THE JOURNAL

OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

BUDDHIST STUDIES

93-2 / 14.2

03. 57. 57

Volume 14   *1991*   *Number 2*

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

II. BOOK REVIEWS

An Old Inscription from Amarāvatī and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries

by Gregory Schopen

Although they have yet to be carefully studied, there are references scattered throughout extant Buddhist literature to permanently housing the mortuary remains of deceased monks. In both the Pāli *Udāna* and *Apadāna*, for example, there is a clear injunction addressed to monks—and monks alone—directing them not only to perform the funeral rites for a "fellow-monk" (*sabrahmacārin*), but to build a mortuary *stūpa* for him as well and to worship it.[1] In the Pāli *Vinaya*, too, there is an account which describes, in part, a group of nuns performing the funeral rites and building a *stūpa* for a deceased member of their group.[2] In the account of the deposition of the remains of Śāriputra preserved in the Tibetan version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, there is a passage in which the placement of the monastic dead within the monastery complex is directly addressed. Here the Buddha first gives instructions concerning the form of mortuary *stūpa* appropriate to different categories of individuals, starting with a *buddha* and ending with "stream-winners" (*rgyun du zhugs pa*) and "ordinary good men" (*so so'i skye bo dge ba*). He then says: "As Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana sat (in relation to the Buddha) when the Tathāgata was sitting, just so should their mortuary *stūpas* be placed as well. Moreover, the *stūpas* of various elders (*sthavira*) should be aligned in accordance with their seniority. *Stūpas* of ordinary good men should be placed outside the monastery (*dge 'dun gyi kun dga' ra ba, saṃghārāma*)."[3] The *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya*—according to de la Vallée Poussin—also contains such passages: "D'après le Mahāsāṃghikavinaya,"

he says, "des moines hommes du commun (*pṛthagjana*) ont aussi droit au *stūpa*, à savoir le *Vinayadharadharmācārya*, le *Vaiyāpṛtyabh-ikṣu*, le Vertueux-bhikṣu. Comme ils ne sont pas des Āryas, il n'y a pas de *lou-pan* ["dew-dish"] et [le *stūpa*] est dans un lieu caché. Péché à faire autrement."[4]

There is also—though again not yet systematically studied —an important body of independent evidence for the monastic preoccupation with permanently housing their dead from well preserved cave sites like Bhājā, Bedsā and Kānheri. But with a few exceptions, little certain evidence has been noted for such activity at structural monastic sites. Evidence of this sort would in fact be difficult to detect at such structural sites for several reasons. The first and most general reason is, of course, that structural sites in India are far less well preserved than the Western Cave Complexes. Those same cave complexes sug-gest in addition that the structures associated with the local monastic dead at structural sites would very likely have been small, and very well might have been situated some distance away from the main *stūpa* or center of the site. Neither of these factors would have favored the detection of such structures. Moreover, very few structural monastic sites in India have been extensively investigated or excavated horizontally; gener-ally attention and effort have been focused on the main *stūpa* of such sites. Anything not in the immediate vicinity would only accidentally have been noted.[5] The fact, too, that such small structures would have required—and therefore left—no sub-stantial foundations, that their superstructures would not only have been exposed to the elements, but been easy prey for those who used such sites for building materials—all this suggests that even horizontal surveys may have noted little. In such circum-stances, stray epigraphical evidence for the housing of the local monastic dead is the most likely certain evidence to survive at structural sites, but even then such survivals may not be numer-ous and each possible piece should be carefully studied. The present note concerns one such possible piece from Amarāvatī.

Amarāvatī must have been a striking monastic site. The main *stūpa* stood on a plain between the old city of Dharaṇikoṭa and the neighboring hills "where," said Burgess, "so many dolmans or rude-stone burying places are still to be seen."[6] "Upwards of 10,000 to 12,000 [carved] figures" were— according to Fergusson's calculations—associated with the

stūpa. He calls it, perhaps without undue inflation, "a wonderful pictorial Bible of Buddhism as it was understood at the time of the erection of the monument."[7] But through the work of Zamindars, zealous treasure seekers, and untrained if well intentioned British civil servants, most of the complex—one of the longest lasting in India—has disappeared.[8] As a consequence, we know next to nothing about the monastic quarters there and very little about any secondary structures at the site. We do know that there were a number of mortuary *stūpas* clustered around the main *stūpa*. Burgess, in 1882, referred to two of these, in one of which he found "a small *chatti* [a type of pot]... and a quantity of calcined bones." A similar "*chatti*" had earlier been recovered from another.[9] Rea too excavated several secondary *stūpas*, one of which still had its lower portion encased in sculptural slabs,[10] and another overlay a group of seventeen "megalithic" urn burials.[11] In fact, the site-plan published by Rea in 1909 shows almost twenty small *stūpas* and at least one "earthenware tomb." We do not, unfortunately, know anything more about these *stūpas* except for the fact that their placement and contents conform to a pattern found at a considerable number of other Buddhist sites in India and seem to reflect the practice which I—on analogy with the Christian West—have called "burial *ad sanctos*."[12] The inscription we will be primarily concerned with here may have been associated with one such *stūpa*.

The stone on which our inscription is inscribed was not found in its original position. It had already been displaced and could have been moved even from a considerable distance, given its size and shape. Burgess describes it as "a circular slab 2 feet 1 inch in diameter... with a mortise hole in the centre surrounded by a lotus, and this again by a sunk area carved with rays. The outer border is raised..." and it is on this raised border that our record—"a well-cut inscription"—occurs.[13] This "circular slab"—a good photograph of which was also published by Burgess[14]—is clearly the "umbrella" (*chata, chattra*) referred to in the inscription. That this "umbrella" was intended for a shrine (*cediya*) or *stūpa* is clear as well from the inscription, and the comparatively small size of the *chattra* is sufficient to indicate that the *stūpa* was a small one. We do not, however, know exactly where this small *stūpa* stood.

With a few minor exceptions, the readings of this "well-cut" record were not difficult to establish, and after something of a false start in the first transcription published in Burgess' *Notes*, the basic text was quickly established. In the "additional notes" added to that same volume, in fact, Hultzsch had already come very close to his final version, which appeared a year later.[15] The text is printed there as:

> uvāsikāya cadaya budhiṇo mātuya saputikāya sadutukāya aïrānaṃ
> utayipabhāhīnaṃ cediyasa chata deyadhamaṃ

and this is the basic text accepted by Lüders,[16] Franke,[17] and Sivaramamurti.[18] Sivaramamurti does, however, read -*pabhāhi-naṃ* rather than -*pabhāhīnaṃ*, and notes that "the nasal"—he means *anusvāra*—"is not quite clear in *airānaṃ* and *utayipabhāhi-naṃ*," although this is more true of the latter than the former.

Hultzsch first translated the text as:

> "An umbrella (*chhattra*), a meritorious gift to the Chaitya (?) of the venerable Utayipabhāhins by the female worshipper Chadā (Chandrā), the mother of Budhi, together with her sons, together with her daughters"

He added as well the following note: "*Utayipabhāhin* seems to be the name of a school like *Dharmottarīya*...Perhaps *utara* (= *uttara*) is to be read for *utayi*, and *pabhāhin* = *prabhāsin*."[19] But a year later he published a slightly different rendering:

> "Ein Sonnenschirm (*chattra*), die verdienstliche Gabe der Laiin *Cadā* (*Candrā*), der Mutter des Budhi (*Buddhi*), mit ihren Söhnen, mit ihren Töchtern, an die (Schule der) ehrwürdigen *Utayipabhāhis* (?) (und) an das *Caitya*"[20]

The English translation of the record that appears in Burgess' later report looks like a somewhat garbled version of Hultzsch's second translation, and here, too, *Utayipabhāhin* appears to have been taken as the name of a Buddhist school. Burgess adds to it the following note: "May this not be synonymous with Uttaraparvatas, or Uttaraśelas."[21] Lüders, although he proposed no emendation or equivalent, lists *Utayi-pabhāhi* in his index of personal names as the name of a Bud-

dhist "school," and translates the portion of the record which most concerns us as: "Gift of a parasol (*chhata*) to the Chaitya (*chediya*) of the venerable (*aïra*) Utayipabhāhis, etc." [22] In fact, Sivaramamurti alone *seems* to have considered other possible interpretations of the text, but his translation—as printed—is also garbled and without explanation or comment: "Meritorious gift of umbrella for the caitya (*cediya*) of the worthy airānam Utayipabhāhi, etc." What "airānam," still carrying its case ending, is doing in the translation is, of course, far from clear, especially since it already seems to have been translated by "worthy." Moreover, Sivaramamurti too lists Utayipabhāhi in his glossary as "probably Uttaraseliyas." [23]

The inclination to see in *utayipabhāhin* the name of a "school" has had, in fact, a wide currency. Lamotte says: "Les donations religieuses signalées par les inscriptions proviennent, non seulement de particuliers, mais encore de clans (*kula*), de groupes (*gaṇa*) et d'associations (*sahaya*). Parmi ces dernières, quelques-unes peuvent avoir été des sectes bouddhiques, non mentionées en littérature," and as one example of such a group he cites the "aïra (ārya) Utayipabhāhi" of our inscription. [24] Much more recently, Furtseva has said: "The epigraphic data gives evidence of the existence of the schools unknown to any tradition. These are such schools as, for example, Utayibhāhī in Amaravati...," again citing our inscription. [25]

Although this interpretation of our record has received wide currency, and although Furtseva, for example, seems to take it as an established fact that the inscription refers to a Buddhist school, the evidence for this was never firm: Hultzsch had only said *utayipabhāhin* "*seems* to be the name of a school," Burgess, "may this not be...," Sivaramamurti, "probably," etc. In fact, there are a number of things against seeing in the inscription a reference to a shrine or *caitya* that "belonged" to a specific Buddhist school, and a number of things which suggest a much more supportable interpretation.

Although the evidence is sadly fragmentary, it appears, as has already been indicated, that the main *stūpa* at Amarāvatī was—as Marshall says of Sāñcī—"surrounded, like all the more famous shrines of Buddhism, by a multitude of *stūpas* of varying sizes crowded together." [26] The *stūpa* or *caitya* to which

our umbrella was donated appears to have been just one of
such a multitude and—to judge by the size of the *chattra*—a
comparatively small one at that. That one of such a multitude
of secondary *stūpas* close to—or in the vicinity of—the main
shrine would have been claimed as the special property of a
specific school seems very unlikely. That monastic orders "ac-
cepted," and therefore "owned," specific forms of property—
relics, fields, buildings, images, etc.—is virtually certain. It is
equally certain that specific schools "owned" the main *stūpa* at
certain sites. But there is no other case, in so far as I know,
where one of the small secondary *stūpas* was so "owned." Sec-
ondary *stūpas* at Buddhist sites, whether near the main shrine
or situated elsewhere in the complex, are almost always unin-
scribed and anonymous. There is, however, a small number of
significant exceptions, and it is this group of exceptions which
may point towards a better understanding of the record on our
small umbrella from Amarāvatī.

The first exception may come from Amarāvatī itself. If we
can accept Sivaramamurti's reading of his no. 103 as even
approximately correct, then the one other secondary *stūpa*
which had an associated inscription at Amarāvatī was "the
small cetiya of the mendicant monk Nāgasena." Sivaramamurti
gives the text of his no. 103 in the following form:

> *sidham (namo) bhagavato gāmmamahivathasa peṇḍavatikasa*
> *nāgasenasa khudacetiya...haghavāṇikiniya paṭiṭhapitam*
> *savasatamata a...*[27]

If we put aside *gāmmamahivathasa*, which is clearly wrong,
although it just as clearly indicated the place of residence of
Nāgasena, and if we follow—however reluctantly—Sivarama-
murti's interpretation of...*haghavāṇikiniya* as "by the merchant's
wife, Haghā," this could be translated as

> Success. (Homage) to the Blessed One. The small *cetiya* of
> the mendicant monk Nāgasena who lived in...established by
> the merchant's wife Haghā for the...of all...

We do not know where the sculptured slab on which this
record was inscribed was discovered. Already by the time of

Burgess (1887) it had been removed to Bejwāḍā, "possibly," says Burgess, by Colonel Mackenzie.[28] Sivaramamurti assumes on the basis of the expression *khudacetiya*, "small *cetiya*," in the record itself that the slab formed a part of one of what he calls the "smaller votive *stūpas*." That the inscribed slab did, in fact, belong to a secondary *stūpa* appears likely. The problem remains, however, that Sivaramamurti's reading of the record cannot actually be verified with the published material at hand. Although Burgess and Stern & Bénisti both illustrate the slab on which the record occurs, in neither case is the photograph sufficiently clear to allow the inscription to be read with any confidence.[29] Sivaramamurti also reproduces the record reduced to such a degree that no certain reading is possible,[30] and in cases where his readings can be checked they are by no means always as careful as one might wish. Given this situation, the most that one could say is that it appears—although it is not certain—that in the one other case at Amarāvatī in which a secondary *stūpa* had an associated inscription that inscription does not refer to the *stūpa* as "belonging" to a specific school, but seems to describe it as "belonging" to an individual monk, a monk who appears to have been of purely local stature and who is otherwise unknown. But this itself raises some further questions that it would be well to deal with here.

The exact sense of the genitive construction used here in *nāgasenasa khudacetiya...*, and in other records connected with *stūpas* "of" local monks, is not at first sight immediately clear. This, in part at least, is related to the fact that in inscriptional Prakrits, much as in the Prakrits generally, the dative case—although it has not entirely disappeared—is very much attenuated, and dative functions have been taken over by an already elastic conception of the genitive. Given these linguistic realities, *nāgasenasa khudacetiya...*, for example, can be understood at least on one level in two ways: "the small *cetiya of* Nāgasena," or "the small *cetiya for* Nāgasena." It could be argued that the intended meaning here is more like "the small *cetiya* built *for the merit* of Nāgasena by Haghā," but the one certain case I know of that does record something like this is not only late, but articulated in a very different way. The case in point occurs in a 10th-century inscription from Nālandā where the disciple of a monk is said to have raised "a *caitya* of the

Blessed One, the Sugata" (*bhagavataḥ sugatasya caityaḥ*) with the expressed hope or intention that his teacher, through the merit of the disciple's act, might "obtain the unsurpassed station of a *buddha*" (*puṇyenānena labdhāsau bauddham padam anuttaraṃ*).[31] In fact, from the earliest Buddhist inscriptions that record acts undertaken for another, the statement of purpose almost always involves an explicit expression of that fact—something like *aṭhaya* (*arthāya*, "for the sake of") either in compound with the name of the person or persons involved, or with the latter in the genitive (*mātāpituna aṭhāyā*); or a construction like *sukhāya hotu savasatānaṃ* ("for the happiness of all beings") is used.[32] The transaction involved is very rarely, if at all, expressed by the simple genitive or dative. In the rare and still uncertain cases in which the simple genitive or dative might so be used, it appears that the name of the person for whose benefit a gift is given is put not in the genitive, but in the dative. On what Rao calls "an āyaka pillar" found near the second *stūpa* at San-nati, for example, we find: *ahimarikāya nāganikāya arikā-bhātuno giridatanakasa*. This would appear to indicate that the "pillar" in question was the gift of Giridatanaka, brother of Arikā, "for or in honor of"—expressed by the simple dative—Nāganikā of Ahimara, the latter being a place name.[33] Considerations of this sort would seem to rule out *nāgasenasa khudacetiya...* in our Amarāvatī inscription being intended to convey "the small *cetiya* for the benefit or merit of Nāgasena;" so, too, does the fact that, though now fragmentary, there seems to have been a separate dedicative statement at the end of the record (compare the better preserved record from Mathurā cited below).

If, then, *nāgasenasa khudacetiya...* does not mean "the small *cetiya* for the benefit or merit of Nāgasena," it—and similarly constructed records elsewhere—must mean "the small *cetiya* of or for Nāgasena" in some other sense. Since *stūpas* or *cetiyas*— whether they were "memorials" or mortuary containers—were never as far as we know erected *for* anyone who was not physiologically dead,[34] this would mean that if our inscription in fact refers to "the small *cetiya* of or for Nāgasena," then Nāgasena must have been not just a local monk, but a *deceased* local monk. But in that case, it is important to note that although Nāgasena was "dead," the *cetiya* was not said to be "of" or "for" his relics or remains, but "of" or "for" him—

period. Exactly the same thing is, of course, said elsewhere at Amarāvatī and at other Andhra sites in regard to the *cetiya* of the Buddha. On more than one occasion at Amarāvatī we meet with something like... *bhagavato mahāc(e)tiyasa*, "for the Great Shrine of the Blessed One," or ... *bhagavato mahacetiya-padamale* [rd:-*mūle*], "at the foot of the Great Shrine of the Blessed One."[35] Similar phrasing is also found, for example, at Jaggayyapeṭa—*bhagavato budhasa mahācetiye*, "at the Great Shrine of the Blessed One, the Buddha."[36] In all these cases the genitive phrasing was almost certainly intended to express both the fact that the *cetiya* "belonged" to the Blessed One—that is to say, he "owned" it—and the fact that it contained, or was thought to contain, the Buddha himself.[37] It is again important to notice that where we might want to say the *cetiya* was "of" or contained the "relics" of the Buddha, these inscriptions themselves never use a term for "relics": they say the *cetiya* was "of" or "for" the Buddha himself. He—not his remains—was, apparently, thought to reside inside. But if this is true in regard to the *cetiyas* "of" the Buddha, it would be hard to argue that exactly the same genitive phrasing applied to the *cetiya* "of" Nāgasena"—or to the *stūpa* "of" any other local monk—could have meant something different. This secondary *stūpa*—actually called a "small shrine" if we can accept Sivaramamurti's reading—must either have contained, or had been thought to contain, what we would call the "relics" of a local mendicant monk named Nāgasena, but what the composer of the inscription called Nāgasena himself.[38]

It would seem, then, that in the one other possible case at Amarāvatī where we have an inscription associated with a secondary *stūpa* there is no support for the interpretation of the record on the small umbrella from the same site proposed by Hultzsch, Burgess, Lüders, etc. The former makes no reference to a "school," but rather points towards a very different possibility and set of ideas. It suggests the possibility at least that *utayipabhāhin* in the umbrella inscription may not be the name of a "school," but the name of a deceased local monk. This possibility receives further support when we look elsewhere since, although there are no other instances where a secondary *stūpa* is said to be "owned" by a specific "school," there is a small but significant number of cases where secondary *stūpas* are

explicitly said to be "of" or "for" the local monastic dead. At least one of these other cases comes from another sadly dismembered structural site.

It is ironic that although we have a large number of inscriptions—and a far larger number of sculptural and architectural pieces—from Mathurā, we know very little really about the structures they were associated with, about what the Buddhist complexes at the site looked like or how these complexes were laid out. We have only a large number of fragments and disassociated pieces.[39] On one such piece occurs an inscription which van Lohuizen-de Leeuw has read in the following fashion:

> sa 90 2 he 1 di 5 asya pū(r)vvaye
> vi(or kha)ṇḍavihare vasthavyā bhikṣusa grāha-
> dāsikasa sthuva prāṣṭhāpāyati sa-
> rva sav(v)anaṃ hitasukhaye

She translates the record as:

> "In the year 92, the first (month of) winter, on the 5th day, on this occasion as specified, the inhabitants of the Viṇḍa Monastery erected a stūpa for the monk Grāhadāsika. May it be for the welfare and happiness of all beings."[40]

More than a dozen years later, this same inscription was edited again by Sircar, who seems to have been under the impression that the record was discovered in 1958. Although his reading differs on several minor points from van Lohuizen-de Leeuw's, it is significantly different in only one regard: where van Lohuizen-de Leeuw read vasthavyā, plural, "inhabitants," Sircar read vastavya- and took it in compound with the following bhikṣusa. But this makes for an odd compound and—more importantly—results in a text in which there is no possible subject for the main verb, which Sircar himself read as pra[ti*] ṣṭhāpayati.[41] The absence of such a subject renders Sircar's construction of the text highly problematic, and suggests that for the moment van Lohuizen-de Leeuw's is to be preferred. From the paleographic point-of-view, however, Sircar's vastavya— with short final -a—appears likely, and this would give a singu-

lar subject for the singular verb. The result would be a slight alteration of van Lohuizen-de Leeuw's translation: "...an inhabitant of the Viṇḍa Monastery erected a *stūpa* for the monk Grāhadāsika."

Here, of course, there is no possibility of taking the text to mean "for the benefit or merit of the monk Grāhadāsika." The text ends with an explicit statement indicating for whom the act was undertaken, and it was not Grāhadāsika, but "all beings." Sircar says: "the object of the inscription is to record the erection of a *stūpa* of the Buddhist monk Grāmadesika" [this is his reading of the name]. But he adds: "In the present context, the word *stūpa* mean[s] a memorial structure enshrining the relics of the monk in question."[42] Such an interpretation seems very likely, although here too it is important to note that where Sircar speaks of "relics" the composer of our record—although he certainly could have—does not. For him, the *stūpa* does not seem to have been a structure for enshrining relics, but a structure for enshrining in some sense the monk himself.

We do not, again, know where the *stūpa* of Grāhadāsika stood. Van Lohuizen-de Leeuw assumes that it "was erected in the monastery," but that is not terribly helpful. The slab on which the inscription is inscribed appears to have been a small one—the writing covers a space that is only 9.5 inches long and 4 inches high. More than anything else it seems to resemble the small engraved slabs—to be discussed more fully below—associated with the brick *stūpas* of the local monastic dead at Kānheri where the writing covers a space of almost the same dimensions. It would appear, then, that the *stūpa* at Mathurā was a small one situated somewhere within the confines of one of the monastic complexes. But in spite of the uncertainties concerning the exact location of the *stūpa* it mentions, this Mathurā record—like Amarāvatī no. 103—does not lend any support to the view that sees in the inscription on the small *chattra* from Amarāvatī a reference to a *stūpa* "belonging" to a specific monastic school. On the contrary, both this Mathurā inscription and Amarāvatī no. 103 would seem to indicate that when secondary *stūpas* or *cetiyas* in this period are inscribed, those *stūpas* or *cetiyas* are *stūpas* or *cetiyas* "of" deceased local monks. That this is so not just for this period but also for periods long before and after will become evident below, but

these two cases are already sufficient to establish the suspicion
that the record on the Amarāvatī umbrella is, again, also refer-
ring to such a *stūpa*. Neither Amarāvatī no. 103 nor the
Mathurā inscription, however, accounts for a peculiarity of the
Amarāvatī umbrella record, which has undoubtedly exerted
considerable influence on previous interpretations.

The Amarāvatī umbrella record does not at first sight
appear to be referring to a *cetiya* of a *single* monk. The reading—
which is virtually certain apart from the final *anusvāras*—is
aïrana(ṃ) utayipabhāhina(ṃ) cediyasa. aïra, a Prakrit form of *ārya*,
is certainly in the plural, and the following *utayipabhāhin*—
though the form is not so well recognized—was almost cer-
tainly also intended for a plural. But this use of the plural,
rather than suggesting that the *cetiya* "belonged" to a group of
monks, may in fact confirm the possibility that the reference is
to a single, *deceased* individual.

There are more than a dozen inscriptions that can be cited
to demonstrate that the name and titles of a monk for whom a
stūpa was built were commonly put in the genitive plural. Two
are particularly informative, one from Bedsā, which Nagaraju
assigns to the 1st Century B.C.E., and one from Kānheri
which he dates to the early 2nd Century C.E.[43] In both
instances, we are dealing with small secondary *stūpas* whose
precise location relative to the main shrine is known. In both
instances, these small secondary *stūpas* are inscribed and can
therefore be certainly identified as *stūpas* "of" local monks.
And in both instances the individual local monk in question is
referred to in the plural.

Less than 25 feet to the left of the entrance to the main
caityagṛha at Bedsā there is "a tiny apsidal excavation" contain-
ing a small *stūpa*. On the back wall of this "excavation" there is
a short "much weatherworn" inscription in two lines. Some
syllables at the beginning of both lines appear to have been
lost, but what remains can be fairly certainly read and the gen-
eral sense of the record is clear in spite of the missing syllables.
Burgess published the following reading in 1883:

> ...*ya gobhūtinaṃ āraṇakāna peḍapātikānaṃ mārakuḍavāsinā thupo*
> ...*[aṃte]vāsinā bhatāsāḷa[ḷha]mitena kārita* [/ /] [44]

In spite of the fact that Gobhūti's name and all his epithets are in the genitive plural, this can only mean:

> The *stūpa* of...Gobhūti, a forest-dweller, a mendicant monk who lived on Māra's Peak—caused to be made by his pupil, the devoted Asāḷamita.

At Kānheri, too, we have to do with a small excavation containing a *stūpa*. The steps leading up to the chamber containing this *stūpa* are no more than twelve feet to the left of the steps that lead to the main "hall of worship" at the site. On the *harmika* of the small *stūpa* the following record occurs:

> *sidhaṃ heranikasa dhamanakasa bhayā-a*
> *sivapālitanikāya deyadhaṃma*
> *therāna bhayata-dhaṃmapālānaṃ*
> *thuba [/ /]*[45]

Here, too, we have the name of a monk and his title in the genitive plural, and here, too, this can only refer to a single individual:

> Success. The religious gift of Sivapālitanikā, the wife of the treasurer Dhamanaka—the *stūpa* of the Elder, the Reverend Dhaṃmapāla.

Bearing in mind, again, that *stūpas* were, in so far as we know, erected only for individuals who were dead, these two cases from Bedsā and Kānheri present us with two clear cases where a deceased local monk is referred to in the plural. These cases can only represent a specific application of the so-called *pluralis majestaticus* or plural of respect, and it is important to note that in this regard they are not, apparently, exceptions, but represent something of a rule. Plurals of respect are certainly the rule in the numerous *stūpa* labels found in association with the two monastic "cemeteries" that have been identified at Western Cave sites.

At Bhājā, "probably one of the oldest Buddhist religious centres in the Deccan," there is a group of 14 small *stūpas* clustered together in what Mitra alone has explicitly noted "may

be regarded as the cemetery."[46] Nagaraju suggests that these *stūpas* "belong to different dates ranging from late 3rd century B.C. to about the end of the 2nd century A.D."[47] Although Burgess seems to have been of the opinion that a larger number of these *stūpas* had originally been inscribed, in his day only five such inscriptions still remained in part or in whole. One of the two inscriptions that appear to be complete reads:

> *therānāṃ bhayaṃta-aṃpikiṇakānaṃ thūpo* [/ /]
> The *stūpa* of the Elder, the Reverend Aṃpikiṇaka.

The other complete record is of exactly the same form, and enough survives of the rest to show that in every case the name of the monk for whom the *stūpa* was built, and his titles, were always in the genitive plural.[48] The use of the *pluralis majestaticus* in referring to deceased local monks appears from the Bhājā cemetery labels, then, to have been both an early and a continuous practice over time. But the evidence from the Bhājā cemetery not only confirms this linguistic usage noted previously at Bedsā and Kānheri, it confirms as well the assumed character and contents—in at least one sense—of *stūpas* built "for" deceased local monks. Fergusson & Burgess noted in regard to at least four of these *stūpas* that there were on their capitals "holes on the upper surface as if for placing relics... and in two cases there is a depression round the edge of the hole as if for a closely fitting cover."[49] The fact that Deshpande discovered at Pitalkhorā exactly the same sort of "holes" still plugged with "a closely fitting cover" and—as a consequence—still containing their relic deposits, makes it highly likely that the "holes" in the *stūpas* at Bhājā—and perhaps all such "holes" in rock-cut *stūpas* in the Western Caves—originally held relics: such *stūpas* were, as a consequence, by no means simply "commemorative," but contained the mortuary deposits of the monks mentioned in their accompanying inscriptions.[50] The Bhājā cemetery, however, is not the only monastic cemetery in the Western Caves which provides evidence for the use of the *pluralis majestaticus* in referring to deceased monks.

The character of the large monastic cemetery at Kānheri was almost immediately surmised. In 1862, West had already said in regard to these groups of *stūpas*: "It seems likely that these topes have contained the ashes of the priesthood and that

this gallery has been the general necropolis of the caves."[51] In
1883, Burgess had described this "gallery"—which at that time
was assigned the number 38—in the following terms: "No. 38
is the long terrace under the overhanging rock on the brow of
the hill, where are the bases of numerous brick stūpas, being the
monuments over the ashes of numerous Bauddha sthaviras or
priests who died there...a vast number fill this gallery"—more
than a hundred according to the most recent count—"which is
about 200 yards in length; many of them, however, are covered
over with the débris of decayed bricks and rock and all seem to
have been rifled long ago of any relics or caskets they con-
tained".[52] Although West had already published in 1861 an eye-
copy of at least one inscription connected with "the Kaṇheri
Bauddha Cemetery"—his no.58—it was never read,[53] and it
was not until 1974 or 1975 that further and fuller epigraphical
data came in the form of a considerable number of small
inscribed slabs that had originally been inset into the brick
stūpas, but which—after these stūpas had decayed—had either
fallen or been thrown into the ravine on the edge of which the
"gallery" sits. The exact number of inscribed insets recovered
is not clear—S. Gokhale says in one place that there were
"nearly 15," but in another "nearly twenty"; Gorakshkar put
the number at "about forty," but Rao at "twenty-nine."[54]
Gokhale has edited eight of these inscriptions, but not always
well, and the published photographs are not always easy to
read. In spite of these problems, some important points are
sufficiently clear.

    Like the inscriptions associated with the stūpas of the local
monastic dead at Bhājā, none of the inscriptions so far avail-
able from the Kānheri cemetery are donative. They are all
labels, and—like the Bhājā inscriptions though more elaborate
—they are all consistently patterned. Both considerations are
enough to indicate that these labels—like all labels at Buddhist
sites—are not the result of individual donative activity, but the
results of endeavors by the monastic community or "adminis-
tration" at their respective sites. Again as in the Bhājā labels,
in all the Kānheri labels that are available—including that
published long ago by West—the name and titles of each indi-
vidual monk for whom a stūpa was erected are in the genitive
plural. I cite here just two examples that can be checked
against the photos.[55]

therāṇam ayya-vijayaseṇāṇaṃ tevijāṇaṃ arahantāṇaṃ thūbhaṃ
The *Stūpa* of the Elder, the Venerable Vijayasena, One Possessed of the Three Knowledges, an Arhat

therāṇaṃ bhadata-dāmāṇaṃ anāgāmiṇam thū(bhaṃ)
The *Stūpa* of the Elder, the Reverend Dāma, a non-returner.

These labels—obviously written by someone familiar with the technical textual terminology of Buddhist conceptions of "sainthood"—establish that at Kānheri, as at Bedsā and Bhājā, deceased local monks were individually referred to in the plural. The use of the *pluralis majestaticus* was, in fact, the rule in referring to such individuals. But if the Bhājā labels establish this usage long before our Amarāvatī umbrella inscription, those from Kānheri establish its continued currency for a long time after. Gokhale had first suggested a date of "between 550 A.D. and 700 A.D." for the Kānheri labels; later they are said to be "written in the late fifth- or early sixth-century boxheaded variety of Brāhmī." [56] In any case, they date from a period long after our Amarāvatī record.

The material presented so far from Amarāvatī itself, from Mathurā, Bedsā, Bhājā and Kānheri, must bear heavily on any interpretation of the Amarāvatī umbrella inscription. This material establishes at least two things. First, it would appear that all secondary *stūpas* from Buddhist sites that have associated inscriptions and date from well before the Common Era to at least the 6th Century C.E. are—in every case—*stūpas* raised for deceased local monks. Secondly, with some exceptions that prove the rule, the names and titles of deceased individual monks that occur in *stūpa* inscriptions or labels from this period are put in the genitive plural. The Amarāvatī umbrella record comes from the same period; was associated with a small secondary *stūpa*; and has a name in the genitive plural preceded by a title commonly given to monks. Since, therefore, it conforms in every other respect to records connected with the shrines of deceased local monks, and since *Utayipabhāhin* is nowhere certainly attested as the name of a "school," nor is there any other instance where a secondary *stūpa* is said to belong to such a "school," it is very difficult—if not impossible—to avoid the conclusion that Utayipabhāhin in the Amarāvatī umbrella inscription is the name of a local monk. Such a

conclusion, it seems, must be accepted until there is clear and incontrovertible evidence to the contrary.[57] There is however, one further point in regard to this name that is worth noting, a point which involves us again with yet other *stūpas* of the local monastic dead.

Sivaramamurti said that "the term *Utayipabhāhi* is puzzling," and there has, in fact, been some uncertainty in regard even to the stem form of what appears in the inscription as *utayipabhāhīnam* or *utayipabhāhinam*. Originally Hultzsch seems to have preferred *utayipabhāhin*, but later he and almost everyone else seems to have preferred *utayipabhāhi*.[58] Given the morphological variation in inscriptional Prakrits, a genitive plural form that ends in *-īnam* or *-inam* could have been made from either an *i*-stem or a stem in *-in*. In the present case there is, therefore, no certain formal means of determining the stem, but this—in the end—may not pose a serious problem. It is perhaps more important to note that Hultzsch had proposed *-prabhāsin* as the Sanskrit equivalent of *-pabhāhin*[59] and this—the only equivalent that has been suggested—seems likely: the change of *s* to *h* is well attested in the South.[60] In fact, whether the stem form is taken to have been *-pabhāhin*—which seems preferable—or *-pabhāhi*, it seems fairly certain that in either case we would have a derivative from *pra*√*bhās*, "to shine, be brilliant," etc. It may therefore be of interest to note that other derivations from *pra*√bhās occur as the final element of a name or title in—interestingly enough—two other inscriptions connected with the local monastic dead.

Almost a hundred and forty years ago, Cunningham published an account of his explorations and "excavations" of the Sāñcī ruins and the "Buddhist Monuments of Central India." Much work has, of course, been done since on Sāñcī—its art, architecture and inscriptions—but the other related sites in this complex, Sonāri, Satdhāra, Bhojpur and Andher, have been almost completely ignored. In fact, it is hard to find a reference to them after Cunningham. Ignored, too, is the fact that this cluster of related sites—among the earliest structural sites that we know—produced some of the clearest and most concrete evidence for the monastic cult of the local monastic dead. Cunningham discovered that the remains of ten individual local monks—representing at least three generations—

had been deposited in *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī. The remains of
some of these same monks had also been deposited in Sonāri
Stūpa no. 2, which contained the "relics" of five individuals,
and in *Stūpas* no. 2 and 3 at Andher.[61] In all these cases, the
deposits had been carefully labelled and the inscription on one
of the Andher deposits read: *sapurisasa gotiputasa kākanāva-
pabhāsanasa koḍiñagotasa,* which Majumdar renders as: "(Relics)
of the saint Gotiputa, the Kākanāva-pabhāsana, of the
Koḍiña-gota."[62] Majumdar notes as well that "the expression
kākanāva-pabhāsana is used as an epithet of Gotiputa and means
'the Light of Kākanāva,'" Kākanāva being, of course, the old
name for Sāñcī.[63] A variant of the epithet also occurs at Sāñcī
itself in the one donative record connected with the deposits in
Stūpa no. 2. Majumdar reads and translates the latter as
kākanava-pabhāsa-siha[n]ā dana, "the gift of the pupils of the
Light of Kākanava," and says here that *kākanava-pabhāsa* "may
be taken as standing for Gotiputa himself."[64] If Majumdar is
correct in his interpretation of these inscriptions—and the
chances are good that he is[65]—they may provide a possible
parallel for the "name" that occurs in the Amarāvatī umbrella
inscription. *Kākanava-pabhāsana* or *-pabhāsa* is at Sāñcī and
Andher used both as an epithet of a local monastic "luminary"
named Gotiputa and—by itself—as an alternative designation
or name of that same individual. This may suggest that
utayipabhāhin too could have been both an epithet and an alter-
native name for a prominent deceased local monk from a place
named Utayi which was situated somewhere in the region of
Amarāvatī, that *-Pabhāsa* or *-Pabhāsin* might have been an
ecclesiastical title of some currency, and that *Utayipabhāsin*
might be translated "the Light or Luminary of Utayi"—all of
this, at least, would seem a reasonable possibility.

As a result of the discussion of the material presented so far
we are, then, in a position to do two things. We can offer a new
and defensible translation of the old inscription on the small
umbrella found long ago at Amarāvatī; and we can make some
preliminary and perhaps promising observations on the cult of
the local monastic dead in Indian Buddhist monasteries.

In light of the above discussions the Amarāvatī record can
now be translated —keeping close to the syntax of the origi-
nal—as follows:

Of the lay-sister Cadā, the mother of Budhi, together with her sons, together with her daughters, to the shrine of the Venerable Luminary from Utayi, the umbrella is a religious gift.

Interpreted and translated in this way, the Amarāvatī inscription takes its place as one of a limited series of significant inscriptions or labels associated with *stūpas* of the local monastic dead. It is significant in regard to Amarāvatī itself because it would provide a much more certain piece of evidence than Sivaramamurti's inscription no. 103 for the presence of such *stūpas* at the site. The presence of such *stūpas* at Amarāvatī is in turn significant because it allows us to add it to the list of structural sites for which we have firm epigraphical evidence to prove the presence of *stūpas* of the local monastic dead: epigraphical evidence for the presence of this type of *stūpa* at structural sites has come from Sāñcī, Sonāri, Andher, Mathurā, and now from Amarāvatī. But the Amarāvatī inscription has broader significance as well. It provides us with an especially clear case in which the *stūpa* of a deceased local monk is presented with "gifts" exactly like the *stūpas* of the Buddha himself were, a clear instance in which such a *stūpa* receives the same kind of accoutrement—an umbrella—as did the *stūpas* of the Buddha. This is welcome corroboration of what we learn from the donative inscriptions associated with *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī, which indicate that coping stones, cross-bars, rail-pillars, and pavement slabs, etc., were donated to this *stūpa* of the local monastic dead, just as they were to the *stūpa* of the Buddha at the site. In neither form nor content do the inscriptions associated with *Stūpa* no. 2 differ from those associated with *Stūpa* no. 1. The two sets are virtually indistinguishable, and may, in fact, have had some of the same donors.[66] But in arriving at our interpretation and translation of the Amarāvatī umbrella inscription, we have had to look at virtually all the parallel records which are known, and even our limited discussion of this group of inscriptions allows for some interesting provisional generalizations.

The first and perhaps most obvious generalization might be stated as a simple fact: the remains of the local monastic dead were permanently housed at a significant number of monastic complexes, the majority of which are very early: we

have epigraphical evidence from Sāñcī, Sonāri, Andher, Mathurā, Amarāvatī, Bedsā, Bhājā and Kānheri. These remains, moreover, were permanently housed in the same type of architectural structure as were the remains of the Buddha. I have elsewhere collected epigraphical, archeological, and literary evidence that suggests that the mortuary remains or "relics" of the Buddha were thought to be possessed of "life" or "breath," that—as Lamotte says—"la relique corporelle... c'est un être vivant,"[67] that they were thought "to be impregnated with the characteristics that defined and animated the living Buddha," that "relics" are addressed as persons and behaved towards as persons.[68] Professor A. Bareau had in fact already noted that the "culte bouddhique des reliques...s'inspire en effet d'abord des marques de vénération que l'on adresse aux personnes vivantes."[69] But the fact alone, that the remains of the local monastic dead were both treated and housed in the same way as the remains of the Buddha, makes it again very difficult to argue that they were thought to be, in any essential way, different. Professor Bareau has also said that "dès avant notre ère, donc, le *stūpa* est plus que le symbole du Buddha, c'est le Buddha lui-même."[70] To argue that the *stūpa* of Utayipabhāhin, or the *stūpa* of Gobhūti were thought of any differently would require clear evidence. What evidence is available does not now favor such an argument.

The parallelism between the remains of the Buddha and the remains of the local monastic dead is not limited to the kinds of structures used to house them. There is as well a strict parallelism in the way in which these similar structures are referred to. As we have already seen, although we might describe a *stūpa* as a structure "for" relics or a container "of" relics, our inscriptions do not. They refer to *stūpas* or *cetiyas* "for" *persons* or "of" *persons*. This—again as we have seen—is clearly the case for *stūpas* "of" or "for" the Buddha or Blessed One (*bhagavato mahāc(e)tiya-, bhagavato budhasa mahācetiye*, etc.). But it is also the case for *stūpas* "of" or "for" deceased local monks (*aïrānam utayipabhāhīnam cediya-, bhikṣusa grāhadāsikasa sthuva, gobhūtinam āraṇakāna...thūpo*, etc.). Exactly the same construction and phrasing are used without distinction and regardless of the person "for" whom the *stūpa* was intended. But if this genitive phrasing suggests in the case of the Buddha

that the *stūpa* "of" the Buddha was thought to contain him, or to be owned or possessed by him, or to be—in some sense—the Buddha himself, then the *stūpas* "of" Utayipabhāhin or Grāhadāsika or Gobhūti, since they are referred to in exactly the same way, could hardly have been thought of differently. In other words, parallel linguistic usage points in the same direction as parallel architectural form. There may be yet another parallel as well.

If we stick to actually datable *stūpas* of the historical Buddha—and put aside the not infrequent assertions of an "Aśokan" date for what are usually hypothetical "earlier" or "original" forms of extant structures—then it will be possible to see that there may be few or no clear chronological gaps between the earliest actually datable *stūpas* of the historical Buddha and the earliest examples of *stūpas* for the local monastic dead that we know. We might take Bhārhut as an example. Scholarly consensus at least would place it at or very near the beginning of the known sequence of *stūpas* for the historical Buddha. But Bénisti has recently argued that at least the rail that surrounded the Bhārhut *stūpa* was not the earliest such rail. She has said: "...la décoration qu'offre la *vedikā* qui entoure le *Stūpa* n° 2 de Sāñcī...remonte, dans sa quasi totalité, à la première moitié du IIe siècle avant notre ère; elle est donc, de peu, antérieure à celle du *stūpa* de Bhārhut...et, très sensiblement, antérieure à celle des *toraṇa* du grand *Stūpa* n° 1 de Sāñcī." [71] Since "le *Stūpa* n° 2 de Sāñcī" is a *stūpa* of the local monastic dead, this would seem to mean either that this *stūpa* for the local monastic dead predates both the Bhārhut and Sāñcī *stūpas* of the historical Buddha "de peu" and "très sensiblement," or—at least—that it was the first of these to receive the kind of rail we associate with *stūpas* of the Buddha and, therefore, may have been considered, in some sense, more important. However this might ultimately be decided, it would appear—again at the very least—that at these early sites there is no clear or considerable chronological gap between *stūpas* of the local monastic dead and *stūpas* for the historical Buddha; rather, in regard to these structural sites, there appears to be a broad contemporarity between the two types of *stūpas*. This same contemporarity appears to hold for the Western Caves as well. The main *caityagṛha* at Bhājā —Bhājā no. 12—has, for example, been called "the earliest

of rock-cut chetiyagharas of [the] Western Deccan" and as-
signed by Nagaraju to the 3rd Century B.C.E.[72] But some of
the labelled *stūpas* of the local monastic dead at Bhājā have been
assigned to the same period. There is, again, no clear chrono-
logical gap. Even at somewhat later sites *stūpas* for the Buddha
and *stūpas* for the local monastic dead seem to appear simul-
taneously. The inscription in Cave 7—the main *caityagṛha* at
Bedsā—is assigned by Nagaraju to his "series III" (60
B.C.E.), but that associated with Gobhūti's *Stūpa* he places in
his "series IVa" (60 B.C.E. to 100 C.E.), and he says that it
"probably" falls towards the end of the 1st Century B.C.E.[73]
Given the fact that paleography alone is rarely capable of mak-
ing such fine distinctions, it is clear that the two inscriptions—
and therefore the two *stūpas*—belong to the same broad period.
Although the question requires and deserves much fuller study,
it appears now that there is very possibly little, if any,
chronological gap between *stūpas* for the historical Buddha and
stūpas for the local monastic dead, little clear evidence for the
kind of gap which could suggest that practices connected with
the former's remains were over time extended or generalized to
the remains of the latter. Archeologically and epigraphically
the two types of *stūpas* appear now as roughly contemporary,
with in some cases some indication that *stūpas* of the local
monastic dead may actually have predated those of the Bud-
dha. It is interesting to note, moreover, that if we look at the
internal chronology or "narrative time" taken for granted in
our literary sources, it would appear that their redactors also
considered *stūpas* for the local monastic dead to predate those
of the Buddha. Both the *stūpas* mentioned in the *Udāna* and
Apadāna, and that referred to in the Pāli *Vinaya*, for example,
long preceded—according to the narrative time assumed by
our texts—those erected for the Buddha.[74] It might in fact some
day be possible to argue that the relic cult and *stūpa* of the his-
torical Buddha only represents a special and particularly well
known instance of what was a common and widespread monas-
tic practice. It may, indeed, have been much more widespread
than our certain evidence now indicates.

    It is certain that there were *stūpas* of the local monastic
dead at Sāñcī, Sonāri, Andher, Mathurā, Amarāvatī, Bhājā,
Bedsā and Kānheri. This is certain because at all these sites we

have either donative inscriptions or inscribed labels to prove it. These inscribed and therefore certain instances are, of course, important in themselves. But they also have an importance which goes beyond their respective individual sites. Given the poor state of preservation of most Buddhist sites in India, and the virtually complete absence of contemporary documentation concerning them, we often must, and can, argue—as in archeology in general—from those cases which are certain to those that are less so. In this situation, the individual labelled *stūpas* in their own small separate shrines placed near the main shrine at Bedsā and Kānheri, the clearly labelled *stūpas* in the ordered monastic cemeteries at Bhājā and Kānheri, and the multiple labelled deposits in *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī, all have considerable indexical or typological importance. They establish the important fact that *all* secondary *stūpas* at monastic sites which are situated in small separate shrines near the main *stūpa*, or in ordered groups away from the hub of the complex, or that contain multiple deposits, are—*in every case in which they are labelled and it can therefore be determined*—mortuary *stūpas* of the local monastic dead. In light of this, it would seem that unless, and until, there is evidence to the contrary forthcoming, we are obliged to assume that those *stūpas* found at monastic sites which are similar, but not actually labelled, are also *stūpas* of the local monastic dead. On this basis we may be able to identify a considerable number of additional *stūpas* of this category.

We may note, for example, using Nagaraju's numbers, that Cave 1 at Bedsā, and Caves 2c, 2d, and 2e at Kānheri, are all—like the shrines of Gobhūti at Bedsā and Dhammapāla at Kānheri—excavations grouped around the main *caitya*-hall at their respective sites; they are all small chambers; they all contain a single *stūpa*.[75] If these are not mortuary *stūpas* for the local monastic dead like. those of Gobhūti and Dhammapāla, they have no readily explainable function. We may note as well that both at cave and structural sites there are groups of unlabelled small *stūpas* which look remarkably like the labelled monastic cemeteries at Bhājā and Kānheri.

Among the Western Caves, Sudhagarh provides an early example. Here in "a large low-roofed cell" Kail found a group of eight *stūpas* ranging in height from three-and-a-half to four-and-a-half feet. Kail, without citing his evidence or good illus-

tration, said these "are not devotional *stūpas* but are funerary mounds, the relics...of a Buddhist saint being enshrined in a hollow receptacle in the square abacus."[76] Nadsur also provides a good example. Here in Cave 3—which measures 34′ × 20′—there are twelve *stūpas* differing somewhat in size, form, and type of construction, making it virtually certain that they were not cut or constructed all at the same time. In fact, four of these *stūpas* were structural and in the most complete of these Cousens found "a handful of old rice husks, and about as much grey ash."[77] We might cite Pitalkhorā as a final example from the caves. At Pitalkhorā, on the side of the ravine opposite the main *caityagṛha* and the living quarters, Deshpande describes a cluster of four excavations all of which contain at least one small *stūpa*, and one of which contains three, again dating to different periods. None of this cluster of small *stūpas* is well preserved, but in at least one Deshpande noted "two holes," one with "a ledge...to receive a cover," which—on analogy with similar still plugged holes still containing "relics" in the *stūpa* of his Cave 3—could only have been used to hold mortuary deposits.[78]

There are no inscriptions associated with these *stūpas* at Sudhagarh or Nadsur or Pitalkhorā, but at all these sites we seem to see a number of common characteristics. In so far as we can tell from the reports, there is evidence at all three sites that these were mortuary *stūpas*. At all three sites these *stūpas* had been placed together in orderly groups over more or less long periods of time. In so far as we can tell—and this is particularly clear at Pitalkhorā—these groups were situated well away from the public areas of their complexes. All three cases— on analogy with similar but inscribed and, therefore, certain cases at Bhājā and Kānheri—can only have been, it seems, cemetery shrines for the local monastic dead. This same kind of argument could be made for several structural sites as well.

This argument could be made for Bhojpur, for example, where at least fifty small *stūpas* whose mortuary character is strikingly evident—large deposits of bones being found in several—are placed together away from the hub of the complex in a way which parallels the placement of the local monastic dead in the cemeteries of the Western Caves and, significantly, at the structural site at Sāñcī.[79] It could be made for the orderly rows

of mortuary *stūpas* at Guṇṭupalle, in Andhra, which Longhurst
long ago suggested could represent "the ruined tombs of monks
who died" at the site.[80] It could be made for the area "to the
east and north-east of monastery 19" at Śrāvastī, which "seems
to have been specifically utilized for the erection of *stūpas*."[81] It
could, as well, be made in regard to the still curious orderly
arrangement of secondary *stūpas* at Lauriyā Nandangarh,
whose mortuary character is again clear and whose Buddhist
affiliation now seems sure.[82] All these sites—and a number of
others—have all or several of the characteristics which define
inscribed and therefore certain monastic cemetery shrines, and
this would suggest that they too belong to this category.

It is, however, not just individual labelled shrines or label-
led monastic cemeteries which have uninscribed parallels. The
certain cases of the deposition of the mortuary remains of a
number of local monks together in a single *stūpa* at Sāñcī,
Sonāri and Andher argue well for Longhurst's interpretation of
the deposits he discovered in at least two *stūpas* at Nāgārjuni-
koṇḍa. Longhurst found in the spaces created by the "spokes"
and cross-walls of the foundations of his *stūpa* no. 4 "twelve
water-pots covered with inverted food bowls...together with
six large begging-bowls...placed on the floor of the chamber
near the other vessels. The pots were in small groups of three
or four and filled with a mixture of bone ash and fine red
earth." By itself, in a separate space, he also found a distinc-
tively shaped "globular" pot inside of which was a silver "cas-
ket" which contained in turn "a tiny gold reliquary." Longhurst
suggests that this *stūpa* "was built to contain the remains of
twelve monks and the ashes of some important divine" from the
monastery in front of which it stands. In his *stūpa* no. 5 Long-
hurst again discovered six "water-pots and bowls" of the same
form and content, and again suggested that this *stūpa* too "was
erected to contain the remains of monks or priests" belonging
to its associated monastery.[83]

None of the deposits in the two *stūpas* at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa
were labelled, and Longhurst does not cite the Sāñcī, Sonāri,
and Andher deposits which are. The latter, however, establish
a sure precedent for the deposition of the mortuary remains of
a number of local monks together in a single *stūpa*, and they
indicate again that, until we have equally sure evidence or

examples to the contrary, we must assume—even in the absence of inscriptions—these *stūpas* at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa also contained, as Longhurst suggested, the remains of the local monastic dead. The same may apply as well to other instances. At Śrāvastī, for example, Marshall discovered in the northeast corner of a very early *stūpa* three "earthen jars...filled", he says, "with a mixture of sand and clay." [84]

To round out the range of the possible, we might cite several examples in which there are neither associated inscriptions nor parallels with such inscriptions, but which nevertheless have been interpreted as possible *stūpas* for the local monastic dead. Ghosh, for instance, in referring to the still badly reported Ghoṣitārama monastery at Kauśāmbī, has said: "the portion presently excavated contained the foundations of a large number of small *stūpas* and pavements with numerous roughly-circular post-holes. It appears that ordinary monks were memorialized by the erection of small pillars, their relics being buried in earthen pots in the floors adjoining the small *stūpas*." [85] In *vihāras* at Taxila, Kālawān, and Mohṛā Morādu, Marshall found small *stūpas* built in what originally could only have been the living quarters of individual monks. He suggested that these *stūpas* were funeral monuments intended "as memorials to signalise the sanctity of the cell where some specifically holy *bhikshu* had lived and died," that these *stūpas* "probably" contained the ashes of these monks, or "doubtless contained the bodily relics" of a former resident. [86]

It would appear, then, that the list of certain, probable, and possible monastic sites for which there is evidence for the permanent housing or enshrinement of the local monastic dead is already a long one: Sāñcī, Sonāri, Andher, Mathurā, Bedsā, Kānheri, Bhājā, Amarāvatī, Sudhagarh, Nadsur, Pitalkhorā, Bhojpur, Guṇṭupalle, Śrāvastī, Lauṛiya Nandangarh, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Kauśāmbī, Taxila, Kālawān, and Mohṛā Morādu. This list—which is nothing more than preliminary and provisional—is startling if for no other reason than that it reflects only what a superficial survey turned up in reports of explorations and excavations which were almost completely unconcerned with, and uninformed about, the treatment of the local monastic dead. A good deal could be said about early archeological methods in India and the character of the published

reports, much of which would not be kind. One thing, however, is clear: Buddhist historical archeology in India was from the beginning—and to a large degree remains—text-bound.[87] Unfortunately, the texts that were, and to some degree continue to be, the best known are coming more and more to be seen as least representative and—at least as they were interpreted—less than a sure guide to actual practice.[88] This meant, of course, that investigators of Buddhist monastic sites often did not know what to look for or did not recognize what they were seeing. Since, for example, it was taken on good scholarly authority that "the *Vinaya*" contained no rules governing the disposal of the monastic dead,[89] it is hardly surprising that no attempt was made to survey sites for evidence of such practices. What is, however, surprising is that especially the early investigators sometimes actually noted such evidence, and in some cases accurately identified it for what it was. It is still more surprising that, in spite of anything even approaching a systematic attempt to locate evidence for the treatment of the monastic dead, our list of sites for which there is such evidence—however casually or incidentally reported—is as long as it is. Had there been any attempt to locate such evidence, it is reasonable to assume, our list would have been far longer. But this list is impressive not just by its length. It contains a considerable number of early sites and several of the earliest sites that we have certain knowledge of (Sāñcī, Sonari, Andher, Bhojpur, Bhājā, Pitalkhora); it includes some of the main Buddhist sites referred to in *Nikāya-Āgama* literature (Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī); it includes sites from the South (Amarāvatī, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Guṇṭupalle), from the West (Bedsā, Kānheri, Sudhagarh, Nadsur, etc.), from the Northwest (Taxila, Kālawān, Mohrā Morādu), from Central India (Sāñcī, Sonāri, etc.), and from the Buddhist heartland. In short, this list testifies to a preoccupation with permanently housing or enshrining the local monastic dead that was very early and geographically very widespread. Again, if nothing else, this preoccupation with local monks forces us towards a long overdue recognition of the limited character of the so-called "great tradition" and an acknowledgement of the potential significance of the purely local in actual Buddhist communities. In an interesting sociological study of the monasteries and mod-

ern monks of Bhubaneswar, Miller and Wertz found that when
people were asked to name a "holy man," by far the greatest
number of them (38.2%) named contemporary ascetics *in the
local community.* Only 11.3% named historical religious figures
such as the Buddha, Guru Nanak, or Śaṅkara.[90] These figures
must at least remind us of the distinct possibility that whereas
we tend to locate the "holy" almost exclusively in major histori-
cally known Indian religious men, actual Indian communities
—including monastic communities—may never have done so.
In fact, the mere existence of the architecturally marked pres-
ence of the local monastic dead in so many Buddhist monastic
complexes already suggests that those who lived in such com-
plexes located the holy at least as much in purely local figures
as they did in pan-Buddhist figures like the Buddha or Śāriputra
and Maudgalyāyana. We are, moreover, already able to say a
little more about who or what these local figures were, and
about the individuals or groups who were preoccupied with
preserving their permanent presence.

Information regarding the individual local monks whose
remains were preserved at Buddhist monastic sites is, of
course, limited to what is contained in the inscriptions and
labels associated with their *stūpas* or the deposits of their "relics."
In some cases, there are indications of the monk's place of ori-
gin or residence, but in all cases the individual monk involved
is given an ecclesiastical title, or a title indicative of his religious
practice and status, or both. It is, however, almost immediately
obvious that these titles—whether ecclesiastical or religious—
are not, until very late, elaborate. There is little indication that
these individuals were "great saints," at least in terms of what
we might have expected from textual descriptions of religious
achievements.[91] Nor is there much indication that they were
high ecclesiastics or "pontiffs." Grāhadāsika in the Mathurā
record is simply called a *bhikṣu*, a monk. Dhammapāla at
Kānheri, and all the monks in the Bhājā cemetery, are referred
to only as "Elders" (*thera*) and given the title *bhadanta*, "Rev-
erend." The monks whose remains were deposited in *Stūpa* no.
2 at Sāñcī may be referred to collectively as *vināyakas*, which
should mean "guide, leader, or trainer, discipliner," but may
be an alternative expression for *vinaya-dhara*, "preserver of the
Vinaya," "Vinaya master." But only one of the monks is indi-

vidually so called. Two are called *ara*, but the significance of the term is unclear. Most scholars have taken it to be equivalent to *arhat*, although that is not likely.[92] The term *arhat* occurs in the Prakrit inscriptions of Central India not infrequently as *arahata, araha, ariha, arāha*, but never as *ara. ara* could in fact just as easily be from *ārya*, although the common form of *ārya* in these same inscriptions is *aya*.[93] One of these monks is also called an *ācārya* and one is called a "pupil" (*ātevāsin*). Most significantly, however, *all* of these monks are individually referred to as *sapurisa*, and in eight out of the ten individual labels that is all that they are called. At Sonāri, too, *sapurisa* is the only religious title that occurs in the four labels; and at Andher, although one individual is again called a "pupil" and another a *pabhāsana* or "luminary," both are also called *sapurisas*, and the two other individuals named there are called only that. The one thing, then, that all of these monks had in common—in addition to the fact that their remains had been enshrined in a set of Central Indian *stūpas*—was classification as a *sapurisa*. Unfortunately what such a classification meant is not very clear. *sapurisa* in Pāli seems to mean little more than "a good, worthy man" and is cited as "equal to ariya";[94] in Sanskrit sources, too, it is said to mean literally a "worthy or true man." Edgerton says both that "they are evidently a lay category" and that "the term *satpuruṣa* may include monks."[95] Although the monk in our Amarāvatī umbrella inscription may have a title (*-pabhāhin*) which may be related to one of the titles that occurs at Andher (*-pabhāsana*), and although he is also referred to as an *ārya*, the title *sapurisa* occurs neither in this inscription nor in any of the other inscriptions or labels associated with the local monastic dead. It seems to reflect a purely local classification and—at the very least—one which has no demonstrable connection with "canonical" or textual definitions of religious achievement or "sainthood." In fact, only two of the early inscriptions connected with the local monastic dead contain references to a distinct type of religious practitioner recognized by the textual tradition. In Amarāvatī no. 103, Nāgasena is called a *peṇḍavatika*, a "mendicant monk," and in the *stūpa* inscription from Bedsā, Gobhūti is called both a *peḍapātika* and an *āraṇaka*, a "forest-dweller," as well. Both *piṇḍapātika* and *āraṇyaka* are, of course, known in the literature, primarily as

two of the twelve or thirteen *dhutaṅgas* or *dhutaguṇas*. But the
status and value placed on these "ascetic practices"—espe-
cially in Pāli sources—are less than clear. The Pāli Text Society
Dictionary, for example, refers to a passage that occurs twice
in the *Pārivara* "deprecating such practices," and says that each
of the *dhutaṅgas* is "an ascetic practice not enjoined in the
Vinaya." It notes as well that "the Milinda devotes a whole
book (chap. VI) to the glorification of these 13 *dhutangas*," but
says "there is no evidence that they were ever widely adopted."
That there was a certain amount of ambivalence towards these
practices in at least some of the literary sources seems fairly
sure, and it appears that nowhere were they considered obliga-
tory or an integral part of the career of the *arhat*. It is therefore
curious that they and they alone find mention in Buddhist epi-
graphs which refer to significant individuals in actual com-
munities.[96] What is perhaps even more significant, though, is
what is absent in these epigraphs. Nowhere in these early
inscriptions which refer to local monks whose remains were
treated like those of the Buddha is there any reference to the
"classical" textual definitions of Buddhist "sainthood," no cer-
tain references to *arhats* or any of the levels of spiritual attain-
ment associated with or preliminary to this ideal. There are, in
fact, no indications—apart from references to *piṇḍapātikas* or
āraṇyakas—that "canonical" or textual definitions of religious
achievement or "sainthood" ever penetrated into actual early
monastic communities in India, no indication in these records
that they were known at all. The absence of such indications in
early records connected with the local monastic dead is in itself
striking. But it is even more so in light of the fact that such indi-
cations are fulsomely found—in spite of what might have been
expected—in the latest series of such inscriptions, long after,
one might have thought, the *arhat* ideal had lost its predomi-
nant place. It is not until the 6th or 7th century, and even then
only at Kānheri, that we find in records associated with the
local monastic dead certain references to *arhats*—seven of the
eight Kānheri labels published by Gokhale in 1985 refer to
monks who are called *arhats*—and to characteristics associated
with textual definitions of "sainthood"—*tevija*, *ṣaḍabhijñāna*,
anāgāmin, etc. This situation is, again, not what might have
been expected, and deserves fuller study. But it would appear,

at the very least, that we have here yet another case which indicates that we need not—and probably should not—assume that the presence of an idea in a canonical Buddhist text necessarily means that that same idea was current in actual Buddhist communities. The two need not—and probably often did not—have any necessary connection, chronological or otherwise. Our inscriptions, for example, suggest that the significance of the individual local monks whose remains were carefully and permanently preserved at early monastic sites was not linked to their having achieved the religious ideals articulated in what are taken to be early texts. Such a linkage occurs , in fact, only later, long after we think those early texts were composed. Although it would lead too far afield to discuss it here, it is also at least worth noting that nowhere in these inscriptions—even very late and at Kānheri—is there the slightest hint or trace of the religious ideals we associate with the Mahāyāna. When we do finally encounter textual definitions of the ideal, they are definitions articulated in traditions firmly rooted in the *nikāyas* and *āgāmas*, and show no influence of the Mahāyāna *sūtras*, even though a very large number of the latter seem to have been composed long before.[97]

If, then, epigraphical data tells us something about the local monks for whom *stūpas* were raised and whose remains were preserved in early India, if it tells us that such monks were not thought—until very late—to have been *arhats*, but are instead said to be *theras* or *bhadantas* or, sometimes, *piṇḍapātikas*, that same material also tells us something, finally, about the people who made considerable efforts to ensure the permanent presence of those *theras* and *bhadantas* in their midst, who established, honored and adored the structures that housed them. Our best information concerning these matters comes, perhaps, from *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī.

Among the labels found on the deposits in *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī there is, as we have seen, one donative inscription. Majumdar reads the latter as: *kākanava-pabhāsa-siha[n]ā dana*, and translates it: "the gift of the pupils of the Light of Kākanāva"—"the Light of Kākanāva" being the monk and *sapurisa* Gotiputa mentioned also in an Andher label. If Majumdar's reading and interpretation are correct, then so too must be his conclusion: "It may, therefore, be concluded that the casket on

which this inscription occurs was the gift of the disciples of
Gotiputa, the *Kākanava-pabhāsa*. It is highly probable that the
other three caskets, which do not bear any donative inscription
but were deposited along with this one in the stone box, were
likewise contributed by the same persons."[98] Although Majum-
dar's derivation of what he reads as *siha* from Sanskrit *śaikṣa* is
not entirely free of problems,[99] his interpretation of the record
appears to be the most satisfying to date, and it suggests that
the deposition of the monastic remains in *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī
was the result of monastic endeavors. But even if this sugges-
tion cannot be taken as entirely certain, even if some doubt
might remain concerning the donors of the deposit itself, there
can be no doubt that the structure that housed this deposit was
disproportionately paid for by monks and nuns. There are
ninety-three donative records connected with *Stūpa* no. 2 at
Sāñcī in which the status of the donor is clear, and which
record the gifts of coping-stones, cross-bars, rail-pillars, pave-
ment-slabs and berm and stairway balustrades. Forty-four of
these inscriptions record the gifts of monks (28) and nuns (16),
and eight more the gifts of pupils (*antevāsin*) of monks and
nuns.[100] This means that well over half the donors who contri-
buted to the construction and adornment of this *stūpa* of the
local monastic dead were monks and nuns, some of whom were
sutāikas, "versed in the *Suttantas*," and *bhāṇakas*, "reciters (of the
Dharma)." Unless one would want to argue that monks and
nuns made up more than half of the population in the area
around Sāñcī, it would appear that monks and nuns not only
made up an absolute majority of the donors concerned with
Stūpa no. 2, but that their numbers were disproportionately
large in light of the fact that they almost certainly constituted
only a small percentage of the local population—Sāñcī, after
all, was very near "the famous and populous city of Vidiśa"
and, perhaps, a "nodal point" on an important commercial
route between Andhra and the north.[101] It should, therefore,
have had a large lay catchment area.

It is unfortunate that we do not have comparably rich data
for other *stūpas* of the local monastic dead. But what we do have
points very much in the same direction. We know, for example,
that the *stūpa* of Gobhūti at Bedsā was "caused to be made" by
the monk-pupil of Gobhūti. It is also virtually certain that the

stūpa of Grāhadāsika at Mathurā was erected either by a monk
or group of monks who resided in the Viṇḍa Monastery. The
labelled *stūpas* in the monastic cemeteries at both Bhājā and
Kānheri could have been erected and maintained only—almost
certainly—by the monks of their respective establishments.
Had they had individual "donors," it is reasonable to assume
that those donors would have been named—as they are at
Bedsā, Mathurā and elsewhere—in their associated inscrip-
tions. But no donors are mentioned. Moreover, the labels at
Kānheri especially could only have been written by persons
familiar with the textual, technical definitions of "sainthood,"
and this too would suggest monks. Even in the case of the unin-
scribed *stūpas*, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the
monks themselves were responsible for the deposit of the re-
mains of what appear to be local monastic dead. At Nāgārjuni-
koṇḍa, for example, neither *stūpa* no. 4 or 5 was the main *stūpa*
at the site. Both appear to have been the private *stūpas* of the
monasteries that they are closely and physically associated
with. Again, it is unlikely that anyone but the monks could
have established and maintained the orderly groups of *stūpas*
at, for example, Sudhagarh and Nadsur. Moreover, and much
more broadly, there is evidence to indicate that from the very
beginning constructional activity at monastic sites was—not
surprisingly—under the supervision and control of specifically
designated monks, and that, as a consequence, what we see at
such sites is the reflection of monastic choices and monastic
values. Already at Bhārhut and Sonāri, at Amarāvatī, Nāgār-
junikoṇḍa, Kānheri, etc., we find evidence for the presence of
navakammikas, monks "appointed by the Chapter as a superin-
tendent of the building operations." [102] Njammasch has in fact
gone some ways towards showing that "Der *navakammika* war
offenbar eine wichtige Persönlichkeit in der Struktur der indis-
chen buddhistischen Klöster." [103] The earliest *navakammika* that
we have reference to is Isipālita at Bhārhut, and he appears to
have been by no means an "average" monk—in addition to
being a "Superintendent of Works," he is also a *bhadanta*, an
ārya, and a "Reciter (of *Dharma*)" (*bhāṇaka*);[104] at Amarāvatī,
the *Navakammika* Budharakhita is called both a *thera* and a
bhadanta—that is to say, he belonged to the same class as did so
many of the monks for whom *stūpas* were built;[105] at Nāgārjuni-

koṇḍa, the three *navakammikas* mentioned in "the Second Apsi-
dal Temple Inscription F" are all called *theras*, the monk
responsible for the construction of the *cetiya* and *vihāra* referred
to in "Detached Pillar Inscription H" is called "the Master,
the Great Preacher of the Law, the *Thera* Dhamma[gho]sa"
(*acariyena mahādhammakāthik[e]na dhamma[gho]sa-therena anu-
thitaṃ*), and the *māhacetiya* was said to have been brought to
completion by "the Reverend Ananda, who knows the *Dīgha-*
and the *Majjhima-nikāyas* by heart" (*dīgha-majhima-nikāya-
dharena bhajaṃtānadena nithapitaṃ*).[106] Monks—and often times
learned monks—supervised and controlled building activities
at monastic sites, then; they determined, it would appear, what
was and what was not built and where it was to be placed.
Their choices and their values are, again, what we see expres-
sed at Buddhist monastic sites. These monastic choices and
monastic values have almost certainly determined the pres-
ence—whether they are inscribed or not—of the *stūpas* of the
local monastic dead at so many sites in India.

Although the evidence that we have primarily points
directly and indirectly to monastic initiative for the deposition
of the remains of the local monastic dead and the establish-
ment of permanent structures to house them, and although
this same evidence suggests that monks would have been pre-
dominantly preoccupied with and active in any cult of the local
monastic dead, there is as well some evidence to indicate that
the laity was not entirely excluded. The Amarāvatī umbrella
inscription, for example, records the gift of an Upāsikā or "lay
sister" to the *stūpa* of a local monk, although the *stūpa* itself
seems, obviously, already to have been in existence.[107] At
Kānheri, however, "the *stūpa* of the Elder, the Reverend
Dhammapāla" is explicitly said to be "the religious gift of
Sivapālitanikā, the wife of the treasurer Dhamanaka."[108] In
addition to these records, there are the donative inscriptions
from *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī which also reveal lay participation in
activity connected with the local monastic dead. But that par-
ticipation at Sāñcī, as everywhere else, seems to have been
overshadowed by that of the monks. The place and participa-
tion of the laity in activity connected with the local monastic
dead seems everywhere to have been restricted, and this in
turn may be reflected in the literature.

Conflict—potential or actual—is a consistent theme in literary accounts of the deposition of the Buddhist dead. "The war of the relics," never actually launched, is an established element of the accounts of the death of the Buddha.[109] Ānanda's death and the deposition of his remains also takes place in a context marked by the threat of war between competing claimants for his remains.[110] But the conflict over the remains of Śāriputra may be of particular interest. Although the only canonical Pāli account of the death of Śāriputra has either suffered—or been intentionally altered—in transmission, still it is clear from the account in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* that the collection and preservation of Śāriputra's remains was thought to have been an exclusively monastic affair.[111] The account of these same events in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, however, presents a much more complicated situation.[112] Although here too the initial collection of Śāriputra's remains was undertaken by a monk, and they were taken possession of by another monk, the Elder Ānanda, in this account the monastic claim to exclusive possession and access is challenged by the wealthy layman Anāthapiṇḍada. He approaches Ānanda and asks for the remains, but Ānanda flatly refuses. This conflict between the monastic and lay claims has then to be mediated by the Buddha himself, who initially seems to favor Anāthapiṇḍada, and instructs Ānanda to hand over the remains. But that the redactors of this version did not see this either as a happy solution or as signalling the end of monastic control seems apparent from what follows: Anāthapiṇḍada takes the remains and enshrines them in his own house, but this only restricts access to these relics in another way. People come to Anāthapiṇḍada's house, but find the door locked. They complain to the Buddha, who as a result indicates that *stūpas* for deceased monks—although they might be erected by laymen—have to be erected within the confines of the monastery.

Although this quick summary does not do justice to the text, a text which deserves to be translated in full, it at least suggests that its author assumed or asserted the priority of an exclusive monastic claim to the remains of the monastic dead; it suggests that that claim at some point had been challenged, and that the monastic response to the challenge had been, at best, ambivalent: it allowed lay participation and involvement,

but it restricted it to the confines of the monastery and indi-
cated that lay participation was to be governed by monastic
rules.

The account of the deposition of the remains of Śāriputra
in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is—in so far as we can now tell—
only a story; as such it can only tell us what its compilor or
redactor thought or wanted his intended audience to think.
The same applies as well to the accounts in the Pāli *Udāna* and
Apadāna in which the Buddha is presented as directing monks,
and monks alone, to perform the funeral and build a *stūpa* for a
deceased fellow monk, or the account in the Pāli *Vinaya* con-
cerning a group of nuns doing the same for one of their
deceased members.[113] There is, of course, as of now no way to
relate any of these geographically unlocalizable and largely
undatable documents directly to any of our sites. The most that
we can say is that it appears that all of the compilors or redac-
tors of these stories assumed or asserted that concern for the
local monastic dead was originally and primarily a concern of
monks and nuns, that the laity, if they were involved at all,
were thought, or directed to be, only secondarily, even tangen-
tially, involved. This assumption or assertion, moreover, would
appear to have been widespread.

These and other passages from the canonical literature
deserve to be much more carefully studied for what they can
tell us about attitudes and ideas concerning the local monastic
dead that various authors or redactors attributed to the Bud-
dha. It is, however, very likely that they will not tell us very
much, and this, perhaps, gives rise to the broadest generaliza-
tion that we can make. The epigraphical and archeological
material we have looked at—although it too requires much ful-
ler study—already tells us some important things about the
limitations of our literary sources. We know from the epi-
graphical and archeological sources not only that the remains
of the *local* monastic dead were housed in permanent structures
that paralleled structures used to house the remains of the Bud-
dha; we know too that the relationship between the *local* dead
and the structures that housed their remains was expressed
exactly as was the relationship between the "dead" Buddha
and his *stūpa*—that in both cases the structure was said to be
"of" or "for" the person, not "for" or "of" his remains. We

know that there was little, if any, chronological gap between *stūpas* for the Buddha and *stūpas* for the *local* monastic dead; that a considerable amount of effort and expenditure went towards ensuring the continuing presence of deceased purely *local* monks in their respective communities; that the remains of *local* monks were deposited in separate shrines near the main *stūpa* of some sites, or that the remains of several *local* monks were deposited together in a single *stūpa*, or—most commonly—in ordered groups of individual *stūpas* placed away from the central hub of the complex. We know that there were *local*, perhaps regional, definitions of "sainthood," and that the status of *bhadanta* or *thera* appears to have had more than merely ecclesiastical significance in *actual* communities; that the preoccupation with the *local* monastic dead was primarily and predominantly a monastic concern and activity. Finally— and perhaps most importantly—we know that these conceptions and practices concerning the *local* monastic dead were certainly current at Sāñcī, Sonāri, Andher, Mathurā, Amarāvatī, Bhājā, Bedsā and Kānheri, and probably at a dozen or more widely separated *actual* sites, and that such activity was not only widespread, but in most cases very early. We know all of this from epigraphical and archeological material. But almost none of this could have been clearly perceived, precisely understood, or even known from our canonical sources for the simple reason that all of it took place at a local level in actual monastic communities, and our canonical sources know nothing of—or say nothing about—the vast majority of the actual local sites at which we know early monastic Buddhism was practised. There is, moreover, for the vast majority of such sites, no evidence that the canonical sources we know were known or used by the communities that lived there. These sources have, in this sense, no *direct* documentary value at all. If the study of Indian Buddhism is ever to be anything other than a study of what appears to be an idealizing and intentionally archaizing literature, if it is ever to deal directly with how this religion was actually practised in actual local monasteries, these facts will have to be fully confronted, however uncomfortable that might be.

NOTES

1. P. Steinthal, *Udāna* (London: 1885) 8.21; Bikkhu J. Kashyap, *The Apadāna* (II)—*Buddhavaṃsa-Cariyā-Piṭaka [Khuddakanikāya*, vol. VII] (Nālandā-Devanāgarī-Pāli-Series) (Bihar: 1959) 125.16 (54.6.216).

2. H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ* (London: 1882) iv 308–09; cf. G. Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 13 (1989) 91 n.19

3. For the Tibetan text see D. T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1958) 44, 95–2–1; certain aspects of this text—largely shorn of their context—have been discussed several times: W. W. Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur* (London: 1884) 111; L. de la Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1935) 276 ff; A. Bareau, "La Construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinayapiṭaka," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 236, 240, 247, 264; G. Roth, "Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according to the Tibetan Version of the Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra, the Sanskrit Treatise Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana, and a Corresponding Passage in Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgraha," in *The Stūpa. Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, ed. A. L. Dallapiccola & S. Z. Lallemant (Wiesbaden: 1980) 183 ff; see below pp. 315–316.

4. de la Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam," 288.

5. For a survey of the kind and character of the "excavation" work done on Buddhist sites up until the '50s—and comparatively little major work has been done on such sites since then—see now D. K. Chakrabarti, *A History of Indian Archaeology from the Beginning to 1947* (New Delhi: 1988).

6. J. Burgess, "Is Bezawāḍa on the Site of Dhanakaṭaka?" *Indian Antiquary* 11 (1882) 97–8. There is a good drawing of the plan and elevation of one of these "dolmens or rude-stone burying places" at Amarāvatī in J. Fergusson, "Description of the Amarāvatī Tope in Guntur," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (= *JRAS*) (1868) 143, fig.6. Amarāvatī is not the only Buddhist site in Andhra built on or near proto-historical burials. There is evidence of such burials at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa (R. Subrahmanyam, et al, *Nagarjunakonda* (1954–60), Vol. I (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 75) (New Delhi: 1975) 165 ff), Yeleswaram (M. A. W. Khan, *A Monograph on Yelleshwaram Excavations* (Hyderabad: 1963) 4 ff), Jaggayyapeṭa (R. Sewell, *Quelques points d'archéologie de l'inde méridionale* (Paris: 1897) 5–6), Goli (K. P. Rao, *Deccan Megaliths* (Delhi: 1988) 23), etc. The association of Buddhist sites with proto-historical burials is also by no means limited to Andhra—see, for convenience sake, D. Faccenna, *A Guide to the Excavations in Swat (Pakistan) 1956–62* (Roma: 1964) 62, 65—and deserves to be much more fully studied as a general pattern.

7. Fergusson, "Description of the Amarāvatī Tope in Guntur," 138, 140.

8. For the modern history of the site and a summary account of the work done on it see N. S. Ramaswami, *Amaravati. The Art and History of the Stūpa and the Temple* (Hyderabad: 1975) 14–23. There is epigraphical evidence of Buddhist devotional and donative activity at the site in the 11th Century (E. Hultzsch, "A

Pallava Inscription from Amaravati," *Madras Journal of Literature and Science* for 1886–7 (Madras: 1887) 59–62), in the 12th and 13th Century (E. Hultzsch, "Two Pillar Inscriptions at Amaravati," *Epigraphia Indica* [= *EI*] 6 (1900–01) 146–60), and in the 14th Century (S. Paranavitana, "Gaḍalādeṇiya Rock-Inscription of Dharmmakīrtti Sthavira," *Epigraphia Zeylanica* 4 (1935) 90–110. Some of the earliest work on the site had already revealed stray sculptures, relief work and plaques which belonged to a "late" period, and in 1954 D. Barrett had made an attempt to describe "the Later School of Amaravati" which he situated between the 7th and 10th Centuries (D. Barrett, "The Later School of Amaravati and its Influence," *Arts and Letters* 28.2 (1954) 41–53). More recently, a certain amount of attention has been focused on what is rather loosely called "tantric" material from Amarāvatī and other Andhra sites (K. Krishna Murthy, *Iconography of Buddhist Deity Heruka* (Delhi: 1988); K. Krishna Murthy, *Sculptures of Vajrayāna Buddhism* (Delhi: 1989), and, although this recent work is often careless and badly done, still it makes clear that we have much to learn about the later phases of Buddhism in Andhra and suggests that it persisted for longer than we are wont to think. There is, moreover, evidence for this persistence not just at Amarāvatī, but at Sālihuṇḍam (R. Subrahmanyam, *Salihundam. A Buddhist Site in Andhra Pradesh* (Hyderabad: 1964) 91 ff), Guṇṭupalle (I. K. Sarma, *Studies in Early Buddhist Monuments and Brāhmī Inscriptions of Āndhra Deśa* (Nagpur: 1988) 59–91), Gummaḍidurru (M. H. Kuraishi, "Trail Excavations at Alluru, Gummadidurru and Nagarjunakonda," *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* (= ARASI) *for 1926–27* (Calcutta: 1930) 150–61), and a number of other sites.

9. J. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa* (Madras: 1882) 4, 9.

10. A. Rea, "Excavations at Amarāvatī," *ARASI* 1905–06 (Calcutta: 1909) 118–9 & pl.L—Rea's pl. XLVII.6 reproduces "evidently a late example" of the kind of sculpture referred to above in n. 8.

11. A. Rea, "Excavations at Amarāvatī," *ARASI* 1908-09 (Calcutta: 1912) 90–91 and figs. 1 & 2. Rea called these burials "neolithic pyriform tombs," but Rao (*Deccan Megaliths*, 46) has pointed out that "...taking into account the recent evidence, we can safely assign them to the megalithic period." Note, too, the "late" sculptures illustrated in Rea's pls. XXVIIId and XXXId.

12. G. Schopen, "Burial 'ad sanctos' and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism. A Study in the Archeology of Religion," *Religion* 17 (1987) 193–225.

13. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa*, 49.

14. J. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, Surveyed in 1882* (London: 1887) pl. xlv.6.

15. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa*, 49 (no. 88b); 55 (88b). Hultzsch's final version appeared in E. Hultzsch, "Amarāvatī-Inschriften," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (= ZDMG) 37 (1883) 555–56 (no. 24).

16. H. Lüders, *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of those of Asoka* (Appendix to Epigraphia Indica 10) (Calcutta: 1912) no. 1276.

17. R. O. Franke, "Epigraphische Notizen," *ZDMG* 50 (1896) 600.

18. C. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum* (Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, N.S.—General Sec. Vol. IV) (Madras: 1942) 295, no. 92.

19. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa*, 55 and n. 2.

20. Hultzsch, "Amarāvatī-Inschriften," 555–56, no. 24.

21. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, 87.

22. Lüders, *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions*, no. 1276.

23. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, 295, no. 92; 342.

24. Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien. des origines à l'ère śaka* (Louvain: 1958) 583–84.

25. O.R. Furtseva, "On the Problem of the Territorial Distribution of the Buddhist Schools in Kushana Age (According to the Epigraphic Data)," in *Summaries of Papers presented by Soviet Scholars to the VIth World Sanskrit Conference, October 13–20, 1984, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.* (Moscow: 1984) 55; see also A. M. Shastri, "Buddhist Schools as Known from Early Indian Inscriptions," *Bhāratī, Bulletin of the College of Indology*, no. 2 (1957/58) 48; etc.

26. J. Marshall, *A Guide to Sanchi* (Calcutta: 1918) 87.

27. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, 298.

28. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, 72.

29. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, pl. xxxi.6; Ph. Stern & M. Bénisti, *Évolution du style indien d'Amarāvatī* (Paris: 1961) pl. lxvi.

30. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, pl. lxv.8.

31. G. Schopen, "A Verse from the *Bhadracarīpraṇidhāna* in a 10th Century Inscription found at Nālandā," *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 12.1 (1989) 151–53.

32. See for references G. Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: the Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit," *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 44–45.

33. M. S. Nagaraja Rao, "Brāhmī Inscriptions and their Bearing on the Great Stūpa at Sannati," in *Indian Epigraphy. Its Bearing on the History of Art*, ed. F. M. Asher & G. S. Gai (New Delhi: 1985) 41–45, esp. 42, no. 8. There are a number of problems concerning the inscriptions from this recently discovered site in Karnataka, and their nature even is not fully understood. For example, although Rao takes the record cited above as a donative inscription and says it occurs on "an āyaka pillar," it is very likely—to judge by the illustration in his pl. 62—that it is a memorial pillar, not an āyaka pillar, and the record might well then be simply a label.

34. Literary sources do, of course, refer to *keśanakha-stūpas*, "*stūpas* for the hair and nail clippings," and these are—as Feer has said—presented as a kind of "monument élevé à un Buddha de son vivant" (L. Feer, *Avadāna-Çataka. cent légendes bouddhiques* (Paris: 1891) 482). References to this type of stūpa occur, moreover, widely. They occur in the *Avadānaśataka* (J. S. Speyer, *Avadānaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales belonging to the Hīnayāna* (St. Petersburg: 1906–09) i 123.1; 307.1 ff; ii 71.3; etc.), in the *Divyāvadāna* (P. L. Vaidya, *Divyāvadāna* (Dar-

bhanga: 1959) 122.1–25: *dharmatā khalu buddhānāṃ bhagavatāṃ jīvatāṃ dhriyamāṇānāṃ yāpayatāṃ keśanakhastūpa bhavanti*...—this is a particularly important passage, perhaps, and a part of it is quoted as well by Śāntideva (C. Bendall, *Çikshāsamuccaya. A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching* (St. Petersburg: 1897–1902) 148.13) where he attributes it to the Sarvāstivādins: *ārya-sarvāstivādānāṃ ca paṭhyate*), and scattered throughout the *vastus* of the *Mūlasarvāstivada-vinaya*: the *Cīvara-vastu* (N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2 (Srinagar: 1942) 143.12), the *Pārivāsika-vastu* (N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 3 (Srinagar: 1943) 98.4), the *Śayanāsana-vastu* (R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu* (Roma: 1978) 28.1, 5), the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (*The Sde-Dge Mtshal-Par Bka'-'Gyur. A Facsimile Edition of the 18th Century Redaction of Si-Tu Chos-kyi-'byuṅgnas Prepared under the Direction of H.H. the 16th Rgyal-dbaṅ Karma-pa* (Delhi: 1977) Vol. 10, 9.6, 7) etc. There are also a number of references to a *keśanakha-stūpa* in some of the versions of the meeting of the Buddha with Trapuṣa and Bhallika (for some of these—and for further references to *keśanakha-stūpas* in general—see A. Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapiṭaka et les vinayapiṭaka anciens: de la quête de l'éveil a la conversion de śāriputra et de maudgalyāyana* (Paris: 1963) 106–23; A. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinayapiṭaka," *BEFEO* 50 (1960) 261–63; de la Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam," 285–86; etc.). But in spite of the fact that there are numerous references in literary sources to such *stūpas*, and in spite of the fact that the Chinese pilgrims refer to them (Li Yung-hsi, *A Record of Buddhist Countries by Fa-hsien* (Peking: 1957) 32; S. Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World* (London: 1884) ii80, 173; etc.), there is as yet no archeological or epigraphical evidence to confirm their actual existence. Moreover, the texts themselves indicate that though such *stūpas* were thought to have been built while the *buddhas* in question were still alive, such *stūpas* were only built for *buddhas*, certainly not for local monks like Nāgasena. Finally, it might be noted that the possibility of *cetiyas* being made during the life time of the Buddha is also explicitly raised in the Pāli *Kāliṅgabodhijātaka: Sakkā pana bhante tumhesu dharantesu yeva cetiyaṃ kātun* (V. Fausbøll, *The Jātaka together with its Commentary* (London: 1887) iv 228.17), and—although the text is not entirely clear—what we normally think of as *stūpas*, *sāririka-cetiyas*, are clearly and obviously ruled out. Things like the *bodhi*-tree which the Buddha had "used" are alone clearly allowed (cf. de la Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam", 284–85.) The classification of *cetiyas* into *sāririka*, *pāribhogika*, and *uddesika* found in the *Kāliṅgabodhijātaka* and other Pāli sources, although frequently cited, shows several signs of being very late; cf. E. W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo: 1946) 135, but note that he has overlooked the *Jātaka* passage.

    35. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, nos. 102, 118; cf. no. 51.

    36. G. Bühler, "Inscriptions from the Stupa of Jaggayyapeṭā," *Indian Antiquary* 11 (1882) 258 (II.6), 254(.6); also in Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, 110 (no. 2, 1.5; no. 3, 1.4).

    37. For both ideas see Schopen, "Burial 'ad sanctos' and the Physical Presence of the Buddha," 194–225, esp. 206–09; G. Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18 (1990) 197–200.

38. It is worth noting here that it is in Andhra alone that structures con-
nected with the local monastic dead are called *cetiyas*. Elsewhere even in the
Deccan they are referred to as *stūpas*. A similar—but not exactly the same—pat-
tern seems to hold as well in regard to structures connected with the "dead"
Buddha: in Andhra they are consistently called *cetiyas*, usually *mahā-cetiyas*,
while elsewhere in inscriptions—apart from the Western Caves—such struc-
tures are usually called *stūpas*. In the Western monastic cave complexes there is
evidence to suggest that the structures connected with the "dead" Buddha were
called *cetiyas* (e.g. *caityagṛha*), while the word *stūpa* was used "primarily to
denote" what Sarkar calls "small-sized memorial *stūpas* raised in honour of
some elder *thera*" (H. Sarkar, *Studies in Early Buddhist Architecture of India* (Delhi:
1966) 4). Obviously these regional differences must be more fully studied and
precisely plotted, but it is, again, worth noting that some canonical Pāli litera-
ture—like Andhran epigraphy—shows a clear preference for the term *cetiya*, and
that this shared preference may evidence mutual contact and influence (cf.
Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," 89–91).

39. Although it is neither well written nor well documented, C. Mar-
gabandhu, "Archaeological Evidence of Buddhism at Mathurā—A Chronologi-
cal Study," in *Svasti Srī. Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra Felicitation Volume*, ed. K. V. Ramesh
et al (Delhi: 1984) 267–80, provides an overview of work on the site; for
attempts to reconstruct even the basic outlines of the development of the site,
see M. C. Joshi & A. K. Sinha, "Chronology of Mathurā—an Assessment,"
Puratattva 10 (1978–79) 39–44; R. C. Gaur, "Mathura-Govardhana Region: an
Archaeological Assessment in Historical Perspective," in *Indological Studies. Prof.
D. C. Sircar Commemoration Volume*, ed. S. K. Maity & U. Thakur (New Delhi:
1987) 103–13; S. C. Ray, "Stratigraphic Evidence of Coins from Excavations at
Mathura," in *Sraddhāñjali. Studies in Ancient Indian History (D. C. Sircar Commem-
oration Volume)*, ed. K. K. Das Gupta, et al (Delhi: 1988) 375–84; M. C. Joshi,
"Mathurā as an Ancient Settlement," in *Mathurā. The Cultural Heritage*, ed. D. M.
Srinivasan (New Delhi: 1988) 165–70; etc. There are two papers which—for dif-
ferent reasons—are particularly important for the site, neither of which is directly
connected with Buddhist material: K. W. Folkert, "Jain Religious Life at Ancient
Mathurā: the Heritage of Late Victorian Interpretation," in *Mathurā. The Cul-
tural Heritage*, 103–12, which discusses some of the distortions in interpretation
which have arisen at least in part from the piecemeal discovery and publication
of the material from Mathurā; and H. Härtel, "Some Results of the Excavations
at Sonkh. A Preliminary Report," in *German Scholars on India. Contributions to
Indian Studies*, Vol. II (New Delhi: 1976) 69–99, which both establishes a clear,
datable stratigraphical sequence, and—by contrast—makes clear what could
have been gained by systematic excavation of specific complexes at Mathurā.

40. J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, *The "Scythian" Period. An Approach to the
History, Art, Epigraphy and Palaeography of North India from the 1st Century B.C. to the
3rd Century A.D.* (Leiden: 1949) 181–83; van Lohuizen-de Leeuw refers to a still
earlier treatment of the record in V. S. Agrawala, "New Sculptures from
Mathurā," *Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society* 11.2 (1938) 66–76, but I
have been unable to consult this paper.

41. D. C. Sircar, "Brahmi Inscriptions from Mathurā," *EI* 34 (1961–62)
9–13, esp. 10–11 & pl.

42. Sircar, "Brahmi Inscriptions from Mathurā," 11.

43. S. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India (c. 250 B.C.–c. A.D. 300)* (Delhi: 1981) 113 (a reading of the Bedsā record is given on p. 329 as well); chart iii places the Kānheri inscription early in the period between 100 A.D. and 180 A.D. (see also 333, no. 6 under Kānheri). V. Dehejia, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples. A Chronology* (London: 1972) 177, assigns the record from Bedsā to "c. 50–30 B.C."; for Kanheri see 183–84.

44. J. Burgess, *Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions* (Archaeological Survey of Western India, 4) (London: 1883) 89 (VI.2) & pl. xlvii; see also D. D. Kosambi, "Dhenukākaṭa," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 30.2 (1955) 50–71, esp. 70; for the spatial location of this *stūpa* within the Bedsā complex the most useful site plan is that published in A. A. West, "Copies of Inscriptions from the Caves near Bedsa, with a Plan," *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 8 (1864–66) 222–24 & 2 pl.—this contains as well an eye-copy of the inscription.

45. J. Burgess, *Report on the Elura Cave Temples and the Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India* (Archaeological Survey of Western India, 5) (London: 1883) 78 (no. 10) & pl. li; for the position of this small "shrine" within the complex see Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 197-98 & fig. 39; J. Fergusson & J. Burgess, *The Cave Temples of India* (London: 1880) pl. liii.

46. D. Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments* (Calcutta: 1971) 153.

47. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 129; Dehejia, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples*, 47–48; 154, assigns the inscriptions to c. 70–50 B.C.

48. For these records from Bhājā, see Burgess, *Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions* 82–83 (I.2–5); Kosambi, "Dhenukākaṭa," 70–71; Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 330; etc.

49. Fergusson & Burgess, *The Cave Temples of India*, 228.

50. M. N. Deshpande, "The Rock-cut Caves of Pitalkhorā in the Deccan," *Ancient India* 15 (1959) 66–93; esp. 72–73. On "relic" deposits in monolithic or rock-cut stūpas see also Fergusson & Burgess, *The Cave Temples of India*, 186 n. 1; H. Cousens, *The Antiquities of Sind. with Historical Outline* (Calcutta: 1929) 105 (referring to Kārli); etc.

51. W. West, "Description of Some of the Kānheri Topes," *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* [= *JBBRAS*] 6 (1862) 116–20, esp. 120.

52. Burgess, *Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions*, 67—on the same page there is a good wood-cut illustrating what a part of the cemetery looked like in his day.

53. E. W. West, "Copies of Inscriptions from the Buddhist Cave-Temples of Kānheri, etc. in the Island of Salsette, with a Plan of the Kānheri Caves," *JBBRAS* 5 (1861) 1–14, esp. 12, no. 58.

54. S. Gokhale, "New Inscriptions from Kānheri," *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 5 (1975) 110–12, esp. 110; S. Gokhale, "The Memorial Stūpa Gallery at Kānheri," in *Indian Epigraphy. Its Bearing on the History of Art*, ed. F. M. Asher & G. S. Gai (New Delhi: 1985) 55–59 & pl. 94–101, esp. 55; S. Gorakshkar, "A Sculptured Frieze from Kānheri," *Lalit Kalā* (18 (1977) 35-38 & pls. xvi–xviii, esp. 35; M. S. Nagaraja Rao (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1983–84—A Review* (New Delhi: 1986) 154 (cf. M. S. Nagaraja Rao (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1982-83—A Review* (New Delhi: 1985) 122).

55. Gokhale, "The Memorial Stūpa Gallery at Kānheri," 56 (no. 1, pl. 95); 57 (no. 4, pl. 98).

56. Gokhale, "New Inscriptions from Kānheri," 110; Gokhale, "The Memorial Stūpa Gallery at Kānheri," 56.

57. Before leaving the question of the use of plurals of respect in Buddhist inscriptions—a question which also requires further study—it is important to note that the use of such plurals, though characteristic of records referring to the local monastic dead, is not restricted to records of this kind; see, for examples, E. Senart, "The Inscriptions in the Caves at Nasik," *EI* 8 (1905–06) 76; Burgess, *Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and their Inscriptions* 85, no. 7; 87, no. 22; 95, no. 17; etc;. D. C. Sircar, *Epigraphic Discoveries in East Pakistan* (Calcutta: 1975) 11 (there is here, however, the additional problem that the inscription Sircar is referring to may not be Buddhist—cf. S. Siddhanta, "The Jagadishpur Copper Plate Grant of the Gupta Year 128 (A.D. 44–48)," *Journal of the Varendra Research Museum* 1.1 (1972) 23–37; Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," 188 (referring to the Valabhī grants); etc.

58. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa*, 55 (no. 88b) and n. 2; Hultzsch, "Amarāvatī-Inschriften," 555–56; Burgess, *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*, 87; Lüders, *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions*, no. 1276; Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, 295 (no. 92).

59. Burgess, *Notes on the Amaravati Stupa*, 55 n. 2.

60. M. A. Mehendale, *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits* (Poona: 1948) 122 (§232, c ii); O. von Hinüber, *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick* (Wien: 1986) 111 (§221).

61. A. Cunningham, *The Bhilsa Topes; or Buddhist Monuments of Central India* (London: 1854) esp. 184–89; 203–05; 223–36. The local character of the monks whose remains were deposited in the stūpas at Sāñcī and related sites has been obscured by an early and persistent tendency to identify some of these monks with some of the monks involved in the so-called "Third Council" which is known only from Sri Lankan sources. This sort of identification started with Cunningham himself (pp. 184–89) and has been reasserted—with variation and differing degrees of certitude—over the years: J. F. Fleet, "Notes on Three Buddhist Inscriptions," *JRAS* (1905) 681–91; W. Geiger, *The Mahāvaṃsa or the Great Chronicle of Ceylon* (London: 1912) xix–xx; E. Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature* (Serie Orientale Roma VIII) (Roma: 1956) 14–15; Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 333–34; etc. Such identifications have not, however, gone entirely unquestioned, and recently Yamazaki has presented an argument which has put the question of the "council" and the identification of the monks named on the Sāñcī area deposits in an entirely new light: G. Yamazaki, "The Spread of Buddhism in the Mauryan Age—with Special Reference to the Mahinda Legend," *Acta Asiatica* 43 (1982) 1–16. It is, moreover, important to note that even if we were to accept that *some* of the monks whose remains were deposited in stūpas at Sāñcī, Sonāri and Andher were connected with a "Third Council," the majority were not. At least seven of the ten monks—like the named monks at Bedsā, Bhājā, Kānheri, Mathurā and Amarāvatī—are completely unknown in the so-called "Great Tradition," and could only have been local monastic "saints."

62. J. Marshall, A. Foucher & N. G. Majumdar, *The Monuments of Sāñchī* (Delhi: 1940) Vol. I, 294.

63. For some more recent remarks on Kākanāva/Sāñcī see P. H. L. Eggermont, "Sanchi-Kākanāda and the Hellenistic and Buddhist Sources," in *Deyadharma. Studies in Memory of Dr. D. C. Sircar*, ed. G. Bhattacharya (Delhi: 1986) 11–27.

64. Marshall et al, *The Monuments of Sāñchī*, Vol. I, 294.

65. Majumdar's interpretation of *siha*, which he says "can be equated with Arddha-Māgadhī *seha*, corresponding to Sanskrit *śaiksha*," remains, however, problematic; see below n. 99.

66. For the inscriptions from Sāñcī Stūpa no. 2 see Marshall et al, *The Monuments of Sāñchī*, Vol. I, 363–75, nos. 631–719, nos. xvi–xxi, nos. 803, 812, 819–21.

67. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 474.

68. Schopen, "Burial 'ad sanctos' and the Physical Presence of the Buddha," 203–11; G. Schopen, "On the Buddha and his Bones: the Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions of Nāgārjunikoṇḍa," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988) 527–37, esp. 530–33.

69. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinayapiṭaka," 268.

70. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinayapiṭaka," 269.

71. M. Bénisti, "Observations concernant le stūpa n° 2 de Sāñcī," *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 4 (1986) 165–70, esp. 165.

72. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 119; 129.

73. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 112–13.

74. For references see ns. 1 & 2 above.

75. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India*, 107; 191.

76. Very little work has been done on the Buddhist caves at Sudhagarh, the primary source of information on them being O. C. Kail, "The Buddhist Caves at Sudhagarh," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, ns. 41/42 (1966/67) 184–89, figs. 1–7. Kail assigns the caves to a period ranging from 200 B.C.E. to 150 B.C.E. (p. 188).

77. H. Cousens, *An Account of the Caves at Nadsur and Karsambla* (Bombay: 1891) esp. 3–4 & pl. II; see also J. E. Abbott, "Recently Discovered Buddhist Caves at Nadsur and Nenavali in the Bhor State, Bombay Presidency," *Indian Antiquary* 20 (1891) 121–23. Cousens (p. 10) says: "…I think we cannot be far wrong in ascribing to these caves as early a date as Bhājā or Kondāne, i.e., about B.C. 200"; Dehejia, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples*, 118, assigns the sculpture at Nadsur to "the period of Sanchi II," but the inscriptions to "around 70 B.C." (p. 153).

78. Deshpande, "The Rock-cut Caves of Pitalkhorā in the Deccan," esp. 78–79; see also W. Willetts, "Excavation at Pitalkhorā in the Aurangabad District of Maharashtra," *Oriental Art*, ns. 7.2 (1961) 59–65; Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, 174—the latter says: "Curiously enough, all the four caves of this group are associated with *stūpas*…evidently made in memory of some distinguished resident-monks as at Bhājā."

79. A. Cunningham, *The Bhilsa Topes; or Buddhist Monuments of Central India*, 211–20.

80. A. H. Longhurst, "The Buddhist Monuments at Guntupalle, Kistna District," *Annual Report of the Archaeological Department, Southern Circle, Madras, for the Year 1916–17* (Madras: 1917) 30–36 & pls. xvii–xxvii, esp 31, 35; see also R. Sewell, "Buddhist Remains at Guntupalle," *JRAS* (1887) 508–11; A. Bareau, "Le site bouddhique de Guntupalle," *Arts Asiatiques* 23 (1971) 69–78 & figs. 1–32. Professor Bareau noted that "de tels alignements de petits *stūpa* se retrouvent sur d'autres sites bouddhiques," and evidence for the mortuary character of these *stūpas* is accumulating: see A. Ghosh (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1961–62—A Review* (New Delhi: 1964) 97; B. B. Lal (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1968–69—A Review* (New Delhi: 1971) 64. For other results of recent work on the site see I. K. Sarma, "Epigraphical Discoveries at Guntupalli," *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 5 (1975) 48–61 & pls. i–ix (pl. i gives a good photograph of the rows of stūpas on the middle terrace); Sarma, *Studies in Early Buddhist Monuments and Brāhmī Inscriptions of Āndhradeśa*, 57–91.

81. See, for convenience's sake, M. Venkataramayya, *Śrāvastī* (New Delhi: 1981) 15.

82. T. Bloch suggested that "the funeral mounds in Lauriya go back to the pre-Mauryan epoch," and hinted at a "Vedic" connection (T. Bloch, "Excavations at Lauriya," *ARASI* 1906–07 (Calcutta: 1909) 119–26. Bloch's views are still occasionally referred to (e.g., P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* Vol.IV (Poona: 1953) 234, 254), in spite of the fact that Majumdar's later work on the site (N. G. Majumdar, "Explorations at Lauriya-Nandangarh," *ARASI* 1935–36 (Delhi: 1938) 55–66 & pls. xix–xxi; N. G. Majumdar, "Excavations at Lauriya Nandangarh," *ARASI* 1936–37 (Delhi: 1940) 47–50 & pls. xxi–xxiv) "proved that many of the mounds at Lauriya are Buddhist in character, enclosing *stūpas*" (so G. N. Das, "Coins from Indian Megaliths," *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 8 (1947) 208; cf. Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, 83–85). A good survey of work on the site may be had in J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, "South-East Asian Architecture and the Stūpa of Nandangarh," *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1956) 279–90; esp. 281 ff.

83. For both *stūpas* and Longhurst's comments see A. H. Longhurst, *The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, Madras Presidency* (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, no. 54) (Delhi: 1938) 20–21. There may as well be a third *stūpa* of this type at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa—see A. Ghosh (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1955–56—A Review* (New Delhi: 1956) 25, under Site XXV.

84. J. H. Marshall, "Excavations at Saheṭh-Maheṭh," , *ARASI* 1910–11 (Calcutta: 1914) 4.

85. A. Ghosh (ed.), *Indian Archaeology 1955–56—A Review* (New Delhi: 1956) 9; see also G. R. Sharma, "Excavations at Kauśāmbī, 1949–55," *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* 16 (Leyden: 1958) xlii–xliii.

86. J. Marshall, *Taxila. An Illustrated Account of Archaeological Excavations carried out at Taxila under the Orders of the Government of India between the Years 1913 and 1934* (Cambridge: 1951) Vol. I, 246; 335; 361; J. Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization. Being an Official Account of Archaeological Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro carried out by the Government of India between the Years 1922 and 1927* (London:

1931) Vol. I, 120–21 —see also R. D. Banerji, *Mohenjodaro. A Forgotten Report* (Varanasi: 1984) 59 ff. The burial deposits in what has been taken to be a Buddhist monastery at Mohenjo-daro may also be connected with the local monastic dead, but the interpretation of this data remains controversial.

87. cf. G. Schopen, "Archeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism," *History of Religions* 31 (1991) 1–23.

88. Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," 96–98; G. Schopen, "Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism," in *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religions in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua*, ed. G. Schopen & K. Shinohara (Oakville: 1991) 187–201.

89. See H. Oldenberg, *Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde* (Berlin: 1881) 384 n. 3; H. Oldenberg, *Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order*, trans. W. Hoey (London: 1882) 376 & note (which contains a significant addition); T. W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas* (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI) (Oxford: 1900) xliv–xlv; but see too G. Schopen, "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20 (1992) in the press.

90. D. M. Miller & D. C. Wertz, *Hindu Monastic Life. The Monks and Monasteries of Bhubaneswar* (Montreal: 1976) 100, table 8.

91. See most recently—although limited to Pāli sources—G. D. Bond, "The Arahant: Sainthood in Theravāda Buddhism," in *Sainthood. Its Manifestations in World Religions*, ed. R. Kieckhefer & D. G. Bond (Berkeley: 1988) 140–71.

92. Marshall et al, *The Monuments of Sāñchī*, Vol. I 290 n. 5.

93. Mehendale, *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*, 169 (§294); 166 (§290 b, i).

94. T. W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede, *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (London: 1921–25) 680.

95. F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: 1953) 554.

96. These references to "ascetic" monks—one specifically called a "forest-dweller"—may suggest that what has been noted recently in regard to such monks in modern Thailand and Sri Lanka may have a long history; see S. J. Tambiah, *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets* (Cambridge: 1984); S. J. Tambiah, "The Buddhist Arahant: Classical Paradigm and Modern Thai Manifestations," in *Saints and Virtues*, ed. J. S. Hawley (Berkeley: 1987) 111–26; M. Carrithers, *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka. An Anthropological and Historical Study* (Delhi: 1983); etc.

97. There are also epigraphical references to the Mahāyāna, or related to what we call "the Mahāyāna," which almost certainly predate the Kānheri labels—at least two at Kānheri itself; see G. Schopen, "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21 (1979) 1–19; G. Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit," *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 37–43; G. Schopen, "The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India," *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 10.2 (1987) 99–134; G. Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," 211 n. 49.

98. Marshall et al, *The Monuments of Sāñchī*, Vol. I, 294.

99. Elsewhere at Sāñcī itself we find *sijhā-* for *śaikṣā-*, and *sejha-* for *śaikṣa-*, which suggests a development different from that suggested by Majumdar—see Mehendale, *Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits*, 151 (§267.b, §286.a iv); also von Hinüber, *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 114–16 (§§232–36).

100. See Schopen, "The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya," 97 n. 32 for a detailed tabulation.

101. Marshall, *A Guide to Sanchi*, 2; H. P. Ray, "Bhārhut and Sanchi—Nodal Points in a Commercial Interchange," in *Archaeology and History. Essays in Memory of Shri A. Ghosh*, ed. B. M. Pande & B. D. Chattopadhyaya (Delhi: 1987) Vol. II, 621–29—it should be noted that Ray's figures and remarks concerning the donors at both Sāñcī and Bhārhut are unreliable; they are entirely based on Lüders *List* and do not take into account the much fuller and more complete collections of inscriptions from both sites published after 1912.

102. This is the definition of *navakammikas* given by J. Ph. Vogel, "Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda," *EI* 20 (1929–30) 30.

103. M. Njammasch, "Der *navakammika* und seine Stellung in der Hierarchie der buddhistischen Klöster", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1 (1974) 279–93, esp. 293; but see also P. V. B. Karunatillake, "The Administrative Organization of the Nālandā Mahāvihāra from Sigillary Evidence," *The Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* 6 (1980) 57–69, esp. 61–63; G. Fussman, "Numismatic and Epigraphic Evidence for the Chronology of Early Gandharan Art," in *Investigating Indian Art*, ed. W. Lobo & M. Yaldiz (Berlin: 1987) 67–88, esp. 80–81 and the sources cited there.

104. H. Lüders, *Bhārhut Inscriptions* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 2.2), ed. E. Waldschmidt & M. A. Mehendale (Ootacamund: 1963) 38 (A59).

105. Sivaramamurti, *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*, 290 (no. 69).

106. Vogel, "Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda," 22;24 (for an important correction to Vogel's reading of the "Detached Pillar Inscription H," see K. A. Nilakanta Sastri & K. Gopalachari, "Epigraphic Notes," *EI* 24 (1937–38) 279, VI); 17.

107. See above p.

108. See above p.

109. See, for convenience sake, A. Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapiṭaka et les vinayapiṭaka anciens: II les derniers mois, le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*, t.II (Paris: 1971) 265–88.

110. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, 44, 243-3-5 ff; cf. J. Przyluski, "Le partage des reliques du buddha," *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4 (1935–36) 341–67, esp. 347 ff.

111. The account of Śāriputra's death occurs at L. Feer, *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, Part V (London: 1898) 161–63, and is translated in F. L. Woodward, *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, Part V (London: 1930) 140–43. The text as it appears in Pāli has a close parallel in the Tibetan *Kṣudrakavastu* (Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, 44, 93-1-7 ff) as well. The textual situation for the Pāli version is complicated. In the text as printed by Feer, when Cunda announces Śāriputra's death he says: *āyasmā bhante sāriputto parinibbuto idam assa pattacīvaran*

ti, "Sir, the Venerable Sāriputta has passed away—here are his robe and bowl."
This reading represents the Sri Lankan mss., but Feer notes that one of his Bur-
mese mss. has... *idam assa pattacīvaraṃ idaṃ dhātuparibhāvanan ti*, and Woodward's
note suggests this reading is characteristic of the Burmese mss. What
dhātuparibhāvana means is not immediately obvious, but it almost certainly con-
tains a reference to relics. In fact, the text of the *Saṃyutta* on which Buddhaghosa
wrote his commentary—the *Sāratthappakāsinī*—also appears to have had a refer-
ence to relics. Buddhaghosa, citing the text, says: *idam assa pattacīvaran ti ayam
assa hi paribhoga-patto. idam dhātu-parissāvanan ti evaṃ ekekaṃ ācikkhi* (F. L. Wood-
ward, *Sārattha-Pakāsinī*, Vol. 3 (London: 1937) 221.28): "'This is his robe and
bowl' [means] this is indeed the bowl [actually] used by him. 'This is the [or
'a' or 'his'] water strainer [full] of relics'—he described them thus one by one."
Where the Burmese mss. have the difficult *dhātu-paribhāvana*, the text cited by
Buddhaghosa had, then, the more immediately intelligible *dhātu-parissāvana*,
"water strainer [full] of relics." The latter, in fact, may well represent a "correc-
tion" introduced by a scribe who also had had difficulty with the meaning of
-paribhāvana. The Tibetan version, though it has nothing corresponding to either
-paribhāvana or *-parissāvana*, also clearly refers to relics. When Sāriputra's death
is announced it is done so in the following words: *btsun pa śā ri'i bu ni yongs su mya
ngan las 'das te / de'i ring bsrel dang / lhung bzed dang / chos gos kyang 'di lags so /* : "The
Venerable Sāriputra has passed away. These are his relics and his bowl and
robe." All of this will require fuller study to sort out, but it seems virtually cer-
tain that the Pāli text as we have it is defective. It appears that in the only
canonical Pāli account of the death of Sāriputra reference to the preservation of
his relics has either dropped out, or been written out, of the Sri Lankan mss. of
the *Saṃyutta*.

    112. What follows here is based on the Tibetan translation—see above n. 3.
    113. For references see above ns. 1 & 2.