NOTICES OF BOOKS.

- C. M. PLEYTE. BIJDRAGE TOT DE KENNIS VAN HET MAHĀYĀNA OP JAVA. I, Opmerkingen naar aanleiding van Grünwedel's "Mythologie du Bouddhisme au Tibet et en Mongolie"; II, Vajrapāṇi als Dharmapāla (Bijdr. tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie). Sér. VI, viii, pp. 362-380, and x, pp. 195-202, 1901-2; with 10 plates.

These articles, so far as I know, have not been noticed in the *Journal*; they deserve much attention, not only because they afford new materials for the iconography of the Buddhism of the Great Vehicle, but also on account of the knowledge and ability displayed by the writer. His larger work, "The Legend of Buddha in the Sculptures of the Temple of Boro-Budur,"¹ has been fully appreciated by M. Barth in the "Bulletins" and by M. Speyer in the "Onze Eeuw."²

The title of the first article is somewhat misleading. Mr. C. M. Pleyte proposes in a short, decisive manner new identifications³ for a large number of stone and bronze Javanese statuettes now in the Royal Museum at Leiden. The so-called Lakṣmī is really a Prajñāpāramitā, the Mahākālī must be named Bhṛkuṭī, and so on; on the other hand, where the old catalogue (not so very old, having been published in 1885) furnishes a vague mention as a *Statuette of Buddha*, we have to admire in one place a Śākyamuni,

¹ Amsterdam, de Bussy, 1901.

² *ii*, pp. 77-95 (1902).

³ Giving all details and argument for these.

in another a Vairocana, in another an Akṣobhya. The "female Buddhas" are Pāṇḍarās or Locanās. No doubt the standard work of Grünwedel has given the clue to unravel the mysterious characteristics of the Indonesian icones; but one must remember that the publications of Waddell, Foucher, and Grünwedel himself, not to mention older works on the Tibetan Pantheon, were already of great use for such a task.

Mr. Pleyte gives a very interesting account of the visit paid by the Buriat friends of Prince Oukhtomsky to the Javanese Section at the Exposition of Paris: "It was evident that the two Asiatics were in no ways strangers to the iconography of their religion; . . . the [Indonesian] sculptures are intelligible to the actual followers of the Mahāyāna; . . . they may as well have been made in Northern Tibet as in Java." In the description of the sculptures the author gives observations on the 'pose,' according to the technical terms of Waddell's Lamaism; as concerns the 'mudrās,' he does not alter the designations proposed by Groeneveldt, "as there is an infinite variety of attitudes of which the specific name is as good as unknown to us" ("van hare namen is nog zo goed als niets bekend"). This last remark is somewhat strange, but I completely agree with Mr. Pleyte that such works as the *Sādhana-mālātāntra*, "which contains minute and exact descriptions," must be studied with greater care than has been the case hitherto. Mr. F. W. Thomas has published in the *Muséon* exhaustive catalogues of some Tibetan and Sanskrit *Sādhana-garlands*, and it should not be very difficult to find in these rich nomenclatures of the Buddhist deities exact and trustworthy references to the "explicative" Tantras.¹

The task of the iconographer has been in some cases facilitated by the presence of Javanese inscriptions; for instance, the statue of Vajradhātviṣvarī, the so-called *śakti* of Vairocana, is inscribed with the word *Verocanā*, the female Vairocana. I wish to make some objection, not to the very

¹ I now hear that M. A. Foucher has found in this work the starting-point of new iconographical inquiries.

clear and interesting exegesis of the beautiful Prajñā-pāramitā-icon (p. 372), but to the definition of this deity as the *śakti* of *Ādibuddha*. I am not sure that there is not some anachronism. At an early date Lassen thought that the name of *Ādibuddha* occurred on Indo-Scythian coins; but, so far as we know, there is no mention of *Ādibuddha* in old documents; the data quoted by Hodgson on the *Aśvarikas* (or theist Buddhists) and the *Svayambhū-purāṇa* cannot be said to be old.¹ The idea of an *Ādibuddha* is very clearly expressed in the Lotus of the Good Law: "From the very beginning (*ādita eva*) I have roused, brought to maturity, the Bodhisattvas to be fit for their Bodhisattva positions,"² words which provide the analogy-hunters with a splendid opportunity for comparison with the eternal procession of the Logos; but, although Major Waddell writes that the Anuttarayoga (i.e. the 'feminising' theory and practice of the Yoga schools) has awarded female energy to the primordial *Ādibuddha* himself, I feel inclined to believe that the Prajñāpāramitā, being, as is well known, the 'spiritual body' (*dharmakāya*) and 'the mother' of all the Tathāgatas, being the incarnate Pratīyasamutpāda (evolution's or origination's law), is a *śakti* by itself without the assistance of a celestial or metaphysical tutor,—the same can be said of Pārvatī;—or rather, if one wants a special Tathāgata as a counterpart to the Prajñā, he must be found in Vairocana, who is by some schools elevated to the dignity of *Ādibuddha*. Vajradhātviçvari, the official wife of Vairocana, the central deity of the *maṇḍalas*, can be etymologically the wife of the mystical Vajradhātu-master, the so-called Vajrasattva. There is something 'male,' or, as Tibetans say, 'fatherlike' (*yab*), in the Vajradhātu; something 'female' or 'motherlike' (*yum*) in the Garbhadhātu.

The second essay, "Vajrapāṇi as Dharmapāla," bears on four compositions—three Javanese, at Leiden, in London (Raffles Collection in the British Museum), at Batavia, and

¹ But, on the contrary, the *Nāmasaṃgīti* is rather old.

² Quoted by Waddell from Kern, "Lotus," pp. xxii-xxv (Lamaism, 126).

one Indian of Buddhagāyā—which, notwithstanding small discrepancies, agree on the whole. The principal figure, an eight-armed divinity, with four concentric heads and a fifth as a diadem with a third eye (which is sometimes an *ūrṇā*), and with the terrific attributes, must be, from Tibetan types, a *Dharmapāla*, or rather a divinity in the rôle of a protector of the law.¹ There is round the neck a chaplet of Amitābha figurines.² This figure stands in a well-known leg-posture, on the corpses of two personages—divinities, one male, the other female, the attitude of which, in one piece at least, is very ‘Tāntric.’ It is in itself very interesting to observe that the Javanese icones are in such a way analogous to the so-called Bhairava of Buddhagāyā (according to Rājendralāl, p. 139, pl. xxvi, fig. 2); some chronological data are afforded by this circumstance. But we must admire the perspicacity with which Mr. C. Pleyte attempts the identification of the Dharmapāla and the deities thus trampled on.

There is in the “Tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Čākya-muni’s” a curious episode. The future Buddha, having paid visits, before his illumination, to the highest heavens, has intercourse with the Dhyāni-buddhas.³ By way of pleasure or edification the Tathāgatas display, by magical power, a collection of sixty female deities. Then Maheśvara and his cohort being deluded by their charms, Vajrapāṇi does not hesitate to give orders to the Great God. Maheśvara answers, “Shall I obey your orders? You are nothing but a Yakṣa.” Such insolence is, of course, punished. Vajrapāṇi, under his choleric form, presses down on the soil Umā with one foot and the Great God with the other, etc. I believe, with Mr. C. Pleyte, that our sculpture must probably be explained as an illustration of this episode or of episodes of the same sort. There are, indeed, some other legends of battles between Buddhist and Hindu divinities

¹ Tibetan, *yi-dam*. Quite an *iṣṭadevatā*, as everybody chooses his tutelary deity. See Wassilieff, p. 195 (213).

² So Mr. C. Pleyte. The photograph is not clear enough for verification.

³ For a similar account from Chinese sources, see Wassilieff, p. 187 (204).

in Nepal, namely, between the Śaivas and the Tāntrikas. They are too near relatives not to be hostile one to another.¹ But, be the icones illustrations or not of this very performance, it is a good fortune to find so exact a correspondence between written and iconographic documents. Add that the narrative of Schiefner is derived from a book written in 1734 A.D.

As concerns the Yakṣa-nature of Vajrapāṇi, Mr. Pleyte refers to the Lalita, c. vi (to be exact, p. 75, 12²), where a relation is established between him and the Guhyakas or Yakṣas; to a *mantra* (quoted by Csoma-Feer, p. 300), “Om Vajrapāṇi Mahāyakṣa Nīlāmbara hūṃ phaṭ”; and to a curious passage of the *Subāhupariṣcchā*, quoted by Wassilieff (Buddhism, p. 198): “There are Bhikṣus and other people who do not accept the doctrine of the Dhāraṇīs, who ascribe to it a demoniac origin: they believe that Vajrapāṇi himself is of the family of the Yakṣas.” It is very useful to bring together such documents as show clearly the hostility between the Tantra-yānists and the followers of the old Vinayas. Certain as is the antiquity of the Tāntric rituals and theories—they are, we may say, older than Śākyamuni—the question remains open at what epoch these superstitions found for the first time literary (?) expression. They were never orthodox, so much is certain.³

¹ Śiva is, of course, the fiendish counterpart of Vajrapāṇi; but, for the Yogin, there is no difference to be made between them. See Pañcakrama, vi, 33: *yathā rudras tathā vajrī* . . . (readings confirmed by the Tib. version).

² Bibl. Indica.

³ There is a noteworthy document in the translation of Atīsa's *Bodhipathapradīpa*, by Candra Dās.* Being, as it is, lost in the luxuriant footnotes, I fear that it might have escaped the attention of the reader. The Acārya, we are told, at the time of his death, said to his pupil, the celebrated Hbrom-ston, “O Kalyānamitra, purify your mind by means of the Sūtras. The four classes of Tantras being mixed up together would be dissolved, i.e. discarded as misleading and useless.” The exegesis of Candra Dās is mixed up with the text; but it appears that the Acārya had objections to the fourth class of Tantras; the three first, being necessary to the pūjā and to the ordinary yoga by regulation of the breath, are assured of a relative orthodoxy.

* See Journal of the Buddhist Text Society, i, p. 44.

LOUIS DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN.