CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

THE GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITS OF GANDHARA

The geographical limits of the region called Gandhāra are difficult to define with any certainty. The earliest mention of Gandhāra is found in the Rīg-Veda, but there it consists only of a broad indication of a region. The Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana, yield some information about its location: the former refers to it as a 'North Indian' principality, and the latter places it on both sides of the Indus. The Purāṇaś do not say very much more, the Vayu-Purāṇa however, notices that the two major cities of Gandhāra were Takshashila (Taxila) and Pushkaraśvāti.

Some of the inscriptions of the Persian emperor, Davūs, refer to Gandhāra, but there is no detailed information. Strabo describes Gandhāra (Gandaritides) as lying along the river Kāphes between Chosapes and the Indus. According to Ptolemy, Gandhāra included both the banks of the Kāphes directly above its junction with the Indus. This makes the picture

2. Ibid., p. 54, fn. 11.
3. Ibid., p. 54, fn. 2.
4. Ibid., p. 54, fn. 3.
7. Ibid., p. 55.
somewhat clearer, but beyond the broad location of ancient Gandhāra we still have no substantial facts about it.

It is with the description supplied by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang that we are on somewhat firmer ground. He refers to Gandhāra as lying 500 li South-East of Nagarāhāra and "...about 1000 li from East to West, and about 800 li from north to South. On the East it borders on the river Sin (Sindh)." This information of much significance to us not only because it is comparatively explicit in nature and because it gives us one of the widest geographical connotations of Gandhāra known from any ancient source, but also because the terminal period of our discussion of Gandhāra art coincides roughly with the time that the Chinese pilgrim was in the region. Cunningham, basing his information on Hiuen-Tsang's account, defines the geography of Gandhāra as comprising of Lāmghan and Jalālābād on the West, the hills of Swāt and Buner on the North, the Indus on the East and the hills of Kālābāgh on the South. This is about the closest definition of the Gandhāra region that we can get except for one fact, Cunningham prominently excludes Takṣashilā from the limits of Gandhāra, apparently because it was situated to the East of the Indus.

2. Cunningham, op. cit., p. 56.
The issue of Takshashila deserves some attention. For some scholars refer to Takshashila as a part of Gandhāra, while others see it as lying outside it. The Vāyu Purāṇa includes Takshashila in Gandhāra mentioning it, along with Pushkaravatī, as one of the two cities. This apart, the evidence of art is important: a large number of sculptures in the Gandhāra style have been discovered in and around Takshashila. The most important patrons of Gandhāra art, the Kushākas, had Takshashila as one of their strongholds. For these reasons, thus, it is appropriate to include Takshashila in the Gandhāran region, at least from the viewpoint of art.

Being situated between the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent on the one hand and Afghanistan on the other, Gandhāra obviously shared geo-cultural traits of this whole contiguous region. Many of the actual centres of Gandhāra art lay not within its so-called geographical boundaries perhaps, but spread out to further ones in Afghanistan, parts of which art-historically speaking, could thus be referred to as something like ‘Greater Gandhāra’. Two such important centres are Hadda and Bāmiyan, in Afghanistan and Rokri in the south of Kalabagh.

2. "During the floods in 1868, the Indus made a sweep to the Eastward a few miles above Mianwali, and cut away a part of the old high bank on which stands the small town of Rokri. When the river subsided number of plaster figures and concrete mouldings were found at the foot of two concentric circular walls which had been laid bare. The remains were carefully collected by Mr. Priestley, and are now in the Lahore Museum, ASI Annual Report, Vol.XIV, 1978-79, p.29."
Buddhism in Gandhara

The lack of evidence makes it difficult to ascertain the faith of the people of the Gandhara region before the time of Ashoka. But it appears that Buddhism spread to Gandhara at least from Ashoka's days if it did not exist there earlier. While Ashoka's personal faith is the subject of discussion, it is certain that Buddhism received great encouragement under his aegis; a number of missionaries were sent far and wide to spread the faith. To Gandhara went a mission led by Majjhantika, sent out by the third Buddhist Council held at Pārīkapura under the patronage of the Mauryan emperor.

Buddhism continued to flourish in the centuries that followed. The excavations conducted by Sir John Marshall at Sirkap (in Takshashila) clearly show the presence of many Buddhist stupas and relic caskets belonging to the 2nd century B.C. A small gold reliquary with the figure of the Buddha engraved on it was recovered from a stupa at Bimaran. On the basis of many coins belonging to Aaza I, found together with the reliquary, reliquary has been ascribed to the 1st century B.C.

3. Bachhofer mentions in his Early Indian Sculpture, Vol. I, Delhi, 1973, p. 72, that the coins were found 'by the side' of the reliquary, whereas Ingoldt in Gandharan Art in Pakistan, New York, 1957, p. 23, writes that the coins were found 'inside' the reliquary.
The situation remained much the same with regard to Buddhism in the early post-Christian centuries too. According to the reports of recent excavations conducted at ten sites: Bhirmound, Sirkap, Pushkalāvati, Shaikhan Dheri, Kapisi, Ghatpat, Andan Dheri, Bambolai, Damkot and Ramora, by Pakistan Archaeologists, the earliest Buddha figures there discovered belong to Strata ascribable to the 1st century A.D.

Buddhism clearly became an important force in the region in the time of Kanishka. The great Buddhist Council which he convoked is believed to have been held in Gandhāra; a large number of Buddhist edifices embellished with sculptures with primarily Buddhist themes were also constructed. One of the coins of Kanishka bearing an image of the standing Buddha together with the legend inscribed on it reading 'BODDE' is well known. There seems to be no doubt about the leanings of Kanishka towards Buddhism and about the success he met in promoting the faith.

After the Kushānas, no available historical document throws light on the state of Buddhism in Gandhāra till the early 5th century. Then from the accounts of Fa-hsien we come to know...

2. Sircar, D.C., 'The Kushānas', The Age of Imperial Unity, p. 147, '...Kanishka is said to have convoked...the great Buddhist Council held in Kashmir according to some traditions, but in Gandhāra or Jalandhara according to others.'
that during his times '...the people of the country were mostly students of the hinayana.' Clearly here is evidence of the continuation and flourishing state of Buddhism up to that part of time.

However, the faith seems to have received a major blow from the devastating invasions of the White Huns led by Mihirakula in about the first quarter of the 6th century. Presumably it is these invasions to which we owe the devastated Buddhist monuments that Hieun-Tsang refers to in the 7th century while he refers to about 1000 Buddhist monasteries in ruins at Gandhāra.

The fact Buddhism flourished in Gandhāra over a long period of at least eight centuries, if not more, is supported by the discovery of a vast number of Buddhist sculptures executed during this long span of time. In their subject these sculptures relate not only to the major Buddhist legends, but they deal also with the depiction of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas based on different iconographic formulations. All this is indication of the fairly firm footing that Buddhism and its various myths and legends had gained in the country of Gandhāra during these centuries.

It needs to be noted, however, that although the sculptures of Gandhāra are predominantly Buddhist in their and

1. Grünwedel, A., Buddhist Art in India, (Translated by A.C. Gibson, revised and enlarged by Jas Burgess), New Delhi, 1972, p. 80.
2. Beal, op. cit., p. 150.
theme and spirit, the works executed during these centuries was not exclusively Budhhistic. Huen-Tsang refers here to the existence of a number of Deva temples also, temples obviously raised to Brahmical Hindu deities. A few Brahmical sculptures depicting scenes from the R̄amayana and the Krishna legends are known. Shiva, kartikeya (seated on peacock), Ganesha and a goddess with goose are also met with in Gandhāra sculptures. In addition, of course, one has to recall to one's mind the representation of Shiva on the coins and seals issued by the rulers of this land.

1. Real, pp. cit., p. 159.
5. Joshi, N.P. and Sharma, R.C., Gandhāra-Sculptures in the State Museum, Lucknow, Lucknow, 1969, Fig. 71.
One cannot rule out at the same time the existence of some other folk-based faiths in Gandhāra, although they did not perhaps play a dominant role. Several sculptures belonging to the early pre-Christian centuries and representing fertility deities indicate the existence of a number of folk and local cults in Gandhāra, faiths which might eventually have been absorbed into the larger bodies of Buddhism, Brahmānism, etc.

PATRONS

There is little direct evidence available for determining where principal patronage to the artists of Gandhāra came from, what its nature was. From indirect evidence one can, however, reconstruct some kind of picture. The enormous output of sculptures, which decorated, a vast number of monuments, and the large size of many stone sculptures, all indicate that a good amount of patronage received by the artists was from the ruling class. Apart from the royalty, probably the merchants, the rich, the caravan leaders were providing some support to the artists. One can even think of 'patronage' extended by common people; for them the commissioning of sculptures also might have represented an expression of faith or simply a matter of aesthetic pleasure.

Some of the rulers of the Gandhāra region had definite Buddhist leanings. The celebrated Kanishka should be mentioned

Debbins, op. cit., Figs. 4, 5, 10.
as the foremost among them. These rulers, inhibited by their foreign heritage, must have had routine apprehensions about their being not accepted by the people at large. In order to come near the people, then it is not unlikely that they extended some patronage, sometimes even more than what was expected, to the religious faiths of the land. This would undoubtedly cover the expression of the faith in the arts. The large number of sculptures depicting Buddhist deities and themes found from Gandhāra speak eloquently of such a phenomenon which belonged certainly to the period of the Kushanas, if not to that of the others. Kanishka's patronage towards Buddhism has already been mentioned and it is likely that he gave support both economic and moral, for making the prodigious number of Buddhist sculptures produced under his regime.

A number of Gandhāran sculptures contain inscriptions mentioning the names of the donors. Although these donors cannot be identified always in terms of their social status and profession, they were clearly the patrons who paid for the execution of these sculptures. In doing this, they must either have had in mind the acquisition of religious merit or for the more earthly reason of using these sculptures in commerce.

It is possible that both the royalty as well as the merchants and other people supported regular ateliers that produced sculptures. The execution of numerous sculptures with similar style and themes sometimes exact copies of each other.

---

suggests such a possibility. One cannot be sure as to whether the artists were paid salaries or whether they were paid for by patrons according to individual commissions. But whatever the situation, it seems that in Gandhāra, for a considerable length of time, the making of sculptures turned into something like an industry, providing sustenance to a large number of people.

**ARTISTS**

The enormous output of sculptures in Gandhāra postulates a very large number of artists at work. A study of the works reveals three basic stylistic trends: there are sculptures which have a distinctive indigenous flavour; two, there are those that bear foreign influence; three, there are works in which indigenous and foreign features are mixed in varying proportions. The majority of the sculptures belong to the last category.

It is a fair guess that the foreign and Indian artists were working simultaneously in Gandhāra. Foreign artists must have migrated to these parts over a long span of time. A brief history of the region provides some clues to and the background of such a situation.

With its geographical situation what it was, Gandhāra was exposed in various degrees to influences from Greece, Rome, Asia minor, Mesopotamia, Persia and Afghanistan. According to the inscriptions from the 6th century B.C. at Behistun

---

1. Mookerji, 'Foreign Invasions', *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p.41.
(c.520-518 B.C.), Persepolis (c.518-515 B.C.) and Nakhsh-i-
Rustam (c.515 B.C.), Gandhāra was one of the provinces of the
Achaemenian Empire. Thus it continued to be for a little less
than two hundred years. The invasion of Alexander the Great
in 326 B.C. exposed the region to influences first from
Greece and then from Rome. Alexander's conquest was followed
subsequently by the exchange of embassies and active trade.
Thus communication between Gandhāra and these areas was
established and free exchange of people and ideas must have
resulted. Under these circumstances some artists from these
foreign lands must have come to Gandhāra from time to time,
something of which many scholars have taken note.

The art of Gandhāra being anonymous, no names of any
individuals, native or foreign, have come to notice so far.
The makers of these thousands of sculptures chose not to
project their identity, and made their silent contribution to
art and faith much in the approved tradition at work in India.

1. A. Baehro, op.cit., p.67.

B. Rowland, F. (Jr.), The Evolution of the Buddha Image,

C. Majumdar, N.G., A Guide to the Sculptures in the Indian
One of the most difficult tasks faced in any study of Gandhāran art is that of ascribing provenance to the sculptures.

The issue because of the difficulties involved, has not received the attention that it deserved from scholars. A large majority of the sculptures have been published with no indication of provenance except the broadest one that they belong to Gandhāra. Most authors, do not also add any explanation for not mentioning the exact location, or even the region of the finds. At places where provenance is mentioned, the source of the information is not cited. However, it can be presumed that their information was based mostly on the records of the Archaeological Survey of India.

In the matter of the ascription of provenance, there are two major problems. One, excavations have often brought to light different types of sculptures, possessing no uniformity of style from the same site. Thus from the same place the Buddha and Bodhisattva figures do not wear the same expression nor do they have the same appearance. To take some examples:

Sculptures from Chatpat, all from strata III (figs. 35, 36, 57 in Dobbins, 2001) are different; there are marked differences in the proportions employed and in the manner of standing and sitting as noticed in two works from Sikri (Pls. 103, 126, Ingholt, Gandhāran Art in Pakistan); in the types and arrangement of the hair of two figures excavated from the Swat (Pls. CXVII(a),
Sculptures from the Sacred Area of Bakhra (Swat, Pakistan), Rome, 1962. Considerable variations are once again noticed in the mode of showing the drapery and its folds in sculptures from Swat (Pls. CCCII, CCXXXVI, Ibid). Even the nimbus behind the heads of the divinities are not of the same type as clearly seen in two figures excavated from Strata III of Chatpat (Figs. 50, 51, Dobbins, op. cit). There are, to be sure along with all these dissimilarities seen in sculptures excavated from the same site, some similarities that can be noticed. But the differences are so considerable that assigning clear provenance to the sculptures becomes problematic.

There is another side to the problem. Some features like the treatment of the hair, the type of the eyes and eyebrows, the shape of the mouth, the mode of draping the body and the drapery folds, the various bhāmas, āsanas and mudrās, occur in works from more than one site. Thus one sees wavy hair in images from Chatpat (rep. in Dobbins, op. cit. as Fig. 46), from Shāikhan Dheri (Ibid, Fig. 32) and Andan Dheri (Ibid, Fig. 62). Similar eyes are noticed from Chatpat (Ibid, Fig. 46), from Lōrīyan Tāngai (rep. in Grünwedel, op. cit., Pl. 112) and from Takht-i-Bahi (Ibid, Pl. 118). The drapery folds and the mode of taking the drapery in figures from places like Takht-i-Bahi (Ibid, Pl. 122) and Chatpat (Dobbins, op. cit., Fig. 45) are similar. Much the same is the situation with respect to bhāmas, thus in works from Takht-i-Bahi (Grünwedel, op. cit., Pl. ) and Sikri (rep. in Ingholt, op. cit., Pl. 197) are alike. Likewise similar mudrās and āsanas in works from sites like Karāmar.
can be noticed. Thus we have a situation in which different stylistic features can be observed in works found from the same site and at the same time a certain commonness can be seen in some stylistic features in works from very different centres. All this makes the allocation of 'Provenance' on the basis of style alone very difficult.

Under these circumstances the best way of ascribing provenance may be to indicate the location, the place of the discovery of the works. Thus sculptures found from Takht-i-Bahš may be placed under "Takht-i-Bahš". This may not of course necessarily mean that the find place was also the place of execution of the sculptures.

However, even the assignment of the provenance on the basis of find-spot is not a simple matter and there are many difficulties. Many times no proper records were maintained.

1. Mon Meunie's work is in search of treasures as done by the 'common' people. He had dug at random, without plan or stratification, without recording antiquities and left the work to the care and mercy of the labourers who smashed pottery and removed baskets full of earth which had not been searched. Mon Meunie has done great harm in ten years. More finds without their proper sequence is not beneficial for the students of history and archaeology... (Shakur, M. A., A Dash Through the Heart of Afghanistan, Peshawar, 1947, pp. 3, 4, 5) that such a state of affairs exist is also known from the writings of several other authors, for instance, E. Barger, 'Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Oxus Territories of Afghanistan', Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 64, 1941, pp. 2, 3, 22 and Percy Brown's, Guide, Lahore Museum, 1908, p. 14.
at the time of excavation and sculptures were dumped in the godowns of museums where they got mixed up with sculptures excavated from other sites. Some sculptures fell in the hands of private individuals whose major interest was collection or trade and not keeping a record of their find-spot and the like. At the time of the excavations, however, some records were maintained, on the basis of which provenance can be ascribed. The number of sculptures the find-spot of which is not recorded remains, all the same, much larger than of those the records of which are available.

In the case of the Chandigarh collection, the provenance of some sculptures is given in the present catalogue on the basis of the records maintained and available (discussed in chapter III). In other cases the provenance is ascribed on the basis of finding great similarity with the sculptures, the provenance of which is definitely known. The footnote, while cataloguing each sculpture, clarifies the basis. Majority of the sculptures of this collection seem to have come from the sites which are in the Peshawar District.

**Material and Technique**

Most of the sculptures from the Gandhāra region are executed in schist. The types vary; thus there is Chalicoxe Carbonaceous and Micaceous schist but schist remains easily the most popular material. A part from this work in


1. limestone, shaly stone, black calcareous marble, soapstone, gesso, pot stone, Terski sandstone and clay is known. Metal was used on very modest scale being mostly employed for reliquaries and for a few small figures.

Schist is a fine-grained stone and is fairly easy to handle. It does not offer too much of resistance and makes it possible to bring in fine details. A number of shades of grey colour, both light and dark, in various hues like steel blue, black, green, brown etc. are found in schist.

Stucco in which some work was done is composed of lime plaster mixed with small stones and chopped straw or animal hair. The material is thus harder than clay but softer than stone. The colour of stucco is off-white. Takshashila and Haddā seem to have been two most prolific centres of stucco sculptures. When and why stucco gained popularity in the region is an issue which has attracted the attention of a
a number of scholars. There is no clear evidence that the one material followed the other, but most scholars agree that schist was most commonly used in the early phase and stucco and clay in the later phase. Reasons for this have been guessed at. Thus, Sir Mortimer Wheeler felt that it was in order to meet the large demand for sculptures stucco was considered to be the most suitable material. He does not, however, explain why there was this sudden large demand in the later years only. According to Goetz, the demand for stucco came from those areas where there was no stone available. Marshall states that schist was popular with the Kushānas and stucco with theKidara Kushānas, and since Kidara Kushānas came later stucco became the favourite in later centuries. But at best this remains a guess, for there is no evidence to support the statement. Dani writes that stucco was used at those places where stone was costlier and rarer. Ingholt, however, puts forward the suggestion that due to the Sassanian

   b. Wheeler and Rowland quoted by Dani, A.H., Gandhāra Art of Pakistan, Peshawar, 1968, p. 7. ...decline in the 3rd century, it deteriorates in the 4th when it is saved only for a time by the huge stucco figures. On page 2 Dani clearly writes that stucco was popular in later years.
3. Goetz, H., India; Five Thousand Years of Indian Art, (Art of the world), London, 1959, p. 77.
4. Marshall, quoted by Goetz, ibid, p. 75.
war when money was scarce and there was no official encouragement, and the need to switch over to stucco, the comparatively cheaper material must have arisen.

The situation can be viewed in the light of the socio-political situation of this part of India during the period between the 3rd and the 5th centuries. The Sassanian attack in the middle of the 3rd century gave obviously a setback to the Gandhāra school. The Kidara Kushānas who came after the Sassanians were not as rooted in Gandhāra as the Kushānas were and could not have given the same type of patronage to the arts of the land as their predecessors. The artists, one might guess thus, could not have but looked for cheaper means to express themselves and to cater to the needs of the people. Stucco and clay bring both cheaper and easier as materials to work in, gained in popularity. And once the artist started using these materials, it is easy to see that they might have discovered their potential for giving expression to subtle features through a more manoeuvrable medium. For work in stucco moulds could be used and thus larger production must have resulted. This could have met the growing need, if there was one, alike for religious purposes and for serving as items for trade and commerce. If trade was in question, the choice of a material which is lighter and easier to transport from one place to another must have been a factor also. Some of these sculptures it might be noticed, were hollow from the inside. All this speculation apart, a reason, for the preference

1. Chandigarh Museum No.298.
for stucco/clay might simply have been a change in the taste of the people.

Most of the stuccos are said originally to have been painted. Many of them still show traces of paint. There was thus probably a conscious attempt to extend the means of expression. The addition of colour might at the same time have met new iconographic needs.

Of interest to the study of Gandhāra sculptures also are some matters related to the technique employed, one can notice them here only briefly.

The treatment of the figures in which the shoulders and the head jut out while the rest of the body stays more or less in the background is familiar from work in Greece and Rome, but it is seen in an even more pronounced form in Gandhāra.

There are some Gandhāra sculptures which have broken forearms. In the centre of broken forearm is noticed a hole or a neatly scooped out depression in the elbow, suggesting quite clearly that forearms were separately attached. This evidently saved the artist the effort of cutting away a large

2. Ibid., pl.228.
3. Chandigarh Museum No.310, (Second panel from top).
4. Chandigarh Museum No.719
quantity of superfluous stone. This, again is not a pecul-
arity of Gandhāra alone, it is seen not only in other Indian
schools but also in works from other countries like Greece
and Etruria.

An unusual device is seen in one of the representations
of the Dipānkara Jātaka where Sumati is prostrating himself
before the Master. As he prostrates a small cut is made in
the arris at the base in order to accommodate his right foot.

In the matter of the treatment of hair ringlets were
sometimes drilled. Again moustaches were sometimes affixed
separate although normally they were carved.

Reliefs seem to have been inset into the wall faces
of the stūpas in two ways: either by making niches for them,
or by building them into place in the first instance.

Stucco was used on a large scale in Gandhāra and in
Afghanistan, and it seems that the artist fully understood
the nature of the material and its potentiality. With the
help of different techniques, he used the material intelli-
gently and brought out varied results as best as he could.

1. Chandigarh Museum No.3568, Seated Devi from Sholapur.
2. Bazin, G., The History of World Sculptures, Connecticut,
   1966, pl.251.
   1966, pl.234.
4. Marshall, The Buddhist Art of Gandhāra, pl.49, fig.73.
5. F newcomer, Reports on the Campaign 1956-57 in Sāvat,
One of the techniques applied was to model the figure on a frame made of wood, reeds or some other perishable material bound by strings of vegetable fibres and fixed firmly in the base. This supported a rough core of plaster and on this successive layers of stucco were applied which gave the figure its final form. About the constituent of the core, Marshall writes that it was composed either of soft Kanjur stone roughly fashioned to the form of the figure, or small Kanjur stones and mud combined, or sometimes mud alone. While the body was made this way, the heads of the images were made of stucco. This material being more durable, thus, than the material used for the bodies, many heads of such sculptures have survived.

Somewhat similar was the technique used for the two colossal Buddha images (125 ft. and 175 ft.) at Bamiyan in Afghanistan. Of the smaller image (125 ft.) the body and head were cut from the cliff and the features and the drapery folds were modelled in clay which contained small pieces of stone which acted as the binder. Over this, a coating of lime plaster was given.

In the case of the larger image (175 ft.) from Bamiyan

the method of construction of the body was the same as that of the 125 ft. Buddha, only the style was a bit different. To show the folds of the drapery ropes were attached to the body of the figure with the help of wooden pegs driven into the stone surface.

For the making of stucco heads sometimes moulds were used but at times they were also made individually. Some stucco heads have been found which are hollow from inside, as pointed out earlier, but others are all solid.

The sculptures in stucco are believed originally to have been brilliantly coloured. Traces of pigments still adhering to some sculptures have been found. Usually a terracotta shade was reserved for the flesh and deep red was used to show the folds of the neck, lip, nostrils etc. Brown was preferred for the iris which was given a blue and brown outline, dark cinnabar was used for the robe, jewellery was painted in various colours, including lapis-lazuli.

Metal never gained popularity in Gandhara. Only a few small figurines and reliquary caskets have been discovered. In metal, the 'cire-perdue' technique was used for the figures; the reliquary caskets are mostly in repoussé work.

1. Shakur,op.cit.,p.41.
2. Chandigarh Museum No.298.
The art of Gandhāra is by and large Buddhistic. Some non-Buddhist sculptures are of course known, but their number is very small compared to the enormous production of sculptures of Buddhist themes.

The themes in general can be divided broadly into the following group heads: Buddhist, non-Buddhist and non-Indian. The Buddhist themes in their turn can be classified under different heads: the Buddha who is represented mostly in his human form rather than through symbols, is shown mostly standing or seated. A large part of the surviving work from Gandhāra consists of heads of the Buddha, as also his busts, originally parts of the standing or seated Buddha figures. The Bodhisattva figures also abound and occur both in standing and seated forms. As in the case of the Buddha figures, a large number of Bodhisattva heads and busts (parts of standing and seated figures) have also been found. Out of the Bodhisattvas, Maitreya seems to have enjoyed the greatest popularity in Gandhāra.

There is a vast number of narrative reliefs connected with the life story of the Buddha. These can be sub-divided into three broad categories; in the first category are reliefs depicting earlier lives or the Jātaka stories. It seems, however, that Jātaka tales though frequent, did not find excessive favour with the Gandhāra artist. Their number is much less compared to that of the other stories. Among Jātakas six - the Dipānkara, Vessantara, Chhaddanta, Shyāma, Jyotishka and Sibi seem to have been preferred and they are seen time
and again. Even out of these the Dipankara Jātaka seems to have been the most popular. The second category of narrative relief comprised of scenes connected with the life of Gautama, prior to his attainment of Buddhahood. Finally, there are scenes depicting activities of Gautama after his attainment of Buddhahood.

Of the lesser Buddhist deities, the figures of Hariti, Pañcikā, the Yakṣis and Nāgas occur frequently in Gandhāra.

From the study of many sculptures of the same theme like the 'Nativity of Gautama' or the 'Great Departure', one finds so much similarity in the characters represented and in the compositions, that one begins to wonder if some particular text narrating these episodes was not being faithfully followed by the artists.

Though most of the Buddhist themes revolve round Gautama the Buddha, there are a few others connected with other personages. Thus, we have, a relief showing the 'Nirvāṇa of Ānanda', but the number of such sculptures is very small indeed.

Non-Buddhist themes, which form a very small part of the total number of themes, fall into different categories. Themes related to Shaivism, Vaishnavism and Shaktism are known

1. Chandigarh Museum Nos. 2343, 1034, 2315; Ingholt, Gandhāran Art in Pakistan, pls. 13, 15.
2. Ibid., pl. 40 (Lowest panel); Chandigarh Museum Nos. 2139, 209, 1543; Ingholt, Gandhāran Art in Pakistan, pls. 13, 15.
3. Chandigarh Museum No. 2265.
from Candhāra.

One comes across a few sculptures like Shiva and Nandi from Charsada. Here Shiva is three-headed (the fourth head at the back being not visible), three-eyed, six armed, he stands before Nandi while holding the damaru, trishula and kamandalu. An Ek Mukhalanga and an image of dancing Shiva have also been found at Sirkap. Shiva is also represented on coins and seals. One sculpture of Kārtikeya riding a peacock is in the State Museum, Lucknow. A sculpture of Ganesh too has been found in Gandhara. A few scenes from the Rāmāyaṇa, identified as those of the abduction of Sītā, and of the war in Lanka are carved on a jug which was obtained at Jalālpur. Apart from these a figure of Garuda, a figure of Vishnu and Kṛṣṇa as representing Vaishnava themes, have come to light.

Some Shākta themes like goddess with goose have been unearthed. There is also the record of the discovery of Sūrya and Chandra from Gandhāra.
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2. See fn. 4(b) on p. 7.
3. See fn. 4(a) on p. 7.
4. See fn. 8 on p. 7.
5. See fn. 9 on p. 7.
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8. See fn. 3 on p. 7.
10. Ibid., p. 57.
11. See fn. 3 on p. 7.
Coomaraswamy observes that although Jainism also was established in Takshashila, as proved by the architectural remains, it is surprising that "not a single example of Greco-Jain sculpture is found."

In Gandhāra secular sculptures existed side by side with religious sculptures although the number of such examples is not large. Dancers, musicians, drinking scenes, portrait heads, garland bearers, Atlantes and exotic scenes occur frequently in Gandhāra but they do not relate directly to any particular religion.

A large number of architectural fragments like chhatras have been found. These belonged in all probability to Buddhist monuments.

Finally non-Indian themes which found a place in the art of Gandhāra are of unusual interest. Some of the notable figures are those of Athena, Roma, Dionysus, Aphrodite, Psyche with Eros and Harpocrates. One also comes across figures of centaurs, ichthyocentaurs and tritons etc. Some of these figures are incorporated in larger reliefs; some of them are in the form of sculptures in the round, and others appear on trvays etc.

SOME STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS

In terms of style, there is much in Gandhāra that is

2. Faccenna, Sculptures from the Sacred Area of Bâhkara I (Swat Pakistan), Part IV, pl.CCLXXXIX.
familiar from the work in other centres in India or the work in the Hellenistic Roman tradition. But some aspects, all the same, be usefully pointed out.

The device of continuous narration, a popular feature in early Indian art is seen also in Gandharan narrative reliefs sometimes. Apparently Benjamin Rowland's statement that the Gandhāra sculptor abandoned continuous narration needs amended. Thus in the rendering of the Dipankara Jātaka, Sumati is shown three times; again, in the Shyāma Jātaka the parents of Shyāma are shown thrice.

A problem that attracts notice is whether the narrative reliefs, within the same slab, are to be from left to right or from right to left. From some of the panels representing episodes of which the sequence is known, it appears that the narration was mostly from right to left. This might have been more suitable when these panels were set into the walls of the monuments around which the visitors were supposed to move in the clockwise direction. There are several examples of this. Thus in No.611 of the Chandigarh collection, in the lowest register, in the panel at the extreme right the 'Cremation of the Buddha' is shown; then, in the middle panel, comes the 'Distribution of the Relics' and, finally

2. Chandigarh Museum No.586.
3. Ingolt, Gandhāran Art in Pakistan, pl.5, p.49.
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the panel at the left shows the 'Worship of the Stupa'.
In another example, No.1347 of the Chandicarn collection,
in the right lower compartment there is the scene of the 'Bath
of the Buddha' which is followed by the panel on the left
showing 'Māyā Returning to Kapilvastu'.

It might be stated, however, that while a large number
of scenes are meant to be read from right to left, no rigid
following of the rules in the execution is to be expected.
This is possibly because the carving in most cases, was not
done on the slabs set into the walls, but on the detached
slabs: these could be arranged at any time. Sometimes
devotional reasons were also made to yield to aesthetic
considerations and no chronological sequence was maintained
in the arrangement of panels depicting scenes from the life
of the Buddha.

In some narrative reliefs the figures seem to move
about quite freely on the ledge like actors on the stage.

This treatment is reminiscent of the art of Greece and Rome.
The compositions of the reliefs, where the figures of
the Buddha or of the Bodhisattvas are shown as being worshipped,

1. A. Soper, A. C., 'Aspects of Light Symbolism in Gandhāra',
3. Ibid., p. 228.
are usually very symmetrical. The normal pattern followed is of the figure of the Buddha/Bodhisattva standing or seated in the centre, flanked by an equal number of figures on either side.

The human figures in Gandhāra art are treated differently. Thus, some are very elongated, nearing the proportions of the figures from Fendukistan, while others are short and stumpy; some are robust and muscular, while others are lean and anaemic. Some are well proportioned and elegant and others ill-proportioned and crude. Some move about in a natural graceful manner, other turn and twist at all conceivable angles. In terms of workmanship some are carved with delicacy and fineness, while others are crude. It is to be mentioned that the latter far outnumber the former.

There is a wide range in the types of faces one sees in Gandhāra. In some cases the facial features are so individualised and distinctive that one wonders if many of them are not based on the studied features of the various members of the Buddhist institutions known to the artists.
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The expressions of the human figures are generally speaking firm and monotonous. The expressions on the Buddha's face vary from being stern to pleasant, seldom does one see the inner light reflected in the faces.

Grief, mainly in the nirvana scenes, is expressed very graphically. Sometimes the mourners are shown throwing their hands above their heads or touching their foreheads, or burying their faces in handkerchiefs. Their movements also appear at times convulsed and their faces are contorted bringing immediately to one's mind the Hellenistic sculptures where emotions are explicit and vividly expressed.

The considerable variety in the treatment of the hair in Gandhāra has perhaps no parallel in many Indian schools of sculpture. The most popular type here is the wavy hair. Various types of hair treatment are to be seen; loose and tight waves, formed by thick or thin strands, hair raised high or close to the scalp, swept back or going sideways towards the ears. Apart from the different types of wavy hair, snail-shell
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curls also occur on some heads. Though they are more commonly seen on the Buddha heads, they appear occasionally also on the heads of laymen. The snail-shell curls were evidently more popular in Mathura, Amaravati and Gupta schools than in Gandhara. These kind of hair is seen in Greece and Persia as early as in the 5th century B.C., and later in Palmyra, Hatra and even in Etruria. Straight hair too is found in Gandhara work but it did not apparently find too much of favour with the artists.

In Gandhara the Buddha's dress seems generally to consist of two garments, but in some figures three garments are clearly visible - one garment coming down to the shins is meant to be tied at the waist, another reaching the knees or a little above (usually visible from the side), is the lower edge of a loose cloth which is thrown around the chest and covers the left shoulder. On top of this is worn the large shawl which covers almost the whole of the body. In most cases both the shoulders are covered, but in some the right shoulder is left bare. In some Buddha figures, mostly seated, the upper edges of the two shawls going across the chest are visible.
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The figures of the Bodhisattvas are usually shown with two garments, a dhoti and a long loose scarf or shawl. Apart from the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, various other figures are shown in Gandhāra sculptures wearing the usual Indian dress, like the dhoti, with the accessories. But some foreign types of dresses like baggy trousers, tight pyjamas and coats, knee-length skirts, full sleeved blouses/shirts and long dresses gathered below the breasts are seen on occasions.

A great variety is noticeable in the treatments of the folds of the garments in Gandhāra. There is a difference in the distance between the folds: sometimes they are very closely spaced and sometimes the distance between them is greater; there is variation also in the projection of the folds: at times they are stringy and prominently raised; in other cases there is very little projection. There are cases in which the folds are mere incisions. Fork pleats though they are not common also occur. Paired lines are found on a fairly large number of sculptures.

The texture of the drapery is almost always shown thick and weighty. The transparency of the fabric seen in Mathurā, and even more so in the Gupta work from Sārnāth etc., is seldom seen in Gandhāra.
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A variety of ornaments adorn the male and female forms. In the case of the Bodhisattvas, the gods, men of high status, the head ornaments consist usually of pearl strings, metal discs and head bands etc. Wreaths, pearl strings and gold ornaments adorn the heads of the female forms. Earrings, worn both by men and women have shapes like a bud or a leaf, crescent, tulip, disc etc. and are usually large in size. Necklaces received a lot of attention from the artists and figures are usually shown wearing more than one. Often one broad necklet is seen close to the neck, and other necklaces consisting mainly of pearls, attain varying lengths. In the case of the Bodhisattvas, out of the many pearl necklaces, one is seen often thrown over the right shoulder. In addition, there is an amulet chain going across the chest. Pieces pendants from some of the necklaces are elaborate, consisting of human and animal figures. Armlets and wristlets are a common sight, especially among the male figures. The female forms are often shown wearing a number of bangles, also anklets.

INFLUENCES

'Influences' is the main theme of most discussion on

1. Ingholt, *Gandhāran Art in Pakistan*, pl. 289.
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the art of Gandhāra, and it is so with much justice for perhaps no other school of Indian sculpture has as many influences on its art as Gandhāra has. For this situation, of course, many factors are responsible.

Historically speaking, we know that the Gandhāra region was under the Achaemenians in the 6th century B.C. In 326 B.C. the region came under the domination of Alexander the Great and passed into the hands of his successors. Subsequently it came under the sway of the Mauryas. The territory was later ruled by Scythians, the Parthians and the Kushānas. The Kushānas were followed by the Kidara Kushānas to the ousted in turn by the White Hūṇas in the early 6th century A.D. In these circumstances it is only natural to expect that the art of Gandhāra was moulded and influenced by the art of the peoples who came to rule over it.

It is generally believed that the Gandhāra school of sculpture is post-Alexanderian. There is more than one view regarding the extent of the impact of Alexander's invasion on the art of Gandhāra. According to some including Mahajan, Alexander's invasion did not leave any permanent results, and there is plausibility in the argument that Alexander's invasion is unlikely to have left a lasting impact, being a short lived event that it was. But one definite outcome of Alexander's campaign was the opening-up of new lines of communication with the Greco-Roman world. Soper observes that the "Mediterranean and Indian Indian world

maintained close commercial contact by sea during the 2nd
century A.D., a fact too well established to require more than
a reminder*. In the words of Rasham: "It is not to the
Graeco-Bactrian heirs of Alexander, but to the trade with
the west, encouraged by the rising prosperity of Rome and
the eastward march of her legions, that we must attribute
this syncretistic school." The matter of Gandhāra being
affected thus by Greece, Rome and the countries of Western
Asia is underscored by nearly every scholar and remains largely
undisputed. Literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence tend
to confirm these links of Gandhāra further. The themes, the
motifs, the style of the sculptures, the employment of Greek as
a language of the Kushāpas are additional evidence and all
these point to the Hellenistic dimension of the art of
Gandhāra.

The fact that by and large, subject peoples tend to
imitate the habits, customs and preferences of their rulers
needs scarcely to be stressed. When conquering groups came
to Gandhāra, along with them came their ideas and their
material culture, their weapons, utensils, draperies and other
objects, things that affected the art of Gandhāra. Sometimes
the influences are pronounced and they can be clearly
identified, in other cases they are subtle and imperceptible.
But taken together, they fashioned the character of Gandhāran
art. At first sight, the art of Gandhāra, shows a noticeable
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Greek aspect, and it was in view of this that the Gandhāra school was early described early by many scholars as 'Graeco-Buddhist' or 'Romano-Buddhist'. A little later however, it was realized that it is not the direct influence of Greece and Rome that is seen in the art of Gandhāra: Greek and Roman art traditions filtered in through many places like Parthia, Hatra, Dura-Europos, Palmyra, Pergamon, Persia etc. before they reached the North West of India. At each place the Graeco-Roman strain interacted with the school of art forms, retaining at times its own character, and at others became modified transforming and acquiring a different character.

Many a scholar talks about Greece and Rome as being synonymous in the context of Gandhāran art, for in sculpture, what is termed as Roman feature was virtually a descendent from Greek prototype. In any case during the period covered by Gandhāran sculpture, Greek art activity had almost ceased to exist in its own land but had been transmitted in various directions in different forms and contexts. Because of the close and unmistakable link between Greek and Roman art then, they are treated together in discussions of Gandhāra, and it is Graeco-Roman impact on the art of Gandhāra that is emphasized by nearly every scholar. This influence is reflected alike in themes, motifs, style and technique. One frequently sees, thus, Graeco-Roman figures like those at Atlas, Athena,


B. Banerjee, G.N., Hellenism in Ancient India, Delhi, 1961, p. 46.
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Homa, Zeus, and many marine deities in Gandhāra. The treatment of the human form in Gandhāra art at times is Greek, the drapery with its folds, texture and the mode of wearing it, is reminiscent of Graeco-Roman drapery. The treatment of the wavy hair or snail-shell curls is taken clearly from Greece/Rome.

Some of the Buddha figures from Gandhāra resemble the figure Apollo Belvedere. The himatia so prominently seen in Gandhāra is considered by some to be a Greek invention. The wreath motif, architectural motifs like Corinthian capitals and Ionic columns and acanthus leaves are Graeco-Roman in origin. One can even see derivations in compositions where scenes are placed within architectural settings of columns supporting an architrave, or in the symmetrical arrangement of the figures set against flat backgrounds. One notices marked similarity again in the manner in which figures are overlapped in Gandhāra art and in a Roman monument say, that of Ara Pacis.

Continuous narration was used on a limited scale in Gandhāra; it was the Roman method of showing separate scenes in successive panels which was more frequently adopted. The deep 'under cutting' illusionistic technique of Greece and
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Koroe is also seen in Gandhāra.

Some features like the leaf-and-dart motif, the rosettes, palm branches, pointed boots and tight-fitted trousers found in Gandhāra occur also in Palmyra and Hatra. The use of moulds and the colouring of stucco sculptures in Gandhāra is believed to be the result of the impact of a similar mode noticed in Alexandria, although no clear evidence exists to support this view.

Gandhāra and Persia became linked to each other from the 6th century B.C. and this relationship continued through the centuries of the Christian era. Under these conditions some parallels between the art of Gandhāra and Persia are to be expected. Thus one sees motifs like Indo-Persian pillars, winged animals, tunic, trousers, palmate and rosette etc. that bespeak of borrowings from Persia. It has been observed that the Achaemenians preferred profiles the Parthians frontal views and the Sassanians a combination of front and side views. In Gandhāra interestingly all these three views are seen.

Symmetry of composition, avoidance of empty spaces in the background, muslin and silk costumes with billowing folds and clinging draperies, ribbons fluttering over the haloes

1. Ingholt, *Palmyrene and Gandhāran Sculptures et al.*, pls. 6, 11, 17
are pointed out by Saras to be some of Sasanian features which
affected the art of Gandhāra.

Some similarities between Gandhāran and early Christian
art have also been observed because it was Graeco-Roman art
which provided the models both for early Christian art and
the Buddhist art of Gandhāra. Sometimes one finds striking
resemblance between Gandhāran art and early Christian art in
the types of figures, their stances, facial features, the mode
of wearing the drapery and treatment drapery folds.

Above all, it is the Indian core of Gandhāran art which
stands out. The Gandhāra school flourished on Indian soil,
Predominantly
the themes were Buddhist, and there is much in it that
remains core of the school is Indian even though affected
heavily by the art of many other countries.

Among the apparent Indian features noticeable in Gan-
dhāra are the dhoti, the turban, the top knots, some āsana
and mudrās, the lotus seat, marks on the Buddha's palm, and
sols, the lion throne, the svāstika, and lotus symbols izas
etc. Architectural motifs like the stupa, the apsidal hall,
the railing, torana, āmala, and pot-based pillars seen often
in Gandhāra sculpture are again dominantly Indian in content.
Most of these features occur in pre-Gandhāran Indian art and
they have continued into the art of India through the ages
even after the Gandhāran school of art had died out. These
features and motifs are thus so much identified with Indian
art and we know that it is very difficult to think of them
as coming from outside. In any case, it is difficult to postulate their derivation from a non-Indian source. When we see the use of these characteristics and motifs in the art of Gandhāra then, an art characterised by the presence of many foreign influences we recognize the presence of strong Indian element in the art of Gandhāra.

All of this coming together of strains, this medley of influences makes Gandhāra one of the most interesting of the styles in the range of Indian art. At no point is one allowed to forget the art of other countries, while looking at Gandhāra art and yet it is not always easy to disentangle one strand from the other, for the mixing is often subtle and elements not fused.

DEVELOPMENT AND CHRONOLOGY

The dating of Gandhāra sculptures continues to remain a virtually insoluble problem, despite the variety of suggestions and formulae put forth by different scholars from time to time. Some scholars place emphasis, sometimes unduly, on one feature or the other in the style or the technique of the sculptures in their attempt at establishing a chronological scheme but it does not always work. What is regarded often as a criterion, an index, thus, for the early dating of a group of sculptures turns up in works of decidedly later dates. Many scholars have tended to arrive at generalizations often quite beyond what is permitted by the evidence available. Stylistic development of Gandhāra sculptures thus remains a more or less open matter.
According to some scholars for instance, the large size of the Buddha images is indicative of late date. This thesis is arguable for definite evidence is lacking. Some scholars have argued that the Buddha images carved with both the shoulders covered are early; this is controverted whereas a by others who hold that the Buddha figures with only one shoulder covered are older. The thickness and thinness of the drapery, and the types of folds, the appearance of moustache and the depiction of different types of eyes have each been taken in turn, as throwing light on the chronology of the sculptures but unfortunately none of these 'systems' really works.

Sir John Marshall was of the view that the Jātaka stories occur in the earlier phases of Gandhāra works compared to the depiction of episodes from the present life of the
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Buddha. Even architectural motifs have not been left out while suggesting a date for the sculptures: thus, round pilasters are said to have been often depicted earlier than the flat pilasters; even feature like the oblong marking on the flat pilasters is considered to be evidence of a late date.

But a careful study of the works would reveal that some of the above-mentioned observations do not stand close scrutiny. For instance, in a relief, (No. 605 in the Chandigarh Museum) showing a number of seated Buddha figures some of the figures are shown with both the shoulders covered while others appear with only one shoulder covered. The simultaneous occurrence of both the modes of the covering of shoulders in the figure of the Buddha, in the very same panel, shows clearly that little significance can be attached to this feature in establishing a chronological sequence. Again, with regard to Marshall's suggestion we can examine the base of a miniature stupa found from Sikri. It is carved with a number of episodes in a series of compartments. In one compartment the 'Dīpāṅkara Jātaka' is shown and in the other compartments appear the episodes like the 'Meditation of the Buddha', 'Indra's Visit to the Buddha' etc. The suggestion therefore, that the Jātakas were carved earlier than the episodes from the life of Gautama Buddha becomes open to question.
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With regard to drapery folds two entirely different types of folds appear on the garment of one and the same seated Buddha figure from Butkara; the folds of the drapery covering the major part of the body are suggested with faintly incised lines, considerably separated from one another, but the same drapery while falling over the right leg is characterized by deep close-set undulating folds. Similarly, the emphasis laid by some scholars on the treatment of the hair for fixing the date of the sculptures is of questionable value. On occasions we see three different types of hair depicted in the figures on the same relief.

In one relief slab from Butkara two types of pilasters, round and flat are carved side by side, disprove the theory that appearance either of flat or of round pilasters can help in determining chronology. The oblong mark on flat pilasters likewise suggested as evidence of late date is seen on the Bimaran reliquary (rep. as Bl.V. Hallade, op.cit.) which is one of the earliest examples of Gandhāra work. Taking this mark to be an index of late time, therefore, seem to have ignored this well-known document.

All these that these examples show is that the chronology cannot and should not be based on such unconvincing
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and shaky grounds, and there is the need for great care in the matter of deciding upon chronological sequence on the basis of these and other features.

It is clear that the problem of establishing a chronology of Gandhāra sculptures is not a simple one. The difficulties are added to by several factors.

The absence of a reasonable number of dated or dateable sculptures is an obvious handicap. So far the number of dated sculptures found is very meagre indeed. Even the few dated sculptures are also not of much help, for the era given in the inscriptions are not always unspecified. According to different calculations the difference in the reckoning runs into centuries. Again even from the few well documented excavations no clear picture emerges. For example plate numbers 34 to 38 showing the figures of the Buddha, Bodhisattva and some female figures all excavated from Strata I of Shaikhan Dheri, but they do not share the same stylistic features. Similarly plate numbers 49, 50 and 51 showing Bodhisattva and Buddha figures—all coming from strata III of Chatpat they are not all alike with a result that a chronological index cannot be based on the styles of these sculptures even though they hail from the same strata. In the same manner sites like Bhirmound, Sirkhp, Shaikhan Dheri, Pushkalavati,
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Kapisi, Chatpat, Andan, Dheri, Bamboali, Bankot and Hanora where careful excavations were conducted do not help much in the matter of chronology. At any rate no clear picture emerged.

Under these circumstances it is possible, in the state of our present knowledge, one can only make an attempt to trace the stylistic development of Gandhara sculpture within a very broad framework.

Before going into tracing the development we have to be clear as to what do we mean by the Gandhara school of art. Do we mean the beginning of the artistic activity in the Gandhara region or the starting point wherefrom the Buddhist sculptures are evidenced on the soil of Gandhara? Understandably we mean the latter.

One begins from the negative evidence. The Gandhara school of Buddhist art had probably not come into being in the 1st century B.C., the terminal date for Bhismound in Takshasila for the site has yielded no Buddhist monuments whatsoever. From Pirkap too, the city which succeeded Bhismound as the capital of the region, no figure of the Buddha not even a fragment has been found.

The excavations conducted at Jhaikhan Dheri and nine other sites again have not yielded any Buddhist sculptures from a stratum datable to earlier than the 1st century A.D.

The inception of the school, it appears goes back to the Scythian period, between the 1st century B.C. and 1st century A.D. allowing for a margin of error. This conclusion is arrived at on the basis of the discovery of the so-called datable reliquary from Bimarān, bearing the carved image of the Buddha along with which a few coins of Azes I (1st century B.C.) were discovered.

There is another reliquary known as 'Kanishka's reliquary' which should be placed around the broadly accepted time of Kanishka, namely, Ist/2nd century A.D. Both these reliquaries contain figure sculptures of the Buddha giving us a rough stylistic index to the work of the time between the 1st century B.C. and the Ist/2nd century A.D. The Bimarān reliquary figures are possessed of a more 'foreign' air, visible in the swaying manner in which the Buddha stands and the way his drapery swirls; the figures represented in Kanishka's reliquary on the other hand appear more Indian in Character as seen through features like the iconography of the Buddha, Brahmā and Indra, their costumes, the frieze of geese and the top-knots of some of the erotes. This will possibly suggest that the development in style between the 1st century B.C. and the 1st/2nd century A.D. in Gandhāra was in terms of a gradual 'Indianization' of the stylistic features with some interim process of synthesis.

The nature of developments taking place in Gandhāran political and social life during these two or three centuries might justify, at a different level such a speculation. An idea of the conditions prevailing in Gandhara during the time that the Bimarān casket was presumably made can be formed. The Greeks, the Parthians and the Scythians had already entered the Gandhāra region. Under their influence art had an "alien" air and could hardly have come to terms with the local art, and is likely thus to have its own identity. It did not speak the native language yet. But this situation could not last too long. Art activity expanded, and different strains which were co-existing moved towards a process of synthesis, probably under the early Kushānas.

Gandhāra seems to have attained to its full development under Kanishka, the greatest of the Kushānas. Kanishka as we know was a great patron of learning. Literature, sculpture and architecture reached new heights under him. He is also believed to have convoked the great Buddhist Council in which manuscripts were collected and commentaries were prepared. Learned philosophers like Aśvaghosa, Pārāva and Vasumitra enjoyed the ruler's favour. Kanishka himself was presumably a Buddhist even though his coins with Greek, Sumerian, Persian and Indian deities depicted on them are a fair indication of his religious tolerance. His motive in formulating a tolerant religious policy was probably to be accepted by the people to be popular with them. Under this man, with a broad vision, whose empire
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extended far and wide and under whom trade and commerce flourished which not only brought wealth but new ideas too. Gandhāra was exposed to influences from the countries towards its west and from the vast region of India towards the East. Thus a coming together came about; different trends which were co-existing and had started mixing probably even before his time, now become synthesised. And, as time passed, Indian elements started playing a more vital role, the contact with India being very active.

In Kanishka's reliquary, apart from the Indian elements, visible are some features derived from Perso-Hellenic sources. These are reflected in the wreath motif, in Kanishka's clothes, in the nude erotes carrying garlands. Kanishka's reliquary may not be the best of examples showing a blending of styles, but its importance is underlined because of its being detectable. There are numerous other sculptures in which the blending is clear. Possibly these sculptures were produced during a period around the time of, or subsequent to the making of Kanishka's reliquary.

It is possible that the process of synthesis might have offered to the artists many opportunities for permitting permutations and combinations leading to a considerable variety in the sculptural output. The period of Kanishka, namely the end of the 1st century A.D./middle of the 2nd century A.D., could thus be regarded as the peak period in the development of Gandhāra art. At this time many artefacts had in some way or the other something new say, and in view of
possible competition, repetition or mechanical reproduction are likely to have been avoided. Then, once the standards were laid down, good work must have continued for some length of time after Kanishka, presumably through the beginning of the 3rd century till the time the Kushāṇas remained in power.

With the fall of the Kushāṇas the trade suffered, the importance of the land route became less compared to the trade through the western sea coast. It is possible that the flow of the ideas diminished, money became scarce, and the enthusiasm of the patrons dwindled. These conditions could have ushered in a period of decadence in which excellence departed, exhaustion came in, innovations ceased. In their conventionalization, monotony and a certain sterility set in. This could have been the period of haphazard regression.

This phase might have lasted from the 2nd quarter of the 3rd century into the 4th century A.D. During this period the making of the stone sculptures was on the decline, but activity did not necessarily come to a sudden halt with the coming of the Sasanians in the middle of the 3rd century A.D. as is believed by Marshall. At this juncture art probably began looking for new direction. And when it revived itself in a new form under the Kidara Kushāṇas; it was in a different material—stucco. The time of prolific production in stucco sculptures is the 4th and the 5th centuries A.D. and some moving works were turned out made in this medium.

The end of the stucco phase and the Gandhāra school in general is attributed to the invasion of the White Hūnas in the early 6th century A.D. After the Hūnas had devastated the Gandhāra region, some efforts were made to revive art; some monasteries and stūpas were restored, but life had departed from the art, as Hargreaves writes. In the 7th century A.D., a huge number of Buddhist monks left Gandhāra and took refuge in Kashmir. Apparently this amounted to a partial shifting of artistic activities. The introduction of stylistic trends of the Gandhāran art into Kashmir in the 7th century onwards, as evidenced by the discovery of many sculptures from Kashmir is another development. The situation now was somewhat similar to the one that obtained in Nepal with the migration of Pāls and Sans artistes to that country after the Islamic invasion in Bengal and Bihar.

The above outline may not be based on specific dated examples of art, will give us the following tentative scheme for the development of Gandhāran art. For the purposes of the present catalogue, it has been made the basis of the broad dating of the works according to phases.

First phase: The beginning work in the 1st century B.C.

Second phase: The transition from 1st century B.C. to 1st century A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third phase</td>
<td>Maturity and synthesis: from the end of 1st century A.D. to the middle of 2nd century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth phase</td>
<td>The continuation of the tradition: up to the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth phase</td>
<td>Decadence and retrogression: 3rd and 4th century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth phase</td>
<td>New trends with the emergence of stucco as the alternate material: 4th and 5th century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last phase</td>
<td>Termination of the style, and its partial transmission to Kashmir: 6th century onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>