

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BUDDHASTATUEN.---*Ursprung und Formen der Buddhagestalt. Von Dr. Leonhard Adam. Mit 52 Photographien und 20 Abbildungen im Text. Stuttgart, 1925, pages xii, 122, 48.*

The author of this excellent, abundantly illustrated monograph, who has previously published a work on Central Asian Art (Hochasiatische Kunst), has been guided in his present publication by the laudable intention of presenting to the learned world a number of good reproductions of typical Buddha statues, without paying regard to their æsthetic value. The statues with the exception of a few characteristic samples of Gandhāra, Northern Indian and Turkestan art, come from Further India and from East Asia. The originals mostly belong to the Berlin Ethnographic Museum and to private collections at Berlin, including Dr. Adam's own collection. Short descriptions are added to the plates, giving an account of the origin, age and special features of each statue. The introduction contains a brief history of Buddha types in the chief Buddhist countries, showing their mutual interdependence. Thus the bodily marks of the Buddha and his gestures or *mudrās* as well as the halo may be generally traced to Gandhāra art, but the style of the Buddha statues of Nepal, Tibet, Mongolia and Java is more immediately derived from the Indian sculptures of the Gupta period. Burma may be supposed to have followed Ceylon models at first, its Buddhism originating in Ceylon, but the typical Buddha statues of the country correspond to Indian statues and the conical crowns of certain specimens resemble South Indian crowns. Burmese art, on its part, naturally enough has influenced the neighbouring art of Siam, but the pointed flames on the top of Siamese statues and certain peculiar attitudes and gestures of the Buddha must be of local origin. In China

it is the Foistic form of Buddhism which represents national Chinese art, while the Indian type has been preserved both in the statues coming from Tibet and in those imported from India direct. The early Buddhist art of Japan is decidedly more Indian than Chinese in its character, and so is Korean art to which it may be traced back. In explaining the *Om maṇi padme hūm* prayer, the author has not yet been able to avail himself of the evidently correct interpretation of the *Ṣaḍakṣarī* proposed by Professor Konow. *Maṇipadme* should be taken together as one word, a vocative of the feminine base *maṇipadmā*, an epithet of Tārā, meaning "thou in whose *padma* there is a *maṇi*". See J.B.O.B.S., March, 1925.

J. JOLLY.

INDIAN PAINTING UNDER THE MUGHALS.—*By Percy Brown*,
11½ × 8½. 204 pp. Oxford Clarendon Press, 1924.

The portrait of Amir Timur shown on *plate IV*, figure 1, is ascribed by Mr. Brown to about the year 1575 A. C. In the *Memoirs of Jahangir*, however, under the events of the third year of this reign (1608 A. C.) we read :— "Muqarrab Khan, Surati, sent me a picture, (with a letter) saying that the Europeans (*Firangīs*) assert that it is a portrait of Hazrat Amir Timur, taken, at the time when he made a prisoner of Bayazid, the Sultan of Turkey, by a painter who had accompanied the ambassador sent by the Christian governor of Constantinople with some presents, etc. If this were true, no present in the world could have been better for me ; but as the face and features (of the portrait) did not resemble those of his descendants I could not believe it."

From this statement of Jahangir it would seem that there was no authentic portrait of Amir Timur in the possession of the Mughal Emperors up to that time (about 1608 A. C.) ; for if there had been, it would have been easy enough for Jahangir to say that it did not resemble the older pictures.

The portrait on *plate XVII*, figure 2, said to be of the Young Prince Salim is ascribed to 1585 A. D., when Salim was only a youth of 17 or so. From other pictures of the prince we