

THE JOURNAL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
BUDDHIST STUDIES

CO-EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

*Gregory Schopen*  
*Indiana University*  
*Bloomington, Indiana, USA*

*Roger Jackson*  
*Fairfield University*  
*Fairfield, Connecticut, USA*

EDITORS

*Peter N. Gregory*  
*University of Illinois*  
*Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA*

*Ernst Steinkellner*  
*University of Vienna*  
*Wien, Austria*

*Alexander W. Macdonald*  
*Université de Paris X*  
*Nanterre, France*

*Jikidō Takasaki*  
*University of Tokyo*  
*Tokyo, Japan*

*Steven Collins*  
*Indiana University*  
*Bloomington, Indiana, USA*

*Robert Thurman*  
*Amherst College*  
*Amherst, Massachusetts, USA*

*Volume 11*

*1988*

*Number 1*

# CONTENTS

## I. ARTICLES

1. The Four Levels of *Pratītya-Samutpāda* According to the *Fa-hua hsüan i*, by Carl Bielefeldt 7
2. On the Possibility of a Nonexistent Object of Consciousness: Sarvāstivādin and Dārṣāntika Theories, by Collett Cox 31
3. Magical *Upāya* in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, by Edward Hamlin 89
4. Buddhist Sanskrit in the *Kālacakra Tantra*, by John Newman 123
5. Two New Fragments of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia, by Richard Saloman and Collett Cox 141
6. Some Reflections on R.S.Y. Chi's *Buddhist Formal Logic*, by Tom J.F. Tillemans 155

## II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism*, by Peter Mansfield (Charles Hallisey) 173
2. *Studies in the Buddhist Art of South Asia*, ed. A.K. Narain (Robert L. Brown) 175
3. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Henrik H. Sorensen) 179

- LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 185

ical thesis: "My next reading of the Nikāyas will probably cause me to rethink some of the claims made in the present work but if . . . enough has been said to stir others into realization of the need for a re-examination of the Buddhism portrayed in the Nikāyas, my efforts will have been rewarded" (p. xx.). I expect that few students of Buddhism will want to adopt the general claims of Masfield's book, but if my own experience is at all representative, it will indeed send many back to the texts for a fresh reading.

Charles Hallisey

*Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia*, edited by A.K. Narain (New Delhi: Kanak Publications, 1985), 139 pp., 54 figs., US \$50.00

*Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia* publishes seven papers presented at an international conference on Buddhism held at the University of Wisconsin in 1976. The essays are arranged chronologically by topic, with the first three dealing with the origin of the Buddha image and the remaining four with diverse subjects. The three essays on the early Buddha image are, I think, particularly suggestive and deserve careful reading by scholars interested in early Buddhist doctrine and art.

The first of the early Buddha-image essays, by the volume's editor A.K. Narain, proposes that the earliest anthropomorphic Buddha images occur on a coin-type of the Śaka king Maues who reigned ca. 95–75 B.C.E. in the area of the Swat Valley and Kashmir. Narain argues that the cross-legged figure on Maues' coins, although long considered but mostly rejected by scholars as a Buddha image, should be reconsidered as indeed the Buddha. He suggests that the ideological underpinnings for the creation of the anthropomorphic image came from the Sarvāstivāda school of "Hīnayāna" Buddhism and its philosophy of "realism." Narain feels the Sarvāstivādins associated themselves with the Śakas as patrons in a mutually advantageous political and economic alliance that allowed for the creation of the Buddha image. The period from the appearance of the Maues coin-type to the numerous examples of anthropomorphic images during the reign of the Kuṣāṇa king Kaniṣka some 200 years later is, according to Narain, one of experimentation. Extant Buddha images of the period are few, however, and mostly on coins,

except for those on the Bimaran reliquary (which Narain accepts as dating to the period of Azes II, ca. 30 B.C.E., due to four of his coins found inside).

Most of Narain's evidence is not new, but he argues that it has not been fairly analyzed and spends considerable time reviewing past arguments. As with the other two writers on the early image, Narain assumes that the reader has considerable familiarity with the now extensive and increasingly complicated Buddha-image bibliography.

Such familiarity is particularly helpful in understanding Joe Cribb's essay on the origin of the Buddha image as revealed by images on the coins of King Kaniska. Unlike the images on the coins discussed by Narain, whose identification as the Buddha is controversial, the Buddha images on Kaniska's coins are clearly labeled as such. Cribb argues that on all the coins there are only three different basic image types and three inscriptions, two that identify the Buddha Śākyamuni and one the Buddha Maitreya. That Maitreya on the coins is dressed in princely clothes and is labeled a Buddha points out that the later distinction between a *buddha* and *bodhisattva* was not made in Kaniska's time.

Cribb's coin evidence is helpful, and he proposes to use it to comment on a vast array of theological and art historical issues, such as the chronology of Gandharan sculpture and the early artistic relationship between Mathura and Gandhara. His basic methodological assumptions are that the coin images were modeled on existing sculpture; that unlike the sculptural models, however, the coins are securely dated by inscription to Kaniska's reign; and that, therefore, the coin images can be used to identify sculptures of Kaniska's reign. Unfortunately, to properly judge Cribb's essay would require a paragraph-by-paragraph analysis, as, I think, there are serious problems with many of his ideas and conclusions. His key assumption, for example, that the coin images were modeled on sculpture gets off to a shaky start when he repeatedly shows that there are, in fact, very few likely sculptural models and none that fit the coin images precisely. Rather than come to the logical conclusion that the coin images are not modeled on sculpture, but are independent creations that *share* with sculpture certain underlying characteristics, Cribb is forced to find his sculptural models scattered from Gandhara to Mathura (although the mints are all in Gandhara), each exhibiting only this or that characteristic. The arguments made in this essay are not well served by either the awkward writing style or the unfortunate typographical errors for the figure numbers.

(Readers are advised to read Cribb's previously published articles where much of the same material is presented: "Kaniška's Buddha Coins—The Official Iconography of Śākyamuni & Maitreya," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 3.2 [1980]:79–88, and "The origin of the Buddha image—the numismatic evidence," in *South Asian Archaeology 1981* [Cambridge, 1984]:231–244).

The third article, on the origin of the Buddha image, written by John Huntington, is an interesting attempt to judge, based primarily on analyses of literary references, how early the anthropomorphic Buddha image was invented. We have seen that Narain places it at ca. 100 B.C.E. in Kashmir or Swat; Cribb concludes that there is little evidence for images before Kaniška's reign and locates their emergence at Mathura; Huntington, on the other hand, argues that there is a probability that images were made during Buddha's own lifetime (5th c. B.C.E.), most likely in Magadha. He suggests that it was not the monks but the laymen who prompted the first making of images, and their motivation was to enable themselves to gain merit by viewing the Buddha (*buddhadarśanapunya*). While one may question certain of Huntington's propositions in this long essay, the cumulative evidence he presents does strongly argue for the existence of Buddha images long before their extant examples (in stone) in the 1st c. C.E. The question has always been: where is the earlier archaeological evidence? Huntington tentatively presents a possible Maurya-period piece (ca. 3rd B.C.E.), a small stone relief image, which would be the earliest example thus far known; but one must wonder why there are no examples in the extensive Buddhist sculptural remains of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E.

The fourth article in the book is a straightforward analysis of an iconographic formula popular in Gandharan art, the Buddha flanked by two weapon-holding attendants in narrative scenes. Its author, Joan Raducha, points out that identification of the guardians is, however, anything but straightforward. She shows that textual references do not explain or identify the attendants. Rather, she relies on reconstructing the religious context for attendant and protective deities in Gandharan sculpture and in popular beliefs, concluding that the attendants are most likely Vajrapāṇi and Pāñchika. Raducha reminds us of how few of the often very prominent subsidiary figures we can identify in Indian sculpture, as they are creations of concepts and beliefs not necessarily recorded directly in texts.

The fifth article also deals with iconography. Janice Leoshko



presents a number of Pāla style reliefs of the Bodhisattva Amoghapāśa, a multi-armed form of Avalokiteśvara. She finds that Amoghapāśa was popular primarily in the area of Gayā and only during the 9th and early 10th centuries. She stresses that, although it is not usually done, the possibility of such geographical and chronological specificity should be considered when dealing with iconographical questions.

The sixth article is by Walter Spink, on the internal chronology of Cave 7 at Ajanta. Spink argues that Cave 7, and primarily its major Buddha image, was the result of two separate artistic campaigns, one that lasted from ca. 462–468 and the second from ca. 477–479. As with Spink's previous work on Ajanta, one stands in awe of the careful sifting of evidence that allows the reconstruction of events that appear to explain what we see. Spink is attempting to give, in far greater detail than is usually possible in Indian art due to the lack of historical documentation, a detailed explanation of the chronology of the making of the monument. In many ways, he is suggesting what was in the minds of the cave's makers, what their decisions were, and how these decisions resulted in what we see. When one recalls that Spink is working with almost no hard historical data, his results are amazing.

Is he correct? The explanations are, to my mind, too plausible, too helpful, to be "incorrect." They may be reconstructions, with some pieces out of place, but most of the edifice must be original and it enables us to understand the art in an unusually direct and personal fashion.

The final article, by Martha Carter, is on the colossal Buddha images at Bāmiyān in Afghanistan. She makes the interesting suggestion, based on the Chinese pilgrim Hsüan-tsang's comments on his visit to Bāmiyān in 632, that only the smaller (the 127 foot) of the present two colossal rock-cut Buddha images existed at the time of his visit. Hsüan-tsang does mention two colossal images, but one he describes as made of metal and joined together in parts. This description has puzzled scholars (who assumed he had mistaken stone for metal), but Carter proposes to accept it at face value—that there was a now lost metal image. Since Hsüan-tsang estimates its height at 100 feet, this would be a very large metal image indeed. Carter suggests that the larger rock-cut image (the 175 foot) was not carved until the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century.

Most scholars today accept that the two extant monumental stone relief Buddhas at Bāmiyān are not as early as was thought

just a decade or so ago, when they were often dated 2nd/3rd c. for the smaller and 4th/5th c. for the larger. That they both were made after 600 C.E. has been shown, for example, by the work of Deborah Klimburg-Salter and Zmaryalai Tarzi. Carter's suggestion, however, that one of the colossi Hsüan-tsang mentions is metal is difficult to judge. Although she points to examples of monumental bronzes from both Western and Asian antiquity, a 100-foot standing Buddha in metal appears to me an interesting but unlikely possibility. As with the other six essays, however, Carter's article is an important contribution that will be of interest to all students of Buddhist art and religion.

Robert L. Brown

*Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism.* Edited by Peter N. Gregory. Studies in East Asian Buddhism no. 4. The Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism and Human Values. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1987. 266 pp.

Since the publication of *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen* in 1983, the first volume in the *Studies in East Asian Buddhism* series edited by Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, a number of significant contributions to our understanding of East Asian Buddhism have appeared in this excellent series. The present book, which is a collection of six lengthy articles on different aspects of meditation in Chinese Buddhism, is the most recent. Despite the fact that meditation in one of its many forms has always been at the heart of the Chinese Buddhist tradition, surprisingly little has been written on this topic from a scholarly point of view. For this reason the present collection is a very welcome contribution towards a deepening of our understanding of the contemplative aspects of Chinese Buddhism.

The book opens with a long, very interesting and perceptive introduction by Peter N. Gregory, the editor. Recapitulating the views of previous and current authorities on Zen/Ch'an Buddhism, he points out the need for revising many of our fixed opinions on Chinese Buddhism meditation, which hitherto has tended to be identified solely with Ch'an Buddhism. Gregory presents his views with detailed consideration of the hermeneutics of the various traditions of meditation within Chinese Buddhism, i.e., the methods of meditation seen in relation to their underlying