NOTES
NOTES

1. About the chronology of Indian art, see note 16 and pp. 7 and 137; about locality and ethnical structure, see p. 128 and passim.

2. Re the antiquity of Amri and other sites, remoter than that of Mohenjo-Daro, etc., see *India in 1929–30*, p. 353 (Central Publication Branch, Government of India, Calcutta, 1931).


Mesopotamian affinities cannot be interpreted as influences if it can be proved that they proceed from the same root. The main and essential character of these early relics, and also of later sculptures, does not decrease if such traits can be shown. Not that they occur matters, but the connection in which they occur. The study of form and the study of motifs are two different subjects, and the latter has nothing to do with art. (See, however, C. F. Fabri, ‘Mesopotamian and Early Indian Art Comparisons,’ *Études d' Orientalisme*, Vol. I, 1932, p. 204.)

4. The practice of yoga (cf. *Mohenjo-Daro*, op. cit., p. 54) must have been familiar to the craftsman of the Indus civilisation. But it is recorded in scripture at a relatively late phase only (Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad).

5. *Mohenjo-Daro*, op. cit., Pl. CXII, Fig. 387; Coomaraswamy, op. cit., Fig. 6; and Cunningham, *The Stūpa of Bhāṛhut*, Pls. XIII, XV, etc.


8. *Ibid.*, Pl. XII, 17, and Pl. XCV, 17, 26, 27. Mahābāhu, long armed, is a standing epithet of Indian heroes in literature.

9. *Mohenjo-Daro*, op. cit., Pl. XII, Figs. 6, 7–9, 10. These heads with an altogether high cranium—and not as in most of the images of the Buddha, with an excrescence on the crown of the head only—correspond to the well-developed head and forehead (paripuṇṇasāsa and paripuṇṇalalāṭa) of Buddhaghoṣa. Cf. *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, Mahāpadāna
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Sutta Vaṭṭanā, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1928, p. 77; Kramrisch, Mahāparuṣa Lakṣaṇas; Golden Book of Tagore, 1931, p. 286.

10. Mohenjo-Daro, op. cit., Pls. XII, 17 and CXVI, 29; the feet only are crossed, and not the legs.

11. Mohenjo-Daro, op. cit., Pl. CXVI, Fig. 29.

12. Mohenjo-Daro, op. cit., Pl. XII, Fig. 17.


16. Chronology literally means doctrine of time. This doctrine, in the case of Indian art, differs from that of European art.


18. Bachhofer, Early Indian Sculpture, Pl. I.


20. R. P. Chanda, op. cit., p. 44; for other fragments, see p. 33.


This type survived not only in later Yakṣa statues (Maṇibhadra, from Pawāyā, Gwalior, about the beginning of the Christian era Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 62), but it underlies also the images of Bodhisattvas of Mathurā in the Kuśāna period; cf. Coomaraswamy, Yakṣas, Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collection, Vol. 80, No. 6, p. 29. It further protracts a transformed existence in the cult-images (pratīmā) of later date, which are shown in samapadasthānaka, i.e. rigidly in front view.


¹ Archeological Survey of India Memoir is subsequently abbreviated in the following manner—A.S.I.M.; Archeological Survey of India Annual Report—A.S.I.A.R.; Archeological Survey of India, Western Circle—A.S.I., W. Circle, etc.
NOTES


28. Coomaraswamy, 'Early Indian Terra-cottas,' Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, XXV, p. 90; Codrington, Indian Antiquary, 1931, p. 141; Salmony, 'Statuettes Indiennes en Terre cuite,' Revue des arts asiatiques, 1927, p. 98; Coomaraswamy, 'Archaic Indian Terra-cottas,' Ipek, 1928, p. 64. An early terra-cotta figure, related to those from Bulandhi Bagh, although of a somewhat later type, has recently been found at Pokharnā, District Bāṅkurā, western Bengal.

The only well-preserved face of a Mauryan stone figure is the one from Didargānāj. The features and their treatment well agree with those of the terra-cotta heads from Bulandhi Bagh and Buxar. Either of them may be called 'Mauryan.' It has been shown with regard to the treatment of the human and animal body in the art of the Indus valley and in Mauryan art of the Ganges valley that the tradition is unbroken. The terra-cotta heads from Buxar and Bulandhi Bagh equally belong to an ancient plastic type ('Buxar Terra-cottas, Series A,' No. 7, Journal of the Bombay Historical Society, Pl. opposite p. 186 is physiognomically a type by itself). But stylistically they are not on one level with heads in stone or clay of the Indus art, whereas their connection with the head of the Didargānāj statue is close. One head (Moherjo-Daro, op. cit., Pl. XCV, 23), with a modelled face and heavy in treatment, can be considered a remote ancestor.

29. 'Excavations at Bhīṭā,' A.S.I.A.R., 1911-12, p. 73, Pl. XXII, 9.

30. 'Classical' here does not denote a phase of art parallel to, or dependent upon, any in Europe. It indicates Indian artistic utterance in its fullness. In this sense the Vedas could be called classical with regard to Indian religious and philosophical thought.

31. About the abstract art of the majority of people north of India who had lived mostly as nomads or half-nomads, such as the Āryans, etc. (see also Chapter III, p. 103), expressed without the representation of the human figure by the movement of lines, the suggestive-ness of colour, etc, cf. Strzygowski, Asiens Bildende Kunst, 1930, pp. 597, 649, 720 and passim, as well as Altai, Iran und Voelkerwanderung, passim, and other writings by the same author.

32. This plastic quality necessitated careful researches into the modes of how to make the surface appear rounded. Shading, in this sense,

33. On the middle architrave, West gate, inside, of stūpa I, Sāñci, the umbrellas oversect the frame. Cf. Bachhofer, op cit., Pl. 53; Marshall, *A Guide to Sāñci*, Pl. VIII b; *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, Fig. 64.

34. The topographical method has been first noticed by Foucher, *Journal Asiatique*, 1921, p. 103; it has been corroborated by Foucher, 'Une Representation du Sutasoma Jātaka (Aurāṅgābād),' *Études d' Orientalisme*, 1932, Vol. I, p. 261, where, although the relief is of a later date and events which took place at various localities are shown, the main principle of arranging the scenes remains topographical.

35. Griffith, *The Paintings in the Buddhist Cave Temples at Ajañṭā*, Pl. 37; later versions on Pls. 55, 60, 6, 14, 18, 31, etc.


‘From every country were summoned companies of skilled artists’ (transl. Cowell, p. 123), to work in the palace at the occasion of the wedding of Rājyaśri.


Bodhgaya and also Patna and Sārnāth lie to the east of Allahābād, i.e. outside Madhyadeśa proper. But stylistically they are connected with Bhārhut, so that their monuments may be counted as belonging to the tradition of Madhyadeśa.

The importance of the topographical element was not only considerable to the mind of the craftsman (note 34). Ancient Indian geography is very definite about the various provinces, etc. Geographical distinctions are valid throughout for Indian sculpture. The topographical element is furthermore maintained, and not only horizontally on the surface of the earth, but also vertically with regard to the various regions. These are elaborated mythically and—what matters most—with regard to the levels of consciousness. Of the mythical and vertically situated localities the seven strata of the earth, the seven and more hells, the six Kāmāvacaraka Devalokas and Brahmā-
loka may be mentioned (Marshall, Guide to Sāṇḍhi, p. 63; Coomaraswamy, Early Indian Architecture, Eastern Art, Vol. III, p. 209, Fig. 21). Re āyatanas (spheres) of unbounded space of infinite intellection, etc., cf. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, Buddhist Psychology, p. 71.

39. Veṅgi comprised the districts between Kṛṣṇa and Gōdāvāri (N. L. Dey, op. cit., pp. 29 and 85). Kaliṅga at this phase refers mainly to Bhuvanēśvar and surroundings.

40. Buddhists as well as Jainas set up stūpas and surrounded them with carved railings, etc., see V. A. Smith, The Jaina Stūpa and other Antiquities of Mathurā.

41. Coomaraswamy, History, Figs. 53, 54.

42. Plastic treatment restrained by considerations of the surface leads to various solutions.

A bracket may have a separate relief on each side (a stone bracket of a Yakṣa and a Yakṣi on the obverse and reverse respectively (at Bhilsa, Gwālior), see also the double figure on a capital, Fig. 45 and others) or else the head is repeated on each side (rider figures on the toraṇas of Sāṇḍhi). These three solutions, i.e. (1) to display and confine 'sculpture in the round' within the two surfaces of the toraṇa (Yakṣi brackets in Sāṇḍhi); (2) to treat each surface separately and to show a different figure on it, but so that, if the interstices are cut out between the portions in relief on either side, they coincide (Bhilsa); (3) a bilateral treatment, similar to (1) but with a repetition of heads on either side, so as to maintain the independence of each side, all these and also the frameless pillar figure (Bhārhat) are attempts at a compromise between fully three-dimensional sculpture according to the ancient Indian tradition (Figs. 1–4) and between a form in the main two-dimensional.

43. Re riding on horseback around the kurgān, i.e. the cognate form of the stūpa, by the relatives of the deceased, in connection with the round form of the funeral mount and with pradakṣinā (circumambulation), cf. Strzygowski, Asiens Bildende Kunst, p. 356.

Coomaraswamy, Yakṣas, Pt. I, p. 3, and passim.

44. Sāṇḍhi, North gate, left pillar, outer side-face, Strzygowski, op. cit., Fig. 316, p. 312.

45. In addition to passages already known, attention may be drawn to Kaliṅga Bodhi Jātaka (Siamese edition, pp. 184–85). A referential object of worship (uddesikam caitya) is without a positive basis and is only a creation of the mind (cf. Cowell, Jātaka, 479). Buddha is shown in this passage to take an averse attitude against images. With this may be contrasted a passage of the Khuddakapāṭha Commentary.
of the Nidikāṇḍa sutta (fifth century), where Buddha patimā, i.e. the image of the Buddha, is spoken of as uddesikam caitya. (I am indebted for this reference to Prof. B. M. Barua.)

46. The lotus creeper composition, with scenes or human figures, is not only given an important position and wide extent as frieze of the coping stone of the railing in Bhārhat, but it also figures on the posts of stūpa II, Sāñci (Figs. 29-31) and on the gates (South gate of stūpa I, gate of stūpa III, Sāñci, on the inside and outside of the latter) and on fragments from a railing at Besnagar (A.S.I., W. Circle, 1914, phot. 4042, 4048).

The lotus creeper without human scenes or figures is equally frequent in Sāñci, on railing posts of stūpa II, and in Sārnāth (A.S.I.A.R., 1914-15, Pl. LXVIII, Figs. 18-19, 22-23); in Amarāvatī (Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pl. LXXXIX, etc.); and in Orissa (Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 136, etc.); and is equally rich in its landscape suggestiveness in the paintings of Ajaṇṭā, on the Dhāmek stūpa (Fig. 107), and on many other monuments. Its undulating rhythm is transferred in a more or less free manner to friezes of animals (Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 133, etc.). The importance of this motif has been verified from the iconographical point of view by Coomaraswamy, Yakṣas, Pt. II. Its artistic importance has been suggested by Kramrisch, op. cit., p. 38, and is dealt with in its further consequences on p. 54.


48. Sāñci stūpa I, South gate, outside, upper- and lower-most beam, Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 46.


The stylistic development which Bachhofer sees in the work of Sāñci makes the author consider the fifth gate the 'classical' solution on account of its 'gebundene Form' (p. 47, German edition).

Such valuations, which occur throughout Bachhofer's Early Indian Sculpture, are derived from Woëflin's Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. They are to be applied with great caution, if at all, to Indian sculpture. The trends of the latter are conditioned and directed otherwise than, and produce a different effect from, those of
the art of the Renaissance and Baroque in Europe, with regard to which the criteria used by Bachhofer were originally found by Wölflin.


51. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, Fig. 61.
54. Kramisch, 'A Stone Relief from a Kaliṅga Railing,' *Indian Antiquary*, 1931, p. 89, Pl. II.

56. Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 108, figure to the left, lower row.
57. Coomaraswamy, *History*, Fig. 27.
58. Coomaraswamy, *ibid.*, Fig. 83.


61. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro*, op. cit., Pl. CXVII, Fig. 11.

63. Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 74; Vogel, *La Sculpture de Mathurā*, Pls. VIII, XVI c, XXIII a, etc.; This type of relief, although it is most characteristic of the school of Mathurā at this phase, does not rule exclusively. The other type, with relatively many and small figures, is also represented; for instance, Vogel, *Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathurā*, Pl. XX (see, however, the top-most preserved panel of this slab). Figures whose height equals that of the panel occur, on the other hand, in Śāńcī and Bhārhut, but not in narrative
reliefs with several scenes. Narrative reliefs of later ages again resort to the crowded context.

64. E. J. Rapson fixes the date of the Amohini votive tablet of Mathurā as 17–16 B.C., Indian Studies in Honour of C. R. Lamman, p. 49.

65. Cf. note 58. The images from Mathurā, as a rule, show the Buddha while he is yet a Bodhisattva, i.e. before illumination.


68. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 52.


71. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 89. The original is in the Museum at Peshawar.

72. Cf. J. J. Barthoux, Les Fouilles de Haḍḍa, III; A. and Y. Godard and J. Hackin, Les Antiquités bouddhiques de Bāmiyān. The syncretistic sculptures of Gandhāra combine Hellenistic, Indian and Scythian features. The latter are conspicuous on the Kaniṣka casket and on contemporary stone sculptures. They are absent from the Bimarān reliquary.

The Bimarān casket (Afghanistān) has the earliest Buddha figures and its date is about the beginning of the Christian era. The dated stone figures from Loriyān Tāṅgai, etc., however, show a considerable linearisation of the drapery, a different relation of body and robe, and a novel sense of volume, so that a century may not be too long an interval to divide them from the Bimarān reliquary. In this connection it is the Buddha from Loriyān Tāṅgai (Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 142, figure to the right) which appears to be the earliest stone image bearing a date; affinities with the Kaniṣka casket would assign it to approximately the same phase, whereas the Buddha from Chārśadda appears to belong to a later date. The eras to which the inscriptions on the images refer have not been identified as yet.

Some smaller antiquities from Sirkap, for instance (A.S.I.A.R., 1928–29, Pl. XIX, Figs. 2–4, pp. 53, 56), show an Indian version of Hellenism which has quality and charm. They may be compared with the tiles from Harvān, Kaśmir (see note 116).

73. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 158.

74. A.S.I.A.R., 1926–27, p. 150, PIs. XXXV, XXXVI (Gumadidurru);
NOTES


The extent to which plastic art in Veṅgi is differentiated in the various sites is illustrated by the work on the monuments quoted here. Gumaddurru stands nearest in quality and style to corresponding compositions in Amarāvati, i.e. of the latest phase (Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pls. LXXIX–LXXXI), although a heavier and more flaccid modelling of some of the figures links them with the reliefs of the other sites. On the whole the reliefs from these recently discovered sites but rarely attain the level of the reliefs of Amarāvati. The leading craftsmen must have worked in the capital, while it was left to lesser talents to decorate the stūpas in the vicinity. They vitiate the balance of the many trends which are at one in Amarāvati by singling them out, and while they work in one trend or the other they overemphasise its possibilities.

The Nāgārjunikūṇḍa reliefs (Hackin, op. cit., Pls. V–VIII) show the trend which is most peculiar to this site. An altogether heavy physique (see, however, the majority of figures in Amarāvati, where a heavily built torso is supported by legs of slender elegance) is employed, and the linear element recedes in the Nāgārjunikūṇḍa reliefs for the sake of a densely packed plastic contiguity.

The linear compositional movement, if at all resorted to, is as flaccid as the plastic treatment. The high relief results, with all the amount of figure, modelling, etc., in a vacuity which none of the faces of these figures attempts to disguise. Other reliefs (A.S.I.A.R., 1927–28, Pls. LI–LII) mete out the same treatment in a slipshod manner. The heavy treatment of these sculptures is allied to certain reliefs from Amarāvati (see note 75 and also Bachhofer, op. cit., Pls. 121, Fig. 3; 122, Fig. 3, etc.). From these they branch off and are assignable to a subsequent phase, i.e. to the third century A.D. (see, however, the date assigned by Hackin, op. cit., p. 6).
Some reliefs from Nāgārjunikođa are distinguished by very slender figures and a precise outline (Hackin, op. cit., Pl. IV). They rely chiefly on the linear component of the work of Amarāvatī.

The plastic treatment of the Goli reliefs is cursory and febrile. It links them with some of the last reliefs in Amarāvatī (Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 127, Fig. 1) and assigns them to the third century. The heavy type, however, is also represented there (Ramachandran, op. cit., Pl. IX).

75. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XV, p. 260; Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, Pl. XCV, Fig. 1.

76. The earliest sporadic occurrence of the Hellenic contrapost belongs to the middle of the second century A.D. (for instance, the two figures of guardian deities in back view, Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 126). Examples of the later second century and of the third century are: Fergusson, op. cit., Pl. LXXXII, 1; *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*, 1927, Pl. VI a, from Nāgārjunikođa.

77. Fergusson, op. cit., Pls. LXXIV, XCI, Fig. 4, etc.

78. In the majority of the reliefs of the railing, i.e. of the middle of the second century, the integrity of the outline is kept intact. Towards the end of the century and later, specially in the Nāgārjunikođa and Goli reliefs, the density of the modelled figures precludes a clearly tangible outline. But this also refers to the reliefs of the Ajātaśatru pillar, Bhār hut, to Sānci, etc., and is the form adequate to an ageless trend of Indian art. It is not a style of a late period (Bachhofer, op. cit., pp. 60, 61, German edition), but one of the possibilities of form which had its chance already at an earlier phase (notes 74, 75), but was superseded when the school was at its height. After this high tension was relaxed, this trend once more, in its specific Veṇgi version, and with means more complex, came into its own.

79. Rudiments of this treatment in Sānci; Coomaraswamy, *Early Indian Architecture, Eastern Art*, Vol. II, Figs 6, 9, 12, etc.

80. Griffith, *The Paintings in the Buddhist Cave Temples at Ajanta*, Pls. 45, 49, 10, etc.

Altogether the paintings in Ajanta are more closely related to Veṇgi reliefs than to the contemporary rock-cut reliefs in Ajanta itself. But this does not refer to most of the representations of the Buddha; these are of the same type in the reliefs and wall paintings.

81. Cf. also Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 122, 4, middle panel.


83. As a paradigm of Amarāvatī reliefs in this respect, the Elevation of
the Bowl-relic may serve (best reproduced by Coomaraswamy, *Viśvakarmā*, Pl. 25; also Codrington, *Ancient India*, Pl. 25 a).

84. The horizontal-vertical compositional framework, however, is frequently used in Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Goli. But there its character is as little tectonic as it is where it occurs in Bhārhut and Sāalī (Figs. 22, 34). Here as well as there it is employed, faute de mieux, where rectangular panels are to be filled and where the artistic urge is not cogent enough to dictate its own linear composition.

85. T. N. Ramachandran, op. cit., Pls. I–III, etc.

86. The reliefs of the caitya hall at Kārli (Figs. 43, 44) mark a phase shortly before the turning point.

87. Vāhana means a conveyance. Animals were such conveyances of the gods (Figs. 27). Originally the figure itself of the divinity was not represented, but the animal conveyed its presence (Figs. 10, 6; cf. also R. P. Chanda, *Beginnings of Art in Eastern India*, p. 32). In this sense a composition, too, may be called a vāhana, for it conveys an everlasting presence. This term differs from the symbol, which denotes a substitute and contains only an allusion. It is not shaped by the living reality. It is not form, but just a mere sign. A symbol may, however, as any other motif, become integrated into a form context.

88. This refers to images and to reliefs which are not narrative. But in the few narrative friezes (R. D. Banerji, *Bas Reliefs at Bādāmī*, *A.S.I.M.*, No. 25, Pls. XXIII d, XXIV b, c; and Auranṭābād, *Études d' Orientalisme*, Vol. I, Pl. XXI), trees, etc., occur, if rarely, and are interspersed with the figures; they are used as requisites and actors or else indicate locality. To this extent and in this manner they were also employed in the later phases of the reliefs of Veṇgi (see p. 48). But in exceptional instances (Ajanṭā, Kramisch, op. cit., Pl. 8) trees and foliage are as telling as the human figures.


90. Śilpa śāstras, as far as they are known hitherto, deal either with image-making with regard to iconography and iconometry, or else with the theory and practice of painting, but not with the theory and but little with the technique of sculpture as plastic art.


92. Āryāvarta is the northern part of India, between the Himaλayas and the Vindhya range. N. L. Dey, op. cit., p. 12.

93. Neither spiritual realisations such as that of the Buddha, nor the systems built on them, necessarily synchronise in India with an art-form which expresses them. As in the case of the Bodhisattva-Buddha image, a millennium may lie between them. The inscription
rightly calls also this image a Bodhisattva (cf. note 64). The state
of mind shown in this image belongs to a stage prior to the attain-
ment of nirvāṇa.

94. Upekkhā (indifference) is the state in which this face dwells. The
four jhānas, etc., a elaborated by the Buddhists, condition cast and
physiognomy of the faces of Buddha images. While various centres
and various ages tend towards physiognomies approximately expres-
sive of the one or the other jhāna, etc. (Figs. 54, 59, 62), it is not
possible to assign any of these faces definitely to one of them. Their
terminology is—and has to be—more rigid than the plastic context
and its expression.

95. Kramrisch, Die Figurale Plastik der Gupta Zeit, Wiener Beiträge
zur Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Asiens, V, p. 24, Fig. 7.

96. Re the effect of Sārnāth on Mathurā in the sixth century, cf.
ibid., Fig. 4.

97. Kramrisch, ibid., Figs. 9 and 10.

a, b, d; and Kramrisch, ibid., Figs. 8, 9 and 10 respectively.

The Buddha from Mānkuwār, with its date (448–49) and facial
expression, is situated midway. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 162.

99. Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 10.

100. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 161.

101. Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 8.

102. Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 12.

103. Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 8.

104. A.S.I.A.R., 1909–10, p. 80, Pl. XXXVIII. Buddhist stūpa at
Mirpur Khās.

105. A.S.I.A.R., 1905–6, Pl. XL.

106. A.S.I.A.R., 1911–12, Pls. LXXIII–LXXV, p. 161; Four sculptures
from Caṇḍimā (recte Rajaona); and Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 17.

107. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 177.

108. Sahni—Vogel, Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth,
Pls. XXIV–XXIX; and Kramrisch, ibid., Fig. 14.

109. Detail of Fig. 60 in Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 173. Re reliefs
in Deoghar, W. Cohn, Indische Plastik, Pls. 24, 25.


111. R. D. Banerji, Bas-reliefs at Bādāmi, op. cit., Figs. XVII a, IX a, XVI.

112. The relations between art-form and the substance of religious and
philosophical systems cannot be investigated here in detail.


114. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 165; Viśvakarma, Pl. 66.
115. Other sculptures in central India have the same characteristics, but none of them are as thorough-bred in their central Indian peculiarity. When speaking of central India, the central part of India is meant and not the province Central India.

116. Terra-cotta plaques, varying in treatment from impressions taken from sketchy moulds to carefully chiselled plaques after they had been burnt, are found in Mirpur Khās, Sind (A.S.I.A.R., 1909-10, p. 80, Pl. XXXVIII); Hanumangarh, Bikanir, Rājputāna (A.S.I.A.R., 1917-18, Pls. XII-XIII); Khītargāon (Cunningham, A.S. Rep., XI, Pls. XIV-XVII); A.S.I.A.R., 1908-9, p. 5; Fig. 2, p. 10); Sahelth-Maheṭh (A.S.I.A.R., 1910-11, Pl. III); Kasiā (A.S.I.A.R., 1910-11, Pl. XXXIV); Harvān (A.S.I.A.R., 1918-19, Pl. XI; R. C. Kak, Ancient Monuments of Kaimūr, p. 108, Pls. XVIII-XLI; Sabhar, in eastern Bengal; Chausa, near Patna (K. P. Jayaswal, ‘Note on a Terra-cotta Rāmāyaṇa Panel,’ Modern Review, 1932, Vol. LII, p. 148; Pahārpur (seventh century), see note 125.

Not the material, but form itself is the primary factor. This may be illustrated by two instances. In Pahārpur the composition of a stone relief is carried on in terra-cotta where the size of the stone-panel is too small for the niche into which it is fitted (A.S.I.A.R., 1926-27, Pl. XXXII a, the trunk of the tree to the right). One and the same composition makes use of two materials; stone and terra-cotta are joined, but not in order to achieve a special effect; without any regard to their differences the two materials are combined, so that with the help of this—scarcely perceptible—patchwork the completeness of the composition may not suffer. In another instance the mouldings of the frame of such a composition are executed in stone on the left and in terra-cotta on the right side. The indifference towards the material is obvious in this instance, but the reliefs of the Kailāsanātha temple of Kāñcipuram (eighth century) afford another illustration. There stone and plaster were combined from the very outset—the stone as foundation of the modelling and the plaster for the elaboration of details—and not only in recent restorations, in all the reliefs.

The formal treatment, in its indifference against the exigencies of the various materials, has its equivalent in the actual combination, either collaterally (Pahārpur) or intrinsically (Kāñcipuram), of two different materials.


The origins of the different technical treatments and of the motifs connected with them require special investigation.
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119. Also in Udayagiri, Gwālior, A.S.I.W.C., 1914, phot. 4032, 4034; also on the frames of the panels at Mirpur Khaḍa, A.S.I.A.R., 1909–10, Pl. XXXVIII, and carved bricks, ibid., Pl. XXXV a.
120. R. D. Banerji, Bāḍaṇi, op. cit., Pl. XIII, c, d.
121. Mohenj-Daro, op. cit., Pl. XCIV, Figs. 500–515.
122. Sculptures in Āryāvarta can be assigned to the seventh—the same holds good for the third—century A.D., mainly on stylistic grounds, for want of dated inscriptions on preserved monuments.


125. A.S.I.A.R., 1925–26, Pl. LIII a; 1926–27, Pls. XXXII c, d; XXXIII b; 1927–28, p. 101. Of the same date and of 'provincial Gupta type' are the reliefs from Dah Parabatīya, Darrang, Assam (A.S.I.A.R., 1924–25, Pl. XXXII; see also Kramrisch, Pāla and Sena Sculpture, Rūpaṇ, 1929, Fig. 1).

The terra-cotta and stone panels from Pahārpur, North Bengal, belong to two traditions—the one, numerically in the minority, is an eastern and provincial version of contemporary sculpture in Madhyadeśa, but the other is an undiluted and indigenous eastern Indian contribution. Significantly enough, the latter is mainly employed in showing events from the life of Kṛṣṇa and other animated scenes and figures. But when divinities are represented in śāmapada-sthānakā, a hybrid compromise between the tradition of Gupta sculpture of Madhyadeśa and Bengali form is arrived at. From there the cult images of the Pāla and Sena school take their beginning.

126. Vogel, Antiquities of Cambā State, p. 7, Fig. 2.

130. Balance is established between, or the composition is clearly referred to the vertical and the horizontal—but this does not mean that a rectangular frame is merely filled with parallel rows of figures, cf. note 84—in most of the reliefs in the caves (exceptions: Durgā Mahiṣā-sura-mardini, Gāṅgā relief, etc.). Architectonic in this connection denotes the equilibrium established by the dynamic urge itself. It is not a superimposed scheme.
NOTES

131. T. G. Aravamuthan, Portrait Sculpture in South India, Figs. 2–4, p. 25.

132. W. Cohn, op. cit., Pl. 89; Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 208; in the latter relief the parabolic composition is carried by the curves of the Asuras and Gaṇas, on the extreme right and left respectively.

133. See, however, Marshall, 'The Influence of Race in Early Indian Art,' Rūpam, 1924, p. 69.

134. Ars Asiatica, III, 'Sculptures Śivaites,' Pl. XXX; and Grousset, The Civilisations of the East: India, Figs. 63, 66.

135. Burgess, Elura Cave Temples, pp. 23, 38, 41, etc.


139. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. I, Pt. II, Pls. CIV, CV; Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 208.

140. W. Cohn, op. cit., Pl. 39.

141. The division into three sections, i.e. ancient, classical and mediæval, is derived from the character of form of Indian sculpture. The dates assigned to these demarcations have been fixed on the basis of symptoms of the sculptures themselves. To correlate such symptoms, with data that affected the whole of India, had been a secondary consideration. Two migrations, the one about 2000 B.C., the other approximately in the first half of the first millennium A.D., and beyond these limits, either of them of people who came to India from countries to the north of it, infused new blood into the Indian organism. Its assimilative power had been adjusted to such infusions (Austro-Asiatic and Drāviḍian elements, etc.).

Chronologically these immigrations and the transformations observed in sculpture do not coincide. In either case stylistic symptoms are posterior. The foreigners did not overthrow the indigenous heritage of art; on the contrary, they grew into it. This took time.

Although there are signs of mediævalism in reliefs of the fifth and sixth centuries (pp. 67, 74, Figs. 61, 107), in the whole of contemporary sculpture of that phase they are only stray instances. Their importance is not manifest within the character of the whole of contemporary art. It becomes so retrospectively only when these seemingly stray instances had grown to be qualities of mediæval sculpture. The middle ages in Indian sculpture are framed by the second immigration from the north and by a third invasion, that of
Islam, which put an end to sculpture. Where, as in south India, it left the monuments untouched, the practice, too, of medieval sculpture continued. The term ‘medieval’ is used here in this sense. It presupposes the classical. As in Europe, so in India, it has the migrations of people for its background. Its roots, however, are sunk into the soil of India, and from there forms are brought forth organically one with those that came from more ancient roots.


144. Apart from these, earthbound with their rigid weight, whether seated or standing in kāyotsārga posture, other Jain images are conspicuous as such only by their respective cognisances and symbols. Cf. Fig. 84. To result in the typically medieval image of Tīrtham-karas, etc., two components had to meet—(1) special postures essentially not different from those of Buddha images and indicating in each case a state beyond the possibility of change, and (2) their linear and angular interpretation by the craftsmen of western India.


An early instance of this treatment is to be seen on a bronze bowl. (Coomaraswamy, ‘An Indian Bronze Bowl,’ *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 1930, p. 247, Pl. 33.) The facial type, with its sharply projecting features, results from the general conduct of lines. They are nervy and precise, with a tendency towards angularity, although the appearance of these Yakṣas goes back to chubby Indian prototypes. The central circle with the lion is reminiscent of Sassanian textiles, while the outline of the back of the animal can be seen in a relaxed and
sculptural version in the statue of a lion (amongst others) standing near the Kândârya Mahâdeva temple at Khajurâho of the year 1000 approximately. The bowl is to be dated about A.D. 600 (cf. Coomaraswamy), and belongs to the western school.

148. The Tibetan historian Târanâtha speaks of the western school. He also distinguishes the work of Madhyadesâ as well as the eastern school, and he connects the one with Magadha and the other with Bhangala, i.e. Bihâr and Bengal. He is not precise about art-geography. Cf. Târanâtha, Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, ed. Schiefner, pp. 279, 280.

The northernisation of the ethnical fabric of mediaeval India, and the corresponding differentiations of form are more definitely tangible than the Āryan factor in the ancient Indian heritage during the early classical phase. But a similar process has left its traces in either phase of Indian sculpture.

149. G. Yazdani, The Temples of Palampet, A.S.I.M., No. 6, Pl. XXXII.


151. The black and white effect of these clear-cut patterns (Figs. 90, 107), when imagined translated into colour, is of the same kind as are carpet designs, specially from Baluchistân, up to this day.

152. Springer, Kunstgeschichte, Vol. VI, op. cit., Fig. 316; Codrington, op. cit., Pl. 66, a, c.

153. K. N. Dikshit, Six Sculptures from Mahobâ, A.S.I.M., No. 8. Mediaeval sculptures from central and western India are also illustrated in Codrington's Introduction to the Study of Mediaeval Indian Sculpture. But the dates assigned to the sculptures on Pls. 2–5 are erroneous. These sculptures, too, are mediaeval.

154. R. D. Banerji, The Haihayas of Tripûri and Their Monuments, A.S.I.M., No. 23, p. 78, Pl. XXXI, etc.

155. Utkâla was an independent kingdom at the time of Kâlidâsa and of the Brahmâ purâṇa (N. L. Dey, op. cit., p. 213). During the eighth and ninth centuries, and with regard to Buddhist sculpture, Utkâla is to be considered an art-province with a dialect of its own, although it is related to that of contemporary reliefs in Bhuvanesâvar, specially on the maṇḍapam of the Parasurâmeśvar temple, and to a lesser extent to reliefs on the garbhaṅgârha of this shrine or to those of the Satryugneśvar, Uttareśvar, and allied temples of this phase.

Kâliṅga is taken here to denote the country round Bhuvanesâvar and Puri.
The stylistic evidence of mediaevalism, i.e. of western Indian features, in Kaliṅga, and its absence in Bengal and Bihār, may elucidate the racial stratification of these provinces at that age.

According to inscriptions, they are not earlier than the first half of the eleventh century. Others belong to the twelfth century. Vogel, op. cit., p. 32, Fig. 12, Pl. IV.

The limits between the single art-provinces are artificial, in order to draw attention to the most relevant features in each province. In reality, needless to say, the demarcations are not so sharp and an interchange of traditions goes on along them.

Of whatever kind the ethnical contributions are, the main fact is that all of them make the specifically Indian amalgam of plastic art. Re certain residues, see note 165.

Sculptures, like grāma devataḥs in south India, Gonga sculptures in Nāgpur, reliefs on virgals (hero-stones) and satī stones in central and western India, the Dekkhan, etc., the rock-cut reliefs at Tripura, Bengal, and others, could not be dealt with in this book. They remain apart from the main stream of Indian sculpture, and, while they accepted scarcely anything from it, they contributed towards it, and deserve special investigation.

In Orissā the tradition of mediaeval sculpture is still carried on, but elsewhere a disorganisation of the plastic continuity seeks Western support.

According to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Vedānta.

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, etc.

L. Scherman, 'Dickbauchtypen in der indisch-ostasiatischen Geisterwelt,' Jahrbuch der asiatischen Kunst, 1924 p. 120, Pls. 59–64.

Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 158.
NOTES

170. Kramrisch, *Pāla and Sena Sculpture*, op. cit., Fig. 8, etc.
171. *Mohenjo-Daro*, op. cit., Pl. XI.
173. Back-view in Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 9; Springer, op. cit., Fig. 243.
175. Mesopotamian versions also include the sinuous stem, cf. Fabri, loc. cit., p. 216, Fig. B.
176. Kramrisch, *Pāla and Sena Sculpture*, Fig. 9, cf. note 211.
178. See note 9 X.
180. The whole figure is reproduced in Springer, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*, Vol. VI, Fig. 246.
182. The symbols in this case are used vicariously. Various symbols refer to the same reality by one allusion or the other, and are exchangeable amongst themselves. See note 183.
186. The navel has creative significance. ‘On the navel of the unborn stood that in which all beings stood’ (Ṛv., X, 82, 5). Cf. Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*, Pt. II, p. 2, and note 1; pp. 21, 24, etc.
195. An earlier example of this trend is illustrated by Bachhofer, op. cit., Pl. 101.
196. A stone bracket from Bhilsa, Gwālior Museum; cf. note 42.
199. See note 214; Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pl. LXV, 2, p. 185.
200. Divyāvadāna, Cowell and Neil, pp. 439–61. I am indebted to Prof. B. M. Barua for drawing my attention to this story. The Identifications of Amarāvati Reliefs, by Linossier and Foucher, Revue des Arts Asiatiques, Vols. V, VI, could not be consulted as these volumes were not available in Calcutta, and, in spite of being ordered from Paris, have not arrived hitherto.
201. Burgess, Buddhist Stūpas of Amarāvati and Jaggayapaeta, Pl. XII, 3, p. 36. For another version of this story in Amarāvati, cf. Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pl. LXIII, Fig. 1. I am obliged to Prof. B. M. Barua for the reference to the Divyāvadāna story.
203. See note 9. The high cranium is a subsidiary and not too frequent feature of Buddha images.
204. Re this treatment of the uṣāṇīṣa, cf. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 93; and Kramrisch, Grundszüge, Pl. 31. In neither of these two instances is the figure that of a Buddha.
205. Vogel, La Sculpture de Mathurā, Pls. IV, XXIV a, XXXII, etc.
207. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 66.
208. Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 68.
209. Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pls. LXX and LXVII are the most convincing instances. In these non-iconic representations the flaming pillar stands behind a lotus-pedestal with footprints.
211. From the seventh century. Examples from Pahārpur, A.S.I., photo, Eastern Circle; see also note 176 and Pl. XXXIII.
212. Vogel, La Sculpture de Mathurā, Pls. XXII a, LX b.
213. V. A. Smith, op. cit., Pl. 49; W. Cohn, op. cit., Pl. 25.
216. Cunningham, The Stūpa of Bhārkut, Pl. XXI a and c.
218. The type of Ekapāda Trimūrti, with Śiva as middle pillar and Brahmā and Viṣṇu issuing laterally, is well known from southern India. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. II, Pt. II, Pl. CXIX.
NOTES 223

219. See notes 207, 208, and Fig. 36.
220. G. Rao, op. cit., Vol. II, Pt. I, Fig. XI.
221. G. Rao, ibid., p. 105, Pls. XIII, XIV.
222. The entire composition is reproduced by Codrington, Ancient India 
    Pl. 37 a.
223. Jouveau Dubreuil, ‘La Descent de Gaṅgā,’ Études d' Orientalisme, 
225. Cf. Codrington, op. cit., Pl. 53; Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 193.
    Malaviya Commemoration Volume, 1932, p. 293.
228. Coomaraswamy, Early Indian Architecture, Eastern Art, Vol. II, 
    p. 215, Fig. 7.
    Cf. Kramrisch, Mogulmalerei und Indische Ueberlieferung in Strzy- 
    gowski, Die Asiatische Miniaturenmalerei, op. cit.
234. Kramrisch, Pāla and Sena Sculpture, Rūpam, 1929, Figs. 5–7; 
    J. C. French, The Art of the Pāl Empire of Bengal, Pls. X–XV; 
    89, sees south Indian influence at work in the sculpture of this school 
    from the third quarter of the eleventh century onward. But those 
    features which sculptures from Karnāṭaka (p. 118) share with those 
    from Bengal are due to the phase to which both belong. Cf. Fig. 110, 
    of an earlier phase, and free from the over-elaboration which 
    Banerji supposes to be specifically southern.
235. R. P. Chanda, Bhaṇja dynasty of Mayūrbaṇja, Pl. XXI.
236. Such intertwined human figures may be seen—wrestling—in 
    Bhārhut, Cunningham, Pl. XXXV, 2. Intertwined animal figures in 
    Mohenjo-Daro, op. cit., Pl. CXII, 386.
    Coomaraswamy, History, Fig. 219.
238. J. Ph. Vogel, ‘The Woman and Tree, or Śālabhaṇjikā, in Indian 
    Literature and Art,’ Acta Orientalia, VII.
240. H. Cousens, Cāluṅkyan Architecture, p. 101, Pl. CVII.
241. Mahabhārata, Karṇa Parva, Chapter 90.


244. Similar reliefs, although not so strict in the flatness of their surface treatment, are on the outer wall of the Mallikarjuna temple at Sríśailam, *A.S.I.S. Circle*, 1917-18, p. 29, Pls. X-XVI.