

New Evidence for the Identification of the Figure with a Bow in Depictions of the Buddha's Life in Gandharan Art

Robert Arlt and Satomi Hiyama

Abstract: This paper aims to draw attention to some literary sources concerning the century-long debated identity of a male figure holding a bow, depicted in scenes of Śākyamuni's Great Departure in Gandharan Art (figs. 1–4). These literary sources, that seem to have been overlooked by most art historians, may offer a clue as to his identity. Since the paper's main contribution lies in raising new questions, the authors would like it to be seen as a preliminary report on work in progress.

Narrative Context and Iconographical Features

Before beginning the detailed study of the identity and function of the male figure holding a bow, the narrative context in which this figure plays a role should be clarified. The Great Departure is one of the most important moments in the Buddha's life and has been described in various literary sources of different genres; the setting of the event is Kapilavastu on the way from the palace's door to the forest, where he became a recluse.

Born as a prince of the Śākya clan, Siddhārtha Gautama lived his youth in the luxury of the royal palace. After encounters with people suffering age, illness and death, he became determined to abandon the

secular life and fled from the palace at night to become a mendicant. This so-called Great Departure was supported by the miraculous powers of numerous gods and genii.



Fig. 1 (Indian Museum, Kolkata, Ac. No. 5043).

Among the divine figures surrounding the prince riding on his horse Kaṇṭhaka, a male figure holding a bow can be found (figs. 1–4). Although his appearance can vary, there are two constant elements that identify him; first, he is always standing close to the prince. Second, he always holds a bow in his left hand (and often an arrow in his right). The most variable features of his iconography are his clothes; he can be represented either as wearing a turban or a winged headdress. When wearing a turban, he is sometimes depicted with an unstitched cloth wrapped around his waist (fig. 1),¹ sometimes combined with a tunic,² and sometimes with tunic and trousers,³ or in scaled armour like a warrior (fig. 2).⁴ When wearing a winged headdress, he is clad in a tunic without trousers (fig. 3),⁵ or in scaled-armour (fig. 4).⁶

Previous identifications

This figure with a bow has been interpreted by Foucher (1905–1922) as Māra trying to hold back the Bodhisatva from his flight out of Kapilavastu, citing the *Nidānakathā* (Nid) in the Commentary to the *Jātakaas* a

reference.⁷ Foucher explains the bow as an attribute of Māra with reference to the *Buddhacarita* (BC),⁸ in which Māra is shown in his aspect as the god of desires.⁹



Fig. 2 (after Ingholt – Lyons 1957, pl. 47).

Lobo (1983) asserts that this figure is Indra, rejecting the *Nidānakathāas* a valid source text for Gandharan images and pointing to the fact that Foucher cited the description of Māra in the *Buddhacarita* from an episode concerning the enlightenment of Śākyamuni, not from his Great Departure.

While Lobo admits that Māra is sometimes depicted as the one wearing armour in depictions of the temptation, she also points out the fact that Māra does not hold a bow. Lobo's identification of this figure as Indra is based on references in the *Lalitavistara* (LV) that mention his presence during the departure from Kapilavastu.¹⁰ She explains

¹ For an overview of the variations of this figure see Pons 2014, 18–26, figs. 1–11. For illus. see Spooner 1910, 11f. 57f.; Ingholt – Lyons 1957, no. 45; Ackermann 1975, 70f., pl. XIV; Tanabe 2000, figs. 1. 4. 10; Kurita 2003, (I) no. 475; Tanabe 2006, fig. 32; Pons 2014, figs. 2–3.

² For illus. see Senagupta – Das 1991, 38, no. 369; Tanabe 2006, fig. 33; Pons 2014, fig. 11.

³ For illus. see Dobbins 1973, fig. 42; Tanabe 2000, fig. 1; Tanabe 2006, fig. 43; Pons 2014, fig. 4.

⁴ For illus. see Ingholt – Lyons 1957, pl. 47; Tanabe 2000, fig. 6; Tanabe 2006, fig. 58; Pons 2014, 24, fig. 9.

⁵ For illus. see Ingholt – Lyons 1957, no. 168; Dagens 1964, 16, pl. III–9; Pons 2014, fig. 7.

⁶ For illus. see Faccenna 1962, pl. II–2, 29, pl. 91; Tanabe 2006, figs. 34, 44, 57; Taddei 2008, fig. 1–2; Pons 2014, figs. 8. 10.

⁷ Ed. Fausbøll 1877, 63, transl. Rhys-Davids 1880, 175.

⁸ Ed. Johnston 1972, 145f.; transl. id., 188f.

⁹ Foucher 1905–1922, vol. 1, 356f.

¹⁰ Lobo 1983, 436f. Lobo only refers to the French translation of the LV: Indra (Śakra)



Fig. 3 (after Kurita 2003, vol. 1, pl II-1. Guimet Museum, MA3397).

his attribute of a bow by means of another episode, in which Indra takes the shape of a hunter to exchange his clothes with the Bodhisatva after taking leave from his horse and groom, again referring to the *Lalitavistara* and the *Vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādins*.¹¹

Later Tanabe (in 1993–1994, 2000, 2006) identified this figure as neither Māra nor Indra but Vaiśravaṇa. He accepted Lobo's refutation of Foucaux's explanations and added, according to Parimoo's observations,¹² that Māra was absent in representations of the Great Departure in Gandharan art, as well as in South Indian reliefs.¹³ On the other hand, Tanabe rejected Lobo's identification of the figure as Indra,

because he is never depicted wearing a winged cap or a bow.¹⁴

Tanabe is the first among the scholars mentioned above to consult a larger number of written sources. His main arguments for the identification of the figure with a bow as Vaiśravaṇa rely on visual similarities with this deity depicted in one representation of the offering of the four bowls,¹⁵ and a number of texts referring to Vaiśravaṇa guiding the prince on the night of the Great Departure.¹⁶

In her recent article dedicated to the figure with a bow, Pons (2014) investigated this issue further and took a middle position between the identifications of Lobo and Tanabe; while dismissing Māra altogether, she rather favours Vaiśravaṇa over Indra,

opens the gate: LV, ed. 147. 160. 168. 171; transl. (French) Foucaux 1884, 179. 194. 202. 204; transl. (English) Goswami 2001, 193. 208. 211. 218. 220.

¹¹ *Saṅghabhedavastu* in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, ed. Gnoli, 1977–1978, vol. 1, 92; in fact, in the Sanskrit LV it is *not* stated that the Bodhisatva exchanges clothes with Indra, but with a śuddhavāsa-god: *atha śuddhavāsakāyikānāṃ devānāṃ etad abhūt kāṣāyair bodhisattvasya kāryam iti / tatraiko devaputro divyaṃ rūpam antardhāpya lubdhakarūpeṇa kāṣāyavastraprāvṛto bodhisattvasya purato 'sthāt* / LV, ed. Vaidya 1958, 164; transl. (French) Foucaux 1884, 197; transl. (English) Goswami 2001, 212.

¹² Parimoo 1982, 77.

¹³ Tanabe 2006, 75–90.

¹⁴ Tanabe 1993–1994, 173f.; Tanabe 2006, 94–100.

¹⁵ Another representation from the Peshawar Government Museum has been introduced into the discussion by Pons (2014, fig. 27), in which one of the depicted figures is wearing a winged cap.

¹⁶ According to Tanabe Vaiśravaṇa is mentioned as guiding the prince in T 186; the *Vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin*, its Chinese translation T 1450, T 190 and the *Lalitavistara: vaiśravaṇa āha* [...] *ahaṃ ca purato yāsyē yūyaṃ ca vahathā hayaṃ* / But it is only in the few lines below that state Indra does the job: *svayaṃ caśakro devānāṃ indra evam āha - ahaṃ dvārāṇi vivariṣyāmi / mārgaṃ ca saṃdarśayāmi* / ed. Vaidya 1958, 147; transl. (French) Foucaux 1884, 179; transl. (English) Goswami 2001, 202.

but states that both of the latter identifications are quite possible in light of the literary and visual evidences.¹⁷

There is, however, a fundamental problem that remains unsolved in these previous studies. Namely, no conclusive explanation of the most fixed attribute of this figure – the bow – has been provided so far;¹⁸ previous identifications relying only on the sporadic elements of his costume, such as the winged headdress.



Fig. 4 (after Lobo 1983, pl. 5).

Inquiry of Literary Sources in the Early Chinese Translations

In regard to the iconographical study of this scene, textual sources about the Buddha's biography have not been thoroughly explored in previous studies. Especially those translated into Chinese during the 3–4th centuries are of a significance, because they are approximately contemporary to the making of many Gandharan reliefs. Among them, three texts seem to include an exact reference to the figure under discussion.¹⁹

¹⁷ Pons 2014, 36.

¹⁸ Tanabe (2007, 113–122) explains the bow and arrow as attributes of Kubera, the subordinates of Vaiśravaṇa.

¹⁹ It is Prof. Rhi who first related these three texts to the Gandharan representations; cf. Rhi 2011 (unfortunately unpublished). The following analysis was developed by the present authors

T 185 (佛說太子瑞應本起經 *Fóshuō-Tàizǐ-Ruìyīng-Běnnqǐ-Jīng*) is considered to be the oldest source among them, which is the translation work of Zhī Qīan (支謙) who was the “Upāsaka of the Yuezhi (月支優婆塞)” in the Wú (吳) dynasty (222–280 CE).²⁰ As for the exact year of the translation, there are two records: either the year of Jiànxìng (建興年) = 252–253 CE or the year of Huángwǔ (黃武年) = 222–228 CE.²¹ Nevertheless, it has been pointed out that this text is most probably a patchwork of two older translations.²²

In this text, it is described that the prince, after his Great Departure and before his self-ordination and the subsequent exchange of clothes with a hunter, had the following encounter:

After the prince had mounted Kaṇṭhaka, Candaka went ahead for several ten Li. (Then they) suddenly saw the great god, who reigned over the five paths (主五道大神), by the name of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì (賁識), the single most powerful (of the gods). In his left hand he held a bow, and in his right hand he had an arrow. At his waist he carried a sharp sword. He

at the beginning without knowing Prof. Rhi's unpublished paper, since it only became known to the authors after submitting the first draft.

²⁰ For the study on the biography of Zhī Qīan and his translation style see Nattier 2008, 116–148; for the study on the formation of this text also see Matsuda 1998; Kawano 2007, 7f.

²¹ See Kawano 2007, 7f.

²² Cf. Kawano 1991, 133f.; Kawano 2007, 232–236; Nattier 2008, 135. Kawano supposes that there are two archaic translation works, on which T 185 largely relied: the *Xiao-Benqi-Jing* (小本起經), which has been already lost, and the *Zhong-Benqi-Jing* (中本起經, T196). It was the typical style of Zhī Qīan to use the preceding Chinese texts for his translation work as reference: in this meaning, his work should be termed a revision rather than translation. Nattier 2008, 118–121.

dwelled at an intersection of the three paths (所居三道之衢). The first is the path to the heaven(s). The second is the path to the human-realm. The third are the three bad paths. This is the place, where spirits of the deceased pass and meet him.²³ The prince asked him which path he should take. Bēnshí / Bēnzhì frightened and bashful, threw away the bow and arrow, untied his sword, hesitated and then pointed towards heaven, and said to go on this path.²⁴

Here a remarkable character can be observed: Bēnshí or Bēnzhì, “the Great God who reigned over the five paths”. The Chinese character 賁 has three possible readings in the present Pinyin system: *bēn* / *bì* / *fén*, while 識 can be read as *shí* or *zhì*. As later shown, however, the character 賁 can be replaced by 奔, such as in T 186, which is also readable as *bēn* or *bèn*. The replacement of this character most probably indicates that this name was a phonetic rendering of a certain foreign name. For the first syllable, the common reading of two replaceable characters 賁 and 奔 as *bēn* can be employed, therefore the name of this deity shall be transcribed as Bēnshí / Bēnzhì in the present paper.

Eichenbaum-Karetzky translated Bēnshí / Bēnzhì as Māra but without any explanation.²⁵ The five paths apparently

refer to the five *gatis* in the Buddhist context, i.e. the five destinations of one’s reincarnation: the god-realm, the human-realm, the animal-realm, the ghost-realm and hell. The description of his appearance is most interesting, for he is described as holding a bow, an arrow, with a sword fastened to his waist. This description corresponds exactly with that of the discussed figure in Gandharan representations.

Bēnshí / Bēnzhì can be found in two more texts. A similar account of him is given in T 188 (異出菩薩本起經 *Yichū-Púsà-Běngqǐ-Jīng*), which also details the Buddha’s life but in many places diverges from other sources. In the *Taisho Tripitaka* this text is ascribed to the translator Niè Dào zhēn (聶道真) and to the time of the Western Jin (晉) dynasty (280–313),²⁶ although the name of the actual translator seems to have been lost.²⁷ The title of this text with the prefix *Yichū* (differently translated) displays that the translator or editor of this text was well aware of its uniqueness.²⁸

(...) After the prince had ridden his horse for more than ten Li he saw a youth, named Bēnshí / Bēnzhì (賁識). Bēnshí / Bēnzhì was a great god among the demonic gods (鬼神中大神), appearing threatening to everyone.

²³ Eichenbaum-Karetzky translated this sentence as “the spirit demon of death”. See Eichenbaum-Karetzky 1992, 72.

²⁴ Taisho Tripitaka vol. 3, No. 185, p. 475, c20–26 (translation by the authors): “將車匿前行數十里。忽然見主五道大神。名曰賁識。最獨剛強。左執弓。右持箭。腰帶利劍。所居三道之衢。一曰天道。二曰人道。三曰三惡道。此所謂死者魂神。所當過見者也。太子到問。何道所從。賁識惶懼。投弓。釋箭。解劍。逡巡示以天道曰。是道可從。”。 For another English translation see Karashima 2016, 176.

²⁵ See Eichenbaum-Karetzky 1992, 72.

²⁶ For the list of the texts ascribing the translator of this text to Niè Dào zhēn see Matsuda 1998, fn. 17.

²⁷ See Nattier 2008, 135, fn. 67. Nattier points out that the attribution of this text to Niè Dào zhēn, which can be only found in later sources, is obviously false; the *Chū-Sānzàng-Jì-Jí* compiled in the Liáng Dynasty (梁, 502–557 CE) says that the translator of this text is anonymous (T 2145: 16c18).

²⁸ Kawano 2007, 148. Kawano assumes that the translator may suppose T 185 as the text from which the content of T 188 deviated. For a study on the close association between T 185 and T 186 see Matsuda 1998.

He held a bow in his left hand, and an arrow in his right hand. At his waist he carried a sharp sword. He stood on the road. Where Bēnshí / Bēnzhì stood there are three paths. The first one is the path to the heaven(s). The second is the path to the human-realm. The third is the path of the bad-ones going to hell (泥犁 = Skt. *naraka*). He saw the prince from a distance and felt uncomfortable. When the prince's horse stood directly in front of him, Bēnshí / Bēnzhì became scared and trembled. He loosened his sword and took the bow and arrow and remained standing on the path. The prince asked him which way he should go. Bēnshí / Bēnzhì immediately pointed to the heaven, (and said,) this is the path to go.²⁹

Another text mentioning Bēnshí / Bēnzhì is T 186 (佛說普曜經 *Fóshuō-Pǔyào-Jīng*), an earlier Chinese translation of the *Lalitavistara*. It should not be forgotten that the Sanskrit *Lalitavistara* preserved today and another Chinese translation (T 187, 方廣大莊嚴經 *Fāngguǎng-Dàzhuāngyán-Jīng*, translated in 683 AD) are products of later times.³⁰ The episode with Bēnshí / Bēnzhì is completely absent in these two latter texts.

²⁹ Taisho Tripiṭaka vol. 3, No. 188, p. 619, 22–29 (translation by the authors): "即上馬而去。行十數里。見一男子。名曰賁識。賁識者。鬼神中大神。爲人剛愎。左手持弓。右手持箭。腰帶利劍。當道而立。賁識所立處者有三道。一者天道。二者人道。三者泥犁惡人之道。太子遙見。心爲不樂。直以馬前趣之。賁識即惶怖戰慄。解劍持弓箭。却路而立。太子問曰。何道可從。賁識即以天道示之。此道可從。". For another. English translation see Karashima 2016, 176.

³⁰ For the analysis of the generation process of this text see Matsuda 1988; Okano 1990; Kawano 2007, 232–236. Okano points out that there had once existed an older Chinese translation of the *Lalitavistara* in the Shǔ (蜀) period (221–263 CE), which has been lost but recorded in the *Chū-Sānzàng-Jì-Jí*; from this record and some other factors, Okano assumes that the original *Lalitavistara* was

According to the *Chū-Sānzàng-Jì-Jí* (出三藏記集, *Compilation of Records about the Translation of the Tripiṭaka*), T 186 was translated by the monk Zhú Fǎhù (竺法護) in the year two of Yǒngjiā (永嘉二年 = 308 CE) in the Tiānshuǐ-Temple (天水寺).³¹ Zhú Fǎhù was born into a Yuezhi family based in Dunhuang.³² After travelling in Central Asian countries together with his master, monk Zhú Gāozuò (竺高座), and allegedly having mastered 36 languages, he came to Chang'an through Dunhuang with a great number of "foreign" texts (胡本) acquired during his travels, also translating various Buddhist texts into Chinese himself. He is said to have translated the original manuscript in the Hu language into Chinese, while the two monks, Kāng shū (康殊, who, following his family name, is most likely of Samarkand origin) and Bó Fǎjù (帛法巨, whose family name most probably refers to his Kuchean origin) wrote it down.³³ The Tiānshuǐ-Temple most probably indicates a certain temple in the present Tiānshuǐ area in Gānsù province, which was an important stop on the Silk Road connecting Cháng'ān and the Western Regions. Although these accounts ensure that Zhú Fǎhù translated T 186 from the manuscript written in a certain foreign language, it is apparent that he also consulted Chinese texts about the Buddha's life, which had been available at that time, especially T 185.³⁴

compiled in Northwest India in the late half of the second century AD.

³¹ T2145: 7b15, 48b27–c1.

³² T2145: 97c19–98b2.

³³ T2145: 48c1 (手執胡本口宣晉言。時筆受者。沙門康殊帛法巨).

³⁴ Cf. Matsuda 1998; Okano 1990, 60f.; Kawano 2007, 232–236.

Following are the passages corresponding to T 185 cited above:

[...] When the Bodhisatva went forth, he saw a god of the five paths (五道神) called Bēnshí / Bēnzhì (奔識), who dwelled at the passage (五道頭) to the five paths. He carried a sword, a bow and an arrow. When he saw the Bodhisatva approaching, he relaxed his bow, threw away the arrow, untied the sword and stepped back. He worshiped the Bodhisatva by prostrating himself before him and said: “On Brahma’s command I am guarding the five paths, but I don’t know what they are. Please tell (me) this ignorant person what they mean.” The Bodhisatva said: “even though you are the lord of the five paths, you do not know the origin of the five paths. The rule is: those who follow the five precepts (戒 = Skt. *śīla*) will be reborn in the human-realm. Those who did ten good deeds will be reborn in the heaven(s). Those who are parsimonious will fall into the hungry-ghost (餓鬼 = Skt. *preta*)-realm, while those who touch (lustfully) will go to the animal-realm. And those who did ten bad deeds will be reborn in hell. But none of these five paths (五趣) are the way one should go. One should not stick to these five paths. (The Buddha explains how he wants to overcome the five *gatis* and reach Nirvana) Bēnshí / Bēnzhì’s mind became liberated and reached the state of non-transmigration. The aspiration for enlightenment arose in the minds of an incalculable number of gods.³⁵

In this text, some more information about the protagonist in discussion can be elucidated. Especially interesting is his dialogue with the prince, where Bēnshí / Bēnzhì is instructed by the Bodhisatva in the five paths and through this reaches a state where his mind is set on non-transmigration.

These three passages cited above provide us with new evidence for the identification of the figure with a bow in the Gandharan art. The figure with a bow, which is standing in front of the prince on his horse, can be identified as the deity, called Bēnshí / Bēnzhì and is described as the god of the five paths.

Thus, the next question to be asked is: who is Bēnshí / Bēnzhì “the god of the five paths”?

Identification of the God of the Five Paths

Before analysing the connection of these specific textual accounts and the Gandharan images, one important question may puzzle the reader: is the episode about Bēnshí / Bēnzhì, that is only found in T 185, T 186 and T 188, not a Chinese invention? No source in Indian languages including the exact parallel episode has been found so far to the best of the authors’ knowledge. Its Indic origin is perhaps even more doubtful considering the fact that the deity called “the Great God of the Five Paths (五道大神)”, or “the General of the Five Paths (五道將軍)”

³⁵ Taisho Tripiṭaka vol. 3, No. 186, p. 507c17–508a1 (translation by the authors): “於是菩薩稍進前行。觀五道神名曰奔識。住五道頭。帶劍執持弓箭。見菩薩來。釋弓投箭解劍退住。尋時稽首菩薩足下。白菩薩曰。梵天之際天王見勅。守五道路不画像知如之。愚不敏達惟告意旨。菩薩告曰。雖主五道不知所歸。源所從來。五戒爲人。十善生天。慳墮餓鬼。舐突畜生。

十惡地獄。無五趣行便歸人本。不慕五趣。以無五陰三毒六衰。則是泥洹。不處生死不住泥洹。便不退轉受菩薩決。無所從生靡所不生。於諸所生悉無所生。卿持俗刀。五兵宿衛。吾執智慧無極大劍。斷五趣生死皆至本無。無終無始永安無形。奔識心解速不退轉。無限天神皆發道心。” For another English translation of the first few sentences see Karashima 2016, 176.

is a well-known figure in Chinese mythology of later periods.³⁶

The cult of the Great God of the Five Paths was familiar to wide areas of China by the sixth century at the latest, witnessed by the so-called *grave-good lists* (随葬衣物疏) from that period.³⁷ Some of the *grave-good lists* clearly display the status of this deity; he controls the deceased, as well as their

belongings, who pass the five paths, the gateway to the netherworld – a function that matches the above-cited description of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì in T 185. Borrowing the words of Dudbridge, “in sixth-century Buddhist China the General of the Five Paths was indeed perceived as a powerful and threatening figure outside the Buddhist system, yet still dimly associated with the gates of death”.³⁸ After the Táng dynasty onwards, the God of the Five Paths became one of the ten acolytes of King Yama (Yánmó 閻魔), the Ten Kings of Hell,³⁹ and thus developed into a substantial part of the Hell cult. The cult of this deity is reflected in popular literature up until a much later period,⁴⁰ and a sanctuary dedicated to this deity has even been recorded in northern China in the twentieth century.⁴¹

Interestingly, the “General of the Five Paths” in Medieval China is often represented as an armoured figure with a winged helmet, equipped with a bow, arrows and a sword (fig. 5).⁴²

³⁶ Pioneering research on the cult of the God of the Five Paths (五道大神) in China has been carried out by Oda (1961; 1976), who drew an overview of textual accounts on this deity in a trans-religious context from the 4th to the 20th century. Dudbridge (1996) introduced some additional sources that demonstrate multilayered aspects of this deity. Arakawa's study (2006) focused on the analysis of the reception of the God of the Five Paths among the Buddhists in China in the 6th century, mainly on the basis on the grave-good list manuscripts involving the accounts on this deity. Zheng's recent paper (2009) adds a wide range of new textual accounts concerning this deity, especially from different genres of the *Dunhuang Bianwen*. He also systematically collected the iconographical corpus of this deity from various visual arts from the 6th to the 10th century. This deity was also transmitted to Japan as a Taoist god (Cf. Oda 1976, 23). Yamaguchi's study (2013) demonstrated the link between the God of the Five Paths in China and Muto-Shin, a god of pestilence in Japan.

³⁷ For the detailed analysis of these lists see Oda 1961; Oda 1976, 17–21; Dudbridge 1996, 92f.; Arakawa 2006. These *grave-good lists* are manuscripts containing magical phrases ensuring the smooth transit of the deceased to the other world, with a list of buried goods, which are intended to be a preparation for the dead person's new life in the after-world. There is a specific standard formula, which is regularly employed in these visa-like documents: “(the clothes and other goods) are respectfully transmitted to the Great God of the Five Paths (敬移五道大神)”. Oda pointed out that the style of these manuscripts follows the older format of the grave good list used in the Han dynasty; just the God of the Underworld Dixià Chéng (地下丞) was replaced by the God of the Five Paths, and the deceased persons are claimed to be Buddhists. Cf. Oda 1976, 18f.

³⁸ Cited from Dudbridge 1996: 92, l. 26–28.

³⁹ As the tenth king of the Yama's court, the God of the Five Paths is called “Cakravartin of the Five Paths (五道轉輪王 Wudao-Zhuanlun-Wang)”. Cf. Oda 1961, 45–51; Dudbridge 1996, 94–96; Zheng 2009, 10–17; Faure 2014.

⁴⁰ Cf. Zheng 2009, 12f.

⁴¹ Cf. Oda 1976, 16f.; Dudbridge 1996, 96–98.

⁴² See Zheng 2009, 13–17. The Dunhuang manuscript of the *Hán-Qínhǔ-Huàběn* (韩擒虎话本, *Story about the Tiger Captor Han*) even describes that the General of the Five Paths, who suddenly emerged in front of the General Han from a cross-shaped earth crack, wore “golden chain mail, a winged headgear and held a trident”. See *Dunhuang Bianwen*, Pan 1994, vol. 6 no. 8, 1089 (忽然十字地裂, 涌出一人, 身披黄金锁甲, 顶戴凤翅, 头牟按三丈头低, 高声唱喏); Cf. Zheng 2009, 14f.

The origin of this deity has been disputed among Sinologists until today, although most of the scholars assume its Buddhist / Indian origin.⁴³ The earliest written accounts of the God of the Five Paths stem exclusively from Buddhist sources; namely, the above-cited Buddha's life stories and the *Ekottarikāgama* translated in the fourth century.⁴⁴ In the *Ekottarikāgama* (No. 27–35–7), however, this deity is clearly described as a pagan deity worshipped by a rich householder in Rājagṛha, which is in a sharp contrast to the “proper” worship of the Buddha. In this text, no personal name of this deity is referred to.

On the basis of the absence of a parallel passage in the Sanskrit *Lalitavistara*, Arakawa assumed that the episode about Bēnshí / Bēnzhì was a later insertion by translators, added for the convenience of Chinese readers and to make the notion of the five *gatis* understandable.⁴⁵ This view needs a slight modification, since the earlier form of the Sanskrit *Lalitavistara* has been lost and thus there are no means to prove the presence of the Bēnshí / Bēnzhì's episode in this earlier version. In addition, the presence of a figure in Gandharan art, which literally fits to the descriptions of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì, makes it difficult to assume that no Indian original version had been given. It is unclear, however, whether there was in fact a cult for this specific deity somewhere in Gandhara, or if the compiler(s) of the texts were



Fig. 5 Bodhisatva Kṣitigarbha, General of the Five Paths and Venerable Monk Daomiao, Dunhuang, 10th–11th century (Copyright at Freer Gallery of Art, Inv. No. F1935.11, image available under: http://www.asia.si.edu/collections/edan/object.cfm?q=fsg_F1935.11).

inspired from the preceding visual images.⁴⁶ It is equally unsure how faithful the Chinese translations are to their Indic originals. The description in T 185, that the place where Bēnshí / Bēnzhì stands is wherespirits of the deceased pass and meet, is very close to the function of the "the Great God of the Five Paths" mentioned in the above-cited *grave-good lists* in Chinese. Even though the

⁴³ Oda 1976, 23–28; Dudbridge 1996, 89; Zheng 2009, 2–4.

⁴⁴ T 125: 683a11f.; 699c24–700b26. This *sūtra* was translated by Gautama Saṅghadeva (瞿曇僧伽提婆) at the end of the fourth century CE.

⁴⁵ Arakawa 2006, 516f. (he assumes that this deity was inserted by the translators of Central Asian origin into the Buddha's biography, the original name of which might have been composed with a word "five" in Sogdian *pnc*, *pncw*, or in Sanskrit *pañca*).

⁴⁶ This possibility has been well argued in the conference presentation by Prof. Juhung Rhi at 16th IABS Congress in Taiwan in 2011, mentioned in footnote 1 of the present paper.

Chinese translations may have incorporated certain allusions to the Chinese cultural tradition, the presence of the Gandharan representation of the corresponding figure seems to prove 1) the presence of a certain narrative tradition (either written or oral) in Central Asia, and 2) a certain aspect of this deity, which could be anyhow connected to the Five *gatis* or the underworld.

Then who was this deity originally meant to be in Indic context? Previous studies have demonstrated three possible solutions.

First is the assumption that the Skt. *pañca* “five” is the first syllable of the original name of this deity. Many scholars already assumed a phonetic relationship between the name Bēnshí / Bēnzhì and Skt. *pañca*, which may refer to his function as the guardian of the *pañca-gatayah* “the five paths”.⁴⁷ The pronunciation of two characters 賁 / 奔 (both read as *bēn* in Pinyin) in Middle Chinese is transcribed as *pwon*, while 識 (*shí* or *zhì*) is *syik* or *tsyiH* according to Baxter – Sagart;⁴⁸ and according to Pulleyblank, 賁 / 奔 (*bēn*) is *pən* and 識 (*shí* or *zhì*) is *eik* or *te^h* or *te^h* in Early Middle Chinese.⁴⁹ The most recent study of

Karashima suggests the tones of *pwon syik* / *pəncik* could be a transliteration of *Pāñcika*,⁵⁰ the possibility which was also suggested by K. R. Norman, cited in a footnote of Dudbridge’s paper published in 1996.⁵¹ *Pāñcika* is a *yakṣa*-general, who is often paired with Hārītī. There is no Buddhist tale known so far, however, in which this demigod is anyhow connected to the five *gatis* or the netherworld. From this reasoning, the following explanations may be given for the interpretation of this deity, as Karashima suggested; 1) his function as a ruler of the five paths might have rather been invented by the editors of these texts due to his name *Pāñcika* being associated with the word *pañca* or *pañcagati* (Five Paths);⁵² or 2) there was a certain unknown deity protecting the intersection of the five paths, and this deity was named *Pāñcika* which sounds similar to *pañca*.

The next possible interpretation of the name Bēnshí / Bēnzhì is to interpret it as a fanciful translation of *Vaiśramaṇa*, the idea which is also suggested by Karashima in the same paper as an alternative solution. *Vaiśramaṇa* is a by-form of *Vaiśravaṇa*, which has been understood as “rushing mind” (*vi-√śr* “to run or flow through; to rush upon” + *maṇa* “mind”) and could have been translated literally into Chinese characters (奔 “rushing”, thus 賁 in T 185 may be a scribal error of 奔 + 識 “mind, consciousness”).⁵³ The possibility to interpret the argued figure as *Vaiśravaṇa* is thoroughly studied by Tanabe, even though his interpretation is not based on the discussed episode found in the

⁴⁷ Oda 1976, 24; Dudbridge 1996, 89 (he supposes *Pañcika* as the original name); Arakawa 2006, 516f. (see fn. 46); Zheng 2009, 4 (he also supports a certain Sanskrit name with the prefix *pañca* as its original name).

⁴⁸ See Baxter – Sagart 2014, Appendix (327–378) and also a more comprehensive list in an online version of appendix under <http://ocbaxtersagart.lsa.umich.edu/>.

⁴⁹ According to the definition of Pulleyblank, Early Middle Chinese is the language which underlies the *Qieyun* (rhyming dictionary completed in 601 by Lu Fayuan), which is based on the elite standard language commonly spoken by educated people both in the north and south during the period of division until 589, which ultimately went back to the dialect of Luoyang in the second and third centuries. Cf. Pulleyblank 1991, 1–4.

⁵⁰ See Karashima 2016 (3.2 Bēnzhì).

⁵¹ See Dudbridge 1996, 89.

⁵² Cf. Zheng 2009, 4.

⁵³ We would like to express our deep gratitude to Prof. Seishi Karashima at this point, who kindly provided us the manuscript of his paper before its publication.

three Chinese texts featured in this paper. Yet, the relationship between *Vaiśravaṇa* and the five paths remains unclear.

The third idea is to regard the name Bēnshí / Bēnzhì as not necessarily only referring to a specific deity, but also to see the whole episode as allegorically representing the attainment a state of mind of the final stage of liberation as a non-dualistic suspension, as suggested by Radich.⁵⁴ The deity with the name 奔識, literally meaning “Runaway Consciousness”, disarmed himself upon encountering the Bodhisatva, and through their conversation he established himself in a state of mind directed towards ultimate liberation. As Radich himself states, it is very plausible that at least in the case of T 186 such a second implication was endowed to the name Bēnshí / Bēnzhì 奔識 from its scripts and influenced the narrative description. Nevertheless, the literal coincidence between the textual descriptions about the appearance of this deity and its visual rendering in Gandharan art make it seem that this deity is not only a personified allegory but rather refers to a certain deity with a particular identity.

In the present state of the research, it seems impossible to judge whether the deity Bēnshí / Bēnzhì may be *Pāñcika* or *Vaiśravaṇa*. Then what can the iconographical features in Gandharan art tell to us?

Iconography

Is this deity Bēnshí / Bēnzhì, whose name could be a rendering of *Pāñcika* or *Vaiśravaṇa*, exactly the figure who is represented in the scene of the Great Departure? At least from the description of his behavior and appearance, holding a bow and arrow (in the exact same hands as in text and art) and wearing a sword, the correspondence between the representation and the literary sources seems evident in this case. Care must be taken however, for this correspondence does not necessarily clarify his identity and there is still the possibility that the descriptions we can read in text may have been inspired from what we can see in art.

In fact, the represented figure neither matches the traditional iconography of *Pāñcika* nor *Vaiśravaṇa* or more precisely, its appearance does not fit to the iconography of any figure in Gandharan / Indian art. The *yakṣa*-general *Pāñcika* is normally represented as husband of Hārītī, often potbellied and mostly holding a spear. On the other hand, *Vaiśravaṇa* in Gandharan art borrows iconographical features of Farro (a young male deity either in Iranian costume or in armour, often with the winged headdress), as Tanabe demonstrated. Nevertheless, there are a number of studies demonstrating the fusion of *Pāñcika*, *Kubera*, *Farro*, *Vrthragna* and *Vaiśravaṇa* in Gandharan art.⁵⁵ Borrowing the phrases of Rosenfield concerning Hariti and Pancika, "(Because) they were not among the canonical Buddhist icons, there is great irregularity in their imagery."⁵⁶ Especially

⁵⁴ See Radich forthcoming. We would like to express our deep gratitude to Prof. Michael Radich for generously providing us the manuscript of his paper, which is still unpublished as of March 2016.

⁵⁵ Bachhofer 1937; Bussagli 1951, 142–146; Rosenfield 1967, 246–249; Tissot 1976, 76; Carter 1995; Quagliotti 2005, 123–139. 152f.; Tanabe 2006, 122. 135f.

⁵⁶ Rosenfield 1967, 246, l. 33f.

these deities, seemingly popular among the Kushan citizens, were highly correlated in terms of their iconography. Thus, very roughly said, the reasons why the represented figure should be *Vaiśravaṇa*, can be also valid for *Pāñcika*, *Kubera*, *Farro* and *Vrthragna*. Yet the bow, the fixed attribute of this figure, remains still unexplained, because none of them is usually represented as holding a bow and arrow.

Even though the name of this deity can most probably be derived from *Pāñcika* or *Vaiśravaṇa*, the represented figure does not really follow the iconographical tradition of these two deities; however, in light of his function as the Lord of the Five Paths as well as his iconographical features, he could have been influenced by Māra for the following three reasons.

First, Māra can be described as the supreme god among the demonic gods, especially in his aspect as *mṛtyu-Māra* (Māra of death); which reflects the description of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì as “the great god among the demonic gods” as described in T 188. Second, Māra is highly related to the five *gatis* and can even be represented as turning the wheel of the *saṃsāracakra* (the wheel of rebirth), as has been discussed by Zin and Schlingloff.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ According to the situation Māra is either associated with desire, death or erroneous beliefs, all of which he can engender. Extant texts suggest that the idea of a fourfold Māra was widely known from as early as the fourth century CE. The oldest example of the four forms of Māra in art, distinguished by different attributes, can be found in a representation of the *saṃsāracakra* in Ajanta. Their appearance is explained in a source that has been part of a Buddhist *Vinaya*, describing how to depict a *saṃsāracakra*. This text refers to the fourfold Māra, who is said to be represented as turning the wheel and explains how his four aspects should be represented: (1) *skandha-Māra* (the Māra of errone-

Although no personal name of Māra with the prefix *pañca* is known in Indian sources so far,⁵⁸ this aspect of Māra enables us to call him “the Lord of the Five *gatis*”, since he has direct influence on all beings in these five *gatis*.⁵⁹ Third, while all other kinds of deities immediately worship the Bodhisatva or Buddha when they see him, Māra is the only god who tries to resist him permanently at least.⁶⁰ Bēnshí / Bēnzhì stands on the way of the Bodhisatva in arms, and despite the fact that he promptly abandoned his weapons, he did not show any personal

ous beliefs), as an hermit; (2) *kleśa-Māra* (the Māra of desires), as the god of love; (3) *devaputra-Māra*, Māra in his own form; (4) *mṛtyu-Māra* (death-Māra), as a demon; See Zin – Schlingloff 2007, 100–105. 183.

⁵⁸ It can be noted that some early Chinese translations of Buddhist texts (for example those of Kumārajīva), one aspect of Māra, namely *skandha-Māra*, is often translated as 五眾魔 or 五蘊魔 “five-category-Māra”. This translation with the prefix “five” seems to be a literal translation of the notion *skandha*. Also seen in *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* ed. Wayman 1959, 112: *pañcopādāna-skandhāḥ skandha-māraḥ*.

⁵⁹ In the *Samyuttanikāya*, which is an exhaustive source on how Māra can be understood, form, feeling, perception, volitional formations and consciousness are all described as Māra (ed. Feer 1884–1894, vol. 3, 188f. and 195, transl. Bodhi 2000, vol. 1, 984f. and 986) as well as are subject to Māra (ed. Feer 1884–1894, vol. 3, 195, transl. Bodhi 2000, vol. 1, 986). On another occasion, perception, forms, sounds, feeling, craving and clinging are described as the origin of suffering, making Māra the cause of suffering (ed. Feer 1884–1894, vol. 2, 74f. and vol. 4, 90f., transl. Bodhi 2000, vol. 1, 582f. and vol. 2, 1187); whoever clings, conceives, seeks delight or takes delight in forms cognizable by the eye is bound by Māra (ed. Feer 1884–1894, vol. 3, 73–79 and vol. 4, 91–93, transl. Bodhi 2000, vol. 1, 906–909 and vol. 2, 1187f.).

⁶⁰ In the *Nidānakathā*, in which Māra appears at the same point of the episode instead of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì, Māra, here called Vasavattī, appeared in the air and promised him the rule of the whole world within seven days if he would turn back, when the prince was going to leave from the palace's door.

eneration of the Bodhisatva in T 185 and T 188.

As known from many sources, Māra has been understood as possessing different aspects and his development has been the subject of many studies.⁶¹ The description of Bēnshí / Bēnzhìas “the Lord of the Five Paths” points to an association with, or at least incorporates aspects of, Māra, something that is also plausible from the art historical point of view.

The instructions of how to depict Māra mentioned (in footnote 58) help to explain, why he can be represented, either as wearing armour (like the members of his demonic army) or only in wrapped cloth (in his *devaputra* form and possibly in his *kleśa* form as well (fig. 6). It explains his bow (which is also an attribute of Kāma, the god of love) as an attribute of *kleśa*-Māra, and the sword, again, as an attribute of *mṛtyu*-Māra.

As pointed out earlier, the only permanent attribute of the discussed figure is his posture holding a bow (sometimes also an arrow, i.e. figs. 1. 3. 4), while the second most often depicted attribute is a sword. All other elements of his costume may change. Foucher’s reference to the *Buddhacarita* may have been adverse to Lobo and Tanabe; but there is no doubt that Māra, in his aspect as the God of desires (Skt. *kleśa*), can be understood as carrying a bow.⁶²

⁶¹ One of the earliest exhaustive studies concerning Māra has been carried out by Windisch 1895, a more condensed study can be found in Malasekera 1938; Other works on Māra have been written by Wayman 1959, (Eichenbaum-) Karetzky 1982 and Guruge 1991 for example.

⁶² There are numerous references to Māra with a bow in Buddhist literature. Only a selection shall be given here, covering various genres: for BC see fn. 8; For a reference in, and

A new explanation for the attributes (bow, arrow, armour and headgear) has been introduced by Stoye in a presentation in the Asian Art Museum of the State Museums of Berlin at 15th February, 2016.



Fig. 6 Fourfold Māra represented at the right upper corner of the *samśāracakra* in Ajanta Cave XVII (colour drawing by John Griffiths (c) Institut für Indologie und Tibetologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München).

She demonstrated the possible inspiration of the figure’s iconography and its introduction into scenes of the great departure in Gandharan art by Roman coins. In her talk she proposed that Gandharan artists could have adapted the iconography of Roman coins showing the *profectio* (the setting forth), which often feature a forerunner very similar to that of the figure with a bow.

Then how is the winged headgear to be understood, which the figure under

Gandharī- and Sanskrit-parallels to the *Dhammapada* in Pāli see Falk 2015, 51 (*phenūpamaṃ kāyam imaṃ viditvā marīci-dhammaṃ abhisambudhānochetvāna mārassa papupphakāni adassanaṃ maccurājassa gacche* / DhP ed. von Hinüber – Norman 1994, 13; transl. Müller 1881, 17; THT 946 (A312), 949 and 950 (A315f.), all accessible on CEToM (<https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>);

discussion sometimes wears but does not belong to the attributes of Māra? It has to be considered that the winged crown could simply stand for the kingly status in Gandharan iconography. The winged headgear belongs to one of the symbols embodying the concept of *hvarnah* (*x^varənah*), the divine glory / fortune of kings according to Iranian mythological system. The Kushan rulers, apparently acquainted with the Iranian visual language, employed several symbols representing *hvarnah* in their portraits, i.e. fluttering ribbons, flaming shoulders and the halo.⁶³ Farro, the Iranian god of fortune mostly being clad in Central Asian caftan, also wears the winged headdress in Gandharan representations.⁶⁴ Since Māra is the lord of the sensual world, there may be also a possibility to represent him with this symbol of the divine glory.

Conclusion

From an art-historical point of view, the figure with a bow in Gandharan art can be understood as the deity Bēnshí / Bēnzhì “the God of the Five Paths” mentioned in three early Chinese translations (T 185, T 186 and T 188) concerning the Buddha's biography. Originally he was meant to be *Pāñcika* or *Vaiśravaṇa*, but with new features possibly inspired from Māra. At present it remains difficult to find out whether it was the iconography that inspired the descriptions in T 185, T 186 and T 188, or whether the iconography was inspired by the texts. The God Benshi is also very hard to grasp, for he seems to conflate the names of Gods like *Pāñcika*, or *Vaiśravaṇa* with functions of

Māra. Whether there is a missing link between the representation of Bēnshí / Bēnzhì in Gandharan art and of the General of the Five Paths in Medieval China, remains an open question. It must be considered that the name, iconography and function of the figure with a bow mentioned in texts do not necessarily have to belong to the very same stratum found in the development of the episodes. It is possible that the iconography and function of the figure was related to an older stratum of the text and that the name has been introduced at a later time.

The authors hope that this study brings a fresh perspective and will inspire future studies of Gandharan art.

⁶³ Rosenfield 1967, 198–201; Tanabe 1993–1994, 164f.; Tanabe 2006, 125–137; Shenkar 2014, 132.

⁶⁴ For detailed study on the iconography of Farro with references to the previous studies see Tanabe 2006, 125–137.

Acknowledgements

At an oral presentation held at the international workshop "Crossroads" by the present authors in the Asian Art Museum of the State Museums of Berlin at 15th February 2016, the eminent scholar Prof. Juhyung Rhi (Seoul National University) kindly informed the authors about his paper given at the 16th congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies in Taiwan in 2011, which focused on the relationship between the Gandharan representation of the Great Departure and the same literary sources, featured in the present paper; see Rhi 2011. To the authors' knowledge, he was the first to utilise these sources directly for the identification of the argued figure in Gandharan representations. Unfortunately, his paper is yet to be published. The present authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to Prof. Rhi for kindly providing us with his unpublished draft of the paper and generously encouraging us to work on this topic further. All of the findings referred to in his draft have been considered in the present paper.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bodhi 2000

The Connected Discourses of the Buddha, transl. by B. Bhikkhu, 2 vols. PTS (Oxford 2000)

Fausbøll 1877

Nidānakathā (in the commentary on the Jātaka) in: Jātaka, ed. by M. V. Fausbøll, vol. 1. PTS (London 1877) 2–94

Feer 1884–1894

The Saṃyutta Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka, 4 vols., ed. by L. Feer. PTS (London 1884–1894)

Foucaux 1884

Histoire du Bouddha Sakya Mouni, transl. by P. Foucaux. Annales du Musée Guimet vol. 6, Librairie de l'institut, de la Bibliothèque Impériale et du Sénat (Paris 1884)

Gnoli 1977–1978

Mūlasarvāstivādinaya-Saṅghabhedavastu, The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, ed. by R. Gnoli, 2 vols., Serie Orientale Roma 49 (Rome 1977–1978)

Goswami 2001

Lalitavistara, transl. by B. Goswami (Kolkata 2001)

Johnston 1972

The Buddhacarita: Acts of the Buddha, 1: Sanskrit Text, 2: Cantos 1–14, transl. by E. H. Johnston from the original Sanskrit, supplemented by the Tibetan version (New Delhi, 1972; repr. from 1935–1936)

Müller 1881

The Dhammapada. A Collection of Verses. Being one of the Canonical Books of the Buddhists, transl. by M. Müller, Sacred Books of the East 10 (Oxford 1881)

Pan 1994

Dunhuang Bianwen, Dunhuang Bianwen Ji Xinshu, ed. by Z. Pan (Taipei 1994)

Rhys-Davids 1880

Buddhist Birth Stories, transl. by T.W. Rhys-Davids, vol. 1 (London 1880)

T = Taisho Tripiṭaka

Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo, ed. by J. Takakusu – K. Watanabe – B. Ono (Tokyo 1924–1934)

Vaidya 1958

Lalitavistara, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, ed. by P. L. Vaidya, vol. 1 (Darbhanga 1958)

von Hinüber – Norman 1994

Dhammapada, ed. by O. von Hinüber – K. R. Norman. PTS (Oxford 1994)

Secondary Sources

Ackermann 1975

C. H. Ackermann, Narrative Stone Reliefs from Gandhara in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London: Catalogue and Attempt at a Stylistic History (Rome 1975)

Arakawa 2006

M. H. Arakawa, Zui Toshō no Zaizoku Bukkyō Shintō to Godō Taishin [Buddhist laity in Northern Dynasty, Sui and Early Tang periods and the God of Five Routes], in: Kaji Nobuyuki Hakushi Kōki Kinen Ronshū Kankokai (ed.) Chugoku gaku no Jujiro (Tokyo 2006) 509–523

Bachhofer 1937

L. Bachhofer, Pāñcika und Hārītī - Pharo und Ardoxsho, *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 13, 1937, 6–15

Baxter – Sagart 2014

W. H. Baxter – L. Sagart, *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford 2014)

Bussagli 1951

T. M. Bussagli, Guerre et fécondité à propos d'une monnaie kuṣāṇa, *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 140, 1951, 129–154

Carter 1995

M. L. Carter, Aspects of the Imagery of Verethragna: The Kushan Empire and Buddhist Central Asia, in: B. G. Fragner – C. Fragner – G. Gnoli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies* (Rome 1995) 119–140

Dagens 1964

B. Dagens, Fragments de sculpture inédits, in: *Délégation archéologique française en Afghanistan et Librairie C. Klincksieck* (eds.), *Monuments Préislamiques d'Afghanistan, Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan* vol. 19 (Paris 1964) 9–39

Dobbins 1973

K. W. Dobbins, Gandharan Art from Stratified Excavations, *East and West* 23, 1973, 279–294

Dudbridge 1996

G. Dudbridge, The General of the Five Paths in Tang and Pre-Tang China, *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9, 1996, 85–98

(Eichenbaum-)Karetzky 1982

P. (Eichenbaum-)Karetzky, Māra, Buddhist Deity of Death and Desire, *East and West, New Series* 32, 1982, 75–92

Eichenbaum-Karetzky 1992

P. Eichenbaum-Karetzky, *The Life of the Buddha. Ancient Scriptural and Pictorial Traditions* (New York – London 1992)

Faccenna 1962

D. Faccenna, Reports on the Campaigns 1956–1958 in Swat (Pakistan), Mingora: Site of Butkara I; Sculptures from the Sacred Area of Butkara I (Swat, Pakistan), Part 2, Plates I–CCCXXV and Plates CCCXXVI–DCLXXV, *IsMEO Reports and Memoirs* 1–2 (Rome 1962)

Falk 2015

H. Falk, *A New Gāndhārī Dharmapada (Texts from the Split Collection 3)*, ARIRIAB 18, 2015, 23–62

Faure 2014

B. Faure, *Indic Influences on Chinese Mythology: King Yama and His Acolytes as Gods of Destiny*, in: J. Kieschnick – M. Shahar, *India in the Chinese Imagination (Philadelphia 2014)* 46–60

Foucher 1905–1922

A. Foucher, *L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhâra*, vols. 1–2 (Paris 1905–1922)

Guruge 1991

A. W. P. Guruge, *The Buddha's Encounters with Mara, the Tempter: Their Representation in Literature and Art*, *Indologica Taurinensia* 17–18, 1991, 183–208

Ingholt – Lyons 1957

H. Ingholt – I. Lyons, *Gandhāran Art in Pakistan (New York 1957)*

Karashima 2016

S. Karashima, *Indian Folk Etymologies and their Reflections in Chinese Translations – brāhmaṇa, śramaṇa and Vaiśramaṇa*, *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* vol. 19, March 2016 (forthcoming) 163–196

Kawano 1991

S. Kawano, *Shoki Chugoku Bukkyo no Butsuden wo meguru Shomondai [Some Problems on the Early Chinese Translation of the Buddha's Life Story]*, *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* 103, 1991, 127–176

Kawano 2007

S. Kawano, *Kanyaku Butsuden Kenkyu [Study on the Chinese Translations of Buddhas Life Story]* (Ise 2007)

Kurita 2003

I. Kurita, *A Revised and Enlarged Edition of Gandhāran Art*, 2 vols. (Tokyo 2003)

Lobo 1983

W. Lobo, *Der Bogenträger in den Weltflucht-Darstellungen der Gandhara-Reliefs*, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Suppl. 6, 1983, 430–437

Malasekera 1938

G. P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, vol. 2 (London 1938)

Matsuda 1998,

Y. Matsuda, *Chinese Versions of the Buddha's Biography*, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 37.1, 1998, 489–480

Nattier 2008

J. Nattier, *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms Periods*, *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* vol. 10 (Tokyo 2008)

Oda 1961

Y. Oda, *Torufan Shutsudo Soso yo Bunsho no Ichi Kosatsu—Toku ni “Godo Taishin” ni tsuite [A Study on the Funerary Documents from Turfan – on the Focus of “the God of Five Routes”]*, *Ryukoku Shidan* 47, 1961, 39–56

Oda 1976

Y. Oda, *Godo Taishin Ko [Study on God of Five Routes]*, *Toho Shukyo* 48, 1976, 14–29

Okano 1990

K. Okano, *Fuyo-Kyo no Kenkyu - Ge- [Study on the Puyao-Jing, no. III]*, *Bunka* 53 (3, 4), 1990, 268–249

Parimoo 1982

R. Parimoo, *Life of Buddha in Indian Sculptures: Aṣṭa-mahā-prātihārya* (New Delhi 1982)

Pons 2014

J. Pons, *The Figure with as Bow in Gandhāran Great Departure Scenes: Some New Readings, Entangled Religions: Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Religious Contact and Transfer* 1, 2014, 15–94

Pulleyblank 1991

E. G. Pulleyblank, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver 1991)

Quagliotti 2005

A. M. Quagliotti, *Puer mingens, the Tutelary Couple and Connected Problems: a Gandharan Relief in the Royal Ontario Museum*, in: Z. Tarzi – D. Vaillancourt (eds.), *Art et archéologie des monastères gréco-bouddhiques du Nord-Ouest de l'Inde et de l'Asie Centrale* (Paris 2005) 123–162

Radich (forthcoming)

M. Radich, *A “Prehistory” to Chinese Debates on the Survival of Death by the Spirit, with a Focus on the Term Shishen 識神 / Shenshi 神識*, *Journal of Chinese Religions* 44.2 (forthcoming)

Rhi 2011

J. Rhi, *How Does Iconography Work or Not Work? Questions in Reading Visual Depictions of the Great Departure from Gandhara and Andhrapradesh*, Paper Presented at the 16th IABS Congress, Dharma Drum College, Taiwan, 24th June 2011 (unpublished)

Rosenfield 1967

J. M. Rosenfield, *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans* (Berkeley 1967)

Senagupta – Das 1991

A. Sengupta – S. D. Das, *Gandhara Holdings in the Indian Museum: A Handlist* (Calcutta 1991)

Shenkar 2014

M. Shenkar, *Intangible Spirits and Graven Images: The Iconography of Deities in the Pre-Islamic Iranian World* (Leiden – Boston 2014)

Spooner 1910

D. B. Spooner, *Archaeological Survey of India: Annual Report, Frontier Circle, 1909–1910* (Peshawar 1910)

Taddei 2008

M. Taddei, *Some Reflections on the Formation of the Buddha Image*, in: ed. E. M. Raven, *South Asian Archaeology 1999, Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference of the European Association of South Asian Archaeologists held at the Universiteit Leiden, 5th–9th July 1999* (Groningen 2008) 1–13

Tanabe 1993–1994

K. Tanabe, *Neither Māra nor Indra but Vaiśravaṇa in Scenes of the Great Departure of Prince Siddhārtha*, *Silk Road Art And Archaeology* 3, 1993–1994, 157–185

Tanabe 2000

K. Tanabe, *Kubera, Vaiśravaṇa, Indra and Brahmā in Gandharan Great Departure Scenes*, *South Asian Archaeology* 3, 2000, 1087–1100

Tanabe 2006

K. Tanabe, *Bishamon ten zo no Kigen [The Origin of the Vaiśravaṇa Image]* (Tokyo 2006)

Tissot 1976

F. Tissot, *Remarques iconographiques à propos d'une tête de roi barbare du Gandhāra*, *Ars Asiatiques* 32, 1976, 71–90

Wayman 1959

A. Wayman, *Studies in Yama and Māra*, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 3.2, 1959, 112–131

Windisch 1895

E. Windisch, *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung*, *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 26,2 (Leipzig 1895)

Yamaguchi 2013

K. Yamaguchi, *Godō-Shin to Buto-Shin* [”Wudaoshen” and “Mutoshin”], *The Bulletin of the Institute of Humanities Research* 49, 2013, 1–14

Zheng 2009

A. Zheng, *Tang Wudai “Wudai Jiangjun” Xinyang zhi Fazhan—yi Dunhuang Wenxian Tuxiang Wei Hexin* [Development of the “General of Five Routes” Cult in Tang and Five Dynasty Periods – on the Focus of Dunhuang Manuscripts and Iconography], *Zhongguo Su Wenhua Yanjiu* 5, 2009, 1–17

Zin – Schlingloff 2007

M. Zin – D. Schlingloff, *Saṃsāracakra. Das Rad der Wiedergeburten in der Indischen Überlieferung*, *Buddhismus Studien* 6 (Düsseldorf 2007)