

The Buddhist *Pratimālakṣaṇa*: “Defining the Image”¹

Charles Willemen

Belgian Royal Academy of Sciences

IN MANY ŚILPAŚĀSTRAS one finds a section that deals with iconometry, *tālamāna*. A text now often referred to is Varāhamihira’s *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* (sixth century), and Bhaṭṭotpala’s commentary (967 CE).² Buddhist literature also has its iconometrical texts. They actually come from a common brāhmanical tradition. Ancient Indian craftsmen, such as painters, were not necessarily linked with a specific religious tradition. They were primarily members of a guild of painters.³ But the Buddhist tradition nevertheless introduced adaptations, producing Sthāvīriya texts,⁴ and later Mantrayāna texts too.

Early in the twentieth century Lévi discovered Sanskrit iconometrical texts in the Darbar Library in Nepal.⁵ Some of these Newārī Sanskrit manuscripts found their way to the Viśvabhāratī Library in Śāntiniketan and generated initial interest. Bagchi stimulated research there, drawing attention to the *Kriyāsamuccaya* too. Sri Lanka also has its share of Sanskrit iconometrical texts, such as the *Bimbamāna*, also called *Śāriputra*, and the *Alekhyalakṣaṇa*.⁶ These texts were really introduced by Ruelius in 1968, and published and studied in his doctoral dissertation in 1974.⁷ The *Alekhyalakṣaṇa* seems to be a more recent compilation, maybe twelfth or thirteenth century,⁸ with Buddhist elements only in its Sinhalese commentary.⁹ Consisting of thirty-one Sanskrit stanzas and its Sinhalese *sannaya*, the text speaks about the measurements of the human body. The *Bimbamāna* supposedly dates from about the same period. Its oldest manuscript dates from 1352 CE.¹⁰ The text counts 139 Sanskrit stanzas and has a Sinhalese *sannaya*. It only deals with the measurements of a Buddha statue. Marasinghe says that the *Bimbamāna* shows a definite link with the last two chapters of the *Citrakarmasāstra*, a text that may have been written before the seventh

century, but the two texts represent different traditions.¹¹ The *Citrakarma* is clearly Mahayana.

Laufer's study of the Tibetan *Citralakṣaṇa* in 1913 informed the scholarly world about Tibetan iconometrical scriptures.¹² The *bsTan-'gyur*, the translated doctrine, contains four texts. The catalogue of the Peking edition of the Tibetan *Tripitaka*, kept in the library of Ōtani University in Japan, mentions the following texts:¹³

no. 5804: *Daśatālananyagrodhaparimaṇḍalabuddhapratimālakṣaṇa*, i.e., the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, *Defining the Image*.

no. 5805: *Samḃuddhabhāṣitapratimālakṣaṇavivaraṇa*, a commentary on the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*.

no. 5806 *Citralakṣaṇa*, *Defining a Painting* (of a *cakravartin*, a wheel-turning ruler).

no. 5807: *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇa*, *Defining the Measurements of Images*. Also called *Ātreyaṭilaka*.

There is no known Sanskrit original of the *Citralakṣaṇa* yet. A Sanskrit text of the other three now exists, and will be discussed *infra*. (1), (2), and (4) are Tibetan translations made by the Tibetan Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan and the Indian Dharmadhara. The *Pratimālakṣaṇa* exists in a Chinese translation from the Tibetan, made by the Mongol Gombojab, Tibetan name mGon-po skyabs, in 1741. Iconometrical literature has been discussed by de Jong in *T'oung Pao*, and more recently by Onoda in *Bukkyō Gakkai Kiyō*.¹⁴

THE CITRALAKṢAṆA

The best known text to this day is the Tibetan *Citralakṣaṇa*. It was studied and translated in the pioneering German work of Laufer in 1913. New and additional light was thrown on the *Citralakṣaṇa* by Roth in 1990. He translated *Citralakṣaṇa* as "The Characteristic Marks of a Painting."¹⁵ He clearly states that the text shows no trace of a Buddhist tradition. No attempt is made to give the *Citralakṣaṇa* a Buddhist appearance. Roth says that the text originated in a guild of craftsmen who were not Buddhists. The other texts mentioned above may have originated in the same circles, but they are given a Buddhist interpretation. Roth stresses that the Indian artist was a transmitter of a common cultural heritage, across sectarian borders. The three parts that together form the *Citralakṣaṇa* may be a product of the Gupta age,

sixth century or somewhat earlier.¹⁶ The same opinion has also been advanced by Ruelius, who traces the *Citralakṣaṇa* back to the time of Varāhamihira, sixth century.¹⁷

At the end of the first part of the text the title, “Traits of Painting,” is mentioned in Tibetan. The author is Nagnajit. In this part the supernatural origin of the painting is narrated. Brahma orders a king to paint the deceased son of a grieving *brāhmaṇa*, and then Brahma brings this likeness to life. Brahma had advised the king to go to Viṣvakarman for instructions to execute the painting. The term *nagnajit*, “conqueror of the naked,” is used for the king, who conquers the naked *pretas* and returns the dead son to life. Roth says that *nagnajit* originally was a designation of a victorious champion in athletic contests, a designation suitable for a king of Gandhāra. Later on, the term *nagnajit* became the name of the author of the treatise called *Citralakṣaṇa*, which relates that, after he had conquered Yama and his naked *pretas*, a king was called Nagnajit by Brahma. This Nagnajit may have lived before Varāhamihira.¹⁸ The second part of the text ends with the title “Origin of Sacrificial Rites.” The third and main part deals with the corporal measurements, actually of a *cakravartin*.¹⁹ The text does not speak about the thirty-two characteristic marks. The *Citralakṣaṇa* is, however, preserved by the Buddhists.

THE PRATIMĀLAKṢAṆA

Both the Sanskrit text and a Japanese translation have been published by Sakaki.²⁰ Banerjea edited and translated a Newārī Sanskrit manuscript in 1932, and Mitra edited another Newārī Sanskrit manuscript in 1933.²¹ Mitra supposes that the archetype of the manuscripts was written in Gupta script, certainly not later than the tenth century.²² The presently available manuscripts may be dated to the thirteenth century.²³ Mori proposes that the *Pratimālakṣaṇa* was completed in the tenth century, because Tucci mentions a Tibetan translation by Atīśa (982–1054).²⁴ The text is more recent than the *Citralakṣaṇa* and older than the *Bimbamāna*.²⁵ There is a commentary, *Vivaraṇa*, on the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, translated from Sanskrit to Tibetan by Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan and Dharmadhara. The colophon of the Tibetan *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa* contains two parts.²⁶ The first one, in prose, informs us that the Indian sage Dharmadhara and the Tibetan Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan (Kīrtidhvaja), *lo-tṣā-ba* (translator) from Yar-

kluñs, translated the text in Guñ-thañ, in Mañ-yul. The second part, a stanza, makes it clear that the text was translated at the request of the Bhoṭapaṇḍita, Tibetan sage, Dam-chos-'dzin (Saddharmadhara) in Guñ-thañ. The Chinese commentary gives the same information.²⁷ The Tibetan *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa* is mentioned in Bu-ston's catalogue of 1322.²⁸ So, the translation was made early in the fourteenth century, a period when Nepalese artisans had a considerable influence in the Yuan empire (1279–1368), spreading there Himalayan and Pāla art from Bengal.²⁹

The Sanskrit of the *Vivaraṇa*, as can be seen in Mitra's edition of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, reproduced three chapters of the *Kriyāsamuccaya*, the earlier text being the *Kriyāsamuccaya*. Roth has established this connection between the *Kriyāsamuccaya* and the *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*.³⁰ He says that the *Kriyāsamuccaya* was almost certainly compiled before the twelfth century by Avadhūti Śrīmad Jagaddarpaṇa from Vikramaśīla. The Sanskrit *Vivaraṇa* is a loan from the *Kriyāsamuccaya*.³¹ The basic Sanskrit *Pratimālakṣaṇa* has introductory prose that definitely makes it a Buddhist sutra. It contains a dialogue between Buddha and Śāriputra. Having returned to the Jetavana from the Tuṣita heaven, where he had expounded the doctrine to his mother, Buddha was asked by Śāriputra how to represent him after he had passed away. Thereupon Buddha expounds the measurements when making his likeness. The Chinese version, translated from Tibetan, also places the dialogue in the Jetavana in Śrāvastī, but Buddha is about to ascend to the Trāyastriṃṣa heaven to preach to his mother. At that moment Śāriputra asks Buddha how to make an image, and Buddha expounds the measurements. So there is more than one version of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*. The Chinese commentary, referring to the Tibetan, mentions three translations and one commentary.³² Yuexi and Henmi have said that the three translations are *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa*, and *Citralakṣaṇa*, and that the one commentary is *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*.³³ The one commentary probably is *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*, but it is difficult to understand how *Citralakṣaṇa* could be one of those three translations.³⁴ Tucci says that the Tibetan tradition, as preserved by sMan-thañ-pa (fifteenth century), knows four versions of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*.³⁵ It seems that maybe three of the four versions mentioned by Tucci may have been a *Pratimālakṣaṇa*. One may have been a *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa*.³⁶ Of the three *Pratimālakṣaṇas*,

one is translated by Atīśa and called *Śāriputrapariṣcchā*, because it is expounded at Śāriputra's request.

Śāriputra appears as an artist in three *avadānas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*.³⁷ In the Chinese *Kṣudrakavastu* of that same *vinaya*, Buddha, who is about to ascend to the Trāyastriṃṣa heaven, was making conversions in Śrāvastī and sees *brāhmaṇas* and artisans from far and near, who then go forth to become *śramaṇas*.³⁸ So it is no surprise that the codification of rules for artists is connected with Śāriputra. This seems to be a Sthāviriya tradition, of which there is more than one kind. The Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* and its Tibetan original may have belonged to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. This does not mean that the affiliation of the Singhalese texts, e.g., *Bimbamāna*, is exactly the same. Anyway, the *Pratimālakṣaṇa* is Buddhist, describing the Buddha, and only the Buddha, and his thirty-two characteristic marks. The Sanskrit versions mention the term "bodhisattva" in the introduction, but the Chinese (Tibetan) does not.³⁹ The Sanskrit clearly only describes Buddha, in forty-nine stanzas. I count thirty-three stanzas in the Chinese (Tibetan). It is beyond any doubt that there were a number of versions of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*.

The *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa* or *Ātreyatilaka*, a text that is close to the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, has a brāhmanical origin, but Buddhist elements have been included. Ruelius has established that the *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa* is mainly based on the *Pratimāsthāpanalakṣaṇa*, in which Buddha is not mentioned.⁴⁰ Roth explains that the author, Ātreya, a descendant of Atri, belongs to brahmanical circles.⁴¹ The *Pratimālakṣaṇa* also has been attributed to Ātreya, legendary descendant of Viṣvakarman.⁴² The measurements in the *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa* slightly differ from the *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, and certainly from the *Citralakṣaṇa*. The *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa* was edited and translated by Bose in 1929. Banerjea, who is critical of Bose, edited the text again in 1956.⁴³

GRAGS-PA-RGYAL-MTSHAN (CA. 1285~AFTER 1378)

Graggs-pa-rgyal-mtshan, Kīrtidhvaja in Sanskrit, was a translator from Yar-kluṅ.⁴⁴ The *Blue Annals* informs us that he assisted at an ordination in 1378. He was a pupil of Śes-rab-seṅ-ge (1251–1315) and a master of bKra-śis-'od (1323–1350). He was a layman, a "respected uncle," of the Sa-skyapa rulers of Tibet in Ža-lu Monastery. This title was given to him in 1306 when he was in Yanjing (Beijing) for the funeral

of Anige, the celebrated Nepalese artist at the Yuan court.⁴⁵ There and then the plans to renovate Ĵa-lu were made, supported by emperor Chengzong (成宗, 1295–1307), son of Cinggim (1243–1285) and successor of Qubilai. Anige's disciples played a role in this renovation.

Grag-s-pa-rgyal-mtshan was a great patron of the arts. He considered himself to be a manifestation of Vaiśravaṇa. So, it is no surprise that he stimulated the translation of iconometrical texts from Sanskrit to Tibetan at that time. The first comprehensive *bsTan-'gyur* collection was made during the reign of Renzong (仁宗, 1312–1320) in sNar-thaṅ.⁴⁶ Bu-ston (1290–1364) made the final redaction and a catalogue in 1322.⁴⁷ The *Pratimālakṣaṇa* was known to Bu-ston, but Yuexi says that the *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa* and the *Citralakṣaṇa* are not in Bu-ston's catalogue.⁴⁸ Mori says that the Tibetan *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa* is mentioned by Bu-ston, who arrived in Ĵa-lu as abbot in 1320, invited by Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan.⁴⁹ Is it unreasonable, then, to assume that the Tibetan *Pratimālakṣaṇa* can be dated between 1306 and ca. 1315? Anyway, there can be no doubt about the early fourteenth century. The translation was made in southern Tibet, at the Nepalese border in Guṅ-thaṅ, on the way to Kathmandu.⁵⁰ Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan greatly contributed to the popularity of the so-called *Fan* (梵, Indian) style in Buddhist art in Yuan China. This Indian, Western, actually Newar style of image-making was known as *Fan* in eighteenth-century China.⁵¹ The style originated in Pāla-Himalayan art and is distinguished from the *Han* (漢, i.e., Chinese) style, which actually is the *Tang* (唐, 618–906) style, Gupta-inspired.

Grag-s-pa-rgyal-mtshan collaborated with Dharmadhara, a sage from Kha-che (translated as Kaśmīra). Kha-che actually designates the whole of the northwestern Indian cultural area, of which Kaśmīra was the central part ever since the end of the second century CE, but by no means the only part. A Gandhāran may also be said to be from Kha-che. The Chinese term is *Jibin* (罽賓).⁵² Dharmadhara is also called an Indian (rGya-gar) sage. Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan also worked with the Indian Kīrticandra, who was active in Nepal, Svayambhū, in the Dhanvārāma. Both men brought out some important texts, such as the *Caryāgīti* and Munidatta's commentary, between ca. 1310 and 1334.⁵³ Naudou lists the following translations by Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan.⁵⁴ In collaboration with Dharmadhara: *Sekoddeṣaṭīkā* of Nāropā; *Kulalokanāthasādhanāloka* of Mahiman; *Jambhalastotra*, attributed to Vikramāditya; *Pratimālakṣaṇa* and *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*;

and *Sānudrikanāma tanūlakṣaṇaparīkṣā* of Narada.⁵⁵ In collaboration with Kīrticandra: a *pañjika* of the *Kriyāsaṃgraha*; *Amarakośa* and an incomplete *ṭikā* by Subhūticandra; *Lokānanda*, a play attributed to Candragomin; and *Caryāgītikośavṛtti* of Munidatta. In general, his translations have been poorly appreciated by modern scholars.⁵⁶

GOMBOJAB (CA. 1690–1750)⁵⁷

This Mongolian aristocrat, scion of the Kiyān⁵⁸ family and the Yuan imperial family, author of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, served under three Qing emperors: Kangxi (1662–1722), Yongzheng (1723–1735), and Qianlong (1736–1795). He is better known by his Tibetan name, mGon-po skyabs (Ch. Gongbu Chabu, 工布查布).⁵⁹ He lived during a period of intensive *Tripitaka* editing. The four great Tibetan editions of the *bsTan-'gyur* were all brought out in the eighteenth century.⁶⁰ The Peking edition, started by Kangxi in 1684, came out in 1724. The sNar-thaṅ *bsTan-'gyur* came out in 1742, the year of publication of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*. It is almost certain that Gombojab took part in these activities. The sDe-dge *bsTan-'gyur* came out in 1744, and the Co-ne edition in 1773, too late for Gombojab to see. The Chinese Dragon edition (1733–1738) was completed before the Chinese translation of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa* was completed in 1741. The Mongolian *Tripitaka* was being printed, and in 1790 the Manchu *Tripitaka* was completed. Gombojab is known to have been fluent in Mongolian, Tibetan, Manchu, Chinese, and eventually also in Sanskrit.

He was an aristocrat of the Üjümüčün tribe, from the area of Inner Mongolia to the west of the Hinggan Range, which forms the border with Jilin province today.⁶¹ Because he had inherited his father's aristocratic title Fuguogong (輔國公), he was referred to as Gong, "Duke."⁶² He grew up in Beijing and married into the imperial family during Kangxi, i.e., before 1722. This earned him the title *yibin* (儀賓), princely in-law. He was appointed director-general of Tibetan studies, i.e., head of the Tibetan Institute, and he took care of translation activities. During Qianlong he was a Cabinet Member.⁶³ His literary activities span the period 1725–1743. No text is later than 1743. In 1748, in his preface to the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, Upāsaka Aiyue (愛月, 1695–1767), hereditary prince of the first rank during Kangxi,⁶⁴ refers to him as a former official, *yuanren* (原任). Aiyue was versed in mathematics and in music. In 1736 he was in charge of the Board of Works (Gongbu, 工部), which

made him responsible for the making of images. When Gombojab's Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* came out in 1742, immediately after its completion, and again in 1748, Aiyue must have played a role in it.

Gombojab's work has been discussed in detail by de Jong in 1968, making use of all publications available at that time.⁶⁵ In 1725 Gombojab completed the Mongolian translation of a Manchu text, and in that same year he wrote a history of Mongolia in Mongolian. He is also known for his Tibetan translation of Xuanzang's *Xiyuji* (西域記, T. 2087, "Record of the Western Region"). During Kangxi he also collaborated in the writing of the *Töbed üge kilbar surqu bičig*, a Mongolian translation from the Tibetan. In 1737 a supplement to this text was added. In 1741–1742 Gombojab took part in the compilation of a Tibetan-Mongolian dictionary. He also is the author of a short Tibetan-Mongolian syllabary. In 1734 he published a list of herbal drugs, in both Tibetan and Mongolian, and he also wrote another list of drugs. (Gombojab certainly was interested in medicinal subjects. One must not forget that physiognomy and iconometry are related with medical techniques.) Anige, who had come to Tibet in 1260, invited because of his architectural skills, was then asked to repair an old Song bronze statue, judged by Qubilai and his court to be beyond repair. The statue, which was useful for acupuncture, was repaired by Anige in 1265. This established his fame at the court.⁶⁶ Gombojab was interested in such subjects, topics that were considered to be artisanal by traditional Han intellectuals.

The Chinese *Tripitāka* contains three translations made by Gombojab. T. 927 is a text, written in 1742–1743, about Bhaiṣajyaguru, the *tathāgata* of healing. It was originally written in Tibetan by the fifth Dalai-lama (1617–1682). T. 1144, about Maitreya, was completed in 1743. Gombojab is said to have translated it from Sanskrit, but he may have used an already existing Tibetan version. T. 1419 is the Chinese translation of the *Pratimālakṣaṇa* from the Tibetan: *Zaoxiangliangdujingjie* (造像量度經解). It must have been completed in 1741, the oldest preface being dated Sunday, January 14, 1742.⁶⁷ Gombojab further completed a Tibetan text by Bu-ston, adding at the beginning his own Tibetan translation of the Chinese T. 887 (*Advayasamatāvijayanāmakalparāja* [?]). This T. 887 was translated from the Sanskrit by Dānapāla in 1006 in the Song Translation Bureau, and it is known for its numerous *anuttarayogatantra* texts.⁶⁸ In 1743 Gombojab translated T. 1008 into Tibetan. This Chinese *dhāraṇī* text is said to be the work of Amoghavajra (705–771),

the most important figure for Sino-Japanese esotericism. Finally, in 1736 Gombojab wrote his Tibetan historical work *rGya-nag chos-'byuṅ*. It contains a Tibetan translation of the famous catalogue *Zhiyuanlu* (至元錄), compiled in 1285–1287 during Qubilai's reign under the leadership of Qing Jixiang (慶吉祥).⁶⁹ It may be remembered that Gombojab himself was actively involved in the publishing of the *Tripitaka* in the languages used during the Qing dynasty.

THE CHINESE PRATIMĀLAKṢAṆA (T. 1419).

The Chinese title of this work can be translated as *The Scriptural Text: Measurements in Image-making, Expounded by Buddha, and Its Explanation*. The text has five prefaces, which have all been translated by Cai in 2000.⁷⁰ The first preface is written by Prince Aiyue, on the auspicious day of the fifteenth of the seventh month, Qianlong 13, cyclical year of Wuchen, (i.e., Thursday, August 8, 1748). He seems to have re-edited the translation completed earlier in 1742.⁷¹ Yang had the text printed in Nanjing in the Jinling Printing Bureau (金陵刻經處) in Tongzhi (同治) 13, i.e., 1874. This Jinling edition was reproduced by Xinwenfeng Publishing Company in Taipei in 1993⁷² and by Chandra in 1984.⁷³ In 1885 Imaizumi Yūsaku (今泉雄作) rendered the Jinling edition more accessible in Japan by adding *kunten* and *siddham*.⁷⁴ The Jinling edition was published in Kyoto in the *Dainihon Zokuzōkyō* (1905–1912),⁷⁵ and this was the basis for the *Taishō* edition, T. 1419, 936a–956b.

T. 1419 contains five prefaces. The first, Aiyue's preface of 1748, is the most recent one. The second preface was written by the *lCang-skyā hu-thug-thu* Zhangjia Hutuketu (章佳胡圖克突), Rol-pa'i rDo-rje (1717–1786), the most eminent monk at the Qing court. In 1734, he was appointed National Preceptor (國師, Guoshi).⁷⁶ This learned scholar in the field of art⁷⁷ wrote his preface on the day of Buddha's first turning of the wheel in Qianlong 7, i.e., Thursday, July 5, 1742. He was probably responsible for publishing the text for the first time. The third preface is by the dGe-lugs-pa monk Dingguang (定光, Dīpaprabha). Sakaki calls him *jiezhu* (界珠),⁷⁸ *rJe-'jug* (?), disciple of the master (Atīśa?). His preface is dated on the day of Buddha's realization of enlightenment of Qianlong 6 (i.e., Sunday, January 14, 1742). This preface is the earliest one, and comes after the prefaces of the first two extremely important persons. The Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* must have been completed shortly before this preface. The fourth preface was written by Mingding

(明鼎) on Buddha's birthday, Qianlong 7 (i.e., Saturday, May 12, 1742). Mingding is referred to as Huang Sizu of Chu (楚黃嗣祖) in the colophon. He was a collaborator of Gombojab for some time starting in 1736, taking care of the editing of the *Tripitaka*. The fifth preface is by the monk Bencheng (本誠), written on the day of Buddha's going forth, Qianlong 7 (i.e., Wednesday, March 14, 1742).

T. 1419 comprises five parts. The five prefaces are the first part. Then comes Gombojab's own introduction, dated the day of Buddha's return from the Trāyastriṃṣa heaven, Qianlong 7. It is mentioned that this is the twenty-second day of the ninth month according to the Tibetan calendar (i.e., Saturday, October 20, 1742).⁷⁹ The fact that the Tibetan calendar is especially mentioned seems to imply that the prefaces follow the Chinese Buddhist calendar. It may also be remembered that the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* is expounded by Buddha before his ascension to that heaven. From the introduction we know that the monk Jingxue (靜學) provided the Tibetan text to Gombojab, who had been interested in iconometry and iconography for a long time. He had learned about the measurements of the mandala of the *Guhyasamāja* from his master. The third part is the main part, but the shortest one. It is the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, counting thirty-three stanzas. The fourth part is Gombojab's explanation of the stanzas. This part mentions the (Tibetan) *Samvarodaya-tantra* and *Kālacakra-tantra*.⁸⁰ No other text is mentioned, but it is difficult to believe that other Tibetan iconometric texts were not used, such as *Pratimālakṣaṇovivraṇa* and *Pratimāmānolakṣaṇa*. The fifth and last part is a supplement in nine chapters, written by Gombojab, about the representation of bodhisattvas, wrathful deities, and so on. It may be noticed that there are five prefaces and that the whole text consists of five parts, five being a special number (e.g., five families, *kula*) in esoteric Buddhism.

The Chinese title and its Sanskrit (梵, *Fan*) original is explained in the text itself. I translate (945b28–c7):

The Scriptural Text *supra* is called *śāstra* in Sanskrit. *Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍalabuddhapratimālakṣaṇāma*. In translation: *śāstra*: exposition [meaning scriptural text]. *Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala*: vertically and horizontally equal, just like the tree without segments. *Buddhapratimā*: Buddha image. *Lakṣaṇānāma*: systemic terminology. According to the wording the whole means: "Exposition of the Scriptural Text called *Iconometrical System of the Buddha Image, Vertically and Horizontally Equal, Just Like the Tree without Segments.*" Taking up the meaning I

have now abbreviated the title to: *Scriptural Text about the Measurements in Image-making, Expounded by Buddha*.

Gombojab makes some incomprehensible mistakes. For example, the Tibetan clearly says *daśatāla*, not *śāstra*. Sakaki corrected that mistake in 1916, but this was overlooked by more than one scholar. Gombojab apparently translated *Pratimālakṣaṇa* as *Xiangzhi* (相制), which means “iconometrical system.” *Zhi* has the meaning of both *zhizao* (制造), “to make,” and of *zhiqui* (制規), “rule or regulation,” i.e., system. *Xiang* (相) renders *pratimā*, “image.” So, in the final title *Zaoxiangliangdu*, the meaning of *zhi* (制) appears twice (1. *Zao*; 2. *Liangdu*). The text explains how to make a painted image of Buddha in ten spans, one hundred twenty digits, i.e., fingerbreadths, of the image itself. For tridimensional images (胎偶, *taiou*) one adds five digits altogether. So, a tridimensional image is one hundred twenty-five digits high and wide, if both arms are outstretched. The Chinese only explains a representation of a Buddha, not of a bodhisattva, etc. These are added in the supplement.

The basic Sanskrit text was edited in Devanāgarī twice. Both Mitra in 1933 and Banerjea in 1932 edited a Newārī manuscript. Banerjea also gives a translation. Another Newārī manuscript is kept in the University Library, Cambridge.⁸¹ Śāstri also mentions two manuscripts named *Devapratimālakṣaṇa*.⁸² The Sanskrit was for the first time edited in transcription and translated into Japanese by Sakaki.⁸³ The author edited a Sanskrit manuscript donated to the Kyoto University Library by Naitō Torajirō (内藤虎次郎).⁸⁴

The Tibetan *Pratimālakṣaṇa* was translated into Japanese by Sakai in 1941. The same author translated *Pratimālakṣaṇovivraṇa* in 1944.⁸⁵

The Chinese text was translated into literary Japanese by Henmi in 1930. In 1977 this was edited as a book in Kyoto. According to the introduction, the basic work for this Japanese translation was apparently done by Gotō Shōfū (五島正風), also called Gudō An (求道庵).⁸⁶

In 2000 Li and Bai composed a study of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* (T. 1419) in Beijing. In 2001 Huang published his study in Shijiazhuang.⁸⁷ In 2000 Cai gave a complete translation of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, but a new English translation is necessary and will be published soon.⁸⁸

NOTES

1. I immediately express my gratitude to S. Dietz, A. Bareja-Starzynska, and P. Verhagen for their precious advice.
2. Gustav Roth, "Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa* and Other Ancient Indian Works on Iconometry," in *South Asian Archaeology: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, Held in the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Island of San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice 1987*, ed. Maurizio Taddei, Serie Orientale Roma 62 (Rome: ISMEO, 1990), 986–987.
3. Roth, "Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*," e.g., 981 and 1005; Hans Ruelius, "Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts," *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 54 (1968): 171.
4. The Buddhist authority in iconometrical texts is Śāriputra. He is the ultimate authority for the Sthāvīriya family (Sarvāstivāda, Dharmaguptaka, Theravāda, etc.). The Mahāsāṃghika family reserves that role for (Mahā) Kātyāyana. This fact is obvious in *abhidharma* literature.
5. Sylvain Lévi, *Le Népal*, vol. 3, ed. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes 19 (Paris: Ernest Lhoux, 1908), 185ff. Cecil Bendall, in his *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge* (Cambridge: University Press, 1883), 199ff., had already catalogued Newārī iconometrical Sanskrit texts. See also Haral Prasād Śāstri, *Catalogue of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*, vol. 2 (Calcutta: n.p., 1915), 41 and 137.
6. See for example Roth, "Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*," 1006.
7. The doctoral dissertation of Hans Ruelius ("Śāriputra und Ālekhyalakṣaṇa. Zwei Texte zur Proportionslehre in der indischen und ceylonesischen Kunst" [PhD diss., Georg-August Universität, Göttingen, 1974]) is the most thorough study of these two texts. See also E. W. Marasinghe, introduction to *The Bimbamāna of Gautamīyaśāstra*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 138 (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1994), xiii–xxi.
8. Roth, "Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*," 1008.
9. Ruelius, "Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts," 170.
10. *Ibid.*, 174.
11. Marasinghe, *Bimbamāna of Gautamīyaśāstra*, xvii–xxi.
12. For the latest study, see Roth, "Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*." He also gives an overview and his appreciation of the earlier studies (pp. 979–981), including Berthold Laufer, *Das Citralakṣaṇa, Dokumente indischer Kunst, Hft. 1 Malerei* (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1913); and its English versions by B. N. Goswamy and A. L. Dahmen-Dallapiccola, *An Early Document of Indian Art* (New Delhi: Mano-

har Book Service, 1976); and Asoke Chatterjee, *The Citralakṣaṇa. An Old Text of Indian Art*, B. I. Series 315 (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1987). For whatever reason, Chatterjee does not seem to know Laufer's work.

13. See D. T. Suzuki's catalogue of the Peking ed., *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, in the Library of Ōtani University (Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1957–1958), vol. 143, nos. 5804–5807.

14. Jan Willem de Jong, review of *O "Zolotoj knige," S. Damdina*, by Š. Bira, *T'oung Pao* 54 (1968): 173–189, esp. 178ff., provides a discussion of mGon-po skyabs; Shunzō Onoda (“造像量度經類研究史 [A Brief Survey of the Studies on Tibetan Iconometrical Literature],” *Bukkyō Gakkai Kiyō* 3 [1995]: 1–15) gives an overview of recent studies about iconometrical literature, paying much attention to Tibetan studies.

15. Roth, “Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*,” 987; see also 994: *citra* means “painting.”

16. *Ibid.*, 1008, 987.

17. Ruelius, “Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts,” 174.

18. Roth, “Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*,” 985ff.

19. *Ibid.*, 986.

20. Ryōzaburō Sakaki, “佛説造像量度經の梵本研究 [Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū],” *Geibun* 9 (1918): 255–261; the author also translates the text into Japanese, pp. 262–267.

21. Jitendra Nath Banerjea, *Pratimālakṣaṇam*, Texts from Nepal 2 (Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1932); Haridas Mitra, *Buddhapratimālakṣaṇam*, Bhavana Texts 48 (Benares: Gov. Sanskrit Library, 1933).

22. Mitra, *Buddhapratimālakṣaṇam*, 12.

23. Ruelius, “Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts,” 172.

24. Noboru Mori, “造像量度經の成立背景と意義 [Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi],” *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 32 (1993): 98; Giuseppe Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1949), 292.

25. Roth, “Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*,” 1008.

26. The colophon was studied by: (1) Ryōzaburō Sakaki, “佛説造像量度經の梵本研究 [Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū],” *Geibun* 7 (1916): 260 (this author was the first to restore the first part of the Sanskrit title to *daśatāla*); (2) Shirō Sakai, “西藏文造像量度經註釋和譯 [Chibettobun Zōzōryōdokyōchūshaku Wayaku],” *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 89 (1944): 84. See also Jean Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr* (1968; repr., Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1980), 256ff.

27. T. 1419, 945c7–9. I translate: “Referring to this text [*Pratimālakṣaṇa*] there are

three translations and one commentary altogether. This copy was translated in the Guñ-thañ region by the western *Tripitaka* Dharmadhara, together with Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan, translator from Yar-kluGs” (達磨多囉 Damoduoluo, Dharmadhara; 恭唐 Gongtang, Guñ-thañ—this place is located in southern Tibet in the district 吉隆 Gyirong, sKyid-groñ, on the way to Kathmandu; 查巴建參 Chaba Jiancan, Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan; 亞哩弄 Yalinong, i.e., 雅龍 Yalong, Yar-kluñs). See also Sakaki, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū” (1916), 254–255.

28. Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 98. The *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa* is in the sNar-thañ edition of the *bsTan-'gyur*, of which Bu-ston made the final redaction.

29. Anige (1245–1306) was the main artist and official at Qubilai's court. His entourage and disciples are really responsible for this influence. See Anning Jing, “The Portraits of Khubilai Khan and Chabi by Anige (1245–1306), A Nepalese Artist at the Yuan Court,” *Artibus Asiae* 54, 1–2 (1994): 40–86; Roberto Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet* (London: Serindia, 1990), 89–122: “Shalu Serkhang and the Newar Style of the Yüan Court.”

30. Roth, “Notes on the *Citrakṣaṇa*,” 1016–1017. He says that “Appendix C: Extracts from the *Kriyā Samuccaya*” in Banerjea, *Pratimālakṣaṇam*, 67–73, agrees with Mitra's edition of the *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*, included in his *Buddhapratimālakṣaṇam*.

31. Roth, “Notes on the *Citrakṣaṇa*,” 1008.

32. See note 24.

33. Baiei Henmi, “佛說造像量度經 [Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō],” *Kokka* 40 (1930): 22; Yuexi, “關於造像量度經的歷史 [Guanyu Zaoxiangliangdujing de lishi],” *Xiandai Foxue* (August 1959): 13. Kazumi Yoshizaki (in “金剛杵金剛鈴の製作図。梵文造像量度經註釋 [Kongōsho Kongōrei no seisaku-zu. Bonbun Zōzōryōdokyōchūshaku ni yoru],” *Tōyō Daigaku Daigaku-in Kiyō* 17 [1980]: 32) advances the idea that the three translations are (1) Tibetan, (2) Mongolian, (3) Manchu.

34. The Tibetan title is completely different from the Tibetan titles of *Pratimālakṣaṇa*, *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*, *Pratimāmanolakṣaṇa*; Onoda, “A Brief Survey of the Studies on Tibetan Iconometrical Literature,” 2, gives the Tibetan titles.

35. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 292.

36. The first translation, by the Nepalese Jayasiddhi, has the term *sku-gzugs-kyi tshad*.

37. Ruelius, “Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts,” 175.

38. T. 1451, 345c. Yuexi, “Guanyu Zaoxiangliangdujing de lishi,” 15.

39. How can one explain this? Mantrayāna influence? Or is the bodhisattva Buddha before enlightenment?
40. Ruelius, “Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts,” 170. The *Pratimālakṣaṇa* must not be confused with the text edited by Dipak Chandra Bhattacharyya, *Pratimālakṣaṇa of the Viṣṇudharmattara* (New Delhi: Harman Publishing House, 1991).
41. Roth, “Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa*,” 1019–1020.
42. Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr*, 257. M. Henss in Jingfeng Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry* (Ulm: Fabri Verlag, 2000), 12.
43. Phanindra Nath Bose, in *Pratimā-māna-lakṣaṇam*, Punjab Oriental Series 18 (Delhi: Bharatiya Publishing House, 1929), edits one Newārī manuscript and also gives the Tibetan. Jitendra Nath Banerjea, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, 4th ed. (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1985), Appendix B, 579–617, presents his Sanskrit edition. Banerjea, Bose, and Mitra all give a Nāgarī ed. of their Newārī original manuscript.
44. Most information about him can be found in: Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr*, 256–257; Pieter C. Verhagen, *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet, Vol. 1: Transmission of the Canonical Literature*, Handbook of Oriental Studies, India Bd. 8 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 93–94, 324; Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet*, 89–106; Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 98.
45. See esp. Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet*, 98ff.
46. *Ibid.*, 122 n. 222.
47. Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 98. Bu-ston 布敦, Budun; Źa-lu 夏魯, Xialu.
48. Yuexi, “Guanyu Zaoxiangliangdujing de lishi,” 15.
49. Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 98. Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet*, 119 n. 138, 101.
50. See note 24.
51. Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 49, translating Gombojab’s introduction to T. 1419, the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*. Image-making in China before the Tang is mainly inspired by Gandhāran art. T. 692 (25–220 CE), T. 693 (317–420, i.e., Eastern Jin), and T. 694 (by Devaprajña from Khotan, seventh century) do not speak about iconometry, but about the merits of image-making. Nevertheless, early painters may have painted images according to Chinese tradition, e.g. Cao Buxing 曹不興 in Wu 吳, early third century. See W. R. B. Acker, *Some T’ang and Pre-T’ang Texts on Chinese Painting*, vol. 2, *Sinica Leidensia* 12 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), 19–20.
52. C. Willemen, “Sarvāstivāda Developments in Northwestern India and in

- China,” *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 10 (2001): 167.
53. Per Kvaerne, *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs: A Study of the Caryāgīti* (Oslo, Bergen, & Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), 2.
54. Naudou, *Buddhists of Kaśmīr*, 256–257.
55. This text, as well as *Pratimālakṣaṇa* and *Pratimālakṣaṇovivtraṇa*, was translated at the request of the *Bhoṭapaṇḍita*, Tibetan sage, Dam-chos-'dzin (Sad-dharmadhara).
56. Kvaerne, *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs*, 2; Verhagen, *History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet*, 94.
57. de Jong, review of *O “Zolotoj knige,” S. Damdina*, 175 n. 1; M. Hens in Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 8 n. 5, prefers 1669–1750, referring to L. Petech.
58. T. 1419, 945c18: Qiwowen 奇渥溫.
59. In the *Qingshigao* 清史稿, *Fanbu Zhuan* 2, 藩部傳 2, his name is written Gunbu Zhazhen 衮布札慎. See Yuexi, “Guanyu Zaoliangliangdujing de lishi,” 16.
60. For the following editing activities: Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 97; Sakai Shirō, “Ka-hoku Godaisan no Daizōkyō,” *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 87 (1942): 66.
61. Today’s Ujimqin Banner 烏珠穆倫旗, situated to the west of the Hinggan Ling 興安嶺, has two parts: East Ujimqin, capital Uliastai 烏里雅; West Ujimqin, capital Bayan Ul Hot 巴音烏浩特.
62. For his biographical data see Yuexi, “Guanyu Zaoliangliangdujing de lishi,” 15–16; Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 97; Yoshizaki, “Kongōsho Kongōrei no seisaku-zu. Bonbun Zōzōryōdokyōchūshaku ni yoru,” 29–30; Herbert Franke, *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit* (München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 73–74.
63. This information can be found in the colophon of T. 1419, 941b. Cabinet member: 內閣, *neige*. In charge of the translation of Tibetan and Mongolian texts: 掌譯番蒙諸文, *zhangyibomengzhuwen*. Director-General of Tibetan studies: 西番學總管, *Xiboxue zongguan*.
64. Yuexi, “Guanyu Zaoliangliangdujing de lishi,” 16; Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 97. Sakaki, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū” (1916), 252, calls him 壺月 Huyue.
65. de Jong, review of *O “Zolotoj knige,” S. Damdina*, 178ff.
66. Jing, “The Portraits of Khubilai Khan and Chabi by Anige,” 45. Physiognomy, of both Chinese and Indian origin, can be found in terminology of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa*. My complete translation and glossary (Chinese-Sanskrit)

of the Chinese *Pratimālakṣaṇa* is published in Charles Willeman, *Defining the Image: Measurements in Image-making*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 239 (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 2006). A Sanskrit *Pratimālakṣaṇa* in transcription with English translation is included.

67. See Wang Huanchun, *A Comparative Calendar for Western, Chinese, Muslim, Hui, Dai, Yi, Tibetan, Buddhist Calendars, and Julian Day Numbers AD 622–2050* (Beijing: Kexue Publications, 1991). The preface itself by Dingguang 定光 is dated “Day of realization of enlightenment, Qianlong 6,” i.e., the eighth day of the twelfth month of Qianlong 6. For the preface, see *infra*.

68. See Charles Willemen, *The Chinese Hevajratāntra* (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982), 23 n. 66. Shinkō Mochizuki, *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 1960–1963), 8:265ff., s.v. “Yakuyoin 譯經院.”

69. Zhiyuanlu in *Shōwa Hōbō Sōmoku* 昭和法寶總目錄 (Taishō ed.) 2:25. Franke remarks that too often Chinese names and titles are erroneously translated. Franke, *Chinesischer und Tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit*, 74.

70. Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 33–46.

71. Pieter Hendrik Pott, *Introduction to the Tibetan Collection of the National Museum of Ethnography, Leiden* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951), 45; M. Henss in Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 8 n. 6.

72. Renshan Yang, 佛說造像量度經附續補 (*Foshuo Zaoxiangliangdujing fu xubu*) (orig. Jinling ed. 1874; repr., Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1993).

73. Lokesh Chandra, *Buddhist Iconography in Nepalese Sketch Books*, Śata-piṭaka Series 302 (New Delhi: Mrs. Sharada Rani, 1984).

74. For these early editions, see Yoshizaki, “Kongōsho Kongōrei no seisakuzu. Bonbun Zōzōryōdokyōchūshaku ni yoru,” 27, 31 n. 2; Sakaki, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū” (1916), 251; Henmi, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō,” 25.

75. *Dainihon Zokuzōkyō* (Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin, 1905–1912).

76. M. Henss in Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 22–23; de Jong, review of *O “Zolotoj knige,” S. Damdina*, 183, mentions that he has written about Wutai Shan and about the sandalwood image of Buddha.

77. He was an art consultant to Qianlong and compiled the illustrated pantheon of Tibetan Buddhism, called *Three Hundred Icons*, a reference book ever since. See M. Henss in Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*, 23; Mori, “Zōzōryōdokyō no seiritsu haikai to igi,” 97.

78. Sakaki, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū” (1916), 252.

79. Dieter Shuh, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Tibetischen Kalenderrechnung, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband*

- 16 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1973). See esp. p. 181 for 1742.
80. 戒生大教王經 *Jieshengdajiaowangjing*, *Samvarodayamahātantrarāja*: 941c11 and 945c13. 時輪大教王經 *Shilundajiaowangjing*, *Kālacakramahātantrarāja*: 942a12 and 945c12.
81. Add. 1706 (III–IV), as mentioned in Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 199ff.
82. Śāstri, *Catalogue of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts*, 2:41 and 2:137.
83. Sakaki, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō no bonpon kenkyū” (1918), 255–261.
84. Yoshizaki, “Kongōsho Kongōrei no seisaku-zu. Bonbun Zōzōryōdokyō-chūshaku ni yoru,” 31 n. 2.
85. Shirō Sakai, “Kanyaku taishō Chibettobun Zōzōryōdokyō Wayaku,” *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 86 (1941): 87–102; and Sakai, “Chibettobun Zōzōryōdokyōchūshaku Wayaku,” 71–84.
86. Henmi, “Bussetsu Zōzōryōdokyō”; Baiei Henmi, *Zōzōryōdokyō 造像量度經* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1977).
87. Dingxia Li and Huawen Bai, 佛教造像手印 *Fojiao Zaoliang shouyin* (Beijing: Yanshan, 2000); Chunhe Huang, *Fojiao zaoliang yishu* (Shijiazhuang: Hebeisheng Fojiao Xiehui, 2001) (in Jpn.).
88. Cai, *The Buddhist Canon of Iconometry*. This artisanal text describes how to make a painting or a statue, starting from the head to the feet. Roth, “Notes on the *Citralakṣaṇa* and Other Ancient Indian Works on Iconometry,” 1026, aptly says that worship starts from the feet.