

WIENER STUDIEN ZUR TIBETOLOGIE UND BUDDHISMUSKUNDE
HEFT 66

INDICA ET TIBETICA

Festschrift für Michael Hahn

Zum 65. Geburtstag
von Freunden und Schülern
überreicht

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
KONRAD KLAUS UND JENS-UWE HARTMANN



ARBEITSKREIS FÜR TIBETISCHE UND BUDDHISTISCHE STUDIEN UNIVERSITÄT WIEN
WIEN 2007

WIENER STUDIEN
ZUR TIBETOLOGIE UND BUDDHISMUSKUNDE

GEGRÜNDET VON
ERNST STEINKELLNER

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
BIRGIT KELLNER, HELMUT KRASSER,
HELMUT TAUSCHER

HEFT 66

WIEN 2007

ARBEITSKREIS FÜR TIBETISCHE UND BUDDHISTISCHE STUDIEN
UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

INDICA ET TIBETICA

Festschrift für Michael Hahn

Zum 65. Geburtstag
von Freunden und Schülern
überreicht

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON
KONRAD KLAUS UND JENS-UWE HARTMANN

WIEN 2007

ARBEITSKREIS FÜR TIBETISCHE UND BUDDHISTISCHE STUDIEN
UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Verzeichnis der Schriften von Michael Hahn	13
ANĀLAYO	
Who said it? Authorship Disagreements between Pāli and Chinese Discourses	25
NALINI BALBIR	
À propos des hymnes jaina multilingues (sanskrit, prakrit, per- san)	39
CHRISTINE CHOJNACKI	
Les dialogues dans le <i>Kuvalayamālā</i> . L'inventivité d'Uddyo- tana au service de la foi jaina	63
RAHUL PETER DAS	
On the Pāda-End Break in Ślokas of Āyurvedic Saṃhitās	85
SIGLINDE DIETZ	
The <i>Saptasūryodayasūtra</i>	93
DRAGOMIR DIMITROV	
Ratnākaraśānti's <i>Chandoratnākara</i> and Tathāgatadāsa's <i>Chandomāṅikya</i>	113
AKIMICHI EDA	
Freigebigkeit in Bezug auf Frauen?! Eine Untersuchung zu den Quellen der <i>Ratnāvalī</i> des Nāgārjuna	139
GERHARD EHLERS	
Sieben Seher, sieben Wasser	145
FRANZ-KARL EHRHARD	
A Short History of the <i>g. Yu thog snying thig</i>	151
HELMUT EIMER	
Die Liste der Mahāyāna-Texte im tibetischen <i>Nandimitra- Avadāna</i>	171
KARL-HEINZ GOLZIO	
Śiva nur noch auf Platz Zwei!? Der Buddhismus des Angkor- Herrschers Jayavarman VII. und die Integration des Hinduis- mus	183

ALBRECHT HANISCH	
New Evidence of Aśvaghōṣa's <i>Sūtrālaṃkāra</i> : Quotations from the <i>mDo sde rgyan</i> of gZan la phan pa'i dbyaṅs in the Tibetan Version of Dharmakīrti's <i>Jātakamālāṭīkā</i>	193
JÜRGEN HANNEDER	
Vasubandhus <i>Viṃśatikā</i> 1–2 anhand der Sanskrit- und tibeti- schen Fassungen	207
PAUL HARRISON	
The Case of the Vanishing Poet. New Light on Śāntideva and the <i>Śikṣā-samuccaya</i>	215
JENS-UWE HARTMANN	
Ein Schauspielfragment aus Afghanistan	249
MONIKA HORSTMANN	
Caukasrāms Vermächtnis	259
TAKASHI IWATA	
Dharmakīrti's Interpretation of the Word <i>iṣṭa</i> in the Definition of the Thesis	275
PETER KHOROCHE	
On the Vocabulary of Ārya-Śūra's <i>Jātakamālā</i>	289
SIGNE KIRDE	
Wieviele Wirkungen hat Schlangengift? Bemerkungen zur Toxikologie im Schauspiel <i>Bhagavadajjuka</i>	295
KONRAD KLAUS	
Zu der formelhaften Einleitung der buddhistischen Sūtras . . .	309
KLAUS-DIETER MATHES	
The Ontological Status of the Dependent (<i>paratantra</i>) in the <i>Samdhinirmocanasūtra</i> and the <i>Vyākhyāyukti</i>	323
MAREK MEJOR	
A Tibetan Prose Version of Kṣemendra's <i>Bodhisattvāvadāna-</i> <i>kalpalatā</i> X: <i>Garbhāvakraṅtyavadāna</i>	341
ADELHEID METTE	
Buddhistische Sanskritstrophen aus dem Rotkuppelraum der Ming-öi von Qizil: Proben aus der Fragmentsammlung SHT 25	351
ULRICH PAGEL	
Stūpa Festivals in Buddhist Narrative Literature	369

BHIKKHU PĀSĀDIKA	
The <i>Ekottarāgama</i> Parallel to <i>Jātaka</i> 77	395
ULRIKE ROESLER	
Materialien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des <i>mDzañs blun</i> : Die Selbstaufopferung des Prinzen Sujāta	405
LAMBERT SCHMITHAUSEN	
Zur Frage, ob ein Bodhisattva unter bestimmten Vorausset- zungen in einer neutralen Geisteshaltung (<i>avyākṛta-citta</i>) töten darf	423
JOHANNES SCHNEIDER	
Candragomins <i>Āyurvardhanavidhi</i> . Ein Ritual zur Erzielung eines langen Lebens	441
PETER SCHWIEGER	
A Glance at the Problematic Relations Between Different Buddhist Traditions in Tibet	453
FRANCESCO SFERRA	
Fragments of Puṇḍarīka's <i>Paramārthasevā</i>	459
JAYANDRA SONI	
<i>Anekāntavāda</i> Revisited — for <i>doṣas</i>	477
ULRIKE STARK	
Makkhanlāl's <i>Sukhsagar</i> (1846/47): The First Complete Ver- sion of the <i>Bhāgavata Purāṇa</i> in Modern Hindi Prose?	491
ROLAND STEINER	
Das „dreifache Leiden“ in <i>Sāṃkhyakārikā</i> 1	507
MARTIN STRAUBE	
Die Adaptation von Kṣemendras <i>Sudhanakinnaryavadāna</i> im <i>Bhadrakalpāvadāna</i>	521
RAFFAELE TORELLA	
Studies on Utpaladeva's <i>Īśvarapratyabhijñā-vivṛti</i> . Part II: What is Memory?	539
HELGA UEBACH	
Geheime Wörter und Zeichen aus dem Kreis der Heruka- Tantras	565
CLAUS VOGEL	
The Propitiation of the Planets in Indian Ritual and Allied Literature with Special Reference to Colours and Flowers . . .	587

NOBUYUKI YAMAGIWA	
Vinaya Manuscripts: State of the Field	607

Stūpa Festivals in Buddhist Narrative Literature¹

ULRICH PAGEL, London

Buddhism is not a religion readily associated with merriment or celebrations. Protestant values dominating Anglo-Saxon Buddhology during its formative years in the 19th cent. created an image of Buddhist communal life wholly driven by a fervent longing for deliverance. The path that led to such state of awakening was perceived rooted in self-denial, austerities and withdrawal from all worldly pleasures. To be sure, this is what the texts of the Pāli tradition, back then as today, seem to demand of all Buddhist practitioners. During the last 30 years or so, most scholars have come to realise that the picture mapped in the literary sources does not tell the whole story. Most of us accept now that the accounts preserved in the scriptures give only an incomplete, distorted vision of Buddhism in ancient India. Modern Buddhology recognises that many aspects of the Saṅgha's communal life are only partially documented, if at all. In order to gain a glimpse of those 'hidden' features, we have learned to read 'between the lines' and to turn increasingly to archaeological and historical sources, sometimes with spectacular results. But what does all this have to do with stūpa festivals? Despite the efforts of its spiritual elite, Buddhism never managed to isolate itself from the world. In fact, the more we learn about its monastic governance, the better we appreciate the dexterity with which the Saṅgha negotiated its role and status within Brahmanical society.

For centuries, travellers visiting the subcontinent commented on the large number of communal religious festivals permeating India's multi-layered social fabric. Rites of passage within the family unit, celebrations held in honour of countless gods, commemorations of great battles recorded in legends of distant times, festivals instituted by the ruling classes to assert and legitimate their hold on power, social gatherings aimed at reinforcing the cohesion of local kinship groups have all long been a defining charac-

¹ I would like to thank the editors of this Festschrift, J.-U. HARTMANN and K. KLAUS, for their valuable comments and corrections that helped me turn this paper into a much better product. Even though the preparation of felicitation volumes of this type tends to be laborious and very time-consuming, it is never without gratitude.

teristic of Indian civilisation.² The Saṅgha soon realised that it could ill afford to ignore these events and found ways to advance its own cause by tapping into their economic potential. Communal celebrations always attract commercial interest harnessed by those quick enough to spot the opportunity. Not long after the demise of its founder, monks began to insti-

² See, for example, J.J. MEYER, *Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation*, Leipzig 1937; J. AUBOYER, *Daily Life in Ancient India from approximately 200 BC to AD 700*, London 1965 (esp. pp. 117–131 on construction rituals and pp. 143–214 on religious festivals); G.R. WELBON & G.E. YOCUM, *Religious Festivals in South India and Sri Lanka*, New Delhi 1982. Some useful material is also found in A.C. MUKHERJEE, *Hindu Fasts and Feasts*, Gurgaon 1918 (repr. 1989). For the *Purāṇas*, consult V.S. AGRAWALA, *Ancient Indian Folk Cults*, Varanasi 1970. I would like to thank my colleague A. MALINAR for these references.

The last publication contains a number of interesting, if largely unsubstantiated, observations about the origins of the term *maha* in Vedic literature (pp. 7–9). It features also a section called ‘Stūpamaha and Caityamaha’ (pp. 132–138). However, apart from a useful reference to the Marichavathṭhivihāramaha chapter of the *Mahāvamsa* (p. 135), AGRAWALA adds little of significance to the discussion. In fact, most of his account is dominated by haphazard comments about stūpa worship and barely touches on festivals. More recently, anthropological research has produced a great deal of material on Hindu festivals in modern and pre-modern India. Since these focus mainly on contemporary issues and deal with non-Buddhist ceremonies, they do not yield much relevant information about stūpa festivals in ancient India.

The best-informed and most resourceful study of Buddhist festivals to date is a paper delivered by G. SCHOPEN on the occasion of the ‘Life of the Buddha’ conference held at McMaster University (Toronto) in October 2003. In this paper, entitled: “Celebrating Odd Moments: The ‘Biography of the Buddha’ in some Mūlasarvāstivādin Cycles of Religious Festivals,” SCHOPEN examined ten festivals cited in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* and identified their origins in events that took place during the life of Śākyamuni. To my knowledge, this paper, in spite of its importance, has not yet been published. It came to my attention only a few days before submitting the final draft of this article. Apart from the odd reference in the footnotes, I was therefore unable to feed his findings into my study. In any event, because SCHOPEN focuses on festivals that sprang from key events in the life of Śākyamuni Buddha (which are outside the purview of my investigation) while I examine primarily stūpa festivals, the overlap is minimal. Much of SCHOPEN’s paper is devoted to a passage in the Nidāna section of the UttG (v.4) which contains important information about the festivals of the Top-knot, Fifth Year, Sixth Year, Hut and the Great Festival. He touches also on the Toyikā Festival, on the Festival of Indra’s Visit to the Buddha and on the little-known festival celebrated in honour of the nāga kings Girika and Sundara, but apart from the well-known encounter between Indra and Śākyamuni, reaches no firm conclusion about their location in the Buddha’s biography. If memory serves, versions of this talk were delivered on various occasions in Europe and the US. Although, as a provisional and therefore only partially referenced pre-publication draft, it is not ready for citation, because it has been widely circulated, I draw attention to its general content when relevant or helpful.

tute festivals in order to commemorate the key events in the life of the Buddha. More festivals were added as time went by, some in response to local customs, others to secure the upkeep of the monasteries and their estates.³

³ Buddhist canonical literature contains a surprisingly small number of references to festivals. Most of them are found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* but even here it is rare to find detailed accounts of their organisation and purpose. Apart from stūpa festivals, the following are the best documented celebrations: the Festival of Toyikā (*Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GM I 73.17f., esp. 179.1f.; VinV Kha 155v5–169v6, esp. 162v4f.; *Cīvaravastu*, GM II 143.16–144.12; VinV Ga 113r6–114v2), the Festival of Indra's Visit to the Buddha first celebrated on Mt Vaidehaka (KṣuV Tha 234r2–235r2), the Festival of the nāga kings Girika and Sundara (VinVibh Ja 221r1–230v1, esp. 224r4–v3; VinV Ka 18v5–23v3), a group of five festivals celebrating formative events in the life of Śākyamuni Buddha: Festival of the Fifth Year (*lo lña'i dus ston: pañcavārṣikamaha*), Festival of the Sixth Year (*lo drug kyi dus ston: ṣaḍvārṣikamaha*), Festival of the Shaving of the Top-knot (*gtsug phud 'dreg pa'i dus ston: cūḍa...maha*), Festival of the (Birthing) House (*gnas khañ gi dus ston: layanamaha* or perhaps, according to SCHOPEN 2003, *kuṭimaha* for *gtsug lag khañ gi dus ston* elsewhere) and the Great Festival (*dus ston chen po: mahāmaha*). The key passage that establishes the occasions which inspired these five festivals is found in the UttG (Pa 140r2–6; see also: VinVibh Cha 58v2–59v5, esp. 59v3). This passage, and several other *vinaya* episodes bearing on these biographical festivals, have been discussed by G. SCHOPEN (2003). Individual references to these festivals are found in the KṣuV Da 317r2–6, 319r2–v4 (Festival of the Fifth Year), Da 295v7–301r3, esp. 297r7, 298r6, 298v4, 299v1, 299v7, 300r2, 300r5, 300r7, 300v4, 300v5 (Great Festival) and UttG Pa 176r1–177v1; 177v1–178v3, 178v3–179r3; 179r3–180r1 (Great Festival). Guṇaprabha, in his *Vinayasūtra* (VinS), reminds the monks of the need to conduct festivals that celebrate the Buddha's birth (*jāti*), the shaving of his hair (*jaṭā*) at the age of five, the putting aside of the top-knot (*cūḍā*) at the age of six and the enlightenment (*bodhi*) (VinS 144, §§498–500; according to SCHOPEN (2003) the Tibetan conflated *jaṭā* and *cūḍā*: VinS-T 99v5). The same source contains two other references to public celebrations (104, §295 (*utsava*), §314 (*maha*); VinS-T 72r1, 72r4). One of them is also recorded in the *Lalitavistara* (ed. LEFMANN, Halle 1902: 225.11–226.13; see also p. 270.10f. for another festival).

In addition, the *vinaya* records a handful of festivals that might have been non-Buddhist in origin since they are not obviously tied to any event in the Buddhist calendar. This includes, for example, the frequently cited Festival of the People (*'jig rten kyi dus ston*). The *vinaya* marks its celebration with a public holiday when labourers lay down their tools (VinVibh Ca 146r1–148r6, esp. 146r7; VinV Ņa 105r2–107v5). Next, there are a number of references to festivals that were held on rocky hills (*ri brags*). The occasion of these celebrations is not explained, but their context indicates that they were probably not festivals organised by the Saṅgha (VinVibh Ca 159r1–161r1, esp. 160v2; Ņa 52v7–55r3, esp. 53v3; Ņa 57r2–59v7, esp. 57v4f.). Because the *vinaya* does not define the content of these festivals, it is also possible that it simply sought to establish the preferred venue for public celebrations, barren hills, without vegetation. More work needs to be done here. Next, I met with the Festival of the White Lily (*ku mu da'i dus ston: kumudamaha*), cited in the VinVibh (Ja 86r1–6), and with the Festival of the Drinking Bowl (*khar phor gyi dus ston: kāṃśimaha*) included in the *Udrāyaṇāvadana* (NOBEL 1955: 41.25–42.7) but also found in

Most of what we know about Buddhist monasteries and the ways in which their inhabitants came to terms with their new life stems from the monastic code (*vinaya*). Although we still possess only an incomplete picture of monasticism in ancient India, it is now widely accepted that many of its rules were shaped by pressures entering monastic governance from the values and customs of the dominant brahmanical communities which provided recruits for the Saṅgha. The principal source that records this interaction and documents the tension between the two communities is of course the Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya*. About 20 years ago, G. SCHOPEN began to lift this code out of obscurity and revealed a matrix of cultural pressures, monastic economic ambitions and political constraints that had hitherto escaped scrutiny. That *vinaya* is also the starting point for this investigation. In an article which examined how Buddhist monasteries generated revenue to sustain their wide-ranging religious activities, SCHOPEN identified festivals performed at stūpas dedicated to Śāriputra and other direct disciples as one of the few opportunities where monks were permitted to acquire personal property (SCHOPEN 2004: 306f.). The *vinaya* allows for only a small part to be reserved for the Saṅgha or to be invested into stūpa maintenance:

“The Blessed One said: Those gifts [offered to the stūpa of Śāriputra] that are the ‘first fruit’ offerings are to be given to the ‘Image that sits in the shade of the Jambu Tree’ [the Buddha]. Moreover, a small part is to be put aside for the repair of the stūpa of Śāriputra. The remainder is to be divided by the assembly of monks.” (KṣuV Tha 247r3, tr. SCHOPEN 2004: 307).

Guṇaprabha, in the VinS, goes even further arguing that irrespective of the occasion monks were always allowed to appropriate offerings placed at

the VinVibh (Ña 127v7–128r5). Finally, the KṣuV (Da 284r3–285v5, esp. 285r7, 285v3f.) records an odd celebration that is specifically said not to be a festival (*dus ston ma yin pa'i mchod ston*). Since our source does not elaborate, I cannot make out what this particular event is all about, in particular since *mchod ston* is elsewhere used as a synonym for *dus ston*. In his discussion of *dus ston* and *mchod ston*, SCHOPEN (2003) offers two interpretations. He suggests that *mchod ston* could either be a simple variant translation for *maha*, or that it might constitute the honorific equivalent for *dus ston*. At least indirectly, our passage in the KṣuV would seem to support such general synonymy since the text appears to talk about a special celebration (*mchod ston*) which, in this instance, is not the usual festival (*dus ston*). In other words, we are looking here at the exception to a rule.

Since our sources rarely concern themselves with the organisation of the festivals they cite, it is difficult to get any sense of their role in the economic life of the Saṅgha. We know from the *vinaya* that festivals were a constant burden for the monks in charge of logistics, including the provision of food and accommodation, but their precise impact on communal monastic life remains yet to be explored.

disciple stūpas: “That which is given to the stūpa of a disciple belongs indeed to his fellow monks.”⁴ A key event at which disciple stūpas attracted offering were festivals commemorating their lives. These would typically be held at their stūpas towards the end of the summer retreat. The Saṅgha had every reason to promote such stūpa festivals because they constituted a rare opportunity for monks to augment their personal wealth.⁵ Even kings played a role in the preparation of stūpa festivals. In order to secure maximum attendance, they waived taxes and tolls for those who wished to join the festivities. King Prasenajit of Kośala was the first king to support such celebrations. When he heard that Anāthapiṇḍada had received permission from the Buddha to institute a stūpa festival for Śāriputra, he thought,

“‘It is excellent! I too should help in that,’ and having the bell sounded, declared: ‘Sirs, city dwellers who live in Śrāvastī, and the multitudes of men who have come together from other places, hear this: ‘At the time when the festival of the stūpa of Śāriputra occurs, for those who have come bringing merchandise there is no tax, no toll, no transportation fee. Therefore, they must be allowed to pass freely here.’” (KṣuV Tha 246v5–247r1, tr. SCHOPEN 2004: 306)

The monks’ response to this opportunity of personal enrichment is predictable. According to Fa-hsien, these festivals were celebrated in all Indian Buddhist communities every year at least once:

“Wherever monks live, they build stūpas in honour of the saints of Sariputra, Maudgalaputra and Ananda ... A month after the summer retirement, all devout families collect offerings for the monks while the monks hold a great

⁴ VinS 143, §470: *sabrahmacāriṇāṃ śrāvakastūpe niryātitasyesitvam* (read *śrāvakastūpe niryātitasyeśitvam*). VinS-T 99r6 reads: *ñan thos kyi mchod rten la phul ba ni tshañs pa mtshuñs par spyod pa rnams dbaṅ ba ñid yin no*. Tr. SCHOPEN 2004: 310.

⁵ The Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* contains several passages that give us a glimpse of the scale of the offerings received at festivals. According to the UttG, where most of them are found, their value was so vast that, at first, the Saṅgha did not know how to administer them effectively and thus embarked on their sale (Pa 176r1–7). Festivals organised by the Saṅgha were so lavishly endowed that they attracted frequently thieves. One such theft is recorded in the UttG and led to the appointment of an officer responsible for the safekeeping of monastic property (Pa 171r1–177v1). Another episode, contained in the VinVibh, records a stūpa festival that was plundered by a band of 500 robbers (Ja 267v7–268r7). The scale of the assault would suggest that the thieves had reason to expect rich pickings. In addition to the standard donations of precious metals, jewels, lamps, ointments, etc., some lay donors went a step further to offer their wives and children (UttG Pa 179v3–180r1). Again, initially, this led to consternation among the monks, but was soon resolved when the donor proposed to pay a cash-ransom in return for his family. This was readily accepted even though it entailed a debate within the Saṅgha about the appropriate level of payment per head (Pa 179v5 f.).

assembly to expound the Law. The assembly at an end, they offer all manner of incense and flowers at the stūpa of Sariputra. ... The lives of Maudgala-putra and Kasyapa are also performed in this way.”⁶

From this and the preceding passages, we can surmise, I think, that stūpa festivals were primarily instituted to raise funds. The property offered on this occasion would either be distributed among individual monks when celebrated at disciple stūpas or to the Saṅgha in general when held at Tathāgata stūpas.⁷ Prior to SCHOPEN’s foray into the Mūlasarvāstivāda code, this aspect of stūpa worship had not been noted. Even BÉNISTI (1960) and BAREAU (1962) who contributed so much to our knowledge of the roles of stūpas in Buddhist religious life, and more recently KOTTKAMP (1992), failed to notice this function. But the passages from the *vinaya* raise as many questions as they answer. While they tell us about the purpose of one particular kind of stūpa festival, the *vinaya* does not discuss the activities that took place at such festivals. It does not disclose the scale of the celebrations, the occasions on which they were held, who organized and paid for them, who participated in them or how they are positioned within the larger context of stūpa worship. In fact, the *vinaya* does not tell us very much at all about stūpa festivals.

Apart from the passages cited by SCHOPEN and a handful of other, either minor or indirect, references in the *Cīvaravastu* (GM II 113.8; VinV Ga 99v3f.), KṣuV (Da 295v7–301r3) and VinS (144, §498f.; VinS-T 99v5), there is not a single, reasonably detailed, description of stūpa festivals anywhere in the *vinaya*. Also in Mahāyāna sūtras, which contain many hun-

⁶ Fa-hsien, *A Record of the Buddhist Countries*, [tr. by LI YUNG-HSI], Peking 1957: 36.

⁷ For two additional places where we learn about offerings given to (disciple) stūpas, consult VinS 63, §1766f., & 104, §289f. (VinS-T 43v4 & 71v6f.). Note, however, although supported by context, the text is abbreviated here and does not actually use the term *śrāvā-kastūpa*. The *vinaya* itself contains two further references to disciple stūpas: In the UttG (Na 260r7–261r3), monks are instructed in the correct distribution of stūpa property accumulated during the summer retreat. The position regarding property of disciple stūpas is very clear: “What was transferred (*bsnos par gyur ba*) to a disciple stūpa, such as (*pas na: iti*) the utensils of the deceased, should be distributed” (Na 260v5). It is perhaps no coincidence that here, as by Fa-hsien, disciple stūpas are cited in connection with the period of settled residence during the rainy season. Further below in the same text, disciple stūpas are cited alongside Buddha stūpas as repositories for items that monks have received on alms round, but are not allowed to keep, such as garlands, ointments and handles of fly whisks (*sbrañ yab kyī yu ba*) (Pa 274r6–v2). While the fate of these objects, once deposited at the stūpas, is not discussed, it is probably safe to assume that they too (or at least the proceeds from their sale) found eventually their way into private hands.

dreds of references to stūpas and stūpa worship, stūpa festivals do not feature even once. If they really played such an important role in Buddhist liturgical life, why is it that they are so poorly documented? Was Fa-hsien misled or are we looking in the wrong place? Perhaps we need to widen our purview beyond the *vinaya* and *sūtras* and consider other genres of Buddhist literature. A good starting point is the *avadāna* literature since this contains numerous references to stūpa worship.

While a good deal has been said about individual *avadāna* collections and the narratives they include, a study of the genre as a whole remains to be written. Early *avadāna* research was dominated by a small group of philologists who produced editions of some of the key texts. These included E.B. COWELL, R.A. NEIL, L. FEER and J.S. SPEYER. The first were COWELL and NEIL who published in 1886 a critical edition of the *Divyāvādāna* (DA), based on a Sanskrit manuscript discovered by B.H. HODGSON in Nepal. In roughly the same period, L. FEER produced translations of the *Avadānaśataka* (1891; AŚ) and *Karmaśataka* (not dated; KŚ), using mainly Tibetan manuscripts kept at the Bibliothèque Nationale. This translation of the KŚ was never published but is now available in Paris at the Bibliothèque de la Société Asiatique. FEER wrote also several articles about individual *avadāna* stories which appeared in the *Journal Asiatique*. A few years after FEER's translation of the AŚ, SPEYER produced a critical edition of its Sanskrit text (1906–1909). His introduction to this text remains one of best discussions of *avadāna* literature to date. A few years later, J. PRZYLUCKI published his landmark study of the *Aśokāvādāna*.⁸ This was the golden age of *avadāna* research. While scholars continued to work on *avadānas*, the focus shifted to other, often later, collections. J. W. DE JONG and M. MEJOR, for example, worked towards a critical edition of the *Bodhisattvāvādānakalpalatā*,⁹ J. TATELMAN explored the Yaśodharā narrative in the *Bhadrakalpāvādāna*¹⁰ and M. HAHN examined a number of *avadāna* legends in the larger context of Buddhist narrative literature, most notably

⁸ *La légende de l'empereur Aśoka*, Paris 1923.

⁹ DE JONG, J.W., *Textcritical Remarks on the Bodhisattvāvādānakalpalatā (Pallavas 42–108)*, Tokyo 1979 (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 2). — *Idem*, “The Sanskrit Text of the Śaḍḍantāvādāna,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 7 (1979), 281–297. — MEJOR, M., *Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvāvādānakalpalatā. Studies and Materials*, Tokyo 1992 (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 8).

¹⁰ *The Trials of Yaśodharā: A Study of the Bhadrakalpāvādāna, II–V*, 2 vols., PhD Dissertation, University of Oxford 1996.

those associated with the *Mahajjātakamālā*¹¹. Some revisited *avadānas* that had already been ‘placed on the map’ but added new perspectives,¹² or prepared detailed studies of individual narratives found in the larger collections.¹³ Still others focussed on specific themes within *avadāna* texts¹⁴ or produced survey papers sketching entire collections¹⁵. Even though our understanding of *avadāna* literature greatly advanced as a result of these studies, a lot remains to be done. For example, we still lack translations of the DA and KŚ. In addition, FEER’s translation of the AŚ, which was produced before SPEYER’s Sanskrit edition, no longer meets contemporary scholarly criteria. Finally, many of the individual texts included within the larger collections have never been studied in detail. This paper will demonstrate that *avadāna* narratives possess good potential to shine light on some of the issues that preoccupied Buddhist communities in ancient India.¹⁶

¹¹ “Ajātaśatrvavadāna: A Gopadatta Story from Tibet,” in *K. P. Jayaswal Commemoration Volume*, Patna 1981, 242–76. — *Der große Legendenkranz (Mahajjātakamālā): Eine mittelalterliche buddhistische Legendensammlung aus Nepal*, nach Vorarbeiten von G. BÜHNEMANN und M. HAHN hrsg. und eingel., Wiesbaden 1985 (Asiatische Forschungen 88). — “On the Affiliation of the Avadānaśataka,” paper read at the 32nd ICANAS, 25–30 August 1986 (The abstract of c. 500 words is published in the conference proceedings). — “Puṅyarāśyavadāna: Another Legend by Gopadatta?” in: *Frank-Richard Hamm Memorial Volume*, ed. H. EIMER, Bonn 1990 (Indica et Tibetica 21), 103–132. — *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*, 2nd ed., thoroughly rev. and enlarged, Tokyo 1992 (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series 1).

¹² E. g. STRONG, J., “The Transferring Gift: An Analysis of Devotional Acts of Offering in Buddhist Avadāna Literature,” *History of Religions* 18 (1979), 221–237. — *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna*, New Jersey 1983. — “The Buddhist Avadānists and the Elder Upagupta,” in: *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein*, ed. M. STRICKMANN, Brussels 1985 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 22), 862–881.

¹³ E. g. NOBEL 1955. — TATELMAN, J., *The Glorious Deeds of Purna: A Translation and Study of the Purnavadana*, Richmond 2000.

¹⁴ E. g. OKADA, M., *Dvāviṃśatyāvadānakathā: Ein mittelalterlicher buddhistischer Text zur Spendenfrömmigkeit*, Bonn 1993 (Indica et Tibetica 24). — LEWIS, T., “Contributions to the History of Buddhist Ritualism: A Mahāyāna Avadāna on Caitya Veneration from the Kathmandu Valley,” *Journal of Asian History* 28 (1994), 1–38.

¹⁵ E. g. BECHERT, H., “Über das Apadānabuch,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 2 (1958), 1–21. — CUTLER, S. M., “The Pāli Apadāna Collection,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 20 (1994), 1–42.

¹⁶ In addition to the *avadāna* passages about stūpa festivals discussed in this paper, there is a small number of references to stūpa festivals in the *Apadāna* book of the Pāli canon. Most of these are very short and reveal little that is not in our Sanskrit sources (e. g., AP 172 # 145). However, the *Apadāna* contains two references to other Buddhist festivals not found

Avadānas are important to the current investigation since they are the only texts outside the *vinaya* that refer to stūpa festivals.¹⁷ In total, I found 14 *avadāna* narratives that contain references to, or descriptions of, stūpa festivals. Of these, eight belong to the AŚ, five to the KŚ and one to the PBA. Although most of the descriptions are quite formulaic and might well go back to a single source, they record a wide range of customs that accompanied such celebrations. Because the festivals stand nowhere in the foreground of the narratives, but serve to frame the plot, we learn only bare outlines and much is left to the imagination. Yet, they yield a number of recurring themes that, judging by their frequency, were probably widespread features of stūpa festivals. Some of these match what we found in the *vinaya*, others add to what is discussed there. In some cases, they record traditions that are totally without parallel.

Since the *vinaya* was our point of departure, it is useful to recapitulate what it says about festivals. First, it speaks only of festivals associated with stūpas built in memory of Śāriputra. Fa-hsien reports that, by his time, festivals were celebrated at the stūpas of most of the Buddha's main disciples, including Ānanda, Maudgalyāyana and Kāśyapa but these are not mentioned in the *vinaya*. According to Guṇaprabha, the privilege of public commemoration at stūpas was not restricted to the Buddha's principal disciples. In his VinS, probably posting more of a general recommendation than a specific rule or requirement, he extends this prerogative to (all) "noble ones" (*ārya*).¹⁸ Now, because none of these three sources mentions festivals

in our Sanskrit sources. The Elder Vedikāraka is on record to have held a rail-festival (*vedikāya maham katvā*) (AP 171 # 143) and the Elder Dhammasañña (AP 249 # 304) participated in a "great Bodhi-(tree) festival" (*mahābodhimaho*). So far, no serious attempt has been made to interpret these accounts. WALTERS, in his study of stūpa construction and stūpa worship in early post-Aśokan India, brings together most of the relevant material (1997: 170f., n. 44) but does not analyse its content. Clearly, these passages will need to be considered when Buddhist festivals are eventually put on the map.

¹⁷ Even in the *vinaya*, which contains otherwise much interesting information about Buddhist festivals, we find only a handful of references to stūpa festivals. Apart from the passages cited above, I was able to locate only two other contexts where stūpa festivals appear: VinVibh Ņa 127v7–128r5 (cited from *Udrāyaṇāvadāna*), and Ja 267v7–268r7. But even here we learn practically nothing about the festival itself.

¹⁸ VinS 143, §469: *arhaty āṛṣastūpamaham*. VinS-T 99r5f. reads: 'phags pa la ni mchod rten gyi dus ston rigs so. SCHOPEN (2004: 315) follows the Tibetan and takes this sentence to mean: "In regard to Noble Ones, a festival for the stūpa is necessary." It would seem that the translators read *arhaty āryastūpamaham* or *arhaty ārye stūpamaham* (or possibly *arhaty ārya[sya] stūpamaham*) and interpreted *arhaty* as 3rd Sg. Pres. Ind. Act. of the root *arh*.

celebrated at buddha stūpas, they were either totally unknown or, more likely, so routine that they required no special prescription. Second, King Prasenajit steps in personally to promote the stūpa festival of Śāriputra by suspending all taxation and road levies that merchants would normally have to pay should they wish to trade at stūpa fairs. Apparently, the king expected such festivals to attract substantial commercial interest and develop features beyond the religious domain. Third, the majority of offerings placed at the stūpa are not used for stūpa maintenance but finds its way into the pockets of individual monks. Finally, the stūpa festivals were apparently very popular and quite frequent. While initially such festivities may have been limited to stūpas built in memory of the Buddha's direct disciples (KṣuV, Fa-hsien), their scope was eventually broadened to include stūpas erected over the remains of ordinary monks (VinS). Furthermore, we know that stūpa festivals constituted a regular feature of the monastic calendar ("a month after the summer retirement"), attracted a large number of participants ("all devout families collected offerings for the monks") and lasted for at least 24 hours ("lamps were burning throughout the night"). We also learn that monks took advantage of the occasion to teach the Doctrine to a large audience ("monks hold a great assembly to expound the Law") and that the celebrations were accompanied by plays in which the actors re-enacted the main events in the lives of the disciples. While the *vinaya* sources do not specify the scale stūpa festivals could reach, the tone of their descriptions suggests that they were not minor religious events driven by personal piety.¹⁹ The extent of the festivities will have varied from place to

Since *maha* is masc., we should probably read *arhaty ārya[h] stūpamahaṃ* and translate the sentence with: "A Noble One is worthy of a stūpa festival." SCHOPEN's proposition to interpret the Tibetan *rigs so* to indicate 'necessity' would seem too strong and is in any case at odds with the Sanskrit.

¹⁹ The VinVibh contains an episode that gives us some idea of the measure of such celebrations. In the aftermath of an unidentified festival held in Rājagṛha, a group of traders returning from a sea voyage found the entire city stripped off merchandise, even food or drink. Rājagṛha, presumably on order of the king, had devoted all its resources to the festival and was now unable to engage in trade of any form. To secure survival, the visiting merchants were forced to approach the private residence of a wealthy businessman and ask for leftovers (Ja 119r7–v7). While we should perhaps not overrate the historical value of this account, it nevertheless hints at the breadth of resources such festivals were held capable of consuming. The VinVibh records another episode where a dancer who travelled from the south to attend the Festival of Girika and Sundara in Rājagṛha marvelled at the lavish provision of the celebrations (Ja 224v1–3). For a brief, but unreferenced, summary of events leading up to this festival, see SCHOPEN (2003).

place, reflecting the disposition and power of the local ruler, the wealth and religiosity of the local population as well as the influence of the Saṅgha. Since stūpa festivals were financed through contributions from various sources, they probably accommodated a variety of interests and catered to the religious, economic and political ambitions of all their sponsors.

These are bold claims difficult to sustain on the basis of a handful of passages. We need additional testimony in order to lend credibility to such wide-ranging conclusions. For this I turn now to the *avadāna* literature. Let me begin with a few comments about the structure of the collections used in this investigation. As indicated by their titles, the AŚ and KŚ consist of one hundred stories.²⁰ Each of these extols the exploits of a particular Buddhist ‘saint’ and explains their spiritual achievement through deeds carried out in the past. While every story starts afresh and is not linked with the preceding narrative, they are batched in groups that share certain themes, such as a concern with pratyekabuddhas, arhats, gods, animals or future Buddhas (AŚ I: xiv–xxv; but see FEER 1901: 54 for the KŚ). Because their narratives are essentially independent, some of the stories appear in more than one collection (FEER 1891: xiv–xxviii). The relationship between the collections themselves differs from case to case. Even though they are governed by very different structures, the AŚ and KŚ are closest since they share many narratives. SPEYER found 16 narratives that appear in both works, be it on occasion with slightly different content (AŚ II: v–xiv, FEER 1891: xvi–xxvii). It would appear that both collections drew in part on material derived from the same literary tradition. This is corroborated by their use of similar stock-phrases and narrative structures. Both collections name their *avadānas* after the protagonist at the centre of the stories (e.g., Suvarṇābha, Sugandhi, Vapuṣmat). Because we do not have a Sanskrit text for the KŚ and the Tibetan translation is rarely a reliable guide when it comes to Indian names not all the titles are available in the original.²¹ Fortunately, the identity of these persons is not our primary concern today and we can therefore set aside this problem.

²⁰ In the case of the KŚ, this is only a rough figure since this collection contains 127 narratives (FEER 1901: 54). The AŚ, in contrast, is comprised of exactly 100 stories, spread over ten decades.

²¹ E.g., brDzis: Abhibhūta? (Ha 238v4–242r5); Thoṣ pa: Śrāvaka? (Ha 201r3–204v5); Rab bzañ: Subhadra/Paravāḍa? (Ha 216v7–220v7). — FEER (1901) gives brief summaries of the events that unfold in each of the *avadānas* from the KŚ: Thoṣ pa, 295 f.; gDol ba’i khye’u, 300 f.; Rab bzañ, 302 f.; brDzis, 311 f.; Kun dga’ bo, 416–18.

My analysis of stūpa festivals in *avadāna* literature focuses on five features: (1) sponsorship and preparation, (2) stūpa category, (3) rules of participation, (4) performance elements and (5) maintenance issues. Based on the outcome of this investigation, I shall then assess the role of stūpa festivals in ancient Indian Buddhist communities and evaluate its contribution to recruitment, monastic as well as lay.

There is strong evidence that most, if not all, stūpa festivals were sponsored and inaugurated by kings. Not a single narrative records that such festivals were funded or instituted by monks or the local population. In most cases, the king also sponsors the construction of the stūpa.²² The Suvarṇābha episode of the AŚ contains a good example of the events that typically lead up to the celebration of a stūpa festival:

“O monks, previously, in times gone by, during the 91st world age, there emerged in this world a Buddha, a Blessed One, called Vipāśyin. He was a Tathāgata, Arhat, Saṃyak Saṃbuddha, perfected in wisdom and good con-

²² This, however, is not what is recorded in epigraphic sources of the Deccan and Andhra during the post-Mauryan and Sada-Sātavāhana periods from which most surviving stūpas stem. Even though we have many hundred stūpa inscriptions of that period, there is very little evidence that kings played any role in stūpa construction at all. This applies to both freestanding stūpas as well as rock-cut examples. Neither Sānchī or Amarāvati nor any of the other contemporary stūpa sites in coastal Andhra preserves inscriptions that record royal patronage. This holds also true for the cave stūpas in the western Deccan (Nāsik, Ajanṭā, Junnār, Kudā, Kārḷā and Kaṇherī). Royal support, if at all documented, appears to have been limited to the secondment of court artisans (e.g. Sānchī 1, South Torāṇa, records the participation of the chief artisan of king Sātakaṇi [LÜDERS 1912, no. 346]). This contrasts with the widely attested royal patronage of *vihāras*, mainly through land endowments. These findings, recently brought together by A. SHIMADA (2006), cast doubt on WALTERS' claim (1997: 177–80), in part inspired by the Aśokan pillar edict of Nigāli Sāgar which records the king's massive expansion of the Konākamuni stūpa (HULTZSCH 1925: 165), that stūpa foundations of this period were 'imperial acts' designed to enhance royal authority. It does not, of course, invalidate the king's promotion of festivals recorded in *avadāna* literature. Moreover, judging by epigraphic evidence from the Ikṣvāku period, royal disinterest in stūpa foundations did not last forever. Three of the stūpa sites of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa (1, 2 and 3) feature votive inscriptions which credit Cātasiri (sister of the first Ikṣvāku ruler, King Vāsīthiputa Cātamūla) and her relative with generous donations to the stūpas and adjacent shrines. The reason for the newly emerging royal interest in stūpas has not yet been identified, though it may well have been triggered by changes in the economic status of the Saṅgha and the socio-political environment within which its members operated. For a detailed analysis of this problem, see SHIMADA 2006: 223–243. Regardless of the factors that brought about this change, the absence of documented royal support for stūpa foundations prior to the 3rd/4th cent. may help us to approximate the period when those *avadānas* which cite royal stūpa construction were conceived. The epigraphic evidence from surviving stūpa sites indicates that they may well postdate the 3rd cent.

duct (*vidyācaraṇasampanna*), a Sugata, knower of the world (*lokavid*), an unsurpassed guide of people in need of restraint (*puruṣadamyasārathi*), the teacher of gods and humans. [...] After he had performed all the deeds of a buddha, Vipasyin entered into *parinirvāṇa* in the nirvāṇa sphere that has no aggregates remaining, like a fire whose fuel is exhausted. When this had taken place, King Bandhumat performed the worship of the body with respect to the body of the Buddha and built a stūpa made of four types of precious substances that was one *yojana* in circumference and one *krośa* in height. Next, he also prescribed a stūpa festival (*stūpamahaś ca prajñap-tah*).” (AŚ I 349.3–8; AŚ-T 168v4–169r1).

While this account may not be historical, most *avadānas* place stūpa festivals in such setting. In *avadānas*, stūpa festivals do not celebrate the Buddha’s disciples, but serve to commemorate the life of the Buddha himself. In the AŚ and KŚ, this is either Vipasyin, Kāśyapa or Krakucchanda. Our sources use different terms to record the contributions of the kings. Some say that the king prescribed (*prajñapta*) the festival, others say that he held (*kārita*) a festival.²³ On the other hand, all the *avadānas* concur in employing the Sanskrit term *stūpamaha* (or its standard Tibetan equivalent *mchod rten gyi ston dus*) to refer to stūpa festivals. The expression *mchod ston*, recorded in some texts as a synonym for *maha*, does not appear once (see n. 2). The fact that the stūpa was built on order of the king indicates that he may also have funded the festival since the celebrations marked the stūpa’s public inauguration. In fact, most texts emphasize that it is celebrated immediately after completion of the construction works. In some sources we learn that it can only take place after the stūpa was completed “in all parts” (*rnam pa thams cad [du]*).²⁴ Whether this is a reference to the architectural features of a Tathāgata stūpa (which contains some elements omitted from

²³ The *vinaya* adds two other terms frequently used in connection with festivals: *sthāpita* (“instituted”, GM I 79.1 f.) and *prasthāpita* (“celebrated”, GM II 143.15 f.) The exact connotations of these terms are not always clear, since some passages appear to use them interchangeably. The Tibetan, for one, renders both *sthāpita* and *prasthāpita* with *btsugs pa*. As a result it is often difficult to draw firm conclusions from a particular wording. While there can be no doubt that kings were closely involved in the organisation of festivals, we do not know whether they actually instituted them. Some festivals were evidently not founded by kings. The Toyikā festival, for example, was instituted (*sthāpita*) by devout brahmins and householders (GM I 79.1; VinV Kha 162v4). In his paper on festivals, SCHOPEN (2003) gives a synopsis of the circumstances surrounding the foundation of this festival. The Festival of Girika and Sundara, on the other hand, was founded by Bimbisāra himself in an attempt to persuade the two nāga kings to return to Magadha (VinVibh Ja 224r7–v1).

²⁴ KŚ Ha 216r2 f. & 240v4: *rnam pa thams cad yoñs su rdzogs par byas nas*; 220r3: *rnam pa thams cad du zin par byas nas*.

stūpas built for pratyekabuddhas and arhats²⁵) or alludes to an episode where celebrations commenced while work was still in progress we cannot tell.

Completion itself is achieved through the ritual “raising of the staff” (*yaṣṭyāropaṇa*) since this signalled the very moment of inauguration. According to one source, the raising of the staff was considered a special privilege granted by the king to those who had financed the construction of the stūpa. Construction rights were awarded in a public competition to those who managed to procure the largest amount of money. The process of tender and its emotional pitfalls are recorded in the KŚ:

“After (Vipaśyin’s *parinirvāṇa*) had taken place, King Bandhumat built a stūpa for his relics. When he decided to ‘raise the staff’ (*srog śiñ gzugs pa: yaṣṭyāropaṇa*) on the stūpa (in order to inaugurate it), once a large group of people had assembled at the (stūpa), he issued the following command (*bsgo ba*): ‘The person who procures the greatest amount of property (*nor bu*) for this stūpa shall raise the staff on this stūpa.’ When a certain son of a householder who had just arrived at the (stūpa) site (*sa phyogs der*) heard the King’s decree, he thought to himself: ‘Once I have procured the greatest amount of property for this stūpa, I shall raise the staff on the stūpa. However (*na*), since I do not possess riches of such proportion (*de tsam gyi ’byor ba dag*), well, let me approach my relatives (for help), pay my respects and procure the property (in this way).’ After the householder’s son had asked his relatives for help, they replied: ‘Steady you go and don’t lose heart! As much property as you have (already) procured, so much we shall give you (again).’ Then, as soon as he had heard this, the youth and king procured more and more (in competition), approaching 60 million pieces of gold. After a while, the king grew unhappy about this contest (*gzi: adhikaraṇa*), lost heart and thought: ‘Oh, what shall I do about the damage (this rivalry inflicts) upon me?’ His ministers dispensed the following counsel: ‘O Majesty, steady you go and don’t lose heart! We would like to give property to your Majesty.’ (In the meantime) also the youth was restrained by his many relatives: ‘Since we must protect the mood (*thugs*) of the king, do not compete with him.’ As soon as he had heard their (warning), the youth abandoned (his ambition). As a result, the king took (again) pleasure in the contest, gave a large amount of revenue (*loñs spyod*) to the youth, raised the staff on the stūpa and accomplished everything within a short time. He then paid homage to the stūpa with incense, aromatic powder, perfume and flowers and prescribed (*lugs bcas so*) a stūpa festival. At that time, the householder’s son

²⁵ VinS 143, §461–64; VinS-T 99r3–5; KṣuV Tha 246r3–v1, tr. SCHOPEN 2004: 303 f. For more material about arhat and pratyekabuddha stūpas, see VinV Kha 27r2–28v4.

thought to himself: ‘Since I am not worthy of the revenue (that I received from the king), I shall offer all the things (*rdzes*), including the 60 million gold coins, that I intended for the stūpa, to (his) stūpa.’” (Ha 203v4–204r4)

While one passage alone does not allow us to conclude that such fund-raising formula was common practice, we know that it was applied at least in some quarters. The key issue here is the ceremonial “raising of the staff”. The “raising of the staff” has long been recognised as a central feature in the inauguration process (WELLER 1953; ALSDORF 1955: 14–16, BÉNISTI 1960: 76f.). The *vinaya* requires the “raising of the staff”, although typically funded by lay donors, to be carried out by monks or, at least, in the presence of monks (SCHOPEN 2004: 21). Even though our passage does not call for monastic participation, perhaps because this is not its principle concern, it confirms that funding for this event was expected to come from the laity. Installation of the staff would have taken place at the very end of the stūpa construction, probably right before or during the stūpa festival. In either case, it would have been exactly the kind of high-profile event that a donor would want to be associated with. Whether the donation paid only for the staff, for the ceremony surrounding the installation or for the whole construction is not recorded. The *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* lists the staff installation as only one of four stūpa funding opportunities open to lay donors. The others are the “raising of an umbrella” (*chattrāropana*), the “raising of a flag” (*dhvajāropana*) and the “raising of a banner” (*patākāropana*).²⁶ Apparently, it was possible for the public to sponsor individual features of the stūpa as well as the entire construction. While we do not learn how much money a staff installation typically consumed, our passage indicates that it was not cheap. It was expensive enough to cause serious financial hardship not only for a well-connected householder but even for the treasury of a king.

The need for monks to participate in the flag installation leads us to another question. Who took part in a stūpa festival and how was their participation secured? Several sources report the king summoning monks to the festival (KŚ Ha 275v4f., PBA 19r2–4). In most cases, the king is content with the presence of the local community, but in one instance he goes as far as to arrange for monks to be transported (*‘dren btañ ño*) to the stūpa site (KŚ Ha 275v5). This *avadāna* also has the king providing monks with copious amounts of food, drink and robes (*loc. cit.*). Since stūpas were typi-

²⁶ GM IV 139.11–17, VinV Ka 242v1–4; for a translation of this passage, see SCHOPEN 1997: 76.

cally erected either in or near the local *vihāra* (KŚ Ha 240v5–241r2) most festivals took place in the vicinity of monasteries.²⁷ Judging by a passage in the VinVibh, the king’s generosity did not extend to all festivals. This text records a group of forest monks that had to borrow bedding, furnishings and seats from an affiliated village *vihāra* in order to accommodate visiting monks during a festival held in their own monastery (Ja 12v4–19r2, esp. 15r4–v1).²⁸ When they did not receive funds from lay donors, the monks were forced to turn to an affiliated community for help. Not every festival attracted royal sponsorship.

Although the monks were required to be present for prestige and validation, they did not play a very active role in the celebrations. Restrained by their monastic vows preventing them from engaging in frivolous activities, their main task was to give Dharma discourses to the revellers midway (*phyed yol tsam na*) through the festival (PBA 19r3f.). But a festival with only monks would be rather dull and generate little income. Who else took part? The *vinaya* indicates that the king sought to win the participation of merchants. It suggests that he did this in order to maximise revenue for the local monastic community. However, his motives may not have been entirely selfless. Since kings will have ranked among the principal sponsors of stūpas and their festivals, they would have had a personal interest to see them thrive and attract publicity. In order to secure a good turn out, the king “had gongs (*gaṇḍī*) struck, drums beaten and conch shells blown”.²⁹

²⁷ The PBA (19r2) records that the festival was held in or near a royal palace (*pho bran khor zig tu*). However, because the content of this passage is somewhat ambiguous, we should perhaps not read too much into this reference.

²⁸ This story is discussed in SCHOPEN 2004: 230 f.

²⁹ Poor attendance at festivals appears to have been a widespread concern. In the UttG the Buddha proposes to increase turn-up through a better organised publicity campaign (Pa 176r1–6):

“The Buddha, the Blessed One, dwelt in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada, in the Jetavana in Śrāvastī when he said (to the monks): ‘Hold the Great Festival and advertise that the Image of the One Sitting in the Shade of the Jambu-tree is coming to town (*groñ khyer du gśeḡs par rgyas par byos sig*).’ The monks went ahead without, however, to inform (*ma sbran par doñ ño*) the brahmins and householders. These complained: ‘Alas, if the Noble Ones had informed us beforehand, we would have prepared offerings.’ The monks reported what had happened to the Blessed One who said: ‘You should announce that you (plan to) hold the Great Festival seven or eight days in advance on markets, in the streets (*srañ*), on highways (*lam*) and at crossroads.’ When they (went around) proclaiming: ‘Festival, Festival’, the Blessed One advised them: ‘You should inform them that you (plan to) hold the festival on such an occasion, at such a day (*zag dus thab la zag ’di sñed cig na*).’ When, even though they did this,

These drew “a very large group of people” (*srog chags ’bum phrag du ma*) to the festival site (PBA 19r3). This must have been quite effective, since several texts boast of the “large crowds of people” (*mahājanakāya*, *anekaprāṇīśatasahasra*) that came together at stūpa sites for their inauguration (KŚ Ha 203v4 & 241r1; AŚ I 361.15 & 387.9).³⁰

nobody took any notice, the Blessed One said: ‘Write it on birch bark (*gro ga*) and mount it on top of an elephant. Then have it announced on markets, in the streets, on highways and at crossroads.’”

Elsewhere in the same text, in order to increase festival attendance among his monks, the Buddha advises Anāthapiṇḍada to offer a meal as part of the celebrations (Pa 178v3–6). This yields immediate results:

“The Buddha, the Blessed One, dwelt in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada, in the Jetavana in Śrāvastī when the householder Anāthapiṇḍada asked him: ‘If the Blessed One permits, I shall hold the Great Festival (*dus ston chen po*).’ The Blessed One replied: ‘With my permission, you should do it.’ After the festival had taken place in the Jetavana, because the monks had failed to attend, the Blessed One said: ‘When you hold the Great Festival (again), sound a gong, drum and trumpet. (In this way) the monks will know that the time has come for the midday meal (*gdugs tshod*).’ When the monks were alerted (*brdegs na*) by the sound of the drum and trumpet, they frantically (*chol bar*) sat down (for the meal).”

The prospect of food, it would seem, provided sufficient incentive for a large group of monks (the text records further below that on this occasion no less than 500 bhikṣus scrambled hurriedly for seats in the dining area) to find the leisure to join Anāthapiṇḍada’s party. The monks appear to have taken the Buddha’s advice to heart since many texts highlight the lavish amount of food served at festivals (e.g. UttG Pa 84v4). Sometimes, however, this carried unexpected consequences, even death. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* records the well-known episode where the monk Mūlaphalgunā died from overeating during the Toyikā festival (GM II 144.11–13; VinV Ga 113r6–v5). Even in death, this monk continued to cause problems for the community. According to an account in the KṣuV, his stūpa, erected by a group of friendly nuns, was destroyed on order of the monk Udaḥapāna which gave rise to a new rule about nuns’ carrying concealed weapons (SCHOPEN 2004: 341, 345 f.).

³⁰ In several places, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* gives specific information about the range of people who attended Buddhist festivals. A festival commemorating Indra’s famous visit to the Buddha held annually on Mt Vaidehaka (KṣuV Tha 234r3–235r2), for example, attracted “all the multitudes of people living in Magadha” (*der yul ma gadhā na gnas pa’i skye bo’i tshogs thams cad ’du’o*, 234r4). Elsewhere in the same text (Da 181r4–182v3), on the occasion of a joint-celebration of the Festival of the Top-Knot, Festival of the Fifth Year and Great Festival, we learn that monastic celebrations had sufficient pull to draw “people, monks, nuns, lay brothers and lay sisters who lived in different regions” (*yul tha dad pa*) (Da 181v2 f.). The UttG records that each of the five biographical festivals commemorating key events in the life of the Buddha (see n. 2) attracted revellers from far afield: “Monks, nuns, lay brothers and lay sisters had come now to Śrāvastī (*’dir*) from various regions (*yul so so nas*) for the great worship (*mchod chen po*) of the Bodhisattva” (Pa 139v7–140r1). In my translation of this last sentence I follow SCHOPEN (2003). However, I prefer the term

But who were all those people that converged around stūpas to share in the festivities? Besides monks, *avadānas* cite four other groups of participants: relatives of the king, ministers of the court, brahmins and householders. Faith in the Buddha was apparently not a prerequisite. The Rab bzañ (*Subhadra/Paravāḍa) *avadāna* contains an episode where a non-believing minister (*blon po ma dad pa*) is appointed overseer of works (*lag dpon*) for a stūpa construction and later attends the festival even though he does not appear to care much for the monument (KŚ Ha 219v6–220r5). Two other texts speak of gamblers (*dyūtakara*) milling among the revellers (AŚ II 76.15–17, AŚ I 383.5f.). But not everybody was eager to party:

“When (the stūpa of Kāśyapa) was completed in all parts, King Kṛkin³¹ paid homage to the stūpa and prescribed (*lugs btod pa*) a stūpa festival which he announced by striking a gong (*gaṇḍī*) and (issuing) the following command: ‘All the people who live in the city of Vārāṇasī must come and pay homage to this (stūpa on the day) when the stūpa festival takes place. Those who do not come to the (festival) shall have all their possessions confiscated.’ King Kṛkin had a certain priest (*purohita*) who was not a believer. But because the priest’s son was friendly with the King’s son, he was treated amicably. As soon as it came to the attention of the king that the brahmin priest, as a non-believer, had failed to attend the (festival) because he was not well disposed (*sdañ ba’i sems kyis*) (towards Buddhism), he realised that the priest had not followed his command and grew angry. He then declared: ‘I shall confiscate all the possessions of this priest and never release them.’ When the King’s

“region” for *yul*. SCHOPEN translates this word by “country” which, in my opinion, carries today connotations that were probably not intended by both the Tibetan (*yul*) and the (hypothetical) Sanskrit (*deśa*). Apart from this detail, our interpretation of the Saṅgha’s concern for a good turn-out at festivals is similar and draws on pretty much the same sources. The fact that people had come to the festivals from far field seemed to matter since it is also mentioned at the beginning of the UttG section (Pa 139r7). Other festivals enjoyed similar popularity. The Toyikā festival, apparently held every six months in Śrāvastī was particularly popular among the members of the Saṅgha (VinV Ga 113r6f.). The Festival of Girika and Sundara, in contrast, was primarily celebrated by lay people; at least we have no record of monks or nuns attending in large numbers (*skye bo phal po che’i tshogs der ltags te*, VinVibh Ja 227v4, 228r3). The first celebration of this festival, convened by Bimbisāra in Rājagṛha, was especially well-attended, drawing a large crowd from the six great cities of north-east India (VinVibh Ja 224v1–3): Campā, Rājagṛha, Śrāvastī, Sāketa, Kauśambi and Vārāṇasī (cf. *Dīghanikāya*, PTS-ed., vol. II, p. 146.14f.).

³¹ The Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* contains many passages, mostly drawn from *avadāna* sources, which describe the reign of this legendary king, contemporary of the Buddha Kāśyapa. Kṛkin gained particular fame through his stūpa foundations. See, for example, VinV Ka 266v7–268r5, Ga 6v5–11v7, 82v3–83r7, 266r2–5, Ņa 127r4–130r2; VinVibh Ca 167v1–177r7, Ja 241r6–242v1, Ņa 78v4–85v6; KṣuV Tha 156v6–158v5, Da 33v6–35v2.

son heard his (father's) decree (*tshig*), he called for the priest's son and said: 'Go and tell your father that he must go swiftly to the stūpa festival. The king plans to confiscate all your possessions.' As soon as the brahmin priest had learned this (warning), he went, together with his son, to the *vihāra*. Upon arrival, they saw that there was a host of people engaged in stūpa worship." (KŚ Ha 240v5–241r2).

This passage reveals much about the dynamics governing festival organisation. After the king had the stūpa built — presumably at this own expense — he prescribes a stūpa festival. Such a celebration would bestow public recognition of his generosity and attest to his faith in the Buddha. It is interesting that the king felt it necessary to invoke his royal authority to see his plan implemented. He did not propose a stūpa festival, but “prescribed” (*lugs btod pa*) it. Next, the king calls for all local citizens to attend the inauguration. However, rather than soliciting their presence through invitation, he orders their attendance. The harsh tone of his decree, accompanied by the explicit threat to dispossess all those who do not turn up, could be interpreted that gentler announcements at previous occasions failed to attract an adequate response. Even persons with no links to the Buddhist faith are expected to participate. The prospect of financial ruin is clearly an effective motivator. It certainly persuades the priest and had perhaps a similar effect on other people. The king's efforts to achieve a good turn-out may have been driven by concern to secure the upkeep of the local monastery which, as we have seen, stood to gain most from a well-attended festival. However, the tone of the decree and his reaction to the priest's abscondence suggests that more was perhaps at stake.³²

The *avadāna* narratives make reference to four types of festival activities. The religious highpoint was undoubtedly the sermon delivered by the monks at noon of the first day in front of the stūpa. Our sources do not dis-

³² The text does not give the reason for the priest's resentment towards Buddhism. He is simply described as a non-believer (*mi dad pa*). But his personal beliefs need not have been decisive since other accounts indicate that stūpa festivals were routinely attended by people from all walks of life, Buddhist or not. Perhaps we need to look elsewhere. The VinVibh contains an episode that hints at the frustration and envy among ordinary people (hired labourers, in this case) about the frequency with which the Saṅgha held its festivals (Ca 146r4–v7). Here a workman (*gla mi*) employed to help with the construction of a monastic bathing house complains: “O Noble Sir, those who make a living through virtue constantly hold festivals” (*phags pa gañ dag bsod nams kyi 'bras bus 'tsho ba de dag la ni rtag pa kho nar dus ston mchis kyi*) and requests a day off, or at least a pay rise (Ca 146v2f.). In other words, our priest may have simply suffered from festival fatigue and had sought, by hiding, to escape yet another royal engagement.

close the content of this discourse. Because it was given to a lay-audience, it is likely to have been quite basic. The sermon was probably accompanied, in the morning and the afternoon, by acts of worship and stūpa offerings. All 14 narratives place stūpa veneration in the foreground of their accounts. The provenance of the offerings was of little or no concern. Some were given by non-believing brahmins or householders,³³ others by hustlers who fastened their gaming proceeds to the stūpa. Monks do not participate in this aspect of the celebrations. The items fastened to the stūpa during the festival include flowers, perfume, incense, banners, flags, lamps, precious stones, gold coins and jewellery. The greater their value, the higher they are placed on the stūpa. The most valuable items are attached to the pole and rain receptacle (*varṣasthālī*: *char khab*; AŚ I 383.6f., AŚ-T 186r7–v1). Theft was probably not uncommon and led to this precaution.

It is difficult to assess how much weight the religious activities carried. The texts want us to believe that they were the principal component of the celebrations. We have reason to doubt this. Several *avadānas* describe festival activities that fall clearly outside the religious domain. The Mallapatākā narrative of the AŚ, for example, records a wrestling competition:

“Then, one day, King Bandhumat held (*kārita*) a festival at the stūpa. While the stūpa festival took place (*vartamāne*) a banner (*patākā*) was raised in the midst of (a group of) wrestlers (for which they had to fight). In the end, one of the king’s wrestlers defeated another wrestler, appropriated the banner and carried it off, accompanied by a retinue of several hundred thousand people and to the tunes of various musical instruments to the spot where the Vi-śāyin stūpa stood. When he reached that stūpa, (the wrestler) recalled the good qualities of the Blessed One, fixed the banner to the staff on top of the stūpa and took the following vow: ‘May I obtain such good qualities, delight such teacher and not alienate him.’” (AŚ I 387.7–12, AŚ-T 188v3–5).

While the motive that led to the inclusion of a wrestling match is not spelt out, there can be little doubt that it will have helped to draw a greater crowd to the festival. The timing was clearly sanctioned by the king since he sent one of his own wrestlers to compete. In order to increase the visibility of the event, the king had even banners raised and musicians hired to play at the closing parade. This was not some small-time sporting rivalry, but a generously funded, royal event. Although the wrestling did not take

³³ The Mūlasarvāstivāda-*vinaya* records several other instances where stūpas are sponsored, or even built, by devout (*dad pa can*) brahmins and householders. See, for example, VinV Ga 288v5f., 289r6f., Na 13v6f., 15r7. This corroborates what has, of course, long been known from epigraphic sources about lay involvement in stūpa foundations.

place at the stūpa site itself, it must have been close by, at least within easy reach of a large procession. In view of the king's concern with festival turnout, it is tempting to conclude that the sporting competition served to boost attendance figures at the stūpa celebrations.

We know that stūpa festivals attracted people from all walks of life, some for religious reasons, others out of commercial self-interest. King Prasajit, as we have seen, decided to waive all tax, toll and transportation levies on merchandize displayed at the festival venue. This, of course, suggests that he expected merchants to travel to the festival site in order to sell their goods. If that is what happened, the festival would have doubled as a regional market, attracting traders and craftsmen from all over the country. Some of their goods will have been used as offerings placed at the stūpa, others perhaps not. At any rate, in the evening, the sporting and market atmosphere gave way to general merriment, dance and song held in the light of the lamps lit on the stūpa. Once all religious duties had been discharged, the commercial deals closed and the king's entertainment drawn to a close, the stage was set for jollity and relaxation. Although the exact content of the evening festivities is not spelt out, they were sufficiently exuberant to cover the entire stūpa in a layer of dust:

“While a stūpa festival took place (*vartamāne*), a great crowd was singing and dancing (near the stūpa). (As a result), the stūpa got covered in dust. Some day later, a householder arrived in the stūpa courtyard (*stūpāṅgaṇa*) and saw that it was covered with dust.” (AŚ I 361.15 f., AŚ-T 175v4 f.).

At first sight, this passage may not seem very remarkable. However, it contains two important leads. First, it indicates that the evening celebrations were not a solemn affair but passionate enough to whirl up enough dust to coat the entire stūpa. Second, it is significant, I think, that the dust was allowed to remain on the stūpa for several days and that there was no provision for the stūpa to be cleaned after the festival. It is as if, once constructed and inaugurated with royal funds, the stūpa ceased to command the attention of the king and was handed over to the local community. More specifically, it was for a householder, apparently out of concern for its condition following the ravages of the party, to anoint it with a mixture of sweet-smelling oils (*tailavyāmiśro gandhakāyaḥ*). Even though the stūpa was erected in or near a *vihāra*, monks apparently did not look after it. This fell to a lay brother who happened to visit it a few days later. The Balavat episode is not the only source that records the stūpa's neglect following a festival. A passage in the Vapuṣmat story attests similar indifference:

“Next, King Bandhumat, together with a host of relatives and ministers, held (*kṛta*) a stūpa festival. Some day later, a poor person arrived in the stūpa courtyard and saw that the flowers had withered and that the stūpa was covered with dust. Thereupon, once he had recalled the good qualities of the Buddha and developed faith in them, he took a broom to sweep the stūpa and removed the withered flowers.” (AŚ I 357.4–7, AŚ-T 173v2–4).

The point is similar. After the festival, the stūpa is looked after by a civic-minded member of the public who happened to visit the stūpa courtyard, not by a monk of the local vihāra or a servant dispatched from the king’s palace.

These two episodes suggest that royal interest in the stūpa waned soon after its inauguration. It lasted only as long as the stūpa contributed to consolidate and enhance the king’s authority and prestige. Since routine maintenance does not serve either, there was little motivation to continue the support. But even the monastic community lost quickly interest in the fate of the stūpa. At this point it is important to recall that all stūpa festivals attested in *avadāna* literature celebrate the inauguration of buddha stūpas, not disciple stūpas. The reason for this indifference is recorded in the *vinaya*. In a landmark paper on the mechanisms governing the construction and maintenance of stūpas, SCHOPEN demonstrated that everything offered to a buddha stūpa remained the inalienable and inviolable property of the stūpa (2004: 303–310). In other words, it is of no use to anybody and can only be put to stūpa repairs. The exception, and now we have come full circle, are offerings made to disciple stūpas for these may be claimed by the local Saṅgha and distributed among its monks. Disciple stūpas, we are told, stood at the centre of an annual festival celebrated at the end of the summer retreat to commemorate the lives of Śāriputra, etc. Since these stūpas played an important role in the Saṅgha’s on-going fundraising effort and provided a steady flow of income throughout the year they were probably used again and again. In other words, it was in the monks’ best interest to look after them on a regular basis. Not so with buddha stūpas, it would seem.

Since we possess now a good understanding of the different levels of monastic access to offering placed at buddha and disciple stūpas, they need not be rehearsed here (SCHOPEN 2004: 285–328). However, we still have to ascertain whether these rules applied also to the festivals held at those stūpas. What happened to the goods offered to buddha stūpas during festivals? Were they subsumed into the storerooms and treasury of the local monastery or set aside for stūpa repairs? This question is not addressed in either the *vinaya* or the *avadāna* collections. For this we need to look a

little further afield. Jayarakṣita's *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṃgrahaṭīkā* states quite clearly that all income derived from festivals celebrating the Buddha's birth, his awakening and indeed any other festival belongs to the resident monks of the local Saṅgha.³⁴ Although this text does not enjoy the same authority as the *vinaya* since it is essentially a handbook for novices, its admonitions run probably just as close, if not closer, to the practices observed in monastic institutions. It would certainly explain the fate of the stūpa offerings after the festival. The descriptions in the Vapuṣmat and Balavat episodes convey a strong sense of desolation and suggest that the goods were removed from the stūpa immediately after the festival.

In sum, we have good evidence that stūpa festivals, be they in commemoration of a buddha or of his most prominent disciples, brought substantial benefit to all participants. For the king, because he funded the event, the festivities offered a good opportunity to enhance his prestige and popularity. The celebrations also reinforced his power over the Saṅgha since the monastery depended on his resources to organise the event in the first place. Although the king may have encouraged sponsorship initiatives among his subjects, he bore probably most of the cost. First, since it would have been embarrassing to be sidelined at the inauguration, it was in his long-term interest to finance the event. Second, his treasury must have lost considerable income by waiving all taxation and transportation fees for merchants trading at the festival. Third, the king provided food, drink, robes and accommodation for at least some of the monks. In addition, if we follow the *avadāna* accounts, the king would normally have paid for the construction of the stūpa itself. In spite of the high cost, perhaps because of the positive impact on their public image, kings evidently sought to play an active role in stūpa festivals.

The greatest beneficiary was probably the monastery that hosted the celebrations. First, its members were the sole recipients of all the goods offered to the stūpa. Even if we allow for exaggeration and hyperbole, the descriptions in the *avadānas* indicate that these were quite substantial. Second, the festivals must have played an important role in the monastic recruitment effort. While not everybody may have joined the celebrations on his own accord, many probably did. A successful festival may well have increased the ranks of the Saṅgha and secured additional lay support. Even

³⁴ See DERRETT, J.D.M., *A Textbook for Novices. Jayarakṣita's 'Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana'*, Torino 1983 (Pubblicazioni di 'Indologica Taurinensia' 15), p. 49f.

the merchants who ran stalls at the festival site stood to gain since they enjoyed exemption from taxation and had access to a large body of customers eager to purchase offerings. For the public, finally, it will have been an opportunity to combine merry-making with merit-making. The festivals gave them a chance to listen to senior monks delivering weighty sermons, to present offerings to the stūpa purchased at subsidized prices, to witness sporting events organized by the royal palace and to relax during the evening celebrations.

One cannot help but suspect that stūpa festivals were more frequent than their descriptions in our sources. Their performance brought substantial benefit to a broad section of the population: it enhanced the religious status of the king, promoted the economic interests of the merchant class, channelled much-coveted funds to individual monks and served as a recruitment opportunity for the Saṅgha. But most importantly, the festivities provided occasion for the laity to strengthen its ties with the local monastery and to consolidate its faith through participation in the liturgies and rituals conducted in commemoration of the Buddha and his direct disciples. At the same time, apart from Kṛkin's priest perhaps, everybody had fun.

Bibliography

- AP = *Apadāna*
The Apadāna of the Khuddaka Nikāya. Ed. by M. E. LILLEY. 2 vols. London 1925.
- AŚ = *Avadānaśataka*
Avadānaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna. Ed. by J. S. SPEYER. 2 vols. St.-Petersbourg 1906–1909 (Bibliotheca Buddhica III).
- AŚ-T = *Avadānaśataka*, Tibetan translation³⁵
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section mDo sde, vol. Am.³⁶
- UttG = *Uttaragrantha* (Mūlasarvāstivāda)
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section 'Dul ba, vols. Na–Pa.
- KŚ = *Karmaśataka*
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section mDo sde, vols. Ha–A.
- KṣuV = *Kṣudrakavastu* (Mūlasarvāstivāda)
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section 'Dul ba, vols. Tha–Da.

³⁵ The Tibetan tradition, in its bKa' 'gyur editions, refers to the AŚ as *Pūṇapramukhā-vadānaśataka* (*Gaiṅ po la sogs pa 'i rtogs pa brjod pa brgya pa*).

³⁶ All references to Tibetan sources are to the sDe dge (Derge) bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur, Taipei edition: sDe dge bKa' 'gyur, *The Tibetan Tripitaka*, ed. A. W. BARBER, Taipei 1991.

- GM = Gilgit Manuscripts (vol. 3)
Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. 3, parts I–IV. Ed. by N. DUTT. Srinagar/Calcutta 1942–1954.
- DA = *Divyāvadāna*
The Divyāvadāna. A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends. Now first ed. ... by E. B. COWELL & R. A. NEIL, Cambridge 1886 (repr. Amsterdam 1970).
- PBA = *Puṇyabalāvadāna*
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section mDo sde, vol. Aḥ.
- VinV = *Vinayavastu* (Mūlasarvāstivāda)
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section 'Dul ba, vols. Ka–Ña.
- VinVibh = *Vinayavibhaṅga* (Mūlasarvāstivāda)
 sDe dge bka' 'gyur, section 'Dul ba, vols. Ca–Ña.
- VinS = Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*
Vinayasūtra: Introduction and Sanskrit Text, ed. Study Group of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibetan dBU med Script. Tokyo 2001 (<http://www.tmx.tais.ac.jp/sobutsu/vinayasutra.html>).
- VinS-T = Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, Tibetan translation
 sDe dge bsTan 'gyur, section 'Dul ba, vol. Wu.
- ALSDORF, L., “Der Stūpa des Kṣemaṃkara,” in: *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel*, hrsg. von O. SPIES, Bonn 1955, 9–16 (repr. in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von A. WEZLER, Wiesbaden 1974 [Glasenapp-Stiftung 10], 592–599).
- BAREAU, A., “La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les Vinayapiṭaka,” *Bulletin d'Études Française d'Extrême-Orient* 50.2 (1962), 229–274.
- BÉNISTI, M., “Étude sur le stūpa dans l'Inde ancienne,” *Bulletin d'Études Française d'Extrême-Orient* 50.1 (1960), 37–116.
- FEER, L. (1891), *Avadāna-Çataka. Cent Légendes (Bouddhiques)*, trad. du Sanskrit, Paris (Annales du Musée Guimet 18) (repr. Amsterdam 1979).
- FEER, L. (1901), “Le Karma-Çataka,” *Journal Asiatique*, 9^e série, 17: 53–100, 257–315, 410–486.
- HULTZSCH, E. (1925), *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 1)
- KOTTKAMP, H. (1992), *Der Stūpa als Repräsentation des buddhistischen Heilsweges: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung and Entwicklung architektonischer Symbolik*, Wiesbaden (Studies in Oriental Religions 25).
- LÜDERS, H., *A List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to About AD 400 with the Exception of those of Asoka*, Calcutta 1912 (Appendix to *Epigraphia Indica* 10 [1909/10]).
- NOBEL, J. (1955), *Udrāyaṇa, König von Roruka: Eine buddhistische Erzählung*, 2 Teile, Wiesbaden.
- SCHOPEN, G. (1997), *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*, Honolulu.
- SCHOPEN, G. (2003), “Celebrating Odd Moments: The ‘Biography of the Buddha’ in some Mūlasarvāstivādin Cycles of Religious Festivals,” paper delivered at: ‘Life of the Buddha’ conference, McMaster University, October 2003.
- SCHOPEN, G. (2004), *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still more papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*, Honolulu.

- SHIMADA, A. (2006), *A Study of the Amarāvati Stūpa: The Chronology and Social Context of an Early Historic Buddhist Site in the Lower Krishna Valley*, PhD Dissertation, SOAS, University of London.
- WALTERS, J. (1997), "Stūpa, Story, and Empire: Constructions of the Buddhist Biography in Early Post-Aśokan India," in: *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*, ed. J. SCHÖBER, Honolulu, 160–192.
- WELLER, F. (1953), "Divyāvadāna 244, 7 ff.," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1, 268–276, (repr. in *idem, Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von W. RAU, 2. Halbband, Wiesbaden 1974 [Glasenapp-Stiftung 21, 1–2], 1467–1475).