

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

A. K. Narain
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

EDITORS

ERNST STEINKELLNER
WIEN

Heinz Bechert
Universität Göttingen, FRG

Leon Hurvitz
UBC, Vancouver, Canada

Lewis Lancaster
University of California, Berkeley, USA

Alexander W. MacDonald
Université de Paris X, Nanterre, France

B. J. Stavisky
WNIIR, Moscow, USSR

Alex Wayman
Columbia University, New York, USA

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Stephan Beyer
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

Volume 4

1981

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Concepts of Truth and Meaning in the Buddhist Scriptures, *by Jose I. Cabezon* 7
2. Changing the Female Body: Wise Women and the Bodhi-sattva Career in Some *Mahāratnakūṭasūtras*, *by Nancy Schuster* 24
3. *Bodhi and Arahattaphala*. From early Buddhism to early Mahāyāna, *by Karel Werner* 70

II. SHORT PAPERS

1. A Study on the Mādhyamika Method of Refutation and Its Influence on Buddhist Logic, *by Shohei Ichimura* 87
2. An Exceptional Group of Painted Buddha Figures at Ajanṭā, *by Anand Krishna* 96
3. Rune E. A. Johansson's Analysis of *Citta*: A Criticism, *by Arvind Sharma* 101

III. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

1. Cross Currents in Early Buddhism, *by S. N. Dube* 108
2. Buddha's Lions—The Lives of the Eighty-Four Siddhas, *by James B. Robinson* 111

3. Tangles and Webs, <i>by Padmasiri de Silva</i>	113
4. Buddhist and Freudian Psychology, <i>by Padmasiri de Silva</i>	114
5. Buddhist-Christian Empathy, <i>by Joseph J. Spae</i>	115
6. The Religions of Tibet, <i>by Guisepppe Tucci</i>	119

IV. NOTES AND NEWS

1. A Report on the 3rd Conference of the IABS	123
2. Buddhism and Music	127
3. Presidential Address at the 2nd IABS Conference at Nalanda <i>by P. Pradhan</i>	128

Contributors	143
--------------	-----

Presidential Address at the 2nd IABS Conference at Nalanda

by P. Pradhan

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: *maṇau 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 *khādī* or the Khadi Movement of Mahatma Gandhi; and at Puri, *dhotī*, or lengths of men's wear, are called "*khādī*". 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 *khādī* of India and the *khādī* 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:

*bhaksyam bhojyam tathā pānam yathā prāptamtu bhakṣayet grahaṇam
nātra kartavyamiṣṭāniṣṭa-vikalpitaḥ bhakṣyābhakṣyavicāramtupeyā-
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 practitioner 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:

*bhaikṣya-paryāṇanārthāya na pātram saṁgrahed vṛatī bhuktottaram
tu saṁgrāhya rathyā-karparamallakam tatraiva paryated bhikṣām
patamānam ca bhakṣayet bhakṣyaitvā tu tam tasmin tṛptastraiva tam
tyajet* (MS-6th Chapter.)

At the time of wandering for begging alms, the *vratin* or practitioner 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 *khapara*, which mean alms bowl; and *khapada*, meaning earthen alms-bowl or pot-sherd. In Oriya there is another word, *khaparā-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 Kumbhipaṭiā 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 karparamallakam*, 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, Nuāpāṭnā, 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 *kārikā* of the 4th chapter, i.e., *Prayogastu Trimūlajah*, as the illustrations of the *mohaja prāṇātīpāta*, or killing out of ignorance, and *kāma mithyācāra*, or amorous wrong-doing or co-habitation out of aberration, Vasubandhu says:

pārasikānāṃ ca te hyevamāhuḥ-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 pārasikānāṃ mātṛādigamanam gosave ca yajñe yathoktam, brāhmaṇo gosavenesṭyā samvatsara-govratī bhavati. upahā udakam cūṣati trāṇi chinatti upaiti mātaramupavasāramup sagotrāmiti. ye cāhurudūkhala puṇyaphala pakvāṇna tīrtha mārga prakhyo mātṛgrāma 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 Brāhmin, 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*,

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 *Dharmaruchi Avadāna* as:

*panthā samo mātṛgrāmaḥ yenaiva hi
pathā pitā gacchati, putro'pi tenaiva gacchati. na cāsau panthā
putrasyānugacchato doṣakārako bhavati. evameva mātṛgrāmaḥ.
tīrtha samo'pi ca mātṛgrāmaḥ yatraiva hi tīrthe pitā sāti,
putro'pi tasmin snāti. na ca tīrtham putrasya snāyato doṣakārako
bhavati. evameva mātṛgrāmaḥ. api ca pratyanteṣu janapadeṣu
dharmataivaisā yasyām-eva pitā asaddharmenābhigacchati tenaiva
putro'pyadhigacchati. (page 158–159).*

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 *pakvāṇna*, 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 *gourata*, or cow-like life, but also of *kukkura-vrata*, or the dog-like life, in the *Kukkura-Vratika Sūtra* of the *Majjhima Pannāsaka* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*. In these *suttas*, Purṇa Koliyaputta 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 palikujiṭṭvā ekamantaṃ nisīditi*) and to take food thrown on the ground (*chamā nikkhattaṃ bhojanaṃ bhuñjati*). Similarly, we come across *aḷa-vrata*, or goat-like life (*Jataka*, IV, 318), *vagguli-vrata*, bat-like practice (J., I, 493: III, 235; IV, 229) and the like. These *vratas* 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 *Purāṇas*, 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 Atthakathā*. In this *attakathā* is the story of the quarrel between Devila and Nārada, two ascetics of the Himālaya, who come down to a town for salt and sour and stay in the potter's hall. When Nārada 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 Nārada asks his forgiveness. While returning, Nārada steps on Devila's neck, as Devila had shifted to avoid a repetition. This time Devila gets furious and curses Nārada, saying:

*sahassaraṃsī satatejo sūriyo tamovinodano
pāṭodayānte sūriye muddhā te phalatu sattadhā*

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, Nārada, 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 Jaigīṣavya, describes Devila, saying *Jaigīṣavye tapo nāsti viśmāpayati 'so 'sitam*. "Jaigīṣavya 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 debarbs 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 *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (Vh. XVI), stopping the sun-rise has been mentioned in the context of the birth of Dattātreyā, who has a connection with the introduction of the Nātha cult, a later development of Buddhism, though said to be Śaivite. At Pratiṣṭhānpura, 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 Māṇḍavya, who had been put on an iron stake with the suspicion that he was a thief, though he was not. Māṇḍavya 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:

*na pāhu rāti na maru pati
ekta rāti heu sapata rati*

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 *Aṭṭhakathā* of the Buddhist *Dharmapada*, Nārada is a ben-evolent ascetic and Devala is an obstinate one. But when we come to the Brāhmaṇic mythology, Nārada is depicted as the quarrelsome one, as if in the Brāhmaṇic 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 Saptaśatī*, popularly known as *Caṇḍī*, Śumbha and Niśumbha are said to be *daityas*, *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, Raktavīrya, Caṇḍa-Muṇḍa, led to their relegation to inferior positions in the Brāhmaṇic 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 mahā-krodhas like Yamāntaka, Aparājita, Hayagrīva, Vajrāmṛta, Takkirāja, Mahāvala, Nīlandaṇḍa, Vajrācala and Ekākṣara. It is said there:

*śumbhaṃ jñānāgradharam krūraṃ bhayodadhi samaprabham
trimukhaṃ jvalārcivapuṣaṃ bhāvayet dhyānāsūprabham* (*Guhya*.
Page 71.)

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 *paṭala*, it is said:

*khavajramadhyagaṃ cinted sūryamaṇḍalamuttamam
buddha-vimbaṃ vibhāvītvā vajra-sumbham prabhāvayet*

*tikṣṇa jvālārcivapuṣam sphūrantam meghavajriṇam
vajrahastam mahājvālam bhāvayan siddhimāpnuyāt
mukute' kṣobhyasamayam dhyātvā tuṣṭipravardhanam
eṣo hi sarvakrodhānām samayo duratīkramaḥ (Guhya. 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 Akṣobhya 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 bhagavān samayavijrmbhitavajram nāma samādhim
samāpadyemaṁ sarvavajradharasamayam sumbhamahākrodham
svakayavākcittavajrebhya niścārayāmāsa. (Guhya-XIV Paṭala, Page 86.)*

The Lord Buddha, in the meditation called *samayavijrmbhitavajra*, himself brought forth Sumbha Mahākrodha from his own body, speech and mind.

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

*oṃ namaḥ samantakāya vāk citta vajrāṇām.
oṃ sumbha nisumbha hūṃ gṛhṇa gṛhṇa hūṃ gṛhṇāpaya
gṛhṇāpaya hūṃ ānaya ho, bhagavan vidyārāja hūṃ phat. (Guhya, p. 86)*

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

This mantra, except for the first line, is quoted in the *Piṇḍīkrama* or *Piṇḍīkrama Sādhana* of Nāgārjuna.

In the *Piṇḍīkrama*, Nāgārjuna further elaborates the appearance of Sumbha, for which the main source is *Guhya Samāja*. This is further expounded in the *Niṣpanna Yogāvalī*, in the *Piṇḍīkramokta Akṣobhya maṇḍala*.

In this Akṣobhya *maṇḍala*, Sumbha-rāja is said to be black having three faces—black, white and red—and to hold a thunderbolt, wheel, diamond and noose, forefinger, lotus and sword. “*sumbharājah*

kṛṣṇaḥ kṛṣṇa sīta raktānana vajra cakra ratna hr̥t sapā's atarjanī padma khaḍgadharah." Then it is said: "Ete' kṣobhyādayo devā viśvapaḍmopari. . ."

These deities, like Akṣobhya (ending in Sumbha), are seated atop the lotus of the universe. Here, Akṣobhya and others, including Sumbha, are said in clear terms to be deities.

Further, it is said there:

atra cakreśa eva saprajñāḥ aparadevatāḥ sumbhaparyantā nisprajñāḥ rakṣā cakra-sthastu yamāntakādayaḥ sasvābhaprajñāḥ

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 *maṇḍalas*, too, such as the Mañju Vajra, Vajrasattva, Vajra Hunkara (Tricatvarimsadātmaka) Manju Vajra, Dharmadhātu Vāgīśvara and Kālacakra. The Kālacakra *maṇḍala* 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 *maṇḍala*, four-legged Heruka is said to be dancing naked in the sun, trampling the hearts of four *Māras*, namely, Hari, Hara, Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā) and Purandara (Indra), who are supinely lying on the pericarp of the lotus of the universe. "*Kūṭā-gārasya madhye viśvābhāsyā karmikoparyuttānahari hara hiraṇyagarbha purandara rūpa māra catuṣṭayadhīdayastha sūrye catuṣcaraṇo nagno . . . nr̥tyan.*" These four, the principal deities of the Brahmins, are portrayed as *Māras*, and disparaged in the Buddhist tradition. In the Bhūtaḍāmara *maṇḍala*, too, these and other Hindu gods and goddesses are relegated to an inferior position, as they are in the Durgati-pariśodhana *maṇḍala*, of which Śrī Śākyasiṃha 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 *pattiśa* and *sankha* (spear and conch) in the left. Such illustrations are numerous in the Buddhist culture.

In the *Sādhana-mālā*, No. 261, Sumbha is said to have four legs: one right leg treads on Indrāṇī 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 Maheśvara and the right on the breasts of Gouri.

Why, of all deities, was Sumbha selected? In revenge for his killing by Durga, the consort of Maheśvara? He may have some relation with Sumbha, which is both a country as well as a *Kṣatriya* tribe. According to the *Śabdaratnāvalī*, Śumbha 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 Saptasatī* and Durgā-worship may be the result of the victory of Brāhmaṇic culture over Buddhist.

The controversy between Brahmins and Buddhists is reflected not only in the *Sādhnamāla*, but in the *maṇḍalas* of the *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, which allots inferior positions to the highest Brāhmaṇic deities.

Referring to the subordinate position ascribed to the highest Brāhmaṇic deities in Buddhist works, the learned Dr. Bennoyotsh Bhattacharya says in the introductions to the *Sādhnamāla* and *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, "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 suradvīṣām
buddho nāmnānjanasutaḥ kīkaṭeṣu bhaviṣyati (Bhāg. 1/3/24.)*

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

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

*deva-dvīṣām nigamavartmani niṣṭhitānām
pūrbhirmayena vihitābhiradyatūrbhiḥ
lokān ghnatām mati-vimohamati pralobham
veṣam vihāya bahu bhāṣyata aupadharmyam (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 Avatāras, says:

ete cāṁśakalāḥ pumsaḥ kṛṣṇastu bhagavān svayam (Bhāg. 1/3/25.)

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

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

Further, why is Buddha called Añjana Suta? Who is Añjana? This reading is accepted even by the 'Sabda Kalpadruma, and the commentary says, further: *ajinasuta iti pāṭhe'pi sa eva*.

There is another reading, "*ajina suta*," and if this reading is accepted, Ajina Suta also refers to the same person, viz., Buddha. But neither Añjana nor Ajina has any relation with Buddha. The *Bhāgavata*, Gita Press edition, reads as "*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 "*dvija suta*." All these posed problems to which I have tried to apply the method of philology. In the reading, "*buddho nāmnā'jina sutah*," I removed the sign of elided "a" kāra and got the reading "*jina sutah*," which later on I found in one Oriya translation and in the edition of the *Bhāgavata* with Śrīdharsvāmi's commentary, where the reading is:

*tataḥ kalau sampravṛtte sammohāya suradvīṣām
buddho nāmnā'janasutaḥ kīkaṭeṣu bhaviṣyati*

The commentary says:

*buddhāvatāramāha tata iti. ajanasya sutah.
jinasutaḥ iti pāṭhe 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 *jina* (Conquerer) himself; he is not *jina-suta* or son of a *jina*.

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 *Niṣpanna Yogāvalī* (P. 22), “*The Vimāla Prabhā*, a commentary on the *Kālacakra Tantra*, 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 inter-dining 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 inter-dining 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 pramādataḥ
hasanti durjanāstatra samādadhati sajjanāḥ*

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 jarā
yataḥ hasanti durjanāstatra samādadhati sajjanāḥ*

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.