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Ciñcā Māṇavikā,
the Identification of Some Paintings in Kizil
and a Gandhara Relief in the Asian Art Museum, Berlin

Monika Zin, Leipzig

The Department of Indian Art at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität was closed before Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann arrived in Munich. However, under his leadership art has remained a subject of both research and teaching at the Institute for Indology. For his lasting dedication to furthering Indian art history studies in Munich, and his enduring support for art history projects, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks. I dedicate this paper to Professor Hartmann, because its subjects—Gandhara and Kucha—have always been his favourite areas of artistic production.

It was the Chinese scholar Shichang Ma who recognized the representation of the narrative of Ciñcā Māṇavikā among the rhomboid paintings on the barrel vault in Cave 163 in Kizil in 1984. Ma’s study, dealing with identification of several subjects depicted in the Buddhist murals of Kucha, was written in Chinese. However—unlike many other publications in Chinese or Japanese— it has not remained wholly unknown in the West, as some of Ma’s identifications were cited by Lesbre in her paper from 2001.

Ma has explained the story of Ciñcā Māṇavikā by means of a single text, the travelogue of Xuanzang. The source is easily accessible to us as well, thanks to Samuel Beal’s translation.¹

¹ The new project “Wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung der buddhistischen Höhlenmalereien in der Kuča-Region der nördlichen Seidenstraße” at the Saxon Academy of Sciences in Leipzig will include an internet-accessible “Annotated Bibliography” of the entire body of secondary literature in all languages. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Yu Meng, who worked the entire year 2016 in Leipzig on the annotated bibliography of the Chinese works on Kucha.


Xuanzang renders the story by connecting it with those realities he was able to perceive while visiting Śrāvasti, where the narrative takes place. In doing so he likely repeats information given to him \textit{in situ}. He writes of a pit in the vicinity of the Jetavana monastery. The pit was so deep that even during the heaviest rains it was never filled with water. This was the entrance into the \textit{avīcī} hell, the spot where the earth had opened itself to swallow Ciṅcā Māṇavikā because of her attempt to slander the Buddha.

The painting which Ma explains as the representation of the narrative can be found on the vault in Cave 163 (Fig. 1).\textsuperscript{3} The picture shows the Buddha looking at a woman sitting on the (viewer’s) left side. The woman has one hand on her round belly. The gesture of the other hand is not specific, but it does not display any sort of typical indication of worship of the Buddha. In front of the woman, a hemispherical object standing upright is visible, resembling a flat white bowl, which is apparently meant to be rolling downwards. The depiction identified by Ma corresponds indeed in many points to the narrative delivered by Xuanzang. It can be summarised as follows: Ciṅcā (Ma as according to Xuanzang: 戰遮 [Zhanzhe]; in Beal’s translation: Chanścha) was a female follower of the heretics who wanted to destroy the good reputation of the Buddha. She fastened a piece of wood to her abdomen and, in the presence of a huge congregation, accused him of impregnating her. Indra took on the form of a white rat and gnawed through the bandage holding the artificial belly. The belly fell to the ground noisily. The earth opened itself, and Ciṅcā fell into the \textit{avīcī} hell.\textsuperscript{4}

If one is familiar with the narrative, one can comprehend the depiction. The first indication is the presence of the woman, who appears to be pregnant, in the image. This woman is not portrayed as demonstrating any honorific gesture, which suggests that she is ill-disposed towards the Master. Nothing in her appearance indicates, however, that she is a follower of heretics. The

\textsuperscript{3} Fig. 1: Kizil, Cave 163, illus. in: Tan, et al. 1981, vol. 2, pl. 65; Kizil Grottoes, vol. 2, pl. 169, in Ma 1984, with fig. 188 (drawing); Mural Paintings 2008: 68; Mural Paintings 2009, vol. 2: 80.

\textsuperscript{4} Xuanzang refers to two other deep pits to the south of the Jetavana; it was not only Ciṅcā Māṇavikā who descended to hell here, but also Devadatta and his follower, the nun Kukālī. Because the earlier pilgrim, Faxian, also tells these stories (with exception of that of Kukālī) and does not mention the pits, Deeg (2005: 312) supposes that the pits in the vicinity of Jetavana were only later associated with the narrative. Cunningham (1862–65: 342) has identified the pits \textit{in situ}, to the south of the remains what is believed to be the Jetavana monastery.
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Descent to hell is not depicted. The rolling object, i.e. the artificial belly, is not obvious in and of itself, and begs comparison with more precise representation.

Such a representation is available in a depiction in Cave 80 (Fig. 2). MA does not write about this picture even though he provides six new identifications of paintings on the vault in this cave. The representation in Fig. 2 presents additional details of the story. Here, too, the woman is seated at the side of the Buddha. She still has one hand on her round abdomen (which, contrary to all logic, appears to be naked), while her other hand is placed in a non-specific position which does not suggest devotion towards the Buddha. In this depiction, the resemblance of the falling hemispherical object to a flat bowl is much more pronounced, providing us with greater evidence. Next to it, clearly recognizable, we see a white mouse running. This is certainly the god Indra in disguise.

Two additional pictures in the rhomboidal sections of the vaults can be presented here as depictions of the narrative of Ciñcā Māṇavikā. Regarding one of these, in Cave 34, we cannot be absolutely certain. The lower-most portion of the rhombus is no longer preserved; in the archive photograph (Fig. 3) the upper edge of an object is still perceptible in front of Buddha’s throne. This was likely the bowl-shaped “artificial belly”. The woman to the side of the Buddha holds one hand beneath her round belly, while the second hand is held before her breast, perhaps suggesting the act of speaking.

5 Fig. 2: Kizil, Cave 80 (Höllentophöhle), illus. in: Tan (et al.) 1981, vol. 1, pl. 80; Kizil Grottoes, vol. 2, pl. 53; Lesbre 2001, fig. 11 (drawing); MA, Gin, 2007: 192–193; Mural Paintings 2008: 132; Mural Paintings 2009, vol. 2: 260, 268.

6 Hardly possible that MA did not recognize this well-preserved representation; the explanation of the picture as the narrative of Ciñcā Māṇavikā is given by Lesbre (2001: 319).

7 Fig. 3: Kizil, Cave 34 (Höhle mit dem meditierenden Sonnengott), historical photograph from the archives of the Asian Art Museum in Berlin, no. B 1518, © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst; today’s state of preservation illus. in: Kizil Grottoes, vol. 1, pl. 78.—I am indebted to Dr. Lilla Russell-Smith, the curator for Central Asian Art at the Asian Art Museum, Berlin, for her enduring cooperation with the Kucha Project in Leipzig (cf. fn. 1) to which the access to the Archives of the Museum belongs. In the present article, Figs. 3–5 and 7 show historical photographs, taken during the Prussian Turfan Expeditions, which belong to the archives of the Museum.

8 Interestingly, in two rhombi to the left, bowls are lying in front of the Buddha’s throne, as if the representations were chosen according to their association with different topics by means of this iconographic element.
The next picture (Fig. 4)\(^9\) shows that both the standing position and the gesture signifying speech were indeed plausible in the iconography of our narrative, as we can be certain here regarding the rest of the depiction with the bowl rolling downwards. On the other side of the Buddha we see another person standing. This figure is displayed making the inverse of the gesture made by Ciñcā. It is a man shown as a typical Brahmin ascetic, and must be one of the heretics of whom Ciñcā Māṇavikā is said to be a follower.

A particularly interesting representation of the same topic can be viewed in an archive photograph from Cave 219 (Fig. 5).\(^{10}\) The painting—which is, as far as I am aware, the only depiction of the Ciñcā Māṇavikā narrative as a complex “sermon scene” on a wall—displays elements of the previously mentioned iconography. The Buddha is sitting under the tree (which signals that the episode takes place outdoors) and is surrounded by gods adoring him by playing music, sprinkling blossoms, and carrying pearl necklaces, as well as two monks, which suggest the presence of the saṅgha. Vajrapāṇi is seated to the (viewer’s) left, at the side of the Buddha. It is not possible to say whether the two men behind him are gods, or humans with a royal appearance. The men, like the monks, appear to be discussing the incident amongst themselves. The Buddha is oriented towards his left, i.e. towards the lower right part of the picture. Ciñcā Māṇavikā is easy to recognize: she is standing, holding her protruding belly, and grinning so that her teeth seem to be visible—a feature which cannot be indicative of anything good. Below, between Buddha’s throne and her skirt, the “belly” in the form of a dark bowl (?) is falling downwards. The woman is clad, as in all previous examples, in worldly clothing. She is wearing jewellery and a headdress with pearl strings and flowers. Behind Ciñcā Māṇavikā, the instigators of her transgression are standing—the heretics. Directly behind the woman we see a “typical” Brahmin, with a full white beard, long hair piled into a bun, and an animal skin knotted across

---

\(^9\) Fig. 4: Kizil, Cave 184 (Drittletzte Höhle), Berlin IB 8447, war loss, © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst, illus.: Le Coq 1924, pl. 14b.

\(^{10}\) Fig. 5: Kizil, Cave 219 (Ajātaśatruhöhle), photograph in the archives of the Asian Art Museum, no. B 654, published in Grünwedel 1912, fig. 320, © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst. The part of the painting with Ciñcā and the ascetics was brought to Berlin and given the number III 8883; today it numbers among those lost during the war (cf. Dreyer / Sander / Weis 2002: 176). Today, the piece belongs to the collection of the Hermitage, no. VD 815, although one tiny fragment of the painting with the head of the man in profile on the left edge belongs to the Cleveland Museum of Art, no. 1985.14.
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his chest. He wears no earrings or bracelets. However, he does have two long pearl chains, one of which is draped across his right shoulder, and the other of which is draped across his left shoulder. The ascetic behind him is young, beardless, and has dark hair. He is depicted wearing all sorts of ornamentation. The cloth which forms his wraparound covers only one hip, leaving his left leg bare. The dark-skinned, robustly built ascetic above Ciñcā is also wearing pearl chains (the remains of the one which was once draped across the right shoulder is still visible) and many bracelets. His long moustache and beard are painted with a different colour than that of his long hair, which stands on end, and is surrounding his face like a large white bonnet. Behind the man we can also see the extended arm of yet another ascetic—the most interesting of the entire group. Unfortunately, this portion of the painting was never completed—the man is (and has always been) faceless. His hair is dark and bound into a little knot above his head. He wears earrings and a torque, a simple band around his neck. With his left hand, he holds the stick of a striped fan in the shape of a triangular broom. It is apparent that the painter (or perhaps the benefactor who financed the decoration of the cave) made an attempt to provide the "heretics" with diverse characteristics, as did the painter in Cave XVII at Ajanta in portraying the heretics distraught after the Buddha’s triumph in the Mahāprātiḥārya at Śrāvasti.\footnote{Cf. Schlingloff 2000/2013, nos. 90 and 92, vol. 1: 511, 514 and Schlingloff’s paper "Jainas and other ‘Heretics’ in Buddhist Art" (1994).} The difference here is that in Central Asia, there was no living tradition of non-Buddhist religious groups, so that the portrayal of their adherents should hardly be taken as a depiction of reality.

In analysing the painting from Cave 80 (our Fig. 2) Emmanuelle Lesbre (2001: 319) writes about the “illustration, apparently without a Gandhāran antecedent”, a statement which, until recently, was my own opinion as well. One relief from Gandhara, located today in the Study Collection of the Asian Art Museum in Berlin, gives us, however, a different perspective, even if the representation appears not to have any other equivalents among the art of Gandhara.\footnote{I would like to express my gratitude to several colleagues—Osmund Bopearachchi, Muhammad Hameed, David Jongeward, Isabell Johne, Isao Kurita and Jessie Pons—for examining their collections of pictures of the Gandhara reliefs. Two pieces of information from the Pakistani art trade, one of which was provided to Isao Kurita, regarding a relief showing...}
The relief in Berlin (Fig. 6)\textsuperscript{13} seems to represent our story, and, as we will see, embodies at the same time a pictorial element which will be repeatedly illustrated in the Kucha paintings in different narrative contexts. The Buddha in the relief is sitting under the tree. There was another scene on the right side which also took place outdoors. The two branches of a tree are, however, all that remains of it. This provides us with no evidence that our story was revealed in more than one register—a possibility that is, however, not to be ruled out.

Due to the poor state of preservation, we cannot ascertain who the male figure in the lower left of the scene is meant to be. The face of the person has been destroyed. He is not wearing any jewellery and his robe looks like that of a monk. Yet, two other men in the relief are clad in a similar manner, and are not monks. The man above is wearing a necklace, and his hair is tumbling down—he might be a heretic from the story, or an adoring god. The man on the other side has a clearly visible knot of a wisp of hair at the top of his (shaven?) head, which allows us to identify him as the follower of a non-Buddhist religion.\textsuperscript{14} His hand, which must once have been visible, has since been destroyed. Of the two men on the left, the upper one has his hands in a position of adoration, while the lower one has positioned his right hand with one finger stretched towards the hollow of the left hand. The gesture is unusual; could it indicate sexual intercourse?

A woman is standing at the lower right. Her abdomen is round and her left hand is positioned beneath it. Her right arm is raised. Her hand has been destroyed but enough of it is still visible that we are able to rule out any manner of adoration, such as holding a garland, etc.

According to the story mentioned earlier, we can identify the woman as Cīncā Māṇavikā. It is difficult to say if her appearance is similar to that of a seated pregnant woman at the side of the Buddha, and the other given to Osmund Bopearachchi, regarding a relief with a "lady on a pedestal burning in fire", provide us with records from several years ago (no pictures of the reliefs exist). These records are the only results of the search for comparative representation, which has otherwise remained unsuccessful to the present date.

\textsuperscript{13} Fig. 6: Gandhara, Berlin, Asian Art Museum, no. I 483 (23.5 cm high; 30.5 cm wide; 6 cm deep), from Dr. Leitner Collection © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst, SMB / Jürgen Liepe; the relief was not published previously.

\textsuperscript{14} The man has a typical appearance of a wandering ascetic, parivrājaka, cf. Zin (forthcoming).
a typical lay-woman, as in Kucha, as she seems not to be wearing the usual hand and ankle bracelets, nor the necklace. However, she may possibly be wearing earrings. Her body is covered with cloth—also the big stomach (the bulge of the stomach has been broken off but the folds are clearly visible in the original relief up to the edge of the fracture). Her head is covered; her hair is either down behind her ears, falling to the back, or what we are seeing is a cloth which covers her hair.

The falling “artificial belly” is not represented here, or may, perhaps, have simply not been preserved. There is an unusually long pleat of fabric between the legs of the woman, which falls down to the floor, and covers her right foot. It might be a depiction of an object, rolling down underneath the cloth, or of the cloth slipping downwards.

In front of Buddha’s throne, the narrative continues. Here we see a small depiction of a woman with her right arm held high. It is not possible to identify whether she is clothed or nude, but her hair, falling to her shoulders, is clearly visible. The relief displays an interesting iconography here: the woman is sitting in a round pot.

An explanation of this entire relief would hardly be possible without making a comparison to Kucha. As such, an elucidation of this element can also be given through examples from the paintings. In Kucha, people in hell are represented in this manner. Our Fig. 7\textsuperscript{15} shows just such a pot with no less than four sinners boiling in it. The representation was so impressive that Grünwedel referred to the cave as the “Cave of the Hell Pot”.

With this, the identification of the Gandhara relief in the Asian Art Museum in Berlin is ascertained. Still, the depiction calls for analysis, further comparison with Kucha, and association with a literary tradition.

The narrative of Ciñcā Māṇavikā (also: Cañcā Mānavikā, Campā Mānavikā or Ciñcamāṇavikā) must have been quite well known as it is rendered or men-

---

\textsuperscript{15} Fig. 7: Kizil, Cave 80 (Höllentopfhöhle), historical photograph from the archives of the Asian Art Museum in Berlin, no. B 624. © Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst; today’s state of preservation illus. in: Tan (et al.) 1981, vol. 1, pl. 174; Kizil Grottoes, vol. 2, pl. 43; Ma, Gin, 2007: 274–275; Mural Paintings 2009, vol. 2: 253–255. The painting probably shows the Miracle of Śrāvastī according to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition (cf. Zhao Li 1995, 2006, 2008); the sinners in the pot are therefore the heretics.
tioned in several texts\textsuperscript{16} in Pali,\textsuperscript{17} Sanskrit,\textsuperscript{18} Tibetan,\textsuperscript{19} and Chinese.\textsuperscript{20} It is probable that the story was also retold in Kucha in the local Tocharian. Tocharian manuscript fragments have been preserved which contain the analogous narrative about Sundari (in some of the sources courtesan, and in others, female wandering ascetic).\textsuperscript{21} This story was considered to have originally been the same as the narrative of Ciñcā.\textsuperscript{22}

Interestingly, in the representations in Kucha, the white mouse—a motif which is quite appreciated—appears only once, which might signalize that the


\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Bhaisajyavastu} of the \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya}, ed. in Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. III.1: 161–162; the narrative is mentionet also in the \textit{Lankāvatārasūtra} 7.89, ed.: 240–241; transl.: 207.

\textsuperscript{19} Tibetan transl. of the \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya} (cf. fn. 18, ed. vol. 41: 223,5,2 (259a), analysis in Panglung 1981: 50.


\textsuperscript{21} Cf. HACKSTEIN / HABA / BROSS 2014; Tocharian, fragments B15, B17 (found in Šorčuq), \textit{Vācavarga} of the \textit{Udānālankāra}, the narrative about Sundari (Chinese parallel in T 729, the \textit{Udānālankāra Vācavarga} transl. Zhī Qiān (3rd c.); the narrative is also preserved in the Uighur translation, cf. ZIEME 2008.

\textsuperscript{22} Féer 1897 with comparative analysis of both narratives; references to the story of Sundari also in Deeg 2005: 307–308 and HACKSTEIN / HABA / BROSS 2014: 32–33; the narratives are similar indeed the difference being, however, that the motif with the artificial belly falling down is not there and Sundari is being killed by the heretics.
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23 The dissertation project of Mrs. Wen-ling Chang on the jātakas in Kucha seems to provide the proof that the paintings illustrate different literary sources, while the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya delivers the basis for the most of the narratives depicted in the “sermon scenes”, the jātakas follow the versions in the vernacular languages or the versions in Kumārajiva’s translation of the commentary Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa (T 1509). The last of these sources might probably be explained by the fact that Kumārajiva, who has translated the commentary to the Larger Prajñāpāramitā, was from Kucha and might have interpolated stories he was familiar with from his home country.

paintings illustrate different literary traditions. This is an observation which can be supported by several other examples.

As the literary basis for depictions in Kucha and in Gandhara one might consider the version from the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya; but it is apparently not, or at least not always, the case. The story in the Bhaisajyavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya (cf. fins. 18–20) narrates how the anyatirthikas persuaded Cāntcā Māṇavikā, a female wandering ascetic (parivrājikā), to slander the Śramaṇa Gautama. She bound a vessel (sā bhājanam ekam baddhvā) to her belly and went to Jetavana, where the Buddha was in the act of delivering a sermon, and accused him of impregnating her. Indra caused the vessel to fall to the earth by means of his magic power (bhājanam ṛddhyā prthivyāṃ nipātitavān). Neither the white mouse—as in our Fig. 2—nor Ciñcā’s descent to hell—like in our Fig. 6—appear in the narrative. The depictions in our Figs. 1, 3–5 might have been inspired by this source, even though Indra is not represented and Ciñcā never takes on the appearance of a female ascetic.

The white mouse and the descent to hell, those elements of the story which are not mentioned in the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya, appear both in the “northern” literary tradition as well as in Pali, which could conceivably point to the existence of another (old?) source which has since been lost.

The narrative in Pali is preserved today only in the commentary literature. It is repeated with only a few small changes in the Paccupannavatthu of the Mahāpadumajātaka and in the aṭṭhakathās to the Dhammapada and Itivuttaka (cf. fn. 17). The Mahāpadumajātaka draws a long story of deceit, telling of how Ciṅcā (Ciṅcamāṇavikā nām’ ekā paribbājikā) spent nights in the vicinity of Jetavana to defame the Buddha, and went every morning from the park towards the city, changing the shape of her body after nine months not only with the round piece of wood bound to her abdomen (udare dārumaṇḍalikāṃ bandhitvā) but also by causing her hands and
feet to swell by beating them with the jawbone of an ox. Comprehending that Ciñcamāṇavikā is making an accusation of this nature, Indra sends the Four Sons of the Gods (catūhi devaputtehi), who transform themselves into mice and gnaw at the cords holding the piece of wood. When the wood falls to the ground, it severs all her toes. The people expelled Ciñcamāṇavikā from Jetavana. When she leaves, the earth opens; flames emitting from the lowest hell emerge from the cleft and she falls into the hell.

Some of the Chinese sources (cf. fn. 20), T 152, T 310 (no different from e.g. the Apadāna in Pali, cf. fn. 17) are only an allusion to the story—and are as such of great importance, because mentioning the story without re-telling it makes it clear that the story was well known, and acts as proof of the narrative’s popularity.24 The artificial belly is mentioned in T 152, T 154, T 197, T 212, T 384, T 1448, T 1509, T 2087; it is described as a wooden vessel or alms bowl, which corresponds very well to our paintings. Indra, transformed into the white mouse, appears in T 154 (here, the colour of the mouse is not mentioned), T 197, T 212, T 384 (here the mouse is yellow) T 384, T 2085, and T 2087.25 The two last sources, the travelogues of Faxian and Xuanzang, are certainly the most famous. Faxian (cf. fn. 20) tells of Indra in disguise as a mouse and of Ciñcā’s descent into hell, but his version is not quite suitable for comparison with the paintings. In his tale, the artificial belly was made solely of cloth. Could the unusual long pleat of fabric between Ciñcā’s legs in the Gandhara relief (Fig. 6) be an illustration of a version as told by Faxian? Xuanzang, whose report does not omit Indra changed into a mouse, talks of a piece of wood and a wooden vessel.

As was mentioned at the beginning of this paper, Xuanzang narrates the story relating to the pit through which Ciñcā Māṇavikā falls into the āvīci. This was, for him, the most important aspect of the story as evidence for historical fact. Ciñcā’s descent to hell is not represented in the Kucha paintings with which I am familiar. The reason for this might be the absence of this element from the literary tradition. However, it may also be that it was, in fact, present, but according to the description, could only be depicted in such

---

24 How thorough the knowledge of the story was is difficult to say, while in the T 154 Ciñcā is called bhikṣuṇī, cf. Deeg 2005: 312.
25 I am very grateful to Dr. Yu Meng (cf. fn. 1) for analyzing the Chinese narratives for me.
a way that it would not be understood by the viewer, as it would correspond too closely with other images.

The imagery found in the following excerpt, “the great earth split apart, an abyss opened under her feet, and flames shot up from the Avīci Hell”,

matches with the depictions of the story of the infant Jyotisha, rescued from the funeral pyre of his mother, as e. g. in Kizil Cave 34 (Fig. 8).

When viewed from this perspective, our Fig. 6, the representation of the Ciñcā Māṇavikā from Gandhara, is well designed to avoid confusion with representations of other narratives while still suggesting a descent to hell.

The question concerning the dependence of the paintings of Kucha on the representations from Gandhara should, however, not be neglected here. In the case of Ciñcā Māṇavikā, a direct pictorial dependence is not evident, and yet the person in the pot in front of Buddha’s throne in Gandhara might well be the prototype for all of the representations in Kucha of sinners who fell to hell, although such representations are rare in Gandhara. Once again, it appears that an important element in the pictorial development between Gandhara and Kucha is missing.

---

27 Fig. 8: Kizil, Cave 34 (Höhle mit dem meditierenden Sonnengott), illus. in: Kizil Grottoes, vol. 1, pl. 78; Mural Paintings 2008: 56; Mural Paintings 2009, vol. 2: 31.
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