K. Lim

Studies in later Buddhist iconography

In: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 120 (1964), no: 3, Leiden, 327-341

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

STUDIES IN LATER BUDDHIST ICONOGRAPHY

1. *The Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of Nganjuk*

An interesting study by F. D. K. Bosch on Buddhist iconography was published in 1929 under the title: *Buddhistische Gegevens uit Balische Handschriften*,¹ in which by manuscripts are meant: I. the *Sang hyang Nāgabāyusūtra*²; II. the *Kalpabuddha*.³ No. 1 is a prayer to the five Jinas mentioning their names with their corresponding jñānas, colours, mudrās, śīṃhāsanas, paradises, krodha-forms, Tārās, Bodhisattvas and mystic syllables. The *Kalpabuddha* (in Old-Javanese) contains an enumeration of the principal qualities and characteristics of the five Jinas which for the greater part correspond with those of the *Sang hyang Nāgabāyusūtra*. However, the names of their krodha-forms are lacking, instead of which one finds the names of their emblems (sañjatas = weapons), of their cosmic places, of their śaktis, of the sense-organs, and of the places in the body having relations with the quintet. Both mss. are closely allied and treat on the same subject, except some points in which they complement each other. In comparing them with the *Sang hyang Kamahāyānikan* Bosch stated that both mss. are independant of this text, and that, where other sources keep silent, they contain the complete list of the paradises of the five Jinas, viz. Sukhavatī of Amitābha, Abhiratī of Akṣobhya, Ratnavatī of Ratnasambhava, Kusumitaloka of Amoghasiddha and Sahavatiloka of Vairocana. Another particularity is the occurrence in the *Nāgabāyusūtra* of the names of the krodha-manifestations of the five Jinas (in corrupt spelling): Navabava, Yamamaraja, Simhāvaha, Matthāna and Vatsala. This group, according to Bosch, agrees with the 5 Myō O (Vidyārāja)

¹ *Mededelingen der Kon. Nederl. Akad. van Wetenschappen*, afd. Letterkunde, vol. 68 B, no. 3, pp. 43—77. (English translation in: *Selected Studies in Indonesian Archaeology*, The Hague 1961, pp. 109—133, ills.).

² Cf. *Sanskrit Texts from Bali*, edited by Sylvain Lévi, Baroda 1933. *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, vol. LXVIII.

³ Cf. *op.cit.*, note 9, p. xxii.

of the Japanese Mantra-Buddhistic sect, the Shingon, of which we know that they are the demoniac forms of the 5 Tathāgatas.⁴ Although they agree in their functions, their names however are different (except one, viz. Yamamaraja is the sanskrit counterpart of Yamāntaka). The most important information the Balinese mss. contain consists in the names of the 'parivāradevatās' belonging to the 5 Buddhas. In the four cardinal points Vairocana is surrounded by Satvabajrī, Ratnabajrī, etc., Akṣobhya by Vajrarāja, Vajrarāga, etc. Bosch points to the occurrence of 8 of these vajra-deities (belonging to Akṣobhya and Ratnasambhava) in ms. B of the Sang hyang Kamahāyānikan. Moreover, Bosch remarked that he could not find any system in the Nepalese and Tibetan pantheon that might be compared to this Javanese (Balinese) one, from which, however, may not be concluded that an analogous group did not exist in those regions.⁵ Here again the pantheon of the Shingon-sect gave Bosch the point of contact with the Balinese mss. The deities mentioned in these mss. correspond in their functions as well as in their names with the deities described in treatises on the Vajradhātu-(Kongōkai)maṇḍala of the above mentioned sect. For his comparison Bosch made use of H. Smidt's articles on popular conceptions of the Shingon,⁶ which is a recast of Tomita Kojun's work *Himitsu Hyaku Wa*.⁷ Furthermore he drew the attention — and this is most important — to the close resemblance which a group of Hindu-Javanese bronzes known under the name 'Nganjuk bronzes' (consisting of about 90 pieces found in 1913 in the soil of the village Caṇḍi Reja, near Nganjuk, East-Java) bears to this Vajradhātu-maṇḍala.⁸ In the words of Bosch: "It seems to us now that a comparison of the deities of Nganjuk with those of the central square of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala can bring us a step forward in the direction of the explanation of the group as a whole".

The principal figures of the Nganjuk bronzes are at once recognizable as 'Dhyānibuddhas' (they are 'paré'), these being the same deities we

⁴ Cf. J. Przyluski, *Les Vidyārāja, contribution à l'histoire de la magie dans les sectes mahāyānistes*, BEFEO, XXIII, 1923, pp. 301 ff.

⁵ In the course of this article we shall see that such a system is also to be found in Tibet.

⁶ Cf. H. Smidt, *Eine populäre Darstellung der Shingon Lehre*, *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 1. Folge, VI, 1916—1918, pp. 45—61, pp. 180—212; VII, 1918—1919, pp. 103—121.

⁷ Tomita Kojun's work *Himitsu Hyaku Wa* was published in Tōkyō in 1913.

⁸ Cf. N. J. Krom, *De bronsvondst van Ngandjoek, Rapporten Oudheidkundige Dienst*, 1913, pp. 59—72, ill.

meet in the Balinese mss. as well as in the system of the Shingon-sect. In reference to the four-faced principal figure of the bronzes Bosch, however, remarks that it is not Vairocana, but perhaps a particular form of Mañjuśrī. Consequently, the author continues, the maṇḍala of Nganjuk is not wholly identical with the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of the Shingon-sect and the Balinese mss., but must be considered as a sectarian transformation of it.

Another manifestation of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala Bosch wanted to see in the Caṇḍi-Sèwu complex, situated between the provinces Jokyakarta and Surakarta. Ingeniously, again on the analogy of the centre square of the Shingon Vajradhātu-maṇḍala, he was able to replace, in mind, the deities originally standing or sitting on the lotus-cushions in the different empty niches (the original statues all having disappeared) of the principal temple. Moreover, he called the attention to the coincidence that, though for the four Tārās — the so-called 'Playing'-, 'Garland'-, 'Singing'- and 'Dance'-Tārā⁹ — there are no niches left, we find, in the places where we would expect them, scenes in relievo of human figures delighting in dancing, singing, etc. The fact, however, that only a small part of these panels are preserved, prevents the author to be more conclusive on this point. Another striking resemblance between the Caṇḍi-Sèwu complex (sèwu = thousand) and the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala is the encadrement formed in the former by 240 sanctuaries (occupied by Buddha statues) and in the latter (i.e. the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala treated by H. Smidt) by the Thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa.

Till so far the gist of Bosch' article which he himself considers more hypothetical than conclusive. So he winds up with words: "Whether the results of our examination in the form of the suggested hypothesis for the explanation of the bronze group of Nganjuk and of the meaning of Caṇḍi-Sèwu will stand firm, future research will have to prove". He is convinced, however, that Balinese literature, in addition to the above mentioned examples, contains data being of the greatest importance with respect to archaeological research on Java.

The following essay is a preliminary attempt to pursue the course shown by Bosch in order to advance a step in the explanation especially of the Nganjuk bronzes, an attempt which I intend to follow up with a study entering more in details.

Most scholars in writing and speaking about the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala

⁹ I.e. Vajra-lāsī, Vajra-mālā, Vajra-gītā, and Vajra-nṛtā.

and the Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala of Japan, have always kept in mind the so called Genzu Taizōkai-mandara (Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala) imported by Kōbō-daisi (Genzu means: 'the picture in circulation in the present time', it being an addition by which it is distinguished from other maṇḍalas, i.a. the Sanzu mandara, imported by Enchin, etc.; vide: Togano, *Mandara no Kenkyū*, p. 99 f.), and the Genzu Kongōkai-mandara (Vajradhātu-maṇḍala), which are considered as forming an inseparable couple (ryōbu-mandara), belonging to the Shingon-sect, and being present in the Kanjō (Abhiṣeka)-Hall of the Tōji (Eastern Temple) in Kyōto. The articles by Smidt dealing merely with this pair of maṇḍalas are not free from shortcomings and mistakes (e.g. the author gives too little Sanskrit equivalents for the Japanese Buddhistic terms and names. On page 188, *O.Z.*, VI, 1916/18, Shaka Nyorai = Sākya Tathāgata, who got a place north of Vairocana; must it not be Fukuseishū = Amoghasiddhi? etc.). Of these Genzu Taizōkai-mandara and Genzu Kongōkai-mandara, there are many variations. Of the Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala alone there are at least 9 (see Tongano, *op. cit.*, plates 45—53).¹⁰ As we know, this maṇḍala is based on the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*, of which Chinese and Tibetan translations were made.¹¹ The Chinese translation was executed by Zemmui (Śubhakarasiṃha) between 724 and 725 (see Tokano, *op. cit.*, p. 67, and R. Tajima, *Etude sur le Mahāvairocana-sūtra*, Paris 1936, p. 141) while the Tibetan translation came into being about a hundred years later, during the reign of Ral pa can (806—842), king of Tibet, done by the Indian monk Śilendrabodhi and the Tibetan translator dPal brtsegs (see Togano, *op. cit.*, p. 67). Though both translations are essentially of the same tenor, there are some minor points of difference (Togano, *op. cit.*, p. 67) which, however insignificant they may seem in the texts, wax in proportion as soon as the maṇḍalas derived from the texts are depicted. Apart from these differences, other monks as Vajrabodhi, Amoghavajra, Buddhaguhya (invited to Tibet by K'ri sroñ lde bstan (728—786),¹² and not to forget Zemmui himself,

¹⁰ In due time I hope to discuss these variants in greater detail.

¹¹ A translation in French of the first chapter together with an analysis of the subsequent chapters is given in R. Tajima, *Étude sur le Mahāvairocana-sūtra (Dainichikyō) avec la traduction commentée du premier chapitre*. Paris 1936, 8vo.

¹² For a discussion of the dates of K'ri sroñ lde bstan, Ral pa can, etc., cf. G. Tucci, *The Validity of Tibetan Historical Tradition*, in: *India Antiqua, a Volume of Oriental Studies presented to J. Ph. Vogel*, Leiden 1947, pp. 309—322, and G. Tucci, *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*. Roma 1950. *Serie Orientale Roma*, I.

wrote comments on the same subject, so bringing forth different appearances of the Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala, so that we could make a real pedigree of this maṇḍala-‘family’.

With regard to what Bosch wrote about the Nganjuk bronzes, in which he saw a representation of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala in bronze — an opinion we completely agree with — we will try to show to which ‘family’ of that maṇḍala the Nganjuk bronzes belong.

The Vajradhātu-maṇḍala is based on the so called Kongōchogyō (= the Sino-Jap. abbr. of the Sanskrit: *Vajraśekhara-sarvatathāgata-satyā-saṃgraha-mahāyāna-pratyutpannābhisam-buddha-mahātantrarāja-sūtra* (for a description of this text, see S. Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. II, p. 1341), which was introduced in China by Amoghavajra (ca. 746), who translated a part of it, corresponding with the central group of the nine-fold Vajradhātu-maṇḍala. He died before he could translate the rest of it (Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 189). Consequently, his work contains no information about the deities occupying the eight squares which surround the central one. In the Sung period (960—1278), the work was completely translated in Chinese by Śikṣānanda and Dharmabhadra (?) (cf. Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 190).

Of the Tibetan translations of texts on this subject we mention Śākyamitra’s *Kosālaṃkāra-tattvasaṃgrahaṭīka* (indicated by Toganoo as: *Commentary on the Kongōchogyō of the first Meeting*), executed by Dharmasrībhadrā and the famous official translator (lotsāva) of Tibet Rin c’en bzan po, born in 958 in Mngaḥ-ris — now Ngari-khorsum — in Western Tibet; he went three times to Kasmir to study Buddhism which flourished there. When he was 55 he went from Kasmir to Tibet.¹³ For his work, *Mandara no Kenkyū*, Toganoo made also use of Tibetan translations of Ānandagarbha’s works: *Sarva-tathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha-mahāyānābhisamaya-nāma-tantra-vyākhyā-tattvāloka-karī-nāma* (translated in Tibetan by the Indian Scholars Mahākaruṇa and Āryaprajña) and the *Vajradhātu-mahāmaṇḍalopāyikā-sarva-vajro-daya-nāma* (translated by the Indian Buddhaśrīsānti and Rin c’en bzan po).

In an article of Jakuun Kiyota, entitled: *Kongōchogyō no Bon-Kantaishō ni tshuite* (Comparison between the Sanskrit and Chinese text of the Tattvasaṃgraha)¹⁴ the author made use of a Sanskrit ms.

¹³ Cf. Toganoo, *op. cit.*, pp. 522 f.; and G. Tucci, *Indo Tibetica*, II, Roma 1933. (*Rin c’en-bzan-po, e la rinascita del Buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al mille*).

¹⁴ Published in *Indogaku Bukhyōgakukenyū*, IV, no. 1, 1956, pp. 89—92 (in Japanese).

discovered by Tucci,¹⁵ and compared it with the Chinese translations of Vajrabodhi, Amoghavajra and Śikṣānanda. Having noted that Śikṣānanda's translation completely agrees with the Sanskrit origin, he draws the attention to the interesting fact that not seldom the three Chinese translations differ in whole sentences, parts of sentences, words and names from the Sanskrit origin. Often too the Chinese renderings are meaningless. For instance: the Sanskrit text gives 'Vajrayaṣṭi' as the name of a Vajra deity, in which 'yaṣṭi' means 'flagpole'. Vajrabodhi translated this name by 'Chin-kang Piao-ch'a' in which 'Piao-ch'a' has nothing to do with the Sanskrit 'yaṣṭi'. Amoghavajra rendered it 'Chin-kang ch'uang', in which 'Ch'uang' may mean 'pennant', indeed an acceptable translation for 'yaṣṭi'. And Śikṣānanda's translation of this name is 'Chin-kan Hsi'; 'Hsi' means 'pleasure', 'joy', again a wrong translation of 'yaṣṭi'.

Apart from the above sources of differences, the translator-authors created novel ones by providing their translations with commentaries (forming independant works, for example the above mentioned Kosā-lamkāra) on the shape of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala as a whole, on the appearances of the deities ('paré' or not 'paré', colours, etc.), on their attributes, their seats, riding-animals, etc., by which each author independently gave expression to his opinion on the matter involved. In brief: The Tattvasaṃgraha established the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala, while the commentaries on it created several types of that maṇḍala.¹⁶ Which are these types? Let us quote some of them with their principal characteristics.

I. The so called Genzu Kongōkai-mandara of the Shingon-sect in the Abhiṣeka-Hall of the Tōji (see p. 330). Another name of this maṇḍala is the nine-fold maṇḍala, discussed by Smidt (*op. cit.*).

Some characteristics of this maṇḍala are: a large maṇḍala divided

¹⁵ G. Tucci dealing with the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala classifies more texts under this heading than I have done. In his *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, II, pp. 603 a-b he writes; "... they are especially taken from the Tattvasaṃgraha literature, the Vairocanaḥhisambodhi and other Tantric texts, almost all centering round the symbol of Vairocana." "But the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala is found in other Tantric cycles as well" (*i.e.* the Samputatantra).

¹⁶ G. Tucci states in his *Indo-Tibetica*, III, part I, p. 38, that translations of the Tattvasaṃgraha are preserved in the bKa' agyur (cf. Beck, *Cat.*, p. 91), and in the Chinese Tripiṭaka as well. The Sanskrit original seems to be lost. However in Nepal he discovered a compilation entitled *Sarvatathāgatābhisa-mayamahākālparāḍja* which corresponds with the Chinese translation of the Tattvasaṃgraha, and consequently may be considered as a redaction of it.

into 9 small ones (Smidt, *op. cit.*; Toganoo, *op. cit.*, pl. 74; Bosch, *op. cit.*, pl. 1). On closer examination of the central group (the Seishin- or karma-maṇḍala) — in this connection we leave the other 8 maṇḍalas by which it is shut in out of consideration — we notice: Vairocana in the centre is one-headed, two armed, shows the bodhyagrī-mudrā and is 'paré'. The other 4 Jinas are represented as bhikṣus, non 'paré'. The figures are sitting on lotus-cushions. This group of 5 Jinas with their satellites (the Jinas included 24 in all) is surrounded by the thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa.¹⁷ This encadrement of a thousand Buddhas is interrupted by 8 Vajra-deities (4 in the four corners and 4 in the four cardinal points) namely: Vajradhūpā, Vajrapuṣpā, Vajrā-lokā, Vajragandhā, Vajrāṅkuśa, Vajrapāśa, Vajraphoṭa and Vajrāveśa. This row of a thousand Buddhas is framed again by 20 deities: Vāyu, Brahmā, Indra, Varuṇa, etc., most of them belonging to the Hinduist pantheon.

II. A Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of the 81 venerable ones (son), introduced in Japan by Kōbō Daishi together with the 'nine-fold maṇḍala' (I). Toganoo is of the opinion that it might be the same as the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala brought to Japan by Jikaku Daishi (posth. name of Ennin, 794—864), now so popular among the adherents of the Tendai-sect (see Toganoo, *op. cit.*, pl. 75).

Characteristics of this Vajradhātu-maṇḍala (to compare with I) are: Vairocana in the centre is the same as in I (paré, one-headed, etc.). The 4 other Jinas, however, are 'paré', like bodhisattvas. The thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa are represented by 16 deities (probably the 16 Great Bodhisattvas). Moreover, we find in the 4 corners, outside the Vajra group, 4 deities; in the S.E.: Trailokyavijaya, in the S.W.: Kundari, in the N.W.: Yamāntaka, and in the N.E.: Acala. Such a combination does not occur in I. Compare *e.g.* these figures with what Bosch wrote in his article about the krodha-figures. Another curiosity of this Vajradhātu-maṇḍala: the 33 deities are sitting not on lotus-

¹⁷ According to the translation of Ānandagarbha (cf. Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 209) this place agrees with the *vīthi* of the Kūtāgāra, and is the accumulation of 'Buddhaization' manifested by the five Jinas. As a matter of fact there must be three thousand Buddhas, viz. those of the past, of the present, and of the future, but as the paradise of Vairocana is always of the present-time, there is only one row of a thousand Buddhas needed. Another text (*Hizō-ki*) states that, though one is speaking of 'a thousand', this round number only indicates the illimitedness of Buddha-beings. To simplify matters there is instead of this set one row of sixteen deities, the sixteen Great Bodhisattvas Maitreya, Amoghadarśana, etc.

cushions as in I, but directly on 'animal-seats' (quadrupeds or birds). For example: Vairocana sits on a lion with 7 heads, Akṣobhya on an elephant with 7 heads, Ratnasambhava on a horse with 7 heads, Amitāyus on a peacock with 7 heads and Amoghasiddhi on a garuḍa with 7 heads. The other minor deities have the same 'animal seats' as their respective bosses except that the animals are one-headed.¹⁸ Symbolically, the ability and power of the various animals correspond with those of their riders. A lion for example is the king of beasts, he roams everywhere, without fear of other beasts. So Vairocana has the power to manifest himself without any obstruction.

III. The Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of the Gobu-shinkan, introduced in Japan by Enchin, in the form of a makimono (scroll), at the end of which is to be found a portrait of Zemmui. Toganoo assumed it to be handed over by Vajrabodhi to Zemmui.

Characteristics: It is a large maṇḍala composed of smaller ones, 6 in number (instead of 9 as in I). The 37 deities of the central maṇḍala are sitting on 'animal seats' just as the 81 figures of II. The 4 Jinas, however, are represented as bhikṣus in conformity with I. This maṇḍala is more or less a combination of I and II.

IV. Another Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of the 81 venerable ones (as in II) — not discussed by Toganoo — we find in Appendix I of the *Taisōkyō zuzō* (*Picture section of the Tripitaka*), no. 13, the original of which is in the Ishiyama temple (belonging to the Shingon-sect, in Ōmi).

Characteristics: The Vairocana and the 4 Jinas are 'paré' as in II; 33 deities are sitting on 'animal seats', as in II, whereas the complete set of the thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa is present as in I.

Outside Japan, where four varieties of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala could be traced already, we find an almost inexhaustible material in Tibet. The work enabling us to cast a glance at the multitude of maṇḍalas in this region is the highly valuable series: *Indo-Tibetica*, by G. Tucci. One look in vol. III of this work: *I templi del Tibet occidentale e il loro simbolismo artistico*, part I: *Spiti e Kunavar* (Roma 1935), and in vol. IV: *Gyantse ed i suoi monastri*, part I: *Descrizione generale dei templi* (Roma 1941) convinces us of the intricacy of the problem. From the ocean of informations at our disposal here, we have to sift out the data with regard to the representations of the Vajradhātu-

¹⁸ Some of these animals are winged.

maṇḍala, what means that we look for types of this maṇḍala which are depicted according to the Tattvasaṃgraha (Jap. Kongōchōgyo) or, properly, according to the commentary (or commentaries) of the Tattvasaṃgraha, in the same manner as we have done in the case of Japan. And, indeed, such Vajradhātu-maṇḍalas are current in Tibet, all of them depicted according to the Tattvālokakārī, a commentary or treatise on the Tattvasaṃgraha, written by Ānandagarbha. From Tucci's above mentioned work we quote the following examples: 1. *Indo-Tibetica*, III, 1, p. 39, 'Il mandala di Vairocana secondo il Tattvasaṃgraha'; 2. *Ibid.*, p. 43, 'La famiglia della gemma'; 3. *Ibid.*, p. 46, 'La famiglia del loto'; 4. *Indo-Tibetica*, IV, 1, p. 100, being a description of a mc'odrtē decorated with the 37 deities of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala; 5. *Ibid.*, p. 119, 'Il mandala di Samada rappresenta il Vajradhātu-maṇḍala'; 6. *Ibid.*, p. 149—150, 'La prima capella a sinistra è dedicata a ciclo di Vairocana . . .', etc.

Another work mentioning a Vajradhātu-maṇḍala based on Ānandagarbha's commentary is Toganoo's indispensable *Mandara no Kenkyū* (p. 201 f.). The find-spot of this maṇḍala, the 'Three Storeys' temple ('gSum-thsag') in Alchi near Leh,¹⁹ lies to the north of Tucci's finds.

V. The above Vajradhātu-maṇḍala, described by Toganoo, corresponds with Tucci's 'Il mandala di Vairocana secondo il Tattvasaṃgraha' (*Indo-Tibetica*, III, 1, p. 39), etc. As this description, however, is rather concised, we prefer to follow the one given by Toganoo. According to Tibetan chronicles, the temple was built during the life of the famous *lotsāva* Rin c'en tzañ po (958—1043). The maṇḍala itself (Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 201) is based on the *Kongōkaimandara-kodaigiki-bon* (*Extensive Rite on the Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu*) of the Kongōchōgyō of the first Meeting, and is a maṇḍala of the Seishin-group (to be compared with the central maṇḍala of type I, painted according to the Tibetan translation of Ānandagarbha's text (this scholar lived during the reign of King Mahīpāla, 978—1030 A.D.; was born in Maghada, and was a Vaiśa; he belonged to the Nyāya-madhyamika; he wrote many commentaries and treatises on texts).²⁰

Characteristics of this maṇḍala as compared with the Japanese specimen are:

¹⁹ For reproductions see A. H. Francke, *Antiquities of Indian Tibet* I, pl. XXXIX, and Toganoo, *op. cit.*, pl. 76, with the corresponding text on pp. 201 f.

²⁰ Cf. *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, aus dem Tibetischen übers.* von A. Schiefner, p. 226.

1. The thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa are represented by only 16 figures (the 16 Great Bodhisattvas);
2. The Jinas are not sitting on 'animal seats' as in II, III and IV but on lotus-cushions, supported by their respective vāhanas (Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 232);
3. All Jinas are 'paré';
4. A square consisting of vajras surrounds the central group from the outer plan of the maṇḍala (cf. A. H. Francke, *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, pl. XXXIX), whereas in the Japanese specimens a circle consisting of vajras separates it from the outer plan. Even this small detail is recorded in the Tibetan as well as in the Chinese text quoted by Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 202;
5. Of great interest is the description of the central figure Vairocana (rNam par snañ msad), according to Tucci: he has 4 faces, 2 hands, the bodhyagrī mudrā (byan c'ub mc'og) (*Indo-Tibetica*, IV, 1, p. 106, 110), his colour is white; his symbol: the 5 pointed vajra ('rdo rje a 5 punte'), his vāhana: the lion. (cf. *Indo-Tibetica*, IV, 3, fig. 25).

From Toganoo's work we learn that the Japanese Vairocana-types in the Vajradhātu-maṇḍalas (I, II, etc.) agree with what in brief is described in the *Bumpi no Hizōki*, viz. "On this central platform, on the central cakra, Vairocana-tathāgata is present. He is flesh-coloured and shows the bodhyagrī-mudrā'. The corresponding passages of Ānandagarbha's work (Peking-ed., vol. 52, pp. 12—13, ms. 396) read: 'Lokanātha Vairocana is white-coloured; (in his hand) in bodhyagrī-mudrā he holds the five-pointed vajra. In vajrāsana-posture he resides on the padma and candra-cakra, which are to be found on the simhāsana. He is dressed in an upper- and under-garment of avaśyāpatta equipped with the rays of the sun. He has the jewelled head-gear and silk garment of the abhiṣeka. Of his 4 faces the first looks to the East".

Another description of Vairocana by Ānandagarbha (cf. Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 343), now represented as the principal figure of the so-called Trailokya-vijaya-mahā-maṇḍala (Peking-ed. p. 398, ms. 838 cited by Toganoo) reads as follows: "So in regard with Lokanātha Vairocana with 4 faces, one makes the colour of his body (as white) as the moon. Adorned with his jewelled head-gear and silk garment he performs abhiṣeka. On a framework as is already explained, he resides, in vajrāsana, on the simhāsana and padmāsana. His two hands are folded in the bodhyagrī-mudrā. His first face is turned towards the East".

It is worthy of being noticed that the Vairocana of the Japanese Vajradhātu-maṇḍala is almost always one-headed. We know only one example of the principal Vairocana figure being 4-headed (on the Kōyasan-yogi-stūpa),²¹ the iconographical description of which (cf. R. Kanda and S. Omura, *Butsu-zō shinshū*, Part 1, 4th ed., Tōkyō 1927, p. 3) follows the *Kongōchō-yuga-chū ryakushitsu-nenju-kyō* by Vajrabodhi. However this may be, by our discussion of five varieties of the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala we have clearly demonstrated that the specimen described by Smidt is not the only possible one.

When we now return to the Nganjuk bronzes, it has become evident that they belong to the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of the Ānandagarbha-type, not to the Japanese specimens described in I, II, III and IV, and that they find their duplicates in the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala of Alchi and in the other find-spots in Indian Tibet.

Let us now compare the Nganjuk bronzes with the descriptions of Vairocana according to Ānandagarbha's text.

About the principal figure placed in the centre of the maṇḍala it is said that: a. he is 4-headed; b. has 2 arms; c. shows the bodhyagrī-mudrā²² which is typical for only Vairocana or aspects of this deity; d. the attribute in his hands is the vajra (probably the five-pointed one); e. his vehicle is the lion; etc.

²¹ Possibly, this Japanese stūpa is a copy of the Tibetan *mc'od rten* described by G. Tucci, *Indo-Tibetica*, IV, part 1, p. 100.

²² Vairocana or Mahāvairocana — there is a subtle difference between these two denominations depending on the positions the deity occupies in the various religious systems — exhibits different mudrās: the *bodhyangīmudrā* (= dharmacakra-mudrā, cf. Toganoo, *Rishukyo no Kenkyū*, pp. 477—479, and examples by B. Bhattacharyya, *Buddhist Iconography*, pls. VII d, and VIII a), the *dhyāni-mudrā* (as shown in the Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala of the Shingon; compare the figure of the crowned Buddha in the so-called Buddha-hall of the National Museum of Ethnology, Leiden); the right hand showing the *dharmacakra-mudrā*, and the left hand in *dhyāni-mudrā* (a rather unusual combination for this deity); the *bodhyagrī-mudrā*, i.e., the mudrā of 'the fist of wisdom' (with which the deity appears in the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala in Japan as well as in Tibet. It appears that this mudrā is interpreted — and visualized — in different ways: accompanied by a vajra or not, and showing some minor varieties, but in all cases the 'fist of wisdom' is clearly discernable. Examples are: the central bronze figure of a crowned Buddha in the Buddha-hall, the central figure of the group of Nganjuk bronzes, and the painting reproduced in Tucci's *Indo-Tibetica*, IV, part 3, fig. 25.

Other corresponding forms of this mudrā are the *jñānamuṣṭi-mudrā* (mudrā of the bodhi leading to the supreme jñāna) the powerful *vajramuṣṭi-mudrā* (the mudrā being capable to destroy all darkness), the *dharmadhātu-mudrā*, etc. Cf. Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

As these characteristics are in complete conformity with those of the principal figure of Nganjuk, our conclusion must be that this figure represents Mahāvairocana, (this name to be preferred to 'Vairocana') and not Mañjuśrī or whatever deity else.

As for the other Jinas, the same text of Ānandagarbha translated by Toganoo (*op. cit.*, p. 232) reads: "In this way Akṣobhya etc. are respectively blue, yellow, red and green of colour; in vajrāsana they are sitting on the padma and candra-cakra placed (respectively) on an elephant, a horse, a peacock and a garuḍa-seat; showing (respectively) the bhūmiśparśa-mudrā, varada-mudrā, samādhi-mudrā and the abhaya-mudrā, and holding at the same time in their hands (respectively) the vajra, vajra-ratna, vajra-padma and karma-vajra. They are equipped with the cakra of the rays of the sun (*i.e.* encircled by these rays), moreover they are in the possession of the jewelled head-gear and silk garment of the abhiṣeka. With their single face they are turned towards Vairocana". This description completely agrees with that of Krom (*op. cit.*, p. 65) when dealing with the Nganjuk image which belongs to 'the pedestal with the elephant', and 'has one normal head', with the right hand on the right knee 'while it holds at the same time a vajra'.

Our conclusion must be that, whereas Krom was still in doubt about the identity of the four large figures of Nganjuk (*loc. cit.*, p. 65) Bosch rightly identified the first one as Akṣobhya (*Sel. Studies*, pl. IIa), the other ones being Ratnasambhava, Amitābha (only his seat with the body and legs of the peacock is left over) and Amoghasiddhi, all of them in *sambhogakāya*.

Our contention that the Nganjuk bronzes cannot be identified with one of the Japanese Vajradhātu-maṇḍalas (I, II, III, and IV) was mainly based on the fact that Vairocana in all Japanese varieties is represented as an one-headed figure. This, however, is not our only argument. There are other reasons to support our supposition: In the Japanese specimen I — the one discussed by Smidt — the other four Jinas are depicted as bhikṣus (and not as Buddha 'paré'), whereas these figures belonging to the Nganjuk group, and likewise all other figures of this pantheon, are shown as 'paré'.

Furthermore, there is no evidence whatever that another characteristic of type I, viz.: that it comprises the thousand Buddhas of the Bhadrakalpa, finds its counterpart in the Nganjuk group, whereas the 16 Great Bodhisattvas who according to Ānandagarbha represent the Bhadrakalpa

are much more likely to have formed part of that group when it was still complete.

A further comparison between the Japanese varieties I, II, III, and IV and the group of Nganjuk bronzes leaves no room for another conclusion than that none of the former corresponds to the latter, while on the other hand Ānandagarbha's text and the Vajradhātu-maṇḍalas constructed according to this text fit in both on the whole and in details with the Nganjuk group. If our supposition in identifying these bronzes with Ānandagarbha's scheme is right, the group must not be dated before the 10th century, because Ānandagarbha lived during the reign of Mahipāla (978—1030 A.D.).

2. *The Bhīmastava and the Mahāvairocana-sūtra*

Another reinforcement of Bosch' admonition to study Buddhist iconography by making use of data taken from ancient Balinese literature is found in his most valuable article entitled *The Bhīmastava*, which he contributed to the volume *India Antiqua*, published in 1947,²³ and in which he drew the attention to a Sanskrit document of that name. Though a great deal of the text remains uncertain, it is evident that Bhīma is glorified in it as the hero of extraordinary strength (*mahābala*), and that he is identified with Vajrasattva, which appears from the sentence, translated by Bosch: "Śrī Vajrasattva, whose aim is the well-being of creatures, who is one in soul with Ārya Bhīma and who is the friend of the (whole) world, to thou be adoration", in which Vajrasattva is considered by the author as the deity, who, "as is well-known, was superimposed by several tantric sects on the existing set of five Dhyānibuddhas", this being suggested by the fact that the *Bhīmastava* immediately follows in the Karang-Asem-mss. the *Nāgabāyusūtra*, in which the same set is mentioned. If this is true, the author wonders what is the conception underlying the identification of one of the Pāṇḍava brothers Vajrasattva.

His solution of this problem is as follows: Bhīma was, according to the epic, the son of Vāyu. Further, it seems highly possible that in Java, in an early period, Bhīma was compared and associated with Indra, who again was closely connected with Vāyu by the well-known triad Agni-Vāyu(Indra)-Sūrya. Still more striking is the parallel in the kind of attribute in the hands of Indra and Bhīma: Indra is famous

²³ F. D. K. Bosch, *The Bhīmastava*, in: *India Antiqua*, a Volume of Oriental Studies presented to J. Ph. Vogel, Leiden 1947, pp. 57—62.

as the wielder of the vajra, and one of his names in this quality is Vajradhara. On the other hand, in the wayang Bhīma is equipped with a special weapon, the so-called 'pañcanakha', showing a close resemblance to the vajra of Indra or Vajradhara. So Bosch concludes that the identification of Bhīma with Vajrasattva was effected by the medium of Indra.

This argumentation leads the author to the more important conclusion that the Buddha images sitting in the stūpas on the three highest, circular, platforms of the Barabudur, one of which is called by the population Bima, are Vajrasattvas, a conclusion which corroborates the identification as proposed by Krom.

Since the Bhīmastava in the Karang Asem-mss. immediately follows the Nāgabāyusūtra, in which clearly the Vajradhātu-maṇḍala system is recognizable, I am tempted to look for the solution of the problem in question in another direction, that is to say in the sphere of maṇḍalas. Now it is a fact that Bhīma as one of the Pāṇḍava-brothers does not occur in the various maṇḍalas in Japan and in Tibet, not even in the maṇḍala of the Kālacakra, which may be considered as the last and most gigantic development of maṇḍalas in which the major and minor Hindu deities are incorporated.²⁴ However, if we approach the problem not by means of the epitheton name 'Bhīma' but by the epitheton 'mahābala', then we find, noteworthy enough, a deity with that denomination in the Hall of the Vajra-bearing deities of the Taizōkai-(Garbhadhātu)-maṇḍala, the main and central figure of which is Vajrasattva (see: Toganoo, *op. cit.*, p. 155).

A detailed description of Mahābala (properly speaking an embodiment and deification of the 'Great Power' of Vajrasattva) is to be found in Mochizuki's *Bukkyōdijiten* (Vol. IV, p. 3456) under 'Dairiki Kongō Bosatsu' (Sanskrit: Mahābala-Vajra-Bodhisattva). Briefly rendered: He is standing on the left side of Vajrasattva, in the first row of the Vajra-carrying-deities-Hall of the Genzuitaizōkai (Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala of the Tōji). His esoteric name is 'Great-zealous-vajra', his bija is 'he' and his distinguishing attribute the single-armed vajra. In respect of his appearance: his mouth is open, and his eyes awe-inspiring; he has flaming hair; the elbow of his right hand is bent and the palm of this hand of which four fingers are lightly bent, is turned upwards and the thumb is stretched. The left hand holds the single-armed vajra. His

²⁴ Cf. *Niṣpannayogāvalī of Mahāpañḍita Abhayākara-gupta*, edited by Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, Baroda 1949. *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, vol. CIX.

right foot is stretched, the left one is bent, each of them treading on a lotus. Moreover, the Bukkyōdaijiten, quoting the *Taizōkai-mandara-soni-genzu-shōshi* (Vol. II), gives the following explanation of the name Mahābala: "When some one asks why he bears [that] name, the answer is, because he is the Lord over the samādhi of [Vajra-] sattva. As for [that] samādhi, it is quiet and undisturbed by the 10.000 dharmas, by the greatness of his samādhi-power he has in his hands the 4 virtues (the 4 nirvāṇa virtues: permanence, joy, personality and purity). This is the reason why we call him Mahābala".

This description brings to the fore the striking likeness in features and qualities existing between Mahābala and Vajrasattva of the Garbadhātu-maṇḍala on the one side and Bima of the wayang and of the Bhīmastava on the other side. In view of these data we may perhaps consider the Bhīmastava as part of a text (Mahāvairocana-sūtra?) in which the Garbhadhātu-maṇḍala was built up and which formed a unity with the Vajradhātu-text.

I think it is now easy to imagine how Old-Javanese and Balinese Buddhists when noticing in Mahābala the close resemblance with their so popular hero Bhīma, interpolated his name in the text, so that it got its peculiar and local appearance.

K. W. LIM