

23

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY

ORIENTAL JOURNAL



Volume: XXXV

January - December 1992

Parts: 1 & 2

SRIRAMULA RAJESWARA SARMA

**EARLY HISTORY OF INDIAN BOOK
PAINTING - MEDHĀTITHI'S EVIDENCE**

I

The *Manubhāṣya* of Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi is an erudite commentary on the *Manusmṛti*.¹ In his monumental *History of Dharmasāstra*, P.V. Kane has established that Medhātithi flourished in the ninth century between the years 825 and 900 A.D. and that he was an inhabitant of Kashmir.² Kane also thought that Medhātithi's was the oldest available commentray,³ but this status now goes to the seventh century *Manu-sāstra-vivarāṇa* of Bhāruci which was discovered some years ago by Duncan Derrett.⁴ Even so, Medhātithi's work remains the most authoritative interpretation of Manu's code. It also contains extensive references to, and quotations from, a vast corpus of juridical literature. Moreover, there is an abundance of information on non-legal matters as well. In this paper, I wish to discuss a small passage which throws valuable light on the early history of book painting in India. But, before discussing this passage, I must prepare the necessary background just as one does in a painting.

II

In India, as elsewhere, painting is classified according to the medium upon which it is executed. Perhaps the earliest medium used

for painting was the naked rock. In pre-historic times, the primitive man painted scenes from his daily life on the walls of his cave dwelling. A number of sites with such rock paintings have been discovered in Central India.

In historical times, paintings were done on prepared wall surfaces (*bhitti*) in temples, monasteries, and royal palaces. These are called wall paintings or mural paintings. The most prominent examples are at Ajanta.

Paintings were also drawn on specially prepared cloth (*paṭa*). Such cloth can be rolled up into a scroll. Therefore these are known as cloth or scroll paintings. Occasional references to scroll paintings are met with in Sanskrit literature. In the first half of the seventh century, Bāṇa describes in his *Harṣacarita* a man who goes about displaying a scroll on which the awesome god Yama was painted.⁵ In the *Kuvalayamālā* composed by Uddyotanasūri in 778 A.D., there is an elaborate description of a *Samsāra-cakra-paṭa*, which depicts the miseries of the mundane life.⁶

A number of interesting scrolls with Jaina themes from western India have survived.⁷ However, the most spectacular scroll painting that is extant today, is not a religious painting but a secular one, containing the old Gujarati poem *Vasantavilāsa*. The scroll measures 23.5 cm in width, but eleven meters in length and was painted in 1451 A.D. at Ahmedabad. It is divided into some eighty panels. Each panel contains a verse in old Gujarati in praise of the spring season, also the original Sanskrit or Prakrit verses which inspired the Gujarati composition, and a painting illustrating the theme of the verse. This scroll is now in the Freer Gallery of Art at Washington. Norman Brown, who pioneered the study of Western Indian painting, published the text together with fascimile reproduction of several folios.⁸

Paintings were also executed on wooden painting boards (*citrāphalaka* or *ālekhyaphalaka*).⁹ According to the *Kāmasūtra*, every fashionable man is supposed to keep a painting board and a box of paints (*varṭikāsamudgaka*) in his house.¹⁰ Painting portraits on the *citrāphalaka* has been a favourite motif in Sanskrit drama from Kālidāsa onwards.¹¹ But no wooden board bearing a painting has survived from olden days. However, at Khajuraho there is a sculpture which shows an art teacher painting on a large board, while his pupils watch attentively.¹²

The next and the last important variety of paintings are those painted on the pages of a book (*grantha, pustaka*). It is well known that in India books were made up of either palm-leaves (*tālapatra*), or birch bark (*bhūrjapatra*), or - from about the thirteenth century - paper. Compared to the other mediums, the pages of the book are much smaller and consequently, the paintings done on these pages are also very small. Therefore, these book paintings are also known as miniature paintings. They are also called manuscript illustrations because the books were written by hand. Again of all the different varieties of paintings, the book paintings are of comparatively late origin.

III

The earliest known specimens of book painting come from the western and eastern extremities of India, namely Gujarat in the west and Bihar-Bengal in the east. In both cases they were manuscripts written on palm-leaves and belong to the late tenth or early eleventh century.

In Gujarat, these manuscripts were produced by the Jains. The earliest illustrated palm-leaf manuscript is dated V.S. 1117 (1060 A.D.) It was discovered and announced by U.P. Shah in his presidential address to the Fine Arts & Technical Sciences Section of the All-India Oriental Conference at Varanasi in 1968.¹³ In this manuscript from Jaisalmer were copied two texts, *Oghaniryukti* and *Daśavaikālika-ṭikā*. The illustrations are not exclusively Jaina. They depict Kāmadeva with his bow and arrow, goddess Śrī and several elephants, besides a *pūrṇakumbha* and decorative lotuses. The next one in chronological sequence is the manuscript of the *Nisīthacūrṇi* of 1100 A.D. containing roundels with geometrical patterns.

Purely Jaina motifs begin to appear soon in the painted palm-leaf manuscripts of the *Jñātasūtra* of 1127, *Daśavaikālikālaghuvṛtti* of 1143, *Oghaniryukti* of 1161 and so on.¹⁴ In these manuscripts, the paintings depict a single figure, usually a Tīrthaṅkara, emphasis being laid on the iconographic aspect. In these manuscript illustrations, one can clearly see the experimental nature of composition and the typical features associated with the western Indian style of painting have not yet become crystallized. Therefore, the actual beginnings of this

school of painting cannot be pushed back beyond the beginning of the eleventh century.

From the thirteenth century onwards, paper gradually replaced the palm-leaf in western India. Though cut like the palm-leaf in the so-called *pothī* format, paper offered a larger area for painting and the illustrations took on greater complexity in composition and colour palette. Contact with Persian painting under the Muslim rule introduced the lavish use of gold and blue. The earliest illustrated paper manuscript is dated V.S. 1403 (A.D. 1367) and is preserved in the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad. It contains the text and illustrations of the *Kalpasūtra*. A number of exquisitely illustrated paper manuscripts are extant from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.¹⁵ A majority of these illustrated paper manuscripts are devoted to works of Jaina hagiographical literature, such as the *Kalpasūtra* and the *Kālakācārya-kathā*. Often both the texts are copied in the same manuscript.

The *Kalpasūtra*, attributed to Bhadrabāhu, is part of the canonical literature of the Śvetāmbaras, and consists of three parts. The first part *Jinacarita*, describes the life of the Jina Mahāvīra in an elaborate Kāvya style reminiscent of the *Lalitavistara* of the Buddhists. After this, the lives of other Tīrthaṅkaras are described, but in a less elaborate manner. The second part, entitled *Therāvālī*, is devoted to the enumeration of the different schools, their branches and penitents, while the third part, *Samācāri*, contains rules of conduct for the monks during the rainy season. Usually, the first part is heavily illustrated, the second less abundantly and the third contains fewer illustrations.¹⁶

The *Kālakācāryakathā*, generally recited by the monks immediately after the *Kalpasūtra*, is an anonymous composition in prose and verse about prince Kālaka, who becomes a Jaina monk. When his sister the nun Sarasvatī was abducted by king Gardabhilla of Ujjain, Kālaka invites a Śaka king to invade Ujjain.¹⁷

These two texts were repeatedly copied and illustrated. The illustrations usually occupy the right-hand side of the page. Often the illustration has no organic relation to the textual matter on the page.¹⁸ This is so not only because the scribe of the text and artist who painted the miniature are two different persons,¹⁹ it is also because both the text and the picture are independently considered sacred objects. Just

as copying the text was not an academic act but a religious one, even so painting was not an aesthetic activity but one that confers religious merit.

Besides these Jaina texts, the Western Indian school of painting also produced some illustrated Vaiṣṇava texts like the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, *Gītagovinda* (c. 1540), *Bālagopālastuti* (1530-40), and Śākta texts like the *Devīmāhātmya*.²⁰ More important still is the production of illustrated manuscripts of secular texts like the *Vasantavilāsa* in 1451, which has been mentioned above. Thus in the fifteenth century Gujarat, the focus of the miniature painting began to shift from the ritual or religious plane to the purely decorative or aesthetic plane. An important discovery, in this connection, is the illustrated manuscript of the Prakrit drama *Karpūramajjarī* of Rājasekhara. The manuscript was copied and illustrated with thirteen miniatures in 1478. It is the only one of its kind where a drama is fully illustrated in this style. Recently I have published a report about this unique manuscript together with reproductions of all the thirteen miniatures.²¹

The Western Indian style of painting in which these paper manuscripts were illustrated during the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, distinguishes itself with its vibrant colours and the jewel-like quality of the miniatures. The main characteristics of these manuscripts illustrations are the brilliant hues of red, blue and gold, stereotyped postures of the body, three-quarters profile of the face, long pointed nose, the eye on the farther side protruding into space, and so on. Human figures are draped in elaborately patterned costumes which reflect the rich tradition of embroidered and printed textiles of Gujarat. There is, however, little effort at modelling and all the figures appear two-dimensional. These richly painted manuscripts were commissioned by the prosperous merchant-bankers of Gujarat.

IV

In eastern India, on the other hand, illustrated palm-leaf manuscripts were produced by Buddhist monks at the monasteries of Nālandā, Vikramasīlā and Odantapurī, under the patronage of the various kings of the Pāla dynasty.²² Perhaps the earliest surviving of these is the manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* at the Asiatic

Society, Calcutta. The colophon states that it was copied at Nālandā by Kalyāṇacintā-Māṇikya in the sixth regnal year of Mahīpāla. King Mahīpāla I ruled between c. 980-1025. Consequently the manuscript must have been copied and illustrated in the last quarter of the tenth century. But the custom of illustrating palm-leaf manuscripts must have begun much earlier here, because we see a quite developed form of the art in this manuscript. From Bengal, this art spread to the Himalayan kingdoms of Nepal and Tibet, but it never underwent the transition to the paper manuscript as in Gujarat. Indeed, manufacture of Buddhist illustrated manuscripts ceased completely in eastern India after A.D. 1200.

A majority of the illustrated manuscripts of eastern India contain the text of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. The *Prajñāpāramita-sūtras* describe the perfections attained by the Bodhisattva. The most important of these perfections (*pāramitas*) is *prajñā*, the highest wisdom which consists in the recognition that everything is *śūnya*. There are many versions of this sūtra of varying length. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* version contains naturally 8000 stanzas. There is little scope, in this highly metaphysical text, for pictorial illustration except for the anthropomorphic representation of the goddess *Prajñāpāramitā*. Even so, these manuscripts are filled with illustrations depicting various incidents in the life of the historic Buddha, or with single figures of the Buddhist pantheon like *Avalokiteśvara*, *Mañjuśrī* and *Tārā*. Here also, the reason for the apparant lack of logical connection between the text and the picture is that both the book and the picture are seen as sacred objects which assist in meditation.

Stylistically these miniatures differ considerably from those of Western India. While the latter contain angular lines and flat colour treatment, the Eastern Indian miniatures exhibit 'flowing and sinuous lines, a charming sense of modelling and plasticity in line as well in colour, soft and subtle tonalities, etc.'²³

V

Thus, in both Bengal and Gujarat, manuscript illustrations appear to have begun during the tenth and eleventh centuries and much later in other parts of India. This chronology of Indian book painting rests

naturally on the extant specimens. But even the theoretical works on painting do not provide an earlier testimony to manuscript illustrations. Indeed, these texts refer mainly to murals and occasionally to paintings on the wooden board and cloth but never to manuscript illustrations.

Thus the *Citrasūtra* of the *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāna*, one of the early texts on painting, explains how to plaster the walls on which paintings are to be done, but does not mention book paintings.²⁴ Bhoja's *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, written in the middle of the eleventh century, has a full chapter entitled *Bhūmibandha*, or 'dressing the ground for painting'. This chapter describes the method of preparing and applying layers of coating on walls (*bhittibandhana*), boards (*paṭṭabandhana*) and cloth (*paṭabandhana*) but does not mention painting on manuscripts.²⁵ Likewise, the *Mānasollāsa* composed by Someśvara Cālukya about a century later in 1131, discusses only wall paintings.²⁶

Therefore, Karl J. Khandelwala and Moti Chandra, two eminent historians of Indian painting, conclude as follows:

Though we have an abundance of references in early Indian literature on murals, portraiture and several other forms of painting, we find no mention of illustrated manuscripts.... It seems to us very doubtful if the art of manuscript illustrations was in vogue prior to the tenth century. It appears to be essentially a medieval development with the Jains and Buddhists.²⁷

VI.

In these circumstances, Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi furnishes valuable evidence to show that illustrated manuscripts existed much earlier than has been hitherto supposed. The context in which Medhātithi speaks of manuscript illustrations is the following. Laying down the duties and obligations of the brahmācārin, the *Manusmṛti* (II.176) states thus:

*nityam snātvā śuciḥ kuryād devarṣipitṛtarpaṇam /
devatābhyanāṇam caiva samidādhānam eva ca //*

After taking a bath and becoming pure [in body and soul], the brahmācārin should offer daily oblations to gods, ṛṣis and ancestors. He should also perform the worship of the gods (devatābhārcana) and collection of the fire-wood [for the sacred fires].

On this, Medhātithi has the following to say:

*atra kecic cirantanā vicārayāṃcakruḥ. kā etā devatā nāma yāsām idam abhyarcam ucyate. yadi tāvac citrapustakanya-staś caturbhujō vajrahasta ityādyāḥ pratikṛtaya iti laukikā vyavaharanti. ato gauṇas tatra devatāvvyavahārah.*²⁸

In this connection, some ancient [commentators] deliberated thus: who then are these devatā-s, whose worship is mentioned here? If [these are] the four-armed [god], the thunderbolt-armed [god], and others delineated in illustrated manuscripts (*citra-pustaka*) - common people consider these [just] likenesses (*pratikṛtayaḥ*) - then the use of [the word] devatā [for this is admissible only] in a metaphorical sense (*gauṇo vyavahārah*).

For the ancients, the point at issue is how one can be asked to worship 'gods' when these are not visible and available for worship. One can at the most worship likenesses of gods as present in manuscript illustrations (or in sculpture) but these objects cannot be equated with devatā-s. They are devatā-s only by courtesy, that is in a metaphorical sense (*gauṇa*). However, since the real gods cannot be reached, one might as well worship their likenesses, thus the ancient commentators finally decided.

Once more to quote Medhātithi:

*ayaṃ ca teṣāṃ nirṇayaḥ mukhyāsambhavād gauṇasyaiva grahaṇaṃ nyāyayaṃ samācārāc ca. ataḥ pratimānāṃ evaitat pūjāvidhānam.*²⁹

Their final decision is as follows. Since that which is denoted by the primary meaning (*mukhya*) is not possible, it is legitimate (*nyāyā*) to accept that which is denoted by

the metaphorical sense. This is also the custom (*samācāra*). Therefore, the worship prescribed here pertains only to the replicas/icons (*pratimā*) [and not to the real gods]

The problem is reiterated on two more occasions. While discussing the householder's duties and obligations, Manu enjoins that whenever the householder has to pass by certain sacred objects, he should do so only by keeping these objects to his right-hand side.³⁰ One of these sacred objects is *daivata*. Here also the word can only mean a likeness. Medhātithi considers three possibilities:³¹ either it is the likeness of a god painted on a cloth or other medium for the sake of worship (*paṭādilikhitam arcārtham*) on a cloth or other medium,³² or it is a temple like the famous temples of Caturbhuja (Viṣṇu) and Mārtāṇḍa [Sūrya],³³ or it can be a sacrificial place (*yajñagṛha*).

Again, in connection with witnesses, Manu lays down that brahmins should be asked to give witness in the presence of *devas* and brahmins.³⁴ Here Medhātithi succinctly remarks that the word *devas* means icons of Durgā, Mārtāṇḍa, etc.³⁵

But, leaving aside the semantics of the terms *deva* (m.), *devatā* (f.), *daivata* (n.), the first passage is of great significance for Indian art history, because it refers to the pictures of gods painted in books. The crucial word here is *citra-pustakā* 'manuscript with illustrations'.

This is the earliest literary reference to manuscript illustrations, and goes to establish the existence of illustrated manuscripts in Kashmir in the ninth century, if not at a yet earlier period to which the anonymous 'ancients' may have belonged. It is also quite certain that Medhātithi's *citrapustakas* were not made up of palm-leaves but of birch bark (*bhūrjapatra*), the traditional medium of writing in Kashmir.

Medhātithi's statement also shows that the illustrations were painted in manuscripts not for decorative or aesthetic purposes but for ritual purposes, a fact which is true also in the case of the Buddhist manuscripts of Bengal and the early Jaina manuscripts of Gujarat.

We have, of course, no means to determine what kinds of religious texts were copied with illustrations on birch bark in Kashmir at the

time of Medhātithi. But he mentions two subjects that were delineated in paintings, namely Caturbhuja and Vajrahasta. The former is no doubt Viṣṇu who was a popular deity in Kashmir. Elsewhere Medhātithi himself refers to temples of Viṣṇu under this name, as we have seen just above. Ananda Coomaraswamy mentions that the Viṣṇu images from Kashmir have a distinct iconography of their own:

Among the numerous small sculptures from the Avantipur sites are a number of very interesting Viṣṇu groups in a style peculiar to kāśmīr and its then tributary States of Cambā and Kuṣhī..... The general type is that of a four-armed Viṣṇu, with elaborate jewellery, crown and dagger, the latter an unique feature....³⁶

But who is Vajrahasta: is it Indra who wields the thunderbolt or Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi? Buddhism was of course prevalent in Kashmir at his time, but Medhātithi was not referring to Bodhisattva by the term *vajrahasta*. It will be recalled that the context is the daily worship by a [Hindu] brahmacārin. Therefore, here it can only be the Brahmanical god Indra. Was Indra then worshipped as late as the ninth century in Kashmir? The answer is in the affirmative. His worship is attested by the *Nīlamata-purāṇa*, which is attributable to the sixth or the seventh century. According to this text the bright half of the month of Bhādrapada was observed as Indrapakṣa, when the picture of Indra was painted on a cloth and worshipped.³⁷ In the twelfth century, Kalhaṇa adds in his *Rājataranginī* that the festival of Indradvādasi was celebrated on the twelfth day of this fortnight. M.A. Stein, the incomparable interpreter of this chronicle, reports that Indradvādasi was observed still at the end of the last century.³⁸ Thus there is enough evidence to show that Indra worship continued until recent times in Kashmir. Therefore the term Vajrahasta used by Medhātithi can only refer to Indra.

It is remarkable that manuscript illustrations of the three main religions of India should have their origin, or at least should flourish, in three widely separated extremities: Hindu manuscripts in Kashmir, Buddhist manuscripts in Bengal and Jaina manuscripts in Gujarat. While the Jaina and Buddhist book illustrations derive inspiration from the wall paintings of central India, though with contrary results, we can only conjecture about the antecedents of book painting in Kashmir. It is probable that, just as Hindu sculpture of Kashmir had

much in common with the Buddhist sculpture, Hindu book painting may not have been much different from Buddhist book painting, which originated in Bengal and spread to the Himalayan regions. In 1938, Pandit Madhusudan Kaul discovered two Buddhist manuscripts with painted wooden covers in Gilgit area. In case of the first manuscript, the outer sides of the wooden covers are painted with a lotus scroll, and the inner sides with the figures of Buddha and Avalokiteśvara. The covers of the second manuscript are decorated with Padmapāṇi Lokeśvara. From the stylistic point of view, P. Banerjee assigns the figures of the Buddha and Avalokiteśvara to the ninth century and that of Padmapāṇi to the tenth.⁹⁹ Stylistically also these paintings have much in common with those of the eastern Indian manuscript illustrations. Although the existence of painted book covers need not imply the existence of illustrated manuscripts as well, the painted book covers of Buddhist manuscripts from Gilgit and Medhātithi's evidence taken together would suggest that in the ninth century Kashmir both Hindus and Buddhists illustrated their sacred manuscripts, probably in a style akin to that of the eastern Indian manuscripts.

Finally, if the art of book painting came from eastern India to Kashmir, where it is mentioned in the ninth century by Medhātithi, then the art must have been prevalent in eastern India even prior to the ninth century. Thus Medhātithi's seemingly innocuous remark about the *citrapustaka* provides us a *terminus a quo* or the starting point for the art of book painting.

REFERENCES

1. Ganganatha Jha (ed), *Manu-Smṛti with the Manubhāṣya of Medhātithi*, (Bibliotheca Indica, No.256), Calcutta, 1939.
2. P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, vol. I, Poona 1930, pp. 268-275. See also idem, "The Predecessors of Viṣṇāneśvara," JBBRAS, New Series, 1 (1925) 193-224. To the various passages cited by Kane in support of Medhātithi being from Kashmir, we may add his remarks on Manu IV.39 and VII.92 where the famous Mārtaṇḍa temple of Kashmir is mentioned. See section VI below.
3. *History of Dharmasāstra*, vol. I, p.268.

4. J. Duncan M. Derrett, 'A Newly-discovered contact between Arthaśāstra and Dharmasāstra: the Role of Bhārucci', ZDMG 115 (1965) 134-152.
5. Suranad Kunjan Pillai (ed), *Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa with the Commentary Marmāvabodhini of Raṅganātha*, (University of Kerala Sanskrit Series, 187), Trivandrum 1956, p. 203: *yamapaṭikā ivāmbare citram ālikhanty udgītakāḥ*; p. 226: *praviśann eva vipaṇivartmani kutūhalākula-bahubālakaparivṛtam ūrdhvayaṣṭi- viṣṭambha-vitate vāmahastavartini bhīṣaṇamahīśādhirūḍhapreta- pātisanāthe citravati paṭe paralokavyatikaram itarakarakalitena śaraṅaḍena kathayantaṃ yamapaṭikaṃ dadarśa*. See also C. Sivaramamurti, *Sanskrit Literature and Art – Mirrors of Indian Culture*, New Delhi 1970, p. 96 and Pl. XXIII.75, which reproduces a *yamapaṭa* of the late Deccani school with Telugu labels from the Madras Museum.
6. A.N. Upadhye (ed), *Uddyotanasūri's Kuvalayamālā*, (Singhi Jain Series 45), Bombay 1959, p. 185ff. Cf. U.P. Shah, 'Progress of Studies in Fine Arts and Technical Science, with a few remarks on the Study of Western Indian Art', Presidential Address of Fine Arts & Technical Science Section, All India Oriental Conference, XXIV Session, Varanasi 1968, pp.21-24.
7. U.P. Shah, *Treasures of Jaina Bhaṅḍāras*. (L.D.Series 69), Ahmedabad 1978, pp. 47-51; 85-92; Pls. IX, XII.
8. W. Norman Brown, *The Vasanaṭavilāsa: A poem of the Spring Festival in Old Gujarāṭī, accompanied by Sanskrit and Prakrit Stanzas and illustrated with Miniature Paintings*, critically edited and translated, with an introduction and a description of the paintings (with 48 plates), (American Oriental Series volume 46), New Haven 1962.
9. Cf. Sreeramula Rajeswara Sarma, *Writing Material in Ancient India*, (Aligarh Oriental Series, No.5), Aligarh 1985, p. 3 et passim.
10. *Kāmasūtra* 4.10: *nāgadantāvasaktā viṇā citraphalakaṃ vartikā-samudgakah yaḥ kaścit pustakah kuraṇṭakamālāś ca*.

11. Thus in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, act VI, Duṣyanta paints a picture of Śakuntalā on a board; in *Vikramorvaśīya*, act II, the Vidūṣaka advises the king to paint the likeness of Urvaśī on a *ciṭṭaphalaa*;

in Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī*, act II, there is a delightful scene with the painting board.
12. Reproduced in C. Sivaramamurti, *Chitrasūtra of the Viṣṇu-dharmo-ttara*, New Delhi 1978, fig.2.
13. Shah, 'Progress of studies.....', pp.19-20, and figs.1-3.
14. Shah, *Treasures.....*, pp. 7-15.
15. Cf. Moti Chandra, *Jaina Miniature Paintings from Western India*, Ahmedabad 1949; Shah, *Treasures.....*, pp.16-46 and the connected plates.
16. Cf. K. Norman Brown, *A Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue of Miniature Paintings of the Jaina Kalpasūtra as executed in the Early Western Indian Style*, (Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art Oriental Studies, No. 2), Washington 1934.
17. Cf. K. Norman Brown, *The Story of Kālaka: Texts, History, Legends and Miniature Paintings of the Śvetāmbara Jaina hagiographical Work, The Kālākācāryakathā* (with 15 plates), (Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art Oriental Studies, No.1), Washington 1933.
18. Cf. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, reprint: New York 1965, p. 120.
19. Curiously enough, while a few scribes wrote their names in the colophons, not a single artist did so. Thus this school of painting is entirely anonymous.
20. Moti Chandra, *op.cit.* pp. 41-44.
21. Sreeramula Rajeswara Sarma, 'An Illustrated Manuscript [of Rāja-

- śekhara's Karpūramañjarī]', *The India Magazine*, 13.8 (July 1993) 42-52.
22. This account is based primarily on S.K. Saraswati, 'East Indian Manuscript Painting' in: Ananda Krishna (ed), *Chavi*, Banaras 1971, pp. 243-262.
23. *ibid.* p. 248.
24. Cf. C. Sivaramamurti, *Chitrasūtra of the Vishṇudharmottara*, New Delhi, 1978, pp. 150-151; 180.
25. T.Ganapati Sastri (ed), *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra of Mahārājā-dhirāja Bhoja*, rev. Vasudeva Saran Agrawala, (GOS 25), Baroda 1966, ch. 72; see also my *Writing Material in Ancient India*, p. 4.
26. G.K. Shrigondekar (ed), *Mānasollāsa of King Bhūloka-malla Someśvara*, vol.II, (GOS 84), Baroda 1939, pp.13-14.
27. Karl J. Khandelwala and Moti Chandra, *New Documents of Indian Painting: A Reappraisal*, Bombay 1969, p.1.
28. Ganganadha Jha, *op. cit.* vol.I, p. 167.
29. *ibid.*
30. *Manusmṛti*, IV.39:
*mṛdaṃ gāṃ daivataṃ vipraṃ ghṛtam madhu catuṣpatham/
 pradakṣiṇāni kurvīta prajñātāṃś ca vanaspatīn//*
31. Jha, *op.cit.* vol.I, p. 347: *daivataṃ paṭādilikhitam arcārtham. gautamaś tu devāyatanāni sapradakṣiṇam anuvarteti paṭhati. lokaprasiddhyā caturbhujamārtāṇḍāgarādi vijñeyam. yajñagrhaṇi ceti vakṣyati.*
32. Paintings of the pictures of gods on cloth for the sake of worship is mentioned already by the *Nīlamatapūrāṇa*. Cf. Ved Kumari, *The Nīlamata Purāṇa*, vol. II: Critical Edition & English translation,

- Srinagar 1973, v. 679 (Kāmadeva); v. 755 (Mahendra). Ved Kumari assigns the *Purāṇa* to the sixth or the seventh century, *ibid*, vol.I: A Cultural & Literary Study of a Kāśmīri *Purāṇa*, pp. 9-15.
33. Medhātithi must obviously be referring to the famous Mārtāṇḍa temple built by Lalitāditya Muktapīḍa in the eighth century, the spectacular remains of which still survive. Cf. *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, IV. 192 et passim; M.A. Stein, *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī: A Chronicle of Kāśmīr*, Westminster 1900 (reprinted often in India), vol.I, p. 141(IV.192n). Hermann Goetz, "The Sun Temple of Martand and the Art of Lalitaditya-Muktapida" in: *idem, Studies in the History and Art of Kashmir and the Indian Himalaya*, Wiesbaden 1969, pp.23-36.
34. *Manusmṛti*, VIII.92:
*devabrāhmaṇasānnidhye sāksyaṃ pṛched ṛtaṃ dvijān/
 udanmukhān prānmukhān vā pūrvāṅṅe vai śuciḥ śucin//*
35. Jha, *op.cit.* vol.II, Calcutta 1939, p. 112: *devā durgāmārtāṇḍā-
 dayāḥ pratimākālpitāḥ.*
36. Coomaraswamy, *op.cit.* p.143.
37. *Nīlamatapūrāṇa*, vv. 755 ff.
38. *Rajatarāṅgiṇī*, viii.182, 495. see also viii.170; Stein, *op.cit.* vol.II, p.17 (viii.182n).
39. P. Benerjee, 'Painted Wooden Covers of Two Gilgit Manuscripts in the Sri Pratap Singh Museum, Srinagar (Jammu and Kashmir)', *Oriental Art*, Ns. 14.2 (1968) 114-118.

ISSN 0081 - 3907