NOTES

CHAPTER ONE

2 Gnoli, p. 6. mātuḥ Śrī Rājyavatāḥ hitakṛtamanasaḥ sarvvardā puṇyavrddhyai rājā śrī Mānadevaḥ śubhavimalamatiḥ pōtradānām- buvarṣi ( / ) lakṣmīvat kārayitvā bhavanam iha śubham sthā- payāmāsa samyac Viṣṇum vikrāntamūrttiniḥ suramunimahitam sarvvalokaikanātham ( / / ) sarṇvat 300 80 9 vaiśākhaśukla- diva 2.
3 Although a number of Licchavi inscriptions give dates, no era has been specified. R. C. Majumdar [‘The Eras in Nepal’, *JAS* Vol. I., 1 (1959) pp. 47ff] has convincingly argued that they must be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A. D. which has been confirmed by L. Petech (*The Chronology of the Early Inscriptions of Nepal*, *East and West*, new series, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 227ff).
4 Gnoli, pp. 1-2. Also see Chapter Three of the present work.
5 ibid, p. 68.
6 ibid, p. 71.
7 ibid, p. 81 ; see also Chapter Three.
8 ibid, p. 48.
9 ibid, p. 41.
10 Many of the Licchavi inscriptions mention Pāşupata ācāryas by name ; e. g. ācārya Pranarddana, *ibid*. p. 79.
   Indian historians in general have ignored the sectarian rivalries that must have characterized the history of religions in India. For instance even today the orthodox Śrī Vaiśṇavas of south

12 Gnoli, p. 28; see also Chapter Six.

13 *ibid*, p. 48.

14 *ibid*, p. 50.

15 see note 6.

16 D. C. Sircar, ‘Kokāmukha-tīrtha’, *The Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. XXI, no. 1, pp. 56ff. See also Kunja Govinda Goswami, ‘Vaiṣṇavism’, *The Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. XXXI, no. 2, p. 109. Goswamy seems to have been unaware of Sircar’s article and mistakenly suggested the identification of Kokāmukhasvāmī with Śiva.


19 *Brahmapurāṇa*, 118, 106.

20 *Varāhapurāṇa*, chapter 140; see Sircar, *op. cit*.

21 This and the following lines are from the *Varāhapurāṇa* as quoted by Sircar, *ibid*, p. 58.


23 *DHI*, pp. 386ff.

24 *ibid*, p. 389. Also his Radhakumud Mukherjee Lectures delivered in the University of Lucknow some years ago (in press).


26 31, 17-22. 

\[ \text{śrīśca te lakshmīśca patnyāvahorātre} \\
\text{pārśve nakṣatrāṇi rūpamaśvinou vyāttam} \\
\text{iśnannisānāmuṁ ma iṣāṇa sarvalokāṁ ma iṣāṇa} | | 22 \]

27 Gnoli, 28.

28 In a later inscription of Aparājita found at Udaypur in India, dated A. D. 661, Viśṇu is addressed as Sauri. cf. Goswamy, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-29.
29 Gnoli, 81.
30 ibid, p. 64.
31 ibid, p. 117.
33 ibid, p. 2.
34 ibid, p. 71. ‘nuppunne bhag unārāyaṇasvāmino’. The term ‘bhagavat’ in these inscriptions is quite freely employed for both Śaivas and Buddhists. e.g. ācāryabhagavat Pranardinana (p. 79) or ratnatrayam bhagavad āryyam...(p. 85).
35 See Goswami, op. cit., passim ; also Chapter Two.
37 ibid, pp. 156-57.
38 ibid, p. 164.

svasti Nēpāla bhūkhaṇḍe khyātā śrīśikharāpūrī /
Gopāla sopiyatrā ste Viṣṇūṭīrtheśa Mādhavaḥ //

41 ibid, p. 6.

kṣīrodāmbu nidhau vidiḥārayabhasāt giriṁ mandaraṁ /
sambhītā kamalālayā pramathite devāsurairviśvataḥ
saṁvi kṣyasvadhyāyā vicintya camuha rdevesu
sarvātmanā śrēṣṭasā dhiṭiyaṁ gatā sujagatāṁ
kuryācchriyāṁ Mādhavaḥ / yaḥ pārijātadrumānayatima
bhārṭulakṣmipate rasurakānana dhūmaketoḥ karturṁ
pramodamavamanyasamastadevāndeyāccabhaṁ sajagatā
vigatātanaṁ // ...arccā śṛīpati Mādhavasya

...samprāptumuccaiḥ padaṁ bhaktyā śrīgaruḍasya śaṅkara
iti khyātena bhūmaṇḍale / patyā sahānindya ca citra-
vatyākalan kahina ḍupa vimbakāntaṁ / vakram daḍhatya
hrdayaṁ kṣipantya niruttare śreyasitejalakṣmyaṁ //

43 Skandapurāṇa, Nepālamahātmya, 7, 3-18

See Chapter Four; see also below note 54.


This too is in the Bir Library, Kathmandu. For an illustration of one of the covers, showing the ten avatāras, see *Nepalese Art*, pl. XXXV B.

Priyabala Shah, *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*, III, pp. XV & 397

A beautifully illustrated copy of the *Hanumānaṭaka* is preserved in the Bir Library, Kathmandu.


Although Rādhā is not mentioned in the *Bhāgavatpurāṇa*, the relation between the gopīs, especially those who were married, and Kṛṣṇa certainly shows parakiyā bias. Mr. Sinha finds in the word ārādhana the root of the concept of Rādhā (*A Study of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, p. 419).

The image and the gate were commissioned by king Pratāpamalla (cf. Wright, *History of Nepal*, p. 145). In fact this and the following pages describe at length Pratāpamalla’s achievements and he is also credited with having donated an image of Narasimha in the palace and built the Jagannāth-deval in front of the Kathmandu darbar, probably the octagonal shrine (see Chapter Five). He is also credited with having composed hymns in honour of Kṛṣṇa and Vāsuki Nārāyaṇa (cf. Regmi, *op. cit.*, pt. II, p. 70).


*ibid*, p. 73.

*om namo Vasundhārayai l. Viṣṇorvāhulatākaphoṇi śikharanoddhāratā medini gaṅgādyā saritāmbaraiva ruciralaṅkāritā sthāvaṇi l nānādravyamayapragupta-
karaṇāmanyāsalagnāhiṭā tvāṁ naumī ha Vasundhare
varaṇaśālam rakṣataṁ sarvvaṁ //

57 ibid, p. 17...Sāradā jagataḥ mātpathite......kāmāṅrītī.

58 ibid, p. 67.

om namoḥ śrī Sāradāyai // Ya śaktih parameṣṭino
Madhuripoh śaktistrisandhyāsu ca syādvālāyuvatojarātrigunagā
padmāsanasthā yaya // sajjāpyāvali pustakābhayavarador-
bhīṣvatubhirdṛtā prasurayedbhuvah śrī Sāradā nisyaśaḥ //

59 Nepalese Art, pl. XII B.

60 See Chapter Three.

61 1, 57-65. Saurāṣṭradesādāgatyā Buddharaṇī Janārddanaḥ /
manidhātau girivare tapasyāmakaṇḍoḍvaś //

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

Śrutvā girisutavākyam Buḍḍhah kāruṇikastadā /
saṅgane sthāpayāmāsa liṅgaṁ kāruṇikeśvaram /

62 Skandapurāṇa, Nepālamahātmya, 12, 1-5.
tato’iti tuṣṭo Gṛgindaṁ saputro munisaṁyutaḥ /
liṅgaṁ saṁsthāpayāmāsa Gopāleśvaranuttamam //
Pradyumnaścāpi santuṣṭaḥ pitṛbhaktisamānvitaḥ /
Śivanāraṇaṇāmnā sthāpayāmāsa yatnataḥ /
Kṛṣṇena sthāpitam liṅgaṁ Gopāleśvaranuttamam /
Ye drakṣyanti narā bhāgyāste kṛtārthā na saṃśayaḥ //
pradhyumnaśthāpitam Viṣṇumūrti drakṣyanti ye narāḥ /
inha loke sukham sthitvā yānti te paramā gatim //
Nepāle durlabhke kṣetre Kṛṣṇena sthāpitam svayam /
Gopāleśvaranāmām nam ye drakṣyanti kalau yuge //
teṣāṁ tuṣto murariupurviṣṇorlokaṁ prayacchati /

Curiously, here it is stated that those who see the liṅga Gopāleś-
vara, established by Kṛṣṇa, will attain Viṣṇuloka.


Also in fifteenth century Buddhist paintings from India, Kṛṣṇa
accompanies Brahmā and Indra at the Nativity of the Buddha
to adore him. (cf. P. Pal, ‘A New Document of Indian Pain-

64 B. Bhattacharyya, *The Indian Buddhist Iconography*, p. 363. The *dhyāna* quoted for Viṣṇu here is quite interesting. *Garuda Viṣṇus-caturbhujaḥ cakraśaṅkhabhṛtsavyavāmābhyaṁ mūrdhṇi kṛtāṁjali-gadāśārīgadharah* / It is curious that here Viṣṇu's principal hands holding the *cakra* and the *śaṅkha* should display the *aṅjalimudrā* above his head. As a matter of fact, the majority of the Brāhmanical divinities included in this maṇḍala are said to display this *mudrā*, no doubt indicating their submissiveness to Dharmadhātu Vāgīśvara, the principal deity of the maṇḍala. The other two hands of Viṣṇu hold the mace and the bow, instead of the usual lotus.

65 *ibid.*, pp. 159, 195.

66 Sastri, *A Descriptive Catalogue* ... p. 16. The manuscript was copied in Nepal in N. S. 481/A. D. 1361. The relevant portion is as follows: *bodhisattvasambarīya Nārāyaṇo aho āśrayamiti kṛtvā śaṅkha-cakra-gadāvanamālayuktāḥ mayāniya bhagavanta tripradakṣiṇikṛtya praṇāmya prahasitavadano bhūtvā bhagavanta gāñhaya stauti sma /


yena yenaiva rūpeṇa sattvā yānti vineyatām /
tenā tenaiva rūpeṇa shtito'hāṁ lokahetave //
yena yenaiva te lokā yānti Buddha vineyatām /
tenā tenaiva rūpeṇa Māyādevīsuto jināḥ //

68 ye yathā māṁ prapadyante tāṁstathaiva bhajāmyaham /
mama vartamā'nuvartante manusyaḥ Pārtha sarvasaḥ // (IV 11) ye'pyanyadevatābhaktā yajante śraddhayānvitāḥ /
te'pi māmeva kaunteya yajantyavidhipūrvakam // (IX, 23)


om svasti / kratu graha samāyukte samvatsare śatadvaye /
yeṣṭhamāsā sitāsthamyāṁ rājeyamṛtabhūpateḥ / bhrāturvijaya-
devasya svargga samprāpti hetave / śrī Viṣākhādidevena janaṁyā 
Madhukaśriyāḥ / ājñāmsrajamivādhāya mūrdhṇā dolācalasthiteḥ /
Kṛṣṇasyavidhibadbhaktyā Viṣṇorarccā niveditā // punyenājena-
loko'yam sukhi bhavatu, sarvadā / parārtha karaṇiyaiva pravṛtti
rhi mahātmanām //

70 ibid, pp. 8ff.

71 ibid, pp. 89-90.

anena punyena bhavantu lakṣmīḥ putrāyurārogyasahṛtyavarggāḥ /
vardhantu sarve dhanadhānya varṁāḥ saubhāgyalābhāḥ sakalā
bhavantu //

72 ibid, p. 81. In an earlier Newari inscription of N. S. 454/A.D.
1334, Śrī Viriṇci-Nārāyaṇa is addressed as a witness (sākṣi),
and a prayer is made for the expiation of all sins and for the
attainment of Brahma-loka, Rudra-loka and Viṣṇu-loka as well
as for temporal benefits. (pp. 18-19).

73 ibid, p. 89. vedoktena vidhānena Mādhava pratiṣṭhitaḥ /
CHAPTER TWO

1 *Rgveda*, 1, 9, 4; 1, 55, 4; 6, 47, 18.

2 *DHI*, p. 389.

3 *MBH*, XII, 349, 37; 389, 77-90 and 140.

4 *Vāyupurāṇa*, 98, 71f. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, I, 3, 6-22
   see also *DHI*, pp. 390ff.

5 *DHI*, p. 391

6 Schrader, pp. 43-46. It is interesting that in the *Ahirbudhny-asamhitā* list Trivikrama and Vāmana are cited as different emanations and so also Kroḍātman and Varāha. J. N. Banerjea has conclusively shown that Śantātman of the Pāṇcarātra list is really the Buddha (*DHI*, pp. 389, 392). We also know that the Buddha came to be regarded as an avatāra sometime around the fifth century (see R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, Dacca, 1940, pp. 41-42 and also the same author’s *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, vol. I, Calcutta, 1958, passim), and the fact that he has been included in the *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā* has an important bearing on the question of the age of that text. Certainly Schrader’s contention that the *Ahirbudhya* list of the avatāras is earlier than that of the *Mahābhārata* is untenable if only because the *MBH* does not include the Buddha (Schrader, p. 47). Schrader suggested the eighth century as the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of that work, but, as he points out, if the story of Muktāpīḍa is of Kashmiri origin, it is possible that the story was inspired by Kalhana’s *Rājatarāṅgini*. Moreover, Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa, as we know, ruled into the second half of the eighth century. Thus the eighth century for the *terminus ad quem* does not seem probable.
Schrader, p. 47.

University Library Cambridge No. Add 864. The manuscript has been more fully discussed in a paper contributed to the *Bulletin of the American Academy of Benares*, vol. I, 1967, pp. 23-33.

Gonda, p. 127 and references cited therein.

Schrader, p. 43; *MBH*, vanaparvan, 188f, *Matsyapurāṇa*, ch. 167.

Schrader, p. 42.


*ibid*, p. 264. The story of the Kūrmāvatāra in the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* is recounted in sk. VIII, chs. 5-12.

*DHI*, p. 413.


Gonda, pp. 129ff.

*Atharvaveda*, 12, 1, 48; Gonda, p. 137.

Gonda, pp. 137-39.

*ibid*, pp. 139-40.


*VDP*, III, 79, 9. It may be relevant here to examine the following verse in this chapter. *samagra kroḍarūpo vā bāhudāna-vamadhyagāḥ / nṛvarāho varāho vā kartavyaḥ kṣmāvidhāraṇe //10*

Dr. Priyabala Shah, however, accepts the alternative reading, found in another manuscript of the text, *samagrakrodharūpo*, and translates the line as follows: ‘Or he may be represented as the personification of full anger in the midst of many dānavas’ (*Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, Third Khaṇḍa, vol. II, p. 158 and n. 1). It is our contention that the correct reading is *samagra kroḍarūpo*. *Kroḍa*, meaning a ‘hog’, is obviously here used as a synonym for ‘varāha’, thus implying that his form should be completely that of a boar, as we indeed find frequently in Indian sculpture (e. g. Khajuraho Boar). Only
in this sense would this line be meaningful in relation to the previous śloka and the second line of this śloka. In the previous śloka we are told that Nṛvarāha (half human and half boar) may be represented with two arms holding the piṇḍa of the earth. The first line of verse 10 would then have relevance as follows: 'Or he may be represented completely as a boar (kroḍa) in the midst of many dānavas'. And then the following line: 'But whether he is represented as Nṛvarāha (half man and half boar) or as Varāha (fully a boar) the earth should always be held by him'.

For the meaning of the word kroḍa as hog see, Gonda, p. 126 and references cited therein; M. Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit English Dictionary, Oxford, 1963, p. 323. In one context, however, even Monier-Williams seems to have been confused. He translates the word kroḍakāntā as 'dear to Saturn (?)' (ibid). The question mark is his. At the same time he notes that it is a name of the 'earth'. In view of this it is difficult to see why he takes kroḍa here to signify 'Saturn', when he admits that Kroḍakāntā refers to the earth. Literally kroḍakāntā means 'dear to a hog' and obviously it follows that in the particular context Pṛthivī or Earth, whom the Boar rescues, is dear to him (kroḍakāntā) and this is why he saved her. Moreover, in the Kālikāpurāṇa he is said to have co-habited with her (Gonda, p. 141) Further, in the Pāñcarātra list of avatāras one of the names is Kroḍatman, and, as pointed out by Schrader, this can only refer to Yajñavarāha (Schrader, p. 45).

23 The Deogarh Varāha is comparable, but the treatment of the form there is quite different from the Nepali version (Cf. N. R. Banerjee, 'New Light on the Gupta Temples at Deogarh', Journal of the Asiatic Society, V, 1-2 [1963], Pl. V8). Another sculpture of about the seventh century showing the same bulky solidity as the Nepali sculpture is that from Kadvar and now in the Junagadh Museum (Cf. M. A. Dhaky, 'Some unpublished Images of Varāha and Kuvera from Gujarat', Satābda Kaumudi, Nagpur, 1964, Pl. VII, 11).
24 Quoted from Wilson’s Viṣṇu Purana by A. Boner, *Principles of Composition in Hindu Sculpture*, p 107.

25 A. Lippe, who first published the sculpture, suggests that it belongs to the eighth century A. D. (‘Viṣṇu’s Conch in Nepal’, *Oriental Art*, n. s. vol. VIII, no. 3, p. 119), but stylistically it must belong to the same period as the Śikhara Nārāyaṇa Viṣṇu Vikrānta image (Fig. 10), which cannot be earlier than the twelfth century.


27 *ibid.*

28 Lippe mistakenly identified the broken club as a fragment of the pillar from which Narasimha is said to have emerged. But the correct identification was suggested by Prof. J. E. Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw (*Oriental Art*, n. s. vol. IX, no. 1 p. 47.)


30 *Nepalese Art*, pl. XXVB.

31 See Chapter One, n. 54.

32 Rgveda, I, 32, 16-21.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ate devā avantu no yato Viṣṇurvicakrame/} \\
\phantom{\text{ate devā avantu no yato Viṣṇurvicakrame/}} \text{prthivyāḥ tapta dhāmavīḥ //} \\
\text{idam Viṣṇurvicakrame tredhā ni dadhe padam /} \\
\phantom{\text{idam Viṣṇurvicakrame tredhā ni dadhe padam /}} \text{samudhastya pāṃsura /} \\
\text{trīṇi padā vicakrame Viṣṇurgopā adāḥhyaḥ /} \\
\phantom{\text{trīṇi padā vicakrame Viṣṇurgopā adāḥhyaḥ /}} \text{ato dharmāṇi dhārayan //}
\end{align*}
\]


The chronological position of these sculptures has been discussed fully in the present writer's forthcoming book on Nepali sculpture and painting.

DHI, p. 419.

Boner, op. cit, p. 39.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa, VIII, 15, 23

Vāmanapurāṇa, 92, 36f.

According to the Vaikhānasāgama Namuci should be shown as adoring the right foot of Viṣṇu, Rao, op. cit., p. 166.

Vāmanapurāṇa, 92, 16. Valirbṛहṛṅgāramadaya dadau Viṣṇoḥ kramatrayam ///

ibid, 89, 46 pā拉萨amadaddāddandaḥ Maricirbrahmaṇaḥ sutaḥ / akṣasūtraṁ Vāruṇistu ... ... ///

ibid, 89, 29. svetāmbaradhara daityaḥ svetāṁśyānulepanaḥ / mṛgaṁiṁśṛtapṛṣṭho vārhapatravicītraksah ///

Boner, op. cit., p. 89.

DHI p 419.

See note 44.


Gnoli, p. 2.


Gonda, p. 55. In this and following pages Prof. Gonda has given a very erudite explanation of Viṣṇu's three strides and much of the discussion that follows is based on his chapter.

Gonda, p 57.

Aṣṭarvaveda, 10, 5, 25-35.

Gonda, p. 58. The three-strides are symbolic of kingship and connected with the Rājasūya-Yājña.
54 Gnoli, p. 6.

55 Gonda, pp. 58-9 and 62-3. Further in the MBH (17, 6, 16) we are told that a kṣatriya acquires śṛi by vikrama.

56 Gonda, pp. 118ff.

57 ibid, p. 119.

58 See note 15.

59 Sinha, op. cit., p. 281. In the Vāmanapurāṇa (92, 56) the god tells him that during the ceremony of Indrotsava, a special rite called dipadāna will be performed in honour of Bali.

60 Possibly earlier sculptures are too fragmentary to merit a discussion of their iconography.

61 DHI, pp. 418-19.

62 Quoted by Klaus Bruhn, op. cit., p. 169, n. 2.

63 H. Goetz, ‘Early Indian Sculptures from Nepal’, Artibus Asiae, 18 (1955), Fig. 1, p. 66.

64 ibid.

65 Comparable is the similarly kneeling figure of Ahalayā in a Rāmāyaṇa relief on the Daśāvatāra temple at Deogarh [cf. M. S. Vats, The Gupta Temple at Deogarh, New Delhi, 1952, pl. XV, (a).]

66 See note 8.

67 The earliest stereotyped representations occur on a cover of a thirteenth century Viṣṇudharma manuscript, cf. Nepalese Art, pl. XXXV B.

68 In a south Indian bronze also we find Narasimha pulling out and eating the entrails of Hiraṇyakaśipu (Rao, op. cit., pl. XLVII).

69 Usually in late Nepali and Tibetan paintings of the Buddha and his paradise we often find him flanked by two monks carrying a staff and a bowl, representing Mahāmaudgalyāyana and Sāriputra. Ānanda here is given an identical iconography.

70 Agnipurāṇa, 49, 9.
71 Bhagavadgītā, X, 14 V. S. Agrawala’s translation, Varanasi, 1963, p. 127. All the translations of the verses that follow are taken from V. S. Agrawala’s translation.

72 III, 65.

kuryācchaśāṅkasarikāśami ratnojvalapahānāvitam /
nīlastraṁ caturbāhuṁ sarvābharanadārīnam //2
padmaṁ samusalam kāryaṁ devadaksinahastayoḥ /
vämayōṣīr śaṁkhou ca kare (? kāryaḥ) tasya surāmbudhiḥ //4

73 Dr. P. Shah is certainly correct in emending the word kare in the verses quoted in the previous note to kāryaḥ and then taking tasya surāmbudhiḥ to signify that Ananta represents the celestial ocean (op. cit., p. 152), rather than Dr. Kramrisch’s translation.

It may be mentioned here that Klaus Bruhn (op. cit., pp. 194-96), in discussing the nāga motif, found particularly in the context of representations of Varāha, Trivikrama and Gajendramokṣa in India, suggests that ‘the nāgas are most probably in all these cases artistic innovation’. He further states in connection with Sivaramamurti’s explanation of the nāga below a Rajim Trivikrama as representing the pāṭāla that ‘that would practically mean that any nāga (and any lotus) can be taken as an indication of the chthonic (or aquatic) association of a myth. But unless it is quite clear that nāgas and lotuses are only indications of the scenery (as in the case of the lotuses on the Gajendramokṣa panel at Deogarh), it is safer to explain lotuses and nāgas which are not referred to in the myth by transfer’.

It appears that Mr. Bruhn has posed a problem that does not really exist and then has given a laboured explanation. In our discussion of the Viṣṇu Vikrānta reliefs we have shown that the artist, whether in India or in Nepal, has constantly symbolised the pāṭālaloka, which is intimately connected with the Vāmanāvatāra myth in all the versions, with a nāga figure or couple. Similarly, in the Viśvarūpadarśana sculpture from Nepal there can be little doubt that Ananta represents pāṭāla, and the Viṣṇudharmottara passage, quoted above, certainly associates Ananta with water. Mr. Sivaramamurti is therefore perfectly
justified in his interpretation. In the case of the Varahavatara as well we are told (VDP, III, 79, 2f; III, 106, 48 and not 46 as given by Mr. Bruhn) that the God should stand on the serpent Sesha. Here too the context is perfectly justified since the boar rescued the earth from the bottom of the ocean and clearly the naga in this case signifies the ocean. As a matter of fact, the naga and water are so intimately connected in Indian literature and the association is so much of a common place that no iconographer or compiler of a myth deemed it necessary to state the obvious on each occasion.

In the case of Gajendramoksha obviously the presence of a naga is to indicate water. Landscape, both in Indian sculpture and painting, right down to the period of the Rajput style, has always been rendered conceptually. Once again the Vishudharmottara enlightens us on this. In chapter 42 of the third khanda in declaring how water is to be represented the author writes: toyam ca darśayedvidvānanantairmatya kacchapaḥ //63 padmākṣaiśca matvārāja tālhānyairjalajairgunai // Clearly here the artist is being enjoined to depict water as containing serpents, fishes, tortoises and other beings that live in the waters. It is thus not difficult to see why the Deograh artist represented the ‘setting’ for Gajendramoksha as he did.

74 DHI, p. 391 ; Ananta is also included in the Pañcaratra samhitās as an avatāra (Schrader, p. 42). The VDP description of Ananta or Sesha ends as follows (III, 65, 8) : etaddhi rūpaṁ parameśvaraṁya Viṣṇorcintyasya mayeritaṁ te //.

75 VDP, III, 85, 6-7 ; Shah, p. 142.

76 Shah, p. 145.


78 Kuiper, op. cit., p. 150.

79 ibid, p. 144.

80 ibid, p. 145.
81 For a discussion of the iconography of this sculpture see C. Sivaramamurti, *Indian Sculpture*, pp. 98-99.

82 See note 6, citations of R. C. Hazra’s works.

83 *VDP*, III, 83; Shah, p. 162.

84 *VDP*, III, 83, 7. grasamānāh sa kartavyāh sarvvaṁḥ sattvabhayaṁkaraiḥ /

85 49, 21f.

86 *Rūpamaṇḍana*, 3, 53f; *Aparājitāprccā*, 219, 28-32.

87 Shah, 162; *VDP*, III, 83, 11.


91 See Chapter Four.

CHAPTER THREE

1 DHI, p. 387.

2 ibid, p. 388 and f. n. 1.

3 Rūpamaṇḍana, III, 9-23.

4 Agnipurāṇa, chapter 49; see also M. T. de Mallmann, Les enseignements iconographiques de l’Agni-Purana, pp. 22-3.


7 Rūpamaṇḍana, III, 17.

8 Gnoli, p. 81. The invocation is as follows:

om ananatāgādhipabhogabhāsura jalāśaye śāntatamam

manoharam (/)

Murārirūpaṁ yad aṣeta dehināṁ śivāya tad vo vidadhātu

maṅgalam (///)

9 According to the Rūpamaṇḍana, Trivikrama’s attributes are to be disposed as follows: mace, lower right; discus, upper right; conch, upper left; lotus (?) lower left. But in the Agnipurāṇa, the corresponding hands hold the lotus, mace, discus and the conch. As Dr. Srivastava has pointed out there are also other differences between the two lists (B. Srivastava, Rūpamaṇḍana, p. 51). Dr. M. T. de Mallmann appears to be mistaken when she claims that the Agnipurāṇa list as published and tabulated by her (op. cit., p. 23) corresponds ‘exactement a cette du Rupam’.

10 Regmi, Medieval Nepal, part II, plate (the plates are not numbered).

11 For their detailed identification see P. Pal, ‘Composite Form of
Vāsudeva and Lakṣmī', *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, vol. V.

12 Miss Kalpana Desai of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay
who is working on Vaiṣṇava Iconography of northern India,
kindly showed me a number of photographs of quite a few
images with such a composition from Rajasthan and Gujarat.

13 There is a dated bronze sculpture in a private collection in
Bombay, a slide of which was shown by Dr. Pramod Chandra,
where the trio is portrayed exactly as in the stone versions.

14 For a discussion of such images as well as the concept of
pañcopāsanā, see J. N. Banerjea, *Pañcopāsanā* (In Bengali).

15 Although the Jaina caumukha does not quite signify five Jinas,
the symbology of five is not unknown in Jainism as e.g.
pañcamaṇḍalas, pañcameru, pañca-Parameśṭhiñkalpa, etc. (cf.
117, 123).

16 Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Haridas Swali of Bombay.

17 Gnoli, pp. 1-2.


19 *Skandapurāṇa, Nepālamāhātmya*, ch. 2.


vol. VIII, No. 3, p. 118.


23 *The Art of India and Nepal : The Nasli and Alice Heeramanek Collection* (catalogue of exhibition held in the Museum of Fine
Arts, Boston, November, 1966). There the sculpture has been
mistakenly dated as seventh century and ascribed to central
India. There is no doubt that it is from Nepal.

24 The āsana here is slightly different from the usual delineation of
this posture in art.

25 In early Indian iconography, in Sanchi, or in a beautiful terracotta piece recently acquired by the Bharat Kala Bhavan, we
find two females, side by side, one carrying a flower and a jar of water and the other a thāli with foodstuff. Such images must have been prototypes of the later conventional iconography of Śrī and Bhūmi as we find in this Nepali example.

26 Schrader, p. 53. Here, however, Viṣṇu is also being represented as Ananta.

27 *ibid*, pp. 50-51, 53-54.

28 Gnoli, p. 50.

29 *ibid*, p. 81. The same event seems to have been referred to in another inscription of the following year (*ibid*, p. 83).

30 According to Wright’s *Vaṁśāvalīs*, however, the image was not commissioned by Pratāpamalla, but an old image recovered and placed in the tank. If this were true, the image at Balaju may claim a date older than the seventeenth century. ‘He (Pratāpamalla) went to consult Jalahayana Narayana and was told not to make an image for this tank, so he brought an old image, which was lying in a pond near Gyaneshwar, and placed it in the tank. Being desirous of supplying water to the tank from Nilakantha, he got permission from the deity, and brought the water in a narrow channel. When it reached Ranimban, it stopped, and the Raja made a vow that he would not go to the durbar till he went along with the water’. Ultimately after a year of propitiation the water reached the tank and the king worshipped Nārāyaṇa. ‘On the same night the Raja had a dream, in which he was told by Buddha-nilakantha that he or any of his descendents or successors who went to visit Nilakantha would die.’ (Wright, *History of Nepal*, pp. 145-46). This appears to be the reason why ever since no Nepali king has visited this shrine, but instead pay their respects at Balaju.

31 Collection of Alice and Nasli Heeramanec, New York.

32 For a discussion re: *darpaṇa* as an attribute of Śrī-Lakṣmī see Chapter Six.

33 Schrader, p. 41.

34 See note 11.
Schrader, p. 55. See also Appendix at the end of this book.

36 Rūpamāṇḍana, III, 67-71; Aparājitaprechā, 218, 50-52.

37 Schrader, p. 52, n. 3.

38 ibid, p. 53.

39 See note 37.

40 Viṣṇutilaka, II, 11-16; Schrader, p. 53.

41 Schrader, p. 56.

42 ibid, p. 122.

43 ibid, p. 61.

44 ibid, pp. 55, 84.

45 Ahirbuddhnyāṣāṁhitā, XXXII, 18.

46 Viṣṇudharmottararūpāṇa, III, 85, 1-14.

47 Mallmann, op. cit., pp. 16ff.


49 DHI, p. 396.

50 See Chapter One, n. 50.
CHAPTER FOUR

1 See Chapter One.

2 The Bhāgavatapurāṇa appears to have gained exceptional popularity, particularly in the sixteenth century, all over India and was translated into the regional languages. cf. B. B. Majumdar ‘The Bhāgavata Purāṇa and Its Influence in the Sixteenth century’ The Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Vol. XLVII, Parts I-IV, 1961, pp. 380ff.

3 Regmi, Medieval Nepal, part II, pp. 89-90.

4 Wright, History of Nepal, p. 146. According to Wright’s Vamśāvalis, Pratāpamalla had also brought an image of Gāruḍa along with that of Viṣṇu destroying Kāliya. Both these images had been found in a place called Sakonha in the Sāṅkasya-nagari. ‘This Gāruḍa gave much annoyance to the Rājā, who in consequence removed him to a spot near the Nārāyaṇa of Nārāyaṇa Hiti’.

5 Bhāgavatapurāṇa, X, 16-17.


8 This is the concept underlying the following dhyāna of Kṛṣṇa from the Bṛhat-tantrasāra (p. 178):

\[
dvārāvatyāṁ sahasrārkabhāsurasairbhavanottamaṁ/
analpaṁ kalpavrksaiśca parite maṇiṁmaṇḍape/
\]
\[
jvaladratnamayastambhadvāratoraṇakuyake/
phullasrogulasaccitravitānālamvīmouktike/
padmaṁgasthalirājadratnanadyośca madhyataḥ/
anāratagaladratnadhāraśya svastaroradhaḥ/
\]
ratnadīpāvalibhiśca pradīpitadigantare /
udyadādityasāriksamanśitisimhāśanāmbuje /
samāśino' cyuto dhyeya drutahatikasannibhaḥ /
samānodita-candrārka-taṅtī-koṭi-samadyutiḥ /
sarvāṅgasaundersaḥ saumyaḥ sarvābharaṇabhuṣitaḥ /
pitavāśaścakrasaṅkhagadāpadmojvaladbhujah /
anāratacchadaladraunāhakalasam sprśan /
vāmapādāmbujāgreṇa muṣṇatā pallavacchavim /
rukminiśatyaḥhame 'syamurddhīṇi ratnaughadhārayā /
siṅcanyouv dakṣavāmaste svadokṣṭhākalasotthayā /
nāginajīśunandā ca diśantyous kalasau tayoḥ /
tābhyaḥśca dakṣavāmaste mitravindāsulakṣaṇe /
ratnanadoḥ samuddhṛtya ratnapūrṇour ghaṭau tayoḥ /
jāmbavati susīlā ca diśantyous dakṣavāmake /
vahihṣoḍaśa sāhasryasāriṅkhyaṭāḥ paritaḥ priyāḥ /
dhyeyāḥ kanakaratnoughadhārāmbukalasojvalaḥ /
tadvahiścaṅdaṁidhāyaḥ pūraranto dhanairdharām /
tadvahivvṛṣṇayah sarvve purovacca surādayaḥ /
evāṁ dhyātvā......

Here not only is Kṛṣṇa conceived as being under a kalpavṛkṣa, but he is to be accompanied by Rukmini and Satyabhāmā and is clearly identified with Viṣṇu. In the majority of the dhyānas of Kṛṣṇa, quoted in the Brhat-tantrasāra, he is to be represented under a kalpavṛkṣa.

9 Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Haridas Swali of Bombay. It may be mentioned that the āsana here is not quite of the same variety that we usually find represented in art.

10 Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Haridas Swali of Bombay.

11 When Kṛṣṇa was born he was taken to Vrindavana to the house of Yaśodā and Nanda, and their daughter, born at about the same time, was substituted in the prison of Kaṁsa. This girl was an incarnation of Devī.


13 Bhāgavatapurāṇa, X, 29-33.

14 Sinha, op. cit., p. 422.
15 See Chapter Two.


18 It may be of interest here to mention that the story of Bānāsura was also a popular theme with artists of the Panjab hills. Although the National Museum miniatures depicting this theme [cf. ‘An Aniruddha-Ushā series from Chambā and the Painter Rām Lāl’ *Lalit Kalā*, 1-2, (1955-56), pp. 37ff.] were probably painted a few years earlier than the Nepali scroll, stylistically they differ considerably. Even if the Nepali painter was aware of similar paintings either from the Panjab or from elsewhere in India, he chose to render the theme in what was already a developed indigenous idiom.


20 See Chapter One.

21 See n. 17.
CHAPTER FIVE


2 saumyasiṁhādibhūyiṣṭhavaktrabhedāścaturmukha /
dvītryādimukhabheda vā mūrtirekaiva pūjyate //
saṁvṛtā parivāraīś svairvinā vā sarvakāmadā /
yatra tantrāntaraṁ tatsyaścaturthā caturānana //


mukhyānuvṛttibheḍena yatra simhādayastu vai /
caturśtidyadikenaiva yogenābhycite tu vai (nātu) /
saṁvṛtāṁ parivāreṇa svena svenonvi (sthi) tāstu vā //
yacchaktyārdhitaṁ sarvaṁ viddhi tantrāntaraṁ tu tat /

_Pauṣkarasaṁhitā_, 38, 300-02 ; *ibid.*, p. 145.

3 anādinidhānaṁ devaṁ jagatsraṣṭāramiśvaram /
dhyocaturbhūjaṁ vipra saṁkhaçakragadādharam //
caturvaktraṁ sunayanaṁ sukāntarī padmapāṇinam /
Vaikuṇṭhānī narasimhāśyaṁ vārāhanī kapilānanam //

_Jayākhyasaṁhitā_, VI, 73-74.

4 *VDP*, III, 83, 14.

5 *DHI*, p. 409.


7 *Agnipurāṇa*, 305, 12.

8 *Rūpamaṇḍana*, 52, 60-62.
9 Pārameśvarasāṁhitā, 19, 541-43; Iśvarasāṁhitā, 21, 579-81; Maheshwari Prasad, op. cit., p. 145, f. n. 3.

10 DHI, p. 502; MBH, IV, 6 & VI, 23; Harivaṁśa, III, 3.

11 DHI, p. 502.

12 Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa, 81, 41.

\[
\text{tannātra vismayaḥ kāryo yoganidrā jagatpateḥ} \\
\text{Mahāmāyā Hareściaśā tayā saṁmohyate jagat} \\
\text{also}
\]

\[
tuṣṭāva yoganidrāṁ tamekāgraḥdayasthitah \\
vibodhanārthāya harerharinetrakṛtyāṁ
\]

viṣveśvarinīn jagaddhātriṁ sthitisamhārakārīnīṁ \\
nidrāṁ bhagavatīṁ Viṣṇoratulāṁ tejasāḥ prabhuh

13 Krodha Bhairava is one of the eight Bhairavas who are supposed to preside over the eight śmaśānas or cemeteries. According to a painting published by Levi, however, Krodha Bhairava presides over the Gahvara-śmaśāna and his Śakti is Kaumārī (cf. Levi, Le Nepal, vol. III, pp. 175ff; P. H. Pott, Yoga and Yantra, p. 82). Obviously, there were more than one tradition as to which Bhairava presided over which śmaśāna and consorted with which Mātrkā.

14 Brhat-Saṁhitā, 57, 56.

15 But once in an inscription her association with Viṣṇu is explicitly declared (cf. Chapter One.)

16 See Chapter One, n. 58.

17 Brhat-Tantrasāra, p. 127.

\[
\text{suḥhrāṁ svacchavilepamālāyavasanaṁ śīrṣāṁ sukhāndojjvalāṁ,}
\text{vyākhyāmakṣagunāṁ sudhādhyaakalasanaṁ vidyāśca hastāmbujaḥ} \\
\text{vibhṛṇāṁ kamalāsanāṁ kucalatāṁ vāgdevatāṁ sasmitāṁ vande}
\text{vāgvibhavapradāṁ trinayanāṁ saubhāgyasampaṭkarīṁ}
\]

It is interesting that she is invoked here for granting good fortune and wealth.
18 Rūpamaṇḍana, III, 51.

vāmāgre (vāmo'gre) kuṇcitaḥ paścādanyapādastu jānunā /
pṛthivīṁ saṁsthito yatra gāruḍaṁ syāttadāsanam //

19 Stella Kramrisch, The Art of Nepal, p. 54.

20 See Chapters One and Three.

21 III, 50.

Kiṁcillumodbodaraḥ kāryaḥ sarvābharaṇabhūṣitaḥ //

22 ibid. Yaduśca bhagavān prṣṭhe chatraṅcumbhadharau karau /
CHAPTER SIX

1 The names of the purāṇas are usually indicative of their particular bias. Thus Śiva is extolled in the Śivapurāṇa and Viṣṇu in the Viṣṇupurāṇa. At the same time they also stress the essential ‘oneness’ of the various divinities. Apart from theological treatises, contemporary literature also, as for example Kālidāsa’s works (see note 8), help us in gleaning a fair idea of the prevailing religious climate of the period.


3 J. N. Banerjea, Pañcopāsanā (in Bengali) for an elaborate discussion.

4 The term saṅghāta designating composite images occurs in the Vāstuvidyā being edited by M. A. Dhaky, to whom I am grateful for the information. I am also indebted to Dipak Chandra Bhattacharyya for drawing my attention to the miśra-mūrti section of the Śilparatna (pt. II, ch. 25, v, 75).

5 DHI. p. 552.

6 For instance Kālidāsa in his Kumārasambhavam (I,50) writes:

\[ \text{tām nāradaḥ kāmacaraḥ kadācit kanyām kila prekṣya pituḥ samīpe | samādideśaikavadhūṁ bhavitṛiṁ premṇā sarīrārdhaharāṁ harasya //} \]

In the following sarga (v.7) the Gods address Brahmā as follows:

\[ \text{strī-puṁsāvātmabhāgou te bhinnamūrtteḥ sisṛkṣayā /} \]
\[ \text{prasūtibhājah sargasya tāveva pitarou smṛtou //} \]

Although Kālidāsa was an avowed Śaiva, he too repeats the vedic precept quite unambiguously; for example, cf. Kumārasambhavam:

(II,4) namastrimūrttaye tubhyam prāk srṣṭeh kevalātmane /
       guṇatraya vibhāgāya paścādhamuṣeyuṣe //

(VII,44) ekaiva mūrttirvibhide tridhā sā sāmāṅyamesāṁ
       prathamāvaratvam /
       viṣṇorharastasya hariḥ kadācidvedhāstostāvapi dhāturādyou ||

9 Skandapurāṇa, Himavatkhaṇḍa, Nepalāmāhātmya, 11, 1; 12, 1-6.


11 Śivāya Viṣṇurūpāya śivarūpāya Viṣṇave /
       Śivasya hṛdayam Viṣṇurūṣṇośca hṛdayam Śivah ||
       ... ... ... ...
       yathāṇtaram na bhadāḥ syuḥ Śivakeśayostathā ||


13 Gnoli, p. 28.

14 Regmi, op. cit., p. 93.

15 VDP, III, 85; in another śloka (85, 55) Trivikrama is also described as sajalāṃbudasaṅkāśasthā.

16 VDP III, 44, 19.

17 Regmi, op. cit, 36.

18 ibid, 93.

19 The present image agrees closely with the description of Hari-Hara in the Agnipurāṇa (49, 24-25).
       ... ... ... Hariśaṅkarako hariḥ // 24
       Śularṣṭidhārī dakṣe ca gadācakradharo pare /
       rudrakesavalakṣmāngo gaurī lakṣmī samanvitaḥ // 25.
Although instead of the aṣṭi, the seed of a fruit or viṣṇupuraka, and the gadā, the attributes in the image are a rosary and a conch, it is interesting that both Gaurī and Lakṣmī are said to accompany the two gods. It may be mentioned here that the word aṣṭi means the stone or seed of a fruit (cf. Monier Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 117) and thus both the Bengali translator of the text as well as M. T. de Mallmann, who translates it tentatively as a javelin (*op. cit.* p. 46), appear to be mistaken.

20 This is the basic theme of his book, *Icon and Idea*.


22 *DHI*, p. 134. J. N. Banerjea (p. 370), however, thinks that the goddess Śrī is really not alluded to in the *Rgveda*. The śrīśūkta (II, 6), it must be remembered, is believed to be a late supplement (*khila*).


I agree with Prof. Gonda that the later concept of Śrī and Bhūmī as the two consorts of Viṣṇu has little to do with the vedic dual personality of Śrī and Lakṣmī as suggested by Gerda Hartmann.

24 *MBH*, II, 10, 19 and III, 168, 3.

25 *DHI*, p. 372.

26 *Rāmāyaṇa*, 3, 46, 17; Gonda, p. 215 and references cited therein.

27 Gnoli, p. 48.
28 D. R. Regmi, _Medieval Nepal_, part II, plate (no number).

29 For a detailed discussion of the maṇḍala in this painting see P. Pal, ‘Composite Form of Vāsudeva and Lakṣmī’, _Journal of the Asiatic Society_, vol. V. Nos. 3 and 4, 1963, pp. 73ff. The reading of the date in the inscription may not be absolutely correct.

30 Regmi, _Medieval Nepal_, III, p. 92-93.

31 _ibid._


34 Schrader; p. 29.

35 _ibid._

36 _ibid_, p. 30.

37 _ibid._

38 _ibid_; _Lakṣmītantra_, II, 17.

39 _ibid_, p. 34. In chapter 4 of the _Saṁhitā_ it is further stated that Nārāyaṇa and his śakti due to ‘over-embrace’ (ati-saṁśle-śāt) have become a single principle (ekam tattvam iva).

40 Schrader, p. 29.


42 Although Rādhā is not mentioned in the _Bhāgavatapurāṇa_ there can be little doubt that the gopīs are attracted to Kṛṣṇa through love which forms the bond between their relationship. This love is also _sahaja_ in the sense that it is spontaneous although, perhaps, not the _parakīyā_ love of the later Sahajiyās.

43 _Śāradātilakā_, VI, 45.

44 Schrader, p. 103.

45 See note 27.
R. D. Banerji, *Eastern Indian School of Medieval Sculpture*, p. 121, pl. LXIIa. Miss Alice Boner has kindly informed me that the *jñāna* aspect of Lakṣmī is also to be seen in Cave No. XIV at Ellora.

As we shall see in the following paragraph one of the *guṇas* of Viṣṇu, according to the Pāṇcarātrins, is *jñāna*: knowledge. In the *Viṣṇupūrāṇa* also Viṣṇu as the Brahmabhūta is equated with *jñāna* and *vijñāna* (I, 22), or *jñānasvarūpo bhagavān yato* *sau aśeṣa mūrttirṇa ca vastubbhūtaḥ* (II, 12, 38).

It is interesting that while explaining the symbology of Viṣṇu’s attributes, the *Viṣṇupūrāṇa* states that the sword of Acyuta (a form of Viṣṇu) symbolises *jñāna* and the sheath ignorance (*avidyā*) (*vibharti yaccāsiratnamacyuto’ tyantanirmalam / vidyāmayantu taj-jñānamavidyākośasaraṃsthitham || 1, 22, 72*). The *Ahirobindnyasamhitā* also explains the sword as signifying *jñāna* and the sheath as *avidyā*. Curiously, in the Buddhist pantheon the sword is one of the principal attributes of Mañjuśrī and there too the sword represents knowledge. (see P. Pal, ‘Two syncretistic Icons’, *J. N. Banerjea Volume*, Calcutta, 1960, pp. 326ff).

Schrader, p. 32.

Lakṣmītantra, II. 25.


Bṛhat Tantrasāra, p. 487.

B. N. Mukherjee, ‘Vausdhārā’ in Basudhārā (Bengali Journal), 4th year, vol. I, No. 1, pp. 21ff. The *Vasundhārodeśa*, a text describing the rituals of Vasundhārā, begins as follows:

*om namo bhagavatī Vasudhārāyai / samanvaharantu mān Buddhā aše (śa) dikṣu saṃsthitā || bhagavatī Vasudhāre jñāna- mūrttim namānīhāḥ /.*


śaṅkha cakra gadā vedapāniścāśvaśirā hariḥ /
vāmapādo dhṛtaḥ śeṣe daksīṇaḥ kūrmapṛṣṭhagaḥ ||

55 H. Goetz. ‘Early Indian Sculptures from Nepal’, *Artibus Asiae*, 18, 1955, p. 72, fig. 6.

56. cakraṁ padmāśanam kūrmaṁ māyāram
kaukkutārin tathā / ... ... etātkūrmāsanaṁ
proktāṁ yogasiddhikaram param /

57 *ibid*, pp. 20-21.

58 *ibid*, pl. VI, Figs. 3 & 4.