represent Śiva as Viśvāmitra (cf. the Audumbara coin noticed above), the name of the person in this seal being after the name of the god reproduced? The bull below the left leg of the principal figure is significant (Pl. VIII, fig. 4).

The most noteworthy representations of Śiva, however especially from the iconographic point of view, are those that appear on the Kushan money, the coins of Wema Kadphises, Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva. It is not merely the feature of the multiplication of Śiva’s hands and heads that is interesting, but the varying nature of the attributes placed in the hands of Śiva is also of great iconographic interest. In the earliest of the Śiva figures in this series, *viz.*, those on the coins of Wema Kadphises, the god is invariably two-handed, the right hand, almost without exception, holds a trident or a trident-battle-axe, while the left one hanging downwards carries a water-vessel, with the skin upper-garment slung round the forearm; the last feature strongly reminds us of the same in the figure of Viśvāmitra on Dharaghosa’s silver coins noticed above and the representation of standing Herakles on the coins of certain Indo-Greek rulers like Demetrius (cf. also the figure of Herakles on some coins of Huvishka; (Pl. I, fig. 18). The treatment of the *jatā* differs in individual specimens, two modes being discernible, one
where the matted locks are gathered together ending in a knob just on the centre of the head, while in the other mode, beneath that is shown a convex-shaped object, which may be the hair treated in a fashion similar to that on the head of Śiva in the Chatreśvara coin of the Kuniṇḍas. On one copper coin of Wema Kadphises, again, reproduced in Cunningham's *Coins of the Indo-Scythians and Kushans* (Plate XV, Fig. 11), the deity seems to be poly-cephalous; Cunningham has, however, described the figure simply as Śiva. In the coins of Kanishka and Huvishka the iconography of Śiva acquires a new orientation, and both the two-handed and the four-handed figures are found with a variety of attributes reminiscent of the varied iconography of later days. Śiva here almost invariably appears without his mount and when he is two-armed, he carries a trident in the right hand and a gourd in the left (Whitehead suggests the possibility of the latter's being a human head, but that is unlikely). On some copper coins of Kanishka in the Indian Museum, Śiva grasps a spear or a staff with right hand while his left hand rests on a club. On several types of gold and copper coins of Kanishka the god is four-armed and is shown wearing a garland or necklace, but different sets of attributes appear on different specimens; on one set of Kanishka's and Huvishka's coins are found in the upper right hand vājra (small hand-drum according to Cunningham and Whitehead; but the object closely resembles the thunderbolt which is held by Vajrapāṇi the attendant of Buddha in Gandhāra art), in lower right, a water-vessel with mouth downwards (an unusual way of holding it), in upper left hand a trident and in lower left an antelope (Pl. VIII, fig. 6). On some specimens of this series we find elephant-goad along with the water-vessel in the lower right hand; this mode of crowding two attributes in one hand is uncommon in the representations of the Indian deities. Again, four-armed
Siva on certain copper coins of the same ruler holds noose in lower right hand, while the lower left sometimes is empty, but at other times resting on hip or hanging down, it holds a water vessel, the other attributes being similar to the above. Some gold coins of Huvishka show three-faced and four-armed Siva, having water-vessel, thunderbolt, trident and club respectively in the four hands from the lower right upwards (Pl. IX, fig. 1); on other gold coins of the same king Siva appears as one-faced with more or less the same attributes, an antelope being placed in the lower left hand; but such is the imperfect state of preservation of many of his copper coins, that the attributes held by the hands of Siva are seldom fully discernible. Huvishka’s gold coin described by Gardner in P. 148 of his book (Pl. XXVIII, 16) has a type of Siva figure on the reverse, which is of outstanding interest from iconographic point of view. His description is as follows, ‘Siva facing, three headed, nimbate; clad only in waist band, ithyphallic; has four arms and hands, in which are goat, wheel, trident, and thunderbolt’ (Pl. IX, fig. 2). Trisula, vajra and cakra are recognisable in the front left, back left and back right hands respectively; the goat or antelope in the front right is not so very distinct. There are undoubtedly three-heads all encircled by a halo sometimes absent round the heads of the varieties of deities; whether however the faces are all human is not quite clear. The cakra in one of the hands and the urddhaliṅga feature, the latter so common in sculptural representations of Siva from the late Kushan period onwards, are noteworthy characteristics. Does the type show the beginning of the interesting composite icon of Harihara of subsequent days or is it of the same nature as that of the Gandhāra sculpture of Trimurti?  

be noted that no other of the early coin representations of Śiva bears the urddhalinga sign. One unique copper coin of Huṣīthka in the collection of the Indian Museum has the figure of an archer standing right, holding a bow as long as himself, with string inwards; legend right in peculiar characters, which look like old Brāhmī for Ganesā' (Smith). Only one other specimen of such a coin was known, when Smith published his Catalogue, and these two coins are of outstanding interest both from the numismatic and iconographic point of view. These are the two exceptional pieces where Brāhmī script is used to describe the deity in the imperial Kushan series, and the device here has nothing to do with the elephant-headed and pot-bellied deity bearing that name. Here Śiva is most presumably indicated by the word which is also mentioned in the sixth canto of the Rāmāyana as one of the attributive epithets of Śiva (Ganeśo lokaśambhuśca lokapālo mahābhujah Mahābhāgo mahāsālī mahādamśtrī mahēśvaraḥ). If the identification of this device is accepted, then we have here a unique representation of Śiva of early times where bow is his principal attribute (cf. the Ṛgvedic description of Rudra already noted in the last chapter—Arhan ribharṣi sāyakāni dhanavārhan niśkam, etc.). Our survey of the iconographic types of Śiva represented on Huṣīthka’s coins will be incomplete, if we fail to take note of the unique quarter stater of the same ruler, in the collection of the Punjab Museum, which has two figures, one male and the other female, standing facing each other, with a Kushan monogram between them, the former being described as Bhāvēśa (Oeso) and the latter as Nana. Now there can be very little doubt that here Nana

the head to the proper right being that of Viṣṇu, while the one to the proper left being that of Brahmā; the central head is that of Śiva recumbent on his bull. But from the plate, the animal appears to be an elephant and the head on the proper left seems to be leonine.
is identified by the die-cutter with Umā, the consort of Śiva, whose figure also is to be found on an unique coin of the same Kushan ruler, where the goddess was correctly described as Umā (OMMO) by the die-cutter (Pl. VIII, fig. 5); this coin was noticed by E. J. Rapson in *J.R.A.S.*, 1897, p. 324. Cunningham had two gold coins in his collection, one a stater and the other a quarter stater, which were later acquired by the British Museum. The latter is similar to the one in the Punjab Museum (*P. M. C.*, Vol. I, P. 197, Pl. XVIII, fig. 135) just described, but the former is the same in which Rapson recognised the figure of Umā. Cunningham wrongly described both the pieces in the same manner; Śiva is no doubt identical in both, but on the stater piece the goddess holds a different object in her right hand (in the other, Nana holds her peculiar sceptre tipped with a horse’s head) and the inscription by her side can be clearly read as OMMO (Umā). Rapson remarked ‘not only is the inscription quite distinct, but the symbol which the female deity holds in her hand, it may perhaps be a flower, is quite different from the well-known symbol of Nanaia; and we may, therefore, unhesitatingly add Umā to the list of Indian deities represented on Kushan coins’ (*J.R.A.S.*, 1897, p. 324). Rapson was quite correct in the above remark and we can produce fresh evidence in its support. The reverse of a stater piece of Huvishka reproduced in Pl. XVIII (No. 136) of the *Punjab Museum Catalogue*, Vol. I (p. 197) is described by Whitehead as ‘Figure of goddess with the cornucopias as on No. 130, with name to l., which is quite blundered and illegible.’ But if the legend is compared with the other where Rapson reads OMMO (the coin is reproduced by Cunningham in *Numismatic Chronicle*, Scr. III, Vol. XII, Pl. XIII and *Coins of the Indo-Scythians and Kushans*, Pl. XXIII, fig. I), it can similarly be read. It begins from top left corner and runs sideways; the first two letters are quite clear,
but the third letter (the second M) shows two short additional strokes attached to it and the last letter an O due to exigencies of space runs into the top corner of the second M. The whole legend stands thus O M M O (Pl. VII, fig. 5). The goddess Umā here holds a cornucopiae like certain figures of Demeter, Tyche and Ardochso; but in the coins of Huvishka, we find some such transpositions. Ambikā (Umā) holding cornucopiae after the Ardochso figures on late Kushan coins can be seen also on the Chandragupta-Kumāradevi coins in the Imperial Gupta series.

We do not get so many varieties of Śiva figures on the gold and copper coins of the last great Kushan emperor Vāsudeva, where the god is usually depicted as two-armed and accompanied by his mount, having one face or three faces. A unique gold coin described by Cunningham bears Śiva with three heads and four arms, standing to front; water vessel, noose, trident and tiger-skin are placed in the four hands from the lower right onwards; his mount has got a bell attached to its neck (C.I.K., Pt., III, p. 74, pl. 24, fig. 9). When he is depicted two-armed, he almost invariably holds noose (pāśa) in the right hand and trident in the left. As regards the treatment of the head, one curious feature of these coins is worth-noticing; sometimes the residue of the hair after being used to form a top-knot on the centre of the head, descending down the sides of the face, are treated in such a manner as to give a spurious appearance of the deity's being three-headed. But on other specimens, the additional faces, one on either side of the central face can undoubtedly be recognised. On the basis of the noose in the hand of Śiva on some Kushan coins, Cunningham describes 'Śiva as Yama' ; but the association of Śiva or Rudra Śiva with noose is also comparatively old, and in the later developed theological doctrines of the Śaiva system, pāśa (fetters) is very intimately connected with the god.
He is the binder of the individual souls as he is also the loosener of them. Thus, the Śvetāsvatara Upaniśad, where Īdra-Śiva is the god extolled says—Tat kāraṇa sāṅkhyā-yogādhitayam ājñātā devam mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ (VI. 13); the Atharvaśiras Upaniśad, which is a sectarian Upaniṣad extolling the glories of Śiva, describes a rite and that is the Pāṣupata one, which is called Paṣupāśavimoksana. The god Śiva as he appears one-headed and two-armed on the coins of Vāsudeva, served as the prototypes of the devices of some of the later Kushan coins and those of Kushano-Sassanian rulers and of many Hindu princes of India, like the kings of Kashmir.\(^1\)

It is curious that though we get some inscriptions referring to the Bhāgavata shrines of the pre-Christian and early post-Christian period, as previously noted, very few representations of the sectarian god Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu are found on the coins of the same period. On the other hand, though, the numismatic portrayal of the other cult deity Śiva is so very elaborate, very few epigraphic references to Śivite shrines of the contemporaneous periods are forthcoming; still, there can be no doubt that there were such shrines as fully proved by some of the Audumbara coins noted above. One can refer here in passim to the Kharoṣṭhī inscription of the 1st century A.D. discovered at Panjtar below the Mahahan range, where a Śaiva shrine is probably mentioned; the inscription bears the date 122. If Cunningham’s eyecopy of it is accurate, there can be no question about the correct-

---

\(^1\) The description of many of the coin-types selected above are based on a close observation of the specimens in the collections of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and the Punjab Museum, Lahore. The reader is referred to the relevant sections of the catalogues of the respective museums. Some descriptions are also based on Cunningham’s plates appearing in his *Coins of the Indo-Scythians & Kushans*, Pl. XV. 11, Pl. XXIV. 6, 7, 8, 9.
ness of Konow’s reading of a part of the 2nd line thus, moike urumujaputre karavide śivathale which has been translated by him as ‘was made an auspicious ground by Moika, the Urumuja scion.’ In the introductory section to his edition of this inscription, he remarks, ‘What a śivathala is, I cannot say. The word may mean ‘a Siva sanctuary’ or simply ‘an auspicious ground,’ and the latter meaning is probably the more likely one.’ But the alternative meaning which he has himself suggested but discarded, seems to me to be more acceptable. The words ‘sthala’ and sthāna are very frequently used in epic literature (cf. the word Brahmasthāna in the passage, Tato gaccheta rājendra Brahmasthānamamuttamam, Mahābhārata III, 85, 103) and the inscriptions (cf. the word mahāsthāna in the Mathura inscription discussed before) in the sense of ‘a sanctuary,’ ‘a shrine.’ The evidence of contemporary coins, as we have seen above, as well as the observations of foreign writers like Hesychius and Stobaeus fully prove that Śiva was the great god of worship among the people of north-western India; Śiva in his animal (bull) form was known to the Greeks as the god of Gandhāra as Hesychius writes, ‘Gandaros, o Taurokrates par Indois.’ Now as regards Vāsudeva-Viśṇu, we could expect to find his figures on the coins which were discovered from Besnagar and Mathura, because both these localities, as we have seen, contained shrines of the god. But on the earliest monetary issues of Besnagar we do not find any such figure which can be described to represent him; the die-struck coins issued by the early Hindu kings and the Saka satraps of Mathura bear a standing figure with right hand upraised and left hand on hip which was described as Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa by some numismatists due to the close association of this place with the Kṛṣṇite tradition. But now this view has rightly been rejected and Śrī-Lakṣmī has been recognised in the particular device. On one interesting coin, however, in the
so-called Pāñcāla Mitra series, we find the figure of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu. The coin was issued by Viṣṇu mitra and in evident allusion to his name this particular god was figured; the close correlation between the name of the issuer and the deity represented on the reverse is one of the interesting characteristics of most of these coins dateable in the 1st. century B.C. The figure is described by Cunningham simply as four-armed; but Allan thinks that he is really two-armed, ‘his robes hanging down giving an effect’ which led Cunningham to describe it as above. According to him the four arms would come down from the shoulders and not from the elbows. ‘It is possible that he is represented as grasping on the left a pole surmounted by a discus and another on the right surmounted by a trident.’ The size of some of these copper coins is so small and their preservation is so indifferent that it is impossible to be sure about the iconographic features of the deity figured on them. But the artistic convention of separating the arms from the elbow downwards is well known in India and many early mediaeval specimens are known where this is adopted by the image-maker. Al Idrisi’s description of the Śūrya image enshrined in the sun-temple at Multan is to be noted in this connection; he says, that ‘its arms, below the elbow, seem to be four in number’ (Elliots’ History of India, Vol. I, p. 82). As regards the attributes, the only certain one is the cakra in the upper left hand of the god, but it is held by the rim and not placed on the top of a pole. We can profitably compare this figure with the other one of Viṣṇu which appears on a Kushana seal matrix attributed by Cunningham with a great deal of justification to Huvishka. The seal representation is of interest not only from the iconographic point of view, but also from the fact that a Kushan chief, possibly Huvishka himself, appears in the rôle of a devotee of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu. The chief in the Kushan
dress, with a jewelled cap like the one to be seen in a type busts of Huvishka on his gold coins, is shown reverentially looking up at the god with his hands in the aṅjali pose. The god carries in his four arms a wheel (shown exactly like a cart-wheel), a mace (curiously reminiscent of the same in the hand of Śiva in the seal of Śivarākṣita, noticed above), a circular ring-like object and a globular thing, perhaps meant to depict a conchshell; he is decorated with a long fluttering scarf (Pl. VII, fig. 4).

These are the few Viṣṇu figures on early Indian coins and seals of the 1st century B.C.—2nd century A.D., known to me. But some emblems, particularly associated with the Vāsudeva cult, are probably to be recognised in some of the devices of the indigenous coins of India of a very early period. We have already suggested the possibility of finding the garuḍa or makara emblems in the signs of a few of the early punch-marked coins of India. Certain double-die square copper coins of Taxila bear on their obverse a symbol which has been described by Allan as a pillar in a railing surmounted by a fish-like object (Pl. II, fig. 4). A few round copper coins of uncertain origin bearing fragmentary legends (reading extremely uncertain) have on the reverse a symbol described by Allan as ‘a bushy tree in railing;’ but a consideration of the figures i-vi of pl. XLVI of Allan’s book enables us to offer a plausible suggestion that these are really columns surmounted by fan-palm capitals (Pl. II, fig. 3). A comparison with representations of ordinary palm trees which

---

1 For Viṣṇumitra’s coins, refer to Cunningham, C.A.I., p. 84, pl. VII. fig. 21; J. Allan, op. cit., pp. CXIX, 202 pl. XXIX, 6-9. For the Kushan seal, refer to Numismatic Chronicle, 1893, pp. 126-7, pl. X, fig. 2. Also R. P. Chanda, Modern Review, 1933, pp. 97-98. A crude outline of a human figure holding a wheel by its rim, appearing on one of the punch marked coins in the Purnea hoard, is also reproduced by me for comparison (cf. M.A.S.I., No. 62, pl. VI, No. 120); cf. Pl. I, fig. 27.
appear on certain coins of Ayodhya lends support to this view. Reference has already been made above to the fan-palm capitals discovered at Besnagar and Pawaya, the former in Bhopal and the latter in Gwalior state. Thus, it is very likely that these symbols are really based on the votive columns connected with Bhāgavatism, *viz.*, the *garuda*, *mina* (*makara*) and *tāla* capitals associated with Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu, Pradyumna and Saṃkaraṇa respectively. The elaborate wheel appearing on the reverse of the unique silver coin of the Vṛṣṇi Rājanya gaṇa has been described by Cunningham and Allan as a *dharmaacakra*; but its appearance on a coin of Vṛṣṇirājanya, with which clan according to consistent Epic and Purānic tradition the name of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa is associated makes it highly probable that the *cakra* stands for the *Sudarśanacakra* of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu, one of the best revered symbols among the early Pāncarātrins and the Vaiśnavas (Pl. II, fig. 7). The basic idea underlying the wheel in its association with Vāsudeva is solar and the wheel as a symbol par excellence of the god is undoubtedly one of the tangible signs of his connection with the Vedic Viṣṇu, an aspect of the Sun. If this suggestion is accepted, we are to seek for the interpretation of the composite pillar capital made up of the forceparts of a lion and an elephant appearing on the obverse of the same coin from the early Pāncarātra mythological literature (Pl. II, fig. 10).¹

¹ For the symbol on the double-die Taxila coin, refer to Allan, *op. cit.*, p. 229; for the Ayodhya coins, refer to *ibid*, pl. XVII, figs. 10-12; for the Vṛṣṇi coin refer to Cunningham, *op. cit.*, p. 70, pl. IV, fig. 15 and Allan, *op. cit.*, 281, pl. XVI, 5. Cunningham reproduced and described the unique Vṛṣṇi coin along with the two Audumbara coins, one silver and the other copper; he does not say anything about its provenance; but Allan says, it presumably hails from the northern Punjab. Allan remarks about its obverse—’The obverse is a pillar surmounted by an animal, half lion and half elephant, above which is a *nandipāda*,’ p. CLV.
The wheel surrounded by a circle of dots appearing on the obverse of the Kaulīta chief Virayaśas (c. 1st century A. D.) as reproduced by Cunningham along with the coins of the Audumbaras, may also admit of this interpretation (Allan, op. cit., p. 158). It has no doubt been described as 'a probable Dharmacakra' by Allan in Introduction to his book (p. c.) but it can also be explained in the above manner. These symbols could well be utilised by all sects for their religious purpose and were never the monopoly of any particular one for all times and all places. A variant of the same cakra, but much less elaborate than the other two noted above appears on the reverse of the copper coins of Acyuta, one of the kings uprooted by Samudragupta. It is of the same type as that held in the hand of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu appearing on the Kushana seal attributed to Huvishka by Cunningham. It should be remembered that Acyuta is one of the twenty-four names of Para Vāsudeva, the weilder of Sudarśana, and the Indians from early times had special predilection for adopting the names of the gods of their choice.

In the previous paragraphs, I have discussed the nature of the data supplied by coins about the iconic and aniconic religious practice of two of the major Brahmanical sects of ancient India. It is time now to consider what materials they supply to us regarding the same of the other sectaries, the worshippers of other principal Brahmanical gods and goddesses. Durga Prasad's attempts to read Tāntrikism, especially associated with the Śakti worship, in the symbols of the ancient punch-marked coins are open to criticism and his conclusions cannot be accepted with confidence. In the die-struck and cast coins, however, appear several female figures some of which can be shown to stand for different goddesses. Variants of Lakṣmī (Gaja-Lakṣmī Śrī) the goddess of wealth and prosperity have already been recognised on some of them. Allan observes 'on the reverse of Bhadra-
ghoṣa’s coins (Pāncāla Mitra series) is a female deity standing on a lotus, whom we may identify as Bhadrā in allusion to the name of Bhadraghoṣa . . . .; he is diffident however, about identifying her with any of the particular goddesses who bear this epithet. She is probably none other than Lakṣmī, or she may also represent the goddess Durgā who is associated in one of her aspects with Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva as Ekānaṃśā or Subhadrā; in the Skanda Purāṇa Kṛṣṇa is made to say, ‘in the white fortnight of the month of Āśādha, in the second day which is in the Puṣyā nakṣatra, after placing Bhadrā with Rāma and myself on the chariot . . . .’ (Āśādhasya site pakṣe dvitiyā puṣyasamyuṭā | Tasyāṃ rathe samāropyā Rāmaṁ māṁ Bhadrayā saha || — as quoted in the Subdakalpaṇḍruma under Bhadrā). The Bṛhatāniṣṭhāna writes: Ekānaṃśā kāryā devī Baladeva- Kṛṣṇayormadhye | Kuṭisamsthitavāmanakā sarojamitareṇa codvahati (ch. 57, verse 31).1 Thus, the lotus in the hand alone would not always justify us in identifying the figure as Lakṣmī unless some other distinctive marks are present; the lotus on which a few of these goddesses are made to stand is not also the characteristic of Lakṣmī alone, for the lotus pedestal is one of the commonest pedestals on which the images of sectarian divinities are placed in Gupta and post-Gupta art. The coins simply give earlier evidence; they also emphasise another common pedestal used in earlier times, viz., railing pedestal which has been invariably and in most cases quite unjustifiably described by Cunningham as ‘Buddhist basement railing’ in his account of early Indian coins. On the basis of the above observations, one will be justified to hold that some of these female figures on coins

1 For the association of Ekānaṃśā Subhadrā with the Sakti (Durgā) in one of her aspects, refer to J. C. Ghosh’s paper on Ekānaṃśā in J.R.A.S.B., 1936, pp. 41-46 and Pl. 7. For Bhadraghosa’s coins, refer to Allan, op. cit., pp. cxvii, 197, and plates.
with lotus in their right hands and their left hands resting on hip are variants of the goddess Durgā. Their association with particular animals, however, will help us to differentiate between these two classes of goddesses. Now, on the coins of the Kuniṇḍas, we almost invariably find a stag (at first incorrectly identified by Theobold as a buffalo) along with a goddess standing on lotus and holding a lotus flower in her right hand. S. V. Venkatesvara in his article on Vedic Iconography discussed by me in the second chapter of this book, writes, ‘In the latest (kōta) Vedic texts we have the goddess Śrī represented as a golden antelope adorned with garlands of silver and gold’ (p. 25). But he does not give us any reference, so it cannot be checked. If he is correct, however, then we find here both human and animal forms of this goddess. The Mahāmaṇḍurī (verse) refers to the Yakṣa Uṣṭrapāda who was the special object of worship in the land of the Kuniṇḍas (Uṣṭrapāda Kuniṇḍesu). Uṣṭra-
pāda means a being either human or animal with the feet of a camel, and not a camel; if we recognise the Yakṣa Uṣṭrapāda in the animal represented on the Kuniṇḍa coins, then the attendant female figure may or may not stand for Lakṣmī. The obverse of the coin type No. 30 of Azes in the Punjab Museum Catalogue, Vol. 1, p. 129, has been described by Whitehead as ‘Goddess Lakṣmī standing to front with flower in raised right hand.’ Gardner writes about the same device ‘a female deity facing, clad in himation; holds in raised right hand, flower; stands on lotus; besides her, lion? (Lakṣmī?).’

Gardner, op. cit., p. 85, Pl. XIX. 5. Gardner says, ‘It is probable that the goddess who appears on the coins of Azes as standing on a lotus, and holding a flower is either Pārvatī, the dread wife of Śiva, or Lakṣmī, the goddess of fortune; the supposed lion, which seems to lie under her left elbow, may be after all only a lump of oxide (p. lix). But the possibility of recognising the mount of the goddess is still there and in any way she is thoroughly an Indian
is recognisable from his plate and this makes it highly probable that here we find a representation of Durgā-simhavāhini, the consort of Śiva (Pl. VII, fig. 6). It is true that the lotus at her feet and the same in her raised right hand would indicate the possibility of her being Lākṣmī; but its nature may be more or less the same as that of the reverse device of the Chandragupta I-Kumaradevī coins and the lion-slayer type coins of Chandragupta II, in the imperial Gupta series of gold coins. The goddess seated on a lion, holding a lotus flower or cornucopiae in her left hand, a fillet in her right hand and her feet sometimes resting on lotus led Allan to describe her as Lākṣmī or Ambikā (CGCBM, lxxii-lxxiii, lxxxiii). The Brāhmaṇa passage has already been quoted in my support; many texts like the aṅgamas give us more or less identical descriptions of two-armed Durgā-Gaurī images (Dakṣine cotpalam haste vāmahastam pralambitam...). It is true that the Syrian or Elamite goddess Nanaia is occasionally represented on some Kushan coins and seals as riding on a lion (Pl. I, fig. 24); but the mode of her presentation is quite different from the device under discussion.¹ The goddess in the Azes coin, however, is purely Indian; her graceful tribhanga pose, the haṭhīhasta feature and the raised right hand holding lotus are all Indian characteristics. That Śiva was the god par excellence in the Gandhāra region has already been noted; it is no wonder that his consort Ambikā should also be well recognised as an object of worship in the same locality. Hiuen Thsang’s reference to the shrine of Bāhmaḍvi, the spouse of Iśvara Deva (Śiva) in Gandhāra, as supported by the reference to Bāhmaṣṭhāna in the Mahābhārata, previously mentioned, goddess, be she Lākṣmī or Pārvatī. Coomaraswamy recognises in her Lākṣmī, in his article on ‘Early Indian Iconography’ noticed above.

¹ Cunningham, Coins of the Indo-Scythians and Kushans, p. 68, Pl. XXII, fig. 19.
should be noted again in this connection. On some of the gold and copper coins of the Kushan emperor Huvishka also, appears a goddess who is described as Nana; we have already seen that OESO (Bhaveśa or Śiva) is depicted in company with Nana on some of his gold coins (CCI, pp. 65-66, Pl. XXIII, 2, and Whitehead PMC, p. 197, Pl. XVIII, 135). On the other coin of Huvishka noticed above in connection with Śiva type, Śiva is accompanied by another goddess who is described as Umā (OMMO). It has already been shown that we can correctly recognise the goddess Umā by her name on the gold coin of Huvishka in the Punjab Museum (PMC., Pl. XVIII, fig. 136); here, however, the goddess holds a cornucopiae instead of a lotus. It should always be borne in mind that we do not get the help which is rendered to us by the Kushan die-cutters in naming the deity used as a device in particular dies, from others. But that there lie hid some Indian divinities among the medley of coin devices appearing on the Indo-Scythian and other coins is extremely probable. The Sakas were ruling over part of northernmost India and it is natural to expect that they would show on their coins some of the Indian cult divinities, the objects of worship among their subjects for whose use these coins were issued. Several unidentified goddesses appear on the reverse sides of certain copper and silver coins of Indo-Scythian rulers Mauces and Azes. Gardener remarks 'When we reach the issues of king Mauces (Pls. XVI, XVII), we find a wealth of most remarkable and original barbaro-Hellenic figures; a figure resembling Tyche (XVI, 3), holding in one hand a patera, in the other a wheel, who seems to be the original of the still more outlandish figure of Azes' coins (XVIII. 10, 11). . . .

The so-called Tyche may after all be an Indian goddess, because the many-spoked wheel which is held by her left hand distinctly reminds us of the one placed in the hand of the ithy-phallic figure of Śiva on a coin of Huvishka, as also of the other in the hand of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu in the Kushan seal attributed by Cunningham to the same Kushan emperor (Pl. VII, fig. 7). Comparison may be made between this goddess on Manes' bronze coins with the sculpture of a goddess discovered in the Mohmand country reproduced by V. A. Smith in his *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon* (1st. Ed. fig. 78); the latter is, however, four-handed, holding in her hands among other objects, a cakra and a gadā and is most probably a Hellenistic representation of Vaiṣṇavī, the sakti of Viṣṇu. The goddess standing on lotus, facing and holding an uncertain object in her raised right hand (a tree branch with three leaves attached to it ?), with the left one resting on her hip, on the coins of Pāñcāla Phalgunīmitra may depict the asterism Phalgunī whose name is borne by the striker (Allan, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-5, and plates).

If it be a representation of Phalgunī at all, its iconography is in no way similar with that of Pūrva-Phalgunī and Uttara-Phalgunī as it appears in the late compilation of Hemādri. Pūrva-Phalgunī is described by him as elephant-faced, red-coloured, two-handed with parrot in her hand and seated upon a wheel (Pūrvā hasti-mukhā sphastrā sukhamastadyarūṇā), while Uttara-Phalgunī is tiger-faced, riding on a cow, white in colour, her four hands holding sun, moon, rosary and khaṭvāṅga (Vyāghrānanottarā gosthā śubhravarṇā caturbhujā | Deva-kṣini sūtra khaṭvāṅgadhāriniś parikīrttī || aṣṭiṁ here means sun and moon).

1 For some detailed observations of mine on the Indian elements in the coin devices of early foreign rulers of this country, the reader is referred to *I.H.Q.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 98-8.
Sūrya appears frequently as an object of worship on the early tribal coins of ancient India. But the mode of his representation is not anthropomorphic. The commonest symbol to be found on the early punch-marked coins of India is designated by scholars as solar; it is the wheel and its numerous variants (Pl. II, fig. 6). Foucher finds in them so many forms of the Dharmacakra symbol; but the earlier suggestion that most of them stand for sun is more acceptable. We have already seen that spoked wheel and its variants appearing on certain tribal coins may stand for the Sudarśana of Viṣṇu and Vedic Viṣṇu was an aspect of the sungod with whom Vāsudeva was identified. On some of the earliest coins in the punch-marked series and on the Eran money (dated as early as the 3rd century B. C.) we very frequently find the lotus figure; in the latter the eight petalled lotus is clearly recognisable (Allan, op. cit., p. 143). Now the lotus is intimately connected with the sun from very ancient times; it p’ayed a conspicuous part in the mythology of Brahmanism and its association with the sun is fully borne out by the evidence of the Purāṇas which enjoin the execution in sculpture of a twelve-petalled lotus, on different petals of which figures of the different aspects of the sun god are to be placed with the god Bhāskara on the central pericarp (karnikā).

The lotus symbolising the sun and the creative force (Sūrya is Savitṛ—sarvasya prasavitr, the creator of all) came to hold a unique place in Indian art of all ages and all religious creeds; the author of the Viṣṇudharmottara realised the importance of this motif in iconographic art and gives full and detailed instructions for

1 Hemādri in his Vratakhandā, pp. 528, 535 and 539, quotes from the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Skanda P. and Matsya P., the respective passages dealing with Divākara Vratam, Āsāditya Vratam and Sūryanakta Vratam. See also Hemādri, ibid, p. 553 about Sūrya Vrata from Saura Dharma: “Upalipya sucau debe Sūryyam tatra samarccayet | Samilikhet tatra padmantu dvādasāraṃ sakarnikam ||
its carving (Book III, Ch. 45, Vv. 1-8). In the anthropomorphic representations of divinities in sculptures, lotus is the commonest symbol found in their hands. Some of the lotuses, at least those on the early coins, if not all, may be taken to represent the sun. In this connection, reference may be made to the so-called Taurine symbol which is very frequently found on these as well as later coins of India. It was suggested by me long ago that it might symbolise the sun and the moon represented together, the disc symbolising the one and the other being symbolised by the crescent attached to it.  

1 A few round cast copper coins of Kāḍa (probably a tribal name) of the 3rd century B.C. bear on one of their sides a large rayed circle which has been correctly described by Allan as 'Sun' (Allan, CAI, p. 145). But the clearest and the most significant way of representing the Sun god as a rayed disc enshrined as an object of worship is to be found among the devices of certain tribal coins which can be dated from '200 B.C. to the end of the first century B.C.' (Allan). These are the coins of Sūryamitra and Bhānumitra in the series described by Cunningham as 'Pāncāla Mitra'; in the former, the god is represented 'as a ball from which rays radiate; below it is the symbol, and the whole is placed on a platform, as usual between two pillars with cross-bars,' while in the latter he is also shown as a radiate globe placed immediately on a railed platform between two pillars' (Allan, CAI, pp. cxviii-cxix, 193, 195, 197). The relationship between the name of the issuer as well as the deity reproduced on these coins has already been emphasised; now what is most interesting is that we find here an unmistakable

---

evidence of the Brahmanic symbol for the sun used in sacrificial ritual as a regular object of worship (Pl. II, fig. 8). The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa tells us that in piling the fire altar, a disc of gold was placed on it to represent the sun (Ś.B., VII, 4. 1. 10); in Sūryamitra's coins, the symbol upon which the rayed disc of the god is placed is very likely the summary representation of the firealtar, which is conspicuous by its absence in the coins of Bhānumitra. Now, there can be very little doubt that at the time when these coins were being issued, the Vedic sacrificial system had been much mixed up with the far-reaching religious changes and thus it happens that the sun-symbol appears in the rôle of an arcā on these coins. As regards the anthropomorphic representation of this god on the coins, we do not find any such on the early indigenous ones of India; but figures of sun in human form are met with on certain coins issued by the alien rulers of India like the Indo-Greeks and Kushans and they will be elaborately noticed in determining the evolution of the north Indian sun type in my forthcoming book on the images of the Hindu gods and goddesses.

Another deity who can be recognised without doubt on some of the tribal coins of ancient India as well as on the coins of the Kushan emperor Huvishka is Skanda Kārttikeya. Though he has not found a place in the stereotyped list of five principal gods of the five chief sects (viz. Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Saura, Śākta and Gānapatya) as formulated in later texts (Pañcopasanā, the worship of Gaṇesādi Pañcādevatā), numismatic evidence distinctly proves that his images or emblems were certainly highly venerated by a good many people of ancient India. He was worshipped by some Indian kings and tribes, such as Kumāragupta I of the Gupta dynasty and the Yaudheyas, who had special reason to court his favour. Some other kings also seem to have paid homage to him. On the reverse of a circular copper coin of Devamitra, a local king of Ayodhyā of an early date (c. 1st
century A.D.) we find a symbol which has been described by V. A. Smith as ‘Cock on top of post’ (Pl. II, fig. 5); on some coins of Vijayamitra of the same series also we find the same device (Nos. 31 & 32 in the series). It can justifiably be presumed, that it was based on a cock-crested column special to Kārttikeya. This suggestion is further supported by the carved pillar shaft and the cock capital found at Lala Bhagat, previously noticed in the chapter.¹ I have already shown that the staff and vase carrying standing figure on certain Ujjain coins cannot be called Kārttikeya but is to be described as Śiva. But the former god appears in human form sometimes in a poly-cephalous manner (six-headed) on one unique silver and certain copper coins of the Yaudheyas, belonging to the second century A.D. The obverse of one class of these coins bears the six-headed but two-armed Kārttikeya (Ṣaḍānana), holding a long spear (sakti, the emblem special to Kārttikeya) in his right hand, the left hand resting on hip; the reverse bears the goddess, presumably Lakṣmī, with an aureole round her head, and not a six-headed goddess as Cunningham describes. The legend on the silver coin has been reconstructed by Allan as Yaudheya-bhāgavata-svāmino Brahmanya (sa or sya) and on the copper coins as Bhāgavata-svāmino Brahmanya-devasya (or sa) Kumārasya (or sa) (Allan, CAI, p. cxlix, cl). Allan renders the two legends into English

¹ V.A. Smith, CCIM, vol. I, p. 151, Nos. 28, 31, 32. Sometimes the ‘cock is placed on ground in front of post’ as on No. 29 of Vijayamitra. Allan does not tell us anything about the pillar, but in his plate XVII, fig. 22, is reproduced a coin of Vijayamitra with the device of the ‘cock on pillar’; in the body of the Catalogue, he invariably describes the bird as a cock, but in his introduction (p. lxxxix) he writes about it as ‘a bird, usually called a cock but probably a haṁsa.’ I have seen the above coins of Devamitra and Vijayamitra in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and I have no doubt that Smith’s description is correct. Considered along with the Lala Bhagat finds, the above suggestion should be accepted.
in this manner: 'Of Brahmanya (a name of Kārttikeya), the divine lord of the Yaudheya' and 'of Kumāra the divine lord Brahmanya deva.' In both the cases the genitive case-ending of the name of the divinity and of the attributive epithet svāmi (the reading Bhagavato in place of Bhāgavata would better fit in with the general sense of the coin legend) shows that the coins were issued in the name of the deity. This is very interesting, because it possibly shows that the Yaudheyas had dedicated their State to the god of their choice who was regarded by them not only as their spiritual but also as their temporal ruler.¹

Sir John Marshall's description of a very well executed terracotta seal with inscriptions in characters of the 3rd or 4th century A.D. found by him in course of excavations at Bhita, and his illuminating remarks on them deserve attention in this connection. It is the seal of a ruling chief; it has in its field a pile of balls (evidently a mountain) with a post on its either side, a waved line (river?) below and sun and crescent (moon) above; the legend around the margin is 'Śri Vindhya-vedhamahārājasya Maheśvara-Mahāsenātisṛṣṭarājasya Vṛṣadhvajasya Gautamīputrasya.' Marshall translates it as follows: 'Of the illustrious Mahārājā Gautamiputra Vṛṣadhvaja, the penetrator of the Vindhya, who had made over his kingdom to the great Lord Kārttikeya.' The appellation Maheśvara-Mahāsenātisṛṣṭarājasya is significant. He remarks, 'It seems to indicate that in ancient times there may have existed a pious custom according to which rulers on the occasion of their accession entrusted their kingdom to their īṣṭādevatā and considered themselves as their mere agents.' He also cites the analogical case of

¹ M. A. Smith suggested that these coins were issued by a chief calling himself Svāmi Brahmanya Yaudheya. A proper interpretation of the legend as well as that of the Chatresvara coin of the Kuniḍhas previously noted leads to one conclusion—that suggested by me.
Travancore rulers who call themselves Padmanābhādāsa, they being mere agents of the Lord Padmanābha. I may observe here that I suggested my interpretation of the particular Kunindha and Yaudheyas coin legends, before I read Marshall’s remarks on this particular seal.

Rohitaka, the country of the Yaudheyas, the āyudhajīvi Kṣatriyas, also known as Mattamāyūrakas, was the specially favoured residence of the god as we know from the Mahābhārata passage (III. 32, 45):—Tato bahudhanam ramayam gavādhyam dhanadhānyavat | Kārttikeyasya dayitaṃ Rohitakamupādravat | Tatra yuddham mahaccāsit suraimattamāyūrakaīh. Rohitaka (modern Rohtak where B. Sahni discovered a large number of Yaudheya coin moulds) ‘being specially favoured by Kārttikeya’ means that he was the tutelary god of the region, where there must have been many shrines dedicated to him, the cult image enshrined in them being used as a coin device.1 As regards the name Svāmi Brahmanya or Svāmi Brahmanyadeva Kumāra, reference may be made to the Bilsad stone pillar inscription of Kumāragupta I (date 96 G.E. = 415-16 A.D.), which records some additions by one Dhruvasarman to the temple of Svāmi Mahāsena already existing in the locality.2

1 In the Jarṣandhavadhā parvādhyāya of the Mahābhārata (Sabhā-parva), Krṣṇa, while recounting to Bhīma and Arjuna the characteristic excellence of Rājaṅgha, says that in Rājaṅgha was the residence of Takṣaka and Maṇināga (Takṣakasyālayaścåtra Maṇināgasya cottomā). This means that there were shrines of Takṣaka and Maṇināga at Rājaṅgha; recent excavations in the locality by the Indian Archaeological department have brought to light many interesting evidence of the once flourishing snake-cult at that place.

2 Fleet, CII, III, pp. 44-5; the name Brahmanyadeva is also ascribed here to the god:—‘bhagavatstrailekoyatejassam-bhūrasamittad-bhutamūrtte…Brahmanyadevasya—Svāmi Mahāsenasyāyatane’, etc., etc. Bilsad is in the Eta district of U. P. and is about 140 miles to the south-east of Rohitaka or Rhotak. The Vākāṭaka mahārāja Rudrasena I is frequently described in the Vākāṭaka copper-plate inscriptions as
The iconographic type of Kārttikeya differs on the other
class of the Yaudheya coins (class 6 of Allan) of a quite late
date (3rd-4th century A.D.), which show undoubted Kushan
influence in style and types; the one-faced War god stands
facing, his right hand holding a spear and the left resting
on hip with his vāhana on the left (the peacock is not usually
shown on the other type—a few specimens of which,
however, show the god with one face radiate, cf. Allan,
p. 272, Pl. XXIX, 22). Among the Indian museum
specimens of the type with six-headed Brahmanyadeva,
I could recognise the bird mount only on one
specimen. Another elaborate iconographic type occurs on
the reverse of the ‘peacock type’ gold coins of Kumāra-
gupta I. It shows the god Kārttikeya nimbate riding on
the peacock (Paravāṇī) holding spear in left hand over
shoulder, his right hand being in the varada pose; his figure
is placed on an elaborate pañcaratha pedestal, commonly
found in Indian art of the late Gupta and subsequent
periods. There can be very little doubt that here we find a
replica of the image of the favourite deity of Kumāragupta I
—probably the very image enshrined in a temple built by
the Gupta King in the royal capital. The iconographic
importance of the type cannot be too sufficiently noticed.
Smith’s description of it as ‘Goddess (Kumāridēvi ?)’ was
corrected by Allan as ‘Kārttikeya nimbate’; but a part of
Allan’s description will have to be modified. He writes that
the god sprinkles incense on altar on r. with right hand
and the peacock stands on a kind of platform. The altar
appears to be nothing but two of the re-entrants of the right
side of the pedestal (pīṭhikā) on which the god with his
mount is shown and the right hand thus does not sprinkle

atyanta Svāmi-Mahābhairavabhaktasya, i.e., an excessive devotee of
Svāmi Mahābhairava, evidently a terrific form of Siva.
incense but is really shown in the iconographic pose of varada, i.e., that of conferring a boon (Pl. X, fig. 9).  

Huvishka was the only foreign ruler who had this god reproduced under various names, such as Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha, and Mahāsena, on the reverse side of some of his coins. The iconography of Skanda-Viśākha as delineated in them requires careful study. Mahāsena, another form of Skanda, is shown nimbate, clad in an undergarment covered over by a long flowing cloak (like the Saṃghāṭī to be found in the Buddha figures—not chlamys as Gardner suggests) holding a standard surmounted by a bird (ruде peacock—cf. Barhiketu as one of the epithets of Kārttikeya-Skanda Kumārarūpa barhiketus-śaktidharāśca, Brhat samhita, Ch. 57,) and his left hand rests on the hilt of the sword which is tied to his waist-girdle (Pl. IX, fig. 7). Next we find Skanda-kumāra and Viśākha standing face to face similarly dressed, the former holding in his right hand a standard surmounted by bird (it is not clear in the reproduction; what seems a bird might be a combination of the letter m of KOMARO and part of the hair or turban of the god) while the latter or both of them hold a long spear (Pl. IX, fig. 8). On the coin, Viśākha is shown clasping the right hand of Skanda-kumāra who touches the former with his left hand (Gardner, op. cit., Plate XXVIII, fig. 22). Lastly, we find a shrine consisting of an ornamented double platform with a linear representation of a super-structure having inside it three figures on the pedestal; the whole device has been described by Gardner as "Niche on basis, within which, Skanda and Viśākha standing as above;  

1 Smith, op. cit., pp. 113-14, Pl. XVI, 3; Allan, CCGDBM, pp. 84 ff. and plates. Kumāragupta was certainly in urgent need of the graces of the War god Kārttikeya, for the last period of his rule was troubled by the ruthless invasions of the Hunas and the Pushyamitrás and his special predilection for this martial god is also manifest in the name of one of his sons, viz., Skanda, if not of himself.
between them Mahāsena, horned (?), facing, nimbatte, clad in chlamys; sword at waist'" (Pl. IX, fig. 9).\footnote{Gardner, op. cit., p. 138, Pl. XXVII, fig. 16; p. 140, Pl. XXVIII, figs. 22 and 23; p. 150, Pl. XXVIII, fig. 24.} Gardner's description of the three figures in the last-mentioned coin device may be correct, but the figure on the right does not seem to have any halo carved round the head, while the other two distinctly bear the traces of halo round their heads. But this point need not be stressed far, because as I have previously observed sometimes the aureole is missing from the heads of divinities on Kushan coins. The types of the three divinities enshrined, however, differ so widely from their representations on the other coins of Huvishka noted above, that they cannot but engage our attention. In any case, we have no grounds to support D. R. Bhandarkar in his assumption that on certain coins of Huvishka there are four figures corresponding to four different gods, viz., Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsena (Carmichael Lectures, 1921, pp. 22-23). If these coins prove anything they prove that there were three gods—or rather three aspects of the same god—viz., Skanda-kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsena. The Mahābhārata lays down Skanda's several forms as brothers or sons, viz., Sākha, Viśākha, Naigameya; among his other names are Kumāra and Mahāsena; the very involved mythology which is presented to us by it about the origin of Skanda shows that various god concepts of an allied character were merged in the composition of Skanda-Kārttikeya. Huvishka's coins inform us that the three (or two?) gods had not lost their separate personal entities even then, though their iconography shows that they were to all intents and purposes, the same god. Patañjali's mention of Skanda and Viśākha have been noticed on a previous occasion; these coin types bear out in a characteristic manner what is incidentally observed by him.
Among the other members of the Brahmanic pantheon, whose effigies can be recognised among the early coin devices, mention may be made of Indra and Agni. Both of them appear on the reverse sides of the coins of Indramitra and Agnimitra respectively in the Pañcāla series. Jayagupta in the same series may also show the god Indra on the reverse of his coins. On Indramitra’s coins, Indra is crudely represented in two different ways; first, as standing, facing, on a pedestal, and holding an uncertain object in his right hand (cf. Allan’s plate XXIX, 1 and 2; a club seems to hang down from the left), and secondly, he is shown inside a domed shrine (‘arch way,’—Allan) where other details are absolutely lacking (these are very small coins and very much corroded). Jayagupta’s coins show the latter device on their reverse, marked by the same indistinctness. The reverse of Agnimitra’s coins figure a deity standing facing on a railed platform between two pillars; five flames represent his hair; his right hand is raised and the left rests on hip in the approved early Indian iconographic manner (kaṭihasta); some object (a sword or a club?) seems to project downwards from his hip. Most numismatists identify him as Agni; but Mme. Bazin Poucher finds in him the representation of Ādi Nāga, the presiding deity of Abicchatra, the capital city of Pañcāla. She lays stress on the identity of the reverse device of Bhūmimitra’s coins with the same of Agnimitra and describes the two as above.

The deity on the former stands facing on a platform between two pillars, each with three cross-bars at the top. Cunningham described the figure as ‘standing on Buddhist railing; head with five rays’ and remarked, ‘The figure is probably that of Bhūmi, or the earth personified’ (CAI. p. 83). Allan observes about the same, ‘His attitude is similar to that of Agni, but his hair is represented by five snakes (nāgas). He holds a snake in his hands. One would expect a personification of the Earth goddess Bhūmi
but as the figure is male, it is probably the king of the Nāgas representing the earth’ (CCA I, P. cxviii). A careful inspection of the plates given in Cunningham’s (Pl. VII, 12-16) and Allan’s books (Pl. XXVIII, figs. 5-14) shows that the two devices seem to be almost identical and whatever may be the designation of one is the same of the other; but on certain coins of Agnimitra (fig. 11 in Allan’s plate) the deity is made to stand on a lotus and rays of flames and nāgas cannot be distinguished in the coin representations. R. Burns, however, says, ‘The five lines are not identical on the two coins, those of Agnimitra ending in sharper points than those of Bhūmimitra. If these two figures are Nāgas, the difference is not important; while if one is of Agni, the iconographical explanation of that of Bhūmi is difficult, and I know no other representation of the Earth.’

Thus, the whole question is still an open one and unless better preserved coins are available, no certainty can be arrived at. The devices, tree within railing and the undulating line, may, in some cases, represent the Vṛkṣacya-ityas (the residences of the different Yakṣas) and Nāgas, though there can be no doubt that in many more they stood for the sthalarākṣas and rivers.

Indra appears in the garb of the Greek Zeus on the coins of Eukratides, Antialkikas and a few other Indo-Greek rulers and on those of Maues. On the kaviśiye nagara devatā coins of Eukratides, the god (usually described in the coin catalogues as Zeus) is shown seated left on throne, holding wreath in the right hand and palm branch in the left; the forepart of an elephant, rarely the whole animal, appears on the right and a conical object in the left field. The same device

---

appearing on the reverse of several hemidrachmae of Antialkidas is reproduced in my Pl. IX, Fig. 3, where the object in the left field is, however, not distinct. Rapson definitely described the conical object as a mountain, and, to explain this type, he drew our attention to the statement of Hiuen Thsang regarding the elephant having been the presiding genius of the Pi-lo-sho-lo mountain, to the south-west of Kapiśa. The Chinese traveller refers to a suburban city of Kapiśa, viz., Si-pi-to-ja-la-tzu which is the Chinese transliteration of Svetavatālaya according to Watters. Now, Svetavatālaya (the residence of Svetavat, a name of Indra) and Indrapura are presumably one and the same, and the Mahāmāyūrī tells us that Indra was the tutelary deity of the latter, a place to be located in the north-west on account of its association with Varṇu, another locality in the same region. So, on the basis of the above remarks, it is highly probable, nay certain, that we find on the above type representations of Indra in his theriomorphic as well as anthropomorphic forms—the latter being evidently identified with Zeus, the exact Greek counterpart of the Indian king of the gods (devarāja). On the reverse of a unique silver coin of Antialkidas in the collection of the British Museum appears the same deity standing or advancing to left with a long sceptre in his left hand and the right hand hanging down, and the elephant, with its trunk at the salute, Nike on its head and a bell round its neck, also striding to the left (Pl. IX, fig. 4). Whitehead who noticed this coin device in his‘Notes on Indo-Greek Numismatics’in Numismatic Chronicle, 1923 (pp. 325-6, Pl. XV, fig. 4) remarks, ‘apparently this quaint design shows the elephant-deity and his elephant indulging in a victorious march past.’ Thus, we see in the devices, the simultaneous theriomorphic and anthropomorphic representations of Indra, as we have seen above the same mode of representing Śiva on the Ujjain coins and certain Kushan coins (the deity and his animal mount). On
certain square copper coins of Maues, however, we find a new orientation in the representation of Indra; on the obverse of the coins, numbered 12-13, in the British Museum (Gardner, op. cit., p. 70, Pl. XVI., fig. 9), the enthroned appears with a long sceptre in his left hand, while his right hand is placed on the shoulder of a human figure. Gardner described the latter as a ‘small winged female figure’; but the wings and the female character of the figure are not at all clear from the plate; what he described as wings appear to be the prongs of the vajra. The figure, however, as has rightly been suggested by Gardner, ‘seems to be an embodiment of the thunderbolt’ (Pl. IX, fig. 6). This reminds us of the Indian practice of occasionally representing the attributes in the hands of divinities as personified beings (āyudhapuruṣas). The iconography of Indra in these Hellenistic presentations of Indra on the above coins does partially tally with the description of his icon as given in Brhatasamhitā of Varāhamihira (Suklaścaturviṣaṇo dvīpo Mahendrasya Vajrapāñitvam | Tiryaglalātasaṃstham tṛtiyamapi locanaṁ cihnam 2—ch. 57, v. 42), if we take all of them together.¹

The Yakṣas and Yakṣinīs, so frequently represented in the pre-Christian and early post-Christian art of northern India, do not fail to make their appearance on early indigenous coins, though it is comparatively rare. The Ujjain coins, again, furnish us with an important clue in this connection. Allan reproduces three coins in his Catalogue

¹ I am not sure whether the elephant’s head which appears on the obverse of certain round copper coins of Demetrius (Pl. IX, fig. 5) and some others of Maues has anything to do with Śvetavat, the mount of Indra; Demetrius and Lysias are sometimes shown with elephant’s scalp on the top of their diademmed heads. All these points have been discussed by me in my article on ‘Indian Elements in Coin Devices of Early Foreign Rulers of India,’ in Indian Historical Quarterly (Vol. XIV, 1938, pp. 95-101, and the accompanying plate, figs. 1-4).
(Pl. XXXVI, figs. 1-3), the obverse sides of which bear, according to him, two draped female figures standing facing side by side, the one on the left holding an uncertain object in her raised right hand; a river with fishes is shown below (ibid., p. 257). With regard to another fragmentary coin included by him in the same series, he remarks in his introduction, 'Variety c (of the class 4 of the Ujjain coins, the two-figure coins belong to Var. b of the same class) is a broken coin, but seems to have had three figures on it; the type was probably the same as the three figures found on certain punch-marked silver coins (p. 37, 1).' He further says that he has grouped together as class 4 'four varieties with deities on the obverse' (of the remaining two varieties, one has the abhiṣeṣka-Lakṣmī or Gaja-lakṣmī, the other has a standing figure and three other symbols). Now, two years before the publication of Allan's Catalogue, I published one square coin from Avanti or Ujjain, which is identical to the variety b of class 4 of Allan, just noticed. Then it was unique of its kind and I remarked that it 'differs from all the known varieties of the Ujjain coins, in so far as its obverse side bears two human figures, a male and a female one. The dress and attitude of the figures remind us of a Yakṣa and Yakṣinī from Bhilsa (Nos. 190A and 191A in the archaeological collection of the Gwalior State Museum) who are dressed similarly and represented in the same attitude.' I am certain about my description, because the male figure bears on its neck the graiveyaka ornament which is so frequently worn by the Yakṣas found at Mathura, Gwalior and other places. It is thus highly probable that on this variety of coins hailing from Ujjain and dateable as early as the 2nd century B.C., if not earlier, we find a comparatively early representation of the Yakṣa and Yakṣinī couple. As regards

1 This Ujjain coin was published by me in I.II.Q., Vol. X, 1934, pp. 723-25 and plate.
the Nāga devices on coins, I may draw the attention of scholars to the cast coins (Nos. 21 and 22) reproduced in plate II of Cunningham's *Coins of Ancient India*. The author remarks about them, "Nos. 21 and 22 are cast coins, on which a snake is the prominent figure. The legend, in Aśoka characters, reads Kādāsa, which may, perhaps, have some reference to the descendants of the serpents called Kadru" (p. 62). Allan distinguishes as many as five varieties of the same coins and describes one of the devices on them as 'undulating line presumably representing a snake'; but from one observation of his with regard to Var. d of the same series, viz., 'one side is completely filled by an elephant and the other has the usual snake, taurine and legend,' it is certain that he accepts Cunningham's suggestion (Allan, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India*, pp. xcii—xciii). Nāgas depicted as human beings with snakehoods attached to the back of their heads, a type often found in early and late Indian art have been recognised by Mme. Bazin-Foucher, in the reverse devices of the two Pāṇcāla kings, Agnimitra and Bhūmimitra. But I have already shown above that her suggestion has not been universally accepted.

In the above survey of the devices on the early indigenous and foreign coins of India, a few points are to be noted. Some of the symbols appearing on the early punch-marked and cast coins seem undoubtedly based on the religious practices of their issuers. On the local and tribal cast and die-struck coins that are Indian in character, we find the continuation of some devices already met with in the earlier series, with this difference that now their nature is more clearly understandable than in their previous presentation. It should also be borne in mind that the same device could be equally available to the various sectaries of these days to illustrate their own religious faith and a cakra, which in one place might definitely represent Buddhist Dharmacakra, could
in another setting stand for the emblem of Viṣṇu, which, as we have seen, is based on the Sun god. Coomaraswamy rightly remarks, 'the vocabulary of these symbols was equally available to all sects, Brāhmaṇas, Buddhists and Jains, each employing them in senses of their own' (HIIA, p. 44), Cunningham was oblivious about it and thus he invariably described the railing, so frequently to be found on these coins, as 'Buddhist basement railing,' the tree as 'Bodhi tree,' the pillar as 'Buddhist pillar' and so on. In these early cast and die-struck coins, however, we light upon the representations of regular icons which were the objects of worship, and various gods and goddesses make their appearance with somewhat elaborate iconographic features. In the case of the oft-reproduced deity on the coins, viz., Śiva, his various types show that varieties of Śivite icons were being made on which these coin devices were based. Again, such observations of previous scholars that 'the appearance of the figure of Śiva and not a Liṅga as an object of worship on the Kushan coins clearly shows that up to the time of the Kushan king Vāsudeva, Śiva worship had not come to be identified with Liṅga worship' must have to be set aside. D. R. Bhandarkar observes further in his Carmichael Lectures (pp. 19-21) that Śiva was certainly being worshipped in his anthropomorphic form up till the 7th century A.D., for 'Śiva recumbent on his mount' figures on the reverse of Śaśāṅka's gold coins. But on the evidence of much earlier coins as well as seals we know for certain that Śiva was also being worshipped in his phallic form. That phallicism was a part of Śiva worship in the time of Huvishka is fully proved by the ithyphallic (urdhvaliṅga) feature of the unique figure of the god on one of the gold coins of the Kushan emperor already noted. Much earlier evidence in the shape of the uninscribed cast coin (provenance unknown) and the die-struck coins from Ujjain and Taxila has been produced. The Ujjain coins are specially
interesting from this point of view, because some of them portray Siva in human form while others do so in phallic form, proving that Siva was being worshipped there in both these forms simultaneously. Another point worth noticing is that though Siva used to be represented mostly in his bull form in the Gandhāra region (cf., Hesychius' statement quoted above), still by the time the Kushanas had begun their rule, that form was regarded as his mount while his human form was predominant. This is proved by the so many extant coins of the Saiva Kushan emperor, Wem Kadphises. In the coins of Kanishka and Huvishka, it was not even thought necessary to associate his theriomorphic form with the anthropomorphic one. But with Vāsudeva, the older practice was resumed and thenceforward Siva, in particular aspects of his representations, was never to be dissociated from his mount. In the shrines which had invariably the Liṅga enshrined in the main sanctum, the bull Nandin was always given a prominent place in front of it, in order that he may always look at his lord in the symbolic form (cf., my observations about Siva and bull on one Ujjain coin). But it should not be forgotten that, by the time of Huvishka, the iconography of Siva had attained such an elaboration as to include among its many varieties an ithyphallic one, in one of whose hands was placed the cakra which was the symbol par excellence of the other sectarian god Viṣṇu. While assigning attributes to the deity, the Kushan die-cutters were drawing also upon earlier indigenous mode, for, as we have seen, the staff and water-vessel which are the characteristic ones of Siva in the Ujjain coins are also used by them. The three heads of Siva are figured too after the earlier mode and most of the features are based on indigenous mythological details. The plastic execution of this deity as well as the other deities appearing on the Kushan money is no doubt Hellenistic, but the subject was purely Indian. The indigenous Siva
in human form was unquestionably earlier in appearance, for all scholars assign the Ujjain coins to the third—second centuries B.C., which was at least a century earlier than Siva’s first appearance on the money of one of the foreign rulers of India, viz., Maues. I recognised Siva for the first time in two coin devices, hitherto unidentified, of this Indo-Scythic ruler. The staff and water-vessel carrying human figure can be traced to some of the punch-marked coins described by Allan (op. cit., Introduction, XXXVI; see Pl. I, fig. 4).1 Vasudeva Visnu, though some of his emblems, such as cakrā, etc., are sometimes reproduced figures, though rarely, on the early indigenous coins; but it must be observed that even in the Gupta period, of which extant Visnu images are known, none of the coins of the devout bhāgavata kings bear on them any effigy of Visnu. The paraṁbhāgavatas, however, invariably used the Garuḍa emblem on most of their coins, thus showing their cult association. Of the other gods, Brahmanyaka-Kumāra was frequently reproduced on certain coins. The name Brahmanyaka was evidently the base of Subrahmanyā, in which name this god is generally worshipped in the south. The god had several iconographic types, as the coins show, which also prove that much of the mythology about him was already in existence in the 2nd century A.D. As regards several other consti-

1 Allan describes a symbol on some punch-marked coins closely related to those which contain the above, as ‘a rudely made human figure with the dumb-bell symbols on either side, and thinks that both probably represent the same deity named Kārttikeya. But I have shown that Siva is the god that is being figured on the other type. As regards the rudely made human figure, it might have been based on the ‘golden man in the Agnicayana ceremony; the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa expressly refers to one mode of making him, ‘Let him make no arms to this golden man, lest he should cause him to be redundant; for these two spoons are (in lieu of) his arms.’ In the coin device, this rudely made figure is without arms and the dumb bell like symbols (spoons ?) are on either side; see Pl. I, fig. 26.
tuents of the Brahmanic pantheon, the Pāñcāla Mitra coins supply us with some useful data. It has rightly been observed that 'the reverses are of special interest to the student of Hindu iconography, as we have nothing similar elsewhere of so early a date' (Allan). It is regrettable that their usefulness has to a certain extent been minimised by the smallness of the size of some and the imperfect state of preservation of others. The goddess Durgā-Pārvatī is not clearly recognisable in any of the early indigenous coins, though some of the female figures appearing on their reverse and usually identified as Lakṣmī, may represent her. On some coins of Azes I, she may be recognised if we are certain about the identity of the forepart of her lion mount beside her. But, without doubt, she figures on a few coins of Huvishka; Rapson was the first to identify her correctly. In one of the two figures—one male (Śiva) and the other female carrying a lotus flower in her hand—standing side by side on the reverse side of a gold coin of Huvishka in the British Museum collection, the die-cutter definitely puts down her name in four Greek letters by her side, which were correctly read by Rapson as OMMO (Umā). I read the same name by the side of a female figure appearing singly on the reverse of a gold coin of the same Kushan emperor in the collection of the Lahore Museum. But this time she is made to carry a cornucopiae, after the manner of an Ardhoche or a Demeter or a Tyche (as represented on the money of the Indo-Greek and the Indo-Scythic rulers), showing clearly how these Indian deities were being presented in their Hellenistic garb. The reverses of some of the coins of Huvishka, thus like the same of the Pāñcāla Mitra coins, are of special interest to the students of Brahmanical iconography.

A line or two about the character of the art manifest in the treatment of the various figures on the coins noticed
above will not be out of place here. In this way one can with some justification appraise indirectly the standard of art reached by the artist in different localities and different periods. But a word of caution is necessary here. The early punch-marked coins which were current throughout India from c. 6th or 7th century B.C. to as late as the 1st or 2nd century A.D. do little justice to the standard of plastic art, however imperfect, that might have been reached by the indigenous artists before the Maurya period and afterwards. Sir John Marshall, after comparing the monitory technique of the Indians as manifest in the above coins with the same of another Indian ruler Saubhūṭī (Gr. form 'Sophytes') by name, who was a contemporary of Alexander and who adopted Greek style in his money, observes, 'The rudimentary character of Indian art at this period is well exemplified by the current indigenous coins known commonly as punch-marked, which are singularly crude and ugly, neither their form which is unsymmetrical, nor the symbols which are stamped almost indiscriminately upon their surface, having any pretensions to artistic merit' (A Guide to Taxila, 2nd Edition, p. 24). This observation is true to a certain point. Long after the practice of issuing this class of coins was discontinued, coins were being issued in different localities of India, even up till modern times, that are singularly reminiscent of the former. Mention may only be made here of the crude copper pieces, usually known as dhimglā which were being manufactured by the goldsmiths of Umarda, under the orders of the Udayapur State, to supply the State coffers with small token money (W. W. Webb, The Currencies of Rajputana, pp. 13-14). If we are to judge the standard of the art of the locality from that manifest in this type of money, then we shall give very little credit to the former. It is a fact that the Indians, especially in their punch-marked coins did
not achieve any success in the matter of monetary technique. But they were not so unsuccessful in their cast coins and the devices which they executed in the negative moulds sometimes show faint traces of modelling. The elephant, bull and other animal devices on the early rectangular cast coins, the figure of Śrī-Lakṣmī on the uninscribed coin of Kausambi, Śiva and the Yakṣa couple on Ujjain coins, none of which is datable later than the 2nd century B.C., some being much earlier, bear out my statement. There is no justification for tracing any foreign influence on the above types of coins and the execution of these animal or human figures follows the indigenous method as present in the contemporary carvings of the same themes. It must be borne in mind that all these coins are made of molten copper and are mostly in a very imperfect state of preservation, many of their details being obliterated owing to their long circulation millenniums ago. The figure of Śiva-Vispamittra (Viśvāmitra) on the bi-scriptual silver coins of the Audumbara chief Dharaghoṣa, however, show foreign influence, as the over-emphasis of the muscles in the body indicates; it is a fact that these silver pieces were based on the money of the Indo-Greek rulers like Euthydemos II and Apollodotos. The device, however, is taken from Indian mythology. The bi-scriptual silver pieces of the Kuninḍas also, though they contain devices all of which are indigenous to India, are reminiscent of the Greek monetary technique. The figures of Śiva on the Indo-Scythian, Indo-Parthian and Kushan coins, or the very remarkable figure of Viṣṇu on a Kushan seal, justifiably attributed by Cunningham to Huvishka, are undoubtedly Hellenistic in character and there can be very little doubt that they were based on similar plastic forms of the divinities current in the extreme north of India. The deities appearing on the coins of the imperial Gupta rulers illustrate in a very characteristic manner the peculiar features of the Gupta style of sculpture.
CHAPTER V

Deities and their Emblems on Early Indian Seals

The earliest seals in India found in the Indus valley—representations of cult divinities on some of them—several composite forms—Mother-goddess cult in the Indus valley—incidental reference to several types of carved ring-stones discovered in different places of Northern India, like Taxila, Kausambi and Raighat—evidence of animism supplied by the Indus seals: Tree-worship in two different forms—its later manifestations as evidenced by the early coins, seals and stone reliefs of the historic period—the ideology probably underlying these divinities not Vedic in character but epic and puranic—Significance of this fact—comparative paucity of the Maurya, Sunga and Kushan seals—numerosity of the Gupta seals and seal-matrices from various sites like Bhitara, Basarh and Raighat—different cult divinities and their emblems depicted on them—very interesting mementos of religious conditions of the period—general observations.

Like the numismatic remains of ancient India, her glyptic ones also throw a flood of light on the mode of representing her divinities in different periods. The innumerable varieties of seals and similar objects that have been unearthed in various parts of northern India and that are dateable from the third or fourth millenium B.C. to the late Gupta period and afterwards contain numerous figures, many of which have been assumed with a great deal of justification to stand for various divinities in their anthropomorphic, theriomorphic and sometimes therio-anthropomorphic forms. On many seals of the Kushan and the Gupta periods, most of these gods and goddesses as also their emblems can be definitely recognised as belonging to one or other of the different religious creeds that were current in the period when they were manufactured. I have already drawn the attention of my readers, in the previous chapter, to the Sirkap bronze seal of Sivaraksita, that gave me the necessary clue for the identification of Siva on certain coin-devices of Maues. Mention has also been made by me there
of a few other metal and terracotta seals of the Kushan and the Gupta periods, which supply us with characteristic representations of such Hindu gods as Viṣṇu and Śiva, as well as a few of their emblems. I shall presently draw the attention of my readers to a good many seals of the Gupta period (a few amongst them going back to the Kushan age), that were unearthed at such old sites of India, like Bhita, Basarh and Rajghat etc. But before I begin a systematic study of some of these seals and seal matrices, from the iconographic point of view, it will be necessary for me to refer briefly to the many hundreds of sealings that were discovered in the course of excavations at the pre-historic Indus-valley sites of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. Whatever might have been the particular purpose which was served by them, there is little doubt that the figures which very frequently appear on their surface had some connection with the religion that was practised by these pre-historic Indians. The very interesting seal unearthed at Mohenjo-daro, which bears a three-faced horned figure ‘seated on a low Indian throne in a typical attitude of Yoga, with legs bent double beneath him, heel to heel, and toes turned downwards’, has previously been noticed by me. This particular sitting posture clearly corresponds to the Yogic āsana known as kūrmāsana, where the heels are placed under the gluteals in a manner exactly similar to the mode described above. It will be of interest here to give a fuller account about the device, so carefully studied by Sir John Marshall. The two arms of the figure, which are covered with bangles, are outstretched, and his hands with thumbs to front, rest on his knees; on his neck and breast is placed a series of necklaces or torques in a manner similar to that of the graiveyaka ornament placed on the neck and breast of the Yakṣa figures of the Śunga and the post-Śunga period; the lower limbs seem to be bare and the figure appears to be ithy-phallic; his head is crowned
by a pair of horns meeting in a tall head-dress. 'To either side of the god are four animals, an elephant and tiger on his proper right, a rhinoceros and buffalo on his left. Beneath the throne are two deer standing with heads regardant and horns turned to the centre.' Just below the trunk of the elephant on the top left corner and above the tiger is the crude outline of a human figure. Marshall is justifiably sure about the divine character of the figure and from its peculiarly distinctive attributes, such as three faces, the Yogic āsana, its association with animals, as many as five or six in number, its deer-throne and its horns, he concludes that the figure is a prototype of the historic Śiva-Paśupati.¹ The seal just noticed at length is the same as No. 420 in Mackay's list of seals discovered by him at Mohenjo-daro. Two other seals Nos. 222 and 235 in the same list, contain variant representations of apparently

¹ Marshall, M. I. C., Vol. I, pp. 52-6, pl. XII, 17. We miss, in the assembly of animals by the side of the god, Śiva's bull Nandi, Marshall has very rightly referred to the association of deer with the historic Śiva. As regards the horns, there is no need to assume that they 'took the form of the trisūla or trident in later days, and in that guise continued to be a special attribute of Śiva'; for the horns as such were also associated with Śiva, as is evident not only from the epic passage which reads: Svargāduttuṁgamamalam viśānam yatra sūlinaḥ Śvamātmuvihitaṁ dāśīvā mārttyuḥ śivapurum vrajet (Mahābhārata, Vanaparvva, Ch. 88, V. 8), but also from the fact that the horn as an instrument of music is very often placed in one of the hands of the popular representations of Śiva in Bengal. Hopkins thinks that the horn in the epic passage just quoted may refer to the crest of the image of Śiva (Epic Mythology p. 33).

Saletore recently attempted to identify the figure as Agni, in New Review, 55, X, 1930; but his grounds of objection to Marshall's view were refuted by Moraes in a subsequent issue of the same Journal. In one of the latest issues of J.R.A.S.B., the problem of the identity of the figure has been thoroughly discussed from the ethnological point of view by A. Aiyappan who has fully endorsed Marshall's identification (Letters, Vol. V, pp. 401-06).
the same deity, though many of the details of the former are omitted there. The figure on seal No. 235 bears only one face, and the head, adorned with a pig-tail hanging down on one side, is shown in profile. The head-dresses of the figures in these two seals (222 & 235) are very similar, 'but surmounted by a plant motif with three branches in the one case and only a single branch on the other.' Mackay remarks about this head-dress, 'The larger figure on seal 420 lacks this spray of foliage, but has instead the fan-shaped ornament commonly associated with the pottery female figurines.'

Marshall refers to two seals found at Mohenjo-daro, which contain figures of a god seated in yoga posture, on whose either side kneels a half-human half-animal form of a Nāga with hands uplifted in prayer (M.I.C., III, CXVI, 29 and CXVIII, 11). It is not quite clear, however, from these two seal devices whether the snake-body is attached to the back of the kneeling human votaries of the god; in the early Kushan and subsequent representations of the Nāgas at Mathura and other sites, the whole serpent body and sometimes only its many hoods (one, five or seven) are invariably attached behind the human body (the latter mode

1 Mackay, Further Excavations at Mohenjo-daro, Vol. I, p. 385; Vol. II, pl. LXXXVII, figs. 222 and 235, and pl. XCV, fig. 20. Mackay is not sure whether there are horns on the head of the figures on seals Nos. 420 and 222; with regard to the latter, he says, 'The horns, if indeed they are horns, are definitely separate from the head; they are, moreover, represented as fastened to the base of the twig.' What has been described as a probable urddhaliṅga feature of the figure on No. 420 is absent on the figures on the two other seals, where they appear to be wearing a very short piece of loin-cloth comparable, according to Mackay, with ṭyāṅgot, so frequently worn by yogis and sannyāsins of India.

A. Aiyappan has made some very useful suggestions with regard to the horned head-dress in J.R.A.S.B., Letters, Vol. V, pp. 01-6.
is also adopted in the Suṅga art of Central India). But on these seals, the technique of showing the Nāgas might have been somewhat similar to the one followed by the Bharhut artist in his presentation of the scene of Elāpatra Nāgarāja’s visit to the Buddha; at first Elāpatra is shown in his serpent form, then he is given the human shape with the snake hoods attached behind his head. On these Indus Valley seals, the snakes appear on the far sides while the kneeling human figurines, without any snake hood, on the near sides of the god.

Several other composite figures are also found on these seals; human-faced goat or ram, part goat or ram, part bull and part man, part ram or goat, part bull, and part elephant with human countenance,—all these are figured on seals Nos. 378, 380 and 381. These curious composite forms, so clearly reminiscent of the Pramathas or Gaṇas, the attendants of Siva, of subsequent days, are apparently also represented in the stone images in the round, illustrated in M.I.C., Vol. III, pl. C, 7 and ∨. Marshall remarks, ‘Such stone images can hardly have been other than cult objects intended for worship; on the other hand, the seals which like most of the seals found in the Indus Valley, were almost certainly amulets, were used by the votaries of this curious syncretic form of deity’ (Ibid, Vol. I., pp. 66-7). Mackay’s excavations at Mohenjo-daro brought to light a few more seals with the composite animal figures. The beast on his seals numbering 24 and 494 represents ‘a combination of the usual urus-like animal with two other heads, those of an antelope and a short-horned bull.’ A possible explanation suggested by him about this unusual device is that ‘its owner may have sought the protection or assistance of three separate deities represented by the heads of these three animals.’ ¹ The same archaeologist also records the

discovery of four seals numbering 411, 450, 521 and 636, from the lower levels, having the curious human-faced composite animal similar to that on Marshall's seals numbering 378, 380 and 381, already noticed by me. In this figure, there is a fusion of as many as three, or possibly four, animals,—forelegs of an ox-like animal, the striped hindquarters and feet of a tiger, short curved horns of a bull or an antelope and the lolling trunk of an elephant and its pair of tusks. Mackay observes that this composite figure perhaps represented a deity that was worshipped at Moherjodaro; he is also inclined to think that 'it was perhaps also portrayed in statue form, as the representation of it on the seals shows it to be wearing garlands with which it is likely that its images were adorned' (Ibid, 3:3). These chimaera-like creatures distinctly remind us of the human-faced winged bulls and griffins of the early Buddhist art of Central India, whose prototypes have been found by Grünwedel and others in the similar creatures of imagination portrayed in the early art of Western Asia. I may, however, draw the attention of my readers to one very significant observation of Mackay, in this connection. 'Composite animals are, of course, well-known in ancient art in other parts of the world; they are supposed to have been invented, if we may thus term it, in Sumer and Elam, whence came the later 'beast art' of Europe. It is not outside the bounds of possibility that the conception of a composite animal originated in India and spread from there gradually to the west by the land route.'

1 Mackay, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 83; Vol. II, pls. LXXXIII, XCIV, XCV, XCVI, XCVIII. 'These composite animals appear only on the seals of the earlier occupations,' as is evident from the fact that the latter are found only in the lower level, but the fact of their not being found in the upper strata should not be stressed too far.
unearthed from mound F at Harappa. Each of its three faces contains a standing mythical figure, the one of the left face being very interesting; it is human above the waist and bovine below. The figures on the right and middle faces also seem to be human above and animal below (Vats, Excavations at Harappa p. 44). I have already mentioned the name of the Gaṇas and the Pramathas, while referring to the human-faced animal forms. The Garuḍas, Gandharvas, Kinnaras, Kumbhāṇḍas and others of the epic and purāṇic literature and ancient and mediaeval Indian art of the historic period should also be considered in this connection. The base of some of the above is undoubtedly Vedic in character (Garuḍa-Garutman, Sun conceived as a bird in the Rgveda); but who can doubt that these creatures of imagination owed much for their origin and evolution to the dim memories of the remote past in the minds of the Indians of the age of the Mahābhārata and of the Purāṇas?

Some of these seals also contain representations of particular scenes which seem to illustrate mythological stories current among the pre-historic people of this region. These seal devices can very well be compared with the iconographic presentation of various myths associated with different religious creeds of India in the subsequent period. A reference to a few such seal devices will not be out of place here. Vats describes a triangular prism sealing of terracotta with a blurred legendary scene on each side. One face of this seal shows a god in a standing posture; his right arm is profusely decorated, but the left one is indistinct. Its second face shows a tall, stalwart man engaged in fighting a bison which has been firmly caught by the horns. Vats observes, 'The scene may be a representation of Ea-bani fighting a bison in a jungle.' The third face shows to left a human figure, most presumably a deity, seated in a typical attitude of Yoga with
another figure to right seated on its haunches. The same author elaborately notices an oblong terracotta sealing which contains legendary scenes on both its faces; the order of depiction on each face probably runs from left to right. It is so very interesting for the purpose of our present study, that I cannot but fully note his description of the devices on both the sides. The obverse shows first of all a man attacking a tiger from a māchān (scaffolding) erected on an acacia tree, then the deity seated on a low Indian throne in the well-known Yogic posture; from behind his head-dress there is a long tassel-like appendage to right, which reminds us of a similar object on the head of a similar figure on some Mohenjo-daro seals described by Mackay (cf. Nos. 222 and 235 already noted by me). Of the animals to his right, the one on the enclosure may be a goat, that below the projection, a hare or kid and that above it, an indistinct animal with a long body. The reverse side of it shows from left to right a humpless bull standing by a trident-headed post, with his head bent down a little, then a standing figure, possibly a god, in front of a two-storied structure, followed by three pictograms at the right end. The structure seems to be of wood and is of unusual interest. It 'looks like a combined side elevation and perspective of a double-storied room preceded by a porch—both of open work in front, but seemingly the two-storied room is closed by lattice-work on the rear side and crowned at the corners by somewhat conical finials.' It is not certain what the bifurcated object apparently hanging down from a projection in front of the terrace stands for; just below it, however, is placed a domical something over the porch:

1 *Excavations at Harappa*, Vol. I, p. 129; Vol. II, Pl. XCIII, 310. The tentative explanation of the scene depicted on the first face may be correct; but the scene depicted on the third face is undoubtedly Indian in nature.
Vats remarks, "The structure is probably of a sacred character, and in view of the trident post and bull, which are peculiarly associated with Siva whose prototype has been found at Mohenjo-daro, the possibility of the standing figure being ultimately identified as another form of the same god may not be ruled out."¹ The scene of what appears to be a tiger-hunt is comparatively familiar in Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. Marshall suggests that such seals may have been used as protective amulets against tigers or other jungle animals (M.I.C., Vol. I, p. 71). This explanation holds good as regards the obverse device, but the reverse one partially reminds me of the reverse device of certain Ujjain coins, which I have reproduced in Pl. I, fig. 15; the animals are no doubt absent, but here too is some sort of a structure with conical projections (?), as well as a trident-headed post which, however, is held by the right hand of the standing figure on the right side (in the previous chapter, I have suggested the possibility of this figure representing the votary; it may as well be the cult deity in his human form). As regards 'the domical object over the porch' on the Harappa seal, it might be the same as the realistic phallos which appears on the obverse of the same types of coins (cf. Pl. I, fig. 14). It may be noted in passim, the figure standing by the humpless bull on the Harappa seal seems to hold a long staff in his left hand and a water-vessel like object in his right one, just reminiscent of similar figures on certain punch-marked coins, which I have tentatively identified as Siva in the previous chapter (cf. Pl. I, fig. 4). The devices on the two seals, Nos. 279 and 510 of Mackay's book, are of great interest for our study. The former depicts

¹ M. S. Vats, op. cit., pp. 129-30, Pl. XCI1, 303. Both the above terracotta seals were discovered in Mound F, belonging to Stratum No. III.
a buffalo with its head so represented as to show both the rugged horns, below which is placed an apparently partitioned feeding-trough; in the extreme left corner is shown a man with his foot upon the buffalo's nose, grasping a horn with one hand and with the other about to thrust a spear with a barbed point into the animal's back; there was a pictogram on the top right, only one letter being preserved, the others being broken off. The same scene also appears on two other sealings unearthed at Mohenjo-daro. Mackay, with a great deal of diffidence, remarks that this scene 'may represent a belief not unlike the legend of Dundubhi, the buffalo demon, whom Siva and other gods attacked with tridents; though their weapons proved powerless against the animal, they eventually killed it by means of incantations.' 1 The parallelism noticed by Mackay is no doubt very interesting; I remember one passage of the Durgā-saptasati, which, while describing the fight between the goddess Durgā and the evil incarnate in the shape of the buffalodemon, says, 'sāruḍhi taṃ mahāsuraṃ pādenākrāmya kaṇṭhe ca sūlenainamatādayat' i.e., '(the goddess appearing) to climb upon the great demon, attacked him with her leg and struck at his neck with her śūla (it may be a trident or a barbed spear). The purānic description of this fight may also be a close parallel, but the human figure in Mohenjo-daro seals seems to be a male one and the different forms of plastic representations of Durgā as Maḥiṣamarddini have

1 Mackay, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 936; Vol. II, Pl. LXXXVIII, fig. 279, Pls. XCI, 4a, XCII, 11b. He quotes, as his authority for the Dundubhi legend, Oppert's Oriental (evidently a misprint for Original) Inhabitants of India, pp. 473-74. In the 9th chapter of the Avantikṣetramahāmyam of the Āvanya-Khaṇḍam of the Skandapurāṇa, we find the story of the buffalo-demon named Hālāhala being killed by the Gaṇas of Siva as well as the other gods assembled in the Rudrakṣetra near Avanti.
very little similarity to the scene on the Indus seals, just described. Mackay's seal No. 510 shows a buffalo which seems to have attacked a number of people who are lying on the ground in every conceivable position. Without excluding the possibility of its depicting 'an episode that actually occurred to some of the inhabitants of Mohenjo-daro,' Mackay observes, 'we may perhaps see in this scene a god, or the emblem of a god, attacking his enemies, a parallel to the well-known scene on the slate palettes of the First Dynasty of Egypt, where the king himself in his attribute "Strong Bull" gores a prostrate enemy.'

It is time now to refer to a few more early Indus-Valley seals and incidentally to other objects of a somewhat similar nature, that seems to prove the existence of the Mother-goddess cult among the people of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. Marshall has observed that though there is no direct proof about the existence of Saktism in this region, yet there is enough indirect evidence in the shape of phalli, baetyllic stones and ring-stones. The same author drew the attention of scholars to numbers of female figurines of terracotta, etc., that were discovered not only in this part of India but also from Baluchistan, though the ones discovered in the latter place differ from those of the Indus Valley, in that they are not full-length images. The great majority of these female figurines appear as 'a standing and almost nude female, wearing a band or girdle about her loins with elaborate head-dress and collar, and occasionally with ornamental cheek cones and a long necklace.' Mackay remarks (ibid, Vol. I, p. 265), 'In fact, what are generally regarded as images of an Earth or

2 Marshall, M.I.C., Vol. I, p. 48 ff. Marshall refers to the wide belt of the ancient world from the Indus to the Nile, in which these figurines have been found; he is sure that they are 'effigies of the great Mother-Goddess or of one or other of her local manifestations.'
Mother-goddess are practically always nude, save for quantities of jewellery, a wide girdle and their remarkable head-dress.' Now, an oblong terracotta seal with scenes depicted on both sides, that was unearthed at Harappa, most probably contains a representation of the same goddess with some additional traits. The right side of the obverse face is occupied by a nude female figure shown upside down with legs wide apart, and 'with a plant issuing from her womb'; her arms are shown in the same position in which those of the proto-type of Siva-Paśupati are shown; at the left side of the same are shown a pair of tigers standing facing each other (these are regarded by Marshall as two genii, animal ministrants of the deity). The left part of the reverse side of this seal contains two human figures, one male and the other female; the latter seated, with her hair dishevelled, raises her hands in supplication to the male who stands in front of her in a threatening attitude with a shield-like thing and a sickle-shaped object in his left and right hands respectively. Marshall suggests that the scene is intended to portray a human sacrifice connected with the Earth Goddess depicted on the other side, with whom we must also associate the two genii. This striking and unique representation of the goddess with a plant issuing from her womb is compared by Marshall with a terracotta relief of the early Gupta age from Bhita on which the goddess is shown with her legs in much the same position, but with a lotus issuing from her neck instead of from her womb.¹ One of the most interesting

¹ Marshall. M. I. C., Vol. I, p. 54, pl. XII, fig. 12. M. S. Vats, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 42, Vol. II, pl. XCI, 304. Marshall after comparing the two animal "genii" on this sealing with those hailing from the Aegean area and Mesopotamia, remarks, 'That the conception of these animal genii arose independently in Greece, Mesopotamia and India is hardly conceivable, but whether it originated in the East or West has yet to be determined.'
seals bearing the representation of a goddess, this time a tree-goddess or spirit, was discovered at Mohenjo-daro. The tree, an *asvattha* as recognisable from its leaves shown on the top right corner, is represented by its two branches only springing from a circle on the ground; between the two branches stands the nude deity having long hair, a pair of horns with probably a spring of foliage in between, or *triśūla* horns, and armlets; in front of the tree appears a half-kneeling worshipper, also with long hair, armlets and horns (between a pair of these a leaf-spray or plume is recognisable here), behind whom stands a goat with human face; in the register below are seven ministrants or votaries, each dressed in short kilt and wearing long pig tails with a spray of leaves or a feather in the hair; beyond the foot of the tree on the right is a square partitioned receptacle very similar in conception to the pottery dishes found in Mohenjo-daro. Marshall is of opinion that the whole scene represents the epiphany of the tree-goddess, taking the composite human-headed animal figure as a protecting local divinity of a minor type accompanying the suppliant into the presence of the tree-goddess.¹

Though the objects now to be noted by me do not really fall in the category of sealings, still I feel a brief reference to them will be of some use to us in our present study. A large number of ring-stones, ranging from half an inch to nearly four feet in diameter, have been found in the course of excavations at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa; the larger ones are made of stone, while the smaller ones

¹ Marshall, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 63-5, pl. XII, fig. 18. Mackay, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 337-8; Vol. II, pl. XCIV, fig. 430, pl. XCIX, A. The goddess standing between the branches of the tree is reminiscent of one of the variants of the goddess Lakṣmi, in which she is made to stand on the pericarp of a lotus flower, with lotus flowers and leaves on long stalks spreading on her either side; cf. *H. I. I. A.*, pl. XIV, fig. 52.
are of different materials such as stone, faience, shell, or imitation carnelian. 'The most typical of them have their upper and lower surfaces undulating; in others, the lower surface is flat, and the top takes a quatrefoil form' (Marshall). Two explanations were suggested by scholars with regard to the nature of these objects; according to some, the larger ones of them served as architectural members, while according to others they were stone money. But Marshall has raised very reasonable objections to both these suggestions and his own interpretation that these are to be regarded as representations of Yoni, the female organ of generation, as symbolising motherhood and fertility still appears to be the correct one. When they are compared to the numbers of phalli,—they are so realistic that they cannot be explained in any other way (cf. the realism manifest in the earliest stonephalli of the historic period discovered at Gužinallam, Mathura and other places),—that have been discovered in the same region, there remains very little doubt about the truth of Marshall's explanation. But it must be borne in mind that in the Indus Valley both the phalli and the yoni stones appear to have served the purpose of cult objects separately, as seems to have also been the case with the early phalli and the yoni stones of subsequent days. In fact, the liṅgam in arghya (or yoni) design is comparatively late in appearance and even then in the conventional Śivalīṅgas the spout like projection from which the pūjābhāga of the Śivalīṅga rises upward and which is taken by the uninitiated as symbolising yoni, is really a nāla or drain for the easy outflow of the volume of water usually poured on the top of the emblem by the numerous devotees of the god.¹ These phalli and the ring

¹ The elaborate pedestal, however, in the conventional Śivalīṅgas of the subsequent period were definitely regarded as illustrating the female principle as the iconographic texts of a comparatively late date, as well as many late Sanskrit works fully prove. It must
stones, thus appear to have separately symbolised the principles of virility and fecundity, both of which are highly esteemed by all men in all ages. Marshall has referred to his own discovery of several curious stone discs, three of which were unearthed from the Bhir Mound at Taxila, one from inside the structures uncovered near the foot of Hathial (Taxila) and one at Kosam. A fragment of a similar object was recently found in course of excavation at Rajghat near Benares. The Hathial one is described by Marshall, thus, ‘It is of polished sandstone \(3\frac{1}{4}\)" in diameter, adorned on the upper surface with concentric bands of cross and cable patterns and with four nude female figures alternating with honey-suckle designs engraved in relief around the central hole’ (I.S.I.A.R., 1927-28, p. 66). It will be of interest now to compare with the above Taxila discs a partially broken reddish steatite circular disc about \(2\frac{1}{2}\)" in diameter, found at Rajghat, which contain on the outer side of its top surface a very well-carved decorative design. The decoration consists of a palm tree with a horse by its side, beyond which is a female figure holding a bird in her outstretched right hand (there is an indistinct object beneath her right hand and a taurine near her left shoulder); then follow in successive orders—a long-eared and short-tailed animal, a crane, the goddess again with her hands this time stretched downwards, some object which is broken, palm-tree again, a bird, a small circular disc, the goddess again with the circular disc near her left shoulders, then a winged mythical animal and lastly a crane with a crab-like object near its legs. The goddess is thrice repeated with the various accessory figures noted above in between her three representations. But one thing to be noted here is that be noted however, that these elaborate pedestals are usually absent in the phallic emblems of earlier date.
unlike the Taxila disc just described, the device appears here on the top surface instead of on the side of the central depression of the disc, and the hole is not there; the surface near the central hole of this one is filled with a beautiful scroll design. The carving is so very beautifully executed on this piece which is in the collection of the Bharat Kala Bhavan, Museum, that it can justifiably be assigned to the same age to which the Taxila, Kosam and other discs belong. The same museum has in its collection a fragment of a red steatite disc unearthed in course of excavations at Rajghat near Benares, which is more similar to the Taxila disc. This has a hole through the centre, around which as in the Taxila ones are engraved two nude female figures with their hands stretched downwards with probably a honey-suckle in between them; on the flat surface of the disc between cable designs are two monkey-like animals holding a creeper(?) with a lizard (or an alligator) in between them; there is a partially defaced inscription in early Brāhmī script on its rim, which is illegible. Another partly broken similar disc hailing from Kosam, which has been acquired by the aforesaid Museum at Benares, contains a much damaged though partially legible inscription in Asokan Brāhmī. The inscription reads,......ma ṇ tha ṇ ka bhā dā ma tha lo ga tara śa a ga la(?) na(ni?) ka ye la ṇ ca le......; it is unfortunate that no sense can be made of it. The ring-stone has two bands of decoration cut in relief on one face around the hole. On one band can be seen a row of alligators below a twisted rope, and on the second band which extends into the hole are carved the nude goddess between three-pronged trees. The inscription noted above appears on the side of the disc. All the above discs can justifiably be regarded as cult objects comparable with the pre-historic ring stones of the Indus Valley on the one hand and the cakras and the yantras of the Śāktas, the Viṣṇuṣṭalas of the Vaiṣṇavas and the āyāgapatās of the
Jainas on the other. But their ideological association with the former, *viz.*, the *cakras* and the *yantras* of the latter day Śākta cult appears to be closer.\(^1\) Marshall observes about the Taxila discs, ‘In these ring-stones, which are quite small and used perhaps as exvoto offerings, nude figures of a goddess of fertility are significantly engraved with consummate skill and care—inside the central hole, thus indicating in a manner that can hardly be mistaken the connection between them and the female principle.’ \(^2\)

The pre-historic people of the Indus Valley appear to have been great believers in animism also, as is proved by a good many seals discovered at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. The worship of trees or the tree-spirits is the characteristic manifestation of animistic belief. I have already referred to a seal which seems to unite in its device the worship of the female principle as well as that of the tree-spirit, where the epiphany of the female deity in the tree is

\(^1\) The stone discs in the Bhūrat Kalā Bhavan, noted above have not yet been published. Rai Shahib Krishnadas, the Curator of the Museum, kindly gave me permission to utilise them for my book. I may here refer to one cylindrical amulet like object of red steatite about 1\(\frac{1}{2}\)" in length and 3\(\frac{1}{2}\)" in breadth, found at Rajghat, which is somewhat similar to a few cylindrical seals (amulets?) unearthed at Mohenjo-daro. There are three shallow incuse bands, two on either side and one in the middle, the latter dividing the small cylinder in two fairly equal sections; in one of them are found, in order, a taurine, a long-eared and short-tailed animal, a two-humped camel and a lion, while the other section bears in succession a taurine, a horse, the long-eared and short-tailed animal and an elephant.

\(^2\) *M.I.C.*, Vol. I, pp. 62-3. In the fn. No. 1 on page 63, he says, ‘That ring-stones of this type had a wide vogue in ancient India is shown by the discovery of another specimen at Sahet-Mahet (ancient Srāvasti) in the U.P., and by the fact that they were copied by the Buddhists, though with this difference that the nude figures of the goddess were eliminated.’
portrayed in a half realistic, half conventional manner. Many seals in the Indus Valley sites show the presence of two different forms of tree-worship among the people of the locality: 'One in which the tree itself is worshipped in its natural form, the other in which the tree spirit is personified and endowed with human shape and human attributes.' On several sealings at Harappa (Nos. 16, 20, 21, 25, 26, M.I.C., Pl. XII), various sacred trees are represented, which the artists have attempted to differentiate one from another. A few of these trees appear to be enclosed by walls or railings such as commonly surround the base of the sacred trees (vrīṣṭakaityas) as depicted in the later reliefs of the historic period. In the fourth chapter of my book, I have drawn the attention of my readers to one of the commonest devices on the early indigenous coins of India—which is the 'tree within railing.' These enclosed trees on the Indus seals can very well be compared with the above and can justifiably be taken as distant prototypes of the vrīṣṭakaityas and the sthulavrīṣṭas represented in the latter. The terracotta seal (No. 2410) found at Harappa has as its obverse device 'a deity wearing a kilt or short tunic and a three-pointed head-dress (or īrīśāla horns?), standing under an ornamental arch, which appears to be made of the bent bough of a pipal tree. The lower ends of this bough are rounded up to form loops, each enclosing a star. The head of the deity is turned a little towards the right and on both arms he wears a number of armlets' (Vats, ibid., Vol. I, p. 43). The device on one of the sides of a three-sided terracotta prism discovered at Mohenjo-daro, can be described thus: On the extreme right a horned figure with arms adorned with bracelets, standing between two pipal trees; on its left, a sacred goat decorated with garlands, recalling the scene explained by Marshall as the epiphany of the tree-goddess; beyond it a kneeling horned
deity, apparently a goddess (cf. the long pig-tail), holding out both of its hands, a small offering table with something like a bird on it being shown on the extreme left (Mackay, *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 351; Vol. II, Pl. LXXXII, Nos. 1 and 2). It is no doubt impossible for us at the present state of our knowledge to be sure about the exact significance of this scene, but we shall not be far wrong if we find in it also the representation of a mythology associated with a tree-spirit. The scene on an amulet noticed by Mackay (*ibid.*, pp. 354-55, Pl. XC, 23a and b) may be referred to in this connection. Two men are shown, each carrying a tree torn from the ground, with their roots clearly visible; perhaps, the men are about to transplant the trees for the abode of a spirit who is depicted in between the tree-carrying figures; the leafy nature of the arm of this spirit really represents the armlets of the divinity. Mackay has cited an interesting parallel to this scene in that of the puranic story of the Yamalarjuna trees which were uprooted by the child Kṛṣṇa, thus releasing the two spirits confined in them. We find its iconographic presentation in reliefs of the late Gupta period and afterwards and it has been suggested by Mackay that it owed its origin to a similar myth of a much earlier date.¹

The above survey of a few representative seals of the Indus Valley has partially acquainted us with the nature of the beliefs and practices of the pre-historic people of India in that region. Several conclusions have been drawn about the iconographic presentation of some of

¹ The two Arjuna trees were really the two sons of the Yakṣa king Kubera, viz., Manigriṇa and Nala-Kubera, who were cursed by Nārada to be changed into trees. Kṛṣṇa released them from this accursed existence by uprooting the trees. The scene on the Mohenjo-daro amulet is somewhat different from its puranic counterpart, inasmuch as, in the former, two persons instead of one are shown with the uprooted trees in their hands.
their gods and goddesses, after a careful study of the devices appearing on the seals and amulets; the nature of these conclusions, however, is still a tentative one to a certain extent. As I have said in the second chapter, the unravelling of the mystery of the script and language of the seals, if it is ever unravelled at all, will shed more definite light on the problem.¹ Marshall makes this interesting remark about the representation of the Indus Valley divinities of the remote past, 'the people of Mohenjo-daro had not only reached the stage of anthropomorphising their deities, but were worshipping them in that form as well as in the aniconic'; for, the highly conventionalized type of the image of what he justifiably describes as the prototype of Śiva-Paśupati, its stylized details and the fact that the kindred image portrayed on the faience sealing is being worshipped by the Nāgas clearly point to its being 'a copy of a cult idol.'² The decoration (cf. the amulets, head-dress, etc.), the sitting posture, the mode of showing the hands, the horns on the head, etc., appear also in other figures, some of which may depict the different aspects of the same god. The nude goddess, either in association with a tree or not, with some of the above characteristics, is shown as an object of veneration. Many composite human and animal figures found on the seals and amulets very probably stand for divinities in their theriomorphic or therioanthropomorphic forms, though many others are to be regarded as mere accessories. Most, if not all, of the above types of figures appear to have been based on actual icons of cult gods which were

¹ In the second chapter of my book, I have hesitated to endorse fully the conclusions of Marshall, Mackay and Chanda. But since I wrote those lines, I went to Harappa and studied the seals and other antiquities on the spot. I have now much less hesitation in accepting many of their findings.

being worshipped by the people in those days. But, what is most interesting in this connection is the fact that the ideology which seems to underlie many of the above divinities does not correspond to the same at the root of such Vedic deities as Indra, Mitra, Agni, Varuna and others. It is true we cannot describe the former as so many Hindu divinities and their representations as those of many Hindu icons, yet it can be suggested that they contributed a great deal towards the formation of the concepts underlying some of the later Hindu gods. The apparent reproductions of mythical scenes on these prehistoric objects might also have contained the germs of different mythologies of the later period. It is not suggested, however, that the myths current about many of the Vedic gods and the anthropomorphic conceptions underlying them had nothing to do with the shaping and development of a good many of their epic and purânic counterparts. I have already hinted about the great part which the former had to play in formulating the various god-concepts of the later times; this will also be fully demonstrated in my work on the images of the various Hindu gods and goddesses. But what I want to emphasise here is that the Vedic traits of the latter, especially in the case of some of the sectarian divinities, were really superimposed on their primitive pre-historic core. As the Vedic period was far nearer to the epic and purânic times and as copious literary data of the former age are available to us, we can trace out the analogies and influences with more certainty. Further researches and excavations in various old sites of India, let us hope, will supply us with more clues and links of the intervening period, that are now missing, which will enable us to connect the Indus Valley evidence with the epic and the purânic data with more definiteness. Even the changes in the Vedic beliefs and practices of a date later than that of the early Brâhædic hymns, as has been suggested by me
in the previous sections of this book, were brought about by the rites and customs of these pre-historic people of India.

Seals and seal matrices with devices of an iconographic character on their surface dateable in the Maurya or the Suṅga period are very rare. The small stone discs with the figures of the Mother-Goddess (Earth Goddess?) carved around their central hole have already been mentioned by me in connection with the ring-stones discovered in the sites of the Indus Valley; but they cannot be described as so many seals. Numerous terracotta seals, however, with Hindu divinities and their emblems on them, have been unearthed in two of the old sites in northern India, viz., Basarh and Bhita, which are of great archaeological interest; these mostly belong to the early and late Gupta period, a few being dateable still earlier. To these will have to be added the recent find of terracotta seals of the Kushan and Gupta periods at Rajghat near Benares (a few in this lot even go back to the Suṅga date, though they do not bear any iconographic device); some of them bear representations of deities and their emblems. Many terracotta seals were also unearthed at Nalanda, some of which are of unique interest from iconographic point of view; they, however, mostly date from the late Gupta period and afterwards. Different purposes were served by these seals, some being attached with a string to letter tablets; others were royal, official or mercantile guild tokens meant for the use of their servants and followers; a few of them again were undoubtedly manufactured for the use of the heads of religious establishments and their retainers while a vast number were also the sealings of private individuals. It has been suggested that as a large number of such seals (over 700) were discovered in one single spot while excavating Basarh, it is likely that the seal matrices were manufactured there; so many impressions—sometimes double, triple, and multiple on a single lump of clay—denoted that the former were being
tested in that way. The finished seals were usually made of clay, perhaps prepared according to one of the processes to be mentioned in connection with the manufacture of terracotta images in the next chapter. Most of them were burnt after they had received the impressions from the particular seal matrices, some being very lightly burnt, while a few others were merely sun-burnt. Many of the above varieties of seals bear the figures of several Brahmanical gods and their emblems; the former are comparatively rare, the latter being most numerous. Sometimes, only the name of the cult-deity accompanied with some auspicious symbol is engraved, without any impression of his iconic figure or emblems, while at other times different emblems in varieties of combinations make their appearance. In many cases, there is a characteristic connection between the name of the issuer and the deity or his emblem or emblems reproduced on the seals, as we find on some coins of the Pāñcāla series. One thing, however, is quite evident from our study of representative specimens from Bhita and Basarh, that even when the Brahmanical cult-gods were being iconically represented, they were comparatively infrequently used in the terracotta seals, where copious use was made of the varieties of their emblems. Again, it is highly probable that an emblem which, in its association with others, would belong to one particular cult, may, when depicted singly, be connected with another. Thus the conch-shell with wheel and other emblems is undoubtedly Vaiśampava in character, but when appearing alone may sometimes denote the Saikhanidhi of Kubera, a very appropriate symbol for merchant guilds and bankers.

Siva or his emblems are found depicted on the seals above in various ways. I have already referred to the representation of him in his līṅga from between two trees with the legend 'pādapeśvara' in the field in Gupta characters, which is in the collection of Babu Dhir Sing Nahar of Calcutta. A
pointed oval seal was discovered by T. Bloch at Basarh, which bears on it a Śivalīṅga with a trident-battleaxe symbol (Bloch simply says triśūla, but the combined triśūlā-parāśu is quite clear from his plate), the legend in exergue below being Āmrātakēśvara, meaning the lord of Āmrātaka (Pl. X, Fig. 6). Now Āmrātaka is the name of a mountain; Bloch draws our attention to the eight Guhya liṅgas mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa, viz., Hariścandra, Āmrātakēśvara, Jaleśvara, Sṛīparvata, Mahālaya, Kṛmicaṇḍeśvara, Kedāra and Mahābhairava, which, according to him, were situated in Avimukta, i.e., Benares (A.S.I.A.R., 1903-04, p. 110, No. 30, Pl. XL, 2). Bloch remarks about it: ‘The letter to which it was attached must have been sent by the custodians of the temple of Āmrātakēśvara.’ The oval seal (No. 39) in the same series (ibid., p. 111) simply bears the legend Nama Paśupatī. The square seal matrix (No. 574) discovered by D. B. Spooner at the same site (Basarh) in 1913-14, and reproduced by him in the Annual Report of the year (Pl. XLIX) bears three symbols on the top section and the legend Baņjulaka in early Gupta characters in the lower one, the sections being separated by two closely parallel horizontal lines. Of the three symbols, the middle one is a triśūla with a short handle, that on the right ‘resembling in shape the early Brāhmaṇ character for dhu’ is nothing but a longish water-vessel as seen in the hands of Śiva appearing on the coins of Kanishka and Huvishka and the other on the left ‘looking like ra’ is but a short staff as is placed in one hand of the same deity on some of Huvishka’s coins. So, what we have here is really the three attributes in the hands of Śiva. A fragmentary sealing or seal impression of the early Gupta period found by Spooner at Basarh (ibid., pp. 121, 150, Pl. L, No. 672) shows ‘a very roughly sketch ed bullock running to right with the crescent moon above’ (the suggested reading Māradatta cannot be supported if one refers to the plate and I can suggest no other reading as the
plate is too indistinct); this is, of course, nothing but Śiva with crescent moon (Ṣaśāṅkaśekhara) in his theriomorphic form. The unique seal impression (ibid, p. 129, No. 84, Pl. XLVI) shows on the upper edge of its slightly concave surface a small conventional śaṅkha in outline and a very good humped bull recumbent to left in the middle of the field; the legend is Rudradevasya. The former may have no Vīṣṇute association here and may simply stand for the 'Śaṅkhani Śīhā.' The humped bull appears on several other seals from Spooner's find at Basarh, the name of the owner, such as Rudrarakṣita, etc., in them (a good many of them are inscribed) showing its cult connection; on some there is a globular object placed between the horns of the animal, which shows, according to some scholars, Sassanian influence. But one very fine large temple seal in Spooner's list (ibid., p. 142, No. 369, with one duplicate, Pl. XLVIII) requires notice here, for it bears five interesting emblems in a row on its top section; Spooner describes them as ‘(1) a tall vase with radiating rays or flower-stalks; (2) something that looks like a tall and slender tree, such as a poplar, not that I suppose it is a poplar in reality; (3) the central figure, which has the outline of a stouter tree with spreading base; (4) a battleaxe to left surmounted by a trident; (5) a kalasa with rays or flower-stalks.’ The legend in Ś Gupta characters reads Aramikīśvarasya, i.e., (seal of the temple) of Aramikīśvara. The seal is undoubtedly Śaiva in character as the inscription on it shows, and of the five emblems, the trident-axe particularly belongs to this cult; the vase, represented twice, one on each end, in different forms, may stand for maṅgalaṇghata with twigs on both or on one of them—the slender one on the left side may be a variant of an water-vessel as is sometimes placed in the hands of Śiva on Kushan coins; the central device may represent, though in a schematic way, the somewhat realistic liṅga on a spread base, while the one to its immediate proper
right is nothing but a *sakti* (spear) with a long flat blade. There is thus, not much difficulty to define the five objects, as Spooner thinks; an interesting detail which has been missed by him is that all these five emblems are placed on separate pedestals on 'the ribbon-like horizontal band a little below the true centre,' thus indicating their sacred character. The fine seal No 764 (*ibid.*, p. 152, Pl. L) contains a device which has been described by Spooner as follows—'a tall female figure standing facing, with the upper part of the body bent considerably to the proper left, left hand on hip; right extended toward the right as in the *varadamudra*. The figure is seemingly nude, but there are draperies floating to left and right from the level of the waist, and some garland or drapery pendent in front, as though suspended from a girdle around the waist;......the most curious feature of all is the head-dress which she wears, like a single high horn with streamer floating to the (proper) left.' I had to quote the above description at some length, for the correct understanding of the iconography of the figure; the seal is very imperfectly reproduced in the plate, a reference to which will enable us to add some features unnoticed by Spooner and tentatively explain their nature. The left breast of the figure is abnormally large in proportion to the right one, which holds a staff-like object in its right hand; 'the curious head-dress like a single high horn' is most probably nothing but the longish coil of *jatā* shown on the heads of Śiva figures, and it should be noted, it is deliberately placed on one,—*i.e.*, the right—side of the head; lastly, there seem to be traces of the *ārdhalinga* feature on the front part of the waist. Now, if these observations of mine are accepted, there can be no hesitation about the identity of the figure; it thus represents the Arddhanārīśvara aspect of Śiva, in which the left half is that of Umā, and the right that of the god himself. The staff in the right hand, the longish coil of *jatā* placed on the right side of the head,
the prominence given to the left breast (the right breast is much smaller than the left one and belongs to a male figure) and the probable ārdhālinga feature—all these go to support the suggestion. The legend could not be fully read by Spooner and its hazy reproduction does not help us to improve the reading which is...tipurakṣaṇaṣṭidattah. It may be observed here that this is one of the earliest representations of the Ārddhanārīśvara aspect of Śiva in art; I have already drawn attention to Bardasanes’ mention of it. V. S. Agrawala draws our attention to a miniature relief depicting the same theme, which belongs to the Kushan period; it is in the collection of the late Pandit Rādhākrishna of Mathurā (J.I.S.O.A., 1937, p. 124, Pl. XLIV, 2). The concave impress of a seal (No. 422, ibid., p. 143, Pl. XLVIII) has a battleaxe, with a long handle laid lengthwise of the seal, as its device. The long legend in very small characters is not legible, but seems to end in dattasya. The battle-axe is a Śaiva emblem and it is very frequently found in Śiva images of later period (cf. Paraśumrīya-varābhayahastam); the Śiva figure of the Guḍimallam linga, one of the earliest sculptures of Śiva, carries in one of its two hands a battle-axe.

Of the interesting religious seals unearthed by Sir John Marshall at Bhita, a good many show undoubted Śaiva features; not only various Śaivic emblems like the liṅga, the trident-axe, the nandipāda and the bull (the bull in some instances has a sphere of disc between horns as appearing on Śātavāhana coins) are clearly recognisable on them as well as on those of the officials, localities and private individuals, but also, there appear human representations of Śiva, though in extremely rare instances. Some of the religious seals bear the different appellations of Śiva such as Kāleśvara, Kālaṇjara-bhaṭṭāraka, Bhaḍreśvara, Maheśvara (?) and Nandī—the last the name of his mount. One of the oval seals in Marshall’s list (A.S.I.A.R., 1911-12, p. 47,
Pl. XVIII, No. 14) has a trident-axe flanked by a diagram of dots, reały a hill symbol, and an unidentified emblem on its left; the legend in eastern Gupta characters is Kāleśvara priyatām (‘May Kāleśvara be pleased’). Marshall observes that Kāleśvara is the name of a Sivalīṅga according to Skanda Purāṇa, and this tablet would seem to have been presented as an offering at some shrine of Śiva at Bhita. The seal next in the list is also Śaiva in nature; it bears a realistic Sivalīṅga with an umbrella on one side and a trident on the other. The līṅga is placed on a hill in the form of a well-arranged pile of round balls, below which is a waved line probably standing for a river; the legend in northern Gupta characters is Kālañjara-bhaṭṭārakasya, i.e., ‘of the lord of Kālañjara.’ Kālañjara, according to Cunningham, is the name of a hill in Bundelkhand, the favourite resort of Śaiva tapasvins from very early times (A.S.R., XXI, p. 20 ff.). The manner in which the Mahābhārata refers twice to the Śaiva shrines at Kālañjara in its Tīrthayātra Parvādhīyāya of the Vanaparvam definitely proves their importance.¹ This seal was evidently issued from a Śaiva shrine on the Kālañjara hill, though no remains of a temple exist on the hill at present. The seal No. 16 bears also a Sivalīṅga of an extremely realistic nature, placed on

¹ Ch. 85, Verses 56-57: Atra Kālañjaraṁ nūma parvalaṁ lokaviśrutam | Tatra devahrade snātvā gosahsraphalāṁ labheta || Yah snātastarpayet tatra giru Kālañjare nṛpa | Svarga-loke mahiyeta naro nāstyaṁra samāyaḥ || Thus the waved line below the hill, evidently the Kālañjara hill, is the river or devahraḍa near it where a dip is specially recommended. Again, cf. Chapter 87, verse 21—Hiraṇya-vinduk kalhita giru Kālañjare nṛpa. In the Matsya Purāṇa we find mention of Kāliñjraravaṇa as one of the places very much sacred on account of Śiva’s presence; Kāliñjraravaṇaicaiva saṅkukaraṇaṁ sthaleśvaram || Etāṁ ca pavitrīṁ sāṃnidhyāddhi mama priye || —Ch. 181, V. 27. The Great Epic places the hill somewhere near Prayāga and Citrakūṭa. The Kāliñjraravaṇa of the Matsya Purāṇa is evidently the same as Kālañjara of the Epic and of the seals.
a pedestal with the representation of a hill on one side and a trident-axe on the other, having a legend \( K(\tilde{a})la(\tilde{u})jara \) in north-eastern Gupta characters (Pl. X, Fig. 4). But the next seal—that numbered 17—is of unique iconographic interest; it bears a two-armed male figure seated in \( lalil\tilde{a}sana \) pose on a \( p\tilde{a}dapi\tilde{t}ha \) with uncertain objects in his hands. There appear to be foliage (?) or flames over head and shoulders; the legend in northern characters of the 4th or 5th century A.D. is \( Bhadre\tilde{s}vara \) (Pl. X, Fig. 5). Marshall says that 'this is the name of the Sivalînga of Kalpagrâma (not identified up to date) according to the \( V\tilde{a}manapur\tilde{a}na \) (Ch. 46). The male figure may, therefore, be Siva in the Bhadre\tilde{s}vara aspect.' The figure is unmistakeably Siva and this shows the simultaneous phallic and human mode of representing the divinity. If the reading of the legend on seal No. 23 as \( Bhagavato Ma(h)e\tilde{v}arasya \) is upheld—Marshall says that it is problematic—then the two-armed male figure standing facing with right hand outstretched and left hand on hip, with folds of drapery falling on both sides, may also represent Siva.

The three Bhita seals numbering 26-28 described by Marshall in \( A.S.I.A.R., 1911-12 \) (p. 51 and Pl. XVIII) require notice in this connection. The first bears on it a bull standing to left with a crescent under its neck; a woman stands in front, with her right hand outstretched and left hand on hip; a post or a thunderbolt appears behind the bull; bow with arrow and pile of balls (\( i.e., \) the symbol for mountain), similar to those in Kolhapur series of the Andhra coins, are shewn in exergue. The same figures are present on the second (No. 27) though in a transposed manner and on the third (28), the latter being much worn. The legend on No. 26 is \( Mah\tilde{a}r\tilde{a}ja Gautam\tilde{i}-putrasya Sivameghasya \) in characters of the 2nd-3rd century A.D. while the legend in similar characters on No. 27 is \( \tilde{V}\tilde{a}ssu (\tilde{V}\tilde{\dot{a}}\tilde{s}\tilde{i}\tilde{\dot{t}}\tilde{\dot{h}}i) putrasya \tilde{S}r\tilde{i} Bh\tilde{\dot{h}}imasena(sya). \) Marshall
remarks about the first that ‘the bull and crescent point to the king’s leaning towards Saivism;’ the bow and arrow as well as the mountain are also characteristic emblems of Siva. The female figure on the seals very probably stands for Durgā, the consort of Siva, her standing posture and the handpose closely coinciding with the same on seal No. 23, where we may find the god himself in human form.¹ The Bhita seal No. 44, of an official, showing bull standing facing, with round object between horns is interesting, because in it the main device is flanked by a wheel in side elevation and ‘an uncertain symbol’ (Marshall); their sacred character is fully emphasised by the fact that all three are placed on altars. The early Gupta legend in northern characters is Dāndanāyaka-Srī Saṅkaradattasya; the name of the official is no doubt Sāiva, and so the animal form of Siva in the centre of his seal is quite appropriate; but to this sectary, Viṣṇu is also an object of adoration, for his two emblems (we shall see presently that ‘the uncertain symbol’ is a Vaiṣṇava one) are allotted honoured, though subordinate, positions in his seal. The devices of particularly Sāiva connection that are to be found on the other seals of officials or of private individuals at Bhita are bull, trident, trident-axe, nandipāda, etc.

The unique seals of the late Gupta and early mediaeval period that were discovered at Nalanda contain some figures of Siva and his emblems, interesting both from the artistic and iconographic point of view.

It will be of interest here to refer to a few terracotta seals of the Gupta and the pre-Gupta periods which

¹ The king Sivamegha of the Bhita seal is very likely identical with the same mentioned in inscription No. II, from Kosam edited by D. R. Sahni in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 159-60, noticed also by Sten Konow in ibid, Vol. XXIII, pp. 245-8. For the coins of Sivamegha, reference should be made to Motichandra’s article on ‘A Hoard of Kausambi coins from Fatehpur,’ J.N.S.I., II, pp. 95-108.
have been discovered at Rajghat near Benares, and which contain the representations of some Saivic emblems. A large Gupta seal impression has a bull to left with a combined trident-axe in front; the legend below reads—Avinuktesvara-bhattaraka. A fragmentary circular seal with the legend Rājñō Abhayasya in the 1st and 2nd century A.D. Brāhmī script bears a bull to the left with the three-arched symbol (a hill) in front; there appear also traces of a cakra, a śankha and a spear. This shows a combination of Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva emblems. A sealing with the legend Phalgunjimitrasya in 1st century B.C. Brāhmī script bears a bull standing to left facing a standard (trident?). A circular seal with indistinct legend in Gupta characters bears a Śivalinga flanked by a combined trident-axe on left and a double-faced thunderbolt on right. A lenticular sealing with the legend Yogesvara in Gupta script has a serpent device with a trident on one side and a rosary on the other. The circular sealing bearing the legend in early Gupta script, Śrī devaladeva svāmī (naḥ), is of unique interest, for it undoubtedly shows one mode of representing Śiva in human form, the devadevasvāmī of the inscription. The god stands facing on an elaborate pedestal with outstretched arms holding a wreath (or a noose?) in right and flask in left hands, a serpent being shown to his left. One can compare this variety of Śiva figure with the Bhadresvara one on the Bhita seal noticed above. The device on another seal with legend Śrī-Avi(mukteśvara in Gupta script can be usefully compared with the large Gupta seal noticed first in this series (one with the legend Avinuktesvara-bhattaraka).

1 These seals have not yet been published and I am much indebted for this notice of mine to the courtesy and kindness of Rai Shahib Krishnadas, the Curator of the Benares Bharat Kalabhavan, and his assistant Mr. Vijaykrishna; I studied the seals on the spot and checked the reading of the legends and the description given in the museum records.
Here also, the bull is seated to left, but it is flanked by a trident to the left and a tridantī to the right. A circular seal of black clay shows an aṅkuśa (elephant-goad) on a pedestal with the legend Sauridharmanah in Gupta characters below. A circular seal has the device of a bull seated to left on pedestal; the legend below in the Brāhmī script of the Śunga period reads Gopasenasa. Another circular black clay seal impression shows a bull standing to left with a yūpa standard in front and a cakra standard behind; the legend below is Nāgarjunasa in early Kushan Brāhmī script. An oval seal with bull seated to left has the owner’s name as Caṇḍesvaradāsa in Gupta characters; it means ‘the slave or devotee of Caṇḍeśvara. Caṇḍeśvara is one of the names of Siva and is also the name of one of the principal Sivagaṇas (cf. the Caṇḍeśanugrahamūrti of Siva).

As regards Viṣṇu and his emblems in the various terracotta seals, a seal from Basarh, numbered 31, described by T. Bloc in A. S. I. A. R., 1903-04 (pp. 110-1, Pl.XL. 3), is highly interesting. Bloch describes it as follows: ‘Ornamental triśūla in the centre, to right staff consisting of seven dots, śaṅkha and solar disc; to left symbol for moon and ornamental wheel; horizontal line below which the two-lined legend is 1)Śrī-Viṣṇupādasvāmī-Nā- 2)rāya(na), meaning ‘Nārāyaṇa, the lord of the illustrious Viṣṇupāda.’ Bloch further remarks that ‘This looks as if the seal came from the authorities of a temple of Viṣṇupāda, perhaps the famous shrine at Gaya. If I am right the seal would prove the existence of this temple in the 4th century A.D.’ (ibid, p. 104). The seal being thus without doubt a Vaiṣṇava one, the central position given to a Saiva emblem is queer; but the symbol is certainly not ornamental triśūla, but an ornate variant of the much simpler one which is sometimes described as ‘nāga’ symbol, (cf., figs. 11 and 12 in Pl. II). The Bhita seal No. 36, as described by Marshall (A. S. i. A. R., 1911-12,
p. 53, Pl. XIX), has symbols of wheel and conch with a variant of the above symbol named 'uncertain symbol' by him, between the two; Marshall rightly remarked that the other two symbols being Vaiṣṇava, the intervening one must also be a Vaiṣṇava one, but he was unable to identify it. All these different symbols are originally derived from the so-called Nāga symbol just mentioned, in which D. R. Bhandarkar recognised the Kaustubha maṇi, the jewel par excellence which adorns the breast of Viṣṇu (kaustubhamanibhūṣitoraśkah-Brhat-samhitā); he saw the sign on the breast of the Viṣṇu figure sculptured in the verandah of the cave at Udayagiri, bearing the date 82 (Gupta era) as also on the breast of the Garuḍa which crowned the Besnagar column (A. S. I. A. R., 1913-14, p. 211). A. C. Coomarswami, on the other hand, would identify it as the Śrīvatsa mark, one of the eight auspicious signs (aṣṭamaṅgalā) in Jain literature and art, which is also a Vaiṣṇava symbol; Varāhamihira describes the image of Viṣṇu as Śrīvatsāṇkītavakṣa (Ost-Asiatische Zeitschrift, 1927-28, pp. 183-4); this is more probable of the two suggestions. In many cases, there is no doubt about the Vaiṣṇava character of the symbol and its variants in its present association and we have seen how one form of it appears on the Bhita seal of Śaṅkaradatta. Now the symbol on the Viṣṇupāda temple seal described by Bloch as 'a staff consisting of seven dots' (Pl. I, Fig. 12) is nothing but the peculiar club we have found in the hands of Śiva on Maues' coin and bисcriptual copper seal of Sivarakṣita, as also in one of the hands of the four-armed Vāsudeva Viṣṇu on the Kushan niccolo seal tentatively attributed by Cunningham to Huvishka. This peculiar kind of club (gadā) is placed on the back right hand of another four-armed Viṣṇu image of late Kushan or still later period, that was recently discovered at Taxila (A. S.
I.A.R., 1935-36, Pl. XLa) and it is similar to the handle of a trident placed in the front left hand of a late mediaeval image of the śiva aspect of Śiva, belonging to eastern school of Indian sculpture (these will be noticed in detail in my book dealing with Viṣṇu and Śiva icons). Thus, though in the early representations, numismatic as well as sculptural, the emblem in question is associated with Śiva as well as Viṣṇu,—still there is no doubt about its closer association with the latter in the later times, though in a changed manner;—in its Viṣṇuite association it is to be described as a variant of gadā, while in its Śivaite one as a form of daṇḍa. Now the remaining symbols on the seal in question, śaṅkha on one side and cakra on the other are undoubtedly Vaiṣṇava emblems, the sun and moon being shown as adjuncts on the top; and in a temple seal of Śrī Viṣṇupāda-Svāmi Nārāyaṇa all these are quite appropriate. The seals numbering 32 and 34 described by Bloch (A. S. I. A. R., 1903-04, p. 111, pl. XLI) bear ornamental wheel on altar with two śaṅkhas one on either side; the former bears the legend in two lines below the horizontal line with its ends turned up, 1) Jayaty-ananto bhagavān s-Āmabh, translated by him as “Victorious is the lord Ananta (Śiva) with Ambā (Dūrgā).” But the emblems being Vaiṣṇava, Ananta and Ambā here refer to Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu (cf. Bhagavadgītā, VI, 16—Arjuna describes the Lord,—Paśyāmi tvām sarvato’nantarūpam, Nāṁ na madhyam na punastavādim ; temples of god Ananta Vāsudeva are known from mediaeval times onward) as also of his consort

Coomaraswami’s description of this seal reproduced by him as fig. 16 on Tafel 27, of O.Z., 1927-28 requires modification, after what has been written above. He has not noticed the śaṅkha, and the left symbol should be properly named as gadā and the right one is not fan as has been so hesitatingly suggested by him. His suggestion that the central emblem is Śrīvatsa seems to me correct.
Lakṣmī (standing for Ambā which also means mother). The seal No. 37 has the śrīvatsa (wrongly described as shield by Bloch) on altar flanked by two saṅkhās, with two line inscription, Jitām bhagavato-nantasya namde (śva)rīvara-svāmina(h), the reading of which is doubtful; Bloch translates it thus, 'Victorious is the Lord Ananta (Siva), the chosen husband of Nandeśvari (Dūrgā).'

The same remark as has been made with regard to Bloch's interpretation of the legend on No. 32 is applicable here; Nandeśvari is no doubt another synonym of Dūrgā, but it could also mean Lakṣmī, the consort of Viṣṇu (in the lexicons Nanda is given as another name of the god)—the character of the emblems supporting the above suggestion. Spooner's excavations in the Basarh site in 1913-14 brought up among others a few seals which are unique from the stand-point of Viṣṇuite iconography. The seal No. 54, without legend bears on its oval area a finely executed figure of a boar recumbent to left; the boar may represent the Varāha avatāra of Viṣṇu. But the oval seal No. 191 is one of the most interesting in the series, for it shows the figure of Nṛsiṃha, the man-lion incarnation of Viṣṇu, seated facing in the lalitaśana pose on a high pedestal; his right arm is raised, while the left rests on hip; the legend, however, is extremely faint, no certain reading of it can be offered. Spooner rightly remarks, that 'it provides us with our oldest dateable representation of the deity Nṛsiṃha in India; ' the sealing is certainly of Gupta date. This device is very important, for it definitely shows that as early as the period when it was manufactured, this particular incarnatory form of Viṣṇu had acquired the appearance of the regular cult-picture to be placed in the main sanctum of a temple; it is distinct from the elaborate reliefs illustrative of the mythology underlying this incarnation, which were usually prominently placed in the subsidiary shrines in a Vaiṣṇava temple.
Of the many religious seals that were unearthed by Marshall at Bhita, only one bears the name of Vāsudeva; the much worn, nearly oval seal No. 21 in the series contains the legend in northern Gupta characters—(Namo Bhagava) te Vāsude (vasyu). Marshall says that the sealing is interesting, for it shows that Bhita possessed a temple of Vāsudeva in the Gupta period. The male figure on the seal No. 22, standing facing with its right hand outstretched below which is the variant of the Śrīvatsa mark (Marshall describes the latter as a mark identical with the one figuring in a lead coin of Pulūmāyi, reproduced by Rapson in C.C.A.W.K T.B, Pl. V, 105) and left hand on hip with a conch-shell near left foot, is undoubtedly that of Viṣṇu. The sacred character of the figure and the symbols is fully proved by the fact that all the three are placed on pedestals; the legend, however, is defaced. Among the seals of officials and private individuals are to be found emblems which are Vaiṣṇava in character, the names of the former in many cases showing Vaiṣṇava features. Thus, the Śrīvatsa mark on seal No. 86 is accompanied with a legend, tentatively read as Vāsudevasya, the wheel mark on No. 88 with Padmanābha etc.; Marshall remarks about the latter, ‘The device of wheel may have been selected in allusion to the fact that Padmanābha is also an epithet of Viṣṇu, who wields the wheel’ (A.S.I.A.R., 1911-12, pp. 50, 58; Pls. XVIII, XX).

The number of seals found at Rajghat bearing Vaiṣṇava emblems is small. One circular seal of black clay with the legend (De ?) varātascāmin (Ś?) in Guptā script bears a cakra flanked on either side by a śaṅkha. Another such seal has the same Vaiṣṇava emblems, the Gupta legend reading as Dharmamaddha. An oval seal bears the legend Buddhasya in the Brāhmī script of the Kushan period in the middle, flanked on either side by standards with a cakra and a fish-tailed lion as capitals. The
owner's name in association with the above emblems is interesting.

Lakṣmī very appropriately occurs several times in the sealings dug up at Basarh and Bhita. I have shown how frequently the type was utilised in Indian art of the pre-Christian and early post-Christian period. With regard to the identity of a particular variety of this figure in early Buddhist monuments, there has been some difference of opinion among scholars. Marshall, in his latest monumental work on Sanchi (p. 96, l. n. 1) has reconciled this difference; he says, 'Some of the Māyā figures on the balustrades and gateways are identical with the familiar type of Śrī-Lakṣmī, standing or seated on lotus, which the Buddhists evidently appropriated, along with so many other formulae and motifs, from the current art of the period, since it can hardly be doubted that the Śrī-Lakṣmī type goes back to a more remote age than Buddhism.' Now, there can be very little uncertainty about the character of this particular motif and its variants in the Gupta seals of Bhita and Basarh; in the Gupta coins, she is figured in different ways, one of which being an exact Indian counterpart of the foreign Ardochso motif. The terracotta figurine of the Maurya-Suṅga period (No. 550 in Spooner's list, A.S.I.A.R., 1913-14, p. 116, Pl. XLIV) very probably presents us with a variety of the same goddess, in which she is distinguished by a pair of wings of a very unusual type, a scanty costume of the usual archaic type and ornaments like a huge pair of ear-rings, heavy bracelets and torque. Certain very finely executed seals from Basarh of the Gupta period that were noticed by T. Bloch in his notes on Excavations at Basarh (A.S.I.A.R., 1903-04, pp. 107ff., Pls. XI and XLI) bear on them the Gaja-Lakṣmī figure and a few of its variants. The seal of the Kumārānātyādhikarana (ibid, p. 10 No. 3; 3 specimens were found) shows Lakṣmī standing in the midst of a group of
trees with elephants pouring water over her; two dwarfish attendants holding objects like money bags. Seal No. 4 of which as many as 28 specimens were found has the same goddess (*ibid*, Pl. XL, 10), but here the attendants are absent; No. 5, of which 9 specimens were discovered, shows the Gaja-Lakṣmī type, its left hand holding the stalk of a six-petalled flower, the two dwarfish attendants pouring out small objects from round pots; No. 6, of which 12 specimens are known, shows Gaja-Lakṣmī as above, but here the elephants stand on flowers, attended by a kneeling male on each side with a knob on his head; money bag in front of each of these attendants, from which he throws down small round objects which are coins (Pl. X, Fig. 2; the shape of the money bag is exactly similar to that of the several bags shown under the *Kalpadruma* capital found at Besnagar and noticed by me in detail in chapter III). Many such figures more or less similar to one another were found by Bloch and it will not be necessary to define each of the types in detail. Bloch’s suggestion about the attending figures of Lakṣmī in these seals that these were figures of Kubera, throwing down coins or pouring them out of round pots is not wholly correct; for these are not really Kuberas, but the Yakṣas who are the custodians of riches. The combination of Lakṣmī, the goddess of wealth and prosperity and the Yakṣas connected with riches is certainly not inappropriate, the idea being that these custodians dole out riches to those who are specially favoured by this goddess. Bloch remarks, ‘The combination of Lakṣmī and Kubera, however, is not known to me to occur anywhere else in Indian art, and my theory should, therefore, only be regarded as hypothetical.’ I may, however, refer here to the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* passage, already quoted by me while explaining the *Kalpadruma* capital at Besnagar in chapter III; in connection with the enumeration of eight *nidhis*, the *Purāṇa* says, *Padmī
nāma yā vidyā Lakṣmīstasyādhīdevatā 1 Tadādhārāśca nidhaya-
stān me nigadatāḥ śṛṇu.' Thus, the eight nidhis which are particularly associated with Kubera are the ādharas of Padāminī vidyā whose presiding deity is the goddess Śrī. The unique seal No. 93 dug up at Basarh by Spooner (A.S.I.A.R, 1913-14, pp. 129-30, Pl. XLVI) bears the figure of a goddess, nimbate, facing, with her left hand on hip and right hand raised, standing on a high pedestal placed in the central part of what looks like a barge covering the entire area of the sealing. The presence of a small naturalistic śaṅkha to the left in the exergue above (the small standing animal cannot at all be clearly distin-
guished from Spooner's plate) discloses her probable identity and if we are justified in describing her as Lakṣmī then her appearance in a barge, though unusual, is quite appropriate; for does not the goddess of wealth and prosperity reside in trade and commerce (cf. the oft-quoted saying—Vāṇijye rasati Lakṣmīḥ) and did not many of the owner:-of these seals belong to the order of the śrṣṭi-sārthavāha-kulikaka-
nigama? Spooner remarks about the seal, 'There are no duplicates of this most peculiar and interesting seal, and there is no trace of any legend by which its origin and meaning could be learned. I should judge it to be the seal of some temple, and of a temple to some goddess of the waters.' But he is far too conjectural in his next observa-
tion, 'In the light of our Persian fire-altars and our winged terracottas at this site, is the cult of Anahita not perhaps suggested?' In the magnificent large official seal No. 200 (ibid, p. 131, Pl. XLVII), however, there can be no doubt about the identity of 'the central figure of Lakṣmī standing on a low pedestal, facing, with the two customary elephants above pouring water over her from jars held in their trunks.' There is a śaṅkha to her proper left while the uncertain object in the opposite side may be a variant of the ārīvalsa mark or the so-called 'nandipāda' symbol in an inverted
manner. The legend read by Spooner as ‘Vesālināmakundel-kunārānātyādhikaraṇasya’ is interesting; Spooner is surprised at this form of the legend and cannot be sure whether the kunda here means a sacred spring as usual or not. But it might refer to the markataākṛtaka or the monkey-tank at Vaisali, which, according to H. Tsang, commemorated the miracle of Buddha’s life associated with the locality. The long narrow oval sealing No. 208 (ibid, p. 134) bears a female figure with right hand out-stretched and the left on hip, seeming to clasp a lotus stock; the nimbus and the legend are defaced, and it may represent the Indian goddess of fortune. The impression of an oval seal, No. 312 (ibid, p. 140, Pl. XLVII) bears the device of a standing female figure, facing, with her right hand extended and the left clasping a tall lotus which rises above her shoulder; the one numbered 446 is a duplicate of this, and there is every reason to believe that in both Laksāṇi is represented.

A brief reference to the seals that were unearthed by Marshall at Bhita will show that figures of the goddess Śrī, more or less similar to the above types, are found on them. The seal No. 32 (I.S.I.A.R., 1911-12, p. 52, Pl. XVIII) bears Gajalaksṇi, the elephants dousing her are placed on lotuses; the right hand of the goddess is raised above elbow, while the left rests on a bird (?) which is perhaps Garuḍa, according to Marshall. But the latter may also be identified as a chauric held downwards, its handle looking like the neck of a bird; a cakra is placed to the immediate right. The name Viśṇurakṣita among the long legend in eastern Gupta characters as well as the cakra shows the Viṣṇuīte association of this seal. The seal No. 35 in the same series shows Gaja-Laksṇi on lotus with a dwarfish figure seated on lotus with folded hands, on each side of the goddess; we have just discussed similar types at Basarh. The seal or token No. 42 (ibid, p. 54, Pl. XIX) shows on its upper part the same goddess standing on a full-blown lotus, her both
hands being raised above the elbows, her right hand holds śaṅkha, while her left, probably Garuḍa or the chaurie; vases are shown on either side containing water or flowers, according to Marshall, but these little dots may stand for coins or treasure. Coomaraswamy has discussed at great length the symbolism underlying the concept of Śrī-Lakṣmī, and the attending elephants in his article on Early Indian Iconography (Eastern Art, Vol. I, pp. 175-189), wherein he has utilised these seal representations along with various other data concerning the subject. The circular seal No. 18 found at Bhita (ibid, p. 50, Pl. XVIII) contains a vase (bhadragnaha) on pedestal; below it is written in northern characters of the Gupta period, Sarasvatī. The goddess of learning is thus represented here by means of the ghaṭa emblem. It has been suggested that the female figure standing by the side of a bull on the seals of Śivamegha and Bhīnasena found at Bhita may stand for Durgā; the oval seal No. 75 (ibid, p. 57, Pl. XX) with legend that could not be read may also bear the same goddess in the person of the female figure which stands facing by the side of the bull recumbent to left, her left hand being placed on hip, while the right one is out-stretched towards the erect trident-axe. Marshall compares it with the goddess standing by the stag on Kuninda coins. The lion standing facing on many seals hailing from Bhita and Basarh could have been explained as representing the Śakti cult, lion being the mount of Durgā; but one cannot be sure as most of the particular names associated with them, are associated with Viṣṇu who also has some very intimate mythological association with lion (cf. the Narasimha aspect of Viṣṇu, and Hari, another name of Viṣṇu, means also a lion).

Several Rajghat seals bear on them a few very interesting goddess figures. A circular scaling with a two-line legend, Vāraṇasyādi(śtha)nādhikaranaśya in Gupta script, shows a goddess standing facing on lotus; to her proper right
is a radiate disc on an elaborate pedestal and to her proper left, an indistinct object; from her hands held downwards, treasures appear to trickle down. Another oval seal of sun-burnt clay bears a two-armed goddess standing facing, on a long pedestal, holding a wreath in left hand and a four-pronged object in right hand; her hair is braided; a snake with its face downwards is shown on her right; legend below in Gupta script is Durggah (does the devī stand for Durgā, the consort of Siva?). A round seal with pot and foliage on pedestal and Gupta legend Śrī sārasvata reminds us of the Bhita seal No. 18 noted in the previous paragraph. Another oval sealing of the early Kushan period shows a goddess standing facing with hands akimbo; the legend on her proper right is Saghamita (ā); she may, however, belong to the Buddhist creed.

A few other Brahmanical deities and their emblems can be recognised in the medley of seals and seal impressions found at Basarh, Bhita and Rajghat. The very fine temple seal No. 607 discovered by Spooner at Basarh (J.S.I....1.R., 1913-14, pp. 118-120, 140, Pl. XLIX) contains a very perfect example of a fire-altar with probably the solar disc placed above it; the legend in Gupta characters is Bhaga-rata Ādityasya. I recognised on the coins of Pañcāla Bhānu-mitra the same deity, viz., sun placed on an altar; but here there may be some justification for Spooner’s suggestion that the altar is a Persian fire-altar. The association of sun and fire in this instance may be directly due to the fire and sun-worshipping Iranian Magii who must have influenced the local north-Indian sun-worship in the early centuries of the Christian era. Rapson, while writing on a similar device on a seal with Indian legend found at Sunet (J.R....1.S., 1901, p. 98) suggested that it might be due to the Sassanian influence; the fire altar occurs on much earlier Kushan coins, viz., on those of Wema Kadphises and others. Thus, this will not prove Spooner’s contention that,
'this particular form of the fire-altar in Indian Archaeology, without attendant figures, is not due to any modification of Sassanian coinage through Kushan influence, but rather to the survival, in India itself, of the older, more original Persian tradition in such matters, which antedates the Sassanians themselves by many centuries.' A part of his other suggestion, that this particular seal with the legend above noted 'must be the seal of some temple, presumably in Eastern India, to the divinity of the Blessed Sun as worshipped in the cultus of the Persians domiciled in India,' is more acceptable; but in place of the Persians domiciled in India, we are to understand eastern Iranians who migrated to India in large numbers with their cultus in the early post-Christian period. Block illustrated a seal found by him at Basarh (A. S. I. A. R., 1903-04, Pl. XL, No. 9) with the significant legend śravīṣa (b), 'the slave of the sun.' Marshall found a seal at Bhita (A. S. I. A. R., 1911-12, p. 58, No. 98), which bears the same device with the legend ādityasya; he rightly says that 'this emblem occurs on the coins of the Kushanas, Guptas, Indo-Sassanians as also on a Gupta seal from Sunet,' the last one was described by Rapson whose remark about it has just been quoted. All these fairly prove that by the 4th and 5th centuries A.D., the eastern Iranian fire-sun cultus was thoroughly acclimatized in northern and eastern India and the north Indian sun icons of the Gupta period and afterwards show unmistakable evidence of it. Among other cult-deities whose emblems or names can be found on those interesting terracotta objects, mention may be made of Skanda and Dhananada. An oval seal bearing a peacock standing to left with uplifted tail and the legend śrī Skandākūrasya was found by Marshall at Bhita (op. cit., p. 58, No. 83); the oblong seal, No. 14 discovered by Spooner at Basarh bears a 'fantail peacock' facing, the emblem peculiar to the eastern mintage of Gupta silver coins, issued by Kumāragupta I and some other
successors of his; the name of the banker, issuing it, is Vyāghrabala (A. S. I. A. R., 1913-14, p. 125, Pl. XLVII, No. 271; several impressions of this seal were found at Basarh). An ivory seal matrix found at Rajghat shows a fantail peacock with legend Śūra gupta in Gupta Script: the name and the emblem associate it with Kārttikeya. Another oval seal of the Gupta period, from the same place, shows two soldiers standing, holding spear in their right hands and with their left hands akimbo; the legend on the right reads—Mahāśi (a mistake for śū?) rasya. This seal device reminds us of the figures of Skanda-Komaro and Bizago on some coins of Huvishka already noted and the standing Dioscuroi on the coins of such Indo-Greek kings as Diomedes, Archebius and others. Seal No. 722 unearthed at Basarh (Spoon, ibid, p. 151, Pl. L) 'is exceptional, in that the device a small, naturalistic saṅkha occurs below the legend, which is in very raised akṣaras and reads (Śrī-) Dhanadakasya.' Now, Dhanada is a name of Kubera and the couch-shell here may justly stand for the saṅkhanidhi of that god after whom the issuer of the seal was named. Some other unrecognisable figures, most probably of divinities, and unassignable emblems are found on these seals. One or two can be noticed here. A very interesting seal was discovered by Bloch at Basarh, which has for its device a man seated in Indian fashion, his raised left hand holding probably a branch of a tree and the long slender object placed in his right hand stretched over the knee is unrecognisable; the legend in Gupta characters in Udana-kūpe pariṣadaḥ (A. S. I. A. R., 1903-04, p. 109, Pl. XL, 12). The device, man with tail (?) holding down a bull by its horns with uncertain legend on a seal that was also unearthed at Basarh by the same scholar is unidentifiable; Bloch says 'it looks like an adoption of some classical design' (ibid, p. 106, Pl. XLI, 17). The identity of the female figure standing between two trees appearing on an indifferently
preserved seal found there cannot be ascertained (ibid, p. 119, Pl. XLII, 56). A human figure, standing facing, right hand holding a staff and left hand hanging down (it distantly resembles the Siva figures on the Ujjain coins, though the water-vessel is not present and the style is different) with an uncertain object to his right and defaced legend in exergue, appears on the seal impression (b) on No. 109, discovered by Marshall at Bhita; he suggests that it is a 'representation of some sort of a grāmadevalā of the village.' The impression (a) on the same lump of clay (No. 109) bears a vase on pedestal and legend in early Gupta characters—Vicchigrāma, the ancient name of Bhita (A. S. I. A. R., 1911-12, p. 59, Pl. XIX). 'The fish on side on an oblong seal of Bilvedāsa' dug up in the same place may be an auspicious symbol of general application, as many other symbols, not definitely assignable to any of the cults, can be assumed to be. But when there is such uncertainty in the determination of the iconography of the device appearing on the seal, we shall not be justified in arriving at any far-reaching conclusions on the basis of this very feature. Spooner's conclusions based on this (cf. his lengthy dissertation on seal impression No. 572 A, A. S. I. A. R., 1913-14, pp. 146-47, as also on pp. 120 and 129-30—the character of the last two has been determined in a different way) were thus easily challenged by others who could not see eye to eye with him.

The rapid survey of the terracotta seals from the cult point of view has enabled us to collect some fresh data which are eminently useful for the study of Brahmanical Hindu iconography. Bloch observed in connection with his excavations at Basarh, 'The evidence of the emblems on the seals, so far as they have any connection with religious worship, together with the names occurring in the inscriptions and the seals bearing benedictory formulas, rather lead me to conclude that most of the persons to whom the seals
belonged were followers of the Brahmanical creed or Jainas, not Buddhists — (op. cit., p. 105). Bloch was not aware of the identity of the śrīvatsa mark which he described as an ornamental triśūla, though he rightly remarked that he names it thus 'without pretending to have found the true name of the symbol'; now the very same mark, though it may be connected with the Jaina cult, cannot be assigned this character, when associated with such symbols as ornamental wheel, knotted club (gadā) and conch-shell which when taken together will have to be regarded as Vaiṣṇava ones. The two human feet which so frequently appear on the sealings discovered by him and less so on those dug up by Marshall and Spooner can no doubt be explained as Buddha-pāda or Jina-pāda; but in consideration of the symbols on the host of the other seals they can much better be interpreted as Viṣṇu-pāda. Similarly, the kalasa on so many seals in association with the particular legends and other emblems may mostly be the Brahmanical auspicious sign. Moreover, the appearance of several Śivalingas more or less realistic in character, the different varieties of the goddess of fortune, the highly probable representations of Umā and Arddhanārīśvara, the earliest figure of Narasimha as a cult deity, etc., on these seals and seal impressions, greatly enhances our knowledge of Brahmanical Hindu iconography.
CHAPTER VI

ICONO-PLASTIC ART IN INDIA—FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO ITS DEVELOPMENT

Discovery of extant images of the pre-Christian and early post-Christian period in India not commensurate with what we know about the prevalence of the practice of making images and other objects for worship during the period, from literary and archaeological data—paucity of actual finds to be accounted for—explanation of this paucity to be sought in the significant practice followed by ancient Indian artists of using perishable materials like wood and clay for the making of images, as in early Vedic times, the ritual implements used to be mainly made of wood and clay—evidence of post-Christian texts like the Bṛhatasthāpata, the Purāṇas and the Āgamas in support of it—its special bearing on the growth and development of Indian icono-plastic art.

Methods of manufacture of images—bronze-casting—evidence of texts—early bronze images—other metal images—stone images—stucco and frescoes—pictorial representations—not only on canvas with brush and paint but also on raised platforms before the main sanctum of the shrine with coloured rice-powder—but the latter are mainly decorative.

Contributory factors leading to the development of icono-plastic art:—(a) wide prevalence of sectarianism—multiplicity of sects—sectarian rivalries and jealousies; (b) gradual increase of the pantheon—its necessary corollary, the development of mythological stories in order to explain the origin of the new creations—construction of relics illustrative of these myths and legends—their purpose, however, primarily decorative; (c) foreign contact—an incentive and impetus to the creation of new art forms—an estimate of the nature and extent of the Hellenistic influence on Indian iconic art; (d) evolution of the Tantras; (e) gradual canonisation of the modes for the making of icons facilitates the icon-makers' art—stereto-typed icons produced in large numbers from their workshops—reputed art-centres of ancient India like Mathura, Gandhara, Amaravati etc.,—their art productions in great demand in various parts of India; (f) the patronage of the ruling powers and other important personages of early and mediaeval India—their excessive temple-building activity—they not only built temples but funerary structures in the shape of shrines—monastic establishments and Gūrūyatanas.

The data which have been gathered together and presented by me in the three preceding chapters prove that the construction of images and other objects associated with the worship of the deity with deep loving faith was fairly well prevalent
in India during the few centuries preceding the Christian era and the ones immediately succeeding it. From the multiplicity of evidence in support of the above hypothesis it would be natural for us to expect a large number of very early images belonging to the various sectaries, both orthodox and heterodox from the Brahmanical standpoint, from the various parts of India. True it is that several free-standing Yakṣa statues, or relievo-figures principally associated with early Buddhist funerary monuments have been discovered, which can go back to two or at most three centuries before the Christian era; it is also true that many Buddhist, several Jain and Brahmanical images and sculptures have been discovered in stray groups from distant parts of India like Gandhara, Mathura and Amaravati that belong to two or three centuries after its commencement. But when we consider the vastness of the Indian continent and think of the religious needs of the majority of her untold millions of people, we cannot but be struck with the fact that the actual discovery of the extant images going back to these earlier times is very much incommensurate with our expectations. The reasons for this extreme paucity have been briefly mentioned by me in passim in the last part of the introductory chapter of this book. The iconoclastic zeal of the image-haters of alien faith, the ever active spoliation of ancient religious structures for building materials by the utilitarian vandals of mediaeval and modern times and the natural causes of decay and destruction were no doubt responsible to a great extent for this comparative infrequency of early finds of images. The ancient practice of making images in such perishable materials like wood and clay is also one of the main reasons which explain the above fact. In the Vedic times, in the fashioning of the ritual implements that were necessary for the correct performance of particular sacrifices, wood was the principal material that was used, and the altars of various shapes and
kinds were made of clay and bricks. In referring to the materials out of which the god Viśvakarmā could have created the universe the one that comes foremost to the mind of the Vedic seer is wood. The hymnist asks, 'which was the forest and what was the tree out of whose wood the heaven and earth were made?' (R. V., X, 81, 4—Kim svidvanam ka u sa vyksa asa yato dyavaprthivi nistata-taksuh.) It is natural that wood should be easily thought of in the construction of structures and other objects, for it is not only one of the easily procurable materials but also is an important one among such, which is the easiest to work upon. It is no wonder then that we find so many passages in early Indian iconographic texts expatiating on the selection of wood to be used in the construction of images. Some of these are taken notice of here; attention of the reader, however, needs be drawn in passim to the extreme care and consideration which is enjoined by the writers of these texts, to be followed by the image-makers in the cutting of the particular trees whose wood should be employed by them for the shaping of the arcā of the god.

Writers on Indian iconography and iconometry have discussed the importance of chapter 57 on Pratimālakṣaṇam of Varāhamihira's Brīhatsaṃhitā (Sudhakar Dvivedi's edition) and have utilised its contents in various ways; but very little notice has as yet been taken by them of the next chapter, viz., Vanasampravesādhya and its bearing on the art of image-making in ancient India. The latter lays down details regarding the ceremony of securing wood from the forest trees, and bringing it home for the purpose of making images of gods and goddesses. We are first told that the image-maker should enter into the forest on an auspicious day selected by the astrologer and be careful about the omens which he would see on his way to it. Then a list of trees which are to be avoided in the search for proper wood is given; trees which grow in cremation
ground, by the side of roads, near temples, or on ant-hills, in gardens and hermitages, caitya or sthala vrksas, those growing by the confluences of rivers, or which are planted by human hands, extremely bent ones, trees growing very close to other trees or overgrown with creepers, trees struck by lightning or broken by storms, falling by themselves or damaged by elephants, dried or burnt trees, or those on which bees make their hives, these are not to be selected by the sculptor. Next are given the names of those the wood of which is to be used for making images; deodar, candana, sami, madhuka for images to be set up by Brahmans; arista, asvattha, khadira, vilva—for those to be made for the Ksatriyas; jivaka, khadira, sindhuka and syandana are auspicious for images to be enshrined by the Vaiśyas, while tinduka, keśara, sarja, arjuna, āmra, and sāla are so for the Śudras.¹ Before the selected tree is to be felled by axe certain rites are to be performed by the sculptor. First he is to mark off on its trunk the various sections of the Lingam or image to be made out of it in order that the top, bottom and the sides of the object to be fashioned may correspond to those of the trunk of the tree.² Next he will propitiate the tree with various offerings and worship the gods, manes, Rāksasas, Nāgas, Asuras, Gaṇas,

¹ Suradāru-candana-sami-madhukataravah śubhā dvijātinām ||
Kṣatrasyaarīṣṭāsvattha-khadira-vilvā vivṛddhikarāḥ ||
Vaiśyāṇām jivaka-khadira-sindhuka-syandanaśca śubhaphaladāḥ ||
Tinduka-keśara-sarjarjunāṁrasālāśca śūdrāṇām || (Verses 5-6)

The same list is given by Kāśyapa in his work; Utpala quotes three couplets from it in his commentary.

² Lingam vā pratimā vā drumavat sthāpya yathā disam yasmāt ||
Tasmācvinayitavyā diśo drumasyordhavanathavādah ||
(Verse 7).

Kāśyapa says:—

Vṛksavat pratimā kāryā prāgbhāgādyupalakṣitā ||
Pādalā pādeṣu karttavah śirṣamūrdhve tu kārayet ||
and Vināyakas at night and utter the following mantra, touching the tree with his hands:—

Oh, thou tree, salutation to thee, thou art selected for (being fashioned into) the icon of deity; please accept this offering according to rules. May all the spirits which reside in this tree transfer their habitation elsewhere after accepting the offerings made according to rules; may they pardon me today (for disturbing them); salutation to them.¹

Lastly, in the morning after sprinkling water on the tree and smearing the blade of his axe with honey and clarified butter, he should cut round the trunk rightwards, beginning from the north-east corner. In the last verse of the chapter the author states that further details about the felling of the tree omitted by him in this chapter, have been described in his chapters on Indradhvaja and Vāstuvidyā, and the same should apply in this case also. The information which we gather from a study of this chapter is also supplied to us in various other texts like the sections on architecture and sculpture of the Purāṇas like Bhavisya, Viṣṇudharmottara, Mātya and others and such works as Mānasāra, etc. Of these the chapter of Bhavisya Purāṇa on Pratimācidhi (Ch. 131) in the Prathama Brāhma Parva which begins just after the chapter on Prāśadalākṣaṇa-vāraṇam gives details more or less similar to those noted

¹ Arcārthamaṃukasya tvam devasya parikalpitah
Namaste vṛṣa pūjyaṁ ridhiva īsamprayaghātām ||
Yānāha bhūtāni vasanti tāni ruliṁ gṛhītvā ridhivat prayuktam ||
Anyatra vāsaṁ parikalpayaṁtā kṣamantu tānyaṁyā namo’stu
teḥ hṛdaya || (Verses 10-11).

The same mantra is to be found in the Bhavisya Purāṇa chapter on Pratimācidhi; a few other passages common to both can be found in the two.
above. Nārada, while explaining to Sāmba rules for the construction of images of gods in general and Sūrya in particular, mentions that seven kinds of images tending to the welfare of the devotees are known; viz., those made of gold, silver, copper, earth or clay, stone, wood and the ones that are drawn (on canvas and other objects); of these Nārada selects those made of wood as deserving special notice.¹ This shows that wood was the most frequently used material for image-making from very early times.

In the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa a whole chapter entitled Devālayārtha dāruparikṣaṇam (Bk. III, Ch. 89) is devoted to the details of procuring wood for temple-building and image-making activities, and rules similar to the above for marking off the different sections of the images and building posts on the trunk of the tree are incorporated.² The next two chapters deal with Śilāparikṣā and Iṣṭakāparikṣā, in the former of which rites enjoined are somewhat similar to those mentioned in connection with Dāruparikṣā. The Mānasāra, a work giving details of architectural construction

¹ Atha te sampravakṣyāmi pratīmāvidhīvistaram || Sarveṣāmeva devānāmādityasya viśeṣataḥ ||
Araśa saṃtāvidhā proktā bhaktānāṁ śubhaśvādhaye ||
Kāṇcanāḥ pājali tāmīrī pārthīvī saṁlājī smṛtāḥ ||
Vārkhī cālekhyakhā celi mūrtisthānāṁ sapta vai ||
Vārksividhānāṁ te vīrā vāṃṣayāmyaśeṣeataḥ ||

Bhūvisya Purāṇa, Bk. 1, Ch. 131 Verses 1-8.

² Agram mūlam prayatnena kārtavyam tasya cīhānī—
Agram devaṃya mūrdhānam pādāṃ mūlaṃ tu kārayet ||
Arocakītā viparyastā līyāvatī mūrapāvahā ||
Agramūlāṃ viparyūsaṃ slambhānāṃ ca vivarjaya ||
Agramāvapapyāste kṛte veśmakṣayaṃ vrajayet ||
Pūrvagrā cōtārāgrā vā drumā yojāy grheṣu ca ||

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

Tasmat sarvacraftnaṇa cīhānīstāṃ kārayed dramam ||
Agre mūle ca dharmajīva tatāḥ samyak praveṣayet ||
its foremost consideration, deals at great length with the topic of Dārusanga grahaṇa in lines 251-347 in the chapter on Stambhalakṣaṇam (P. K. Acharya’s Edition, Ch. XV, p. 103 ff.). These particulars are of the same nature as the ones gleaned from the other texts, but here they apply chiefly to the construction of wooden columns. A formidable list of sakunas is given in lines 260-94; in lines 295-304 are mentioned rules about sacrifices to the various kinds of evil spirits, the eight Dikpālas beginning with Indra and ending with Iśāna, to eight Rākṣasas like Mukhya, Mṛga, Aditi, Udita, Vitatha, Antarikṣa, Bhrṣa and Pūṣan and lastly to the Vanaspati.¹ The whole of the chapter 257 entitled Vāstuvidyānukīrtanaṃ of the Matsya Purāṇa deals with the Dārvarahaṇāvidhi in a succinct way; the next few chapters (258-263) discourse on details of iconometry and iconography, incidentally referring to different kinds of materials used for image-making. Thus, while recording the characteristic signs of the pedestals (pīṭhikā), the author remarks that stone, earthen, wooden and mixed pedestals are to be assigned to images which are made of stone, earth, wood and mixed materials, respectively.² In the next chapter on Liṅgalakṣaṇam, the author expressly mentions in the last verse that ‘Liṅgas should be made of (such materials) as precious metals,

¹ A few other details are recorded here; one such refers to three sex groups among the trees. The last lines in this section, viz.,

Vyākṣasya mālāṃ niśe ca agre cāgraṃ tathaiva ca ||
Bhūmisparśanukhaṇi jñātva tadādhyāram parabhāgataḥ ||

have been translated ‘The base of the column is (to be marked) on the lower part of the trunk and on the upper part of the capital; the part other than these (i.e., the middle part) is known to be that which touches, (i.e., makes) the body, i.e., the shaft of the column.

² Saile sālamayī mādyāt pārthive pārthivim tatha ||
Dārujac dārujaṁ kuryāṃśe niśrāṃ tathaiva ca ||
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crystal, earth and wood in the manner laid down in the previous lines.  

It will be of interest to refer in this connection to the different classifications of images on the basis of materials out of which they were made, mentioned in a few other texts. Gopala Bhatta purporting to quote from the Matsya Purāṇa and Hayaśirṣa Pañcarātra supplies us with two such groupings in his Haribhaktivilāsa. The first is that images can be divided into four broad divisions, viz., citrajā (i.e., those that are painted on canvas, wall or pātra), lepajā (made of clay), pākajā (made of molten metal, i.e., cast images) and śastrotkīrṇā (carved by metal instruments). The second list includes seven different varieties, viz., mṛṇmayī, dāru-
ghaṭitā, lohajā, ratnajā, sañjā, gandhajā and kañsumī. It will be seen that with the exception of the last two in the second list (or one, viz., kañsumī, because gandhajā may come under lepajā in the first list), which are evidently kṣāṇika images, all the others in it can very well come under the first one. The Śukranitisāra refers to eight kinds of materials thus:—Pratimā saikatī paiśī lēkhyā lepyā ca mṛṇmayī | Vārski pāśāṇa-dhātūtthā sthirā jñeya yathottarā || (IV, 4, 72). In this list several new materials occur, such as sikatā (sand) and piṣṭa (substance ground and then mixed with water into a dough); the latter evidently refers here to such a material as rice powder mixed with water (in Bengali colloquial, it is called piṭuli) and not to the compound which make up stucco. Each succeeding material in this list is more durable than the preceding one and the metal images are described as the most permanent (sthirā) among them. The Samarāṅgaṇaśīlādhara, a late anthology by king Bhojadeva, also refers in these lines to the seven kinds of images:—Pratimānāmatha brūmo lakṣaṇam

1 Evam ratnamayaṇī kuryāt sphāti karṇa pārthivaṇa tathā |
Subham dārumayaṇcāpi yadvā manasi rocate ||
dravyameva ca I. Suvarṇa-rūpya-lāmrāśma-dārulekhyāni saktitah II Citram ceti vinirdiśtam dravyamarcaṣu sapladhā I (Gaekwar Oriental series, Vol. II, Ch. I, v. 1). This list is practically the same as that in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, noticed above, with this difference only that it omits reference to clay images while mentioning pictorial representations twice under the heads lekhya and citra. That clay was undoubtedly one of the most commonly used media for making images (as it is so used now in Bengal for the making of kṣānika or impermanent ones) is fully borne out by a very interesting passage quoted by Gopala Bhatta from Hayāśīrṣa Pāñcarātra which lays down rules about preparing clay for this purpose. It can be freely translated thus:—‘ Members of all castes, from the highest downwards, should collect earth from river banks, cultivated fields or sacred places; then equal portions of powdered stone, karkara (sand) and iron should be mixed with it and the whole mixture should be pressed with some astringents; extracts of khadira, arjuna, sarjja, śrī, veṇṭa(?) and kuṅkuma, kautaja and āyuṣa wood, and curds, milk and clarified butter should be repeatedly stirred up with the above; the whole compound should then be left over for a month till it is ready to be shaped into images.’ 1 This mode of the preparation of clay, however, shows that the material thus prepared was used for making images far more durable than ordinary clay ones, some of its constituents being powdered

1 Mṛttikāvarṇapūrvena grhiniyussarvacavarninah | Naditire thavā kṣetre puṇyasthāne thavā punah | Pāṣāṇa-karkara-lohacūrṇāni samabhāgaḥ | Mṛttikāyām prayojāthā kaṇāyenaprayipāyat | Khadiḥarjūnenaṁ sūrjaśrīveṇṭakuṅkumaiḥ | Kautajāyāsaiḥ snehairddhikṣūrghṛtadībhīḥ | Aloṭaya mṛttikāṁ tuṣṭaiḥ sthāne sthāpya punah punah | Māsāṁ paryuṣitaṁ kṛtvā pratimāṁ parikalpayet || Haribhaktivilāsa. 18th vilāsa.
iron and stone. This compound is similar to the material known as stucco which was so copiously used by the Hellenistic artists of Gandhara from the third to the fifth century A.D.; if we are to understand that limestone is meant by the word pāśāṇa, then the similarity becomes greater. This seems to be the substance which was so frequently used in making many figure sculptures on the towering gopuras of many of the south Indian temples. We are further informed in the same text that a central wooden frame designated here as pratimāśula of a length of 120 or 125 aṅgulas (daśatāla or uttamadaśatāla measurement) and made of khadira or yajñīya (yajñādumbura) wood is to be set up on the rātnanyāsa (ratnavedi or altar on which the image is to be placed), whereon the different limbs of the image are to be modelled according to the proportions laid down in the text. Reference has already been made to the Mātsya Purāṇa passage where there is mention of mixed materials used for image-making; evidently the compound just noted falls under this category. The text is of unique importance; it not only gives the formula for the preparation of the stucco-like substance, but also shows how wood, clay and such other perishable materials were mixed up to make images of a comparatively durable nature.

The above extracts fully prove how in ancient and mediæval times, wood, as well as clay, was one of the

1 Śīhāpayet pratimāśulaṁ rātnanyāsasya copari |
Śūlaṇca khādirādīmāṁ yajñīyānāṁ prakulpayet II
Vinśotttarsatam śūlam kuryādva paṁcavinśatiḥ |
Pratimāṅgulamāṇena kṛtvā saṁsthāpayed budhāh II
Haribhaktivilāsa, 18.

This wooden core (pratimāśula) in modern clay images of Bengal is described as kāṭhāmo in Bengali language; the word is derived from kāṭha or kāṣṭha meaning wood. At present, it is made of bamboo slits and straw.
commonest media for the making of images in India. Texts like the Bhārīṣya Purāṇa and the chapter 58 of the Bṛhatsamhitā which lay special stress on wood as the material for image-making are of comparatively early date, because they take stock of earlier traditional practice. Some of the later texts like Agni Purāṇa, though mentioning it among other materials, chiefly expatiate upon the use of stone. Scholars after a careful study of the early extant architectural remains throughout India came to the conclusion long ago that much of the form and technique of their construction was influenced by their earlier and commoner prototypes of wooden structures. It can very well be presumed that some of the characteristic features of the few extant early Indian sculptures in the round and many relief carvings show their intimate connection with carved wood sculptures which were common in ancient times. From this it does not necessarily follow that the indigenous artists of India first learnt to use stone for architectural and sculptural purposes after their contact with the foreigners. But the data collected above prove that stone, though certainly in use from a very early date, was much less frequently employed than wood and clay. In the 6th chapter of Antagada Dasāo, a Jaina text, we find a clear reference to the wooden statue of the Yakṣa Moggarapāṇi in a shrine outside the city of Rājagṛha. Even long after stone began to be principally used for image-making, wooden images were also made by the artists. The finely carved wooden pillar bearing figure sculptures and decorative motifs on it discovered at Arial near Dacca and now preserved in the Arial Museum, and the weather beaten standing Viṣṇu and several other objects of carved wood in the collection of the Dacca Museum show that wood remained as one of the principal media for image-making. The wooden images of Jagannātha, Balarāma and Subhadrā enshrined in the main sanctum at Puri are renewed every
twelve years and the old ones are buried underground in an unfrequented part of the extensive temple compound. Very few wooden images, however, of any antiquity have so far been discovered; the reason is obvious. In this tropical country with its humid climate, and infested by destructive agencies like the white ants and rats, wooden objects seldom attain to any age. Herein lies one of the explanations of the extreme paucity of the extant images in the pre-Christian period of the art-history of India. References to images in the literature and inscriptions of India datable in the 3rd century B.C., if not earlier, are to be found; but few, if any, are the images discovered up till now which can be confidently dated back to this period. Two other interesting deductions can be made from the data collected above. The first is that the wide celebrity of the artists of such centres as Mathura, Gandhara and Sarnath might have been greatly due to the fact of their making more systematic and constant use of such durable materials as red sandstone, black slate and Chunar sandstone. The second is that the method of coloring stone images with appropriate paints, so much practised in earlier times, was due to their wooden prototypes which were surely coated with paint in ancient days (it is still the custom in Burma).

Of the seven different kinds of mūrtisthānas, i.e., materials for the making of images, several others such as metal, stone and paint, etc., require to be considered at some detail. The metal images especially the bronze ones fall under the pākajā class as it has been mentioned above and discovery of some early specimens fully proves that the Indian artists were quite adept in the art of bronze casting. In fact, the skill they display in the casting of the beautiful bronze Buddha of the early Gupta period found at Sultan-ganj and now in the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery is unique; it can surely rank as one of the best specimens. The gold plated bronze image of Mañjuśrī recovered from the
Balai Dhap mound, close to the ruins of Mahāsthān and now in the Rajshahi Museum, is another fine specimen of the same art, though of a slightly later date. It is unfortunate that very few, if any at all, earlier images have so far been found, but the discovery of the above proves that the Indian artists had long experience in this branch of fine arts. The uninscribed and inscribed cast coins of the pre-Christian period, some of them going back to an age as early as the 2nd or 3rd century B.C., if not earlier, do not portray, it is true, that excellence which is evinced by the bronze images of later date. But it should be borne in mind that the Indians in their early efforts at coinage both in the issues of the punch-marked and cast coins especially the former, were never very successful and the crudeness with which some of the purely indigenous money were being manufactured up till recent times should be noted.¹ The metal-casters' art especially in the fashioning of divine images on the other hand remained at a high level throughout and the mediaeval bronze statues and statuettes from Nalanda, Kurkihar, Jhaveri (Chittagong) and other places of eastern India, and Chamba, Rajputana, etc., from northern India and the ones from Negapatam, Madura and various other parts of Southern India characteristically testify to the truth of the above remark.

It is however interesting to note that though a few texts contain detailed descriptions of the method of casting images, there are many others which remain silent about it. The earliest of the latter, as we have shown, lay down rules for making images in wood and clay, which materials are

¹ The copper coins of Udaipur, Mewar, now known as ḍinglā and some of them formerly known also as trisūlāṇ on account of their bearing on them a trident, can be mentioned as an example. W. W. Webb informs us that these coins were still being manufactured as late as the sixties of the last century; The Currencies of Rajputana, p. 13.
comparatively inexpensive and easily acquired. A devotee who wished to give some sort of permanency to the image of his god would naturally think upon stone of various kinds; and texts incorporated in the Purāṇas and Āgamas give minute details about the method of stone carving. But the casting of large-sized metal images was an elaborate process and required a great deal of expense and so could be practised only occasionally. This is borne out by the significant observation of T. A. G. Rao that 'metal is rarely employed in the making of dhrūva-beras; this material is almost exclusively used for casting utsava, snāpana and bali images,' the latter being usually small ones cast solid. The compilers of the second group of the iconographic and iconometric texts usually incorporated rules and canons which would be mostly in demand for supplying the religious needs of the general class of devotees belonging to the various sects. But rules on the method of casting for the use of the more skilled technicians were no doubt collected by some of the ancient and mediaeval iconographers of India. A few comparatively late compilations, thus, base their description of this method called the 'Madhūcchīṣṭa-vihānam,' on these collections. The word madhūcchīṣṭa means bees' wax, what is left over (ucchīṣta) after the honey is strained. In this process which is known to the western artists as ‘cire perdue’ or the ‘lost wax’, the molten metal is left over in the earthen mould to conceal after the wax is gradually melted away by heat, and the bees’ wax played the most important part; thus, the process acquired the above name. Gopinath Rao quotes three passages from Kāraṇāgama, Suprabhedāgama and Viṣṇusunhitā; the first two merely testify to the use of bees’ wax in the metal casting while the last mention briefly the process thus, 'if an image is to be made of metal, it must first be made in wax and then coated with earth; gold or other metals
are purified and cast into (the mould) and a complete image is thus obtained by capable workmen.' The Mānasāra (P. K. Acharyā’s Edition) devotes a complete chapter (LXVIII) for describing the method of casting images in metal. S. K Saraswati rightly points out, however, that the whole chapter is concerned chiefly with the ritualistic side of the subject; and the meagre information regarding the technique of the process is very little explicit in character, on account of the extremely corrupt form of the text. Saraswati has drawn our attention to the first prakaraṇa of the Abhilāṣitārthacintāmaṇi, also known as Mānasollāsa Śāstra, said to have been composed by king Somesvara Bhūlokamalla, of the Western Cālukya line of Kalyani who came to the throne in 1124-25 A.D. In connection with the topic of ‘adoration to the gods’ (devatā-bhakti) the prakaraṇa consisting of 21 verses gives a succinct and by far the best account about the process of manufacture of metal images.

The text first refers to the preparation of the image (i.e., the model, evidently made of wax, though not expressly said so here) complete with all the details, according to the navatāla measurement; then instructions are given about the placing of wax-tubes on its back, shoulders and the neck or crown and besmearing it with refined clay in three layers. Rules for the preparation of the clay are given in detail and it is needless to say that it is much different from the one mentioned in the Haṣṭāṅga Pañcarātra. The clay coatings should be made in regular intervals and be


carefully dried up in the shade. The textual injunction is to be noted that the amount of wax used to prepare the model should be weighed in the very beginning by the wise artist (sikthakam tolayedādāvāreccālayanam vicākṣaṇaḥ). Then the particular metal out of which the casting is to be done should be measured according to certain proportions; if the image is to be made of brass or copper, the metal should weigh ten times (or eight times according to a variant reading), if of silver, twelve times, and, if of gold, sixteen times that of the wax model, according to the specific gravity of the metals. Then the measured metal should be encased in a cocoanut shaped earthen crucible (nālikerākṛtim muśām) and the wax from the clay-coated mould should be melted away by heating the image in fire. The crucible with the metal within ought to be so heated as the latter should form a liquid mass and after puncturing the top of the crucible with an iron rod, the whole molten metal should be carefully poured down the mouth of the tube. When the molten metal has congealed after cooling down, then the clay coating should be broken up very carefully. Any superfluous metal and the tubes adhering to the fully-fashioned metal image should be filed away with a cāraṇa (a file?) and lastly the whole should be brightly polished (paścādūjjvalatāṁ nayet). When this is all done in the manner prescribed above, the king should instal it on an auspicious day according to the usual rites and should offer daily worship to it.¹ Saraswati remarks that the above text 'does not say whether the model would have to be made of solid wax or with an inner core.' But a perusal of the text will show that it does seem to refer to solid casting which was the general rule in case of small images. In the case of bigger images, the method of hollow casting seems to have been followed on account of their cost and weight.

¹ The above is a summary of S. K. Saraswati's translation of the text under observation.
Several of the earliest big metal images of India, Mahasthan Mañjuśrī and the Sultanganj Buddha mentioned above, exhibit a core still sticking tightly to their inside. From this it seems that the wax model was worked over an inner compound probably consisting of charred husk, finely rubbed clay, thoroughly carded cotton and powdered salt—the same ingredients that were used in the preparation of the clay for applying to the outside of the wax mould. Saraswati has not referred to another edited text on metal casting, viz., that contained in the Silparatna of Śrikumāra who flourished in the 16th century A.D. It consists of twenty-two verses incorporated in the second chapter (verses 32-53) of the printed edition of Silparatna, Part II, by T. Ganapati Sastri. The text, though corrupt, seems to lay down details which are concerned with hollow casting. The first verse (Madhūcchiṣṭena nirmāya sakalam niśkalan tu vai Baddhvā mrdā dṛṣṭham śuṣkamadhūcchiṣṭam bhūh śṛṛet, and verses 42ff. speak of a process in which the inside of the image remains hollow after the wax inside and the one outside is melted away by heat. The last verse (No. 53, viz., Ghanam cellohajam vimbam madhūcchiṣṭena kavalaḥ Kṛtvā mṛlepanādini pūrvarat kramataścared) does nothing but refer to the casting of ghanam, i.e., solid images. That hollow cast metal images were made is fully proved by writers on Śṛṣṭi works like Manu and others who refer to such images heated from within which an adulterer would have to embrace as a sort of punishment. The Ṛgvedic passage sūrmyam suṣiramīva (VIII. 69, 12), though not referring to an image of the god meant for worship, seems also to refer to the practice of hollow casting.

Elaborate details are laid down in early and late texts about the selection of proper kind of stone for the making of images. The earlier ones, however, have special preference for wood as we have already shown from such texts as
Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Brhatśamhitā and the Matsya Purāṇa. The Viṣṇudharmottara does not only lay down elaborate rules for the selection of wood, but also for that of stone to be used in making durable images of gods. The whole of the ninetieth chapter entitled Śilāparīkṣā, of the third book of the Viṣṇudharmottara, deals with this topic and the details mentioned there closely follow those enjoined in connection with Dāruparīkṣā. In the first few verses it is laid down that the sthapati will go to a hill and select the particular stone for image. White, red, yellow and black stones are used for the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra devotees, respectively. Stone that is suitable for such images should be one-coloured, smooth, imbedded in earth, without any grains of sand in its layers, good to look at, washed by spring water or merged in water, shaded by trees and bailing from sacred tīrthas, of good length, breadth and thickness (āyāmaparīnāḥadhyan). Stones, that are not so, are those that are burnt by sun-rays, which are used for other works, which contain alkaline water, which are very much rough, which are marked with minute spots or patches of different shape and size (Tilaiḥ sambhūṣitā yā tu vicitrār vindumistiṣitā) and so on (on this authority the spotted red sandstone of Mathura will be unsuited for image-making). Then mention is made of various modes of testing the selected stone,—the tests consisting of different kinds of śilālepas, a few recipes of which are given; the application of this test to the stone and the reactions which will follow will show whether the stone is worth collecting for images or not. After being fully satisfied on all these points, the artist will take the selected stone according to rules to the temple for being fashioned into the divine image. The last part of the eighteenth vilāsa of Gopal Bhatta’s Haribhaktīvilāsa entitled Śilāgrahānam is devoted to the consideration of the same subject. He quotes extensively from the section of the Hayāśīrṣa Pāñcabātra, which elaborately deals with the rituals connected
with entrance in the forest, selection of flawless one-coloured stone, worshipping the god Viṣṇu, offering of bāḷi to the guardians of the quarters, worshipping the selected stone with sandal paste, flowers and naivedya and propitiating the various Yātudhānas, Guhyakas and Siddhas who may reside in the stone or in its vicinity and asking their permission to use the stone for the image of Viṣṇu and entreating them to go to reside in another place with these words—'Viṣṇuvim-bārthamasmākam yatraiṣā Keśavājñayā | Viṣṇuvarthanam yajbhavet kūryanā yuṣmākamapi tad bhavet || Ānena balidānena prītā bhavatha sarvathā | Keśemena yacchataṁyatra mukte v sthānamidam punah ||' The Pañcarātra text also refers to the significance of the various dreams which the selectors of the stone might dream while sleeping at night near it. Then early in the morning of the next day, after the performance of the daily rites and paying respects to the stone and the stone-cutting implements, the sculptor with the taṅka (stone-mason’s chisel) in hand (śilpi taṅkahastih) should commence his work. The stone for the image should measure a little more than the image to be fashioned out of it. After cutting it out and raising it up, it should be brought near the temple and expert artists then should begin their work on it (Tataḥ pravarttayet karma cidrāṇa vijnāistu śilpibhīh). In the section under Silālakṣaṇam, the Hayasiriṣa refers to various kinds of stone that are to be avoided. A list of different kinds of stone fit for being fashioned into the images of Vāsudeva Viṣṇu is now given. Those stones which are procured from sacred places, which are to be found merged in rivers, on shady hills or under ground, not burnt

1 Keśārāmlasevilā yā ca nadiṭirasamudbhacā | Puramadhye sthītā yā ca tathāpi tu vane sthītā || Catuspathe sthītā yā ca mṛchilā-pakkane ca yā | Usare ca tathā madhye vāmike vāpi yā sthītā || Suryaraśmi-pratītā yā yā ca daṇḍāhā dāvāgniṇā | Anyakarmmopaya-vuktā yā anyadevaśthanimitā | Kṛvyādādyayupahatā vairya yatncena vai śilā | Yena kecacid āṇītā varijaniyā tathā śilā ||
by sun-rays, which are of one pleasing colour like pale brown, red yellow or black (pāṇḍurā cāruṇā pīṭā kṛṣṇā śastā ca vārinām) are recommended. Then details are given about different types of stones such as yuvā (youthful), madhyā (of middle age), bālā (very young) and vṛddhā (old) of which the first two only are to be used for images (these refer to the geological age of particular varieties); stones of masculine, feminine and neuter gender are to be distinguished with the help of their characteristic signs such as their ring and their glaze. The main image should be made of masculine stone, the pedestal of feminine, while the piṇḍikā (lowermost base) of the neuter (Pumāliṅgaiḥ pratimā kāryā striṅgaiḥ pāḍapīṭhikāḥ Piṇḍikārtham tu sā grāhyā drṣṭvā ya śandalakṣaṇā). This injunction would mean that these above three were made of separate stones; but in most cases, the actual practice was different, the three being made out of one single block of stone. If the stones in the time of being cut and dressed show circular patches inside them they are to be avoided as far as possible, for the different kinds of such patches (many are enumerated) bring forth various kinds of misfortunes, if they are worked upon. The Haṇaśīrṣa then goes on to describe the characteristic signs of the piṇḍikā and pīthā of the image proper. Elaborate details are given and as many as ten different kinds of the former, such as sthāndilā, yakṣī, vedi, maṇḍalā, pūrṇacandrā, vajrā, padmā, ardhaśaṣṭi and trikoṇā (the name of the tenth is not given), are enumerated. As regards the height of the image and its pedestal, it is expressly laid down here that the shrine door should be divided into eight equal units; the image proper should measure two of these units, while the piṇḍikā, one part of the height of the image divided into three equal parts.¹

¹ Devārocchrāyasya yanmānunaśṭadadhā tat tv kārayt | Bhāgadvayena pratimāni tribhāgiktvā tat punah | Piṇḍikā bhāgataḥ kāryā
says that all this work connected with the fashioning of the image in all its minute details should be done in a covered secluded place by the image-maker in pious and well-controlled manner and while engaged in his work he should always meditate on the god whose image is being fashioned by him. Detailed instructions are incorporated in most of the texts dealing with Brahmanical iconography about the actual proportions to be followed in the carving of the entire image and its various sections and sub-sections; a reference to the eighth chapter of this book where some of these iconometric texts are discussed will testify to the thoroughness and accuracy of the ideal which was set before the ancient and medieval iconographers of India.

Pictorial representations of divinities were also much in vogue in ancient and medieval India; this custom still persists in present times, but the background on which the

nālinicā na cocchritā 1 The distinction between piṇḍikā and piṭhikā or pitha is not very clear; in the text, under piṇḍikālakṣaṇam, we are told that the former should measure half the height of the main image in its altitude and be equal in its width to the same of the image—Ucchāryaṃ pratimārdhānaśa daīrghyena pratimāsamā 1 Then after enumerating the ten different kinds of piṇḍas noted above, the text lays down some interesting details in the following lines some of which I quoted from the Matsya Purāṇa in a previous chapter:—Saile śailamayiṃ piṇḍiṃ paṁthivaṁ paṁthivīṃ tathā 1 Dāruje dārujaṁ kuryāniśūre miśraṁ tathaiva ca 1 Nāgāyonista kāryā vai sada śubhaphalapsubhikśa 1 Arecāyāmasamantā daīrghyamā līngāyāmasamanantā tathā 1 Yasya devasya gā padni lāṃ piṭhe parikupalve; then it adds, Evameca samakhyātaṁ samāsāt pithalakṣaṇam.

1 Vivikte samyogte sthāne sthapatīḥ samyogendriyāḥ 1 Pūrvavat kaladrajaṁ śāstraṁ śaklabhūṣaṇaḥ 1 Prayato nīgatāḥ kāro devatadhyānatatparaḥ 1 Yajamānānukūlaṁ vidvān kārma samācarat 1

All the quotations from the Hayagrīva-Paścarattra and the Matsya Purāṇa are here taken from the 18th vilāsa of Gopal Bhatta’s Haribhaktivilāsa.
image is now painted mainly consists of paper. When it is found inconvenient and expensive to worship his god in stone, bronze or even clay icons, a sectary would often worship him in ‘ghaṭa’ and ‘pāṭa,’ i.e., in an water vessel with vermilion and sandal or other paints on it and in a paper picture of the deity encased in an wooden frame (this custom is mostly in vogue in Bengal, where it is called in local dialect—‘ghate pate pūjā’). In earlier times, cloth or canvas was the principal medium and the word pāṭa which originally signified cloth acquired the sense of pictorial representation of a deity or some mythology connected with it. This is citra in a more restricted sense of the term, another of its wider significance being sculptures fully in the round. It is used in the former sense in many of the texts dealing with iconographic matter and when the Matsya Purāṇa refers to the first of the four different kinds of images it undoubtedly uses the word in the former meaning. But the scope of these citrajā images, as we have seen, is much wider, for it does refer not only to divine images painted on cloth but also on walls and vessels (Pate kūḍye ca pāṭre ca citrajā pratimā smṛtā). Not only colour drawings on the bare surface of mud walls, but also frescoes that are painted in variegated colour on some kind of plaster fixed to the surface of stone walls as in those of rock-cut caves of Ajanta are included in this group of icons. The pātraś are evidently water-vessels, ghaṭas mentioned above, made of clay or metal and painted in colour on their outer surface with the figures of divinities. The Viṣṇudharmottara gives a detailed account of the rules of painting which is of unique interest and importance for a thorough appreciation of the great advance that the Indian artists of ancient and mediaeval times made in the art of painting.¹ The Hayasirṣa-Paṅca-

¹ Viṣṇudharmottara, published by the Venkatesvara Press, Book III, chs. 2, 27, 35-43. Translation with introduction and notes by
ṛātra expressly eulogises the pictorial representations of Hari and says that he who draws beautiful rūpas of Viṣṇu (on cloth or other objects) enjoys one thousand yugas of blissful residence in the Viṣṇuloka; as Hari is always manifest in frescoes (lepya citra), so he should always be worshipped in his lepya citra forms; as beauty, ornament and expressions are clearly discernible in his painted forms, so Janārddana approaches them; so the sages ordain that hundred-fold virtue accrues to the worshippers of the lord in these forms; seeing Puṇḍarīkākṣa in picture, full of grace and illusive excellence, one is freed from sin hoarded through untold numbers of births; therefore the god Nārāyaṇa should be worshipped in pictures (paṭasthāḥ) by those who want spiritual welfare and piety. ¹

Stella Kramrisch, Calcutta University Press, 1928, pp. 1-20, 31-62. Several emendations of this translation were made by A. C. Coomaraswamy, in J. A. O. S., 1932 pp. 13-21. The Citralakṣāṇa, said to have been composed by Nagnājit, now available only in its Tibetan version, deals extensively with the rules of painting. The Silparatna also has a section which deals with painting. The sections on Paṭaṃvidhāna in Argya Maṇjuśrīmūlakalpa (edited by T. Ganapati Sastri, in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series) also contain some useful information on this art; but it is more concerned with the iconographic presentation of the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna divinities. M. Lalou in her work on Iconographic Des Etoffes Peintes (Paṭa) has translated these chapters in French, given their Tibetan version and written a very useful introduction (Paul Geuthner, Paris, 1930).

¹ Hayaśīra-Paṇcarātra in connection with the installation of citrāja images, as quoted by Gopal Bhatta: Yāvanti Viṣṇurūpāṇī surīṇḍuṇihā lekhayet | Tāradyogā-sahasrasāṇi Viṣṇuloke mahiyate | Lepye citra Hārīṇityat asambhānamapati hi | Tasmāt sarvaprāyatnena lepya-citrāyatan yajet | Kāntibhūṣanabhārādyākecitre yas- nāt sphaṭam sthitah | Atah sānvidhyamāyāti citrajasu Janārddanaḥ | Tasmāc citrāvarecane punyam suṣṭam śataguṇaḥ budhāḥ | Citraṣṭham Puṇḍarīkākṣaḥ saṅvāsanā saṅvibhramam | Drṣṭāvā vimucyaḥ pāpar- jānmaṇiḥ susaṅcatiḥ | Tasmācchabhārthāḥbhārindhāmāhāpunya-jigisayā | Paṭasthāḥ pūjaniyastu devo Nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuh |
Reference ought to be made here, for completeness' sake, to various other modes of representing the deity. The āgamas enumerate several kinds of precious and semi-precious stones like sphaṭika (crystal), padmarāga (lapis-lazuli), vajra (diamond), vaidūrya (cat's eye), vidruma (coral), puṣya and ratna (ruby). That crystal could be very skilfully handled and fashioned into beautiful forms is proved by the discovery of the excellently carved crystal bowl with fish handle on the lid among the relics of Buddha inside the big monolithic chest at Piprava. This class of images really falls under the ratnajā group of the Ḥayaśirṣa and the āstrotkīrṇā one of the Matsya Purāṇa, the latter also including images made of wood and stone. To the āstrotkīrṇā class will also go those metal plaques gold and others—which bear on them the effigies of gods. Mention has already been made of the Lauriya Nandangarh and Piprava gold plaques bearing the representations of a nude goddess; among the several other tiny gold leaves discovered inside the big relic casket at Piprava, a few other figures in outline—an elephant, a crude human figure, etc., can still be recognised, whose character cannot be determined with certainty. The unique representation of Śiva-Pārvatī embossed on a concave plaque of pure gold, $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches high, found on the site of the Patna fort is one of the most interesting finds of this nature that have recently been made.¹ Metal plaques containing

¹ K. P. Jayaswal, 'Paruliputra Śiva-Pārvatī Gold Plaque' in J.I.O.S.A., Vol. II, 1934, p. 1. Jayaswal writes: 'Below the jatā knot of the male figure, there is a crescent-like band. Its left hand touches the bosom of the female figure. It is undoubtedly a figure of Śiva-Pārvatī. The figures are not nimbate; the style of the female figure is that of the Didarganj Yakṣi and that of the male figure of the Patna statues. The absence of nimbus and general treatment assigns it to the Maurya or Pre-Maurya times.' If this dating is accepted then it becomes the earliest joint representation of these two deities in the historic period. the second in point of date being that on the coins of Huvishka, noted in the previous chapter;
the figures of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu and his incarnations, described by some scholars as Viṣṇupāṭṭas (these were also made of stone), as also those of various other divinities are to be grouped along with the above. There was not much of technical nicety and elaboration that was wanted in the fashioning of such objects of worship and the texts are usually silent about the methods of their manufacture. As regards the ratnajā class of images, little or no details about their manufacturing technique are to be found in the general body of the iconographic literature for the obvious reason that these images being expensive ones were seldom in demand by the common class of devotees and even when a few wealthy ones were in need of them, the highly skilled jewellers and ivory-carvers of ancient and mediaeval India were never handicapped for lack of instructions in meeting their wants.

Cast images have been placed by me under the pākujā class; another class of images which can also very well come under the same are the numerous terracotta-figurines that have been discovered in untold numbers from various parts of India and datable from the remotest times onwards. Some of them have undoubtedly cult significance, while others are children’s toys; numerous others, again, are clay seals which were stamped with the particular signs of royalties, court officials, trade-guilds, religious establishments and others, and lightly burnt afterwards. These latter classes sometimes bore on their surface the various Brahmanic deities and their emblems which were certainly based on the contemporary mode of their representation. Terracotta plaques bearing figures of cult-deities as also mythological stories associated with them were very

but it is doubtful whether it can be dated so early. The Didarganj Yakṣi has been assigned by Marshall to as late a date as 1st century B.C. or later, in his latest work, viz., Monuments of Sanchi.
frequently used in Bengal and such other parts of India as outside decorations of stūpas, vihāras and temples for the pious edification of various sectarian devotees. These were comparatively cheap and easily available and so the potters' art was extensively patronised by the sectaries. Attention has already been drawn to the terracotta objects described by Mackay as images of gods in the Indus valley sites; Mackay expressly tells us that the numerosness of such finds shows that they were manufactured in the factories of image-makers of these regions. Excavations in the historic sites of Vaiśālī, Bhita, Srāvasti, Kausāmbī, Somapura (Pāhārpur), Puṇḍra- varūdhana (Mahāsthān) and others have brought to light large numbers of the terracotta objects belonging to the different categories noticed above, and some of them are particularly useful for the study of Hindu iconography. Thus the variant representations of a nude female figure in burnt clay dating from a few centuries before the Christian era have been taken by Coomaraswamy to stand for the mother goddess whose cult seemed to have been much in vogue not only among the original settlers of India, later finding an wider currency there, but also in the countries of the near East and eastern Mediterranean. As regards the seal impressions, reference has already been made in Chapter V to those found at Mohenjo-daro, Harappa, Basarh, Bhita, Rajghat, etc., which are of unique interest for the purpose of the study of Hindu iconography. It has often been said that these were ordinary clay objects which were either sunburnt or burnt in kilns after they had received the impression of the device from the seal matrix, the negative of the plaques, and the other moulds. But it is possible that some sort of preparation was necessary for the ordinary clay and a few other ingredients had to be mixed with it. I have already referred to the formula laid down in the Hāyasīrṣa for preparing clay for image-making; but this was not ordinary clay, but stucco and when the image was made out of it, it was not
burnt. Brief reference has also been made by me to the clay compound which was used in the casting of metal images as written in the *Mānasollāsa*; it may be mentioned now in detail. ‘To clay should be added charred husk finely rubbed, cotton severed a hundred times and a little salt finely powdered. All these (when mixed with clay) should be finely ground on a smooth stone.’

The *Silparaśatna* refers to five kinds of clay compounds with their constituents, used in metal casting, in these lines:—

Kāthiṇā manda-kāthiṇā ṁrdvī mṛdutarā tathā | 
Mūṣākaraṇayogayetipāṇeṣu yāthā | 
Pañcoktāṃ nākujāṃ vātha mṛṣṇāṃādīya yatnatah । 
Mṛlosī{(r)u-}cūṇasamyuktāṃ yathāyukti vimardayet । 
Suddhāṃbhāsa pūjācarmacarasāṃ yuktā nyojayan | 
Kārayet kāthikamevaṃ sīlamūryata tādītan । 
Tasmin gomayasamyuktānī yamāṃdakāthiṇā punah । 
Mṛdbhāumacūṇasamyuktāsam taptāṃśaḥyakamtyikām । 
Praṣayāṃ pṛṣayed yām sū mṛdvi kathitā purā । 
Tasmin gomayyaḥ vṛṣna mṛṣṇā mṛdutarāṃ smṛtya । 
Tūṣādyāṅgūracūrṣena samyuktā ghaṭamtyikā । 
Kārpasapatacūryena samāna mṛṣṭalapiditā । 
Eṣā mūṣyāmṛdūkhyaṭā kartavyā sāmya drīkam । 
Yatkiṇiṣcīdipyatā taṃtu kīṃcinṛṇā pramāṇatah ।

It can be summed up in English as follows: The five kinds of clay compounds are: kāthiṇā (hard), manda-kāthiṇā (medium-hard), ṃrdvī (soft) mṛdutarā (softer) and mūṣākaraṇayogya (clay fit for making crucibles); the first is made of ordinary clay or that from ant hills (nākujā) thoroughly mixed with finely powdered brick-dust, pure water and extracts of betelnut husks (pūjācarmacara); when the above compound is mixed up with cow-dung, it constitutes the second variety; finely powdered dust of earthen pots mixed with clay in proportion of one to four makes up the third, while cow-dung added to the same, the fourth; lastly the fifth is made by mixing charred husk, earthen pot dust and desiccated cotton cloth all in equal proportions and all finely powdered. It will be seen that the fifth compound is more or less the same as that given in the *Mānasollāsa*. 

---

1 Saraswati’s translation of the original which runs thus:
refers, in connection with making of terracotta lingas (pakvaliṅga), to the mode of preparing the clay which has special bearing on this question. It says good earth fit for use should be procured and well ground; then it will be left over for a month in pañcagavya (i.e., milk, milk-curd, clarified butter, urine and dung of the cows) and afterwards burnt in fire.  

T. A. G. Rao mentions, on the basis of an unnamed śilpa text, that brick, kadi-śarkara and danta (ivory) as a few other materials which were used for making images. The main ingredient in the preparation of kadiśarkara, according to him is limestone, the others are not named by him; I shall not be surprised if the compound be something like the other described by me on the basis of the Hayāśīra as quoted by Gopala Bhatta, in which as we saw powdered limestone was one of the main constituents. The text there

---

1 Silparatna, T. Ganapati Sastri’s Edition, Pt. II, p. 6, verses 49-50: Athavā kevalāṃ ‘mṛtsnāṃ karmayogyāṃ vicārītāṃ | Marditāṃ pañcagavyādbhimāsamāntāṃ tathoṣītāṃ || Gṛhitvā kārayellīngaṃ sapīṭham tviṣṭamānataḥ | Vipacet kusālairāgavā pakvaliṅgani tu lad bhavet || The other clay compound which is mentioned in the same text in verses 44-48, for making durable clay images (without being burnt) differs from the one mentioned in the Hayāśīra in as much as it mentions four different kinds of clay. viz. white, red, yellow and black; among the other ingredients are grains of barley, wheat, a kind of pulse (māsa), baelium (guggula) and extracts of lac, pumpkin, syāma and kunḍuru (a kind of aromatic plant), pañcagavya and oil. In this there is no mention of powdered iron, stone and sand and so this is the real clay compound and not the stucco-like substance mentioned in the other text. The method of manufacture was—Tāṃ mṛdāṃ marditāṃ pakṣam māsamātroṣītāṃ punah | Gṛhitvā kārayellīngaṃ sapīṭham lakṣaṇānvinītāṃ | Māsam tu ṃśayed gharme ||; i.e., the clay should be kneaded for about a fortnight and left over for a month; after that linga with the pitha and its characteristic signs should be made out of it; then the linga with its pitha should be dried for a month in the sun.
refers to karkara as another of the materials and karkara and šarkara probably denote the same thing, viz., little stone-chips, perhaps lime-stone chips; the Sabdakalpadruma records that karkaram means cūrna janakṣudra-pāsana-khandam, kānkara ghuṭiṇī iti bhāṣā and šarkara also is explained as ‘a pebble,’ ‘gravel’ and ‘small stone.’ Rao further informs us, ‘Brick and mortar or kadī-šarkara images are also occasionally met with in several temples; in the famous temples at Śrīraṅgam and Trivandrum (Ananta-sayanam), the main central images are understood to be of this kind.’

As regards brick and mortar images, the same author refers to one instance found by him in Vatishvarankoyil (Tanjore District) image of Mahisasamūrti. This image corresponds to the textual description (as given in the Mānasāra) that this form should have twenty-five faces—each of the five aspects of Śiva (Vāmadeva, Sadyojāta, Aghora, Tatpurusā and Iśāna) being represented by five faces and fifty arms. ‘The heads are arranged in tiers in arithmetical progression—thus the top-most tier has only one head, the next one below has three, the next five and so on till the last tier has nine heads.’

The above presentation of the manufacturing technique followed by the iconplastic artists of India will show how great was the demand for the cult images, as also their emblems and accessories throughout India of the p.st-Christian period. The services of the wood carver, the potter, the stone mason, the painter, the jeweller, and the metal caster were utilized by the numerous religious-minded

---


2 T. A. G. Rao, Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 374, Pl. CXIV, fig. 2. Reference may be made in passim to the similar arrangement of heads of the multi-headed Avalokiteśvara figures belonging to the Vajrājānā pantheon of Tibet and Nepal. One such eleven-headed standing figure has been illustrated by Grünwedel in his Buddhist Art, p. 308, fig. 118.
people of India in greater or lesser degrees. In fact, the
divine images and their worship had come to be the most
potent factor and the commonest manifestation of the inner
religious experience as inculcated in bhakti, in the lives of
the majority of the Indians. Some of the intellectual
thinkers, as we have seen in a previous chapter, were not
much in love with this religious practice, but they could
not ignore it altogether and, however grudgingly, allowed it
a place of importance in their works. Texts, often in a
curious manner, refer to this acceptance when they say
that the gods were visible to men in satya, tretā and the
dvāpara yugas, but with the advent of kali they are not
so and they are now to be found in their images.¹ The
Viṣṇudharmottara tells us that the gods were worshipped in
their visible forms, not images, in the satya yuga; in the
tretā and dvāpara yugas, this was done both in the former
as well as in their images. In the tretā yuga these
were worshipped in households and in the dvāpara in the
forest; in kali yuga, however, the practice of building
houses of gods (i.e., temples) in town was begun. The
enshrinement of the gods (i.e., their images) should be
done in land suitable for such purpose, which should be
given according to the rules followed in gifts of lands. The
above is a free translation of the following:—‘Satyayuge
devānāṁ pratyakṣapūjananāṁ—tretādvāparayoh pratyakṣa-
pūjā pratimāsu ca—tatrāpi tretāyuge gṛhe dvāpara cāraṃye
calau ca devāyatanaṁ nirmitirnāręṣu samārabdhaḥ, bhūmi-
dānam vidhāyaiva devāyatana-pratistha karyā, devalaya-
yogyabhūmi’ (Viṣṇudharmottara, Bk. III, Ch. 93, Vv.
1-9).

Sever: 1 factors will have to be taken into consideration
which collectively contributed to the phenomenal rise to

¹ Krtatretādvāpareṣu narāḥ paśyanti devataḥ
Tiṣyōṁ prāpya na paśyanti pājāstvauccāyataṁ yataḥ
importance of this practice and the consequent development of the icono-plastic art in its various phases. The first and foremost of them was undoubtedly the wide existence of sectarianism that prevailed in India in this period and which was ever becoming more and more important and all embracing. The Indians were now divided into multiple numbers of sects and if we leave aside the Buddhists and the Jains, and their various sub-sects, which were heterodox from the Brahmanical point of view, there were still the five stereotyped sectaries—the followers and worshippers of the Pañcavedatās, viz., Viṣṇu, Śiva, Śakti, Sūrya and Gaṇapati. Over and above these well-known five principal sectaries, there were a host of others which had grown up and had found their particular places under the ever-expanding shelter of the composite Hinduism. In the chapter on the installation of images, Varāhamihira gives a list of several sects which were flourishing since a long time before his work was composed. He says that the image of Viṣṇu, Sūrya, Sambhā (Śiva), Mātrganas, Brahmā, Buddha and the Jinas should be duly consecrated and installed by the Bhāgavatas, the Magas, the ashbesmeared twice-born ones (i.e., the Pāṇḍavas), those well-acquainted with the puja of the Mātrganas, the Brahmins versed in the Vedic lore, the Śākyas and the unclad ones, respectively, according to the rites particular to the worship of the individual gods.¹ The list may not


Viṣṇorbhāgavatān maģaṃśca saviłə sambhoh sabhasmadrijān ||
Mātrganaṃpi maŋdalakramarido viprān vidurbrahmanah ||
Śākyān sarvahitasya sāntamanaso vagnān jinānaṃ vidu. ||
Rya yaṃ devamapāśritāḥ svāvidhinā laistasya kāryā kriyā ||

Utpala elaborately comments on the above; a part of his commentary is quoted here for our better understanding of the text:—

¹ Dvijān brāhmaṇān sabhasma-bhasma-sahitān pāŋkapatāṇityarthah ||
mātrgāṃ brāhmijādinām (sapta maŋtrikāḥ) maŋdalakramarido ye
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be an exhaustive one but is highly significant; the Gaṇapatyas as a sect are not included here and it is presumable that though the worship of Gaṇapati-Viṇāyaka was in vogue from a time much earlier still the sect of his exclusive worshippers had not then been organised. The Iranian element in the worship of the sun especially in northern India had been long acclimatised; the Bhāgavata (known also as the Pāñcarātras) and the Pāṣupata were still the authorised way of referring to the sects centering round Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu and Rudra-Śiva; the worship of the Mātrganas (the Saptamātrakāh) was the chief manifestation of the Śakti cult. The Vedic section of the Indias had not even at that time given up the fight for the inclusion of

maṇḍalakraman pājâkraman vidanti jânanti 1 .............Saṃvhitasya buddhasya jñânamataso jñânañcaya sākyan raktapatān viduḥ (it seems the Baudhās in Utpala’s time used to wear red robes); Jīnānāmarhatām mahuṣān mahâkaṣapañâyakān viduḥ 1

The last part of the commentary is very interesting:

Ye nāma yan devamapâśritah āranyagam bhaktibhāvena prāplastair-naraisya devasya stridhānā ātmigadarśanokttena vidhānena 1 Pāñcarātravidehīnā viṣṇoh 1 Saumadarsanavidhānena sañkarah 1 Vatulatantrakancantatraoktavidehīnā vā śambhoḥ 1 Mātrijnām svakalpavihitavidhānena brāhmaṇaśravadvihita-karmaṇā buddhasya pāramitakramena 1 Arhatām tadārjasanavidhānena kriyā kāryāti.

It can be freely translated thus:—‘The installation of different divinities who are worshipped by different groups of people with bhakti should be done according to their respective tenets; thus, the images of Viṣṇu should be installed according to the Pāñcarātra, those of Śūrya according to the Saura, those of Śiva according to the rites mentioned in the Vatulatantra (evidently the Pāṣupatalaśāstra, the means or doors mentioned in which are such mad acts as kṛāthana, spandana, maṇḍana, śṛṅgaraṇa, avitalkaraṇa and avitādabhdhāna) the images of the Mātrganas, according to their individual tenets, that of Brahmā according to Vedic rites, of Buddha according to the Pāramitā rules, of the Arhats (Jīnas) according to their own system.'
Prajāpati-Brahmā, the Vedic-Brahmanic god *par excellence* as one of the sectarian divinities, though we know they were fighting for a lost cause; eighth century sculptures in illustration of the mythology of Śiva’s curse on Brahmā for his immorality (falsehood—cf. the Elura Lingodbhava-mūrti of Śiva) show that Brahmā had no chance against his powerful and virile rivals like Śiva and Viṣṇu. There can be no doubt about the existence of feelings of jealousy and rivalry between these sectaries, though, as we have shown in the first chapter, this ill-feeling and bitterness might not have been as keen and destructive as in other countries of Europe, long after this period; still these were there and helped to create new iconic forms for the edification of and worship by the individual sectaries. I have already drawn attention to the particular type of the Śaiva image known as Sarabhā which was a direct counterpart of the Vaiṣṇava one, Narasiṃha, itself pre-eminently sectarian in character. Our attention to this particular type was first drawn by T. A. G. Rao who also emphasised the nature of the Trimūrti icons of Southern India in which Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu is the central figure with Brahmā and Śiva half issuing from his either side with their hands in the aṇjali pose. It is not a simple presentation of the later Brahmanical triad Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, but is a direct sectarian rejoinder to a type of Śiva image known as Ekapādamūrti. The latter represents Śiva standing on one leg (this type evidently based on the Vedic Aja Ekapād regarded in the epic times both as one of the eleven Rudras and an epithet of Śiva), the figures of Viṣṇu and Brahmā projecting from his left and right sides respectively, with their front hands in the aṇjali poses. Rao remarks, 'In opposition evidently to this Śaiva view, and with an equally strong Paurāṇic authority on their side, the Vaiṣṇavas have similarly represented the Supreme God as Viṣṇu with Brahmā and Śiva proceeding from
him. 1 Many of the mythological stories connected with one or other of these sects have this bias underlying them and reliefs in illustration thereof were carved in large numbers and put into prominent parts of the temples where icons of the different sectarian divinities were worshipped. Rao, in the same connection, has noted that 'often in the Purāṇas, Śiva is said to have paid homage to Viṣṇu and equally often is Viṣṇu said to have paid homage to Śiva.' The presence of sectarian bias in the origin of these myths and in the manufacture of sculptures thereof is undoubted, and a study of such stories and reliefs, connected with Viṣṇuvaṇugraha or Cakradānāmūrti of Śiva, Viṣṇu offering redemption to Śiva from the sin of Brahmadhatyā for the Brahmaśiraschedaka aspect of the latter, the Daśarathi Rāma and Jāmadagnya Rāma avatāras of Viṣṇu (the last also basically illustrates in a way the struggle between the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas) etc., will fully prove the hypothesis. Rao thinks that the fanciful rendering of the Tamil name Kacchiyappa, meaning the lord of Kacchi (Tamil for Kancipura—Conjeevarum) has given rise to a new god and his image, viz., Kacchapesvara where Viṣṇu in his tortoise incarnation is seen bathing a Śivalinga (ibid., pp. 42-3, pl. D.). But in this we do not find the creation of a new god or a new image, but a novel presentation of a theme, in which also sectarian prejudice is clearly discernible, by a Śaiva devotee who took advantage of the phonetic similarity between Tamil Kacchiyappa and Sanskrit Kacchapa (the latter meaning a 'tortoise'). Rao has not noticed the other class of images which show definite efforts towards a rapprochement between the different sects. I have already referred to several plastic forms in which this tendency is definitely present in the introductory chapter of this

work and such images as Hari-Hara, Dattātreya (Hari-Hara-Pitāmaha), Arddhanārīśvara, etc., are evidently of this class.

The phenomenal increase in the number of divinities constituting the Brahmanic pantheon, which were highly venerated by the different sectaries necessitated the construction of sculptures for representing one or other of them. The Vedic Indo-Aryans no doubt believed in multiple gods; an attempt is made in many of the early and late Vedic texts to fix the aggregate of thirty-three gods divided into three groups of eleven each, one connected with heaven, the second with earth and the third with waters or sometimes with the antarikṣa region equated with the last. But this number is never strictly adhered to and Yāska's enumeration of three orders based on the above, viz., prthivīsthāna, antarikṣasthāna or madhyamasthāna and dyuasthāna centering round three principal deities, viz., Agni on earth, Vāyu or Indra in air and Sūrya in heaven contains a number of minor deities and deified objects which far exceeded the stereotyped list. It may be argued that as these gods were not iconically represented, the question of their number does not arise at all. But, many were the Vedic divinities who came to be intimately associated with one or other of the later sectarian deities and lent their characteristic traits to the latter in their multifarious iconic representations. An epithet which served to emphasise one particular trait of a Vedic god, later gave rise to the composition of an elaborate story for emphasising that trait of the same deity in his Purānic setting, and reliefs illustrating it were constructed in large numbers. To refer to one particular instance: Rudra in the Vedas, especially in the Satarudriya section, is given an epithet called kṛttivāśa which means one that has a skin for his garment. Now, there can be little doubt that here was the nucleus of the elaborate story of Gajāsurasamāhāramūrti
in illustration whereof so many images of Siva were made, in which he is shown as using the hide of the slain elephant demon as his outer covering. In the Vājasaneyī recension of the White Yajurveda (I. 63), Rudra the fearful is being described as Siva, thus, ‘Thou art gracious by name; the thunderbolt is thy father; reverence to thee; destroy us not’ (Siva nāmāsi svaditiste pitā namaste astu mā mā hīnsīh). In the Rgveda, Rudra is described as Kṣadvīra, generally accepted by scholars in the sense of ruler over heroes, as the wise, but his terrific aspect is much emphasised; thus the hymnist prays to the god, ‘Oh Rudra, do not, out of thy anger, injure our children and descendants, our people, our cattle, our houses, and do not kill our men, we invoke thee always with offerings’ (I. 114, 8—Mā nāstoke tanaye mā na āyau mā no goṣu mā no aśecsu rīrīṣuḥ | Virāṁna no Rudro bhāmito vadhīrharismamantah sadamittvā havāmahe). In the Mahābhārata (Anuśāsana Parva,) Kṛṣṇa praises the god before Yudhiṣṭhira thus, ‘Brāhmaṇas versed in the Vedas know two bodies of this god, one awful, one auspicious; and these two bodies again have many forms’ (Dve tanu tasya devasya brāhmaṇah vedajñāḥ viduḥ | Ghorāṁ anyaṁ śivāṁ anyaṁ te tanu bahudhā punah). Now, this idea is consistently given expression to in many of the multifarious reliefs of Siva where the great god is depicted as the destroyer (cf. his so many Saṃhāramūrtis) or as the bestower of favour (cf. his multifarious Anugrahamūrtis). Viṣṇu in the early Vedic texts is simply mentioned as Trivikrama and is often extolled there for his feat of having taken three strides and thus covering the whole universe (tredhā nidadhe padam). Subsequently, elaborate mythology grew up round this, and interesting sculptures in illustration thereof were made which were classed as the transformed phase of his Vāmanā incarnation. It will be needless to multiply instances here, as this will be discussed in my study
and description of the different sectarian icons. But one point should always be borne in mind, *viz.*, the purpose of these reliefs and sculptures in many cases was decorative and subsidiary; thus, it being the general order to enshrine the Linga of Śiva as the principal cult object in the main sanctum of Śaiva shrines, many of the mythological stories connected with him were plastically represented and put in as so many accessories for the edification of the devotees in the different parts of the same. But, in the case of Viṣṇuite icons, the same theme which could in one place serve as a Pārśvadevatā (*i.e.*, a deity serving as an accessory and placed in a side niche of the main sanctum), in another shrine could be the principal object of worship. Thus, the Śeṣaśayanamūrti of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa—that again a mythological elaboration of the Rgveda, X, 82, 5 and 6—is used in one of the three niches of the Deogarh temple (Lalitpur subdivision, Jhansi district); but in most of the South Indian Vaiṣṇava shrines, the chief icon in the main sanctum is Raṅganātha which is one of the names of the above type of Viṣṇu images in South India.

Many divinities again, were new entries into the orthodox hierarchy; they must have existed in some form or other as objects of veneration by particular classes of people, but they could not but be recognised by the orthodox thinkers and given the stamp of this recognition in various ways. The Brāhmaṇas also in a very interesting manner incorporated the principal deities associated with other cults into their ever-increasing pantheon. Thus, Buddha and Rṣabha, two principal gods of the rival sects, were recognised by the Viṣṇuites as so many aratāras of Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu Purāṇa glibly suggested that Viṣṇu incarnated himself as Buddha to delude and thus destroy the asuras with false doctrines. Further, particular doctrinal tenets of a cult had to be emphasised and represented in concrete forms for the benefit
of the sectarian devotees; thus, the Twenty-four forms of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu (Caturvimśatimūrttayāḥ) and the Pāñcabrahmā forms of Śiva (Īśanādayāḥ) are really meant to represent in a concrete manner two of the cardinal tenets of the Pāñcarātra and Śaiva systems, viz., those centering round the Vyūhavāda and Śiva’s five śaktis (Ādiśakti, Parāśakti, Ichhāśakti, Jñānaśakti and Kriyāśakti), respectively. Innumerable icons were made in illustration of the above and this gave a great impetus to the activities of the iconoplastic artists of India.

Another important factor which contributed to the development of iconographers’ art in India was undoubtedly her contact with the foreigners, especially with the Greeks in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. The exact character of the influence which was exercised by the Greeks on the cultural activities of this country has been a much debated question and controversy was specially keen as regards the indebtedness of the Indians towards the Hellenistic Greeks for their own icon-making art. Discussions concerning the latter generally centred round the problem about the origin of the Buddha image and incidentally the wider aspect of it, viz., the iconical representation of the cult gods and worshipping them in those vehicles, was brought in. It is not necessary here to refer at length to different views of well-known scholars about the above; it will be sufficient to observe, however, that, though images were made and worshipped in certain places in ancient India,—for which we have cited numbers of early texts in the second and third chapters of this book, the image-making activity of the early Indians received a new impetus after they came in contact with the Greeks. Images were being made of the intermediate divinities, really the objects of worship among the general mass of the people and the previous settlers of India, and therein lay the root cause of the recognition of this practice by the higher section of the
people; but that one of the prime factors contributing to its
development was the example set up by the Hellenistic
Greeks of Gandhara can be fully demonstrated with the help
of the coins. It has been shown in the previous chapter that
Śiva was being worshipped in Gandhara in his bull form
at the time the region was being ruled over by the Bactrian
Greeks; shortly afterwards, during the Indo-Parthians
and the Kushans the god began to be anthropomorphi-
cally represented, though his theriomorphic form was not
altogether forgotten. Now, this human as well as animal
representation of Śiva was certainly not unknown in other
parts of Central and Northern India, as is proved by the coins
of much earlier times. In fact, the Hellenistic die-cutters
must have made themselves familiar with the staff and
water-vessel carrying Śiva figures of the latter and utilised
this iconographic knowledge in giving shape to the Gandhara
Śivas. But, the plastic treatment and new orientation they
gave to them on the coins show to what extent the theme
was transformed. This is the reason why several scholars
were sceptic about identifying Śiva on the reverse side
of some coins of Gondophares and why the treatment
of this deity on some of the tribal and Kushan coins
forcibly remind us of a Herakles of the Indo-Greek
and the Indo-Scythic coins. The striking figure of
Viśvāmitra, really Śiva as Viśvāmitra, on the obverse
of certain bisscriptical silver coins of Dharaghoṣa cannot
but convince us of the truth of the above remark;
there is, no doubt, some thing that is Indian in the icono-
graphy of the figure, but much there is also in its whole
presentation that is Hellenistic in character. Cunningham
characteristically describes it thus, ‘Śiva, standing to front
with right hand raised to head, and leopard’s skin over left
arm; similar to figure of Herakles crowning himself’ (CAI.,
p. 67); the very style and treatment of the whole coin itself
is Hellenistic and a comparison can profitably be made
between the Śiva figures on indigenous coins of Ujjain in Central India with this Viśvāmitra-Śiva type on the coins hailing from an area roughly corresponding to 'the valley of the Beas, or perhaps the wider region between the Upper Sutlej and the Ravi.' A contrast made between the iconographic presentation of two other gods, viz., Indra and Śūrya, on early indigenous coins and the same on the Indo-Greek and Kushan coins will enable us further to substantiate our hypothesis. Reference has been made to the figure of Indra enshrined on the coins of Indramitra in the Pañcāla series; the same deity appears veritably in the garb of a Zeus on the coins of Eukratides and a host of other Indo-Greek and Indo-Scythic rulers of the extreme north-west of India. Nay, in the latter region, there is no doubt that Indra used also to be represented in his elephant form as has been shown in a previous chapter; but, a Zeus type could very conveniently be utilised to represent the god who was the city-deity of Kapiṣa. In the numerous sculptural representations of the same god in Gandhāra, however, he appears in the role of a worshipping attendant of Buddha, but still the type reproduced there is in striking contrast to another indigenous one presented by the figure of the same god in the Bhaja facade. As regards Śūrya figures on early indigenous coins, we have seen what was their mode of representation; the Indians were quite justified in reproducing him as he is visible to all (pratyakṣa), but they also represented him in human form as the Bhaja, Udayagiri and Bodh Gaya reliefs show. But the type of the north-Indian Śūrya image which came to be regularly worshipped by the Sauras was certainly stylistically connected with the one so often represented on the coins of Kanishka and Huśavik. The association of the latter with the Hellenistic sun-god as also many other matters concerning the former will be treated at some length in my book on the Hindu images. But it will be sufficient to
note here that in this case a very striking example is produced to show how some of the plastic features of an image type, that survived till a very late period, were undoubtedly influenced by their Hellenistic counterparts. This was the nature and extent of the contribution that was made by this art of north-western region—and in fact it was at its apogee during the rule of the Kushan emperors—to the development of icono-plastic art in India. The themes were in most cases Indian, but the technique of presentation of some varieties of them at least was greatly influenced by these alien motifs. Even when the former was in a decadent stage as is proved by the stone sculptures of the third and fourth centuries A.D. in the north-west (but the art was still flourishing in stucco as has so ably been demonstrated by Marshall), the Ardhoṣho type of the late Kushan coins (cf., those represented on those of Vāsu Kushan) could influence the Lakṣmī type on those of the early imperial Guptas; but the latter, undoubtedly far more cultured than the late Kushans, soon gave it a character which was far nobler and more artistic than the crude schematic figure, its prototype.

The evolution of the Tantras and the gradual canonisation of the modes for icon-making were also important factors conducive to the development of Indian icono-plastic art. Mention has already been made, in the first chapter, of the Pāñcarātra, Saiva and Sākta saṃhitās, āgamas and tantras incorporating elaborate instructions for the use of the temple-builder and the image-maker. It would be doing an injustice to the compilers of these practical guidelines actually based on the experience of generations of artists, if we remark that ‘the most potent cause that injuriously affected Indian icono-plastic art is the hard and fast rules laid down in the Āgamas and the Tantras for the making of images’ (Rao, op. cit., Vol. I., introduction, p. 31). It is like suggesting that the canonisation of the
rules of speech and writing would adversely affect the language of a people. In the hands of an expert worker these rules, even if they were meticulously followed, would, instead of being so many impediments, serve as useful guides. The far-famed artists of Hellas had also certain stereotyped canons before them which were really derived from the works of the early masters. Greek sculptors closely followed ratios of proportions and we have statues of various schools which are distinguished by fixed proportions of parts such as the Old Attic, Old Argive, Polyklitan, Argive-Sikyonian or Lysippan, etc. "An oft-quoted saying of Polyclitus is to this effect that, 'successful attainment in art is the result of minute accuracy in a multitude of arithmetical proportions........' Polyclitus not only published his theory of sculpture in a work called 'The Canon,' but also having taught in that treatise all the proportions of the body, he carried his theory into practice by constructing a statue according to the prescriptions in the treatise." 1 That is the attitude of the compilers of these Indian iconographic and iconometric texts, which is summed up in a very characteristic manner by the author of the Sukranitiśāra. He writes: 'That image is called beautiful which is neither in excess of correct proportions nor short of it...... The limbs of those images which have been praised by sages (i.e., experts in iconography) never exceed or fall short of the correct proportions and thus are to be regarded as beautiful. All the limbs that are neither too fat nor too lean are pleasing from all points of view. One in one hundred thousand images is excellent in all its parts; so that image which is so according to the śāstric proportions is really beautiful, others are not. Those images which go against the above are not good to the

E. A. Gardner, Six Greek Sculptors, pp. 118 and 120.
sages.' 1 In this view of the case, Rao's statement about the 'handicap of the artist' and about his 'loosing freedom of action' requires modification. The icons no doubt became to a certain extent stereotyped; but it should never be forgotten that they were not being made for art connoisseurs' criticism, their primary purpose being to serve as so many aids to the religious efforts (sādhana) of the innumerable devotees (bhaktas) and not as drawing-room or museum specimens to be judged chiefly for their artistic merits or demerits. Rao himself says, 'Like all art, the Indian icono-plastic art also has to be judged from the standpoint of its motive. To those who cannot appreciate this motive, the very ideal of the art remains hidden and inexplicable.' These rules therefore facilitated to a very great extent the work of the image-maker and helped immensely the development of the icono-plastic art in this country. There are good and indifferent artists in every country and in particular periods the artistic activities of its inhabitants seem for various reasons to reach a very high level or in other times sink

1 Sukranitisāra, IV, 4, 73, 102-05:—Mānato nādhīkāṃ hināṃ tadvīmbaṃ rāmyamucyate । Tadvijñaiḥ prastuṭa ye ye mūrtteravayaḥ sadā । Na hinā nādhikā mānat te te jñeyāḥ susobhanāḥ ॥ Na sthūlā na kṛśā vāpi sāvec sarvamanoramāḥ । Sarvāngaiḥ sarvaramyo hi kaścillakṣe prajāyate । Śūtramāñcena yo rāmyaḥ sa rāmyo nānya eva hi. But the author was also aware of the existence of a certain class of opinion according to which 'that image is beautiful in which one's heart is attached'—Ekeṣāmeva tadramyāṃ lagnāṃ yatra ca yasya hṛt. It is not clear, however, whether in this statement the author refers to his own appreciation of his work by the icon-maker or it simply means that whatever may be its execution, the image is beautiful, if the heart of one (i.e., its devotee) is attached to it. If the latter is meant, then it signifies that the beauty of the image depends on the bhakti of its worshipper. Then the author's express observation that as very few are the images which are really beautiful in all its limbs, it will be better if the image-maker follows strictly the authorised canons of proportions.
down to a low one; but to make these injunctions mainly responsible for the latter condition is not scientifically correct. We should never minimise the very common advice to be met with in such compilations that the śilpin, though he should closely follow the rules, must try to make the image as beautiful as possible, for have not the gods a special liking for beautiful images (ābhīrūpyācca vimbānāṃ devaḥ sānνidhyaṃrcchati)? The reputed art centres of ancient India, such as Mathura, Gandhara, Sarnath, Amaravati, etc., were the homelands of the master workers whose works served as standards on which these canons were probably based. The images fashioned by their chisel were in great demand in various other parts of India as is proved by early epigraphic and monumental evidence. It is unfortunate we know so little about them who generally hid themselves behind the names of such mythical artists as Viśvakarmā, Maya and others. We have no means of identifying an Indian Phidias, a Polyclitus or a Lysippas. It is quite accidentally that we light upon the names of a few individual artists from some inscribed sculptural and architectural fragments of early period. The ivory carvers of Vidisa might or might not have been responsible for the actual carving of a section of the railing of the Great Sanchi Stupa, which was their gift; but a Nāka, pupil of Kunika, was the maker of the so-called statue of Manasā Devī at Mathura (really the image of Yakṣī Layava, as the epigraph informs us), the stone mason (śilārūpakāra) Śivamitra was responsible for the early Kushan image of a Bodhisattva discovered in 1908-09 at Śrāvasti by Marshall (only the lower portion of the statue with the inscription was found) and Dinna a resident of Mathura fashioned a statuette of the Gupta period as also of the famous Nirvāṇa statue, both discovered at Kasia (the former was found by Vögel).  

1 A.S.I.A.R., 1922-23, p. 165; if Vögel's reading of the pedestal inscription of the Parkham Yakṣa is correct, then we find the name of
of the two Sūrya images of the Gaudian school in the collection of the British Museum bears on its pedestal an inscription in very corrupt Sanskrit in Nāgari characters of the tenth century A.D. It reads 'Oṃ Indra-nilamaṇiṣiṣyaḥ śīlaḥ buddhiḥ sālinā | ghaṭitāya kritajñena Amṛtena suṣi(l)pinā. It has thus been translated by R. P Chanda: "(This image) has been carved in stone by the wise, grateful, and good artist Amṛta, pupil of Indranilamaṇi" (R. P. Chanda, Mediæval Indian Sculptures in the British Museum, p. 66, Pl. XX). Here we get the names of two good sculptors of eastern India, viz., Amṛta and Indranilamaṇi; the work of the former bears undoubtedly the stamp of an artist of consummate skill and ability who can well claim to be designated as a susilpin. One other interesting fact to be noted in the above epigraph is this; Amṛta does not fail to express his gratitude for the artistic ability which he acquired from his preceptor. More of such inscriptions on the extant images would have been of great use to students of Indian icono-plastic art. We wish we could get many such personal names and had an Indian Pausanias who could have given a systematic record of the activities of such Nākas, Kunikas, Sivamitrás, Dinnas, Amṛtas and Indranilamaṇis of the remote past.

The last, though not the least, important factor contributing to the development of Indian religious art was certainly the systematic patronage which was given by the ruling powers of early and mediæval India. The growth another pupil of Kunika, viz., Bhadapugarin—Gomitaka—Bhadapugarina(ka)...(ga) atha...pi...Kuni(kka) te vāsina (Gomitakena) kātā. But the inscription is extremely fragmentary and various readings have been suggested; still all agree in reading Kunika and so evidently this Yakṣa statue was also the bandi-work of another pupil of Kunika, Mathura Mus Cat, p. 83. Māthureṇa śīlarāpakāreṇa Sivamitrāṇa Bodhisattvā kātā; kṛli(r)-Dinnasya in the Gupta statuette and Pratimā ceṣāṃ ghaṭitā Dinnasānā Māthurākena, in the other one.
and development of these sectarian religions were largely due to the activities of the ancient sovereigns; the religion of Buddha could certainly not have been as great as it came to be in later times, had there been no Aśoka to espouse its cause and try his level best for its propagation in India, as well as outside India. The Brahmanical sectaries too found their champions not only in the persons of indigenous rulers, but also in those of foreign ones who held sway over particular parts of India. The great Kushan emperor Wema Kadphises was an ardent devotee of Śiva and in the spirit of a true sectary only used the figure or rarely the emblem of the god of his choice as his coin device; it will not at all be presumptuous to suppose that many Šaiva shrines were erected in the different parts of his empire under his imperial patronage. His successors were probably eclectic in spirit, and they equally patronised the various religious cults flourishing in their dominions.1 The imperial Guptas were devout Bhāgavatas and it is certain that excessive patronage was given by them to this particular cult, though it is also proved by archaeological data that other sectaries, both orthodox and heterodox, from the Brahmanical point of view, flourished side by side. The imperial Pālas of Bengal were Paramasaugetas and the Senas were worshippers of Sādāśiva. Many other such instances can be shown in which the royalties extensively patronised one or other of the cults and those that were not professed by them did also prevail in their kingdoms. The temples and religious

1 The earlier view about the eclecticism of the Kanishka group of kings has been challenged by Rapson (who himself once held the view) and Kennedy. But the explanation which is given by Rapson of the varied reverse, if accepted by scholars, would also support my hypothesis. His latest view as expressed in his C C A W K T B, p. XII, f.n., is, 'The coins, no doubt, reflect the particular form of religion which prevailed in the district in which they were struck.'
structures which were built by them or the rich and the influential citizens in their realms had to be decorated with numbers of subsidiary figures and other forms. Images were also necessary for the primary purpose of enshrinement in the main sanctum. Not only were the shrines of these gods built, but also funerary structures in honour of their departed ancestors were erected by the royalties and rich magnates, and shrines with images of gods and goddesses were invariable adjuncts to them. Then monastic establishments, associated with one or other of the Brahmanical sectaries would contain different devagṛhas and daicatas (temples and images). Lastly, Guruvāyatanaś were erected by particular sectarian clericals, which also contained shrines and images of gods. One of the earliest Guruvāyatanaś that we know of is the one referred to in the stone pillar inscription of the time of Chandragupta II (year 61 of the Gupta Era), which records the establishment of two images (Śiva-liṅgas), called Kapileśvara and Upamiteśvara, in such a one, by Pāśupata Uditācārya, in the names of his gurus. The base of the inscribed pilaster contains a three-eyed human figure holding a club in right hand, an unidentified object in the left shown akimbo (cf., the early Śiva figures on Ujjain coins), correctly identified by D. R. Bhandarkar as Lakulīśa, the founder of the Pāśupata sect.¹ All these different religious and funerary structures contained numbers of divine images and emblems and served as a great incentive to the development of icono-plastic art in India. These temple-building and image-making activities received a rude check in the hands of many of the Muslim rulers of India after her invasion by the Muhammadans. The relative prevalence of these activities in the different parts of

¹ Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXI, pp. 4-9. Further interesting data deducible from this remarkable Gupta inscription will be discussed in my book on Hindu images.
India shows the truth of the above remark. The part which
was last to be affected by the Islamic conquest retained in a
remarkable manner these active manifestations of the
religious instinct of its people to a late period and this
explains why in the extreme south of India magnificent
temples and innumerable images of substantial proportions
and detailed carving were being built when such activities
were already much restricted in the north. Muslim rulers
on account of their creed could not patronise them as the
Hindu ones did before, and thus their Hindu subjects had
to satisfy their pious needs with much smaller images and
emblems in stone and bronze for worship in private chapels
of their individual households.
CHAPTER VII

ICONOGRAPHIC TERMINOLOGY

Technicalities about iconographic representation of deities—Handposes (hastas and mudrās)—their association with ritualism—a smaller proportion among them used in early images—some of these handposes already stereotyped in early art—different postures in which the main image and its accessories are shown: sthānaka-, āsana, and sayana mūrtis—different types of standing poses—various kinds of sitting postures—most of them yogic in character—reclining postures in image very few—the Saṣa-sayana or Nārāyaṇamūrti and the Mahāparinirvāṇa figure of Buddha—the basic idea of the former—supposed connection of the former with the Endymion figure—Nītyamūrtis—Siva in various dance poses—Flying pose of the Gandharvas and Vidyādharas, conventional representation of the clouds.

Ornaments on the images—their excessive use hampering the free display of the physical form—different kinds of ornaments, head-gear, etc.—various modes of dressing the hair—representation of costume—nudity in Indian art—the nimbus behind the heads of images (Śrīraścakra) and the stela or back slab (Prabhācali)—the relievo character of the images emphasised by the above two.—The pedestals (Piṭhika).

Varieites of objects held in the hands of the Hindu divinities—the ideology underlying them.

It is indispensable for one studying Indian Iconography to know the meaning of certain technical terms, in order to understand correctly the images of divinities and their accessories. As these are mostly depicted in anthropomorphic form, it follows that the dress, ornaments, weapons, implements, etc., used by a people are also shown by them on the images of their gods. I have already drawn the attention of my readers to Varāhamihira’s dictum about the close juxtaposition between the dress and ornaments worn by the people of a country and the same shown on the bodies of the gods worshipped there (Desānurūpa-bhūṣaṇa-āveśa-lakārayamūritibhih kāryā). I have also suggested in the first chapter of my book how an intensive study of
images current in a particular locality will help one to throw much light on her social history. I now propose to explain the nature of some of these technical terms which are used to denote one or other of these various forms of dress, ornaments, weapons and implements; the various gestures and postures in which the different limbs of the images are shown by the artist will also be explained. These terms are very often used in the iconographic texts which, as every student of this subject knows, serve as the guidebooks of the iconographer. In the course of explaining some of them, I shall refer, whenever possible, to their early and late forms of representations in art. T. A. G. Rao, while supplying his readers with a full account of these technicalities, hardly ever touched on this point.

One of the most interesting items, in this connection, is the various poses in which the hands of the images and their accessories are shown by the artist. The technical term, which is used in the texts to denote them, is mudrā; sometimes the word hasta is also used to denote one or other of these handposes. The latter is generally used in cases where the whole of the arm along with the hand is shown in a particular pose (cf. danda-hasta, gajahasta, kaṭhihasta, etc.), while the former usually denotes the peculiar posture in which the palm with the fingers is shown (cf. jñāna-mudrā, cinmudrā or vyākhyāna-mudrā, yoga- or dhyāna-mudrā, etc.). It must be observed, however, that sometimes, though comparatively rarely, both the terms are used in the texts to signify particular hand postures; thus, in iconographic parlance, abhaya-mudrā, varuda-mudrā as well as abhaya-hasta and varada-hasta are equally appropriate. It is true that the term hasta can also be used in association with an emblem or weapon in the hand of the deity; thus padma-hasta, pustaka-hasta, gudā-hasta, etc., would mean a hand which holds a lotus, a book or a mace, respectively. But sometimes, confusion is likely to arise, if in explaining such
a term, an inappropriate synonym is chosen; thus, sūcī means a ‘sewing needle,’ but it has also various other meanings, one of which is ‘the act of pointing.’ Now when a god or a goddess is described as sūcī-hasta, we are not to understand that he or she holds a sewing needle in his or her hand, but we are to know that a particular hand of the god or the goddess is shown in a pointing pose.\footnote{The term was thus explained by the late N. N. Vasu in his Archaeological Survey of Magurbhunj. T. A. G. Rao first corrected the mistake in his Elements, etc., Vol. I, p. 15.} Again, the term like danda-hasta may mean one holding a club in hand, but it is also the name of a peculiar hand pose which will shortly be explained.

Hastas and mudrās thus usually indicate some action in which the god or his accessory is shown as engaged. The action consists in the expression of an idea by means of a particular gesture. Man, himself a rational animal endowed with the power of speech, often finds it necessary to use such gestures for expressing his ideas with more clarity and emphasis; sometimes, a mere gesture with a hand or any other limb of his body will contain a volume of ideas otherwise imperfectly expressed.\footnote{In India, many of the handposes were long stereotyped. Coomaraswamy observes, ‘such motions must have been elaborated and codified at a very early date; and later on we find that the art of silent communication by means of signs, which is in effect a ‘deaf and dumb language,’ and just like the American Indian hand-language, was regularly regarded as one of the ‘sixty-four arts’ which every educated person should have knowledge of.’ He refers to Jātaka No. 546 (J. text, VI, 364) where the Bodhisattva judges the suitability of a woman for being his wife by communicating to her through the medium of a particular hand-sign (hautha-mudrā); she understood it correctly and replied to him with another of her own. Coomaraswamy and Gopālakrishnāyya, The Mirror of Gesture, p. 24.} How absolutely necessary it will be for him to endow his mute gods with
such suggestive action poses in order that the idea or ideas which he wants to be symbolised by his deities will be correctly explained. Herein—in this very act of showing the images belonging to the various Indian religious creeds with the different gestures and postures—lay one of the marked and significant differences between the fetish of a Polynesian tribe and the developed image worshipped by the highly civilised Indians. In India of the pre-historic times, as we shall presently see, a few of the highly expressive poses were being used to characterise the representation of the divinities on seals, amulets and other figurines. Some of the conventional handposes that were common in early and late mediaeval iconographic art of India, can be definitely recognised in the central Indian art of the Sunga period.

It should be noted here that the fully developed and highly technical mudrās, that are described in the Indian works on dramaturgy such as Nāṭyaśāstra, Abhinaya-darpana, etc., have not much application in our present study. It is true that some south Indian types of dancing Siva of the mediaeval period or the Vajrayāna deities of the same age in the north, specially the latter, are endowed with a good many of the above; but very few are the Hindu gods and goddesses, especially in the early period, whose hands are shown in any of the highly technical poses. Such mudrās as are reproduced by me in Plate V from a late Buddhist text on ritualism procured by P. C. Bagchi from Nepal (it contains many more such handposes) are usually adopted by a bhakta or a sādhaka in the Tantric form of worship or sādhanā. R. K. Poduval distinguishes between ‘three broad divisions of Mudrās, viz., Vaidic, Tantric and Laukik (Mudrās in Art).’ He says that he has recognised as many as 64 Mudrās in Art and 108 in Tantra. The Vaidic Mudrās are more or less finger signs or indications employed to regulate the stress, rhythm
and intonation in the chanting of Vedas by Brahmins. Poduval has reproduced as many as 45 mudrās, which are described by him as anjali, vandani, yoni, vaināyakī, hrdaya, śiras, śikhā, karuca, astra, netra (dvaya, -traya), garuda, galini(?), surabhī, abhivāhinī, stāpinī (sthāpanī?), sannidhāpanī, saṃmukhī, avakṣulānī (avagunthani ?), prasadani, saṃnirodhini, saṅkha, gadā, padma, parasu, hariṇa, abhaya, varada, śūla, kapāla, cakra, five types of prānāhuti (perhaps symbolising the offering of five vital breaths or pāṇca prāṇīḥ, viz., prāṇa, apāṇa, samāṇa, udāna and vyāna), śara, cāpa, kūrma, jala, gandha, puspa, dhūpa, dipa, nyavedya (naivedya), and matsya. A careful analysis of the above names shows that some are connected with the deities to be worshipped, while others with the worshipper, a third set again symbolising the upacāras used in worship. In the outline drawing of the above mudrās, Poduval wrongly describes the two well-known ones, viz., abhaya and varada; what is really varada is described by him as abhaya and that which is abhaya, as varada. A glance at his plate will show that there is a close parallelism between the pose outlined by the position of the hands and fingers, and the name by which the pose is described. To refer to one or two instances: the vaināyakī-mudrā characteristically outlines the elephant head of Vināyaka with its lolling trunk, the saṅkha-mudrā a conch-shell, the hariṇa-mudrā a deer head with its antlers, the kapāla-mudrā a skull with its concave side shown up, matsya-mudrā a fish and so on. But most, if not all, of these, as I have already observed, were adopted by the devotee or the aspirant after salvation in the ritualistic performance of his pūjā or sādhanā. Reference should also be made, in this connection, to Poduval’s diagrams of several mudrās which are used by the Nambudiri

1 *Administration Report of the Archaeological Department, Travancore State*, 1107 M.E., pp. 6-7, and plate.
chanters of the Śāman hymns in Kerala; he has photographed as many as twenty-five of such hand-poses from actual life, assigning no name to any of them.¹

Among the forty-five Tantric mudrās illustrated by Poduval, we can recognise only a few that were also depicted in the early representations of the Indian divinities and their attendants; these are abhaya, varada and aṇjali (cāpa-, sara- and kapāla-mudrās may also come under this category, if we note that the hands of the deity holding the above objects, viz., a bow, an arrow and a skull are shown in the postures illustrated in the plate). Many more mudrās or hastas in which the hands of the images were usually depicted, such as dhyāna or yoga, jñāna, vyākhyāna, dharmacakra, katyaralambita, kālaka or simhakarna, gaja or dānḍa, sūcī, tarjjanī, vismaya, bhūsparśa, etc., are not included in the list. But, as it has been observed above, the list is more concerned with the practice of the ritualist himself than with the depiction

¹ R. K. Poduval, op. cit., 1109 M.E., p 8 and plate. He refers to a Sanskrit work on histrionics and dramaturgy, Bālarāmahābhāratam by name, written by king Bālarāma Kulaśekhara Vañci Bhūpala of Travancore. The work deals with, among other things, the aṅgas, upāṅgas and pratyāṅgas in Nāṭya, and classifies them each under six subdivisions. 'The aṅgas include the movements of the head, hands, breast, sides of the body, hips and feet; the upāṅgas those of the eyes, eyebrows, nose, cheeks, chin and lips; while under the pratyāṅgas come the movements of the neck, arm, abdomen, loins, thighs and the shanks.' There is hardly any doubt that this portion of the work is based on works on histrionics and dramaturgy of much earlier date. 'The poses of the hand are classified into uṣamugula and samyutakhasas, as many as forty of the former and twenty-seven of the latter are described in the book. See infra about 23 former and 13 latter types of hand-poses adopted in dancing, as mentioned in the Visnuṛharmotlara.

Mr. P. O. Matthai, M.A., Librarian of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, has kindly drawn my attention to the Administration Report of the Archaeological Survey of Travancore.
of his deity. The *abhaya-hasta* is the same as *śāntida* which latter term has been used by Varāhamihira in his description of the two-, four- and eight-armed images of Viṣṇu (*Bṛhat-samhitā*, ch. 57, vv. 33-5). This pose has been very characteristically explained by Utpala as 'the hand turned towards the visitor (i.e., turned to front) with fingers raised upwards' (*draṣṭuraḥbhimukha ārdhvāṅguliḥ śāntidakarabh*). One cannot improve upon this description and a glance at the right hand pose of the Mathura Buddha figure of the Kushan period sketched in Fig. 5 of Plate III of my book will show that it fittingly illustrates the description. The right hand of the Śiva-Viśvāmitra figure (on the coins of Dharaghoṣa) sketched in Plate I, fig. 20 of my book is also in the same posture. Fig. 20 in Plate II is based on the representation of King Brahmadatta in the illustration of the Mahākapi Jātaka at Bharhut; the right hand of the king is shown also in the same pose, the artist thus typifying the protection assured by the king to the monkey chief, the Buddha himself in one of his numerous previous births. Some of the divinities represented on early Indian coins and seals have also one of their hands in the same pose. This is one of the commonest *mudrās* in which one or other hands of the Brahmanical, Buddhist and some Jaina images are shown and it stands for the assurance of fearlessness, tranquillity and protection given by the deity to his worshipper. *Varada-* or simply *vara-mudrā*, also another of the typically common *mudrās* in iconographic art of ancient and mediaeval India, symbolises the bestowal of boon or benediction by the god on his votary. In the Śivaite mythology, the act of grace or benediction (*anugraha*) is regarded as one of the five principal activities of the lord Śiva (*pañca-kṛtyas, viz., srṣṭi, i.e., the act of creation, sthiti—of preservation, samhāra—of destruction, tirobhāva—of obscuration and *anugraha*—of grace). The stereotyped
manner of depicting this pose in art is by putting the palm spread outwards with the fingers pointing down; in standing figures the arm usually hangs down by the side of the body, while in seated ones the arm is sometimes flexed according to artistic requirements. Varāhamihira, while describing the four- and eight-armed images of Ekānaṃśa says that one right hand of either varieties of the goddess is to be shown in the varada pose. Utpala explains the term varada as the pose in which the palm with fingers pointing downwards is shown inside out (uttāno’do’ngulirhasto varadah; Brhatasamhitā, ch. 57, p. 780). The añjali, vandanī or nama-shāramudrā is usually to be found in the hands of the devotees or in those of the attendant or subordinate deities. This is one of the earliest handposes recognisable in art, its antiquity going as far back as the age of the prehistoric Indus valley civilisation. I have referred in the last chapter to the supplicating pose of the figure kneeling before the tree goddess on one of the Mohenjo-daro seals, the scene being described by Marshall as the epiphany of the tree spirit; the hands are, however, not joined together as they should be in the sampuṭāñjali pose. But this is also not wanting; several of the terracotta human figurines that were discovered at Harappa distinctly portray it. I may refer to a few descriptions of such clay figurines given by M.S. Vats: ‘No. 6 is a squatting male figure with folded hands,’ ‘No. 7 is seated with hands folded in devotional attitude,’ ‘No. 8, a rough figure seated on its haunches with arms clasped about the knees and hands folded in worship,’ ‘Nos. 9 and 10 also show male figurines with their hands folded above the breast.’ Reference has already been made by me in the last chapter to the two Mohenjo-daro seals which contain figures of a god seated in yoga posture, on whose either side kneels a half-human half-animal form of a Nāga with hands uplifted in prayer. The

1 Excavations at Harappa, p. 294, Pl. LXXVI.
above evidence fully proves that the idea of worship was well prevalent among the prehistoric people of the Indus valley. *Kupiro Yakho* (Kubera, the king of the Yakṣa and the guardian of the northern quarter) is depicted in Bharhut with his hands in the above pose (Pl. II, Fig. 19); many more are the Yakṣa, Nāga, and human votaries that are shown with their hands in the devotional attitude. This is the most correct attitude of a devotee and sometimes this pose alone enables us to distinguish the chief deity from one subordinate to him. Thus, Nandin, originally Śiva himself in theriomorphic form and afterwards his mount, is carved exactly like Śiva in late mediaeval and modern reliefs of southern India, the only distinction lying in the fact of his front hands being in the namaskāra pose (the back hands like those of Śiva carry parasu and mṛga, Śiva's front hands being shown in the abhaya and varada poses).

*Dhyāna-, yoga-, or samādhi-mudrā* is that particular pose in which ‘the palm of the right hand is placed in that of the left hand and both together are laid on the crossed legs of the seated image’ (Rao). Thus, it is specially associated with a seated figure and is one of the most correct attitudes for the practice of *dhyāna-yoga*. One of the earliest descriptions of the correct posture of a *yogī* is to be found in the *Bhagavadgītā*, which says that the *yogī* should be ‘steady, holding his body, head and neck balanced and motionless, fixing his gaze on the end of his nose, and looking not about him.’

1 *Samānñaphalasutta*, one of the early Buddhist texts, also gives us a clear idea about the sitting posture of a *yogī* in these words: ‘*nisidati pallaṅkaṁ abhujitvā ujum kāyāṁ panidhāya parimukhaṁ satim upatthāpctvā*, i.e.,

---

‘(he) sits bending (the legs) crosswise (i.e., he sits cross-legged) on a raised seat, with erect body and setting up his memory (i.e., of the object of thought) in front.’ 1 But it is noteworthy that in the above two descriptions there is not the least allusion to the pose of the hand, which as the Indus valley seals show was different. The prototype of Śiva-Paśupati shows his hands stretched sideways over the knees of the seated figure; this posture is also a yogic posture and ascetics seated entranced in this manner can be found in India even now. 2 The earliest approach to the dhyānamudrā of the texts, as explained by the above quotation from Rao, is to be found in the figure of a deity seated on a lotus seat, appearing on certain copper coins of Ujjain, dateable in the 2nd-3rd century B.C. (Pl. II, Fig. 16). 3

1 A.S.I.A.R., 1929-30, pp. 191-92. It was R. P. Chanda who first drew our attention to this passage as well as the Gītā one, in order to explain the peculiar look and attitude of the mutilated limestone statue found at Mohenjo-daro as well as the three or one-faced deity on seals, already noted. Saṅkara in his commentary on the Gītā passage quoted above says that the phrase about ‘fixing his gaze on the tip of his nose’ is figuratively used and it really means ‘fixing the eyesight within.’ Hill, however, observes, that ‘there is no doubt that the physical posture was literally recommended.’

2 The description of Śiva practising dhyānayoga in the Kumārasyaṁbhava, however, gives a full idea of the bandpose. The passage reads: Paryāṅkaṁ bandhasīlayaṁ nīrvarṇavāyamītvaṁ samanmaṅtbhayāṁ or Vasūnarpāṇīdayamāṇivesāt praśūlīṭityāṁvaṁvaṅkamadhye. The āsana is the same as padmāsana where the legs are interlocked on the seat, the upper part of the body remains straight and well-spread, both the shoulders being bent a little; the palms turned upwards are placed on the lap like a fullblown lotus. The fixing of the eyes on the tip of the nose is beautifully expressed by Kalidāsa in the following verse (III, 47): Kincitprakāśa-rūpasamsthitātaṁ bhūrāviṇīrṇyātā virudhaḥprasangītaṁ Netraivispandita-pakṣamālair lakṣyāṅkīrṇaghaṇamadhaṁmanamāyukhālaṁ

3 Coomaraswamy found in it one of the earliest representations of Buddha in the dhyāna pose, but it may as well stand for Śiva, the
In Gandhara some of the numerous Buddha figures are shown with their hands in this pose; its association with asceticism (tapas) is characteristically emphasised in the figures of Buddha practising asceticism in the collections of the Peshwar and Lahore Museums.\(^1\) The red sandstone figure of Pārśva-nātha, from Mathura and now in the collection of the Lucknow Museum, shows the god seated erect with his legs crossed and his hands in the dhyānamudrā; it belongs to the early Kushan period.\(^2\) Many images Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain of the Gupta age, as well as of the early and late mediaeval periods, show this pose, two Yogāsana-Visṇu figures in the Mathura Museum characteristically portraying it.\(^3\)

Two other mudrās, which are also found in the iconographic art of ancient and mediaeval India have been named by T. A. G. Rao as jñāna and vyākhyāna-, vitarka- or cint-mudrā. Rao says, that in the former, ‘the tips of the middle finger and of the thumb are joined together and held near the heart, with the palm of the hand turned towards the heart.’ Fig. 2 in Plate III of my book illustrates this pose. The front right hand of the figure of Nārāyaṇa in the Nara-Nārāyaṇa relief at Deogarh shows it; but it can probably be traced to a period far earlier than the above belonging to the Gupta
great Yogi. The coin device is very much blurred and it is not sure whether the palms of the fore-arms flexed inwards near the waist actually joined each other on the lap; my drawing is based on the obverse of Fig. 10 in Plate X of Cunningham’s Coins of Ancient India.

1 H. Hargreaves, *Handbook to the Sculptures in the Peshwar Museum*, Pl. 8. Cf. also statuette No. 1550 in the Mathura Museum; this Gandhāra stone figurine showing the ascetic Buddha is said to have been found at Maholi village about 100 years ago; V. S. Agarwal, *Handbook of the Sculptures in the Curzon Museum of Archaeology*, Muttra, p. 52, Pl. XXII, Fig. 43.\(^2\)

2 Coomaraswamy, *II I A.*, Pl. XXIII, Fig. 60.\(^2\)

3 V. S. Agarwal, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXII, Fig. 45.\(^3\)
date.\(^1\) Drawing No. I in Plate III is based on the figure of Ajakālaka Yakṣa in Bharhut with his right hand in the same characteristic pose; the standing male figure in the representation of a donor couple (or are they Yakṣa and Yakṣinī?) in the same plate has his left hand shown in the same pose, but it must be observed that in both a lotus flower is placed between the tips of the thumb and the index finger. We are not certain, however, whether this typical pose was known under that name as early as the 2nd century B.C.; as regards the flowers held in the hands, it should be noted that different objects such as a lotus flower, a rosary, a bowl, etc., are sometimes also placed in them even when they typify some particular pose (for example in some Dhyāni figures of Buddha, an alms-bowl is placed on the hands showing dhyāna-mudrā).\(^2\) The cimudrā is described by Rao thus,—‘the tips of the thumb and the fore-finger are made to touch each other, so as to form a circle, the other fingers being kept open. The palm of the hand is made to face the front.’ The hand in this pose is usually raised upwards near the breast and it appears that this is the exact counterpart of jñāna-mudrā. Rao remarks about it that it is the ‘mudrā adopted when an explanation or exposition is being given; hence it is also called vyākhyāna-mudrā and sandarśana-mudrā’ (Pl. III, Fig. 3). The extreme right section of a large panel in the Cave temple of Rāmeśvara at Ellora depicts Subrahmanya teaching his father Siva the significance of Om; the right hand of the polycephalous god

---

\(^1\) T. A. G. Rao, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pl. LXXI. Rao wrongly described this relief as the Jñāna-Dakṣiṇāmūrti of Śiva; Yarde first corrected this mistake and identified the two ascetic figures seated side by side as Nara-Nārāyaṇa on the basis of the Viṣṇudharmottara.

\(^2\) For Ajatkāda figure, see B. M. Barua, *Bharhut*, Vol. III, Pl. LVII, Fig. 61; for the figure of the donor (?) couple, cf. Coomaraswamy, *H.I.I.A.*, Pl. XII, Fig. 44.
is shown in the *vyākhyāna* pose, a rosary being shown in
the palm.¹ The two-armed figure of Nara in the Deogarh
relief just referred to shows his right hand in the same pose,
a rosary being also placed in the hand. One of the earliest
representations of a teacher expounding his lessons or
doctrines is to be found at Bharhut where the sage Dīrgha-
tapasvī is shown in the attitude of instructing his pupils;
he is sitting at ease on a raised seat facing his four disciples
seated below in a reverential attitude; his left hand rests
on his knee while his right hand is raised towards his breast
with the thumb and index finger projecting outward, the
other fingers being bent inwards. It is true that the tips
of the thumb and the fore-finger are not joined together,
but they also characteristically portray the expounding
pose.² A reference now to the *dharmacakra-mudrā*, though
it is usually associated with the representations of Buddha
figures and not with the same of any Brahmanical deity, will
be of some interest. The particular pose symbolises the
first preaching of the law by the Master at Sarnath, thus,
figuratively speaking, setting thenceforward the wheel of
the Law in motion; it was also used in the representation of
the Great Miracle at Srāvastī. The Gandhara artists were
never sure about the mode in which it was to be depicted;
sometimes the right hand of the Buddha was placed on the
rim of a wheel on stand, at other times, the hand seemingly
in the *abhaya* pose was used to serve the purpose, while more
frequently it was depicted in a manner that was not at all
suggestive of any clear idea (the right hand with fingers flexed

and left sections of the panel portray the incidents connected with the
marriage of Siva with Pārvatī.

² B. M. Barua, *Bharhut*, Book III, Pl. LXXVIII, Fig. 104; the
inscription above reads: *Dīghatapasi sīva anusāsati, i.e., 'Dīrgha-
tapasvī instructs his disciples.* Fig. 18 in Pl. II of my book is based
on the Bharhut figure of Dīghatapasvī.
inward was placed near the breast, the left hand with its fingers drawn together touching it from below). But in the truly Indian images of the Buddha from the Gupta period onwards, the dharmacakra-mudrā is invariably presented in the manner shown in Fig. 4, Plate III, of my book. A glance at the drawing will at once show that this hand pose is nothing but the combined representation of jñāna and vyākhyāna mudrās, the left hand being in the former and the right in the latter. The ideology here is thus characteristically expressive, Buddha in the act of expounding the true knowledge which he had himself first obtained through his efforts.¹

The kalyavalambita- or kāṭisamsthita-hasta is the pose in which 'the arm is let down so as to hang by the side of the body, and the hand is made to rest on the loin, indicating thus a posture of ease' (Rao); but the hand is usually bent a little at the elbow and placed on the upper part of the waist. This is one of the commonest poses in which the left hand of a standing image is shown (in seated images also, this pose is commonly met with). Figures 19, 20, 21, 22 and 28 in Plate I of my book illustrate the manner in which it appears in the depiction of deities on early Indian coins. Figure 28 is sketched from a punch-marked coin in the Purnea hoard, Fig. 19, from Siva on some coins of Wema Kadphises, Fig. 20, from the Śiva-Viśvāmitra on Dharaghoşa’s silver coins, Fig. 21, from Śiva Chatreśvara on some Kuniṇḍa coins, Fig. 22, from Lakṣmī on the unique coin with the legend ‘Pakhalavadidevata’ grouped by the numismatists in the Indo-Scythic series. The goddess tentatively identified by me as Durgā Simhavāhinī or Ekaṇamaṃśā appearing on certain copper coins of Azes shows

¹ This interpretation of the dharmacakra-mudrā was first suggested by me in my article on ‘The Webbed Fingers of Buddha’ published in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. VI, 1930. p. 722, f. n. 4.
this characteristic pose (Pl. VII, Fig. 6). Varāhamihira described the image of Ekānāmśa as Kaṭisamsthitavāmakarā sarojamitareṇa covedahati, i.e., ‘her left hand is placed on her waist while the other (right) hand holds a lotus flower’ (BRhatsamhitā, p. 780). The standing images of Buddha, the Nāgas and various other divinities, belonging to the early Kushan period onwards found at Mathura and adjacent places very frequently display this attitude; the Katra, Anyor and Mankuwar figures of seated Buddha also show the same pose. Coomaraswamy was fully justified that this pose along with the raised right hand was the iconographic pose par excellence in ancient and mediaeval India. Figure 14 in Plate II of my book, based on the device of a Mathura coin, shows that perhaps the order was sometimes, though very rarely, reversed. Figure 1. in Plate IV, is sketched from the usual pose appearing in many Brahmanical images. A brief reference to the kāyotsarga pose which is usually adopted in the representations of the Jinas will not be out of place here. In it the hands are shown hanging straight down the side of the body without the least bend in any of the limbs; this is described by Varāhamihira as ājānulambabāhu, i.e., ‘the arms long enough to reach the knees’ (this is one of the characteristic signs of the great men and divine beings). R. P. Chanda was the first to note the portrayal of this pose on some Indus Valley seals (cf. the seal with the epiphany of the tree-spirit, discussed by me in Chapter V); Fig. 13, in Plate II, sketched by me from a punch-marked coin device, also portrays the same hand-pose.

Kaṭaka- or sinhalakaraṇa-hasta denotes that particular pose wherein ‘the tips of the fingers are loosely applied to the thumb so as to form a ring or, as somewhat poetically expressed by the latter name, so as to resemble a lion’s ear’ (Rao). As Gopinath Rao has rightly understood, this pose is very useful in the depiction of goddesses in
whose hands fresh flowers are often inserted; it is thus very common in the iconographic representation of divinities. One of the earliest instances of this posture is to be found in the figure of Sirimā devatā at Bharhut where her right hand holding a lotus flower (partially broken) shows it, her left hand hanging stiffly by her side. Дандахаста or gajahasta has got the technical sense of the hand and arm being thrown forward (sometimes across the body), appearing like a straight staff or the lolling trunk of an elephant (Pl. III, Fig. 8). The palm in this drawing seems to be in the vairāyakī mudrā and sometimes, especially in the well-known Naṭarāja images of Śiva, this mudrā is also recognisable. This pose is usually met with in images of gods or goddesses shown in the dancing attitude. Śiva Naṭarāja dancing vigorously on the back of Mūyalaka or the apasmārapuruṣa, Nritya-Gaṇapatī, Kṛṣṇa Kāliyadamanā, dancing Cāmuṇḍā and such other images have one of their hands in the above pose. The figure of the dansense on the right side in drawing No. 22, Plate II, has her right arm and hand extended forward in a manner somewhat different from the above, but it can justifiably be described to be another variety of the same pose. Several other dancing Apsaras in Bharhut have one of their hands extended in a different manner, but all illustrate the idea of a straight staff or an elephant trunk. The significance of śucīhasta has already been explained by me; it is comparatively rare in iconographic art (Pl. IV, Fig 6, but it should be shown upside down). Another very suggestive handpose is the tarjjanīhasta, where the projected forefinger of the right hand points upwards (in the śucī, it usually points downwards, the hand being held down), 'as if the owner of the hand is warning or scolding another' (Rao). A person while threatening or admonishing another very often holds his hand in this position and so there is a characteristic conformity here between the actual practice
and artistic representation (Pl. IV, Fig. 6). In Vajrayāna sādhanaś, Māricī and several other goddesses are very often described as, tarjjanī-pāśahasta, i.e., 'with a hand holding a tarjjanī-pāśa'; it is not meant hereby that the deity holds a noose (pāśa) in one hand while another is shown in the tarjjanī pose. The epithet really means that the noose which is meant for chastisement is placed in the same hand which is shown in the threatening pose; this interpretation is actually borne out by the images of the above goddesses. One of the earliest representation of this particular hasta is to be found in a Jātaka relief on one of the coping stones at Bharhut; this scene has been tentatively identified by B. M. Barua as illustrating the Gahapati Jātaka (Fausboll, 199). The standing figure on the right side in this section of the coping, none other than the Bodhisattva himself as the householder, is threatening and admonishing with the projecting forefinger of his raised right hand another male figure shown seated below cowering; a female figure is seen peeping out of a hut, to whom the seated figure points with both hands (the pose in which the latter’s hands are shown can with some justification be called sūci). The right hand of Sudarśanā Yakṣīṇī in Bharhut seems to be in a pose practically similar to the tarjjanī (Pl. II, Fig. 23). Barua is not quite accurate in his description of the Yakṣīṇī when he writes 'the four fingers of her right hand are bent towards the palm, while the thumb remains stretched out'; his plate (op. cit., Vol. III, Pl. LXIV, Fig. 74) as well as

1 For the story and illustration, cf. B. M. Barua, Bharhut Vol. II, pp. 105-106. Vol. III, Pl. LXXVI, Fig. 102. Barua thus describes the attitudes of the two male figures in the scene; the seated man 'with downcast eyes is pleading his innocence by referring to the woman with the forefingers of his two hands directed towards her,' while the standing one, the owner of the house, 'is angrily asking the accused to explain his conduct threatening him with the forefinger of his upraised hand.'
my drawing definitely shows that three fingers are only bent inwards, both the forefinger and the thumb remaining stretched upwards.

T. A. G. Rao rightly observes that ‘vismaya-hasta indicates astonishment and wonder. In this pose the forearm is held up with the fingers of the hand pointing up and the palm turned away from the observer (Pl. IV, Fig. 4).’ The relief illustrating the Caṇḍeśānugrahaśānti of Śiva in the Kailāsaṇadāna temple at Conjeeveram, belonging to the Pallava period, shows the father of Caṇḍeśa ‘fallen on the ground, with his left hand held in the vismaya pose’ (for the story and its illustration, cf. Rao, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 209 and Pl. XLIX, Fig. 2). It will be of use to refer here to the Figure No. 3 in Plate IV of my book; the drawing is based on a railing pillar relief of the Saka-Kushan period in the collection of the Mathura Museum. A male figure is shown standing with the index and middle fingers placed on his chin. The figure has been rightly identified by V. S. Agrawala and B. S. Upadhyaya as the young hermit Ṛṣyaśṛṅga; they observe, ‘This mudrā is indicative of astonishment (vismaya) and reflection (vitarka). The eyeballs are turned upwards and the whole expression is one of deliberation in which an awareness of the immediate surroundings is absent. Satisfaction beams on the face.’ The story of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga is often narrated at length in the Brahmanical and Buddhist literature and the most suggestive moment in it is that in which the young Brahmācarin for the first time beholds a maiden; the artist has chosen this moment and has very effectively portrayed the pleasant wonder of the unsophisticated youth when sex consciousness was being aroused in his mind.¹ The handposes which are

depicted in Figures 6 and 7 in Plate No. III of my book should be studied now. The former figure which is based on the bronze statuette of Harpocrates (thus identified by Marshall) unearthed at Taxila shows the right hand of the child god raised towards his face with the index finger placed on the chin in token of silence. The latter is sketched from a four-armed Viṣṇu image from Khajuraho whose front left hand is shown in similar pose (the index finger here more suggestively touches the left corner of the lower lip); this is one of the most unique representations of Viṣṇu and no text is known to me which enjoins that Viṣṇu is to be shown in such a pose. Upadhya and Agrawala have very correctly drawn our attention in their article above to the Kumārasambhava passage which describes Nandi guarding the entrance of Siva's place of meditation: "Nandi posted at the entrance of the bower, having a golden-staff resting against his forearm, bade the Gaṇas to observe stillness with a gesture in which a finger of his right hand touched his mouth."1 The bronze image of Hanumān, one of the four (the others being of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā) belonging to the temple of Shermadevi in the Tinnevelly district of the Madras Presidency, shows his right hand placed upon the mouth indicating the attitude of silent respect and ungrudging obedience of the devoted follower.2 Figure 21 in Plate II of

1 Kumārasambhavam, III, 41: Lālāgphalāvāragato'tha nandi vāmaprakṣṭhārparitahemavetroh | Makhāripitaikāhulāsamajñayaiva ma cāpulāyati gaṇān vyanaṁit || For the Harpocrates figure, cf. Marshall, A guide to Taxila, p. 79, Pl. XV; according to him, it is a late Hellenistic work. Vögel identified the Ṛṣyaśrnga figure as 'probably a Yakṣa of a fashionable type,' suggesting that its pose resembled that of Harpocrates (Ars Asiatica, Vol. XV, p. 102), but this suggestion was rightly challenged by Agrawala and Upadhya. For the Khajuraho Viṣṇu, see J. I. O. S. A., Vol. I, p. 103, Pl. XXX.

2 T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, Pl. LIV. Another bronze figure of the same monkey-god hauling from Ramesvaram portrays the identical pose.
my book is also another unnamed handpose where two fingers (index and thumb) are put inside the mouth in order to produce some whistling sound; the left hand is shown in that pose, while the right one waves high one end of the scarf worn by the figure. This drawing is based on a deva figure from Bharhut relief depicting the victory of Buddha over Māra (Barua, Bharhut, Vol. III, Pl. XXXVII). Exactly the same posture is shown on similar figures appearing in the scene of Buddha’s birth in numerous reliefs from Gandhara. The waving of the cloth is called cellukhepa in Pali and is expressive of the great joy of the waver; the left hand pose, thus, is also of similar import. Even now boys who are able to do it uses the above expressive pose to give vent to their joy by whistling. I may say that I have not met with any such pose in my study of the Brahmanical sculptures of different periods.

A somewhat detailed reference has been made to the various handposes which are usually depicted in the images of the Hindu divinities and their attendants. The bhū-sparśa or bhūmisparsa pose, in which the left hand rests on the lap with palm outward and the right touches the seat below, is particularly associated with Buddhist iconography. This pose illustrates the story of Buddha’s calling the earth as his witness for testifying his right to sit on the Vajrāsana under the Bodhi tree, which was challenged by Māra, just prior to his enlightenment. Grünwedel has remarked that ‘certain hand-positions attached themselves to particular legends and the position of the hands in the chief figure becomes an indication of the legend’ (Buddhist Art, p. 177). This observation is mainly applicable to the two, viz., the dharmacakra and the bhūsparśa-mudrā; both these were principally connected with Buddhism and in developed Mahāyāna iconography, they were the typical handposes of the two Dhyānī
Buddhas, *viz.*, Vairocana and Aksobhya respectively. The nearest approach of the latter pose in Hindu iconography is to be found in the two-armed figure of Nara in the Deogarh relief already noted where the god is seated in the *ardha-parvānka* fashion on a raised seat with the index and the middle fingers of his left hand touching his seat; but unlike the Buddhist mode of representing the *mudrā*, we find here the palm of the hand as turned outward.

A few remarks about the complicated handposes which are reproduced by me in Plate V are necessary. I have already shown that these were mainly ritualistic in character adopted by the *sādhaka* in the performance of his *sādhana* or the *bhakta* in the worship of the deity of his choice. I have selected at random the eight *mudrās* from the manuscript text in order to show how the particular postures adopted by the *sādhaka* in the most intricate processes of his *sādhana* are indicative of the ideas contained in the *mantras* uttered by him with every different pose. The eight *mantras* associated with eight figures are thus laid down in the text: 1. *Om vajrānālampadaha-paṭhama-bhaṅjana hūm*; 2. *Om vajrapāsa hriṃ*; 3. *Om vajrapuspe svāhā*; 4. *Om vajradevi(dī)pe svāhā*; 5. *Om vajrāṃkusa ja*; 6. *Om vajranaiceda svāhā*; 7. *Om sarvecatathāgatasiddhi-vajrasamaya tiṣṭha eṣastraṃ dhārayāmi vajrasattva hi hi hi humiti*; 8. *Om sarvavāt vajradhūpe trām*. Now, the ideological association of the *mudrās* numbering 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 with the different *mantras* are not difficult to follow; Nos. 4, 5 and 6 in some mystic way may contain the outline representation of a lamp, an elephant-goad and a pot of offering. It may be noted here that the *nivedya* or *naivedya* *mudrā* outlined by Poduval is closely similar to No. 6 in my plate; I may also observe that the Brahmin priests when they dedicate any *naivedya* (or offering) to the deity usually adopt this *mudrā* and taking a flower with the tips of the index fingers of the two
interlocked hands drop it on the naivedya. The waving flames of fire, the hands tied by a noose (pāśa) and the offering of a palmful of flowers to the deity are characteristically expressed by Figs. 1, 2 and 3; Fig. 7 expresses the invocation of the success attained by all Tathāgatas, symbolised here by the raja and ghanta (bell, does it also indicate time?) and asking it to stay with the sādhaka, as he holds these symbols in his hand; Fig. 8 simply shows the incense-burner with smoke issuing from it held in the right hand, the left hand being placed below.¹

The Dhruvaberas or the principal types of Viṣṇu images are grouped under three broad heads, viz., sthānaka (standing), āsana (seated) and śayana (recumbent), in the Vaikhānasāgama text. The images of the other gods and their attendants also are represented in one or other of the first two attitudes, the recumbent ones being very rare. Several varieties of images also are to be found in dancing or flying pose, the latter being mostly used in the representation of such accessories as the Vidyādhara and others. In the case of standing images, different types of stance are met with, while there are numerous varieties of sitting postures in which the seated images are shown. Four

¹ The text from which the above poses as well as the mantras are taken is a late 18th century Vajrayāna one collected by P. C. Bagchi from Nepal. In its colophon I read, 'Iti śrīmahābhajana-durgatipariśodhanamukhyakhyāna heguri(? samāpta | Samvat 915 puṣṇaśukle ekādasi bṛhaspativāra kunhu(? | Suvarṇa-pañcarīsamhāna-cuṇāhastāhah samākaramahāvihāravēṣṭiḥ tān lācchito (?) rathyākāvāḥaragai (?) śrīvajra-cārya nāmasamgati nāthajai (?) tha(?) durgatipariśodhana-samādhi-thamanam(?) cojājura(?) abhaḥ'.' The language is corrupt Sanskrit and there seems to be some intermixture of Newari in it. The date 915 Newar Samvat corresponds to c. 1795 A.D.
different standing postures were usually adopted by the Indian iconographer in the representation of the sthānakamūrtis; these postures are usually called 'bhaṅgas, i.e., flexions or attitudes.' They were samabhaṅga or samapāda, ābhaṅga, tribhaṅga and atibhaṅga. The first denotes the equipoised body where 'the right and left of the figure are disposed symmetrically, the sūtra or plumb line passing through the navel, from the crown of the head to a point midway between the heels' (Tagore). Thus, the weight of the whole body is equally distributed on both the legs and the poise is firm and erect, there being no bend in the body. Many are the Indian images which are shown in this attitude, the most typical being the early and late figures of the Jain Tirthaṅkaras whose hands also hang straight down by their sides without showing the least bend in them (kāyotsarga). The Brahmanical and Buddhist divinities when they are depicted in the above attitude usually show various dispositions of their hands, either according to the nature of the ideas expressed by them or according to the type of the weapon or emblem held in them. Sirimā-devatā and many other Vyāntara-devatās on the Bharhut railing stand in the samabhaṅga attitude. Figures 7, 8, and 20 in Plate I (varieties of Śiva on Ujjain and Audumbara coins), Figure I in Plate VII (Gaja-Lakṣmī on some coins of Azilises), Figure 7 in Plate IX (Mahāsena on Huvishka's coins) and Figure 2 in Plate X (Gaja-Lakṣmī on a Bhita seal) are shown in the above pose. Ābhaṅga is that form of standing attitude 'in which the plumb-line or the centre line, from the crown of the head to a point midway between the heels, passes slightly to the right of the navel' (Tagore). In other words, in this form, a slight bend both in the upper and the lower halves of the figure is definitely perceptible. Many also are the Indian images which are represented in this pose; Figures 13 and 19 in Plate I (Śiva on some Ujjain coins and the same god on some coins of.
Wema Kadphises), Figures 4, 5 and 7 in Plate VII (Viṣṇu on a Kushan seal, Umā on some coins of Huvishka a goddess with cakra on Maues' coins), Figures 2, 5 and 6 in Plate VIII (Siva on some coins of Maues, as well as of Huvishka-Fig. 4 on a seal of the Saka period has, however, been identified as Poseidon trampling on a bull-shaped river god), the figures of Siva and Skanda Kumāra Viṣākhā on Huvishka's coin reproduced in Plate IX (Figs. 1, 2 and 8), Gaṅgā and Sarasvatī (?) in Plate X (Figs. 1 and 3, Fig. 1 shows Gaṅgā on the elephantine Makara on the reverse side of the Tiger-slayer type coins of Samudra Gupta and Fig. 3, possibly Saraswati on those of Narendra-vinata, a Bengal king of the late Gupta period) can be described as standing in the abhaṅga pose. The tribhaṅga pose has been described by A. N. Tagore as one in which 'the centre line passes through the left (or right) pupil, the middle of the chest, the left (or right) of the navel, down to the heels. The lower limbs, from the hips to the feet, are displaced to the right (or left) of the figure, the trunk between the hips and neck, to the left (or right), while the head leans towards the right (or left).’ It should be noted that the number of bends in the figure is three and thus, the name is quite appropriate. The pose may not be as common as the above two, but it is also used in the iconographic art of ancient and mediaeval India, especially in the representations of goddesses and other attendants of principal deities. Rṣyaśraṅga on the Mathura railing (Pl. IV, Fig. 3) and the goddess on certain copper coins of A zes, tentatively identified by me as Durgā (Pl. VIII, Fig. 6) are undoubtedly depicted in the tribhaṅga pose. Atibhaṅga has rightly been described by A. N. Tagore as really an emphasised form of the tribhaṅga, the sweep of the tribhaṅga curve being considerably enhanced. The upper portion of the body above the limbs below are thrown to right or left, backwards or forwards, like ‘a tree caught in a storm.’ This type is
comparatively rarely represented in Indian art and is used in the depiction of dynamic action on the part of the divinity; several Ugra (terrific) forms of Śaiva and Śākta deities and the various Krodha-devatās of the Vajrayāna Buddhism are usually depicted in this manner. Reference may be made here to the ālīḍha and pratyālīḍha poses in which some sthānakamūrtis are shown. Ālīḍhapada, which is sometimes loosely called ālīḍhāsana, denotes that particular mode of standing in which the right knee is thrown to the front and the leg retracted, while pratyālīḍhapada is just its opposite; both these attitudes are adopted in shooting arrows and one of the earliest depictions of these poses is to be found in the two arrow-shooting figures of Uṣā and Pratyūṣā, the two goddesses of dawn accompanying Śūrya in the old stone railing at Bodh Gaya. In a fragmentary Gandhara relief in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Śūrya is seated on a chariot and one of the arrow-shooting figures is present, the other being broken away. Another very early representation of the ālīḍha pose is outlined in the drawing No. 25 in Plate I, which is based on a figure appearing on some punch-marked coins among the Puranea hoard. Śiva appearing on the Sirkap bronze seal of Śivarakṣita and on some copper coins of Maues (Figs. 1 and 3, Pl. VIII) is shown in the same posture, though he is not depicted as shooting arrows. Tantrasāra describes the Brahmanical goddess Tārā, ideologically similar to the same goddess in the Vajrayāna pantheon and most probably a borrowal from it, as ‘fierce and standing in the pratyālīḍha attitude’ (pratyālīḍhapadām ghorāṃ). The standing pose shown in Figure 28, Plate I (drawing from a figurine on a few punch-marked coins in the Purnea hoard) is very interesting. The right knee flexed outwards with the right leg crossing the left leg firmly planted reminds us of the posture in which some Yakṣinīs on Bharhut and Mathura railing are depicted; some mediaeval and modern figures
of Kṛṣṇa in several of his lilāmārtis are also shown in this pose.¹

Mention may be made here of the various poses or sthānas in which pictures of gods and men are to be shown, according to the Viṣṇudharmottara. There are as many as 13 sthānas, viz., prṣṭhāgata, ājvāgata, madhyārdha, ardhārdha, sācikṛtamukha, nata, gaṇḍaparāvṛtta, prṣṭhāgata (?), pārśvāgata, ullepa, calita, uttāna and valita. The above poses are characterised by the position of the legs and feet which are varied by a series of motions like vaiśākha, ālidha and pratyālidha (poses peculiar to arches—Tatra vaiśākhamaṃ pratyālidhaṃ ca dhanvinām), citragomutrakagata (?) and viṣuma (peculiar to wielders of sword and shield), calita, khalita (balita ?), āyāsta (āyata ?) and ālidhaikapada (peculiar in turn to the holders of a spear, a tomara, i.e., an iron club, a stone and a bhindipāla, i.e., a small javelin or dart to be thrown at the enemy), savalqita (in a sort of gallop ?—pose peculiar to the persons who hold a wheel, a trident, a mace, a kunapa, i.e., a kind of spear). The above varieties of the positions of legs and feet are in addition to the two principal groups of standing postures, viz., sama and arddhasama or asama which are respectively well-planted and in motion (Samaścārdhasamāḥ pādāh susthitāni calāni ca I Samāsamapādashtham ca dvividham sthānakaṃ bhavat II). Samapāda is also known as the stance which is pādabhūyisṭha (feet firmly and squarely planted ?), while the other type (i.e., asama or arddhasama should be (known as) manḍala (in rotatory motion; Tadgatvaḥ pādabhūyisṭham sthānāṃ samapadāṃ smṛtam I Mandalaṅca dvitiyāṃ syāt......). One foot firmly planted, the other shown in moving posture is really the arddha-samapāda

¹ The names of the 4 principal standing poses described above are from A. N. Tagore's 'Some Notes on Indian Artistic Anatomy' (published by the Indian Society of Oriental Art), pp. 11-13.
or ehasamanapāda, as seems to be the sense in the description of the standing pose of the female figures in the text. The author of the Viṣṇudharmottara describes the attitude in which the female figures are to be shown in this manner—'one of the legs (should be) in the samasthāna (straightly planted), the other in the vidgala (does it refer to the manner of showing one leg crossing the other firmly planted leg?)—cf. Fig. 28 in Plate 1, it is a female figure as is clear from the big braid behind the head), the body should be shown in a graceful manner, sometimes held by supports, charming with its grace and dalliance, with the front part of the loins being broad and spacious, with one leg firm and well-adjusted—thus should a sage paint a female figure.'

1 The above extracts are from Viṣṇudharmottara, Bk. III, Ch. 39, verses 39-50. The description of the postures is introduced there to show how they can be painted with the help of decrease and increase (kṣaya and vṛddhi, translated by St. Kramrisch as 'the science of foreshortening'). Kramrisch's translation of many of the above passages seems to me somewhat inaccurate. Verses 49-50 read—Ekapādāsamasthānāṃ devīgīna tu vidgalaṃ | Surīrāṃ ca salilam syāt sāvaṭambhāhī kvasiddhēram (in the edited text the reading is kvasiddhāram which is evidently incorrect) || Lilavilāsavibhrāntaṃ visālajaghanasthālam | Sthiraikapādācintāyāsaṃ sthirūpaṃ vilkhedbudhāḥ || These have been translated by her in the following way—'The flight (lit. running away) of stout men is in some cases depicted with one leg in a straight position and with the other (placed in such a way that) the wanton body should be (shown) with the neck stretched forward. The learned painter should paint a female figure with one foot calmly advanced, with the part about the hips and loins broad and hurried, on account of amorous dalliance.' There can be little doubt that both the couplets, my translation of which is given above, describe the standing pose of a female figure. The passages are bristling in technical terms, many of which may not be correctly printed in the text; the significance of a good many of them again is unknown to us at present and so the task of translating them is extremely difficult. I myself have not attempted to translate literally some of the terms quoted by me.
Only a small number of the multifarious poses noted above from the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, however, though they could all be painted by skilled artists on canvas, wall or such other objects, were actually used by the image-makers of ancient and mediæval India in the depiction of the cult-deities and their attendants. Moreover, it was the lyrical painting (*vaṁśika*) which was very rich in ‘ideal proportion and in poses (*pramaṁsthāna-lambhāḍhya*) and which dealt with ‘happenings on earth, not with the iconography of the gods.’ As Coomaraswamy remarks, ‘the action will require the representation of many different positions and movements, not merely the frontal pose appropriate to the image of a god’ (*J. A. O. S.*, Vol. 52, 1932, p. 15). That the ‘frontal pose’ was the most appropriate one in the depiction of the cult deity is proved by the 51st verse of the chapter on Pratimālakṣaṇa in the *Bṛhatasthāṇhitā*; it says that the image which leans to the left side causes harm to the wife and that leaning to the right diminishes the span of life (of the donor;—*Vāmāvanatā patniṁ daksīṇavīnatā hinastāyāyuḥ*).

Various kinds of āsanas are prescribed for different types of divinities in the iconographic texts. The *Ihirbudhnyasamhitā* (Ch. 30) mentions as many as eleven principal āsanas such as *cakra*, *padma*, *kūrma*, *māyūra*, *kaikkuṭa*, *vīra*, *svastiḥ*, *bhadrā*, *sīṃha*, *mukta* and *gomukha* (*Cakran padmāsanaṁ kūrman māyūran ḫaikkuṭan tathā | Vīrasanaṁ svastikān ca bhadrān sīṁhāsanaṁ tathā || Muktāsanaṁ gomukhan ca mukhyāṇyatāni nārada ||*). After naming them, the author describes each type of the sitting posture in detail; all these are evidently yogic āsanas adopted by a yogī as aids to his concentration. It should be noted that in the above list some can be understood to mean the particular animal or object whose name is associated with them. Thus, *kūrmāsana* in one context may mean that it is the tortoise which serves as the seat (of a particular god or
goddess—cf. the river goddess Yamunā who is kürmāsanā) while in another would indicate that type of sitting pose in which 'the legs are crossed so as to make the heels come under the glutuses (Gaḍham nipīdyagulphābhyaṁvyutkramena samāhitah | Etatkürmāsanaprotkam yogasiddhikaram param ||). The earliest example of this sitting posture, as I have elsewhere suggested, is probably to be found in the seated prototypes of Śiva-Paśupati on some Mohenjo-daro and Harappa seals. Padmāsana, may very well signify a lotus as the seat of the deity; but as a particular type of sitting posture it can be described as one in which 'the two legs are kept crossed so that the feet are brought to rest on the thighs' (Urvorupari samsthāpyaubhe pādatalesukham | Padmāsanamidam protkam . . . . ).

The kukkuṭāsana as a sitting posture is a variety of padmāsana, where the whole weight of the body rests on two arms placed on the ground on both sides, the body thus hanging in the air (Padmāsanamadhisṛṣṭāyajāṅvantaraaravindāsrupakaraubhūmaunivesyaitadvyomasīthahaḥkukkuṭāsamana). When the thighs are placed together and the left foot rests upon the right thigh and the left thigh on the right foot it is known as vīrīsana (Ekatvoroṇi samsthāpyapādamkam-athetaram | Uruṇ pādevivesyaitadvīrīsanaamudāḥṛtam ||). In the bhadrāsana, the heels of the legs which cross each other are placed under the testes and the two big toes of the feet are held by the hands. Rao says that 'in the simhāsana the legs are crossed as in the kūrmāsana; and the palms of the hands, with the fingers kept stretched out, rest supinely upon the thigh, while the mouth is kept open and the eyes are fixed upon the tip of the nose (Nāśagra-nyastanayaṇo vyāttavakteṣṭpramāṇo). A few of the eleven yogic āsanas as mentioned in the Ahirbudhnyaṃsathita have been described above; many more are to be found in Tāntric and other texts. The Niruktatantra, as quoted in the Sabdakalpa-druma, refers to innumerable āsanas (as many as 84 lacs),
but specially selects two among them, *viz.*, *siddhāsana* and *kamalāsana*. But in the representations of the deities and their accessories, very few of them are actually used. The most commonly depicted sitting posture among the above is the *padmāsana* which is illustrated by Fig. 5 in Plate III. *Virāsana* is the mode in which the Indians usually sit and is illustrated by Figures 15 and 18 in the same plate (No. 15 from an Ujjain coin, No. 18 from a Bharhut relief). The Aihole figure of Viṣṇu described by T. A. G. Rao as *Virāsanamūrti* does not actually sit in the *virāsana* mode, but in an easy pose which is known as *sukhāsana*, where one leg generally the left one rests on the seat while the right knee is raised upwards on the seat and the right arm rests on the raised knee. The figure of Śiva seated on his mount in Figure 7, Plate X, is also depicted in a pose somewhat similar to that of Aihole Viṣṇu (it is a gem intaglio formerly in the Pease collection now acquired by the Indian Museum, Calcutta). A yogic *āsana* which is sometimes to be found in the representations of deities but which is not included in the above list is the *utkūṭikāsana* where one sits with his heels kept close to the bottom and with the back slightly curved and the forearms resting on the knees raised above the seat. In order to keep the knees in the above position, a cloth band known as *yogapāṭṭa* is tied round the raised knees (Pl. IV, Fig. 5). The sitting

---

1 For the Aihole Viṣṇu figure, see T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Pl. XXX. On the obverse of the coins of Narendraśvarāva, the king is shown as seated on a couch in a similar pose, the difference lying in the left knee being flexed upwards and the right leg bent at the knee resting on the seat. This pose is also sometimes described as *mahārājalilā*. The Śimhanāda variety of Avalokiteśvara and the Mañjuśrī Bodhisattvas are usually depicted in this pose.
posture is used in some images of seated Kevala Narasimha (cf. the Halebidu figure illustrated by T. A. G. Rao in his book, Vol. I, Pl. XLII) and of Lakuliśa the founder of the Pāśupata sect. Figure 2 in Plate IV shows a Yakṣa, found at Maholi near Mathura and now in the Mathura Museum, who has a band passing round his raised left knee and his projecting belly. Paryaṇkāsana can be understood in the sense of a sitting posture in which both the legs are made to dangle down from whatever type of seat the figure sits on; this type of sitting posture is sometimes curiously described as ‘seated in an European fashion.’ Seated figures of Maitreya in mediaeval Buddhist art are very frequently depicted in the above mode; the figure of Ambikā on the reverse side of some coins of the Chandragupta-Kumāradevi type sits on her lion mount in the above pose (Pl. X, Fig. 8). Vajraparyāṇka, baddhapadmāsana and vajrāsana—all seem to denote the type of sitting attitude, similar to padmāsana. The Tantrasāra describes vajrāsana as that kind of āsana in which the feet are placed on the thighs one upon another with the toes shown upwards and on which the hands are placed (Urvāk pāda u kramānnyaset kṛtrā pratyāṅmulhāṅgulī | Karau nidadhyādākhyātum vajrā- sanamanuttamam). The Vajrayāna sādhanas describe a type of Buddha image known as Vajrāsana Buddha where the god is seated in the above pose with this difference that only his left hand with palm upwards is placed on his lap and the right touches the lotus-seat on which he is seated (bhūsparśamudrā). The oblong seat beneath the Bodhi-tree is also described as Vajrāsana or the diamond throne in Buddhist texts. One of the commonest types of sitting modes is the arddhaparyāṇkāsana, known also as lañītāsana or lañītākṣepa, in which one leg, usually the left leg, is tucked up on the seat, while the right one dangles down along it. Many Brahmānical, Buddhist and Jain deities who are profusely endowed with ornaments are often depicted in this
pose. In the Couch type coins of Chandragupta II, the
king is seated in this graceful pose with his right leg tucked
up on the seat (a couch—paryanka) and the left leg hanging
down.2

The word asana can also mean a seat or even a pedestal;
in the latter sense the word pitha is frequently used. Thus
Padmapitha would indicate the lotus seat on which the
deities are often seated. T. A. G. Rao refers to five
different kinds of such asanas as mentioned in the Suprabheda
gama, viz., anantasana, simhasana, yogasana,
padmasana and vimalasana. ‘According to Chandragnana,
anantasana is a triangular seat, simhasana rectangular,
vimalasana hexagonal, yogasana octagonal and padmasana
round.’ But the manner in which reference is made to these five types of asanas in the above
text proves that these were detached pithas which were
used on particular occasions for seating the image. The
Suprabhedagama writes, ‘anantasana should be used as the
seat for the image when it has to witness amusements,
simhasana when it has to be bathed, yogasana during invocation,
padmasana during the conduct of worship and vimalasana when the offerings are offered.’ Rao describes four types
of asanas or pithas, viz., bhadrapitha (bhadrasana), kurmasana,
pretasana and simhasana. The height of the first is divided into 16 parts, of which one forms the thickness of the upana or the basal layer, four of the jagati or the next higher layer, three of the kumuda, one of the pattika, three of the kanthha, one of the second pattika, two of the broader

1 B. T. Bhattacharya’s description of some dancing types of
images of several Vajrayana deities like Heruka and others as dancing
in the ardhaparyanka pose does not seem to me quite happy; Buddhist Iconography, pp. 61, 63, 67, etc.
2 J. Allan, C.C.G.D.B.M, Pl. VI, Figs. 8, 9,
mahāpatṭika and one of the ghṛtavāri the topmost layer.'" ¹

The bhadrāsana referred to by Varāhamihira in connection with the preliminary consecration (adhivāsa) of an image does not seem to have been such an elaborate āsana or pīṭha; Utpala simply explains the term as rājasana (perhaps he means a royal throne by this term).² According to the Tamil work Saivasaṃayanera, kūṃrāsana is to be made of wood and is to be of oval shape; it should be four aṅgulas high and twelve aṅgulas broad and the face and feet of a tortoise should be shown on it. Pretāsana is really a yogic āsana, in which the whole body lies rigid and motionless like a corpse; but when Cāmuṇḍā, one of the seven mothers (mātrkā) is described as pretāsanā, the iconographers represent her as seated on a dead body. Rao surmises that here 'the Yogic āsana has been materialised into the above curious carcass-scat.' But the association of a dead body with this very terrific aspect of the Devī is certainly not

¹ The Matsyapurāṇa (ch. 262, vv. 1-4) also says that the height of the pīṭha should be divided into 16 parts, of which one part should be buried underground, then the part known as jagati should consist of four parts, above it vṛttā one part, then patāla also one part, above that kāṇṭha three parts, then kāṇṭhapatā two parts, ārdhakṣiṣṭa and pattiṣṭa one part; all the parts of the pīṭha from the jagati to the topmost layer pattiṣṭa should be shown above ground (nirgama). Parallel to the surface of the pattiṣṭa should be made the pranālaka or the outward projecting channel for draining out water poured on the top of the liṅga or arccā which is placed on the pīṭha. In the case of the liṅga, however, its shaft goes through the whole length of the pīṭha along the hole carved in the centre of the latter. The Matsyapurāṇa mentions as many as 10 different kinds of pīṭhas which were used for placing different kinds of deities; these were sthāṇḍilā, vāpi, yakṣī, vedi, maṇḍalā, pūrṇacandra, vajrā, padmā, arddhaśaśi and trikopa. A description of each of these is given next (ch. 262, vv. 13-18).

² Bhūtānāṁhitā, ch. 59, v. 7: Maṇḍapamadhye sthāṇḍilam-upalipyāstiṣṭa śikatājātha kuśaiḥ. | Bhadrāsanakṛtaśirṣopadāhānapādāṁ nyaset pratinām}
curious at all when we know that she is endowed with all that is terrific and hideous in mythology and art; she is described as *piśitāśanā* (carrion-eater), holder of a *khatvāṅga* (the osseous shaft of the forearm capped by a skull) and a fleshless skeleton goddess (*kaṅkāli*). *Śimhāsana* is a four-legged seat usually rectangular in shape; its legs are carved in the shape of four lions, thus laying special stress on its name. Some ancient and mediaeval Buddha figures have been found, below whose seat are carved one or two lions; but this has been explained as symbolising the idea of Gotama Buddha as the lion of the Śākyas (Śākyasimha).

*Sāyuna* or fully recumbent images of Hindu divinities are extremely few and far between. All that are known to me are principally associated with the Viṣṇuite pantheon, though in some late mediaeval and modern Sakti images, such as those of Kālī, Śiva is depicted lying on his back under the feet of the principal deity as in the case of the Muyalaka or Apasmārapuruṣa (personifying the evil of ignorance) wriggling beneath the feet of Śiva Naṭarāja. Again, in some iconographic reliefs (showing a definitely sectarian bias) a god of one sect is sometimes shown lying prone under the feet of a deity belonging to another different sect. Thus, in the Sarabhamūrti of Śiva, Narasimha, *i.e.*, the man-lion incarnation of Viṣṇu is thus shown underneath the curious hybrid form of Śiva as Sarabha; in some Vajrayāna Buddhist images, Gaṅapati the cult deity of one of the five principal Brahmanical cults is also depicted in this attitude in the pedestals of such deities like Parnaśavarī, Aparājitā and others (in this case, Gaṅapati may symbolise the obstacles in the way of the sādhaka, of which he is the remover according to the Hindu mythology, *cf.* his name Vighnāntaka). If we leave them aside, all of which are in the way of subordinate figures, the two principal types of fully recumbent images belonging to the Brahmanical and Buddhist pantheon are those of Śeṣaśayana
of Viṣṇu and the Mahāparinirvāṇamūrti of Buddha. Jalaśāyin and Vaṭapatrasāyin aspects of Viṣṇu, which are ideologically similar to his Seṣaśayananamūrti are also represented in this particular attitude; Jalaśāyin is the same as Seṣaśayana, while the Vaṭapatrasāyin aspect shows the god as an infant lying on a banyan leaf floating in the waters, and sucking one of his big toes. The Seṣaśayana or Anantaśayana depicts the adult god recumbent on the folds of Ādi or Ananta Nāga, the hoods of the latter serving as a canopy over his head; there are several other figures shown round him, the chief among whom is Lakṣmī or Bhūdevī who is shampooing his legs. In the terracotta relief from the brick temple at Bhitargaon (5th century A.D.) and the stone relief from the stone temple at Deogarh (6th century A.D.), the demons Madhu and Kaitabha in a fighting mood are also shown by his side. This type of Viṣṇu image is one of the commonest images enshrined in the main sanctum of the South Indian Vaiṣṇava shrines of some antiquity and importance; there it is specially designated as Raṅganātha or Raṅgaswāmī. Really however, this type is nothing but an elaborate plastic representation of the cosmic god Nārāyaṇa who is one of the components in the cult picture of Bhāgavatism or Vaiṣṇavism, the other principal constituents being Vāsudeva and Viṣṇu. The Manusāṁhitā (I, 10) and the Mahābhārata (XII, 341) record that the waters were called Nārās because they were the sons of Nara and since they were the first resting place of Prajāpati, so he came to be known as Nārāyaṇa.¹ The ideology underlying the

¹ Āpo nārā iti proktā āpo vai naraśūnavah | Tā yadasyāyanam pūrvam tasmānaṁ naraśūnavah smṛtaḥ || The Mahābhārata couplet is in a slightly altered form:—Nivṛttilakṣaṇo dharmasthābhūtyayiko ‘pi ca Narāyaṇāyanaṁ khyātamahamekaḥ sanālanaḥ || Āpo nārā iti proktā āpo vai naraśūnavah | Ayaṁnā mama tatpūrvamato Nārāyaṇōhyaham ||
concept of Nārāyaṇa even goes back to the age of the Ṛgveda where the original principle known as Viśvakarman is described in this manner: ‘That which is beyond the sky, beyond the earth, beyond gods and spirits,—what earliest embryo did the waters contain, in which all the gods were beheld? The waters contained that earliest embryo in which all the gods were collected. One (receptacle) rested upon the navel of the unborn, wherein all beings stood.’

This explanation of the recumbent images of Viśṇu shows the ideological difference that exists between them and the Mahāparinirvāṇa figures of Budḍha. The Anantaśayana-mūrti of Viśṇu sculptured in one of the side niches of the Deogarh temple just referred to is one of the finest presentations of this motif in Indian art. Farnell detected in it a real resemblance with the Stockholm Endymion and Smith endorsed his view; the latter scholar after reproducing both the figures side by side, observed, ‘The peculiar character of the Gupta sculpture seems to me to be undoubtedly derived from Greece. There is no direct copying of Hellenistic models as there was in the Gandhara school, but I feel sure that somehow or other the Gupta artist drank at the fountain of Greek inspiration.’ Smith himself says in the same connection that the Deogarh relief is thoroughly Indian in its theme and treatment, although the artist ‘has felt and understood the European sculptor’s conception of a beautiful pose.’ It should be noted, however, that the resemblance, how far real may be a matter of opinion, exists, only in the placing of the legs in both the figures; a careful scrutiny will show that the head, the attitude of the hands and many other features are entirely different in the two

---

1 R. V., X, 82, 5 and 6; Paro divā para enā prthivyā para devebhūnasarairīyadasti | Kam śudgārhaṇ prathamām dadhra āpo yatra samayacchamta viśve | Ajasya nābhāvadhyakamarpaṇām yasmin-visvāni bhuvanāṇi tosthāḥ u

reliefs. It will be too much to say on the basis of a slight parallelism in the display of legs of two recumbent figures that the sculptor of one of them was indebted for his conception of the recumbent pose and its presentation to that of the other.

I have already referred to several Nṛtyamūrtis of Brahmanical deities like Śiva, Kṛṣṇa and others while explaining the handpose known as dandaḥasta or gajahasta. Of them, those of Śiva are the most variegated and remarkable ones. Śiva, according to the Hindu mythology, is a great master in the art of dancing. In fact nṛtyaśāstra is specially associated with this great god. The Viṣṇudharmottara (Bk. III, ch. 73, vv. 46-8) tells us that Maheśvara represents the science of dancing as the various other sciences like itihāsa (history), dhanurveda (archery), āyurveda (medicine), phalaveda (fruit-culture), pāncarātra (a religious system), pāśupata (another religious system) etc. are represented by Prajāpati, Śatakṛatu (Indra), Dhanvantari, Mahī (the Earth goddess), Saṃkarṣaṇa and Rudra respectively. The Nātyaśāstra of Bharata mentions as many as one hundred and eight modes of dancing and the Saivāgamas also state that Śiva knew the same number of dancing modes. According to the Viṣṇudharmottara (Bk. III, ch. 2, vv. 1-9), the knowledge of iconography depends on the correct understanding of the rules of Cītra (sculpture in the round, relievo and pictorial representations), a true mastery in the latter again is unattainable without a knowledge of the art of dancing which again is supplementary to one’s full acquaintance with the science of music.  

1 Coomaraswamy says, ‘certain of the dance poses possess not merely a general linguistic, but also a special hieratic significance…… Many of the gods are themselves dancers, and, in particular, the everlasting operation of creation, continuance, and destruction—the Eternal Becoming, informed by All-pervading Energy—is marvellously
The 26th chapter of the Book III of the same text deals with names and descriptions of various types of hand postures which are adopted in the different modes of dance (nṛtyahastavasthāvarṇana). These names are:—caturasra, vṛtta, laghumukha, arāla, khaṭakāmukha, ābiddha, vakrasanvyasa(?), recita, arddharectia, avahitthaḥ, palla vita, nitambas, keśabardhanī, latākhyā, karihasta (the same as gajahasta or dandahasta discussed above), pakṣoddyota artha(?)bardhita, garuḍapakṣa, dandapakṣa, ārdhva mandala, pārśramandalaja, pārśvārdhamandala, uromandala, iṣṭavastika, avanī, padmakauśikā, alipallava, uḷvāna, lalita and halita. To the above fairly formidable list will have to be added twenty-two asamyuta and thirteen samyutahastas, the names of some of which are already familiar to us.

I have referred earlier in this chapter to Poduval’s division of the hand poses into two groups, viz., samyuta and asamyuta; our text here names the constituents of each group. The following are the asamyutahastas adopted by one expert in dancing:—pālakā, tripalāka, kartare(mukha, ardhacandra, aṭā(ṛa?)la, guru(sukha)tuṇḍa, muṣṭi, śikhira (should be śikhara), kapittha, khaṭakāmukha, sūcyārdha, padmakoṣa, mṛgaśīrṣa, mṛga, lāṅgula, kālapadma, catura, bhramara, haṃsaśya, haṃsapakṣa, saṃdama and mukula. The thirteen samyutahastas are:—āśjali, kapota, karkaṭa, svastika, khaṭaka, vardhamāna, utsaṅga, niṣidha, dola, puspapuṭa, makara, gajadanta and avahittha (vardhamāna is again mentioned after this, but that would enhance the number to 14). The above list is to a great extent similar to the various nṛtyahastas mentioned in the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata and there seems to be very little doubt that much of it, if not all, was borrowed from the same work. The names

represented in the dance of Śiva. He also exhibits dances of triumph and destruction.’ Coomaraswamy and Gopālakrishnāyya, op. cit., 24-25.
of some of these hand poses were also used in the denomination of several of the dancing modes which are described in detail in Bharata’s work. The great temple of Śiva-Naṭarāja at Chidamvaram contained systematic illustrations of these interesting dance poses and the artists appended fully descriptive labels to each.¹ But these sculptures mainly carved on the walls flanking the passages in the great gopurams of the temple are comparatively late—none of them dating from a period further back than the 13th century A.D.; again the reliefs illustrating the karaṇas are mainly those of danseuse. The principal image of Śiva in the main sanctum of the temple, however, depicts him ‘dancing his cosmic dance, the right foot trampling down Müyaḷaka, the left raised in the kuṇcītapāda with one right hand sounding the cosmic drum, the other in the abhayahasta, with one left hand holding the fire and the other in danḍahasta pose.’² Numerous bronze replicas of the same type of dancing Śiva are found in

¹ The inscribed dance sculptures in the temple were first noticed at some length in the Madras Epigraphical Report for 1914; but the account was not fully comprehensive. V. N. Naidu, S. Naidu and V. R. Pantulu, in their joint work on Tāṇḍava Laksanaṁ, published in 1936 by G. S. Press, Mount Road, Madras, have carefully collected much valuable information about them and have reproduced the 4th chapter entitled Tāṇḍavalaksanaṁ of Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra, with its English translation, side by side. Their reproduction of the photographs of the karaṇas with the English translation of the descriptive inscriptions, as well as the glossary explaining the highly technical terms furnished by them is extremely useful.

² The Aṃṣumadbhedāgama and Uttarākāmkāgama give a full description of this dance pose. The former names it as the first kind of dance and describes eight different other modes, though it says that in all there are 108 different kinds. The latter calls the Naṭariṇja dance as bhujāngatārāsa; but the bhujāngatrāsita, karaṇa No. 24 in the list of 108 dances in the Tāṇḍavalaksana chapter of Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra, is somewhat different.
Southern India, but most of them belong to the 14th or 15th century A.D. or even later. Much earlier figures of Siva dancing in various ways have been found in the Brahmanical cave shrines at Ellora and T. A. G. Rao has rendered useful service to students of iconography by recognising in them two of the karaṇas or dance poses described in detail in Bharata’s work. Plates LXII and LXIII in his 2nd volume are reproductions of two Ellora panels which illustrate the kaṭisama and lalita mode of dances as described by Bharata. Several other South Indian bronze and stone figures of Siva, of the mediaeval period, reproduced by him portray other dance poses such as lalāṭa-tilaka, catura and talasamsphoṭita as delineated in the Nāṭyaśāstra. Siva dancing in the catura mode has been recognised as early as in a relief at Badami. The mediaeval dancing images of Siva that have been found in Eastern India usually show him ten-armed and dancing vigorously on the back of his mount Nandin; this fits well with the Matsyapurāṇa passage which says that the god endowed with ten arms and wielding elephant hyde should be shown dancing on his bull mount (281, 10-11: Vaiśākha- sthānakaṁ kṛtvā uṇtyābhinayasyaṁsthitaṁ | Nṛtyan daśa- bhujāh kāryyo gajacarmacarastathā). In much earlier Indian art, especially the central Indian art of the Suna period, many reliefs depict male and female dancers; Pl. II, Fig. 23, depicts two of the four dancing apsaras in the scene of Māra’s defeat (with none of the karaṇas in the Tāṇḍava-akṣaṇam could I fully identify these two dance types). But, for the earliest Indian representation of dancing posture we shall have to go back to the prehistoric art of the Indus valley. Several female figurines—bronze and terracotta ones—have been discovered at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa, which have been explained by Marshall and others as dancers. But the most interesting discovery, in this connection, is that of a mutilated figure
of dark grey slate at Harappa, which has been described by Marshall as the statue of a male danseuse. The pose of the dancer is full of movement and swing; he stands on his right leg with the body from the waist upwards bent well round to the left, both arms thrown out in the same direction, and the left leg raised high in front. Marshall says, 'Although its contours are soft and effeminate, the figure is that of a male and it seems likely that it was ithyphallic, since the membrum virile was in a separate piece. I infer, too, from the abnormal thickness of the neck, that the dancer was three-headed or at any rate three-faced and I conjecture that he may represent youthful Śiva Nāṭarāja. On the other hand, it is possible that the head was that of an animal.' Whichever suggestion of Marshall be correct, it appears that this is one of the earliest cult-objects depicted in the attitude of dancing.

Another mode in which certain figures were depicted in the iconographic art of ancient and mediaeval India is the flying one. It is usually adopted in the representation of the garland-bearing and flower-throwing attendants or accessories of the principal sectarian deity or his emblem. The early Buddhist monuments of Bharhut, Sanchi and Amaravati, etc., and the Jaina caves of Udayagiri and Khandagiri near Bhubaneswar (Orissa) contain many such figures. They are usually divided into two main groups by the artists; one group are hybrid in appearance, their upper half being human with wings attached to the shoulders, their lower half being bird-like, while the others are entirely human even without the appendage of wings. According to iconographic terminology, the former are the Gandharvas, the latter being the Vidyādharas. The early Mathura artists make frequent use of these two types and their

tendency to differentiate between them is clear. 1 Fig 9 in Pl. IV is based on one of the Vidyādharas shown hovering in the sky with flower basket in his right hand, carved on the top part of the prabhāvali of the Katra Buddha. There are no wings and the artist has in a very characteristic manner suggested the flying attitude. By the Hellenistic craftsmen of Gandhara also the garland bearing cherubim and male and female flying figures were frequently employed. The indigenous artists of the Gupta period made occasional use of flying couples of Vidyādharas, sometimes the male ones carrying swords in their hands (cf. M.A.S.I., No. 25, Pl. XV, Fig. a); but the hybrid flying figures were not discontinued. The Viṣṇudharmottara (Bk. III, ch. 42, vv. 9-10) describes this mode of representing the Vidyādha couple in the following manner: Rudrapramānāḥ kartavyāstathā vidyādharā nyapagatā kāryā mālyālaṅkāradhārīṇāḥ || Khaḍga-

The sculptors of the mediæval period introduce a new canon in their usage of these motifs. They not only retain the use of both the variants, viz., the Vidyādharas and the Gandharvas, but allot well-marked position to both in their comprehensive scheme of the decorated stela (prabhāvali). The hybrid couples, not now in the usual flying pose, are shown playing on musical instruments just above the makara motif on either side of the central figure, while the entirely human garland-bearing figures, sometimes singly and at other times with their consorts borne on their legs, are shown hovering on either side of the kīrttimukha. The Mānasāra (p. 370, vv. 7-9) describes the Vidyādharas and probably also their

1 V. A. Smith, 'Jaina Stupa and other antiquities of Mathura,' Pl. XVI, Fig. 1. Two flying figurines are depicted side by side, the one to the left with its mutilated face is purely human while the other is a mixed being. Smith says about the former, 'The mutilated male figure to the left of the umbrella seems to be intended for a Gandharva.'
flying posture in this manner: Purataḥ pṛṣṭhapādau ca 
lāṅgalākārāveva ca | Jānvāśritau hastau gopuroddhṛta-
hastakau || Evaṁ vidyādharāḥ proktāḥ sarvāharaṇa-
bhūṣitāḥ | The second of the above three lines, especially its 
last part is difficult of interpretation (probably there is some 
mistake here in the text), while the meaning of the third 
line is quite clear. The first line most probably describes 
the flying pose in a very characteristic way; it means ‘with 
ploughshare-like legs (shown) in front of the back.’ This 
appears to be a very significant mode of describing the flying 
pose which is depicted in the late Gupta and mediaeval 
reliefs by the legs flexed backwards near the knees, the feet 
resembling the handle of the plough and the knees, the 
metal ploughshare itself. The Mānasāra describes the 
Gandharvas, after the manner of their representation in 
mediaeval art, as being not in the flying posture but either 
dancing or standing and playing on musical instruments; 
but their hybrid character is emphasised. ¹ On rare 
occasions, more important divinities are also represented as 
flying in the sky. Thus, the top section of the relief 
showing the Anantaśayana Viṣṇu in the Deogarh temple, 
already referred to, shows divinities like Hara-Pārvatī, 
Indra and Kārttikeya flying in the air; they are seated on 
their respective mounts which, as their tensely strained legs 
and bodies show, are soaring through space.

Reference in passim may now be made to the conven-
tional representation of the clouds in early and mediaeval 
Indian art, in order to indicate the firmament through 
which the above figures fly. In the Kushan and early 
Gupta stone reliefs, the sky is hardly indicated on their

¹ Mānasāra, p. 370, vv. 9-10: Nṛtyaṁ vā rvaṇaṁ vṛpi
vaiśākhaṁ sthānakaṁ tu vā || Gita-vṛṇā-vidhānatīca gandharvaśce 
kathyate | Curaṇam paśusamānaṁ cordhuvakyaṁ tu narāham= 
Vadanaṁ garudabhāvanā bāhukau ca pakṣayuktau |
background. On early Kushan coins, however, especially on some of the coins of Wema Kadphises and Huvishka, the imperial busts are shown as rising from the clouds. The clouds are suggested by uneven clots or dots clustering together below the bust and as the Kushan kings claimed to be the sons of heaven, they could very appropriately use such as well as other devices such as fire issuing from the shoulders, halo encircling their heads, etc., in their busts on the coins (cf. Gardner, B.M.C.G.S.I., pp. 124-25, Pl. XXV, Figs. 6-9, Pl. XXVII, Figs. 8-11, 13, 14 etc.). On a fragmentary stone relief in the Gandhara room of the Indian Museum, probably depicting the Śyāma Jātaka, the antarikṣa region is indicated not only by the round disc of the moon on its top section, but also by blotches of stone in an undulating roll suggestive of clouds (cf. N. G. Majumdar, A Guide to the Gandhara Sculptures in the Indian Museum, Part II, p. 107). In the early and late medieval art, however, a distinct layer of logenze-shaped stone with wavy or undulating sides serves as the background of the garland-bearers on the top corners of the prabhāvalī; it is by this device that the artists wanted to indicate the sky full of wavy clouds.

The Hindus from the very early times were excessively fond of displaying ornaments in the images of their gods and goddesses. Most part of the body—the head, the ears, the nose, the neck, the breasts, the upper and lower arms, the palms and fingers, the torso, the waist, the hip, the ankles, the feet—had their various appropriate ornaments. Grünwedel long ago observed this innate feature of the Indian iconographic art and remarked, ‘The heroic form of Indian sculptured figures has been, and at all times remained the same,—they are decked as for gala occasions. This form has been preserved with unalterable tenacity through the whole history of Indian art, and even in neighbouring countries’ (Buddhist Art, p. 31).
principal cult images of some creeds like Buddhism and Jainism, heterodox from the Brahmanical Hindu point of view, no doubt were free from this peculiar feature; but the ornaments which could not be shown in their case were bestowed with greater zeal on the images of most of the subordinate deities like the Bodhisattvas and the Śāsanadevātās. Of all the important types of the male Bodhisattvas, only one, viz., Śīnhanāda Lokeśvara, is known to be without any ornaments (nirbhāṣaṇa); but the above peculiarity of this variety of Avalokiteśvara can only be explained on the basis of his ideological affinity with Śiva whose anthropomorphic form is usually least endowed with ornaments. Even the very images of Buddha himself of the mediæval period—especially in Eastern India, were sometimes endowed with jewelled crown (kīrīṭa) and an elaborately designed torque.¹ Even the images of deities shown in the Yogic postures such as the yoga varieties of Viṣṇu and the Yoga-Dakṣiṇāmūrti of Śiva are decorated with ornaments, though their number may not be as many as in the other types of images (in the case of some Śiva figures, these are shown as made of rudrākṣa, a kind of seed).² The Indian practice of endowing even the dhyāna-yoga images of deities with ornaments goes back to the period of the Indus valley culture; the prototype of Śiva-Paśupati on the seals is decorated with a number of bracelets, armlets, torques or a pectoral-like thing and a horned crown. This frequent and excessive display of ornaments on the images of their divi-

¹ N. G. Majumdar would recognise the Ādi-Buddha in them (V. R. S.: Ann. Rep., 1926-7, Mus. Notes, pp. 7-10 & Figs. 4-6. But Coomaraswamy has disputed this suggestion and described them simply as the ‘Crowned Buddha’; J. R. A. S., 1928, p. 837.

² The two figures of Nara and Nārāyaṇa on one of the side niches of Deogarh temple are shown as two sages wearing no ornaments on their body; cf. T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. II, Pl. LXXI. Rao wrongly describes them as Jñāna and Yoga Dakṣiṇāmūrtis of Śiva.
nities by the Indians had an effect on the modelling of the human figure from the artistic point of view. Grünwedel has observed that 'the ornament, in the painfully careful execution it received, hindered very considerably the development of the human figure, since it always retained the conventional type for the forms' (op. cit., p. 31). It must be said, however, that unlike the Greek artists the Indians were not in the habit of emphasising the muscles on the body; thus, though the ornaments no doubt arrested the outline of the physical form being freely displayed, still the effect was not as harmful as could otherwise be feared. Thus, the same scholar's remark that 'the shoulders loaded with broad chains, the arms and legs covered with metal ring, the bodies encircled with richly linked girdles, could never have attained an anatomically correct form' should be accepted with some modification.

It will be necessary now to describe some typical ornaments which are commonly displayed on the different limbs of the divine image. There is no doubt that these were worn by the people themselves for whose religious use the images were made. The various types of head-gear have been grouped by the author of the Mānasāra under the general term mauli, which according to him, are subdivided into jaṭāmakūṭa, kirītāmakūṭa, karaṇāmakūṭa, śirāstraka, kuntala, keśabandha, dhammilla and alaka-cūḍaka. It may be seen that in the above list the 2nd, 3rd and 4th denote different types of crowns, while the rest so many different modes of dressing the hair. The jaṭāmakūṭa specially enjoined to be depicted on the heads of Brahmā, Rudra and Manomāṇi consists of matted locks of hair done up into the form of a tall crown on the centre of the head; it is sometimes adorned with jewels, crescent and a skull, the two latter being used in the case of those worn by Rudra-Siva. One of the names of Rudra-Siva is Kaparaddī which means 'one whose matted locks wave spirally upward like the top
of a shell' (certain Buddha figures of the Saka-Kushan period at Mathura show this type of *kapardda jaṭā-makuta* on their head; cf. the Katra Buddha, sketched in Fig. 5, Pl. III). Several types of this variety of head-gear are reproduced by T. A. G. Rao in his book, Vol. I, Pl. VII and Pl. IX; those in the 2nd plate have been described by him as *jaṭābandha* or *jaṭābalaga* and *jaṭābhāra*.\(^1\) *Kirīṭamakuta*, specially appropriate for Nārāyana, according to the *Mānasāra*, 'is a conical cap sometimes ending in an ornamental top carrying a central pointed knob' (Rao). This type of head-gear was not worn, however, exclusively by the god Nārāyana-Visṇu; it could also be worn by Śūrya and Kubera. Varāhamihira not only describes Viṣṇu as *Kuṇḍalakirīṭadhāri* (wearing ear-rings and *kirīṭa* crown), but also says that Ravi should be wearing a *mukula* (*mukulaḍadhāri*) and Kubera should be *vāma-kirīṭī*, *i.e.*, the *kirīṭa* should be placed slantingly on the left side of his head.\(^2\) Figure 8 in Plate IV shows the outline of a *kirīṭa-makuta*; it is the so-called basket-like head-dress worn by Sakra in the Hellenistic art of Gandhara an early variant of the former (Pl. IV, Fig. 7)? *Karanḍamakuta* is shaped like a basket held upside down, the basket having the form of a reversed cone, broad at its mouth and narrow at its bottom. This is the type of crown particular to most of the other gods and the goddesses and is indicative of subordination in status according to Rao. *Śirastraka* (*śirastrāṇa*) is an elaborate turban which is so frequently shown on the heads of the Yakṣas, Nāgas, Vidyādharas and other male figures depicted

\(^1\) Rao quotes some extracts from *Uttarakāmikāyana*, describing the *uṣṇīṣa* in which the *jaṭāmakuṭa* is included; but, as he says, the description is somewhat unintelligible (Vol. I, pp. 27-28).

\(^2\) *Bṛhatānanda*, ch. 57, vv. 32, 47, 57; according to Upala, *mukuṭa*, *mauli* and *kirīṭa* are used in the same sense. The extant images show that in most cases there is very little difference between the crown worn by Viṣṇu and that worn by Śūrya.
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in the early Indian art of the Sunga period. The figure of Siva on the Sirkap seal seems also to wear this elaborate turban (Pl. VIII, Fig. 3); the type of head-gear shown on the head of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu on the Kushan seal (Pl. VIII, Fig. 4) is a very interesting one which cannot be named with precision. Kuntala, kesabandha, dharmilla and alaka-cudaka are, as has been said above, different modes of dressing the hair. These are appropriate to particular goddesses, according to Mānasāra; thus, the first is shown on the head of Indirā (Lakṣmī), the first and second on those of Sarasvatī and Sāvitri. The third and fourth are not mentioned in association with any goddess, but the former is recommended for the wives of such subordinate rulers like Maṇḍalikas and the latter ‘for the women who carry torches before a king and the wives of the king’s sword-bearers and shield-bearers.’

A mode of dressing the hair which was being used by the Eastern Indian artists in the representation of youthful Kṛṣṇa and other divinities from the late Gupta period onwards has been described by some archaeologists as kākapakṣa which is explained in the lexicons as ‘matakapārśvadvaye kesaramanaviveśah’ i.e., a type of arranging the hair on the two sides of the head (for illustration of this mode on some figures of Kṛṣṇa at Paharpur, cf., M.A S.I, No. 55, Pl. XXVIII). In the Hellenistic art of Gandhara, different modes of dressing the hair are shown by the artists on the heads of Avalokiteśvara and Maitreya; the former has his hair tastefully arranged

1 T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 26-30. The Mānasāra (P. K. Acarya’s edition, p. 314) lays down that kiriṭa is to be worn by a sārvabhauma, i.e., the ruler ‘whose rule extends to the shores of the four bounding oceans’ and by an adhirāja. i.e., one holding sway over seven provinces; kararṇḍamakuṭa is to be worn by a narendra, i.e., one ruling over three provinces, or sometimes even by a cakravartin (here evidently a ruler of a lesser dignity than a sārvabhauma).
upwards with jewelled bands encircling it, while the latter has long hair tied sideways in a double knot just on the centre of the cranium. Spooner has referred to the later Buddhist texts in general which speak of different hair arrangements for different Bodhisattvas (A.S.I.A.R., 1906-07, p. 116). In some late Gandhara and most of the Gupta and post-Gupta Buddha images, the hair is arranged schematically in separate short curls, each curl turning from left to right (dakṣiṇāvartakesa, a mahāpurusālakṣaṇa). The so-called cranial bump on the head of Buddha images of early and late periods, wrongly described as uṣṇīṣa, the first of the 32 mahāpurusālakṣaṇas, is, as has been shown by me elsewhere, nothing but the plastic form of hair done up in a top-knot in the centre of the head (I.H.Q., 1931, pp. 499-514 & pls.). In the latest issue of J. I. S. O. A. (Vol. VIII, 1940), Moti Chandra has collected a lot of information about 'cosmetics and coiffure in ancient India' and has illustrated his elaborate article with very useful drawings (pp. 62-144).

The custom of perforating the ear-lobes and cars for the insertion of various types of ear ornaments is a very old one in India and it is still current mainly among the women here though in a much restricted manner; but in ancient and mediaeval times it was common to both men and women. The ceremony of karṇabedha (perforation of the ear) is one of the important samskāras in the life of a twice-born and wearing of kundalas was once regarded as one of the privileges of a brahmaśārin (student initiate) as also of a gṛhaśtha (householder). The physical peculiarity of long and distended ears and earlobes, which was the direct outcome of the wearing of heavy and broad ear-ornaments, came to be regarded as a sign of beauty and greatness (cf. prthukarṇatā as one of the signs of greatness in men). The long and distended ear-lobes of the figures of Buddha belonging to different periods and localities in India
also emphasise this peculiar custom. Different kinds of ear-rings (kundalas) are shown on the ears of different types of divinities. Rao refers to five kinds of ear-ornaments, viz., patra-kundala, nakra-kundala, saṅkhapatra-kundala, ratna-kundala and sarpa-kundala. Their very names indicate that they were made of cones of cocoanut or palmyra-leaves or even thin gold leaves, (metal, ivory or wooden piece) in the shape of the mythical makara, cut sections of conch-shells, jewels, and (metal, ivory or wooden piece) fashioned like a cobra, respectively. Siva and sometimes Gaṇapatī are adorned with sarpa-kundalas, the patra and saṅkhapatra-kundalas are usually shown on the ears of the goddesses like Umā and others, while nakra-kundala and ratna-kundala can with equal appropriateness be used to decorate the ears of the divinities of both sex. Varāhamihira describes Viṣṇu, Sūrya and Baladeva as kirītakundaladāhi, kundalabhūṣitadvadana and bibhrat kundalamakam, respectively. The ornament on the nose is known by the name of vesara (not a Sanskrit word) and is not to be found in early Indian images; in late figures of youthful Kṛṣṇa and goddesses like Rādhikā and her attendants, this ornament and its variants sometimes appear. Various kinds of ornaments were and are still used to decorate the neck, their names being niśka, hāra, graivcyaaka, etc. The earliest form of neck ornaments is to be found in the representations of Siva-Paśupati’s prototype in Mohenjo-daro and Harappa, and it seems that the pectoral-like object hanging from the neck and adorning the breasts is really nothing but a concentric row of neck-chains or torques. In the 33rd hymn of the Ṛgveda, Rudra is described as wearing a beautiful niśka; in many other passages of the same as well as in other Vedic texts niśka is mentioned. Niśka in most of the passages signifies neck-ornaments (necklace torque, etc.), and it was first suggested by E. Thomas on
the authority of the *Rgveda* passage that the term there meant a necklace made up of *nīśka* coins.\(^1\) *Hāra* also means a torque or a necklace and various types of it were current in ancient and mediaval India, as the neck ornaments of the images show. Sūrya is expressly described by Varāhamihira as *pralambahārī* (with a long torque hanging from his neck) and Hara (*Śiva*) is described in iconographic texts as 'loaded with the weight of *hāras*’ (*hārabhārārpito Harah*). Another term which is used to denote the broad necklaces in Sanskrit literature is *graiveyaka* which almost invariably adorns the neck and breasts of the Yakṣṇī and other figures in Central Indian art. In many cases these necklaces are adorned with jewel-pendants and the jewel *par excellence* adorning the breasts of Viṣṇu is *kaustubha* (*Viṣṇu* is described by Varāhamihira as *kaustubhamanibhūṣitoraska*).\(^2\) The long necklace or garland hanging down from the neck below the knees, known as *vaijayantī* (also sometimes loosely called *canamālā*) is peculiar to Viṣṇu; according to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, it is.

---

1. E. W. Thomas, *Ancient Indian Weights*, p. 35. D.R. Bhandarkar in his *Carmichael Lectures* (1921) further pursued the idea and suggested that in some context, *nīśka* meant gold coins, while in others necklace made of coins (pp. 65-69); S. K. Chakravarti, however, suggests that the word always means a necklace (*Studies in Ancient Indian Numismatics*, p. 22ff.).

2. The breasts of Viṣṇu, Buddha and the Jinas are also characterised by the *śrivatsa mark*. *Śrivatsa* is a sort of hairy mole, one of the *mahāpurasalakṣayus*; Utpala explains it as a ‘*romāvara*.’ Rao says, *In sculpture this mode is represented by a flower of four petals arranged in the form of a rhombus, or by a simple equilateral triangle, and is invariably placed on the right side of the chest.’ In not many mediaval Viṣṇu figures of the northern and eastern India, I could recognise this mark. In Chapter V of this book, I have referred to a symbol and its variants frequently to be found on the seals of the Gupta period as probably representing the *śrivatsa mark*; *cf.*, Pl. II, Fig. 11 and 12.
five-formed for it is made up of five different gems, *viz.*, the emerald, pearl, blue stone (*nīla*), ruby and diamond, which are associated with the five elements. The *yajñopavīta* or the sacred thread which is invariably to be worn by the male members of the twice-born is found on the images of the gods from the Gupta period onwards; in the earlier images it seems to be absent. In mediæval sculptures, what appears to be the representation of a jewelled *yajñopavīta* sometimes accompanies that of the cotton one; all this of course is placed in the *upavītī* fashion, *i.e.*, it encircles the torso from the top of the left shoulder and below the right arm. Sometimes the skin of an antelope (*kṛṣṇasāra*) is thrown over the body of such deities like Nāra and Nārāyaṇa (*cf.* the Deogarh relief).

*Channavīra*, according to Rao, is 'a kind of flat ornament, a kind of jewelled disc, meant to be tied on the *makuḷa* or hung round the neck by a string so as to lie over the chest.' But Rao is not quite sure about his explanation; the ornament is mentioned very often in the iconographic texts. An ornament made of two chain-like objects worn crosswise on the torso, one in the *upavītī* and the other in the *prācinā-vītī* fashion (the latter is just the reverse of *upavītī*) with a flat disc placed on their junction near the centre of the chest, may illustrate *channavīra*; this is sometimes found on some late South-Indian sculptures of Viṣṇu or his incarnary forms (*cf.* Rao, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Pl. LV, Figs. of Rāma and Lākṣmaṇa) and other images. Curiously enough, I have seen similar ornaments decorating the torso of a few figures in the Taxila museum. The Besnagar Yakṣīṇī seems to be adorned with this ornament (*cf.* also similar ornament on the figure of Culakokā devatā in a Bharhut pillar; many other such examples can be shown). Two other ornaments of the torso are the *kucabandha* and the *udarabandha*; their names signify the purpose for which they were used. Both of them are flat bands, the former to keep the breasts
in position and the latter, the protruding belly. *Kucabandha* is only used in female figures and not even in all of them; Rao has observed that when a deity like Viṣṇu or Subrahmanya is depicted with two consorts, one on either side, the one on the right of the god is only adorned with this ornament or dress. His explanation that 'this peculiarity is perhaps connected with the right hand manner of worshipping the *devī* ' is not at all convincing. *Udarabandha* is shown in many male figures and it reminds us of the band going round the top of the protruding stomach of so many early representations of the Yakṣa figures (cf. the Parkham and other Yakṣa figures). The waist and hip of both the male and the female figures are tastefully decorated with several kinds of jewelled ornaments like *kaṭibandha* (waist-band), *mekhalā* (girdle), *kāncidāma* (a girdle furnished with small tinkling bells held down in chains and arranged in rows), etc. Various types of such ornaments are met with in ancient, mediæval and modern Indian art; I can draw the attention of my readers to such ornaments on the Besnagar and the Diadarganj Yakṣinī figures. In mediæval reliefs, both of the north and south, they are far more elaborate than on the above. Mention of *avyaṅga*, the waist-girdle peculiar to the Sun images of the north should be made in this connection. *tī* is based on the Avestan *āvīvyuonghana*, the sacred woollen thread girdle which a Zoroastrian is enjoined to wear round the waist. Round anklets in rows decorate the ankles mostly of the female figures from the early reliefs onwards, while the upper surface of the feet of the female figures and sometimes of the male figures also is decorated with an ornament elliptical in shape, known as *mañjīra*.

Many and various are the ornaments which are depicted as adorning the upper and lower arms of the deities. The earliest representation of such ornaments is to be found on the prototype of Śiva-Paśupati at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa and the many sculptures and terracotta figurines of the
Maurya, Suṅga and later periods portray various types of them. The names which are used in iconographic and general Sanskrit texts are such as kaṅkana, valaya, keyūra, aṅgada, etc.; the first two are worn on the lower and the last two on the upper arm. 'Keyūra is a flat ornament worn on the arm just over the biceps muscle, the kaṅkana or the bracelet is worn at the wrist' (Rao). Sometimes the amulets were adorned with plaques containing interesting devices; one such is described by Vögel, worn by a seated Bodhisattva figure in the Mathura museum, as 'embellished with plaques on which we observe a human figure riding on a conventional bird, probably a tāruḍa or a peacock.'¹ The palms and fingers are sometimes adorned with ornaments, the former with small round discs held in the centre inside of it with two chains crossing at its back and the latter with rings (cf. Fig. 87 in Pl. XXIII of Coomaraswamy's H.I.I..1).

The early Indian artists attained much success in the treatment of the drapery which, in the case of male figures, is made up of a loin-cloth (dhōti) whose folds are very tastefully arranged in parallel rows in the early and mediæval period and a long scarf thrown loosely on the upper part of the body. In the early figures of the Maurya-Suṅga period and even sometimes afterwards, the excess of the long loin-cloth is gathered together and shown hanging in a long tapering fold or folds in front. This form is common to both the male and the female figures (cf. the figures of Parkham Yakṣa and Besnagar Yakṣinī, shown side by side in H.I.I.A., Pl. III, Figs. 8 and 9). Thus there is not much difference in the dressing of male and female figures in early

¹ M.M.C., p. 58, Pl. X. The broad necklace displayed on the figure is also interesting; it is fastened with buckles in the shape of animal-heads. It is also adorned with a string of amulet-holders, commonly found on the Bodhisatvas of Gandhara, worn in the upaviti fashion.
Indian art, especially in the lower part of the body. But the long scarf shown on the upper half of the male figures is usually absent in the female, the upper part of the latter remaining always uncovered. The torso of the male body is also shown bare (excepting the scarf mentioned above), the modern jacket like garment (āṅgiyā, āṅgrākhā) being nowhere present. It is in the types of figures, undoubtedly representing people foreign to India, a few of which are met with in the early art of Sanchi and Bharhut, that we find the close covering of the whole of the body, from the neck to the feet. This is one way of representing the udīyarvāsa named by the authors of the iconographic texts while describing such figures as Sūrya, Citragupta and Dhanada (cf. Hemādri's Caturvargacintāmani, Bibliotheca Indica Edition, Vratakanḍa, Vol. II, pp. 145-46); Varāhamihira characterises it fully as gudhanī pāḍādura yāvat in his description of the Sūrya figures. In the earlier extant images of Sūrya, the costume he is depicted as wearing is exactly similar to the dress worn by the Kushan kings like Wema Kadphises and Kanishka (cf. the sculptural and numismatic representations of these kings with the Sūrya relief at Bhumara). The mode of presentation of the costume changes in the later sculptures and varies most in details according to the different localities to which they belong. On some late mediæval figures, great care is bestowed by the artist on the carving of the garment; thus, the sārī,

1 The figure on the Bharhut pillar inscribed Bhadaṃtasa mahiḷasa thabo dānaṃ, in the Indian Museum, as also the figures riding on winged lions in the eastern gateway at Sanchi are shown in this costume. cf. Barua, Bharhut, Vol III, Pl. LXII and Grünwedel, Buddhist Art, p. 34, Fig. 10. It is curious that the heads of two of these figures are encircled by a band tied in a loop behind with its two loose ends floating downwards; this is very much similar to the diadems worn by the Greek kings on their heads.
i.e., the cloth worn by women, which is shown round the body of the figure of Pārvatī, one of the Pārvadēvasas (deities shown on the side niches) of the Liṅgaraja temple at Bhuvanesvar, Orissa, is an example of such extreme care. A few remarks about the dress shown on the body of the Buddha figures will not be out of place here; this is the dress of a Buddhist monk. It is made up of three pieces, viz., the lower garment (antaravāsaka) which hangs down to the ankles and is gathered round the loins with a girdle; secondly, the upper garment (uttarāsaṅga) which covers the breast and shoulders and reaches below the knees; and thirdly the cloak (saṅghāṭi), worn over the two under-garments (M.M.C., p. 35). Of these three pieces, the last is most prominently displayed in sculptures, though the artist does seldom fail to suggest one or other of the under-garments. Grünwedel and after him Vögel suggest that the treatment of the drapery was entirely derived from classical art. This is acceptable to a certain extent, though the motif represented, as Vögel himself suggests, is entirely Indian. But the remark of the latter scholar that ‘the indication of the drapery is indeed foreign to Indian art’ (ibid, p. 35) does not bear scrutiny. In its support he has compared the presentation of the drapery on the Buddha images of Gandhara and Mathura with the same on those of the Gupta period and of the mediaeval period. But as I have just shown the Central Indian artists of the pre-Christian period indicate the garments worn in those days in diverse ways, and in many figures of the Gupta and mediaeval period, dress is characteristically represented with great care. The diaphanousness of the drapery on the Buddha figures of Sarnath and afterwards is very effectively suggested by the artists and it certainly does not testify to their inability in indicating the garments. This brings us to the question of the representation of nudity in Indian art. The Greek sculptures, in the figures of the athletes
and the mythological beings very often went in for the representation of the nude human body; in this they had the free scope to reveal the beauty of the physical form. But this in itself seems hardly to have been the aim and intention of the Indian artists; whenever rarely they represented the uncovered body, they were either actuated by a purpose of making the nudity repugnant to cultured taste or by mythological requirements. Thus, some of the Mathura Yakṣiṇīs who appear to be nude or just about to divest themselves of their garments (most of these Yakṣiṇīs are not depicted nude at all, but are presented by the artists as clothed in the most transparent of garments), or the nude female figures in the medieval art of Orissa and central India emphasise the carnal character of nakedness. Mythology again necessitated the representation of nude body, where, however, the voluptuous element was entirely absent; we may refer, for instance, to the figure of a Jina or a Tīrthankara of the Digambara Jaina creed or of a Bhikṣā-ḍaprakāsa of Śiva. Again the idea which underlies the representation of the nude mother goddess found in India from the earliest times onwards is much the same as is evident in the so many realistic phalli, ring-stones of prehistoric India and Śiva-liṅgas of the historic period. But attempts to symbolise and sanctify the principles of virility and fecundity were not peculiar to India alone and many other nations of the world did the same thing in diverse ways.¹

Two other characteristic features of the Indian images in general, which require some notice here, are the śīraścākra and the prabhāvalī. The former represents the halo-circle round the head, corresponding to the Greek nimbus while the latter the same round the whole of the divine body, really serving the purpose of the stela or the back-slab.

¹ Cf. Hartland's article on 'Phallicism' in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics; Wall, Sex and Sex Worship, etc.
Grünwedel remarks about the halo round the Buddha heads of Gandhara that 'the nimbus is borrowed from the Greek school, yet it appeared very late in Greek art—in the time of Alexander' (Buddhist Art, p. 86). But originally it belonged only to the astral divinities. Coomaraswamy has suggested, however, that 'the disk of gold placed behind the fire altar to represent the Sun may well be the origin of the later prabhāmaṇḍala or śiraścakra (nimbus)'1 In Gandhara it is almost invariably plain; in the Saka-Kushan art of Mathura it shows a scalloped border, while in the Gupta period though retaining this feature, it is endowed with more ornamentation. But several images of the Hindu divinities in the Gupta period are represented with comparatively plain nimbus. In the mediæval sculptures different types of śiraścakra are used to decorate the figures, the commonest of them taking the shape of a lotus flower in full blossom; another common variety is parabolic in shape, with two concentric layers of gable decorations at its outer end. Varāhamihira describes the image of Sūrya as having a prabhāmaṇḍala shining with jewels (ratnōjjvalaprabhāmaṇḍalaśca). Rao says that the śiraścakra 'should have the form of a circle or a full-blown lotus, eleven aṅgulas in diameter, and should be away from the head by a distance equal to a third of its diameter. This halo-circle is attached to the back of the head of images by means of a rod whose thickness is equal to one-seventh of the diameter of the śiraścakra.' But the description is more appropriate in the case of bronze images

1 H.I.I.A., p. 41. He supports his suggestion by saying 'Just as the tree behind the empty altar or throne, representing Buddha in the early art, remains in the later art when the throne is occupied, so the sun-disc behind the fire-altar may well have remained there when the deity was first made visible.' He remarks further, 'It is hard to believe that the nimbus can have originated outside the classic area of sun-worship. It may be of Iranian origin, or of Indian origin;' ibid, p. 57, fn. 1.
than in the case of wooden or stone ones. The mediæval bronze Viṣṇu images from Rungpur, first noticed by D. B. Spooner in the *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey* for the year 1911-12 (pp. 152-58, Pls. LXX, LXXI), show separate prabhāmaṇḍalas attached to their heads. The stone or wooden images do not show this separate piece and the nimbus is carved on the back of their heads in the same piece. The prabhāvali is an ornamental decoration, usually elliptical in shape, shown behind the whole body of the image; it is sometimes endowed with a number of jvalās or projecting tongues of flame. This is really the background or the original slab on which the image is carved in very high relief. The usual relievo-character of the Indian sculptures and their necessary dependence on architectural art have been traced by Grünwedel to the ancient Indian style of carving in wood. The scholar's remarks about the Buddhist sculptures are very well applicable to many images belonging to the other creeds. He says, 'even when figures are executed alone they are never represented without an aureole, never without attendant accessory figures, and never without a wall behind to form a solid background to the figure. This fact bears a certain relation to the Indian conception of the universe—the constant merging of historical persons in a system....' (*Buddhist Art*, p. 30). Though, since this was written, several separate Yakṣa, Yakṣini and similar figures of the Maurya-Suṅga and Saka-Kushan periods have been discovered in different parts of northern India, yet it is principally correct. Coomaraswamy, especially with an eye to these 'magnificent primitives' observes the same thing with regard to Gupta art in this manner, 'In the Gupta period the image has taken its place in architecture; becoming necessary, it loses its importance, and enters into the general decorative scheme and in this integration acquires delicacy and repose' (*H.I.I.A.*, p. 71). Occasionally, however, the image is
partially carved out of the black slab, portions behind the torso, the head and the legs being fully chiselled out, giving it the specious appearance of being fully in the round; but it is attached to its background in the extreme ends, thus retaining its relievo-character all the same. The prabhāvalī sometimes contains the emblems special to the god to whose image it serves as the background; while, in the case of some principal types of Viṣṇu images (dhruva-beras) the ten avatāras are carved on it. In early and late mediaeval Hindu images of northern and eastern India, it commonly depicts a scheme of decorative carving on it; thus, in a fully complete stela, the order of arrangement of the motifs from the pedestal (pīṭhikā) upwards is first the leogryph (lion upon elephant—gaja-sārdūla, sometimes the animals bear sword-bearers on their backs), then the makara transom, above it the hybrid couple (Gandharvas) playing on lute and dancing, a little higher up the flying garland-bearers (mālādhārī Vidyādharas) among the clouds and lastly the kūrttimukha finial. This last motif consists of a grinning lion face with protruding goggle eyes and fangs, just placed in the top centre of the prabhāvali, sometimes chains of jewel garland issuing out of either corners of its mouth. The kala-makara motif in Indonesian art seems to be an adaptation of this Indian motif. The age of an image belonging to the eastern India can be satisfactorily determined with the help of its prabhāvali. In the earlier period it is usually plain, decorated with the scallop or cable design at its outer rim and the top is fully rounded (very rarely, the whole of it appears in the shape of a rough oblong); the kūrttimukha, leogryph, etc., are usually absent. Gradually, it becomes torus-shaped with the pointed peak in the top centre, and the various motifs named above crowd in. In the reliefs of the Sena period, some varieties are also characterised by profuse ornamental carvings, reminding one of the Hoysala school of Mysore.
The pīṭha or pīṭhikā, about which something has already been said by me in connection with āsanas is that portion of the stone slab on which the image is shown. In its top layer, it is usually of the form of a mahāmbuja or viśva-padma, i.e., a double-petalled lotus, one set of petals pointing upwards and the lower set gracefully drooping down; the feet of the god or goddess rest on the pericarp (kāṇḍikā) of the flower. The real pedestal below usually of two or more distinct layers is of the pañcaratha or saptaratha type, triratha and navaratha varieties being uncommon; the rathas indicate the re-entrants or facets and their number is never even. On these different horizontal sections of the pedestal are carved the figures of the donors of the image (usually the donor couple are depicted, thus laying stress on the association of the wife, i.e., sahadharmini, with her husband in the pious act), the particular mount of the god or goddess; sometimes, though rarely, objects used in the ritual worship (i.e., the pūjopakaranas) such as a lamp (dīpa), a bell (ghanta), offering (naivedya), etc., are also figured there. In the pedestals of the early mediæval period and even a little later, the decorations in the shape of lotus blossoms with stalks and leaves are far simpler and are usually carved in outline; but in those of the later mediæval period (late Pāla and Sena) these are more ornate and the lotus blossoms are embossed. The above observations show that the image with its accessories, with both the prabhāvalī and the pīṭha are carved out of the same slab of stone, thus all embodying an organic whole. Such other pīṭhas as the bhadrapīṭha, a brief description of which has already been given, are usually made of separate pieces of stone; these are normally broad in their top and bottom sections, the middle ones being narrow. Coomaraswamy makes this interesting remark about the shape of such pīṭhas, “The altar (used in Vedic sacrifice) itself, usually wide above and below and narrow in the middle ‘like a woman’s waist,’ is evidently the proto-
type of the āsana and pītha of later images" (H.I.1.A., p. 41).

I have reserved the consideration of the various kinds of objects placed in the hands of the Hindu images to the last part of this chapter. These objects can be classed under several heads like weapons, implements, musical instruments, animals and birds, etc., which are the respective attributes or emblems of the different members of the Hindu pantheon. The weapons that are usually mentioned in iconographic texts are cakra, gadā, danda, khetaka, dhanus, śara, aṅkusa, pāśa, khaḍga, paraśu, śūla, sañjā, rājra, agni, muṣa'a and khaṭvāṅga, etc. Rām not only mentions the above as so many important weapons, but adds to the above list three other objects such as saṅkha, taṅka and hala which can also justifiably be described as such. Saṅkha is an ordinary conchshell which was blown in ancient times by the warriors in the battle field for the purpose of inspiring their own soldiers with hope and striking terror into the minds of their opponents. In the first canto of the Bhagavadgītā Sañjaya recounts the names of various saṅkhās which were particular to the principal warriors assembled in the field of Kurukṣetra, the special saṅkha of Vāsudeva-Viśṇu being described as pāñcajanya (said to have been made out of a bone of the demon Pañcajana, killed by the god) Taṅka, a stone-mason's chisel, and hala, a ploughshare, really fall under the category of implements, but could also be used as offensive weapons in early times. Sīra is another name of the ploughshare; it is the particular emblem of Śaṁkarṣaṇa-Baladeva as taṅka is of Śiva. Cakra is a wheel, the one par excellence held by Viśṇu being Sudarśana and the Pañcarātra texts like the Aḥirbudhnya Saṁhitā elaborately describes the latter. In art it is represented in two ways, either as a cart wheel (cf. Pl. VII, Figs. 4 and 7; Pl. IX, Fig. 1) or an ornamental disc, sometimes in the form of a full-blown lotus, the petals serving as the spokes. Gadā or the Indian club or mace is usually represented as
thicker than the danḍa or the ordinary cudgel. In the very early representations of this weapon found in some Indian coins and seals, no distinction is probably made between these two weapons, one form of which seeming to have some similarity to the knotted club of Herakles (cf. Pl. I, Figs. 12 and 18; Pl. VII, Fig. 4; Pl. VIII, Figs. 1 and 3; in the hands of the deity shown in Pl. I, Figs. 4, 7, 8 and 13 and in Pl. IX, Fig. 2, the object is shown simply as a short slender cudgel). The mace held in the hands of Viṣṇu is known as kaumodakī or kaumodi. Saṅkha, cakra and gadā are collectively the attributes particular to Viṣṇu, though individually the last two are sometimes placed in the hands of other deities. Khetaka is a shield either round or oblong in shape; it is primarily a weapon of defence and used to be made of wood, metal or skin (on account of its being also made of hide, it is very often named carma in iconographic texts). Dhanus and śara are a bow and arrow and special names are given to the bows held by different gods; thus, the bows of Śiva and Viṣṇu are called pināka and sārṅga respectively. The cow held by Pradyumna (Manmatha, Kāmadeva—the same as Mára in the Buddhist mythology) is described as floral (he is also called Puṣpadhanvā) and having arrows five in number (paṅcaśāra). Ankuśa is an elephant goad (cf. Pl. VIII, Figs. 2 and 6) and pūṣa, a noose or lasso used in binding one’s enemies; the latter is sometimes shown in the form of a snake (nāgapāṣa). Khaḍga means a sword and various names are used to denote swords particular to different deities; the sword of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu is nandaka, while the one placed in the hand of the consort of Pradyumna is nistrimśa. The special weapons of the consorts of Sāmba and Pradyumna, both sons of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, are a khetaka and nistrimśa respectively, their own weapons being a mace and a bow (Bṛhatamhītā, ch. 57, v. 40—Sāmbaśca gadāhastah Pradyumnaścāpālakṛt surūpaśca Anayoḥ striyau ca kārye khetakanistrimśa-dhārīnyau ॥).
Paraśu and śula, the weapons par excellence of Siva, are a battle-axe and a trident and in their early representations are often combined (cf. Pl. I, Figs. 16, 129 and 21; for śula shown separately, see Pl. I, Fig. 15; Pl. VIII, Figs. 1 and 3; Pl. IX, Figs. 1 and 2). Sakti is a spear, the special weapon of Skanda-Kārttikeya and Durgā while vajra, a thunder-bolt, is particular to Indra and Siva. Vajra seems to have been represented in early art in two different ways; one is clublike in appearance, narrow in the middle and wider at both ends (cf. Pl. VIII, Fig. 8, in the upper right hand of Siva on a coin of Huvishka) and the other is a double-faced weapon ending in projecting prongs at its both hands (cf. Pl. IX, Fig. 2, upper right hand; Pl. IX, Fig. 6—a vajra of this variety, shown behind its personified form on whose head the right hand of Zeus-Indra is placed). Agni shown as a ball of fire is placed in one of the hands of Siva-Naṭarāja; it may also be depicted as a torch serving the purpose of an incendiary weapon. The earliest representation of agni as the sacrificial fire (a pot with flames issuing out of it) is found in the scene of the miracle of sacrifice (performed by Buddha for the conversion of Kāśyapa) carved in the eastern gateway of Sanchi (in mediæval Indian art, it is shown in the illustration of the marriage of Siva-Pārvatī, the Kalyāṇasundaramūrti of Siva). Muṣala is the wooden pestle, ‘an ordinary cylindrical rod of wood capable of being used as an offensive weapon’; it is usually placed in one of the hands of Saṃkarṣaṇa-Balarāma. Khaṭṭāṅga is ‘a curious sort of club, made up of the bone of the forearm or the leg, to the end of which a human skull is attached through its foramen’ (Rao). This description shows how hideous the weapon was, though in some of its late mediæval representations, this character is somewhat subdued by the replacement of the osseous shaft by a well-carved and ornamented wooden handle; this weapon is peculiar to the
awe-inspiring forms of the Devī and her consort Śiva, such as Cāmuṇḍā and Bhairava.

I have already referred to the few implements which can be improvised as weapons. Other implements are comparatively rare in iconographic art, but in some of the images of the Ālvars and the Nāyanmārs (the South Indian Viṣṇu-bhaktas and Śiva-bhaktas, many of whom were historical persons) a few such are sometimes shown. Sruk and Sruva are sacrificial implements in the shape of ladles, the usual emblems of Brahmā, the former for taking out the clarified butter from the butter-pot (ājyapātra or ājuyashāli) and the latter for pouring it into the sacrificial fire. The same ladle was not used, as the sruk if it came in contact with the fire would be ucchista, and it would be improper to put it into the butter-pot. Various kinds of musical instruments are represented in early and late iconography and the names of such as vīṇā, venu or murali, ḍamaru, śankha, ghanṭā, mrdanga, karaṭāla, etc., are well known. Vīṇā in the Saṅga art of central India is shown as a stringed instrument like the Greek harp or lyre (cf. such a vīṇā shown as being played by Samudragupta on the obverse of his Lyrist type of coins); another mode of depicting it is the long stringed instrument somewhat similar to modern esrāj, shown in the hands of the mediæval and modern figures of Sarasvatī and Viṇādharaṇaśīnāmūrti of Śiva. Venu or murali is the bamboo flute usually placed in some youthful figures of Krṣṇa of a comparatively late period. ḍamaru or a small kettle drum played by the hand is one of the characteristic emblems of Śiva; this was wrongly recognised in the upper right hand of Śiva on some coins of Huviṣhka (cf. Pl. VIII, Figs. 5 and 6) by Gardner. Śankha also falls under the category of a musical instrument, while ghanṭā is a plain bell usually placed in one of the hands of the multi-armed image of Pārvatī. Mṛdaṅga, a big drum wide in the middle and narrow at the ends, is
sometimes shown as being played by the divine attendants. \textit{Karatalālas} are a pair of metal cymbals struck against each other with both hands to keep time with the music; these are also rarely shown and are usually placed in the hands of the accessories.

Various other objects which can be recognised in the hands of divinities include \textit{kamandalu}, \textit{aṭṭamālā}, \textit{darpana}, \textit{kapāla}, \textit{pustaka}, \textit{padma}, etc. \textit{Kamandalu} is a water-pot, the special emblem of various deities like Śiva, Brahmā, Pārvatī and others and is depicted in various ways (for some early forms of this, see Pl. I, Figs. 4, 7, 8, 13; Pl. VII, Figs. 5, 6; Pl. IX, Fig. 2). \textit{Aṭṭamālā}, or \textit{aṭṭasūtra}, sometimes simply called \textit{sūtra} (the latter has wrongly been translated by B. T. Bhattacharya as ‘thread’ in his \textit{Esoteric Buddhism}, p. 138) a rosary of beads of either \textit{rudrākṣa} or \textit{kamalākṣa} variet as found in the hands of Brahmā, Sarasvatī and Śiva, though rarely in association with other deities’ (Rao). \textit{Darpana} is a mirror made of highly polished metal as in vogue in ancient times and is one of the attributes of certain aspects of the Devī. \textit{Pustaka}, the special emblem of Brahmā and Sarasvatī, is usually represented in art as a manuscript made of palm leaves. \textit{Padma}, a lotus flower, an emblem common to many gods and goddesses, is usually depicted in several varieties, such as a lotus-bud, a full-blown flower round in shape, or a blue lotus (\textit{nīlotpala}) longish in appearance; Rao has shown that in the South Indian Bhogasthānakamūrtis of Viśṇu, goddess Śrī who stands to the right of the god always holds a full-blown lotus in her hand while Bhūdevī who is on his left a \textit{nīlotpala}. The same writer has also observed that the South Indian images of Śūrya almost invariably hold two lotus buds by their stalks in their hands while the North Indian ones, two full-blossomed lotus flowers. \textit{Kapāla}, the most characteristic emblem of some of the fearful aspects of Śiva and Pārvatī, is a cup
made out of a human skull, to drink out of which is one of the various rites of a Tāntric sādhaka. The Chinese annals inform us that the victorious leader of the Hiungnau tribe drank out of such a cup made out of the skull of the Wu-sun chief who was defeated and killed by him. Siva had the skull of Brahmā attached to his hand, of which he could get himself rid after severe penances for the sin of Brahmanicide (cf. his Bhairavamūrti which is the same as Brahmaśīraschedakamūrti). Animals and birds are seldom placed in the hands of the images of deities, a goat or ram and deer, and a cock being the few known to me. The Siva figure carved on the Guṭimallam Liṅga carries either a goat or a ram, and in some of the representations of the same god on some coins of Kanishka and Huvishka an antelope is to be found (cf. Pl. VIII, Figs. 5, 6). The cock which along with peacock serves as the crest of Skanda-Kārttikeya, is sometimes, though rarely, placed in the hand of the god.

One or two words about the ideology underlying this custom of placing the diverse objects in the hands of their divinities by the Hindu worshippers will not be out of place here. I have already drawn the attention of my readers in a previous chapter to the views of Macdonell, Rao and Hocart about the multiplicity of arms of the Hindu divinities, which feature was regarded by some writers like V. A. Smith as a monstrosity of the Indian iconographic art. The views of Rao and after him Hocart are far more acceptable than the same of Macdonell. Coomaraswamy has fully shown in 'Buddhist Primitives' in his 'Dance of Siva', how Smith's charge is absolutely untenable. The idea of symbolising the manifold activities of the deity, in however imperfect a manner, undoubtedly lies at the root of placing in these multiple arms the variety of objects noted above. In the developed concepts about the numerous members of the
Hindu pantheon, particular activities were associated with the individual units among them. It is no wonder then that one or more of these objects came to be regarded as special to different gods, though it must not be forgotten that the same could also appear in the hands of other deities, in a secondary rôle. The mythology at the root of the varieties of divinities also determined the allocation of the objects. Thus, Brahmā, one of the members of the Hindu Triad in the post-Vedic age, was undoubtedly derived from Prajāpati, the Vedic god of sacrifice; so, the srūk, srūva and pustaka (really the Vedas in manuscript form) became his special emblems. Viṣṇu, really a composition of Viṣṇu (a Vedic Āditya), Vāsudeva and Nārāyaṇa, and one of the two prominent members in the Triad (Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śīva), has, in his cakra and his mount Garuḍa, his Vedic trait of an aspect of the Sun-god fully emphasised, for the former is the sun in the shape of a wheel and the latter the same deity in his theriomorphic form. But the cakra was also conceived as a weapon of war along with his other emblem gadā, in order to emphasise his character as the chastiser of the wicked. Śīva, the last of the Triad, an amalgam of the awe-inspiring Rudra of the Vedic texts, the pre-Vedic god of the Indus valley and several other god concepts, could very appropriately be endowed with a cudgel, a trident and a thunderbolt, the weapons with which he destroys the world. But as side by side with this destructive aspect, his benignity and omniscience are also characteristic of him according to the epic and puranic literature, emblems indicative of these traits are not wanting in his mediæval representations. Saṁkarṣaṇa (Balarāma), the elder brother of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa and one of the Vyūhas in the Pāñcarātra system, had certainly in his composition the traits of a harvest or bucolic deity. This seems to be at the root of his characteristic emblems, viz., a plough-share (hala), sometimes a pestle used in
pounding corn *muśala*) and the drinking vessel (*pānapātra*) emphasising his inebriety (Varāhamihira describes him as *Baladeva halapānirmadavibhramalocanaśca karttavyah* | *Bibhratkundalamekaṁ saṅkhendumṛṇālagauratanuḥ* ||)
CHAPTER VIII

Canons of Iconometry

Canons dealing with the proportions of the human figure as represented in art, not particular to India alone—reference to the practice of some other ancient nations—Indian belief in the existence of several types of men (cf. the five types mentioned in the Brhat samhita)—the measure of their height compared to that of the Indian images.

Several kinds of measurements mentioned in the texts: māna, unmāna, pramāṇa, parimāṇa, upamāṇa and lambamāṇa—two different units of measurement: aṅgula and tāla, the former a constituent of the latter—different kinds of aṅgulas: māṇaṅgula, mātrāṅgula and dehalabdhāṅgula—the constituent units of an aṅgula, natural objects—difficult to reconcile the measure of the māṇaṅgula as laid down in the early texts with the actual unit of measure adopted by the artists in the construction of images—different modes by which the latter unit was arrived at, as laid down in various iconometric texts—dehalabdhāṅgula as explained by Upala, the most rational unit, adopted by the artists in the measurement of interspaces—Tāla: its various names—the length of the face equivalent to a tāla—the division of the whole height of the image into tālas and aṅgulas—different tāla heights like uttamadaṣṭāla, dasaṭāla, navatāla, etc., prescribed for different types of images—the length of the face in relation to its breadth—Dravīḍaṅgama—a brief comparison with the practice of other ancient nations and with the modern Western mode.

Theory as laid down in the above texts, how far borne out by the actual practice of the artists of eastern and northern India.

It has already been briefly mentioned in the fifth chapter that the Indian sculptors used to follow certain rules of proportions in the making of images. I have criticised the view that the mere fact of stereotyping these rules and their adoption by the artists was one of the causes of the gradual decadence of Indian icono-plastic art. These canons were really the results of the accumulated experience of generations of artists, and if they were judiciously followed, would not be injurious to the work of the latter. T. A. G. Rao, who was responsible for the above view criticised by me, himself observes, ‘...the rules arrived at by the Indian artist do not appear to be divergent from those evolved by the
European artists, and if in Indian sculpture the results are not good in some instances it is the fault of the artists and not attributable to the guide books' (Elements, etc., Vol. I, App. B., p. 8; italics are mine). In some of the compilations containing these rules, it is expressly laid down that the divine images must not only be well-proportioned but must also be good-looking; the image-maker should visualise in his mind's eye the god to be represented in concrete and then should fashion him according to his mental perception, for these images were really the aids to the attainment of dhyānayoga (Dhyānayogasya samśiddhyai pratimālakṣanam smṛtam | Pratimākāra karo marityo yathā dhyānarato bhavet—Sukranītisāra, IV, 71). But as very few sculptors could be successful in turning out really beautiful images (Sarvāṅgaiḥ sarvaramyo hi kāścīlakṣe praśajyate), it would be better that all divine images should conform to the correct proportions as laid down in the sāstras, for 'beautiful is that image which is made according to the canons detailed in the sāstras,—no other is so' (Sāstramānena yo ramyaḥ sa ramyo nānya eva hi). The practice of stereotyping these rules of proportions in the fashioning of human figures was not peculiar to the Indian artists alone, but was also adopted by many ancient nations of the world. W. W. Hyde says, 'The doctrine of human proportions is very ancient, originating in Egyptian art.' The first canon employed by the Egyptians in the time of the Ancient Empire, 'divides an erect human figure over 18 squares, the highest of which ends, not at the top of the head, but at the top of the brow, thus leaving the dome of the skull outside, as well as the head-dresses or crowns which the Egyptian monuments display in such great variety.' Hyde remarks very properly that the greatest artists—architects,
painters and sculptors of all times have taught and practised the doctrine that certain proportions are beautiful, e.g., the proportion of the height of the head or the length of the foot to the whole body.\(^1\) In modern times, we have only to mention such names as those of da Vinci, Duerer, Raphael and Flaxman. In Greek days there were many artists who formulated such canons of proportions. I have already stated that there were different schools of sculptors in ancient Hellas such as Old Attic, Old Argive, Polyclitan, Argive Sicyonian or Lysippan, etc., which were distinguished from one another on the basis of the fixed proportions of the parts of the human figure. These proportions were written down by subsequent artists and art-historians for the help and guidance of later sculptors and painters. E. A. Gardner tells us that 'theoretical works upon the principles of sculpture were written by several of the most distinguished artists of antiquity; but none of these have been preserved to us. . . . . Later compilers have recorded many opinions or statements, often without acknowledgement which we can trace with more or less certainty to these lost treatises.\(^2\) Polyclitus who flourished in the 5th century B.C. and was most probably a pupil of Ageladas of Argos, was one of the first to write such a work dealing with the proportions of the body; he embodied these rules in a sculpture named as the 'Doryphorus' (the treatise as well as the sculpture was

---

\(^1\) W. W. Hyde, op. cit., p. 68. I shall presently show that in ancient and mediæval India, the length of the face (from the chin to the beginning of the hair-line—\(\text{ko} ś \text{arek} \text{hā}\)) or the inside length of the outstretched palm was the bigger unit known as \(\text{tāl}a\) in terms of which the whole height of the body was calculated.

\(^2\) E. A. Gardner, A Handbook of Greek Sculpture, p. 2. One can compare with the above statement my remarks in the first chapter about the indebtedness of various Indian writers on iconography and iconometry to their predecessors.
described in the Greek works on art as the *Canon*. Euphranor, the Corinthian, who flourished in the fourth century B.C. and who was both a sculptor and a painter, also wrote upon colouring and proportion; his study of proportion seems to indicate at once an imitation of Polyclitus and a departure from his canon.\(^1\) In the Hellenistic age such treatises became quite common and this fact was not a little due to the influence of the great artist of this age, Lysippus, one of the most prolific sculptors of ancient Hellas. He was looked upon by the later Hellenistic artists and art-critics as the most academic of sculptors; he revolutionised the system of proportions adopted by his predecessors such as Polyclitus and others and introduced many technical innovations and improvements which he derived from a direct and thorough study of nature. The activities of the two artists of the Pergamene school, *viz.*, Antigonus and Xenocrates (3rd-2nd century B.C.), who were both writers on art and practical sculptors, can be directly traced to the school of Lysippas. They are cited by Pliny as authorities; and very probably their works commonly served as a basis for the treatises of the later writers (E. A. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 2). Most of the artists mentioned above not only made figures of mere mortal men such as the Greek athletes, where they could display their keen sense of modelling the human body, but also fashioned divine images, such as those of Zeus, Hera, Nike, Aphrodite and a host of other Greek deities. It is needless to state that in the latter class of sculptures also, the artists followed certain canons of proportions, according to the tradition of their respective schools. I have stated in the first chapter of my book that secular images used also to be made in ancient and mediæval

\(^1\) E. A. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 404. ‘He evidently adopted unusually slender forms, in a reaction against the solid and heavy build of the Polyclitan athlete.’
India. A. N. Tagore thinks that the canons of proportions which are incorporated in ancient and mediæval Indian Šilpaśāstras were only applicable in the case of images intended for worship and the artist was 'free in all other cases, to follow his own art instinct.' Such might or might not have been the case; but it is more probable that in their secular images also, the Indian artists, like the Greek and Egyptian ones, followed some recognised rules of proportions.

In India, as well as in other ancient countries of the world, the deities were mostly conceived anthropomorphically and represented as mortals in mythology and art. The affinity between the mortals and the immortals lay not merely in this anthropomorphism, but it also lay deeper. When Euhemerus explained the members of the Greek pantheon as ordinary men who lived and acted in this world in bygone days, he was really giving expression to the very common tendency of the human mind of endowing the deities with human emotions and passions. I have drawn the attention of my readers in the second chapter of this book to the Rāgvedic description of the deities as divo naras, nṛpeśas (‘men of the sky,’ ‘kings of men’), etc; innumerable again, are the myths narrated in the Vedic, Epic and Purānic literature where the denizens of the heavens appear as mere men, living their lives of joys and sorrows. In later times in India, from the iconographic and iconometric points of view, this likeness is always present. Leaving aside the theriomorphic or therio-anthropomorphic divinities, even those gods or goddesses endowed with more limbs than are natural, really present cases of exaggerated anthropomor-

¹ A. N. Tagore, Some Notes on Indian Artistic Anatomy, p. 3. He explains the line 'Sevyā-sevaka-bhāveṣu pratimālakṣeṇam smṛtam,' thus, 'Images should conform to prescribed types when they are to be contemplated in the spirit of worship.'
phism. In the proportional heights assigned to different types of divine images in early iconometric texts, we recognise the heights attained by several types of men in India. The Indians from a fairly early period believed in the existence of five different types of men (pañcamaṇuṣya-vibhāga), which might or might not have ethnic bases. These five classes, according to Varāhamihira, are Hamsa, Saṣa, Rucaka, Bhadra and Mālavya, who are born when the planets Jupiter, Saturn, Mars, Mercury and Venus are ascendant respectively.¹ The height as well as the girth of the Hamsa type of man is laid down by the same author as 96 aṅgulas, the height and girth of the four other classes exceeding by three aṅgulas each from the same of its immediate predecessor (i.e., a Saṣa type of man will be 99 aṅ., Rucaka—102 aṅ., a Bhadra—105 aṅ. and a Mālavya—108 aṅ.).²

¹ Br̥hatsamhitā, ch. 68, vv. 1-2:—
Tārāgrahairbalayutaiḥ svakṣetrasvoccagaiscatuṣṭyagaiḥ
Pañcapuruṣāḥ praśastā jāyante tānaham vakṣye ||
Jivena bhavati hamsah saureṇa saṣah kujena rucakaśca ||
Bhadro budhena balinā mālavyo daityapūjyena ||

² Br̥hatsamhitā, ch. 68, v. 7: Śannavatirāṅgulāṇaṁ vyāyāmo dirghata ca hamsasya | Saṣarucakubhadramālavyasāṅṅitāstraṅgula-
viveddhyā || An explanation is necessary of the height and girth being the same of each of the different classes of men. They are really nyagrodharimapimandalā types, in which the height of the figure is equal to the measurement from the middle finger-tip of one hand to the same of the other, both arms being fully extended each way in the same line with the chest. Vyāyama or prthutā has been explained by Utpala as 'prasāritabhujadvayasya pramāṇam.' This is one of the most important characteristic signs of the Mahāpuruṣas (Mahāpuruṣa-
lakṣāṇas) and Utpala quotes the following couplet from Pārśara to elucidate it further:—Ucchārayaḥ pariṇāhastu yasya tulyam sarīriṇaḥ ||
Sa naraḥ pārthivo īteyo nyagrodharimapimandalāḥ || For further observations on this term, the reader is referred to my Pratimā-
lakṣāṇam (Cal. Univ. Press), pp. 21-24, 77-79.
Now, images of different gods and goddesses conformed to the two of the various proportional heights mentioned above, viz., the first and the last. The aṣṭatāla images,—figures of goddesses usually were made according to this height (cf. V. 88 in the Pratimāṃnālanakṣaṇam, edited by P. Bose, which reads: Dīrghaṃ cāṣṭamukhaṃ kuryād devinām lakṣaṇām budhaḥ), though there were also several other gods who were shown up to this stature,—were those which were 96 aṅgulas, just as high as a Hamsa type, according to Varāhamihira; as I shall presently show, it was also the height of a samaparimāṇa or madhyama class of image. The height of the Mālavya variety of men, viz., 108 aṅ., on the other hand, exactly corresponded to the navatāla images, which were grouped by the same author among the pravara or the best class of images.\textsuperscript{1} It should be noted that from the descriptions given of the five different kinds of men, the Mālavya seems to be the best and the height of the Mālavya and Hamsa varieties of men alone are uniform.\textsuperscript{2} The Matsya Purāṇa evidently refers to the Mālavya type, when it says that the man who measures 9 tālas from the top of the head to the bottom of the feet and whose arms reach the knees are respected even by the gods (ch. 145, v. 10.; Āpādatalamastako navatālo bhavet tu

\textsuperscript{1} Bhāsāṃhitā, ch. 57, v. 30.

\textsuperscript{2} Bhadra type, as we have seen, measures 105 aṅ.; but in verse 18 of the chapter on Pañcamaṇusyavibhāga (ch. 68). Varāhamihira tells us that such men are 84 aṅ. high (Aṅgulam navatiṣca ṣaḍānāṃṇyucchrayena); Utpala reconciles this discrepancy by commenting that when such a type of man attains to the height of 105 aṅ., he becomes a sārvabhauma monarch (Yadi pañcottaramaṅgulaśālam vyāyōmena daighrīṇe ca bhavati tadā sakalāvanināthak sārvabhaumo rājā bhavatityarthah). But in the case of two other types, viz., Sāta and Rucak, the commentator does not care to make any remark about this discrepancy; in verses 21 and 29 of the same chapter in the Bhāsāṃhitā, the respective heights of the two are given as 92 and 100 aṅgulas.
The physical features of the former, which are enumerated by Varāhamihira, contain several of the major mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas, which are also the characteristic signs of a Buddha or a god. The verse reads: Mālavyo nāyanāsasamabhujayugalo jānusamprāptahasto māṁsaiḥ pūrṇāṅgasandhiḥ samarucira-tanurmadhyabhāge kṛṣaśca Pañcaṣṭau cordhvaṃsasyām śrutivivaramapi tryāṅgulonaṃ ca tiryagdiptākṣam sat-kapalam samasitudaśanam nātimāṁsadharoṣṭham. One among these features, viz., ‘the full fleshy limbs and joints of the body,’ typically emphasises one of the particular traits of the ideal divine figure in Indian art.

In order to understand the canons of iconometry clearly, it is necessary to know something about the meaning and usage of certain technical terms denoting the different ways in which an image can be measured. The Vaikhānasāgama mentions six such ways of measurement (mānas), viz., māna, pramāṇa, unmāna, parimāṇa, upamāna and lambamāna. It also gives various synonyms of each of these terms, incidentally explaining the significance of each. Rao, on the basis of this text, writes, ‘Māna is the measurement of the length of a body; pramāṇa is that of its breadth, that is a linear measurement taken at right angles to and in the same plane as the māna; measurements taken at right angles to the plane, in which the māna and pramāna

1 This is māṁsaiḥ pūrṇāṅgasandhiḥ which has been commented on by Utpala as māṁsaiḥ paripūrṇāḥ sarvāṅgasandhayo yasya Anulbanāsthirityarthaiḥ. The Sukranitiśāra lays down that those images in which the joints, bones, veins and arteries are hidden, are always suspicious (IV. 4.146—Gūḍhasandhyasthidhamanī sarvadā saukhyavarddhini).

measures have been noted, are called unmāna, which obvi-
ously means the measure of thickness; parimāna is the
name of the measurement of girths or of the periphery of
images; upamāna refers to the measurements of inter-
spaces;...........; and lastly lambamāna is the name given
to measurements taken along plumb lines. 1 Early texts,
both iconometric and general, use many of these terms in
the technical sense appropriate to each, though in several
instances some difference in meaning is noticeable. It
will be of interest here to refer to the section on iconometry
in the Bṛhatśamhitā and see what terms are used there to
denote the different kinds of measurement followed in
image-making. Verses 1-28 of chapter 57 of this work
deal with several iconometrical details and in these 28 verses
many such terms occur. The word parimāna, occurring
only in verses 3 and 28, is used in the same sense as
pramāna occurring in verse 1, meaning simply measure-
ment; the latter, however, when used in verses 8 and 23
undoubtedly means width measurement (in verse 16 it
means the inter-space measurement — kaṇṭhāddvādaśa
hrdayam hrdayānābhī ca tat pramānena). The measure-
ment of width is also denoted by such terms as vistīrṇa
(4, 13, 15, 25), vitata (5), pṛthūla (5), vistāra (6), vipula
(9—vaipulya in 22), pṛthutā; the measurement of length

synonyms of the 6 kinds of measurements as laid down in the Vai-
khānasāgama are:—māna—āyāma, āyata, dirgha; pramāna—vistāra,
vistṛta, tāra, visṛtī, visṛta, vyāsa, visārita, vipula, tāla, viskambha,
viśāla; unmāna—baha(u?l)a, nivra(?), ghana, ucchrāya, tūnga,
unata, udana, utsedha, ucca, niśkrama, niśkṛti, nirgama, nirgati,
rudra; parimāna—mārga, praveśana, nata, pariṇāha, vṛti, āvṛta;
upamāna—nivṛtta, vivara, antara; lambamāna—sūtra, drāmbana (or
according to another reading—sūtra, lambana, unmita). Rao's enu-
meration of the above synonyms evidently on the basis of the text
is a bit faulty; his errors are corrected here.
is indicated by the words, dairghya (4, 15), āyata (4, 18); in verse 9 it means length sidewise), dirgha (18); the measurement of height is denoted by ucchrāya (10), āyāma (14), māna (17), utsedha (19); the terms pariṇāha (as many as seven times—in 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 26) and paridhi (twice—in 22 and 23) are used to denote the girth or periphery of particular parts of images; antara in verses 10 and 24 undoubtedly refers to inter-space measurement, while vedha in verse 23 denotes depth. Utpala in the course of his comment on the above verses introduces a few other terms not used in the text; thus, he explains the term ucchrāya by auccya (10), āyāma by viṣkambha (14—āyāmato viṣkambhādityurthaḥ, but compare the Vaikhānasāgama text quoted above, where viṣkambha is used as a synonym of pramāṇa, i.e., the width measure-ment), pariṇāha by parimāṇḍalya (22—tat pariṇāhastayah parimāṇḍalyam) and vedha by gāṃbhīrya (23). The words māna, unmāna and pamāṇa occur in the Jaina Kalpasūtra in its description of Mahāvīra’s body; the passage, māṇ’-unmānappamāṇa-paḍipunna-sujaya-savv’-āmga-sumdara’āmga, has been translated by Jacobi as ‘a boy on whose body all limbs will be well-formed, and of full volume, weight and length’ (S.B.E., XXII, p. 221). But in the light of the above observations, the three words ought to be rendered a little differently. The ancient writers themselves do not appear to have been sure of their minds. Thus, the dwellers of the Svetaadvipa, visited by Nārada while he was trying to see the great god Hari, the original prakṛti of Nārāyaṇa, are described in the Mahābhārata as sama-mānonmānāḥ (Bangavasi edition, ch. XII, 335, 10). Now, māna meaning height in this passage, unmāna ought to mean width (here the measurement from the middle finger tip of the one hand to that of the other, when both the arms are outstretched opposite ways in the same line with the chest). This is really the nyagrodhaparimāṇḍala sign of
the mahāpūruṣas, about which something has already been said; so this sense fits ill with the one which has been given to unmāna by Rao, viz., thickness. Nīlakaṇṭha wrongly explains this Mahābhārata passage in his commentary when he writes, mānasconmānascopamānasca samau yeśām te, for there can be no question of the upamānas (the measurement of the interspaces) being the same as the māna (height) and unmāna (really vyāma or vyāyāma, as explained above). I have suggested elsewhere that the words māna-unmāna-pamāṇa in the Jaina text quoted above should be translated as ‘(a body whose) māna and unmāna are pamāṇa, i.e., full and equal’ (the word pamāṇa being not used in its technical sense here). It has been shown that the term parināha according to the Vaikhānasāgama, is a synonym of parimāṇa which has been explained by Rao as the measurement of the girth or periphery. Now, Parāśara, as quoted by Utpala, while describing the nyagrodhaparimāṇḍala sign, uses the term parināha in the sense of vyāyāma. It is also used in the same sense in the Matsya Purāṇa, whose author fully explains it.

It is time now to explain the significance of the different units, āṅgula and tāla, in terms of which the height of the Indian images were measured. The former came to be regarded as a constituent of the latter and was more

---

1 Pratimālakṣaṇam, C. U. Press, p. 78; or if unmāna is taken to mean height in the Kalpaśūtra and Mahābhārata passages, then māṇa which may mean any kind of measurement should signify vyāyāma.

2 Matsya Purāṇa, Bangavasi edition, Ch. 42. verses, 61-2: Mahādhanurdharaśeṣaivatretāyām cakravarttinah | Sarvaśākṣaṇapūrṇāste nyagrodhaparimāṇḍalāḥ || Nyagrodha tu smṛtau bāhū vyāmo nyagrodha ucyate | Vyāmena tucchṛayokyasya ata urddhvatudēhinaḥ | Samocchṛayāḥ parināha nyagrodhaparimāṇḍalāḥ ||
universal in its application, inasmuch as it was used not only in the measurement of the height as the *tāla* mainly was, but also was used in the other varieties of measurements referred to above. The term *āṅgula* served as a unit of measurement in India from very early times. In the first verse of the *Puruṣasūkta* (*R. V.*, X. 90), the Puruṣa is described as covering the whole universe and at the same time outreaching it by 10 *āṅgulas* (*Sa bhunim viśvato vṛtvā atyatasiṭhaddasaṅgulam*). In the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* (X. 2. 1, 2), the author says that Prajāpati measures the fire-altar by finger-breadths; for the sacrifice being a man, it is by means of him that everything is measured here; these fingers are his lowest measure (*tasyaiśāvamā mātrā yadaaṅgulayah*) and the measurement is taken with the help of this lowest measure. The *Sulbasūtras* which contain the rules for the construction of raised altars (*vedis* and *agnis*) used in the performance of *nitya* and *kāmya yajñas*, frequently refer to this unit in giving the measure of the different sections of the altars.\(^1\) Several different kinds of *āṅgulas* are described in the iconometric texts of a comparatively late period; these are *mānāṅgula*, *mātrāṅgula* and *dehalabdhāṅgula*. The first is some sort of an absolute unit, it being derived from the width measurements of some natural objects. The *Bṛhatasamhitā* lays down that a mote in the sunbeam filtering through a lattice is known as *parāṇu*. A *raja* (a speck of dust) is made up of eight such *parāmanus*; a *bālāgra* (the tip of one single hair), a *likṣā* (the egg of a louse), a *yūka* (a louse), a *yava* (barley-corn) and an *āṅgula* are each made up of eight units of its preceding object, a *bālāgra* measuring the same

\(^1\) ‘A *vedi* is a raised altar on which the *yajña* was performed and on which sat the persons performing the ceremony, namely the sacrificer, the Hota, the Adhvaryu, the Ṛtvik, etc. An *agni* is an altar for keeping the fire’; *J.I.S.O.A.*, Vol. VII, p. 39.
as eight particles of dust. But this type of an̄gula could hardly have been used as the unit of measurement by the iconographers of ancient and medieval India. The width of eight barley corns placed side by side is far thicker than the same of the unit which was adopted by the artists in measuring the different sections of images. There is the second type of an̄gula known as mātrāṅgula or a unit of the relative type. This is arrived at on the basis of 'the length of the middle digit of the middle finger of either the sculptor or the architect, or of the rich devotee who causes a temple to be built or an image to be set up' (Rao). This relative measurement was perhaps adopted by the image-makers and the temple-builders for first ascertaining the height of a temple or an image, before they set to work out the other unit on the dharabdhv basis; but the latter, as I shall presently show, was principally adopted in the case of images alone. Another manner in which the mātrāṅgula was reached is referred to by the author of the Sukranitisāra; this is the fourth part of one's own fist (ch. IV, Sec. 4, Verse 82, Svavamsūṭeṣaṭurtho’ṃśo hyan̄gulaṃ parikōrtītam). In the Pratimāmānalakṣaṇam edited by P. Bose, we find in the first line of the fourth verse practically the same definition of an̄gula (Pallavānāṃ caturbhāgo māpanāṃgulikā smṛtā). Here the word pallava is used in place of muṣṭi, pallava evidently meaning the palm of the hand (kara-pallava, cf. the use of the word in the same sense in the Raghuvamśa, III, 7—Lateva saṃnaddha-manojñapallava); the fourth part of one's fist or the same of the middle of one's palm is equal in measurement. But the question is

1 Brhatan̄dhita, Ch. 57, verses, 1-2: Jālānturage bhāna bhagam yadanyutaṃ darsanam rajo yāti | Tadbavedyāt paramanuṃ prathamam taddhi pramanānām II Paramānurajobaligralikṣayukam yavo’ngulam cet || Aṣṭagunāni yathottaramaṅgulomekam bhavati saikhyā ||
whose palm or fist is it to be? Will it be that of the sculptor, the architect or of the rich devotee? The word *sva* in the *Sukranītisāra* passage is significant. The same word occurs in the first line of the fourth verse of the *Bṛhatśamhitā* (ch. 57), where the author describes the length and the breadth of the face of an image: it reads—*Svairāṅgulapramāṇairdvādaśa vistīrṇamāyataṃ ca mukham.* Utpala’s commentary on the above line is very interesting; for it gives us a sure clue to the meaning of the word *sva.* It reads—*Yasmāt kāṭhāt pasaṅgālaṇḍādevā pratīma kriyate taddaiṅghyaṃ pithapramāṇavivarjitaṃ drādasabhāga-vibhaktam kṛtvā tatraiko bhāgo navadhā karyah saṁgu-lasājā bhacati। Yasmādaśṭādhiśaṅgulasatam pratimā-pramāṇam vakṣyati। Svairāṅgulapramāṇairiti। Pratimāyāḥ svairātimyairāṅgulapramāṇairmukham radanaṃ dvādasāṅgulāni vistīrṇam vipulamāyataṃ ca dirgham kāryam।*

It can be freely translated thus:—‘The term *āṅgula* is derived in this manner; first, the height of the block of wood or stone out of which the image is to be made, leaving aside that portion of it on which the pedestal is to be shown, should be divided into 12 equal parts; when one of the latter is again divided into 9 equal parts, each of these subdivisions is equivalent to the *āṅgula* unit, thus, the height of an image is 108 *āṅgulas*; lastly, the length and the breadth of the face of the image should be 12 such *āṅgulas*, *i.e.*, the *āṅgula* of the image itself.’ This is really the *dehalabdha āṅgula* or *dehāṅgula* which certainly was the principal basis of the various kinds of image-measurements referred to above. But one remark can be made with regard to Utpala’s manner of defining the term *āṅgula.* He says it is the 108th part of the measured material from which the image is to be made, only leaving out the pedestal (*pīṭha*). It by *pīṭha*, he means the stele (the *pīṭhikā* or *piṇḍikā* and *prabhāvalī* combined) of the
image, then he is quite correct. But if he means only the pedestal, then some difficulty will arise; because, from the portion of the material without the pedestal not only the image itself, but also the śrīścakra (halo) of the image as well as the top section of the prabhācalī was carved out. The basis of this dehalabdhā aṅgula is also described in more or less the same way in several other texts. Thus, the Hayānārā Pāṇcaratra says—Abhīpartyapramāṇantu navadhā pravibhājayet. 1 Navame bhaskaraibhakter-bhāgah svāngulamucyaite || i.e., the desired length (of the image) should be divided 9 times, each of these divisions should again be subdivided 12 times (bhāskara—ādiyā—12 ādiyās), one of these subdivisions is then called an aṅgula. The Nārada Purāṇa makes a similar statement in these lines:—Vimhamāṇantu navadhā procchrayāt saṃvibhājya vai । Bhāgam bhāgam tato bhūyo bhaveddvādāsadhā dvija । Tadaṅgulanā śyādvibāsye ti. 1 In all the above texts the division into 108 parts (9 × 12) refers to navatāla images only, not to images of larger (daśatāla or uttamadasatāla) or smaller (aṣṭatāla, saṭcatāla, etc.) proportions. That images measuring 108 aṅgulas of their own were the commonest ones in ancient India is proved by Varāhamihira’s observation that the figures of Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, and of Bali, the son of Virocana should be 120 aṅgulas in height; the other groups of images belonging to the best, medium and inferior varieties are each less by 12 aṅgulas from its immediately preceding one, i.e., the best type of image should be less than 120 aṅgulas by 12, i.e., 108

1 Both the above extracts are from Haribhaktivilāsa, vīlāsa 18. The Agni Purāṇa says the same thing in the couplet—Silāṁ silpi tu navadhā vibhājya navamēmāke । Sūrya (should be Sūrya)-bhaktaiḥ silāyantu bhāgam svāngulamucyaite || It should be noted that pramāṇa in the Hayānārā extract means length or height; but the words māna and ucchraya (or ucchraiyā) in the Nārada Purāṇa passage are appropriately used.
aṅgulas, the medium one 12 aṅ, less than 10 (i.e., 96) and the inferior one 84 aṅ. ¹ The Vaikhānasāgama (ch. 22) supplies us with further interesting information in this connection; it lays down: Bārotsedhāṇi tattālavaśena vibhājaikāṇāṃ dehalabdhāṅgulaṃ tadasṭāmāṃ yavamiti, i.e., one part (unit) arrived at by dividing the whole height of the image according to its tāla is a dehalabdhāṅgula, while one-eighth part of the latter is a yavu. It means that if the image be a daśatāla one, then 12⁰th part of it is its aṅgula, and if an aṣṭatāla one, 16⁰th part of it is its aṅgula and so on. In the light of the above observation, Fleet's criticism of the term svena = scamanena is not applicable in the case of iconometry; he writes: 'As regards the expression svamānena, it stands to reason that the measures

¹ Bṛhatanātha, ch 57, v. 30; Daśarathatanayo Rāmo Baliśca vairocanih śataṃ vimśam 1 Drāḍaśahāṃya śeṣaḥ pravarasamanyāna-parimānāḥ || Utpala's commentary on it is worth quoting: Daśarathaputra Rāmaḥ 1 Virocanaputra Balih 1 Viṁśatādhipaścina māṇikārīnāṃ kāraṇamītraḥ 1 Anyāḥ pratimā dvāḍaśaśadrāśa-kahinatvāna pravarasamā nyūnaparimāṇāḥ bharanti 1 Viṁśatāyādhikādaṅgulaśatāddvāsāṅgulaḥapāśyāṣṭādhipaḥ satamanānāṃ pratimā pradhānā bharati 1 Tato'pi dvāḍaśakumārasya śanvataṅgulasamā madhyamā bharati 1 Tato'pi dvāḍaśakumārasya caturasītyaṅgulanyānaparimāṇā pratimā bharati 1 "Svairāṅgula-pramāṇairdvāḍasāristirnavāyatam ca mukham"-ityaṇcena nyūγeṇa yā pratimoktaḥ satāṅgaḥ satamadhipaḥ bharati 1 Yudāraktam "Daśarathatanayo Rāmo Baliśca vairocanih śataṃ vimśam "-ityasmin dvāḍaśāṇāmāṅgulanāmadhipaḥ kāraṇa tairadhikena parimāṇāḥ kāraṇa sannavaṇṇām 1 Eraṃ hinātre 1 purnapāla evaṇuktaṃ āṅgulaṃ jñāyati iti.

It may be incidentally remarked here that an image of Bali the demon king is mentioned along with that of Dāsarathi Rāma, one of the incarnatory forms of Viṣṇu. But Bali's image was an object of veneration to the devout Viṣṇavas, for he was one of the greatest devotees of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu. This is the reason why the images of the Ājvārs and the Nāyanmāras were so very frequently given important positions in South Indian Viṣṇava and Saiva shrines respectively.
must be taken according to an aṅgula or cubit which is of a fixed standard length, not according to the varying fingerbreadths and cubits of individuals who are to be measured (J.R.A.S., 1911, pp. 208-09). Again, higher units of length measurement used in texts, such as kīṣku, prājāpatya, etc., have no place in iconometry; these are undoubtedly the derivatives of mānāṅgula. But the iconometric texts especially of a comparatively late period frequently use various synonyms of an aṅgula of the relative variety and of its higher multiples; it may be noted that many of these synonyms are of a figurative nature. Thus, a space of an aṅgula is called indu (moon—and there is one moon), of two aṅgulas, aksi and paksā (two eyes and two fortnights), of three aṅgulas, agni (sacrificial fire of three kinds: gārhapatiya, āhavaniya and dakṣiṇa), rāma (three Rāmas: Dāsarathī, Bhārgava and Balarāma), guṇa (three guṇas: sattva, raja and tamā) etc.

1 The following is the measure:—

24 aṅgulas or mānāṅgulas make 1 kīṣku
25 " " " " 1 prājāpatya
26 " " " " 1 dhanurgraha
27 " " " " 1 dhanurmuṣṭi
4 dhanurmuṣṭis " 1 danda.

Rao correctly remarks that ‘the measure called danda is employed in ascertaining large lengths like that, for instance, of a street in a village’; Rao, op. cit., Vol. 1, App. B., p. 2.

2 The Vaikānasāgama supplies us with the following list:—
1 aṅgula=mūrti, indu, viśvambara, mokṣa, ukta; 2 aṅgulas=kalā, golaka, aśvini, yugma, brāhmaṇa, vihaya, aksi, paksā; 3 aṅgulas=agni, rudrāksi (three eyes of Rudra), guṇa, arṇa, kāla, śūla, rāma, varuṇa, madhya; 4 aṅgulas=veda, pratīṣṭha, jāti, kara, abjajānana (4 faces of Brahmā, born of lotus), yuga, tūrya, turiya; 5 aṅgulas=viṣaya, indriya, bhūta, iṣu, supratiṣṭha, pṛthivi; 6 aṅgulas=karma, aṅga, rasa, samaya, gāyatī, krīḍāka, kumārānana (six faces of Kumāra or Skanda-Kārttikeya), kauśika, rtu; 7 aṅgulas=pātāla, muni (seven reśis), dhātu, loka, uṇīk, rohini, dvipa, aṅga, ambhonidhi; 8 aṅgulas=lokapāla.
I have already suggested that the other relative aṅgula unit (viz., that based on the width of the middle digit of the medius of either the sculptor, architect or the rich devotee) might have been sometimes first adopted for ascertaining the height of the image and then the second variety of mātrāṅgula was worked out for the detailed measurements; but this was done on rare occasions when the images were life-size ones. There was another mode of first settling the full height of the image. Varāhamihira tells us that an image measuring one cubit (hasta) in height is auspicious, one two cubits high bestows riches, and those images that are three or four cubits in height ensure benefit and plenty.¹ This shows that another unit of measurement, a higher one, was also adopted by the image-makers in fixing the required height of the image. The height of those images which were meant to be enshrined in temples was also based on the same of the door of the particular

(Aśṭadikpālas, the guardians of the eight quarters), nāga, uraga, vasu, anuṣṭup, gana; 9 aṅgulas = bhāti. graha (navagrahas), randhra (navudvara, the 9 doors or orifices of the body), nanda (Nava nandāh, the Nine Nanda Kings of Magadha), sūtra; 10 aṅgulas = dik, prādurbhāva, nādi, pālīti; 11 aṅgulas = rudra (Ekādśa Rudras), triṣṭup. 12 aṅgulas = vīdhi, mukha, tāla, yama, arka (Sūrya—Āditya—Dvādaśa Ādityas), rāsi, jagati; 13 aṅgulas = atijagati; 14 aṅgulas = manu, sakvari; 15 aṅ. = atiśakvari, tithi; 16 aṅ. = kriyā, aṣṭi, indukalā; 17 aṅ. = aṭṭi; 18 aṅ. = smṛti, dhṛti; 19 aṅ. = avidhṛti; 20 aṅ. = kṛti; 21 aṅ. = prakṛti; 22 aṅ. = ākṛti; 23 aṅ. = vikṛti; 24 aṅ. = sanskrīti; 25 aṅ. = atikṛti; 26 aṅ. = ukti; 27 aṅ. = nakṣatra (there are 27 stars or constellations—Āsvini, Bharani, Kṛttikā, Rohini, etc.). Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, App. B, pp. 59-60; a few errors have crept in Rao’s translation of this part of the Vaikhānasagama, ibid., pp. 3-4.

¹ Bhṛhatamsāhitā, ch. 57, v. 49: Saumyā tu hastāmātrā vasudā hastadvayocchṛtā pratimā | Kesmasubhikṣāya bhavet tricatur-hasta-pramāṇa yā || Here the use of the word pramāṇa is to be noted; it means height or length measurement.
temple. Thus, Varāhamihira informs us that the height of the pedestal of the image should be three parts of the height of the shrine door less the eighth part, when the latter is divided into eight parts, and the same of the image should be twice the height of the pedestal. 1 The author, however, is a little roundabout in his manner of referring to the height of the image and its pedestal. Another simpler way of fixing it in relation to the shrine door is mentioned in the Hayasirṣa Pañcarātra; it says that the measure of the height of the door (shrine door) should be divided into 8 equal parts; two of these parts should constitute the height of the image and one part of it divided into three parts, the height of the pedestal which should be neither too high nor too low. 2 It is to be noted that the surface of the pedestal should be square, its length and breadth measuring the same as the height of the image proper, according to some texts, but its height should be half the height of the image. 3 The above details generally apply to the dhruva-beras (in the case of Viṣṇu images) or acala variety of images (they may also be applicable to

1 Bhatsamhitā, ch. 57, v. 3: Devāgaradvārasyaṣṭāṃśonsya yastītyoṃsāh | Taṇḍikāpramāṇam pratiṃ tadavignaparimāṇāṃ ।

2 Hayasirṣa as quoted by Gopala Bhatta: Dvārocchrāyasya yunmānamastadhā tattu kārayet | Bhāgadvayena pratimāṃ tribhāgikrtvā tat punāḥ | Pindikā bhāgataḥ kāryā nātinīcā nacochritā ।
But the Mātṛya Purāṇa (ch. 258, vv. 24-25) with the addition of one line to the above supplies us with the information identical to that given by the Bhatsamhitā; after the first line dvārocchrāyasya, etc., is placed—Bhāgamekam tutasyaaktvā pariśiṣṭantu yad bhanet; then follow two lines similar to the above quoted from the Hayasirṣa.

3 Nāradapāncaratā, as quoted by Gopala Bhatta: Vimbhāmnād yathā pīṭham kuryād devasya tacchān | Caturāram ev tad viddhi caturāṅgatam tu vā | Vimbocchrāyasaman pīṭham paritācaiva nīvṛtam | Tadādhenonnanam kuryādetat oṃnaye-lakṣanaṃ।
calācalu variety). The Matsya Purāṇa distinctly says that those images which are meant for worship in the private chapels of the house-holders should never measure more than a digit of the thumb or a vitasti (one span) at the utmost, while those that are to be enshrined in palaces, i.e., temples, should measure not more than 1/16th part of the whole height of the latter; one should make an image up to this height (this is the uttama or best class) or less than it (of the madhyama, i.e., middling or kaniṣṭha, i.e., the lowest class) according to his means, but on no account the image should measure more than (1/16th part of the full height of the shrine).

A few more words about the word tāla, already described by me as a higher unit of which the aṅgula became a constituent, need be said here. The Vaikhānasāgama informs us that a tāla is constituted of 12 aṅgulas and has as its various synonyms such terms as vitasti, mukha, yama, arka, rāṣi and jagati; of these, however, vitasti and mukha are more frequent in use. Thus, the Pratimāmānalakṣaṇa (3) says, ‘(a unit of) 12 aṅgulas is known as a tāla, vitasti or mukha’ (Dvādaśaṅgulitālaṃ ca vitastirmukhameva ca). The mukha as well as vitasti is 12 aṅgulas; vitasti is the distance between the extended thumb and little finger, which is the same as the length of the middle of the extended palm (Pl. VI, figs. 2 & 3). The Matsya Purāṇa uses the word mukha in the passage Svākīyāṅgulimāṇena mukhaṃ syāddvādaśāṅgulam, i.e., the mukha or the face of the image.

1 Rao refers to one of the modes of classifying the images, viz., cula (movable), acala (immoveable, permanently placed in shrines) and calācalu (which is permanently enshrined, but can also be removed on ceremonial occasions); op. cit., Vol. I, Introduction, p. 17.

2 Matsya Purāṇa; ch. 258, vv. 22-3: Aṅgasṭhuravādāraḥya vitastiṃ yāvaccha tu || Gṛhe vai pratīmā kāryā nādhika śasyate budhāh || Āṣodasāttu prāśādaiḥ karttavyā nādhikā tataḥ || Madhyo-tumakaniṣṭhā tu kāryā vittānusārataḥ
(equivalent to a tāla) should be 12 of its own aṅgula; the text further states that the measurement of the height of the other limbs should be in terms of the measure of its face (Mukhamānena karttavyā sarvāvayavakalpanā, ch. 258; v. 19). The author of the Purāṇa then lays down the whole height of the image as follows: The whole image should be divided into 9 parts in terms of its face-length; the neck should be 4 aṅgulas, the chest (from the bottom of the neck to the same of the breast), 1 bhāga (i.e., mukha or tāla); (the space) from the chest to the navel, 1 bhāga; from the navel to the (top of the) organ, 1 bhāga; the thighs are two bhāgas and the patella of the knee, 4 aṅgulas; the legs (from below the knee to the top of the feet measure two bhāgas in height, the feet being four aṅgulas high.¹ The full height of the image as given in the Brhatsamhitā is exactly the same. Thus in verse 4 (ch. 57) we are told that the face-length is 12 aṅgulas; verse 5 tells us that the neck measures 4 aṅgulas; then in verses 16 and 17, the height of the rest of the body is given.² A glance at Plate VI, Fig 1 will show the distribution of the height of an image measuring 108 of its own aṅgula and it should be noted that the part above the keśarekhā (hair-line) is not included

¹ Matsya Purāṇa, ch. 258, vv. 26-29: Pratimāmukhamānena navabhāgān prakalpayet | Caturāṅgulā bhaved grīva bhāgena hṛdayam punah || 'Nābhīstasmād odhāh kāryā bhāgenaikena sōbhānā | Nābheradhrasthā médhrām bhāgenaikena kalpayet | Dvibhāgenayātā vūrj jānuni caturāṅgule || Jaṅghe dvibhāge vikhyāte pūdau ca caturāṅgulau || The sum total of the above is just 108 aṅgulas; the height of the skull or scalp is not included in the above for the reason that it is generally put inside some sort of a crown or head gear, which according to the same authority is 14 aṅgulas high (Caturddasāṅgulas tadavannaurārasyā prakīrtīlah).

² Kaṇṭhāddvādasā hṛdayam hṛdayānnābhi ca tatpramāṇena | Nābhimadhyānmedhrāntaram ca tattulyamevoktam || Orā cāṅgula-mānaiḥcaturgyutā vīṁstistathā jaṅghe || Jānukapīrche caturāṅgule ca pādau tattulyau ||
in it. It is noteworthy that in none of the above texts, the word *tāla* is mentioned, though in the *Matsya Purāṇa* a brief reference is made to the *daśatāla* images of Rāma (Dāsārathī), Bali the son of Virocana, Varāha and Narasimha, and the *saptatāla* image of Vāmana. One should refer in this connection to the *uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama daśatāla* and several other varieties of the other *tāla* measurements like *navārdhātāla*, *uttama navatāla*, *satryaṅgula navatāla*, *navatāla*, *aṣṭatāla*, *saptatāla*, etc., as mentioned in such texts as the *Vaikhānasāgama*, *Karaṇāgama*, *Silparatna* and others. The *Vaikhānasāgama* says that images of Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Siva should be made according to the *uttamadaśatāla* (124 aṅgulas), of Śri, Bhūmi, Umā, and Sarasvatī, according to *madhyamadaśatāla* (120 aṅgulas), of Indra and other Lokapālas, Sūrya, Candra and the twelve Ādityas, the seven Rudras, the eight Vasus, the Āśvins, Bṛgu, Mārkandeya, Garuḍa, Śeṣa, Durgā, Guha (Kārttikeya) and the seven Rṣis, according to the *adhama-daśatāla* (116 aṅ.) measurement; the lord of the Yakṣas (Kubera), the Navagrahas, and other deities should measure *navārdhatāla* (114 aṅ.), while the lords of the Daityas, Yakṣas (again mentioned) and the Uragas (Nāgas) as well as the Siddhas, Gandharvvas and Cāraṇas should be *uttamana vatāla* (112 aṅ.) high; the figures of those men who are equal to gods (devakalpamanu, perhaps the same as the *mahāpuruṣas*) should measure *satryaṅgula-navatāla* (111 aṅ.) and those of Rākṣasas, Indras, Asuras, *navatāla* (108 aṅ.); *aṣṭatāla* (96 aṅ.) is prescribed for men, *saptatāla* (84 aṅ.) for Vetālas, *ṣaṭtāla* (72 aṅ.) for pretas, *pañcatāla* (60 aṅ.) for

---

1 Ch. 259, vv. 1-2—Daśatālaḥ smṛto Rāmo Balirvairocanaṁ. tathā || Vārāho Nārasimhasça satatālalastu. Vāmanah || The *Bṛhad- saṁhitā* also, as I have already shown, refers to the 120 aṅgula image of Dāsārathī Rāma and Vairocana Bali, but does not use the word *tāla*.
hunchbacks, caṇustāla (48 ań.) for dwarfs, triṇāla (36 ań.) for Bhūtas and Kinnaras, dvitāla (24 ań.) for Kuṣmāṇḍas (? Kumbhāṇḍas) and ekatāla (12 ań.) for Kabandhas.¹

It has already been shown that neither the earliest datable work on iconometry now extant, viz., the earlier portion of Chap. 57 of the Brāhatsamhitā, nor Utpala's commentary on it explicitly refers to the word tāla or its equivalents. Kāśyapa also, as quoted at some length by Utpala, is silent about it (Brāhatsamhitā, pp. 776-78). The Saṃbuddhabhāṣita-Pratimālakṣaṇam (edited by me, C. U. Press, 1932) follows these earlier works and does not mention the word tāla. But most of the other works dealing with iconometry, which cannot be given very early date, not only use it but also record very intricate details about it. Does it prove that tāla as a higher unit in iconometry was a comparatively late introduction, the earlier mode of distinguishing the well-known varieties of measurements being in terms of the lower unit the aṅgula? I cannot help quoting the following lines from Gopinath Rao for elucidating my point: "The reader would be inclined to believe that the phrases daśatāla, pañcatāla and ekatāla mean lengths equal to ten, five and one tāla respectively, but

¹ T. A. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, App. B., p. 61. The text further says that each of the above tāla measurements have three varieties, viz., uttama, madhyama and adhama (teṣām pratyekamuttamamadhyama-mādhamabhedāni bhavanti), it being understood that the first and the last varieties are respectively 4 aṅgulas more and 4 aṅgulas less than the middle one which is normal. Śrī-Kumāra gives us a very detailed account of all these different tāla measurements and their sub-varieties (Silparatna, T. S. S., Vol. II, pp. 34-76); about ekā-. dvi-. and tri-tāla images it is simply mentioned, "Tridvyekeṭālakheyānāṁ pratimānaṁ vicakṣaṇaḥ । Aṅgurāṇyādīmāṇāṁ pramanyel pārcaśāśtratalah || The text enjoins that images of Gaṇapati (Vighnesh) should be made according to the uttama-pañcatāla or madhyama-pañcatāla measurements, some details of which are also appended. Rao has fully utilised this text in his work on iconometry (Tālāmāṇa, M.A.S.I., 3.).
unfortunately this interpretation does not seem to agree with the actual measurements; for example, the total length of an image made according to the uttama-daśatāla measurement is 124 aṅgulas and the tāla of this image measures 13½ aṅgulas; dividing the total length by the length of the tāla we find that there are only 9 tālas in it; again, the total length of a catustāla image is 48 aṅgulas and its tāla is 8 aṅgulas and therefore there are 6 tālas in this set of proportions” (Rao, Tālamāṇa or Iconometry, p. 35). His authority as regards his assertion about the length of the tāla in the above cases is the āgama literature (cf. his table, op. cit., pp. 36-37). He could not offer any satisfactory explanation of this discrepancy, his only remark being, ‘there is no etymological significance clearly visible in the names given to the various proportions.’ It is possible that originally there was never a tāla unit of such varying measurements as laid down in the later āgamic literature; over and above the smaller aṅgula unit, a higher one computed in terms of aṅgula was known (used in differentiating between the pravara, sama and nyūna images of Varāhamihira). This larger unit was composed of 12 aṅgulas, but was not referred to as a tāla in the earlier texts. It is a pity that Nagnajit’s work on iconography and iconometry (Pratimālakṣaṇa) has not been discovered as yet and there is no knowing whether the 14 aṅgula lengthwise measurement of the face was ever described as a tāla. Thus it is quite likely that the tāla of different measurements was comparatively a late feature in the iconometrical system of India. The earlier method of arriving at the smaller and higher units was a much simpler and practical one. This view of mine is further supported by the fact that in all the texts both early and late, this unit of 12 aṅgulas is the basis of calculation, when it is made in terms of a higher unit. Varying face-lengths in different types of images as recorded in the comparatively late iconometric texts were never
mentioned in them as the higher unit on the basis of which the images were to be measured.

W. S. Hadaway explains tāla (he writes 'thalam meaning a short span') and aṅgula in a slightly different way. According to him, the actual image in order to be made in accordance with one definite system, should have its total height divided into one of five different sets of proportions, viz., 10, 9, 8, 7 or 5 equal parts of the whole height, i.e., daśa, navā, aṣṭa, sapta or pūncā tālas respectively; the tāla is now divided into 12 equal parts, each part being termed an aṅgula which is again divided into 8 equal parts called yavas for the purpose of more minute measurements. For still more minute measurements, the yavas may be again subdivided, but it is seldom necessary in practice. It is clear, however, on the authority of the earliest datable text that the lower limit was derived independently of the higher one at an early age. It may be observed here that Hadaway based his conclusions not only on comparatively late South Indian texts but also on the actual method followed by the modern South Indian sthapatis.

I have already shown that several early iconometric texts record the length of the face as equal to its width, both being 12 aṅgulas. But there was the Dravidian measure in which the length of the face was two aṅgulas more than its width, the former being 14 aṅgulas and the latter 12. Varāhamihira mentions the name of Nagnajit, who recorded this Drāvida māna in two verses of his chapter on Pratimā-lakṣaṇam, the first of which with Utpala's commentary on it has already been quoted by me in p. 31. In the second verse we are informed that according to Nagnajit the length or height of the face of the image with the hair on its head should be 16 aṅgulas (Āṣayāṁ sākeśaniyāṁ śoḍaśa dair-

---

ghyena Nagnajitproktam, ch. 57, v. 15); Utpala supplies us with the line from Nagnajit's work in his commentary (Tathā ca Nagnajit—Duyāngulā keśarekhaivam mukhaṃ syāt  śroḍaśaṅgulaṃ). The length of the face of an image of the uttamaḍaśatāla variety as laid down in the various South Indian texts like Kāraṇāgama, Kāmikāgama, Vai-khānasāgama and Silparatna is also 14 to 13½ aṅgulas (according to the first two, 14 and according to the last two 13½, if we include the measurement of the small fleshy fold below the chin in it).¹ The above fact proves that the longer facial type was in vogue in South Indian iconographic art from a very early time. An interesting comparison of the Drāviḍa measure can be made with the face-length of the Buddha image as laid down in the Samyaksambuddhabhāṣita-Pratimālakṣaṇam. This text says that the face of the Buddha image should be 13½ aṅgulas long and it should be divided into 3 parts, viz., the forehead, the portion beneath it up to the bottom of the nose, and thence to the end of the chin. The forehead, like the nose, should be 4 aṅgulas, the portion below the nose up to the end of the chin should be a little in excess (½ aṅgulas according to the Chinese translation of the text and 1½ according to its Sanskrit original).² But the Kriyā-

¹ Rao, Tālamāna, p. 44:—
1. End of the front hair to the aksisūtra—4 añ. 4 yavas.
2. Aksisūtra to nāsikānta (end of the nose)—4 añ. 4 yavas.
3. Nāsikānta to cīvukānta (end of the chin)—4 añ. 4 yavas.
   (Kāraṇa and Kāmikāgamas)—13 añ. 4 yavas.

2 Pratimālakṣaṇam (C. U. Press, 1932), vv. 2-3 (p. 10).
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samuccaya which includes a sort of a commentary on the above text on Buddhist iconometry expressly says that the length of each of the three parts of the face is $4\frac{1}{2}$ aṅgulas. Reference may be made here, in passim, to the face-length of the Mālavya type of men as referred to by Varāhamihira. The height of the face of this type of men should be 13 aṅgulas; the passage—pañcāṣṭau cordhramāsyam—has been commented on by Utpala in the following way:—pañca ca aṣṭau ca pañcāṣṭau trayodasāṅgulāni | Īrddhramāsyam mūrdhvādhamānenaśyam ciṃukāllalāṭāntāṃ yāvat trayodasāṅgulam bhavati | It should be noted, however, that though the full height of the Buddha image according to the above Buddhist text corresponds to the same of an image of the uttamaśatāla type (the former measures 125 aṅgulas in height, thus being only 1 aṅgula in excess of the height of the latter), the height of a Mālavya type is only 108 aṅgulas.

It will be of interest now to compare briefly the Indian canons of proportion with those in vogue among the Egyptians and Greeks. In instituting this comparison, a few only of the broad vertical measurements of the figures are to be taken into account, for we have very little knowledge of the intricate details about the varieties of proportions that were adopted by the artists of the ancient times. I have already drawn the attention of my readers to the very early Egyptian mode of dividing an erect human figure over 18 squares, the highest of which ends not at the top of the head, but at the top of the brow, thus leaving the dome of the skull outside, as well as the head-dresses or crowns. The knee falls over the 6th square, the upper part of the legs over the 9th, the shoulders over the 16th, the nose over the 17th. The head which occupies two squares, is thus $\frac{1}{8}$th of the rest of the body. Under the same system, the sitting figure occupies 15 squares, plus the dome of the head. Lepsius sought for the basis of these canons in the length
of the foot, Wilkinson in the height of the foot, C. Blane claims to have discovered it in the length of the medius.\(^1\) In terms of Indian iconometry, the Egyptian mode of measuring the erect human figure up to the forehead roughly corresponds to the \(aṣṭatāla\) measurement, a measurement which, as we have seen, is enjoined in the case of ordinary mortals. Like the Indians, the Egyptians also left the dome of the head outside because in both cases that was usually adorned with elaborate type of head-dresses.\(^2\) The basis of the canons followed in the Egyptian figures was sought for by different scholars in different parts of the body; Blane's reference to the length of the medius reminds us of the āgamic reference to the width or length of the middle digit of the medius used as the basis in India (cf. the \(Vaikhānasā-gama\) passage—\(Puruṣasya daksinahastamadhyamāṅgulermadhyamaparvāṇi vistāram āyataṁ vā mātrāṅgulam\)). The famous statue of the Doryphorus or Canon in which the Greek sculptor Polyclitus embodied his ideas about perfect proportions of the human body can only be seen now in its imperfect copies. The completest of such copies is that from Pompeii, now in the Naples Museum; 'it represents a young man in the very prime of athletic condition, but remarkable rather for massive strength than for agility. All his muscles are strongly developed, though we must allow something here for the exaggeration of the late copyist; his head is large in proportion, about one-seventh of the total height, and its squareness of skull and rather heavy jaw imply that his athletic prowess is due rather to obstinate

\(^1\) Jean Capart, \textit{Egyptian Art}, p. 156.

\(^2\) P. K. Acarya is wrong when he says that the \(tālamāna\) as a sculptural measurement denoted a system in which the length of the face including the head is stated to be the unit. Another statement of his, \textit{viz.}, 'an image is of \(daśatāla\) measure when its whole length is equal to 10 times the face including the head, is also incorrect. P. K. Acarya, \textit{Dictionary of Hindu Architecture}, pp. 221-22.
power of endurance than to quickness or versatility' (E. A. Gardner, op. cit., pp. 360-62). But the technique which was followed by the same artist in his bronze statues (copies only of which are extant) shows his artistic skill in the delineation of proportions and delicate modelling to much better advantage than it is shown in marble. The statue of an Amazon, leaning with her left elbow on a pillar, her right hand resting on her head, which is in the Berlin Museum and which has been recognised as a copy of Polyclitus' Amazon, shows the square and vigorous form of the athlete who though female in sex is male in modelling and proportion; its head with its squarely shaped skull and heavy jaw resembles greatly the head of the Doryphorus. The successors of Polyclitus gradually changed into figures of slimmer proportions; this is proved by Praxiteles' sculpture of Hermes as the protector of youth, the original of which has been discovered by the German excavators in the Heraeum at Olympia. The figure is more slender and graceful than that of a Polyclitan athlete; it embodies Praxiteles' ideal of Greek youth in its normal and healthy condition. Part of the right leg (from the knee to the ankle) and the whole of the left leg below the knee are broken and so we cannot accurately determine the proportion of the head to the full height of the body, but it was certainly more than 7 : 1 which was so in the case of Polyclitus' Canon. One of his other statues, viz., the Aphrodite of Cnidus (preserved only in copies) prove the same truth. The goddess, represented as preparing for the bath, shows a pronounced stoop forwards, with the weight of the body carried along the projecting right hip and resting on the right foot, the left knee being bent; even in this slightly bent posture, the full height is more than seven times her head and had she been in an erect position, the proportion would have probably been 8 : 1. This is maintained in the works of Lysippus, one of the most prolific of the Greek sculptors who was the
acknowledged and unrivalled master of the Siconian school 'which had contributed more than any other to the advance of academic study and the continuity of artistic tradition.'

'Thus we are told that Lysippus modified the square and heavy proportion of the Polyclitan Canon; he made the head smaller (about one-eighth of the total height instead of one-seventh), the body more slender and drier in texture, thus increasing the apparent height.'

It will be useful, in this connection, to refer briefly to the proportion of the head to the full height of the human figure, which is normally followed by the modern artists of the west in their work. Alfred Fripp and Ralph Thompson have shown in their work on *Human Anatomy for Art Students*, 'that the height of an average adult male is just seven and half times the measurement of the head,' observing at the same time that 'the student of art anatomy will do well to remember that the more exact the measurements which are made upon one special individual, the more liability to error is there if you attempt to lay down general rules therefrom' (p. 255). Still it seems the Western artists generally follow this mode in representing an adult male body in art, the average female being made somewhat smaller in proportion than the average male. Now, if we leave out the measurement of the dome of the head and measure the whole height of the figure in terms of the face-length, it will appear that the full height will approximate to nearly 9 times the face, as is laid down in the early Indian *śilpaśāstras* (Pl. VI, fig. 4). The art students in the Indian

---

1 E. A. Gardner, *op. cit.*, p. 489; *italics are mine.* Lysippus was one of the earliest sculptors to introduce the principle of making men and things, not as they were in nature (which was the mode of the earlier Greek sculptors), but as they appeared to be; 'that is to say, he did not so much consider the correctness to nature of the actual material form of his work, but rather the effect it produced on the eye of the spectator, and was, so far, an impressionist.'
art schools also are usually given this proportion when they are asked to represent an average human body.\footnote{Rao says that according to the canons of European art, a well-proportioned male figure is equal to eight times the length of the head, a female figure is seven and a half times that of its head. He is not quite accurate when he describes the two types as \textit{a\c{c}atat\=a\l\=a} and \textit{s\=ardhasapatat\=a\l\=a} respectively. He further observes, ‘According to European artists the ear is said to extend from a line drawn across the side of the head on a level with the eye-brow, and another which is drawn on a level with the wing of the nose: or, in the language of the Indian artist between the \textit{bhr\=us\=utra} and the \textit{n\=as\=ap\=u\=ta\=s\=utra}. Similarly, the other rules arrived at by the Indian artist do not appear to be divergent from those evolved by the European artist.’ T. A. G. Rao, \textit{Elements, etc.}, Vol. I, App. B, p. 8.}

A few words are necessary here about the comparison of the ideal theory and the actual practice. It has already been shown that there must have flourished in ancient and mediaeval India different schools of image-makers who followed art traditions current in their respective localities. If we carefully analyse the large number of available iconographic and iconometric texts, we seldom fail to find differences, however slight they may be. While editing the text on Buddhist iconometry, \textit{Samyaksambuddhabh\=\=asitabuddhapratim\=\=alak\=\=a\=na\=m} by name, I noted some measurements of as many as 16 selected Buddha images belonging to Gandhara, Mathura and Bihar. I found that those among them hailing from the two last mentioned places very closely approximated to the corresponding details laid down in the text; very few of the Gandhara Buddhas, on the other hand, tallied with the textual data. While engaged in my present work, I measured several comparatively well-preserved images of Brahmanical divinities in the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta and the Asutosh Museum, Calcutta University. I found that in many instances the approximation of the actual practice with the theory was very great. The above sculptures, datable from
the 9th-10th century onwards, were collected mainly from different parts of Eastern India, and the texts that were followed by their makers were certainly North-Indian ones. It must be observed, however, that the iconometric study of the reliefs could only be of a partial nature, the actual measurements taken with the help of anthropometric instruments mainly being of their height and rarely of their width. I append the results of my observations in Appendix C; in Appendix B, I give the text of Pratimāmānalakṣānam and for comparison's sake quote the relevant section of ch. 57 of Br̥hataṃhitā.¹ A comparison of these two texts will show how the latter is much simpler and practical than the former which is much more complicated and which bristles with technicalities.

I conclude this chapter by quoting the observations of V. A. Smith who was sometimes a severe critic of Indian hieratic art and Hadaway, a practical artist, about these canons. Smith says, "There is in the Hindu system nothing complicated or difficult to understand or remember, but like every other canon of artistic proportion, these methods are more capable of producing works of art in unskilled hands than are any other aids or methods.........These sāstras are the common property of Hindu artisans, whether of Northern or Southern India." (I.A., Vol. XLIV, pp. 90-91). Hadaway remarks, "The Hindu image-maker or sculptor does not work from life, as is the usual practice among Europeans, but he has, in place of the living model, a most elaborate and beautiful system of proportions, which he uses constantly, combining these with close observation and study of

¹ Pratimāmānalakṣānam has been edited by P. Bose. But this edition is very much defective, and it seems to have been based on an indifferent copy. I am indebted to my friend and colleague, Dr. P. C. Bagchi, Dr. es. Lettres, of the Calcutta University, for kindly allowing me to utilise a much better copy of this text brought by him from Nepal,
natural detail. It is in fact a series of anatomical rules and formulae, of infinitely more practical use than any European system which I know of, for the Indian one treats of the actual proportion and of the surface form, rather than the more 'scientific' attachments of muscles and the articulation of bones” (O.Z., 1914, p. 34).
APPENDIX A

(a) Image-worship and the Pāñcarātra

I have already referred in the second chapter of my book to the excessive importance attached to the images of Viṣṇu, his Vyūhas and Vibhavas (emanatory and incarnatory forms), in the Pāñcarātra cult. There is very little doubt that it was this cult among all the other Brahmanical cults prevalent in India, that was most responsible for the wide diffusion of the practice of image-worship. To the Pāñcarātras the Arcā or Śrī-vigraha was the God himself in one of his aspects, and was thus the object of the greatest veneration as the 'God manifest' (pratyakṣa devatā). These images were principally anthropomorphic ones and the Pāñcarātra theologians exulted in endowing their god and his various aspects with human traits. It has been proved by me with the help of numismatic data that anthropomorphic as well as theriomorphic images of Śiva were fairly prevalent in this country in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era and those immediately succeeding it, though his phallic form was not surely unknown. But, in course of time, the latter came to be regarded as the all-important emblem to be almost invariably enshrined in the main sanctum, the former being chiefly used as the central figure in decorative reliefs illustrating the various myths associated with Saivism. The Vira-sāivas or Liṅgāyats, a comparatively late branch of the same sectary, were averse to the practice of worshipping the deity in his anthropomorphic form; to them the Śiva-liṅga was the most sacred object symbolising the greatness of their divinity and they carried it on their body in some form or other throughout life from the time of their initiation.\(^1\) The Pāñca-

\(^1\) But, the tendency to anthropomorphise even this aniconic emblem made itself manifest in many late specimens of Śiva-liṅgas.
rātras or the Vaiṣṇavas, on the other hand, seldom (if at all) enshrined a mere emblem of their god in the main sanctum, the aniconic emblems like the sālagrāmas 'being given subsidiary position in the public shrines or worshipped in private chapels of the individual householders. Their principal cult objects enshrined in the sanctum were the images of one or other of the various aspects of the Lord, often anthropomorphic, less so theriomorphic or therio-anthropomorphic. The Nārada Pāñcarātra (Bhāradvāja-Saṃhitā-Pariśīṭa) tells us that Hari is to be always worshipped in images; but when these are wanting, then alone other objects are to be used for this purpose. Of these objects again, Sālagrāmas are the best for a Sālagrāma stone is the celestial form of Hari. ¹

Sometimes, though perhaps rarely, the image of the goddess Śrī, his consort par excellence, seemed to have been the central object of worship in a Pāñcarātra shrine, as is proved by one of her earliest stone images fully in the round, discovered at Besnagar. It is interesting that one of the oldest Viṣṇuite images should be none other than that of this goddess with unmistakable Pāñcarātra association. Reference has been made by me in the third chapter to the sculpture found there by Cunningham and described by him as the Kalpadrum capital; I have proved that in it is to be recognised the earliest representation of the aṣṭanidhis which are usually associated with Kubera. It has also been shown by me that Śrī was the goddess who presided over these eight treasures (pp. 115-116, 210; Pl. X., Fig. 2). I may suggest here that the colossal female statue, 6' 7'' in height, discovered very near

enguished in temples. I have already drawn the attention of my readers to the curious practice of permanently fixing gold leaves in the shape of three eyes, a nose (the outline of a human face) into the pūjābhāga of the emblem (p. 40, f.n. 1).

¹ Bhāradvāja Saṃhitā-Pariśīṭa. III, 57-58.
Arayo'rcaiyāṁ Harirnityam tadabhaṁ tu kutrucait I
Puspenārghyen haviśā natyā stutyāpi vāparum II
Sālagramaśūlāyantu pūjanaṁ snāpanadupī I
Sā hi divyā Harermurttirdarāśindava siddhiṅkṛt II
the above capital by the same archaeologist, and belonging to the same age (3rd-2nd century B.C.), stands for no other than Sri herself who held such an important position in the Pāñcarātra cult as the active energetic principle—the chief consort of the Para-Vāsudeva.¹

A few Besnagar and Nāgari inscriptions of the pre-Christian period refer to the existence of the Pāñcarātra shrines in the ancient towns of Vidiśā and Madhyamikā (Ch. III). It is true that no images of Vāsudeva or of any of his forms have yet been discovered in these places; but it is presumable that they must have been destroyed in course of time. Epigraphic data about the erection of similar shrines at Mathura and other places in the early centuries of the Christian era have to some extent been corroborated by the actual finds of Viṣṇuite images. I have a suspicion that the devagṛhas which housed them might not always have been elaborate structures as they were afterwards, but were sacred places with cult-objects placed on raised pedestals inside them very carefully fenced off by railings. The Nāgari and Mathura inscriptions emphasise these railings (cf. the Pūjā-silāprākāra in the former and vediḥ in the latter), though the latter also mentions the erection of a toraṇa and a catuḥśāla (or devakula—Lüders) in the mahāstāna of Vāsudeva. Numismatic data, though occasionally supplying us with representations of

¹ My suggestion about this sculpture which is usually described as a Yakṣini can be supported with the help of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa passage already quoted by me (pp. 116 and 210—but there I had not discussed its identity), as also by referring to the fact that it closely resembles the figure of Sirimā represented on an upright pillar of the Bhārhat railing. It is highly probable, if not certain, that the above capital with the nidhis was the capital of a dhrvāja before the shrine of the great Pāñcarātra goddess at Besnagar. The existence of three other Pāñcarātra shrines—those of the three Vyūhas, viz., Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣṇa and Pradyumna, has been proved by the discovery there of their dhrvāja-capitals, Garuḍa, Tāla and Makara. The points raised here are discussed in fuller details in two of my papers, one appearing in the current (1941) issue of the J.I.S.O.A., and the other read in the Fifth Session of the Indian History Congress at Hyderabad.
structural shrines of gods (cf. some coins of the Audumbaras and a few of Huvishka), very frequently refer to the railings which usually demarcated these sthānas. It may be remarked here, en passant, that the railings which are very often depicted beneath the feet of so many Yakṣas, Yakṣinīs, Nāgas and Nāginīs in the early Buddhist art of central India, though serving the purpose of pedestals of these vyāntara devatās in their relievo-representations, really refer to such as fenced off their shrines.

A few lines about the sectarian exclusiveness of the Pāñcarātrins, especially with regard to their ritualistic practice will not be out of place here. This exclusive spirit is more noticeable in such late works as the apocryphal Nārada-Pāñcarātra. Bhūradvīja-Samhitā, included in it, writes that such gods as Brahmā, Rudra, Dīkṣālas, Sūrya, their Saktis or their children should neither be worshipped daily, nor should ever be resorted to for the fulfilment of any desire. No (Pāñcarātrin) should stay for a single day or take food and drink in a house or a village in which there are no images of Viṣṇu. Images enshrined and worshipped by heretics and Saivas are always to be shunned; all the gods (i.e., their images), even if they are worshipped according to the rituals prescribed for them should be avoided. No food ought to be taken (by a Vaiṣṇava) in the house of one, where there are images of other divinities, but Janārdana (i.e., his image) is absent, even if the householder be well-versed in the Vedāntas.¹

¹ IV 4:

Brahmarudrادرadigiśārka-tacchaktiprasavādayah
Nityamabhyarcane varjyōḥ kāmo’pi syānna tanmukhah

IV 28:

Viṣṇuvarcārahite grāme Viṣṇuvarcārahite grhe
Na kuryādannapānādi na tatra divasāṃ vuset

IV 30 31:

Varjyōḥ pākhāndasaivūdayaiḥ sthāpitāśca tathārcitāḥ
Anyatra ca svato baddhā niyamat sarvadevatāḥ
Grhe yasyānyadevārca vyakto na ca Janārdanah
Na tasya kiścidaśīyādapi vedāntavedinah

Many more such verses can be quoted.
This mental attitude is in striking contrast to the catholicity of spirit to be found in the Bhagavadgītā, a much earlier text expounding the bhaktimārga of the Ekāntika or Bhāgavata school.¹

(b) The installation of images

The images, until they were duly consecrated and ceremonially enshrined, were not regular objects of worship. Elaborate rituals are prescribed in comparatively early and late texts for their due consecration and installation (mūrtī-praṭiṣṭhā). I give here a free translation of the Chapter on Pratīmā-praṭiṣṭhāpanaṁ in the Brhatasamhitā (Ch. 59, Sudhakar Dvivedi’s Edition).

“A wise man should erect a pavilion for the preliminary consecration of an image in the southern quarter or eastern: the pavilion should be furnished with four torāyas (ornamental arches) and (its top) covered with the branches of such trees as yaśna-ḍumbura, etc. In the different parts of the pavilion—eastern, south-eastern, southern, south-western, western, north-western, northern and north-eastern—garlands and banners of various colours should be hung. Inside the maṇḍapa an earthen altar (sthāṇḍila) should be raised, and the latter should be first sprinkled with sand and then covered over with kuśa grass: now the image should be placed on it with its head and feet resting on a bhadrā-sana (a kind of seat).”²

¹ Bhagavadgītā, IV. 11 and IX. 23:
  Ye yathā māṁ prapadyante tāṁstathaiva bhajāṃyaḥ
  Mama vartmānurcāntante manuṣyaḥ Pūrṇaḥ sarvasaḥ
  Ye’pyanyadavatābhaktā yajante śraddhyānvitāḥ
  Te’pi nāmeva Kaṁcya yajantiyavidhipūrvakam

² In three verses just before it, the author refers to the different materials out of which the images are made, and the different results to be obtained by making and worshipping them:—
  Ayuḥśrībalajyādā dārāmaya mṛṇmayā iñthā pratimā
  Lokahitāya mṛṇimayā sauvarṇī puṣṭidā bhaṇati
  Rajaṭamaya kṛttikā prajāviryddhīṁ karoti tāṁramaya
  Bhūlābhāṁ tu mahānāṁ saṅi pratimāthavā līgam
  Saṅkūpahatā pratimā pradhānāpadraṇaṁ kulaṁ ca ghālayati
  Śvabhropahatā rogaṇupadravaṁśca kṣayaṁ kurute
Now, the image should be successively bathed with various kinds of waters; first, a decoction of the (twigs of) plakṣa, aśvattha, udumbara, sīrīṣa and vaṭa should be used, then the auspicious sarvauṣadhi water and next the water from sacred places, in which earth raised by elephants and bulls, earth from mountain, anthill, confluences of rivers, lotus ponds, and pañcagavya are mixed, should be poured; when the image is being bathed with the above and with scented water in which gold and precious gems are put in, it should be placed with its head towards the east; during this ceremony, tūryas (a kind of musical instrument—a trumpet) should be sounded, and ‘punyāha’ (‘auspicious day’) and Veda mantras should be uttered. The most respected of the Brāhmaṇas then chant Aindra mantras (mantras associated with the Vedic god Indra) in the eastern and Aagnimantras in the south-eastern quarter; these Brāhmaṇas are to be honoured with handsome offerings or fees (dakṣinā). The Brahman (i.e., the priest) should offer homa to fire with the mantra particular to the deity being enshrined. If during the performance of the homa, the fire becomes full of smoke, or the flames turn from right to left or the burning faggots emit frequent sparks, then it is not auspicious; it is also inauspicious, if the priest forgets his mantras, or, (the flames) rage backwards. After having bathed the image and decked it with new cloth and ornaments and

1 The following plants constitute sarvauṣadhi according to Utpala: Jayī, jayantī, jivantī, jīvaputṛī, punarnava, viṣṇu-krāntā, abhayā, viśvambhari, mukhāmoda, sahadevi, pūrṇakośā, satāvari, sahasravirya, lakṣmani. The pañcagavyas are cow-dung, urine of the cow, milk, curd and clarified butter.

In performing nitya (daily) and naimittika (occasional) pūjās, the Yajamāna, after performing ācamana, will think of Viṣṇu after uttering a particular mantra (Viṣṇu-smaraṇa) and then say: ‘Om karttaryesarśmin karmani punyāhāṃ bhavanto brubantu (‘In this action that should be done, you kindly say that the day be auspicious’) and the Brahmin priest should say ‘Om punyāhām’) (‘yes, let it be auspicious ’); this is ‘punyāhavācana.’
worshipped it with flowers and sandal paste, the priest should lay it down on a well-spread bed. When the image have slept its full, it should be roused from sleep with songs and dances and should be installed at a time fixed by the astrologers. Then after worshipping the image with flowers, garments, sandal paste, and the sounds of conchshell and trumpet, it should be carefully taken inside the sanctum from the pavilion, keeping the temple to the right (prādakṣiṇyena). After making profuse offerings (to the deity) and honouring the Brāhmaṇas and persons assembled there, a piece of gold should be put into the mortise-hole of the piṇḍikā (base), and the image should be fixed (in its base). The enshriner of the image, by honouring specially the astrologer, the Brāhmaṇas, the assembled persons and the image-maker or the architect (the word here used is sthāpati explained by Utpala as vardhakī), enjoys bliss in this world and in heaven. Images of Viṣṇu, Śūrya, Śiva, Mārgaṇaś, Brahmā, Buddha and the Jinas should be installed by a Bhāgavata, a Maga, a Pāṇḍīṭa, one well-versed in the worship (of the Śakti), a Brāhman knowing the Vedas well, a person of the Śākya race, a Digambara Jaina respectively, according to the different rituals prescribed in the above different sectarian systems. The installation of god (i.e., their images) is recommended in the bright fortnight in the period of the summer-solstice and during certain particular positions of the planets and asterisms, and in days other than Tuesday and in a time particularly auspicious to the donor of the image. I have given here in brief the general and easily practicable rules about the preliminary consecration (adhiśīrṣa) and installation (pratiṣṭhā) of images. In the Śāvitra (śāstra), however, preliminary consecration and installation (of individual divinities) have been elaborately treated (Adhiśīrṣana-sanniveśane sāvitrē prthageva vistarāt).

One or two points in the above rendering of the chapter on Pratimā-pratiṣṭhāpanam require notice. In the installation ceremony of the sectarian gods and goddesses, some importance is undoubtedly given to Vedic ritualism; in the preliminary consecration, the Indra and Agni mantras are to be uttered and
the Vedic homa is to be performed. But during the performance of the homa, the mantra particular to the deity whose image is being installed is to be recited. The principal installation is to be done by a sectarian initiate according to the rites prescribed in the individual sectarian system. The mixed ritualism, partly Vedic and mostly sectarian, has been curiously enough described by Utpala as Vaidik vidhāna, while explaining the word sāmānyam in the last verse (Sāmānyamaviśeṣam vaidikena vidhānena). Then reference is made in the last verse to the elaborate treatment of the same topic in Saura śāstra in which detailed descriptions of rituals followed in the installation of different divinities are incorporated.¹

The whole of the 19th Vilāsa (named Prātiṣṭhiko) of the Haribhaktivilāsa supplies us with an extremely full account of Śrīmūrti-praṭiṣṭhā (the installation of the auspicious image of the Lord Vāsudeva) based on the Hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātra and several Purāṇas. The Saṃkarṣaṇa-kāṇḍa of the Hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātra itself is principally devoted to this topic, but it is still in manuscript form (note that the Saura-kāṇḍa in this Pancharātra text also contains something on pratiṣṭhā and compare this with the last line of the chapter just quoted). Lastly, notice should be taken of the honours to be done to the architect or the sculptor, the artist or artists responsible for the construction of the image and the building of the temple. Haribhaktivilāsa quotes from various texts like the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Matsya Purāṇa and the Hayaśīrṣa-pañcarātra about the full satisfaction and honour to be given to the artists by the person who is enshrining an image (cf. the section on Silpiparītaṇam in the 19th Vilāsa)².

Utpala gives two explanations of the last line of the last verse. The first is given above by me; the other is:—Athaśāvite śavitarādityasya ye adhiväsana-sanniveśane prthageva vistarāt tucchastre saure bhavati iti.

² Tato Viṣṇum sāmānyam sudhautam suparīkṣitam
Silpinah pājaye paścād vastrālaṅkaraṇādibhibhī
(Bhaviṣya Purāṇa)
(C) Jirnoddhāra

Restoration of old and dilapidated shrines and replacement of broken, decaying and sometimes defiled images or other cult objects by new ones have been regarded from a long time as great acts of religious merit in India. In some texts, these are even described as more meritorious than the establishment of new shrines and construction of new images. One of the earliest instances of jirnoddhāra, though associated with Buddhism, has been recorded in the steatite casket discovered at Shinkot in Bajaur territory, 20 miles to the north-west of the confluence of the Panjorama and Swat rivers, beyond the borders of the North-West Frontier Province. Two sets of inscriptions are engraved on it, the earlier one referring to the establishment or consecration of (the corporeal relic) of the Buddha in the reign of Mahārāja Minadra (Menander), the donor being a person named Viyakamitra, the apraca-raja (one who has no king as his adversary). The later portion of the record also refers to the establishment of the corporeal relic of the Buddha, and of the bowl, but by a person named Vijayamitra, also an apraca-raja and evidently a descendant of Viyakamitra, on the 25th day of Vaisākha of the 5th regnal year. This subsequent epigraph records—'

This corporeal relic having been broken is not held in worship with zeal. It is decaying in course of time, (and) is not honoured; (and here) by the offering of alms and water, ancestors are no longer propitiated; (and) the receptacle of that (relic) has been cast aside. (Now) in the fifth year and on the twenty-fifth day of the month of Vaisākha, this has been established by Vijayamitra, who has

\[\text{अनुरा लिङ्गां रस्तम वा शिापिनाः पुष्यायुभिः वै}\\\text{पाृत्राहरायरतान्त्रा ये सा तम्परतराकावः}\\\text{क्षमाध्रामिति दौ सर्वत्र याजयमानो ह्यातः परन्म}\\\text{(मन्द्रा पुराणः)}\\\text{पुष्यायुवा तु प्रतिमाः शिापिनाः तोऽयत लोकः वै}\\\text{गृहपुष्पपादिभिरविध्रुवां तोऽयत कतकादिभिः}\\\text{सर्वस्तोऽत्ता कर्ममिनस्तुष्टस्तस्मि कूले प्रियात्रे प्रियात्रे}\\\text{क्षमापयिताः सर्ववन प्रियप्राप्तेऽसर्ववातः वै}\\\text{(हायासर्सा-पुराणात्रा)}\]
no king as his adversary. Thus, there is no doubt about its being a clear case of jīrnodhāra. H. Thsang says that in recent times Saśāṅka, the enemy and oppressor of Buddhism, cut down the Bodhi-tree, destroyed its roots down to the water, and burned what remained. A few months afterwards Pūrṇavarmā, the last descendant of Aśoka on the throne of Magadha, by pious efforts brought the tree back to life and in one night it became above ten feet high. This king then built round it a stone wall 24 feet high (Watters, On Yuan Chwang, Vol. II, p. 115). Here also is a clear case of restoration after the original shrine was defiled by a non-believer, for the stone wall which was set up by Pūrṇavarnā was nothing but a re-erection. The śilā-prākāra was originally erected in the first century B.C., through the pious zeal and munificence of a lady, Āryā Kuraṅgī by name, the wife of Indrāgnimitra, perhaps a local chieftain. What Pūrṇavarmā did was to use the old materials—the thabhās (pillars), sūcis (joining pieces) and usūnas (coping stones) all made of greyish sandstone—in rebuilding the wall, using new material (granite) when the old fell short of his requirements; there are clear structural indications which fully prove this point (Banva, Gayā and Buddha Gayā, Vol. II, p. 12 ff.). I have referred in the last page of my first chapter to the rebuilding of the Chauṇaṣat Yoginī temple at Bheraghat by Alhanādevi, the queen of the Haihaya King Gayakarnaṇadeva, during the reign of her son Narasiṃhadeva, in the Kalacurī-Cedī year 907 (1155 A.D.). Cunningham noticed that the style of architecture of this temple was plain and simple and might belong to any period between 900 and 1200 A.D. But the characters of the inscriptions on the pedestals of the images point to the earlier date and thus it

1 Imē śārira paluga-bhūd(r)au na sakare atrila | sa śārīa-
(t)ikulā(l)ena śudhro na pimḍoṣayēyi pitri griṇayāt (r)i ; tasa ye
patre apomua | Vagaye pancamaye 41 Vcō(r)akah(r)asa maga-
śa divasa pamcaviś(r)aye iyo prati(r)iṭhavīt(r)e Vijayamitrēnā apracaratena
Bhag(r)avatu Sakiminīsa samasa(ṃ)budhāsa śārīra |

—Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXIV, p. 7. The Kharoṣṭhī record was edited by N. G. Majumdar (ibid., pp. 1-8), who, however, did not notice this aspect of the epigraph.
is clear that they were restored and re-enshrined at a later date. R. D. Banerjee proved with the help of the images divisible into two broad groups, one standing, made of brittle reddish sandstone, with no inscription, and the other seated, mostly carved out of a dull greenish yellow sandstone, inscribed with letters datable in the 10th century A.D. inside the circular temple, that 'before the building of the circular temple in the tenth century A.D., another structure existed on this spot.' Banerjee thinks it extremely probable that the most ancient shrine on the top of the hill, on which the circular temple stands, was erected in the Kushan period, and it enshrined the standing uninscribed images of brittle reddish sandstone.

The last few verses of the Pratimamāṅalakṣaṇam, being edited by me with translation and notes in the next Appendix (B), contain some interesting details about the replacement of old images by new ones, similar to those incorporated in Ch. 67 of the Agni Purāṇa. The details, however, contain more about the manner in which the decaying images are to be destroyed than about their restoration. My study of some ancient Brahmanical and Buddhist images in the Sarnath and Rajshahi Museums has led me to conclude that attempts were made to restore them when they were partially damaged. The Silparatna tells us that 'when an image is slightly damaged, it should never be discarded; but when its arms, hands, feet and legs are severed, when it is broken, split up or nine yava portion of it is gone or when it gets disfigured, it is usually to be discarded. If its fingers, etc., are cut up (or broken) the sages recommend binding (repairing) them'.

1 Cunningham, A.S.R., Vol. IX, pp. 11, 73. Cunningham says, 'the old circular wall, with its inscribed statues, belonged to the 10th century and the cloister with its roof was the work of Queen Alhaṇādevi in the 12th century.'


3 Silparatna, Part II, p. 200:—
Doṣe laghiṭate bimbam naiva tyājyaṃ kadācana |
Bāhucchede karaṭcchede pādaṭcchede tathaiva ca ||
(d) Dhūlicitra

In the prefixed summary of my chapter VI, I have referred to the pictures drawn with coloured rice-powders, but I have inadvertently omitted to discuss it in the body of the chapter. I do it now in the following para.

In many Vaiṣṇava shrines of Bengal, there is a custom of illustrating the stories connected with the early life of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, through the medium of differently coloured rice powder. A part of the shrine, generally of the nāṭmaṇḍap is set apart for this purpose; on a raised platform there, are painted these scenes with extreme care by putting the coloured powder. This is done at the time of Vaiṣṇava festivals like Jhulanyāṭrā and its purpose is mainly decorative and edificatory. Such pictorial representation is probably referred to in the Silparatna as Dhūlicitra (not exactly the same as Ālponā). Śrī Kumāra tells us that there are three kinds of citra, viz., Rasacitra, Dhūlicitra and Citra (Rasacitraṇī tathā dhūlicitraṇī citramiti tridhā). The second one is thus described by him:—‘After powdering separately fire and other colours (methods of preparing different mixed colours such as autumnal green, the colour of elephant, those of bakula fruit, fire, water, etc., are first detailed by him), a beautiful altar (platform) should be painted temporarily with these powders. The old painters have described this as Dhūlicitra; in it likeness is shown just as reflection appears in a mirror.’ The Original text is: Etānyanulavaranāni cūrṇayitvā prthak prthak | Etaiścūrṇaiḥ sthaṇḍile ramye kṣanikāṇi vīte-payet । Dhūlicitramitaḥ khyātaḥ citraṅgaiḥ purūtanaiḥ । Sāḍṛśyaṁ śṛṣṭate yattu darpaṇe pratibimbarat । (Silparatna, Part I, ch. 41, Verses 144-45):

Tathāiśa śṛṣṭite bhinnā yaśminnaryeṣvo gate ।
Vairūpyaṁ jāyate yaṣya tu tyaṁyum prāyaō bhavet ॥
Aṅgulaśādipariśeṣe bandhanaiḥ śasyate budhaiḥ ।

(Ch. 29, vv. 30-32).
APPENDIX B

PART I

प्रतिमामानलचरणम्

नमो बुद्धाय

आविकतिलंके बोधश्राक्षेत्रवन पुरातने।
उक्तं यत्स्वर्णनिम्भोऽप्रतिमामानलचरणम्॥१॥
तत्सत्वत्वेऽब्रम्ह चेकर विष्णुक्तः यथाकरम्।
नला सर्बविन्दे देवमन्यवलक्यस्यमुद्गते॥२॥
हादशाङ्कुलि तालघ वितस्तिमुखमेव च।
स्यमिकार्यनामिन हि शालं गोलकं कला॥३॥
पर्यवानं चतुर्भंगो मायपानांकिका खत।
ततोश्चान्यभागम् यवं विन्याहितचच:॥४॥
प्रत्यात्मा मक्षप्रक्ष्णं मायपार्थमिति खतः।
स्यश्चेति विधाने विषमायतार्थम्ब लयं वुधः॥५॥
यज्ञिक्षिप्तकायां विभाज्य नवभागतः।
पक्षानं सुखं कुष्ठाधिन्वितं तथैव च॥६॥
वचारात्मरति चूतां ( सुखं ) खण्णिकं तिलात्मरति
साहानाखविहीनं यत्रकारात्मतीष्ठति॥७॥
हादशालिनं बिहीनं तु चूताभमानवन भवेत्।
साहानाखविहीनस्य खण्णिककारसूचयते॥८॥
वर्जित्तान्ताङ्कि यतं नामविषय तिलात्मरति।
चतुर्थियात्मो वचारां कपोलसु विसर्जयते॥९॥
क्रियानं तिलसंख्यानं नारीवामितं सुखम्।
साहानाख सुखं च वल यज्ञामानो विन्यायति॥१०॥
वर्षों के बाद कला का प्राचीनता कार्यक्रमः ॥
वर्षों के बाद कला का प्राचीनता कार्यक्रमः ॥
हिंदु विश्वभागत कलाकार प्रयोजनः ॥
कला हिंदु हिंदु-ललात परिक्रमातिम् ॥
तिथिकल्प च लक्षणस्य नियतं प्रशासककम् ॥
हिंदु-विश्वभागत नामिकायाम चर्चते ॥
हिंदुविश्वभागत निष्काम साहित्यकल्म् ॥
हड़क्कल्प पार्श्वयोक्तृः नामावय (नामावश्न) यवचयम् ॥
चर्चावलिस्मे हते वंशमूलि यवचयम् ॥
क्षेतसी विद्याव्याप्तता प्रशासकति सुगोभिना ॥
रति मानसमायजित किशापिष्टि प्रमुखः ॥
तिलपुष्पसमाकाय-सुकृतिनुस्रोपमा ॥
हड़क्कल्प हितावं तस्मा भक्तिभागम प्रचरि ।
प्रहोरं भोजकं कृतिहुद्वरोऽत चतुर्वसम् ॥
विभागाकोलिका कार्या गोजी तस्योपरि स्त्रिता ।
परमसारमुक्तिहृदयम् ॥
निष्कामं पढ़ं यथे मध्ये विवेचित्वाचार कार्येतु ।
श्रीकणि चांडकलाहिन गुप्तिकिस्त्रान्नु कार्येतु ॥
हड़क्कल्प मितुकं तिथिजायामिन यव दश ।
विहारलं भुनोमायो दोहे पद्मालं भवेतु ॥
यवादेवमाना भृ रेखा चापाकारितखरिफता ।
हड़क्कल्प हितावं नीतिकायतन्तु विभागतः ॥
लोकनाय वत्रोभागं तथा तारं प्रकृतिस्वितम् ॥
तथा भागतं कृत्यादिसस्तं सम्मकृतिततम् ॥
कुमुदविलपलनम पद्मपत्र व्योरं (अभोरं)दशम ।
प्रातः हे कले भौये नित्यमाध्य हड़क्कल्पम् ॥
कस्मां हड़क्कलविद्यारी दीपं वर्षकालं चतुर्वसम् ।
प्रकृत: कार्तिक्षाकां हड़क्कलं परिक्रमातितम् ॥
बुधिका घग्नलं समयक् तद्विन्द्र ककुनी (१) भवेत्।
चंद्रनः पञ्च चरुश्रीम: कर्षणवर्णः (कर्षणविणिः) स्तु विन्दुः: ॥२४॥
विचार नकारेयस्य स्वर्ग यशश्रोभा च पारिधीका।
कल्याणेमूः संस्कारां कर्षणनालम्प्रकोपितम् ॥२५॥
कर्षणोक्षहयोपक्रीयो मकरोक्षतारशाखः।
चंद्रशाखः पुष्करं लक्षणम् न संशयः ॥२६॥
अन्नरेखा मन्त्रोपक्रीयो गोलकं परिकोपितम्।
चंद्रशाखः वर्णायं चिवुककरणेमूः लयः। ॥२७॥
तत्तथा चिवुककोपित संक्षेप्यं निरूपयः च।
क्षणी तारकापश्वं संस्कृतम् मात्रयेत् ॥२८॥
अन्नरेखा कर्षणश्रोपश्वं समस्य तार्कः ॥२९॥
बुधिका नेत्रम् यथिवच समक्ष तत्तथांनम् ॥३०॥
दिगोलं सुकर्षणां मर्त्यायस्मात्त्वेव च।
स्यमस्युर्ज्ञातस्य यवव्याहोलकवत्यम् ॥३१॥
चिवुकाधियं यशस्वीयं कर्षणं मांसवत्यम्।
तदालम्प्रमाणिन यहिं खश्येरकनाकः ॥३२॥
मौलिकोधूग जतावन्यः कूचिनों वा विंजोडः।
किरोटि विशिष्यैव सुकुटं स्वयमेव च। ॥३३॥
तंगामस्ताकः दूरवर्षयं नारदिक तन:।
सुवाकारं प्रवच्यामः श्रमं वा यदि वासुश्रमम् ॥३४॥
किरोतिप्राप्तसं कृष्यामाधुरं लवणा लवणा)वितम्।
कषायं करतं क्रमं भावं तिलकः च। ॥३५॥
वज्रे वेद न संख्यानं दूरतयं परिवर्जयेन।
तद्वपरवच्यामः ब्रह्मानाम् मानलचनाम् ॥३६॥
हिङ्कातो नामपर्यंतं हिम्स्वं कर्षणेवहः।
नार्विनो व्रषस्मुलं निर्यंक्षुभिः स्वती तथा ॥३७॥
हिङ्कासुतु कर्षणम्यं सुतुकालन्तरमेव च।
सीवियाग्नोद्योगेष्टैं तालबंक्तं प्रकोपितम् ॥३८॥
नाभिरुचिकोयोमभो भाग्यतुरं दशकङ्गलम्।
समस्कुवलब वर्णां दिव्या चाङ्ग(चांसा)थ्रीवेव च।
बंधवोमः अविश्वास्त्रिन्ताल: समुदायत: ॥२॥
कंच पञ्चकूलं काव्यात्या काकास्तानारम्।
एकगोलप्रमाणच च चाङ्गकायास्ताङ्गलम् ॥४०॥
हियवं द्विते वर्णं तियशं नाभिमण्डलम्।
निम्नाभिगंग कर्त्या दर्शियावत्तलांकुन्ना ॥४१॥
बाङ्घलो द्रष्टरी ञ्यातां मेंून्तु चतुरङ्गलम्।
स्वाववाङ्घलायुज्ञी योज्यातो सुषोभी ॥४२॥
भुजायाम शस्त्रसमंतं तज्जामुखवं चतुरङ्गलम्।
बाङ्घ याहकली यं चायां प्रवाह नवगोलको ॥४३॥
बिगोलं कर्णोऽन्तु तावनी मध्याङ्गुलि:।
कुर्याविहिंगोलमक्षुजः ततुप्रक्षः क चनीयसि।
मध्यमाया नवार्डन होना चानामिकाङ्गुलि:।
होना नविन विडीया मध्यमय प्रक्षकानो। ॥४५॥
अवङ्गक्ष: तु विस्तां काल्यंतु यवा नव।
साईमन्तवं नियतः मध्यमायाः योज्येत्। ॥४६॥
सभी चाहथवं कळा सम्यवा चनीयसि।
कनिष्ठमूलनो बन्धोः मणि: पञ्चकुलसमम् ॥४७॥
तत्रमायिन जानीयासिंधुकर्तल्लक्ष तु।
अवङ्गमूलमो बन्धर्मणिएवर्क्षोऽज्ञोलकम् ॥४८॥
अवङ्गमूलो(? मूलातु): तत्रम्या मूलं साईकलं कलेवत्।
अवङ्गस्त्यासिंधिपाल्: स्वरिःवैस्तुदुष्को भवेत्। ॥४८॥
अवङ्गस्त्याङ्गकीनाश समप्रवा विहीरते।
सुवासंलघसुंगासुंस्माह प्रयोज्येत्। ॥५॥
खाङ्गलायं नां सियं प्रविष्टेदोदशेवं च।
सुदुःख्यायनयस्युः संगमां कार्येशुहुः। ॥५॥
पाणिः पञ्चाङ्गलं कुर्यात्तपामाङ्गकुलहयम्।
पूर्णं कर्त्तव्यं कुर्याद्भरेर्कोपशोभितम् ॥५॥
हस्तरेखाओं प्रवच्चायमि देवानां सुमलचन्म्।
श्रृंखला धवलं बलं चलं स्वतंत्रकुकुटकलम्॥५॥
कलम्यं मशिगच्छतं श्रीतुमानकुलम्।
विशुल्लं यव(अस्मालाधि कुरैत वसुरां तथा ॥१॥)
नामिन्मालक्योर्मध्ये नीऽमूलं समस कन्हेऽ॥
.
हिवितक्षणदेवेतोऽङ्ग जहा दोषेऽङ्ग वाहकस्यम्॥५॥
जावते दिवकली स्वाता गुनताविभकली सरतो।
हि रानी भार्तोरी भयो परगिविकलाभवति ॥५॥
शंक्रं (शंक्रं) मसाङङ् विहितवायमिन दयाकुलम्।
चतुर्मणिन पादसङ्ग कुलायमं विपोष्टो ॥५॥
तस्मात् चुविका होना मध्यमा दियवेन तु।
चनामिसकानखांदेवी तेना पर्वं कन्हा ॥५॥
चंक्रवर्त तु विन्दुः एकाह यथा चुनाति।
मष्ठकाक्योर्मणे चालार (') वर्षांभवेत ॥५॥
सन्तो (सन्तो) नवयवा तिल्यंक माहा। द्याममध्ययमा।
अनामांत्यवा तिल्यकोणति मार्यन्तै। ॥६॥
बालशूक्लस्यानि श्रीलुः परिकारिविक्ति।
कूणपृतमासारं पादस्थोपरि कारयेत् ॥६॥
जनुकपदम् स्यानि श्रीलुः परिकारिविक्ति।
पादो समतलो कायं शुक्लाकारं निखा। खुता। ॥६॥
अतःपरं प्रवच्चायमि परवर्षय लचन्म्।
षट्विनंदद्वशलं चेवं घरम्। परिमण्डलम्।
श्रीवाणाकुलविधवा विशायणं परिमण्डलम् ॥६॥
कुज्योर्मणे अविलारी विशायकुलिवत्।
जनविशारातलं कुरौवर्षिणि वृद्धमानः ॥६॥
भुजांभलमध्य ग्राममण्डलं चतुरकुलम्।
खविशाराप्राप्तविविषेण मण्डलं विप्रणां भवेत् ॥६॥
कुवेश मध्यविलारी प्रीघः परि दशतालवः।
शोभाकुलिवत् अथाः कक्षराष्ट्रदशाल्पि। ॥६॥
पञ्चगोलसुस्मूले च जालस्मूले पञ्चकुशः।
जालस्मूले हिकलं विन्यासिद्धार्थकेन परिणतः॥६३॥
एतेषाः सर्वां मण्डलं भिगुणं भवेत्।
तथामलानों सर्वां न हस्तलं यव विद्यते॥४३॥
पञ्चकम्: श्रीपूजनिकाः कलमेकं प्रकोपितनः।
पञ्चकम् (पञ्चक) वंशं समं कुर्यात् स्वतःतुष्टावल्लभ्यो॥६५॥
उक्तं च पिण्डका पाणिः: कुर्यात् खावनस्मि:।
पञ्चस्य लघुर्व विन्यासितं संहबिधो दिजः॥३७॥
सुपञ्चकां राजदिनस्य कटकलेखकुण्डनम्।
वस्मुपञ्चकां विन्यासम् रात्रिगुणकारपंडितः॥७२॥
भ्रमणीनम् मुनो देशभूषणांविद्वानेन:।
देशभूषणांविन्याससंगुत: देशभूषणस्: सुक्षरम्॥३२॥
पञ्चकसमम् कायं धन्यान्मदेशिदम्।
सुभ् रेखा लवलिते च ग्रामती टटव: (टटानि) स्थितम्॥३३॥
सुभ्ना सा भवेदचारी जायन समुखः। प्रजाः:।
कामुक्रोहसा भवेदचारी सर्वाणि उपितारी सदा॥३४॥
शरीरं संतुं स्थानाम् सुमित्रं बलं भधिनम्।
भूमी करिकाराकारी सर्वकामाध्यसाधको:॥३५॥
श्रव्यस्वप्नां निहं तुर्वस्मु सुभवजजः।
रामभोगागोकृत्यिन्महासति: सुपिण्डका॥३६॥
सुपदा च भवेदचारी शीलविधा प्रसचको।
द्विचर्यां प्रज्ञांमहतो श्रीमद्विमध्यव: च॥६३॥
दुभिचो राजभक्तः स्वामीना विस्तारदीघो:।
ट्रिहासना भवेदे कुमारानामाही: च रीतिका:॥३७॥
वामहठिनियोगाः स्मूटहठिनिययम्।
पञ्चाश्च मण्डलालो च नेत्रकाची तैयवं च॥६८॥
ट्रिहासनाहठिनियय: रं: परिवर्तनेव।
विनिकाच: भवेदचारी स्मार्तार्यं सदा भवेदः॥८५॥


त्रस्त्यो ज्ञान भवेद्वर्ती गर्मि: पत्तिति ग्रामभ:।
वयो खऽना महादेवो नासिका नेत्रकुमळः।॥८१॥

वयोदीर्व(१) महादेवो जह्माधीवेषविवस्था।
वय: खऽना महादेवो: शिर: कथर्य नासिका।॥८२॥

वय: खऽना महादेवो सन्धिकुचिनिनन्दस्था।
वयो निस्मा महादेवो हस्ती पादी च लोचनो।॥८३॥

वयो खऽना महादेवो ग्रीवासो (ग्रेवस) शुभ एव च।
इति दौषधुगुणं भाला कर्त्तव्याचं विवशितं।॥८४॥

नवतालचतुर्यामपरिशिष्टा च हि समी संप्रकोटिताः।
नववच्छो प्रवं देव अष्टादी देवमानुषः।॥

महामध्यतालबज जनया चादेनसमम्।॥८५॥

सुभं वर्षमतालनायम्बिरिष्टासंस्कृतम्।
कोरित्वत् यथायमामेवलचचर्यानिम्नित्तमिति।॥८६॥

दौर्भ(२) चार्सुभं कला (कुर्यो दु) देवीनां लक्षणं तुः।
सुभं सर्वकलं कला (सुभं च शर्कलं कुर्यों)।

देवं चेकादशाकला॥८७॥

वयो ग्रीवस्तुवैव भवि वुजुवशाकलोऽऽ।
(तिथ्युः ग्रीवा स्तनबैव भवि च)चुजुवशाकलोऽऽ।

सववत्ति सुभमवं च देवोनास्वाव विहोयति॥८८॥

मध्यानाराजः कला (कुर्यं) मीलो प्रयकलं सृष्टा।
काढी विशाक्षणं कुर्यं दुःचेकादशी कली॥८९॥

जानुनो ग्रामवी चैव पिरोष्टका विशादकला।

गुल्फं च हलकुंकु दुविद्रीवनां लक्षणं श्रमम्॥९०॥

खऽना (कुर्यं) विशाक्षणं दुविद्रीव यिरसि परिमेश्वरम्।
पश्चात्तुलं सूचीा शूलं विगुणं मशकलं भवन्तु॥९१॥

ग्रामवी मशिवन्याच मशकलं स्वातं तथेव च।

अजमध्यवला पशुभिन्विगुणं परिमेश्वरम्॥९२॥

मध्येपश्चात्तुलं जह्मामशकलं विगुणं भवन्तु।
सर्वत्र विगुणं कार्यमशकलीनां तथेव च॥९३॥
विनायकानान् यथार्था प्रतिमालक्षणं समभम्।
गोलकं मुद्रां विशेषा संस्करण गोलक्षणं सुख।
प्रां नाचहुँ बूढ़ा विशेषां कुर्विन दीर्घं (ि) विंगासनं।
वसंगोलकला नाभं रूपीनमकृतं तथा।
दृश्य क्रियाकारः क्रमाकारः जातुनी।
पाणीमुखः पर्कलं कुर्विन्फ्लाेकिकुछूँ क्रमम्।
पाणीमुखः पर्कल मोहीकृत्येकलकं ततः।
मूलकः अधिन यथावत् दुर्पूरीः।
पाणीमुखः पर्कलं किरणकृत्येकलकं ततः।
मूलकः अधिन यथावत् दुर्पूरीः।

चक्रसनं निम्नकाणि (िकांस)वाण भेड़ नवालकम्।
प्रवाहः पल्ललकमं कर्दमालीं इगोलकम्।
मूलाक्षणः।
भावननखालिनं (भामालनखालिना) कार्ययुक्ता नामिका।
भावननखालिना दोषविकशकनीयसा।

प्राणां: समकथामभिं विस्तारिण कलानि।
हिकालातिभविषुः निम्नुमण परिम्यवलम्।
पर्कल मुक्कूलेः कर्मचारिणयेव।
विनायकां जीवावधि च क्रमबलुण्युवः।
मध्ये दुर्गोलकायक्ष (कायस्य दुर्गोलं)
कटिष्ठ समगोलकम्।

भूमिः चतुरंगांल जातुविकल्पः यव(म)।
मध्यसं चाकुलं (मध्ये पद्माकश्लं) जल्ला गुल्फं वाङ्ललमिव च ।
हिकलार्क्षाश्लं पादी विस्तारिण यकोऽस्तितम् ॥१०५॥
नववाङ्ललकेल चार्गं च्यवं चुतम ।
यववाश्वतिकं कुय्ये यवसं च मध्यसं ॥१०७॥
यइ यवानामविकालयश (कार्यः ?) यवपञ्च कनोऽसी ।
पवं कार्यते विहानु पादाङ्लेलश्योभनम् ॥१०८॥
वाङ्ललव तथा पार्श्वास्तित्रेष प्रकोऽचना ।
[चत वाङ्ललका चैव न(य)वसं च मध्यसं ॥१०८॥]
अर्थियतिलकं पवोऽ पल्लवः ॥

चत:परमवच्चारम् श्राद्वतसङ्क लचनम् ।
वाङ्लन (मद्वाणः) चाचिकात्रिवो(व्यः) कक्षोऽणां
विभावत्सा: (सांसः) ॥११०॥

dिवानां चैव बुद्धानां कार्येपीतमां (सां) श्रावम् ।
पतिः कार्येहिंदरास्त्व (नवोः) नेवि कार्येन ॥१११॥
हिगोलं भवेच्च्च्चष्टि: (विषी) सं मुखपद्य: गोलकमिव च
(सुसं पद्य: गोलकमिव च) ।

yोवा (') हिगोलं कुप्तर्च सवा: श्राममलं ॥११२॥

नितम्यं दिकलं विशिष्ट कर्ति पञ्चकर्त भवेत् ।

वाङ्ललकसम्मुख जानू पद्माकश्लो खरुः ॥११४॥
वाङ्ललकस्मी जल्ली गुल्फो पाश्च लक्षी खरुः ।

yaभागः(वः) प्रकरः अवः (वः) पद्माकश्लसम्भः (कः) ॥११४॥
वाङ्लना: (वः) प्रकरः अवः (वः) अष्टगोलकमिव च ।

श्रागोलक विभेडः प्रवासुक विपवता ॥१५॥
कार्यवभागः पञ्चकल्लु विजनत ।
पतिः सुवाच मानाना कर्तव यं शास्चिनकः: ॥११६॥

अर्थियतिलकं श्राद्वतसङ्कल्लचनम् ॥१६॥

यस्यात्: सम्प्रवच्चारवस्मि सम्तालसः लचनम् ।

श्रागोलकसम्मुख सुकं पञ्चकल्लमिव च ॥११७॥

yaवा श्रागोलकसय खम्पर्वीवश कार्येन ।

alविश्लेष्यं वेय(वः) मानलखसयोभितम् ॥११८॥
एकाकुलि नित्यवर्षे गोलकं काठित्यातः (क)भः।
जनविशाखलसूर्य जानु वर्गान्धनुष च नौ।
जनविशाखलं जग्न (झाँ) गुरुकृष्णकल्पसत्मः।
हारामलख चरोभागम्यत्मा समतालकम्।
षड्याक्तं प्रकारत्वं चिंका चांसायनीव च।
वादु अकुलिविश्रेष्ठा एकतालं प्रकोपितं तमः।
प्रवाणं सतगोलचं कर्तव्यं सुनिश्चतमेः।
कर्पश्यवभागस्य षड्याक्तं (') प्रकोपितं तमः।
मारुश्य प्रमाणतु कर्तव्यं शास्त्रचिन्तके।

चालितलंके समतालक्षणम्।

चालनं समवच्चारी चतुर्लक्ष्यं लक्षणम्।
एकाकुलि घरं कुर्याबुर्षं हादयमहक्षमः।
थ्रीवं एकाखलं विवद दृश्य हादयमहक्षमः।
षेष्टीकुलं नित्यवर्षे काठित्याकल्पसत्मः।
नवाक्तं भवेदुर्जालु एकाखलं अघनम्।
जला नवाक्तला थ्रीवा गुरुकृष्णकल्पं भवेत्।
षंभोभागा प्रकारम् थ्रीवा एकाखला प्रकोपितं
चतुर्लक्ष्यं विश्रेष्ठा चिंका चांसायनीव च।
वादु विगोलकं वैव प्रवाणं षड्याक्तं।
समतालक्ष्यं च विश्रेष्ठं (समतालक्षं विश्रेष्ठं)
कर्पश्यवभागस्य।

यथाशोभेन विश्रेष्ठा कर्तव्यं मांवत्तनम्।
गामनस्य प्रमाणतु कादंतु सुनिश्चतमेः॥

चालितलंके चतुर्लक्ष्यं लक्षणम्॥

संहाराप्रतिमा (ि) विवामं प्रवच्चामयुक्ता खुशं।
दशपदाधिकैकस्म: प्रतिमा व (क) ध्वसी खर्ता।
हिरण्यां मांवमा थ्रीवा व्युष्टं तु हिरण्यं खर्ता।
पति:परम कुर्वीत यद्यकृष्णमाधवः॥
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द्रष्टा जीवनि च महान च स्वस्तिता चापि देवता ।
खिता या स्वाभाविना या शरदा दीपकरा भवेतु ॥१३४॥
द्राक्षारोपितैं तनाष्टिरतिन्योर्पिता धनवर्यम् ।
भग्नाधिक चूले नारक सुरितां युक्तमादिरितृ ॥१३५॥
परवा या यद्वा वा लिखू ् वेदी मात्तमस्तथा ।
शैवसुधाप्रदेव विधिन्द्रेण कर्मण्या ॥१३६॥
पुष्याव्यं तथा ध्यं नविवेद्वतिभिः च ।
दर्शा च वासीं चेव होमकर्मसमिति: ॥१३७॥
विव्र(प्र)शायुद्रकं चेव वेदन्वलेश्वा कारवेतु ।
बालर्जुनस्तथा मोक्षो दुकृताचीमकस्तथा ॥१३८॥
विकारितम समुहिष्टो रजनृशाब विवेदिताः ।
बषस्य ककुटिद वहा भाजङ्जीवाङ्यदेवताम् ॥१३९॥
श्रीं(श्री)लोकाला संवीभवै तोषी वशेषकेशु च ।
नदीस्कृतमस्तथानि तस्मादेव संवीदित: ॥१३५॥
मोक्षीण (श्री) रजतं (रजनो) चेव तास्यं (तास्यो) ।
चेभ्यायोमिपि (रोतिमयोरिपि)
द्वार्याद्विन्ना सर्व(प्र) यदीच्छु चत्वरस्माक्षमि ॥१४०॥
द्राक्षारोपितैं भवेदौ नववस्तेपि विषेदः ।
परिवते मधुना स्विर्ग(प्र) द्राक्षारोपितैं प्रगैपेयतः ॥१४१॥
पार्थिवो च भवेदं यद्व स्वाभाविनोमिपि ।
भू खर्निला श्रीमृतिन्युक्तिस्वप्न्युपस्येतृ ॥१४२॥
भारे यात्रे वा निम्नं पुन: श्रीमन्तु स्वाप्येति ।
सर्वजनंसम्पत्ता विविहितेन रापेयत् ॥१४३॥
हि जनव...नां ( दिवाना वादनाना ) मातुरायां श्रभाय ।
राजा जयमवाद्रोहिती महेश्वरवर्तं भवेतु ॥१४३॥
वीर्याद्विन्नम्यन्तं कतं देव महाबनाः ।
युगकोटियतसभ्याः (युगकोटिसभ्याः)
देवलोके महीयते ॥१४३॥**

प्रातियतिलके जीर्षोद्वारः समाप्त: ॥१॥
नवतालसैकनेंलाक्षणिक १०५ गिरोज्जळिक ४ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक ४
देहाकुलि २४ नितम्बाक्षिक २ काव्याक्षिक ४ जनवेक्षिक ४
पिष्टाक्षिक २४ गुल्फाक्षिक २ अधोभागाक्षिक ४ दिकासायाक्षिक १७
बाभागाक्षिक १६ प्रावाक्षिक १८ करभागाक्षिक १२ यवभागपरिसंख्या
एकलेन ५६४ ॥

प्रततालसैकनेंलाक्षणिक ८५ गिरोज्जळिक ३ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक ३
देहाकुलि २२ नितम्बाक्षिक १ काव्याक्षिक ३ जनवेक्षिक ३
पिष्टाक्षिक २२ गुल्फाक्षिक १ अधोभागाक्षिक ३ दिकासायाक्षिक ७
बाभागाक्षिक १४ कराक्षिक १२ एकलेन यवसंख्या ३४८॥

प्रततालश्च एकलेनाक्षणिक ३२ गिरोज्जळिक १२ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक २
देहाकुलि १६ नितम्बाक्षिक १ काव्याक्षिक २ जनवेक्षिक २
पिष्टाक्षिक १६ गुल्फाक्षिक १ अधोभागाक्षिक २ दिकासायाक्षिक १४ (५)
बाभागाक्षिक १० प्रावाक्षिक १२ करभागवाक्षिक ८ एकलेन यवसंख्या ५३५॥

दृष्टतालश्च एकलेनाक्षणिक १२० गिरोज्जळिक ४ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक ४
देहाकुलि २६ नितम्बाक्षिक २ काव्याक्षिक ५ जनवेक्षिक ५
पिष्टाक्षिक २६ गुल्फाक्षिक २ अधोभागाक्षिक ५ दिकासायाक्षिक १६
बाभागाक्षिक १८ प्रावाक्षिक १६ (२०) करप्राक्षिक १२ एकलेन
यवसंख्या ५६०॥

रसतालसैकनेंलाक्षणिक ५४ गिरोज्जळिक २ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक २
देहाकुलि १८ नितम्बाक्षिक १ काव्याक्षिक २ जनवेक्षिक २
पिष्टाक्षिक १८ गुल्फाक्षिक १ अधोभागाक्षिक २ दिकासायाक्षिक ५
बाभागाक्षिक १२ प्रावाक्षिक १४ करभागवाक्षिक १० एकलेन यवसंख्या ६३२॥

चतुस्तालसैकनेंलाक्षणिक ४५ गिरोज्जळिक १ सुखाक्षिक १२ गोवाक्षिक १
देहाकुलि १२ नितम्बाक्षिक × काठ १ छव ५ जानु १ पिष्टा ५ गुल्फ ×
pाणि २ दिकासाय ५ बाभ ६ करप्राक्ष ३ एकलेन यवसंख्या ३८८॥

परशु विशुध्धाष्ट्रयं वस्मकेवदृष्टांतः। नूनाभिक यथा कुर्या वराहस्
वराह स्वपालक (१)॥

प्रचीनतालापनं पुनर्कात्मकत्वं मद्यम्॥
Adoration to Buddha.

1-2: Whatever characteristic signs about the measurements of images (details) have been recounted by the ancient sages in the Ātreya-tilaka and other old Buddhistic śāstras—after collecting them all together and piling (arranging) them in order and after bowing down to the all-knowing god, the characteristic signs about images are being narrated (by me).

1 According to P. Bose, this text is described in the Tibetan version in two ways, viz., (1) Pratimāmānalakṣāṇam by the sage Ātreya, and (2) Ātreya-tilaka, while the Sanskrit original suggests three different names, viz., (1) Devīlakṣāṇam, (2) Ātreyalakṣāṇam, and (3) Ātreyatilaka (P. Bose, Pratimāmānalakṣāṇam, Introduction, P. V). But Devīlakṣāṇam can on no account be taken as a name of the text; as our text puts (just after verse 94)—iti devīlakṣāṇam aṣṭatālam, which can only mean that the devi icons are eight tāla in measurement. The section on aṣṭatāla in Bose's text (v. 88—v. 87 in our text) contains a distinct reference to this feature of the devi images—Dirghaṃ čāṣṭamukham luryāt devinām lākṣāṇam buddhah.

2 This text is thus based on Ātreya-tilaka and other old Buddhistic texts (or the first line may also be translated as 'in the Buddhist text Ātreya-tilaka and other old texts'). But this does not mean that the canons are applicable to Buddhist images only; they are presumably of general application, though these are collected here by a Buddhist. Reference to the old sages is interesting; compare my observations in Chapter I, pp. 14-16. Atri is one of the 18 Vāstuśūstrāpadeśakas.

3 Sarvavidam meaning the all-knowing (Sarvajña, Samyaksambuddha) Buddha is a much better reading than Bose's sarvavidam.
3: Twelve aṅgulas make one tāla¹ known also as vitasti and mukha, while two aṅgulas make one golaka, known also as kalā.

4-5: The fourth part of the pallava ² is known as the measuring aṅguli ³; an expert should know that a yava is the eighth part of the aṅgula; this (the latter) is meant for the measurement of the different limbs of the images. One who knows should measure an image according to this rule.

6: After dividing the height of whichever the object (out of which the image is to be made) ⁴ into nine (equal) parts, the face (of the image) should be made one tāla (i.e., one of the nine parts) in length and its width should also be the same.

7-9: Faces (of the images) are (differently) shaped,—some like the letter va, others like a mango, others again like the egg of a bird and (a fourth type) like the sesame (seed); that (type of face) which is less by 1 ½ aṅgulas is known as the va-shaped, that face which is less by 2 aṅgulas is of the shape of a mango, (a third variety) which is less by 2 ½ aṅgulas is called a bird-egg in appearance, while (the type) in which three aṅgulas are left out is named sesamum-shaped; in these four (varieties of) faces, the (above reductions) should be shunned in the cheeks (i.e., the length of the faces should only be reduced, not their width). ⁵

¹ Aṅgula and tāla have been fully explained by me in Chapter VIII.
² Pallava is karapallava; here it means the section of the hand just a little above the place where the fingers shoot out from the palm.
³ It is a relative unit (mātrāṅgula); though there is no explicit reference to the owner of the pallava, it appears that the palm of the image is meant here.
⁴ The passage—Yatkiṇīcidrūpākāyatam which has been translated as above reminds one of Utpala's passage—Yusmāt kāṭhāt pāśāhādikādvā pratima kriyate taddāirghyam, etc., fully explained by me in Chapter VIII.
⁵ Reference to the four types of faces is interesting. It is clear that this comparison is based on the outline view of faces; if the above reductions are made in the length of their various types, they appear in outline like the four different objects. Va is the old
10: Faces of female (figures) only should be of the sesainum
(seed) variety. The head of the family dies, if the face (of the
image) is not made according to the śāstric injunctions.

11: If the face is made according to the śāstric injunctions,
(the donor of the image) prospers with his friends. A sage should
make (the face of) images, after acquiring proficiency in all the
śāstras.¹

12: The head should be made 4 añgulas (a gola = 2 añgulas)
and should be shaped as an umbrella.² The forehead is said
to measure 4½ añgulas.³

Bengali va, shaped like an equilateral triangle, here seen in an
inverted position—its base corresponding to the forehead and its apex
to the chin. In Tantric texts, the letter is sometimes compared with
the female organ. A. N. Tagore refers to two types of faces, one
having the form of a hen’s egg (kukkuṭāṇḍa) and the other suggest-
ing a ‘pān (betel leaf)’; the former is the khagāṇḍāha variety of
our text and the latter closely conforms to the tilākṛti of the same
(the outline of the sesamum seed being the same as that of the betel
leaf—the sesamum flower is likened in Bengali poems to a well-
shaped nose—tilphul-jinī-nāsā). Tagore remarks, ‘It is for this
reason probably (a certain well defined fixity of form in the different
specimens of the lower animals and plant organism), that our great
teachers have described the shapes of human limbs and organs not
by comparison with those of other men but always in terms of flowers
or birds or some other plant or animal features’ (Some Notes on
Indian Artistic Anatomy, p. 7, fig. 6). These four types of faces differ
evidently from those in which the length and the breadth are the same.

¹ There is some mistake in the last line of the couplet. If the
reading in our text is correct, then it is practically a repetition of the
same idea. Bose’s emendation of this line—Evam śāstrāyaman kṛtvā
arccāṁ tāṁ kārayodbudhah—is also not very happy.

² This characteristic shape of the head is one of the Mahāpuruṣa-
lakṣānas. The Mahābhārata describes the great gods Nara and Nara-
yaṇa as characterised by such heads (XII, 343, 38—Alaptreṇu suṛśe
śirasī devayostayoh. 1 Evam lakṣānasampannau mahāpuruṣa-
samjñitau). Varāhamihira describes the heads of Cakravarttins as
resembling the shape of an umbrella (Br. Saṃ., ch. 67, v. 79—Chatrā-
kāraīḥ śirobhūrāvaniśāḥ).

³ In most other texts the forehead is said to measure 4 añgulas.
13-15: The curvature (sidewise) of the forehead is always 10 añgulas. The length of the nose is said to be 4½ añgulas; its width at the top is ¾ añgula (two yavas) and its projection is 1¾ añgulas. The height of the two sides (of the nose) is 2 añgulas, and the nasal septum is 3 yavas (in width); and the circular (orifices of the nose) are equal, measuring ½ an añgula each (in diameter), while the root of the nasal septum is 2 yavas; the outer surfaces of the nasal orifices (i.e., the outside of the nostrils) is 3 yavas each and are conch-shell-like in appearance.

16-19: The mouth with the following measurements is praiseworthy. (The nose) is similar to the sesamum flower and it can also be compared to the face of either a parrot or a falcon. The lower portion of it (the face and not the mouth) is said to be 3 añgulas and 2 yavas, while the mouth proper

---

1 Ayāma does not mean height in this context, but length, which is ¾ añgula more than that laid down in many other texts. Niśhāsa has been several times used in our texts; it was not translated by Bose. It no doubt means the mean projection of the nose from the facial surface.

2 The curious word used in the text is jihvāpipiḍī. Pīḍī means base or the place of rest. Bose says that in the Tibetan version the line appears as—Iti māṇam samayāgniṇena jihvāgāre praśasyate. Thus, this word may justifiably be translated as ‘mouth’ (Bose also has done so).

3 This line is out of place here. The mouth cannot be compared to a sesamum flower or the face of a parrot or a falcon. It appears that arrangement of the two lines in the couplet is reversed due to the copyist’s error and according to this suggestion of mine this line can very well go along with the preceding ones in which the different sections of the nose are described. The other line introduces the description of the mouth and its various parts. Bose could not render the word samākāśa; it is evidently a long form of samākāśa meaning similar.

4 Bose’s reading gives 1 añgula and 2 yavas.

5 Bhujaka; Bose emends it into Oṭṭhaka and translates it as upper lip, rendering the next caraṇa (uttaroṭṭhamaḥ caturyavam) as ‘the lower lip is four yavas.’ This is evidently incorrect. ‘Adhara’ (lower lip) is mentioned below.
should be made 6 yavas (in width), the upper lip being 4 yavas; the goji (the short vertical dimple between the centre of the upper lip and the nasal septum) placed above it should be made 3 parts of an aṅgula (i.e., 6 yavas).\(^1\) The lower lip should be like the mouth proper (in height or thickness, i.e., 6 yavas), its width being 2 aṅgulas; a line (red, like) the bimba fruit should be made 6 yavas, in the middle or parting (of the two lips). The sides of the mouth (ṣṛkkāṇi) should be made a little drooping, (measuring) \(\frac{1}{4}\) an aṅgula each.

20-23: The chin should be 2 āṅ. sidewise and 10 yavas long (i.e., high)\(^2\). (A space: of half an aṅgula should be between the two eye-brows, their length should be 5 āṅ. (each); the unbroken and bow-shaped line of the eye-brow should measure \(\frac{1}{4}\) a yava (in width)\(^3\). The eye should be 2 āṅ. 2 yavas (in length), its width being just 3 parts of it.\(^4\) Then the pupil is said to be \(\frac{1}{3}\) part of the eye; it is well-known that 3 parts of the former should be made black. The inside of the eyes should be of the tinge of the leaves of the water-lily and lotus and (should be shaped) like the belly of a fish; the outer corners of the eyes should be known as 2 kalas (? and their inside 2 aṅgulas.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Bose reads the first line of v. 18 as Tribhadgāṅgulikā kāryā oṣṭhakṣuyopariṣṭhitā. But our reading is much better and the line is exactly the same as the last line in verse 8 of the other iconometric text, Pratimalakṣaṇam edited by me (cf. p. 11).

\(^2\) Bose renders the line as ‘the chin should be 2 āṅ. broad and 10 āṅ. long’; but the translation given above seems to be better in keeping with the text.

\(^3\) Bose reads cāyākṛti in place of cāpākṛti (clear in our text), and thus cannot translate the passage correctly.

\(^4\) Bose says that ‘the eye is the three-fourth part of the eye-brow,’ which is incorrect for 2 āṅ. and 2 yavas cannot be regarded as three-fourth of 5 aṅgulas.

\(^5\) There seems to be some mistake here in the text. Jyasonodaram is meaningless. Bose’s emendation of the second carana as padmapatraṣaya sodare is unsupportable. The Kriyāsamuccaya refers to the different measurements of the eyes of 3 types of divinities,
24-26: The ears are 2 aṅā. broad and 4 aṅā. long; the projection of the ears from the back is said to be 2 aṅā. The trūṭikā (lobe of the ear?)¹ should be full 2 aṅā. and kakuni should be its half;² the raised little ridge between the temple and the earhole (karnaṇāvarta) is one-fourth part of an aṅgula.³ The hole of the ear is 3 yavas (in diameter) and the sides (pārsvikā—? pārśvikā) are as beautiful; the ear-canal is said to be similar to the handle of a small chopper (?).⁴

27-31: The (section of the) head between the two ears is 18 aṅā.; there is no doubt that the back of the forehead is 14 aṅā. (The space) between the line of the eye-brow and the eye is 1 golaka (i.e., 2 aṅā.); (The space) between the chin and the root of the ear is 8 aṅā. Then, the chin and the forehead are parallel to the eyes, and the sides of the mouth should be measured in the same line with the side of the pupil; the line of the eye-brow and the karnaṇa-sūtra should also fall in the same

viz., the Buddhas, the Bodhisattvas and the Goddesses; the shape of the eyes of the last, according to it, should be like the belly of a fish (parvāsiṣṭā kṣīnyārastrinām astādaśayavayyāme triyavavistārān-
matsyodarākāram). Jhāsodaram which means the belly of a fish, seems to be the correct reading.

¹ Trūṭikā I have tentatively translated as ear-lobe. it is 2 aṅā. long; but in the case of the images of Buddha it is as long as 4 aṅā. (cf. Pratimālakṣaṇam, verse 20).

² Kakuni in our text is meaningless. Bose reads it as kakudā, but his reading of the major part of the line is faulty. He reads Trūṭikā duyaṅgulaṁ sampattadūrddhā kakudā bhavet—which has very little sense in it.

³ My emendation of this line is based on the Kriyāsāmuccaya commentary on the 18th verse (2nd line) of the Pratimālakṣaṇam, which reads—Aṅgulasya caturthāṁśaḥ karnaṇāvartastu vistarāḥ. The commentary explains the word karnaṇāvarta as kapolakarnaṇačidraγor-
madhya karnaṇāvartaḥ kalikānāro dviyavah (2 yavas = ½ aṅā.). Thus my emendation karnaṇāvartastu is far more acceptable than Bose's karnaṇpulayastu which he translates as 'the circle of the ear,' whatever he may mean by it.

⁴ This line, especially its first half, is certainly faulty. I am not at all sure about my rendering.
line. The *trūṭikā* and the middle of the ear should be like the above in the same line.\(^1\)

31-32: The projection of the face (from the plane of the neck) should be 2 *golas* and the length of the neck should also be the same. (The space) from the root of the shoulder to the root of the ear will be 3 *golakas*. Folds of flesh below the chin should be made as beautiful (as ever) and their length measurement should be lessened by degrees.\(^2\)

33-35: The hair on the head (should be shown in different ways) such as in the shape of a *mauli* or a *jaṭābandha* (particular modes of dressing the hair) or they may be curled; (or there should be) a *kirīḷa*, a *triśikha* (a three-peaked tiara), a crown (*mukūṭa*) or a *khanya* (? a *karaṇḍa* another type of crown). Their height should be made 8 *aṅg*, but never more.\(^3\) I shall

---

\(^1\) These directions about the correct placing of the different parts of the face are very helpful to the sculptor. The *bhrūsītra*, *aṅkṣītra* and *karaṇasītra* are mentioned here, the first two implicitly and the last explicitly.

\(^2\) Bose’s reading and translation differ greatly from mine. The second line is read by him as—*Tudālambapramāṇena cibukā karaṇamūlayoh*, and translated thus, ‘it (the rounded flesh below the chin) should fit in with the chin and the roots of the ears.’ But this is not at all satisfactory. Undoubted reference is made in this couplet to the parallel folds of skin below the chin, which characterise one of the *Mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas*, viz., *Kambugrivatā* (front part of the neck compared to the top of a conchshell which show these parallel lines). What the author means is that these skin folds should be shown by several parallel lines which will be shorter by degrees. In the Gupta and early mediaeval images, this feature is frequently present.

\(^3\) It seems that when the hair on the head are shown dressed as above they should never be more than 8 *aṅg* long; when they are enclosed within one or other types of the crowns mentioned above, the latter also should also not be more than 8 *aṅgulas*. But in Chapter VIII, I have drawn attention to a *Matsya Purāṇa* passage where the *mauli* is described as 14 *aṅgulas*. In Bagchi’s copy of this text the copyist writes *aṇḍādaśaṅgulam* which is rhythmically defective. The copyist, however, knows his mistake and puts two dots under *daśa*,...
speak now about the auspicious and inauspicious types of faces. (The former, i.e., those which are auspicious) should be made a little smiling and endowed with beauty and grace. Know that there is no place (in art) of faces which are malicious, passionate, wrathful, sour or bitter; they should be shunned from a distance.¹

36-39: Now I shall speak about the details of the measurements of the limbs. A sage should make the (portion of the body) from the hiccup (the dimple on the centre of the throat) to the navel two faces, i.e., 24 aṅgulas; (the portion) from the navel to the root of the testicles, the curve of (either of) the buttocks sideways,² the (section) from the hiccup to either of the nipples, the space between the two nipples and (that) from the side of the neck to the top of the arm are all said to be one tāla. The portion between the navel and (either of) the two nipples is 14 aṅgulas. The hiccup and the top of the shoulders (aṁsāgra) should be placed in the same line; it has been well-said that the width of the space between the two shoulders is 3 tālas.³

40-41: The arm-pit should be made 6 aṅgulas and the space between it and the paps (stana) should also be the

¹ Bose reads the first part of the last line of my couplet No. 35 as cakram vadanaśaṁsthānam. But 'a circular face' ill fits with the other types which refer to their different expressions; I adhere to my reading and translation given above.

² Bose reads tiryak pārśve hi te tathā in the first line of my couplet 37. But I think my reading is much better, and it gives a clear and correct sense. The distance between the navel and the root of the testicles can never measure two tālas; the curvature of each of the buttocks measures also one tāla. A glance at fig. 1 of plate VI in my book will support the correctness of my reading and translation.

³ Fig 1 in Plate VI seems to show that the hiccup and the top of the shoulder are not in one line. But this is due to the curvature of the latter, its centre-line and the hiccup are really in the same plane. The lowermost base of the shoulders measures 3 tālas from one end to the other.
same; the curvature of the region by the side of the nipple should measure one gola. The round nipple should be two yavas and the circle of the navel three yavas; the navel should be made deep and should be characterised by the dakṣiṇāvarta sign (i.e., the curvature of the navel should turn from left to right).  

42: The testicles should be 3 aṅgulas (each) and the penis 4 aṅgulas; the height of the hip or the buttock which will be fleshy, round and beautiful in appearance should be 8 aṅgulas.  

43-45: The length of the arm which is praised by the learned is four faces; the upper arm should be 8 kalās and the four-arm 9 golakas; the length of the palm (without the fingers) should be 3 golas (the measurement of) the middle finger being the same. The thumb should be made 2 golas and the little finger similar to it; the ring finger should be less than the middle one by one half nail and the index-finger one nail less than the middle one.  

46-52: The width of the thumb should be made 9 yavas; the side (measurement) of the middle finger (i.e., its width) should be 8½ yavas; after making both (the ring finger and the index finger) 8 yavas (wide), the little finger (should be made)

---

1 Bose reads aksa for hakṣa, which is wrong; he cannot translate aksa; the second caruṇa is read by him as vakṣastanāntaram which is also incorrect. The author first gives us the inside measurement of the armpit and then remarks that the space between the armpit and the breast (i.e., the centre of the breast—the nipple) is also the same.

2 Bose translates the passage—dakṣiṇāvartalāṇčāhū, as ‘having the marks of its whirlpool,’ which has no meaning. I have tried to render it correctly; the sign is one of the mahāpurusālakṣaṇas.

3 The first part of the second line was read by Bose as hicāvaṣṭāṅgulāvārvādhyam and translated as ‘hicha should be eight aṅgulas;’ I have given the correct reading and translation.

4 The palm and the middle finger being 6 aṅgulas each, the two taken together make up one tālā. In some texts, the former is 7 aṅgulas long and the latter 5 (cf. Pratimālakṣaṇa, vv. 27-8.)

5 Verse 43 tells us that the length of the whole arm should be 48 aṅgulas (mukha-caudataya) but when the constituents of the arms are added up we get 46 only (bāhu—16 + prabhū—18 + kara—6 + madhyamā—8 = 46).
7 yavas. The wrist is known as 5 aṅgulas (distant) from the root of the ring-finger; the side measurement (i.e., the width) of the palm should also be known as the same. The wrist from the root of the thumb is 2 golas, i.e., 4 aṅgulas (apart), while (the space) between the root of the thumb and that of the index finger should be made 1½ kalā (3 aṅgulas). The thumb should be of 2 digits while the rest should be of 3; the digits of the thumb and those of the other fingers should be known as the same. The tips (of the fingers) should be pointed and well-rounded, and the finger-joints should be well-marked. The side measurement (width) of the nail should be made half of its own aṅgula and its length half of its digit; the sage should shape a nail where it joins its root like a crescent. The palm (near its base?) should be made 5 aṅgulas (wide) while its sides should be 2 aṅgulas. The whole of the palm should be adorned with auspicious lines.

53-54: I (now) shall speak of the marks in the palms of the gods which are of an auspicious character; the following, viz., a conch-shell, a lotus flower, a flag, a thunder-bolt, a wheel, a Svastika, an ear-ring, a pitcher, moon, star, Śrivatsa, an elephant-goad, a trident, a rosary and the earth goddess (l'asudhā?) should be made (i.e., drawn on the palm).

1 The first part of the first line of my verse 47 (the first part of the second line of v. 47 in Bose’s edition) is not correctly rendered by Bose. He simply puts down that the width of both should be 8 yavas but the word ubhau undoubtedly refers here to the ring and the index fingers.

2 Bose’s reading suvṛtta in place of suvantita is metrically defective.

3 Bose wrongly renders this line as ‘the wise should make a nail like a half-moon at the tip.’ The nail where it joins the finger at its root is shaped like a crescent.

4 This refers to one of the Mahāpurusālakṣaṇas; the 29th one in the stereotyped list to be found in many Buddhist texts is cakrañkita-hastapādatalāk. In verses 53-4, some of these auspicious signs are enumerated.

5 A few only of these auspicious marks are mentioned in the Pratimālakṣaṇam (v. 27: Saṅkhaṁ cakram tale nyasam padmam ca
55-58: The root of the thighs (i.e., the region from which the thighs come down) should be placed in the same line as the centre of the navel and the private parts; the length of the thighs is 2 *vitattis,* while the same of the shanks is 2 *mukhas.* The knees should be 2 *kalas* and the ankles known as 1 *kala* each; the heels are known as 2 *kalas* each, and they are of the shape of a ripe *bimba* fruit. The feet should be 7 *aṅgulas* wide and 10 *aṅgulas* long; the length of the big toe should be made one-fourth part of the foot, the second toe (sūcīkai) is equal to it (in measurement), while the middle toe is less by 2 *yavas*; the fourth toe is less by half a nail while the little toe is less by a digit (thin the middle toe). ¹

59-62: The width of the big toe is known as 11 *yavas*; the intervening space between its top and that of the second toe is 9 *yavas*; the same of the middle and fourth toes is said to be 8½ and 8 *yavas* respectively, in the canons of measurements. The toes are said to be like a green mango in appearance, the top of the feet should be made like the back of a tortoise; the toes are said to be similar to the feet of a *jutuka* (here meaning a swan). The feet should be made flat and level (to the ground) and the nails, of the form of oyster-shells.²

¹ This rendering of the line seems to me more apposite than Bose's, which is, 'the root of the thigh should be measured parallel to the centre of the navel and penis'.

² In many other iconometric texts, the length of the feet is one *tāla,* i.e., 12 *aṅgulas*; it is likely, the measurement of the big toe is left out in the estimate of the length of the foot in our text. It is laid down here that the length of the big and second toes is a quarter of the foot, i.e., 2½ *aṅgulas.* Thus, according to this estimate, the feet with the toes will measure 12½ *aṅgulas.*

³ The upper surface of the feet convex in appearance like the back of a tortoise is one of the *Mahāpuruṣalakṣāna.* Varāhamihira tells us that the toes of the lords of men should be well-set and their feet convex-shaped like a tortoise (*Śiṣṭāṅguli.......... kārmanntalau ca*
63-65: Now I shall speak about the measurements of the girth or periphery (of the different limbs). The girth of the head is known as 36 aṅgulas; the neck is 8 aṅgulas wide and three times this (i.e., 24 aṅgulas) in its circumference. The space between the two arm-pits is 20 aṅgulas while the intelligent (artist) should make the girth of this region 19 kalās. The root, middle and front sections of the arm are 8, 6 and 4 aṅgulas respectively, while their respective girths should be thrice the measurement of their own width.

66-68: The width of the belly in the middle is to be known as 15 aṅgulas—(the same) below it being 16. The hip is 18 aṅgulas (wide), the root of the thighs is 6 golas (wide) and the width of the root of the shanks and their end should be known to be 6 aṅgulas and 2 kalās respectively, by the learned. The periphery of all the above as also of the fingers and all other (limbs) where there is roundness should be thrice (the measurement of their width).

69-70: The projection of the head from the back is to be one kalā. The backbone should be made straight and be on the same plane as the buttocks; the thighs, the calves of the legs and the heels should also be made on the same plane; a twice-born

caraṇau manujeśvarasya—Bhatsāṃhitā, Ch. 67, v. 2). The well-planted feet with fleshy convex shape were very carefully depicted by the early Indian artists. Reference to the toes being similar to the feet of a jaluka in the previous line is enigmatic. Jaluka means a leech; but ‘toes like the leg of a leech’ (this is Bose’s rendering) have little sense. The passage ‘julukapādasanāsthanā’ may be a mistake for ‘jālapādasanāsthānā’ which would mean like the (feet of the) swan and may refer to the webbing of the toes. One of the Mahāpurusālakṣaṇas is ‘jālāṅgulihaṣṭapāda,’ which, whatever might have been its original significance, came to mean as early as the fourth century A.D.—‘the feet and the hands of the mahāpuruṣa are netted’ like those of the ḫamsarāja—the golden mallard. For discussion about this sign, see my articles on ‘The Webbed Fingers of Buddha,’ I. H. Quarterly, Vol. VI, pp. 717-27; Vol. VII, pp. 654-56.
should know as above the characteristic sign of the back (parts of the body).  

71: Pearl-garlands, waist-girdles, bracelets, armlets, earrings and well-arranged drapery should be made (shown) on the body.

72-77: The merits and demerits of images according to their big or small size are being spoken of now. (To them) should be given well-fixed seat (pedestal) having (requisite) length and breadth. The head (of the image) should be made like an umbrella; (this) produces wealth, good crops and prosperity. Well-drawn lines of eye-brows on the forehead bring eternal good fortune. If the image is well-made, the subjects become full of happiness; if the image has conch-shell like neck, then it is always the bestower of all success. The body like a lion enhances plentitude and strength; the arms shaped like the trunk of an elephant fulfil all desires and ends. (Images with) well-shaped belly bring forth plentitude and prosperity; (their) thighs shaped like a plantain-tree increase (the stocks of) goats and cows, while well-shaped calves of the legs make the villages prosperous. An image, if it be of well-carved feet, causes good conduct and learning. Thus has been described the excellence of images; now are being narrated their defects and demerits.

1 Bose's translation of the 2nd line of verse 60 is wrong. He renders it thus, 'the back should be made like a bamboo and the end of the neck should be on the same plane.' His difficulty was that he could not emend the passage _prātham vamśam_ in the text as _prāthavamśa_ which means 'the back-bone'; _spīcau_ means buttocks and not 'the end of the neck.'

2 The above couplets refer to some signs of physical beauty such as _chatrākṛtisirṣatā_, _kumbugrivatā_, etc., which are peculiar to great men and gods. The comparison of several limbs to different animal and plant organisms in some of the lines is very apt; I have already referred to A. N. Tagore's very illuminating study of this aspect of Indian art (_Some Notes on Indian Artistic Anatomy_). These verses and those immediately following fully show that the authors of the _Silpaśāstras_ were very much alive to the necessity of artists fashioning really beautiful images, even when they were asked to follow the injunctions laid down in the texts.
78-84: The deficiency in the length and breadth (of an image) causes famine and revolution. If it (the image) be deficient in body, (its maker or donor) becomes hunch-backed and if it be noseless, then he gets ill. The eye-sight of an image turned towards the left destroys one's fame, while the same raised upwards causes loss of wealth; (images) with small eyes, round eyes or eyes with squint are also of similar nature (i.e., they cause loss of wealth). One should avoid from a distance (images) with eyes small (in measurement) or eyes cast down. If the image is made with a sunken belly, then there will always be destruction of crops; if its thighs be less (in measurement), then abortion will certainly be caused there. If the three, viz., the nose, eyes and fingers are short, there will be great demerit; this will also be so, if the shanks, neck and chin (of the image) be too long, if its head, ears and nose are too thick, if its joints, belly and nails are too thick, if its hands, feet and eyes are too low, if its neck, shoulders and arms are too short. After knowing these merits and demerits, the wise should make an image.

85-86: The length or height and girth of (images) characterised by Navatāla have been described as above. The gods should surely (measure) 9, and god-like men 8\frac{1}{2} faces; (ordinary) men are 8 tāla, the mothers (i.e., women) 7\frac{1}{2}.  

1 Bose's translation of the above verses is somewhat defective; e.g., he renders kekavākṣi as 'eyes contracted,' while it certainly means 'eyes with a squint.' His reading grīvā'syam bhūja in verse 82 can certainly be improved upon; the passage should read grīvāpsabhūja all of which should never be too short or low. Saptotsedhatā, i.e., the seven limbs being raised is one of the Mahāpurusālakṣayas. The Kriyāsamuccaya comments on the term in this manner: Saptotsedheti saptādvaṇaḥ utsedhā unmatāsceti... katame pādadvayam hastadvayam skandadvayam grīvā ceti... kiṇcidunnatirutsedhah.

2 Evidently this height measurement is only applicable to ordinary women; in verse 85, it is expressly mentioned that the Devi images are characterised by a height which is 8 times their own face. Bose's reading as well as rendering of the first line of
The periphery and height (measurements) of (images) of 6 or 7 lālu measure are described according to the rules (detailed) in the Ātreya lakṣaṇa.¹

87-90: The sage should make the Devī images eight times the face in height; the face should be made 6 kalās, the torso 11 kalās. The width of the neck, breasts and the space between the two nipples—all these parts of the goddesses’ figures are made one-half the face (i.e., 6 aṅgulas). The middle part (?) should be made 8 aṅgulas, the loins are known to be 5 kalās, the hip should be made 20 aṅgulas and the thighs or upper legs 11 kalās. The knees are 3 aṅgulas each and the calves of the legs 20 aṅgulas; the ankle should be made 2 aṅgulas—this is the auspicious mark of the goddesses.

91-94: The periphery of the head should be made 30 aṅgulas; the root of the arms is 5 aṅgulas, while its girth should be three times this. The wrist is 3 aṅgulas (wide) and its circumference is thrice the same (i.e., 3 times 3 aṅgulas, viz., 9 aṅgulas). The middle part of the thighs is (characterised) by 6 kalās and its girth is 3 times it (i.e., 18 kalās or 36 aṅgulas). The middle of the shanks is 5 aṅgulas, its circumference being thrice the same. In all cases, (the girth of the particular limbs) should be made three times (their width), and in the case of the fingers, this is the same. The outer corners of the eyes, the breasts, the hips (of the female figures) should be made a little more than the mea-

my couplet No. 85 is faulty; he reads it as—Kīmca vaṣṭre dhruvam caiva aṣṭārdha devamānasah and translates it as, ‘In the case of the mouth of gods and men, it should be eight and half.’ But there is no doubt that the author refers here to the height of two individual types, viz., ‘gods’ and ‘men like gods’ (devaḥ patama asūjya in the Mātṣya Purāṇa, already referred to by me in Chapter VII). The first line of verse 85 evidently refers to the Nyagrodhaparimandala type of beings.

¹ In this line, there is an undoubted reference to the original source, viz., Ātreya lakṣaṇa, from which all these details were collected by the author.
surement (laid down in the canons), for then it will be more pleasing to the eye.

The above is the eight tāla Devi image.¹

95-96: Now I shall speak about the characteristic measurements of children (gods in the shape of boys); the auspicious characteristic marks of the image of Senāpati (Kārttikeya), Vināyakas and the Yakṣas are all in the shape of boys—(their height) is 6 times (their face).²

96-102: A golaka is to be known in the top of the head (i.e., the latter is to measure 2 aṅgulas in height), the face (should be a sum) of 6 golakas. The neck is to be made 2 aṅgulas, there should be 20 aṅgulas in the torso. The navel is to be ½ a gola or a kalā, the depth there being 1 aṅgula.³ The thighs should be made 7 kalās (each), the knees being one golaka; the calves should be made 6 kalās, while the ankle is known as 1 aṅgula. The heel as before is 3 aṅgulas, the feet 5 kalās and the big toe 1 golaka in length. The second toe should be made equal to the big toe, the middle toe is just less than it by 2 yavas, the fourth toe is less by a nail while the little toe, by a digit. (The space between) the hiccough and the shoulder (extremity) is 8 aṅgulas, the upper arm 9 aṅgulas, the fore-arm 5 golas, the length of the palm 2 golakas. The middle finger is 2 golas, the index finger is

¹ I have already pointed out Bose's mistake in reading it as Devi lakṣāne and suggesting that the term is one of the names of the text.

² Bose's translation of this part of the text as 'the marks of the idols of children, of generals, of the Vināyakas, of Yakṣas are six-fold and auspicious' is undoubtedly wrong. Senāpati is Kārttikeya, the war-god; Yakṣas here evidently refer to the Gaṇas, and Vināyakas, to their leader Gaṇapati and his various aspects. In other iconographical texts, the god Gaṇapati is enjoined to be made according to the Pañcatāla measurement. The text is very corrupt here.

³ Bose's reading and rendering of this line are partly faulty; he reads it—Arddhagolakalā nābhyāṃ khanitam tryaṅgulam tathā, and translates it as follows: 'the navel should be half a gola and one kalā, and three aṅgulas deep.' The width and the depth of the navel in figures of boys can never be 3 aṅgulas each.
less than it by a nail; the ring-finger should be made half a nail less than the middle finger; the thumb and the little finger are to be less by a digit than the ring-finger.\textsuperscript{1}

103-109: Now, I shall speak about the kalās (in connection with) the width (measurements of the six-tāla images).\textsuperscript{2} The head should be $2\frac{1}{2}$ kalās, its circumference being thrice as much; the middle of the face is 6 kalās, the space between the ear and the tip of the nose being as much. There are 3 kalās in the middle of the neck, 16 añgulas being the belly; in the middle of the torso (the width) is 6 golas, the hip being 7 golakas. The middle of the thigh is 4 golas (wide), the knee is 2 kalās and 6 yavas; the shank in its middle is known as 5 añgulas (in width), the ankle is 3 añgulas. The feet in their width are said to be 2 kalās and $\frac{1}{2}$ añgula each. The big toe is 9 yavas, the intervening space (between it and the next toe) is known as 3 yavas; the second toe should be made 8 yavas. The middle toe, 7 yavas. The fourth and the little toes are to be made 6 and 5 yavas respectively; thus should the learned make the toes beautiful. The heel is said to be 3 añgulas in its width. Or, the big toe is 8 yavas and the middle toe 7.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} I accept Bose’s emendation of this passage as ‘madhyama-mārdikhanakhāhināṃ’ which has much better sense than madhyam-parvanakhāhināṃ of the Sanskrit original. The Tibetan version fully supports his correction.

\textsuperscript{2} Bose has inserted just before this line Iti saptatālāḥ on the authority of the Tibetan version. But it is evident that the verses preceding it (95-102) deal with the length or height measurements of Sattāla images; the wordśadgūnaṃ (6 times the face) in verse 95 means sattālam. His preference for sattālasya laksanam in the first line of my verse No. 103 to vistāreya kalāni ca, on the authority of the Tibetan version, is unjustifiable. The author of the text gives us details of the width measurements of the Sattāla images in verses 103-109, and their length or height measurements in verses 95-102.

\textsuperscript{3} This line is omitted in the Tibetan version and Bose omits it accordingly. But it refers to an alternative measurement of two of the toes and can be accepted as genuine.
These are the characteristics of the six-rūpa (tāla—images) in the Ātreyā-tilaka.¹

110-11: After this, I shall speak about the characteristics of the daśatāla. The auspicious images of such deities as Brahmā, the goddess Carcikā, the Ṛṣis, the Brahmārākṣasas, the celestial beings and the Buddhas should be made (according to this tāla measurement) and no images of others (should be made according to it).

112-16: The head should be 2 golakas, the face 6 golakas; the neck should be made 2 golakas, and the torso 26 aṅgulas. The buttocks are to be known as 2 kalās (each), the hip should be 5 kalās; the thighs are 26 aṅgulas, the knee is known as 5 aṅgulas. The shanks are 26 aṅgulas, the ankle is known as 3 aṅgulas; the portion below it (i.e., the heel) is to be made 5 aṅgulas, as is well-ordained. The portion of the upper arm is to be made as 8 golakas and the learned should know that the forearm is 10 golakas. Know that the section of the palm with the fingers is 6 kalās. Those who are well-versed in the śāstras (śilpaśāstras) should make these measurements (of height or length in the daśatāla images).

These are the characteristics of the daśatāla (measurement) in the Ātreyā-tilaka.²

117-18: Now I shall speak about the characteristics of the sapta-tāla. The head is to be known as 3 aṅgulas, the face 6 kalās; the neck is known as 3 aṅgulas, and it should be made with the conch-shell mark. The torso is 19 aṅgulas, well-adorned with (proper) proportions and roundness.

¹ Bose reads Ātreyalakṣaṇe ṣaṭṭālasya lakṣaṇam.
² The author of the text gives only a summary of the length measurements of the daśatāla images. In verse 143, the height of the nitamba and kāṭi is laid down as 2 kalās and 5 kalās, i.e., 4 and 10 aṅgulas respectively. But the summary of these details given in the end of the text lays down that the nitambāṅguli and katyaṅguli are 4 and 5 aṅgulas respectively; this would make the sum total of a daśatāla image full 120 aṅgulas, while, according to verse 113, it would be 125 aṅgulas.
119-22: The buttock is one anūgula, the hip 1 golaka, the thighs 19 anūgulas, the knee 3 anūgulas, the shanks 19 anūgulas, the ankle is known as 1 anūgula; the portion below (the ankle—i.e., the heel) in the sapta-tāla image is 2 anūgulas. The portion from the hiccough to the extremity of the shoulder should be made 8 anūgulas; the anūgulas known to constitute the upper arms are said to be 1 tāla (this is a round-about way of saying that the upper arm is 12 anūgulas in length), the forearm should be made 7 golakas (in length) by the best of the sages. The section of the palm with the fingers is said to be 8 anūgulas. The (above) measurements (length-wise) of men are to be made by those well-versed in the śāstras.

(Thus end) the characteristics of the Sapta-tāla measurement in the Ātreya-tilaka.¹

123: Now I shall speak about the characteristic features of the catustāla (measurement). The head should be made 1 anūgula, the face 12 anūgulas; know that the neck is 1 anūgula, the torso 12 such; the buttock and hip are known to be ½ and 1 anūgula respectively. The thigh should be 9 anūgulas, the knee is known as 1 anūgula; the shank is known as 9 anūgulas and the ankle should be ½ anūgula; the portion below the latter (i.e., the heel) is said to be 1 anūgula. The space between the hiccough and the extremity of the shoulder is to be known as 1 kalās. The upper arm is 3 golakas, the fore-arm 8 anūgulas; the palm with the fingers is known as 7 anūgulas in its length. The modelling of the above should be made as beautifully as possible. The measurement of the dwarfs is described (as above) by the best of the sages.

The above is the description of the Catustāla in the Ātreya-tilaka.

129-30: Listen! I shall now speak about the disposition of images of large size. (Among them) the smallest one is known

¹ The proportions of the Sapta-tāla images come after those of the Daśatāla ones; The Navatāla and Asfatāla proportions are given order of precedence to the other two. Pañcatāla, Tri-Dvi- and Eka-tāla images are not referred to in our text.
to be 15 cubits (in height); the medium-sized one is twice (the above size—30 cubits), the big-sized ones being known thrice the same (i.e., 45 cubits). If one wishes for his own welfare, he should not make (an image) bigger than it (45 cubits).

131-36: The image of a deity, if it be burnt, worn out, broken or split up, after its establishment or at the time of its enshrinement, will always be harmful. A burnt image brings forth draught, an worn-out one causes loss of wealth, a broken image forbodes death in the family, while one that is split up, war. Be it an image or be it the phallic emblem of Siva, whether the images be those of the goddesses or Divine Mothers—all of them should be raised (from the sanctum) according to the rites laid down by the law. After giving oblations of flowers, incense, food and sacrificial offerings and clothes (the householder or donor of the above types of images), after duly performing sacrificial rites, should have the ceremony of propitiatory water performed according to Vedic mantra. A rope is to be made of hair, muñja-grass, woven silk or linen, according to rule; then the old or worn-out god (i.e., the image) should be taken away after tying him (with the rope) to the hump (i.e., the neck) of a bull.

137-40: If the image is made of stone, then it should be immersed in sacred streams full of water or in the confluences of rivers. If the images are made of gold, silver, copper or

1 These huge images were usually made of clay; but it is certain that they reached such heights very rarely. Varāhamihira, as I have shown in Chapter VIII, speaks only of two, three or at most four cubit images.

2 Bose wrongly renders the term ‘devatā’ as ‘goddess.’

3 I prefer the reading udghātayet which means ‘should be raised’ to Bose’s udjāpayet which he has translated as ‘should be given farewell.’

4 The Brahmin priests usually sprinkle propitiatory water (śāntijala) on the householder and the members of his family after the performance of such paimitika karma, while muttering the Vedic mantra:—Om svasti na Indra vyāhdhaśravāḥ svasti naḥ puṣā viścu-vedāḥ, etc.
brass, then all of them should be melted in fire, if one desires his own welfare. If the image is of wood, then it should be covered with new cloth and, after being sprinkled with clarified butter and honey, should be put into a blazing fire. In case the image is made of earth, then a pit should be dug into the ground (to the depth of its head) and afterwards it should be put into the hole, and the latter filled up.¹

141.43: Whether it be an image or a liṅga (which is to be destroyed in the above different ways), another one endowed with all auspicious signs should again be re-enshrined according to rules (i.e., a new replica of the old one is to be set up in the latter’s place). This act results in the welfare of the Brahmans, the young and old and all mankind in general, the king obtains victory, and (the act of restoration) conduces to the increase of crops. The noble soul by whom the old images are replaced by new ones, lives a glorified life in the heavens for more than one thousand crores of yugas.

Here ends the chapter on the restoration of old images—jīrṇoddhāra) in the Ātriya tilaka.²

¹ Bose reads paśāṇi in place of pārthivi; but śilamayi is already mentioned in verse 137. Pārthivi and mṛmmayi, however, denote practically the same type of images. It may be that one refers to terracotta figures, while the other means ordinary clay figures.

² Bose takes vv. 141-42 as later additions, because they are not in Tibetan and because they seem to have no connection with the preceding verses. But the verses are certainly not out of place or context here for several of the preceding verses expati ate on the merits of restoration. The Agni Purāṇa (ch. 67, vv 1-5) expatiates on the same topic; there is, however, some difference noticeable in the two texts as regards disposal of the old images.
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Part II

ब्रह्मसंहिता

( य. ९७ )

जालाणार्थी भानो यद्यथार्थं दर्शनं रजो याति।
तदिन्द्रात् परमाष्ट्र प्रथमं तविष्कारणानां ॥१॥
परमाष्ट्रासंव वास्तविलययुक्त यत्वेऽत्रत्त्वे सैनिकः।
षट्षुणानिः यथोऽत्ररमालमेऽतृत्वस्य भवति सहस्राः ॥२॥
देवगार्दहाराः अधांशोजनस्य यस्तुनियोगः ॥
तत्विष्कारणमेऽपि प्रतिमा तद्विहुणयिनमिवः ॥३॥
खेमानार्थप्रार्थणेः हृदयविश्विलयनां सुखमोः।
नमनजीता तु चतुर्दश्च दैवयुक्ति कारिनमेऽकार्त्तम ॥४॥
नासालकान्तचित्वुक्तं वास्तवरुक्तलकान्तः कार्त्तमुः।
हे प्रकृतं च हरति चिन्तुकं च हरुक्तं विततं ॥५॥
प्रतालुः ललाट विद्वारादु हरुक्तान्ति परे मागोः।
चतुर्गुणो तु शाने कपोः तु हरुक्ती पूर्णी ॥६॥
कार्षपानम् कार्ष्यादचर्याचर्ये भूसमेन चक्रेण ॥
कार्षश्रेयः मुक्तारः च निद्राप्रकाशसमम् ॥७॥
.तुरुक्तं वध्यः कार्यनित्य विद्वारादविरमस्मै।
अधरोऽहुक्तलमार्गस्वत्स्यर्वोत्तरोत्तरधर्मोऽपि ॥
अधरोऽहुक्तात् गोचरा वर्मं चतुरुक्तात्यतं कान्तम्।
विचुलं तु सार्वभूतानांस्य वारुक्तां व्यासम् ॥८॥
हरुक्तचतुर्विष्कारणां नासापुत्रो च नासापुत्रात्मो श्रेयोऽपि।
स्थादु हरुक्तमुक्तायवलिुक्तमस्य चाच्छोऽपि: ॥१०॥
हाजुलमितोलिस्विनों हैं नेत्रे तत्त्वात्मिका तारा।
हककारा पर्वतों नैविकायोऽहुँलं भवति॥ ५१॥
पर्वतकालू पर्वतनं दया भ्रु वीरसिंहं भुवोलंक्रा।
भू मध्य हाजुलकारूऽ भू देवसिंहकं चतुष्कम्॥ ५२॥
कार्यं तु कैमरे॥ भू वनमयसमाजलाहर्वस्वस्तोष।
नवलेन करवीरकसुपत्तिसिद्धक्षमितम्॥ ५३॥
हविल्गतो परिधानः सुदृढ़श्यास्मतोहुँलालि चित्रः॥
उदयं तु चित्रकर्मैणु हृदयन्ते विशिष्टद्वृषः॥ ५४॥
आर्यं मोहसिनः घरं पोडङ्ग दैवथं नगरविप्रेक्षं।
चोवा दशसिंहस्तीर्णेऽ परिशिर्वाहिर्गति: सेका॥ ५५॥
काळवट्टू हादग्रं हयां हदगावर्मो च तवमाशिन।
नाभोमचाब्दांत्तरं च तत्तुलस्वविक्रमम्॥ ५६॥
उद्व चाजुलमानेतुत्रीता विशिष्टस्तथा जलो।
जानुकंवक्षो चतुरसिंहे च पादी च तत्तुल।॥ ५७॥
हादग्रं मौर्यां पदं पुनः वया च पादो विकायताहुँक्र।
पवाजुलपरिश्चो प्रतिपिन्धिन स्वसिंहं दौर्ज।॥ ५८॥
श्रद्धास्वास्त्रां होः: शिवाक्ष: कर्मैण कर्म वा।
स चतुर्थासंगमंकु लशुकु घोडङ्ग एकस्वीकं॥ ५९॥
बहुरुक्तनः: काव्यतत्तथार्गोगोमंकुलं तहवै।
श्रीवन्यानामथिस्वलं कमातु जिब्बितूँक्रा वा॥ ६०॥
जस्तान्वः परिशिष्टवतुद्गोक्षलु विस्तारतात पद।
मध्ये तु संस बिपुला परिशिष्टवति बिपुलिता: सम॥ ६१॥
प्रसीते तु जानुकंवक्षो बिपुलं ता तु परिशिष्ट।
बिपुलो चतुमेधकं मध्ये बिपुलेश्वर्त पवित्रिविषे॥ ६२॥
कार्यस्वादम्य बिपुला चवारंशेखतुहूँक्र परिशिष्ट।
वशलोकं नाभो वेदेन तथा प्रमाशिन॥ ६३॥
चवारंशेखुः सितुः नाभोमध्येन मध्यपरिशिष्ट।
क्षणोऽऽ घोडङ्ग चानामुनीं कच्चे घटकुलिके॥ ६४॥
वष्णुवंशी हादश्म बावस कायथा तथा प्रवाह च।
बावस बढ़तिविन्यासं प्रतिवाहं त्वकु लचच्चुकम्॥२५॥
वोवु बाहुमुलि परित्यागाख दादश्रयाङ्कस्ते च।
विप्रार्धं करतं बढ़तुलं सम दैधेवन्॥२६॥
पञ्चागुलां बलसा प्रदेश्यनो मध्यपर्वर्तल्लोिना।
पनया तुष्या चानामिका कनिष्ठातु परैना॥२७॥
परिवर्तमणुः देशाक् स्वस्वमित्वियः कायः।
वर्षपरिमाणं कांचं सर्वसं परिवर्तोधिनं॥२८॥
देशानुसरणभूषणवेशलक्षार्मूचिक्षिः कायः।
प्रतिमा लचणयुक्ता समविहिता हनिद्रा हवति॥२९॥

सीम्या तु इश्नमावति भसुदा इश्नहोऽविभिर्मात्रत्वृतिम्।
रूपनिमित्यायः भवेत् बिचार्तद्वस्तप्रभाण्या या॥४८॥
शब्रांह्यायां वज्रयमर्गदोिनायः कुशाक्यायाम्॥५०॥
मरणं तु सन्नतायां गृहनिवारपि निििृष्टो कष्ठः।
वास्मावनता पशी देशविनाय बिनक्यायः॥५१॥
सर्वप्रतिमामेवं समायमं भाषायमिथुसमाम्॥५२॥
BRHAT SAMHITA

(Ch. 57, Verses 1-29, 49-52)

Translation with Notes

[I have quoted the above verses from the Brhat Samhita just to show by way of comparison the difference between the earlier and later iconometric texts. It will be seen that the verses from the Brhat Samhita mainly deal with images measuring 108 anugulas, incidentally referring to a few which measure 120 anugulas. The Pratimamana alaksanam which I take to be a fairly good specimen of the texts of the later period, on the other hand, gives us many varieties of measure such as navatula, asatatula, saptatula, dasatula, etc. It must be noted, however, it gives the honour of precedence only to the navatula images.]

Verses 1-4: These have been translated and commented on by me in Chapter VIII.

Verse 5: The nose, forehead, chin, neck, ears are all 4 anugulas (in length); the jaws are two anugulas each (in width) and the chin is 2 anugulas wide1.

Verse 6: The forehead is 8 anugulas in its width; the temples on each side are 2 anugulas further off from it, their (downward, i.e., lengthwise) measurement being 4 anugulas2. The ears are each 2 anugulas in width.

1 In the Taithriya Upanishad (1. 3), the words uttarahanu and adharahanu occur in the sense of upper and lower jaws respectively. Utpala comments on the Brhat Samhita passage as hanuni dvé dvé aṅgule ca vistre 1 Mukhagalasandhi hanuni. So, according to him, 'the place where the face and the neck join is the hanu;' Rao incorrectly translates the word as chin in his Tālamāna. p. 77.

2 The saṅkhas, i.e., the temples are 4 anugulas when taken downwards. Utpala comments on the passage thus:—Saṅkhau caturāṅgulāvadhobhāgau dirghau kāryau yataḥ saṅkhādho gaṇḍabhāgau ucyate.
7: The upper margin of the ear should be made in the same line with the eye-brow and should be $4\frac{1}{2}$ aṅgulas distant (from the latter); the ear-hole and the eminence near it are in the same line with the extreme corner of the eye.\(^1\)

8: Vasiṣṭha says that (the space) between the extreme corner of the eye and ear-hole (near it) is 4 aṅgulas.\(^2\) The lower lip is 1 aṅgula wide, the upper being its half.

9: The gocchā (gojī, i.e., the short dimple between the centre of the upper lip and the nasal septum) is $\frac{1}{2}$ aṅgula (in width), the mouth being 4 aṅgulas in length. When the latter is closed, it is 1$\frac{1}{2}$ aṅgulas in width, it being 3 aṅgulas wide (in the middle), when open.

10: The nostrils are 2 aṅgulas in extent; at their end rises the nose 2 aṅgulas in height. The intervening space between the two eyes is 4 aṅgulas.\(^3\)

11: The sockets of the eyes and the eyes measure 2 aṅgulas, the ball of the eyes being $\frac{1}{3}$ of the same. The vision of the pupil is $\frac{1}{3}$ (of the ball) and the aperture of the eye is 1 aṅgula.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Utpala says that the raised tip of flesh near the ear-hole is in the same line with the rheum of the eye; his words are: Sukumāra-akaṇḍa karṇaṇaḥ lañhasamipra umato mārgastan-netraprabandhasamām | Netraprabandhasabdenu prabhūṣikocyate. Kern wrongly quotes the last part of this commentary as prabhūṣikocyate (J.R.A.S., 1873, p 324 and n. 1).

\(^2\) Vasiṣṭha as quoted by Utpala: Karṇanctrāntaram yacca tadvindyaaccaturāṅgulaṃ. There is a slip in Kern’s translation of the line in the Brhaspalhitā; he puts ‘the space between the extreme eye-corners and eyes, at 4 digits’ (J.R.A.S., 1873, p. 324).

\(^3\) This evidently refers to the space between the two pupils, not the inside corners of the eyes; the distance between the latter is 1 aṅgula (netrāntarc ‘ṅgule juśeyo, Pratimālaśāhanam, v. 10).

\(^4\) Utpala explains ḍkāṭarā as madhyavarttini kumāri. Kern remarks that ‘this is right if we take kumāri or kāninikā in the sense of the pupil’s innermost part, cf. Suśruta, ii, p 303.’ He further says that ‘it must be taken into account that the vision in the pupil requires a larger measure in sculpture than in nature;’ J.R.A.S., 1873, p. 324, f. n. 2.
12: The line of the eye-brows (extending from one extremity to other) measures 10 añgulas, its width being only $\frac{1}{4}$ an añgula. (The interstice between the two eye-brows (not their line) is 2 añgulas, (each) brow being 4 añgulas in length.

13: The hair-line (i.e., the line on the forehead from which the hair begins to sprout upward) should be made equal in extent to (the length of) the joint eye-brows (i.e., 10 añgulas), its thickness being $\frac{1}{4}$ an añgula. At the end of the eyes must be delineated karaviraka (i.e., the inner corner) 1 añgula in measurement.¹

14: The head is 32 añgulas in circumference and 14 in its extent (apparent width). In pictorial representations, 12 añgulas (only of the 32) are shown, twenty being invisible.²

15: The face along with the full complement of the hair make up 16 añgulas in length, as it is said by Nagnajit.³ The neck is 10 añgulas wide, and 21 añgulas in circumference.

16: From the throat (the lower-most part of it) down to the heart, it is 12 añgulas; from the heart to the navel, it is the same; equal in length is the space between the centre of the navel and the penis (viz., the root of the penis).

17: The thighs measure 24 according to the añgula measurement; the shanks measure also the same. The knee-caps are 4 añgulas and the feet are the same (in height).⁴

¹ Utpala says karavirakaṃ duśiketi prasiddham. But Kern remarks that ‘the inner corner. karaviraka is also called mūshika in a quotation from Kāśyapa’ (J.R.A.S., 1873, p. 325, f. n. 1); but evidently he is inaccurate.

² This is interesting. In pictures only the front of the head is shown, the deity being represented frontally. But in reliëvo representations, greater or lesser section of the girth of the head is to be shown, according to the nature of the relief. In sculptures fully in the round, however, the whole of the periphery is to be shown.

³ Utpala comments: Mukham dirgham caturdasaṅgulāni keśarekha deve añgule evam sōlaka | Tathā ca Nagnajit | Dyanaṅgulā keśarekhaiṃ mukham syät sōlāsāṅgulam |

⁴ Jānukapiccha is explained by Utpala as the same as ekkalaka (?) as is well-known to the people (jānukapiccha...ye ca loka ekkalaka iti
18: The feet are 12 aṅgulas in length and 6 in breadth; the great toes are 3 aṅgulas long, and 5 aṅgulas in circumference. The second toe is (also) 3 aṅgulas long.

19: The rest of the toes should be made less by one-eighth, in succession. It is said that the height (elevation) of the great toe is 1½ aṅgula.

20: Those well-versed in the knowledge (of pratimā-lakṣaṇa) say that the nail of the great toe is ½ aṅgula; the nails of the other toes are less by ½ aṅgula in succession, or a little less.

21: The circumference of the extreme top of the shanks is said to be 14 aṅgulas long and 5 broad; in its middle, it is 7 aṅgulas wide and 3 times 7 (i.e., 21) in circuit.

22: The knees in their middle are 8 aṅgulas in thickness (width), 3 times 8 (24) being the girth. The thighs in their middle part are 14 aṅgulas in width, their circumference being just the double (i.e., 28 aṅgulas).

23: The hip is 18 aṅgulas wide and 44 in circumference. The navel is 1 aṅgula in depth as well as in extent.

24: The circumference of the middle (part of the body) at the centre of the navel is 42 aṅgulas. The intervening space between the paps is 16 aṅgulas; 6 such higher up (in an oblique direction) are the arm-pits. ¹

25: The shoulders should be made 8 aṅgulas, the upper arms as well as the forearms 12 (in length); the upper arm is 6 aṅgulas in width and the lower arm 4.

26: The circumference of the arms at their upper end is 16 aṅgulas, the same at the wrist (agrahasta explained by Utpala as prakṣṭhapradēśa) being 12. The palm is 6 aṅgulas broad and 7 long.

prasiddhe). Kern’s quotation from the commentator is faulty; he writes, ‘jānukapitthe (sic.) ye loke cakkalike iti prasiddhe. This cakkalikam or cakkalikā looks like a prākṛt form of the diminutive of cakra, ‘disc.’ He translates the word as ‘insteps’; but evidently the author refers to the measurement of the knee-cap or the patella.

¹ Utpala expressly tells us ‘Stanayorūrdhvam tiryak kṛtvā sād-aṅgulike kakṣye kārye.’
27: The middle finger is 5 aṅgulas (long), the forefinger is half a joint (or digit) smaller; the ring-finger is like the latter and the little one is less than the same by a whole digit.

28: The thumb has 2 digits, the remaining fingers should be made with 3 each. The measure of a nail is the same as one-half the joints of each finger.

29: 'An image should be represented in such a way that its equipment, dress, ornaments and outward form be in agreement with the country. By possessing the required characteristics an idol will, by its very presence, bestow prosperity' (Kern).

43-52: ‘A statue (of Śūrya) one cubit high is beneficial; one that measures two cubits in altitude brings wealth; an image of three cubits promotes peace; and one of four, abundance. An idol (of the sun) with excessive limbs bodes peril from the monarch; one with undersized limbs, infirmity to the maker; one with a thin belly, danger of famine; one that is lean, loss of wealth. When it shows a wound, you may predict the maker's death by the sword. By being bent to the left, it destroys his wife; by being bent to the right, life. It causes blindness by having its eyes turned upwards, and care, by the eyes being downcast. These good and evil tokens, as told in respect to the Sun's statue, apply to all idols' (Kern).\(^1\)

\(^1\) The verses 49-52 contain matter somewhat similar to that contained in verses 131-33 of the Pratimāmānālakṣaṇaṃ; verses 72-84 of the same text, however, supply us with a far more detailed account of the merits and demerits of images, especially navatāla ones; but the same is applicable to other images also, as in the Brhatanshikā verse (No. 52) it is expressly laid down that 'these good and evil tokens, as told in respect to the Sun's statue, apply to all idols.'
APPENDIX B

PART III

In this part of the Appendix A are incorporated in tabular form the broader details about the height measurements of the daśatāla images as laid down in a few comparatively late texts. The daśatāla, as I have shown in Chapter VIII, is of three varieties, viz., uttama, madhyama and adhama, measuring 124, 120 and 116 aṅgulas respectively. For further details about the above, the reader is requested to refer to T. A. G. Rao’s Tālamāna or Iconometry (M. A. S. I., No. 3), where he has collected much valuable textual data about the other tāla images. Since the publication of Rao’s Work, Silparatna of Śrīkumāra has been edited in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series and now it is possible for one to check some of these data with the help of the edited text.

UTTAMADASATĀLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Śilparatna</th>
<th>Kāraṇāgama</th>
<th>Kamikāgama</th>
<th>Vaiṣṇānasāgama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1̄gula</td>
<td>1̄gula</td>
<td>1̄gula</td>
<td>1̄gula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The height of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the uṣṇīṣa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From it to</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keśānta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From keśānta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to aṃśiṣṭtra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From aṃśiṣṭtra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to nose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From nose to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From chin to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From hikkāṣṭra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the end of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the breast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From breast to</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the navel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From navel to</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the meghramūla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From meghramūla</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the thigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee-cap</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janghā</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janghā to pūdātala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

DASATALA

1. Height measurements of a Buddha image of 120 aṅgulas according to Pratimālakaṇa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uṣṇīṣa</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kośasthān</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to chest</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to navel</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to penis</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thigh</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shank</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulpha</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārṣṣṇi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total height: ... 120 aṅu.

II. Same, according to the Kriyāsamuccaya commentary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uṣṇīṣa to neck</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to chest</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to navel</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to penis</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thigh</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shank</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulpha</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārṣṣṇi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total height: ... 124 aṅu.

So, the commentary gives us details about a Buddha of the Uttamadaśatāla measure.
III. Height measurements of a daksatīlapramāṇa image according to Sukraniti:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>5 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to chest</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to navel</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to penis</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thigh</td>
<td>26 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>5 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shank</td>
<td>26 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārṣṇi (gulphādhaḥ)</td>
<td>5 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total height: 119 aṅ.

It is one aṅgula less than the full measure. But there is no mention of the height of gulpha here.

IV. Same of a madhyamadasatīla image (goddess) according to Mānasāra:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head (crown to hair line)</td>
<td>4 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forehead (up to the eye-line)</td>
<td>5 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose (up to the lip)</td>
<td>4 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thence to chin</td>
<td>3½ aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck-joint</td>
<td>¼ aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>4 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiccup to chest</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to navel</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to organ</td>
<td>13 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thigh</td>
<td>26 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee</td>
<td>4 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shank</td>
<td>26 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>4 aṅ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total height: 120 aṅ.

It is to be noted that in most of the above tables (except in that from the Sukraniti), the portion above the hair-line is included in the computation of the total height. The author of the Sukraniti follows the earlier tradition in leaving it out (cf. Bhātisamhitā; see Pl. VI., Fig. 1).
APPENDIX C

When I edited the text, Samyaksambuddhabhāṣita. Buddha-pratimulakṣanum, I thought it would be interesting to compare the measurements of a few well-preserved Buddha figures of different periods in the collections of Museums in Northern India, with those laid down in the text. I wanted to find out how far the actual practice tallied with the textual data. While engaged in this work, I measured several representative specimens of Brahmanical images in the galleries of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and the Asutosh Museum, Calcutta University, with the same object in view. The measurements which I could take with the help of anthropometric instruments were mainly of height or length and rarely of the width of the various sections of the images. Ancient and mediaeval icons are usually relievo-figures; so the periphery of their respective parts cannot be measured. Interspaces can also seldom be measured in most cases, owing to the difficulty in locating the extreme points. Again, as these images, unlike those of Buddha, very often bear on their different limbs a variety of ornaments, it is extremely difficult to be sure about the iconometric data collected from them. So, I took only those measurements about which I could reasonably be sure, and I record them in order that they may be compared with the corresponding ones laid down in the texts. I have initiated this comparison myself, and have shown that there seems to be a fair agreement between the respective data in the case of those images which are comparatively well-executed ones. Most of the images partially measured by me belong to the mediaeval period.¹

¹ I offer my thanks here to Messrs. S. K. Saraswati, M.A., and T. C. Raychowdhuri, M.A., P.R.S., of the Calcutta University, for helping me in collecting these iconometric data. My sixth-year students of A.I.H.C. (Gr. IB) and Pali (Gr. E) departments (session 1939-40), also helped me in this work.
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1. Viṣṇu (from Bihar), formerly in the Indian Museum (No. 3864), now in the collection of the Asutosh Museum; date—C. 9th century A. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with kiriṭa)</td>
<td>67.7 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without ,,)</td>
<td>59.0 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the crown</td>
<td>1.3 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, ,, face</td>
<td>7.0 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, ,, neck</td>
<td>2.6 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>12.4 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to knee</td>
<td>21.3 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee to instep</td>
<td>12.4 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instep</td>
<td>2.0 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full height without kiriṭa</td>
<td>59.0 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the kiriṭa</td>
<td>8.7 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the face</td>
<td>7 ,,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the dictum of the Brhatsamhitā, the aṅgula unit of this image would be \( \frac{59}{108} \), i.e., \( \frac{54}{12} \) c.m. approximately (decimal places more than two being left out). Now \( \frac{54}{12} \times 12 \) is 6·48 which is 6·52 less than the actual face-length. But the length and width of the face of the image are the same and there is a close conformity with the text, as regards the measurements of the neck, neck to navel, the shanks and instep sections of the figure. The crown of the head (i.e., from the hair-line to the top of the head) is included here in the whole height. The length of the kiriṭa, or mauli according to the Matsya Purāṇa is 14 aṅgulas, which on the basis of the above unit will be 7·56 c.m.; but its actual length is 8·7, or 1·14 aṅgulas in excess.
2. Viṣṇu (No. 10, P. C. N.) in the Asutosh Museum, from Eastern India; date—C. 10th century A. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with kirīṭa)</td>
<td>43.8 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, (without ,, )</td>
<td>38.5 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, Length of the crown</td>
<td>7 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, ,, face</td>
<td>5.2 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, ,, neck</td>
<td>1.8 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>8.6 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to feet</td>
<td>22.2 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the forehead</td>
<td>1.6 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, nose</td>
<td>1.6 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, chin</td>
<td>2.0 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total face length</td>
<td>5.2 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the face</td>
<td>5.2 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width along the shoulders</td>
<td>13.8 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, from arm-pit to arm-pit</td>
<td>8.8 ,,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, of the waist-line</td>
<td>5.9 ,,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aṅgula unit of this image would be \( \frac{38.5}{108} \), i.e., \( 35 \) c.m.

Now, \( 4.2(35 \times 12) \) ought to be its face-length; but actually it is 5.2 c.m., i.e., a little more than 2 aṅgulas in excess. This would be so according to the Drāvida-māna, but the width in that case should have been 4.2 (which is not so here). It ought to be noted here that the respective lengths of the forehead and the nose of this image approximate to 4 aṅgulas, while the same from below the end of the nose to the extremity of the chin is somewhat in excess. A reference to Appendix B will show that according to some texts, the last is a little longer than the first two.
3. Viṣṇu Trivikrama (from Eastern India), now in the Indian Museum (Ms. 13); date—C. 11th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with kirīṭa)</td>
<td>77.9 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , (without ,,)</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face length</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin to navel</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to knee-top</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patella</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārśṇi</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the face</td>
<td>7.1 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the forehead</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , nose</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose to chin</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the waist</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From shoulder to shoulder</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , arm-pit to arm-pit</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the middle digit of the mediās</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dekalabdha-aṅgula unit of this figure is '61 c.m. The length of the face according to the textual basis would be 7.32 ('61 × 12), which is very close to the actual face length. The sameness of the length and the width of the face fully endorses the textual data. It should be noted that the three sections of the face are not equal in our sculpture; but the length of the nose very closely corresponds to what has been enjoined in many of the Silpaśāstras: the actual measurement is 2.4 c.m., while the academic one is 2.44 (.61 × 4). Here, the kirīṭa exceeds the academic length by as much as 3.16 c.m.
4. Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu (from Jessore district, Bengal), now in the Asutosh Museum; date—C. 11th century A. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with kirīṭa)</td>
<td>134.6 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, (without ,, )</td>
<td>115.8 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-length</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to knee</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanks</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115.8 c.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The width of the face         | 13.6 c.m. |

From shoulder to shoulder     | 38.5     |

,, arm-pit to arm-pit          | 26       |

Length of the forehead        | 4.5      |

The dehāṅgula of this image according to previous calculation will be 1.07 and on this basis its face-length ought to be 12·84 which is somewhat less than the actual face-length. If we derive its anīgunta on the adhama daśatāla basis, then the dehāṅgula becomes '99. Then its academic face length will be equal to 11·88 or 12; but still this does not conform to actual length. The actual measurements of the other sections also do not at all conform to the textual data, in whatever manner we may derive the anīgunta. The sculpture is not well-executed, and the artist, it seems, did not bother much about the details of measurements.
5. Miniature Viṣṇu (from Sunderbuns, Bengal), originally in the collection of Kalidas Dutt, and now in the Asutosh Museum; date—C. 10-11th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (without kiriṭa)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-length</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to ankles</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṛṣṇī</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the face</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the forehead</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;, nose</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;, chin</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a very well-carved miniature figure of Viṣṇu and the artist seems to have closely followed the details of the nava-tala mode. One thing to be noted here is this: in each of the image measured up till now, the top of the crown of the head is included in the academic measurement of the whole height of the figure. In the Brḥutsaṃkhitā, the portion above the keśarekhā seems to be left out of it. But in later texts on iconometry, this is not the case.

6. Śiva (from Bihar), now in the Indian Museum (No. 3851); date—C. 10th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with jaṭāmukuta)</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot;, (without jaṭāmukuta up to the hair line)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the face</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to knee</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee to foot</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Width of the middle digit of the medius ... .5 c.m.
The height of the Prabhāvali

with pisṭhikā ... 98.4 ,,
The height of the pisṭhikā ... 11.6 ,,  
The width of the waist ... 8.6 ,,  
From arm-pit to arm-pit ... 12.3 ,,  
The height of the jatāmukula ... 9.6 ,,  

The navatāla measure of this sculpture does not seem to include the length of the top of the crown and this is thus laid down in the Bṛhat-saṃhitā. Its dehaṅgula is 63 and its face-length fairly corresponds to the academic one of 7.56. The correspondence is not so approximate in the other sections of the body measured by me.

7. Sūrya (from Bihar), now in the Indian Museum (No. 3934); date—C. 10th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with kirīla)</td>
<td>72.1 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without ,,)</td>
<td>62.0 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-length</td>
<td>7.2 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>2.8 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>13.7 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to feet</td>
<td>38.3 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.0 c.m.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of the face</td>
<td>6.9 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, waist</td>
<td>9.5 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From arm-pit to arm-pit</td>
<td>11.8 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle digit of the medius</td>
<td>.75 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the prabhāvali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with pisṭhikā</td>
<td>91.3 c.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the pisṭhikā</td>
<td>11.2 c.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dehaṅgula of the above sculpture will be 67 which is 18 less than the width of the middle digit of its medius. That the former was the measuring unit is proved by the fact that the actual length of the face approximates to its 12 times. The length of the face is however a little more (3) than its width.
The height measurements in the lower parts of the body do not conform to the textual data.

8. Hari-Hara (from Bihar), in the Indian Museum (No. 3969); date—C. 10th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (without the head-dress)</td>
<td>113.6 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>15 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>3.5 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>25.2 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to feet</td>
<td>69.9 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113.6 cm.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Its dehāṅgula is 1.05. Calculating on this basis, there is some discrepancy between the actuals and the textual data.

9. Kārtikeya (from Eastern India), now in the Indian Museum (No. A.S.B-Ms. 2); date—C. 8th century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (including head-dress)</td>
<td>47.2 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without),</td>
<td>40.7 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>4.8 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>3.1 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck to navel</td>
<td>8.3 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navel to feet</td>
<td>24.5 ''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.7 cm.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Width of the face** ... 4.8 cm.

The dehāṅgula of the above sculpture is 3.7. The actual face-length of the image is 3.6 less than the academic one. But the former is equal to the measurement of the width of the face.
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Narasimha, 6, 218, 218, 251, 300, 287
Narasimhadeva, 39, 378
Nārāyaṇa, 87, 201, 211, 255, 277, 278, 301, 302, 311, 313, 318, 331, 345, 395
Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu, 12, 57, 255
Nārāyaṇa-vātika, 101
Narendra, a subordinate ruler, 314
Narendra-vināta, 210, 216
Nāruṣa sūtra, 366
Naṭarāja, 282, 300, 305, 397, 330
Natesa Aiyar, 37, 137
Nāṭ maṇḍapa, 380
Navagrahās, 367
Navarathna, a type of pedestal, 327
Navatāla, 283, 312, 350, 360, 406, 411, 417, 421, 430, 431; names of its varieties, 3-7
Nyāmanāra (Nyāmanāra), 29, 89, 331, 351
Nékapatam, 231
Nēlapal, 270, 288, 367
Newar, Newari, 288
Nīlās, 116, 210, 211, 371
Nīghanta, 85
Nīke, 10, 168, 330
Nīla (a nīdi), 116
Nīlakaṇṭha, 346
Nīlōpala, 9-12
Nīrgha, 299
Nīritti, 83
Nīrvāṇa, 263
Nīska (a kind of coin), 317
Nīska (a neck ornament), 57, 316, 317
Nītrīṇa, 329
Nītambāṅgula, 410
Nītyapūjā, 374
Nītīya Vyāhas, 347
Nṛśihī (avatār), 207
Nṛtya-Gaṇapati, 283
Nṛtyahastas (various types of), 301
Nṛtyamūrtis, 303
Nṛyagrodha, 94
Nṛyagrodhāparīmanḍala, 341, 345, 346, 407
Nyāna (class of images), 359

OESO, 150
Old Argive, 260, 398
Old Attic, 260, 388
OMMO, 139, 140, 170
Orissa, medieval art of, 323

Pāḍapiṭha, 201
Paḍma, 392
Paṇḍā (a variety of pīṇḍikā), 283, 299
INDEX

Sa, 108
Saññānana, 155
Saññaraka, 120
Saññasara, 11, 264
Saññhaka, 27, 270, 287, 289, 300, 333
Saññhana (a), 25, 26, 201, 271, 293, 287, 289
Saññyogata, 247
Sahet-Mahet, 189
Sahi, B., 137
Sahni, D. R., 202
Sailaja, 226
Sañjunāga, 41, 107
Saita, 25
Saśa (a), 5, 6, 20, 21, 23, 38, 92, 126,
129, 130, 131, 140, 141, 154, 168, 197,
199, 200, 202, 204, 251, 252, 255, 256,
259, 264, 291, 351, 372
Saśiva mantra, 87
Saśivas, 203, 369
Saṭka (a), 41, 142, 160, 290
Saṭka-Kushan, 284, 313, 324, 325
Saśka (a form of Skanda), 160
Saṭka, 112, 313
Saṭka, 6, 28, 98, 92, 154, 188, 189, 259, 290
Saṭki, 38, 92, 151, 372
—image, 300
—mantra, 87
—worship, 146, 219, 219, 250, 375
Saṭki (weapon), 117, 155, 198, 328
Saśtism, 173
Saśūna, 225
Saśyasa, 210, 300, 375
Sālāruma, 91, 92, 98, 101, 369, 370
Sāletore, 175
Sama (class of image), 292, 320
Sāmacchānta, 289
Sāmīḍha-mūtra, 275
Sānīja, 100
Sāman, 59, 372
Sāmapada, 289, 292
Sāmaparimāna (class of image), 392
Sāmanabhāna, 203
Sāmība, 224, 320
Sāmbhū (Śiva), 240
Sāmśūghati, 159, 322
Sāmthāramūrti (of Śiva), 231
Sāmībhūdevāsā Śiva, 25
Sāmṛkṣavara, 13
Sāṃśākaśaṇa, 11, 101, 114, 115, 115,
301, 328, 330, 331, 371
Sāṃśupājñāla mūtra, 271
Sāṃśkaśaṇa, 315
Sāmudragupta, 11, 121, 129, 146, 289,
391
Sāṃśyata hastas, 272 (names of 13
such), 304
Śaṃchi, 3, 4, 57, 110, 112, 124, 209, 262,
307, 321, 330
Śanda, 77
Pandārasana mūtra, 278
Śaṃndāsī, 48
Śaṃdrī, 43, 63, 49
Śaṃṣaya, 328
Śaṃkara, 82, 276
Śaṃkara-vatāra, 205
Śaṃkha (an emblem), 197, 203, 204, 206,
207, 208, 211, 213, 216, 328, 329
Śaṃkha-mūtra, 271
Śaṃkhandhā, 110, 193, 197, 216
Śaṃksapatramūra, 316
Śaṃkhyā, 18
Śantīda, 273
Śaṅkīḍa, 412
Śaṅkūmatāryā, 256
Śaṅkarath, a type of pedestal, 327
Śaṅkha-pati, 120
Śaṅka Ṛṣi, 13
Śaṅkatāla, 350, 357, 369, 410, 411, 417
Śaṅkotsadhī, 406
Śara, 328, 329
Śarabha, 6, 251, 252, 300
Śarabhamūrti, 300
Śarumūtra, 272
Śaracā, 103
Śāra-va, 11
Śaravati, 33, 219, 290, 311, 321, 332, 357
Śaravati, S. K., 233, 231, 235, 245
Śārha Śaṅkatāla, 366
Śarga, 22
Śarvādā, 7, 36, 106, 230, 262, 273, 322
Śarvabhauma, 77
Śravahanna, 314, 312
Śravatā, 101, 102
Śravantī, 374
Śaṭā (type of ment), 311, 312
Śrīśaṃstamahā, 111
Śāśākā, 167, 378
Śrīśāmkavātara (an epithet of Śiva), 121,
197
Śrīśan, 197, 211, 215
Śrīśatrākṣrī, 226, 313
Śrīśati, 71
Śrīśatakrāta, 303
Śrīśāvantā, 193
Śrī, 92
Śrīsātrap (of Mathura), 123, 112
Śaṭṭāla, 357
Śaturn, 311
Śāṭvatas, 86
Śatyay (Yuga), 348
Śauḥśūl (Greek form—Sophystic), 171
Śauḍulīkāya, 77
Śaura-stāli, 6, 151, 250, 258
Śavitr, 14, 152
Śavitrī, 314
Śeṣa, 21, 28
Śebmann, C., 10
Śeṣārī, 61
Śenāsāri, 7, 11, 264, 326, 327
Śenāmahā, 111
Śenāpati, 406
Śeṣa (ŚĪN), 113, 357
Śeṣasāyana mūrti, 255, 300, 301
Śhama Sastri, R., 95
INDEX

Ukha, 75
Ulana, 104
Uikakha, 77
Um, 84, 98, 130, 140, 150, 170, 198, 218, 291, 316, 357
Umānanda, 93
Umardha (Ujjaypur State), 171
Umāna (one of the 6 ways of measuring images), 343, 344, 345, 346
Upacāra, 271
Upādhyāya, 87
Upadhye, 8, 284, 295
Upamana (one of the 6 ways of measuring images), 343, 344
Upamīrāvarṣa, 265
Upan, 298
Upanāga (in Nājoya), 272
Upan, 72
Upatnī, 318, 320
Uparagā, 357
Urddhālālāga, 137, 138, 167, 176, 198, 199
Urddhāpata, 299
Urmi, 314
Uṣa, 76, 51, 177, 201
Uṣabha (Vṛṣabha), 125
Uṣāna, 14
Uṣṇa (cooking stone of a railing), 378
Uṣṇa (head-gear), 313
Uṣṇa (the so-called cranial bump of Buddha), 315, 421
Uṣṇapāda, a Yakṣa, 148
Uṭkutikāsana, 296
Uṣyva, 293
Uṭtana, 29, 358
Uttamadaśatāla, 228, 350, 357, 359, 361, 362, 423
Uttamadatta, 123
Uṭtara-Pāhulīma, 151
Uṭtaraśāstaka, 322

Vācan, 81
Vāhana, 168
Vaidic (mudrā), 270
Vaidic vidhāna, 376
Vaidūrya, 212
Vaiśājyanta, 95, 96
Vaiśayanti, 317
Vaiśayanti-pātāki, 117
Vaiśāyak-mudrā, 271, 292
Vaiśikha, 294
Vairocka, 287
Vaiśākhā, manner of moving the legs, 292
Vaisali, 212, 244
Vaiśārāval, 6, 20, 21, 21, 28, 81, 92, 130, 115, 151, 185, 195, 202ff., 208, 218, 251, 253, 311, 351, 370, 372, 390
Vaiśñav, 36, 151
Vaiṣṇavism, 21, 301
Vaiśravaṇa, 16, 95, 96, 108, 116
Vaiṣyās, 222, 236
Vaiṣṇava, 66
Vaijra, 242
— (thunderbolt), 9, 136, 137, 161, 288, 328, 330
— (a sagrota of Kṛṣṇa), 23
Vajra (a variety of piṇḍikā), 283, 299
Vaijayanti, an epithet of Rudra, 57
Vaiśrāpiṇi, 130
Vaijrapāyaliṣka, a sitting posture, 297
Vaijṛāśaana, (a kind of sitting posture), 297
Vaijṛāśana, the seat of Buddha), 91, 296, 297
Vaijṛāśana Buddha, a type of Buddha image, 297
Vaijayāna, 26, 27, 241, 217, 270, 283, 286, 291, 297, 298, 300
Vaiūjāka, 157
Vaiyā, 280
Vāmikī, 40
Vāṃdeva (a Vedic Ṛṣi), 60
Vāṃdeva (one of the 5 aspects of Śiva), 217
Vāma-kriṣṇa, an epithet of Kubera, 313
Vāmanā (incarnation), 254, 357
Vāṇī, 22
Vāṇaśanacarita, 22
Vānāmālā, 317
Vānāprasthas, 73
Vānapatī, 295
Vāndā (a mudrā), 274
Vāpī, a kind of piṭhikā, 299
Vāpūr, 11, 19
Vārada (a mudrā), 35, 90, 158, 159, 198, 268, 271ff., 275
Vārada-hasta, 268
Vārāha (tavārā), 207, 357
Vārāhi, 38
Vāreca (a niṣṭhā), 116
Vardhāhaka, 16, 375
Varieties of wood used in image-making by members of different castes, 292
Varṇa, 168, 163
Varro, 64
Varūpa, 48, 54, 58, 59, 63, 77, 80, 83, 193
Vashāhika, 114
Vaiśāli, 14, 15, 17, 18, 418
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
Vaiśānivāsana, 67
INDEX

Yajña, 68, 73
Yajnapuruṣa, 49
Yajñopavita, 318
Yakṣī, variety of pipāṭikā, 238, 290
Yama, 14, 19, 83, 140
Yamatārījuna, 191
Yamunā, 38, 86, 295
Yantra, 91, 92, 188, 189
Yarde, 278
Yāska, 51, 55, 59, 60, 63, 70, 253
Yātudhāna, 78, 237
Yātus, 78
Yaudhēya, 117, 121, 131, 154ff, 158
Yava, 351, 360, 361, 370, 394ff
Yoga, 21, 29, 33, 46, 87, 174, 179, 311
Yogadakṣipāmūrti (of Siva), 87, 311
Yon. a-mudrā, 268, 272, 275
Yogapāda, 21
Yokṣapāṭha, 296
Yogāṣana, a kind of pedestal, 298
Yogāṣana Viṣṇu, 87, 277
Yogī, 87, 88, 113, 275, 277, 294
Yoni, 186
Yonipiṭha, 93
Yonitīrtha, 93
Yudhiṣṭhira, 254
Yūṣ, 121, 122, 204
Yūṣastambhas, 114
Yuvā (one of the 4 varieties of stones), 293

Z
Zeus, 9, 10, 42, 162, 163, 258, 330, 339
Zoroastrian, 119, 319
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 14.
11. 29: Read ‘arranger or compiler’ in place of ‘explanator or expounder.’ The latter sense is secondary in Monier-Williams Sanskrit-English Dictionary. One of the meanings of the word Vyasa is ‘a Brāhmaṇa who recites or explains the Purāṇas, etc., in public pathakabrahmaṇa.’

16. 10 & 16. 30: Read ‘Vardhākā’ in place of ‘Vardhākā.’ The word has been rendered into English as ‘carpenter’ by Monier-Williams.

19. 25: Read ‘Catalogorum’ in place of ‘Catalogorum.’
21. 16: Delete ,‘, after the word ‘edition.’
41. 13: Read ‘accept’ in place of ‘accepts.’
57. 11: The Indus Valley seals, however, supply us with the earliest examples of these hybrid forms; the latter have been somewhat elaborately treated in the first part of Chapter
61. 19: Read ‘VIII’ in place of ‘VII.’
69. 31: Read ‘Krīḍāgūḍa’ in place of ‘Krīḍāgūḍa.’
74. 16: Read ‘vargamanaḥ’ in place of ‘vāgarmanoḥ.’
96. 1, 108, 16, 110, 19, 111. 23:

Add after ‘livelihood’ ‘This is supported by a verse in the Nānda Pārāṣārī (Bhūṣāṇa Sūrya, IV, 29), which says that one should never use the images of gods as the means of their livelihood. The whole verse reads: न अर्थोष्टं मन्त्र भवनः कपालेणिज्ञाताः कृत्यदितिविधास्त्वा अर्थोष्टं मान्यमोदिताः. Reference may also be made in this connection to Panini’s Śūtra Jātakaro upaṣṭya already noted in the third chapter.

97. 33: Read ‘earlier’ in place of ‘earlier.’
100. 10: Read ‘M.I.A.I., No 30’ in place of ‘Ibid.’
110. 19: Read ‘Ajaśakāla’ in place of ‘Ajaśakāla.’
121. 6: Insert ‘Pl. I, Fig. 22’ after ‘article.’
128. 1: Read ‘Raudragupta’ in place of ‘Rudramitra.’
135. 6: Read ‘35’ in place of ‘33.’
138. 6: Read ‘dateable’ in place of ‘dateable.’
138. 15: Put ‘32’ after ‘verse.’
150. 31: Read ‘V’ in place of ‘M.’

157. 37: After ‘servile’ insert the following—‘The Mahāmanī informs us that Kumara Kāttikeya was the world-famed sutaury desy of Kāttakeya (Y. 21. Rohitaka. Kāttikeya kumara kāttakeyaka).’
169. 11: Put a ‘;’ after ‘reproduced.’
173. 31: Read ‘in’ in place of ‘on.’
178. 1 (n.): Read ‘236’ in place of ‘33.’
182, 1 (f.n.) : Read ‘336’ in place of ‘306.’
193, 7 : Insert ‘so’, before ‘many.’
205, 21-2 : Read ‘In any case’ in place of ‘In many cases.’
206, 1 : Read ‘XIa’ in place of ‘XI a.’
209, 31 : Read ‘107’ in place of ‘10.’
217, 13 : Read ‘XXI’ in place of ‘XIX.’
236, 15 : Read ‘the’ in place of ‘these.’
239, 22 : Read ‘piiyikás’ in place of ‘piiyiias.’
250, 8 : Read ‘Pañcaratra’ in place of ‘Pañcaratras.
257, 23 : Read ‘reminds’ in place of ‘remind.’
258, 5 : Insert the following sentence after ‘Ravi’—’Hermes on some coins of Azes I with the scarf placed on the upper half of his body, his standing posture, his extended right hand, the manner of holding the caduceus (a wand intertwined with snakes) placed on his left shoulder reminds us also of the Siva type on the coins of Mnae, already discussed.’
258, 28 : Johnston, however, has interpreted recently these two Bhaja seals in a different manner. He is of opinion that the so-called India-relief there stands for Surya and the other one usually identified as Surya is Mara; cf. J.I.S.O.A., Vol. VII.
261, 14 (f.n.) : Insert ‘is’ after ‘observation.’
263, 21 : Put ‘as’ after ‘given.’
278, 8 : Read ‘Santulah kara’ in place of ‘Santulakahara.’
274, 11-12 : I have made no distinction between ‘nágula, randas or nánaklámuda,’ though the last denotes also the action of touching the forehead with the folded hands. The idea of reverence underlies each of the above terms.
275, 27 : Read ‘Samānānaphalasutta, for Samānānaphalasutta.’
278, 2 (f.n.) : Read ‘Ajasakula’ for Ajakula
281, 10 : Insert ‘in remarking’ after ‘justified.’
285, 6-12 : It was Dr. Stella Knaurisch who first drew the attention of scholars to this unique image. I have given the reference to her article in the footnote.
287, 27 : Read ‘is’ in place of ‘are.
290, 29 : Read ‘pl. VIII’ in place of ‘pl. VIII.’
292, 11 : Read ‘archers’ in place of ‘arches.’
292, 29 : Read ‘samapādam’ in place of ‘samapadam.’
295, 1 : Read ‘glutelias’ for ‘glutoses.’
296, 5 : Insert ‘and Fig. 16 in pl. II’ after ‘Plate III.’
297, 7 : Read ‘Pl. II’ for ‘the same plate.’
300, 24 : Omit ‘thus.’
302, 3 (f.n.) : Insert ‘der’ after ‘yatra.’
304, 31 : Add the following after ‘work’—’Nandikaraka speaks of as many as 28 single (sañiyuta) and 21 combined (sañiyata) hands (hasta). His list differs from the Vīṣṇudharmottara list in supplying us with a few names like ardhapātha, māyā, candrala, sarpa-sīra, ṣiṣṭha-mukha, tamra-cūda and trisūla in the case of the former types of hands (māyā in the Vīṣṇudharmottara list is omitted and sola padma in his list is probably the same as kālampadma in the other list): the sañiyata hasta in the Abhinavagupta’s darpana are more numerous, and thus new names, such as śrīcīkha, kārttari-śrūsika, śanāta, śākha, cakra, sañiyata, piśa, kīlaka, māyā, kūma, cañāka, guruda, nāga bhadra, khaṭṭa and bhurugya are included in the list which, however, omits four, viz., vardhamāna, nāḍiha, mukulī and gajadanta from the
Vijnanabhairavottara one (khatuka in the latter is a mistake for kataka which is written as kataka-varahana in the former). These have been elaborately described in the Abhinavagupta’s Akhanda. The joint authors of The Mirror of Gesture have made elaborate comments on the description and have illustrated many of these hard poses by drawings from old sculptures and from life (Coomaraswamy and Gopalakrishnavya, The Mirror of Gesture, 2nd Edition, pp. 45, ff. and plates VII, VIII, XIV-XX).

305, 1: Read ‘contain’ in place of ‘contained.’

313, 19: Delete ‘it.’

314, 6: Add after ‘precision’: ‘Is it to be described as ‘trisikha’ (a head-dress with three peaks) mentioned in some texts?’

317, 1 (f.n.): Delete ‘W’ after ‘E.’

321, 1: Read ‘nearly’ in place of ‘always.’

322, 26: Put a ‘,’ after ‘shown.’

326, 21: It was Dr. Stella Kramrisch who first enunciated this principle of dating relief-sculptures of the early mediaeval periods mostly belonging to the Eastern Indian School with the help of the prabhārī of the image of her observations in ‘Pala and Sena Sculpture,’ Royam, No. 40. I regret that I have omitted through inadvertence to mention her name in the footnote.

328, 31: Read ‘describe’ in place of ‘describes.’

329, 20: Read ‘bow’ in place of ‘cow.’

330, 3: Read ‘19’ in place of ‘129.’

330, 11: Read ‘Fig. 6’ in place of ‘Fig. 5.’

332, 11: Read ‘pl. VIII’ in place of ‘pl. VII.’

351, 6 (f.n.): Read ‘sama’ in place of ‘sama.’
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Fig. 2. Length as well as breadth of the face = 1 āṭā (12 āṇ.),

Fig. 3. Length of the hand = 1 āṭā (12 āṇ.)
Middle digit of the medius = 1 āṇ.

Fig. 4. Proportions of the male body acc. to 'Human Anatomy for Art Students'.

By courtesy of the Publisher of the 'Human Anatomy for Art Students.'
By courtesy of the British Museum and the Indian Archaeological Survey.
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