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Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,
I am grateful to the Executive Body of the International Association of Buddhist Studies for selecting me to be the President of this august Conference. I am conscious of my shortcomings and of my heavy responsibilities.

Buddhism is a very vast and complicated subject, spreading throughout the length and breadth of the world. Buddhist Studies no longer is an appendage of some branch of the Humanities, but now has attained the status of an independent subject. I do not know where to start. But the first President of the IABS General Conference, Professor Gadjin M. Nagao, has already cracked the nut. The great Sanskrit poet Kālidāsa has very aptly said: *manau vajra samutkīrṇe sūtrasyevāsti me gatiḥ*. "I can move like a thread in the gem or precious stone after it has been perforated by a diamond-pin." My position is just like that.

Professor Nagao has very ably and exhaustively enumerated and illustrated the methods to be adopted for the study of Buddhism at present. As a resumé, it may be stated here that for the study of Buddhism he suggests two methods: the method of analysis and the method of synthesis. By analysis, information, be it textual, archaeological or any other type transmitted to us, can be converted into or established as fact. For synthesis, we must bridge gaps between (i) the Jaina and Buddhist traditions, (ii) the Theravāda tradition and the Sarvāstivāda and other traditions, (iii) the Mādhyamika and Vijñānavāda traditions, (iv) the Buddhist logical tradition and the later Mahāyānic and Tantric traditions, (v) Indian Buddhism and Chinese Buddhism, and (vi) Indian Buddhism and Tibetan Buddhism.

These suggestions have covered all aspects of Buddhist Studies
as an independent area of the Humanities. This is nearly exhaustive. Still, I venture to make a few more suggestions for the consideration of the scholars of this august gathering.

In addition, I think that the study of Buddhism needs the study of anthropology. In 1950 when I was in China, the Panchen Lama also was visiting China, and a reception, in addition to State receptions, was organized in the Lama Temple of Pei Hai, Beijing. As I was an Indian, I was given the privilege of joining the reception. At this reception, one was to present, in addition to other things, a khā-tā to the Panchen Lama at the time of paying respect to him. I had no idea of what a khā-tā was. I paid about Rs.2 for one the next day, it was nothing but a scarf-like piece of woven cotton cloth, about 6 inches wide and 2 yards long, having a border on each end. After the Panchen Lama arrived in the temple he took his seat on a high pedestal in front of the Buddha statue. When his worship was over, we passed before him in a line, bowing our heads and presenting the khā-tā. When we bowed, he touched our heads with two pieces of cane with tassels at the end. As soon as we passed, a man gave us in return a small piece of red cloth with a knot in the middle. When the passing ceremony was over, cooked rice, soup and other vegetables in a Chinese bowl, with a Chinese spoon in them, were offered to the Lama as to a Buddha or deity. When the food was brought out, all the devotees, male and female, rushed to it and took some pieces from it.

What is the origin of this practice? It is not a Chinese custom, nor is khā-tā a Chinese word. Surprisingly, a similar custom is found in the Jagannath temple of Orissa in India. I have never seen khā-tā anywhere in India but Puri. Further, devotees at the Puri temple put on a piece of red cloth, like the garland torn from the cloth used by Lord Jagannath. It is generally called Śrī Kāpada, or auspicious piece of torn cloth.

I have already mentioned that khā-tā is not a Chinese word. It might have some relation with khādi or the Khadi Movement of Mahatma Gandhi; and at Puri, dhotī, or lengths of men’s wear, are called “khādi”. In Tibetan, there are two words, kha-btags and kha-thi. The meaning of kha-btags is given by Das as “Anything that is put on the face, i.e., presented or placed before a person for his acceptance; hence that ubiquitous article of Tibetan social intercourse, the presentation of a salutation scarf;” and “kha-thi—a kind of satin in variegated colors.” The khā-tā mentioned above has some relation with the kha-btags and kha-thi of Tibet, and the khādi of India and the khādi of Puri.
The practice by devotees of taking food offered to the Panchen Lama has some similarity with the communal eating of food offered to Lord Jagannath by the devotees of the Hindu community, irrespective of caste. I think it is the remnant of a Buddhist practice of the Tantric period, still lingering at the Puri temple. Food at the Puri temple is not polluted by the touch of a person of any caste, even if it is left over after eating and thrown on the road. It is called nirmālya or unsullied. In the Hevajra Tantra it is said:

\[
\textit{bhaksyam bhojyam tathā pāṇam yathā prāptamtu bhakṣayet grahāṇaṁ nātra kartavyamīśānta-vikalpah bhakṣyābhaksyavicāramtupayā-}
\textit{peyam tathaiva ca gamyāgamyam tathā mantri vikalpam naiva kārayet}
\]

One should take food or meal and drink as available: one should not take it with the hesitation that it is agreeable or disagreeable or acceptable or unacceptable. The Mantrin or the practicant should not have any hesitation or reservation in his mind regarding whether the food is edible or inedible, the drink potable, and a lady cohabitable or uncohabitable.

In the Guhya Siddhi, it is said:

\[
\textit{bhaiksya-paryātanārthāya na pātram saṃgraheṇa vrati bhukttattaram tu saṃgrhyā rathyā-karpamavallaṁ tatraiva paryate bhikṣāṁ patamānāṁ ca bhaksayet bhaksyavā tu tām tasmin trpastraiva tām tyajet} (MS-6th Chapter.)
\]

At the time of wandering for begging alms, the vratin or practicant is not to collect or hoard a bowl; he is to collect a pot-sherd (or pot or a bowl) thrown on the road after eating and should beg alms in that or should take what is thrown or has fallen there; after taking his food from that pot and being satisfied, he should leave or throw it (the pot) there.

When we compare this injunction with the practice at Puri even today, we can see some similarity. At present people take their food from the earthen cooking pot or pot-sherd, even thrown or left by some persons after they have taken their food. They take their food together from the same pot or pot-sherd without any caste-prejudice or restriction and without any hesitation they take left-over food or offal.

In the above-mentioned verse, one of the meanings of karpara is pot or pot-sherd, and the meaning of mallaka is bowl. The word mallaka may also be derived from malla, which means, among other things, drinking vessel or cup and the remnants of oblation. The word
karpara has another form, kharpara, meaning almost the same, and from it are derived the Hindi words kharpara or kha̓para, which mean alms bowl; and kha̓pada, meaning earthen alms-bowl or pot-sherd. In Oriya there is another word, kha̓parā-khiā, meaning “one who takes food from a pot-sherd.” This practice is still prevalent in the Jagannath temple of Orissa.

Within the campus of Puri temple, cooked food, after being offered to Lord Jannath, is sold in the same earthen cooking pots or pot-sherds. These pots or pot-sherds are collected when thrown after food-taking and are utilised for selling food again. Without hesitation people take food from these pots or pot-sherds. Further, the pots used for cooking in the Puri temple have a peculiar shape. Generally, the earthen cooking-pots in India have a thick rim protruding outside, but the earthen cooking pots used in the Puri temple have no rims. In Orissa, there is a Mahimā sect, also called the Kumbhipāṭā sect, the followers of which take food early in the morning, and if they are offered food in the earthen pots, they very dexterously break the rim, probably in order to make them pot-sherds, and take their food in them. Has the shape of earthen pots used in the Puri temple some relation with the pot-sherds or rathyā karparamallakaṇṭa, pots and pot-sherds thrown on the road?

I may repeat here what you probably already know; that in place of nine planets (nava-grahas) usually carved on the door-jamb of a temple, the ten incarnations have been carved on the door jamb of the Puri temple, and a figure of the Lord Jagannath has taken the place of Lord Buddha as the ninth incarnation. The Buddha seems to have been transformed into Jagannath; this contention is further supported by the fact that in the Cuttack district of Orissa, at villages like Badambā, Nuāpāṭňā, etc., there is a community called Sarākas, whose members are weavers by profession. The word Sarākas might have been derived from Śrāvaka. That apart, we see that Sarāka houses have niches and in the niches are small statues of the Buddha and Jagannath for daily worship. In Bolangir district, in the far western part of Orissa, on the border of Madhya Pradesh, a manuscript called Buddha Purāṇa Vā Jagannatha Purāṇa has been found; it deals mainly with the history of Jagannath, but called “Buddha Purāṇa.” Further, in that part of Orissa, i.e., Sambalpur-Bolangir and other districts, the bell-metal pots and plates for taking watery rice and vegetables have a shape similar to that of the Buddhist alms-bowls and cover still prevalent in Ceylon and other parts of the Buddhist world.
I also learned when I was in China, that at the time of the installation of a statue of Buddha in Beijing and other parts of China and Tibet, a small, specially-designed Buddhist sutra is placed in a hole or a pit carved out on the chest of the statue. I procured some examples of such sutras. In the Puri temple the wooden statue of Jagannath is changed every 12 years and something taken out of the old statue is placed in the new one by a blind-folded person whose hands are covered by silken cloth.

These are a few examples that can be studied and solved by anthropology. Now I will pose before this august body an anthropological problem that has preoccupied me for a long time. In the Abhidharma Kośa Bhāṣya, while commenting on the last part of the 68th karika of the 4th chapter, i.e., Prayogastu Trimūlajah, as the illustrations of the mohaja prāñāṭpāta, or killing out of ignorance, and kāma mithyācāra, or amorous wrong-doing or co-habitation out of aberration, Vasubandhu says:

*pārasīkānām ca te hyeyamāhuḥ-mātāpitarau jīrṇau vā glānau vā hantavyau.

The Persians kill out of ignorance. They say 'Mother and father, if aged or diseased, are to be killed.'

As regards mohaja kāma mithyācāra, or amorous wrong-doing or co-habitation on account of aberration, he says,

*mohajo yathā pārasīkānām maṭrādigramanam gosave ca yajñe yathoktam, brāhmaṇo gosavenesya samvatsara-govrati bhavati. upahā udakam cuṣati trāṇi chinatti upaṭi maṭāramuṭpaṇavaṁ sarāmaṁ sagotrāmī. ye cāhurudūkhala pūnyaphala pakvānna tīrtha mārga prakhyo maṭryāmathi iti.

The example of wrong-doing (co-habitation) on account of aberration is as of the Persians having (copulation with) the mother and the like and in Gosava sacrifice. It is said, 'a Brāhmaṇ, for the sake of the Gosava sacrifice, should practice or lead the mode of life of a cow for a year, i.e., the sacrificer (like a cow) sucks water, lops off grass, approaches (co-habits with) mothers, sisters and kin.' Further, they also say that the class of mothers (women) is like husking machines, reward of meritorious acts, cooked food, ford in a river and a road.

The practice seems to be very queer. Was it practised anywhere? La Vallée Poussin quotes in relation to it from the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, 132
in a note explaining the Gosava sacrifice, how one observes the vow and practises like a cow, which has close similarity with the practice mentioned in the *Abhidharma Kośa Bhāṣya*. Further, the comparison of the mother class with the husking machine, reward of meritorious deeds, cooked food, descent into the river and the road is partially echoed in the *Divyāvadāna*. Of these five, two are elaborated in the *Dharmaruci Avadāna* as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{panthā samo mātrgrāmāḥ yenaiva hi} \\
\text{pathā pīṭā gacchati, putro'pi tenaiva gacchati. na cāsau panthā} \\
\text{putrasyānugachchato dosakārako bhavati. evameva mātrgrāmāḥ.} \\
\text{tīrtha samo'pi ca mātrgrāmāḥ yatraiva hi tīrthe pīṭā sāti,} \\
\text{putro'pi tasmin snāti, na ca tīrtham putrasya snāyato dosakārako} \\
\text{bhavati. evameva mātrgrāmāḥ. api ca pratvantesu janapadesu} \\
\text{dharmatānvisaśa yaśyaṁ-eva pīṭā asaddharmayābhigacchati tenaiva} \\
\text{putro'pyadhigacchati. (page 158—159).}
\end{align*}
\]

The mother class is like a road. The son also goes by the same road by which the father goes. The road does not cause any guilt to the son who goes after; the mother class is like that. The mother class is like the ford in the river. The son also takes his bath in the same ford where the father takes his bath; the ford does not cause any guilt to the son, who takes his bath there. The mother class is like that. Further, it is the prescribed course of conduct in the border countries that the son also goes to (or co-habits with) her, whom the father falls in with (or meets with).

From these two elaborations we may easily understand the meaning of the other three, viz., husking machine, reward of meritorious deeds and cooked food, which are also meant for common use. These practices are said in the *Divyāvadāna* to be prevalent in the border countries; they are said in the *Abhidharma Kośa Bhāṣya* to be prevalent among the Pārasikas, or the Persians. As regards *pakvānna*, or cooked food, it may be said that among the people of border countries or Persia, in other words, the Muslims, there is communal dining. But the main problem, i.e., the practice of cohabitation with the mother class, including mother, sister and kinswoman, and the killing of mother and father when they are old and diseased, which also has been referred to as prevalent among the Persians, still remains unsolved. I inquired of many Persian scholars, and they could not throw any light on it. Therefore, a thorough search should be made by the scholars of Anthropology regarding the origin of such facts or myths.
There is mention not only of govrata, or cow-like life, but also of kukkura-vrata, or the dog-like life, in the Kukkura-Vratika Sutra of the Majjhima Pannâsaka of the Majjhima Nikâya. In these suttas, Purna Kolivaputta was a go-vratika, or the follower of cow-like life, and Acela Seniya was a kukkura-vratika, or follower of dog-like life. As mentioned above, there is some light thrown on go-vrata, or cow-like life, but no light has yet been thrown on kukkura-vrata, or dog-like life, except that the practicant is to sit crooked or bent like a dog (kukkuro va polikujjivâ ekamantam nisiditi) and to take food thrown on the ground (chamâ nikkhittem bhojanam bhuñjati). Similarly, we come across aja-vrata, or goat-like life (Jataka, IV, 318), vagguli-vrata, bat-like practice (J., I, 493: III, 235; IV, 229) and the like. These vrata indicate the existence of different ascetic sects in ancient India. Do they exist in other countries and is there mention of them in other religions? The study of these things will certainly throw new light on Buddhism and Buddhist culture.

Now, let us take mythology into consideration. There are many Buddhist stories that have penetrated into Hindu mythology and the Purânas, sometimes with considerable change. Sometimes they take the form of folk-tale; sometimes folk tales may be their source. For illustration we may take the third story, “Tissa Thera Vatthu” of the “Yamak Vagga” of the Dhammapada Atthakathâ. In this attakathâ is the story of the quarrel between Devila and Nârada, two ascetics of the Himalaya, who come down to a town for salt and sour and stay in the potter’s hall. When Nârada wakes and goes out into the night, he steps on the matted hair of Devila as the latter shifts in his sleep. Devila gets annoyed and Nârada asks his forgiveness. While returning, Nârada steps on Devila’s neck, as Devila had shifted to avoid a repetition. This time Devila gets angered and Nârada asks his forgiveness. While returning, Nârada steps on Devila’s neck, as Devila had shifted to avoid a repetition. This time Devila gets furious and curses Nârada, saying:

\[
\text{sahassaramsi satatejo sūriyo tamovinodano} \\
\text{pātodayininte sūriyo muddhā te phalatu sattadāh} \\
\]

The sun has thousand beams, a hundred glares, and dispels darkness. Soon after the sun rises in the morning, let your head break into seven pieces.

In return, Nârada, who is innocent, curses Devila with the same words. With his superhuman power he can see that the curse will befall Devila, and out of compassion he does not allow the sun to rise. As the sun does not rise and the darkness continues, people cannot do
any work. Troubled, they go to the King and blame him. But the king cannot find any fault of his own, and apprehending that it may be on account of the quarrel between the ascetics, he finds Nārada and Devila at the potters' hall. Learning from Nārada the story and the remedy—that if Devila will apologize, the curse will be averted—the king asks Devila to apologize. Devila obstinately refuses. Seeing no other way out, the king asks his people to hold Devila by his hands and feet and forcibly throw him on the feet of Nārada. Nārada excuses Devila, but as the apology was forced, he advises him to put a lump of clay on his head and stand throat-deep in water in a pond. As soon as the superhuman power is released, he must submerge. The moment the sun-ray touches the lump of clay, it cracks into seven pieces.

Here, we see that two ascetics are involved in a quarrel and the sun not allowed to rise. In the Mahābhārata. Nārada and Devila, or Asita Devila, meet, but there is reference to a quarrel only in the Salya Parva, Chapter 50. Nārada, while overwhelmed with the Yogic power of Jaigīsavaya, describes Devila, saying Jaigīsavaye tapo nāstī vismāpayati 'so 'sitam. “Jaigīsavaya has no mortification or moral virtue, he simply fills Asita with astonishment.”

Nārada has quarreled with the ascetic Parvata on account of the marriage of the former with the pretty daughter of King Srinjaya, though Parvata wanted to marry her. By curse, each debars the other from going to heaven without him. (Drona Parva.) In the Śānti Parva, they are said to be maternal uncle and sister's son and, for the same reason, Parvata curses Nārada to be monkey-faced after marriage, and Nārada curses Parvata to be unable to go to heaven despite his asceticism. There is no reference to the checking of the sun-rise.

But in the Mārkandeya Purāṇa (Vh. XVI), stopping the sun-rise has been mentioned in the context of the birth of Dattātreya, who has a connection with the introduction of the Nātha cult, a later development of Buddhism, though said to be Śaivite. At Pratiṣṭhānpūra, there is a Brahmin named Kauśika, who is a leper on account of sins committed in a previous life. While riding on the shoulders of his wife in the darkness, he stumbles against Māṇḍavaya, who had been put on an iron stake with the suspicion that he was a thief, though he was not. Māṇḍavaya curses Kauśika to die at sunrise, soon after he sees the sun. Kauśika's wife, on hearing this, forbids the sun to rise. Later on, Anasūyā persuades the wife of Kauśika to withdraw her forbidding. The sun rises, and soon thereafter Kauśika dies. Before he falls to earth, Anasūyā holds him and, swearing by her chastity, brings him back to life.
This story, with some modifications, is found in Oriya Purāṇas, even in some versions of the Oriya Ramāyana. In Orissa, it has taken the shape of a folk tale where the motive of stopping the sunrise plays an important part. It has given rise to a folk saying:

\[ \text{na pāhu rāti na maru pati ektā rāti heu sapata rāti} \]

Let the night not turn to dawn, let my husband not die, may one night be (equal to) seven nights.

Buddhist influences such as these may be found in different parts of India.

In the Atthakathā of the Buddhist Dharmapada. Nārada is a benevolent ascetic and Devala is an obstinate one. But when we come to the Brāhmānic mythology, Nārada is depicted as the quarrelsome one, as if in the Brāhmānic traditions conscious attempts had been made to deviate from the Buddhist traditions. To illustrate this, we will recount the episode of Sumbha-Nisumbha.

In the Durgā Saptāsati, popularly known as Cāndī. Śumbha and Niśumbha are said to be dāityas, dānavas and asuras. These terms are taken to be synonymous. Śumbha and Niśumbha were brothers killed by the goddess Durgā. The defeat by Durgā of Śumbha-Niśumbha and other asuras, like Mahiṣa, Raktavirya, Cāṇḍa-Muṇḍa, led to their relegation to inferior positions in the Brāhmānic culture.

But, when we come to the Buddhist culture, the picture is something different. In the Guhya Samāja Tantra, Sumbha has been given a position equal to that of deities like Vairocana, and mahākrodhas like Yamantaka, Aparajita, Hayagriva, Vajrāmṛta, Takkirāja, Mahāvala, Niłandaṇḍa, Vajrācala and Ekākśara. It is said there:

\[ \text{śumbham jñānāgradharam krūram bhayodadhi samaprabham} \\
\text{trimukham jñānavatūdātum bhāvayet dhyānāsūprabham} \]

One should meditate upon Śumbha, who holds the best of knowledge, fierce, having the splendour of the ocean of fear, three faces and body illuminated with the rays of flame and bright with knowledge.

Further, in the same paṭāla, it is said:

\[ \text{khavajramadhyagam cinted śūryamandalamuttamam} \\
\text{buddha-vimbaṃ vibhāvitvā vajra-śumbham prabhāvayet} \]
tiksna jvalarcivapusam sp huranta meghavajrinam
vajrahastam mahayvalam bhavayan siddhimahayat
mukute' kshobhyasamayam dyavavatu tuñijpravardhanam
eso hi sarvakroothanam samayo duratiikramah (Guha. p. 77)

One should think of the disc of the sun in the sky, and then
reflecting upon the image of Buddha should meditate upon Vajra
Sumbha, having a body of fiery rays of flame, shining (like a)
cloud, and holding a thunderbolt in his hand, having a body of
great flame and having Aksobhya on the crest. Thus meditating,
one attains the perfection causing satisfaction. This practice is
very difficult (unsurmountable) so far as all the krodhas (angers)
are concerned.

Thus we see that Sumbha is identified with great knowledge
and great anger and produced by Buddha himself.

atha bhagavan samayavijrmbhitavajram nama samaddhim
samapadyeyam sarvavjrajadharasamayam sumbhahakhrodham
svakavyavakeittavajrebhyo niscarayamasa. (Guha-XIV Patala, Page
86.)

The Lord Buddha, in the meditation called samayavijra
bitavajra, himself brought forth Sumbha Mahakrodha from his
own body, speech and mind.

Sumbha or Sumbha-Nisumbha is invoked as the deity of the vajra
kanyakarsana mantra, a magic spell or incantation for attracting girls.
The formula runs:

om namah samantakaya vik citta vajyanam.
om sumbha nisumbha hum gyhna grhndpaya
gyunam hum anaya ho, bhagavan vidyaraja hum phat. (Guha, p. 86)

Here, he has been said in clear terms to be Vidyaraja, or chief of
lore.

This mantra, except for the first line, is quoted in the Piñdikrama
or Piñdikrama Sadhana of Nagarjuna.

In the Piñdikrama, Nagarjuna further elaborates the appearance
of Sumbha, for which the main source is Guhya Samaja. This is further
expounded in the Nispanna Yogavalī, in the Piñdikramokta Akṣobhya
maṇḍala.

In this Akṣobhya maṇḍala, Sumbha-rāja is said to be black hav­
ing three faces—black, white and red—and to hold a thunderbolt,
wheel, diamond and noose, forefinger, lotus and sword. “sumbharajah
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These deities, like Āksobhya (ending in Sumbha), are seated atop the lotus of the universe. Here, Āksobhya and others, including Sumbha, are said in clear terms to be deities.

Further, it is said there:

\[
\text{atra cakresa eva saprajñaḥ aparadevatāḥ sambhāparantarā nisprajñaḥ}
\]

Here, the Lord of the circle alone has a Prajñā, and other deities are without Prajñā; but when they are in the circle of protection, all of them, i.e., Yamāntaka and others (ending with Sumbha) have Prajñās similar to them.

Sumbha or Sumbharāja appears, with slight variations, in other mandalas, too, such as the Manju Vajra, Vajrasattva, Vajra Hunkara (Tricatvarimsadātma) Manju Vajra, Dharmadhātu Vāgīśvara and Kālacakra. The Kālacakra mandala is a very elaborate and complicated one, and includes various Hindu deities, whose position, however, is much inferior to that of the Buddhist deities.

In the Heruka mandala, four-legged Heruka is said to be dancing naked in the sun, trampling the hearts of four Māras, namely, Hari, Hara, Hiranyagarbha (Brahmā) and Purandara (Indra), who are supinely lying on the pericarp of the lotus of the universe. "Kūṭagārasya madhīye vīśvābhāsya karṇikoparyuttānahari hara hiranyagarbha purandara riṣa māra caustuṣṭadhyānyastha śūre caustuṣcārano nāgna... nityan." These four, the principal deities of the Brahmins, are portrayed as Māras, and disparaged in the Buddhist tradition. In the Bhūtaḍāmara mandala, too, these and other Hindu gods and goddesses are relegated to an inferior position, as they are in the Durgatipariṣodhana mandala, of which Śrī Śākvasimha Bhagavān Vairocana, with dharmacakra mudrā, is the central deity. One of the many important Brāhmaṇic gods and goddesses placed at the outer circle is Durgā, who is said to be Siṃha Durgā or Durgā on a Lion. She is dark blue ("Syamā, a form of Durgā"), holding vajra and cakra in the right hand and pattisā and sankha (spear and conch) in the left. Such illustrations are numerous in the Buddhist culture.

In the Sādhānamālā, No. 261, Sumbha is said to have four legs: one right leg treads on Indrāṇi and Śrī, the other on Rati and Prīti; one left leg treads on Indra and Madhukara, the other on Jayakara...
and Vasanta. In N. 262, he is depicted with his left foot on the head of Mahēśvara and the right on the breasts of Gourī.

Why, of all deities, was Sumbha selected? In revenge for his killing by Durga, the consort of Mahēśvara? He may have some relation with Sumbha, which is both a country as well as a Kṣatriya tribe. According to the Śabdaratnāvāli, Sumbha is a country in the eastern part of India. There, Buddhism once was widespread; at present, Durgā-worship has exterminated it. The conversion of the deity Sumbha into a doitya, dānava or asura in the Durgā Saptasati and Durgā-worship may be the result of the victory of Brāhmanic culture over Buddhist.

The controversy between Brahmins and Buddhists is reflected not only in the Sādhanaṃalā, but in the maṇḍalas of the Nispannayogāvālī, which allot inferior positions to the highest Brāhmanic deities.

Referring to the subordinate position ascribed to the highest Brāhmanic deities in Buddhist works, the learned Dr. Bennoytosh Bhattacharya says in the introductions to the Sādhanaṃalā and Nispannayogāvālī, “It is a matter of satisfaction however, that the Hindus never disgraced any Gods belonging to the alien faith in this manner. On the contrary, they placed Buddha amongst the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu.” But is it a fact? What about the Buddhist deity Sumbha? It is true that Buddha is one of the Avatāras of Viṣṇu, but for what purpose and with what words? In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, one of the most respected books of the Hindus, it is said regarding the Buddha Avatāra:

tataḥ Kalau sampravṛtte sammohāya suradvijāṃ
duddho nāmāṇi janaśutakah kikāṭesu bhāvivyati (Bhāg. 1/3/24.)

Then, when Kali (or the age of Kali) comes, Buddha, the son of Aṇjana, for the sake of misleading the enemies of the suras (asuras), will be born in the country of Kīkāṭas (Bihar).

The Bhāgavata further says of Buddha, though not by name:

deva-dvijāṃ vigamavartmanī niṣṭhitānām
prībhīrnavemā vihitābhivrddvatiś ribhibh
lokāni ghnatām matī-vimohamati pralobham
veśaṃ vihāya bahu bhāṣyata aupaṭhārayam (Bhāg. 1/17/37.)

(Buddha) ordained the apparel which beguiles and bewilders the minds of the enemies of the gods (asuras), who are well grounded in the paths of the Vedas; he spoiled the people
by strongholds built by Maya, where haste or activities are not noticeable; and he preached many false doctrines.

Is it true that the Buddha or Buddhist robes are meant to beguile the asuras? Is Buddhism a false doctrine or inferior religion? Further, the Bhāgavata, after enumerating 22 Avataras, says:

\[ ete cāṃśakalāḥ purnaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ bhagavan svayam (Bhāg. 1/3/25). \]

Of these some are part-Avataras and some (including Buddha) are power-Avataras of the Supreme; Kṛṣṇa alone is the Bhagavān (fountainhead of all Avataras).

Thus, we see that in Brāhmaṇism, Buddha is given a position subordinate to Kṛṣṇa's.

Further, why is Buddha called Aṇjana Suta? Who is Aṇjana? This reading is accepted even by the Sabda Kalpadruma, and the commentary says, further: \textit{ajinasuta iti pāthe'pi sa eva}.

There is another reading, \textit{"ajina suta,"} and if this reading is accepted, Ajina Suta also refers to the same person, viz., Buddha. But neither Aṇjana nor Ajina has any relation with Buddha. The Bhāgavata, Gita Press edition, reads as \textit{"jana suta."} In one of the Oriya translations of the same verse, Buddha is said to have been born in the house of a dvija, or Brahmin, thereby possibly adopting the reading \textit{"dvija suta."} All these posed problems to which I have tried to apply the method of philology. In the reading, \textit{"buddho nāma'jina sutah."} I removed the sign of elided “a” kāra and got the reading \textit{"jina sutah,”} which later on I found in one Oriya translation and in the edition of the Bhāgavata with Śridharsvāmi's commentary, where the reading is:

\[ tataḥ kalau sampravṛtte sammohāya suradbhisām buddho nāma'janasutah kāteṣu bhaviyati \]

The commentary says:

\[ buddhāvātaramāha tata iti. ajanasya sutah. jinasutah iti pāthe jinopi sa eva. \]

This shows how ignorant of Buddhism the commentators and redactors of the Brahmanic tradition are, and in what manner Buddha is treated by them. Buddha is \textit{jīna} (Conquerer) himself; he is not \textit{jīna-suta} or son of a jīna.
Further, it shows the extent of bitterness between Buddhists and Brahmins. The consequences of this quarrel were disastrous. As Dr. Beneytosh Bhattacharya notes in the Introduction to the Nispanna Yogāvalī (P. 22), “The Vimala Prabhā, a commentary on the Kālacakra Taṇtra, records that an invitation was extended to the highest Hindus to embrace the worship of Kālacakra in order to ward off the evil of Mleccha civilization which was sure to envelop the east and corrupt the sons and daughters of both the Hindus and Buddhists. The Hindus could join the Buddhists only on two conditions, namely interdining and intermarriage with the Buddhists. It is said that the Hindus at first refused both—but later on accepted the two conditions owing to certain miracles.”

From this, the learned and erudite scholar concludes that “the fusion of cultures made what India is today.” But is it true that the Hindus later accepted the two conditions, owing to certain miracles? Is there any sign of interdining and intermarriage even today? My conclusion is that the India of today resulted not from the fusion of cultures, but from the Hindus’ refusal of the Buddhists’ offer. The Hindus and the Buddhists could not be united; they could not form a united front against the Mleccha invasion. The Hindus gained supremacy over the Buddhists, the Buddhists were exterminated forever from India, while India lost her independence and developed the culture it has today.

Friends, I have taken enough of your time and inflicted enough boredom on you. I am conscious of my short-comings. Some of my findings and conclusions may not be acceptable to you. But I am reminded of a Sanskrit saying:

\[
gacchataḥ skhalanam kvāpi bhavatyeva pramādaṁ
hasanti durjanastraḥ samadadhāti sajjanaḥ
\]

When one goes forth, he slips at places on account of inadvertence or oversight. The bad people laugh at that and the good people set it right.

Inversely speaking, those who laugh are bad people and those who set aright are good people. In my case, I want to modify one word and read it:

\[
gacchataḥ skhalanam kvāpi bhavatyeva yataḥ
yataḥ hasanti durjanastraḥ samadadhāti sajjanaḥ
\]
I am an old man. On account of my old age, I must have stumbled down at many places. But I expect the good people, the learned scholars to set me aright with their large-heartedness.

Again, at the end I offer my sincerest thanks for offering me the opportunity for contact with you and the punya therefrom.

*Editor's Note:* The inconsistencies in style of the Sanskrit quotations are due to the different presentations in varying Sanskrit texts.