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**PREFACE**

The Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Traditions of the University of Michigan is very pleased to be able to present this collection of papers by Professor Gregory Schopen as the second volume in its series. Through his meticulous studies of a wide range of neglected or forgotten sources, many of which are carved in stone, Professor Schopen has effected a major shift in the direction of Buddhist Studies, a shift away from the sometimes excessive focus upon the rarefied categories of the scholastic productions by monastic elites, and a shift toward a recognition of the importance of the materiality of “popular” practice. These practices not only occupied the concerns of a much larger segment of the Buddhist communities of India, both monastic and lay, but served as the inevitable context for the formulation and elaboration of scholastic doctrine.

Professor Schopen’s work, published over the last fifteen years in a wide range of scholarly journals, has been focused broadly on two issues in the history of Indian Buddhism: monastic life and the rise of the various movements that we refer to as the Mahāyāna. Monastic Buddhism in India is the subject of the current volume. Professor Schopen’s highly influential papers on the rise of the Mahāyāna, which have called into question both the coherence of the category as well as its date, are currently being edited for publication as the next volume in our series.

The present volume provides an essential foundation for a social history of Indian Buddhist monasticism. Challenging the popular stereotype that represented the accumulation of merit as the domain of the layperson while monks concerned themselves with more sophisticated realms of doctrine and meditation, Professor Schopen problematizes many assumptions about the lay-monastic distinction by demonstrating that monks and nuns, both the scholastic elites and the less learned, participated actively in a wide range of ritual practices and institutions that have heretofore been judged “popular,” from the accumulation
CHAPTER VII

Burial Ad Sanctos and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism

A Study in the Archaeology of Religions

It is hardly revolutionary to suggest that, had the academic study of religions started quite literally on the ground, it would have been confronted with very different problems. It would have had to ask very different questions, and it would have produced very different solutions. It would, in short, have become not the History of Religions—which was and is essentially text-bound—but the Archaeology of Religions. It would have used texts, of course, but only those that could be shown to have been actually known or read at a given place at a given time, or to have governed or shaped the kind of religious behavior that had left traces on the ground. In fact, texts would have been judged significant only if they could be shown to be related to what religious people actually did. This Archaeology of Religions would have been primarily occupied with three broad subjects of study then: religious constructions and architectures, inscriptions, and art historical remains. In a more general sense, though, it would have preoccupied not with what small, literate, almost exclusively male and certainly atypical professionalized subgroups wrote, but rather, with what religious people of all segments of a given community actually did and how they lived.

All of this—since it did not happen—is, of course, totally academic. But—and this is the beauty of it—since the History of Religions is also totally academic, it still might. In fact, what I will present here is meant as a small push in that direction. In what follows, I want to look at Indian Buddhism on the ground. It is, however, very clear to me that, since this is something of a first attempt, the results that it will produce will necessarily be somewhat tentative. My data can and should be supplemented. My methods may have to be refined. My conclusions and interpretations may have to be modified and perhaps, in part, rejected. But it should be an interesting discussion, and once the discussion is engaged, I very much suspect it will become an unavoidable part of Buddhist Studies and, I hope, of the academic study of religions in general.

Starting on the Ground

If, then, our study of Indian Buddhism is to start on the ground, the first and most noticeable things we encounter are Buddhist sacred sites. Like so many sacred sites elsewhere, these sites immediately appear to be connected, at least in part, with the way in which the early Buddhist tradition disposed of and behaved toward its "very special dead."2 From two inscriptions of Aśoka we know that, already in the third century B.C.E., the Buddhism that he knew had developed two geographically fixed sacred sites. In fact, both of these sites are probably pre-Aśokan. Of one of them, most certainly is. Although these two sites appear to us to be different in kind, Aśoka himself behaves in regard to both in exactly the same way. In both inscriptions when he initially describes what he did, he uses exactly the same wording: "King Priyadarśī ... came in person (and) worshipped (here)" (devānapāpyena ... attana āgacca mahāyite, Rummindei; and devānapāpyena ... attana āgacca mahāyite, Nigelva).3 The places in question are Lumbini, the birthplace of the Buddha Śākyamuni, and the stūpa or monumental reliquary of the past Buddha Konākamaṇi.4 In regard to the latter, it should be noted that some years before "coming in person," Aśoka had the reliquary doubled in size (sthūbe dutiyaṃ vadāhīte). In regard to the former, he also effected some construction at the site, and he describes it in an important way. He says:

King Priyadarśī ... came in person (and) worshipped, saying 'Here the Buddha was born, Śākyamuni,' he had a stone wall made and erected a stone pillar. Saying 'Here the Blessed One was born,' the village of Lumbini was freed from tax and put at one-eighth.

devānapāpyena ... attana āgacca mahāyite hida buddhe jate sakyamunī ti silāvīga-dhibhi ca kalāpita silāṭṭhake ca ussapaṭṭe hida bhagavān jāte ti lummini āgacca ubbaleke kaṭe attahābhāgīye ca.

The statement "here the Blessed One was born," however, is almost certainly not Aśoka's, but an old ritual formula that was to be spoken by any individual upon arriving at the sacred site. It is almost certainly an actual quotation or direct paraphrase as is indicated, at least in part, by the particle ti (Skt. iti),
although this has not always been understood.\(^5\) This quotation, or direct paraphrase, makes it highly likely that Aśoka knew some version of a short text now preserved in somewhat different forms in the various versions of the \textit{Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra}. The earliest actually datable Indian version—which is also closest to the wording found in Aśoka—has the Buddha say:\(^6\)

\[\text{After I have passed away, monks, those making the pilgrimage to the shrines, honoring the shrines, will come to these places; they will speak in this way: 'Here the Blessed One was born,' 'here the Blessed One attained the highest most excellent awakening,' etc.}\]

The similarity in context and wording between the \textit{Mahāparinirvāṇa} text and the Aśokan inscription is too close to be coincidental.

If Aśoka knew a version of the text that was similar to the one that has come down to us—and the fact that Aśoka quotes or paraphrases what he does indicates that some version of it was very old and predated him—then we are able to recover a number of other points. First, there is the question as to whether or not Aśoka’s action was unique and purely individual in its motivation; a predated text would suggest otherwise. It would suggest that he was only doing what was prescribed for “a devout son of good family.” The extant Sanskrit version of the old text says:

Monks, there are these four places which are to be/must be visited by a devout son or daughter of good family during their life.

\[\text{cattāra ime bhikkavaḥ pūjīvīpaścātāḥ śrāddhayasya kulaputrasya kuladūhitār vā yāvajjīvav anuśamanānti (but read with the ms. abhiṣamanānti) bhavanti, 41.5.}\]

The Pāli text is, interestingly, even stronger. It says:

Ānanda, there are these four places that a devout son of good family must do ārāma of, and powerfully experience.

\[\text{cattār' imānā ānanda saddhassā kulaputtassā dassanīyāni saṃvejanīyāni śāmānī.}\]

In both cases, there are future passive participles that blend into and frequently replace the imperative in both languages. Both versions make it clear that there must be direct contact with these places, and the verbs in the Pāli version are particularly striking.\(^8\) It is worth noting that, despite the fact that it has dropped out of the English translations in particular, the final sections of the Pāli version of the \textit{Mahāparinibbāna-sutta} are clearly marked with the notion and importance of ārāma, and ārāma is about direct, intimate contact with a living presence.\(^9\) In fact, the idea that Bodh-Gaya was a place at which one did ārāma must have persisted for a very long time. We find reference to it again in an inscription written in Devanāgarī that may be as late as the fifteenth century.\(^10\)

It is also worth noting, in light of a common misconception, to whom these injunctions were directed. A \textit{kulaśūtra}, “a son of good family,” was no more the actual son of a family of a certain socioeconomic class than an \textit{ārya} was a member of a specific racial group. “Son of good family” was simply an honorific title, a title applied as frequently to monks as to laymen. Note that in the Sanskrit version the injunction is delivered to monks and in the Pāli version to a specific monk. A few lines later in the same passage, the Sanskrit version replaces “devout son of good family” with two other titles: “one who makes the pilgrimage to the shrines,” and an “honorer of shrines”—and we know from early inscriptions from Amaravati that the second of these, at least, was a monastic title.\(^11\) The Pāli version makes an even more specific substitution. For its “devout son of good family,” it substitutes later in the same passage “devout monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen” (\textit{sādhu bhikkhu bhikkhuniyo upasaka-upāsikāya}).\(^12\) In fact, all of the early epigraphical material confirms a predominately monastic preoccupation with Bodh-Gaya. The greater part of the surviving first century B.C.E. railing appears to have been the gift of a single nun; all of the Kushan and Gupta inscriptions in which the status of the donor is clear record the donations of monks—monks from as far away as Sri Lanka.\(^13\)

Again, if we can assume that Aśoka knew a version of the old text that was similar to the oldest actually datable version we have, then we can make at least two other important statements about the early Buddhist conception of sacred sites. After having the Buddha say “After I have passed away, monks, those making the pilgrimage to the shrines . . . will come, they will speak in this way, . . .” that version has him then say:

Those who during that time die here with a believing mind \textit{in my presence}, all those who have \textit{karma} still to work out, go to heaven.

\[\text{ātrāntara ye kocit prasaṅgacittā mamāntake kāleṁ karīvantī te sarve svargoṣagā ye kocit soppadhiśeṣāḥ, 41.9 and 14.}\]

First, it seems fairly clear that the monk redactor of the text thought that the Buddha was, after his \textit{parinirvāṇa}, in some sense actually present at the places where he is known to have formerly been. The text is hard to read in any other way. Second, it is equally clear that the monk redactor of the text accepted as fact that a devout death that occurred within the range of this presence assured for the individuals involved—and these were both monks and laymen—rebirth in heaven. The Pāli version of the text, while it differs somewhat in articulation, confirms the essentials:
Indeed, Ananda, whosoever being engaged in visiting the shrines with a devout mind dies, they all after the breakup of their body, after death, will be reborn in heaven.

ye hi kaci ānanda cetiyacārikaṃ abhinandantā pasannacittā kālam karissanti sabbe te kāyassa bhūdā param maraṇā sugatiṃ saggāṃ lokāṃ uppajjissantī.

One cannot help but suspect that both of these ideas are somehow connected with a curious but consistent pattern clearly observable in the archaeological record of Buddhist sacred sites.

An Archaeological Pattern

Everywhere in the Indian Buddhist archaeological record, the exact spot at which the former presence of the Buddha was marked had a clear and pronounced tendency to draw to it other deposits. Bodh-Gaya, although a much disturbed site, is a fine example. Crowded in a jumbled mass around the central point of the site, the exact point of former contact, are hundreds and thousands of small stūpas of various sizes, and what we see today is only the lowest strata. Above this strata, according to Cunningham, were at least:

four tiers of similar monuments ... carved stones of an early date were frequently found in the bases of the later monuments, and as the soil got silted up, the general level of the courtyard was gradually raised, and the later stūpas were built over the tops of the earlier ones in successive tiers of different ages ... so great was the number of these successive monuments, and so rapid was the accumulation of stones and earth that the general level of the courtyard was raised about 20 feet above the floor of the Great Temple.

However, it is not just at spots at which the former presence of the Buddha was marked that we find this pattern; exactly the same configuration occurred around stūpas containing relics. Here, the presence of the relic has had exactly the same effect that the presence of the point of former contact with the Buddha’s physical body had. It has drawn to it a jumble of minor stūpas which crowd around it in an ever increasing state of disarray. The Dharmarājika stūpa in Taxila is a good, early example. Although, as Marshall himself admits, there is no surviving evidence to actually prove that the main stūpa is Mauryan, it is unlikely that it is much later; a second century B.C.E. date is not unlikely.

Within a century this main stūpa was surrounded by a tight circle of smaller stūpas crowding around it, some of which can be dated by coin finds more specifically to the first century B.C.E. A similar situation is found at Jauliānā, a later but particularly well-preserved site that had not been overwhelmed by successive layers of building. Here, there is a central stūpa on a well-planned oblong plinth, but crowded around it are at least twenty-one smaller stūpas of varying size that, by their irregular placement, were clearly not a part of the original plan, and that were clearly added at different times wherever space allowed. When space ran out, these stūpas spilled down to a lower level where five more are found. Likewise at Mīrpur-Khas in Sind—a site both badly preserved and badly reported—around the main stūpa at the upper level was “a regular forest of smaller stūpas” that, much like at Bodh-Gaya, had been built directly on top of still earlier levels of still earlier minor stūpas. Cousins thinks that the main stūpa at least cannot be later than 400 C.E. and may be earlier.

This clustering apparently occurred even at sites where it is no longer visible. The main stūpa at Sānci, for example, today rises somewhat awesomely straight out of the flat, clear ground that surrounds it. This, however, was not always the case. Marshall says “Time was when the Great Stūpa was surrounded, like all the more famous shrines of Buddhism, by a multitude of stūpas of varying sizes crowded together on the face of the plateau. The majority of these appear to have been swept away during the operations of 1881–1883, when the ground around the Great Stūpa was cleared for a distance of some 60 feet from the outer rail.” Only a very few of these smaller stūpas survived the destruction.

The Mortuary Associations of the Pattern

These smaller stūpas have, by habit, been taken to be votive stūpas and a number of imaginative scenarios created to explain their presence. But in a significant number of cases this simply cannot be so. These cannot be “votive” in any meaningful sense of the term because these smaller stūpas contain things, and the things they contain are of particular interest. All of the earliest smaller stūpas crowding around the Dharmarājika described by Marshall contained “relic” deposits; that is, anonymous bones and ashes. That these bones and ashes did not belong to Sakyamuni may be inferred from the fact attested almost everywhere, that, when his relics were deposited, they were accompanied with an inscriptional label of some sort indicating that they were his. Moreover, his relic was already present in the main stūpa. Likewise at Jauliānā, where only the bases of most of the smaller stūpas survive, still, at least three of these contained anonymous burial deposits or chambers that once contained such deposits. At Mīrpur-Khas “all the smaller stūpas of the upper level, which had been opened, had funerary associations, as they contained urns with pieces of bone. Below the floor of these stūpas were found some earlier minor stūpas, which included two of clay, one with bones.” Even at Sānci, at least one of the very few surviving “votive” stūpas contained such an anonymous burial deposit.
Cunningham attributes this "loss" to the construction of new structures on top of the old, but there is now evidence to suggest that his explanation may not be correct.

Excavations of the site at Ratnagiri in Orissa have revealed very similar "votive" stūpas in numbers equaling, if not surpassing, those found at Bodh-Gaya.26 Here, it is even more clear than at Bodh-Gaya that a considerable number of these stūpas were portable; that is they were brought from somewhere else and deposited near the main stūpa. But here—to judge by the photographs—most of these stūpas appear never to have had pinnacles. Most appear to have a socket on top into which plugs of various shapes were inserted.27 Indeed, a very considerable number of these so-called votive and deposited near the main stūpa. That at least some of the monolithic "votive" stūpas at Ratnagiri corresponded, not only in form but also in function, to I-tsing in his Record of The Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago called a "kula." However, these kulas had a very specific use. I-tsing says: "They [Buddhist monks in India] sometimes build a thing like a stūpa for the dead, to contain his sarira (or relics). It is called a 'kula,' which is like a small stūpa, but without the cupola on it."28 That at least some of the monolithic "votive" stūpas at Ratnagiri corresponded, not only in form but also in function, to I-tsing's kula is beyond doubt. Mitra, in referring to the smaller monolithic stūpas at Ratnagiri, says: "They are mostly votive in nature, with or without some inscribed texts in their cores, but in a few cases their funerary character was obvious, for they contained charred bone relics either within sockets plugged by stone lids or in urns."29 It may not be these cases only that are funerary. If, as appears likely, the sockets on the top of these stūpas that previously have been taken to be meant for the insertion of some kind of finial were actually intended for and held ash or bone, then the funerary character of a very large number of these stūpas is established.30 But there is still something more of interest in what Mitra says.

The Mortuary Associations of Inscribed Dhāraṇīs

Mitra refers here, and elsewhere, to the presence of "inscribed texts" in the cores of some of these stūpas, and the same thing has been noticed at Bodh-Gaya, Nālandā, Paharpur, and at other sites. A significant number of these texts are dhāraṇīs, at least in later stūpas. Although largely ignored, it has recently been shown that these are not ad hoc compositions but specific dhāraṇīs taken from a specific group of texts. And these texts tell us quite explicitly why these dhāraṇīs were placed in stūpas.31 Although this group of texts is only now beginning to be studied, even a preliminary survey makes it clear that all of them are preoccupied with the problem of death and with either the procurement of a means to avoid rebirth in the hells or other unfortunate destinies, or with the release of those already born there. The latter, in fact, is one of the primary reasons for placing dhāraṇīs in stūpas. I cite here a typical example from the Tibetan translation of the Rasavidvinaśīlīstūpadhābāhārāṇī:

Moreover, if someone were to write this dhāraṇī in the name of another (who is deceased) and were to deposit it in a stūpa and earnestly worship it, then the deceased, being freed (by that) from his unfortunate destiny, would be reborn in heaven. Indeed, being reborn in the region of the Tātāta gods, through the empowering of the Buddha he would (never again) fall into an unfortunate destiny.

But these dhāraṇīs are also connected with Buddhist mortuary practices in a variety of other ways as well. Again, a typical example can be seen in the Sarvakarmavārāṇśīlīstūpadhābāhārāṇī: If one, reciting (this dhāraṇī) over earth or sesame or white mustard or water, were to scatter it over the corpse, or if, having washed (the body), one afterwards were to either cremate it or deposit and preserve it in a stūpa, writing this dhāraṇī and attaching it to the top (or head), then the deceased—although already reborn in an unfortunate destiny—being freed, would without a doubt after seven days be reborn in a blessed heaven, or else he would be reborn through the power of his own vow.

Finally, it is perhaps worth noting that similar, although more complicated, funerary rituals involving the same kinds of uses of written dhāraṇīs are to be found in the Sarvadurgātīparāśīlīstūpanāṇa published in 1983 by Skorupski—a text which, though a fully developed tantra, is clearly related both narratively and doctrinally to our group.34
The archaeological record of Buddhist sacred sites exhibits, then, from the very beginning of our actual evidence, at least one curious but consistent pattern. This pattern, significantly, is most distinctly and directly visible at our very earliest undisturbed sites. The Dharmarajikā at Taxila, which dates to the second century B.C.E., is a fine example. But there are also clear indications that the same pattern held at other very early sites like Sāñcī and Bharhut until these sites, by different agents, were irrevocably altered or virtually destroyed. It continues to hold through the fourth and fifth centuries C.E.—for example, at Jaulian and Mirpur-Khas—and is found at Ratnagiri still in its full disorderly effervescence in the tenth and twelfth centuries. What we find is a large central structure that marks one of two things: either the presence of a spot that was formerly in direct contact with the physical body of the Buddha, or—more commonly—the presence of an actual physical piece of that body. Around this structure, closely packed, in increasing disorder, are a large number—increasingly so—of other smaller structures that frequently contain anonymous bones or bone ash or other items connected with mortuary deposits. That these smaller structures were added at different times is apparent from the fact that they are not part of any discernible original or ordered plan. In fact, they frequently appear to violate any preexisting orderly plan of the sites. The only concern that appears to have governed their placement was an apparent desire to have them as close as possible to the main structure. All of this would suggest, in turn, that these mortuary deposits were purposely brought here, again at different times, from somewhere else. In fact, a considerable number of the smallest of these structures were obviously portable.\textsuperscript{37} This, in outline, is what we see. What we want to know, of course, is what it means.

Some Archaeological Parallels

It is worth noting, however briefly, some remarkably similar archaeological configurations found elsewhere. In at least some of these other instances, we know a considerable amount about the ideational systems that produced these parallel configurations, and they are, therefore, at least suggestive of what the configuration in Buddhist India might have meant.

Ariès condensed into a few sentences a large body of archaeological literature that is of interest to us. He says:

Over the saint's tomb a basilica would be built... Christians sought to be buried close to this structure. Diggings in the Roman cities of Africa or Spain reveal an extraordinary spectacle concealed by subsequent urban growth: piles of stone sarcophagi in disorder, one on top of the other, several layers high, especially around the walls of the apse, close to the shrine of the saint.\textsuperscript{38}

This, again according to Ariès, "is what one finds in Tipasa, Hippo, and Carthage. The spectacle is just as striking in Ampurias, in Catalonia... the same situation is found in our Gallo–Roman cities, but it is no longer visible to the naked eye and has to be reconstructed beneath the successive deposit of history."\textsuperscript{39}

Notice that, apart from the technical vocabulary ("basilica," "sarcophagi," etc.), Ariès' description of the archaeological record in the Roman cities of Africa, Spain, and France could almost serve equally well as a description of what was seen at Bodh-Gaya, Taxila, and other South Asian sites. Another site of interest to us differs from these two groups in only one significant way: the successive waves of mortuary deposits, rather than being heaped one on top of the other, have spread out in horizontal layers to cover an immense area, to produce in effect what has been called "the greatest cemetery of Japan." This is the cemetery on Mount Kōyasan. Here, a dense jumble of graves and markers covering many acres crowds around the tomb of Kōbō Daishi, the eighth or ninth century monk who, among a multitude of other accomplishments, founded Shingon Buddhism. Casal notes that "the number of graves... is indeed very large... But not all the graves contain a body or its ashes; it suffices to bury a bone, or even some hair or a tooth. The important thing is that one's symbol be interred near the great teacher..."\textsuperscript{40}
It is interesting to note that the ideas that produced the configuration of crowding or clustering of mortuary deposits around a central structure in both the Roman cities of Africa and Spain and on Mount Kōyasan appear to be reducible—in both cases—to two basic sets. The first set is perhaps the easier to describe because there is an established vocabulary that can be applied to it. The ideas grouped here are essentially eschatological: in the Christian case, they concern the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead; in the case of Kōyasan, they concern the coming of Maitreya, the Future Buddha. The Christian case can be illustrated by some remarks of Geary: “Early Christians took literally Christ’s promise of the resurrection and thus expected that on the last day the martyrs’ physical bodies would be taken up again by their owners . . . Christians believed that physical proximity to these bodies was beneficial, and that those buried near a saint’s tomb would be raised up with the saint on the day of judgment.” Similar ideas were also certainly associated with the tomb of Kōbō Daishi, although one might dispute the exact wording of those scholars who have described them. Lloyd, for example, says: “The Shingon are firm believers in Maitreya . . . It is their conviction that the body of Kōbō Daishi, which never decays, is awaiting the advent of Maitreya in his tomb at Kōya San, and Shingonists often send the bones of their dead, after cremation, to Kōya San, so as to be near to Kōbō at the resurrection, which will take place when Maitreya makes his appearance.”

The eschatological set, although clearly present in both cases, is only one of two sets and probably is not the most important. The second set—again present in both cases—is based on the notion that the tomb or shrine contains an actual living presence. It was thought, to quote Hakeda, that “Kukai had not died but had merely entered into eternal Samadhi and was still quite alive on Mt. Kōya as a savior to all suffering people.” Here, there is no preoccupation with some distinctly future eschatological event. Burial in close physical proximity to the living presence, in fact, effects an immediate result: it assures that the individual whose bones or ashes are placed there will gain rebirth in paradise, in the Pure Land of Amitābha, in Sukhāvatī. Christian notions that fall into this second set are much more richly documented. “It was commonly believed,” says Wilson, “. . . that, far from inhabiting any distant heaven, the saint remained present in his shrine. Delehaye wrote that, for those who followed his cult, St. Menas ‘resided, invisible, in his basilica’ in the Mariut, near Alexandria.” Here too, eschatological notions are largely absent, and a different set of functions comes into play. Ariès first quotes St. Paulinus, who had had the body of his son buried beside the Saints at Aecola. Paulinus writes: “We have sent him [his dead son] to the town of Complutum so that he may lie with the martyrs in the union of the grave, and so that from the blood of the saints he may draw that virtue that refines our souls like fire.” Ariès himself then adds the following observation: “We see here that the saints not only grant protection from the creatures of Tartarus, they also communicate to the deceased who is associated with them a little of their virtue, and post-mortem, redeem his sins.”

**The Buddhist Conception of Relics as “Living Entities”**

We know, then, that the above ideas produced the essentially similar archaeological configurations that are to be seen at Carthage and Kōyasan, and we might well expect that similar thinking produced the same configuration at Bodh-Gayā and Taxila. In India, however, the first set seems not to have been operational. There is no evidence of any kind of a connection between the presence of the relic—whether it be a contact relic, like a spot of earth, or an actual bone—and any eschatological event. In fact, if there is any eschatological thinking in India, it takes a decidedly different form. This would seem to suggest that if the configuration found at Bodh-Gayā and Taxila was produced by ideas similar to those that produced Carthage and Kōyasan, then the ideas involved would probably belong not to the first set, but to the second. But if this were the case, we might expect to find at least some indications that the relic in early Buddhist India was thought of as an actual living presence. And we have some evidence for this.

The first piece of evidence that might be brought forward is the old text we started with, which is now preserved in the various versions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. Notice that the redactor of the Sanskrit version seems clearly to have thought that the Buddha, although dead, was somehow actually present at the places where he was formerly known to have been. Notice too that he explicitly indicates that a death in physical proximity to that actual presence produces specific and positive results, that it, like burial near a Saint or close to Kōbō Daishi, resulted in “heaven.” In other words, death at Bodh-Gayā and burial *ad sanctos* at Carthage and Kōyasan have exactly the same result, although the heaven in each case is somewhat differently appointed. In fact, the key concept in this old text—only very slightly extended—is probably able to account for itself for what is seen in the archaeological record of several Buddhist sacred sites in India. The extension would only be from death to deposition of the already dead in close physical proximity to that actual presence.

However, strictly speaking, the old text is referring only to geographically fixed points of former contact with the physical body of the Buddha: Bodh-Gayā, Sārnāth, and so on. The text says he is present at these places, and yet the archaeological pattern appears to indicate burial *ad sanctos* not just at these sites, but also at sites where there is only a bodily relic. This archaeological evidence, if we are correct in our interpretation of it, would suggest that, at these sites
too, the Buddha was thought to be actually present and alive. There is, again, some evidence that would indicate this to be the case.

One of the earliest Indian inscriptions after Ashoka is written on the broken lid of a relic casket that came from Shinkot. It records, very laconically, the deposition of a relic of the Buddha Sakyamuni in the reign of the Indo-Greek king, Menander, who ruled in the second century B.C.E. All are agreed—Majumdar, Konow, Sircar, Narain, and Lamotte—that it said on the rim:

... [on] the 14th day of the month Karttika, the relic of the Blessed One Sakyamuni which is endowed with life was established. karttikaviya (māsasya) div usa 14 prāṇasametaṃ (sārīram) (bhagavataḥ sākyamuney) pratiśṭhāpitam.50

Similar wording to this also occurs on the inner face of the lid:

This is a relic of the Blessed One Sakyamuni which is endowed with life.

prāṇasametaṃ sārīram bhagavataḥ sākyamuneyḥ.

What this seems to mean is, of course, what Konow and Lamotte have already said: "The relics were looked upon as living entities"; "la relique corporelle ... c’est un être vivant ‘doué de souffle.’" However, neither of these authors noted—perhaps because it did not seem germane to their particular point—that this is the earliest actually datable reference to the relics of the historical Buddha, and that, in fact, the conception of the relic as "un être vivant" is the earliest actually attestable conception that we have.

Other early sources indicate that the physical relics of Sakyamuni were endowed with more than just "life" or "breath." They were "infused," "parfumée," "saturated," "pervaded," "imbued" with just those characteristics that defined the living Buddha. Statements to this effect are found in a wide variety of sources. The Inscription of Senavarma is a good example. This inscription, which dates to the early first century C.E., is "la plus longue des inscriptions Kharaṣṭrī jusqu’ici connues," and has proven to be difficult.51 The portion which concerns us, however, is clear. Senavarma says in part:

I establish these relics which are infused with morality, infused with concentration, wisdom, emancipation, and knowledge and vision.

ima dhātu silaparībhāvita samasiprajanamutānanda śak yamuney pratīṣṭhāvemi.

The list of faculties and qualities given here looks very much as though it may have been intended for, or is perhaps a haplography of what the Pāli tradition calls the five sampadās or "attainments" and, of course, normally only a living person can be "infused with" such "attainments." Yet another Kharoṣṭhī inscription, which can be dated more exactly to 25 to 26 C.E., has a similar characterization of the relics of Sākyamuni. Here, the relics are said to be silaparībhāvita samat(i)parībhāvemita prāṇaparībhāvita or "infused with morality, infused with concentration, infused with wisdom."52 That is to say, the relics themselves were thought to retain—to be "infused with," impregnated with—the qualities that animated and defined the living Buddha.

Something of the same vocabulary found in these two inscriptions is also found in Áśvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita. In fact, both of these inscriptions and Áśvaghoṣa may have been closely contemporaneous. Johnston dates the latter to "between 50 B.C. and 100 A.D. with a preference for the first half of the first century A.D."53 It is not, however, just his date that makes Áśvaghoṣa important for us. Both of our inscriptions record the gifts of laymen, although they, or the redactors of their inscriptions, had some apparent familiarity with accepted Buddhist doctrines.54 Áśvaghoṣa, on the other hand, was most decidedly a monk, an extremely literate and very widely learned monk, and his conception of relics is important because of that: they are the conceptions of a monk exceptionally well-versed in Buddhist doctrine.55 In the passage that concerns us, Áśvaghoṣa says, for example, that the relics of Sākyamuni, like "the sphere (dhātu) of the chief of the gods (Brāhmaṇa) in heaven at the end of the aeon," cannot be destroyed by the final cosmic conflagration, that these relics "cannot be carried even by Viṣṇu’s Garuda," that "though cool, they burn our minds" (śīl ba yin kya bḥag caṣ cṣ ryām kyi yid rnam sreg s). But Áśvaghoṣa also uses less wrought expressions, like those found in our inscriptions. The relics, he says, are "full of virtue" (dge legs gan ba), and "infused (parībhāvita?) with universal benevolence (maṅtraitī) (byams pas yongs su rnam par bsgoms pa).56

There are also other witnesses, at least one of which is hostile. The Ágastāhāsirikāprajāpāramitā is one of the earliest Mahāyāna texts translated into Chinese, and some version of it was very probably contemporaneous with both our inscriptions and Áśvaghoṣa.57 Like the Suvarṇaprabhāśāsana, the Buddhacakalādhāna, the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, and a number of other, later texts, it is in part preoccupied with sometimes sustained arguments intended to devalue—if not altogether deny the value—of relics.58 In fact, it devotes large parts of at least three chapters to such arguments. As a part of these arguments, the Ágastāhāsirikā on two occasions concedes that there are good reasons for worshipping relics, and, in so doing, uses much the same vocabulary as is found in our two inscriptions and in Áśvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita. It is stated quite explicitly that:

the relics of the Tathāgata are worshipped because they are saturated with the Perfection of Wisdom.

api tu khulu punar bhagavams tāni tathāgataśarīraṃ prajāpāramitāparībhāvita tuṭā paṭām labhyante.59
The final instance that we might cite here where relics are said to be “saturated” or “infused” or “pervaded” with specific qualities comes from the Fourth Book of the Milindapañha, a book which Demiéville has shown was almost certainly added to the Milinda in Ceylon at a date not much earlier than the fifth century C.E. It is, therefore, noteworthy that despite the fact that it is separated from the Senavarma Inscription by 500 years, the Milindapañha—as Fussman has already pointed out—contains an almost exact verbal parallel to that inscription. Here too, the relic is described as “infused with morality, concentration, wisdom, emancipation, and the knowledge and vision of emancipation” (silasmaddhipaññāvimuttimuttiññāsaṃaparābhavītām dhātutaratanā). Each of these passages comes from a distinctly different kind of source, and yet they all use exactly the same participle, paribhāvita, in characterizing the relics of the Buddha. The same participle is, of course, used elsewhere, and its characteristic usages are worth noting. One of the most common usages of the term in canonical Pāli, oddly enough, has to do with chicken’s eggs. In a frequently found simile, eggs are described as “sat on” (adhisayita), “heated” (parisedita), and “pervaded or infused” (paribhāvita) by a hen. It is this that makes the eggs “live.” In fact, the point of the simile is that, if this is not done properly, the chicks do not live. Apart from this, the term is more usually applied to living persons. A particularly interesting usage occurs twice in the Mahāvastu (maitrīparibhavita), and “pervaded or infused” (paribhāvita) to the common Indian term for a temple, devakula, “a house of the deva.” But if this is the case, we know that devakula was taken quite literally, that it was the place where the deva lived, where he was actually and powerfully present, and it is rather unlikely that an ācārya-kula would have been conceived of any differently.

The second point to be noted here is that these inscriptions indicate that a set of important ideas known only from later literary sources was already operational at Sāṇḍhya in the first century B.C.E. In a very useful study of the material found in the various monastic codes (vinayas) dealing with “la construction et le culte des stūpas” Bureau noted that “comme toute personne, le stūpa a le droit de possession ... et ce droit doit être protégé.” He goes on to say, for example:

Les Sarvaśtvavidin parlent aussi des biens inépuisables du stūpa, qui sont inaliénables. Les biens qui sont donnés en offrande au stūpa ou à une personne, à un acariya-kula peuvent être utilisés à d’autres fins. On ne doit pas les mélanger avec les biens de la Communauté des quatre directions, ni avec les biens consistant en nourriture, ni avec les biens à partager.

From these same texts, it is clear that the property belonging to the stūpa or reliquary included real property such as land in the form of gardens with productive fruit and flowering trees and ponds.

What Bureau did not note was that “le droit de possession” of the stūpa was referred to and elaborated in sources other than the Vinayas. These other sources are important for two reasons: first, they are still later than the Vinayas and, therefore, indicate the long continuity of these ideas; second, at least some of these sources must be considered, again, as hostile witnesses since they are Mahāyāna Sūtras, the majority of which perhaps are at best ambivalent in regard to the value of relics and stūpas, if they are not explicitly engaged in actually devaluing them. The number of these references in Mahāyāna literature is also impressive. Edgerton, under the term stauṣṭika, cites two passages from the Śikṣāsamuccaya, two from the Bodhisattvabhumi, and one each from the Rāṣṭrapāla and Gaṇḍavyūha. However, there are at least four more in the Śikṣā and two also now available in the Upālīparipr̥ṣchā.
The strength of the ideas concerning the stūpa’s rights of ownership is clear from a long passage from the Rāmarāṣṭra quoted in the Sīkṣā (56.9). The substance of this passage is this: although funds of the local order—if there is a surplus and unanimous agreement—can be used to make up a deficit in the ecumenical order (normally such funds must be kept strictly separated), funds belonging to the stūpa, even if there is an excess, must never be handed over to either the local or ecumenical order (yadi punah kāśyapa hriyad babur api staupitaka labho bhavet / sa taiyāstvyakareṇa na sāmge na caturgdarṣyaṃ upanāmyaśyati). The text, in fact, goes so far as to say that “a robe (or piece of cloth) given to the stūpa must be allowed to go to ruin on the stūpa through the wind and sun and rain,” that such a robe cannot be exchanged for a sum of money, and that nothing that belongs to a stūpa can have a commercial price set on it (ya staupitika antasia ekadapi / nirvītyā bhavati / sa sadvatsaryaṃ lokasya caityaṃ). That is to say, an object given to a stūpa becomes itself a sacred object (caitya). However, we know that there is only one way for objects to become sacred in a Buddhist context: they must be owned or used by a sacred person. In fact, the Chinese version of the above passage translates staupitaka or “belonging to the stūpa” by characters which mean “belonging to the Buddha.”

We should also notice that some of these Mahāyāna texts—exactly like the gateway inscriptions at Sāfcī—explicitly associate or equate taking property belonging to the stūpa with “the five acts with immediate retribution”; for example, this is true of the Ākāśagarbha-sūtra and the Upālipariṇītakha. This, if nothing else, indicates the extremely serious nature of such an act, as these five acts are the most serious offenses known to the Indian Buddhist tradition. However, the association of theft or destruction of property belonging to a stūpa with this set of five offenses is probably more than just a way of indicating its terrible seriousness. “The five acts with immediate retribution” are: taking the life of one’s mother; taking the life of one’s father; taking the life of an ascetic; taking the life of one’s teacher; taking the life of an arhat; causing a division within the Sangha; and wounding or causing physical harm to a Buddha. Four of the five, then, have to do with seriously harming living persons of rank. That harm done to a stūpa or relicary is explicitly equated with acts of this kind would suggest, again, that the stūpa was cognitively classified as a “living person of rank.” If this were not the case, it would be difficult to understand the extreme seriousness with which such harm was viewed.

In noting that the stūpa or relicary “comme toute personne” had the right to, and did in fact, possess personal real property, and in noting that the ideas surrounding this right were both old and markedly tenacious, it is of some interest to point out that we find ourselves again in front of a phenomenon noted elsewhere. In discussing the “Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages,” Geary repeatedly insists that “in a very basic sense, men in the Central Middle Ages perceived relics as being alive . . . relics were actually the saints themselves, continuing to live among men.” One body of evidence he uses to establish this view parallels exactly at least a part of what we have just seen in regard to the Buddhist stūpa. He says, “Relics even had legal rights; they received gifts and offerings made specifically to them and owned churches and monasteries, which were technically the property of the saints who lay in their crypts.”

The Functional Equivalence of the Relic and the Living Buddha

If Buddhist reliquaries and the relics they contained were legal persons, that is to say, if they had and exercised the rights of living persons, and if harm done to them was explicitly equated with harm done to living persons of rank, then the reverse of the second equation in particular should also hold: honor or worship done to them should be explicitly equated with honor or worship done to living persons. And so it is. An instance of exactly this equation is found, for example, in a text now preserved in the Gilgit Mulasarvāstivadī-vinaya, which has the appearance of being very old. This text, in fact, seems to reflect a period prior to the development of the monumental stūpa when relics were simply buried in the ground at specific places.

The text says the Buddha in company with Ānanda went to a place called Toyikā. When he arrived there, there was a brahmin plowing his field. This gentleman saw the Buddha and said to himself, “If I approach the Blessed One Gautama and pay honor to him, my work will suffer; but if I do not approach him and pay honor to him, my merit will suffer. What can I do to avoid both a loss of work and a loss of merit?” He decided—being a clever brahmin—to remain where he was, but to pay honor to Gautama from a distance, which he did still—as the text pointedly notes—holding his goad. Gautama, of course, was not terribly impressed with this expedient—the text calls it an upāya—and he said, in part, to Ānanda:

‘Mistaken, Ānanda, is this brahmin. Had he approached this spot then when he did honor here, he would himself have known ‘on this spot the undisturbed mass of relics of the Perfect Buddha Kāśyapa is present.’ Had he approached I would have been honored by him, indeed honor would have been done by him to two Perfect Buddhas. Why is that? Because, Ānanda, at this spot the undisturbed mass of relics of the Perfect Buddha Kāśyapa is present.’
The implications here are that there is no distinction between a living Buddha and a collection of relics—both make the sacred person equally present as an object of worship, and the presence of either makes available the same opportunity to make merit. In case his reader missed the point, the redactor of the text adds a set of verses that make it explicit in slightly different terms:

He who would worship a living (Buddha), and he who would worship one who has entered final nirvāṇa, having made their minds equally devout—between them there is no distinction of merit.

The learned should know the qualities of the Buddha, and that if one worships with similar devotion the Seer when he is present, or if one worships his relic after he has entered final Nirvāṇa, the result is the same.

Notice that all of these texts emphasize that the individual is to “make his mind equally devout” in regard to the actual presence and the relic (samaṃ cittaṃ prasādyeta; same cittaṃ prasāde hi; semi dge ba ni mtshoṅs ’gyur na; yid kyi dan ba mñam na; etc.). That is to say, one is to adopt the same frame of mind toward the relic as is adopted in regard to the living presence. For the believer they are to be taken as the same. They have the same function. They make possible the same result.

It is interesting too to note that one of the clearest expressions of these ideas is to be found in the Mahāvamsa, the fifth century Pali chronicle of Buddhism in Sri Lanka written by the Monk Mahānāma. The passage concerned is supposed to be the record of a conversation which took place in the third century B.C.E. between the Monk Mahinda, who is credited with the conversion of Sri Lanka, and the reigning Sri Lankan king, Devanampiya Tissa. Mahinda, who according to the Mahāvamsa is on the verge of leaving Sri Lanka, complains to the king: “For a long time O King, we have not seen the Perfect Buddha, the Teacher. We have lived without a Master. There is nothing here for us to worship”; to which the king replies: “But, sir, did you not tell me that the Perfect Buddha has entered nirvāṇa?” The Mahinda answers—and his answer perfectly condenses much of our discussion—“when the relics are seen [or: are present], the Buddha is seen [or: is present]” (ciradiṭṭho hi saṃbuddho satthā no manuṣyādhipa / anāthavāsām vasīmba nattthi no pūjyāṃ idha // bhāsīthā nanu bhante me saṃbuddho nibbuto iti / āhaḥ dātusu diṭṭhesu diṭṭho bhi jino iti). The king, of course, promises to build a stūpa, and Mahinda appoints another monk to fly to India to procure relics.

The Public Value Placed on Relics

Before our findings up to this point are summarized, it is worth looking briefly at one final piece of evidence, not because it provides further indications that the relic was thought of as a living presence—that, I think, is already sufficiently clear—but because it is an early piece of evidence for what we might call, in the absence of a better term, the communal or public value placed on relics. The evidence in question is an old tradition concerning what has come to be called the War of the Relics. Already in the oldest surviving Buddhist art—at Sāṇī, Bhārhat, Amarāvatī, and in Gandhāra—we have illustrations of this episode, although the narrative details are now known only from later texts. After the cremation of the Buddha, the Mallas of Kusināra “surrounded the bones of the Exalted One in their council hall with a lattice work of spears, and with a rampart of bows.” Seven other groups representing distinct and apparently competing political entities also came, however, armed for war to claim a share of the relics. They were initially refused. Interestingly enough, imminent conflict was avoided only by the intervention of a brahmin who pointed out the incongruence of waging war over the remains of one who was a teacher of forbearance (khanti-vāda). We might note that this old tradition, however the details might fall, forcefully articulates in the strongest possible contemporary political idiom the extreme value placed on these remains. Bareau has noted:

Qu’elle [this tradition] raconte un fait historique ou qu’elle soit pure légende, peu importe ici, l’essentiel pour notre propos est que . . . les fidèles, dont les hagiographes reflètent l’esprit, ont cru à la réalité de cet épisode,
ont regardé comme parfaitement vraisemblable que la dévotion de leurs prédécesseurs ait poussé ces derniers à se disputer les restes corporels du bienheureux, les armes à la main. Cela prouve qu’au temps où la première version de ce récit fut composée, les fidèles trouvaient normal et même édifiant un tel excès de zèle...

And, but for one small detail, Bareaux’s remarks are very much to the point: unless he wants to assert that it was written by a layman—and I doubt that he would—“la première version de ce récit,” or any other for that matter, can tell us nothing directly about some hypothetical and generalized “fidèles.” What it can and does prove, however, is what “les hagiographes” who composed it—almost certainly monks—“trouvaient normal et même édifiant.” This, of course, is a very different matter.

**Conclusions**

Several different kinds of data have been presented here. There are the archaeological data that show a seemingly characteristic, repeatedly encountered configuration of material remains at Buddhist sacred sites. This configuration consists of a central structure marking either a spot known to have been formerly in direct contact with the physical body of the Buddha, or housing an actual part of that physical body. Around this central structure are crowded in increasing disarray large numbers of smaller structures, a considerable number of which contain anonymous mortuary deposits—bone and ash—or other objects known to be associated with mortuary practices. These mortuary deposits have been purposely brought and placed here at different times. They do not form a part of an original or ordered plan.

In addition, an old literary tradition exists that indicates that the Buddha was thought to be actually present at certain spots with which he was known to have had direct physical contact. There is also a whole series of epigraphical and literary documents that prove that the physical relic of the Buddha was thought to be possessed of “life” or “breath,” and to be impregnated with the characteristics that defined and animated the living Buddha, that show that the relic or the reliquary that contained it had and exercised the right to own personal property—that it was legally a person—and that it was cognitively classified with living persons of rank. Some of these literary documents, at least one of which is very old, also establish that the presence of the relic was thought to be the same thing as the presence of the actual Buddha, that the two were religiously the same, and that the same behavior was required in regard to both.

This, in turn, means that the central structures at both types of Buddhist sacred sites contained or located the actual living presence of the Buddha, and it was this presence that drew to it the secondary mortuary deposits and a host of subsidiary structures.

Another part of the same old literary tradition proves that it was thought that a death in the presence of the Buddha resulted in rebirth in heaven. In addition, there are the parallels in conception and mortuary practice in the Roman cities of Spain and Africa and on Mount Kōyasan.

We have, it would seem, reason to believe that Indian Buddhists also practiced and believed in some form of what in the Latin West was called depositio ad sanctos, and that—regardless of what some canonical texts might occasionally suggest and what some scholastic texts definitely state—the Buddha was and continued to be an actual living presence in the midst of the Buddhist community.

**Notes**

I would like to thank my colleagues Gérald Fussman and Patrick Olivelle for their helpful comments on different drafts of this paper.
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Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1991,
Nr. 6 (Stuttgart: 1991).] More recently, von Hinüber has said “that most of the surviving
manuscript material [for the Pâli canon] is hardly older than the late 18th century.” He
also refers to “an extremely old manuscript dated as early as A.D. 1412,” and adds “if
this date is correct, this would be the oldest dated Pâli manuscript known so far” in
“Pâli Manuscripts of Canonical Texts From North Thailand—A Preliminary Report,”
Journal of the Siam Society 71 (1983) 78. Note too that, in terms of Pâli literature, a

slightly shorter account of the Mahâparinibbâna passage on pilgrimage also occurs at
Anguttara, ii, 120. In light of these passages, it is difficult to understand what A. Bharati
meant when he said, “Although pilgrimage figures importantly in the religions of India,
it never had any canonical status in non-tantric traditions” (The Tantric Tradition (London: 1965)) 85.

7. Waldschmidt’s anumarantîya appears to be reconstructed on the basis of Tibetan
rjet su avan par ’gyur bar bya. In fact, in neither of the two manuscript fragments for 41.5
has the actual reading been preserved. But in the restatement of 41.5 that occurs in
41.10, the one manuscript in which the actual reading has been preserved has quite
clearly abbhigamantâya; see Teil I, 43, 113.2. Note that this passage of the Mahâparinirvâna-
Sûtra has been reedited by F. Edgerton in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Reader (New Haven:
1953) 34–35; cf. n. 14 below.

8. For the range of meanings of samyoijantâya, “to be powerfully experienced,” see
Coomaraswamy 1. Selected Papers. Traditional Art and Symbolism, ed. R. Lipsey (Princeton:
1977) 179–185. He translates samyoijantâya from our passages of the Mahâparinibbâna-
sutta as “should be deeply moved.” For an interesting use of vegal pravega in early Mahâyâna
sûtra literature, see Vajracchedika Prajñâparamita (Conze ed.) 14A: atha bhava yasmin
abhikkhet dhammanyasrîrî (the Giltic text has -pravega-) pramucat," etc.

9. J. Gonda has clearly demonstrated the antiquity of many of the ideas that most
secondary literature associates only with the much later “classical” bhikku conception of
darjan in Eye and Gaze in the Veda, Verhandlungen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie
darjan generally, see the fine little book by D. L. Eck, Darjan. Seeing the Divine Image in
India (Churchill: 1981). In light of the pervasiveness and age of these Indian ideas
about “seeing” and what it entails, it would appear that many of our translations, at the very
least, miss the nuance and may, in fact, miss the whole point. The exhortation that
Ànanda was directed by the Buddha to deliver to the Mallas is a good example. Ànanda
was told to go and tell the Mallas that the Buddha would enter parinibbâna during the
last watch of that night, and he was supposed to say to them: abhikkhabamathâ ... abhikkhabamathâ ... ma pacchâ sippâ sivittvirînari abhavutta: ambâhâri ca no gânakkhetabbhata parinibbânam abhi, no mâyam labhimbâ pacchime kâle tâhâgauma dassanâyath, which Rhys Davids translates as: “Be favourable ... be favourable. Give no occasion to reproach
yourself hereafter, saying: ‘In our own village did the death of our Tathâgata take
place, and we took not the opportunity of visiting the Tathâgata in his last hours’”; see T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha. Pt. II (London: 1910) 162.
The Rhys Davids’ translation is, of course, not really wrong, but unless the reader has
the etymology of the English word clearly in mind, to translate dassana by “visit,” from
Latin, visere "to go to see," visere, visum "to see," is at best terribly flat. In a culture where
“casting one’s eyes upon a person and touching him were related activities” (Gonda,
19), where there were large numbers of old “ritual texts prescribing a conscious and directed
look by which the spectator was ... believed to benefit, or ritual acts performed to
derive some advantage from looking on a mighty being ... to participate in its nature or
essence, to be purified or raised to a higher level of existence by being vid-avô with
such a man” (Gonda, 1977) 179-185—in such a culture, to go to “see” a man, especially an exceptionally
holy man, clearly involves much more than a “visit.” In fact, the Uåpâva Incident in
the Mahâparinibbâna-sutta makes it absolutely clear that, for this text, the important
aspect of *dassana* was direct visual contact and that such contact was very highly valued. In this remarkable incident, the Buddha is lying on his deathbed and the Monk Upāśaṇa is standing in front of him fanning him. But then the Buddha "spoke harshly" to Upāśaṇa (apastātii—a very strong verb and an action very uncharacteristic of the textual Buddha), saying "Get away, Monk! Don't stand in front of me!" (utapi bhikkhu mā me purato asthitāti). Ānanda is puzzled (shocked, cf. Skt. 35. 4) and asks about the Buddha's behavior. The latter calmly explains that the *dassana* also worth noting that there is Buddhist evidence for other aspects of the conception of *dassana* but this eminent Monk standing in front of the Blessed One is preventing it and *we do not get to gaze on the Tathagata in his final moments* (na māyaṃ labhānām pacchime kāle tathāgatam dassanayāti). Clearly, here again the *dassas* did not come simply "to visit," and, in fact, here Rhys Davids was almost forced to translate *dassana* as "behold." It is also worth noting that there is Buddhist evidence for other aspects of the conception of *darian* usually associated with *bhakti* which is, relatively speaking, much earlier. Both Coomaraswamy (*Medieval Sinhalese Art*, 2nd ed. [New York: 1956] 70–75) and Gombrich ("The Consecration of a Buddhist Image," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 26 [1966] 23–36) have pointed out that Buddhaghosa, already in the fifth century at Buddha-Gaya, inscriptions of roughly the same period that refer to *darian*, certainly several centuries earlier than Buddhaghosa. Cunningham, no. 12 63, a gift made by "Papin (Papin), brother of Budhi"; no. 12 70, and in H. Liiders, no. 12 70, and in H. Sarkar, "Some Early Inscriptions in the Amaravati Museum," *JAIH* 4 (1970–1971) 9, no. 63, and a dharmakathika, "a preacher of Dharma," in a third inscription in Liiders, no. 1267. This would seem to indicate that some, at least, of the "honors of shrines" were the acknowledged transmitters of Buddhist doctrine and monastic rules and monks of considerable standing.

12. In the Pāli canon, in the *Araṇavibhaṅgasutta* (Majjhima, iii, 237), the Monk Su-bhūtī is called a *kalaputta*; in the *Dhātuṃbhanga-sutta* (Majjhima, iii, 238–247), the Monk Pukkāsāti is repeatedly referred to as a *kālaputta*; in a recurring "arthat formula," the *kālaputtas* are the ones specially said to go thereby from the house to the houseless state (Anguttara, i, 282; *Dīgha*, ii, 153; etc.). In very early Mahāyāna literature, it is clear that not only did the title *kalaputta* apply both to monks and laymen, but it was also a title that could be applied to followers of both who usually call the Mahāyāna and the Hinayāna. In the *Pratīyosānabhasamukkhaṭṭhasamāññhītā*, *byiḥ chaḥ sans dāpī khyiṃ pa 'am rāḥ tu bhyān ha*, "both householder and renunciant bodhisatvāras," are equated with *rigs kyi bu 'am rigs kyi bu nu, "sons and daughters of good family"*; see P. M. Harrison, *The Tibetan Text of the Pratīyosānabhasamukkhaḥṭṭhasamāññhītā* (Tokyo: 1978) 7B; see also 8G, where *kalaputtas* who seek arhatship are referred to; 9E, which refers to *kalaputtas* who are "adherents of the Śrīvedaśāstra;" Likewise, in the equally early *Aṣṭhāṣṭāḥbāgata-sūkṣma*, we find *byiḥ chaḥ sans dāpī iṣaḥ pāpa daṇī anā thos kyi thag pāl riṣi kyi bu 'amrīgs kyi bu mo gān dag khyiṃ gyi gus nas nes par byaḥ śīn rāḥ tu byaḥ bar gyr pa dag ...* Peking, 22, 132-5-4, cf. 137-1-2, 154-4-6, 156-1-7, 2-3, 3-4, etc. On this important but until recently little studied text, see now J. Danin, *La splendeur de l’Indo-bouddhisme* (Aṣṭhāṣṭāḥbāgata-sūkṣma), T. I (Louvain-la-Neuve: 1983). For a much later occurrence, see *Sudāknāvākramāpariprścāḥ* (Hikata ed) 64.14.

The benefit of rebirth in heaven while no longer requiring an actual pilgrimage. The Tibetan translation appears to be introducing is also clearly visible in the Chinese version for the Sanskrit, as in 41.10, it is abhigamanāya. The substitution or option that the Tibetan translation appears to be introducing is also clearly visible in the Chinese version of the text translated by Waldschmidt: "Wenn man an diesen vier Plätzen entweder persönlich seine Verehrung bezeugt oder (ihnen) aus der Ferne seine Achtung übermittelt, sehnsuchtsvoll und außergewöhnlich zu läuten und beständig die Gedanken daran heftet, wird man nach Lebensende Geburt im Himmel erlangen." Here too, one can either go in person to the four places or call them to mind from afar; cf. A. B. Griswold, "The Holy Land Transplanted: A Guide to Sanchi and new options, like visualization "aus der Ferne," had to be introduced into the text. It is in this light, I think, that the Tibetan translation and some of the Chinese translations of our passage are to be viewed. There were, of course, other ways of dealing with the problem of actual pilgrimage. See, for example, the interesting paper by A. B. Griswold, "The Holy Land Transplanted: Replicas of the Mahabodhi Shrine in Siam and Elsewhere," Paramanitaka Felicitation Volume, ed. N. A. Jayawickrama (Colombo: 1965) 173–222.


20. Marshall, Taxila, Vol. I, 240ff. Marshall does not specifically describe all the earliest smaller stūpas, but of those that he does all contain bone or ash (i.e., R3, S8, S9, B6, B3). Other contemporary stūpas that contain bone or ash are J2, N7, and Q1. Stūpas of varying date scattered around the complex that are specially said to contain "relic" deposits are G4, G5, T12, K3, P6, S10, N11, N10, N9, P10, P12, U1.

21. See, for example, "The Piprīśhāvī Buddhist Vase Inscription" in Liders, List, no. 932; "Buddhist Vase Inscription from Taxila No. 1," Stupas and Monasteries at Taxila under the Orders of the Government of India between the Years 1913 and 1934, ed. N. A. Jayawickrama (Colombo: 1965) 173–222.

22. Marshall, Taxila, Vol. I, 373, A11; 373, D5; 374, A16. There was also at least one reliquary found in the debris between Stūpas A7 and A8.

23. Mitra, Buddhist Monuments, 133; Cousens, The Antiquities of Sind, 97.


27. See Mitra, Ratnagiri, pls. IX, XX–XXI, XXXIV, XLII, LV–LVIII, etc.


found empty, and only a few (stūpas 112 and 188 for instance), which were found plugged by stone blocks, retained the relics." This raises the real possibility that many more might have contained relics, a possibility that she clearly states in discussing the structural stūpas, as we will see below. Notice too that she incidently notes (44n) that "the relics were noticed mostly during the conservation of the stūpas, i.e., the possibilities of the presence of bone deposits were not in any way systematically studied.

31. G. Schopen, "The Text on the Dhāraṇī Stones from Abhayagriyā: A Minor Contribution to the Study of Mahāyāna Literature in Ceylon," JIABS 5 (1980) 100–108; G. Schopen, "The Bodhi-garbha-lāṅkāraka-laśā and Vimala-griyā Dhāraṇīs in Indian Inscriptions: Two Sources for the Practice of Buddhism in Medieval India," WZK 29 (1985) 119–149. In the second of these papers, I was able to show that the "dhāraṇī-text" on the Cuttack Stone Inscription published by A. Ghosh (EI 26 [1941] 171–174) was an incomplete Sanskrit version of a text called the Bodhi-garbha-lāṅkāraka-laśādhaṇī. Although Mitra refers to Ghosh (Ratnagiri, 31), she apparently did not recognize that the two dhāraṇīs found on eight plaques at Ratnagiri that she transliterated (43, 99) were the same dhāraṇī that he had transliterated. The same dhāraṇī is also found on at least two plaques from Nālandā and on a "cache" from Qunduz.

32. 'Phags pa’od zer dri ma med pa’ ram par dag pa’i od ca bya ba’i gzun, Peking, 7, 190–1–4. It is interesting to note that the two earliest known examples of printing—one from Korea and one from Japan—both contain the Rājavinimala, and in both countries were found inside stūpas; see L. Carrington Goodrich, "Printing: Preliminary Report on a New Discovery," Technology and Culture 9 (1967) 376–378; T. F. Carter, The Invention of Printing in China and Its Spread Westward, 2nd ed. rev. L. Carrington Goodrich (New York: 1955) 46–53; B. Hickman, "A Note on the Hyakumantō Dharani," Monumenta Nipponica 30 (1975) 87–93.

33. 'Phags pa la kyi sgrab pa’ thams cod ram par sryon ba’i sbyon ba’i gzun, Peking, 11, 251-1–4. It is very likely that the dhāraṇī from this text was one of the dhāraṇīs deposited by the Monk Bu Stōn in the stūpa he built for his deceased mother; see D. S. Ruegg, The Life of Bu Stōn Po Che, With the Tibetan Text of the Bu Stōn Ram Thar, Serie Orientale Roma, XXXIV (Rome: 1966) fol. 29a, 5 and 136.

34. T. Skorupski, The Sarvadurgatiparifodhana Tantra (Delhi: 1983). Notice that, although the dramatic personae and the setting differ in each case, the Rājavinimala and the Bodhi-garbha-lāṅkāraka-laśā, the Samantamukha-praveshavimimala-lokotakaprabhasaravatāsthāgatajanayasa-rasaylakotika (Peking, 7, no. 206), and the Sarvadurgatiparifodhanī-anangatīgyāna (Peking, 7, no. 198) dhāraṇīs and the Sarvadurgatiparifodhana Tantra (Skorupski, 4, 122.22ff) are all introduced by essentially the same thematic kind of narrative. The introductions to the dhāraṇīs are summarized in Mēkas Grub Rje’s Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras. Rgyud sde’i spyiṅ rnam par gcig pa’i rgyas par brjod, trans. F. D. Lessing and A. Wayman (The Hague: 1968) 104–107, 115–117. On dhāraṇīs in funerary rites in the Sarvadurgati Tantra, see Skorupski, 81, 242.22ff.

35. Mitra, Ratnagiri, 43, 98–99. It should be noted that a more complete and systematic survey of Buddhist sites than the one I have been able to present here promises—despite the deficiencies of much of the published archaeological literature—to produce much fuller evidence for the funerary functions of the minor stūpas found at almost all Buddhist sites. For now I can only mention the following points. It is possible that "les stūpa à avancée" or "les stūpa à cella" which occur at both Bodh-Gaya (Cunningham, Mahābodhi, 48, pl. XXIII.k; Bénetti, Contribution à l’étude du stūpa, T. i, 20–22; T. ii, figs. 25–26, 28, 29, 31, 33) and Ratnagiri (Mitra, Ratnagiri, pls. XXla. 102, XXlb. 107, XIVIIA.228) and which have been taken—on very weak evidence—to have been meant for images, may, in fact, have been intended and used for funerary deposits. It has been reported, at least at Mainamati, that "the hoard of miniatures baked and unbaked clay stūpas" found there contained bone relics or small sealings or sometimes both ("Mainamati Excavations," Pakistan Archaeology 5 [1968] 173). These miniature stūpas have a very wide distribution indeed; see M. Taddei, "Inscribed Clay Tablets and Miniature Stūpas from Ganzī," EW 20 (1970) 85–86. Finally, G. Fussman has already published two K κ a r o g hī inscriptions that he thinks are funerary in "Une inscription kharoṣṭhī à Haḍḍa," BEFEO 56 (1969) 5–9, and "Documents épigraphiques kouchans," BEFEO 61 (1974) 58–61. There are, according to a personal communication from Prof. Fussman, also a number of similar inscriptions from Haḍḍa that have yet to be published. A. H. Dani has also published a number of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions that appear to be funerary in "Shaikhān Dherī Excavation (1963 and 1964 Seasons)," Ancient Pakistan 2 (1965–1966) 109–113. All of these things deserve to be studied much more fully.

36. Mitra, however, has indicated that, at Ratnagiri at least, there is some evidence to indicate that the "portable monolithic stūpas" were made locally (Ratnagiri, 32).


44. Aries, The Hour of Our Death, 33.

45. There is, of course, the old story of Kāśyapa awaiting the coming of Maitreya entombed in the "Kukkurapada" or "Gurupada" mountain that has some obvious similarities with some of the ideas connected with Kobo Daishi; see T. Watters, On Yuan Chongyuan’s Travels in India, Vol. II (London: 1905) 13ff, and literature cited therein, but this has nothing to do with relics as such. Outside of India, G. Obeyesekere refers to a "Sinhalese myth which states that in the flood that heralds the destruction of this age all the Buddha dattas found in various parts of the world will assemble together through rūḍha and the Buddha himself will be refashioned out of these substances. He will then utter a last sermon" ("The Buddhist Pantheon in Ceylon and Its Extensions," Anthropological Studies in Theravada Buddhism [New Haven: 1966] 9). M. E. Spiro cites several instances of a similar "myth" in Burma: "Just prior to his [Maitreya’s] arrival, the relics of the present Buddha, Gautama, will be recombined to form his physical body. By worshiping him, the woikza will automatically achieve nirvana" (Burmese Supernaturalism. A Study in the
Explanation and Reduction of Suffering [Englewood Cliffs: 1967] 231, 165–66, 191. The Indian antecedents of the Sri Lankan and Burmese materials are very vague. Both are undoubtedly related to the Anāgātavāpaṇa; see J. Minayef, “Anāgātavāpaṇa,” JPTS (1886) 36; cf. H. C. Warren, Buddhism in Translation (Cambridge: 1896) 484–485, but this text is itself sometimes presented as a sutta (e.g., Minayef’s Ms. B from Rangoon) while at other times it is considered an authored work attributed to a Colijyan monk named Kassapa who probably lived between 1160 and 1230 C.E.; see J. Minayef, "The Gandhā-Vāpaṇa," JPTS (1886) 60–61, 66, 70; A. P. Buddhaddatta and A. K. Warder, Mahāvīcchedāni Abhidhammahatthakathavagāṇī (London: 1961) x–xi, xvi–xviii. The Anāgātavāpaṇa itself clearly owes much to Buddhaghosa’s Indian antecedents of the Sri Lankan and Burmese materials are very vague. Both are et al., “Century Persian Chronicle: Notes on Some of Rashid al’Din’s Sources,” The Buddha’s Mission and Last Journey; Buddhacarita, XV–XXVIII,” Acta Orientalia 15 (1937) 26–111, 231–292. For the passage that concerns us, XXVII, 77–79, I follow Johnston, 276. The Sanskrit equivalents in parentheses are his; the Tibetan in parentheses is cited from Peking, 129, no. 5656, 169-4-9 to 169-5-3, the only version that was available to me.

48. See D. L. Eck, Banaras: City of Light (New York: 1982) 215: "Those who die in Kāśī, assured of liberation, will be cremated on the banks of the river of Heaven at this most sacred of śīrāhs. If one cannot die in Kāśī, then cremation by the Ganges anywhere along her banks is desirable. If even this is impossible, then relatives might later bring the ashes of the deceased to the Ganges at Kāśī, or even send them to Kāśī posthumously.”


50. I cite here, and below, Sirac’s Sanskritized text from Select Inscriptions, 105. It should be noted that this inscription is very fragmentary, and not all of the inscriptions on the lid go back to the time of Menander.


54. On the important question of the role of “le rédacteur” in Buddhist inscriptions, see Fussman, BEOFE 56 (1969) 7, and his review of Th. Damsteegt, Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit, JA (1980) 424.

55. See Johnston, Buddhacarita, Pt. II, xxiv–lxxix.

56. Cantos XV–XXVIII of the Buddhacarita are known to us only in the Tibetan and Chinese translation. Johnston has published an English translation of the Tibetan text in “The Buddha’s Mission and Last Journey; Buddhacarita, XV–XXVIII,” Acta Orientalia 15 (1937) 26–111, 231–292. For the passage that concerns us, XXVII, 77–79, I follow Johnston, 276. The Sanskrit equivalents in parentheses are his; the Tibetan in parentheses is cited from Peking, 129, no. 5656, 169-4-9 to 169-5-3, the only version that was available to me.


58. See G. Schopen, “The Phrase ‘sa prthivā padeśas caitya-yāhūto bhavet’ in the Vajracchedikā: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna, IJ 17 (1975) 147–181, esp. 163–167, for the Saddharmapundarikā; also J. Nobel, Śvānabhadrotattamātrāṇī. Das Goldglanz Sūtra. Ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna Buddhismus (Leipzig: 1937) 6–19; G. Schopen, “The Five Leaves of the Buddhabaladhinapratiḥayavikurvanirdeśasūtra Found at Gilgit,” JIP 5 (1978) 329ff, and Peking, 34, 191-4-6ff. The translation offered in JIP 5 is a rather awful piece of English. This is, in part at least, because I tried to translate the Sanskrit and Tibetan at the same time—an exercise I would now never repeat—and because I tried to be unnaturally literal. But I also occasionally did not understand the text. One instance of this occurs on 332, where the passage beginning “As-so-ever he sees . . .” up to “does not (exist in the Tathāgata)” should be translated from the Tibetan: “As he sees those beings who will not honor the Teacher, who do not have faith in the Tathāgata, who are the lowest dregs but a Tathāgata does not come and does not go.” I am now working on a revised edition of the Sanskrit fragments and an edition of the complete Tibetan translation of the Buddhabaladha. [Unfortunately, I am still working on it.]


65. Majumdar then makes a number of very tenuous assertions concerning the demography of early Buddhist sects on the basis of his "connection." In "Buddhist Schools as Known from Early Indian Inscriptions," *Bharati. Bulletin of the College of Indology* 2 (1957/58) 28-29, A. M. Shastri questions some of the assertions but not Majumdar's basic "connection." The whole question needs further study in light, especially, of other epigraphical imprecations and the now much richer inscriptive materials in which named "schools" appear. [See also G. Schopen, "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mulasarvastivādavinaya*," *JAOS* 114 (1994) 527-554, esp. 550-551.]


68. Majumdar's basic "connection." The whole question needs further study in light, especially, of other epigraphical imprecations and the now much richer inscriptive materials in which named "schools" appear. [See also G. Schopen, "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mulasarvastivādavinaya*," *JAOS* 114 (1994) 527-554, esp. 550-551.]

69. In "La construction et le culte des stūpa," Bareau did, however, point out that these interdictions were maintained regardless of whether a given sect maintained "que le don au Buddha ou le culte rendu à un stūpa ne produisent pas de grands fruits." In fact, of the schools that he named as holders of such a view—Mahisasaka, Vettulaka, Pûtavasala, and Aparasak—a least the last three are Mahâsâṅghika, and it is just the Mahâsâṅghika who most explicitly and with the greatest detail "interdisent de prendre ou d'utiliser les biens du stûpa." (233).

70. *BHSID*, 608-609; Śīkṣā, 56.3, 170.3; *Bbh*, 163.11, 166.20; *RP*, 29.8; *Gs*, 228.21.


72. *Śīkṣāsamucaya* (Bendall ed.) 54.13ff (Ākāsagarbhasatā); *Vinaya-Viniscaya-Ujāali-Pariśeṭṭha* (Python ed.) paragraph 22.


74. I have discussed this interesting text in more detail in G. Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism," *Ch. II* above, 28-29.


77. *Mahāvāma* (Geiger ed.) XVII.2-3; cf. W. Geiger, *The Mahāvāma or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon* (London: 1912) XVII.2-3; H. Oldenberg, *The Dīpanavamā. An Ancient Buddhist Historical Record* (London: 1879; repr. New Delhi: 1982) XV 1-5. It should be noted that Pāli dīṭṭha, though literally meaning "seen," blends into—like dēṭṭha in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit—"visible," "present," "here," cf. the idioms dīṭṭhe dhamme, deṭṭhe dhamme, in contrast to samparāya. The Sri Lankan Chronicles are rich in references to relics, and a careful study of them would undoubtedly produce interesting results. On the other hand, references to relics in the anthropological literature on Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia generally are few and rather disappointing. A notable exception, however, are the remarks of G. Obeyesekere, "The Buddhist Pantheon in Ceylon and Its Extensions" (see n. 47 above), 5-9.
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