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Editorial

This issue has eight articles. The first article by Sujata Gautam is about the painted rock shelters of Likhichhaj in the catchment area of river Asan, district Morena, Madhya Pradesh, India. It provides glimpses into the life of the pre-historic man in this area. The second article by Akash Srinivas is about cup marks found on a rock near Honnenahalli, Hirisave, district Hassan, southern Karnataka, India. This record is an effort to preserve the antiquities being lost in the process of modern developmental activities. The third article by Dhanushka Kumara Jayaratne gives the details of antiquities found around Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha, Wāyā Ulpatha GN Division, Palugaswewa DS division in North Central province of Sri Lanka. The finds cover the antiquities from pre-historic times to the early historic period. The fourth article by Rajesh Kumar Meena is about Bead making in Khambhat, Gujarat, India in present times. This ethno-archaeological study gives a glimpse into the working of ancient bead makers of this area. The fifth article by Vijay Kumar gives the catalogue of terracotta images and miscellaneous objects found from Kannauj city and surrounding areas, and at present kept in Kannauj Museum, Kannauj U.P. India. It gives the glimpses into the evolution of Indian culture from Iron Age to the early medieval period as revealed through terracotta art. The sixth article by Prof. Amar Singh gives the survey of the literature about Indian architecture. It traces the evolution of Indian Architecture from proto-historic period to the medieval times. The seventh article by Marcel Courthiade describes the history of Rroma from the invasion of Mahmud Ghazanavi to the medieval times. The linguistic study is a useful tool in working out the historical process of making of Rroma people. The eighth article by Asif Ali & Mohammad Saquib describes the Ghaziuddin complex which is the prime example of Mughal architecture of Aurangzeb’s reign. The different regional architectural styles were inspired by such later Mughal period buildings. This evolution finally culminated into Indo-Saracen style introduced by Britishers.

Vijay Kumar
Chief Editor
Indian Journal of Archaeology
The Rock-Shelters of *Likhichhaj*: An Analysis

*Dr. Sujata Gautam*

(Associate Professor)

Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology,
Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi

**Brief Introduction of the studied area:** The proposed area of painted rock-shelters lies on the bank of River Asan in Morena district of Chambal region (Madhya Pradesh) (Fig. 01).

![Fig. 01: Map of Madhya Pradesh](image)
The greater area which houses the rock-shelters on the both the bank of River Asan in the forest of Pahargarh in Morena district is known as Likhichhaj. The rock-shelters of Likhichhaj can be approached by road from Morena via Jora, Kailaras and Pahargarh. Covering a distance approximately 81 Km beyond Pahargarh. The distance between Pahargarh to rock-shelters can be covered by jeep because of unmetalled and uneven road, but last 5-7 km distance in forest can only be travelled by foot. Beyond Pahargarh the forest area begins and the area is covered with forests which has wild life. Since the Likhichhaj is covered with dense forest so it provides ideal shelters to dacoits and criminals of the surrounding area from police.

Three basic requirements for human existence: water, forest produces and game are easily available in this region which attracts primitive man in this particular area. Author's exploration was limited and the possibility of finding stone implements in the area is there but I didn’t get any stone tools from the surface of rock shelters. Shelters of Likhichhaj (Fig. 02) having paintings is the earliest centre of activities of early man. Rock-Shelters lie in the South-East of Pahargarh on the bank of river Asan and different seasonal nallah. The names of prominent rock-shelters of this area are as follows: (i) Likhichhaj, (ii) Narerachhaj, (iii) Bhaddechhaj, (iv) Naubta, (v) Pankha, (vi) Ranidaha, (vii) Varradaha, (viii) Kundighat, (ix) Charyeta, (x) Khajura, (xi) Chunewali, (xii) Siddawali, (xiii) Katavali, (xiv) Padkho, (xv) Hawamahal etc. because of the acquaintances of the local people with these rock-shelters the whole area is prominently known as Likhichhaj. The wall and ceilings of these rock-shelters are full of pictures.

Fig. 02: General View of Likhichhaj Rock Shelters

Role of painted rock-shelters in the writing of history of prehistory: Many researchers have made their contribution in the field of rock-art studies. Archibald Carlyle (1867-68) was the first
scholar who noticed paintings on the walls of the shelters of Sohagighat in Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh. After him so many scholars discovered painted rock shelters throughout the country and their contribution laid the foundation of rock-art study. But lot of work is yet to be done. In this continuation, I also did some exploration in Northern Madhya Pradesh. Here in this article I would like to discuss on the findings of my field work.

Though the painted rock-shelters have been found from various places in India but after the discovery of Bhimbetka (world Heritage Site) in 1957-58 by Prof. V.S. Wakankar, Madhya Pradesh, this field drew attention of other scholars also. Besides Bhimbetka, Adamgarh & Panchmarhi many painted rock-shelters found from the Northern part of Madhya Pradesh at Gwalior-Chambal region are also equally important. Some rock-shelters have been reported from Gupteshwar, Chudelchhaj, Babachhaj and Tikla in Gwalior district; Chudelon ka pahar, Karothra and Tunda Bharka-kho in Shivpuri district; Doobkund & Budera in Seopur District and the Pahargarh & surrounding area in Morena District. These rock-shelters have been the major source of painted records of the rock paintings. These shelters are the great art works which had been created by the early habitants of the region. The walls and the ceilings of the shelters are covered with paintings depicted wide range of subject expressed in a variety of style. Most of the paintings of rock-shelters have been drawn with thick brush. The colour is generally dark tan but some paintings are drawn in light red colour too in the studied area. The rich assemblages of paintings from the shelters of Likhichhaj throw sufficient light on the life of early man. Therefore the theme of paintings of Likhichhaj shall be classified into following types:

i. Hunting Gathering
ii. Cattle rearing and Domestication
iii. Dancers or Celebrations
iv. War scenes (early historical)

Hunting Gathering

Depiction of hunters & gatherer were the most common theme of rock-art. Numerous hunting scenes were noticed from the shelters of Likhichhaj. Animals were shown being hunted by a single hunter or by group of organised hunters. In one of the picture a group of hunters are shown proceedings for hunting wielding their weapons. In this image, weapons are hanging with stick on their shoulders. All the hunters wear headgears decorated with feathers, horns etc. probably as a camouflage (Fig. 03).
Archers are shown chasing or aiming the arrows with stretched bows at a running prey. Sometimes arrows are shown poised in mid-air or pointing towards the target. A group of archer and an archer is shown chasing or aiming the arrow with stretched bows pointing towards the target (Fig. 04 & 05). Spear holding hunters are throwing spear to the target (Fig. 06).
A group of fisherman are also shown here in one of the shelters. In this image, the hunter is carrying a fish hanging on the shoulder with a stick (Fig. 07). The way of carrying fish and weapons on the shoulders are similar to the present day practice.
The main economy of early men was hunting thus, animals that were eaten will find place again and again in the paintings of early men. Deer seems to have the most favourite animal among the other animals. Among the different species of deer Sambhar, Chital, Swamp deer, Chinkara are the commonly painted once in the shelters. A group of different species of deer are portrayed in a single line and moving from one place to other (Fig.07). A group of Swamp deer moving in a line are also displayed (Fig. 08).
In this scene an x-ray image of deer is shown and size of deer is bigger than other animals. In this image the stomach is filled with dotted double circular lines (Fig.09).

![Fig.09: Group of Swamp Deer](image)

From one of the shelter a panoramic view of wild life has been recorded. In this image different activities of man and animal have been painted. A group of five people without weapons are shown in motion, may be they are migrating from one place to other. Two hunters holding Celts are also displayed, both the hunters are shown moving in a same direction. May be one hunter is following the other hunter. Representation of water sources were found in the form of dotted lines in this area. Semi-circular dotted lines indicate the river or seasonal nallah. On the one side of river bank two animals are depicted in aggressive posture. One hunter carrying weapons is shown near the animal. He is ready to retaliate (Fig.10).

![Fig.10: Panoramic view of wild life](image)
Cattle rearing and Domestication: The scene of domestication was also found from one shelter of Likhichhaj. In this painting, group of animals have been shown inside the circle. This circle is the clear mark of cattle pen. This is very unique picture of domestication of animal during Mesolithic period. Some other animals are shown outside the cattle pen (Fig. 11).

In one shelter, a man is shown riding an animal. He is holding a trident like weapon in his right hand (Fig.12).
The rock art in *Chambal* region are particularly rich in paintings of men leading bulls. An elongated horned humped bull has also been painted in one rock shelter (Fig.13).

In one another rock painting a Bullock Cart has also been shown. In this image, two bulls are carrying a cart and a men stands in front of bulls (Fig.14).
Some Birds are also painted in some rock shelters. Here in the image of two birds (peacock) facing each other. One peacock holding a snake in its beak is shown (Fig. 15).

**Fig.15: Two Peacocks**

**Dancers or Celebrations:** A group of dancers has also been shown in one shelter. A group of nine dancers are shown in it. They are moving in a single line stepping forward and backward (Fig.16).

**Fig.16: A Group of Dancers**
A group of people (Man & women) are also depicted in one painting. In this painting, some people are dancing, a couple is seen playing with a child, the mother has raised her baby above her head and her husband is watching the scene. It represents the portrayal of a family in a rock painting (Fig.17).

**Fig.17: Panoramic view of dancers & playful activity of a family**

**War scenes (early historical):** In one painting, two elephant riders have been shown. It is overwritten with modern graffiti (Fig.18).

**Fig.18: Elephant Riders**
In another image, two warriors holding spears in their hands are standing on two different elephants and two warriors standing on the ground. They are being opposed by an archer and a sword wielding warrior. The whole picture reflects the war scene (Fig.19).

Fig.19: War Scene

This area was occupied by the primitive man from Mesolithic through Neolithic up to historical period. These paintings are rich in descriptive details. The predominant colour in the paintings is red with its variant shades. These paintings are the representation of the artistic activities of our ancestors. The motivation behind the artistic creation might simply be the visual expression of their thoughts. We see a natural and realistic depiction of the active animal hunters and their prey. The rock art will show the whole life of primitive man like their hunting technique, nomadic behaviour, daily challenges, domestication of animals and celebrations on festive occasions. The rich assemblage of wall paintings found from the shelters of Likhichhaj throw light on life of early man’s social activities, his achievements, his mental development and his sociological and religious ideas as well as his material achievements. Hunting & Dance scenes are very expressive and shows a sense of action & rhythm. The bodies of some of the animal figures are decorated with a checked or doted pattern. These painting as their written documents (Pictographs) in which they painted their lives.

References:
**Honnenahalli: A Note on a Recently Discovered Cupule site in South Karnataka**

**Akash Srinivas**

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Mohali – 140306

Email: akashs91@yahoo.co.in

In the fields adjoining the metalled road leading to the Nuggehalli temple, off the Mangalore-Bangalore Highway (NH 48) near Honnenahalli, Hirisave, Hassan district, southern Karnataka, a set of 31 cupules was noticed on an outcrop of granite (12.961° N; 76.549° E; 892m AMSL) (Fig. 1 & 2). The fields are currently used as pasture grounds by the migratory pastoralists, who graze their herds of goat and sheep here.

![Fig. 1: Location of the Honnenahalli cupule site](image-url)
Four patterns of arrangement of the cupules are noticed. The major pattern is the alignment of 20 cupules, as ten pairs of two cupules, as a parallel line running east-west. To the south of this parallel alignment, is a group of 6 cupules in a random pattern. To the north of the parallel alignment, is a set of 4 cupules, in a single line, running north-south (Fig. 3). One isolated cupule is noticed in the south-east corner of the outcrop. The cupules measure between 6-8cm in diameter.

Weathering of the granite outcrop, and its quarrying may have resulted in the loss of other cupules which might have been present here. More detailed investigations in the vicinity of the outcrop, to identify possible cultural material, is necessary before any postulations about this cupule site can be presented, but at present, this granite outcrop is currently marked, most probably for its excavation/quarrying to enable road widening activities, which may result its permanent elimination from the archaeological record.
Fig. 3: Plan of the cupules at the Honnenahalli cupule site
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Archaeological Landscape at Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha and its vicinity in Anuradhapura District of Sri Lanka

Dhanushka Kumara Jayaratne

Introduction

Present research has been carried out for a better understanding of the archaeological evidences spread in Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha Early Iron Age (EIA) burial site and its environs. The study area administratively located within Wäyä Ulpatha Grama Niladhari (GN) division in the Palugaswewa Divisional Secretariat (DS) of the Anuradhapura District in the North Central Province of Sri Lanka. Wäyä Ulpatha is also bordered by the Mathale District in the Central Province (Fig. 01). This research is an attempt to understand the nature of the archaeological evidences scattered in the study area. Preliminary investigations indicate that it has a high potential for further study on the spread of early settlement patterns in the study area. Approximately 1256 hectare physical area from the centre of the village had been surveyed for this purpose. The physical area for this research lying within 10km radius from the above-mentioned village forms a macro study area and area within 3km radius forms a micro-study area (Fig. 01). This demarcation was identified considering the natural boundaries of the site and distribution pattern of the archaeological materials obtained from the survey. The study area, in general, has a flat topography with an elevation ranging from about 140m at the Yän Oya banks to 340m at the top of the highest peak (Inamaluwa Range) in the Wäyä Ulpatha GN Division. Many tributaries originating from the small reservoirs scattered throughout the Palugaswewa DS Division, flow into the three major rivers, named the Kalā Oya, Malvatu Oya and Yän Oya. The three main river basins are separated by a ridge (elevated 150 m to 220 m) running in the South-North direction. The highest elevation is of 340m and the place is located at the south-west corner of the Palugaswewa DS area. The centre point of the research area the Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha is located in the upper part of the Malvatu Oya catchment area at an elevation of 160-340 m (Fig. 01).

Entire Sigiriya - Dambulla physical area was identified as a specific geographic macro zone for the development of ancient settlements. Seneviratne identifies this region as an Intermediate Transitional Eco-zone. As such, this region represents both wet and dry mixed climatic conditions. Archaeological evidences indicate this region as a sensitive eco-zone which was favourable for the ancient settlements in the Sigiriya - Dambulla region. Therefore, previous
researchers paid attention to sites such as Sigiriya, Dambulla, Potâna, Aligala, Pidurangala, and Ibbankatuva etc. Settlement Archaeology of the Sigiriya-Dambulla region (A project of the Postgraduate Institute of Archaeology) also attempted to understand the function of this region for the development of ancient settlements. However, they couldn’t archaeologically examine the entire upper Kalâ, Malvatu, and Yân Oya river basins at that time due to the lack of manpower and budget. As a result, they interpreted the ancient settlement distribution patterns of the region without studying Ihala Kalawellâ Ulpathera and its surrounding archaeological landscape. Therefore, one of the major efforts in this research is to uncover the ancient settlements located in this watershed area which feed by the upper Kalâ, Malvatu, and Yân Oya river basins.
Methodology

The current investigation involved locating archaeological sites and analysing spatial parameters of Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha cist burial site and its vicinity. The site was selected from the upper Malvatu Oya basin, which is located in the Sigiriya – Dambulla region and has been frequently used to interpret the Early Iron Age period of the island. A total of 30 Global Positioning System (GPS) locations of settlements were identified and raw material from sites were collected and analysed for the purposes mentioned earlier. All locations were analysed by the Geographic Information System (GIS) software to analyse spatial variations and locational significances. The collected locations were uploaded to the Arch. GIS 10.3 at the GIS laboratory in University of Peradeniya to handle spatial and geophysical data.

The field survey was the prime data retrieval method from the field. Two main exploration methods were used. First was remote sensing exploration. At the initial stage, the total space of the study area was explored by remote sensing techniques. Satellite images, one-inch maps and 1:50000 maps produced by the Survey Department of Sri Lanka were used for this purpose. Next was the field survey. Totally 1256ha physical area was surveyed in details. Eye observation was the key data retrieval method to examine the archaeological data from the field. In addition, scale drawings and digital camera photography were used to record sites in details. Furthermore, personal communication with the people who inhabited in the surrounding area was pivotal to retrieve information about ruins which were scattered in the thick jungle of the study area.

During analysis, standard artefact typologies and classifications were followed to identify artefacts and obtain relative dating. Ceramic and stone artefacts were highlighted in this regard. In addition, expertise knowledge was used in relevant fields for analysis and interpretations. The literature review also was done to study the settlement history of the entire region. Information uncovered from this approach was vital in the interpretative level of the evidences recovered from the present survey.

Results and Discussion: Present research is attempting to provide a clear picture of the distribution pattern of ancient settlement evidences in the micro study area. To achieve this, the writer synthesized data including collections of surface artefacts, visible architectural remains and other fragmentary evidences associated with the ancient settlements of the surveyed area. Field survey method is the primary exploration method in this study. The cultural landscape of the study area is recorded using the GPS Receiver. GIS is used as a primary analytical tool to evaluate and reconstruct the ancient settlement patterns in Wāyā Ulpatha and its environs. A geographic information system (GIS) is a computer system for capturing, storing, querying, analysing and
displaying geospatial data. In other words, GIS is a computer-based cartographical methodology to analyse spatial data. Various applications of GIS were used in this survey. A complex spatial database can be handled using GIS technology. In addition, GIS software is utilized to analyse, interpret or reconstruct the archaeological contexts through the multi-criteria decision-making model (MCDM), visual representations and thematic model making. GIS analysis of this research showed that there are two main G.P.S. location clusters on the map. Cluster one is located around the Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha EIA cemetery and cluster two is located quite closed to the Dambagollāgama reservoir (Fig.02).

Fig. 02: The map shows two settlement clusters recovered from the present survey

Settlement cluster one

This cluster located on the south-western side of the Wāyā Ulpatha village (Fig.02). According to the retrievable artefacts obtained from the survey, it can be concluded that the cluster one shows most ancient settlement evidences than the cluster two because this cluster contains some
prehistoric and EIA cist burial site with its adjoining settlement and other evidences from the historical period.

According to the history of research, the human history of the dry zone Sri Lanka can be traced back to the prehistoric period\(^7\). Settlement archaeology project of Sigiriya Dambulla region also mentioned that this region can be identified as a continuously attractive region from the prehistoric period to late historic periods\(^8\). Sites such as Potāna, Aligala and Sigiriya provide ample archaeological evidences of the prehistoric period\(^9\).

Present field survey also mentioned that Wāyā Ulpatha and its environs would be a continuously attractive region for ancient settlements. According to the survey, Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha and its vicinity suggested that it has a high potential for the study on prehistoric evidences in dry zone Sri Lanka. It can be proved through the evidences recovered from the areas such as Runigga and Tambahitiya Kanda hill range. In general, the present field survey provides relatively low prehistoric evidences in the study area. Thick vegetation cover and various natural and cultural formation processes of the study area reduce the visibility of the surface and displacement of tiny artefacts such as stone tools in the study area. However, quartz chip observed at Runigga (N 7° 58′ 36.91″ E 80° 40′ 15.49″, Elevation 715ft) area suggests that this region would be an ideal territory for prehistoric hunter-gatherers (Fig.03) In addition, availability of raw material for stone tools, flora, fauna, natural water sources and rocky outcrops of the Tambahitiya Kanda hill range would be an ideal habitat for the prehistoric hunter-gatherers. Present survey hints that series of further systemic field surveys need to uncover the prehistoric evidences in the micro study area. It will be utilized to understand the prehistoric background of the entire upper Kalā, Malvatu and Yān Oya basins as well as their outer peripheres.
According to the research history, entire Sigiriya – Dambulla region can be taken as a favourable region for early settlement developments\textsuperscript{10}. Apart from prehistoric evidences, the present survey represents plenty of evidences related to the EIA and later historical periods. Among them, \textit{Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha} Early Iron Age cist burial site is the remarkable archaeological site identified through the present field survey. Detailed description related to this EIA burial site can be summarized as follows,

\textbf{Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha Early Iron Age cist burial site}

Location: N 7° 58′ 28.09″ E 80° 39′ 58.81″

Elevation: 764ft

\textit{Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha} Cist burial site (N 7° 58′ 28.09″ E 80° 39′ 58.81″) is the centre point of the present research. Field observations suggest that there is a natural water source (\textit{Ulpatha} in Sinhala) called \textit{Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha} located quite closed to the cemetery. Therefore, this area is
locally named as *Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha*. This cemetery is located in the teak plantation block in the thick jungle approximately 3km distance from the *Wāyā Ulpatha* village. Cartographical and remote sensing studies in this research suggest that this burial site is located on the flat land of the foothill of the mountain called *Tambahitiya Kanda*. (Fig. 01)

Preliminary investigations on *Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha* EIA burial site has been carried out by the Central Cultural Fund (CCF) *Sigiriya* project between months October to December in 2010\(^1\). After that, they decided to excavate this burial site to obtain undisturbed stratified data. Excavations in the cemetery were conducted between months August to December in 2011\(^2\). Two cist chambers were excavated 4m × 4m in size. Context recording method was used as a basic data recording method and X, Y, Z recording with Mean Sea Level (MSL) also used for special detail recordings. Totally 34 beads, terracotta, Iron slag, one Iron plate and fragments of crucible were also uncovered\(^3\).

This excavation revealed a considerable amount of stratified undisturbed archaeological evidences. Wheel made Black and Red Ware (BRW) and Red Ware (RW) shreds and few pots were unearthed. Preliminary analyses on potsherds proved that majority of them belong to various types such as bowls, dishes, jars and pots\(^4\). Three charred samples obtained from these excavations mentioned that this site can be dated to the Early Iron Age period of the island according to the standard periodization. Two of the samples obtained from inside a Cist was dated to the 520 – 390 B.C. and 390 – 200 B.C. Next sample is obtained from the outside soil of the Cist dated to the time period between 360 – 270 B.C.\(^5\). These samples were dated by the *Beta Analytic* laboratory in the USA with 98% probability.

Geo-archaeological studies of this research proved that this EIA cemetery is located in the specific soil region. This area consists of erosional remnants, weathered rock with occasional rocky knobs (Fig.04). This deposit is formed by the weathering activities and surface rainfall runoff. The topography of the study area is affected by these processes. Investigations revealed that this soil is low in fertility and it is not favourable for agricultural activities. Remote sensing survey shows that *Tambahitiyā Kanda* hill range runs toward the North-South direction and it may be a natural boundary or a barrier to the EIA communities who inhabited this region. It can be concluded that they were attracted to above mentioned geomorphologic features of the land and they selected this place as their cemetery.

Geographical studies of this research also proved that this land is much higher in elevation than the other flat watershed areas of the micro study area. Sometimes they preferred the elevated area for their cemetery. It can be argued that they had some cognitive aspects in their minds such as idea about the sacred place or ancestral worship. On the other hand, it can also be argued that
they selected this place considering the flood pattern in the area. Because of the North – Eastern monsoon this region receives heavy rainfall every year. Every rainy in season, the seasonal stream called *Maha Eli* which flows across the micro study area is flooded. GIS analysis proved that the *Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha* cemetery is located in the most elevated (764 ft from the MSL) flat land in the micro study area. (Fig.01 and 04) This would be the reason to EIA communities to locate their cemetery in the foothill of *Tambahitiyā Kanda* to protect their ancestors‘ monuments from the flood.

Fig. 04: Micro soil variation and the scattering pattern of archaeological sites
Fig. 05: General view of the burial ground
Fig. 06: One of the largest capstones of the cemetery
Fig. 07: Site plan shows the distribution pattern of burial chambers
Investigations revealed that this EIA cemetery contains twenty-seven (27) Cist burials\(^{16}\). Field observations suggest that these burials are oriented in the North-South direction. Detailed drawings of the cemetery proved that some cist chambers are small and some are large in size\(^{17}\). These burials represent evidence that helps in the reconstruction of the material culture of the EIA people in this region\(^{18}\).

Numbers of archaeological site formation process can be seen on this site. It was observed that site formation process was highly affected by the burial chambers. For example, floral disturbances such as roots on the burial ground, algae and fungus activities in the burial chambers highly affected and changed its original conditions. Faunal disturbances such as rodents' activities in the soil, large animals' activities on the burial ground also changed the archaeological context of the site.

Aquatic disturbances such as surface rainfall runoff on the site during the North – Eastern monsoon also affects to displace the small artefacts. In addition, field observations attested that recent human activities on the site highly disturbed the burial chambers and displaced the tiny artefacts such as small potsherds, beads and other small artefacts to the greater distances from their original context. The activities of Illegal sands miners and treasure hunters' in the cemetery area are also important factors altering the original conditions. Therefore, in this research, an attention was given to understand the subsequent modifications of the site. This is pivotal to the interpretative of the condition of cemetery and its archaeological context.

**Stone slab quarry site**

**Location** N 7° 58′ 29.36″ E 80° 41′ 12.15″

**Elevation** 600ft

This site is located approximately 400 meters to the northeast of the burial site (Fig. 08). Several cut marks and some quarry activities can be observed on the boulders. These evidences proved that these rock boulders were used as a raw material for the stone slabs which were used to make orthostat and capstones of the Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha cist burial site.
Fig. 08: Boulder located near to the cemetery with cut marks

Two conical holes can be observed on the rock boulder. The treasure hunters disturbed one of these (Fig. 09). Another one is approximately 12 cm in width and 15 cm in depth in size. It can be surmised that locational distance of raw materials was important to the EIA communities making burial chambers. Sometimes these people tried to find raw materials situated nearby area for their burial chambers. This was affected by their contemporary socio-economic and technological dynamics. Cut marks related to the slab extraction activities on this boulder proved that this rock used as a raw material for the burial chambers at Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha cist burial site.
Apart from above-mentioned burial and quarry sites, the writer identified several sites which contained a large number of potsherds, conical holes and Iron slag. Scatter pattern of these sites is vital to reconstructing the adjoining settlements related to the Ihala Klawellā Ulpatha and Siyambalāweva cist burial sites. The numbers of the sites are given according to the field sessions and GIS database of the present field survey. Details related to these sites can be summarized as follows:

**Pottery site No. 01**
**Location N 7° 58′ 25.86″ E 80° 40′ 29.81″**
**Elevation 700ft**

This site is located approximately one kilometre to the east from the burial ground. This is an open-air site. Apart from potsherds, an ancient broken part of the bund of a tank was identified quite close to this site. This is a flat grassland at present. The fragments of red ware and black
ware were observed. Most of them were of very small size because of natural and cultural processes. Broken pottery rims were also found (Fig. 10).

![Fig. 10: Potsherds observed at pottery site No. 01](image)

**Pottery site No. 02**  
**Location** N 7° 58′ 32.95″ E 80° 40′ 28.56″  
**Elevation** 705ft

This site is also located on the eastern side of the burial ground. There is a tank named *Kalawellā Ulpatha* and this site is located near the north end of the dam. Red ware fragments are common.

**Conical hole site No. 01**  
**Location** N 7° 58′ 24.25″ E 80° 40′ 19.04″  
**Elevation** 705ft
Conical hole site No. 01 is located quite close to the Kalawellā Ulpatha tank’s south end. Two conical holes are still preserved on the boulder located near the dam. One is approximately 4cm x 8cm width and depth in size. Another one is approximately 10 cm x 16 cm in depth and width. Treasure hunter activities can be observed on this site. One conical hole on this boulder was blasted by the treasure seekers. Two blasting activities observed (Fig. 11 and 12).

Fig. 11: Conical hole observed near the Kalawellā Ulpata reservoir
Pottery site No. 03
Location N 7° 58′ 34.38” E 80° 40′ 30.40”
Elevation 680ft

This site is also located on the eastern side of the burial ground. This place is located near lower part of the Kawawellā Ulpatha tank at a distance of 500 m. Villagers mentioned that they practised Chena cultivation (Shifting Agriculture) in this area a few decades ago. They told that plenty of potsherds were unearthed at that time due to the cultivation activities (Personal Communication with Mr Rājakaruna at Wāyā Ulpatha). At present, this area is overgrown with scrub vegetation and is flooded annually. However, during the present survey, the writer could identify highly fragmented ancient potsherds. Most of them are red wares. The colour and texture of these has been considerably changed by the action of rain water.
Pottery site No. 04 with Iron slag
Location N 7° 58’ 34.03” E 80° 40’ 34.16”
Elevation 636ft

Pottery site No. 04 is located near the stream which flows across the study area. Some potsherds were deposited in the middle of this stream. It was observed that these potsherds moved to their present location due to rain water flow. Several rims and pottery pieces were found at the site. Most of these are red ware and a few are black ware. These shreds are highly weathered (Fig. 13). Apart from potsherds, Iron slag pieces were also found.

Fig. 13: Highly disturbed rim sherds observed at pottery site No. 04

Pottery site No. 05 with Iron slag
Location N 7° 58’ 46.26” E 80° 40’ 31.51”
Elevation 705ft
Pottery site No. 05 is located approximately 400 m distance from the pottery site no. 04. There were several types of thick decorated rims and pottery pieces at this place. BRW sheds are also available (Fig. 14).

![Pottery site No. 05](image)

**Fig. 14 – Iron smelting activities at site No. 05**

Pottery site No. 06
Location N 7° 58’ 41.69” E 80° 40’ 31.39”
Elevation 706ft
This site is also located on the eastern side of the burial ground at a distance of 500 m from the site no 05. Several types of rims and potsherds are available at this place. Most of these are decorated with incised designs (Fig. 15).

![Decorated potsherds observed at site No. 06](image)

**Fig. 15: Decorated potsherds observed at site No. 06**

**Pottery site No. 07**
**Location 7° 58′ 33.00″ E 80° 40′ 28.48″**
**Elevation 708ft**

Pottery site No. 07 is located at a distance of one-kilometre to the northeast of Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha burial ground. This area is named as Kalawellā Ulpatha Mukalana by the villagers. Several potsherds and rim were found from the surface. Most of them are red ware.

**Runiggala conical hole site**
**Location N 7° 58′ 36.91″ E 80° 40′ 15.49″**
Elevation 715ft
This site is located approximately 1km to the north-east of the burial site. It is a rock boulder line roughly 150 ft long. Several conical holes can be seen on this rock. However, unfortunately, treasure seekers have destroyed all of them. Five conical holes were blasted. Few potsherds can be seen around the boulder. Most of them are red ware. Rims are also available.

**Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha broken dam**
Location N 7˚ 58′ 21.50″ E 80˚ 39′ 59.12″
Elevation 715ft
This ruined tank located approximately 500 meters to the south of the burial ground. There is a huge partially broken dam. Remaining dam is roughly more than 30 meters in length and 3 meters in width and 10 meters in height. According to the villagers, this was one of the largest tanks located in the micro study area and this tank is spread over fifteen acres. The upper end of this tank goes back to the lower part of the Tambahitiya Kanda. At present, the scrub jungle has grown inside the abandoned tank area.

**Kalawellā Ulpatha reservoir**
Location N 7˚ 58′ 14.29″ E 80˚42′ 66″
Elevation 740ft
*Kalawellā Ulpatha* is a small rain-fed tank, located on the western side of *Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha* EIA cemetery at a distance of 0.5km. Several potsherds and few Iron slag pieces were observed during the survey. Adjoining archaeological deposits are highly disturbed due to the recent renovations of this tank. Few conical holes were seen on the boulder located near the western end of the tank. This reservoir was a part of an ancient cascade, which connected the other ancient tanks in this area.

**Wāyā Ulpatha reservoir**
Location N 7˚ 58′ 14.26″ E 80˚ 40′ 55.43″
Elevation 715ft
*Wāyā Ulpatha* reservoir is an ancient small rain-fed tank situated in the upper part of the *Malvatu Oya* basin. Recently renovations were done here. Few potsherds were found here during the survey.

**Veheragodella**
Location N 7˚ 58′ 12.83″ E 80˚ 40′ 48.74″
Elevation 715ft
Veheragodella, the temple mound is an archaeological site which has a Buddha image, a Stupa, few stone pillars, brickbats etc. This site is located in the jungle in the vicinity of the settlement cluster one (Fig. 02). Evidences at the site prove that there were a small size Stupa and a temple at Veheragodella in ancient times (Fig. 16 and 17). The architectural and morphological characteristics of artefacts show that this site probably belongs to the Anuradhapura period. Field observations suggest that the Buddha image of this place was approximately four feet high. However, at present, this place is highly disturbed by the treasure hunters. Quite closed to the broken image there is a small mound, roughly seven feet in diameter. It is the ancient Stupa of this place. There are no other architectural remains at this place related to this Stupa. The centre of this mound was dug by treasure hunters. It appears that this site is highly disturbed by the various cultural processes and the elements.

Fig. 16 - Broken Buddha image and other remains at Veheragodella
Settlement cluster two: The cluster two is located on the northern side of the Wāyā Ulpatha village (Fig. 02). This cluster belongs to the early historic period. The archaeological and architectural evidences at this place proved that there were a large monastic centre and its adjoining settlements here. Treasure hunters have already disturbed the archaeological remains in this cluster. According to the villagers, there was an ancient cascade system in this area. However, this system has now collapsed and only a few tanks can be seen in this area such as Siyambalâwewa, Dambagollâgama, and Bellankadawala. Flatland and fertile soil of this region would have been very suitable for the ancient settlements in this area in the ancient times. The description of sites belonging to the cluster two can be summarized as follows.

Dambagollagama ancient monastery
Location N 7° 59’ 49.29” 80° 40’ 53.49”
Elevation 600ft
Dambagollagama is a northern sector of the Wāyā Ulpatha village. Archaeological evidences at this place prove that this place was an ancient Buddhist monastic site. This place is highly disturbed by the treasure hunters. There are a few fragmented stone pillars in this place. The villagers found two metal lamps here. A high density of potsherds on the surface was seen here. A large number of decorated potsherds were also recovered.

**Dambgollāgama ancient monastery mound**  
**Location N 7° 59’ 54.64” 80° 40’ 55.63”**  
**Elevation 616ft**  
This is a small-scale mound located quite close to the above-mentioned site. Few fragments of small sized stone pillars were found during the survey. There are two pits located quite close to the pillars and two meter deep. This appears to be the work of treasure hunters. In addition, a large number of potsherds were also seen scattered on the surface of this mound.

**Dambgollāgama ancient potsherds**  
**Location N 7° 59’ 52.77” 80° 40’ 53.49”**  
**Elevation 614ft**  
The potsherds are scattered over the surface at the site. This site is located at a distance of 0.5km from the above mentioned monastic site. On the other hand, this site is quite close to the Dambagollāgama small reservoir. Various types of potsherds are available at this place. Most of them are Red Ware. A few BRW sherds were also found.

**Dambgollāgama reservoir**  
**Location N 07. 99852° E 080. 68212**  
**Elevation 605ft**  
*Dambagollāgama* tank is a partially ruined, small rain-fed tank located in the northern part of the Wāyā Ulpatha village. This is quite close to the Bellankadawala reservoir. This tank is connected to the Wāyā Ulpatha tank by a small channel. Highly fragmented potsherds can be seen in the vicinity of the tank.

**Dambgollāgama ancient settlement**  
**Location N 7° 59’ 56.93” 80° 41’ 07.80”**  
**Elevation 520ft**  
This ancient settlement site is situated few hundred meters below the above-mentioned reservoir. This may be an adjoining ancient settlement of this reservoir and above mentioned monastic site.
A large number of potsherds and Iron slag pieces were found at this site. These evidences proved that this site is an ancient Iron smelting place. (Fig. 18 and 19).

Fig. 18: Various types of rim sherds recovered from Dambagolla ganu
Fig. 19: Iron slag observed at Dambagollagama

_Dambgollagama _ancient brickbats

Location N 7° 59’ 58.31’ 80° 41’ 09.21”

Elevation 601ft

This site is located at considerable distance from the northern end of the Dambagollagama tank dam. At present, there are paddy fields in this area. A considerable amount of fragmented ancient bricks can be observed in this place (Fig. 20). Field observation reveal that there was an ancient brick building at this place. However, the use of this building is difficult to identify due to lack of archaeological evidences.
Fig. 20: Ancient brickbats observed at Dambagollāgama

_Ambawalawela quarry site_

Location N 7° 59’ 54.23“ 80° 40’ 53.49”
Elevation 625ft

This is an ancient stone pillar quarry site located approximately 0.5km distance from the Dambagollāgama reservoir. This may be a quarry for the above mentioned monastic site. There are several cut marks on the rock boulder which represents an ancient stone pillar extraction sites (Fig. 21).
Fig. 21: Cut marks on boulder at Ambawalawela quarry site

Wāyā Ulpatha pillar inscription
Location N 7° 59′ 13.71″ 80° 40′ 56.89″
Elevation 613ft

This inscription is the only lithic record observed during the present fieldwork. However, it should be noted that this inscription does not belong to the above mentioned settlement clusters. Because GPS readings mentioned that this lithic record is now placed in the middle of the present Wāyā Ulpatha village. (Fig. 22) There are some previous records about this pillar inscription. Both Paranavitana and Ranawella deciphered this inscription as ‘Viyaulpatha’ pillar inscription in their records²¹. This lithic record engraved on the four faces of a rough stone pillar which is lying on the present Wāyā Ulpatha temple premise. According to observations, this inscription is highly
disturbed due to various cultural and natural formation processes. At present this pillar inscription is broken in few parts and lies on the ground.

Fig. 22: Fragmented pillar inscription at present Wāyā Ulpatha temple premise

According to Paranavitana, the script in this inscription is Sinhalese of the ninth century. He mentioned that this inscription belongs to the reign of King Sena II (ca. 846 – 880 A.D.) and contained an edict issued by him to monastic dwelling called ‘Sāṅguna’ - Panhala. According to Paranavitana, text and translation of this pillar inscription is as follows,

Wāyā Ulpatha pillar inscription

1. Svasti isaSirisambay mapurumukā

2. Palamuvanehi Aṣelāva do –
3. – losvak davas vat – himiyan Mihi –

4. – ndal Mahapanan vajaleyn Sihigiri –

5. bima’aycu Sāṅgūna - Panhala’udad - vu’tak ta’

6. – (nat du) nu – ma (nفد)llan rat – ladu ……………

7. ….. (yan no – vadda’isa) …………………………..

8. ….. (no – vadda’isa) …………………………… a –

9. – vul no – karanu isa’vat himiyan mahāpāṇan vajaleyn

10. ā’mekāppar Kaṇṭhāni Ravaṇāḥi hāl – pasā’sam – jaryuva

11. ek - taṅk mete attaṇi - kanu hinduvmhay siddi (Paranavitana 1983)

Translation

Hail! on the twelfth day of the waning moon in the month of Āsela’ in the first year of His Majesty Sirisamboy whereas it was so decreed by His Highness Mihi – ndal Mahāpā [it is ordered] that dunumanḍullan and governors of districts ……. shall not enter ……. shall not enter …….. shall not create a disturbance to the lands belonging to Sāṅgūna - Panhala which is in the Sihigiri district. I, Kaṇṭhā and I Ravaṇā (both members of) the body-guard, who have come in accidence with the decree of His Highness the Mahāpā set up this attain pillar having had the gentlemen of the neighbourhood assembled together25.

Paranavitana noted that Sāṅgūna - Panhala, the monastic residence which was the object of the immunities granted by the edict, is not mentioned elsewhere. He believed that this institution was situated not far from the place where the inscription was found26. In this regard, it can be strongly noted that present field survey carried out in the micro study area provided two remarkable evidences related to the information given in the Wāyā Ulpatha pillar inscription. Two Buddhist holy places identified by the present field survey such as Veheragodella and Dambagollāgama (See above-mentioned details).

Elder persons in the village mentioned that this inscription was originally located near Dambagollāgama reservoir and later they took it to the present temple premise. (Personal Comm. with Mr Rajakaruna at Waya Ulpatha) On the other hand, Veheragodella site provides some ample evidences of an ancient Buddhist holy place. According to the architectural features at Veheragodella, history of this site probably traces back to the Anuradhapura period. (See above-mentioned details) Therefore, it can be presumed that the Wāyā Ulpatha pillar inscription probably
belongs to one of these two sites. However, this suggestion should be verified through future investigations. In addition, the manuscript noted that this area was named as *Sihigiri bima* at that time. *Sigiriya* rock located approximately six miles from the *Wâyâ Ulpatha* village. Therefore, Paranavitana believed that this area was an important place in the 9th century A.D.²⁷.

**Siyambalâwewa cist burial site**

**Location N 7° 58′ 39.44″ 80° 42′ 47.68″**

**Elevation 677ft**

This site is located approximately 500 m distance westwards from the *Dihampataha* in *Inâmaluva – Habarana* main road. However, according to the remote sensing analysis, this site does not belong to two above mentioned settlement clusters (Fig. 02). Observations proved that this is the closest EIA cist burial site to the *Ihala Kalawellâ Ulpatha* cemetery. This site is located quite close to the *Siyambalâwewa* reservoir. Nevertheless, observations proved that there are few cist chambers on the mound near the reservoir. They are highly disturbed due to various cultural and natural formation processes²⁸. At the time of the present survey carried out in the area the visibility of the site is highly reduced due to the thick cover of *Imperata cylindrical* (*Illuk* in Sinhala). This site is the second remarkable cist burial site observed during the present field survey. Therefore, locational significances of *Siyambalâwewa* cist burial site can be used for future investigations on EIA regional settlement distribution patterns in the entire region.

**Conclusions:** Total existing archaeological landscape as revealed by field survey, proved that there were several settlement phases. Morphological characteristics of the archaeological sites in the region show that some sites in cluster one are more familiar with the *Ihala Kalawellâ Ulpatha* EIA cemetery. Potsherds are vital in this regard. Because it can be observed that there is a similarity between potsherds recovered from the EIA cemetery and sites located in eastern and north-eastern parts of cluster one. According to the field observations, in general, it can be concluded that the majority of the sites recovered through the survey can be put to the EIA. Relative comparison between artefacts recovered from the burial site and settlement cluster one indicated similar morphological characteristics. These similarities in artefacts and spatial locations in both contexts proposed that the settlement cluster one would be the habitation of the *Ihala Kalawellâ Ulpatha* EIA burial site. However, it should be noted that present limited work is not enough to fully confirm this idea. Therefore, it can be proposed that more multidisciplinary archaeological investigations are needed to reinforce this theory.

Few sites such as sites located in the vicinity of *Dambagollâgama* reservoir, *Veheragodella* and *Wâyâ Ulpatha* pillar inscription can be put to the later historical periods. However, this should be
validated through further investigations. This dynamics indicates that this region was a continuous attractive region for early humans. They located their habitations from prehistoric to late historical periods. Physical and biotic environmental caring capacity of the study area would be a prime aspect of this continuous attraction.

Present surface survey at Ihala Kalawellā Ulpatha and its vicinity suggested that it has a high potential for study on prehistoric evidences in dry zone Sri Lanka. It can be proved through the evidences recovered from the areas such as Runiggala and Tambahitiya Kanda hill range. Availability of flora, fauna, natural water sources and rocky outcrops of the hill range would be an ideal habitat for the prehistoric hunter-gatherers of the region. Present survey hints that series of further systemic field surveys are needed to uncover the prehistoric remains in the study area. It should be used to understand the prehistoric background of the entire upper Kala, Malvatu and Yan Oya basins as well as their outer peripheries.

According to the evidences recovered through the present field survey, the study area was also attractive to the EIA and later historical periods. Two cist burial sites such as Ihala Klavellā Ulpatha and Siyambalāweva as well as their adjoining settlements proves that this fertile valley/ watershed was a core area for EIA settlement developments. According to the analysis, environmental background of the study area would be an ideal territory for the EIA people to practice their subsistence economies. This watershed area belongs to three main upper river basins such as Malvatu Oya, Kalā Oya and Yān Oya. This would be strategically more significant location to EIA people to connect with other contemporary adjoining EIA settlements which spread along the above mentioned three river basins. In addition to the above-mentioned evidences, plenty of later historical evidences was also found during the present field survey. These evidences are vital to future researchers who wish to follow the ancient settlement history in the region.
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Introduction:- The ethno-archaeological study of Khambhat bead making has been an attempt to record a wide set of data on this traditional specialized industry before it is completely transformed by technological change. In this paper I will focus only on the production of semiprecious stone beads, more commonly referred to as carnelian. Bead making was once quite common throughout the subcontinent and flourished in most regions where there was suitable raw material. At present, however, the town of Khambhat, Gujarat, is only remaining production center where this industry is still being carried out using traditional techniques. The city of Khambhat has a long history as a major port. Its importance has fluctuated with the periodic silting and clearing of the tidal channels that allow ships access into the gulf of Khambhat. From as early as the 10th century AD the channels had been clear and the city functioned as an important port till the 17th century when the approaches became too silted for large ships to dock. Carnelian beads were being produce and trade from various settlements in the region surrounding the Gulf of Khambhat from as early as the mid-third millennium BC, but it is not clear when carnelian bead manufacture became an important industry at the city of Khambhat itself. Excavation at the town of Nagara, some 3 km north of Khambhat, have revealed that carnelian beads were being manufactured there during 14th century. A single unfinished bead from period III can be dated to the early centuries of the Christian Era and some of the beads from period I and II (6th and 5th centuries BC) may have been broken in manufacture. While these few examples do not indicate a large-scale production of carnelian beads, they do suggest that some manufacture was going in a town close to Khambhat from many centuries.

I visited Khambhat with my friends Carla Lencelotty, University of Cambridge, UK and Hitoshi Endo, Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto (Japan). In Khambhat we meet Anwar Hussain. His family has been in this trade for at least 200 years, since Anwar great grandfather’s
father, Faisal Bhai, who started the workshop. Then his great grandfather, Chan Bhai, then his grandfather, Lal Bhai and finally his father, Inayat Hussain have all worked stones. Both Anwar’s father and Anwar himself have won national awards for making stone beads. He explained and showed all the different raw materials he is working upon. It is mainly carnelian and agate but he works with other stones. These are as follows:

- Blood stone
- Rose quartz
- Fossils stone
- Moss agate
- Jasper
- Black and dark grey agate
- Green and white striate agate
- Yellow agate
- Banded jasper
- Fancy agate
- Amethyst

**Raw materials and source areas**

Raw materials used is semi-precious stone mainly agate, found in the rich geological deposits of Baluchistan and Gujarat. The deposits of Gujarat are particularly important because of the high saturation of iron minerals in the agates. Mining in Gujarat is controlled by state contractor who usually hires labors from the local Bhil tribal communities. During the dry seasons of the pre and post-monsoon, men, women and children, using simple tools, mine the agates by digging tunnel into the Miocene agate conglomerates of the Babaguru Formation. The nodules are collected at loading points or stockpiled in local villages where the contractors sell them to middlemen or merchants from Khambhat.

**Raw material price**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian</td>
<td>2500 Rs per 45 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratanpur agate</td>
<td>1500-2500 Rs per 45 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other agate</td>
<td>15-20 Rs per kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose quartz</td>
<td>80-90 Rs per kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the material he can get 4-6 beads per kg.

Anwar Hussain follows the different stages for making the semi-precious stone beads.
First- Drying of raw material
After the nodules are brought to Khambhat they are dried in the sun to remove the moisture that is trapped inside the rock. This is usually carried out for two to three month beginning in March, and large stockpiles of drying nodules are located next to the habitation or workshop of the merchant where they can be easily monitored. Special quality raw materials are laid out to dry on rooftops or enclosed courtyards where no pilferage is possible. In the context of large scale production, considerable quantities of lower quality and some potentially good quality raw nodules become scattered and lost in drains, or get imbedded in the soil of the courtyard or alley ways, particularly along the edges of the unpaved streets (Fig. 01).

Fig. 01: Drying of raw material

Second- Heating of raw material
When the nodules have been thoroughly sun dried they are baked in terracotta vessels or simple pit kilns to remove any remaining moisture, making the rock more homogeneous and easier to flake. A nodule that is not heated tends to fracture irregularly, while one that has been properly heated can be flaked in a controlled and efficient manner that conserves the valuable raw material. In the large workshop heating is carried out in permanent kiln structures, while in small scale workshop temporary kilns are constructed from available broken bricks and rubble.
Though miscalculations of heating and the presence of flaws in the nodules, there is significant breakage during the heating process. Numerous spelled and broken nodules become accumulated in the ash of the kilns, scattered on the floor or ground around the kiln area or around the entrance way to the kilns. The quality of those spelled fragment and their association with more permanent structures can definitely be associated with large scale production and the long term stability of the industry (Fig. 02).

Fig. 02: Heating process of raw material (A-B)
Third - Sawing

In order to conserve valuable raw material large nodules are often sawn before or after the initial chipping. The traditional method of swing involves a hand drawn saw with a copper or iron blade and an abrasive made from emery. This technique has been documented at Harappan site for making long carnelian beads. It takes three to four hours of sawing by hand to cut through a small nodule. Modern sawing is done with electric powered circular blades and, though the process is much faster, there is considerable breakage due to the vibration of the blade. The sawing process is quite easily documented through the careful examination of flake that are removed after the nodule is sawn or from actual sawn block lets (Fig. 03).

Fourth - First Chipping

Once the agate nodule has been heated it is chipped into one or more bead rough outs. Chipping or flaking of the nodules is carried out using a technique that unique to South Asia, called inverse indirect percussion. A pointed iron stake is stuck in the ground and nodule is chipped by resting it against the point and striking it with a hammer made of hard-wood or buffalo horn. This technique appears to have been developed in Prehistoric time. During the Harappan period, before the introduction of iron, a copper stake would have been used.
The scatter of flaking debris resulting from the technique is quite distinctive and, if the flaking area is left undisturbed, it would be identifiable archaeologically. Typologically the flakes themselves would vary depending on the type of beads being manufactured, but overall patterns of large and small and micro flakes would remain unchanged (Fig. 04).

![Image](image_url)

**Fig. 04: Process of first chipping**

**Five-Second chipping**

First he changes the pointed iron stick for one that has a finer point, then with a smaller hammer he starts smoothing down the sharp edges of the bead. He is using very precise but gentle hammering. The debris of the activity is decreasing in size from the very big pieces of the first stage to very tiny fragments. The material is slowly taking its final shape with fatter central part and thinner ends. Even though its shape is still angular it can be guessed what it’s going to become of it. The debris is collected and used to prepare smaller beads.

Endo explained to us that this method is not really similar to the one used in Harappan times because here the bead is worked hammering from two different and opposite directions (bi-polar technique?) while the Harappan worked them by applying pressure only on one side and always from the same direction (Fig. 05).
Six- Grinding

Before the introduction of electrically powered emery wheels the bead rough out was ground and shaped on a hard sandstone or quartzite grinding stone. Different shapes of grinding stones must be used to shape different varieties of beads and they would provide an important archaeological indicator for bead grinding. The dust from bead grinding would also be an important indicator, as long as it was not removed for use as an abrasive in sawing or polishing. Very few ground beads would be lost through hand – grinding techniques, though there would be some breakage due to improper pressure or flaws in the bead rough out.

In the recent past, special grooved stone were used to grind and shape small round beads. The bead was secured in a wooden vise that could be held in both hands, allowing greater pressure to be exerted on the stone. Hand grinding without the use of a vise is very time consuming and experimental studies show that it would take four days in which grinding process can be completed. The modern electrically powered wheels make it possible to shape the same bead in four or five minute (Fig. 06).
Seven- Polishing
This stage is composed of two different parts: first there is the proper polishing and then a shining. The same machine as for rounding is used for both, he just changes the disks. For polishing he uses a disk called chaqmak which is made of mixed soil and flint and has a very fine matter. When the disk is not polishing well he takes some charcoal, dip it in water and spread it on the disk and then he grind a bit of brick on the disk stone.
The second stage is made by using a woollen (?) disk while a paste made by stone powder and water is spread on the disk. This powder is called vari and is the same from every kind of stone but, depending on the quality of the shining wanted it can be white, pink or green (low to high quality) (Fig. 07).
Eight- Drilling

The drilling is done outside Khambhat by villagers who sit near their fields and work. We went to see the drilling process in a village called Nagar at 8 km from Khambhat (locality Koteshwar Mahadeo) to a man called Pratap Bhai.

In Khambhat, the drilling of hard stone such as carnelian and other agate is traditionally done with diamond tipped drills. Two varieties of tipped drills are used in the drilling of a shallow depression to center the second drill, or sayedi. The sayedi has two tiny rounded diamonds set at the edges of the tip and is used for the actual perforation process. The bead to be drilled is held in a wooden vise, and after drilling half way through it is turned over and drilled from the opposite side. Using these two drills, a small bead that is only one centimeter long can be drilled in less than minute, including the time it takes to turn it over and drill from the opposite side.

The drill tip is cooled by a very ingenious contraption consisting of a small pot filled with water set on a tripod in front of the vise. The pot has a hole in the side and a long wire is set into the hole by wrapping the end with cotton thread. The water in the pot seeps through the thread and runs down the wire to drip on the bead where the drill is turning. This cools the bead and drill, and also helps to wash out the agate powder produced in the drilling process. The water and powder is collected in a bowl beneath the bead and then recycled into the pot that is set on top of the tripod. At the end of the day, the agate powder (vari) is removed and stored until sufficient quantities have accumulated. The vari is then sold to bead polishers for use in the final stage of polishing. Very little archaeological evidence is left from the modern bead drilling process. The miniscule diamond chips are unlikely to be recovered even by water sieving and the powder from drilling is collected and sold to the bead polishers. The only non-perishable objects would be the metal drill bits and the vessels used to hold the cooling water.

Diamonds were not used during earlier prehistoric times; rather beads were drilled using various type of mottled green jasper. The Neolithic and Chalcolithic artisans of Baluchistan, and the Greater Indus Valley were familiar with the properties of this stone and were able to drill very long beads with tiny stone drills. Experiments using various qualities of green jasper suggest that drilling was the most time-consuming process of the ancient beads industry. Depending on the specific variety of jasper used for the drill and the nature of the agate itself, it would have taken two to ten hours to drill one centimeter of agate. This estimate does not include the time required to manufacture and replace broken drills (Fig. 08).
Nine- Secondary heating

At evening time started the secondary heating process for making the carnelian beads. First he took some unfired beads to the workshop. Here Anwar Bhai started building a small kiln by placing the pot in which he will be firing the beads at the center of a small structure made by 3 courses of bricks and carefully measuring the distance of the pot from the walls with a stick. Then he filled half of the pot with rice husk ash (sample taken) derived from previous firings. He puts the bead in the pot and covers them again with ash. This is for controlling the temperature inside the pot and particularly to avoid the rapid cooling which breaks the beads. Then he fills the kiln with wood powder (composed of different types of wood but always the same composition because it comes from a furniture factory where the same types of woods are used) and on top of that he puts whatever fuel he finds around: small pieces of wood, bamboos, garbage etc. After that he lights the fire twice and when the flames have extinguished he cover the kiln and leave it overnight.

The difference between wood powder and rice husk is in the temperature reached: wood powder reaches 700-800°C, rice husk only 200-300°C. They usually use rice husk to fire the nodules of Ratanpur agate which is very hard to work otherwise and wood powder to fire the finished beads.
Early in the morning we went to take the small pots with the bead out of the kiln. All the wood powder was gone and the pot was visible among the ash (this ash will be used to put in the next pot of beads). The kiln was smoking and hot. We took the pot out and left it to cool down. We went back around one hour later and the beads were ready, some darker, some lighter. The colour depends on the temperature that is reached inside the kiln (Fig. 09).

**Fig. 09: Final heating make for carnelian**

**Conclusion:** The ethno-archeological study of carnelian bead making in Khambhat has provide an entirely new perspective on the study of specialized craft in the prehistoric period. On the basis of this research it is possible to develop more precise method of excavation and analysis. In conclusion it is necessary to point out that the Khambhat bead project is only in its initial stages and that many new forms of information are expected we continue in the analysis and interpretation of the vast amount of data been collected.
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Introduction:

At the behest of Prof. Amar Singh in 2018, the author visited Government Archaeological Museum, Kannauj, district Kannauj, U.P. (India) to study its antiquities. The museum has a very rich collection of terracotta coins and sculptures. Shri. Deepak Kumar, curator of the museum extended his support in photographing the antiquities. His staff members Mrs. Deepshikha, gallery assistant; Mr. Pradeep Kumar, gallery attendant; Mr. Shyam Kumar, museum employee; Mr. Dinesh Chauhan, museum employee extended their full co-operation in the painstaking task of lifting the antiquities, bringing these to the balcony and taking it back after the photography.

Kannauj is the headquarters of the district of the same name. It lies on the latitude 27°3’ N and longitude 89°59’ E on the right bank of river Ganga. The Kannauj district was split from district Farrukhabad on September 18th, 1997 and is part of Kanpur division. District is bounded by the district Farrukhabad in the north, district Hardoi in the south-east, Kanpur Nagar in the east, Kanpur Dehat in the south-east, Auriya in the south, Etawah in the south-west and Mainpuri in the west. The district is divide into three tehsils namely Kannauj, Chhibramau and Tirwa. It has seven development blocks namely Chhibramau, Haseran, Jalalabad, Kannauj, Saurikh, Talgram and Umarda. City of Kannauj has a population of 84,862 and the district has a population of 1,658,005 (according to 2011 census). The district has a population density of 792 inhabitants per square km. Its population growth rate over the decade 2001-11 was 19.37 person. It has nine Police Stations namely Chhibramau, Gurusahaiganj, Indergarh, Kannauj, Saurikh, Talgram, Thathia, Tirwa and Vishungarh. Ganga is the main river of the district and runs along the north-eastern border. River Kali runs along northern border of the district and river Isan flows through the district in the middle. In the southern part of the district flow two rivers @ Arind and Pandu. The climate of the district is characterized by a hot dry summer and a pleasant cold season. The average rainfall of the district is approximately 87 cm.
History of the Museum: The present day museum got its shape through invaluable contributions from different enthusiastic citizens, historians and archaeologists. The account of the antiquities will not be completed unless the history of museum itself is described. In 1955, Kannauj Vikas Sangha was created at the suggestion of Shri. K. M. Munshi then Governor of Uttar Pradesh. On 18th October 1955, he inaugurated the excavations at Jaichand ka Tila, Kannauj. The excavations was done by Shri. K. K. Sinha, Excavation branch, Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and a report was published in Indian Archaeology: A Review- 1955-61.
Fig. No. 02: K.M. Munshi, then Governor, U.P.
After this excavations, Lala Shyam Lal Guptā, Shri. Kalicharan Tandon, Shri. Mahendra Nath Mishra and many other enthusiastic citizens of Kannauj, U.P. started the work of making the museum. Kannauj Puratana Utthana Samiti also worked in this direction.

The first Kannauj Mahotsava was organized under the leadership of Shyam Lal Guptā. A major turning point was 1972 when Dr. Gopal Krishna Agnihotri was posted as Medical Officer of Kannauj hospital. The team of Dr. Agnihotri, Dr. Hari Mohan Tiwari and Dr. Shyam Bihari Sharma started collecting sculptures & architectural pieces and terracotta & other antiquities.
A temporary museum was started in the campus of the hospital. Shri. Vidya Shankar @ Sardar Mishra, a resident of Kannauj, was a dedicated explorer of archaeological antiquities. The above team guided by Vidya Shankar @ Sardar Mishra searched for antiquities from the mounds of Kannauj. In 1974, the remains of a Viṣṇu temple were found at Mausampur mound, Kannauj. Dr. Agnihotri brought this fact to the notice of then District Magistrate Shri. G. Ganeśa. On his request, Shri. Jagdish Sahai Nigam, Dy. Superintendent, Archaeological Survey of India and Dr. Kailash Chandra Ojha, Director, State Archaeological Department visited this place in October-November, 1974. They recommended the establishment of a museum. After this the antiquities collected by Dr. Agnihotri, Shri. Sharma and Shri. Mishra were displayed in the office of ASI. These antiquities were classified by Mr. Hemraj of State Archaeological Department, Uttar Pradesh. In February 1975, Prof. Krishna Dutt Bajpai, Head of Department, Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Sagar University, district Sagar, Madhya Pradesh and Dr. Hariharnath Tandon, Department of Hindi, St. John’s College, Agra, Uttar Pradesh also visited this museum. During the visit Krishna Dutt Bajpai met Dr. Harihar Nath Tandon. The memorandum for museum committee was drafted. Krishna Dutt Bajpai off and on kept on visiting Kannauj.
Fig. No. 05: Prof. K. D. Bajpai speaking at Kannauj Mahotsava organized by Kannauj museum with Shri. Hajarimal Bathiya (on his left), Shri. Kshemachandra ‘Suman’ and Shri. Kalicharan Tandon (as you move from left to right on his right side)

On 25th February, 1975 museum committee was registered under the Chairmanship of Shri. Narendra Nath Tandon. At that time, D.M. Farrukhabad was also made a member of this committee. Director, State museum, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh and Director, State Archaeological Department, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh made ex-officio members of this committee. Around that time, Dr. Shiva Swaroop Dubey gave two rooms for the museum in Pt. Sundar Lal Memorial Degree College, district Kannauj, Uttar Pradesh. On 18th March 1975, the residents of Kannauj, Dr. Agnihotri presented the outline of the museum in a meeting preceded by G. Ganeśa then District Magistrate of district Farrukhabad. On the appeal of District Magistrate many residents gave archaeological antiquities and money for the museum. Shri. Hemchand Guptā gave three idols to the museum. Many people from Kannauj joined the museum committee. On 24th March 1975, Dr. Nilkantha Purushottam Joshi, Director, State Museum, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, Dr. Arvind Kumar Srivastava & Shri. Virendra Kumar Srivastava visited museum and classified the antiquities kept in it. After sometime Muni Singh came to see the museum and helped in decorating it. On 8th July 1975, D.M. Farrukhabad Shri. G. Ganeśa became the President of this museum at the request of Narendra
Nath Tandon, ex-president of the museum. He choose Sri. Prem Narayan Awasthi as vice-president, Vidya Shankar @ Sardar Mishra, Gopal Krishna Agnihotri as Mantri, Shyam Bihari Sharma as Patron and Hemchand Guptā as treasurer. On 17th September 1975, Dr. M. Chenna Reddy then Governor of U.P. inaugurated the new museum. This museum became the member of the Council of Indian Museums. In 1978, the book ‘Kannauj: Purātattva aur Kala’ edited by Dr. Pratap Narayan Tandon was published by Kannauj museum, district Kannauj, Uttar Pradesh. Shri. Satish Chandra Kaala ji also visited the museum.

Fig. No. 06: Dr. G. K. Agnihotri showing antiquities to of Kannauj museum to Dr. M. Chenna Reddy (1975)
Fig. No. 07: Dr. M. Chenna Reddy with G. K. Agnihotri (standing in front of Police Officer), Pratap Narayan Tandon (standing to the right of G. K. Agnihotri) & Prakash Kapoor (standing to the right of Tandon) at Kannauj Museum (1975)
Fig. No. 08: Satish Chandra Kaala in a function at Kannauj

Fig. No. 09: Agnihotri ji explaining the antiquities of Kannauj museum to the scholars and between Agnihotri and the lady stands Ramesh Tiwari @ Viram.
Terracotta Images and other Objects kept in Kannauj Museum

The terracotta objects found in Kannauj give a fair idea about changing religious belief of the people. In addition to that the toys, the t.c. discs used in hop-scotch and jump, decorative items like t.c. bells, images of mother and child, images of warriors, dancers, ladies etc. have also been found in large numbers. These give a fair idea about day to day life of the ancient people.

The images of Gajalakśmī of Śunga period found from different places in Kannauj indicate that during Śunga period, goddess Lakśmī was independently worshipped as the goddess of prosperity.

Fig. No. 10: Śunga Gajalakśmī
People started making the images of Ganeśa in early Guptā period. These images are simple and stylized. Later images of Ganeśa become complex and the iconography also becomes elaborate as shown in the following figures.

The Buddhist God Kuber who is shown with independently as well as with goddess Hariti earlier is shown as independent god during Guptā period. His iconography follows the figures of Kuśana Kuber. In the following figure,
Hanumān is defied and his independent image as a God is first made during later Guptā period as the following t.c. head of the deity shows.

Fig. No. 13: Hanumān

The iconography of Viṣṇu becomes more elaborate in later Guptā period as the following three images of Viṣṇu found from Kannauj show.

Fig. No. 14: Evolution of Viṣṇu image (All four images are from Kannauj)
Mahisāsuramardini images which first appeared during Kuṣana period evolve. Kuṣana Mahisāsuramardini lifts Mahisāsura in the air and slays him but in the following Guptā image, she has thrown the demon on the ground, pressing him with her right foot and piercing him with her trident.

Snake, the folk deity is worshipped in the form of hooded anthropomorphic figures with snake hoods. During Mauryan period, the figures of Mansa, the goddess of snakes were worshipped. But during early Guptā period, snake hooded deity is worshipped by the people.
Naigameśa, the special deity of children which appears in Jain myths as a god transferring the embryo of Mahāvīra to the womb of Triśalā catches the imagination of common people. A large number of the terracotta images of Naigameśa and Naigameśī were found from Kannauj indicating that during Guptā period their cult became very popular. Earlier the deity was animal headed but later it became human and the iconography also evolved from simple clothes to more elaborate clothes and ornaments. The images of these deities have a holed lug at the top of the image. It appears that their images were either hung from a peg with the help of a chord or these were fixed into the wall by driving a nail through a hole/ holes in the lug/ lugs. Naigameśa cult fades out as we find almost no Naigameśa images during early and later medieval periods.

A large head of Shiva having a crimson red slip was also found from Kannauj. It appears that people were worshipping the terracotta image of Shiva placed in a temple (Fig. No. 435).

A large variety of t.c. toys were made for the children. The toys like elephant, elephant rider, horse, horse riders, bulls, ram, boar, crocodile, birds, ducks etc. were found in large numbers from Kannauj. Some scholars have advanced a theory that these represents pieces of Chess doesn’t appear to be plausible because in addition to horses and elephants we find the images of bulls, ram, boar, crocodile, birds, ducks etc. which can’t be the pieces of chess. These are of the same size as the horse and elephant riders.

---

Fig. No. 17: Evolution of the images of Naigameśa & Naigameśī

A large variety of t.c. toys were made for the children. The toys like elephant, elephant rider, horse, horse riders, bulls, ram, boar, crocodile, birds, ducks etc. were found in large numbers from Kannauj. Some scholars have advanced a theory that these represents pieces of Chess doesn’t appear to be plausible because in addition to horses and elephants we find the images of bulls, ram, boar, crocodile, birds, ducks etc. which can’t be the pieces of chess. These are of the same size as the horse and elephant riders.
The figures of mother and child may be toys or cult figures kept in the houses for well-being of mothers and their children. Similarly, the couple standing in close proximity or in amorous pose may be auspicious images kept in the house to promote the conjugal bond and happiness in the family. The figures of warrior wielding a sword are found in large numbers which probably served the purpose a toy or decorative piece.
One terracotta sealing which mentions the name of a local ruler Rajagupta proves that during later Guptā period before Maukharis, some less important Guptā rulers reigned in Kannauj.
The seals of *Avantivarman* was first read by K. K. Thaplyal. He concludes that this seal belong to *Avantivarman* and proves that the administrative headquarter of his line of Kings was Kannauj.

![Seal of Avantivarman from Kannauj](image)

**Fig. No. 23: Seal of Avantivarman from Kannauj**

The terracotta stamps were used for printing designs from clothes. Terracotta bells were used for decorating houses and doors. The circular discs decorated with different designs were used by the children in the play of hop-scotch and jump. The children also played with terracotta marbles like modern days.
Thirty eight sealings of 9th century A.D. bearing Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah” were recovered from different places of Kannauj city (Fig. No’s. 666-703). One stone image of Buddha (Accession no. 198) dated 9th century having the same Buddhist formula was also found from Kannauj, U.P. It appears that Buddhism was doing well after it got shot in arm by Harshavardhana in 7th century A.D.

Following is the description of Terracotta images and other objects kept in Kannauj museum.
Pre-Mauryan T.C. Images:

1. The accession number of terracotta is 86/918. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Pre-Mauryan period. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mother goddess is wearing a girdle and a long har, both decorated with incised designs. She is wearing a necklace decorated with three tiers of circular holes. The face is crudely made. The eyes are shown by two horizontal incisions. The image is flatly modelled.
2. The accession number of terracotta is 75/731. It is an archaic terracotta. It is of Pre-Mauryan period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 29: Archaic Terracotta
Mauryan T.C. Images:

3. The accession number of terracotta is 83/860. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Mauryan period. The size of the antiquity is 21x10.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The standing mother goddess has got very broad girdled pelvic bone. She is also wearing large stanhār, graiveyak and anklets. Her face is modelled very crudely. The image is flattish.
4. The accession number of terracotta is 75/508. It is the image of animal headed male deity. It is of *Mauryan* period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannaui*. The deity is raising both hands. The face is also raised upward. It is wearing two thick round bands.

Fig. No. 31: Animal headed Male deity
5. The accession number of terracotta is 83/862. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Mauryan period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mother goddess has got a closely fitting necklace. Her eyes are oval and having a hole in the middle.
6. The accession number of terracotta is 80/781. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Mauryan period. The size of the antiquity is 14x67 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She has anthropomorphic head. She is also wearing large ear ornaments. Her hands are broken.
Śunga T.C. Images:

![Fig. No. 34: Gajalakšmī](image)

7. The accession number of terracotta is 80/140. It is the image of Gajalakšmī. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 15.5x5.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. In this goddess is holding two lotus flowers with very long stalks dangling below and two elephants standing on these flowers and anointing the goddess with vessels full of water.
Fig. No. 35: Gajalakśmī

8. The accession number of terracotta is 64. It is the image of Gajalakśmī. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 7x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Upper portion of a Gajalakśmī image in which goddess is holding two lotus flowers. She is wearing ear ornaments, graiveyak and stanahar. Two elephants standing on flowers are anointing her with water vessels."
9. The accession number of terracotta is 74/2. It is the image of Gajalakṣmī. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 15x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Hospital mount, Kannauj. The mother goddess is shown standing on a pedestal. She is holding two lotus flowers with very long stalks on which the two elephants anointing her with water vessels are standing. She is wearing rings in her ankles, girdle long stanhar, large earrings and a turban. 

![Fig. No. 36: Gajalakṣmī](image)

9. The accession number of terracotta is 74/2. It is the image of Gajalakṣmī. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 15x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Hospital mount, Kannauj. The mother goddess is shown standing on a pedestal. She is holding two lotus flowers with very long stalks on which the two elephants anointing her with water vessels are standing. She is wearing rings in her ankles, girdle long stanhar, large earrings and a turban.
Fig. No. 37: Male deity

10. The accession number of terracotta is 80/784. It is the image of a male deity. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is wearing a large and elaborate turban. Ear ornaments, Har and a body length garland invoking later period Vanamala of Viṣṇu images.
11. The accessesion number of terracotta is. It is the image of a female deity. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x5.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a figure of standing female deity. She has kept her hands on her girdled waist. She is also wearing graiveyak and stanahar. Two braids are hanging on each side.
12. The accession number of terracotta is 85/887. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 12.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The goddess is holding some object in her right hand and her left hand is resting on her waist. She is wearing Sari below the waist, with the folds depicted prominently. She is wearing kardhani, stanhar, ear ornaments and a large turban.
13. The accession number of terracotta is 75/62. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 15.5x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mother goddess is standing on a pedestal. One hand is resting on her waist and with the right hand, she is holding something up. She is wearing girdle, a long *stanhar*, *graiveyak*, earrings and a large turban. Fan shaped object is emerging from both the sides of the turban°.
14. The accession number of terracotta is 63. It is the image of Mithun. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 10x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image shows a man and woman in amorous posture. Both of them are wearing large headdresses, ear ornaments and necklace.
15. The accession number of terracotta is 75/65. It is the image of Viṣṇu. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is holding chakra and flower in his right and left hand respectively above his head$^{10}$. 

Fig. No. 42: Viṣṇu
16. The accession number of terracotta is 85/888. It is the image of a mother goddess. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 11.5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the standing mother goddess. Large ear ornaments are visible on both sides of her head.
17. The accession number of terracotta is 80/839. It is the image of a male deity. It is of Śunga period. The size of the antiquity is 7x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Lower portion of the image is broken.
18. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 10x11 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image has black burnished polish with pink dots. It shows that inverted firing has been done to give it this polish. This technique is a continuation of the NBP period.

Fig. No. 45: Elephant
Fig. No. 46: Elephant

19. It is an image of an elephant. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 11x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is burnishing on this piece. Inverted firing technique has been used in making this. The color is black. The body is decorated with pink dots.
20. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has black burnished slip. The inverted firing has been done. The broken head is decorated with pink dots.
21. It is the image of a male. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x2.7 cm. It is of Kuśana period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Both the hands of the male deity are folded. He is wearing a necklace and his head is elongated\(^1\).
22. The accession number of terracotta is 75/224. It is the image of a Yaksha. It is of Kuśana period. The size of the antiquity is 8x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has broken legs and hands. It has got a tall headdress.
Fig. No. 50: Horse

23. It is the image of a horse. The size of the antiquity is 4x3.2 cm. It is of Kuṣana period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The back of the horse is decorated with incised lines. Various trappings are visible on his body.
24. It is the image of a horse rider. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x3.2 cm. It is of Kuṣana period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The horse rider has a very thick waist band but his legs are not visible. His both hands are half raised probably he is pulling the reins.
25. The accession number of terracotta is 80/841. It is the image of a musician playing drum. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 11x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. The musician is sitting and playing drum. He is wearing a broad necklace. 

Fig. No. 52: Musician

26. The accession number of terracotta is 74/06. It is a female head. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 17x10 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Fan shaped hairdo is visible. 

Fig. No. 53: Female Head
27. The accession number of terracotta is 85/884. It is a female head. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 10x9.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady has thick lips.
Fig. No. 55: Male Head

28. It is a male head. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 12x10.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is an arched shaped headgear kept over the head.
29. The accession number of terracotta is 79/764. It is a male head. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x9.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
30. The accession number of terracotta is 80/779. It is a male head. It is of Kušana period. The size of the antiquity is 14x8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Hospital mound, Kannauj. He is wearing a fan shaped headgear.
31. The accession number of terracotta is 79/770. It is a male head. It is of Kuṇa period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male has moustaches and hair are shown by incised lines.
32. The accession number of terracotta is 79/776. It is the image of a female head. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Hospital mound, Kannauj. The lady has a bindi on her forehead. Eyes are slanting. The hair do has incised lines. On the right side of the head is a protrusion with a hole.
33. The accession number of terracotta is 80/814. It is a female head. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 10x9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Hospital mound, Kannauj. She is sporting a bindi in the middle of her forehead.
34. The accession number of terracotta is 74/15. It is a human face. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 6x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The nose, mouth and ears of the face are broken.
35. The accession number of terracotta is 79/773. It is the image of a human. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has broken legs and hands. The figure is very crude and face is not clear.
36. It is the image of a bull (?). It is of Kušana period. The size of the antiquity is 1.6x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body is decorated with incised lines. The eyes have been made by pasting button like piece. The horns are broken.
37. The accession number of terracotta is 85/910. It is the image of a bull. It is of Kuśana period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull has got an enlarged hump. The eyes are shown by punched rings.
38. The accession number of terracotta is 75/540. It is the image of a bull. It is of Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The forelegs of the bull are broken. Its hump is very prominent.
39. It is the figure of a snake. It is of late Kuṣana period. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower portion of the hood is decorated with horizontal incised lines and two button liked devices. 

Fig. No. 66: Snake
The accession number of terracotta is 80/858. It is a standing male figure. It is of Kušana period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body and the leg of the male have been modelled in the round but the face is flattish and the features have been shown by incised lines.
Fig. No. 68: Anthropomorphic Figure

41. The accession number of terracotta is 75/68. It is an anthropomorphic figure. It is of Kuşana period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hands and legs of the figure are broken.
Guptā T.C. Images

Guptā Ganeśa Images:

Fig. No. 69: Ganeśa

42. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/70. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Ganeśa is shown sitting on a high seat. He has kept one leg over the other. The body is decorated with incised lines.
Fig. No. 70: Ganeśa

43. The accession number of terracotta is 80/810. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Sikhana, Kannauj. It is an image of standing two handed Ganeśa whose legs are not visible. On hand is broken and in another hand, he is holding laddus. His trunk is resting on the laddus. His body is decorated with round ring shaped depressions and long incised lines. His crown and ears are decorated with similar incised lines.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/789. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. The crude image is of two handed Ganeśa. In one hand, he is holding laddu15.
45. The accession number of terracotta is 87/943. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a plaque showing two handed Ganeśa sitting in lalitāsana on a pedestal.
46. The accession number of terracotta is 75/350. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.6x5.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Ganeśa image whose trunk is turned in clockwise direction. He is holding laddu, coconut, broken tooth in three hands and the object held in fourth hand is not clear. Abhāmandala of oval shaped is visible behind his head. He is sitting in Lalitāsana}\(^6\).
47. The accession number of terracotta is 75/354. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows image of two handed Ganeśa.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/351. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of later Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4.8cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows image of sitting two handed Ganeśa. His trunk is resting on a bowl of laddus (a type of Indian sweet meat).
49. The accession number of terracotta is 83/879. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of later Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. Two handed Ganeśa is shown sitting in lalitāsana.
50. The accessesion number of terracotta is 87/776. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.5x8.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The figure shows two handed Ganeśa holding a bowl of laddus (a type of Indian sweet meat) on which his trunk is resting. He is sitting in lalitāsana.
51. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/348. It is the image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is sitting on a low seat and holding a bowl of laddus. He has placed his trunk on the bowl.
52. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/356. It is a broken image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x3.2x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
53. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/349. It is a broken image of Ganeśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.3x5.9x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His trunk is resting on the bowl of laddus.
Guptā Naigameśa & Naigameśī Images:

54. The accession number of terracotta is 74/83. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Naigameśa wears a har with a circular pendant on his right shoulder is embossed a circular design. There are cylindrical studs in his long ears. The head is topped with a holed lug.

Fig. No. 81: Naigameśa
It is the image of Naigameśa. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower part of the image is broken.
56. The accession number of terracotta is 75/121. It is the image of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a dot on the forehead and hood like protrusion on the head.
57. The accession number of terracotta is 66. It is the image of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the deity is punched with circular rings. He is wearing a necklace. He has an animal face.
58. The accession number of terracotta is 75/82. It is the image of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.2x5.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It wears a cross belt across his chest shown by two incised lines. Girdle is also similarly shown.
59. The accession number of terracotta is 80/805. It is the image of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head, hands and lower part of the deity are broken.
60. It is the image of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has a holed hood at the top. His clothes are shown with incised lines. He sports a bindi in the middle of his forehead.
Fig. No. 88: Naigameśa

61. It is the figure of Naigmesha. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.2x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is shown standing with folded hands. The head of the figure is missing.
Fig. No. 89: Naigameśa

62. The accession number of terracotta is 74/52. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Tila, Kannauj. The Naigameśa is standing. His body is decorated with incised lines. The eyes are shown by impression of a ring. There is a ring impressed on his left shoulder. There is a flattish protrusion at the top of his head having a hole to hang this image on a wall.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/928. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the deity with long ears and a crown of hood shape.
64. The accession number of terracotta is 80/842. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. Naigameśa head is topped with a holed lug. There is a broad band made with incised lines across his chest. He has long ears and a dot in the middle of the forehead.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/812. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. There are two ring shaped punches on the body. There is a holed lug at the top of the head. There is a dot on the forehead.
66. The accession number of terracotta is 75/753. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period.

The size of the antiquity is 9x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the deity is decorated with punched ring marks. Its hands and legs are broken.
Fig. No. 94: Naigameśa

67. The accessesion number of terracotta is 80/795. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has a cross belt incised on the body. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 74/31. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity wears a necklace and a bindi on the forehead. There is a holed lug at the top of his head.
Fig. No. 96: Naigamesa

69. The accession number of terracotta is 80/838. It is the image of Naigamesa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. There are two punched rings on the chest of the body. The face is anthropomorphic and there is a holed lug at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 97: Naigameśa

70. The accession number of terracotta is 74/29. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There are three punched rings on the chest of the body. The third ring shows the navel. Dupatta is incised on the head. He is sporting a dot on the forehead.
Fig. No. 98: Naigameṣa

71. The accession number of terracotta is 74/32. It is the image of Naigameṣa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug on the head of the deity and his hair are parted in the middle.
72. The accession number of terracotta is 80/780. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period.

The size of the antiquity is 13x8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. The deity is wearing Kurta and Payjama. There is a protrusion on his head which is been broken.
73. The accession number of terracotta is 75/88. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9×5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The legs of the deity are broken. He wears a dhoti and a Dupatta. There is a holed lug at the top of the head and there is a dot in the middle of the forehead.
Fig. No. 101: Naigameśa

74. The accessesion number of terracotta is 74/36. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The garments are incised on the body. There is a dot on his forehead. There is a lug on the top of his head.
Fig. No. 102: Naigameśa

75. The accessesion number of terracotta is 80/796. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*. The deity wears a necklace of rings joined together. There is a hole at the top of his ears.
76. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.6x3.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has a holed circular hood at the top of his head. His clothes and hands are shown with incised lines.
Fig. No. 104: Naigameśa

77. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 1.5x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Below the neck, the image is broken.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/792. It is the figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x6x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head and there is a dot in the middle of the forehead.
79. The accession number of terracotta is 80/834. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.7x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has a holed lug at the top of the head. The portion below the neck is missing.
80. The accession number of terracotta is 74/37. It is the figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x4.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity sports a dot in the middle of the forehead. There is a holed lug at the top of its head.
Fig. No. 108: Naigameśa

81. The accession number of terracotta is 80/819. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a broken holed lug at the top of the head. The image is broken below the neck.
82. The accession number of terracotta is 75/80. It is the figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.6x4.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower right portion of the deity is missing. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 110: Naigameśa

83. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/89. It is the figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x7x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Cloth is shown by incised lines. Navel and nipples are shown by punched circles.
84. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/98. It is a headless figure of Naigameša. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He wears a necklace. Clothes have been shown by incised lines.
85. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/80. It is a headless figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.6x5.5x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Cloth and fingers of hand & feet are shown by incised lines. Navel and nipples are shown by punched circles.

Fig. No. 112: Naigameśa
86. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/84. It is a figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Ornaments have been shown by incised lines. Nipples and navels are shown by punched circles. There is a holed lug at the top of his head.
87. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/421. It is a broken figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x5.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Ornaments have been shown by incised lines. One nipple is shown by a punched circles. The face is damaged and legs and hands are missing.
88. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/115. It is a figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines and the right side nipple is shown by a punched circle. Face is damaged and there is a holed lug at the top of the head of deity.
89. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/83. It is a figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.2x5x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity wears a pendant consisting of circular stone studded portions. He is wearing a headdress. There is a stud at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 117: Naigameśa

90. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 74/34. It is a figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity wears an Uttariya. He sports a bindi in the middle of the forehead.
91. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/336. It is the figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.4x4.5x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Only chest portion is available.
Fig. No. 119: Naigameśa

92. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/100. It is a headless figure of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x7x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Clothes are shown by incised lines. Navel and nipples are shown by punched circles.
Fig. No. 120: Naigameśa

93. The accession number of the antiquity is 74/43. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3.5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
94. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/120. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x2.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
95. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/329. It is the torso of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines. The Navel is shown by punched circle.
96. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/113. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.5x2.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
97. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/67. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5x2.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
98. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/86. It is the torso of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.6x6.4x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines. Nipples and navel are shown by punched circles.
99. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/109. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x2.5x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/108. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 128: Naigameśa

101. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/400. It is the torso of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.2x5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines.
Fig. No. 129: Naigameśa

102. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/435. It is the torso of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.7x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines.
103. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/93. It is the broken image of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x4.5x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes and fingers are shown by incised lines. The nipples are shown by punched circles. He wears a necklace having a round pendant.
104. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/119. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.5x2.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The headgear is decorated with punched depressions and a circular bindi. There is a holed lug at the top of the head\textsuperscript{18}. 

Fig. No. 131: Naigameśa
Fig. No. 132: Naigameśa

105. The accession number of the antiquity is 74/38. It is the head of Naigameśa. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
106. The accession number of the antiquity is 87/944. It is the image of Naigameśa. It is of *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 8x4.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He is wearing a necklace with a circular pendant.
107. The accession number of terracotta is 80/778. It is the image of standing Naigameśī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12×4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. The deity is wearing a cross belt and a necklace of rings. She is wearing a dhoti like lower garment. There are two holed lugs above the ear\textsuperscript{19}. 

Fig. No. 134: Naigameśī
Fig. No. 135: Naigameśī

108. It is the image of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.7x2.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity wears uttariya across her chest. Her clothes and fingers have been shown with incised lines.
Fig. No. 136: Naigameśī

109. The accession number of terracotta is 80/853. It is the figure of Naigameśī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
110. The accession number of terracotta is 80/791. It is the figure of Naigameśī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.5x5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes on the deity are shown by incised lines. She wears a necklace. There is a holed lug at the top of her head.
111. The accession number of terracotta is 75/101. It is the image of Naigmesi. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The female deity wears a necklace and a fan shaped hood at the top of her head.
Fig. No. 139: Naigamesi

112. It is the image of Naigmeshi. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a broken image of Naigmeshi with animal face.
113. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/79. It is a figure of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 1.5x4.4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its hands and lower portion are broken. Clothes and necklace is shown by incised lines. Navel is shown by punched ring.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/97. It is a figure of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11.4x7.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines. The nipples and navel are shown by incised rings. She wears a necklace with a circular pendant.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/400. It is a figure of Naigameśī (?) . It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x5.6x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes are shown by incised lines. Navel is shown by punched rings. She wears a necklace with round pendant.
The accession number of the antiquity is 74/35. It is a figure of Naigamešī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4.5x2.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Her nipples are shown as punched rings. She is wearing a necklace with circular pendant.
117. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/105. It is a figure of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Clothes are shown by incised lines. Nipples are shown by punched circles. She wears a necklace with a round pendant. Her head and legs are missing.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/107. It is a figure of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x7.6x2.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a necklace. Right nipple is shown by punched circle. Head is partly damaged. Her left breast, arms and portion below the waist is missing.
119. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/112. It is the head of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.4x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/106. It is the torso of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x5.8x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a girdle having a circular pieces connected by broad strips.
121. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/103. It is the torso of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.1x5.5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The clothes and fingers are shown incised lines. Nipples are shown by punched rings.
Fig. No. 149: Naigameśī

122. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/110. It is the head of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x3.4x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She sports a dot in the middle of her forehead.
Fig. No. 150: Naigameśī

123. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/102. It is the torso of Naigameśī. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11.5x6.5x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Clothes are shown by incised lines and nipples are shown by punched circles. She is wearing a necklace.
Elephant & Elephant Riders:

Fig. No. 151: Elephant

124. The accession number of terracotta is 75/519. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is the figure of an elephant. The body and head are decorated with incised lines and the eyes are shown with the ring impression.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/673. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is an image of an elephant. Its body is decorated with incised lines and circular ring shaped impressions.
126. The accession number of terracotta is 74/21. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His body is decorated with incised lines. The eyes are made by punching ring shape.
Fig. No. 154: Elephant

127. The accession number of terracotta is 74/25. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The elephant has his trunk folded upwards. The neck and forehead are decorated with incised designs which probably indicate trappings. Eyes are made with two punched rings.
128. The accession number of terracotta is 75/627. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is an elephant very crudely made.
129. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/559. It is the image of an elephant. It is of *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. This toy is broken. The body is decorated with incised designs and the eyes are shown by punched rings.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/554. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a broken toy. The body is decorated with incised designs and the eyes are shown by punched rings.
Fig. No. 158: Elephant

131. The accession number of terracotta is 75/639. It is the image of an elephant. It is of *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 3x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The legs of the figure are broken. The body is decorated with incised designs.
Fig. No. 159: Elephant

132. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 16x11.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the elephant has been decorated with incised lines. Its trunk is broken.
Fig. No. 160: Elephant

133. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/755. It is the image of an elephant. It is of *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 9.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. The body of elephant is decorated with incised lines and punched rings.
Fig. No. 161: Elephant

134. The accession number of terracotta is 75/627. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is an elephant very crudely made.
Fig. No. 162: Elephant

135. The accession number of terracotta is 75/672. It is the figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj²⁰.
136. The accession number of terracotta is 75/516. It is the figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Forelegs and trunk of the elephant are missing.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/687. It is the figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The trunk of the elephant is missing.

Fig. No. 164: Elephant

137.
138. The accession number of terracotta is 75/560. It is the figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.3x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the elephant is decorated with incised lines and punched rings.
139. The accession number of terracotta is 75/518. It is a broken figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.6x5.2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
140. The accession number of terracotta is 75/472. It is the figure of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
141. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/423. It is an image of a broken elephant head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
142. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/492. It is an image of an elephant head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x5x3.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
143. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/489. It is an image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.3x3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its trappings are shown by incised lines.
144. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/662. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x2.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/480. It is an elephant head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x6.5x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
146. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/484. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.3x3.4x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 173: Elephant
147. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/523. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x7x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/618. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
149. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/482. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x3.8x2.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
150. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/647. It is the image of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x3x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/505. It is the head of an elephant. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.1x5.5x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has black and pink colored burnished polish.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/653. It is the image of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.0x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man riding an elephant and moving towards left.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/653. It is the image of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.0x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man riding an elephant and moving towards left.
Fig. No. 181: Elephant with Rider

154. The accession number of terracotta is 75/654. It is the image of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x3.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man riding an elephant and moving towards right.
Fig. No. 182: Elephant with Rider

155. The accession number of terracotta is 75/654. It is the image of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x3.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man riding an elephant and moving towards right.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/856. It is the image of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x8.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana mound, Kannauj. It shows a man riding an elephant. The lower portion of this elephant is broken.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/664. It is the figure of an elephant with a rider. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 8x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. This piece is damaged.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/951. It is the figure of an elephant rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hind legs of the elephant are missing. The elephant rider is wearing a very high cap.
159. The accession number of terracotta is 75/660. It is the figure of an elephant with rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The rider is wearing a very high cap.
Fig. No. 187: Elephant with Rider

160. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/659. It is a broken image of an elephant with a rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Horse & Horse Riders:

Fig. No. 188: Horse

161. The accession number of terracotta is 75/648. It is the image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x2.1x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/496. It is the image of a horse. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the horse is decorated with incised designs. There is a hole near the mouth.
163. The accession number of terracotta is 75/478. It is a broken figure of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Saddle is visible on its back.

Fig. No. 190: Horse
Fig. No. 191: Horse

164. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/355. It is a broken image of a man riding a horse. It is of *Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. 
165. The accession number of terracotta is 75/426. It is the image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 1.2x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its legs are broken.
Fig. No. 193: Horse

166. The accession number of terracotta is 80/836. It is the image of a horse attacked by an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 13x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows an animal bouncing on a horse.
167. The accession number of terracotta is 79/777. It is the image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9.7x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mouth of the horse is open. There is a hole near the mouth.
168. The accession number of terracotta is 75/491. It is the image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the horse and ear are missing.
Fig. No. 196: Horse

169. The accession number of terracotta is 75/662. It is the figure of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the horse is missing.
170. The accession number of terracotta is 75/451. It is the figure of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. One of its hind leg is broken.
Fig. No. 198: Horse

171. The accession number of terracotta is 75/584. It is a broken head of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x3.6x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/498. It is a broken figure of a horse with a rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x8.6x8.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The legs and the upper part of the rider is missing.
Fig. No. 200: Horse

173. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/712. It is a broken image of a horse rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11.5x5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
174. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/499. It is a broken image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.5x4.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
175. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/478. It is a broken image of a horse (?). It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.5x2.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 203: Horse

176. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/488. It is a broken image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4.2x3.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
177. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/479. It is a broken image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.3x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
178. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/454. It is the image of a horse. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.8x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 205: Horse
179. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/609. It is the image of a horse (?). It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5x3.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 207: Horse

180. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/585. It is the image of a horse. It is of *Gupta* period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. 
Fig. No. 208: Horse

181. It is a toy horse. The size of the antiquity is 4×2.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its body is highly stylized with long legs open mouth and hair on the neck.
182. The accession number of terracotta is 75/605. It is the image of a horse rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is mounted on a horse.

Fig. No. 209: Horse with Rider
183. The accession number of terracotta is 87/953. It is the figure of a horse rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head of the rider is broken.
184. The accession number of terracotta is 75/605. It is the image of a horse rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is mounted on a horse.
Monkey Figures:

185. The accession number of terracotta is 83/883. It is the image of a monkey with child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Gwal Maidan, Kannauj. It is an image of a mother monkey with her child. She is holding a fruit in her right hand. She is grimacing.
186. The accession number of terracotta is 87/952. It is the image of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a figure of monkey sitting and clasping his hands.
Fig. No. 214: Monkey

187. The accession number of terracotta is 85/914. It is the image of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is holding some fruit with both hands kept on his knees.
188. The accession number of terracotta is 80/831. It is the image of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. The monkey is sitting and clasping his hands.
Fig. No. 216: Monkey

189. The accession number of terracotta is 75/358. It is the figure of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is holding hands together near the chest.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/363. It is the figure of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Monkey is sitting and holding some fruit in his hands.
191. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/360. It is the image of a monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
192. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/359. It is the image of a sitting monkey. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.9x5.8x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Bull Figures:

Fig. No. 220: Bull

193. The accession number of terracotta is 75/629. It is the image of a bull. It is of early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull has eyes made by pasting disk shaped eyes pierced with a hole. The mouth is shown by a slit.
Fig. No. 221: Bull

194. The accession number of terracotta is 75/674. It is the image of Nandi (?). It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull is sitting on folded four legs.
The accession number of terracotta is 74/634. It is the image of a standing bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x5.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 223: Bull

196. The accession number of terracotta is 75/628. It is the image of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 224: Bull

197. The accession number of terracotta is 74/45. It is a bull. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 8x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Tila, Kannauj. The hump of the bull is disproportionately large.
Fig. No. 225: Bull

198. The accession number of terracotta is 75/539. It is the image of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its horns are broken.
It is the image of a bull. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x2.6 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull is standing on a pedestal.
Fig. No. 227: Bull

200. It is the figure of a bull. The size of the antiquity is 6.2x5.5 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has got a very large hump. Its head is damaged.
Fig. No. 228: Bull

201. The accession number of terracotta is 87/939. It is the figure of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull is in sitting posture.
Fig. No. 229: Bull

202. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x1.8 cm. It is the figure of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull is sitting.
203. The accession number of terracotta is 75/527. It is the figure of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower portion of the legs is missing.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/940. It is the figure of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x2.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bull is sitting.
Fig. No. 232: Bull

205. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/644. It is the image of a crudely made bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x4x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 233: Bull

206. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/652. It is an image of a finely made bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 234: Bull  

207. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/614. It is the image of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x4.5x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
208. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/458. It is the image of a bull. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Boar Figures:

209. It is the image of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The boar is sitting on his hind legs. Its mouth is broken. The ears are round shaped.
210. The accession number of terracotta is 75/493. It is the image of a sitting boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
211. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/624. It is the figure of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
212. The accession number of terracotta is 75/671. It is the figure of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.6x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its left side is damaged.
Fig. No. 240: Boar

213. The accession number of terracotta is 80/830. It is the figure of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. Its lower portion is missing.
214. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x6.6 cm. It is the figure of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The boar is in sitting posture.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/941. It is the figure of a boar. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The boar is in sitting posture.
T.C. Tortoise Figures:

216. The accession number of terracotta is 75/571. It is the figure of a tortoise. It is of Guptâ period. The size of the antiquity is 6.6x3.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/470. It is the image of a tortoise. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x3.3x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Mother with Child Figures:

218. The accession number of terracotta is 75/258. It is the image of a mother with child. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the mother holding the child in her left hand. Her right hand is hanging on her side. She is wearing necklace and earrings.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/230. It is the image of a mother with child. It is of late Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 17x6.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows the mother holding the child in her left hand. Her right hand is hanging on her side. She is wearing necklace and earrings\textsuperscript{23}. 

219. Fig. No. 246: Mother with Child
220. The accession number of terracotta is 75/241. It is the image of a mother with child. It is of late Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.4x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is standing holding the child in her left hand. She is wearing a trifoliate turban, long ear ornaments and a necklace.
221. The accession number of terracotta is 75/232. It is the image of a mother with child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 13.5x5.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows the mother holding the child in her left hand. Her right hand is hanging on her side. She is wearing necklace and earrings.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/248. It is the image of mother with child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.5x4.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the mother holding the child in her left hand. Her right hand is hanging on her side. She is wearing necklace and earrings.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/244. It is the image of a mother with child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.7×4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the mother holding the child in her left hand. Her right hand is hanging on her side. She is wearing necklace and earrings.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/282. It is the image of a woman carrying a child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.2x4.7x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Her hair are falling down on both the sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
225. The accession number of the antiquity is 85/896. It is the broken image of a mother holding her child. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x6.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T.C. Couple Figures:

226. The accession number of terracotta is 75/884. It is the image of a couple. The size of the antiquity is 8x4 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image shows a male and a female standing and holding each other in amorous posture. 
The accession number of terracotta is 75/293. It is the image of a Yugal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a male and a female standing in amorous posture. The image of a Yugal from Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/295. It is the image of a flying couple. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x6.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is sitting on the left leg of the male who is holding a sword.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/798. It is the image of a couple. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. The plaque shows a couple in amorous posture.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/866. It is the figure of a couple. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 1.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. They are shown in amorous posture.

Fig. No. 257: Couple
The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/300. It is a broken image of a man and a woman. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x6.9x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man is running posture and his wife is sitting on his left leg.
The accession number of terracotta is 83/863. It is the image of medallion of *Mithun*. It is of *Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Shikhana, Kannauj*. It is a plaque showing a man and a woman in amorous posture\(^2\).
Fig. No. 260: Couple

233. The accession number of terracotta is 75/294. It is the image of Mithun. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.4x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image shows a male and a female standing and holding each other in amorous posture.
234. The accession number of terracotta is 75/298. It is the image of Mithun. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 13.5x8.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The headless image shows a male and a female standing and holding each other in amorous posture.
Warrior Figures:

Fig. No. 262: Warrior

It is the image of a warrior. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x4 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Warrior is holding a sword resting on his right shoulder. There is a bun at the top of his head. His hair are falling down on both sides.
236. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/311. It is a headless image of a warrior. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9.5x5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The warrior is holding sword in his right hand.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/304. It is a headless image of a warrior. It is of *Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 10.8x6x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. He is holding a sword in his right hand.  

![Fig. No. 264: Warrior](image)
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/44. It is a broken image of a warrior. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10.7x6x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The warrior carries a sword. His legs are missing. Locks of hair are falling down on both sides of his face and there is a bun at the top of his head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/810. It is the figure of a warrior. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x8x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The warrior is holding a sword in his right hand. His hairdo includes four tiers of locks falling from inverted bowl like crown which is topped by a protrusion.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/305. It is the image of a warrior. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12.6x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image is broken. The male is holding a sword in his right hand. His hairdo is typical two bands holding the hair, bun at the top and hair falling on both the sides. He is wearing a tunic in the upper part.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/309. It is the image of a man holding shield. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x9.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows an alert warrior holding a shield in his left hand.  

Fig. No. 268: Warrior
T.C. Female Images & Heads:

Fig. No. 269: Lady

242. The accession number of terracotta is 80/787. It is the image of a lady. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows a lady wearing sari draped around her lower body. She is probably looking in a glass (?) held in her left hand. She is wearing necklace, ear ornaments and bun of hair is visible behind her head.29
243. It is the image of a lady holding a flower. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 14×12.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a necklace and large ear ornaments. Her hair are falling on shoulders.
Fig. No. 271: Female

244. It is the image of a female. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x2.1 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing ekawali. Her hairdo is simple.
245. The accession number of terracotta is 74/58. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/854. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana mound, Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/132. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is standing in tribhanga mudra. Her right hand is raised in some mudra. Her hair are falling in three tiers. A bun stands above the head.
Fig. No. 275: Female

248. The accession number of the antiquity is 83/880. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Locks of hair are falling down. She is wearing a necklace and an ear ornament.
Fig. No. 276: Female

249. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears the typical headdress with a protrusion in the middle of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/297. It is the image of a lady feeding a peacock. It is of Early Medieval period. The size of the antiquity is 7.4x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 278: Female

The accession number of terracotta is 87/950. It is a female figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x4.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing ear ornaments and a large headgear.
Fig. No. 279: Female

252. The accession number of terracotta is 75/386. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing a large headgear.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/846. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x5.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing ear ornaments and a large headgear.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/825. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.3x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady has got inverted bowl like hairdo which has a protrusion in the middle.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/698. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower portion of the image is missing. The lady is wearing large ear ornaments and a headgear.
256. The accession number of terracotta is 75/573. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x2.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is sporting a very large bun at the top of the head. She is wearing large ear ornaments.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/162. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x5.3x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She has raised her left hand up to the level of her left shoulder. She is wearing a large ear ornament and a large headdress.
258. The accession number of terracotta is 75/166. It is figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.6x4.7x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears a large headgear and ear ornaments.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/828. It is figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.5x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears a necklace, large ear ornaments and a very large headgear.
Fig. No. 287: Female

260. The accession number of terracotta is 75/157. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She wears large ear ornaments and a very large headgear.
261. The accession number of terracotta is 75/280. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.2x6.5x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears a necklace, ear ornaments and a large headgear.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/167. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x6.8x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is holding a flower in her left hand and has raised it to the level of her shoulder. She wears a necklace, ear ornaments and a large headdress.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/161. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x5.7x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears ear ornaments and a large headgear.

Fig. No. 290: Female
264. The accessesion number of terracotta is 80/822. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
Fig. No. 292: Female

265. The accessesion number of terracotta is 74/60. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
266. The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/315. It is the figure of a female. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.5x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She wears necklace, ear ornaments and the hair fall on both sides of her head. There is a bun at the top of the head.

Fig. No. 293: Female
Fig. No. 294: Female

267. The accession number of terracotta is. It is the image of a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head of the lady shows her wearing large earrings and a head gear kept above her head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/168. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.5x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The female wears a necklace, ear ornaments and a large headgear.
Fig. No. 296: Female

269. The accession number of terracotta is 75/142. It is the figure of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.2x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady has raised her right hand and holding a flower in it. Her hair are falling from the crown in four tiers. She is wearing a tiara.
Fig. No. 297: Female

270. The accession number of terracotta is 75/287. It is the image of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 13.5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is the figure of a lady with her left hand resting on her waist. She is wearing an elaborate headdress and large earrings.
Fig. No. 298: Female

271. The accession number of terracotta is 80/800. It is the image of a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.4x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. The lady is wearing a large headdress and large earrings.
The size of the antiquity is 1.5x4 cm. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing very large ear ornaments.
Fig. No. 300: Female

273. The accession number of terracotta is 80/815. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. The lady is wearing large ear ornaments and a very large bun on the left side of her head. 
The accession number of terracotta is 74/55. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing an elaborate hairdo and large earrings.
Fig. No. 302: Female

275. The accession number of terracotta is 75/196. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The female is wearing a large turban and large earrings.

276. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 7x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The female head has locks of hair falling in five tiers on the left side. She is also wearing earrings.
Fig. No. 304: Female

277. The accession number of terracotta is 83/882. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Ghar, Kannauj. The female is wearing a large honeycomb like headgear having round depressions placed above her head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/367. It is the image of a female head. It is of the *Early Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. The nostrils and the ends of her mouth are shown pierced. The eyes are bulging. Pupils are incised and have a hole in the middle.
It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 5.2x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing ear ornaments and a headgear.
Fig. No. 307: Female

280. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 4.5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The female head, the locks are falling in two tiers. The crown part is decorated with headgear having round depressions.
281. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 3.5x3.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing a headdress which envelops her head. She is also wearing large ear ornaments.
Fig. No. 309: Female

282. It is a female head. It is of Gupta period. The size of the terracotta is 3.6x3.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady has an elaborate honeycomb hair do. A two tiered protrusion exists at the top of it. Hair are falling in three tiers on both the sides below this.
283. The accession number of terracotta is 79/763. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accessesion number of terracotta is 74/03. It is the image of a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Only upper part of the image is visible which shows the lady sporting a headgear with a ridge in the middle.
Fig. No. 312: Female head

285. The accession number of terracotta is 75/149. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.7x4.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing a headgear having a prominent ridge in the middle.
286. The accession number of terracotta is 86/921. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady has hair falling on both the sides in five tiers and the hair are parted in the middle.
It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 12x9.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing very large sized projected ear ornaments and arch shaped headgear. She is sporting a bindi on her forehead.
288. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing large ear ornaments. She has covered her head with some clothes. She has kept a small water vessel at the top of her head.

Fig. No. 315: Female head
It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is showing her left palm. She is wearing large ear ornaments and a large headgear with a protrusion in the middle.
290. The accession number of terracotta is 80/832. It is a female head. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 7x7.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair of the lady are combed back.
291. The size of the antiquity is 10x6.5 cm. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Lips of the lady are very thick.
292. The accession number of terracotta is 75/697. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.1x5.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Hair can be seen falling in four tiers on the right side of the head. There is a flat bun on the top of the head.

Fig. No. 319: Female head
Fig. No. 320: Female head

293. The accession number of terracotta is 75/234. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is much damaged. The portion below the neck is completely missing.
294. The accession number of terracotta is 75/388. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The face is damaged and the portion below is missing. There is a bun at the top and the hair are falling on both sides of the head from the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/237. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.4x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady is wearing large ear ornaments and a headgear covering her head and falling to the sides with a string of large beads on the forehead.
296. The accession number of terracotta is 75/190. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.6x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears very large ear ornaments and a large headgear.
297. The accession number of terracotta is 75/223. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x5.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a very elaborate headgear. It consists of four balls kept above the two lobes of hair.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/385. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a large headgear and ear ornaments.
The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/181. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4.5x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She wears a large ear ornament and a flat headgear.

Fig. No. 326: Female head
Fig. No. 327: Female head

300. The accession number of terracotta is 75/192. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x2x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is wearing a large ear ornament and a very large headgear.
301. The accession number of terracotta is 75/374. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.6x3.2x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a bun at the head of the lady. Hair fall on both the sides.
Fig. No. 329: Female head

The accession number of terracotta is 80/829. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears large ear ornaments and a large headgear.
Fig. No. 330: Female head

The accession number of terracotta is 87/929. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x5x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She wears ear ornaments. The mass of hair envelops her head.35
304. The accession number of terracotta is 75/158. It is a female head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x5x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lady wears a necklace, ear ornaments and a large headgear.
T.C. Male heads:

Fig. No. 332: Male head

305. The accession number of terracotta is 74/16. It is a male head. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Tila, Kannauj. The male is wearing a tall headdress below which his hair are visible.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/760. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.6x3.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head is crudely modelled. It shows the male wearing a necklace and probably the earrings also.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/275. It is the image of a running male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The image shows a man running to the left. He is holding unidentifiable objects in his both hands.
308. The accession number of terracotta is 75/389. It is the image of a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is wearing trifoliate crown on his head. He has got very large ears.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/99. It is a male figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.6x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is wearing a necklace, har and a girdle. Above the head is a broad lug having two holes.
310. It is the image of a human figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is sitting on a low seat. He has got a prominent belly.
311. It is the image of a sitting male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11x5.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is wearing very large ear ornaments and a top hat like headgear.
Fig. No. 339: Male head

312. The accession number of terracotta is 75/343. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.8x4.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a male wearing a tall cap.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/807. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x7.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana mound, Kannauj. The male has hair falling in two tiers from the crown which is in the shape of shallow bowl. There is a protrusion at the top.
314. The accession number of terracotta is 75/217. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 11x9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It’s upper body of a male figure. He is wearing large ear ornaments and has a hairdo in which locks are falling on his left side in four tiers.
315. The accession number of terracotta is 75/150. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9.5x7.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is wearing large ear ornaments. There is a fan shaped protrusion above the head.

Fig. No. 342: Male
Fig. No. 343: Male

316. The accession number of terracotta is 85/903. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a bun at the top and hair are also falling down on both sides of the head.
Fig. No. 344: Male

317. It is the image of a male. It is of early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a standing male wearing dhoti, cross belt and a garland.
It is the image of a male deity. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 1.8x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hands and body below the chest are missing.
Fig. No. 346: Male

319. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is sitting with folded hands. There is a cap like thing kept above the head. Hair are also falling on both the sides of the head.
Fig. No. 347: Male

320. The accession number of terracotta is 75/365. It is the figure of male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is sitting with folded hands.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/688. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.4x2.5x.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a top knot bound by a band and hair falling on right side of the head.
322. The accession number of terracotta is 75/579. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair are falling down on both sides of the face. There is a bun at the top of the inverted bowl shaped hairdo.
Fig. No. 350: Male Head

323. The accession number of terracotta is 75/546. It is the figure of a male. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is wearing large ear ornaments. There is a large bun at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 351: Male

The accession number of terracotta is 75/448. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x4.5x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has falling locks of hair up to his shoulders and a top knot.
325. The accession number of terracotta is 75/378. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10.2x6.3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male has locks of hair falling only on left side in four tiers from the top knot.
326. The accession number of terracotta is 75/281. It is figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x4x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is wearing headgear and prominently raised bun at the top of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/705. It is the figure of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.3x2.8x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its lower portion is broken. The locks are falling from the crown in three tiers. There is a protrusion at the top of the head.
The accession number of the antiquity is 85/905. It is a defaced image of a male. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 8x5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 356: Male

329. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/157. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His hair are falling down on both the sides of the head. There is a bun at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 357: Male

330. The accession number of the antiquity is 79/774. It is a broken image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x6x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His hands and feet are missing.
The accession number of the antiquity is 74/54. It is a broken image of a male deity. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.3x6x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is badly damaged.

Fig. No. 358: Male
Fig. No. 359: Male

332. The accession number of the antiquity is 80/793. It is the image of a male. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x6.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He is wearing large ear ornaments and his hair have been tied to make a flat bun at the top of the head.
333. The accession number of terracotta is 87/933. It is the image of a male head. It is of Guptā period.

The size of the antiquity is 10.5x7.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/124. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also. 

Fig. No. 361: Male Head
The accession number of terracotta is 75/204. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male is wearing a large turban and ear ornaments.
The accession number of terracotta is unrecognized. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male has got his hair done in typical style. The lips are thick and the eyes are large.
337. The accession number of terracotta is 75/51. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/832. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
339. The accession number of terracotta is 83/877. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6×6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in five tiers. There is a small top knot on his head.
340. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x6 cm. Its provenance is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in five tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
Fig. No. 368: Male Head

The accessesion number of terracotta is 75/126. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/932. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5×5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head has locks of hair falling from the head in three tiers.
Fig. No. 370: Male Head

The accession number of terracotta is 75/147. It is male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.6x5.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in four tiers. He is wearing a headdress also.
The size of the terracotta is 6x5 cm. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The rounded face shows lock of hair falling on his forehead.
Fig. No. 372: Male Head

345. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 6x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a Guptā male head with locks of hair falling on both sides in three tiers from the top layer of hair do with a small protrusion at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 373: Male Head

346. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 4x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is wearing a headgear which is much broken to give clear-cut idea of its shape.
Fig. No. 374: Male Head

It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the terracotta is 4.5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is wearing an ornamented headgear.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/123. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x5.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The crown of the headgear is in two tiers. The hair are falling in three tiers of locks. There is a hood divided in three parts at the top of the head. 

Fig. No. 375: Male Head
The accession number of terracotta is 87/938. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is wearing a turban which has an oval protrusion at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 377: Male Head

350. The accession number of terracotta is 80/835. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana mound, Kannauj. The male has hair falling in three tiers and there is a small protrusion at the top.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/219. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x2.8x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male has a fan shaped crown with deep incised lines and a bindi between the eyebrows.
352. The accession number of terracotta is 75/146. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x7.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His hair are falling on both the sides of the head in four tiers. There is a bun at the top of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/227. It is the image of a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.1x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male head shows an oval headgear placed on the curly hair.
354. It is the image of a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 1.7x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. 

Fig. No. 381: Male Head
355. The accession number of terracotta is 81/859. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x7.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 383: Male Head

356. The accession number of terracotta is 79/76. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9.6x8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/141. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a protrusion at the top of an inverted bowl like hairdo with locks of hair falling in three tiers on both sides of the head. He is also wearing ear ornaments.
358. The accession number of terracotta is 75/144. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.8x4.1x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has got double lobes on both the sides of head and a bun at the top as part of his hairdo.
Fig. No. 386: Male Head

359. The accession number of terracotta is 75/373. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has locks of hair falling on both sides of the head.
360. The accession number of terracotta is 75/137. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5.5x1.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a peculiar hair style. There are two layers of locks in the head. The hair are falling on both sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/551. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x3.6x.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a peculiar hair style. There are two layers of locks on the head. The hair are falling on both sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/210. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a peculiar hair style. The hair are falling on both sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/205. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.9x4.1x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair are falling on both sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
364. The accession number of terracotta is 75/199. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.4x4 1.2cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The upper portion of the image is broken.
The accession number of terracotta is 80/809. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male wears large ear ornaments and a very large bun on the left side of his head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/122. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x7.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a peculiar hair style. There is one layer of locks on the head. The hair are falling on both sides of the head and there is a bun at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/198. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.6x4x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a large headgear and ear ornaments.
Fig. No. 395: Male Head

368. The accession number of terracotta is 87/937. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a large headgear and ear ornaments.
The accession number of terracotta is 87/946. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has four tiers of locks falling on both sides of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/145. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.8x5.1x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has four tiers of locks falling on both sides of the head and a small top knot.
371. The accession number of terracotta is 75/135. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x3.3x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There are two layers of locks on the head. The hair are falling on both sides of the head in three tiers and there is a bun at the top.
Fig. No. 399: Male Head

372. The accession number of terracotta is 87/949. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x6.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair are falling on both sides of the head in two tiers. Above the head is a fan shaped tiara with a bold circle in the middle.
Fig. No. 400: Male Head

373. The accession number of terracotta is 75/173. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.3x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wearing a large ear ornament and a very large headgear.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/170. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.2x4.8x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a large headgear and ear ornaments.

Fig. No. 401: Male Head
The accession number of terracotta is 75/548. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x3.4x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has hair falling on both sides of the head. There is a bun at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 403: Male Head

376. The accession number of terracotta is 75/208. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x3.9x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a large headgear and ear ornaments.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/583. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears ear ornaments and a headdress.
378. The accession number of terracotta is 75/194. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.4x4x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears ear ornaments and a headdress with a protrusion at the top of the head.

Fig. No. 405: Male Head
379. The accession number of terracotta is 75/172. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a large headdress and ear ornaments.
Fig. No. 407: Male Head

380. The accession number of terracotta is 75/176. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.2x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears ear ornaments and a large headdress.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/694. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.2x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has a top knot on his head.
382. The accession number of terracotta is 75/595. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x2.5x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The left portion of the figure is broken. He wears a large headdress.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/700. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x2.5x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has some sort of headdress which has been broken off.
384. The accession number of terracotta is 75/174. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x3.1x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair on both the sides of the head are falling in thick masses. There is a bun at the top of the head.
385. The accession number of terracotta is 75/706. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x3.8x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He wears a large bun at the top of the head above two layers of hair. The hair are falling on both sides of the head.

Fig. No. 412: Male Head
The accession number of terracotta is 75/444. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The hair are falling in three tiers on the sides of the head. There is a bun at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 414: Male Head

387. The accession number of terracotta is 74/20. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity wears a headdress with a protrusion at the top.
388. The accession number of terracotta is 85/902. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.5x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears an elaborate headgear.
Fig. No. 416: Male Head

389. The accession number of terracotta is 75/117. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x3.8x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a holed lug at the top of the head.
Fig. No. 417: Male Head

390. The accession number of terracotta is 75/441. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x3.5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The locks are falling from the crown in three tiers. There is a protrusion at the top of the head.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/221. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.2x4.4x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man has locks of hair falling from the head in form of four tiers.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/716. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.7x2.7x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male has locks of hair falling from the crown which has a small bun in the middle.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/718. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.4x2.2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head is badly damaged.
Fig. No. 421: Male Head

394. The accession number of terracotta is 75/129. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x3.5x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
395. The accession number of terracotta is 75/719. It is a male head. It is of Guptâ period. The size of the antiquity is 4x3.9x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/544. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x3.1x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
The accession number of terracotta is 74/11. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The mass of hair is falling from the crown on both sides of the head. She has a large bun of hair at the top.
398. The accession number of terracotta is 75/547. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.1x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. His hair are falling on the left side. These are tied with a band.

Fig. No. 425: Male Head
The accession number of terracotta is 75/714. It is a male head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.8x3x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man wears a headdress with a prominently raised middle portion.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/341. It is the image of a man wearing a tall conical cap. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.2x4.2x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/320. It is a broken image of a man. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5x3.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 429: Male Head

402. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/404. It is a broken image of a squatting man. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x6x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 430: Male

403. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/443. It is much worn out head of a man. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T.C. Viṣṇu Images:

Fig. No. 431: Viṣṇu

404. The accession number of terracotta is 80/785. It is the image of Viṣṇu (?). It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 19x8.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows standing two handed male deity. He is wearing necklace and a kirita mukuta. Vanamala is very faintly visible.
Fig. No. 432: Viṣṇu

405. The accession number of terracotta is 74/17. It is the image of Viṣṇu. It is of Early Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x5.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
406. The accession number of terracotta is 80/817. It is the image of Viṣṇu. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana mound, Kannauj. The deity is holding Chakra in his right hand. He is wearing graiveyak and a crown.
The image is of Kuber. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity is holding a Nakuli and a short dagger in his left and right hands respectively. He is carrying a bundle on his right shoulder.
408. It is a Śiva head with a benevolent look. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is xx cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a bun behind with his head and his long locks falling on his shoulders. His canine teeth are visible and the third eye is visible on the forehead.  

Fig. No. 435: Śiva head (Front view)
Fig. No. 436: Śiva head (Side view)
Fig. No. 437: Śiva head (Back view)
The accession number of terracotta is 80/823. It is the image of Lakṣmī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows the deity wearing a stanahar and holding flower in her left hand. A lotus with long stack can be seen on her left side.
T.C. Human Figures & Heads:

Fig. No. 439: Human Head

410. The accession number of terracotta is 74/4. It is a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Club Tila, Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/225. It is the figure of human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.4x4.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He is wearing very large ear ornaments. The hair are parted in the middle of the head.
412. The accession number of terracotta is 75/191. It is a broken human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x5.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The upper half of the head is broken. Only locks of hair and ear ornaments are visible.
413. The accession number of terracotta is 75/685. It is a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.3x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The only portion remaining is the upper part of the human head wearing ear ornaments and a headdress having a protrusion at the top.
414. The accession number of terracotta is 75/328. It is an archaic human figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The legs and hands of the figure are broken.
415. The accession number of terracotta is 75/703. It is a part of a human figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x5x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its lower portion is missing.

416. The accession number of terracotta is 75/717. It is a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.7x2.2x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is in very decayed condition.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/154. It is a human head. It is of *Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x3x0.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. There is a holed lug at the back of the head.
Fig. No. 447: Human Head

418. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/111. It is the head of a human. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4x2.7x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He has a dot in the middle of his forehead. There is a holed lug at the top of his head.
Fig. No. 448: Human Head

419. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/372. It is a mutilated human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.5x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 86/925. It is a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x6x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a fan shaped hood at the top which is decorated with broad incised lines.
421. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/692. It is a human head. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 5.6x4.4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The locks of hair are falling on both sides of the face. There is a bun at the top of the head.
422. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/398. It is the image of a human riding some animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.8x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The figure of animal is completely damaged, only human figure is seen.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/325. It is a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4x2.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Locks of hair are falling on both the sides and there is a bun at the top.
424. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/333. It is the image of a human head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its features are not visible.

Fig. No. 453: Human Head
Fig. No. 454: Man carrying a child

425. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/745. It is a broken image of man carrying a child. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 4x4.5x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is sitting in lalitsana and the child is trying to get away from him.
T. C. Ram Images:

Fig. No. 455: Standing ram

426. The accession number of terracotta is 80/803. It is the image of a standing ram. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8x8.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj.
427. The accession number of terracotta is 75/625. It is an image of a ram. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
428. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/495. It is a broken image of a ram. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x5.3x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/677. It is a broken head of a ram. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.5x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/618. It is head of a ram. It is of Gupta period. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 460: Standing ram

431. The accession number of terracotta is 75/625. It is an image of a ram. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. Mahisāsuramardinī Image:

Fig. No. 461: Mahisāsuramardinī

432. The accession number of terracotta is 80/786. It is the image of Mahisāsuramardinī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 10x5.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Shikhana, Kannauj. It shows two handed goddess standing on the buffalo demon. She has pierced her trident in the body of the animal. 

432.
T. C. Hanumān Image:

Fig. No. 462: Hanumān

433. It is the head of Hanumān. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is one of the rarest early depiction of Hanuman wearing a crown and in benevolent looking posture. His ears can be seen on both sides of his head.
T. C. Medallion:

434. It is the image of a medallion. The size of the terracotta is 2.7x2.6 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a man being eaten by a fish and a smaller fish above the large fish.
435. It is a circular medallion. The size of the antiquity is cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It depicts a man being eaten by a fish and another smaller fish above the large fish.
T.C. Bird Images:

436. It is the image of a bird. The size of the terracotta is 2x2.2 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bird has spread wings. The body and the wings have incised lines. The toy has a pedestal.
It is the image of a bird. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bird has a long tail and her pedestal has been broken.
Fig. No. 467: Bird

438. The accession number of terracotta is 75/739. It is the image of a bird. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x8.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the bird sitting with folded wings. The wings are shown by incised lines. The eyes are shown by incised ring.
Fig. No. 468: Bird

439. The accession number of terracotta is 75/738. It is the image of a bird. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bird is placed on a base.
Fig. No. 469: Bird

440. It is the image of a bird. The size of the antiquity is 1.5x2.5 cm. It is of Gupta period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The toy has got a very long pedestal.
The size of the antiquity is 7x3.3 cm. It is the figure of a bird. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The head of the bird is missing and there is a pedestal.
It is the image of a duck. The size of the antiquity is 2x1.5 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The duck is sitting with folded wings. The wings have incised lines.
443. It is the image of a duck. The size of the antiquity is 1.7x1.8 cm. It is of Guptā period. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/739. It is the image of a bird. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x8.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows the bird sitting with folded wings. The wings are shown by incised lines. The eyes are shown by incised ring.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/738. It is the image of a bird. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The bird is placed on a base.
Fig. No. 475: Peacock

The accession number of terracotta is 75/556. It is the broken figure of a peacock. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x4.3x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/497. It is an image of a peacock. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x2.6x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T.C. Animal Figures:

Fig. No. 477: Lion

The accession number of the antiquity is 75/631. It is the image of a lion. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x5.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
449. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/447. It is a broken image of a leopard. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.3x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 479: An animal

450. It is the image of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.7x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The animal is sitting on the ground.
Fig. No. 480: An animal

451. The accession number of terracotta is 75/650. It is the figure of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6x3.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Lower portion of the figure is broken.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/737. It is the broken figure of a headless man riding some animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 9x5.8x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 482: An animal

453. The accession number of terracotta is 75/457. It is the figure of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x5x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/638. It is an animal head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x3.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
455. The accession number of terracotta is 75/636. It is the figure of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x3.1x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/640. It is a broken figure of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.2x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 486: An animal

The accession number of the antiquity is 75/487. It is a broken image of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x3.8x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/463. It is a broken animal head. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.5x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 488: An animal

The accession number of the antiquity is 75/681. It is a broken image of an animal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x4.3x2.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. Anthropomorphic Images:

The accession number of terracotta is 75/730. It is an anthropomorphic votive figure. The size of the antiquity is 5x6.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The lower part of the figure is missing.

Fig. No. 489: Anthropomorphic Figure
It is an anthropomorphic votive figure. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The left hand of the figure is broken.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/732. It is an anthropomorphic votive figure. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The right leg of the figure is broken.
463. It is an anthropomorphic figure. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The left hand is broken.
It is an anthropomorphic figure. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x3.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The left leg of the figure is missing.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/735. It is an archaic terracotta. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The deity has stump like feet and hands. The face shows a raised portion in the middle. It reminds one of some of the anthropomorphic figure of OCP period.
Fig. No. 495: Anthropomorphic Figure

466. The accession number of the antiquity is 86/916. It is an archaic t.c. image. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.5x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. Molds:

Fig. No. 496: Mold of a female

467. It is the mold of a female. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She wears a necklace, large ear ornaments, and large sized hairdo. She is holding a flower in her right hand.
It is the half part of a mold. The size of the antiquity is 8.3x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. This is a mold for making a conch shell.
469. It is half part of a mold to make an apple shaped object. The size of the antiquity is 5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
It is the half part of a mold for making an anthropomorphic head. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The face has monkey like ears and a long moustache.
It is the half part of the mold for making a dancing male figure. The size of the antiquity is 14.5x10.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The man is wearing short dhoti, ear ornaments and a crown on his head. 

Fig. No. 500: Mold of a dancing male figure
Fig. No. 501: Mold of a couple

472. It is half part of the mold for making flattish figure of a standing couple. The size of the antiquity is 8x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male and female are standing enclose proximity and the mold has an oval shape.
473. It is half part of the mold for making the figure of a goddess (?). The size of the antiquity is 7x6.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The goddess is standing in some bhanga mudra.
Fig. No. 503: Mold of an elephant

474. It is half part of the mold for making an elephant. The size of the antiquity is 10.7x10.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the elephant is very small as compare to the head and the trunk.
Fig. No. 504: Mold of a crocodile

475. It is the half part of the mold for making the figure of a crocodile. The size of the antiquity is cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The animal is walking on his four legs.

Fig. No. 505: Crocodile

476. It is a hollow rattle (toy) in the shape of a crocodile. The size of the antiquity is 14x4.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The crocodile is walking on his four legs.
477. It is the half part of a mold for making the figure of a lady standing in *tribhanga mudra* and flowing ropes. The size of the antiquity is 8.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. The figure is enclosed within an oval shape made by circles.
It is the half part of a mold for making a human figure. The size of the antiquity is 7.6x7.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
It is the half part of the mold for making the figure of a sitting monkey. The size of the antiquity is 11x7.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The monkeys is clasping his head between his knees.
Fig. No. 509: Mold of a medallion

480. It is the half part of a mold for making a medallion. The size of the antiquity is 8x6.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is depicting a man being eaten by a fish and a smaller fish above the large.
481. It is the half part of the mold for making some unidentified shape. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
482. It is the half part of the mold for making the female figure. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7.2x5.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is standing below a fruiting mango tree. The lady is wearing large ear ornaments, a necklace and a crown like object on her head. She is flanked by long stacks probably Amramanjaris hanging from the tree⁴⁷.
Fig. No. 512: Mold of a horse rider

483. It is the half part of the mold for making the figure of a horse rider. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 13x10 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The rider is wearing the conical central Asian cap. It probably depicts a native of central Asia riding a horse.⁴⁸
It is the half part of the mold for making some animal. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
485. It is the half part of the mold for making the female head. The size of the antiquity is 10.5x8.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. She is sporting a bindi on her forehead and wearing ear ornaments.
486. It is the half part of the mold for making the male head. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. He is wearing large ear ornaments and a har. He has a hairdo like an inverted bucket on which a small bun of hair is tied.
Fig. No. 516: Mold of a couple

487. It is the half part of the mold for making the figure of a standing couple. The size of the antiquity is 9x4.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The male and female standing near each other.
488. It is the half part of the mold for making a horse. The size of the antiquity is 13.8x8.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
It is the lower portion of the half part of the mold for making the human figure. The size of the antiquity is 10x9.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The fingers of his left feet are visible on the lower left side of the mold.
It is the half part of the mold for making the figure of a couple. The size of the antiquity is xx cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. They are standing near each other under a tree.
491. It is the half part of the mold for making a horse. The size of the antiquity is 13.5x11.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.⁷⁰
Fig. No. 521: Mold of a bull

492. It is the half part of the mold for making a bull. The size of the antiquity is 18x8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
493. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/808. It is the image of a bi-conical bead. The size of the antiquity is 4x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/401. It is a headless torso. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 7x5.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There is a cloth across his body marked by incised lines.
495. The accessesion number of the antiquity is 75/726. It is part of an image. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x3.5x1.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
496. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/616. It is the upper portion of the image of a deity. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6.3x1.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of the antiquity is 75/409. It is a broken piece of an object. It is of *Guptā* period. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. 

*Fig. No. 526: Broken piece of an object*
498. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/704. It is the upper portion of the image of a deity. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5.4x5.6x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 527: Upper portion of the image of a deity
Fig. No. 528: Broken object

499. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/686. It is a broken t.c. object. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3x3.3x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 529: Image of a kid

500. It is the image of a kid. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The kid is standing.
Fig. No. 530: Image of a dancer

501. The accession number of terracotta is 75/299. It is the image of a dancer in a rathikā. It is of 8th century A.D. The size of the antiquity is 11.5x6.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is an image of a lady in dancing posture. She is wearing necklace, ear ornaments and a large headdress.
502. The accession number of terracotta is. It is the image of a deity. It is of 15th-16th century A.D. The size of the antiquity is 9x6.5x3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. This is a broken image of Kārtikeya riding a peacock and holding two flowers in his both hands. Pan leaf shaped abhāmandala is shown behind his head. He is wearing a crown.
The accession number of terracotta is 76/689. It is an unknown figure. The size of the antiquity is 5.7x4.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The two stumps are raised like hands and there is a head like protrusion at the top.
Fig. No. 533: Unknown figure

504. The accession number of terracotta is 75/728. It is an unknown figure. The size of the antiquity is 6.4x4.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/567. It is an unknown figure. The size of the antiquity is 5.1x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has raised hands, a long body and a protrusion in the place of head.
506. The accession number of terracotta is 75/675. It is an unidentified piece. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 5x4x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 536: Unknown figure

507. The accession number of terracotta is 75/646. It is an unidentified piece. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x2.2x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
508. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/483. It is the image of an unidentified object. The size of the antiquity is 7.5x3.5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

509. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/750. It is a broken t.c. object. The size of the antiquity is 9.2x4.3x4.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. Bells:

Fig. No. 539: Image of a t.c. bell

510. The accession number of terracotta is 75. It is the image of a bell. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a terracotta bell decorated with bands having square designs, vertical strips and applique designs as we move from bottom to top. It is topped with a ring for hanging the bell.
It is a t.c. bell. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is a terracotta bell decorated with bands having square designs, vertical strips and applique designs as we move from bottom to top. It is topped with a ring for hanging the bell.
Fig. No. 541: Image of a t.c. bell

512. It is a t.c. bell. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x5.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. T.c. bell is decorated with incised lines. Its ring is broken.
It is a t.c. bell. The size of the antiquity is 5.2x4.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Its ring is intact.
It is a t.c. bell. The size of the antiquity is 6.2x4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. T.C. bell is broken. It is decorated with a broad band having vertical incised lines, thin band of small rectangles and a band of lotus petals. It is broken.
It is a t.c. bell. The size of the antiquity is 5.7x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is broken. The body is decorated with long leaf like motif.
T. C. Discs:

Fig. No. 545: T.C. Disc

516. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.2x4.2x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 546: T.C. Disc

517. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3.5x0.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.
Fig. No. 547: T.C. Disc

518. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is decorated with concentric circles and incised margins.

Fig. No. 548: T.C. piece

519. The accession number of terracotta piece is 75/806. It is the image of a terracotta piece. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
The accession number of terracotta piece is 75/807. It is the image of a button shaped object. The size of the antiquity is 1.4x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The button shaped object has a raised portion at the top of a disc.

It is a t.c. disc having eight holes. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
522. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 6.3x6.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is decorated with fish net pattern.

523. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.8x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
524. It is a t.c. holed disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.6x3.4x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

525. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is decorated with a fish net pattern.
Fig. No. 555: T.C. Disc

526. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4.5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 556: T.C. Disc

527. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.4x3.4x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.7x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
530. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x3.5x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

531. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x4.8x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
532. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x3.3x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

533. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
Fig. No. 563: T.C. Disc

534. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 564: T.C. Disc

535. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 7.6x3.2x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is decorated with fish net pattern.
Fig. No. 565: T.C. Disc

536. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.6x3.7x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 566: T.C. Disc

537. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x3x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with half circle incisions.
538. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

539. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4.3x0.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with triangle incisions.
It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x4.1x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3x3.2x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
542. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x4.1x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.

543. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x4.1x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.
It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4x1.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x4.1x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
546. It is a holed t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x3.1x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.

547. It is a terracotta disc. The size of the antiquity is 8.3x8.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a crocodile skin pattern and a hole in the middle.
Fig. No. 577: T.C. Disc

548. It is a terracotta disc. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is broken and has a hole in the middle.

Fig. No. 578: T.C. Disc

549. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.7x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Raised U within a U figure is made on the disc.

Raised U within a U figure is made on the disc.

Raised U within a U figure is made on the disc.
Fig. No. 579: T.C. Disc

550. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 580: T.C. Disc

551. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.5x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.
It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.5x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.4x4.4x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.
Fig. No. 583: T.C. Disc

554. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.1x4.1x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 584: T.C. Disc

555. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.
Fig. No. 585: T.C. Disc

556. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x4.8x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 586: T.C. Disc

557. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.3x4.3x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.
558. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.

559. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x4.7x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.
It is a broken t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.9x4.9x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.
Fig. No. 591: T.C. Disc

562. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 5.5x5.5x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Margins of the disc are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 592: T.C. Disc

563. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4.2x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with short incisions.
564. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4x4x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.

Fig. No. 593: T.C. Disc

565. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3.5x0.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.

Fig. No. 594: T.C. Disc
Fig. No. 595: T.C. Disc

566. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.6x4.6x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 596: T.C. Disc

567. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3.5x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.
It is a broken t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 3.9x1.2x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. It is decorated with fish net pattern.

It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x4.7x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. Edges are decorated with half circle incisions.
Fig. No. 599: T.C. Disc

570. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.4x4.3x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with short incisions.

Fig. No. 600: T.C. Disc

571. It is a t.c. disc. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x4.8x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
T. C. Wheel Images:

572. It is a terracotta wheel. The size of the antiquity is 3.7x3.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

573. It is a terracotta wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has been made like a wheel having spokes.
574. It is a terracotta wheel. It is a terracotta disc. The size of the antiquity is 6x6.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has been made like a wheel having spokes.

575. It is a broken t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has been made like a spoked wheel.
576. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 4.8x4.8x0.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. There are four incised concentric lines in the middle.

577. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 2.6x2.6x0.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 607: T.C. Wheel

578. It is a broken t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5x4.1x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.

Fig. No. 608: T.C. Wheel

579. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
580. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 4.7x4.7x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges of the disc are decorated with incisions.

581. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5x5x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 611: T.C. Wheel

582. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 5.4x4.6x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 612: T.C. Wheel

583. It is a t.c. wheel. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.7x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. Edges are decorated with incisions.
T. C. Bead Images:

584. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 5x5.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

585. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 4.5x4.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 615: T.C. Bead

586. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 616: T.C. Bead

587. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 617: T.C. Bead

588. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 2.4x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 618: T.C. Bead

589. It is a t.c. bead. The size of the antiquity is 1.8x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. Stamp & Gamesman Images:

Fig. No. 619: T.C. Stamp

590. The accession number of the antiquity is 75/778. It is a stamp. The size of the antiquity is 9.8x5.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is used for printing clothes.

Fig. No. 620: T.C. Stamp

591. The accession number of terracotta is 75/781. It is a broken t.c. stamp. The size of the antiquity is 6.3x7.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
592. The accession number of terracotta is 75/41. It is a broken t.c. stamp. The size of the antiquity is 5.3x5.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

593. The accession number of terracotta is 75/779. It is a t.c. stamp. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x6.1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
594. It is a t.c. stamp. The size of the antiquity is 5x5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

595. It is a t.c. gamesman. The size of the antiquity is 2x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. & Jasper Cylindrical Objects:

596. It is a t.c. cylindrical studs. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x2.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

597. It is a t.c. cylindrical studs. The size of the antiquity is 0.8x2.8x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 627: Jasper Cylindrical Object

598. It is the image of a cylindrical object. The size of the antiquity is 1.6x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is made of jasper.

Fig. No. 628: Jasper Cylindrical Object

599. It is a cylindrical object made of jasper. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
600. It is a cylindrical object made of black jasper. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x2.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

601. It is a cylindrical object made of jasper. The size of the antiquity is 2.6x2.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
602. It is a cylindrical object made of jasper. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

603. It is a box like terracotta object having three linear marks on one face. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x1.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
604. It is a t.c. gamesman i.e. nail like object. The size of the antiquity is 5x2.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 634: Nail like Object

605. It is a t.c. gamesman. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 635: T.C. Tablet

It is a t.c. tablet. The size of the antiquity is 6.5x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is having checkered pattern.
607. The accession number of terracotta is 75/758. It is a t.c. tablet. The size of the antiquity is 9.5x7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is decorated with arrow head motifs pointing downward.
The accession number of terracotta is 75/757. It is the image of a skin rubber. The size of the antiquity is 9x6.5 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 638: T.C. Tablet

609. It is the image of a cow with calf on a tablet. The size of the terracotta object is 1.8x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The t.c. tablet is bordered by a solid line and two dotted lines. It shows a cow and a calf.

Fig. No. 639: T.C. Tablet

610. It is the image of bull on a tablet. The size of the antiquity is 1.8x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The t.c. tablet is bordered by a solid line and two dotted lines. It shows a sitting bull.
T. C. & Bone Dices:

Fig. No. 640: T.C. Dice

611. It is the image of a cubical dice of terracotta. The size of the antiquity is 2x1.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.

Fig. No. 641: T.C. Dice

612. It is the image of a cubical dice of terracotta. The size of the antiquity is 1.7x1.7x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
613. It is the image of a cubical dice of terracotta. The size of the antiquity is 1.4x1.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
T. C. & Bone Chausar Images:

Fig. No. 643: Bone Chausar

614. It is a dice used for playing *Chausar*. The size of the antiquity is 6.1x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. It is made of bone.

Fig. No. 644: Bone Chausar

615. It is a dice used for playing *Chausar*. It is made of bone.

Fig. No. 645: T.C. Chausar

616. It is a dice used for playing *Chausar*. The size of the antiquity is 3.8x1.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. It is made of terracotta.
617. It is a dice used for playing *Chausar*. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x1.2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. It is made of bone.

618. It is a dice used for playing *Chausar*. The size of the antiquity is 6.7x1.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is *Kannauj*. It is made of bone.
Bone Amulet:

619. It is the replica of a dagger made of bone probably an amulet. The size of the antiquity is 8.3x1.9 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has two holes.

Fig. No. 648: Bone Amulet

620. It is the replica of a dagger made of bone probably an amulet. The size of the antiquity is 7x2.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The body of the scabbard is decorated with deep incised lines.
621. It is part of the replica of the dagger made of bone. The size of the antiquity is 3.6x2.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is only the tip of the dagger. It is decorated with deep incised lines and punched holed surface58.
Bone Bangles:

622. It is a part of a bangle made of bone. The size of the antiquity is 5.7x0.6 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj⁵⁹.

623. It is a part of a bangle made of bone. The size of the antiquity is 8.2x0.8 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj⁶⁰.
Fig. No. 653: Bone Bangle

624. It is a part of a bangle made of bone. The size of the antiquity is 6x6x1 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj.
Fig. No. 654: T.C. Beads

625. It is the image of beads made of terracotta.
Fig. No. 655: T.C. Bead Necklace

626. It is the image of a necklace made of assorted terracotta beads found from different sites of Kannauj.
627. It is the image of bone Arrow heads, points, and styluses\textsuperscript{62}.

**Fig. No. 656: Bone Arrow heads, Points & Styluses**
Fig. No. 657: T.C. Marbles

628. It is the image of marbles made of terracotta.
Fig. No. 658: T.C. Marbles

629. It is the image of marbles made of terracotta.
Fig. No. 659: T.C. Beads & a disc

630. It is the image of beads and a disc made of terracotta.
631. The provenance of the terracotta discs is *Kannauj* decorated with different motifs.\(^\text{63}\).
The provenance of the terracotta beads is Kannauj.
Sealings:

Fig. No. 662: T.C. Sealing

633. The accession number of terracotta is 7/5/8. It is a seal. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.5x3x0.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The seal shows the palm leaf. Below it is an inscription of two lines. It reads: (1) Śrīmato rājagu (pta), (2) prakrityasu.
634: The accession number of inscribed terracotta seal of Avantivarman is 79-S-92. The size of the seal is 10x6.3x2.1 cm. The provenance of the seal is Kannauj. It reads as (1) [Chatussamudrātivakrānta kīrtiha pratāpanurāgopanatānyarā*] jo vannarnāśramvyavastāpana-pratāpanapravatta (2) [chatatradanavatradhar iva prajānāmatrihara śrīmahārājaha*] rivarmmā/*] tasya putrayasta] tpādānudhyāto jaya (3) [swāminibhattārikādevyāmutpanna śrīmahārājādityavarābhivalmāi/*] tasya putrayasta] tpādānuvyāto harshaguptā (4) [bhattārikādevyāmutpanna śrīmahārājādityavarābhivalmāi/*] tasya putṭratatpādānuvyāta upaguptā*] bhattārīkā. Thaplyal ascribes it to Avantivarman⁶⁴.
Fig. No. 664: T.C. Sealing showing Gajalakśmī

635. The accession number of terracotta is 75/514. It is image of the part of a sealing showing Gajalakśmī. It is of Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.1x3.3x2 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. The goddess is shown standing. She is being anointed by two elephants standing on large lotus flowers.
The accession number of terracotta is S/13. It is a seal. It is of later Guptā period. The size of the antiquity is 3.7x3x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a lion sitting in front of a wheel. There is a two line inscription below it. It reads: (1) da . Te sa ka sri (2) . . . .
Fig. No. 666: T.C. Sealing

637. The accession number of terracotta seal is S/22. The size of the antiquity is 3.2X3.2x0.6 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhammahetu (2) prabhavohetu (3) tathagato. Vadite (4) saṁ chayonirodha (5) vādi mahāsr (6) maṇḍah.
The accession number of terracotta seal is S/69. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x2.3x0.8 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhamma (2) prabhavohetu (3) tathagato. ha (4) vedatasam chayoni (5) mahasramaṇīha (6) rodhaevam vādi
Fig. No. 668: T.C. Sealing

639. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/48. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x3.2x0.4 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads

(1) ye dhammahetu
(2) prabhava
(3) . . . . .
(4) . . . . .
(5) mahasramanah

Fig. No. 669: T.C. Sealing

640. The accession number of terracotta is S/53. The size of the antiquity is 3x3.3x0.8 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads

(1) ye dhammahetu
(2) . . . . .
(3) . . . . .
(4) . . . . .
(5) mahasramanah
Fig. No. 670: T.C. Sealing

641. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/29. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x2.8x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a stupa in the middle and a seven line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhamma (2) hetu pradhava he (3) tum tesa . . tatha (4) gatohava da tesam (5) cha nirodha (6) evam vādī mahasra (7) maṇḍah

Fig. No. 671: T.C. Sealing

642. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/24. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x2.5x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a stupa in the middle and a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhamma hetu (2) prabhava hetu tesam (3) . . . (4) . . . (5) . . . evam vadi (6) mahasramanah
The accession number of terracotta sealing is 88. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x0.6 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads:

1. yedha[mma]  
2. prabhavohetu tesamtatha  
3. gato havada tesam  
4. chayo . . . evamvadi  
5. mahasramaṇah

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/74. The size of the antiquity is 3x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It reads:

1. yedhamma he  
2. tупраbhavohetu te  
3. sam havada tesam  
4. . . . . . .  
5. evamvadi maha  
6. sramaṇah
The accession number of terracotta seal is S/86. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It reads: (1) yedhamma he (2) tuprabhavohetu te (3) sam havada tesam (4) . . . . . . (5) . . . . . . Maha (6) srama.

The accession number of terracotta seal is S/37. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It reads: (1) yedhamma hetupra (2) bhavo he. tesam (3) havada . . . . tesam (4) chayo nirodha evam va (5) di mahasrama (6) prabhava
647. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/75. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhammahetu (2) prabhavo hetu (3) tesam chayo (4) . . . (5) . . . maha (6) sravanah

648. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/50. The size of the antiquity is 2.7x2.6x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a stupa in the middle and a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) . . . (2) . . . (3) . . . (4) . . . (5) . . . ma (6) hasramaṇaḥ
The accession number of terracotta seal is S/34. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. It is a Buddhist formula and reads (1) ye dhammahetu (2) prabhavo hetu tesam (3) tathagato havadatesam (4) chayo nirodha evam va (5) di mahasramaṇah.

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/45. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x3.5x0.6 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has five line illegible inscription. It has the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.
Fig. No. 680: T.C. Sealing

651. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/25. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x2.2x0.7 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has one line illegible inscription around the central stupa. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.

Fig. No. 681: T.C. Sealing

652. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/32. The size of the antiquity is 2.2x2.2x0.7 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has six line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.
653. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/73. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x2.3x0.8 cm. It is of 9\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It shows a stupa in the middle and an illegible inscription of seven lines. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.

654. The accession number of terracotta seal is S/82. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x2.4x0.4 cm. It is of 9\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.
655. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/71. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.2x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.

656. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/67. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x3x0.6 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.
The accession number of terracotta seal is S/87. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x2.2x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. It carries the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/85. The size of the antiquity is 2.7x2.5x1.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.

Fig. No. 686: T.C. Sealing

Fig. No. 687: T.C. Sealing
659. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/44. The size of the antiquity is 3x2.8x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. It carries the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.

660. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/66. The size of the antiquity is 3x3x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.
661. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/42. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x2.3x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a stupa and a seven line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.

662. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/58. The size of the antiquity is 3x3x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.
The accession number of terracotta seal is S/81. The size of the antiquity is 2.5x2.2x0.2 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/60. The size of the antiquity is 2.8x2.5x0.2 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.

Fig. No. 692: T.C. Sealing

Fig. No. 693: T.C. Sealing
The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/40. The size of the antiquity is 3x3.3x0.7 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/35. The size of the antiquity is 1.8x0.7 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It is broken and has a five line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.

Fig. No. 694: T.C. Sealing

Fig. No. 695: T.C. Sealing
667. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/89. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x20.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.

668. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/28. The size of the antiquity is 2.4x0.7 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a six line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇah”.
The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/77. The size of the antiquity is 2.9x2.5x0.5 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.

The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/65. The size of the antiquity is 2.6x2.4x0.4 cm. It is of 9th century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ”.
671. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/59. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x3.2x1 cm. It is of 9\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “\textit{ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ}”.

672. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/46. The size of the antiquity is 3.2x0.5 cm. It is of 9\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line inscription. Probably it is the Buddhist formula “\textit{ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramaṇaḥ}”.
673. The accession number of terracotta is S/23. It is a sealing. It is of 9th century A.D. The size of the antiquity is 4x3.5x1.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has six line inscription. It is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.

674. The accession number of terracotta is S/27. It is a sealing. It is of 9th century A.D. The size of the antiquity is 3.3x4x0.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has five line inscription. It is the Buddhist formula “ye dhamma hetu prabhavo hetu tesam tathagato havada tesam cha yonirodha evam va di mahasramapah”.

Fig. No. 702: T.C. Sealing

Fig. No. 703: T.C. Sealing
675. The accession number of terracotta sealing is S/32. The size of the antiquity is 2.3x0.3 cm. The provenance of the antiquity is Kannauj. It has a five line illegible inscription.
Carved Bricks:

676. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is Club Ghar, Kannauj.
677. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*.

678. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*. 
679. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*.

680. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*. 
681. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is Club Ghar, Kannauj.
Fig. No. 711: T.C. Brick

682. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is Club Ghar, Kannauj.

Fig. No. 712: T.C. Brick

683. It is a terracotta brick showing the Buddha image. The provenance of the brick is Club Ghar, Kannauj.
684. It is a terracotta brick showing the piece of a chariot pulled by the horses. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj.*
Fig. No. 714: T.C. Brick

685. It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*.
686. It is a terracotta brick showing the image of a man standing with folded hands. The provenance of the brick is Club Ghar, Kannauj.
It is a terracotta brick showing the image of a male standing with right hand raised and the left hand is kept on the waist. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj.*
It is a terracotta brick. The provenance of the brick is *Club Ghar, Kannauj*.
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Ancient Literature of North Indian Architecture

Prof. Amar Singh

Sanskrit Literature from Vedic to Epics, Arthaśāstra, Purāṇas, Agamas, Tantras, Brihatsaṁhitā and other miscellaneous works, is full of references related to a rich Vāstu tradition in Ancient India. Some of them have separate chapters regarding secular and religious buildings, town planning, fortification, art, iconography and paintings. Literary sources of North Indian architecture can be classified mainly into three broad categories: General literature, miscellaneous works and Specific literature. The general literature of early period is Vedic literature (Samhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras), Epic literature (Rāmaṇya and Mahābhārata), Buddhist literature (Pāli canons and Jātakas) and Jain literature, which is religious in character and not directly related to architecture; the miscellaneous works are Arthaśāstra, Purāṇas and Brihatsaṁhitā dealing with numerous subjects and also have one or more than one chapter on architecture; while under the specific class of literature mention may be made of Vāstu and Śilpa-texts which are directly related to architecture.

Vedic literature

Among the Vedic literature, Rīgveda is the earliest. Its numerous incidental references provide a good picture of architectural development during that period. In the Rīgveda, the Vāstu or the site of the building is conceived as being presided over by a deity called ‘Vāstośpati’ who is presented as protector of the house. In two hymns he is prayed for an excellent abode free from disease and full of wealth and cattle. In another verse he is propitiated so that a pillar may be strong and firm at its place.

Many words used in the Rīgveda refer to dwelling places, which give some idea of the architectural buildings, such as chhardi (roof of a house), sabhā (an assembly hall?), durona (a door), harmyā (a room on the upper part of a house). A reference of making a piece of land slope towards the east indicates that the rules of selecting the site for building were already in existence in the Rīgvedic period. The occurrence of the word ‘Māna’ in Rīgveda shows that a system of measurement was also followed in construction of various objects. Rīgveda mentions the word ‘Pura’ for the fort that is wide and expanded, made up of stone and iron, with hundred walls or towers, a Pura full of...
animals\textsuperscript{13}. Thus, the *Vedic Pruas* were merely forts as the *Ṛigveda Saṁhita* mentions tribes living in fortifications called *Pura*, protected and strengthened by wooden and stone walls.

During the *Ṛigvedic* period, the door formed an important feature of all the houses. The door is called *dvāra, dura, bārā, khāni* and so on. In one hymn, doors are described as *Virāta, Samrada, Prābhvi, Vāhbi* and *Bhuyasi* meaning variously and perfectly radiant, manifold, excellent, many and numerous. The strength and stability of the door was a matter of special interest. It appears that a large number of doors were attached to some houses. The house of *Varūṇa* is described as having thousand doors in it (*sahasra dvāram*). A special worship was offered to these doors as is evident from a *Ṛigvedic* hymn.

The other references of pillars are also found in the *Ṛigveda* where several names of pillars like *Sthuna, Stambha, Skambha or Viskambha* and *Yūpa* are provided to both free standing pillars and supports. Several other words such as *Upāmit, Meta, Upāmat, Dharana* etc. are used to refer only to the supports. Many gods are compared to pillars in respect of the support they provide to their worshippers. The “*Sahasra-sthuna*” (thousand-pillared) house of *Varūṇa* is mentioned in the *Ṛigveda*. The *Yūpa* was erected at the time of the sacrifice. The use of the two words ‘*Yūpa*’ and ‘*Sthuna*’ indicates that they are synonymous and that the shape of the pillars at that time resembled each other.

The *Sāla Sūkta* of *Atharvaveda* contains many architectural terms like *vansa* (beam) above the *sthuna* (post) and of the *upāmit*, the *pratimit* (up right support) and the *parimit* (the beam of a roof, rafter) of a *Sāla*. Houses of various shapes and varying sides are referred to in this Veda. Common residential houses technically known as *Sāla* houses represent mainly the wooden architecture. The term ‘*Sāla*’ primarily means a thatch of straw for sheltering people and animals was later on used for a house in general. The *SatapathaBrahmaṇa* and the *AitareyaBrahmaṇa* explain the octagonal form of the *Yūpas* or the sacrificial posts by saying that “it was the *vajra* (thunderbolt) and the *vajra* was eight-sided”\textsuperscript{14}.

From the description of the *Brahmaṇas* it may be inferred that in the *Ṛigvedic* period also the *Yūpas* were octagonal in form. It appears that the ‘*vajra*’ (octagonal) type of pillars mentioned in the latter *Vāstu*-texts which were very common in Indian Architecture seem to have originated from these *Yūpas*. The *Kṛiśṇa Yajurveda* provides numerous hymns to the *Yūpa*\textsuperscript{15}. Of the *Yūpa* it is said, “What is dug in belongs to the *Pitra*; what is above the part dug in, up to the girdle, belongs to men, the girdle belongs to plants. What is above the girdle, up to the top, to all gods; the top to *Indra*, the rest to the *Sandhyās*”\textsuperscript{16}.

According to T. P. Bhattacharya these hymns may have given rise to the depictions of the figures or symbols of the *Pitra*, human beings, plants, *Indra* and the *Sandhyas* on the different parts of the *Yūpa*\textsuperscript{17}. These *Yūpas* may be taken as the prototype of the *Dhwaja-Stambhas* of the latter periods, which were
presented on the front of the shrines or temples depicting an emblem of the cult deity on the top. While describing the building operation, the Atharvaveda mentions the term ‘Sthûna’ for the supporting pillar.

The Sûtras provide basic principles of architecture such as, the different methods of selection and examination of a proper site of a building, the auspicious moments for erecting a house, the regulations regarding the position of the rooms in the house, planting of the trees in and around the house, rules for constructing the sacrificial alters, methods of offerings and rituals during the entering in the newly built house. The Sankhâyana Griha Sûtra describes the rituals performed by a man when he builds a new house. The Asvâlayana, the Khadira, the Gobhila and the Apastambha Griha Sûtras lay down elaborate rules for selection and examination of the ground and the Hiranyakesi Griha Sûtra cites the process for propitiating the ground. This ceremony of propitiation is called the Vâstusamana ceremony. The Gobhila GrihaSûtra provides regulations regarding the direction of the doors of a house on the basis of its merits and demerits placing them on the east, west, north and south.

Epics

Râmâyana and Mahâbhârata both have a very long tradition. Though, traditionally it is said to have been composed thousands of years ago, the description of architecture given in the Râmâyana and the Mahâbhârata help us to get an idea of the age, is undoubtedly a long period extending from several centuries B.C. to the third or the fourth century A.D., as there are many interpolations and additions made in successive periods. Many concepts, ideas and practices pertaining to architecture in vogue during those days are highlighted in both the texts. The people lived in cities and villages. The cities were fortified. There were beautiful houses, palaces, gardens and other buildings. Although the descriptions of the construction of cities (like Ayodhyâ, Kishkindhâ, Lankâ, Dwârkâ and Indraprasthâ), houses and palaces is provided in the epics, it does not have any specific chapter on architecture, as has been compiled in many of the Purânas, neither it gives much information about the actual architectural principles as described in the ancient Vâstu-texts. Even then, there are many passages and technical terms used at various places, which indicate that a science of architecture (Shilpaśâstra and Vâstuvidyâ) existed at that time and the architects (Sthapati) were called buddhi sampanno (Experts in Vâstuvidya). One of the earliest mentions of Vâstu-vidya (the science of architecture) is also found in the Mahâbhârata. The names of Viśvakarmâ and Mâyâ, famous in later literature as the authors of architectural treatise are mentioned in the Râmâyana and Mahâbhârata, not as writers but as master-architects of the Gods (Devasîlpi) and the Danavas (Danavaşîlpi) respectively. In Indian mythology Viśvakarmâ is known as all-creator, divine architect or artist, sometimes identified with Tvâshtri, he is said to have revealed Sthapatya-veda or fourth Upa-veda, he is also identified with Prajâpati-Bramhâ,
the creator of all things and architect of the universe\textsuperscript{23}. \textit{Kishkindhya Kānda}\textsuperscript{24} refers a story that how Maya acquired the knowledge of \textit{Silpasatra} from Brahma. In \textit{Mahābhārata}, Viśvakarmā, the son of \textit{Brahma} is said to have been the master of thousand arts, the Vardhaki (carpenter) of the gods and superior to all architects\textsuperscript{25}. He is also mentioned as son of the \textit{Vasu Prabhāsa} and Yoga-siddha\textsuperscript{26}. He constructed the chariots of the gods. Men earned their livelihood by practicing the arts invented by him and offered worship to Viśvakarmā\textsuperscript{27}. He constructed the Sabhā of Vaivasvata\textsuperscript{28}. Viśvakarmā is also mentioned in the \textit{Rāmāyana} as the divine architect who is credited to build the city of Lanka\textsuperscript{29}. It is difficult to identify mythological Viśvakarmā with a human being who was really an architect, worked as \textit{Silpi} and composed various texts on architecture. The word Viśvakarmā later on became an epithet (title) and was also used for the man who was a good architect.

Māyā is often called Dānava or Daitya, described as Diti’s son in the \textit{Rāmāyana} who was one of the wives of Kaśyapa\textsuperscript{30}. He is also said to be the son of Vipracitti and Simhika and a brother of Rāhu. Simhika is said to be a chhāyāgrahi rākshasi or arākshasi who catches shadows and tried to prevent Hanumāna from reaching Sri Lanka. Māyā, an architect and king of the Dānavas built the city of Lanka\textsuperscript{31}. However, \textit{Uttarākanḍa} of \textit{Rāmāyanasay} says that Lankāpuri was built by Visvakarmā\textsuperscript{32}. Māyā is also known as an Asura, the artificer or architect of the \textit{Daityas}, also versed in magic, astronomy and military science. In \textit{Mahābhārata}, Māyā calls himself the Viśvakarmā of the Dānavas\textsuperscript{33}. He constructed a magnificent palace of illusions called the Māyā Sabha at Indraprastha. It was full of ‘magical’ ponds and lakes as well as natural ponds and lakes\textsuperscript{34}. The materials for the assembly hall was collected by him from the kingdom of the Dānava king Vrishāparva, situated to the north of the Kailāshanear the Vindu Lake and, to the north-east of Indraprastha\textsuperscript{35}. The detailed description of some of the cities provides the idea of town-planning during that period. In the \textit{Adi Parva} of \textit{Mahābhārata}, it is said that the Indraprastha city was surrounded by sea-like ditches and its enclosure walls were touching the sky\textsuperscript{36}. The \textit{Chaityaka} hill of Girivraj had walls or Prakāras.\textsuperscript{37} The Pura was protected with different kinds of gateways (Gopura) attached with towers (Attālakas)\textsuperscript{38}. There were beautiful palatial buildings, houses, pleasant retreats, fine museums, artificial hills, numerous tanks and lakes, many parks and gardens\textsuperscript{39}.

The towns were usually called ‘Puras’ which were generally fortified. They were protected by high parapet walls going all around; and outside them were the ditches, often more than one, deep and of great width, hence the ramparts and the ditches constituted an integral part of the town-planning\textsuperscript{40}. The defense-walls were attached with gateways (Gopuram) and towers (Attālaka). The cities had at least four gates, with high structures, erected over them\textsuperscript{41}. The bridges were also built to cross over the ditches\textsuperscript{42}. Inside the town, there were streets (Rathyas and Anurathyas) and roads (Mahāpathyas or Mahāpathas and Rājapathas) which ran in various directions and crossed one another\textsuperscript{43}. At crossings there was generally a place of worship\textsuperscript{44}. Besides these, there were the
extensive “Rājamārgas”. On two sides of the Mahā-pathas were the shops and sheds for supplying drinking water (Prāpa). The houses, palaces, ponds, tanks and lakes, parks and gardens, Toranas, Pratolis, Yūpas, Chaityas and gardens further beautified the cities. Doors formed an important feature of cities and houses.

Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata contain several references dealing with the forts and fortifications of the cities. The classification of forts into four types such as Nadeya (river fort), Parvatya (hill fort), Vanya (forest fort), Kritima (artificial fort) in the Rāmāyana and six varieties namely Dhanvā Durga (desert fort), Māhi Durga (earth-fort), Giri Durga(hill fort), Manushya Durga (human fort), Vana Durga (forest fort), similar to those enjoined in the Vāstu Śāstras, is also found in the Mahābhārata.

Pali Canons or early Buddhist literature

Pali Canon or early Buddhist literature was composed and compiled between the six and the third or second century B.C. The Jātaka-stories and the Vinaya Pitaka contain valuable information about architecture in general and about Buddhist architecture in particular. The references of Vatthuviḍḍhārīyas (ācāryas of Vāstuvidya) in Jātaka-stories, Vāstuvidya (science of architecture) itself as one of the arts in Diggha Nikaya, Prāsādamangalam in Jātaka-story no.489 (consecration ceremony of a new palace), the technical words like Bhumī (storey) in Jātaka-story no. 541, Padmā, osthā and Grivā (names of the mouldings) in Jātaka-story no. 262, Pannasala (a thatched hut) in Jātaka-story no. 489, the names of palaces and streets such as, Kokānada nāmā Pasāda in Jātaka-story no. 353, Pupphaka (Puspaka) nama Pasada in Jātaka-story no.525, Uppalavithi in Jātaka-story no.261 and numerous other technical terms such as, Prāsāda, Vimūna, prakāra, parikha, dvārakotthaka, attalaka (tower), gopuram, alinda, mandapa, thamba (stambha), khamba (khambha), vedika, kaksāsana, ummaga (underground tunnel) in Jātaka-story no.546, Devakula, Chetiya (Chaitya), bhittī (wall), bhittipada (foundation all) in Jātaka-story no.489, Alindaka (Verandah), uparipesādatala (the upper storey of a palace), Kannika (pinnacle) in Jātaka-stories nos. 396 and 418, gopanasiya, vātayana, sopana, udummarā (udumbara) etc. clearly indicate that the knowledge of architecture had already been established and the rules and regulations regarding constructions of houses were formulated.

The Mahāvagga and the Cullavagga give us an idea of about the architecture of early Buddhist monasteries. The fifth and the sixth chapters of the Cullavagga contain the names of the structures which were, according to tradition, permitted by the Buddha to be used by his disciples. Five kind of buildings allowed to be used by Buddha’s disciples were Vihāra (monastery), Addhāyoga (a peculiar kind of building or probably a house shaped like the Garuṇa bird), Prasāda (a palace or a multistoried building), Harmya (a stone house) and Guhā (artificial or natural cave). Each of these must have been
Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra

Kauṭilyā (also known as Vishnugupta or Chānākya), a teacher at Taxilā University, who is said to have been responsible for the rise of Chandragupta Maurya to the power of Magadha, is credited for the composition of Arthaśāstra, which is mainly a work on polity, but it also deals with many other subjects including Vāstu-Vidyā or the science of architecture. According to Indian tradition Kauṭilyā was the minister and adviser of Chandragupta Maurya and thus his work may belong to the fourth century B.C. but some scholars believe that it is a later compilation of first-second century A.D. but its contents on architecture suggest that the final version of Arthaśāstra cannot be later than first century B.C.

The purpose of the Arthaśāstra is stated to be that of laying down means for acquisition and maintenance of dominion over earth. It is divided into 15 Adhikaranas and 180 Prakaranas which provide information about the duties of a king, the qualification of ministers, the different kinds of spies, the administration and fortification of towns, civil and criminal laws, the seven elements of kingship, the six lines of policy, the foreign policy and many other subjects related to the state and polity. Besides, Arthaśāstra also contains various references and a few chapters separately dealing with civil architecture. Reflections of many old traditions and basic principles of architecture evolved earlier are also found in the text.

According to Arthaśāstra the word ‘Vāstu’ has been defined as: “Houses or the sites of houses, pleasure-gardens (ārama), Setubandhas (embankments and bridges) and lakes were called Vāstu”56. Thus, the buildings like palaces, houses, forts, bridges etc. including other engineering work were called Vāstu. The use of technical words like, Vāstuhrdaya Navabhāga (nine Padas or squares in the centre of 81 Padas or Vāstu-mandala) or Pada-vināyāsa (measurement planning, of using one square of the site as a scale for measurement), Prāsāda, Harmya, Sabhā, Chatuhśāla, Pratoli, Stambha and Sthuna, Setubandha, Chaitya, Stupa and several other references in chapters related to Mārga-vinyasa (road planning), Dig-vināyāsa (giving an account of the position of the habitations of the various classes in the city mentioning directions) and Durga-vināyāsa (planning of forts and fortification)57 suggest that the knowledge of Vāstu-vidyā (the science of architecture) was in existence from an earlier period in India and was perfectly known during the period described by the Arthaśāstra. It appears that the architecture described in the Arthaśāstra was highly developed.
**Brihatsamhītā**

_Brihatsamhītā_, an astronomical work was composed by _Varāhamihira_ during the Gupta period in about six century A.D. Though it mainly deals with astrology but like _Purānas, Brihatsamhītā_ is also encyclopaedic in nature and contains various other subjects including architecture. In this treatise there is one chapter on temple architecture and four chapters are devoted to other building activities and sculpture dealing with the selection of building sites, testing of soil, general plan, comparative measures of storeys and doors and carvings thereon and other important parts of a building. _Brihatsamhītā_ also provides the description of the twenty types of temples with their measurements, shape of ground-plan, elevation and embellishment, same as in the _Matsya_ and the _Bhavisya-Purānas_, the names and details being identical. The preparation of _Vajralepa_, a kind of plaster, is discussed in a separate chapter. One whole chapter is devoted to the construction of the necessary articles of house-furniture, such as bedsteads, couches, and seats. _VarāhaMihira_ clearly indicates that the material of _Brihatsamhītā_ was borrowed from the old works of the authorities like _Māyā, Visvakarma, Garga, Vasiṣṭha, Manu_ and _Nagnajit_. So, it appears that the principles of architecture represented in _Brihatsamhītā_ must have been evolved and propounded up to the Gupta period.

**Purānas**

_Purānas_ deal with various subjects. It is encyclopaedic in nature. The five original topics of _Purānas_ are _Sarga_ (creation), _pratisarga_ (re-creation), _vamsā_ (genealogy of gods or sages or kings), _manvantaras_ (cosmic cycles) and _vamsanucarita_ (accounts of the royal dynasties). They also include chapters on _varnasramadharma, vratas, sadacara, rājadharmā, sraddhā, tirthas, dānas, prayaschittas, Vāstuvidya_ and _prasādalaksana_ etc including a large number of subjects related to polity, sociology, history, religion, geography, medicine, cosmology and science. Most probably the compilation of _Purānas_ was started in the _Shunga_ period (c. 2nd -1st century B.C.) or even earlier and they were revised during the Gupta and post Gupta periods at least up to c.1100 A.D. As far as the architectural material is concerned, casual references are frequently found in all the _Purānas_. Some of them like _Matsya, Agni, Garuṇa, Skanda, Narada, Vāyu, Bhavishya, Brahma Vaivarta, Brahmāṇḍa_ and _Vishnudharmottara Purānas_ have, however, treated the subject more systematically. These _Purānas_ have separate chapters related to _Vāstuvidya_ and _Prasādalaksana_ containing details of architecture, Sculpture, iconography and iconometry. It is believed that most of their part was written in Gupta period but a lot of details were also interpolated later on. Particularly, they represent an advanced stage of architecture which must be developed from very early period to the medieval periods.
As Purānas are mostly compilation of the old texts or short summaries of the lost texts, it appears that these Purānas, like Brihatsamhitā, also inherited their material from earlier sources and have also contributed to the later Vāstu and śilpaśāstras themselves. Matsya Purāṇa gives an account of the eighteen Vāstusastropadesakas (expounders of the Vāstu-vidya) like Viśvakarmā, Māyā, Narada, Nagnajit etc. While describing the architectural activities all the Purānas applied a sufficiently rich glossary of the technical terms used in earlier, contemporary and later Vāstu-texts. These terms correspond to architecturally distinguished organs of prasāda, Vāstupurusa, stambha, mandapa, durga and other buildings.

The Garuṇa Purāṇa, the Agni Purāṇa, the Matsya Purāṇa and the Bhavisya Purāṇa, describe some distinct types of temple with their specified standards and scales for construction. These are the Lingamana Prasāda (linga or the image of the tutelary deity itself serves as the scale (mana), the Dwīnmanana Prasāda (doorway is used as a scale for determining the dimensions of the temple), the Ksetramana Prasāda (the area occupied by the inmate presiding deity should be taken as the scale) and the Mndapamana Prasāda (the dimensions of different portions of the temple commensurate with that of hall (mandapa).

The various architectural terms used in the Purānas are: garbha, pradaksina, nemi, praggriva, kapāla or kapili, mandapa, mukha-mandapa, sikhara, manjari, sukanasa, vedi, kantha, amalasaraka, ratha, rathanka, and andaka, which testify the fact that temple architecture was much evolved by the time this part of the Purāṇa was compiled. It may represent the temple architecture of post Gupta or the early medieval period, i.e. 7th-8th cent. Thus, the Purāṇas provide four kinds of proportionate measurement (scale) of the temples and their general characteristic features.

Matsya Purāṇa, one of the earliest of the series consisting of 290 or 291 chapters deals with the subject of architecture in great detail. Most probably its compilation was started in the Gupta period and it was revised at least up to c.1100 A.D. As far as the architectural material of the Matsya Purāṇa is concerned, it is believed that most of its parts were written in Gupta period but a lot of details were also interpolated later on. Particularly, it represents an advanced stage of temple architecture which must be developed during the early medieval period (c. 9th -10th cent. A.D.)

Matsya Purāṇa contains many Chapters related to architecture, Sculpture, iconography and iconometry. It gives an account of the eighteen Vāstusastropadesakas (expounders of the Vāstu-Vidya) and the birth of Vāstu deva in chapter 252 of ‘Vāstu-pradurbhava’ where the names of Bhṛigu, Atri, Vaśiśtha, Viśvakarmā, Māyā, Narada, Nagnajit, Visālaksa, Purandara, Brahma, Kumara, Nandisa, Saunaka, Garga, Vāsudeva, Aniruddha, Sukra and Brahmaspati are referred to.

Some of these names are of earlier sages or legendary artists. Matsya Purāṇa also borrow its material from earlier sources as Varāhamihira. The text clearly indicates that he has borrowed from the old
works of the authorities like Māyā, Viśvakarma, Garga, Vasistha, Manu and Nagnajit\textsuperscript{63}. In chapter 253 (griha-kalā-vinirnaya) Matsya Purāna deals with the influence of different months and asterisms on the construction of houses with various methods of soil testing and creation of Vāstu-mandala. Purāna says that after testing the soil of the plot, the ground plan should be divided into 81 padas (squares) by drawing ten lines from east to west and ten others from north to south\textsuperscript{64}. Then by installing thirty two deities in the outer compartments and thirteen in the inner squares, in total 45 deities should be worshipped\textsuperscript{65}. Matsya Purāna again speaks of another type of Vāstu-nandala which consists of 64 padas (squares)\textsuperscript{66}.

Chapter 254 (griha-mana-nirnaya) of Matsya Purāna provides the names, characteristics, measurements and locations of catuh-sāla (four halled), tri-sāla (three halled) and dvi-sāla (two-halled) residential buildings which are made for kings, yuvarājjas, commanders, ministers, feudatory chiefs, nobles, king’s officers, astrologers, preceptors, physicians, Brāhminas, Kṣatriyas, Vaisyas, Sudras and the lowest classes like craftsmen and courtesans etc. Here separate measurements are given to each class of buildings.

In the chapter 255 (stambha-mana-vinirnaya) five kinds of pillars and the influence of vedha (hindrances) are given. A pillar that has four sides (square) is called rucaka; one that has eight sides (octagonal) is vajra; one with sixteen sides or sodasasra is dvivajra; one with thirty-two sides is pralinaka and a round pillar is named vṛtta\textsuperscript{67}.

The Brihatsamhita also provides the same description of pillars\textsuperscript{68}. These five types of pillars should be decorated with padma, patravallis, latas, kumbha, and patra etc. The thickness of the tula (main architrave) should be equal to that of the pillar; above this there should be uptula (beams and minor beams), whose thickness should be three-fourth of the preceding tula or uptula\textsuperscript{69}.

Chapter 268 (Prasāda-vidhi), chapter 269 (Prasādanukirtana) and chapter 270 (mandapa-karana) highlight the details of temple architecture, particularly the method of pacification ceremony of the Vāstupurusa (Vāstudosapasamana), the types, names and characteristics of Prasādas (Prasādalaksana) and the names of mandapas with their distinctive features.

Matsya Purāna devotes a complete chapter 270 to the description of mandapas to be constructed in accordance with the shape of temples. Their three broad categories are jyeṣṭha (high), madhyama (medium) and kanistha (low). They are of twenty-seven kinds. The name of each mandapa is given according to the number of pillars attached with it. The Puspaka has sixty-four pillars, Puspabhadrasixty-two, Suvarata sixty, Amratanandana fifty-eight, Kausalya fifty-six, Buddhismokirana fifty-four, Gajabhadra fifty-two, Jayavaha fifty, Srivatsa forty-eight, Vijaya forty-six, Vāstukirti forty-four, Srutinjaya forty-two, Yajnavahatra forty, Visālathyirty-eight, Suslista thirty six, Sratumardana thirty-
four, Bhagapanca thirty-two, Nandana thirty, Manava twenty-eight, Manabhadraka twenty-six, Sugriva twenty-four, Harita twenty-two, Harnikara twenty, Satardhika eighteen, Simha sixteen, Syamabhadra fourteen and Subhadra has twelve pillars. The shapes of the Mandap should be trikona, vratta, ardhendu, catuskona, aśtrasa and dvirastaka; other shapes are inauspicious.

The plot for the mandapa should be divided into sixty-four paddas. The dvāra should be placed in the centre. The height of the mandapa should be double the width and the kati (wall) should be one-third of the height. Half of the total area should be covered by the walls. One-fourth of the central portion (encircled open space) should be taken as the scale for dvāra whose height is the triple and width double of the scale. The dvāra should be made of udumbara. The door-jamb should be decorated with three, five, seven and nine sakhas. The doors measuring one hundred forty and half, one hundred thirty and one hundred twenty angulas are considered as jyeṣṭha, madhyama and Kaniyas respectively. The door measuring 180 angulas is supposed to be the best one for ventilation, while the other prescribed dimensions are 80, 90, 100, 110 and 116 angulas. There are ten doorways for mandapas. Other dimensions are forbidden as they trouble the mind. There should be no obstruction, in front of the door, caused by tree, corner, curve, pillar, banner, well, wall and pit.

To the south of the mandapa should be planted trees with fruits, to the east milky trees, to the west a pond full of lotuses and to the north should be palm trees and flowers. The parivāralayas (family living rooms) should be constructed on both the sides of the main building. In the south there should be a place for penance (tapovana), in the north matraka-temple, in the south-east kitchen, in the southwest Ganesa-temple, in the west Sri or Laksmi-temple and a place for offerings for God Candra etc, in the north-west platform for grahas (navagrahas), in the north yajnasala, in the north-east vapi (step-well) and Sesasayi Visnu therein and in the front side there should be a place for Nandi in Siva’s temple. The temple should consist of ghantā, torana, dhvaja kunda and mandapa etc.

Agni Purāna

The Agni Purāna, one of the important MahaPurāna, contains sixteen chapters related to architecture, iconography and iconometry. It appears to have developed during a few centuries in the post Gupta period from 7th cent. to 11th cent A.D. R.C. as Hazārā proclaims that the extant Agni-Purāna is work of 700 A.D. to 1100 A.D. Besides a large number of subjects ranging from mythology, religion, philosophy, rituals etc., in 382 or 383 Chapters, only temple and city architecture is described in chapters 38, 41, 42, 43, 61, 65, 104, 105 and 106, while dealing with the subject in some cases appears that Agni Purāna followed the earlier tradition of Matsya Purāna. Like Matsya Purāna, the Agni Purāna also suggests that the proposed city or town, village, fort, house or a temple should be worshipped.
in eighty-one squares for prosperity. At another place 81 squares are prescribed for a house and 100 squares for a temple.

Selection of the site, worshipping of the presiding deity of the city, constitution of the Vāstupura- mandala and composition of the town planning are mentioned in Chapter 106 of Agni Purāna. In chapter 38, Agni Purāna enumerates the fruits and benefits gained as the result of the consecration of a temple to Vāsudeva and some other deities. A detailed description of the rituals held at the time of laying the foundation and general characteristics of a temple are dealt elaborately with the procedure of construction of temples with their different parts and proportions, preference of site and measurements in chapters 41, 42 and 104. Agni Purāna classifies the temples in five categories, each consisting of nine sub types, providing in all 45 types of temples. Chapter 61 is fully devoted to the description of the establishment of door-frames and chapter 65 discusses the methods of building stambhamandapa in front of the temples.

Garūṇa Purāna

Like Matsya Purāna, Garūṇa Purāna also described almost identical chapters on Vāstu-Vidya. Garūṇa Purāna contains two chapters dealing with the architecture of all the three classes of buildings: residential, military and religious. These are described as the Prasādas, the forts, the pleasure gardens, the temples and the mathas. One chapter 47 is specifically devoted to the description of a number of varieties of temples (Prasādas) and their respective characteristics. On the basis of architectural material of Garūṇa Purāna and the opinion of different authorities the date of composition of Garūṇa Purāna (at least Purvakhand) may be comfortably placed in c. 8th-9th cent. A. D.

Vāstu and Śilpa- texts

The foremost place among the literary data for the study of architecture of North India must be given to the Vāstu and Śilpa- texts which have got direct bearing on it. These canons are really the results of the accumulated experience of generations of architects. Śilpi (artisans) class such as Sthapati, Sūtradhāra, Śilpi, Vardhaki, Takshaka etc. specializing in architecture came into existence. The Vāstu and Śilpa Sutras were being prepared as the guide-lines by the Āchāryas. From the time of the GrihaSūtras, the various principles of Vāstu-Vidya were recorded systematically and the science of architecture developed gradually. Matsya Purāna (252, 2-4) gives an account of the eighteen Vāstusastropadesakas (āchāryas) (expounders of the Vāstu-vidya). The works of these āchāryas have been lost. Many scholars believe that the writers mentioned in the Matsya Purāna were in existence much before its compilation during the Gupta period because it appears that most of the Purānas
and *Brihatsamhita* (Chapters 56-58) borrowed their material from earlier sources as indicated in the *Brihatsamhita*. *Varāha Mihira* clearly mentions that he has borrowed from the old works of the authorities like *Māyā, Visvakarmā, Garga, Vasistha, Manu* and *Nagnajit*.

We have several *Vāstu* and *Śilpa* texts belonging to different regions and schools of science of architecture. Broadly speaking, there were two principal schools of Indian *Vāstuvidya*- the Northern school or *Nagara* style and the Southern school or *Dravida* style - with their master architects *Viśvakarmā* and *Māyā* respectively. By now there are more than 150 *Vāstu* texts listed by various scholars belonging to both the schools having similarities and differences, influences and interactions and also showing regional variations within their respective schools, though representing common fundamental principles. Besides, there are several manuscripts related to *Vāstuvidya* which are still not published and those published are not translated or interpreted.

The principal works representing North Indian Architecture or Nagar School of architecture are the works of *Viśvakarmā, Samarangana-Sūtradhara, Aparajita-praccha* and the works of Sūtra-dhara Mandana, while the main texts on South Indian Architecture or Dravidian Architecture are *Manasara, Mayamatam* and *Silparatna*.

In the *Rāmāyana* *Viśvakarmā* is mentioned as the architect of the gods (IV, 51, 11) but there was also a *Viśvakarmā* who was really an architect, a real human being and composed various texts on architecture. His famous treatise *Visvakarmā-Vāstuśāstra* (c. later half of the 11th cent.) and *Visvakarmā-Vāstuvidya* (c. early 12th cent.), available in fragments only, are the oldest known texts from Gujarat, which mainly deals with *Maru-Gurjaraarchitecture*. The other extant work of *Viśvakarmā*, the *Visvakarmaprakasa* appears to be a compilation of *Vāsudeva*, the disciple of *Viśvakarmā*. The word *Viśvakarmā* later on was used as an epithet of a good architect.

Following the tradition of the *Purānas*, the 11th century text on *Vāstu-vidya* from Malawa, *‘Samarangana-Sūtradhara’* of *Bhoja* deals with Town Planning, House and Palace architecture, Temple architecture and other allied subjects like sculptures, iconography, iconometry, paintings and the art of mechanical construction.

*Aparājitaprcccha* is another text compiled by *Bhuvanadevacarya* of Gujarat in the latter half of the twelfth century A.D. Its architectural description is highly influenced by *Samarangana-Sūtradhara* and *Vāstuvidya*. The whole text is in conversational-style and in fact, *Bhuvanadeva* himself answers in detail the questions put by *Aparājita*, one of the four mind-born sons (*mānasa-putra*) of *Visvakarma*. The main theme of *Aparājitaprcccha* is architecture, both civil and religious. It deals with the architecture of houses, palaces, villages, cities and temples. The text provides minute details and basic principles of *Vāstu-vidya* like *Vāstupurusa-mandala, Vāstu-chanda, ayadisadvarga*, astrology and astronomy, rites and rituals,
measurement (mana) and decorative motives related to architecture. It also deals with sculpture, painting, music and iconography.

The later Vāstu and Śilpa texts continued the tradition of the Aparajitapraccha, Ksirarnava or Naradapraccha and Diparnava, the other texts on Gujarāt style of architecture borrowed and utilized material from the Vāstuvidya and the Aparajitapraccha to a great extent.

The works of Śūtradhāra Mandana and some other architects of Gujarāt and Rājasthān immensely contributed to the field of architecture during fourteenth and fifteenth centuries A.D. Śūtradhāra Mandana was an inhabitant of Medapad (Mewār in Rājasthān) and the eldest son of a senior sculptor Ksetra(Kheta). He flourished under the patronage of Mewār-king Kumbhakarna, who is also known as Mahārāṇa Kumbha (1433-1468 A.D.). The famous books on architecture and sculpture compiled by Śūtradhāra Mandana are: Rājavallabha or Rājavallabha Vāstuṣāstra or Rājavallabhāmandana, Vāstemandana, Prasādamandana, Rupamandana, Rājavallabhaśilpa, Vāstuśāstrasilpa, Devatāmurtiprakarana or Rupavatam, Vāstuśāstra and Vāstusara. The other text Vāstumanjari was written by Śūtradhara Nath, the younger brother of Mandana and Govinda, the son of Mandana composed Kālanidhi, Uddharadhorani and Dvāradipikā under the patronage of Mahārāṇa Kumbha’s son Mahārāṇa Raimalla (1473-1509 A.D.). Since the Western and Central Indian architects commonly used the guidelines of above mentioned Vāstu texts from Gujarat, Rajasthan and Malwa, almost the same architectural shape, form, composition, embellishment, terminology and measurement are seen represented in that region.

In addition to these works, Jayaprichchha, Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja, Manasollasa of Somesvara, Vāstusaraparakarana of Thakkur Pheru, Lakshana Samuchchaya, Vāstu Rājavallabha and a number of Vāstu and Śilpa texts published by Prabhashankar O. Sompura such as Prasāda Tilaka, Prasāda Manjari, Veda Vāstu Prabhākara, Durga Vidhāna, Vāstukālanidhi and Bhāratiya Śilpasamhitā are significant for the study of Western and Central Indian architecture.

Other North Indian works, especially of Orissan architecture are Oriya texts Bhubanapradipa77 (On Orissan text: Bhubanapradipa, Canons of Orissan Architecture: Calcutta) and Śilpa Prakāśa. Bhubanapradipa, whose original text in Sanskrit is lost but whose sense and essence are preserved in the bhaṣa form, a craftsman’s version of the rendering of that ṣastra in Oriya language is important for the understanding of form, morphology, and metrography of the medieval Kalinga temples. Śilpa Prakāśa is a medieval Orissan text in Sanskrit on temple architecture by Rāmacandra Mahāpātra Kaula Bhattaraka. The book is translated into English by Alice Boner and Sadāśivrath Sarma78. It describes various temples in Orissa and also deals with the art, architecture, iconography and its symbolism.

During and after the tenth and eleventh century A.D. the architectural texts of North and South India, more or less, influenced each other and certain forms of architecture and concepts of Vāstu...
be properly understood and visualized only after going through the Southern Vāstu-texts, Agamas, Pratiśṭha and other works like Manasara, Mayamatam, Śilparatnam, Kashyapaśilpa, Tantrasamuchchaya, Kamikagama, Karnagama, Suprabhedagama, Vaikhanasagama and Isanasivagurudévapaddhati, Haribhaktivilasa, Matha-pratiśṭha of Raghunandana and Chaturvargachintamani of Hemadri etc.
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BACK TO KANNAUJ – AFTER ONE THOUSAND YEARS IN DIASPORA: THE RROMANI MILLENIUM IN 2018

Marcel Courthiade
Professor,
INALCO (Institute national des langues et civilisation orientales),
Paris, France.

“Your arrival to the city of your forefathers has filled me with emotion as if my lost blood had reached to my doors tracing the footsteps of your ancestors”- Dr. Jeewan Shuklā, Kannauj 23.10.2003

Curiously enough, there are still in Europe voices maintaining that the Rromani people's origin is unknown. Some of them are motivated by their activity in show-business, for they believe that the enigmatic origin of a mysterious people will better attract audience, while others just deny any identity, history and culture to the Rroms, out of contempt regarding them and their heritage – yet often well disguised under the mask of democratic sameness of all citizens. However their Indian origin is not a recent discovery, since it is mentioned at least five times between 1422 and 1630 in various publications. Simultaneously, the legend of the Rroms' Egyptian origin was also circulated and it prevailed (at least in print) until the rediscovery of the Indian origin, in the 70's of the 18th century.

1. Avidances about the Indian origin of the Rroms
The table below aims at comparing the very first European mentions of the Rroms' Indian origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Documents in the 1422-1630 span of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>Girolamo Fiocchi &quot;Chronicon forliviense&quot; in Forli (Italy): Eodem millesimo venerunt Forlivium quedam gentes misse ab imperatore, cupientes recipere fidem nostram, et fuerunt in Forlivio die VII augusti. Et, ut audivi, aliqui dicebant, quod erant de India (In the same year some people sent by the emperor came to Forli, wishing to embrace our faith, and they arrived in Forli on August 7. And, as I could hear, some were saying they originate from India). Muratori, 1723:890.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Vaillant de Tours in Blois (France): Pis fuisque boeſme n'Yndien(I am [in a position] worse than [a] Bohemian or Indian). Guichard, 1842:337. In fact this rondo by Vaillant de Tours is inserted in a collection of poems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sebastien Münster: *Le luy dy alors, Vostre Egypte la Baffe n’est donc point en Africque pres le Nil, mais en Asia pres le fleuue Gâges, ou pres la riuire Indus* (I told him then: your Egypt the Low is not therefore in Africa near the Nile, but in Asia near the river Ganges, or near the river Indus). 1565:287.

Cesare Vecellio in *De gli Habiti Antichi e Moderni di Diversi Parti di Mondo* (overleaf of an illustration) in Venice (Italy): *Questa è una sorte di gente, la quale va errando tre giorni in un luogo & tre in un’altro [...] Hanno un Signore, quale dimandano il Rè di Colucut [...] Questo tal Rè hà alcuni Bramini, ouero sacerdoti* (They are such people, living three days in one place and three days in an other place [...] They have a lord, who is king in Kalikot [...] This king has some brāhmans, or priests). 1590:473.

David ben Šalomon Ganz – *Tzemah Dawid* [“David’s Plant”] in Prague (“King Philip in Spain expelled all the black [people] who lived in his kingdom to travel to their country of India, to the place where they were born, to their ancient lands. There were many, more than 200,000.” In: Rromano džaniben, Nr. 1-2. Prague, 2000:7).

Municipal documentation in Bras (Provença): *20s aux Bouemiens, le vingt dud. Baillés pour fere passer les Indiens de se lieu* (Twenty pounds were given to the Indians in order to send them away from this place – register of Bras, near Sant-Maximin and Brinhóla, for the year 1636).

The reason of the unpopularity of the Indian origin vis-à-vis the Egyptian legend was inspired among others by the century long confusion between India and Egypt: Egypt was called *Ægypti* in Latin, while neighboring *Æthiopia* in the South was called *India Æthiopiæ*. Both these countries were allegedly in continuity with India, making up together a "black continent", south of an imaginary Prasodis sea. A second reason for this confusion was that Egypt was much more known than India in medieval Europe and that the Rroms themselves preferred to declare an Egyptian ascend, which presented them as victims of the Saracens. In addition the clerics were inclined to ascribe to the Rroms a verse of the Ancient Testament, making them Egyptians out of an erroneous process of deduction (called in logic "affirmation of the consequent"). Despite the lack of printed mentions of the Indian origin over almost one and a half century, one may consider that it had not been totally forgotten until the five following mentions between 1771 and 1782:
The sentence by Büttner in 1771 alludes without any surprise to the fact that there is in Europe "even a Hindustano-Afghan tribe, the Rroms" – contribution to the diversity of our continent. In ab Hortis' series of articles (1775-1776 – issue of 13 March 1776, p. 88), the identification of the Rrom's origin with India derives from an acoustic misunderstanding during a conversation in Leiden between a Hungarian student in theology (probably Mihály Szatmari or possibly István Vályi) and three students from Sri-Lanka (all three were "Burgers", viz. of local mother and Dutch father): all four were speaking Latin, each of them with his native heavy accent and the word *[singala] "Sri Lankan" seems to have been misunderstood for [(t)singaro] "Zingaro, Rrom" (there is no initial [ʦ] in Indian languages). The list of over 1000 words allegedly similar in Rromani and the language of Sri-Lanka (maybe Sinhala or less likely Sanskrit, possibly Pāli), mentioned in ab Hortis' article pertain to fiction. The two following sources are not very much detailed and Rüdiger's identification of Rromani (as spoken in Berlin, maybe by a Rromani lady of Finnish background) with an Indian language is very poorly grounded (relying on a nearly approximate translation of 23 sentences into both languages, which did not result really similar) and this suggests that a previous reminiscence about the Rroms' Indian origin is highly probable to explain his readiness to link them. The five following ascriptions of an Indian origin to the Rroms are more solidly evidenced but in most cases expressed in a plain unsurprised tone (except Grellmann who longs to be recognized as the "father of this discovery").
Although – to quote col. John Staples Harriott, "an impression existed among them [the Rroms] of their having come from that country (India)", all early statements about their Indian origin were not taken seriously until Grellmann's publication of comparative word lists (which he had actually received from Hofrath Büttner, as he fairly acknowledges in his preface). In fact Rüdiger and Grellmann's publications of the Rroms' Indian origin were contemporaries, with the difference of a year but the latter's book was quickly published in French and English – not Rüdiger's work. This granted him worldwide fame. Grellmann shows ethnic bigotry against the Rroms and a shocking sentence is ascribed to him, claiming that, in doing his research among them, he felt "a clear repugnancy, like a biologist dissecting some nauseating, crawling thing in the interest of science" (G.J. Colijn & Marcia Sachs Littell, quoted by Hancock in Crowe & Kolsti 1991:13 – also on line). This contempt led Grellmann to identify the Rroms' ancestors with the varṇa of the Shudra (Zigeuner sind von der Caste der Suders, p. 261), whom he was mistaking for "outcasts (Dalits)" and this groundless fabrication, inspired only by a few misleading superficial social similarities between some Rroms and some outcasts in India, has been transmitted up to our time. It was one of the reasons for the Nazi genocide of the Rroms.

It is appropriate to mention here a sentence by a major Romanian writer, Ion Budai-Deleanu (1760-1820) who wrote in the beginning of his master piece "Ţiganiada": As he says, we are from India, and our language is spoken there up to this day (După cum spune el, noi suntem din India, şi limba noastră să grăieşte acolo până în zioa de astezi). This statement, written in Blaj (Romania) very far from Leipzig, Götingen and Köningsberg could result from a fresh information but it is not excluded that it was reflecting an oral transmission.

2. Identification of the historical frame-work of the "Baro Telâripen" (Great Departure, Exodus). The subsequent stages in the identification of the historical frame-work of the Rroms' Exodus from India were done step by step and they include the following aspects: area, time and circumstances.
2.1 Area of origin:
As a result of his comparisons between an impressive numbers of Indo-Aryan languages, Sir Ralph Turner proposed a still unrivalled classification of these languages. He distinguishes mainly a central group (the "Hindi belt" plus Nepali and Central Pahari) and a peripheral group, itself divided in three sub-groups, viz. Western, Southern and Eastern, as visible on the following sketch (Fig. no. 01):

Fig. no. 01: NIA sub-lassification based on Turner

Ancestral Rromani and Kannauji language are transitional forms between ancient Braj Bhāṣā and Awadhi, duly recognized literary languages – on the basis of which Hindustani and later Hindi emerged. In his essay devoted to Rromani (Turner, 1927), he confirms the position of Rromani on the basis of a series of confrontations between archaisms and innovations to be found in Rromani and other Indo-Aryan languages. This points also at its geographical position, namely that it emerged in the middle segment of the Ganges plain (Madhyadeś) and its ancient form was close to the ancient language known as "Śauraseni Prākrit", of the Śūrasena kingdom near Mathura. In his "Introduction to Prakrit" (1928:4) Woolner states that "Śauraseni, the Midland Prakrit, is derived from the Old Indo-Aryan dialect of the Madhyadeśa on which Classical Sanskrit was mainly based". Today, Rromani is one of the closest languages to Sanskrit.
2.2 Time of the exodus:
The only weak point in Turner's essay is a wrong chronological ascription of the Rromani exodus from India to a very ancient period, on the basis of his belief that the Rromani evolution Nasal + Voiceless Stop > Nasal + Voiced Stop (namely nt > nd, nk > ng and mp > mb) took place in a Dardic surrounding, due to the fact that a similar evolution occurred in Dardic languages as early as the 3rd century B.C. (attested in the Kharoshthi documents). He concludes that Proto-Rromani was spoken at the time in the same area as Dardic languages and that the evolution in question was common to them and to Proto-Rromani.

In truth Turner overlooked the following three facts:
• first of all, voicing of voiceless stops after an homorganic nasal consonant is a quite common-place case of progressive assimilation encountered in most groups of languages all over the world and that there is no need of language vicinity or contact to make it occur.
• secondly, this voicing developed in Rromani not only in stems — as Turner noticed, but also in the postpositional system which emerged during the second half of the first millennium A.D. so much later than his hypothetical date of exodus: -n + ke > -nge (spelled –nqe), -n + tar > -ndar (spelled –nðar) etc... more or less one thousand years after the Dardic evolution.
• this very evolution did occur in popular Greek, a language spoken all over Asia Minor, as well in Kurdish, Armenian and Anatolian Arabic, as well as Albanian in the Balkan, at the beginning of the second millennium A.D. that is to say accurately when the proto-Rroms reached this area. This development is evidenced in all positions in Greek:
  - within a stem (πέντε "five" pronounced ['pende <'pentel]),
  - with an affix (εμπόριο "trade, business" pr. [emˈborio < emˈporio])
  - and at grammatical junctions (τηνταβέρνα "the tavern" pr. [tin daˈverna < tin taˈverna], τονπρότο "the first one" pr. [tom 'broto < ton 'proto], τηνκασέτα "the tape" pr. [tin kəˈseta < tin kaˈseta] etc... - just like at the Rromani junction B-form + postposition; as a matter of fact this Rromani evolution is similar to the Greek, not Dardic, evolution).

Another scientist, Ian Hancock, Rrom Professor in the United States of America, established around 1990 on the basis of the parallels in reascribing the Sanskrit neuter into masculine and feminine genders in Rromani and other Indo-Aryan languages, pointed out that the people who spoke proto-Rromani left India around the year 1000 A.D. (2001:10). A further parallel between Rromani and new Indo-Aryan systems of postpositions (which arose by the end of the first millennium A.D.) is obvious for any speaker of a modern Indo-Aryan language and confirms this date, since the system under consideration arose by the end of the first millennium A.D. Here is the Rromani paradigm:
The identity is striking in the fact that the possessive structure in the nominal group is also quite identical in Rromani and other Indo-Aryan languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possessed object singular</th>
<th>possessed object plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possessed object masc. kan</td>
<td>e bakria-qo kan</td>
<td>e bakria-qe kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possesses object fem. jakh</td>
<td>e bakria-qi jakh</td>
<td>e bakria-qe jakha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But also (more restricted in dialectal terms in both Rromani and Hindi):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possessed object singular</th>
<th>possessed object plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>possessed object masc. kan</td>
<td>e bakria-qoro kan</td>
<td>e bakria-qere kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possesses object fem. jakh</td>
<td>e bakria-qiri jakh</td>
<td>e bakria-qere jakha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Circumstances of the exodus as unveiled by the Kitāb al-Yāmīnī

Further light was shed on the circumstances of the exodus when a historical record, the *Kitāb al-Yāmīnī* (Book of the Yamin), was translated in 1989 by an Egyptian Scholar, Abdelali Alami. It was Professor Eric Meyer (INALCO, Paris, France) who first suggested a connection between the origin of the Rroms and a passage in this book, the title of which was formulated after sultan Mahmud’s nickname, Yamīn al-dawla "the right [hand] of the empire". This book, an account of the ancient Ghaznavid dynasty’s history, was composed in Arabic shortly after the year 1020 by Muhammad ibn’Abd al-Jabbar al-‘Utbi (who died in 1035 or 1036), secretary and courtman to the first two Ghaznavid rulers and direct witness to many of the events mentioned in the book.

The Ghaznavi dynasty, of Turkish origin, had been founded by Subuktigin (or Sevük Tegin “the beloved prince”, reign: 977-997), who had left Bukhara to Ghazni, then capital of Zabulistan, in the
wake of a palace intrigue and was subsequently recognized governor of Ghazni (or Ghazna, in today’s Afghanistan) by the Samanids in 977 (Fig. No. 02).

Subuktigin and his son Mahmud (reign: 998-1030) expanded widely the territory under their control, forming a vast empire that stretched from the Oxus River (today’s Amu Darya) to the Indus Valley and the Indian Ocean (Fig. No. 03). They also looted neighbouring kingdom, mainly Hindu Shah, to fuel the blossoming of their city.
Fig. no. 03: Mahmud Ghazanavi
A crucial chapter in the *Kitāb al-Yamīnī* describes how, after a series of *razzia* in North-western India within a short distance from Ghazni (Fig. No. 04).

Mahmud decides to head toward Kannauj in 1014, yet repelled near Mathurā by the confederate Hindu armies and again in 1018 – arriving safely on 21 December (Shaban, 8 of 409 of the Hijri) in
front of the main gate of the city. On the second days he captured and displaces 53,000 inhabitants to Ghazni (Fig. No. 05).

![Map of Sultan Mahmud's distant expeditions](image)

Fig. no. 05: Sultan Mahmud’s distant expeditions (Map by A. Kukulka)

In 1186, Abul Sharaf of Yabardicān translated (or rather adapted) the Kitāb al-Yamīnī from Arabic into Persian, with the aim of demonstrating to his sovereign how cruelty, corruption and injustice always lead kingdoms to their downfall. The title of the book in Persian is Kitab-i Yamini. Although extremely convoluted, it is much more readable than the over-embellished style of al-
'Utbi’s original. It replaced gradually the original work in Arabic and was circulated widely in South Asia, Persia, Anatolia and Central Asia. There is indeed an English translation of the Persian version of Yabardicān, made by James Reynolds (1805-1866) and published in London in 1858. Reynolds was a famous British orientalist and secretary to the Oriental Translation Fund of the Royal Asiatic Society, who translated several other Persian and Arabic history books. He included a lengthy introduction to his translation, as well as Yabardicān’s entire preface to his Persian adaptation. However Reynolds’s English version was not complete and one of the chapter missing is the one devoted to the capture of Kannauj in 1018; this event was not either represented in the fragments translated by General John Briggs (1785-1875) before him in 1827. Actually, one year before Reynolds, an Austrian scholar, Theodor Nöldeke, had published unnoticedly in Vienna a bilingual (Arabic and German) version of the book, under the title Über das Kitāb Jamīnī des Abu’ Naṣr Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Gabbār al-‘Utbi (Viena, 1857). Almost one century and a half later, Abdelali Alami from Egypt prepared in the framework of his PhD a full French translation of the book, under the title Les conquêtes de Mahmud al-Ghaznawī d’après le Kitāb al-Yamīnī d’al-’Utbi (Paris, 1989) on the basis of the Cairo edition of 1895.

Clues pivotal for our understanding may be found while comparing this book with Near-Eastern sources. One of these is the Armenian priest Aristakes Lastivertc’i’s writings (1002-1080), where he mentions the arrival of wild Indians among the Saracens: "wicked peoples speaking foreign languages […] from the great river crossing northern India". Another one is the series of allusions in the Sicilian Anonymous’ Gesta francorum (The Deeds of the Europeans), a record of the first Crusade and in which polytheist Saracens are mentioned: these Saracens swear "on the name of all [their] gods" (per omnium deorum nomina), "I swear on Mohammed and all our gods" (iuro ubis per Machomet et per omnia deorum nomina - twice), "For the honor of our gods" (ad deorum honorem) etc. The total incompatibility between polytheism and being a Saracen (a Muslim) is blatant and an explanation is to be found in the mention of Corrozana or Corosanus (Khorasan) as the place of origin of these "polytheist" Saracens, link therefore the displacement of the people from Kannauj to Khorasan with their arrival in the Near East. The Greek erudite Nikos Tzangas mentions also in his book Manzikert – the beginning of the end of Mediaeval Hellenism the "Indians from Pemptopotamia" (viz. Five-Rivers, Punjab) in the context of disasters arriving in Micrasia (1996:21 and 22).

The match between elements drawn from linguistics evidences (Turner and Hancock) and Indo-Persian sources on the one hand and mentions in Western (ratner Near-Eastern) documents on the other hand is obviously of the utmost importance to figure out a coherency for the period in between. Some Persian passages, mainly from Khorasan, albeit spotty and scattered among contexts not related to our subject, also shed light on historical developments. In fact, some Rromani researchers such as Rajko Djurić8 and Professor Ian F. Hancock9 had already suspected a
link between this exodus and the terrible razzias (or raids) perpetrated by Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni into northern India. Hancock also investigated the chronology of the exodus from the linguistic point of view (see above) but their conjectures were not based on concrete evidences. Independently, the Polish anthropologist Lech Mróz had come intuitively to a similar conclusion: "I consider it likely that the Rroms' ancestors arrived in Iran in Mahmud of Ghazni's times, as a result of his raids upon India" (1992:40). Adam Bartosz, quoting Rishi, had also even earlier already mentioned Mahmud of Ghazni's possible role in this exodus in 1984. However, as they were depending on incompletely translated chronicles mentioning only a few forays limited to northwestern India (not the one to Kannauj), they were never able to fully describe the mechanism of this exodus.

The passage in al-ʿUtbi’s Kitab al-Yamini (Book of the Yamini10), though short, appears to shed more light, since it describes a raid perpetrated in the winter 1018-1019 and which reached much further east, beyond Mathurā, as far as the prestigious mediaeval city of Kannauj, 50 miles north-west of Kanpur11. This fits both in terms of location and dating respectively to Turner's and Hancock’s conclusions.

3. The narrative of the exodus from Kannauj as told in al-ʿUtbi’s Kitab al-Yamini

The overall narrative is as follows: on the 27th of September 101812, "the Sultan at last bade farewell to sleep and ease [...] and departed along with his valiant warriors" (11,000 regulars and 20,000 volunteers – a good part of whom originating from Transoxiana13) for Kannauj. Most of the local rulers on his way submitted to him or simply fled, like Triloćanapāla of Eastern Punjāb, who refused to pay him allegiance. After a long and tedious journey through forests and jungles, Mahmud reached the Yamuna and crossed it on the 2nd of December, overwhelming several hill-forts, sometimes with a strong but isolated army, along his route. The sultan next directed his attacks against the sacred city of Mathurā, the birth place of Lord Krṣṇa, but also a very thickly populated and wealthy town.

After having ransacked, looted and desecrated the magnificent temples of Mathurā, Mahmud proceeded to Kannauj14, appearing before its gates on the 20th of December of the same year with a "small body of troops, leaving the greater part of his army behind". According to Firishta, he saw there "a city which raised its head to the skies, and which in strength and beauty might boast of being unrivalled"15. He also found (ibid.) that the city held a very strategic position on the right bank of Ganges and its fortifications consisted of seven distinct forts. It was reputed, moreover, to contain 10,000 temples of high antiquity. But on hearing of Mahmud's sudden approach, the king of the city-state, Rājyapāla, panicked and fled across the Ganges to Bari (located west of near Sidhauli, district Sitapur, U.P.) allegedly ill-advised by his astrologists and soothsayers who had predicted a defeat from the stars and the flight of the bees. More likely, he did a simple calculation, on the basis of Mahmud's earlier raid, in 1014, when the confederate Hindu armies
had trouble repelling Mahmud and the Muslims, then with a far larger Hindu army against less numerous invaders than now. The raid of 1014 had reached only Mathurā, from where some 200,000 prisoners were taken to Ghazni but apparently released later. In fact, divination was done also on the Muslim side and "the Sultan [...] derived a favourable omen, when he opened the Kurān, from finding the resemblance of Kannauj with victory, unexpected gain": the Arabic word for "victory" (futūh [فتوح]) assumes the same form as Kannauj [ق泮ج] when written without dots, as it was the case in Mahmud’s Kuran. This galvanized his enthusiasm and the zest of his troops. Be it as it may, Rājyapāla recommended to his subjects to offer no resistance and to surrender peacefully to avoid bloodshed. Kannauj was therefore deserted by a large number of its citizens, who were anxious to save themselves from the fury of the invaders and in the absence of serious resistance the Sultan "took all the seven forts in one day and gave his soldiers leave to plunder them and take prisoners". They then began to loot the city, raze the temples to the ground, and massacre the unfortunate Indians. In a letter to the governor of Ghazni, Mahmud himself reported that in Kannauj "there are innumerable temples. No other city can be constructed like this in two centuries, but our army destroyed the whole town in a short period".

After the capture of Kannauj, the sultan proceeded to neighbouring Munj, called "the Fort of the Brāhmans, the inhabitants of which were independent as headstrong camels", a place probably near Kanpur, which resisted the invader for 25 days; it was eventually found that not a single soul had survived in the fort, since most of them committed suicide or dashed toward the enemy only to be killed. After this tragedy, Mahmud took possession of Asī (16 km north-east from Fatehpur), although its ruler, Chandrapāla, was one of the most powerful chiefs of India and renowned as a brilliant military leader, he failed in facing Mahmud and fled leaving his fort at the sultan’s mercy. All the inhabitants were put to death and buried in their ruins. The last stage of the Muslims’ incursion was Śarva (near Sahāranpur), an immensely high fort of massive stones commanded by Chāndarājā; this one also fled stealthily at Mahmud’s approach, carrying his treasures (Fig. No. 07).
The Sultan eventually returned to Ghazni laden with immense booty: the expedition against Kannauj had made him master of wealth amounting to 20,000,000 dirhams in chariots full of gold, rubies, pearls and different treasures "beyond all calculation", 385 elephants and 53,000 prisoners of war (each one of them was eventually sold to Khurasan for between 2 and 10 dirhams): "in such quantity that the fingers of those who counted them would have been tired". They had been captured "rich and poor, light and dark [...] most of them 'notables', artists and craftsmen [...] entire families". This element is puzzling, since Mahmud was known for massacring local populations of captured cities, especially men but also, when the local sovereign had escaped, women and children. However he did not do so in Kannauj despite king Rājyapāla’s flight to the forest of Bari upon hearing that the Mahmud was coming, endorses that the population of the city interested him as such for his project, probably at least as much as the material wealth – apparently because he was aware of their cultural skills and he was willing to use them for the prestige of his own city, which he wanted to turn into the capital of the world. This is consistent with Qeyamuddin Ahmad's remark that Ghazni "also contained a number of Indian prisoners of
war, skilled artisans and learned men, who were brought over in the wake of sultan Mahmud's invasions of India" (India, 1983:xviii).

In connection with the sultan's unexpected "indulgence" toward the Kannaujia, one may remind that the poet Abu l'Qasim Ferdowsi (940-1020) had paid in 1010 a visit to Ghazni in search of financial reward for his master piece, the Book of Kings (Shahnameh) and that he could have then suggested to Mahmud that material riches plundered in nearby kingdoms were not sufficient to ensure the grandeur of a city, but human and cultural riches were necessary. Since Mahmud knew of the splendor of Kannauj (as a refined ruler, he probably imported his perfumes from there) he decided to bring to Ghazni the human element which was lacking to grant his city the international brilliance of a major capital according to his plans.

This episode doesn't end here, since after Mahmud's withdrawal, a Chandela ruler, Gaṇḍa, accompanied by neighbouring princes to punish Rājyapāla for his cowardly attitude during Mahmud's attack, moved towards Kannauj. He entrusted the command of the confederacy to the Chandela crown-prince Vidhyādhara. An inscription in Dubkūṇḍ (some 120 km south of Gwalior) tells us the outcome of the resulting fierce battle: Kannauj's king Rājyapāla was killed "with many showers of arrows which pierced his backbone" (Tripathi 1989:286) – and most of his soldiers also perished.

The news reached the touchy sultan's ear, who was so furious to hear that a Hindu king had been killed for "placing himself in subjection" to his authority (in fact he was thinking of him as of a vassal), that he decided to march in retaliation against the "infidels" responsible for this act. In October of 1019 (or 1020), Mahmud moved again toward Kannauj to chastise Vidhyādhara. On his way, he first reached a river where Rājyapāla's son, Trilochanapāla, was camping. The Indian prince put up again resistance, yet was quickly overpowered by a surprise assault of one of the sultan's selected bodies and his army was scattered into confusion. The sultan decided after that to march further on Bari, which had become to the Pratihāras, a kind of new local capital after Rājyapāla's flight there, and took it over easily. Witnesses who went to Kannauj one year after the tragedy of 1018 found most of the city "in ruins and desolate", as reported by Albiruni. According to Tripathi (1989:288), Mahmud next dealt with Gaṇḍa, who opposed him with stupendous force but at the psychological moment he panicked due to the intrepidity, perseverance and strength of the Muslims, as Rājyapāla before him, and under the cover of the night "fled with some of his personal servants leaving all his baggage and belongings behind". Ganguly's interpretation is slightly different: according to him (2001:17), Vidhyādhara was ready to confront Mahmud "on the border of his kingdom with 45,000 infantry, 36,000 cavalry and 640 elephants. The sultan sent an envoy to Vidhyādhara asking him either to embrace Islam or to agree to pay an annual tribute, but the Chandela king rejected both proposals with scorn. The sultan, before issuing order for the attack, went to an elevated place to make an estimate of the strength of the enemy. His courage
failed when he saw the vast gathering of Vidhyādhara’s army. In his despair he fell flat to the ground, praying to the Almighty for assistance”. This is not at all consistent with either the sultan’s temperament or the state of the Indian army in those times and this interpretation could be groundless. The subsequent skirmish between the two armies, disheartening Vidhyādhara, is not really convincing either. Be it as it may, both versions agree that he fled away with his army at night, leaving his bags and baggage behind. In the morning, Mahmud hear with surprise of his enemies’ flight, he first suspected foul play but soon entered the deserted camps and seized everything of value including 580 elephants. However, Mahmud didn’t content himself with this victory: in 1021-1022 he launched a new expedition against Vidhyādhara, attacking the fort of Gwalior on his way. He received some valuable gifts (including 35 elephants) in exchange for retreat and peace and resumed his march to the fort of Kālañjara, commanded by Vidhyādhara. After a few days of siege, Vidhyādhara sent him an emissary with a proposal of peace in exchange for 300 elephants and other valuable presents. The sultan accepted and the Indians let loose the elephants without riders to provoke the Muslims. The latter brought all of them swiftly under control and mounted them, to the great admiration of the Indians, who lost any desire to fight. Vidhyādhara sent over to Mahmud a verse in Sanskrit in his praise and the sultan, allegedly very pleased with the compliment, bestowed on his new friend the government of 15 fortresses and returned to Ghazni. Ganguly, who reports this event, notices that it is very unlikely that Mahmud was satisfied with a few gifts and a poem, which means rather that this campaign was possibly a failure.

After two years of political and military worries in Transoxiana, Mahmud resumed his razzias in India, this time aiming at the fabulous temple of Somnath (Gujarat), one of the seven main sources of spiritual energy in the Hindu faith, alongside with Varanasi (Benares) and Kannauj. The story of this expedition, a chapter of its own in Indian history and a culmination of the sultan’s campaigns, has been recorded in extremely precise details in al-’Utbi’s book, but it is not relevant to the present study. It is in this city that Mahmud faced the most powerful resistance of all his campaigns in India. Nevertheless he did capture the city and brought to Ghazni fabulous riches of all kinds from Indian temples.

Firishta, quoted by D.C. Ganguly (2001: 15), writes: "After this glorious expedition, the sultan founded the famous Jāmi mosque in Ghaznī, universally known as the 'Heavenly Bride', and near the mosque he established a well-equipped university with books in many languages and a museum full of natural curiosities". This supports the idea that the brain drain from Kannauj was probably also a part of his project of cultural and intellectual promotion of Zabulistan (see above). However Mahmud understood soon that the prisoners would not fit into his project in terms of music and cultural life, due to the radical difference between their Hindu heritage and his strict Sunni orthodox culture. On the other side, as al-’Utbi writes, there were "so many slaves that the drinking-places and streets of Ghazni were too narrow for them, and the eatables and victuals of
the country sufficed not for them, and from the most distant parts, the merchants from Khurasan, and Transoxiana, and Iraq ('Ajami) betook themselves to Ghazni, bringing (back) so many slaves, that their number exceeded the free, and a white freeman was lost among them”. So, disappointed by the impossibility of drawing the expected benefit of the Kannaujia population, traumatized by the displacement and whose traditions were in contrast to a strict Muslim rule, Mahmud decided to sell his prisoners to merchants in Khorasan.

4. Main arguments in support of the identification of the displacement from Kannauj in 1018-1019 as the origin of the Romani people

4.1 The displacement from Kannauj in 1018 is the only massive migration from Madhya deś

The main logical argument is that no other massive enslavement and displacement westward of a population ever occurred from a city situated in the area which had already been identified by Turner as the place of origin of the proto-Romani language in the period under consideration – except for a similar deportation, 4 years earlier (1014), actually from Thāneśvar a city belonging to the same kingdom as Kannauj. In addition, the following facts point to this conclusion.

4.2 In the past: Hindus were extremely unwilling to move away from the lands lapped by the regenerating waters of the seven holy rivers, mainly the Ganges – not to mention breaking from religious and other social ties, even in case of natural disaster. Crossing the sea was considered to be a Taboo in India. The consideration of this taboo is curiously absent from in Romani studies, although it was already referred to by Al-Biruni in the 11th century. This omission, pointed out by Elisabeth Clanet dit Lamanit, led to severe historical misunderstandings: the Kalā pani taboo is the fear of traveling outside of the area watered by India’s seven sacred rivers (Saptasindhu), owing to the belief that the traveler would be then severely polluted and that an unexpected death beyond the dark waves of the sea would exclude her/his soul from the cycles of transmigration, loosing any hope of rebirth. The taboo is not limited to the ocean, but includes any trip outside the basins of the holy rivers. We can find in al-Biruni’s masterpiece “Investigation on what India is” the description of the long, complicated and even injurious treatment to which a Hindu slave brought back from Muslim countries was subjected if he escaped and returned to his country and religion (end of chapter 71: “they have to fast by way of expiation, then stay sunken in the dung and milk of cows for several days, till they get into a state of fermentation. Then they are dragged out of the dirt and have to eat a similar dirt”). On the topic of the reintegration into Indian society of persons who had been taken outside of it, he adds that some Brahmans even considered that no expiation is possible. As Prof. Michel Angot stresses in his lectures at INALCO: "In the 19th century, the Indians still didn’t know what the world is; they don’t see it, they don’t know it, they do not travel at all".
This pivotal fact undercuts all accounts of superficial motivations for the Baro Telâripe such as local conflicts, earthquake, drought, poverty and search of a better life, etc. As India, at the turn of the millennium, was the richest country of the world, any comparison with today’s economic migration from a country bled white by two long-lasting merciless foreign occupations and severe internal conflicts is pointless. Only a forcible massive deportation, such as the one Mahmud carried out at the beginning of the 11th century, can account for such a huge movement of population which would impose such a fate on these people.

4.3 The constancy of the Indian element across all varieties of the Rromani language
The geographical unity of the place from which the Rroms' ancestors left accounts also for the striking constancy of the Indian element in the Rromani language, since the main differences between Rromani dialects are not to be found in the Indian component of the language but in the vocabulary borrowed on European soil. European loan-words entered Rromani mostly as a consequence of the need to express new concepts, as well as those of everyday reality (clothes, food, fauna and flora) and those related to administrative and technological evolution. This argument completely undermines the theory that the Rroms originated "from a simple conglomeration of Đom tribes" (or whatever other groups). It also undermines assertions that Rroms' ancestors left India in successive waves, an allegation lacking the slightest bit of evidence – but mirroring the reluctance of the mainstream ideology to accept the Rroms as one people. It is worth mentioning here that Sampson had already noticed that the Rroms "entered Persia as a single group, speaking one common language" (Sampson, 1923:161).

4.4 The Rroms' diversity in terms of social status
The fact that the captured slaves came from all walks of life and included high born individuals could explain how they were so easily introduced to important and influential people such as kings, emperors and popes when they reached Europe: there was among them descendants of "notables" from Kannauj. The French indologist Louis Frédéric confirms that the population of Kannauj consisted mostly of "notables", artists, craftsmen and warriors. One may compare to the archivist François de Vaux de Foletier's statement who points out that "western aristocracy apparently would see in these chiefs coming from the East the members of a caste similar to theirs and compelled to exile (1983:25)" for unknown reasons – the impression of the western noblemen could result by that time from the still preserved presence of "aristocrats" among the newcomers, a feature which however probably dissipated later on, from the outsider's point of view. This social diversity in the original deported population may also account for the continuing survival of the Rromani language, nearly a thousand years after the exodus. As socio-linguistics has shown, the greater the degree to which an exiled population consists of mixed social backgrounds, the stronger and the longer it will carry on transmitting its original language. This transmission over
1000 years suggests three strong elements: social diversity, high cultural level (thus awareness of one's cultural and linguistic heritage) and identity pride.

4.5 The Rroms’ diversity of complexion in the past and today
The Kitāb al-Yamīnī states that Mahmud displaced all 53,000 inhabitants of Kannauj, "rich and poor, light and dark". This last detail could explain the diversity of complexions encountered among the different groups of Rroms, in so far the original population really was mixed. There were probably many Rājputs in Kannauj by that time, warriors ethnically unrelated to the indigenous population, but who had been raised to the dignity of Kshatriyas on military merit. In addition many Indians were light-skinned, as they are today. Therefore only some of the deportees could have represented the aforementioned "dark" portion of the population. The Rroms’ dark complexion is in fact rather a constructed cliché which arose much later upon first contacts between them and German or French populations, which were at that time far fairer than today (Paris travelers in the 19th century would call still "black" the local population south of Lyon, as referred to by Jules Michelet). This cliché spread out later to other countries and quite recently reached some of them say Russia (end of 19th century). True enough Rroms are of very different skin tones but generally speaking they rather contributed in making the Balkan population whiter (the autochthonous were quite swarthy in high Antiquity, and progressively became, as we know them now, due to the inflow of Indo-European tribes: Greeks, Illyrians, Daces, Slavs etc. – and also Rroms) and it cannot be ascertained if some Rroms’ darker skin is always of Indian heritage or possibly rather a local Balkan influence. Much has still to be investigated in this sensitive subject, beyond popular clichés despising dark skin and biased interpretations of ancient chronicles. Unfortunately the Rroms' alleged "blackness" is currently used by some people for political propaganda.

4.6 The Ḍomba "percussionists, musicians, artists, dancers" among the deportees from Kannauj
There could probably have been a great number of Ḍomba artists in Kannauj, as in all the civilised cities of those times. In respect of intellectual, artistic and spiritual qualities in an urban centre in northern India, Kannauj doubtless attracted more numerous artists than other places and among them there were likely many Ḍomba, a word meaning initially "percussionists", but later extended to all "musicians, artists, dancers" involved in ceremonies of worship, rituals and sacred theater. Now, when the Kannaujia population was displaced to Zabulistan and later to Khurasan and neighbouring areas, the Ḍomba artists most probably captured the imagination of local populations, much more than notables and craftsmen and this could explain the extension of the name Ḍomba to refer to the entire group of Kannaujia aliens. In this respect, the Ḍomba artistic and social group were not the direct ancestors of the Rroms and there is no certainty either that they
were the "ancestors" of the present-day Đoms – as suggested among others by Encyclopedia Britannica: "Considerable interest is attached to the Đoms because there is reason to believe that the Gypsies, who originally came from India, are an offshoot of that caste". First of all there is no ground to be believe they represented a "caste" and a simple filiation would be an exaggerated simplification of a much more complex historical and social phenomenon. It is more likely that the displaced Kannaujia took over this name later on to refer to themselves, as a term of self-designation (replacing so the more general designation Sind[h]~, Pers. Hind~, Ionian Gr. Ἰνδ~ meaning "Indian" — from which the name "Sinto" perhaps arose).

On the other hand, British literature promoted the notion of Đoms in colonial India, often called a "criminal tribe" and in connection with the European character of "Gypsies", but there is no convincing evidence that this word, very much popular in anthropologists’ writings of the past, is still in active use in today’s India. Field work has to be done in order to check this.

Other elements linking possibly the Rroms to the 1018 exodus are less substantial:

4.7 Lack of agricole tradition among Rroms

The fact that the proto-Rromani population had come from an urban area, and were mainly notables, artists and craftsmen, might perhaps account for the very low number of Rroms working in farming until now. This aspect reminds of a statement by the Chinese pilgrim 唐玄奘 (Táng Xuán Zàng, 602-664 – also romanised as Hsüan Tsang) who notes that "although the soil of the region was rich and fertile, the crops abundant and the climate warm, few of the inhabitants of the region were engaged in farming". In reality, the land was cultivated chiefly for the production of perfume flowers since the antiquity (mainly for religious purposes) but the main vocation of the city was spirituality and arts. There are many human groups worldwide who are not involved in agriculture, so this rather feeble argument may be used in addition to more substantial once.

4.8 The anecdote of the escapees from an "area northern of Varanasi"

It seems that a small group fled from the razzia on the waters of the Ganges and moved towards Varanasi, from where, due to the hostility of the indigenous population, they left again, to settle in the Ranchee area. These people are said to speak Sadrī, a specific Indian language used mainly for intertribal communication. Ms. Akay Jahria Minz, of the Indian Conference of Indigenous and Tribal People in Ranchee, observed that Sadrī seems to allow an easier communication between its speakers and Rroms than other modern Indo-Aryan languages but this has not been substantiated by systematic research. Furthermore, Sadrī speakers have the habit, during special ceremonies, of pouring a little drink on the floor before drinking, saying: "to our brothers carried away by the cold wind beyond the mountains" (pers. comm. by M. Kumar of the IGRMS in Bhopal) – a tradition known by European Rroms, but also by other peoples. These "brothers" could be Mahmud’s prisoners but such an interpretation would suggest an amazing awareness of History.
Be it as it may, a real study of the Sadrī-speaking group and its traditions is needed prior to any hypothesis.

4.9 Possible parallelism between Kali and the Rromani mythical character of Bibìa

The tutelary goddess of Kannauj was Kali and the former name of the city Kanākubţa (also Κανόγια in Greek sources\(^{26}\)) meant "hunchbacked, crippled maid (virgin)"). The origin of this surprising name is to be found in a passage of Vālmi ki's Rāmāyaṇa: Kuśnāba had founded a city called Mahodya ("Great Prosperity"); he had one hundred beautiful daughters and one day, as they were playing in the royal garden, Vāyu, god of the wind, fell in love with them and wanted to marry them. Unfortunately he met with a refusal and out of anger he changed them into hunchbacks, which in turn became the new name of the city.\(^{27}\) In another version, Kubjā was the nickname of a disabled girl, devotee of Kriṣṇa, to whom the god restored a beautiful and sound body in thanks for her fervently anointing his feet. Dr Rajko Djurić has pointed out some similarities between the Indian myth of Kali and the Rromans’ cult to Bibìa or Kali Bibi (black aunt), a female divinity who is still very popular among Rromani people in Serbia: Bibìa is a protective deity but she is also frightening. Her secret visit to Rromani homes at night by the end of January is considered a blessing; for that night all mirrors are covered, silence is prescribed and a basin with a jug of pure water and a comb are left at night. A black hair found in the morning in the comb evidences her visit and blessing.

\[\text{Fig. no. 08}\]

4.10 Further linguistic common features in Rromani and U.P. desī boli

Some common linguistic features also link Rromani with desī boli(of Uttar Pradesh) but the lack of sufficient data for other areas of India and the fact that these common features are more usually archaisms than innovations, prevents from using them as evidences of dialectal kinship. For example the existence of a long form of the possessive postposition in both Rromani (but restricted to the O-superdialect, as alternative to the short form – see above 2.2) and in Central U. P. desī boli could be a link between them. However, since this structure seems to be an archaism, it is not excluded that it was maintains in both linguistic system by chance. In addition, one has to check the real extension of the long form in India.

The issue of the gender in personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns-adjectives has been neglected in Indian studies, because the lack of differenciation in Hindi and Punjabi has hidden that many languages in the Hindi belt do differentiate gender, at least in the singular. Accordingly
the existence of a specific gender split, which has been first described in Braj brought an argument for a kinship with Rromani – cf. Professor Ian Hancock’s statement that "the language closest to Rromani is Western Hindi". Dialectal fieldwork in the villages of Phulpur, Arrangapur and an interview with Mr. Durgesh Dwivedi of Kannauj confirmed the existence of a masc./fem. differentiation – not to be found in the neighbouring place of Deodhrapur (urban Kannauj was not taken on account, since it is inhabited mainly by newcomers). However further investigation demonstrated that the category of gender is much more widespread than officially described, so the argument is weak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rromani</td>
<td>akava, kado</td>
<td>akaja, kadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>odova, kodo</td>
<td>odoja, kodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>ov, vov, vo</td>
<td>oj, voj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi-Urdu</td>
<td>ye [yah]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>vo [vah]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Ih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>Uh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Braj</td>
<td>Yaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>Vaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Braj</td>
<td>yu, yō, yi, ye</td>
<td>yā, jā, gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>bao, bu, bō</td>
<td>bā, wā, gwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangapur, Phulpur etc.</td>
<td>ʒo ʒā, ʒe, ʒε ji</td>
<td>ʒo ʒā, ʒε ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>ʒo ʒā, ʒε ji</td>
<td>ʒo ʒā, ʒε ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>bā, be, bε ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awadhi</td>
<td>iu, jάɦu</td>
<td>iā, jā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>ʊo, ū, ʊaɦu</td>
<td>ʊa, wəɦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>tī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>Hā</td>
<td>Hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>tī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far and pronoun</td>
<td>Tyō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Yō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>tyō (masc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>tinī (fem.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same may be said about the ending of masculine nouns and adjectives in ~ō (or ~au = ~ō) in this area, identical to their Rromani counterpart, which is also ~ō: purano "ancient, old" (other Indo-Aryan languages puranā, Rromani purano), taruno "young [U. P.]" (Other languages tarunā, Sinto tarno, Rromani terno). In fact the dialectal evolution of common ~ā to ~ō is subject to rather complicated rules which are still to be elucidated: it appears at least in Nepalī but some western vernaculars also use it. This poses the question of methodology in contrastive Rromani and Indo-
Aryan: there is a blatant need of fieldwork over a wide area in India, not only in the presumed area of the origin of Rromani. This research has to be done free of prejudices depreciating desī boli, a bias brought by the Britons. Lexicology has to be also taken into an account but mere dictionary based comparisons, as often practiced, are misleading because many desī boli words which are common with Rromani have been replaced in Hindi by Persianisms. The Rromani vocabulary contains some 70 Persian stems, but they are not common with Hindi. Rromani evolved throughout history, but the various desī boli have not remained unchanged either. Accordingly a very cautious, sensitive and realistic fieldwork is a prerequisite to any conclusion. The truth is that lexeme unknown to standard Hindi are found in U.P. vernaculars and Rromani – but their actual extension in modern Indo-Aryan has to be checked through serious fieldwork.

5. From the archeological point of view:
None of all these events would have occurred if Kannauj had not been such a hot spot of arts, culture, spirituality and knowledge. The city owed its human preeminence to a man, a ruler of the 7th century, Harshavardhana, who had made of a minor town a radiant center. However, from the archaeologic point of view it is worth setting out the early centuries of this town, even before Harshavardhana.

5.1 Kannauj played a major part in history since ancient times. It was an urban centre about 1500 B.C. as the archaeological remains found in the city prove. It was one of the important cities of Panchālas who, with the Kurūs, were the two main tribes of the Ganges valley [PGW] (Fig. no. 09).
This was the period of the so-called "Painted Grey Ware" and a great quantity of this kind of high quality ceramics has been found in Kannauj, as in most sites mentioned in the Mahābhārata. In the same period a philosopher, Śvetketu, lived there and the following anecdote about him is famous in India: after he had studied several years among sages, he came back full of pride to his father Aruṇa in Kannauj. Upon meeting him the father asked what he had learnt and Śvetketu was embarrassed in telling the illiterate old man about philosophy. The father then replied "in my opinion, the most important in life is that you are that (what you are)" and amazed Śvetketu commented: "in all my studies I didn't find so much wisdom in so few words" and the father: "Yes, but if you had not studied, you wouldn't probably in your age understand the significance of this" (there are several variants of this anecdote).

In subsequent centuries, mainly from the Maurya period (325-184 B.C.) to the 7th century A.D. the area produces series of baked clay figurines. Some of these were found in Kannauj by different people. These attest to an uninterrupted cultivation of the arts; many of them are quite charming and often represent mothers holding a child in their arms. Among them goddess Gajalakṣmi (Sunga period: 184-100 B.C.) is probably the earliest evidence of Brāhmanical deity in clay (Fig. no. 10).
Other small artefacts of the Śunga period were found in Kannauj and show the new tendency of celebrating innocent life and love between men and women, as well as toward nature, but sculpture was not neglected. In Gupta period (319-600 A.D.), the art attained maturity of expression with balanced harmony and natural beauty; these terracotta figurines were very much in demand on festive occasions. The history of sculpture in Kannauj is also extremely rich and culminates in the late Gupta period. Some beautifully chiseled high reliefs, all with religious subjects, are unequalled masterpieces in terms of elegance, balance and harmony. However, from the political point of view, Kannauj had lost all of its significance and had become merely a village among thousands of others.

The importance of Kannauj was due to its position near the rivers Kali and Ganges in a time when river transportation was the main means of communication. In addition, as pointed out by Cunningham (1924:436), "the situation is a commanding one and before the use of the cannon the height alone must have made Kannauj a strong and important position". The significance of the city decreased after that until it became a quite small town during the first centuries of our era, but
after the 5th century A.D. it increased in size again during the period of the late Guptas, when it became the Maukhāras' capital city. This family was to dominate the Ganges valley.

5.2 Harsha’s time

At this period, the Puṣyabhūtis, were reigning at Thāneśvar in Eastern Punjāb, the cradle of the Vardhana dynasty. The first of them to acquire real fame was Prabhākara-varadhana, who had two sons: Rājyavaradhana and Harshavaradhana and a daughter, Rājyaśrī who married Grahavarman, the sovereign of Kannauj. After Grahavarman’s assassination (probably by the king of Gauḍa/Bangladesh), Harsha took over the throne of Kannauj as a regent and became eventually one of the most outstanding rulers of ancient India: after some 15 years of military conquest, he turned to non-violence in 620 and extended further his kingdom through negotiation and diplomacy, until it encompassed almost whole of the north India, from today’s Bangladesh to Gujurāt and from Bhutan to Punjab and seemingly Kashmir – with the main part of Rajasthan remaining however outside his frontiers. In the meantime he had turned into a devout Buddhist and a man of peace. He was the very first ruler worldwide to organise an assembly for interreligious dialogue. This occurred first in 643 A.D. at Prayag (today Allahabad – but some sources place rather this assembly rather in Kannauj itself, on the north bank of the Ganges), attended by all the important rulers of various kingdoms. After this, the followers of various religions would gather and discuss the most obscure subjects (basically of Brāhmaṇical faith, Harsha was very open-minded and interested in other denominations, especially Jainism; he had embraced Buddhism probably under his sister’s influence). His quinquennial assembly held in Prayag is a rare example of Harsha’s charitable disposition and humanist outlook. After donating liberally to the various ascetics, he would also donate his valuable personal possessions also in charity.

Actually the circumstances in which Harsha became a king, and later an emperor, of India are a true epic. He was only 16 when, one after the other, his father, king of Thaneshvar, died, then his brother-in-law Grahavarman, king of Kannauj, was killed treacherously by Shashanka, king of Gauḍa (Bangladesh) and finally his brother Rajyavaradhana was also killed. Harsha received the crown of Thaneśvar and went in search of his sister, Queen of Kannauj, widowed when she was 14 years old. Harsha brought her back to Kannauj, from where Shashanka, her husband’s murderer, had just left. He is asked by his sister to stay “near her to advise her”. Sitting side by side on the "lion’s throne", Harsha and his sister then run both Thaneshvar and Kannauj.

Soon, Harsha goes to war against Shashanka, defeats him and sends him back to Bangladesh, without killing him. New campaigns are launched and systematic operations are carried out till around 620 (or 630) A.D., when, after a battle in Dakshin, ending without a winner but with innumerable deaths, his heart changed and he became Buddhist, a bit like emperor Ashoka, a
thousand years before him. After 15 years of conquest and expansion of his kingdom by the sword and fire, he continued to expand, through diplomacy and negotiation.

In domestic politics, Harsha moved throughout the country and listened to everyone. He used to say that "the law of the land must be fair and jest to all". In reality, Harsha was mainly following Buddhism and he made great donations for the expansion of the Buddhist University in Nalanda. In his days, it became an important city thanks to its production of large quantities of aromatic oils used initially for rituals, and later for potentates and finally for trade. This had long been the almost unique activity of the inhabitants and until today many perfumes in Europe are made from aromatic essences of Kannauj. As a writer the sovereign also left three masterpieces of Sanskrit drama: Ratnāvalī, Priyadarśikā and Nāgānanda, as well as a series of stanzas inserted in his charters and two hymns. In many respects Harsha appears to be one of the most prominent characters of Indian and world history – as well as proto-Rromani history.

In Harsha’s time there occurred a scientific revolution: his appointed astronomer, Brahmagupta, who lived in Ujjain and was in charge of making the calendar according to the movement of the stars, discovered the zero and its rules – a prodigious discovery that transformed mathematics. The Arabs of Iraq came then to learn this new arithmetic and spread it, with the Indian figures, through the Maghreb until Europe, where they were called "Arabic numerals".

For centuries, Harsha has been highly respected in India. With British rule, he was gradually forgotten, because his mode of government, very flexible, did not correspond to the British standards, a rigid and centralized imperial model. In fact, Harsha not only succeeded in bringing together all the lands of northern India into the same empire, but he also transformed Kannauj from the size of a small village that it was before into a radiant capital, for which many kings after him were going to fight.

The century of Harsha is also that of Mohammed; the Muslim religion spreads rapidly and reaches Iraq and Persia under the first four Caliphs. In 663, Muslims tried to enter India in Sindh, but the local ruler, Chach, repelled them. After his death, the caliph asked Chach’s son, Dahar, to mediate with pirates who had kidnapped 60 orphaned Muslim girls. Dahar answered by saying that he could do nothing against the pirates. The caliph was upset with this reply and he sent Ibn Kasim against Dahar in retaliation. Under his reign, Ibn Kasim did not affect the religious institutions of India, he respected them and did not destroy the temples. Muslims were not interested in land occupation or domination over men, but only through the control of trade routes.

5.3 Kannauj after Harsha

After Harsha’s death, Kannauj did not remain long the capital of northern India but from the point of view of economy, culture, arts and philosophy, it remained an amazingly wealthy city until its
distruption in 11th century. It regained some importance in 730 when the sovereign of the time, Yaśovarman, subdued Magadha and Gauḍa (Bengal) but was defeated by Lalitāditya, king of Kashmir. The 8th century is also the time of founding of Delhi in 736 A.D., the current capital of India.

At that time, a new power appeared on the banks of the Ganges: the Gurjāra, nomadic warriors, whose main tribes were the Paramara, the Chauhan, the Solanki and the Pratihāra. The first mention of the Gurjāra is to be found during Harsha’s reign, but no precise information about them appears before the late 8th century. Their state stretched as far as Rājastan’s borders and represented a force able to subdue the Arab invaders. Around the year 800, Dharmapāla, sovereign of Bengal, overthrew Indrājudha from Kannauj and gave the throne to Čakrajudha, who was overthrown in his turn about twenty years later by Nāgabadha II (800-833 A.D.). Kannauj became anew a capital city, that of the Pratihāra, during the reign of Bhoja, who reigned from 836 to 886 A.D.

With Harsha, the capital of India had first moved from the ancient city of Pataliputra (now Patna in Bihar) to Kannauj. This shift brought the axis of all politics to the middle Ganga valley, economy and culture of the country and the city itself became the symbol of royal power and spiritual supremacy in India’s Doab, a city 6 km long on the Ganges. That is why all three great dynasties of North India: the Pratihara-Gurjara, the Pala and the Rastrakuta were fighting to win this prestigious city and make it their capital – this competition is called in History “the Triangle of Kannauj” (Keay 2000: 192-201). Al-BIRUNI, a famous eleventh century scholar from Khwarezm, wrote that there were three major cities in India: Kannauj, Mathura and Thaneswar (ch. xviii) – this in a country which was indeed very rich but on the other hand divided into small territories in the hands of kinglets.

In the early 11th century, upon Mahmud’s onslaught, Kannauj was still a major cultural, spiritual and economic centre of northern India, a city spread out for four miles along the bank of Ganges, albeit not any more a political capital town. The Brāhmans of Kannauj, wherever they would go, enjoyed great respect among all the others. Not only did the most learned Brāhmans of India claim to be from Kannauj (as they still do today – pers. comm. by prof. Eric Meyer), but it was also a town that had attained a very high level of civilisation in terms of what we would now call democracy, tolerance, human rights, pacifism and even ecumenism, mainly as Harsha’s heritage, since Kannauj had reached the peak of its influence under his reign. However, even after his death “economic wealth and cultural development didn’t leave this city, making it the unofficial spiritual and intellectual capital of northern India” (Kieniewicz, 1980:218). All Indian and foreign studies confirm this outstanding position of Kannauj since Harsha’s times until Mahmud’s assault in 1018 A.D. Up to modern times an expression depicts this magnificence: when speaking of a person of exaggerated yearnings, one says ”well, you want Kannauj” – meaning ”well, you are crying for the moon".
We arrive so in the year 1000 A.D. with a very rich Aryāvarta but also divided. The incessant tripartite war for Kannauj, blinded the three dynasties and many local lords took advantage to create small, independent kingdoms, shaking the unity around Kannauj, which led to the fragmentation of northern India and a very turbulent situation there during the last quarter of the first millennium. So this is the context in which the capture of Kannauj and the displacement of the 53,000 inhabitants occurred.

After Mahmud’s invasion, people from Kannauj had left the Indian soil and reached Ghazni in Zabulistan, before they were transferred to Khorasan (1020-1022). After the Dandanaqan battle (1040) and in a very tense political context, they joined the Saljuq trail of the Turkish migration toward Bagdad (1055), Ani (1064), and Manzikert (1071 A.D.) and the South of Anatolia from where most of them headed up toward the Balkan and Europe around 1300 A.D.

**Archaeology today in Kannauj**

The area is very rich in archaeological relics and in the past peasants often found sculptures or other artefacts of great value. Early Painted Grey Ware and terracotta of the Śunga period are exhibited in the archaeological museum, which was recently moved to the new premises. The sewage tubes (ring wells) of Mauryan and Sunga period evidence the high level of urbanisation of ancient Kannauj (Fig. no. 11 & 12).
Fig. no. 11: Ring well (Mauryan)
Fig. no. 12: Ring well (Mauryan)
The images of couples made in terracotta are found in large numbers in Kannauj. The photograph of one such image is being given here (Fig. no. 13).

Fig. no. 13: Couple (Gupta period)
The image of Parvati (7th-8th century A.D.) of the later Gupta period is a fine example of sculptural art (Fig. no. 14).
The finest examples of sculptural art of Pratihar period have been found from Kannauj. The three such pieces are Kalyansundar Murti (Fig. no. 15) (depicting the marriage of Shiva and Parvati), Ganesh (Fig. no. 16) and Uma-mahesh (Fig. no. 17). The photographs are being reproduced below.
Fig. no. 16: Ganesh, Kannauj, U.P.
Fig. no. 17: Uma-Mahesh, Kannauj, U.P.
The examples of later Pratihar art in the form of stone sculptural art are three Mahisasuramardini images kept in Kannauj museum (Fig. no 18-20).

Fig. no. 18: Mahisasuramardini, Kannauj, U.P.
Fig. no. 19: Mahisasuramardini, Kannauj, U.P.
Fig. no. 20: Mahisasuramardini, Kannauj, U.P.
Middle size statues of Buddha (7th century A.D.) and Jain (8th century A.D.) near others contemporaneous mirroring Vedic tradition confirm the polity of interreligious mutual respect as officialized by Harsha after his conversion to Buddhism (Fig. no. 21-22).

Fig. no. 21: Standing Buddha (9th century A.D.)
Fig. no. 22: Jain Tirthankarar standing in Kayotsarga mudra (10th century A.D.)
The following images of *Samudramanthan* (10th century A.D.), *Kirtimukha* (11th-12th century A.D.) and load carrying couple (11th century A.D.) are the other examples of the post *Pratihar* art (Fig. no. 23-25).

![Image of Samudramanthan scene (10th century A.D.)](image)

Fig. no. 23: *Samudramanthan* scene (10th century A.D.)
Fig. no. 24: Kirtimukha (11th-12th century A.D.)

Fig. no. 25: Load carrying Couple (11th century A.D.)
The bulk of the ancient city is buried under the Tila, a 20 meters high tumulus, and excavations are forbidden since 1964. Only fragments of ancient walls show in two or three places due to fortuitous land subsidence but the buildings remaining inside are most probably similar to those visible in Harsha ka Tila, Thaneswar, Haryana (Fig. no. 26-29).
Fig. no. 28: Ruins from Thaneshwar, Haryana

Fig. no. 29; Ruins from Thaneshwar, Haryana
Mediaeval ruins of a fortress called *Jaichand ka Qila* can still be seen in the city of Kannauj (Fig. no. 30-33).

![Image of Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.](image-url1)

*Fig. no. 30: Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.*

![Image of Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.](image-url2)

*Fig. no. 31: Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.*
Fig. no. 32: Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.

Fig. no. 33: Jaichand ka Qila, Kannauj, U.P.
Some mandirs have been rebuilt in recent decades and the most noticeable among them is the Gauri Shankar mandir, one of the handful of strongest springs of spiritual energy in India. It is a new structure. It is built according to the design adopted for making contemporary temple (Fig. no. 34).

Fig. no. 34: Gauri Shankar temple, Kannauj, U.P.

Near its gate, a bust of Emperor Harsha reminds the visitor that if this major Indian ruler had not made of Kannauj an envied cultural, spiritual, artistic and intellectual center, most probably it would have not attracted sultan Mahmud's attention and the Kannaujias' exodus would not have occurred one thousand years ago. As a result one may wonder if there would be Romani people in the world today (Fig. no. 35-6).
Fig. no. 35: Bust of Harsha, Kannauj, U.P.
Fig. no. 36: Mrs. Esma (Author’s wife) in front of the bust of Harsha, Kannauj, U.P.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIGINAL LOST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 Dawlat Nāmah</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>See Farruxī, f. 23b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 Tāju’ l-Futuh</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Exploits of Sulṭān Maḥmūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3 Kitāb fī ghurarAxbar Mulūk al-Furs wa-siyarihim</td>
<td>‘Abdu’ l-Malik b. Muḥammad b. Ḥūṣain Baihaqi</td>
<td>Trad. Partielle par Zotenberg Paris, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4 Maqamat-i-Abū Naṣr-i-Muškān</td>
<td>Abū’ l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ḥūṣain Baihaqi</td>
<td>Fragm. preserved in Jawāmi’u l-Ḥikāyāt Āthāru’l-Wuzarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Mujalladāt [1018-1068] Bab-i-Yamīnī – based on state doc. &amp; diary Bab-i-Mas’ūdī Etc...</td>
<td>Abū’ l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ḥūṣain Baihaqi</td>
<td>Vol. 6 [2nd half], 7, 8, 9, 10 [Maḥmūd’s part] preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zīnattu’l-Kuttab</td>
<td>Abū’ l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ḥūṣain Baihaqi</td>
<td>Diplomatic corresp. Maḥmūd &amp; Mas’ūd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal History [up to 1018]</td>
<td>Mahmūd-i-Warrāq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dha’il Tajāribu’l-Umam</td>
<td>Hilāl b. Muḥassīn b. Ḥīrāhīm aṣ-Šābī</td>
<td>Mahmūd’s letters of victory in extenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farīdu’ t-Tawārīx</td>
<td>Abū’ l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Sulāmān</td>
<td>Hist. of Khorasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta’rīx-i-Mujadwal</td>
<td>Imām Muḥammad b. ‘Alī Abū l-Qāsim ‘Imādī, also called Ta’rīx-i-Amīr ‘Imādī Maḥmūd b. al-Imām as-Sinjarī al-Ghaznavī</td>
<td>Dikh Barthold p. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Abū’ l-Ḥasan al-Haitham b. Muḥammad-i-Nājī</td>
<td>Died in 1177/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Khorasan</td>
<td>Abū Muḥammad Hārūn b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta’rīx Mahmūd b. Subuktigīn wa Banīhi</td>
<td>Abū Naṣr Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Jabbāral-‘Utbi</td>
<td>Ornate, verbose, sketchy, scanty in facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTANT &amp; CONTEMPORARY TO THE EVENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Kitābu ‘l-Yamīnī [up to 1020]</td>
<td>Abū’-Ṣaraf Nāṣir al-Jurbādh-qānī (between 1186 and 1206)</td>
<td>Rather an adaptation than a translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Kitāb-i-Yamīnī</td>
<td>Abū Sa’īd ’Abdu’ll-Ḥayy b. ad-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Mahmūd al-Gardēzī</td>
<td>History of Iran; omission, sketchy, colorless but treats in full period of Mahmūd and precise in assigning dates to recorded events. One copy in King’s College Cambridge (No. 213); Copy of copy at Bodleian Library (No. 240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Zainu’ l-Axbar [up to middle of 11th century] (named after Mahmūd’s son)</td>
<td>Abū Sa’īd ’Abdu’ll-Ḥayy b. ad-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Mahmūd al-Gardēzī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Tahqīq mā li’l-Hind (Investigation what is India)</td>
<td>Abū Raiḥān Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Birūnī (973-1048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Ta’rīx-i-Mas’ūdī &gt;&gt; Bab-i-Mas’ūdī</td>
<td>Abū’l-Faḍl Muhammad b. Ḥuṣain Baihaqi</td>
<td>Court life, intrigues, rivalry + lost history of Xwarizm by al-Birūnī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Siyāsat Nāmah (1091/2)</td>
<td>Abū ‘Alī Hasan b. ‘Alī (= Nizāmu’l-Mulk, wazir of Seljuk Sultan Malik Šāh)</td>
<td>Anecdotes about SM, not historical, but excellent about his system of administration (cf. Bartold p. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Ujmalu’t-Tawārīx (1135)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Some references and quotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Rājatarangini (1150)</td>
<td>Kalhana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Čahār Maqāla (1157) [four speeches]</td>
<td>Abū’l-Ḥasan Nizāmu’d Din Ahmad b. ’Umar b. ‘Alī an-Nizāmī al-’Arūḍī as-Samargandi</td>
<td>Relationships Mahmūd/al-Birūnī &amp; Ferdowsī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Al-Muntazam fi Tawārīx’l-Mulūk wa’l-Umam (cc. 1200) the system in the history of kings and nations</td>
<td>Abū’l-Faraj ’Abdu’r-Rahmān b. ’Alī Ibnu’l-Jawzi al-Bakrī (1116-1201)</td>
<td>Quotations from Dhail &amp; SM’s letters of victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Zahiriddin Naṣr Muhammad ‘Auﬁ</td>
<td>Jawāmī ul-Hikāyāt wa Lawāmī ul-Riwāyāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Ibn Esfandīār</td>
<td>Ta’rīx-e-Tabarestān (1216/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Nūru’d-Dīn Muhammad</td>
<td>Jawāmī’u’l-Hikāyāt (1228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>‘Awfī</td>
<td>Lubābu’l-Albāb (1228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Maṣṣūr b. Sa’īd b. Abū’l-Faraj al-Quraishi (= Faxr-i-Mudīr)</td>
<td>Kifāyatu’l-Mamlūl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Abū’l-Muzaffar Yusuf b. Qizughlī (= Sibt Ibnul’Jawzī)</td>
<td>Mir’ātu’z-Zamān fi Tawārīxi’l A’yān (cc. 1260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Abū ’Umar Minḥājū’d-Dīn ‘Uthmān b. Sirājū’d-Dīn Jūzjāni</td>
<td>Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣīrī - shāmil-i bīst-u-yak ṭabaqah az jumla’h-i bīst-u-sīh ṭabaqah (1259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zafar Nāmah (1329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>‘Abdu’r-Raḥmān b. Muhammad b. Xaldūn (= Ibn Xaldūn) (1332-1382)</td>
<td>Kitābu’l-‘Ībar (1397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Sāifu’d-Dīn Ḥājjī b. Nizām al-Faḍlī</td>
<td>Āthāru’l-Wuzara’ (cc. 1460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Faṣīhu’d-Dīn Ahmad b. Muhammad (= Faṣīhī al-Xwāﬁ)</td>
<td>Mujmal-i-Faṣīhī (cc. 1460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Rawḍatu’s-Ṣafā (cc. 1500)</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Xwānd Šāh b. Mahmūd (= Mir-Xwānd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Xulāṣatu’-Tawārīx ??</td>
<td>Chiyāthu’d-Dīn b. Humāmu’d-Dīn (= Xwānd-Amir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Ḥabību’-Siyar</td>
<td>Mullā Ahmad Thatawī &amp; Aṣaf Xān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Ta’rīx-i-Allen (1585)</td>
<td>Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Ahmad b. Muhammad Muqīm al-Harawī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Tabaqāt-i-Akbar” (cc. 1600)</td>
<td>Nizāmu’d-Dīn Ahmad b. Muhammad Qāsim Hindū Šāh (= Firištā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Gūlšan-i-Ilbrāhīmi [= “Ta’rīx-i-Firišta”] (1606)</td>
<td>综述了SM的远征</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Mir’āt-i-Mas’ūdī (1611)</td>
<td>‘Abdu’r-Rahmān Xišti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Xulāṣatu’-Tawārīx ??</td>
<td>Sujān Rāy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Kitāb mu’jam al-buldān</td>
<td>Yāqūt ibn-‘Abdullah al-Rūmī al-Hamawī (1179-1229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Mu’jam al-udabā (1226)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Iršād al-arīb ilā ma’rifat al-adib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYRIAC SOURCES**

| 4.1 | Maktānūt zabnē (Chronicle) | Michael the Syrian | Paris, 1905 mainly Chapters XIV & XV; new edition by Çiçek |
| 4.2 | Anonymous Chronicle to AD 1234 | Anonymous from Edessa | |
| 4.3 | Maktānūt zabnē /Chronicon syriacum | Bar ‘Ebroyo (Gregory Abū’l-Faraq b. Hārūn) | Paris, 1890 by Paul Bedjan |

**ARMENIAN SOURCES**

| 5.1 | Matenagrowthyan banasirakan k’nowt’yown (The misfortunes of the Armenian nation) | Aristakes Lastiverc’i | |
| 5.2 | Zhamanakagrutyun (Chronography) | Mattheos Urhaetsi (of Edessa) | |

**Footnotes**

1 A slightly earlier mention is to be found in Hermann Korner’s Chronica novella in 1437 in Lübeck but its meaning is rather dubious: “Wan se ute wen geholden, so togen se to lande, dat dat klene India genomet is, also se speken, unde so moste eyn ander partye uth theen in der sulven wise echt so lange ute deme lande doen, went dat dat gantze lant de penitencien...”
When they had to leave the country, they had withdrawn [or 'had to withdraw'] to the land called Little India, so to speak, and so another group had to leave the country in the same way until the whole country repented. The text is old low (northern) German.

The Hebrew word כוש [kušîm] 'the black (derogative – boxed word in the quotation)' is the plural of כוש [kuš] 'Ethiopia' (probably of Egyptian origin k3š) and refers basically to the inhabitants of the kingdom of Kush (today's northern Sudan). According to Strong (03568), the meaning was "black, burnt by the sun", although it is difficult to state which one is primitive and which one is derivated. Used in reference to a black person, it was pejorative and usually considered offensive; it could be compared to English "negroe". The use of this qualifier here could be a mere translation of the word Kale "black", by which Iberian Rroms call themselves. The Hebrew fragment quoted is written in Rashi type. We do not quote the Law approved by King Phillip 2nd of Spain in Elvas on 11 Feb. 1581 because the words India and indios used in this text do not refer to India, but to South America.

The Ancient Greek word Αιθιοπιanoi [aithi-ops] "Ethiopian" meant "black, burnt-faced" and was a verbatim translation of "kušî". Note that the original meaning of the Arabic word "Sudan" was also "black" and referred to all black Africa, not only modern Sudan. In modern Hebrew Kušî means "African".

The Ancient Testament mentions Xerxes' empire as 127 provinces: פֶּסֶת [me-hud w3ad kuš] [Ester, 1.1, repeated 8.9] "from India to Kuš/Ethiopia" (they were in fact 120).

"And I will scatter the Egyptians among the nations, and I will disperse them through the countries".

Further quotations are not given hereby, due to their comparatively important length.

Paradoxically enough, Grellmann wrote in his book: "It is a false proposition to say that two peoples who are alike in one or two aspects must necessarily share the same origin" (p. 30).

Rajko Džurić, Romi u Evropskoj Književnosti Beograd, 1996 (p.9).


One of the names of the Ghaznavid dynasty, after Mahmûd's title Yamin-ud-Daulah "Right arm of the empire (secular power)", conferred by the caliph al-Qâdir Billâh, while his other titles were Amīn u-Millah "trustworthy man of the faith" and Wâli Amîr al-Mu'mînin "Friend [to the] commander of the Faithful (= the caliph)").

Cawnpore in colonial English.

The following recount is based mainly on Rama Sh. Tripathy (1964:284 sq.).

Prior to the raid on Kannauj, "nearly twenty thousand men had come from the plains of Máwarán n-Nahr [Transoxiana], through zeal for Islam, and they sat down waiting for the Sultan's movements [...] Their craving zeal and stirring ideas inflamed and excited the Sultan and he desired to proceed with those troops to Kannauj". Ganguly (2001:13) mentions also 100,000 horsemen, but this figure seems exaggerated; he also maintains that a good part of the contingent originated from Khurasân and Turkistân.

Al-'Utbî, Nizamuddin and Firishta disagree about the order of the battles, but al-'Utbî seems more reliable and his order is taken here.

Trans. by Briggs (1827:57) and quoted by Rama Sh. Tripathy (1964:285).

The ultimate aim of the 1014 campaign was also Kannauj but Mahmut's forces were repelled at Thâneśvar by the Indian coalition (v. infra).

Is it rash to suggest that possibly the Roms' lack of inclination for maritime occupations could be a remnant of this fear?

Whenin 1902 Maharajadhiraj MadhoSinghi traveled to London for the coronation of Edward VII, he took with him on board three huge silver pots of 8,200 liters each (the largest silver objects so far produced in the world) in order to comply to the kalâ pani precepts, bringing with him a three-month supply of water from the Ganges. Indian immigrantsto South Africa used to do the same, though on a more modest, rather symbolic, foot. The Britons, who were aware of the kalâ pani rules, built jails on Adaman Islands for Indian convictedanti-British political activists, knowing that the latter exiledtherewill suffera doublepunishment: jail and anxiety before a death outside of Saptasindhu soil, meaning their soul would be lost forever.
It is essential to pay attention to the subscribed dot under the ḍ of ḍomba, because it represents a dental sound pronounced as English “d”, not continental “d”. This dot is crucial, because all Indian languages distinguish clearly retroflex ḍ [d] from dental ḍ [d]. On the other hand, ḍ [d] is not clearly distinguished from ḍ [ṛ] and ḍomba may be spelled Romba as well. This is the reason why the word Rom ought to be spelled ḍomba (fem. ḍombī and pl. ḍomā) in Hindi and not with an initial ṛ.

Before king Harśa’s conversion to non-violence in 620, Kannauj had been a warlike power, and had incorporated battalions of Gurjāra (nomadic warriors, ancestors of the Rājputs) into its army. The Rājputs were warriors, originating “on the one hand from central Asian invaders who had come with the Huns during the 6th century, and on the other hand from aboriginal populations from forested regions, at the edge of the Ganges valley”.

It must be emphasised that the expression "black" to describe Rroms’ skin colour, as used by Europeans from the very first contacts between the populations, gives us more information about the sedentary population’s perception of this skin than about objective colours. Obviously, among the new-comers, the ones with the darkest and more “visible” complexion caught the European populations’ imagination. Later, painters and photographers always chose dark-skinned people to bolster that image, which gradually created the idea of Rroms as “black people” in the common imagination. In Poland, Rroms make a distinction between “black Rroms” and “white Rroms”, according to which group they belong (from the mountains or from the plains). In fact, there is no visible difference between the different groups’ skin colour. We have here a symbolic use of colours that may have made sense at some point in history but is today irrelevant.

The ideological reluctance of associating the ethnic name Rom to Sanskrit रोम्बा (on the ground that Rom/भोम has become highly depreciative in modern India probably under British influence) is of little weight against the undisputable sound evolution leading from ḍomba to Rom. As a matter of fact, the ḍomba (or ḍomba) were not a “despicable” population in ancient times, as is too often claimed. Indeed, we have texts, like the Rājastānangini, written by the Brāhman Kalhana, which describe the friendship of some of them with the Prince of Kashmir. He was eventually to give high functions to their families (‘River of Kings’, English translation by Ranjit Sītārām Paṇḍit, New Delhi: Sahitya Academy, 1935). A research by Jeanne Gamonet on the values of रोम्ब in classic Sanskrit literature (s. bibl.) points out that the idea of a “lower caste of musicians” is only on occasion associated to this word and that Europeans have insisted on it. It is noteworthy that “直辖/直辖” is sometimes merely glossed as “creator, artist”, without any reference to any varna.

The word “caste” renders anyway a Brasilian concept brought by the Portuguese to India as an attempt to render the complicated system of varna and jati they were no able to understand.

The regular Greek form should have been ἱβ/हिंदि with an aspiration, from Persian (when -h- corresponds to Indo-Aryan -s-; cf. som/haoma, asura/ahura etc.) but the word entered Greek through the Ionian dialect, which had no aspiration, thus ἱβ/हिंदि- and hence Latin India (pers. comm. by René Gsell).

In this case, a paradoxical evolution of ~ to ~ should be postulated, so this etymology is far from being ascertained. In fact, some individual Rromani dialects, mainly in Hungary, Austria and Slovenia, seem to present this evolution of ~ to ~. Let us recall that this stem appears in Homer’sliad “Παῦδο ημαφερόμην, ἀμαίνεται δοκατάντα / κάππεσενήμμονο, ἕλεν ἐπιστημονής/ ἐνθᾶμενειδίαναδάρανομολοκαστὶνοτιειοντα" All day I sailed, but at sunset, I fell on Lemnos / I had only little breath left. / There the Sinti people immediately took care of me, who had fallen (Ili. 592-594). The presence of this ethnic name in early Greek literature is probably a mere coincidence but if there is any link with an Indian ethnic name, a possible explanation could be that it was a reminiscence of earlier times, when proto-Acheans had been neighbouring with proto-Indians in the common Indo-European area (likely in Kazakhstan, according to Marija Gimbutas). Then the proto-Indians could have conveyed this ethnic name to the Meluhha valley (today Indus or Sindhu valley), renaming it after their own name (places are usually called after their inhabitants, not the other way around) and thus the stem Sindl extended eventually to the notion of vast bodies of water. However we lack serious elements in support to this supposition. In addition the word Sinto itself could have been a loan into Rromani, from an Italian slang (hence it atypical flexion).
26 In his Geography (VII, ch. II), Ptolemy (90-168 a.D.) provides the coordinates of the city: 143° & 32°10' precising it lays along Ganges river (παρά τόν Γάγγην ποταμόν), given that his coordinates are expressed as fractions of a degree of latitude (measured from the equator) and longitude (measured from an arbitrarily defined prime meridian in the Atlantic ocean). However, the coordinates of his Κανάγιζα refer in the Greek system to a point somewhere Eastern of Katmandu. So if despite the coordinates we have to do really with the same place, the Greek spelling would suggest that the pronunciation was already [kanoiz] or [kanoij] in Ptolemy’s information.

27 Other names of Kannauj were Kusasthali, Kusika and Gadhipuri (pers. comm. by prof. Jeevan Shukla from Kannauj).

28 The sages Āruni and Śwetaketu from there contributed to the Pañcālas’ reputation.

29 Kannauj and its surroundings were sometimes referred to as Pañča-paṇa “five waters”; this was also the name of several tirthas (fords, pilgrimages, especially of one near Benares). The most famous Pañcāpana, in Northe-Western areas, was later renamed Punjāb in Persian language and evolved into the administrative entities now known under this name in India and Pakistan. The Greek equivalent was since ancient times πεντοπόταμος.

30 Also called respectively Pawars, Chauhans, Solankis and Parihārs.
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Medieval art and architecture of India had an Islamic tradition while pre Islamic period was enriched and flourished by native Indian sculptural legacies. In ancient India, temples, palaces and cities were built over the centuries with decorative walls. The dominant trabeated system of covering spans and spaces governed forms and shapes converging into stepped or non-stepped pyramidal forms of monuments. Offsetting of consecutive layers of masonry to cover the space provided more opportunities for sculptural ceiling and walls. Vital elements of figurative representation of animals and deities made spaces animated and dynamic and enhanced spirituality with dimmed and cozy ambience. Thus ancient India created spaces with religious lore from Buddhist rock-cut viharas to monumental Jain and Hindu temples. The dominated religious architecture of ancient India influenced the contemporary trade routes to Central Asia and Southeast Asia.

The arrival of Muslims at the end of twelfth century and their establishment of Sultanate dynasty was a point of inception for the emergence of Indo-Islamic art and architecture\(^1\). Immigrant Muslims came with a different technology which was almost unfamiliar to the Indian world based on arcuated system, the spanning and covering of spaces with arches with radial voussoir and domes. In
the beginning there were some stylistic conflicts between the two technologies. But they merged with the passage of time with native Indian technology similar to their culture, art, music, customs and rituals which were amalgamated. The development of Indo-Islamic architecture continued for centuries first under Sultans of Delhi and later flourished and reached at its peak during Mughal period. Two remarkable incidences in medieval history, migration of artisans from Persia to India due to Mongol's devastation and Humayun's refuge in Persia for a long time ensured Persian influence on Indo-Islamic architecture. Hence medieval architecture of India became a fusion of predominantly Central Asian, Persian and ancient Indian architecture. The development of Indo-Islamic architecture reached its zenith during Mughal period while it is presumed that its decline started with the decline of the Mughal Empire. The legacy of these building monuments though continued despite gradual decline of empire but affected the richness in the architectural character of built structures. The change reflected in the decline in the use of expensive materials due to transfer of patronage of monuments from Emperor to Sub-imperial authorities, however the stylistic development continued for the next centuries in the form of provincial styles. In the last phase of Indo-Islamic Architecture during the reign of Aurangzeb, a marvelous building complex was built at the outskirts of Shahajahanabad in Delhi by one of his Amir, Ghaziuddin Khan, which signifies an important link to understand the transition of Architectural style from classical period of Mughal architecture to late Mughal provincial styles. In this paper authors investigate the significance of Ghaziuddin Khan Complex in the development of Mughal architecture in North India.

Shihabuddin Khan, arrived in India in 1674 from Bukhara to become the Sadr us Sadar of Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb, and was later raised to the position of Amir. On a successful campaign in the Deccan in 1683 as a commander-in-chief hereceived the title of Ghaziuddin Khan Bahadur. A building complex near Ajmeri Gate in Delhi popularly known as Madarsa Ghaziuddin which contains a mosque, madarasa and tomb is attributed to his name. Present complex houses Anglo Arabic Senior Secondary School (Fig.1) while it has been used earlier as Zakir Hussain College for a long time. The complex is well preserved and is presumed as the oldest continuing school in Delhi.
Evidences regarding the period of construction of the complex and its attribution are quite contradictory. Catherine claims it was constructed during the arrival of Ghaziuddin to India and his death and according to her, the building was constructed in between 1674 to 1709. British sources presume that the Madarsa was built in late eighteenth century by Ghaziuddin Khan II, the son of Ghaziuddin Khan I. It is possible that the construction of mosque and tomb might have been constructed by Ghaziuddin I in his life time while madarsa would have been constructed later on by his son. This assumption is also stylistically supported as the mosque is isolated from madarsa, contrary to the earlier mughal mosques and madarsa complexes which were unified structure. The overall layout of madarsa evokes the Central Asian style. The complex has a large courtyard surrounded by a double storeyed madarsa on three sides while there is a mosque and the tomb of Ghaziuddin on the western side.
The main entrance portal, with an outer façade of red sandstone, lies at the centre of the eastern wing of the complex (Fig. 2 and 3). It is flanked by inclined entrances, all leading to the domed atrium overlooking the central courtyard (Fig. 4). The dome over this atrium is raised on squinches converging from square to octagon and finally into a circle (Fig. 5). The eastern wing also showcases octagonal bastions at its corners (Fig. 6). The courtyard is approachable from three entrances situated at the centre of the eastern wing. The main entrance portal opens to the courtyard with a double height projected arch flanked by two projected balconies on upper storey covered with bangla style roof (Fig. 7).
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Fig. 4. Angular side entrance (Photograph by author)

Fig. 5. Dome at the entrance raised on squinches

Fig. 6. Octagonal bastion at the corner of eastern wing (Photograph by author)
The double storeyed Madarsa complex surrounds the large courtyard from three sides and includes the eastern, southern and northern wings. At the centre of each wing of madarsa is a protruding double height *iwan* (Fig. 8) and layout of madarsa evokes the Persian iwan type arrangement. Each *iwan* is flanked by a double storey crenellated structure embellished by multi-lobed arches on both floors (Fig. 9). All the madarsa wings once had verandah around the courtyard, which have now been converted into class rooms at various places.
On the western side there is a mosque making a visual axis starting from the centre of entrance to madarsa and ending at the centre of mihrab (Fig.10). The mosque complex has a prayer hall and a separate courtyard as a spill out space for Friday prayers, which is slightly raised than other buildings in the premises. The prayer hall is further raised two steps from the mosque courtyard. The central half domed entrance to the prayer hall is tall and emphasizes its verticality and hides the part of the dome behind. The triple domed prayer hall has a projected central high pishtaq with slender turrets at its corners. The domes are raised on squinches and arch netting. Mihrab, semi hexagonal in plan is embellished by multi-lobed arch and four centered arch (Fig.11). Central multi-lobed arch is larger than other arches embellished with white marble border. There is small minaret at each corner of prayer hall surmounted by marble cupolas. The domes are having constricted neck and are surmounted by inverted lotus and finial, atypical characteristic of Mughal domes. The central dome is too large in comparison to the other two domes. The pishtaq is flanked by three multi-lobed arches resting on rectangular pillars embellished with floral decoration and flutes (Fig. 12).
Fig. 10. Mosque on the western side (Photograph by author)

Fig. 11. Mihrab (Photograph by author)  Fig. 12. Rectangular pillar (Photograph by author)
The overall structure is similar to Zinatun-nisa mosque built by second daughter of Aurangzeb, however, the former does not have tall minarets. Ebba Koch compares the overall layout of campus with Khairul Manazil mosque built during Akbar’s reign. Unlike Khairul Manazil the mosque is isolated from the madarsa wings. The domes were once striped with different color similar to Jami Masjid Shahjahanabad. On the south of the mosque there is a roofless tomb of Ghaziuddin with marble screen walls showcasing detailed craftsmanship (Fig.13) which is further surrounded by carved sandstone jaali with remarkable arabesque workmanship (Fig.14).

Despite Emperor Aurangzeb’s lack of interest in building expensive monument, his subordinates maintained the legacy of Mughal Architecture. Even during British Raj in India, the Mughal style continued in the form of Indo-Saracenic Architecture, which influenced the contemporary architecture of the region. The Ghaziuddin Khan Complex acts a benchmark which reflects continuity in the development of architecture of later period. It stands as a remarkable witness to the later developments in Indo-Islamic architecture where despite the decline in patronage and use of rich material resources, the stylistic trends were maintained and the richness of spatial arrangements of forms and their relationship with the spaces were intact.
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