XV.

THE TRADITION ABOUT THE CORPOREAL RELICS
OF BUDDHA.

By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (RETD.), PH.D., C.I.E.

III.

Mahāvamsa.

IN continuing the inquiry into the tradition about the subsequent fate of the eight original deposits of the corporeal relics of Buddha,¹ we take next the second Ceylonese chronicle, the Mahāvamsa; or, more precisely, the earlier part of that work, which was composed, by way of being a commentary on the Dīpavamsa, by the Thēra Mahānāma, in or about the period A.D. 520 to 540.²

Like the Dīpavamsa, the Mahāvamsa does not present any narrative such as that found in the Divyāvadāna. But, as we shall see, it gives a story about the relics at Rāmagrāma which is not found in either of those works.³

¹ For the preceding articles on this topic, see this Journal, 1906. 655 ff., 881 ff. The list of the places at which the corporeal relics, and the *kumbha* and the embers, were enshrined, is at page 671.

At page 671, line 14, read "At or in Pippalivana," etc. At page 912, line 13 f., read "Pāvaka (*sic*), Vēṭhadīpa, and Kusinārā, and caused," etc.

The last paragraph of note 1 on page 896 is not quite correct; see page 344 below.

On page 112 above, in line 20, for *sākyā(nam)* read *sākyā|na(m)*.

² The supposed period is A.D. 459 to 477. But see this Journal, 1906. 894, note 1.

³ If that story stood in the Dīpavamsa at all, we should expect to find it in connexion with chapter 19, verses 1 to 20; where, however, there is no indication of it. That chapter is, indeed, described by the editor as being very confused and fragmentary. But, even so, there would surely have been traceable there some hint of the story, however slight, if it was current when the Dīpavamsa was being written.

Again like the *Dīpavaṃsa*, it does not say anything about relics of Buddha in connexion with *Asōka-Kālāsōka*, the son of *Susunāga*. Differing from the *Dīpavaṃsa*, it mentions him only as *Kālāsōka* (Turnour, 15, 19, 20; Wijesinha, 11, 14, 16), and not as *Asōka*.

It mentions *Asōka* the *Mōriya*, grandson of *Chandagutta* and son of *Bindusāra*, as *Asōka* and *Dhammāsōka*, and does not appear to present his appellations *Piyadassi* and *Piyadassana*, or to give the form *Asōkadhamma*. Like the *Dīpavaṃsa*, it does not seem to say anything about his having had the appellation *Chaṇḍāsoka*. In respect of his appellation *Dhammāsōka*, it merely says, somewhat inconsequentially (T., 35; W., 24), that at first, on account of his sinful deeds, he was known as *Asōka*, but subsequently he became known as *Dhammāsōka* because of his meritorious actions.

In chapter 17 (T., 104; W., 67) it gives, without any indication as to whence *Asōka* had obtained any relics of Buddha, the story, which we have cited from the *Dīpavaṃsa* (this *Journal*, 1906. 895 f.) and from *Buddhaghōsha* (*ibid.*, 904 f.), about the *Sāmaṇēra* *Sumana*, deputed by the *Thēra* *Mahinda*, procuring relics (*dhātuyō*) of Buddha from *Asōka*, and obtaining the right collar-bone of Buddha from the god *Sakka* (*Indra*), in order that king *Dēvānampiya-Tissa* of Ceylon (B.C. 246 to 228) might found a *Thūpa* of Buddha. Whereas, however, the *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Buddhaghōsha* indicate (see *ibid.*, 895, and note 5; 904) that it was *Sumana*'s alms-bowl that *Asōka* filled with relics, the *Mahāvamsa* distinctly asserts something else. It represents *Sumana* as being directed to say to *Asōka* (T., 105):—*Muninō dhātuyō dēhi pattam bhuttam cha Satthunā sarīradhātuyō santi bahavō hi tav=antikē*; "Give relics of the Saint, and the alms-bowl used by the Teacher; for thou hast many corporeal relics." And the immediately following instructions to *Sumana* run thus:—*Pattapūraṃ gahetvāna gantvā dēvapuraṃ varaṃ*; "Having taken the bowlful, and having gone to the excellent city of the gods," remind *Sakka* (*Indra*) that

he has a right tooth¹ and the right collar-bone of the Teacher, and ask him for the collar-bone. And it goes on to say of Sumana that:—Thērassa vachanam vatvā rājātō laddha-dhātuyōpattapūram gahetvāna Himavantam upāgami; “Having delivered the message of the Thēra (Mahinda), and having taken the relics, filling the bowl, obtained from the king, he went to Himavat.” Depositing there the bowl, with the relics, he went on into the presence of Indra. From that god (T., 106; W., 68) he obtained the right collar-bone, from the Chūlāmaṇichētiya.² And then, taking that relic and the other relics and the bowl, he returned to the Chētiyagiri mountain, and gave them to the Thēra (Mahinda). The latter placed all the relics there on the mountain; whence that mountain, the Missakapabbata,

¹ This tooth-relic is mentioned in the account of the mission of Sumana as given by Buddhaghōsha (this Journal, 1906. 904), but not in the account given in the *Dīpavaṃsa* (ibid., 895). For the manner in which Indra obtained it, according to Buddhaghōsha, see ibid., 906 f.

Turnour said (*Mahāvamsa*, 105, note) that this tooth is the one which, according to the *Mahāvamsa* (T., 241; W., 154), was transferred in A.D. 370 (as adjusted from his date, A.D. 310) from (Dantapura in) Kālīṅga to Ceylon, in circumstances detailed in the *Dāthadhātuvamsa*, and was installed in the edifice called *Dhammachakka* built by *Dēvānaṃpiya-Tissa*; adding that in his own time it was enshrined in the *Daladā-Māligāva* temple at Kandy. But I do not find any explanation by him as to how it passed from the possession of Indra to Dantapura; and the verses added at the end of the *Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta* (see this Journal, 1906, 665 f.) speak of a tooth in Kālīṅga in addition to a tooth in heaven.

² Mentioned by Buddhaghōsha (see this Journal, 1906. 907) as the shrine in which Indra installed the tooth, when he took it away from the *Brāhmaṇ Dōpa*.

I have not been able to trace any exact statement as to how Indra became possessed of also the collar-bone. But Hiuen-tsiang has said (see, e.g., *Beal, Records*, 2. 40 f.) that, after the division of the relics into eight shares for “the kings of the eight countries,” shares were claimed by Śakra (Indra) on behalf of the *Dēvas*, and by the *Nāga* kings *Anavatapta*, *Muchilinda* and *Ēlāpatra*. Accordingly, the relics were redivided into three portions; one for the *Dēvas*, one for the *Nāgas*, and one for “the eight kingdoms among men.” It may also be remarked that in another place (see, e.g., *Beal, Records*, 1. 126, 132 f.) he has allotted one of the shares in the relics, and a *Stūpa* over them, to *Uttarasēna*, king of *Udyāna*. This person is represented as the son of one of the four *Sakyas* who (see this Journal, 1906. 166 f.) were banished from *Kapilavastu*, because they had the temerity to withstand an attack by king *Virūdhaka*.

And it may be added that, according to the *Mahāvamsa* (Turnour, 4; *Wijesinha*, 5), the Thēra *Sarabhū*, a disciple of *Sāriputta*, received the *givaṭṭhi*, *grivāsthi*, the neck-bone of Buddha, at the funeral pile, and enshrined it in a Chētiya in Ceylon over which king *Dutthagāmini* eventually erected the *Mahiyaṅga Thūpa*.

It seems probable that, if once we go away from the simple narrative of the *Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta*, an extensive list of variations might be made out.

obtained the name Chētiyapabbata. And then, having installed¹ the alms-bowl and the relics (*inside it*) on the Chētiyapabbata, the Thēra took the collar-bone, and went, attended by his disciples, to the appointed place, the Mahānāgavana park, where he was met by the king.

The rest of this narrative runs as in Buddhaghōsha's version (this Journal, 1906. 905); except that the name of the exact place where the Thūpa was made seems to be here given as Pamojavatthu, and that it appears to be located in the Mahāmēghavana garden (T., 107; W., 69). And so, eventually (T., 108 f.; W., 70), the king installed that relic, the right collar-bone, in the Chētiya, and caused the Thūpa to be completed, and founded the Vihāra known as the Thūpārāma.

The following may be added regarding the ultimate disposal of the alms-bowl of Buddha and the relics with which Asōka had filled it. Later on (T., 122; W., 78), Dēvānaṃpiya-Tissa announced to the Thēra Mahinda his intention of building many Vihāras, and asked the Thēra how he might obtain relics to be deposited in Thūpas at them. The Thēra reminded him of the relics, filling the alms-bowl of Buddha, which had been brought by Sumana and had been installed on the Chētiya mountain. Accordingly, those relics were transported thence on the shoulders of an elephant. Vihāras were made at the distance of a *yōjana* from each other; and the relics were there deposited in Thūpas. And the alms-bowl of Buddha was installed *vatthu-gharē subhē*, i.e., according to the translators, "in a superb apartment of the royal residence."²

¹ The word used here is *ṭhapetvā*, while, in the preceding verse we have *ṭhapēsi* where I have translated "he placed," and in a previous passage we have *ṭhapetvāna* in respect of temporarily "depositing" the alms-bowl and its contents in the mountain Himavat. Against these we have, further on, *patitthāpēsi* in respect of Dēvānaṃpiya-Tissa "installing" the right collar-bone in his Thūpa. We gather, however, from Buddhaghōsha (see this Journal, 1906. 905), that the alms-bowl and its contents were regularly installed in some place on the Missaka-Chētiya mountain.

² The history of the alms-bowl does not fall within the scope of our present inquiry. The following notes, however, may be given here.

The bowl consisted of four stone bowls, of the colour of a *mugga* or kidney-bean, presented by the four Dēvarājas, which Buddha placed one above another,

So far as the preceding accounts go, the relics at Rāmagrāma had remained untouched. The Mahāvamsa, however, in a subsequent portion of its earlier part (chapter 27 ff.) presents the following romantic story regarding them:—

King Duṭṭhagāmini of Ceylon (about B.C. 100 to 77)¹ found, inscribed on a golden tablet that had been deposited in a box in his palace (Turnour, 161; Wijesinha, 103), a record of a prophecy, uttered by Mahinda to king Dēvanāmpiya-Tissa,² that after 146 years Duṭṭhagāmini would erect the Mahāthūpa or Great Thūpa, and do certain other things. Duṭṭhagāmini fulfilled the prophecy, in the first instance, by building the Lōhapāsāda palace, to serve as an *upōsatha*-hall (T., 163; W., 104). And he then determined to construct the Mahāthūpa (T., 165; W., 106).

The work was commenced (T., 169; W., 108), and was carried as far as the formation of the *dhātugabbha* or relic-

or one within another, and caused to become one; see the Nidānakathā, in the Jātaka, 1. 80, line 21 ff., and Hiuen-tsiang, in Beal, *Records*, 2. 129 f.

Fa-hian says (Beal, *Records*, 1. introd., 78) that it was originally preserved in Vaiśālī, but in his own time it was in the borders of Gandhāra, or (ibid., 32) in the country of Fo-lu-sha. He mentions other countries, including Ceylon, which it had visited or was to visit. And he says that eventually it would resolve itself into four bowls again, which would return to the Pin-na or An-na mountain, whence they had come.

Hiuen-tsiang says (Beal, *Records*, 2. 73 f.) that Buddha gave it as a token of remembrance to the Lichchavis, when he parted from them after leaving Vaiśālī on his last journey. He further says (*Records*, 1. 98; 2. 278) that after the death of Buddha it went to Gandhāra and was worshipped there for many centuries, but in his own time it was in Persia, in the king's palace, after traversing different countries.

The Buddhavaṃsa, 28. 8, allots the bowl, along with the staff and the robe, to Vajirā, a place at which there arose the schismatic Buddhist school of the Vajiriyas, and which seems (see this Journal, 1906. 666, note 3) to have been also a Jain centre.

¹ The supposed period is B.C. 161 to 137. But see this Journal, 1906. 894, note 1.

² The utterance of this prophecy and the recording of it are mentioned by Buddhaghōṣa in his Samantapāsādikā (see Vinayapitaka, 3. 341). But the fulfilment of it does not come there; and there is no hint there of the story about the Rāmagrāma relics. That the story, however, was in some form or another known to Buddhaghōṣa, seems to be established by the remarks in his Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (see this Journal, 1906. 908) that the danger which in the time of Ajātasatru was hanging over the other relics did not threaten those at Rāmagrāma, because the Nāgas had taken charge of them, and that they were destined for the great Chētiya at the Mahāvihāra in Ceylon.

chamber (T., 179 ; W., 114).¹ That was prepared from six cloud-coloured stones obtained from the land of Uttara-Kuru by two Sāmaṇēras, Uttara and Sumana : one was placed on the flower-offering ledge, in the centre ; four were placed on the sides, in the form of a coffer (*mañjūsa*) ; and the sixth, which was to be the cover, was placed apart, out of sight, on the east.² Various wonderful things, including a golden *bōdhi*-tree, were made for placing in the relic-chamber. And then there remained the matter of obtaining relics and enshrining them (T., 183 ; W., 117).

For the mission of obtaining relics there was selected a young ascetic, a Thēra named Sōnuttara, who, though only sixteen years old, had already acquired the six supernatural faculties. And, in answer to an inquiry as to where he might obtain them, the assembly of Thēras gave him the following statement (T., 184 ; W., 118) :—

When Buddha was lying on the couch on which he died, he spake thus to the god Indra :—“ Lord of the gods !, amongst the eight *dōṇas* of my corporeal relics, one *dōṇa* will be honoured by the Kōliyas at Rāmagāma. Taken thence to the world of the Nāgas, it will be honoured next by the Nāgas ; and it will be deposited in the Mahāthūpa in the island Lānkā, Ceylon.”

Moreover,—said the priests (T., 185 ; W., 118),—the far-seeing Thēra Mahā-Kassapa, the great ascetic, perceiving

¹ The process of construction is detailed at great length ; and the account is instructive. An abstract of it has been given by Cunningham in his *Bhilsa Topes*, 169 ff.

² In this case, the *dhātugarbha*, though shaped like a box, seems to have been a structural part of the Stūpa. For other apparently structural relic-chambers, reference may be made to the illustrations of three *dhātugarbhas* from the Bhaṭṭiprōlu Stūpa, given in ASSI, 6. 9, plate 3 : there, however, in each case, only two stones were used, a bottom slab and another to cover it, and the relic-chambers were sunk in the lower slabs ; the inscriptions accompanying them were (with the exception of that on the hexagonal piece of crystal) engraved on the lower slabs, round the relic-chambers (see EI, 2. 324, plates). We seem to have another structural *dhātugarbha*, somewhat like those at Bhaṭṭiprōlu, from the Boria or Lakha Medi Stūpa, near Junāgaḍh ; see JASB, 60, 1891. 18, plate 5.

We have *dhātugarbhas* which are actual boxes from Sāñchi ; see Cunningham's *Bhilsa Topes*, plate 20, and a mention of two others on page 297. So, also, the stone coffer at Piprahwa, inside which the inscribed vase and other things were found, is evidently to be classed as a *dhātugarbha* ; see *Antiquities in the Tarai*, 43, and plate 27, fig. 3.

that a distribution of relics would be made by king Dhammāsōka, induced king Ajātasattu to make a great deposit of relics in the neighbourhood of Rājagaha, causing to be carried there seven *dōṇas* of relics;¹ but, mindful of (*what had been said by*) the Teacher, he did not take the *dōṇa* which was at Rāmagāma. Having seen that great deposit of relics (*at Rājagaha*), the king Dhammāsōka set his mind on causing the eighth *dōṇa* also to be brought. But sanctified ascetics prevented Dhammāsōka, telling him that that deposit had been predestined by the Jina, i.e., the Conqueror, Buddha, to be enshrined in the Mahāthūpa. Now, the Thūpa at Rāmagrāma had been made on the bank of the Ganges, and was broken open by the current of that river; and the box containing the relics (*dhātu-karaṇḍaka*), being carried away to the sea, came to rest on a bed of gems at the place where the waters are divided in twain,² and lay there covered with rays. Some Nāgas saw the box, and going to Mañjērīka, the abode of the Nāgas, apprised their king, the Nāga Kāla.³ He, going there with ten thousand crores of Nāgas, did reverence to the relics, and took them away to his own abode; and, having erected over the relic-box a Thūpa made of all sorts of jewels and also a house, he, with the Nāgas, ever respectfully did worship to it. There is a close guard over it; but go there, and bring the relics here; to-morrow, the king will place them in this receptacle.

The story proceeds as follows (T., 186; W., 119). On the next day, the king started in procession for the Mahāmēghavana garden, with a great accompaniment of

¹ The text does not name the places whence he obtained them.

² The intention seems to be to indicate Gaṅgāsāgara, the place where the waters of the river and the ocean meet.

³ The Nāga king Kāla was celebrated for singing the praises of Buddha when the latter, having ascended the *bōdhi*-throne, was waiting to undergo the temptation by Māra; see the Dhammapada, ed. Fausbøll, 118.

Of another Nāga king, Chakravāka, an interesting statue was obtained at Bharaut; see Cunningham's *Stūpa of Bharhut*, plate 21, right. And a bas-relief from the same place shews another, Ērapata, Ēlāpatra, doing worship to (the invisible figure of) Buddha; see *ibid.*, plate 14, right.

instrumental and vocal music, to enshrine the relics. Sōnuttara, in his cell (T., 187; W., 119), heard the music, and knew from it that the procession was on its way; so, diving into the earth, he proceeded to the habitation of the Nāgas, presented himself before their king, and demanded the relics. The Nāga king, unwilling to give them up, but apprehending that Sōnuttara was quite able to take them by force, secretly intimated to his nephew, Vāsuladatta, that they should be transferred to some other place. Vāsuladatta accordingly went to the Chētiya, swallowed the box containing the relics, and betook himself to the foot of the mountain Sinēru (Mēru), where he coiled himself up, with his body, three hundred *yōjanas* long, rolled up within the circuit of a *yōjana*. Throwing forth thousands of hoods, he emitted smoke and fire. And, creating thousands of serpents similar to himself, he made them coil themselves around him; while gods and Nāgas came there in numbers, expecting to see a great fight between him and the Thēra.

The uncle, having satisfied himself that the relics had been removed, told Sōnuttara that they were not in his possession, and (T., 188; W., 120), when the Thēra persisted in demanding them, sought to pacify him by shewing him the Chētiya-house,—the house which he had erected over the Thūpa in which he had placed the relics,—exquisitely built and adorned with all sorts of gems; and, claiming that even the jewels on the lowest step of its staircase surpassed all the jewels in Laṅkā, he protested that a removal of the relics from such a place to an inferior one could not be proper. Sōnuttara, however, pointed out that a comprehension of the Truth was unattainable by Nāgas, and that it was quite right to remove the relics to a place where the Truth could be reached, and, further, that in this matter there was an intention of Buddha to be fulfilled; and he demanded the surrender of the relics without any more trouble. The Nāga said:—"If, reverend Sir!, thou seest the relics, take them and depart!" Sōnuttara made him repeat these words three times; and then, standing where he was, he stretched forth a subtile arm, and, thrusting his

hand into the nephew's mouth, took out from him the casket containing the relics. Then, bidding the Nāga remain where he was, he dived into the earth, and ascended again at his cell.

At the place where he emerged from the earth (T., 189; W., 121), the god Sakka received the box containing the relics from him, and placed it in a golden casket (*chaṅgōṭa*) on a jewelled couch or cushion under a jewelled canopy made by Vissakamma. Then (T., 190; W., 121) king Duṭṭhagāmini arrived, and placed that casket in a golden casket which he brought there on his head. Carrying them so on his head, he, attended by the community of friars, marched in procession round the Thūpa, and, ascending it on the eastern side, went down into the relic-chamber. And so, eventually (T., 191 f.; W., 122 f.), after various formalities and miraculous manifestations, in the course of which the relic-box, rising into the air, opened itself spontaneously and the relics came forth and assumed the form of Buddha, the Rāmagrāma relics were installed by Duṭṭhagāmini in the Mahāthūpa; the Sāmaṇēras Uttara and Sumana closed the relic-chamber with the sixth stone; and the Thūpa was completed and was crowned by a square capital.¹

As regards the Nāgas, the story adds (T., 188; W., 120) that, when Sōnuttara, having secured the box containing the relics, disappeared from the presence of the Nāga king, the latter, not realizing what had happened, sent a message to his nephew:—"The friar has departed, outwitted by us; bring back the relics!" The nephew, however, knew quite well that the casket was no longer in his stomach, and returned lamenting, and told his uncle what had happened; whereupon the latter exclaimed:—"It is we who have been outwitted!," and wept. Then the Nāgas repaired in a body to the community of Thēras and friars (in Ceylon), and

¹ Owing, however, to the sickness and death of Duṭṭhagāmini, the construction was not then quite finished off. The canopy, pinnacle, or spire was added, the whole erection was plastered, and a surrounding wall decorated with figures of elephants was built, by his brother and successor, Saddhā-Tissa (T., 200; W., 128).

complained sorely about having been deprived of the relics. They were consoled, however, by the gift of some small relic, or a few of the relics; and they seem to have contributed some utensils of worship in return for it.

Hiuen-tsiang.

We come, finally, to the statements left on record by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-tsiang, who travelled in India between A.D. 630 and 644.

There is no evidence that Hiuen-tsiang visited, out of the places mentioned in the list given in this Journal, 1906. 671, (4) Allakappa, (6) Vēṭhadīpa,¹ and (7) Pāvā.

He visited (3) Kapilavastu and (8) Kuśinagara. But there is no mention for either of these two places, either in the Si-yu-ki or in the *Life*, of a Stūpa containing corporeal relics of Buddha.

He visited, as did Fa-hian, between Rāmagrāma and Kuśinagara, (10) the Stūpa over the extinguished embers of the funeral pile.² Like Fa-hian, he has not mentioned either Pippalivana or the Mauryas in connexion with this memorial. And he has, in fact, attributed it to some unnamed Brāhmaṇs, and has placed it, but perhaps without any important difference, in a grove of *nyagrōdha*-trees.³ He has added that 'ever since the time (when this Stūpa 'was erected), extraordinary prodigies manifest themselves 'here without interruption; and sick persons who come to 'pray at this place, are for the most part healed.'

¹ A suggestion mentioned by me (this Journal, 1906. 900, note 1), that this place might be the modern 'Bettiah, Bettia, or Bettā,' is not tenable; Dr. Grierson having told us (page 166 above) that the latter name is Betyā, Bityā, with the dental *t*.

² See Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 332; Beal, *Records*, 2. 31; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 23. This Stūpa seems to be not mentioned in the *Life*.

³ The Pāli name, as given in the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta, is Pippalivana; see this Journal, 1906. 665. The *nyagrōdha*, Pāli *nigrōdha*, is 'Ficus Indica, the banyan-tree.' In Pāli we have *pippala*, = the Sanskrit *pippala*, 'Ficus religiosa, the sacred fig-tree,' and *pippalī*, = the Sanskrit *pippalī*, with, according to Childers, the meaning of 'the wave-leaved fig-tree,' in addition to that of 'long pepper, Piper longum,' which is given for *pippalī* by Monier-Williams.

Of the other places with which we are concerned, Hiuen-tsiang visited first Lan-mo, = Rāma, = (5) Rāmagrāma, between Kapilavastu and Kusinagara. And in connexion with Rāmagrāma he has left on record the following detailed statement,—a fuller version of the story given by Fa-hian (this Journal, 1906. 901 f.),—of which I give a rendering from the French of M. Julien (*Mémoires*, 1. 325 ff.):¹—

‘On the south-east of the ancient capital, there is a brick Stūpa, a little less than 100 feet high. In days of yore, after the *nirvāṇa* of the Tathāgata’ [the death of Buddha], ‘the first king of this realm obtained his share of the relics, brought them into his realm, and [326] built this Stūpa to honour them. Various miracles display themselves here from time to time; and sometimes (*the relics*) shed abroad a divine lustre.

‘By the side of this Stūpa, there is a pool of pure water. Every day the dragons used to come forth from it to walk, and, transforming themselves into men, used to respectfully circumambulate the Stūpa. Some wild elephants, mustered in a troop, used to pluck flowers and scatter them; encouraged by a secret power, they continued these meritorious acts without interruption.

‘This is the Stūpa in which king Aśoka (Wu-yau) deposited his share of the relics. Those which the other seven kings² had to construct, were already commenced.’

It must be parenthetically observed that there is plainly something wrong about the last two sentences, either in the text which M. Julien had before him, or in his rendering

¹ Compare Beal, *Records*, 2. 26 ff., and Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 20 ff. And for a briefer statement see the *Life*, Julien, 128; Beal, 96: that account does not add any details; on the contrary, it omits the story about Aśoka.

One would prefer to cite Mr. Watters’ rendering of Hiuen-tsiang; partly because it is in English, partly because it is the latest rendering, and so, presumably, the most up-to-date: unfortunately, however, he has almost always used the inconvenient *oratio obliqua*, and has in many places passed over details which are given in the other two versions. Of those other versions, M. Julien’s seems to be generally the preferable one. But, both in using it and otherwise, I substitute Mr. Watters’ transliterations, whenever I can find them, of the Chinese forms or translations of Indian names and words.

² Regarding the meaning of the expressions “the seven kings,” “the eight kings,” see this Journal, 1906. 897.

of it; if only because there was not any king Aśōka at the time when the original Stūpas were made. We must therefore quote the other renderings also :—

Mr. Beal has said (loc. cit., 26) :—“ In former days, when “ Aśōka-rāja, dividing the relics, built *stūpas*, having opened “ the *stūpas* built by the kings of the seven countries, he “ proceeded to travel to this country, and put his hand to “ the work (*viz., of opening this stūpa*).”

Mr. Watters has said (loc. cit., 20) :—“ When king Asoka “ was dispersing the Buddha-relics of the eight topes, having “ taken away those of seven of the topes, he came to Rāma, “ in order to carry off the relics in its tope also.”

However, M. Julien's version runs as rendered above, and then proceeds thus :—

‘ When he had arrived in this kingdom, he wished to put ‘ hand to the work ’ [*of opening the Stūpa*]. ‘ But the dragon ‘ of that pool, fearing an invasion of his domains, assumed ‘ the form of a Brāhmaṇ, and, prostrating himself at the feet ‘ of the elephant, said :—“ Great king !; you have devoted ‘ your affections to the law of Buddha, and have sown largely ‘ in the field of happiness. I venture to ask you to turn aside ‘ your chariot,¹ and to deign to visit my abode.” “ Where ‘ is your abode,” said the king; “ is it near, or far away ?” ‘ [327] “ I am the king of the dragons of this pool,” replied ‘ the Brāhmaṇ; “ as I learnt that Your Majesty wished to ‘ lay the foundations of an excellent happiness, I have ‘ ventured to come to solicit the honour of your visit.”

‘ The king, having accepted the invitation, entered forth- ‘ with the palace of the dragon. When he had sat there for ‘ a long time, the dragon came forward ’ [*in his own shape*] ‘ and said :—“ It is because of my evil actions that I received ‘ this form of a dragon. I hope that, in making some

¹ Beal has said “ to detain your carriage awhile ; ” Watters, “ to dismount.” The text seems to mean plainly that the king was riding in a chariot drawn by an elephant. Such chariots were one of the customary means of conveyance; see, for instance, the Paṭṭadakal inscription (IA, 11, 125), of the time of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dhruva (about A.D. 783), which records that Bādipodḍi, a harlot of the temple of Lōkamahādevī, presented a horse-chariot and an elephant-chariot.

‘offerings to the relics, I may be able to efface my past crimes. I desire that the king should himself go near to the Stūpa, that he may examine it and also offer his homage (*to the relics*).’

‘When king Asōka (Wu-yau) had finished looking, he was seized with fear, and said:—“None of the objects which you use for making offerings at all resemble those which are in use among men.” “If it is so,” replied the dragon, “I ardently desire that you should not destroy them.”’

‘King Asōka (Wu-yau), recognizing that he was not strong enough to contend with the dragon, renounced the construction that he had designed’ [*? the intention that he had formed*].¹ ‘At the spot where the dragon came forth from the pool, there has been placed an inscription.’

Hiuen-tsiang goes on to narrate, much like Fa-hian, the story about elephants tending the place, and about the establishment, near the Stūpa, of a monastery which had been maintained under the direction of a Śrāmaṇera up to his own time. It seems unnecessary to repeat that. But a few words may be added about the position of Rāmagrāma; because there, if anywhere, there might be found an intact Stūpa containing really some of the corporeal relics of Buddha.

The place was named Rāmagrāma after the king, Rāma,—a king of Benares, who had abdicated and gone into exile because he was afflicted with leprosy,—by whom it was founded. It was named Kōlanagara, because (it seems) a *kōla*-tree, *Zizyphus jujuba*, or a grove of such trees, was cleared away to make the site for it. From the same source, the people derived their name Kōliya; and so the place was also known as Kōliyanagara, as being the town of the Kōliyas. And it was further called in Pāli Vyagghapajja, and in Sanskrit Vyāghrapadya, ‘the tiger’s path,’ in connexion with the circumstances in which Rāma found and

¹ Beal has “did not attempt to open the stūpa (*to take out the relics*).” Watters has “abandoned the idea of rifling the tope.”

married the eldest sister of the banished princes who founded Kapilavastu and the race of the Sakyas (see this Journal, 1906. 161 f., 163 f.), who had been immured in a subterranean abode because she also was afflicted with leprosy.¹

Fa-hian and Hiuen-tsiang agree in locating Rāmagrāma on the east of the Lumbinīvana garden, the position of which is fixed by the now well-known Rummindēi. But it is quite certain that, for some reason or another, in this part of their narratives "east" means "south-east."²

Fa-hian says that the distance from the Lumbinīvana to Rāmagrāma was 5 *yōjanas*, = (see this Journal, 1906. 1012) 22·72 miles. Hiuen-tsiang puts it, according to Beal at 300 *li*, but according to Julien and Watters at 200 *li*, = (see *ibid.*, 1013) 24·24 miles. The two statements together, taken as plainly statements in round-numbers, indicate a distance of about 23 to 24 miles.

The Jātaka No. 536 (ed. Fausböll, 5. 412) mentions the town as Kōliyanagara, and places a river named Rōhiṇī between Kapilavatthunagara, the city Kapilavastu, and Kōliyanagara; i.e., as I understand the matter, not actually between the sites themselves of the two towns, but between the territories of which those towns were the capitals. It does not say whether Kōliyanagara was on the bank of the Rōhiṇī. But of course it has the effect of placing Kōliyanagara on the east of the Rōhiṇī; Kapilavastu being on the west.

The Mahāvamsa (see page 347 above) locates the Rāmagrāma Stūpa on the bank of a river. It calls that river the Gaṅgā, the Ganges. But we need only understand it as meaning, in accordance with a not infrequent license, some

¹ For the whole story, see Buddhaghōṣa's *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, ed. Davids and Carpenter, part 1. 260 ff. For another account, similar in leading features but differing in details, see the *Mahāvastu*, ed. Senart, 1. 348 ff.; according to that, however, Kapilavastu was built on the site of a grove, not of *sāka*-trees (teak or Sāl, as the case may be), but of *sākōṭa*-trees (*Trophis aspera*).

Will someone favour us with translations of these (and other) legends? There is much that is of interest in them. My own work leads me only to skim the surface of them.

² Possibly, they both did this part of their travels in the winter, and, starting on each stage at sunrise and taking their bearings by the sun, omitted to allow sufficiently for the declination of the sun.

river the waters of which flowed more or less directly into the Ganges.

These indications, taken together, point to the result that we should look for the Rāmagrāma Stūpa on or near to the east bank of the Rōhin Nadi, somewhere about six miles towards the west from a place which is shewn as 'Bagapar,' in lat. 27° 12', long. 83° 34', in the Indian Atlas sheet No. 102 (1880), about thirty-two miles towards the north-north-east from Gōrakhpūr and twenty-five miles south-east-half-south from Rummindēi. And, while it is rash to speculate when one has not, as a basis, even the certified correct form of a modern place-name, it seems perhaps not impossible that some reminiscence of the name Vyāghrapadya may be preserved in what the map shews as 'Bagapar.'

Hiuen-tsiang visited next (9) the Stūpa raised by the Brāhmaṇ Drōṇa over the *kumbha*, the earthen jar in which the bones of Buddha had been collected. He has perhaps located this memorial in a kingdom,¹ visited by him between Po-lo-na-se (Vārāṇasī, Benares) and Fei-shê-li (Vaiśālī), and mentioned by him as Tchen-tchou according to M. Julien, as Chen-chu according to Mr. Beal, and as Chan-chu according to Mr. Watters; which I take (see below) as meaning Chañchu. He has described it as being in ruins, but still several tens of feet high. And his statement in connexion with it runs as follows (Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 383):²—

'In days of yore, after the Tathāgata had entered *nirvāṇa*, the great kings of eight realms divided amongst them his relics. The Brāhmaṇ who measured out the relics, smeared with honey the inside of the vase which he used. After distributing the relics to the eight kings, the Brāhmaṇ took his vase, and returned home. Having thus obtained some relics which had stuck therein, he erected a Stūpa, and

¹ It is usually understood that this Stūpa was in the kingdom in question. But, in describing his approach to it from the last preceding place visited by him, he says, according to Julien, 'in leaving this country,'—*en partant de ce pays*.

² Compare Beal, *Records*, 2. 65; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 60. This Stūpa seems to be not mentioned in the *Life*.

‘placed them with the vase in the centre of the monument. Thence there came the name of that Stūpa.’¹

‘Eventually, king Aśoka (Wu-yau) opened the Stūpa, and took from it the vase which contained the relics. Then he reconstructed the monument, and enlarged it.’²

‘Sometimes, when there comes a fast-day, a radiant light is seen to issue from this Stūpa.’

A few remarks may be made on the locality of this Stūpa also.

M. Julien said that the Chinese form of the name, Tchen-tchou-koue as transliterated by him, means ‘kingdom of the master of battles;’ and he suggested either Yōdhapatipura as the Sanskrit original of that, or Yōdharājapura as the original of the form Tchen-wang-koue, ‘kingdom of the king of battles,’ which he found in a certain Buddhist encyclopaedia. M. Vivien de Saint-Martin pointed out (*Mémoires*, 2. 362) that, on that understanding, Yuddhapatipura or Yuddharājapura would be more accurate, and proposed to identify the place with Ghāzīpūr, on the north bank of the Ganges, about forty-five miles east-north-east from Benares.³ General Sir Alexander Cunningham (AGI, 438 f.), accepting that identification as certain, cited a statement that the name Ghāzīpūr is a Musalmān adaptation of an original Hindū name Garjpur,⁴ and proposed to take Hiuen-tsiang’s form as the translation of a Sanskrit Garjana-patipura. Mr. Watters said that the term Chan-chu means ‘fighting lord’ or ‘lord of battle,’ and “is evidently a

¹ Hiuen Tsiang has not reported the name of this Stūpa, which might well come to be known as either the Drōṇa-Stūpa or the Kumbha-Stūpa.

Julien has told us that the Chinese word *p’ing*, used here to denote the vase, is one which occurs elsewhere as the equivalent of the Sanskrit *karka*, ‘a water-jar.’ Watters, however, has said that it is the recognized rendering of the Sanskrit *kumbha*.

² Beal says:—“Afterwards Aśoka-rāja, opening (*the stūpa*), took the relics “and the pitcher, and in place of the old one built a great *stūpa*.”

Watters says:—“Afterwards King Aśoka took away the relics and jar, and “replaced the old tope by a large one.”

³ That is, as the crow flies; the distance along the bends of the river is much more.

⁴ This, however, seems to be a mistake for Gādhīpura; see the Imperial Gazetteer of India, 5. 62, and Mr. Hoey in JASB, 69, 1900. 86.

translation of a Sanskrit name or epithet with a similar meaning ;” and, without expressing any definite opinion about the proposed identification, he further remarked that “*chan* is used to translate *yuddha* and *chu* stands for several words such as *pati*, *svāmin*, and *īśvara*, and the Chan-chu of our text may be the rendering of a word like Yuddhapati, which may be an epithet of Siva.”

Now, M. Julien observed (loc. cit., 377, note 1) that this kingdom is the only one of which Hiuen-tsiang has given the name in Chinese, instead of offering us the pronunciation in phonetic characters. This being so, I venture to think, in spite of there being the form ‘Tchen-wang’ as well as ‘Tchen-tchou,’ that there has been a misunderstanding ; that Hiuen-tsiang has in reality, in accordance with his otherwise unfailing practice, given us here, also, his transliteration in Chinese of an Indian name, Chañchu ;¹ and that the supposition to the contrary is to be simply attributed to the fact that the Chinese syllables *chan-chu*, really used here as a phonetic rendering, happen to have an actual meaning, coupled with the fact that, though *chañchu* is a perfectly well known Sanskrit word, with various meanings (notably, ‘the beak of a bird’), it had not been found anywhere else as a place-name or as a part of such a name. As regards one point, we have a very similar case in the writings of Sung-yun, who (see Beal, *Records*, 1. introd., 103) mentioned a certain “tower” as “a Tsioh-li Feou-thou, a pagoda with a surmounting pole ;” to which Beal attached the note :—“*Tsioh-li* means a sparrow, but it is a phonetic for *śūla*, a surmounting spear or trident.” As regards the other, I find a mention of a place named Chañchu, which I take to be the same one, in the Sōhgaurā plate (JASB, 63, 1894. proceedings, 86, plate ; IA, 25. 262). That record, as I understand it,² is a public notification relating to three

¹ I may remark that, if Hiuen-tsiang’s Chan-chu had really to be taken as a translation, then, as Mr. Hoey has observed to me, a most appropriate Sanskrit original of it would be *Raṇēśvara*, from which we might easily have a modern name such as that of Rasrā in the Ballia district.

² See, fully, a separate article on this record.

great highways of vehicular traffic. It notifies that at the junction, named Manavasi, of the three roads, in two villages named Dasilimata and Usagāma, storehouses were made for the goods of people using the roads. It indicates the roads by mentioning, in line 3, the three places to and from which they led, as regards the junction of them. And I recognize Chañchu as one of the names there given.

Hiuen-tsiang places the capital of Chañchu on the Ganges, and plainly on the north bank, at 300 *li*, i.e. three days' journey, down the river to the east from Benares. Going thence 200 *li* to the east and about 100 *li* to the south-east, he came to a town Mo-ha-sho-lo, on the south side of the river. Thence he went 30 *li* east, and then, "in leaving this country," about 100 *li* south-east, and so reached the Stūpa over the *kumbha*. And thence, travelling to the north-east and crossing the Ganges to the north, he reached Vaiśālī by a journey of 140 or 150 *li*.

It appears certain that from Benares to Mo-ha-sho-lo, and perhaps for also the next short stage, Hiuen-tsiang was using the Ganges itself for travelling. And, going downstream, he would make very much more each day than the customary 12·12 miles (= 100 *li*) of travelling by road. On an examination of all the details, it seems to me that it is probable that Ghāzīpūr really is Chañchu, and that this Stūpa was a few miles on the west or south-west of Arrah in the Shāhābād district.

Hiuen-tsiang next visited (2) Vaiśālī. In his account of this place, after mentioning a Stūpa, built by Aśoka, which marked a spot where Śāriputra and others attained the condition of being Arhats, he has said (Julien, *Mémoires*, 1. 386):¹ —

'To the south-east of the place where Śāriputra attained 'the dignity of being an Arhat, there is a Stūpa which was 'built by a king of Vaiśālī. After Buddha had entered 'into *nirvāṇa*, the first king of this realm obtained, in the

¹ Compare Beal, *Records*, 2. 67; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 65. This Stūpa seems to be not mentioned in the *Life*.

‘division, a portion of his relics, and, to honour them, expressly raised this monument.

‘We read in the In-tu-ki (Notes on India):—In this Stūpa, there was formerly a *drōṇa*¹ of relics of Buddha. King Asōka (Wu-yau), having opened this Stūpa, took nine *teou*, bushels, of relics, and left only one.

‘In subsequent times,² there was a king of this realm who wished to open again the Stūpa and take the’ [*remaining*] relics. But, at the moment when he went to apply himself to the work, the earth trembled, and he did not dare further to violate this monument.’

Hiuen-tsiang finally visited the locality which included (1) Rājagriha. And he was shewn there a Stūpa, containing corporeal relics of Buddha, in respect of which he has given us the following statement (Julien, *Mémoires*, 2. 31):³—

‘To the east of the Karaṇḍa-Vēṇuvana, the bamboo-grove of Karaṇḍa,⁴ there is a Stūpa which was built by king Ajātaśatru. After the *nirvāṇa* of the Tathāgata, the kings divided amongst them his relics (*she-li* = *śarīra*). King Ajātaśatru returned home with the share which he obtained, respectfully built a Stūpa, and offered homage to it.

‘King Asōka (Wu-yau), having conceived a sincere faith, opened the monument, took the relics, and built in his turn another Stūpa.

‘We still see the remains of it, which constantly emit a brilliant light.’

¹ The Chinese text mentions here the measure *ho* or *hoh*, which Julien has explained as containing ten bushels, and for which he substituted *drōṇa* because *ho* answers to the Sanskrit *drōṇa* in the name of Ho-fan-wang, = Drōṇodanarāja, one of the uncles of Buddha. Beal has used the word *hoh*, and has explained it as meaning ten pecks. Watters has said “a bushel (*hu* or *drōṇa*).”

These various renderings illustrate well the difficulty of finding suitable western equivalents for oriental technical terms; especially if we bear in mind that a bushel contains only four pecks, not ten.

² Watters has not given this part of the statement.

³ Compare Beal, *Records*, 2. 160; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 158. The *Life* does not add anything, except in one detail noted below. Neither in the *Si-yu-ki* nor in the *Life* is the number of the “kings” mentioned in this place.

⁴ Julien, transcribing the Chinese by Kia-lan-t’o, took it as equivalent to Karaṇḍa. Beal followed him. Watters has given Ka-lan-t’o, and has taken it as meaning Kalanda.

In connexion with the last sentence, it is to be remarked that the *Life* says (Julien, 155; Beal, 115) that Aśoka allowed a small portion of the relics to remain there.

With a view to comparing Hiuen-tsiang's statement in this matter with Fa-hian's (this Journal, 1906. 901) and with the story given by Buddhaghōsha (ibid., 905 ff.), the following remarks must be made here.

In this locality there were two cities, which have come to be treated as "Old Rājagriha" and "New Rājagriha," though it is questionable whether the name Rājagriha ever really belonged to the older city, the original one.¹ And, as regards the connexion between the two cities, and the foundation of the later one, Hiuen-tsiang has given us an account, of which I give an abstract from Julien's *Mémoires*, 2. 38 ff.,² as follows:—

The old town was the one in which king Bimbisāra resided at first. Fires were constantly breaking out in it; and the houses were so crowded together that the fires always spread and caused great destruction.³ Towards stopping the evil, Bimbisāra issued a decree that an inquiry should always be made into the origin of any such fire, and that the person responsible for it should be banished as an outcast into "the cold forest," the place where corpses were thrown. On a certain occasion, a conflagration had its origin in the palace of Bimbisāra himself; and, in pursuance of his decree, he resigned the government to "the Prince Royal or Crown Prince,"—to "his eldest son" (Beal); to "his

¹ The only statement in that direction, that I can trace, is in the *Dīpavaṃsa*, 3. 52, which speaks of Bōdhisa (Bhātiya) the father of Bimbisāra, as reigning "amid the five mountains, in Rājagaha." This, however, appears to be worth no more, for purposes of accuracy, than a statement in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, 1. 32, 8 f., which describes the river Sumāgadhi, the Sōn, as looking, in flowing through Magadha, like a garland amidst the five hills which surrounded Vasumatī, Girivraja. Rājagriha was outside the five hills; and it is hardly possible that the Sōn can ever have flowed in between them.

² Compare Beal, *Records*, 2. 165 ff.; Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, 2. 162.

³ This story illustrates the danger from fire which, according to Buddha's prophecy, might befall Pāṭaliputra; see this Journal, 1906. 668. The danger from water seems to be attributable to the river Sōn, which at one time flowed into the Ganges on the east of Patna, but now joins that river some fifteen miles away to the west of the city.

heir" (Watters),—and banished himself. The king of Vaiśālī, hearing that Bimbisāra was absent in banishment, raised an army and prepared to make an invasion. The wardens of the marches having informed "the king,"¹ a city was built (*in order to ward off the invaders*).² And because "the king" was the first to inhabit it, it was named Rājagriha, "the (*town of the*) house of the king." Others say—(Hiuen Tsiang has added)—that this town, the new one, was only founded in the reign of Ajātaśatru.³ The eldest son of that prince (of Ajātaśatru), on succeeding to the throne, forthwith established his residence there. And subsequently Aśoka transferred his court to Pāṭaliputra,⁴ and gave Rājagriha to Brāhmaṇs.

Hiuen-tsiang reached first the older city; arriving at it, from the direction of Gayā, through the hills on the west of it (Julien, 2. 15; Beal, 2. 149; Watters, 2. 148). He has mentioned this as Ku-she-ka-lo-pu-lo (Watters, 2. 323), = perhaps Kuśāgrapura, perhaps Kuśāṅkurapura, and as "the city surrounded by mountains," i.e. Girivraja. Leaving that city by its northern gate (J., 2. 29; B., 2. 159; W., 2. 156), he came, by only one *li*, to the Vēṇuvana, the bamboo-grove, where Karaṇḍa or Kalanda built a Vihāra which he gave to Buddha. On the east of this grove, at a distance which he has not specified, there was shewn to him the relic-Stūpa built by king Ajātaśatru, his account of which has been given above (page 359). On the north of the Vēṇuvana Vihāra, at a distance of 200 paces, he came (J., 2. 38;

¹ That is, apparently, the king in exile, Bimbisāra. Beal added a note (loc. cit., 166, note 72) to the effect that this new town was built, "as it seems, 'in the place where the king was living. From this it would appear that the 'site of the new town of Rājagriha had been before used as a burial-ground 'for the people of the 'old town.'"

The next sentence seems to imply a return of Bimbisāra from his self-imposed banishment.

² Compare the story about Pāṭaligāma, Pāṭaliputra; see this Journal, 1906. 667 f.

³ So, for instance, Fa-hian; see page 362 below.

⁴ On this point, compare another passage in Hiuen Tsiang's writings; see this Journal, 1906. 669. Julien has left it undetermined whether Aśoka is here mentioned as Wu-yau or otherwise; so also in the corresponding passage in the *Life*, 160; in respect of this detail, see this Journal, 1906. 669, note 2.

B., 2. 165; W., 2. 161) to the site of the Karaṇḍa or Kalanda pool or tank, which had dried up after the death of Buddha. At only two or three *li* to the north-west of that pool or tank, he came (loc. cit.; all three) to a Stūpa built by Aśōka, by the side of which there was a stone pillar bearing an inscription. And then, at a short unspecified distance to the north-east from that Stūpa and pillar, he arrived (loc. cit.; all three) at the city Ho-lo-shi-ki-li-hi (Beal), i.e. Rājagriha.

Fa-hian travelled by a different route, from Patna. He first reached, according to Laidlay (*Pilgrimage of Fa Hian*, 264), "the New Town of the Royal Residence; this new town was built by the king A-che-shi" (i.e., Ajātaśatru); according to Legge (*Travels of Fā-hien*, 81), "New Rājagriha, the new city which was built by king Ajātaśatru;" according to Beal (*Records*, 1. introd., 58), "the new Rājagriha; this was the town which king Ajātaśatru built." He says (Laidlay, loc. cit.):¹—"On leaving by the western gate, you "arrive, at the distance of 300 paces, at a tower raised by "king A-che-shi, when he obtained a portion of the reliques "of Foe: it is lofty, grand, beautiful, and majestic." And he proceeds (ibid.):—"Leaving the town on the southern side, "and proceeding four *li* to the south, you enter a valley "which leads to the Five Hills: these five hills form a girdle "like the walls of a town; it is the Ancient Town of the "king Ping-sha" (i.e., Bimbisāra).

Thus, the southern exit from Rājagriha was at quite a short distance—according to Fa-hian, four *li*, a little under half a mile; with which the details given by Hiuen-tsiang fit in quite well,—from the northern gate of Girivraja. The relic-Stūpa which was shewn to Hiuen-tsiang, and was described to him as having been made by Ajātaśatru and opened by Aśōka, was to the east from a point, which was at one *li* from the northern gate of Girivraja, on the north-and-south line between Rājagriha and Girivraja; and it was evidently the Stūpa over the underground deposit which was made by Ajātaśatru, on the advice of the Thēra Mahā-Kāśyapa, for the purpose of ensuring the safety of the bulk

¹ For Legge and Beal, see this Journal, 1906. 901.

of seven of the eight original shares of the corporeal relics of Buddha, somewhere, as Buddhaghōṣha tells us (this Journal, 1906. 908 f.), on the south-east of Rājagṛiha. The relic-Stūpa made by Ajātaśatru, which was shewn to Fa-hian, was 300 paces outside the western gate of Rājagṛiha; and it was plainly the Stūpa which Ajātaśatru had made in the first instance (this Journal, 1906. 665, 908), over only his own share of the relics.