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Introductory Remarks

In 1985 S. Czuma organized an interesting exhibition of Kushan sculpture(1) and one of the most spectacular pieces exhibited for the first time on this occasion, was a gilt Bodhisattva image (Pl. I) allegedly excavated from Gandhara (Dorishkhella near Mingora, Swat).(2) According to Czuma, this image may be identified as the Bodhisattva Maitreya holding a water flask in the left hand, and his identification is followed by M. Matsuura of the Nara National Museum.(3)

However, the most astonishing feature of this unique image is the unprecedented remnants of the gilding which covers the whole body, clothes, necklaces, nimbus and pedestal. Both Czuma and Matsuura estimated that this sculpture has retained its original gilding. However, it is actually impossible that any Gandharan schist sculpture could have retained the whole original gilding. It is well known that no museum in the world houses a Gandharan image retaining most of its original gilding. Most probably the original gilding was taken away when the piece was excavated by clandestine diggers. Furthermore, the gilding may have been lost when the Buddhist temples were abandoned and devastated. According to the report given by J. Hackin(4) about the famous stele representing the Miracle of Sravasti(5) excavated from Paitava in Afghanistan:

Le vêtement inférieur (antaravāsaka), sorte de tunique dont le bord droit diverge légèrement, porte les traces d’un enduit rouge destiné à faciliter l’adhérence de la pellicule d’or qui recouvrait complètement les vêtements et

---

les parties apparentes du corps du Buddha.

Therefore, no Gandharan gilt image or relief can retain completely its original gilding except in such special cases that of a small reliquary(6) protected in a small room. Consequently, the whole gilding of this image cannot be genuine, judging from the excavation data of the Gandharan schist sculptures.

In addition to this fact, there are many other reasons why this image is not an original but a completely modern fake. However, in this paper the author restricts himself to revealing iconographical and typological mistakes only. The results of other technical and natural-scientific analyses of this image will be published in the forthcoming final report of our research into this image.

1. **Headdress and Water-flask**

Anyone who knows something about the iconography of the Gandharan Bodhisattva images, will easily notice the iconographical contradiction between the headdress (Pl. II) and water-flask (Pl. III-b). The water-flask is one of the attributes of the so-called Maitreya, while the headdress is one of the attributes of the so-called Avalokiteśvara or Bodhisattvas other than Maitreya.

However, in the catalogues published by the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Nara National Museum, this apparent contradiction is not mentioned at all, and instead, this gilt Bodhisattva image is identified as Maitreya simply relying on the evidence of the water-flask. Czuma writes as follows:

If additional attributes are present — in this case, the water flask (kundika) — the Bodhisattva can be identified further as Maitreya, or the Future Buddha. Another identifying mark of Maitreya is a stupa present in the crown. ......In the present case, the Bodhisattva is wearing a hairdo that consists of a jeweled band with ribbons forming a cockade with the stupa in the center and the emblem of a star and crescent underneath. The latter may signify the lunar descent of the deity, to whom it was habitual to trace the origins of prominent clans such as the one to which Buddha belonged.

Czuma did not pay any attention to the type of the hairdo of this image and identified this as Maitreya simply relying upon the evidence of the water-flask and the so-called stāpa(3) in the center of the headdress. There is no misunderstanding about his attribution based on the water-flask, for the seated image of the Buddha Maitreya (Pl. V–a) represented on the reverse of the
bronze coins issued by Kanishka I clearly holds a water-flask in the left hand. Therefore, we might be allowed to identify the Gandharan Bodhisattva image with a water-flask in the left hand or seated on a pedestal in which a water-flask is represented as the Bodhisattva Maitreya, although we might add only that there is a possibility that the Bodhisattva Siddhartha represented in the Tushita Himmel might often have been depicted as carrying a water-flask just the Maitreya.

However, a problem remains concerning the typological shape of the water-flask of this unique gilt image (Pl. III–b). It is clear that the body of this water-flask is round, but the actual shape of the Gandharan water-flask is slightly different. In most of cases the upper portion of the body is bigger than the lower one (Fig. 1). So, typologically speaking, the shape of this water-flask is quite doubtful, or to express it more specifically, of the modern shape. This doubt may be definitely corroborated by the existence of a stopper. As far as the Gandharan water-flasks carried by the Bodhisattva images are concerned, the existence of a stopper is not attested to the author. In our opinion, the Gandharan water-flask, as far as it is represented in the Gandharan Buddhist sculptures, lacks the stopper. Some examples show that the water-flask carried by the Bodhisattva is represented as stoppered directly by the thumb.

According to these observations, we might conclude that the water-flask carried by this gilt Bodhisattva image does not tally typologically with the genuine water-flask of Gandharan Bodhisattva images.

Therefore, the remaining problem lies in the headdress the type of which is rather attributed to the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara as M.-Th. de Mallmann.
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has already clarified:

Cependant, nous avons rencontré deux pièces qui nous paraissent présenter un caractère plus distinctif d’Avalokiteśvara: l’une dans l’art gréco-bouddhique, l’autre dans l’art Kushāna de Mathurā.

The Gandharan image quoted by de Mallmann is the head of Bodhisattva (Pl. III–a) in the head-disk of which is represented a seated Buddha with a nimbus and halo, whom she identifies as Metamorphosed or Transformed Buddha (化仏). Bodhisattva images with the Metamorphosed Buddha on the head are extremely rare among the Gandharan schist Bodhisattva images.(14) As for the Metamorphosed Buddha (seated) on the head of Avalokiteśvara, Chinese Buddhist canons regard him as the Buddha Amitābha. M.-Th. de Mallmann did not identify this kind of Buddha exclusively as Amitābha, though she mentions its possibility. However, she regards the Bodhisattva image with seated Buddha on the head as definitely Avalokiteśvara. As Avalokiteśvara was considered as the heir to Amitābha, it is quite probable that the Metamorphosed seated Buddha is Amitābha. In this connection, we should not disregard the iconographic peculiarity of the halo surrounding the Metamorphosed Buddha’s body (Pl. III–a).

Most of the Gandharan Buddha images lack this kind of halo and are decorated only with a nimbus. These images are recognized as representing Buddha Shakyamuni. As the standing nimbate Buddha images (Pl. V–b) on the reverse of the bronze coins issued by Kanishka I are inscribed as SHAKAMANO BOYDO,(15) the Buddha image with only a nimbus and abhaya-mudra can be identified as Buddha Shakyamuni.

However, the identification of the nimbate and haloed Buddha images (Pl. III–a) is not certain. The nimbate and haloed image (Pl. V–c) on the reverse of the gold coins issued by Kanishka I is inscribed simply as BOYDO.(16) Merely on the basis of this inscription, it is almost impossible to identify the standing Buddha as the Buddha Shakyamuni. It is quite plausible that the standing Buddhas on the Kanishka I’s gold coins represent actually certain unspecified Buddha. At least, the nimbate and haloed Buddha images on Kanishka I’s gold coins are iconographically identical with the seated, haloed and nimbate Buddha images of the so-called Amitābha or the Metamorphosed Buddha (Pl. IV–a).

Next we should investigate the headdress of the Bodhisattva image which is represented with the seated Buddha and standing Maitreya. The Bodhisattva
which usually stands to the proper right of the central Buddha is represented with a headdress in the centre of which exists a disk surrounded by lotus-petals or flower-petals. The proper left Bodhisattva image in a Trinity stele (Fig. 2, Claude de Marteau Collection, Brussels)\(^{17}\) inscribed with Kharoshṭhī and dated from Kanishka year 5th, has the same kind of disk on the head within which is represented a seated Buddha. Therefore, if this stele is a genuine piece,\(^{18}\) the Bodhisattva with Metamorphosed Buddha on the head is most likely Avalokiteśvara and his counterpart is either Maitreya with a water-flask or another Bodhisattva Mahāsthāmaprāpta, as was tentatively suggested by J. C. Huntington\(^{19}\) and G. Fussman\(^{20}\) respectively. These scholars attempted to find out the Mahayanistic trends in the Gandharan sculptures and to identify the representation of Amitābha and the Sukhāvati, but they could not, in our opinion, succeed in identifying Mahāsthāmaprāpta with convincing evidence.

Fig. 2 Gandharan Trinity, after Harle, 1974, Pl. 71.
If we are allowed to regard the Bodhisattva image with the Metamorphosed Buddha on the head as Avalokiteśvara, we might identify the disk on the head of the Bodhisattva as one of the definite attributes of Avalokiteśvara. In this case, we suppose that only the disk was first applied to Avalokiteśvara's head and later a small seated Buddha image was inserted within the disk.

If our surmise is to the point, any Gandharan Bodhisattva image with a disk on the head might actually represent Avalokiteśvara. Therefore, The Bodhisattva image (Pl. I) which I regard as modern fake has Avalokiteśvara's head while he holds in the left hand a water-flask, which is an attribute of Maitreya.

Furthermore, even if the Bodhisattva with a disk on the head cannot definitely be identified as Avalokiteśvara by relevant inscription,\(^{(21)}\) this kind of Bodhisattva cannot be Maitreya either. If we refer to the Trinity stele (Fig. 2), the so-called Maitreya is juxtaposed with a Bodhisattva with a disk on the head. Therefore, the latter and the same kind of Bodhisattva (Pl. I) cannot be Maitreya at all.

Even though we could not definitely succeed in recognizing Avalokiteśvara and its headdress in the above arguments, the headdress of this Bodhisattva (Pl. II) is not beyond any doubt that of Maitreya. So, nobody can deny the apparent iconographical contradiction between the head and the water-flask of this unique gilt Bodhisattva image, and consequently this iconographical contradiction proves definitely that this gilt Bodhisattva image is a dubious one, namely a modern fake.

2. **Star and crescent**

Regarding the unique ornament of a star and crescent (Pl. II) on the centre of the head, Czuma associated this motif with the lunar descent of the Iranian kings. However, Matsuura of the Nara National Museum did not mention anything about the peculiarity of this ornament. However, as far as the Gandharan Bodhisattva images now known to the scholastic world are concerned, such a headdress decorated with a star and crescent has not been attested at all. In this sense, the combination of a star and crescent is quite exceptional with regard to the Gandharan Bodhisattva headdress.

As for the headdress of the so-called Avalokiteśvara, no example of a star and crescent motif is known. Therefore, there remains only one possibility that
this unprecedented motif is related to Maitreya. It is well known that on the centre of several Maitreya heads is represented something like a crescent (Fig. 3). As for the identification of this motif, M. Bussagli(22) identified it with the crescent (Moon god MAO) which symbolizes the regality of the Iranian and Kushan kings. On the contrary, M. Taddei(23) suggested the relation of Maitreya’s crescent to that of the Egyptian god Harpocrates whose headdress is often decorated with a crescent.(24) However, the shape of this so-called crescent on the heads of Maitreya images is different from those of crescents represented in most of the ancient arts of Western Asia and the Mediterranean world. They are represented so realistically that anyone can easily recognize them as crescents. However, some of the so-called crescents on the heads of Maitreya images are hardly recognisable as representing crescents. Therefore, it is doubtful that the so-called crescent motif on the heads of Maitreya images really represented crescent. As one piece of evidence to cast doubt upon Bussagli’s and Taddci’s identifications, we can quote the crescent represented on some helmets(25) of the Kushan kings (Fig. 4). In these cases we can easily recognize that they are crescents. These types of crescents are identical with those of Parthian (Pl. V–d), Hellenistic and Roman crescents,(26) therefore, the same types of crescents ought to have been applied to the Gandharan Buddhist images. However, the so-called cres-
cents on the heads of the genuine Gandharan Maitreya images do not demonstrate, as a rule, the transmission of Western Asiatic or Greco-Roman crescents. However, we cannot deny the transmission of another kind of the Alexandrian or Roman crescent to the Gandharan region.

As is well known, bronze statues of Alexandrian Harpocrates\(^{127}\) were excavated both at Taxila and Begram. Although the headdresses of these finds are not decorated with crescent, there is still a possibility that the crescent of the headdress of Harpocrates influenced the decorative or symbolic ornament of Maitreya's headdress, as Taddei suggested. The present author could not examine all the extant bronze Harpocrates' heads, but can show one example of a bronze Harpocrates figurine owned by a Japanese collector (Pl. IV-a). On the head of this figurine is represented a short crescent the shape of which reminds us of that of the so-called crescents of Gandharan Maitreya images. This Harpocrates figurine was not found in Pakistan, therefore we cannot say definitely that the same type of Harpocrates was brought to Kushan Gandhara and was used as model for Maitreya's headdress. We can say only that we should not reject the possibility that the so-called crescent of Maitreya images might have been typologically related to the crescent of Harpocrates. Otherwise it might be quite illogical that there existed two kinds of crescent-representations in the Kushan Gandhara (those of Kushan kings and of Maitreya).

In either case, the crescent of this gilt Bodhisattva is apparently different from those of the genuine Maitreya images, therefore, from the typological viewpoint, the realistic crescent of this gilt Bodhisattva image can not be genuine at all.

On the other hand, the shape of the crescent of this gilt Bodhisattva is identical with the Western Asiatic crescents (Pl. V-d) and most of Greco-Roman

![Fig. 5 Akkadian Cylinder seal, after Porada, 1948, Pl. XXII.](image_url)
ones, therefore we should not exclude the possibility that the star and crescent motif on the head (Pl. II) was transmitted to Gandhara in the Kushan period from the West, for this motif was quite popular in Western Asia and the Greco-Roman world. Before discussing typologically the authenticity of this motif on the head of this dubious Bodhisattva image, we should enumerate briefly the relevant examples and trace the development of the crescent and star motif.

The appearance of the sun or the star is attested by many cylinder seals of Mesopotamia since the Early Dynastic Period and the Accadian Dynasty (Fig. 5). The star (symbol of Inanna-Ishtar) or sun (Shamash) was represented by even-numbered rays such as 6, 8, 12, 16, and later developed into a cuneiform letter DINGIR\(^{(28)}\) meaning god in Sumerian.

The shape of star and sun was decided by the number of the lines crossed, and consequently the number of rays were always even-numbered.

This tradition was transmitted to the Greek world and in the Hellenistic period the star encircled by a crescent (Fig. 6) appeared.\(^{(29)}\) This motif became popular on the coins of the Parthian kings (Pl. V–d) and of the late

---

Fig. 6 Alexander the Great, after Exhibition cat. 1981, Fig. 42.
Sasanians. During the Parthian and Sasanian periods, the number of the rays were, as a rule, even-numbered. The odd-numbered rays are attested only on the reverses (Pl. V-e) of the coins issued by Peroz (457–484), Zamasp (497–499), and Kavad I (484–531). However, in these cases the star is represented apart from the crescent, not encircled. Furthermore, the reigns of these kings were later than the Kushan period in which the Gandharan sculptures were made. Therefore, these examples could not be used as the model of the star and crescent of this gilt Bodhisattva.

On the other hand, the Kushan empire had a close commercial relation with the Roman Empire, therefore there remains a possibility that the star and crescent motif was transmitted from the Roman West. On the coins issued by the Roman emperors are represented stars and crescents, but the number of the rays are usually even numbered (8). However, there is one example issued by Hadrian (Fig. 7) on which is represented a five-rayed star encircled by a crescent. A large number of Roman gold and silver coins were exported to India, and several finds of Hadrian coins have been reported from Pakistan and Central Asia. Therefore, we cannot reject the possibility that the Hadrian coins of the same type (Fig. 7) came to Gandhara and were available to the Gandharan sculptors, although there is no reported find of the relevant Hadrian coin in Gandhara. However, by typological comparison of the star and crescent (Pl. II) on the head of this gilt Bodhisattva with that of the Hadrian coin (Fig. 7), we cannot admit a definite relationship between them. Rather we can perceive differences such as the shape of the crescent and the rays. Therefore we should not take the Hadrian’s coin as the model for the star and crescent of this gilt Bodhisattva.

Fig. 7 Hadrian’s coin, after Mattingly, 1966, Pl. 55.

Fig. 8 Trajan’s coin, after Mattingly, 1966, Pl. 22.
According to our brief survey of star and crescent motifs, it is almost clear that the protrusions or rays of the star are even-numbered. This is quite understandable because the ancient star was represented by crossing lines, crossed just as we cross several matchsticks. So the protruding angular parts were principally and usually even-numbered. It is true that on a few coins (Fig. 8) issued by Trajan stars with odd-numbered rays are observed but these cases are exceptional, for the blank where the die-cutter represented the stars is quite narrow and the stars themselves are extremely small. Even in these cases the principles of the rays are even-numbered, for on another coins of this emperor is represented a big star with even-numbered protrusions.

Lastly we should mention the fact that there is no known identical motif on all the genuine heads of Gandharan Maitreya hitherto published. If the star and crescent motif was actually applied to the Maitreya’s headdress, it must have had a definite and important symbolic meaning just like the seated Buddha on the head of the so-called Avalokiteśvara and the same motif should have been applied to some of the genuine heads of Maitreya instead of the so-called crescent. However, the star and crescent motif is not attested on the head of any genuine Maitreya image hitherto known. The so-called crescent on the genuine Maitreya’s heads demonstrates, though indirectly, that the crescent and star with five-rays did not exist at all in Gandhara of the Kushan period. In its stead there existed another type of star and crescent motif in Gandhara.

There is one fragment of a princely donor (III-b) of the Gandharan make which is now owned by a Japanese private collector. On the shawl of this figure is represented a star and crescent motif. However the shape of the star is a simple disk and completely different from that of the gilt Bodhisattva image (Pl. II). The same type of star and crescent is attested by a stucco head of a bejewelled Buddha (Fig. 9) excavated from Hadda. The same kind of star and crescent is represented on the kolah of a Hatrean king (3rd century A. D. before 243 A. D.) and of Ardashir I (224–240) (Fig. 10). Therefore, this type of star and crescent was transmitted to Gandhara through the Sasanian occupation or intrusion of the early third century. From these genuine pieces of evidence, we might be allowed to conclude that the Gandharan star and crescent motif was, as a matter of fact, represented by a simple small disk surrounded by crescent. Therefore, the crescent and star with five protruded rays of this gilt Bodhisattva (Pl. II) cannot be a genuine star and crescent motif.
of Gandharan art but is most likely of modern application.

From where, then, did the star with five-rays of this Bodhisattva image originate? It is quite clear that both the star of this type and the star and crescent motif came from the crest of the Pakistan National Flag. If we compare the design (Fig. 11) of this flag, we can observe few but definitely similar characteristics.

The shape of the crescent is apparently similar. As for the star, we should pay attention to its position in relation to the crescent. The star is not arranged

Fig. 9 Head of the Buddha, after Barthoux, 1930, Pl. 54.

Fig. 11 Pakistan National Flag.

Fig. 10 Helmet of Ardashir I, after Göbl, 1971, Tab. I.
symmetrically against the horizontal crescent, but put rather obliquely. This is the same arrangement as in the Pakistan National Flag. The same arrangement is observed on the Hadrian’s coin (Fig. 7), so some scholars might insist that this irregular arrangement was influenced by the Hadrian’s coins, but in this case the shape of crescent is so different that we should not take it into account.

Lastly we should mention the fact that the rays of the star (Pl. II) resemble flower-petals. Some Japanese scholars, who insisted that this gilt Bodhisattva image is not fake without showing any concrete evidence, regarded this star as a flower. However, in ancient times, stars were actually represented something like a flower as attested by the star representations of the Palmyran art.\(^{(39)}\) In the case of this gilt Bodhisattva image, the sculptor might have been influenced by the flower-petals often represented on the headdress of the genuine Gandharan Bodhisattva heads and also the flower just above the star and crescent (Pl. II). As for this flower, M. L. Carter\(^{(40)}\) suggested that it is a *fravahr* symbol popular in Sasanian art. However, if we examine it carefully, it is completely different from the so-called Sasanian *fravahr* symbol (\(\mathcal{X}\), Pl. V–f).

We know that other Islamic countries employ the same design on their national flags, but the Bodhisattva image was bought by Mr. W. H. Wolff at Peshawar, therefore it was produced in Pakistan. So we do not take into consideration other Islamic countries’ national flags.

In our opinion, the crest of the Pakistan National Flag was used by the forger to enhance the attractiveness of the headdress or possibly to warn the dealers, scholars and collectors that this image was made in Pakistan after the independence of Pakistan.

3. Corinthian pilaster

On both sides of the pedestal (Pl. III–c) are represented a so-called pseudo-Corinthian pilaster, as is often the case with the Gandharan pedestal. As for the column of the Gandharan pseudo-Corinthian pilasters, there are attested several kinds of decorations (Fig. 12).\(^{(41)}\) However, there is no example hitherto known or published on which is represented such masonry as that of this gilt pedestal (Pl. III–c). Therefore, the pilaster with such masonry is unprecedented and unique and consequently we can assume this unprecedented pilaster as strong and convincing evidence to support the view that this pedestal is a
modern fake. If this pedestal is not genuine, the Bodhisattva body, legs, arms and clothes prove automatically not to be genuine, because the pedestal is, as a matter of fact, made of the same continuous schist block as the upper body and other parts. Actually, the legs of this image were broken at the lower parts and restored by W. H. Wolff in New York.

In our judgement, this pedestal with masonworked pilasters is completely and apparently of modern forgery, but some curators of the Nara National Museum and several Japanese scholars specializing in Indian Art maintain that there was possibly a pilaster with such masonry among the Gandharan sculptures. Their arguments consist of two points. One is that there remains a possibility that such a representation might be observed on some of the hitherto unearthed Gandharan reliefs. The other is that the masonry are actually represented in several published Gandharan reliefs.

In our opinion, these two points can hardly approve of the authenticity of this pedestal. As for the first point, it is sure that there remain many unearthed

Fig. 12 Gandharan pseudo-Corinthian pilasters, after Tissot, 1985, Pl. XIII.
Gandharan sculptures, but we have more sculptures than unearthed ones. If the masonry were represented on the Gandharan pseudo-Corinthian pilasters, there might be at least one genuine example. However, there is no example at all and they cannot show any example in which a pseudo-Corinthian pilaster with the masonry on the column is depicted. Furthermore, there is no reason why the Gandharan sculptors dared to represent the masonry on the column of the pilaster, because the masonry is nothing but unfinished condition of the Corinthian pilaster. We know that in Gandhara the walls and columns were made by laying one ashlar stone upon another, and that there still exist such walls and columns with exposed masonry in the excavated monasteries such as Butkara in Swat. However, the surface of these walls and columns should not be regarded as original but showing the decayed phase deprived of the stucco coating. As a matter of fact, all the walls and columns of the Gandharan monasteries were put in final shape by coating the surface with stucco. Therefore, complete Gandharan pseudo-Corinthian pilasters were originally covered entirely with stucco, and consequently the masonry was put out of sight. The column with ashlar masonry means the unfinished pilaster and is not appropriate for representing a Corinthian pilaster, for there is no adequate reason or merit to take the trouble to represent the unfinished and ugly column with exposed ashlar masonry.

Thus our judgement is corroborated by the fact that all the types of the columns of the Gandharan pilasters in the reliefs (Fig. 12) represent the finished condition of the surface of the column. Furthermore, we add that the so-called pseudo-Corinthian columns represented in Gandharan sculptures are used as frame. Therefore, there is no reason why the unfinished column should have been used instead of a complete one.

As for the second point, the masonworked wall or building represented in the genuine Gandharan reliefs does not corroborate the authenticity of the pseudo-Corinthian pilaster with exposed ashlar masonry. The walls or other buildings with exposed masonry in Gandharan sculptures are represented in the narrative reliefs. So, those pieces of evidence result from the necessity of the story related to the Buddha's life story. Consequently, if the story tells about the building of brick masonry, the sculptor must follow the story and represent the wall or house realistically. In these cases (ramparts, stable, poor houses and tombs relating to the brick work, not to the stone masonry), it is quite natural that the sculptor represented the masonwork of the brick
work. However, it is completely wrong to confuse the former case (stone ashlar) with the latter (brick work). As the pseudo-Corinthian pilaster of the gilt pedestal (Pl. III-c) is related to the former case and not to the latter brick work, therefore, the existence of the masonwork on the column of the pseudo-Corinthian pilaster can safely be accounted as one of the decisive piece of evidence for the forgery.

**Concluding Remarks**

Above we have tried to point out typical mistakes or iconographical contradictions which demonstrate that this gilt Bodhisattva image can hardly be original and genuine. We can add more points to prove its forgery, but mention only the following facts in order to understand easily that the entire image is a complete modern fake. The nimbus is made of separate stone and attached to the shoulder and head by modern adhesives (epoxy). The head is also made of separate stone and attached to the body by the same modern adhesives. As was already mentioned, the pedestal is made of the same continuous stone as the body. The gilding with gold leaf and the vermilion pigment on the surface of the body are nothing but of modern fabrication. The pigment of this image is composed of red lead \( \text{Pb}_3 \text{O}_4 \) while the genuine red pigment of the Gandharan sculptures is usually consisted of red iron oxide.(46)

According to these facts and iconographical and typological contradictions, this unique gilt Bodhisattva with head of so-called Avalokitesvara and the water-flask of Maitreya can be adequately condemned as one hundred percent forgery made around 1978 by the order of an antique dealer, Mr. Sardar Khan living in Peshawar. He made and sold many gilt fake Gandharan Buddha and Bodhisattva images and they were scattered in the world, and more than ten pieces were brought to Japan around 1978 and are now kept as unique fakes in Japan.
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