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Despite the admonitions of responsible scholars, writers of books on Buddhism still tend to assume that a reasonably historical account of the life and personal teachings of Śākyamuni Buddha may be extracted from the earliest available canonical accounts. This quest of the historical Buddha began as a Western nineteenth-century interest, imitating both in its presuppositions and its methods of inquiry the parallel quest of the historical Jesus of Nazareth. The general principle of the quest is set forth succinctly by Hermann Oldenberg in his impressive work, *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, Berlin, 1881, 92:

"Als wahre wir nun von den Traditionen des bezeichneten Kategorien, welche sinnlich unhistorisch oder doch des historischen Charakter.

within the terms of his enunciated principles, Oldenberg's work is responsible and scholarly. He has created a figure of the historical Buddha, which has been now popularly accepted by Westerners, and by Westernized Asians.

However, cast as it is in the mould of European nineteenth-century liberal and rational thought, it might seem to have on examination no relationship to the religious aspirations and conceptions relating to Śākyamuni Buddha, as revealed in the earliest Buddhist literature. Furthermore it can easily be shown that the whole process of deliberately abstracting everything of an apparent unhistorical and mythical character, all too often leads away from any semblance of historical truth. This is because the elements that are deliberately abstracted, usually these relating to religious faith and the cult of the Buddha as a higher being, may be older and thus nearer the origins of the religion, than the supposed historical element. This easily reveals itself as best as an honest but comparatively late attempt at producing out of floating traditions a coherent story, and at the worst as a tangle of tendentious fabrications produced to justify the pretensions of some later sectarian group.

In this short article I propose examining briefly the traditions relating to Śākyamuni's final nirvāṇa, for it might be supposed that of all the events of his life, the final one would be the best remembered. It is well known that a complete 'biography' was a late and extra-canonical operation. As early canonical material we have consecutive accounts of just two separate periods of his life, one describing his leaving home, his six years' training, his enlightenment and the conversion of his first five disciples, and the other describing his last journey and decease. It is this last with which we are concerned here.
The best-known account is based upon the Pali version of the Theravāda
as legend and history, third ed., London, 1949, 143-64. Fortunately a parallel
account with interesting variations is available in Skodkri, Tibetan, and
Chinese, as published by Ernst Waluschka, Das Mahaparinirvānasūtra,
Berlin, 1960. This second version represents the traditions of the Mulasarvāstivā-
ṇīdīn sect, which was active in north-western India up to the time of the final
eclipse of Buddhism in its homeland.1

The description of the itinerary of the last journey and the accounts of
the various lengthy sessions delivered, run generally parallel, in the two
versions. Sākyamuni travelled with a company of monks from Rājagaha,
regarded traditionally as the centre of much of his teaching, to Pārīśīriṣa
(Tib. 3Mar-bu-can) on the Ganges. Here he stayed by the caitya (Tib. mechod-
men), where he was visited by Bāhima and householders, to whom he preached
a sermon, later, when he became Varnakhala, the minister of the land of Magadha,
organising the building of a fortress in preparation for their intended war
against the Vṛjīs to the north, he prophesied the future greatness of the place
as Aśoka’s capital city of Pātaliputra. Then having crossed the Ganges
inscrutably, he travelled via Kujūriṣa (Tib. sPyi-lha-can) and Nādīka
(sGrva-can) to Vaishāli. Many people had died at Nādīka because of a plague,
and his monks asked him the reasons for this. He gave general teachings on
impermanence, said that all beings must die and there is no need to ask useless
questions, and repeated the teaching of the twelvefold ‘causal nexus’
(pratītyasamutpāda). At Vaishāli he was visited by the Licchavi prince, and
entertained by the popular courtezan Anandālī. Afterwards he went into
retract nearby at Beluṣāgāmaka (Skt.: Vemāgāmaka, Tib.: ’od ma-can-gyi

1 This is the Mahāparinirvānasūtra as it occurs in the Tripitaka. Another and very short
version occurs in the Sarvatathāgatagarbha, as translated by E. W. Thomas in his Early

2 As edited by Waluschka, the Sanskrit version is taken from the edited text of J. Dutt,
Gāpā mantra-pātra, vol. i, Sārangā, (1847), and the Tibetan version from a manuscript copy
of the Kang’tsa in the former Russian State Library in Berlin, and from the Chinese
translation, Dateh-shi, Peking 1928. I have referred throughout to the Chinese
translation as translated contemporarily in the Tibetan Tripitaka, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1958, xxiv,
pp. 219-21, line 1. Future references to the text will appear in the form e.g. p. 219-2-1.

Waluschka provides a translation of the Chinese version from the Tripitaka Tripitakas, xxiv,
p. 320-2.

One may note that the various monasteries in the Tibetan region refer not to the Mahāparinirvāna-
sūtra, but to later, Mulasarvāstvī versions in the Gāpā (in De) section, vtr. T’ang-Kwang ed., xxxi,
pp. 707, 708, and 710. I have referred to points of contact with these later works in the
footnotes. The corresponding Chinese versions of these later works occur in the Tripitaka Tripitakas, xvii.

A most detailed and brilliant analysis of these Pat and Sanskrit versions and of four other
Chinese versions has just been completed by André Bareau, namely his Recherches sur la biographie
du Bouddha dans les Tripitakas et les recueils de textes actifs. Vol. II. Les diverses études, le
1971. His conclusions force loudly any bias for a historical substantiation in the texts, certainly
even less than in myself espoused when first writing this short article.
whether now or after my decease, whoever remain as islands to themselves, as defences to themselves, with the Dharmas as their inland and the Dharmas as their defence, not concerning themselves with other islands and other defences, such ones are the foremost of my questing disciples.

After this he returned to Vaiśāli, and having been on a legging round and finished his meal, he went, still accompanied by the faithful Ānanda, on a visit to a near-by shrine (caitya) named Ĉāpala. It is here that he is said to have proclaimed: 'Whoever, Ānanda, is versed, skilled, and much practised in the four magical powers, i.e., if he wishes, remain for a world-age or even longer than a world-age. Since I as Buddha, Ānanda, am versed, skilled, and much practised in the four magical powers, I too could, if I wished, remain for a world-age or even longer than a world-age.' Since Ānanda said nothing in reply to this claim, Śākyamuni repeated it up to three times, and in some accounts up to six. Still greeted by silence, he sent his companion away with the harsh-scolding words: 'Lost there should be contention between us, go and sit under another tree.' Then Mara, the lord of death, who had attempted previously to persuade him to pass immediately into Nirvāṇa at the time of his enlightenment, appeared again and extracted a promise from him that now at last since his rounds of teaching were complete, he would finally leave the world. Earthquakes greeted this decision, and Ānanda, who came to ask the reason for this, was given a lesson in the causes of earthquakes and was sternly chided for not having begged his master to remain in the world when the chance of making such a request had been repeatedly given him. Thus certain later traditions choose to blame Ānanda for the normal limited human life-span of the Buddha of our present world-age.

Śākyamuni then announced his decision of continuing to Kusaghāra (Tib. Ru-ča), not mentioned in the Pali version, and on the way he looked back to the town of Vaiśāli and announced his imminent nirvāṇa in the realm of the Mallas under two noble trees. From Kusaghāra, they passed on to Śaṅkṣepā (Tib. Long-kyi-rgyud), where Śākyamuni gave more discourses, on the causes of earthquakes, on the various grand assemblies human and divine in which he had taught, and on how to distinguish true from false scripture. Except for the last these are repetitions of previous sessions.

At Pārīśā, the next place of rest, Śākyamuni accepted a meal in the name of the metal-worker Cunda.² Afterwards he fell ill, possibly from dysentery, and he had to rest by the wayside while Ānanda fetched water which had become

² Walshambhuti, op. cit., p. 257.2.
clear quite miraculously, although 500 carts had just passed through the near-by stream. While Śākyamuni was resting and recovering, a wealthy layman named Pukkusma, who was the follower of a rival teacher, came and boasted of the powers of concentration of his religious master, who was not disturbed in his meditation when 500 carts passed by. In reply Śākyamuni told how on a certain occasion he himself had remained undisturbed by a thunderstorm and the noise of the villagers, which he had not even heard. Pukkusma was so impressed by this that he sent for two garments of golden hue which he presented to the Buddha in tokens of his faith and devotion. When Śākyamuni put them on, their splendours were eclipsed by the brilliance of his own corporeal form, and he explained to the astonished Ananda that this bodily brilliance was the sign of a Buddha’s approaching enlightenment or, as in the present case, of his imminent passing into final nirvāna.

They continued slowly on their way, for the master was still sick, and at last they reached the outskirts of Kusumapura, where he lay down, head to the north, between two sila trees, which let fall their blossoms out of season in order to cover him. It was here that he finally expired.

Just as with his final journey, so too with the death scene, a large number of later additions may be easily identified, and especially noteworthy are the later attempts to demagogy Ananda, who from being once the favourite and most trusted disciple, comes to be presented as a blander who lays well behind others in the spiritual quest. A good analysis of the last rites of the Buddha was made by Jean Przyluski in a series of articles published just over 50 years ago, and despite subsequent publications many of his theories would seem to remain valid. Since the verses are less liable to tampering than prose, he concentrates first upon the series of verses pronounced by various messengers...

sublime qu’en aide au deu plus tard as fidèles avaient volontairement exécuté de toutes les
nouveautés naturelles. Mais on ne peut que s’emparer d’authenticité pour un trait que la biographie aurait au bout d’intérêt à tracer en déguisant ? Le vie du Bouddha, Paris, 1929, 304. On such a special task, reserved for the sole consumption of a Buddha, see A. Bouquet, Recherches sur la
biographie du Bouddha, t. Deuxièmes notices, Tom. I, 295-72. One should also refer to the articles
1 La transformation miraculeuse de la couverture offerte au Bouddha par le bhadra Kusumapura
2 Le Bouddha put on a pair of garments as he sits on his low throne, and he becomes the colour of purified gold, filling the directions with rays before an assembled fourfold assembly. Again and again he musts to the skin in a chosen mode of the seven jewels, and as the images grew on, he explains repeatedly that this is the sign of his approaching nirvāna.

9
over the dying Buddha. (Of several similar versions I quote from the Tibetan Finnga version.)

"The Lord expired like a bee at the foot of those two excellent sila trees in the grove of twin sila trees which let fall their blossoms as soon as the Lord Buddha passed from sorrow. Then some other monk recited these verses:

"Here in this grove of two trees, of this beautiful pair of, sila,
The Teacher as he passes from sorrow is thoroughly scattered with flowers.""

As soon as the Lord Buddha passed from sorrow, Indra, chief of the gods, recited these verses:

"Impermanent, alas, are compounds. For being born they are subject to destruction. Having been born, they are then destroyed, but their tranquillization is bliss.""

As soon as the Lord Buddha passed from sorrow, Indrâkṣa, the lord of the universe, recited these verses:

"All beings in the world cast off the accumulated totality (of THEIR own persons).
Thus we who are peerless in the world, all-seeing Buddha, winner of special powers.
Even a teacher such as he, has finally passed from sorrow.""
As soon as the Lóri Buddha passed from sorrow, the Venerable Aniruddha recited these verses:

"He who bestowed protection firm-mindedly
and has won unshakable tranquillity,
His in-breathing and out-breathing have stopped,
the all-seeing one has passed from sorrow thence.
Possessed of all forms of excellency,
when our Teacher made an end of life.
We were most terribly afraid
and our hairs stood up on end.
But with spirit undismayed,
extremely steady in his feelings,
Like the extinguishing of a lamp
his mind was liberated.'

It is significant that in the two versions preserved in the Pali canon, the second set of verses suggesting fear and alarm are pronounced by Ānanda instead of by Aniruddha, and Ānanda’s set of verses, which now follow Aniruddha’s in certain other versions noted by Przybylski, do not occur as at all in Pali.10 The Vimana of the Mūlaaravīśvādīkī canon, however, preserve them, as quoted above, but after several accounts of various happenings, all related in prose and corresponding more or less with the Pali, as retold by E. J. Thomas.11

After the verses just quoted, some monks were quite distraught, but others, remembering their master’s teaching that one must finally part with all things that cause pleasure in the world, reacted more in accordance with his doctrine of renunciation. Aniruddha consoled them with suitable words, but it is significant that in the Mūlaaravīśvādīkī version, where he appears as by no means unshaken himself, he first asked Ānanda to do the consoling. How shrewdful he said, that monks should behave in such a way, when hundreds of shocked gods are all looking on in amazement at such lack of restraint. Then he sent Ānanda into Kuṇingara to tell the inhabitants what had occurred. Hearing the news, they too were distraught, and came out in throngs, both men and women (the Pali discreetly omits the reference to women) to honour and worship the corpse. Then they asked Ānanda how they should prepare the corpse, and he replied that they should do things as for a universal monarch.

"O, most worthy Ānanda, how should things be done for a universal monarch?"12

"Townsmen, the body of a universal monarch should be wrapt in muslin. Having been wrapt in muslin, it should be wrapt in 500 pairs of

clothes. Having been wrapped in 500 pairs of clothes, it should be placed in an iron coffer. When this has been filled with vegetable oil, it should be closed with a double iron lid. Then heaping up all kinds of scented woods and having burned it, one extinguishes the fire with milk, and having placed the bones in a golden vase, one constructs a temple for the bones at a cross-road, and honours it with parasols, banners of victory, flags, garlands, perfumes, powders, and music. One has a great festival.

honouring, venerating, and worshipping it. 

The townfolk replied that it would take them quite seven days to do all this. Having prepared everything as detailed by Ananda, they prepared to move off. According to the Vinaya of the Mahásārnātikāvīddha, an elder instructed the women and maidens to hold up the processionary canopy over the bier which was to be carried by the men and youths. They were to pass through Kusinagara, entering by the west gate and leaving it by the east. According to the Pali account, where no women are mentioned, they were to carry the bier to the south side of the town. In neither case could they lift the bier, for the gods prevented them, in the case of the Mahásārnātikāvīddha account because they wanted to have a full part in the worship of the bier themselves, and in the case of the Pali account because they wanted the corpse to be carried to the north side of the town, entering at the west and going out at the east. Once they accorded to the gods’ wishes, as interpreted by Anumiddha, the procession was able to move off. 16

When everything was ready on the funeral pyre, the gods again interfered, this time to prevent it from taking light, because the Venerable Mahákkáyapá was on his way to salute the Buddha’s corpse. Mahákkáyapá was restrained afterwards as the first patriarch, who presided over the first council, supposedly held at Rágagha immediately after the Buddha’s death, and so later tradition considered it desirable that he should be given a place of honour at the funeral rites, and be shown to establish his authority over Ánanda. He duly arrived, took off all the 500 sets of garments, worshipped the corpse, and then returned. Then he placed the corpse in its iron coffer, filled it with oil, closed it with a double lid, all the details being repeated just as before. Only then did the pyre ignite of its own accord by the power of the buddhas and the power

---

16 Waldschmidt, op. cit., 411; P. T. Stor, p. 223-22: khaañca paham uparíe, bhavítu, abhavítu, anuññahí na, tathásam api yati tathá ni ca bhavítu, bhavítu, anuññahí na. 17 Waldschmidt, op. cit., 415-17. In the Buddhist and Tibetan versions the gods object in particular to the women of Kusinagara honouring the bier. The Chinese version has removed all reference to women, and in this respect comes into line with the Pali account. For detailed comparisons see Frynska, art. cit., J.A. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. 18 Waldschmidt, op. cit., 415.
of the gods'. Finally Ananda, coming to the fore again, pronounced his final verses over the ashes, which do not appear in the Pali canon.16

"The leader with his jewel of a body,
the great, worker of miracles, has gone to the Brahma-world.

His Buddha-body was wrapped with five hundred pairs of garments
and with a thousand religious costumes.

By its own splendour this corpse has been consumed although so well wrapped,
But the two religious garments were not burned.
those two, the inner and the outer.'

These verses were clearly pronounced by Ananda in the role of master of ceremonies, and their absence from the Pali canon, where he is given a verse to say which expresses fear and alarm and which is elsewhere attributable to Anuruddha, may reasonably be connected with the early tendency to denigrate Ananda, which is one of the most significant features of early Buddhist 'history', or at least of some of its interpreters. His real designation takes place at the supposed first council at Rājagaha, and it is interesting to note that one of the accusations made against him on that occasion was that he allowed women to see the Buddha's unclothed body.17 As Psychaki has observed, there may be preserved here a reference to women attending upon the corpse of Śākyamuni immediately after his death, possibly wishing it as would have been the normal course of events; whereas such a suggestion was later removed from the accounts of the last rites as something unseemly, it may have been well enough remembered to be included in the later concocted charges against Ananda.18

The comparative antiquity of the pair of verses spoken by him in the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions, is indicated not only by such a verse as Brahma-world, used as equivalent for the more negative term nirvana, but also by the specific reference to religious gurus (decrees), whereas the previous prose account refers only to muslin and to the 500 pairs of garments. If one assumes that Śākyamuni was cremated if indeed he was ever cremated, in simple religious gurus, one must clearly treat the number 500, which occurs in Ananda's verses, as a round figure in the text in order to bring it more into line with the previous prose account. Once, however, one embarks upon this


kind of speculation, it becomes difficult to set any limit, and the whole story begins to disintegrate.

Sākyamuni's death at Kapilavastu may well be historical fact. Old and ancient, he was possibly travelling from Rajagaha, which had been probably the center of his years of wandering and teaching, on a last visit to Kapilavastu to see what remained of his homeland. The route lay through Pataliputra (Pataliputra), Vaisali, Kapilavastu, and Pāvā. Taking extremely ill as he traveled, he could go no further than Kapilavastu, and he died in a grove just outside this modest village, attended by Ananda and Aniruddha, whose verses of lament must represent the earliest account of his death that is ever likely to be traced. The gods Indra and Brahāvā would have been associated very early on with this last scene, and their lament was joined with that of the two disciples. The inclusion of verses by some 'other monk,' suggests already a certain vagueness about who was present, and is in marked contrast with the precision, however faint, of names, attributes, and so on of all the other vision ranging in importance from Mahākāyana downwards, when later traditions felt bound to associate with these last scenes. It is possible that Sākyamuni died attended by a very few followers in a remote place, where he was little if at all well known. The memory of the actual place of his death may have represented a firm and so inviolable tradition, but later devotional aspirations found the death of their lord and teacher in such a remote place insufficiently edifying. The words are put into Ānanda's mouth. 'O holy one, why have you avoided the six great towns of Śravasti, Saketa, Ceyā, Vārānasī, Vaisali and Rajagaha, which are distinguished in the world, and resolved to pass from sorrow by this wretched village, so remote and so vile, the appendage of a village, the mere remnant of a village?'

In reply Sākyamuni is made to explain that this place was once one of the greatest cities of the world, and so eminently suitable for the 'passing from sorrow' of a Buddha. This insertion may suggest a firm historical tradition, for countless story-tellers would have preferred, if they could have dared, to transfer the death scene to a more glorious place, but perhaps it was known that he had indeed died at Kapilavastu which was a wretched little place.

Apart from these for reasonable assumptions, one is free to make up the rest of the story in accordance with one's own deductions. It is likely that the villages visited the corpse of this renowned holy man, wailing in accordance with conventional mourning rites. It is not impossible that the womenfolk—
washed the body, for this would have been normal practice, and wrap it in a piece of hempen cloth, as was for shrines in those times. The corpse was probably burned and perhaps the remains were somewhere entombed. Because of the persistent reference to the coffin filled with oil, in which the corpse was said to be immersed, and references to a shrine containing the Buddha's relics, which was said to be looked after by water spirits (uṣṇīṣa), mentioned in many later legends, Przyluski has evolved the ingenious theory that Śākyamuni's body was preserved in oil so that it could be transported to the banks of a river, probably the Ganges, and either cast in the stream, or interred on the bank. 1 This certainly one way in which one might have disposed of a revered ascetic. If the bones were indeed entombed in any particular place, especially in the vicinity of Kapilavastu, it is strange that tradition preserved no memory of a single original stūpa (tomb) for Akoka's benefit. The land of the Śākyas had long since been held waste, but tradition was able to identify for him the birthplace at Lumbini.

This brief analysis should be sufficient to indicate how unsatisfactory a proceeding it is to produce a plausible biography from these materials by simply accepting the parts which seem humanly possible and rejecting the miraculous elements as obvious fabrications. In fact most of the materials which make up the stories, whether miraculous or not, are later accretions, and thus very little indeed can be established with historical certainty. The earliest account was probably very brief, consisting of the verses of lament and already introducing Indra and Brahma. A factual account of Śākyamuni's passing probably never existed as traditional oral material burned and recited, but verses of lament might well have been intoned, and it would have been around such a kind of ritual core that stories were woven to satisfy later tendentious requirements. They need not be regarded as pure invention, for many of the concerns now appearing in the accounts of Śākyamuni, such as those about earthquakes or the eight kinds of ghostly assemblies, could well have existed as a kind of floating material. On the other hand Mahākāśyapa's intrusion with his 900 monics was presumably a deliberate fabrication of those later who could not allow that the supposed organiser of the sacred canon, assuming there was such an early canon, was not also present at the funeral ceremony in a primary position of importance.

The cult of the stūpa

Despite Śākyamuni's supposed instructions that a stūpa should be built over his remains at a cross-roads, the canonical accounts insist that his relics were shared at the very start between eight contestants: the Nāgas of Kujina, who were under attack by the other seven, the Khallas of Pāśi, the Bulukars of Cankalpa (or Alakappa), the Kinansans of Vīṇukāsa. 11

(Vehalipa), the Kruvijas (Kalijna) of Zanegikana, the Lochenas of Vuiati, and the Sakyas of Kapilavastu. Then the Malas of Kusamapura gave the vase which had contained the relics to the Malusaggafla Brahman who had divided them, and he took back to his own named Deora and built the tenth stupa.

"Then a Brahman youth from Piyilavasana said to the Malas of Kusamapura:

"Listen, 0 noble ones. For a long time the Lord Gautama was bewildered and dear to us. He has gained nirvana in your village, but we deserve a share in the relics. So give us now the burning ashes as our share, and we will build a stupa for the ashes of the Lord Gautama in Piyilavasana."

"He was given the ashes and a tenth stupa was built."

This is a serious story, and the little-known places included in this list of 10 stupas give it a semblance of veracity, but the most one can safely deduce from it is that in pre-Ashoka times there were in existence 10 special Buddhist tumuli, situated in the area between Rajagrha and Kapilavastu, where Sakyamuni had lived, taught, and died. Today, sometimes in the shape of semi-spherical mounds, may have been common in pre-Buddhist India, as in many other parts of the world at that time, and tombs of the great would have presumably enjoyed a special distinction in the richness of the offerings to the dead that might be periodically placed by them. This may be conjecture, but what is absolutely certain as far as the earliest pre-Ashoka testimony is concerned, is that these early Buddhist tumuli, usually known as stupas, were believed to contain relics of past Buddhas, and especially of the latest Buddha, Sakyamuni. Historically it would seem to be completamente that according to the earliest traceable Buddhist traditions, Sakyamuni's physical remains, through the extraordinary story of the converting communities, diffused into a cult of relics maintained in those special tumuli.

There is no reference in the earliest known traditions to such philosophically-minded disciples simply honouring the tomb of a revered religious master, who has left the world for ever. There is certainly reference to all the complex last rites as the proper responsibility of the laity rather than the monks, but we know from the evidence of inscriptions and scriptures that even in the earliest period the cult of the relic-containing stupa was by no means left to the laity, and that the accoutrements of the extraordinary cult were recorded, revisited, and equally written down by monks. There is no over-all account of Sakyamuni's final moments which is not heavy with psychological significance. Apart from the cult, which defined him effectively as a Buddha, like the Buddhas of former times, Sakyamuni would probably remain quite unknown to us. It was precisely because of the faith that he was installed, that subsequent events were made to reconstruct important parts of his life. But these attempts were made before the actual events were forgotten or were so interpreted in accordance with mythical beliefs as to submerge almost entirely the historical person.

*Vajjieshita, op. cit., 444–45; i. 7, xx, p. 244, 53 8.
**For discussion of these points see Louis de la Villie, Aramb, Nalanda, Paris, 1934, 74.
It is true that his subsequent followers included a number, certainly a minority, of philosophizing contemplatives, who were suspicious of excessive religious enthusiasm, but it is significant that they have preserved no tradition of a plausible historical figure. Their Buddha remains still the great miracle-working and omniscient sage. They may argue that since he has passed into final nirvana, he can no longer give help to his followers in the realm of samsara, and many of the more rational philosophical sayings that they attribute to him, may well represent a reliable tradition of some of his actual teachings. But of the events of his life they record nothing which does not correspond with the presumably earlier mythological and legendary conceptions.

This may seem to be much ado about very little, but the recognition of the primary of mythology and legend over factual storytelling in the canonical presentation of Sakyamuni affects radically any history that we may produce of the Buddhist religion. Having produced a kind of Socratic sage by ignoring the earlier mythological elements, and taking carefully from the legendary elements those references that do not offend rational thought, one assumes that one has discovered an historical figure, who was the founder of a small rationally and philosophically minded community, and that this movement represents an 'original Buddhism'. One then goes on to assume that this originally pure doctrine was distorted by later mythical and popular beliefs. There were certainly pure philosophical doctrines propounded during the early history of Buddhism, just as there have been ever since, but there is no such thing as pure Buddhism per se except perhaps the cult of Sakyamuni as a supermundane being and the cult of the relic strips. These ideas are not new. They were propounded long ago by Louis de La Vallée Poussin, probably the most keen-sighted of Western scholars of Buddhism. In his *Nirvana*, Paris, 1926, he writes: 'Il est utile de distinguer dans le Bouddhisme, comme dans d'autres religions, la foi et les systèmes, celle-ci essentielle et stable, ceux-ci secondaires et variables. L'indianisme official ignore la loi bouddhique au profit d'un des systèmes que la communauté a patronne, et fait sortir le Bouddhisme de ses systèmes' (p. 36).

With direct reference to the main thesis of this article, one might also quote from *The Buddhist religion* of Richard J. Russell, who died tragically in 1972: 'The quest for the objective Gautama, like that of the historical Jesus, is foredoomed to a measure of failure. We cannot get behind the portrait that the early communities synthesized for their leaders; their reports are all we have. But though the Community (Sangha) created the image of the Buddha, the Buddha created the Community and in so doing impressed upon it his personality. The master exulted his disciples to imitate him, and they formulated and transmitted an image of him, along with his teachings, as a model for later generations to imitate' (Richmond, Terre, California, 1970, 13).

It is not for us to distort this total image, in order to fit it into an invented historical framework, suitable perhaps to other times and other places, but entirely remote from the religious life of India in the fifth century B.C.
LATEST PUBLICATIONS OF SRIT

1. KADAM BUDDHI VOLUME KA (PART II): It deals with twenty previous birth stories (Jalabok) of 'Gro-bdan-gyes-pa 'byung-gnas named by Anuś Dipankara (Bhūja) as the Bhuddhi-thang-gyi-tho. The original xylographs reproduced by photo-technic process with introduction in English. Price Rs. 200/-

2. KADAM BUDDHI VOLUME KHA (PART II): This volume contains the instructions, prophecy, short previous life stories of 'Gro-bdan-gyes-pa 'byung-gnas, hymns and a supplementary chapter by Lhuden and chief disciples. Reproduction by photo-technic process with introduction in English. Price Rs. 150/-


4. SAKHYA KABUM CATALOGUE (SAKHYAPA CATALOGUE SERIES VOLS. (I)) This is the first comprehensive catalogue of Sakya Kabum (collected works of five founder lamas of Sakya Order); Tibetan title and its remanition with subject index and introduction in English. This publication is expected to be immensely useful and serve the purpose of the librarians and individual scholar for carrying their research in the field. (1993)

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS OF SRIT

1. GONG SA LNGA PA CHEN POT GSUNG BUM: The collected works of Vih Dalai Lama vol. Khun (II), Ga (III) and Nga (IV)

2. DAMS NGAG MIROD CATALOGUE (KASHYAPA CATALOGUE SERIES VOLS. I): It is the first comprehensive catalogue of gDams ngag rinpoche (collected works of Kongtrul Yonten Gyatso); Tibetan title and its remanition with subject index and introduction in English.

The publication programme of Catalogue Series of all the Buddhist works preserved in the SRIT will be a landmark contribution in the field of documentation and library science. The Institute intends to bring out more issues in the coming years.
BUDDHARUPA
Observations on the evolution of Buddha image

- Nirmal C. Sinha

I

In the first two decades of this century, Western scholars like Alwin Foucher and John Marshall had concluded that image or icon was not a characteristic feature of Indian religions till the advent of the Greeks, Iranians, and others from Western Asia. This conclusion about the origins of image and image worship under foreign influence was supported by the progressives and reformist Hindus - mostly belonging to Arya Samaj, Brahmo Samaj or Prarthana Samaj - who held that idolatry was un-Vedic and un-Brahmanical and that image or image worship was a later Pashnic feature. Theravada Buddhism spread all over South Asia and flourishing in Eastern India also accepted the concept of image being a foreign import in Indian soil. Theravadin pointed to Sastama Buddha's objection to any attachment or adoration of Rupakaya (Buddha's physical form).

Conservative and orthodox Hindus, who held that Pratima (likeness = image) was an indigenous and original idea of Brahmanical religion, very strongly reacted to the findings of Western scholars and their Indian supporters. The Hindus had their stoutest champions in Kashinath Jayaswal and Ananda Coomarasawamy, who contended that Rupa (form) was not unknown to the imagery of early Vedic priests and sages, and that in later Vedic period instances of making or worshiping images are clear and frequent. Besides they contended that archaeological evidence of Indian images before the advent of the Greeks and other foreigners was not forthcoming for the simple reason that both savages of time and iconoclasts of some invaders from the West account for such phenomenon. In 1924 a Welsh scholar, Victor Goloubew challenged the findings of Foucher and Marshall and pointed out that generations before the Gandhara image was designed in North Western India by Greek devotees, image of typical Indian style was made in Mathura. Almost the same time the excavated objects, including images and icons, from the Indus Valley were being noted and displayed for scientific investigation. The study of Mohenge Duro and Harappa remains was somewhat completed by 1930, and an Indian scholar, B.P.
Chanda, found the earliest representative of Siva Pasupati and Yogi in Indus Valley culture. Chanda’s finding was accepted by Western scholars and was ably utilized by brilliant men like Kashirajad Jayawal. Jayawal and other Indian scholars, including progressive or reformist Hindus, referred to the Tibetan tradition that there were exquisite and grand images in the Indo-Gangetic plains even before the Mauryas went ruling. The evidence of Lama Taranand was quite handy.

An altogether new dimension was added to the question of Buddha image when the Soviet archaeologists made extensive excavations in Russian Turkistan shortly after Second World War was over. The Turkistan busts contained a good number of Buddha and Bodhisattva images. The study of these images from Turkistan, made in 1960-70, is still on.

II

Modern scientific study of the Vedic religion was undertaken towards the end of 19th century but still now no categorical answer about the prevalence or absence of idolatry in Vedic religion is found. Max Muller and Macdowell, to mention only two Western scholars, were of opinion that ‘the religion of the Vedas knows no idol’ or that ‘the religion of Vedas was not idolatry’. Indian scholars, except those who subscribed to the philosophy of Vedanta and Samkhya, straightaway rejected the findings of such Western authorities. Reference to the many deities featuring in the Vedic pantheon was emphasized by the Indian scholars who also contended that the Rupa (form) of such Vedic deities was not unknown and last in the later Vedic period images of some of the Vedic deities were well under way. Whether these images grew out of Rig Vedic imagery or were borrowed from the pre-Aryan inhabitants is the moot question; there could be no question about prevalence of images or icons in later Vedic period.

The scholars or either side, it appears lost sight of the great fact that many deities, many rituals or many ways of worship were accommodated in the Vedic religion. The Vedic seers made a most profound statement: EKAM SAT: VIPRA BAHUDHA VADANTI “That which Is is one. Wise men speak of it in many ways” (Eng. tr. Santit Kumar Chatterji).

We have in this pithy utterance the truth that the Absolute or Transcendental may be realized in diverse ways. In such climate of co-existence ‘a deity with form’ (Sakara) and ‘a deity without form’ (Nirakara) could be worshipped in same hermitage or same household; men of different intellectual or moral denominations would aspire for spiritual bliss in their respective ways.

The Upanishads, aptly called the Vedanta, discuss the form of God in highly critical manner. Renu Upanishad makes clear that the Brahman cannot be comprehended with our sense organs. About vision of God, it says ‘that which one sees not with the eye, that by which one sees the eye’s seeing, know that indeed to be the Brahman, not this which men follow after here’ (Eng. tr. Sn Aurobindo). Svetasvatara Upanishad states that the Great One has no likeness or form and lays down ‘His form is not to be seen; no one sees him with the eye. Those who through heart and mind know him as abiding in the heart become immortal’. (Eng. tr. Radhakrishnan)
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Rupa or form of God is expanded in Bhagavadgīti by Krishna in answer to Arjuna’s query. Arjuna wanted to know in which form or object God should be meditated. In answer Krishna first enumerated all phenomenal objects, all fauna, all flora, and so on and so forth. Krishna then gave Arjuna a supernatural eye to behold the mystic power of God. Arjuna had then the vision to look up in the universe, the process of its creation and the process of destruction of the universe. In short, Arjuna beheld that God was identical with form. Such Cosmic Vision would lead to meditation of worship of God in multiple forms, diverse forms, even contrary forms as Akasa and Nirmakara or Rupa and Anirupa.

In a later supplement to Bhagavadgīti it was thus proclaimed: ‘Agni (fire) is the object of worship for the Brahmin. Devas (divinity) is worshipped in the heart of the Minj, Pritima (image) is adored by the men of low intellect, while one whose sight is not limited notices God everywhere’ (Uttarāṇi). The spirit of co-existence between diverse forms and modes of spiritual striving eventually flowered into the great Puranic pantheon. Meanwhile Gauḍa Buddhists’ religion developed into what came to be called Mahāyāna. Mahāyāna had 2 grand pontiffs and the trika-Vaishnavite priests witnessed a period of co-existence between Puranic Hindūism and Mahāyāna Buddhism. Exchanges of denials and rituals between the two religions developed the iconography of both.

The deity which had the same leading role in both Hindūism and Mahāyāna was Tara (Dhūma). It is not yet established which religion had worshipped Tara first and which religion borrowed it from the other. There is controversy even about the provenance of the Goddess. Most scholars hold that Tara originated somewhere in Inner Asia. While some scholars locate Tara’s birthplace in the Parthian region, others point to Mahākāshī on southern shores of Mongolia.

The Thera-Vāda tradition of Gauḍa Buddhists’ love for Buddha and Dharma is well-known among scholars both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. Mahāyāna (i.e., Northern Buddhist) tradition that Raṃānūṭa Kīrti-ūdaya, a devotee of Gauḍa Buddhists, had the Buddha image made during his lifetime is treated as a new legend by the modern scholars; many modern scholars would argue professed ignorance of the First Image legend. With very few exceptions of Mahāyāna scholars and monks in the Himalayan and Trans-Himalayan monasteries I cannot reject the Udayana legend of Dharma-vāja. According to Tibetan tradition, the first images, a few indeed, made in some sacred wood, were not meant for exhibition; Guatama Buddha’s Rūkapāla was not intended for public gaze. Generations later, according to the tradition, images were made in stone or clay and this was definitely before the Hellenistic devotees made images conforming to their own aesthetics.

The Guatama Image raised a fundamental issue about Buddhism and Dharma. In discussing the origins of Buddha image it is hardly noticed that Gauḍa Buddhists was the first prophet who spoke on spiritual matters for all mankind. In India the Vedic Wisdom and outside India Zarautz, Moses, and Confucius preached for their own group: racial or tribal. In short the prophets before Gauḍa Buddhists were followers of caste-centric religions. Buddha spoke for all men and had no rules for eligibility on grounds of birth, caste and race. Five centuries after Gauḍa Buddhists, Jesus
Gautama Buddha himself noticed a tendency among his disciples to adore the Master’s Body. He very much deplored this tendency and disapproved any cult of image or icon for his followers.

An old disciple Vakkali, while on deathbed, was very eager to see Buddha in person. Buddha came to him and said “O Vakkali, why you crave to have a look at this body of my imitate master, Vakkali, one who perceives Dharma perceives me, one who perceives me, perceives Dharma” (Sattvayuta Nikaya). Buddha said that his Teaching was important and not his body. On different occasions through dialogues and sermons Buddha spoke against adoration of his Rupakaya i.e. Buddha Rupa. Disciples and devotees would not do the Master while present on earth. King Udayana of Kausambi had however got the master’s image made in sacred wood. This image was very sacred and not for public exhibition or wide circulation. However the tendency to adore BuddhaRupa continued and even the stupas containing the Buddha relics would have often events of the Master’s life depicted on the walls around. The relics and friezes executed by Maurya and Sunga artists on the stupas preserve the first exposition of BuddhaRupa. By the first century of Christian era Rupakaya was popular with the common people, that is, believers of lower intellect. Buddha images in stone and clay were quite prevalent in the first century A.D.

The portrayal of the Master’s Body was however after the Indian tradition which stood for an idealistic form. The Master’s Body, to quote Buddhaghosha (5th century A.D.), was adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty two major signs of a great man. Therefore a Rupakaya adorned with eighty minor and thirty two major signs could not inspire a grossly realistic form. Mathura, Abhayagiri and Saranath produced different types of BuddhaRupa but none of those types was realistic. Gandhara and under the influence of Hellenistic aesthetics produced what may be labeled as “most realistic”; Gandhara style could not spread all over Jambudvīpa.

This does not mean that Buddhist artists and devotees were hostile to all foreign aesthetics. The image of Gautama Buddha as shaped in Indian ethos was a sublime synthesis of realism and idealism, a perfect mixture of fact and fancy. In his process there
was to be no compromise with gross realism as found in so many Cāndhi images. Mahayana with its pantheon of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas was free to adopt or incorporate ideas and forms of other peoples who took refuge in Buddhism. Vast and varied contents of Mahayana could be depicted to the satisfaction of both Indian and foreign imagery.

Theravāda (Hinayana) permits only one image, the image of Gautama Sakyamuni, the Historical Buddha. Mahayana pantheon contains the Historical Buddha, other mortal or mundane Buddhas, celestial Buddhas and Bodhisattvas and the Primordial Buddha manifested in five forms. The number in Mahayana pantheon is conventionally counted at thousand. This large number, thousand or more, is grouped in three tiers: the top tier is composed of the Five (Pāryāvartins), the middle tier consists of emanations or reflexes from the Five, and the bottom tier composed of Historical Buddha and his predecessors and successors. For the believer the tiers are Three Bodies: Dharma-kāya or the Cosmic Body, Saṃbhogakāya or the Body of Bliss, and the Sāmaneraka or the Mundane Body.

Mahayana accommodating many peoples, many regions, and many languages could thus adopt ideas and forms of so many different cultures. Even the most important members of the Mahayana pantheon may have been in foreign lands and under foreign aesthetic. Thus Amitābha, one of the five Dharma-khayas, is considered by some scholars to have originated in Iranian climate. Vajrasattva, the most prominent Saṃbhogakāya, is claimed by many scholars to have originated in borderlands of Manchuria and Mongolia. Avalokiteśvara, the lord of the pantheon, is also thought of having some non-Indian elements.

The recent discoveries in Russian Turkestan suggest connections of Mahayana with many cultures besides the Scythian Greek.

Researches by Russian scholars like LITVINSHU, MASSON and BONGARDO-LEVIN have thrown much light on many obscure points but the history of Buddhas is yet to be completed.

---

This article presents a gist of the first part of the book, "Buddha Image in Mahayana Tradition," illustrated for publication in winter 1991. Details of references and the original Sanskrit, Pali and Tibetan texts will be found in the scheduled publication.
OUR THREE MAJOR ART PUBLICATIONS

1 RGYAN DRUG MCHOG GNYS (Six ornaments and Two Excellence) reproduces ancient scrolls (1670 A.C.) depicting Buddha, Nagarjuna, Aryadeva, Asanga, Vasubandhu, Dignaga, Dharmakirti, Gunaprabha and Sakyaprabha. Reproductions are as per originals today after 300 years of display and worship with an attempt at restoration or retouching. The expositions in English presents the iconographical niceties and the theme of the paintings, namely, the Mahayana philosophy; the treatment is designed to meet the general reader with an interest in the Trans-Himalayan art or Mahayana. A glossary in Sanskrit-Tibetan a key to place names and a few on source material are appended. Illustrated with five colour plates and thirteen monochromes. (English text) Folio 54 Second Reprint. 1980 and priced at Rs. 150/-

2 SANGS-RGYAS STONG: Submitted An Introduction to Mahayana Iconography. This book of 75 pages (11 and half inches x 8 inches) contains 4 colour plates and more than 80 line drawings (sketches); back paper back with Jacket depicting 31 Buddhas. Intended for the lay readers, this introductory account is based on original sources in Pali, Sanskrit and Tibetan. The basic concept of thousand Buddhas is explain at length, while all important symbols and images in their variant forms are presented from believers' point of view. Artistic or academician will find the book worthy of perusal. (English text) Folio 75 pub. 1988 and priced at Rs. 150/.

3 TALESTHENKAS TELL: Submitted An Introduction to Tibetan Scroll Portraits. The book has64 pages (11 & half inches x 8 inches) and contains well produced eleven colour plates, with Jacket depicting Buddha Sakyasuni and has two disciples. The book tells much about Mahayana Pantheon and particularly about the legends and myths around Buddhism as depicted through numerous Scroll Portrait forms. These colourful portraits speak about the contacts with the traditions of Tibet, China, India, Iran and Byzantium. Pub. 1989 and priced at Rs. 200/-
HĪNAVĀNA AND MAHĀVĀNA

A BROAD OUTLINE

- Anukul Chandra Banerjee

About a century after Buddha's Mahāparinirvāṇa, dissension arose among the monks regarding his actual words and their interpretation. This controversy led to the origin and growth of more than eighteen schools of thought, all claiming to have preserved Buddha's teachings. They took up the cause of Buddhism with great zeal and endeavoured hard to popularize it in the terro r is in and outside India. EConsé observes, "The first five centuries of Buddhist history saw the development of a number of schools, or sects, which are traditionally counted as eighteen. The historical traditions about them are uncertain, contradictory and confused." AndrÉ Bareaux, however, discussed chronologically the origin of these different schools. Lamotte has also dealt with the geographical distribution of the different schools on the basis of the inscriptions.

The first dissension was created by the monks of Vaissali through their breach of the rules of discipline as laid down in the Vinayapitaka. The Cullavagga and the Ceylonese chronicles record that the Second Buddhist Council was held at Vaissali just a century after the passing away of Buddha to examine the validity of the ten practices (dana vatthu) indulged in by the Vaissali monks. The works of Vasumitra, Bhalya and Viniyadva, extant in Tibetan and Chinese translations provide us with a quite different account. According to them the Council is said to have been convened, because of the difference of opinion among the monks in regard to the five dogmas propounded by Mahaddeva a man of great learning and wisdom.

Traditions differ in regard to the cause of convening of the Second Council. But all the accounts record unanimously that a schism occurred about a century after the Mahāparinirvāṇa of Buddha, due to the efforts of a few monks for a relaxation of the vigour of conduct current at the time; the orthodox monks were not ready to allow that. The orthodox points of view prevailed and the monks opposed to them were expelled from the Sangha. They were not, however, disappointed. They gained strength gradually and convened shortly another Council in which ten thousand monks participated. In the history of Buddhism it is known as Mahaddegi (Great Council). The monks who joined the Council later on were called the Mahasanghikas, while the orthodox monks were distinguished as the Theravādins. Thus occurred the first schism which divided the early-Buddhist Sangha into
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two primitive schools - the Theravāda and the Mahāyāna. Undoubtedly this Council marked the evolution of new schools in Indian Buddhism.

It would be quite pertinent in this context to point out that this schism was followed by a series of schisms, and in course of time several sub-sects branched off from these two sects. The Theravāda was split up into ten sub-sects and the Mahāyāna into seven. These appeared one after another in close succession within three or four hundred years after the Buddha's Mahaparinirvāna. But these different sects could not maintain their individual existences for long. Most of them either disappeared or merged with other sects shortly after their origin; only four schools survived. The four schools that could outline and extend their own field of influence were the Viśuddhist, Sautrāntika, Mādhyamika and Yogācāra. In course of time these four schools, however, coalesced together gradually and four philosophical views were formulated into two schools - Pāli Āgama and Mahāyāna-Buddhism today has these two main sects well-known as the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. The former prevails in Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Burma (Myanmar), Thailand (Siam), Cambodia and other countries; the latter in Tibet, Nepal, China, Japan and others. The epistle of the Hinayāna has been given to the Theravāda Buddhism by the Mahāyāna sects. The Theravāda never call themselves Hinayānaists. Asanga's Sūtraśāstrā mentions the points of difference between the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna and indicates that it attempts to show the inferiority of the Hinayānaist in mental culture and their work tend to comprehend the truth.

The Pāli canon (Tetra Kulā) forms the basis of the Hinayāna while Mahāyāna has such three-fold division of the canon. Of the numerous Mahāyāna works, nine books 'so-called Nine Dhammas', which are held in great reverence are the most important works of the Mahāyāna sect, as they trace the origin and development of Mahāyāna as also point out its fundamental teachings.

The ideal of Mahāyāna is Buddhahood while that of Hinayāna is Arhatship. The Hinayānists want their own Nibbāna first as they do not care for others, while the Mahāyānists do not care for their own Nibbāna - they strive hard for the emancipation of all beings. Their principal objective is to make beings attain Nibbāna in life. Mahāyāna has further inculcated the concept of Bodhisattva which is its other ethical ideal. Bodhisattva means a being who is on the way to Buddhahood (enlightenment) but has not yet obtained it. In order to remove the sufferings of the world a Bodhisattva desires that he should stay as long as the sky and the world exist. He further declares that let him alone experience all the worldly miseries and, let all the beings of the world enjoy happiness owing to the meritorious deeds done by him as a Bodhisattva.

With the development of Pravaccita (thought of enlightenment) the practice of the six paramitas, the fulfillment of which is the panacea for the Bodhisattva is enjoined upon him. As the Bodhisattva practices the paramitas, his mind rises higher in path of spiritual progress and ultimately becomes a Buddha. The Hinayāna also recognizes stages for the attainment of true knowledge. But the two schools differ in their conception of the highest truth. According to the Hinayāna it is pannaţa (non-existence of soul) while according to the Mahāyāna it is both pannaţa and dharmaññahaţa (non-existence of soul as also of all things of the world).

Another distinguishing feature of Mahāyāna is its conception of trikāya. Each Buddha has three bodies: (i) Paramaţaya, (ii) Samabhogasţaya and (iii) Dharmakāya. Nirmāṇakāya is the human body of the Buddha. Santabhogasţaya is the subtle body of the Buddha.
Buddha, Dharma, and spirituality are interrelated in the context of Buddhist teachings. The body and mind are seen as interconnected, and the practice of dharma helps in achieving spiritual liberation.

According to the Hinayana, the world is in a state of flux but is not unordered. The Mahayana maintains the flux and reality are two contradictory terms and therefore the world is the creation of the mind. In the Mahayana, Bhava and Samyak Dharma have like wise pointedly shown the advocates of Mahayana to labour under misconceptions, complete eradication of which is the main object of those of the Mahayana.

Mahayana further lays emphasis on the practice of the four Brahmavihara, viz, maitri (friendliness), Karuna (compassion), mudita (sympathetic joy) and upakeśa (equanimity). Through their practice one attains purity of heart, and it is these Brahmavihara which made Buddhism also very popular.

Lastly, Mahayana is metaphysical and speculative while in Hinayana there is no such ground for speculation. Both the sects, however, agree in the fundamentals of Buddhism, viz, the Four Noble Truths, the Noble Eightfold Path, the non-existence of the soul, the gradual stages of the spiritual advancement and the doctrine of Karma. The two are closely related to each other, hence the study of one entails the study of the other.
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4. "They are":
   (i) Sanghatikappa - the practice of carrying rice in a horn, i.e. carrying articles of food.
   (ii) Mangalikappa - the practice of taking meals when the shadow is two fingers broad, i.e. taking meals after midday.
   (iii) Cemantikappiya - the practice of going to an adjacent village and taking meals for the second time.
   (iv) A-satiyā - the observance of the Upavasā ceremonies in various places in the same period (class).
   (v) Anuṣṭhāna - doing deed and obtaining its fruition after wards.
   (vi) Aṇnimito - the customary practice as precedent.
   (vii) Aṇnimito - drinking of water after meals.
   (viii) Ācārayaṇita - doing of today.
   (ix) Ahammad - a ring without a fringe.
   (x) Anugraha - a rope of gold and silver.

5. (i) An Arahant may commit a sin under unconscious temptation.
   (ii) One may be an Arahant and not know it.
   (iii) An Arahant may have doubts on matters of doctrine.
   (iv) One cannot attain Arahantship without the aid of a teacher.
   (v) The noble ways may begin to a soul, that is, one meditating seriously on religion may make such an exclamation as "Here I stand!

6. Akkosa ṣūkṣma perfusō jātaka sūti/ Tavassamama cūkṣaṣeṣeṣa jāgata kusānhita nighātaka/ Yaṭkicat jāgata dikkham iñ cātana mayi poṣyaṇa/ Bodhisattvaṁ cātana jāgata sūkṣhitam aṣa.///
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Snang-gyi-bla Vaisûrya
od-kyi-rgyal-po
(starajya-mtru-vaisûrya-Prabharaja)
VAIDURYA

- Marianne Winder

The Tibetan Medicine Buddha

The Colour of the gem vaidurya plays a great role in Tibetan medicine. The Medicine Buddha is called be-du-rgya sngon-rgyal-po, or 'King of the Vaidurya Light'. In the Saḍḍharmapundarīka of about AD 200 he is only called 'King of Healing'. But in a Chinese medical text of AD 580 to 606, the Sūtra on the Merits of the Fundamental Vows of the Master of Healing in Hisan Tsang's Tropiṣṭaka version, he is called the 'Vaidurya Radiance Tathāgata'. The Chinese word is lu-lī. In Tibetan vaj-dū-rgya or be-du-rgya and other various forms remain untranslated loan words. According to Jäschke's Tibetan-English Dictionary, be-du-rgya means 'azure stone, lapis lazuli'. It quotes Dharmapu (i.e., hdu-ran-bhūn), a collection of legends, in which are mentioned the Vaidurya dkar-po 'White Vaidurya' and Vaidurya sgon-po 'Blue Vaidurya', which are titles of works on astronomy-astrology and on medicine, respectively. The Tibetan-English Dictionary of Chandra Das 1986.

3 Short title of phag-ba rgya-ri bsam-byin mchod-rje's bsnu-bhaa dkar-po's dkar-chos chen-dug bzhad-pa'i rdzod-lab, ston-rje.
5 Rui Sashi Chandra Das. A Tibetan-English dictionary (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1923), 877.
... the yellow lapis-lazuli called मात्जुरि [sic], the green lapis-lazuli called सुपता, the white lapis-lazuli called सिंधु [sic].

मात्जुरि is probably an allusion to the yellow मात्जुरि, सुपता ‘having fared well’ is easily associated with green, the colour of growth, and the colour white with सिंधु ‘empty’. However, there is no such thing as a white, green or yellow lapis lazuli. The colour blue is not mentioned by Chandra Das. The works called ‘White Sāidurpa’ and ‘Blue Sāidurpa’ to which can be added a book called ‘Yellow Sāidurpa’ on history do not seem to mean ‘lapis lazuli’. Even the title ‘Blue Lapis Lazmi’ would not make sense because of the tautology, as lapis lazuli can have no other colour. Jacques André and Jean Filliozat compare the meanings of वादुर्प in nineteenth century dictionaries and come to the conclusion that the early nineteenth century ones favoured the meanings ‘lapis lazuli’, and that those near the end of the nineteenth century preferred ‘cat’s eye’.7

Beryl, cat’s eye or lapis lazuli?

What, then, does वादुर्प mean? Etymologically it is related to Pāli veḷūrāpa and Prākrit veḷūra, veḷūra, veḷūra and veḷūla.8 Prākrit veḷūla became Greek βελολλον which came English beryl.9 While Greek βελολλον and, from there, English beryl were derived from Prākrit veḷūla, the Persian and Arabic words ƅ ihtur and Ƅ ihtur meaning ‘crystal or beryl’ were also borrowed from India, but according to Alfred Master, they are not derived from Sanskrit वादुर्प or Pāli veḷūrāpa.10 He does not sug-

---

7 For example Horace Hayman Wilson, Dictionary, Sanskrit and English (Calcutta: Education Press, 1819.
9 Richard Fischel, Comparative grammar of the Prākrit languages, translated from the German by Subhadra Jhu, 2nd edition, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1965), 173. § 2-1 given various Prākrit forms.
10 J. Halévy, ‘Mélanges etymologiques’, Mémoires de la Société Linguistique, xi (1900), 82., thinks that the Prākrit form veḷūra is a corruption from Greek βελολλον, diminutive of βελολλον ‘beryl’ and that this word of Greek origin was imported into India during the campaigns of Alexander the Great or later. This view does not hold water because the word वादुर्प is found in Sanskrit sources of as early as the Atharva Brāhmaṇa of 650 BC.
gest a Prakrit form from which they could be derived. 'Crystal' can be a
generalised term for 'beryl' because the beryl occurs in crystalline form.

The meaning of the Sanskrit word vaidūrya is also 'beryl' according to
Mayholer.\textsuperscript{11} To corroborate his opinion he quotes A. Master who gives
a chronology of the occurrence of vaidūrya and its Prakrit and Pali forms
and asserts that the evidence for the meaning 'beryl' is conclusive for all
of them.\textsuperscript{12} But he mentions\textsuperscript{13} that Mallinātha\textsuperscript{14} of the fifteenth century
identifies vaidūrya with lapis lazuli, and that Apte followed his example.\textsuperscript{15}
He also mentions that Sten Konow\textsuperscript{16} and A. C. Wooder\textsuperscript{17} translate Prakrit
refūrtā as 'cat's eye', and Dines Andersen does the same with Pali
refūrtā.\textsuperscript{18} The passage in which Mallinātha explains vaidūrya as lapis lazuli
connects it at the same time with the meaning of 'cat's eye' as follows:\textsuperscript{19}

The women are afraid of the rays of the moon coming through the
window, which are reflected on the vaidūrya walls and therefore
\textit{vidālākṣayabhiṣeṣṭatrīkalyāṇaḥ}

which Buddhars explains as 'frighten like cat's eyes' and Master translates
as 'make terrible cat's eyes'. Thakura Phura translates vaidūrya in this
context as 'chrysoberyl' or 'cat's eye' saying that Māgha's use clearly in-
dicates the chatoyancy of vaidūrya.\textsuperscript{20} Perhaps the difference in the dates
is significant: Māgha wrote his work during the seventh century AD and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11}Mayholer, "Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Abhidhamma. A
\textit{conceit etymological Sanskrit dictionary} (Heidelberg: Winter, 1980), iv, 267.
\item \textsuperscript{12}Ibid., 304.
\item \textsuperscript{13}Kalechala Mallishta, \textit{Commentary on Māgha's Śūraṃagnaṭha}, iii, 65. (Bomba:
Naya Sagar Press, 1923).
\item \textsuperscript{14}Vaman Shrivats Apte, \textit{Sanskrit English dictionary}, revised edition, (Bombay: Gopal
\item \textsuperscript{15}Baladevendra, \textit{Rāja cakravāla Karanavavijñāra}, edited by Sten Konow, with notes and translation by Charles
\item \textsuperscript{16}A. C. Wooder, \textit{Introduction to Prakrit}, 3rd edition, (Mumbai: Meenakshi Banarajan,
1939), § 58, pp. 24, 228.
\item \textsuperscript{17}Dines Andersen, Pāli Reader, 4th edition, (Copenhagen: Gjødendal, 1935).
\item \textsuperscript{18}Quoted from George Buddhars, 'Sam Lapa Lazuli in India', \textit{Studien zur Indologie
und Iranistik}, v/si (1940), 6.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Thakura Phura, \textit{Rajapormahākhātī, a Medieval Prakrit Text on Grammar}, trans-
\textit{Kumārīmāla}, i. 24 (fifth century AD) suggests the crystals of beryl. Phura's book
was not accessible to me, and I am indebted to this and other references to Dr Ation
Roga.
\end{itemize}
Mallinatha's commentary is of the fifteenth century. Louis Finot translates 
andīrīya as ‘cat’s eye’ because of the passage in Buddhakhātu’s Ratnopiśā, 200, 
which says that the andīrīya shows such a variety of brilliances 
that it gives the impression of flashing spurs. The passage in the Kerpīma-
marjāvari which Xonow interprets as ‘cat’s eye’ is taken by Lanman to mean 
‘beryl’. Böltlingk and Roth translate andīrīya as ‘beryl’ without explaining 
why.23

In the Pāli canon

Looking for veḷuriya in the Pāli Canon we find in Dipanikā, ii. 84:24

Just, O King, as if there were a veḷuriya gem, bright, of the purest 
water, with eight facets, excellently cut, clear, translucent ...

Now, a lapis lazuli is opaque, and the whole purpose of this passage is to 
show that a coloured thread going through a translucent gem can be clearly 
seen, comparing it to a purified mind recognising the truth easily. Lapis 
lazuli is a rock and does not form crystals. The beryl is six-sided but the 
writer of this passage and similar ones may have regarded the two ends as 
two more sides. Otto Frankl says in this passage that in other passages 
eight-sided columns are mentioned as veḷuriya and that the listeners’ 
ears may have got attuned to this so that the idea of eight facets are an 
asimilation to this habit of thinking.25 There is also the association of the 
Eightfold Path.

Vinesapītaka, ii. 12 has:26

You are not, O Bhikkhu, to use bowls made of gold, silver, set 
with jewels, or made of beryl, crystal, copper, glass, tin, lead, 
bronze.

22 Otto Böltlingk, and Rudolph Roth, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. (St. Petersburg: K. 
Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1855-75).
23 Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids, Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. ii, republic of 
24 Quellen der Religionsgeschichte. (Göttingen: Kg. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 
Press, 1885), 82. J. B. Horner also translated veḷuriya as ‘beryl’ in Cullenopus, 5th 
1952), 152.
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Max Müller's note 1:

It is clear from verses 192-196 of the 13th chapter of the Rājānīṣṭhaṇṭu written by Narahari in the 13th century (or according to B. Laufer, the 15th) that at that time cūḍārjya meant 'cat's eye'. But it is uncertain that that was the only meaning - at the time when this passage was composed.

I shall come back to the Rājānīṣṭhaṇṭu later.

Sanskrit text, i. 6.3 has: 27

Even as a beautiful, illustrious berylstone of eight facets, well polished, when laid on an orange coloured cloth shines and glows and blazes...

Mrs. Rhys Davids' choice of stone seems right since the implication is that the gem is transparent and has facets.

Ariputtaramaññya, iii. 70, 21 has: 28

Within this cūḍārjya [spheres] there are pearls, gems, cat's eyes... all these are not worth one sixteenth part of the merit resulting from a fast with eight vows.

Here again is the pre-occupation with the figure eight. Nyānatiloka's German translation has Türkisen for cūḍārjya. 29

Ariputtaramaññya, ii. 19, 8 has: 30

Lord, the mighty ocean has many and diverse treasures; there is the pearl, the crystal, the lapis lazuli (cūḍārjya), the shell, quartz, coral, silver, gold, the ruby and cat's eye (masāṅgala).

E. M. Hare's note to cūḍārjya: 'the colour of bamboo, of the acacia flower' must be taken from a Pali commentary. Here I thought I would find out what colour cūḍārjya was: bamboo when young is usually dark green but turns into yellow wood after one year, and the acacia flower is white or yellow. This was inconclusive until I read the passage in the Rājānīṣṭhaṇṭu. 31

30 Athgampitiya, Mahāvaṃsa, translated by E. M. Hare. London: Luzac, 1935, 137.
The cat's eye can be recognised from three types of sheen, that is, when it slightly shimmers like a bamboo leaf, shines strongly like a peacock's neck or has the reddish-brown appearance of the eye of cats.

Apart from the fact that my favourite cat would object to the latter description, this seems to be a standard comparison unless it has been lifted out of the Pāli commentary used by Hare. The comparison with a bamboo is probably due to a conventional false etymology which associates vefuriya with Pāli veol or qeyu, both meaning 'bamboo'. E. M. Hare, in spite of his note, 'the colour of the scabra brower', translates vefuriya as 'lapis lazuli'. The reason for this is not far to seek. At the end of the enumeration in the Aṅguttarasaṅkhāra a new gem has appeared, the maśāgpalää, which Hare translates as 'cat's eye'.

While the RājānighañJy compares the sheen of the cat's eye to that of the bamboo leaf,32 Hare's note to the passage in the Aṅguttarasaṅkhāra compares the colour of the vefuriya, translated by him as 'lapis lazuli', to a bamboo.33

The RājānighañJy is a compilation of various works. Verse 194 combines the comparison to a peacock's neck with a comparison to the eye of a cat, and therefore in that passage clearly means the 'cat's eye' gem. In verse 216 in chapter 13, the lapis lazuli is described as also compared to a peacock's neck as follows:34

That lapis lazuli must be regarded as genuine and auspicious which is without white flecks, is blackish or dark blue, smooth, heavy, pure, shining as also like a peacock's neck.

This description of lapis lazuli corresponds to the mineralogical facts. The white flecks are caused by calcite. Here five Sanskrit words are translated by 'lapis lazuli', but not vefuriya.

The comparison of vefuriya to a peacock's neck in Hare's note35 can be substantiated with a passage in Jātaka no.32, the Nacajātaka:36 'peacock, your neck in hue like lapis lazuli ...' This translates vefuriya—Senapamātā. Pāli nibhā means 'lustre', and Senapamātā, Sanskrit senapātī, does not have to mean 'colour' but just 'beauty, appearance'. So the passage could equally mean,

32 Gotthe, Die indischen Katereläen.
33 Hare (tr.), Mahāsaṅgāra, 137.
34 Ibid., 33-216.
35 Hare (tr.), Mahāsaṅgāra, 137.
36 Translated under the editorship of E. B. Cowell by Robert Chalmers, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), i. 84.
'peacock, your neck has more lustre than the appearance of beryl'. The Rajanghanya may have borrowed the same from the Jataka.

Now, while Chalmers translated veñjrajā in Jātaka no. 32 as 'lapis lazuli', H. T. Francis and R. A. Neil, the translators of volume three, still under Cowell's editorship, translated in Jātaka no. 419 veñjrajā as 'emeralds'.

Here is a golden necklace and emeralds and pearls.

In volume four of the same edition, translated by W. H. D. Rouse, in Jātaka no. 463, the word veñjrajā is translated as 'coral':

tammin pana samudde vamsarāgaveñjrajā
Now, this ocean was full of coral the colour of bamboo. Rouse's note says: 'the scholar explains that the sea was red, like the reeds called 'scorpion-reed' or 'crab-reed', which are red in colour'. He adds that the bauld was coral, which is also the word used at the end of the story (patala). In fact, on the next page the sequence of precious substances found in the ocean, 'itself a fanciful notion, is... diamonds, gold, silver, emeralds, vamsarāgaveñjrajâpum', at the end of the passage it is: 'gold, silver, jewels, corals (this time patâla), and diamonds.' Thus 'emeralds and veñjrajâ the colour of bamboo' was replaced by 'jewels and corals'.

The Dhammapada is believed to be an early text. It is mentioned in the Mūlavinipatha which belongs to the beginnings of the Christian era. The commentary to it is called Dhammapaditikkhā and is attributed in its colophon to Buddhaghosa which fixes its date to about AD 400 even if Buddhaghosa was not himself the author. In the part commenting on Sakkassatagga, viii. 3, the line ime vamsarāgāveñjrajā is translated by Eugene Watson Burlingame as, 'Take these golden bracelets, all set with beryls'.

The Mūlavinipatha, i. 267 has an enumeration of precious substances in which nasāragālam veñjrajā are juxtaposed. I. B. Horner translates the two words as 'cat's eyes, lapis lazuli'. Here is the same situation as is...
the Aṣṭuttaraniṇāyika. Again, seṣṭuriṣa is translated as ‘lapis lazuli’ because maṣaṅgaḷa is ‘cat’s eye’ or ‘beryl’.

The Dictionary of the Pāli Text Society renders maṣaṅgaḷa as ‘a precious stone, cat’s eye’ and compares Sanskrit maṣṭra ‘emerald’ and Sanskrit gaḷaṇa ‘crystal’.53 Children’s Pāli Dictionary quotes the Abhidhānappadīpikā as saying that the maṣaṅgaḷa is a stone produced in the hill of Maṣara (otherwise unknown).54 Note 10 by E. M. Lare to the Aṣṭuttaraniṇāyika passage explains maṣaṅgaḷa which he has translated as cat’s eye, as a ‘variegated crystal’.

There does not seem to be any necessity for maṣaṅgaḷa to be regarded as ‘cat’s eye’. Recapitulating, one can say that the translators of Pāli usually rendered seṣṭuriṣa as ‘cat’s eye’ or ‘beryl’, except when mentioned together with maṣaṅgaḷa which for unknown reasons came to be translated as ‘cat’s eye’, and then seṣṭuriṣa was translated as ‘lapis lazuli’.

Something very special

For Sanskrit, Monier Williams’ dictionary says:55

Vaidūrya – a cat’s eye gem; at the end of a compound anything excellent of its kind.

This may well be the clue to the change in interpretation in Chinese and Tibetan: because lapis lazuli seems to be something very precious to the Chinese and the Tibetans they want to give this meaning to vaidūrya which is to express something very special though different from ‘diamond’ which in Sanskrit is suṣmaṇa. Berthold Laufer maintains that not only suṣmaṇa was the Chinese word for vaidūrya, but that the whole word was pi-su-ho which occurs on a Han bas-relief and is a phonetic transcription of the Sanskrit word.56 This is borne out by Stanislas Julien’s list of loan words from the Sanskrit where, indeed, the syllable no.1374, ni, is shown to correspond regularly to Sanskrit su, and ni corresponds to Sanskrit rṣi, and it to Sanskrit rṣa.57

---

53 (Chippstead: Pāli Text Society, 1925), ii. 249.
55 (Monier-Williams: Oxford University Press, 1899), 1021.
56 (Publication 154, Anthropological series, volume x, (Chicago: Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, 1912), 111.
57 (Stanislas Xavran Julien, Méthode pour déchiffrer et transcrire les sons sanscrits qu’ils rencontrent dans les livres chinois (Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale, 1861), 168.)
It seems not unlikely that in some Sanskrit dialect the word was *vitrūryā* from which the Pāścrī dialect *vitrula* was derived. The *cat’s eye* is called in Chinese *mao tsing* ‘cat’s essence’. Laufer does not favour the *lapis lazuli* translation though that is advocated by the books of Eitel[20] and F. Porter Smith,[29] which he quotes.

**Chrysoberyl and aquamarine**

Isidorus of Seville (566-636) mentions that beryl comes from India and is pale green, but that in chrysoberyl, i.e., cat’s eye, a gold-coloured lustre can be observed.[30] Laufer decides it should be ‘chrysoberyl’ because this stone has a opalescent sheen. He also remarks: ‘How could the Tibetan authors distinguish blue, green, white and yellow *vitrūryā* if the word should denote the “cat’s eye”?’. Thus, the cat’s eye can be of only one colour and always has a sheen. While the beryl can be of many colours and without a sheen though it may have a sheen as Laufer’s ‘chrysoberyl’. There are yellow, green and white beryls, and the blue beryl is the aquamarine. It must be due to this that the Tibetan doctor Yeshi Donden and his translator Kelsang Jampa were using the phrase ‘King of Aquamarine Light’ for the medicinal Buddha.[32]

Also, they were, no doubt, aware that vaiduryā must have meant ‘aquamarine’ in early Tibetan writings as is testified by the three lines from the *bla’s brgyud lin*:[34] from sections of the reports of Padmasambhava’s words, chapter 22, item d) which is believed to have been composed during the lifetime of Padmasambhava and edited here.

‘*dab-chags rgyal-po gyu bya kha-byang-bo* sko-mdog bas-dus mthun kha’i-mdog chags-pa
hams-cu zil-ghis-tson-pa bya’i rgyal-po’

‘the king of the birds, the turquoise bird, the cuckoo, which unsezed all because it was born with the colour of the blue vaidurya’. Here the colour of the blue vaidurya is at the same time the colour of the turquoise bird. This could well apply to the colour of the aquamarine which is a transparent bluish green while the turquoise itself is opaque bluish green but it could never apply to the dark blue opaque lapis lazuli.

[30] *Upanisad-gītā*, vii. 7. 5-7: *Berylīya in Indīa pīkatā, gentis suā lingus swāna habēna, viridiscā sitāla mungagdo, sed suā pallīrā... Chrysoberylīya dictus suā suā pallāda eius viriditas suā suāra colorēm repitentia. Et hunc ‘Indiā māttī*.
[32] Laufer, op. cit. in note 49, 111.
[34] Ms. Helmut Ulffen, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Atlantisen Kunstreligion, in Proceedings of the Academy of Science and Literature, Maastricht, 1950, pp.340 and 250, quoting Ma’ “then she has five sections of the reports of Padmasambhava’s words” chapter 22, item d, Khon-pa kho ’i drug-rig.’
Chinese interpretations

The Chinese pi-lu-li usually appears just as lu-lu because the Chinese are as fond of abbreviating as are the Tibetans. Édouard Chavannes is cautious in the 1912 volume of his *Cinq cents contes et apologues*; "des parures de vajjgaru (bua-lu), d’or et d’argent." But by 1921 he has made up his mind: "des parures de beryl, d’or et d’argent." Demiéville in 1924 thinks it designated a purely mythical substance.  

E. Burnouf in his translation of an incomplete version of the *Saddharmacaryika* from the Sanskrit enumerates the seven precious substances svapraṇa, rajja, vajjgaru, saphika, lobhanamukti, amapatika, musamapala [sic], interpreting them as: gold, silver, lapis lazuli; crystal, red pearls (con-necting multi with mukta), emerald, cat’s eye. W. E. Soesthill in his translation of the *Saddharmacaryika* from the Chinese, has gold, silver, lapis lazuli, moonstones, agates, coral, amber. In his note, Burnouf informs us that he is following the *Abhidhammapadipika* in using ‘lapis lazuli’, and that, according to A. Rémuat, musamapala means to the Chinese a blue and white stone, perhaps ‘ammonite’.

Babylonian appreciation of lapis lazuli

A recent author dealing with Chinese scriptural accounts on the Medicine Buddha, in translating texts from the Chinese *Tripitaka*, consistently translates lu-lu with ‘lapis lazuli’. Karl Birnbaum is his *The Healing Buddha*, giving the reason for his choice, saying the Gandhāra is near the only source of lapis lazuli in the ancient world (i.e. Afghanistan) and that these images are noted for their emphasis on the depiction of light and flames emanating from the form of the Buddha. As lapis lazuli is opaque dark blue it is not the best colour to depict light or flames, although dark blue pervaded with golden rays often appears on thangkas as the back curtain or back plate.

---

of a deity. The gold flecks in lapis lazuli which are caused by pyrite were the reason why it was highly prized by the ancient Babylonians who compared them to the stars in the night sky. The etymology of lapis lazuli directs us also to Persia. The word occurs first in the fourteenth century as a compound of Latin lapis ‘stone’ and Mediaeval Latin lazulum from Arabic الزئور from Persian زئوعرد ‘lapis lazuli’. From this was derived the Sanskrit word राजावर्त ‘rajaavrata’ for ‘lapis lazuli’. About this, the Laghuvinayākā, verses 19–29, says: ‘it is without white spots and the colour of a seacock’s neck’. According to the Rajanghanū, xiii. 215, rājāvrata used against bile diseases is soft and cool, while vaisārīya, according to Rajanghanū, xiii. 193, is warm. The English word azure goes back to the same Arabic word الزئور through Old French and Old Spanish, omitting the initial f which was mistakenly regarded as an Arabic article.

Conclusion

In conclusion, then, it seems that vaisārīya, refurgī and ōu-li mean ‘beryl’, and that Pāli refurgī is interpreted as ‘lapis lazuli’ when juxtaposed with Pāli māsagālā, while Chinese ōu-li and Tibetan be-du-rmže are often translated as ‘lapis lazuli’ because lapis lazuli was an extremely rare and special stone which could only be obtained from Afghanistan before the rocks near Lake Bučal were discovered, and because it resembled the night sky with its stars, the most exalted symbol of the divine.

If ‘beryl’ translates vaisārīya, and the Medicine Buddha is traditionally surrounded by a blue radiance, it would have to be called ‘blue beryl radiance’. According to Dongqin’s New Light English–Tibetan Dictionary the Tibetan word for ‘aquamarine’ is ṣa-karm, a lasso word from a Sanskrit word for ‘blue lotus’. But as a blue beryl is an aquamarine, ‘aquamarine radiance’ still seems to be the best translation for Tibetan be-du-rma-hed. Why ṣa-karm is the Tibetan word for ‘aquamarine’ is another question. Is the colour of the blue lotus aquamarine?

Philosophy is nothing but the human quest for truth. From very remote time Indus are blessed with the spontaneous curiosity about what truth is. The first literature containing the truth realized by the ancient Indians is the Vedas. The philosophy revealed in this literature was more or less tuned with human Heisenberg together with submission to nature Gods. This went on unchallenged till the Buddha preached his new doctrine which afterwards brought about a head-on collision with the Vedic system, but the Buddha denied to give any positive answer to any Vedic approach and consequently in later period a gigantic philosophical system was built up against the Vedic philosophy or more accurately there rose a pestilence against the unattained doctrine. In the Brahmanical system of Dharma-dharmayoga, Karthikeya and the Upasunade we find that the philosophy has taken a chal lenging attitude by now. The people also were clearly divided into two major groups. On one hand, the Brahmins were there with the Vedic philosophy and on the other, the Buddhists came forward with their new philosophical doctrines.

It was the beginning of the Christian era when such a situation was created that the Brahmin and the Buddhist philosophers considered their respective philosophical views unsuccessful if those were not directed against the opponent and at the same time not victorious. It is obvious that the introduction of the debate system was largely responsible for the creation of this situation.

The fundamental difference in outlook between realism and idealism led to mutual confrontations which continued in an unbroken line for generations of scholars resulting in the growth of a rich and vigorous literature. In this way a section of the Brahmin philosophers developed a philosophical system predominantly with the science of reasoning (nyaya). Later the system was known as Nyaya philosophy. The first systematic work on the Nyaya philosophy is the Nyaya-sutra of Gantama. It is supposed to be a work of about 150 B.C. Going through this work, we can undoubtedly say that much before the
composition of this work the Buddhists had already put forward a lot of strong arguments that helped their views to give birth to a concentrated self-sufficient system of philosophy.

We find in the Nyāya-sūtra that Gautama refutes several doctrines of the Buddhist philosophy, such as: the whole is not separate from its parts; momentariness of things; denial of the external object; voidness of everything; and so on. But it should be kept in mind that these doctrines could not assume the highly sophisticated forms by that time. And Gautama’s refutation also does not show much complicity of thought to turn those down.

Then there is a century of silence. In this period the followers of these two schools obviously went on with their studies but no remarkable work was composed.

Now came ahead a Buddhist scholar to protest against the views of Gautama. He is none other than Nagārjuna, who is the first outstanding philosopher to propagate the fundamental philosophy of voidness (śūnyavāda). Dr. Sheehanshyk seeks to explain the background of the advent of this school in this way, "... Monism took the offensive and finally established itself triumphantly in the very heart of a new Buddhism. Transplanted upon a fresh soil the old Monism produced a powerful growth of various systems. In the schools of Nagārjuna and Deva it received a dialectical foundation, in the way of a dialectical destruction of all other systems."

In the Mādhyamika-Kāśika, Nagārjuna tries to establish his theory of voidness by contradicting many of the actual Nyāya-sūtras. He composed the oldest Buddhist treatises on the art of debate, viz., Vīrya-vyākhyāna and Pramāṇa-viśeṣana. In Vīrya-vyākhyāna, going to prove the voidness of things, Nagārjuna has shown his daring attitude of uprooting even the existence of the Pramāṇas. As he was an exponent of a particular ‘nihilistic’ theory, naturally he could not also check the temptation of striking at the root of the categories proposed by Gautama. His Pramāṇa-viśeṣana is exclusively a refutative of the sixteen categories contained in the Nyāya-sūtra. By applying his critical axe of relativities he claims that all the sixteen categories are realistical and therefore ultimately unreal.

This Buddhist theory of voidness was one of the crucial points for a Nyāya exponent named Vatsayana. Going to prove his theory, the Buddhist Nagārjuna started with demolishing even the existence of the instrument of valid knowledge. But Vatsayana started with a strong protest and a crucial defense of Pramanas and the very first line of his commentary rends Pramāṇa-nīka pratipatam pratyakṣa-pratītya-artha-pramāṇam.

Gautama formulated the śūtras but Nagārjuna flayed them mercilessly and Vātsyāyana who belonged to the lineage of the Nyāyaśāstra was prompted to write a commentary on the Nyāya-sūtras in about the late 4th century or early 5th century. The commentary bears the title Nyāya-liṅgāyana.

in course of explaining the Nyāya-sūtras, Vatsayana raises objections against Nagārjuna’s doctrine of voidness of things which is discussed in the Mādhyamika-kāśika according to which our means and objects of knowledge are an unreal as things appearing in a dream or exhibited in a hallucinatory state or as the city of the celestial choir or as a mirage. Vātsyāyana argues against the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy (i.e., the theory of idealism) on the Nyāya-sūtras iv. 2. 26-7 and iii. 2. 11 and against the momentariness on the Nyāya-sūtras iii. 2. 11-13.
To answer the objections raised by Vāsīṣṭha, a Buddhist philosopher, Vasubandhu (c. A.D. 410-490), compiled these works, viz., Vāda-vīdiṭṭha, Vāda-viśdhiṇa and Vāda-
hiṭṭha. But unfortunately all the works are lost.

This philosopher however became also famous for propounding a fundamental doctrine of some Buddhist, the doctrine of idealism (Viśeṣa-dvaita), as a sophistical philosophy. As to the advent of Viśiṣṭadvaita, Dr. Scharfesky says, "When Nāgārjuna's standpoint of extreme relativism was forsaken, the brothers Vacila and Vasubandhu took up the study of Viśyā logic and the work of its adaptation in the idealistic foundations of this philosophy".

As all the logical works of Vasubandhu have been lost, so the complete assessment of his view on logic is not possible at present. From the later works it is found that Vasubandhu opposing the nature of perception and inference, the number and nature of the members of syllogism recommended in the Viśyā-sūtra, gave new definitions of them. He wrote his Vāda-viśdhiṇa challenging the laws regulating the debates advocated by Gaṇatama.

This dispute between the realism of the Viśyā school and the dogmatic idealism of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of Buddhist philosophy went on. But it was the 5th century A.D. when India gave birth to her glorious philosopher-logician, Dignāga. In his hand Buddhist idealism assumed a critical shape. Dignāga's Pramāṇa-samuccaya, perhaps the most outstanding of his five works, 14, shook the world of Indian logic. Notwithstanding the truth the Buddhists realized, Buddhist philosophy was suffering from insufficiencies of defects in logic for their own to establish their realization. Now with Dignāga, Buddhist philosophy got the eixir of life. Dr. S.C. Vidyābhushana writes, "Both in matter and in manner his works marked a distinct departure from some of his predecessors. The keenness of his insight and the soundness of his critical senses combined to exempt him with an individuality all his own. No praise seems too high for him. Indeed he may fittingly be styled as the first and last of Indian logicians".

Pramāṇa-samuccaya is a logical work written in Angasā Trim, in this work Dignāga explains his own theories of Buddhist logic. By this Eṣāṇa guarded the Buddhist philosophy in the field where the Naivāyikas were the chief opponents. He criticises a Nyāya view : Viśyā-sūtra 1.1.12, enumerating the sense-organs, does not mention the mind, but the Naivāyikas admit it as a separate sense-organ. In support of their view they say that the mind can unhastingly be admitted as a sense-organ because nowhere in the Viśyā-sūtra the view is contradicted. Now Dignāga says, well, if absence of contradicton means admission, there would have been no necessity at all of formulating Viśsa-sūtra because the group of sense-organ as mentioned there has not been contradicted anywhere in the Viśyā-sūtra. A few more objections like the above can be found which are nothing but trivial.

The crucial point of dispute are the definitions of perception pramāṇa and inference anumāṇa also with the definitions of probans (kṛta) etc. given by Gaṇatama. Restating those Dignāga formulated fresh definitions of them 15. Comparison (apamāṇa) and verbal testimony (liveda) are not separate instruments of valid knowledge in the Buddhist view. 16 It is Dignāga who for the first time draws attention to the theory of Apoha, i.e., the law of contradiction 17. It contains the view opposite to the 'view of knowledge gathered in a direct way'. According to the Apoha theory, the law of cognizance is explained as 'we can actively cognize or determine a thing only by opposing it to what it is not'.
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A spark which ignited the criticism of the realistic philosophy is Dignaga's 'definition of perception'. If the difference in the very basis appears too serious then that in the consecutive stages of development obviously turns to not only doctrinal dispute but also bitter relation in life. And exactly this happened in the later period. In the Nyaya philosophy being a realistic philosophy 'the knowledge resulting from sense-object contact' i also associated with terms is given the respect of nothing but perception and real knowledge. But really, according to Dignaga, is inextricably involved in causal efficiency. A fire which burns and cooks is a real fire. A fire which is absent, which is imagined, which neither really burns nor cooks nor sheds any light, is an unreal fire. A reality which is stripped off from every relation and every construction, which has neither any position in time and space nor any characterizing quality cannot be expressed because there is in it nothing to be expressed. If we express that sensation in words, the thing to be expressed must be attached with some kind of mental imagination which pushes it to the realm of unreality. Representing the view Dignaga's definition of perception pratyakṣam kalpita-dharmam has got the perpetuity.

In this way his observation of the truth rendered him into a perennial enemy to the realistic group of philosophers. But whatever harm might have been to him, we have touched with a thrilling sensation of his revolutionary ideas. Unfortunately India could not protect any of the serious works of her worthy sons from being lost for ever since.

Time rolled on. Then came the seventh century. During this intervening period the Nalasikha philosophers extended with their philosophy and logic but there was no one to put pen to paper. A Bhadrabha Brahman Udyotakara wrote an extensive commentary on Gunatanya's Nyaya-silpa and Vaisesika's Nyaya-dharmaka under the title of Nyaya-vriksha. The very purpose of composing the work, as the author himself declared, was to write an exposition treatise on the Nyaya-silpa to remove the veil of error cast by the quibblers. These quibblers are none but Nalasikha, Vasubandhu, Dignaga chiefly and other Buddhist logicians.

It is quite natural that there are many things to be said for and against both the realists and the idealists. Udyotakara carried out his duties as a realist. But he is much more vociferous against the Buddhist doctrines. His temper can only be compared with that of Udayana.

The first thing to be mentioned is Udyotakara's discussion and refutation of Nalasikha's doctrine of voidness in Nyaya-vriksha under NS II. 1. 8-19. In our world of cause and effect we cannot think of such a situation where there is no pramana. The all-powerful pramana can be by no means be discarded. Only what he has done is that he has set the pramanas on an invulnerable foundation. The definitions of perception and inference given by Vasubandhu and those as given by Dignaga are vehemently criticized in Nyaya-vriksha under NS I. 4-5. Dignaga in his Pramana-samuccaya succeeded a number of views regarding what actually is inferred in an inference and finally expressed his own view. All this is discussed and Dignaga's views are criticized in Nyaya-vriksha under NS I. 1. 35-7. The definitions of proposition (pratipada), probana (heya) and example (dhybhasa) given by Vasubandhu and Dignaga are refuted in Nyaya-vriksha under NS I. 1. 35-7. Also, Udyotakara criticizes the law of debate as suggested by Vasubandhu, in Nyaya-vriksha under NS I. 1. 2. 1. Apoha theory has been refuted by him in Nyaya-vriksha under NS II. 2. 6.5. He also criticizes the demai of the evidences of comparison (samapada) and verbal testimony (sudha) in Nyaya-vriksha under NS I. 1. 6-7. He is actually on criticizing spere
to refute the Buddhist theory in which the whole is viewed as identified with its parts, as Nāyāyika under NS i. 1. 33. He also records a series of pravacana arguments. The later Nāyāyika logicians took up his Buddhist theory by the expression "identity of quality and the qualified".

The essence of the Buddhist philosophy lies in the doctrine of momentariness. In Nāyāyika-vibhūti under NS ii. 2. 10-17, Uddyotakāra shows his erudition to refute the doctrine.

In Nāyāyika-vibhūti under NS iv. 2. 26-37, Uddyotakāra criticizes the Buddhist theory of "Denial of the external objects". Some remarkable passages from this discussion may perhaps be quoted: "pleasure or pain is quite different from knowledge (jñāna), for pleasure or pain is an 'object to be cognized (grāhita), while knowledge means its comprehension (grāhapaś). The object cognised and the act of comprehension can never be identical. Secondly, the admission of illusory knowledge necessarily entails the acceptance of its opposite, i.e., valid knowledge also. An object which is never known rightly can also be never known falsely. Thirdly, one who does not admit the reality of any object other than mere consciousness will not be in a position either to defend one’s own position or to refute that of other’s, because one will not be able to communicate or explain anything to others with one’s own mere consciousness which is intelligible to everyone else, just as the dream-experiences of a particular person are known to himself alone. To this, it may be replied that when a person defends his own thesis or refutes that of others he employs words and with the aid of 'consciousness as endowed with the word-form' (idabdha-loka-citta) communication or explanation becomes possible, consciousness as endowed with the word-form is not unintelligible to others. The reply however does not fit in, for the Vaiśeṣika-dharmas do not admit the reality of jāti as an external object and hence, they cannot speak of consciousness as endowed with the word-form. Fourthly, on the claim that no external object apart from consciousness exists really, no distinction can be made between the states of dream and waking, i.e., in that case, objects will be equally non-existent always.

What Uddyotakāra says against the soul theory of the Buddhists has been more or less followed by the Nāyāyika logicians of later period.

Uddyotakāra criticized the Buddhists a lot. But he never mentioned the name of any particular work or philosopher except in a single case where the names of the two works Viśdaka-vibhūti and Visuddha-vibhūti are mentioned. Though in most of the cases we come to know whether a particular philosopher or logician is, he perhaps thought it would be sufficient to know that the refutation was directed against the Buddhist whoever he might be, as an eminent one or an ordinary one.

Some argue that the mode of Uddyotakāra’s refutation of the Buddhists is concerned more with verbal trickery than with true philosophical insight. It is found that while refuting a Buddhist theory he poses a number of alternative as to the opponent’s theory, as if he is asking the opponent in front to answer those. But, he tries to show, out of a single alternative is inebriate and the only alternative which is found left does nothing but prove the Nāyāya view. Probably this charge against Uddyotakāra is partly true. Though generally Uddyotakāra allows this kind of style and sometimes does not hesitate to distort the opponent’s view, still in some cases he sticks to actual philosophical stand, which is found to be adopted continuously by the Nāyāya logicians of later period.
But Nyāya-vāda could not reign unchallenged in the field of Indian philosophy for a long time. In the middle of the 7th century, challenges came from one of the famous Buddhist philosophers, Dharmakīrti.

This philosopher has written seven logical works, celebrated "seven treatises", which have become the foundational works for the study of logic in the Buddhist community and have more or less overshadowed the works of Dignaga. Among the seven works the Pramāṇapadārtha is the chief one, written in Sanskrit verse; the next work Prakāśa-mālaśāla is a fragment of the first, written in Sanskrit prose, the Nyāya-

kinda is a further abridgment of the same subject; Hetu-kindu is a short classification of logical reasoning; Sambandha-parikalpaka is an examination of the problem of relation in a small text in Sanskrit with the author's own comments; Yuddha-māya is a treatise on the art of carrying on disputation and Kasadāsya-roddhita is a treatise on the reality of other minds, directed against Jainaism.

The Pramāṇapadārtha was lost in India but we are lucky enough that the manuscript of this work has been discovered by Rahul Sankrityayana from Tibet.

In this pioneering work, Dharmakīrti discusses his own philosophy of realism, general-

ly by giving up the temptation of picking the opponent's view. Though some refutations of the Nyāya view are found there, still its own remarkable realism and logic spontaneously imposed the cast of Nyāya philosophy, built by Āryadeva and Āryakārti.

He criticizes the Nyāya view of the existence of God in the chapter called Pramāṇapurāṇa (verse Nos. 12-20). The Nyāya view of perception is criticized in Pravachana chapter (verse Nos. 136-46). The theory of generality (verse Nos. 165-43) and the theory of the existence of the whole also (verse Nos. 149-53) are refuted. The Nyāya definition of Pada-

ja is related in Parārthanānāśīr chapter (verse Nos. 154-71). In the same chapter the definition of prajñāpādāya (verse Nos. 172-73) is criticized. But all these are matters of general logic.

"Although produced by a nimāma coming from an external object, but from an actual time. By the middle of the 7th century, is it indeed a reality? It is supposed to be absolutely stripped off from every vestige of an imaginative or constructive element. But is it not pure imagination? No. "A single moment, just as an absolute particle, is not something representable in an image; it cannot be reached by our knowledge, that is to say, it is not something empirically real. But it is the element which imparts reality to all the others. It is the indispensable condition of all reality and consistent knowledge. It is unempirical, but it is the metaphysical, it is not a 'dew on the thistle'. Dharmakīrti proposes to prove it by an experiment in the way of interpretation. The metaphysical entities are metaphysical just because they are pure imagination, just because there is no point of reality, no moment of pure sensation to which they could be attached. They are 'substantial as in place, time and sensible quality'. But this point and this sensation are present, directly or indirectly, in every act of empirical reality and empirical cognition. This we can indirectly prove by introspection. Dharmakīrti says: 'Such intuition is something quite different from productive imagination - can be proved just by introspec-

tion. Indeed, everyone knows that an image is something attainable (capable of coalescing with a name). Now, if we bring in state at a patch of colour and withdraw all our thoughts on whatsoever other objects, if we thus reduce our consciousness to a condition of rigidity, it becomes as though unconscious; this will be the condition of pure sensation. If we then, (awakening from this condition), begin to think, we notice a feeling of (}
remembering) that we had an image (of a patch of colour before us), but we did not notice it whilst we were in the foregoing condition, (we could not name it) because it was pure sensation. This consecutive observation has given Dharmakīrti immortality in the history of Indian philosophy.

suḥṣaṇa-sphātaṃ yamād abhidhe niṣṭhātadhyayot bhedaścī bhārataśāntiṃ vīyavānta- dūvākārasyaṃ, a verse of Pramāṇa-viniścayya is one of the most remarkable representations of the idealistic philosophy of Dharmakīrtī. Practically there is no opponent philosopher who did not criticize this verse.

Even then Dharmakīrti was not unaware of the danger to which Idealism may ultimately lead in the shape of its direct consequence, solipsism. He therefore singled out this problem from his great work and devoted to it a special tract under the title Saññānāṃśa-siddhāṇa, i.e., Establishment of the existence of the other minds. This work contains a verification of the whole of Dharmakīrti’s epistemology in its application to a special complicated case. Dharmakīrti makes a gift to us of this brilliant piece of document narrating the realistic and Buddhist position in a problematic matter in the day.

However he did not want to discuss about a metaphysical entity, which is a compulsory matter of discussion for the Nyāya logicians. It is said that Dharmakīrti, when studying under Śrāvaṇadeva wrote the chapter on Isolatology in Pramāṇa-viniścayya. But this religious part was dropped in all the other treatises and he himself most emphatically and clearly expresses his opinion in the closing passage of Saññānāṃśa-siddhāṇa, “… Our knowledge being limited to experience, we neither think nor speak out anything definite about Him, we can neither assert nor deny His existence”.

For a century, from Dharmakīrti’s time down to the 1st quarter of the 8th century, Buddhist philosophy was conspicuous by the absence of any remarkable original work due to absence of any talented philosopher in their school. At last a brilliant composition from the Buddhist school came to light. It is the Tatvaśaṃgama. Its author Śaṅkaraśānta (A.D. 708-858) was a professor at Nalanda. He visited Tibet at the invitation of king Khri-srong-deutsan (8th cent.). The king with the assistance of Śaṅkaraśānta built in 749 A.D. the monastery of Sam-yé in Tibet, and Śaṅkaraśānta was its first abbot. It is sure that Tatvaśaṃgama was composed before its author had gone to Tibet. He as elaborately explains the Buddhist doctrines of his own line as he vehemently criticizes the Nyāya views.

Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇa-viniścayya was then inaccessible. The Tatvaśaṃgama throws literally a flood of light on Buddhist metaphysics of the Saṃskāra-śānta-Vyācara school and logic and epistemology. The most remarkable feature of this work is its reproduction of the views of scholars who otherwise would have remained in perfect oblivion. Kamalaśīla gives the names of the authors and quotes from them—

From the study of this work along with Śaṅkaraśānta’s Nyāya-viniścayya and Kumārāśi’s works one can fruitfully gather some ideas about the philosophical activities of the centuries. The attack on realism, on the Soul theory and on the infallibility of the Vedas, provoked simultaneously the Nyāya, and Kumārāśi’s Mimamsa schools. This counter-criticism of the orthodox scholars succeeded in undermining the prestige of the Buddhist monastery. But the Buddhists were not supine and reacted with vigour and force. The Tatvaśaṃgama thus prominently represents this phase of the Buddhist reaction. In fact, Dharmakīrti started to criticize directly the Mīmāṃśa school and as a result Kumārāśi tried
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to take revenge on the Buddhists. Naturally it was not possible for Śaṅkarakṣita and his disciple Kamalśīla, to keep silent against Kamalśīla’s criticism.

We are best concerned with the conflict between the Nyāya and the Buddhist. Therefore from Śaṅkarakṣita’s criticism of the Nyāya views, particularly of Uddhotakāra, it appears that as Śaṅkarakṣita and Kamalśīla (c. A.D. 790) accepted Saṃkara’s view in which the external object exists (though this existence can be proved only by inference), it has been easier for them to criticize the erstwhile’s objections.

In Pañcaviṃśatika, Uddhotakāra’s views on the part and the whole (verse Nos. 500-62, 383, 591-98), on momentariness (verse Nos. 370-84, 388, 466-67, 471-75), on Abhava (verse Nos. 981-99, 1184-99), and on Soul (verse Nos. 180-44, 195-216, 220) are criticized.

There were other famous logicians also in the intervening period. They were Bhāvikās, Avicennakāra and Saṅkhārvastivāda. Bhāvikās may be prior to Uddhotakāra, Bhāvikās’s Pādhyāyaka and Avicennakāra’s Pañcaviṃśatika are known to us only by name. Anyway, those Nātyāyaka logicians were ‘pillars’ of the system. Śaṅkarakṣita and Kamalśīla naturally attacked them. Many minor views of these scholars are found mentioned and criticized in Pañcaviṃśatika and Kāliyaka.

How ever, among many of the objections may be mentioned to some Śaṅkarakṣita and Kamalśīla as to how far the objection was justified. What we call existence, they are never tired of repeating, is always related to an action. ‘Existence is work’ says Śaṅkarakṣita. It is an anthropomorphic illusion to suppose that a thing can exist only, exist placidly, exist without acting, and then, as it were, suddenly rise and produce in action. Whatever exists is always acting. The conclusion that whatever really exists in a cause is vexed upon the Buddhist by his definition of existence quoted above, existence, real existence, is nothing but efficiency. Consequently what is non-efficiency or what is a non-cause, does not exist. A ‘non-cause’, says Uddhotakāra, addressing himself to the Buddhist, it is, it is for you either something non-existing or something changeless. Kamalśīla corrects this statement of Uddhotakāra and accuses him of not sufficiently knowing the theory of his adversaries, ‘because’, says he, “those Buddhists who are students of logic maintain that a non-cause is necessarily a non-reality.” This means that this is a real is nothing but to be a cause, whatever exists is necessarily a cause.

The growth and development of the ideas and the sentiments of these two different groups of philosophers have been reflected in a rich literature which can make the subject extremely interesting.

Now with Śaṅkarakṣita and Kamalśīla, the Buddhist philosophy is in a safe situation, but on the contrary the Nyāya philosophy was rather pushed to the wall without any brilliant logical production up to the middle of the 9th century from the time of Uddhotakāra. In this situation, Viśṇupāda Mīśa-c. A.D. 841-29, a Brahman logician wrote an elaborate gloss on the Nyāya-sūtra under the title Nyāya-dīrśika-śārvastivāda.

In the writing of Viśṇupāda we find his exemplary observation of the logical nuances which can rarely be found in others. He possessed the rare qualities of erudition and faithfulness in representing the opponent’s case. As a Nyāya exponent he followed Uddhotakāra in refuting the Buddhist doctrines but not always without some differences of opinion. His refutation is much more deep and subtle in comparison with Uddhotakāra’s.
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refutation, being pungent and aggressive. Under NS i.1. 4-5, Tika shows us Vācaṣṭhāṇi’s clear understanding about the nature of the Buddhist perception and inference.

Vācaṣṭhāṇi quotes the relevant verses of Dignāga while explaining Vyākhyārïkā’s refutation of Dignāga. He found the fresh scope of refuting Dharmakīrti’s views of perception and others. He quoted verses of Prabhāṣṣa-vīrtika and Prabhāṣṣa-vīrtikya. The verse of Tattvasamgraha is found to have been quoted in Tika but it seems that Vācaṣṭhāṇi did not give much importance to that text.

Up to the time before Vācaṣṭhāṇi, God was not so much considered to be a matter of dispute in debate with the Buddhists. But starting with him, to prove or to refute the existence of God became a prestige issue.

Generally it is found that a philosopher having faith in a certain philosophical system cannot show his adherence to another philosophical system. When a philosopher in course of explaining seeks the permanent justification of the doctrine containing in the philosophy of his own like and tries to adopt those in thought and practice, it is very difficult for him to make his mind agree to give importance to another system of philosophy. Vācaṣṭhāṇi is rather a conspicuous exception. He wrote three commentaries, Niyāya-vīrtika-āśāparas- tiṣṭha on Niyāya philosophy, Śāṅkhyā-satya-kaumudi on Śāṅkhyā philosophy and Bhāvanā on Vedānta philosophy. We do not know which one of them he preferred, but in all the three commentaries, his concursative explanation of the different doctrines makes us believe that none, in actuality, is negligible. Now even after a long journey we are struck with doubt if the objections against the Buddhist philosophy actually forbid us to believe in it.

Now the objections against the Buddhists came from a new direction — Kashmir. After Vācaṣṭhāṇi there flourished another talented Niyāya logician named Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (A.D. 840-900) who was the younger contemporary of Vācaṣṭhāṇi. He wrote an independent commentary on the Niyāya-sūtra, called Niyāya-mañjarī.

He was an orthodox Brahmin who zealously defended the authority of the Vedas and saw the refutation of Buddhism as a religious cause. Yet he was no fanatic. He was capable of retaining his sense of humour under adversity. He tells us that as he writes Niyāya-mañjarī he is being held prisoner in a cave and ‘if I have begun my days here by this diversion of writing a book’ 12. A rare virtue which is indicative of true greatness is his humility in declaring that he could lay no claim to originality 12.

Many of the Buddhist views are mentioned and refuted in Niyāya-mañjarī, such as, there are only two instruments of valid knowledge, perception is conceptual construction which is free from determination by the imagination and is non-illustory 12. Apoha, momentariness, twostories of illusion — atākyāditya (of the Madhyamikas) and ivaātyāditya (of the Vijnānavādins), etc. Among these the Buddhist theory of momentariness exhausted Jayanta’s maximum energy.

It is not easy to say that Dharmakīrti among the Buddhists is no doubt the main opponent of Jayanta. Numerous verses from Dharmakīrti’s Prabhāṣṣa-vīrtika have been quoted and refuted in Niyāya-mañjarī. Dignāga also is occasionally mentioned. Dharmottara (c. A.D. 820) also is criticised by Jayanta in a few places 12.

It is a perennial matter of dispute whether knowledge is like the eye or a candle. The philosophical discussion, however, about knowledge has been divided into two groups on
the basis of these two differences. And this stretched long. Naturally to refute the Vijñānavādins we find this kind of discussion made in a great detail in Nyāya-madhārya.

After Dharmākṣiṣī, the Mīmāṃsā school turned up against the Buddhists. Kāṇḍāṇa (c. 575 cent.) a great Mīmāṃsaka scholar accused great success in refuting them and establishing his opinion. But it was a fact for the Nyāyaśāstras that an evil enemy is vanquished by a new enemy.

Prahalāda (c. late 1st cent.) another strong Mīmāṃsaka scholar played the same role. So the Nyāyaśāstra scholars thought it necessary to stop the group of these new enemies.

Properly going through Nyāya-madhārya, it however appears that Jayanta was also attentive to the refutation of the Mīmāṃsā views of Kāṇḍāṇa as well as of Prahalāda. Actually with the decline of Buddhism in India the doctrinal and logical conflict was shifted to between the Nyāya and the Mīmāṃsā schools of philosophy. It will not be improper to say that Jayanta accelerated the criticism against the Mīmāṃsā school through it is found to have been started long before by Uddvottārāka and rather prominently by Vācaspati. In fact, Jayanta had to protect the Nyāya philosophy from the attack not only of the Buddhists but also of diverse groups of other philosophers. In spite of this Jayanta has retained his renown by faithfully representing the opponent’s views.

Over and above, the activities of the Buddhists are not consistent with what they say. That is why Jayanta also was very much aggressive against them. He says “You, Buddhists, hold that there is no soul, yet you construct statues (idols) to enjoy pleasure. In parinirvāṇa after death, you say that everything is momentary, yet you build monasteries with the hope that they will last for centuries and you say that the world is void, yet you teach that wealth should be given to spiritual guides. What a strange character, the Buddhists possess, they are weildly a monument of conceit”.

In the 10th century the Nyāya system of philosophy is divided into two courses. One flowed in the old line and the other course started with Bāhavarga. To put it clearly, Bāhavarga was the first known proponent of a number of doctrines which diverge boldly from the accepted traditional views. A Kannhkriya like Jayanta, Bāhavarga must have been nourished contemporaneously with him (c. A.D. 860-920).

Nyāyamadhārya is a monumental work composed by him. It is an ant-commentary of Nyāyasastra. It is supposed to be the best for a long time, but it is a miracle that perhaps the only manuscript of Nyāyamadhārya has been suddenly discovered from the personal custody of Saiva Sripur Sastrī in 1939.

Prose quotations and verses from Dharmākṣiṣī’s Pramāṇa-sūtra and Prahalāda’s Pramāṇa-sūtra-sūkṣma are found in this work. He criticizes the views of Nāgārjuna, Vasubandha, Dignāga, Dharmākṣī, Prahalāda, Dharmottara, Sūnatarka, Kṣitigarbha and many others. Prahalāda (c. A.D. 940) started the philosophical school of interpretation of the Pramāṇa-sūtra. He wrote a voluminous commentary on Pramāṇa–vartika under the title Pramāṇa-vartika-bādhīkāra.

Now appeared in the field a great Buddhist scholar named Jīvaka. He was associated with the Vāramahāśīla madhyamika which was established by the famous Buddhist emperor Dharmagupta (c. A.D. 730-810) and flourished under the liberal patronage of his successors. In the 11th century, we find it in the form of an international University attracting scholars from other parts of Asia. All the Shastras were taught in it. Buddhism
received priority among them. There were six great Enuities there. Four of them were called keepers of the four gates – Dvarapāraghs of the sea of learning that was the mahābhūta. The other two, still greater, were called the two “Great Pillars” of wisdom. We find Jñānānirmita as the second Great Pillar of this University. He tried to revive the Buddhist philosophy against the attack of the Nyāya logic.

He criticizes the views of Trilocana and his disciple Viścapani, Bhāśaravajja and a few other Nyāya logicians with the utmost strength of his intellectuality. His writing on the one hand acclaims the acme of intellectual analysis and on the other hand unveils the background of Udayana’s arguments. Among those who were refuted by him, Trilocana was a prominent figure between Kamalākāra and Viścapani to receive the special attention of Jñānani. Anyway, Jñānani was more concerned with the views of Bhāśaravajja, a strong opponent who published immediately before him. It is known that Trilocana composed a work under the title Nyāyesa-prakṛti-muha. We do not know whether this work is the same as the Nyāya-bhāṣya-bhaṭṭa, composed by him. One Nyāya-mādhyāgi also was attributed to him. But unfortunately we do not find any of his works.

Viścapani must have been a Nyāya author of considerable importance. His views on Tāmunāvāda alone have been recorded by Jñānani and his disciple Raknāki. It seems that he wrote a treatise on Tāvara.

Rākanāra and the last Nyāyaśāstri whose view on Tāvara alone has been quoted by Jñānānirmita.

It appears from his writing that being a teacher at Nalanda, Jñānani directly realized the insult coming from the Nyāya logicians. But though Jayanta and Bhāśaravajja criticized the Buddhist doctrines very strongly, the warmth of opposition cannot be realized on their body. But Jñānani and later him Udayana boiled over the dispute. They directly perceived the heat of hostility.

The biggest tract composed by him is on momentariness. To establish the theory of momentariness, the verse: yat sa tataṃ kṣaṇikam satīdha jalaśharam santalakā bhūvā ime tasādhi śaktirārthaśhaṁ gaṇeṣṭeṣu śādhevy asa va śādhevy esa was emanated from his pen and got the honour of fulcrum of the theory. Apoha, anupalabdhi and invariable concomitance (viyāpyaḥ) were discussed in a great detail. On God, Jñānani made such a heuristic discussion under the title Tāmunāvāda, that practically this aroused in Udayana’s writing an assaulting attitude, later.

Raknāki, a worthy disciple of Jñānānirmita, in his ten small treatises on different topics, tried to refute the Nyāya philosophy. He gave more attention to refute Trilocana and Viścapani rather than Bhāśaravajja. A close scrutiny reveals that Raknāki has summarized the works of his guru in many cases and the debt has also been eloquently acknowledged. But the fatal thing that Raknāki did, is his writing a treatise Sattvārtha-dīṣṭā-ārtha and it is a great risk of misapplied religion which scared Dharmarāja and made him write Sattvārtha-dīṣṭā-ārtha-dīṣṭā. But Raknāki was daring enough to compose a work refuting the crucial view of their honoured-by-all preceptor.

Jñānānirmita made his last try to unenumerate the injuries inflicted by Viścapani and Bhāśaravajja on the Buddhist philosophy, but their philosophy again got a mortal hurt, when a Hindu logician Udayana (A.D. 984) composed two pungent works under the titles Nyāya-kasaṇāśātri and Amāsānāśātri. 49
The fundamental philosophy of momentariness and the denial of the existence of God are challenged in these two works. Ānātattavaviveka is mainly devoted to the refutation of the Buddhist doctrines of Soul. It criticizes several Buddhist views like those of Universal flux, Apoha, Universals, unity of knowledge and its object. Cittabhava, Vijñānavāda, identity of the quality and the qualified, self as knowledge alone, Êñavāda, Savyāvāda, etc. in most of the topics Ānātattavaviveka’s works supply the parupāda. Jñānaratnavītī has been quoted and referred to by name. Everything is obviously to prove the existence of God. It can humorously be said here that God will himself intend to exist no more, if He comes to know that his existence depends on so much painstaking efforts done in Ānātattavaviveka. In fact, Mahāvīra gave a heavy jerk to the Niyāva view of the existence of God as for which Udayana had to compose a separate work against him. In the practical life the bitterness travelled so penetratively between the Buddhists and the Niyāvikuțas that a controversy was decided (So goes the story) even by way of jumping from a palm tree. Udayana was very much proud of thinking himself as a protector of God. Here is his utterance: “Oh Lord, you have been puzzled up with pride as you are now illustrious (when I have made you safe after deceiving the Buddhists) and dare ignore me. But (be sure) when the Buddhists come again, your existence will depend upon me.”

The continuous hurt inflicted by the Niyāva logicians made the Buddhist philosophy helpless to survive in the common mind. It is also a point that after Mahāvīra there was no Buddhist scholar who could efficiently hold up their philosophy. Many works undoubtedly were composed but those lacked sharpness of original thinking. In fact, from the 11th century the struggle for existence of the Buddhists in India due to Muslim aggression over the Buddhist education centres was the main cause of unproductiveness of a brilliant philosophical literature for them. But the gradual fall of Buddhism in India was noticed much before. Dr. Sircar writes, “Notwithstanding the great scope and success of his propaganda he (Dhammakāri) could only retard, but not stop the process of decay which befell Buddhism on its native soil. Buddhism in India was doomed. The most enlightened propagandist could not change the run of history. The time of Kumbrā and Sankarācārya, the great champions of Brahmanical revival and opponents of Buddhism, was approaching. Traditionuperseus Dhammakāri as having combated them in public disputations and having been victorious. But this is only an after-thought and a pious desire on the part of his followers. At the same time it is an indirect confession that these great Brahmin teachers had met with no Dhammakāri to oppose them.”

But in the Niyāva line two commentators at least on Udayana’s Ānātattavaviveka (alias Baddhikākhakā) one Baddhikākhakā: tika by Saṅkara Mātra (A.D. 1450) and the other Baddhikākhakā: śrīromapi by Raghunāthī Śrīromapi (A.D. 1477-1547) extinguished the last hope of the Buddhists to escape from the trap of the Niyāva logic.

In Saṅkara Mātra’s Vinayaśāstra Rāmakī’s names found in the list of the foremost Buddhist logicians. But during Saṅkara’s time the Buddhist works lost much of their importance as they were historical documents rather than part and parcel of living faith in India.

NOTES
1 Baddhikākhakā: vide a History of Indian Logic, pp.227-29
2 Kāla-vadā: vide ido pp. 234-40
3Upanishads: vide ido pp. 3
42 NS iv. 2-6-11
10 Definition of perception: samjhita vijja makes people, i.e., perception is cognition coming from that same object.

11 Prasana-samuccaya (Tib. Thad-ma Kon-la bshes-pa), Nyen-peace (Tib. Thad-ma sga-btsas (spug-pa), Hetu-sa-ca-sam (Tib. guy), So-gi-ba (Tib. guy gi gle dang sbyi-pa, Alambanapartha (Tib. dbyig-pa bshes-pa) and Thirta-pa-tseku (Tib. Dma'g-btsan bshes-pa).

12 A History of Indian Logic, p. 270

13 na madhyam prasamya vato vareyakhyamayatanam/ material episteme: asvayamvedana vibhava/

14 "Dignaga longed at Vsvesvara by saying that the hearing of the mind (manasa) takes pride in borrowing his definition of perception (pratyaksa) from the Sutra of the Vaisenekas, viz., that perception is knowledge which arises from the interaction of the soul with the mind, the mind with a sense-organ, and the sense-organ with its object. The Nyaya-vaisesika however careful not to connect his perception with individuality (samsara), particularly (vera), substance (dravya), quality (guna) and action (karma) on which, as pointed out by Dignaga, the Vaisenekas's samsaraviveka is dependent. Oh I what a strange consistency".

15 A History of Indian Logic, p. 279

16 The controversy regarding comparison as a separate instrument of valid knowledge it is very ancient. We find certain references of this in Nyaya-samgraha and Nyaya-Kumarajiva, e.g., NM, pp. 120-20; NRK, pp. 193-204

17 Chapter V of Prasana-samuccaya contains the doctrine of Aruna.

18 Fragments from Dignaga have been found in severallogicaltexts of Indian philosophy. Besides, also a large number of reconstructive works of Dignaga's texts have been stimulated by a number of scholastics of different countries. Translations in different languages from the original Sanskrit and Tibetan translations are also available. vide The Encyclopedia of Indian philosophy, vol I, pp. 51-55
19 19
20 20
21 21
22 22
23 23
24 24
25 25
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27 27
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29 29
30 30
31 31
32 32
33 33
34 34
35 35

"..."


38 Collections of different views of Tattvacara from the works of Jaimini and others can be a valuable contribution to the Indian philosophical studies.

39 "The name of this scholar does not actually occur in three works. Jaimini's introduction introduces his views as those of a 'certain scholar' (apaktha) (Bombayvada, pp. 237, 255). The marginal notes supply the names. Now what we could gather about this scholar in this text is that Vatsyayana wrote some treatises on NayaΠyika philosophy to which the refutation of the Buddhist position will refer in later stages. The five points against the Buddhist position had been proved ineffective in the later works.

39 "...Jaimini had to face a number of scholars who included considerable importance at his time. Many important texts are now lost and perhaps irretrievable. In these works, the system of thousands of highest principles only have been preserved. Those interested between two such works can be lost. Vatsyayana's views were quoted anonymously in these works. Thus some of the later views on NayaΠyika are now lost. In Vatsyayana's "Nayya-vidya" of Udayana, both the Buddhist and Jain authors have preserved passages from ancient writings with proper reference to their authors. Jaimini in his "Nayya-vidya" is responsible for preserving school passages from the works of many important scholars that came between Bhakangoni and Udayana and thus his "Nayya-vidya" became an important document to a student of Indian logic."


41 In the 11th century the Buddhist, Jain, Vaishnava, and Shaivite schools contributed voluminous writing on Buddhist thought and logic. In the NayaΠyika list from the beginning of the 11th century the NayaΠyika logicians were much engaged with the philosophy of the New School of NayaΠyika logic, i.e., with Tattvacarma of Gauniya.

42 BL, p. 35
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Tika ma man-pana-ma (Prakritani-vatika). mDo z nv 11.250b, 6-329b, 1.
In the past, there were artists who drew human beings that could be mistaken for real. After the Mahaparinirvana of Lord Buddha, for a hundred years, there were still several such artists in existence.

During the time of Lord Buddha, there were two great kings, Bhumbasa of Magadha and Udayana of Syangrong (Vatsa). Both were contemporaries of Lord Buddha in the 6th century B.C. and were close friends. King Udayana sent a priceless gift of a coat of mail to king Bhumbasa which could ward off the effects of weapon, poison, fire, etc. The latter could not find a suitable reason (present) and was depressed. Then his Prime Minister Dhyar Tsul (Vadsukara) suggested that since Lord Buddha was residing in his kingdom and as he was the most precious jewel in the three worlds, it would be a fitting present if a painting of Lord Buddha was presented to King Udayana (Udra-yana). Therefore, Bhumbasa requested Lord Buddha to permit him to draw his portrait on cloth. The artist found it impossible to draw the portrait, due to a brightness that radiated from Lord Buddha’s body. The artist finally finished the portrait, looking at the reflection of Lord Buddha in a pond. This painting of Lord Buddha was called “Thub-pa-chub-lon-ma” which means Buddha’s portrait made from the reflection in water.

While Buddha was preaching in Ser-kya (Kapilavastu), the wife of the householder Mingchen (Mahamuni) was listening to Buddha’s teachings. She sent her maid Rohini to fetch her jewellery from her house. Rohini was reluctant to go as she too, wished to hear Lord Buddha’s teachings, but as she had no alternative but to obey her mistress’ order, she went to get the jewellery. On her way back, she was hit by a pregnant cow and killed, but before she breathed her last, she took refuge in Lord Buddha, having great faith in him. As a result, she was reborn as a princess to the king of Ceylon. Her birth was accompanied by a miraculous rain of pearls, for which reason, she was named princess Mang-khi-thiang (a creeping plant of pearls). When she grew up, she heard about the Buddha and his teachings from Magadhan traders coming to Ceylon. Having great faith in the Buddha, she
sent a letter and a present. As a return present, Lord Buddha sent her a painting of himself on cloth, which an artist had drawn from the spiritual ray of light that radiated from his body. This painting is called "Thub-pa-nod-zer-ma" which means the portrait of Buddha made on cloth from the rays that emanate from him. On seeing the portrait, the princess was overwhelmed by deep faith in Lord Buddha and as a consequence, she perceived the truth. This painting was a model of aesthetic perfection. Later paintings of Central and Eastern India evolved from it.

Once a householder named Ges-phyin invited Lord Buddha and his disciples for a feast. Since the Buddha could not be present at the feast, his disciple Mgon-po-das-phyin (Anatha Pindala) thought that it would be most improper and the gathering would not look majestic. Therefore, Anatha Pindala requested Lord Buddha to allow him to make an image of the Lord from precious jewel to represent him at the feast. Permission was granted and he made several Buddha images.

When Buddha went to heaven to preach to his mother, the king of Glass-ldan (Kashi), Glass-tsi-gyi (Pratamapal), made a sandalwood image of Lord Buddha and when the Lord descended to earth this sandalwood image took six steps to welcome him. Buddha directed the sandalwood image to go to China for the benefit of the people there. The image flew to China and is there till this day. It was called "Tan-dan-gzi-sho" (Sandalwood Buddha). In China many paintings were done of this Jobo, and such paintings were known as "Se-Than". These were the earliest of Buddhist paintings.

Before Lord Buddha attained Nirvana, he instructed that his image be made to act as his representative so that his teachings may flourish unhindered by heretics. Rahuladeva made the image "Thub-pa-gang-chang-mcho" from several precious Naga's jewels.

Once, Indra told Vakshakarma to make an image of Lord Buddha from gems collected from gods, men and Asuras. Vakshakarma made three images of Lord Buddha of the age of eight, twelve and twenty-five years. The former two he was able to make by asking Buddha's name at how tall Buddha was at the respective age. The image at the age of twenty-five was taken by Indra as heaven. The two other stayed for many years in Old China. During King Song-Suan Gampo's time (617-641 A.D.) his Chinese queen Han-shin-kun-ja and his Nepalese queen, Bal-sa Khi-shan, brought these two images to Tibet. The image of Buddha at eight is in the Lhasa Gtsang-lug-khang and the one at twelve in Ram-po-che-gang-lug-khang. These two images were considered to be very sacred as they were blessed by Lord Buddha himself.

After the Mahaparinirvana of Lord Buddha, there were very few human artists who could make images of God. Hence, many Gods took the form of men and helped human artists to make beautiful images of Lord Buddha.

About eighty years after Lord Buddha, there lived three Brahamin brothers in Magadha. The eldest made a temple and an image of Lord Buddha from precious stones, the second collected earth from eight sacred places in India (Lumbini, Bodh Gaya, Sarnath, Rajgir, Saravasti, Sarnath, Nalanda and Kushinagar) and erected an image of Lord Buddha in Rajgir, and the third made an image of Lord Buddha at the age of thirty-five from the best powdered sandalwood (Gotho-ba) and from several precious jewels. This image was known to be a perfect replica of Lord Buddha and was called Mahabuddha. Several patrons made unique and precious images in Magadha.
During Ashoka’s time (273 B.C. to 236 B.C.) eight chortens (stupas) were built by Good-shyn (demi-god artisans) in eight pilgrimage centres, and during the time of Nagarjuna 58 B.C., 78 A.C., or 120 A.C. (400 years after Buddha according to Tibetan sources), Naga artists made several Buddha images. Images made by Gods, Naga and demi-Gods were made in such a way even after several years they could be mistaken for real. Images made later did not have the same effect of realism. Several artists made self-ideal images from their own imagination and thus many styles were evolved. In Magadhā, during the reign of King Sanga-rygas-phyo, there lived a man called Birisbisa, in Māra, during King Najag-chshad, there lived a man named Sjugdi, and during King Devapāla’s reign, there lived in Bengal an artist Warendra Doma (Dishun) and his son Bdpala. These artists were extremely good in painting and making images. From Birisbisa, there evolved the image style of Central India, from Sjugdi, there evolved the image style of Western India. From Warendra Doma evolved the image style of Eastern India and from his son Bdpala, the image style of Magadhā and Central India.

In Nepal, images of the old Western Indian style were used but later the style of Eastern India was adopted. In Kashmir, the original images were that of the Western Indian style but later a completely new style was brought in by the great artist Hasura, which to this day is called ‘Khu-che-ma’ or Kashmir style. In Southern India the art of making Buddha images became widespread and styles of three masters Jaya (Rgyal-ba), Prjaya (Gshagan-las-rgyal-ba) and Bṣjaya (Rnam-pr-rgyal-ba) became popular. However, much of the skill was lost and there was a general decline in the art. Of all the styles, only the Southern style did not reach Tibet.

There were many self-evolved images at the time of King Srong-btsan-gampo. Such as the principal images of Khra bhrug temple of Yarlung in Southern Tibet and the most precious eleven-headed Avalokītesvara of Lhaasa Guag-lgag-kvang. During the reign of king khr Khos-rges-fbe-brun (740 to 798) many images were erected and one such image was the Buddha image at Sama-yes monastery known as ‘Jowo-byang-chub-chensor’.

The Nepalese style was the most popular in Tibet. Later on Sman-bla-don-grub-shabs (1440 A.D.) of Lho-brag-sman-thang in Tibet, who was regarded as an incarnation of Manjushri, went to Yumb and learned the art from Rdo-pa-bka-shis-rgyal-po. He saw the painting called ‘Sithang’ which he had painted in his foreign life in China. The painting brought back his recollection of his foreign life as an artist and he painted a great Thanka called ‘Sman-thang Chen-mo’ with which he established a new style. His son and pupils established two schools of arts. Besides, Mkyen-brts-brten-mo of Gong-dkar-syang-stod in southern of Lhasa also started a new style. Sman-bla-don-grub-shabs and Mkyen-brts-brten-mo were considered two of the greatest artists of Tibet.

Another new and beautiful style was started by Spurl-skhu-byi-ki, whose colour surpassed the former two. Another artist Gtsang-pa-cho-dbyings-rgya-moo (1645 - A.D.) started the Sman-gsar school of painting. Subsequently, many other styles were evolved which merged into the three early schools.

Spurl-skhu-tam-mth’i-bka-shis (1550 - A.D.) of Yu-stod in the south of Lhasa, believed to be the incarnation of Karnataka Mi-Mkhyod-rdo-rje, learnt the Sman-thang style of painting from Skul-ldan shar-phyo-pa dkon-mchog phan-sde of Ac, in South Tibet. Later he copied the Indian style of line drawing of images, and for background and colours he followed the Sithang style of Chinese painting that was prevalent during the time of the emperor Tai-ming. This style of painting was known as the ‘Ggar-br’ style. Spurl-skhu
Nam-ika-tha-bika-sha, Cho-bika-sha and kar-sho-darma-bika-sha were responsible for the spread of the Sagar-bri style of painting. Sra-drak Sla-khun-pa and Pad-nas-mikha-po were famous for making images. Kar-sho-dharma was well-known for making images of the Sagar-bri style but his style is lost now. During the Fifth Dalai Lama's (1417 - 1682 A.D.) time, Hor-dar and Sla-kha Rab-phyo were famous for making images. Their style of making images was followed by Hisod-dul (government craft centre in Shol, below potola).

Hrugs-pa-padma-dkar-po (1557 to 192 A.D.) gave a brief description of Buddhist images made in India, Tibet, Mongolia and China. In India the images were classified according to the different regions of north, south, east, west and central India. The images made in central India were made of bronze, Zhi-ha-rim, red bell metal, white bell metal, red bronze, Bodhi tree clay of Nagas and stone. Zhi-ha-rim was found in the river beds of Sambhu in western India, and was known as red gold as it appears like red gold. Zhi-ha-rim contains seven precious Nagas' jewels and was like the wish-fulfilling jewels. The real colour of Zhi-ha-rim is a glowing red but on close examination, it radiates the colour of a rainbow. Rainbow colours were more distinct when the juice of a certain virulent poison (Tien-duk) was applied on Zhi-ha-rim.

Rje-shes-rab-rgya-mtso relating to images, stated that Zhi-ha-rim contains seven precious jewels. Real Zhi-ha-rim radiates five rainbow colours when the poison Tien-duk is applied on it. There were some natural-copper alloys found underground which were identified as Zhi-ha-rim. Artificially manufactured Zhi-ha-rim was prepared by melting gold, silver, copper, iron, kar-tho, white and black lead and quick silver.

Hrugs-med-rgyl-po (1729 - 1998 A.D.) states that there were two types of Zhi-ha-rim - red gold, and the other was prepared by adding seven precious jewels to the molten metal. In artificially prepared Zhi-ha-rim, part of the various metals could be visible and when placed in the sun, rainbow colours radiated like the Lhasa Jovo Rimphoe. In the biography of the Fifth Dalai Lama, it mentioned that the Lhasa Jovo Rimphoe was made from ten jewels of human beings and Devas.

Red bell metal was red in colour with a marked yellowish shade and white bell metal white in colour with a distinct yellowish shade. Red and white bell metals found in Lyul (Khotan) were considered to be the most valuable materials for making images in ancient times and it was believed that the very existence of these materials was due to the blessings of the past four Buddhas. Hrugs-med-rgyl-po again states that red and white bell metal found in the hills of Ceylon and Lyul (Khotan) were considered as the most precious materials for making images as the hills of Ceylon were blessed by the past four Buddhas. There were, however, variations in the art of casting metal. According to some, artificial bell metal was prepared by mixing equal quantities of nine metals of gold, copper, iron, tin, zinc, all bronze and lead. The body of the Buddha image made of white bell metal and the cloak of red bell metal was called 'Thub-pa-sang-dang-ma'. This was also mentioned by Hrugs-pa-pad-dkar. However, according to Rje-shes-rab-rgya-mtso, the Buddha image of central India, the body of which was of yellow bell metal and the cloak of red bell metal, was known as 'Thub-pa-sang-dang-ma'.

Images made of red copper were easily distinguishable. It was believed that Lord Buddha through his prayer has made that whoever touched as image made from the Bodhi tree would be freed from taking rebirth in the three lower worlds of beasts, hungry ghosts and hell. There were images made from soft clay of the Nagas and white marble.
Hti-nga-md-gling-pa states that the Nagas gave soft clay to Nagarjuna (four hundred years after the demise of Lord Buddha according to Tibetan sources). Similarly, Rje-zhes-chub-rgya-mtsho mentioned that Nagarjuna was invited to the land of Nagas and was presented with soft clay. Several images like “Thub-pa-klu-bhig-ma” and “Ha-shang-khu-bhig-ma” of Ngo-mtar temple in Amdo were made from the soft clay of the Nagas. There were images made from the soft clay of the Nagas. These were images made from the Thidka painting “Thub-pa-bod-ge-ma” (the portrait of Buddha on cloth) which Buddha sent to the princesses Mutig-khe-shing of Ceylon. In this image, the body was slim, the crown on the head was horizontal, the nose high, long and the lips sharp. The point between the eye brows was absolutely parallel to the tip of the nose. The space between the eyes was narrow and the lips were beautifully shaped. The Lhasa Tob Rinpoche was classified amongst this image. The sandalwood image of Lord Buddha made by the king of Gsul-ldan (Kashi) was later reproduced. Images made in this form were well shaped and proportionate. Clothes were well-shaped and the folds evenly spaced, hands uplifted and heels fairly thick and the face was a longish oval shape. These images were mistaken to be made in Bhakara and Khotan. Like the sandalwood jobo, “Thub-pa-gser-gling-ma” of the-thang in southern Tibet belongs to this type of image.

The images of Bodhisattvas had a relaxed posture and were never stiff. They had a handsome face, proportionate and good bodily features. The plaited hair bound on the top of the head was in an upright position, adorned with ornaments. Some of these ornaments were made from the precious Naga’s gems. Images of wrathful deities (khor-ba) were neither stiff nor curved in pose. Some images had no throne, whereas others had thrones beautifully shaped and ornamented, supported by figures of men with great physical strength or by lions. Hti-nga-md-gling-pa mentions that very few wrathful figures were made in India because the Tantric teachings were kept in great secret at that time.

Images of these-faced deities resting on fully opened lotus cushions and others on a partly opened lotus cushions but in an upright position were also found. In some cases the lotus were double, some rows of lotus facing upright and some rows turned downwards. Between the two lotus, one above another below, were drawn two lines adorned with a chain of pearls.

Partho-ba rdo-rje-md-ge-pa-chos (Mata Vararana. 11th cent. A.D.) made the image “Gsum-chub-ma” purely of white bell metal. The head of the image was slightly small in proportion to the body. The cheeks were high and full. The image “Thub-pa-khlab-hbla-ma” (Buddha image) was made in Majapith and the image “Chos-lhakhor-ma” in Varanasi.

The images made in east India had a broad forehead. The upper portion of the body was broad resembling that of a lion. The face was short, and the fingers were joined together. The crown of the head (Gsum-gtor) was placed slightly towards the back. These images were placed on the thrones as those of central India, except that the petals of the lotus cushion made in east India were turned slightly inward. Spacing between the upper and lower lotus was filled with chain of designs, but the designs along the lower lotus had bigger gaps than the designs in the upper lotus which were compact. Images made in Zahor (near Dacca in Bangladesh) were mostly identical with others made in east India, except that the white bell metal images of Zahor were studded with gold, silver and copper. The eyes were of silver and copper; some were decorated with precious gems and some were
adorned with pearl necklaces. The belief that these images originated in Dehradun later spread to east India in a Hindu notion. According to Hij-i-red-gurl-ga, images made in Bengal were of white bell metal with eyes and lips of silver and gold, and they looked livelier than those made elsewhere. Precious stones were stuck on these images to beautify them.

Most of the images in south India were made of red bell metal though there were some made of the soft clay of the Nagas and white bell metal. The face of these images was small but with marked cheek bones. The gap between the eyes was slightly wider than normal. The forehead was narrow and the nose slightly flat like that of an ancient Dravidian race. It is very rare to find south Indian images in relaxed postures. The cloak was well-draped without any closed mark. The throne and the single-peaked lotus were broad with lips of the lower petal slightly hollow. The images were slightly gilded with gold of a reddish colour. The shape of the images made in Betha (Kerela) resembled those made in other parts of south India. Exception that the cheek bones of Betha images were not prominent. Chisel marks were noticeable on the cloaks. The face was small with fairly large eyes. The upper part of the nose was lightly hollowed. The lips were slightly protruding with the ends curved up. The images were quite large and in a comfortable posture, adorned with beautiful ornaments and clothed with loose robes but their finishing was rather crude; especially the fingers, toes and lotus cushions. The lotus cushions have a double lotus touching one another in upside down position. Most of them did not have the bordering designs running parallel above and below the lotus cushion. Very few white bell metal images were made in south India. Marble images are excellently shaped and beautifully adorned with ornaments. The mouth was well-shaped and the space between the eyes was narrow. The upper part of the nose was slightly flat, while the lower portion was slightly high. The images were made with a slight curve in postum and the spacing between the folds of the robes was even.

Images made in North India were made from an alloy of white bell metal and brass, giving the image a whishah shade. They were well-shaped and proportionate to a relaxed posture. The face was small with a prominent nose and the gap between the eyes was narrow. The throne and the ornaments were exquisite. Some images of this kind were also made of red bell metal. Hij-i-red-gurl-ga says that most of the images in north India have a simple standing and sitting posture. In Kashmir, images were not only made of white but also of red bell metal, stone, enamel and Zikhyin. Images of Zikhyin were mostly made in Kashmir. Images made in this part have long, heavy faces with thick lips. The gap between the eyes was narrow and the tip of the nose slightly rounded. The posture with supple limbs was in an uncomfortable position. Several images have taper lips and silver eyes. The tip of the tusk on the head was slightly depressed. The cloak was well draped with even spacing between folds which extended fairly long. Some were adorned with pearl bracelets and pearl necklaces. White others had hill hair. Some were seated on thrones and some on lotus cushions, the petals of which were plain, large and open. Some of these images were identical to those made in central India. The difference between the two types of these images was this. The cheek bone prominent, the shoulders and ankles thin and the headdress Hij-i-red-gurl-ga had noted the same except that he had not mentioned the supple limbs.

In Tibet, the Chhos-rgyal-Lima (Bell metal image) made during the reign of different kings was encouraged during three different periods. It was first introduced at the time of king Srong-brtan-sgam-po (7th century A.D.). During this time images were made of Zikhyin, pure red and white bell metal. Besides, images were also made of gold, silver
and crystal glass. Some images were made in the chess board design with red and white bell metal. These images have a wide and proportionate body with a longish face and big nose. The eyelids were long, the lips supple and the robes with few folds. Some were seated on lotus cushions which resembled those made in south India and some images were without a stand. Some images wore gowns, shoes, and were crowned with three spikes slightly bent inwards. In most cases chisel marks were visible on the robes. Images of kings were adorned with turbans and shoes with chisel carved designs. Some images were gilded with gold whereas other were polished or unpolished. High-rotated gliding pa mentions that during king Shron-崩-sam-po's time, images were made mostly of red bell metal adorned in laymen's robes. Images of khor-bo (wrought deities) made during this period have a less fierce expression.

The second period of Chho-gsal-lima was begun in the time of king Kho-song-ide-btser (8th century A.D.). The shape and quality of these images were like those made during the time of king Shron-崩-sam-po, except that the faces were small and fingers badly shaped. Although the images were well polished and adorned with multicoloured ornaments with three spiked crowns, they did not have a good finish. Images of this period did not have turbans but had plaited hair loosely held on all sides. According to Higs-med-glting-pa, images made during the reign of king Shron-崩-ide-btser were heavily polished.

The third period of Chho-gsal-lima was during the reign of king khei-ral-po-chan (9th century A.D.). The images of this period were very much like those of Central India except that they had a heavier face and relaxed posture. The eyes were of silver and copper. The Zang-drang-ma images have copper lips and silver eyes. The brass images have a poor finishing and the images made from an alloy of bell metal and copper have a darker complexion than those made during the time of the former two kings. All the images were gilded with gold.

At the time of king Ye-shes-hod and Byang-chub-hod (11th century A.D.) of Mangshis, images were made from an alloy of red copper and zinclyth. These images were well built with a sharp nose and were in an eased posture, resembling those made in Nepal. They were gilded with gold from Shang-shung, a province in Western Tibet. Images of this period were known as "shon-mching-ma." According to Higs-med-glting-pa, these images were made from different coloured bell metal. Images made during this period were excellent in material and shape. In shape these images resembled the Chho-gsal-lima and were often mistaken to be made in China.

In Mongolia, images were chiefly made in upper Bogkahara, Yugar, Kiootan (Li-yul) and lower Bogakahara with slight variations in their styles. During the reign of king Halahu, upper Bogkahara images were mostly made from an alloy of lead, white bell metal and red bell metal. The colour was darkish but a little lighter than the Chinese brass. The faces of these images were small and round with a sharp nose and well built posture identical to those made in Kusum. The clothes were well draped with closely spaced frills like sea waves. The lotus cushions had a double lotus design with a large single petal, hollow in shape. There was a slight depression at the base. The cushions were circular or square, supported by Nagas, and in some cases the images were placed on rocks instead of throne. Their images made by Chinese artisans from an alloy of lead and bell metal. These images have a narrow face, stumpy body, small eyes and mouth with the chin slightly scooped out. The cloak had numerous pleats. The fingers carried religious offerings. The throne and cushion had Chinese characters inscribed on them. These images were made of dull bell metal by
The Muslim artisans and they resembled those made in Kashmir. Some images were gilded whereas others were not. In Yugar (part of Mongolia situated north of Andor) the images were made from an alloy of white metal and silver and have a silver shade. They were also made from an alloy of lead and bell metal. The faces of these images were small, round, with a slightly flat nose and black hair. The bodies were proportionate but the fingers and toes had a crude finishing. These images were seated in an uncomfortable posture. They were scarcely ornamented and the ornaments were poorly made. The cloaks were well draped with few pleats. Most of these images were seated on a lotus cushion or throne. The lotus cushions were similar to those made in upper Bokhara.

Images made in Liyul (Khotan) were similar to the ones made during the time of king Strong-btsan-sgam-po. The main images of Btsan-yen-dge-rgyal temple and khyi-brug temple were believed to have been brought from Li-yul.

In lower Bokhara, images were made from an alloy of lead and bell metal. They were also made from white lead and wood. The faces of these images were badly shaped, the lower half being larger than the upper half. The eyes and mouth were small but the lips were well-shaped. The fingers were short and the feet and hands looked like those of a young boy. Roofs were closely fitted with the folds and pleats evenly spaced. Most of the images were placed on thrones and on rocks. During the time of emperor Gudan, when China was under the Mongolian sovereignty till the time of emperor Yongzheng (a period of six generations have lapsed between the two), images were made from an alloy of cong (a kind of bell metal) and red bell metal and were gilded with gold. These images were made exactly like the ones that were made in China. Images were also made from sandalwood, crystal glass, red jade, white jade, rhinoceros horn, gold, silver and zilykym.

In China we find two categories of images, ancient and modern. The older images were made during the reign of emperor Tang-chu. These images were well-shaped, heavily built with long faces, all eyes, lips perfectly shaped, nose slightly flat and hands slightly shorter. They were heavily adorned with ornaments and their clothes were finely fitted with evenly spaced folds. The modern Chinese images were made during the reign of emperor Ta-feng. These images have a flat face and long eyes. The gold colour which was used to gild these images were outstanding. The folds of the robes were evenly spaced. The lotus cushion had a double design all round and the tips of the petals were bent outward. The bordering design running parallel to the lotus above and below were evenly spaced. The base of the image was finely sealed with the crossed Vajra design carved on it and painted with red Chinese varnish. Images of poorer craftsmanship do not have the crossed Vajra design at the red varnish. These images were known as 'Skurims-ma' and were made of brass.

According to Hsia-Neo-gling-pa the older types of Buddhist images in China were made during the reign of emperor Tang-chu. These images were made from an alloy of bell metal and lead. Modern Chinese images, according to him were of two types 'Thugs-dan-ma' and 'Skurims-ma'. The 'Thugs-dan-ma' images were well-shaped with long faces. They were finely attired and thickly gilded with gold. On the back of these images was carved and painted the crossed Vajra and some had Chinese marks. The 'Skurims-ma' images were mostly made of brass and do not have good finishing. In China copies were made of 'Chnos-rgyal-bena' which can be identified only by experts.

Rjes-shes-rab-rgya-brtan states that at the time of king Glang-dar-ma, (885 - 906) many Buddhist statues were persecuted and many images destroyed. Some of these images were
believed to have uttered words of pain and some to have even died. Such images were known as 'Glang-dar-khrims-phag-ros'. Reference to such images were also made by the Fifth Dalai Lama in his autobiography’s ‘volume Dza’.

This is only a brief account of the history of ancient Buddhist art from the materials I have so far been able to glean from manuscripts at the Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology. In future, I hope to be able to expand on this subject in greater detail.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TIBETAN SOURCES
That the Buddhist art and Buddhist iconography go together needs hardly any elaboration and is conspicuous through its various modes of creation of such artistic objects as painting, sculpture or icons. It is more so in the case of Mahayana art forms as developed and practised in Tibet, Mongolia and the Trans-Himalayas. What is however, not so well known or usually go unnoticed is the fact that these art forms together with their basic concepts had also travelled to the north along with Buddhism from India. The principles underlying these art forms totally differ from those of the Western mode of expression essentially representational in character and based on mass, volume, dimension etc. treated against perspective view of things and objects. On the other hand the art forms practised and developed in India and the countries of South East Asia, China, Japan, Central Asia and Trans-Himalayas professing both Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism have been based on linear decorative compositions on a single plane in total disregard of the perspective view. This applies with the icons both Brahmanic and Buddhist where the same linear-decorative principles predominate rather than the anatomical preciseness of the Greek models be it depicted in Buddha Rupa, forms of gods and goddesses or symbolic representation of sea, animal, floral or other motifs or any other natural phenomenon.

Buddhist art is for that matter the Mahayana art due to its strict adherence to scriptural injunctions and inticate doctrinaire preoccupations defy any direct understanding by a common observer. It is with a view to facilitate such understanding that the Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology has come out with its latest publication Sangs-rgyas Stong (Sahara Buddha, sub-titled "An Introduction to Mahayana Iconography"...a handy exposition of the secretos of Mahayana Buddhist icons, lucidly narrated by Prof. Nirmal C. Sinha, the Director of the Institute and formally released by Mr. V.V. Rameswar, the Governor of Sikkim and the President, Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology, Gangtok. The author in his preface has stated the objective of the publication that: "A book on Mahayana Iconography simple for the beginner and lucid for the general reader is not an easy task. The task is made doubly difficult when it is desired that the book should be acceptable to the specialist". That both these purposes have been amply served is clearly manifest on the pages of the book. In fact and as stated by the author, he followed the advice of a specialist of Stella Kramrisch's standing according to whom "the best exposition of Mahayana icons was to present or project the believer's point of view". The author had accepted the assignment "with due humility keeping in mind the advice of a leading authority at Madame Stella Kramrisch and showing upon his on-the-spot knowledge of Mahayana monasteries in Himalayas, Trans-Himalayas and Bakhals. Himself a distingushed historian and an authority on Northern Buddhism, the author's treatment of the
subject testifies to his insight and his claim of direct access to the mysteries of the Mahayana pantheon as depicted through art forms.

It is indeed a fascinating study to know about the proliferation of Buddha Rupa into thousand (Sahara) through the meditative visions of the devotees or through the believers' eyes, about the t-molda (Pratika) and their significance, the emergence of three levels of Buddha Rupa (Trikaya) and above all the overriding principles of 'Dharma' encompassing all animate being through which one gets a glimpse—a rare acquaintance with a world once shrouded in mystery but profoundly inspired with a sense far exceeding the mundane estimates of our life.

If we consider the circumstances of Buddhism's entry into Tibet, we would find that its impact was that of a distant echo—much of it had an appeal towards mystery so that the search was turned inwardly. Naturally, the result was partly fantasy, early deep meditational trance—further resulting into vision of images and emergence of numerous forms with numerous variations depending on the individual attainment of the devotees.

In this context, Buddha Rupa also became symbolic in the eyes of the believers. Buddha is not 'Rupa Kaya' (mundane form or 'Sharira'). He is an 'emboss' (of the Absolute—'Shunya' or Void) rather than a 'body' (of imputations). However, for the sake of comprehension of our senses we need to pass through the stages and travel gradually from sentient to transcendent. Hence, the emergence of Buddha Rupa in three levels (Trikaya). Nirmala kaya (assumed body) Manusha Buddha or Budhisattava, who appear in human form to alleviate sufferings of sentient beings; Shambhoga kaya (the body of bliss) super humans capable of blessing the devotees in personal manner; Dharma kaya (the cosmic body) the incomprehensible Absolute beyond all limits of time, form, cause and effect cycle—the void or 'Shunya'.'

This is the conceptual framework under which the artist who is also a devotee and belongs to the Sangha has to visualise the technique, forms and colours suitable for depicting the imagery. The process is therefore, one of complex appreciative perception achieved through meditative practice. The artist in this case is himself a believer and a visionary with a third eye.

The author who knows his job as well as the land of Sahara Buddha well, we have a lucidly compressed account of Mahayana iconography though as an introduction and would look forward to a more comprehensive history of the subject comprising a much wider perspective of its occurrence over the past centuries.

However, the author's occasional turn towards emotionally arousing episodes from the Cita, Kusinagar or even the Tantara could only reveal his deep sense of commitment and belongingness to the high order that gave rise to such splendid burst of spiritual culture hidden for long behind a mysterious world of existence. Mr. T.V. Rajawar, the Governor and the President SRT in his well-written foreword has rightly commended the author in the following words: "His knowledge of Buddhism and Buddhist Doctrine is encyclopaedic'.

Last but not least, the beautifully produced book became all the more revealing with highly ornamental canonical line drawings of Lama Karjan Aisen and the colour plates reproduced from the Thankas that gave much more to it than a mere collection of printed matter between the covers.
TALES THE THANKAS TELL
by Prof. Nirmal C. Sinha
Published by Director SRTI Gangtok, 1989, pp. 64, Price Rs. 200.00

Prof. Nirmal Sinha’s contribution towards Buddhist studies especially that of the
Mahayanaic Lamaist tradition is immense. Equally true is his interest in arts and a deep
sense of aesthetic values besides his prowess and rather ‘encyclopaedic’ knowledge in the
subject of Mahayanaic Buddhist lore. It is the interest in the realm of arts and aesthetics in
general and art forms as related to Mahayanaic pantheon and revealed through believers’
vision is particular that made him wander across the Himalayan and trans-Himalayan
region extending through desert lands of Central Asia including Tun-Huang (Known as
‘Cave of the Thousand Buddhas’) important seats of Buddhist learning from Urga in
Mongolia to Kham in eastern Tibet observing and studying the relics, monuments, icons
and art objects of all varieties through the eyes of not only connoisseurs but with the
humbleness of a believer and a devotee having faith in concepts otherwise deemed
curious or the uninstructed. His latest work ‘Tales the Thankas Tell’ is a
book dedicated to the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru on his Birth Centenary Year and
published by Director SRTI (Gangtok, 1989) is intended to be a “popular guide” for lay
readers as well as specialists “about the visual portraits of Tibet and Mongolia” and seeks
to “present in simple language all aspects of Thankas”. The book is a follow up of the earlier
publication by the author entitled SANG-BOYAS SYENG (An Introduction to Mahayana
Iconography, Gangtok, 1988) and fulfills, though humbly, the wishes of a great soul who
was himself an explorer in the vast realm of human intellect. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, it
will also go a long way in fulfilling the long felt needs of lay observers who are often
bewildered at the splendid portrayal of figures, symbols and apparent riot of colours that
these fabulous art forms reveal.

While acknowledging the fact that “The original and sole inspiration of Thankas has
been religious more precisely ritualistic” the learned author traces the sources for the mode
and technique of these exquisitely decorative paintings in the following words, “For
sculpture or icons in round in Tibet and Mongolia, the dominant if not the sole, influence
was from South, that is, India and Nepal. The Northern Buddhist pictorial art... drew
inspiration from all directions... Irahn, Nectarian or Byzantine mural and icons on wooden slabs or on textile made their influence felt... further into Tun-Huang, Lhasa and
Sakya. Above all the Chinese aesthetics made a heavy impact on portraits on textile, silk
or otherwise.”

As regards themes, the Thanka “paintings from the monk artists of Sakya, Narothang,
Tashi Lhunpo or Lhasa in Central Tibet, Chumdo, Derge, Pulung or Kathok in Kham,
Kumbum or Pemra Machin in ando and Urga (Ulan Bator) in Mongolia constitute a very
valuable source of not only the history of the Dharma but also of the general history and
culture of the different religions concerned.”

It is indeed a fascinating turn of history that transformed as if in one stroke a whole
mass of humanity into beholding as the Supreme message of compassion as propounded by
Gautama Sakya Muni, leaving aside their traditional hostilities and primitive postures, that
too with a rare display of faith and perhaps the staunchest adherence to Dharma and the
 teachings of Guru Rinpoche.
More striking feature of this spectacular spiritual resurgence was its humanistic inclination and a spur of activities accompanying it over a period literally extending for centuries finally evolving into a pattern of culture that sought to promote side by side with the intense religious pursuits such secular practices as art, architecture, medicine and craftsmanship of superb excellence. The Thakurs bear the unmistakable imprint of this highly impressionable order; the spiritual content expressed (or revealed?) through artistic forms—transcendental bliss realised at the level of the immaterial. The master concept of 'Trikaya' (Three Bodies) was the foremost principle that provided the basis for all Mahayanistic art forms including the Thakurs. The Thakurs tell the tales through innumerable legends, mythic, imaginations and mystic visions, the ascending order of the Three Bodies; Nirmana kaya (Armed Body) leading to Shambhogakaya (Body of Bliss) and finally to Dharmakaya (Cosmic Body), the Absolute or Shunya. This is the essence of the two books produced in succession by the author with characteristic mastery over the subject matter and the readers will be well advised to possibly go through them together in order to derive full benefit out of them.

Lastly, a word or two about some shortcomings certainly not of content but of form. Firstly, the size of the prints are too small to facilitate any objective comparison with the expository texts following them. Secondly the cover design leaves a little more to desirer both in respect of selection of type face for the title as well as the broad colour areas in red and white. It seems a distribution of some blue (Lapis-Lazuli) somewhere, would have been possible without violating the scriptural injunctions.

That the book dedicated to the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru has come out just in the Nehru Birth Centenary Year will be welcomed by all.

- H.R. BHATTACHARYYA
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