Chapter- II

DECLINE OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA

The virtual disappearance of Buddhism from India is one of the most baffling problems in the history of India. It was an exotic transplanted in India from other lands. However, it has never been the sole faith of a society claiming superiority over all forms of life rather it co-existed in China with Confucianism, in Japan with Shintoism and in South-East Asian countries with their local cults and practices. But this was not the case in India. It could not co-exist with Brahmanical religion.

The question then arises as to what was the reason that Buddhism was unable to sustain itself in the land of its birth after it had been disseminated to all the parts of the then known world. The study of decline of Buddhism in India is important for one more reason that is, whatever was the problem of development of Buddhist philosophy, the historians must be led back finally to India for a satisfactory answer. Buddhism is a purely Indian growth and thus it is necessary that it bears some connection to other contemporary movements in India. On the whole no period can be identified as marking the commencement of general decline of Buddhism all over India, because while Buddhism was flourishing in one part of the country, at the same time it was suffering from the anguish of decline in other parts.

Further, no single causal factor can be attributed for its decline in India. It was the multiplicity of different causes that must have been in operation persistently in different regions and at different points of time. Hence various theories have been put forward by different scholars to explain the decline.

Persecution

One of the most common causes that is suggested for the decline of Buddhism in India is royal persecution, though it was not sustained and persistent, but periodic and regional. In a late Buddhist work Divyavadana, it is mentioned that, a Brahmin ruler, Pushyamitra Sunga tried to destroy the Kukkutrama vihara and also devastated monasteries at Sakala (modern Sialkot) and promised a reward of hundred dinaras for every Buddhist head.

A late 16th century and early 17th century Tibetan Buddhist chronicler Taranatha also supports this view-point and described the period of “Pushyamitra
Sunga at the end of the Mauryan Empire, as first of the three hostilities against
Buddhism. He wrote that “The Brahmin king Pushyamitra, along with other tirthikas
started war and thus burnt down numerous monasteries from the Madhyadesha to
Jalandhara. They also killed a number of vastly erudite monks. But most of them fled
to other countries. As a result, within a span of five years the doctrine was extinct in
the north.”

However E. Lamotte, D. Devalhuti, and R.C. Mitra are of the opinion that the
tales of persecution and destruction by Pushyamitra Sunga as recorded in
Divyavadana and Taranath are false and bear marks of evident absurdity as it is not
confirmed by any other available contemporary source i.e. none of the Chinese
travelers neither Fa-hien nor Hiuen-Tsang nor I-Tsing have even made a mention of
it. The early Buddhist texts also neither refer to persecution nor any feeling of
hostility between the Buddhists and the Brahmanic followers. The Pali Pitakas also
refer nothing to persecution.

The policy of Pushyamitra Sunga appears to be tolerant enough because if he
was against the Buddhists, he would have dismissed his Buddhist ministers. Besides,
it should not be overlooked that the celebrated Buddhist monuments of Sanchi and
Bharhut came to be puffed-up in the Sunga period and monasteries continued to be
rich and popular. Thus these can reasonably be rejected as sectarian propaganda.
The only fact that can emerge out of the Canonical tales is that Pushyamitra might
have withdrawn royal favour away from the Buddhists. Thus, for a religion, so
popular and widespread, this regional and periodical persecution cannot be the cause
of its decline.

The second hostility, according to Taranatha, might be of Huna tyrant
Mihirkula, the fiercely anti-Buddhist king who raided north India in the sixth century
C.E. Though Taranatha does not use the name and instead says “a Persian king
destroyed Magadha by the Turuska army, ruined many temples and heavily damaged
Sri Nalendra (Nalanda). Even the ordained monks fled away.”

According to Hieun-Tsang he caused the demolition of 1600 topes and
monasteries and put to death nine kotis of lay supporters of Buddhism.

The persecution of the Buddhists by Mihirkula was most likely a fact, as it is
attested by diverse authorities, native and foreign. His sacrilegious acts against
Buddhism are recorded by Kalhanaa and corroborated by Hieun-Tsang and Aryamanjusrimulakalpa. Kalhanaa compares Mihirkula with Yama, the God of death and also records that Mihirkula killed ‘three kotis’ of human beings. But this looks to be an exaggerated account. And it does not seem to be a cause of decline of Buddhism in India as the evil effect of this tyranny might have been neutralized by the generosity of his successive rulers. These attempts at persecution were not sustained and were specific to a region and a particular period. It was still quite popular in other parts of India so as to revive itself after such persecutonal attempts.

Hieun-Tsang gives many tales of hostility, including the well known story of the Shaivite king Shashanka, who cut down the Bodhi tree and burnt what remained of it, and who broke the memorial stone and attempted to destroy other images too. He also mentions a great monumental cave temple construction in a mountainous area in Vidarbha, which is said to have been constructed by a Satavahana ruler under the instigation of Nagarjuna, was totally destroyed. Hieun-Tsang records that Shashanka annihilated Buddhist monks in the region around Kushinagara as a consequence of which “the groups of brethren were all broken up”. A more systematic endeavour to destroy Buddhism was never made in India before. The testimony of Hieun-Tsang is supported by Shashanka’s coins, “the oppressor of Buddhism”, he was a Shaivite.

An echo of the story of Shashanka’s impiety is also found in the Aryamanjusrimulakalpa. However, his persecuting acts were all confined outside the limits of his own Empire and hence it may be assumed that his object was not so much to extirpate Buddhist heresy as to take the wind out of the sails of his own Buddhist subjects by demolishing the sacred tree at Bodh-Gaya. Whatever might have been the motive and the measure of his persecution, its effect was not catastrophic for Buddhism abroad, or in his own kingdom where Hieun-Tsang found the religion in a fairly flourishing state shortly after the death of Shashanka.

R.C. Majumdar is of the opinion that the story of persecution of Buddhism by Shashanka cannot really be given credence without an independent testimony, because they rest upon the solitary evidence of Buddhist writers who cannot, by any means, be regarded as impartial or balanced. It is also pointed out in support of this opinion that Hieun-Tsang himself observed that in Karnasuvarna there were more than ten Buddhist monasteries and also over 2000 monks who were all adherents of Buddhism.
Sammitiya sect. Thus, it can be inferred that during the period of Shashanka Buddhism was in a fairly flourishing condition and the evidence above shows that Shashanka was not a fanatic. But it does not seem to be true, as it appears that Majumdar has a pro-Shashanka bias.

According to B.P. Sinha “it was probably the expulsion of the pro- Buddhist Maukharis from Magadha by the Brahmanical Gaudas which made Shashanka unpopular with the powerful Buddhists of Magadha.” It has also been told that king Bhaskarvarman of Kamarupa threatened the monks of Nalanda with a ‘behaviour similar to that of Shashanka’ and with the destruction of the whole monastery unless Hieun-Tsang was peremptorily dispatched to his court, but this was merely a threat and was never executed, and this is also used by the pilgrim to highlight his own importance.

But these theories of persecution do not hold ground for being the reason for the decline of Buddhism in India because a king has so many weapons other than to massacre people to suppress a religion. He can confiscate the sangha property, take the state patronage away from the Order and tax the followers of the particular religion. These measures in themselves are enough to destroy a religion which is already so near to Brahmanism.

**Brahmanical Hostility**

The revolution in Brahmanism which definitely overwhelmed, though it did not annihilate Buddhism, is generally associated with the names of Kumarila Bhatta (c.750 C.E.) and Shankara (c.800 C.E.). According to the Buddhists, Kumarila and Shankara were the most formidable enemies to their creed, whose activities caused the ruin of Buddhism in India.

“The Historical manuals of South India”, says B.M. Barua, “throw some light on the precise nature of the movement which was going on in the country since Bhatta Kumarila, and which resulted ultimately in the complete victory of Theism or Deism over the varying forms of Atheism.”

According to Gopinath Kaviraja, Kumarila “was one of the most potent forces actively employed in bringing about this decline.” It is evident that Brahmanical hostility to Buddhism was not merely a doctrinal assault. The Puranas, the Mricchakatika, the Yajnavalkya smriti, the Rajatarangini, the works of Kumarila and
Shankara and the Shankara’s biographies, the description of Chinese travelers and the records of Bu-Ston and Taranath, do seem to point to deeper repugnance for Buddhism. \(^{33}\) *Kerala-Utpatti*\(^{34}\) also affirms that the Buddhists were expelled from Kerala by Kumarila. Tradition also represents that Kumarila prompted king Sudhanvan to wipe out the Buddhists, but nothing is known of this king and thus he cannot have had the vast empire which is attributed to him. \(^{35}\)

On the other hand, Kumarila regards the Buddhist system of thought as reliable because it draws its inspiration from the *Upanishads*, and he further allows it the merit of having restrained extreme attachment to sensuous objects. \(^{36}\) Buddhism, however, failed to satisfy the emotional requirements of the masses at large as the prime inclination of the people is towards a supreme deity unto whom they can surrender themselves entirely in the hope of a speedy attainment of salvation. \(^{37}\) With the expansion of Mahayana efforts were made to meet this want by the inclusion of the cult of *Bhakti* and the Bodhisattva ideal. But this fell short and as a result Buddhism began to lose ground before the growing influence of Vaishnavism, Shaivism and other Puranic religions. Consequently, it had to die a natural death. \(^{38}\)

This mounting tide of anti-Buddhist propaganda in *Brahmanical* literature seems to have reached its zenith in the hands of Shankara (cir. 788 C.E.). He describes Buddhist system as ‘*vainashik* or *sarpa-vainashik*’. His biographies tell us that he led a religious expedition against the Buddhists and causing their destruction from the Himalayas to the Indian Ocean. \(^{39}\) In the *Bhasya of Brahmasutra*, Shankara said: “Buddha was an enemy of the people and taught contradictory and confusing things.” \(^{40}\) Taranatha says, Shankara’s was a thundering speech, at whose advance Buddhist monasteries began to tremble and the monks began to disperse in confusion. \(^{41}\)

Wilkins and Rhys Davids maintained that “the disciples of the Buddha were so ruthlessly persecuted that all were either slain, exiled or made to change their faith.” \(^{42}\) S. Radhakrishnan is of the view that, “it is an invention of the interested to say that fanatic priests fought Buddhism out of existence. It is true that Kumarila and Shankara criticized Buddhist doctrines, but the resistance offered by Brahmanism to Buddhism is the natural resistance of an old organization to a new development which came to have nothing really new.” \(^{43}\)
However, the internal decay of Buddhism had begun and it was necessary to sow new seeds in the psyche of men. Kumarila and Shankara only tried their best in sowing the new seeds.44

Though Shankara and Kumarila were very learned religious teachers, could they really harm a popularly followed religion to the extent that it disappeared? The answer seems to be no. They can only pursue people towards the Brahmanical doctrine but cannot forcibly convert them. They were just like the missionaries and not the slaughterers, who could restrain people from following a particular religion.

Exhaustion

One of the causes suggested for the decline of Buddhism in India is exhaustion. As an eminent British scholar on Buddhism said, “What Buddhism in India died from was just old age or sheer exhaustion.”45 It never believed that it was free from the impermanence of all conducted things which it had professed so frequently. The works of Indian philosophy from the 11th century onwards are full of disputes between the Gautama’s Nyaya, the Shankara’s Vedanta and the theistic Vedanta of Ramanuja and Madhava, etc. The philosophy of the Buddhists became destitute. Even new heresies failed to appear.46 As the bodies grow old, wear out and die, so did Buddhism. The ideas had grown obsolete; they had out lived their usefulness and had served its purpose, and there was nothing more left for it to do’.47 Hence Buddhism in India came to a standstill. Exhaustion cannot be said to be responsible for the decline of a religion professed so widely because if it is so every religion might have undergone this phase but none of them have disappeared.

Royal Patronage

During the earlier days of Buddhism, when it was under the royal patronage, the sectarian brahmins could not raise their voice against it, but after the Muslim invasions, the orthodox community was able to move without restraint and slowly converted Buddhist shrines, which evaded destruction, into Brahmanical temples. The Buddhists, who lacked strong leadership and subject to community pressures, were slowly absorbed in Brahmanism. In those parts of India not brought under the control of the invaders, the pressure of the caste system slowly brought about the end of Buddhism.48
“Most of the kings of ancient India showed a marked religious catholicity like the Gupta rulers (Parambhagvatas), the Maitrakas (Shaivites in Kathiawar), King Kumara (of Kamarupa), the Bhauma-Karas (of Orissa were Brahmanical followers), King Harsha of Kanauj, and the Palas (of Bengal) also patronized along with Buddhism, the Brahmanical religions.”

There are also many instances where Buddhism is being patronized by the Brahmanical rulers. Thus in “the Mallar Plate, the devout Shaiva, Mahashivagupta awarded gifts to a Buddhist community at Tardamsake. Queen Kumaradevi was a Buddhist devotee, however her husband (Govindchandra of Kanauj), was a Brahmanical ruler. The same king, while pledging his devotion to Shiva and Vasudeva donates 6 villages to the Jetvana Monastery at Sravasti in 1130 C.E. Gangashiva, of Ranipur Jharial inscription of the 10th or 11th c., constructs temples dedicated to lord Shiva, Karttikeya, Buddha and Laxmi at the same time.”

King Lalitaditya of Kashmir (733-769 C.E.) is credited with having constructed monasteries as well as temples devoted to the sun, but his successors were Shaivaites.

In the Pala kingdom Buddhism, however corrupt, was flourishing so far as the number of its adherents and royal favour were concerned. The Palas favoured Buddhism, but did not actively discourage Brahmanism. They founded the monasteries of Odantapuri, Vikramshila and Somapuri vihara, which later became great centres for learning. They even gave grants to Brahmanical temples and “their Prime Ministers were generally brahmins who used to erect non-Buddhist images in Buddhist Shrines.”

The kings of the Karkota dynasty in Kashmir followed Brahmanical religions, but they, their queens and ministers carried on to support Buddhism.

R. G. Bhandarkar, taking the evidence of the inscriptions, had shown that how gradually changes were brought in the general attitude of the sovereigns and the people towards the Buddhist faith from the 2nd century C.E. onwards, which was till then a strong rival of Brahmanism and Jainism. “The changes were of course from favour to disfavour, from hospitality to hostility.” It is true that after the Guptas no staunch and whole hearted patron of Buddhism in India is known, except some of the Palas and Harsha. Indian Kings were bound by custom to assist all religions, their active support to a sect brought with an increase in status and tangible material gain. The Gupta period is generally held as marking the climax of Brahmanical revival.
However they kept patronizing the Buddhist religion as is evident from the fact that Amrakardeva was a Buddhist general in Chandragupta II’s army, and five later Gupta kings were the patrons of the Nalanda vihara.57

There were occasional Brahmanical persecutions but these could not do any great harm to the existing Buddhist religion. It must be noted that there was no regularity in these persecutions and where Protestantism in Europe could make a stand against such a strong and organized persecution as the Spanish Inquisition it cannot be believed that these intermittent persecutions might have caused the decline of Buddhism in India. But what is evident is that these occasionally recurring active persecutions were suggestive of the gradual loss of state patronage.58 Thus the major dynastic support is lost. However, there might be support for Buddhism by the lay aficionados who were mainly rich merchants who got numerous monasteries constructed. Still it is not appropriate to construe that it is due to the withdrawal of royal support that Buddhism decayed because for the similar and often identical forces were at work on another non-Vedic community (the Jains, etc.) and yet failed to bring about its extermination.59

Even if the withdrawal of royal support is accepted as one of the causes for the decline of Buddhism in India the same does not hold true for other heresies, which were sharing the same environment.

Sectarian Rivalry

The followers of Buddhism were not selected; they belonged to all castes, classes and communities. Whosoever exhibits his faith in Buddha’s doctrines could have access to his order. These unqualified followers must have started undertaking practices forbidden to a Buddhist monk. This laxity in the execution of their duty towards the order brought a divide amongst them and a number of schools and sub-schools appeared soon after the demise of the Buddha.60 Buddha had apprehended the danger of internal disunity and thus he condemned the ‘sanghabheda’ as one of the five deadly sins.61 But, in fact, the history of schism in Buddhism dates back to the time of the Buddha himself.62 The followers of Devdatta were in existence even in the 7th century CE and commanded three cloisters in Karnasuvarna.63 Not only the Sammitiyas of Sidha were abusing the Mahayana, and a famous teacher of Hinayana (Theravada), Prajnagupta, had composed an exposition in 700 slokas hostile to the
great vehicle and Hiuen-Tsang was instigated by the Mahayanists of Magadha to obliterate the heresy by creating a polemic work in 1600 slokas. Fa-hien mentions 96 heretical schools besides the orthodox ones in the Middle Kingdom. Hiuen-Tsang speaks of 18 orthodox schools only. And each of the schools claims their intellectual superiority. I-Tsing speaks only of the 4 schools to which the 18 sub-divisions were respectively confirmed.

The incongruity between the sects of Buddhism was as bitter as between the Buddhists and non-Buddhists, and also among the different sects of other religions but none declined for the reason. Brahmanism has an infinite number of sects and sub-sects but it did not decline for the reason. Yet it helped in assimilation of more and more people into the fold of Brahmanism. Sectarianism among Islam did not lead to its demise even when the dispute, between the sects, was so fierce. So this also might not hold true for Buddhism.

**Responsibility of Mahayana**

Charles Elliot feels that within “it was to the corruptions of Mahayana rather than those of Hinayana (Theravada) that the decay of Buddhism in India was due.” L. M. Joshi and R. G. Bhandarkar too agree with Elliot and consider Mahayana responsible for qualitative decay of Buddhism in India. “The delicate equilibrium between Saddha and Panna tended to be destroyed, as early as the rise of the Mahayana.”

Buddhism failed to satisfy the demand for a deity that emerged out of the notion of Bhakti. It has an utterly rational attitude, thus in the long run it became less acceptable to the general population. However, with the growth of Mahayana, attempts were made to meet this want. But this fell short of the mark and Buddhism, consequently started losing ground before the growing influence of Vaishnavism, Shaivism and other Puranic religions.

Mahayana proved to be weak and hesitant in its clash with Brahmanical religion. Besides, it grew weaker as it became widespread. And the gulf between Buddhism and Brahmanism narrowed down considerably.

On the philosophical level, probably, with the coming of the Brahmanical concept of Bhakti the bodhisattva ideal developed, owing to the discontentment among the Buddhist lay followers with the earlier notion of the Arhats. The blissful
bodhisattvas may well have represented an attempt to provide some outlet for the devotional and emotional needs of the Buddhist lay followers. But the popularity of these beings worked for, rather than against the destruction of Buddhism in India.\footnote{76}

The Jains, the Vaisnavas and the Saivas, the Saktas, all survived even today with their divergent schools and minor sects. The \textit{sangha}, as described by the Buddha, was a self-constituted body, guided by the common ideals of life with a common spiritual goal. It was a religion of the independent way-farers.\footnote{77} And as a matter of fact in such a community mere division into various schools or sects cannot be assigned as a cause of weakness.

\textbf{Degeneration}

The loss of vitality in the Order was suggested to be the major cause for the decline of Buddhism. The importance of \textit{sangha} lay in the spirit of renunciation, self-discipline, broadmindedness, liberality, service and sacrifice for the many, but when these characteristics are diminished and lost, the influence of the Order got deteriorated.

The forte of Buddhism is the uncompromising attachment to moral conduct, but as it overlooked the spiritual plane of human nature the decree began to collapse. The monks gradually became negligent and were devoted primarily to academic pursuits and religious celebrations. They grew lax and accepted mundane practices which were inconsistent with the earlier Buddhist ethics.\footnote{78} Rituals do not form a part of Buddhist religion, but these crept into it gradually. We are also told that worship of the images of the Buddha came into existence as early as the Kushana Period.\footnote{79} This led to the disintegration of the Order into diverse sects and to the weakening of the moral standards of the \textit{sangha}, which led to the dithering faith of the laity in Buddhist ideals.\footnote{80}

Even the early Buddhist texts reveal an awareness of tendencies towards laxity and corruption within the \textit{sangha}. In the \textit{Malatimadhava}\footnote{81} of Bhavabhuti; \textit{Dashakamarcharita}\footnote{82} of Dandin; \textit{Mattavilasa-prahasana}\footnote{83} of the Pallava king Mahendravarman I (cir 600-30 C.E.); \textit{Chaturbhani}\footnote{84} (a 7\textsuperscript{th}, 8\textsuperscript{th}c. C.E. work, ascribed to Veraruchi, Ishvardutta, Shyamalika, and Sudraka); \textit{Mrichhakatika} of Sudraka; the \textit{Bhagavadajjuka},\footnote{85} (a work ascribed to Bodhayana by its commentator and which, according to some, may be a work of Mahendravarman I Pallava); and the
Malavikagnimitra of Kalidasa, it is mentioned that the society became quite corrupt and monks and nuns were indulged in sensual pleasures and nuns acted as go-betweens for the lovers.

The Bhagavadajjukam shows that beggars drove into the Buddhist sangha in order to get free food easily and other material comforts simply at the cost of shaving their heads and putting on the yellow robes. The Rastrapalaparip convincingly shows in the form of a prophecy, a life like sketch and a satirical picture of the lax morals of the Buddhist monks. It says, thus:

“My monks will be without shame and without virtue, haughty, puffed up and wrathful......intoxicating themselves with alcoholic drinks. While they bear the banner of the Buddha, they will only be serving the householders....... they themselves will have wives, sons and daughters like householders. ‘You are not to indulge in sensual pleasures, in order that you may not be born again as animals, ghosts or beings of hell, thus they will preach to the householders, but they themselves will be uncontrolled, and so on.”

The ‘Sutra of Face of Lotus’ translated into Chinese in 584 C.E. cites a prophecy in which it is said that “the bhikkhus shall take pleasure in doing only evil deeds.” Kalhana mentions that in a vihara erected by Yukadevi, a queen of King Meghvahana (Cir 600 C.E.), one half of it was allotted to regular monks of good conduct and the other half to those who had wives, sons and property and were thus blameworthy. Hieun-tsang refers to the sloppy moral conduct of the Buddhist monks of Bolar or Balti (Little Tibet) and says that they did not have adequate knowledge. He described the Sammitya monks of Sindh as sluggish, worthless persons given to debauchery. I-tsing records that most of the monasteries in India sustained on corn-fields, bulls and monastic servants; and some of them did not even divide the produce. Bu-ston records from the Chandragarba-parip that, 1300 years after the death of lord (i.e. in about 800 C.E.), the monks shall covet riches and articles of enjoyments. The Mrchakatika shows that the Buddhist monks were not held in great honour in Ujjaini.

It should, however, be borne in mind that every religious community might have to undergo such periods of decay; but the religious communities which stand this decay may have responded to these situations with instant internal modifications, as a
consequence of which the movement generally became more profound than ever before. Decay in itself might not be fatal; but the inability of the Buddhists to recover from such decomposition might have been a more reasonable cause.²⁵

The Buddhist monasticism developed as corrupt as any other priesthood. “Not mendicant monks, devoted to a pure life, but opulent churches with fat priests; not simple discourses calculated to awaken the moral and religious consciousness, but subtle arguments on discipline and metaphysics were now what Buddhism represented.”³⁶ It became so dissolute that when Hiuen-Tsang visited India he found early Buddhism inundated by the debris of “myth and legend.”³⁷

As a result of the rise of various Bodhisattvas to pre-eminence Buddhism exposed itself to subversive synthesis with Brahmanical Hindu beliefs and practices.³⁸

**Assimilation**

“The best things of the world die before they are reborn, and even so has Buddhism perished in India, to be born again in a refined Brahmanism.”³⁹ The life of the people was dominated by the Brahmanical faith, and Buddhism could survive only by recognizing the Brahmanical gods.⁴⁰ Thus there had been a constant assimilation in the iconography and legends of the two religions. Early Buddhism included Indra, Brahma and other deities into its fold. The Hinayana accepted Brahma, Vishnu and Narayana in their own names. The Mahayana never sincerely opposed itself to the Hindu practices. The brahmins looked upon the Buddha as an incarnation of Vishnu. In turn the Buddhists identified Vishnu with Bodhisattva Padmapani called Avalokiteshvara. The Hinayana (Theravada) with its more ascetic character came to be regarded as a sect of Shaivism.⁴¹

Hiuen-Tsang found non-Buddhists of Simhapura imitating the customs of the Buddhists; in Gaya⁴² the sacred Buddhist place completely occupied by the brahmins. In Patalaka hill,⁴³ also Avalokita had started emerging as Pashupata (Siva); the people of Shatadru⁴⁴ though Buddhists, were observing social distinctions.⁴⁵

When the brahmins developed universal love and devotion of God as its own practices and proclaimed Buddha to be incarnation of Vishnu, the death knell of Buddhism in India was sounded.⁴⁶ The acceptance of the Buddha as an incarnation of Vishnu had been accomplished probably in the 6th c. CE, first in the Matsya Purana.⁴⁷
The Varaha Purana, the Bhagvata Purana, the Dashavtara cave temple at Ellora, the Merutantra, and a hymn of 9th century saint Namalvar, all mention Buddha as a Brahmanical deity, and as an avatara of the lord Vishnu. The Buddha and some Buddhist divinities were incorporated into the Brahmanical pantheon. As a consequence of which the division between them had increasingly diminished and it was not a remarkable thing for a Buddhist to be absorbed into the largely Buddhified Hindu fold.

Sankara’s grand guru Gaudapada’s attempt to synthesize Vedanta and Buddhism is well known. He absorbed the philosophy of Nagarjuna (the Madhyamikas) into the Vedanta. The Tantra practices synchronized the two systems so completely that Buddhism’s independent existence might have appeared useless or even impossible.

The doctrine of Kamma of Yajnavalkya has found its expression in Buddhism. The four fundamental truths (Arya Satyani) are quite similar to the cardinal articles of Indian medical science. The 12 forms of pratitya-samutpada are akin to the Pratyaya Sarga of the Samkhya. The Jataka tales are often a parallel to the fables of the Mahabharta, Panchtantra and the Brihatkatha.

At any rate, the Brahmanical and particularly the Shaiva influence had so strongly affected Buddhism that Hiuen-Tsang was told by the monks of Orissa that the monks at Nalanda differed very little from the Shaiva ascetics. Besides, its philosophical superiority attested in many dialectical duels, neo-Brahmanism appealed more powerfully to the common man’s senses and sentiment. It caught their eyes by means to its magnificent temples and beautiful images as much as it swayed their hearts by its round of glamorous festivals, devotional songs and mystery plays. Its splendid folk lore and inexhaustible fund of myths and local legends warmed up the imagination of the people to an unconscious fervour.

Nourished by the thought and moral discipline of the Upanishads and the early Vedanta, “Buddhism never cut itself asunder from the parent stock of Brahmanism,” from which it has been enriched and revitalized from time to time in its long career in India, it thus proved to be fatal for Buddhism.

Tantricism

The emergence of the Tantra may be considered as a product of Buddhism in its state of exhausted vitality. With the advent of Tantras the gulf between the
Buddhists and Hindus begun to narrow down since the size of Mahayana became definitely fordable.118

"By means of laboured similes drawn from etiological principles, the transition was made easy to a naturalism that opened the door wide to the superstition of grosser character. A craving for supernatural replaced the severally rational outlook of the Buddha. Logic gave way to magic. Tantrik Buddhism in its later state of fluid mixture of magic, erotics and a crust of monistic philosophy, was no more Buddhist than the Holy Roman Empire, in the famous epigram of Voltaire, was Holy or Roman."119

Probably Tantricism did not appear in organized Buddhism until the 7th c E.C., when Hiuen-Tsang reported that certain monastic communities were given to magical practices. The drunkenness, meat-eating and sexual promiscuity were often indulged in, as well as such repulsive psychopathic practices as eating ordure, and sometimes even ritual murder.120 Buddhism turned into Tantricism during the Pala period. The consequence had been that Brahmanism revived and Buddhism fell into disregard.121

Tantrik mystics were accepted as great leaders who professed to have discovered the shortest way to salvation; they openly condemned the strict ethical discipline of the early Buddhist monks and even on occasion propagated mass indulgence in wine and women. Some factions believed in the “grace of the guru (teacher)” as solely sufficient for the realization of the sublime. These decadent and perverse forms contributed to the weakness of Buddhism and made it impossible for Buddhism to recover after the Mahayana temples and monasteries were destroyed by the Muslim invasions.122

A. Wayman seems right when he says that, though it cannot be denied that the Tantra was sometimes followed in degenerate forms, it does not seem to be the cause of decline of Buddhism in India for the Tantra in its Hindu form has enjoyed great popularity, and evidently had not contributed to the fall of Brahmanism in any observable amount.123

**Muslim Persecution**

V.A. Smith maintains that the greatest of the religious persecutors in India were the Muslims. It cannot be really denied that wherever they went, they went with a sword in hand.124 The theory of persecution by Muslims is accepted even by
Ambedkar. He was of the opinion that Brahmanism trampled by the Muslim invasion could get the support and sustenance from the respective rulers. But Buddhism did not have such anticipation. This was the greatest misery that Buddhism in India had to face.  

By the time of Muslim invasion (1190 C.E.), Buddhism was fast merging in the corpus of Brahmanism. The process is exemplified in the doctrine of the incarnation of Vishnu, which does not appear in its final form until just before the Muslim invasion. Buddhism already on its decay on accounts of its internal degeneration was completely brushed aside by the Islamic flood. The furious massacres, as are told, carried out in many places by them were more terrible than orthodox Hindu persecutions and had a lot to do with the disappearance of Buddhism in several regions.

When the Turkish horseman occupied Bihar and Bengal, slew or expelled the “shaven headed brahmins”, as they called the Buddhist monks, and destroyed their monasteries and libraries, Buddhism was dead in the mainland of India. The Muslims had no special animus against Buddhism. They were iconoclasts and saw merit in the destruction of images and slaughter of idolaters. But when the monasteries were destroyed there remained nothing outside them capable of resisting either the violence of the Muslims or the assimilative influence of the brahmins. Hence Buddhism suffered far more from these invasions than Brahmanism but still its remnants lingered long and exists even now in Orissa and the north-west India.

As soon as the Muslim raids began in Bengal i.e. from the 12th century, the sangha no longer enjoyed the position as it had at the beginning and throughout the Pala period. The Sena kings, who followed the Palas in Bengal, though belonging to a Hindu persuasion, were not hostile to the Faith. Still Buddhism declined during their reign, and more so after the invasion of the Muslims in C.E. 1200. The monasteries of Odantapuri and Vikramshila were destroyed; the monks were killed or fled to other countries. The learned Sakyasri went to Orissa, and later to Tibet; Ratnarakshita to Nepal; Buddhhamitra and others sought refuge in South India, while Sangam Srijnana with numerous of his followers left for Burma, Camboja etc. And thus the law of the Buddha became extinct in Magadha.

In Orissa the light of the law flashed anew for an instant, in the middle of 16th
century under the Hindu ruler Mukunda Deva Harishchandra, until it was extinguished, due to the conquest of the country by the Muslim governor of Bengal.\textsuperscript{133}

In Kashmir, it was in 1340 C.E. that Shah Mir, a Muslim general, made Islam popular and Buddhism receded into background except in Ladakh.\textsuperscript{134} Muslim persecution persuaded many monks and disciples of Northern India, to flee to Nepal, carrying their books and pious images with them.\textsuperscript{135}

The affect of Muslim conquest on the ultimate disappearance of Buddhism from the mainland of India is worthy of being over-emphasized, as most of the monasteries like Odantapuri might have been put to the fire and sword and the treasured collection of books, manuscripts and riches were plundered or devastated. With this collapse of the nerve centers of Buddhism i.e. the monasteries, the communal life of people was hindered and abruptly terminated. But the Buddhists did not choose to die stoically in the desperate defense of their sacred relics in the viharas, so that the blood of martyr’s might become the seed of their faith. Nor did they actually try to preserve or reinvigorate their faith in any practical manner. For the most part, they simply abandoned the land in anticipation of danger and moved to adjacent and more secure areas such as Nepal, Tibet etc.\textsuperscript{136}

Persecution might scotch but it could not kill a religion so widely professed. As Christianity survived Moorish persecution in Spain and Turkish persecution in Armenia, and Brahmanism rose into a new vitality after the persecution of Aurangzeb.\textsuperscript{137} In the same manner Buddhism might have survived the Muslim attacks of persecution, but it could not chalk out a stable position and remained confined to Bengal, Orissa, North Western parts of India, and some corners in the Deccan or to say the fringes of Indian subcontinent.\textsuperscript{138}

The Laity

The Buddhist laity at all times appears to be a very fluid social category. It was difficult to draw a line between a Buddhist and a non-Buddhist layman, as it was the scripturally prescribed duty of a layman to respect and support all saintly beings. “Nowhere, in India, did ‘Buddhist’ and ‘Hindu’ become mutually exclusive identities. Among the laity Buddhism was always complementary to communal religion. Buddhists are said to worship Hindu gods in Sri Lanka. And beyond India, for example in Japan, Buddhists are also Shintoists, while in China Buddhists are also
Confucianists or Taoists, and so on. The term ‘layman’ can thus cover a range of possibilities in Buddhism.\textsuperscript{139}

“In the early Indian context, the term ‘Buddhist’ did not, on the whole, include lay people and actually signified only those who had given up the lines of householders and become monks and nuns.”\textsuperscript{140} It was almost entirely centered on its monasticism and saw householders largely as spiritually and morally challenged. Later this lack of cultivation of laity made Buddhism a potentially failed religion which was destined to collapse unrecognizably.\textsuperscript{141}

Further, there were no occasions where the bhikkhu and upasaka could come across. The Patimokkha ceremony was exclusively meant for the monks, making the laity loosely associated with the Order.\textsuperscript{142} Buddhism had no exclusive social code, did not prescribe any ceremonies for birth, marriage and death, no peculiar modes of worship, etc. on the basis of which these individuals could be distinguished. They followed all the rituals in accordance to the Brahamanical practices. This in the long run minimized its hold on the lay society.\textsuperscript{143}

The sense of religious identification felt by the Buddhist lay supporters became weaker. Thus, when anyone became a lay follower of the Buddha, he only states his reverence to the Buddha as a heavenly being.\textsuperscript{144}

On the other hand, “Weber saw Buddhism as having an other worldly ideal which devalued the world and its drives and a restriction of rational purposive activity to meditation,”\textsuperscript{145} “with advice to the laity too vague to be the basis of a rational economic ethic of self-discipline.”\textsuperscript{146}

The relationship of Buddhist lay supporters with Buddhism seem to have acted against the latter’s long-term survival in four ways:

1. “The lay supporters were almost entirely urban. Buddhism did not have much following or support in the countryside. When urbanization began to decline, support for Buddhism also started dwindling and the number of lay supporters and sympathizers became abysmally low. This resulted in the abandonment of a large number of monasteries. Consequently, the sangha became concentrated in fewer and fewer monasteries. When during the early medieval times the Islamic invasions took place, the already enervated sangha simply fell apart and was left with nowhere to turn for support.”\textsuperscript{147}
2. The number of Buddhist lay supporters was very small. Theistic Brahmanism continued to develop even during the period when Buddhism was the strongest as did the six orthodox philosophical systems. It could never become a major religion in India.

3. The lay supporters’ allegiance was mostly towards individual monks and nuns rather than towards Buddhism as such. This meant that the affiliation with Buddhism came to an end when a particular monk/nun died or moved away.

4. The conversion of lay supporters was never complete.

The Buddhist society was kinship based as the Buddha himself regarded them as a strong reason for providing relaxation in a large number of Vinaya rules. Bhikkhus were allowed to have link with their kinsmen in certain cases. Further the Buddha gave so much importance to these kinship ties that he provided alternative ties to the bhikkhus to substitute the lost ones. Due to this, the monks mostly remained attached to their household lives, which proved disastrous for the religion in the long run.

Nevertheless, the final aim of both the Brahmanic as well as the Buddhistic philosophy was same, but there was probably no distinction in the method of maintaining discipline of body and mind. The Vedic teachings were not intended for all uniformly. These differ greatly for different types of followers and were based on the individual qualifications. Only People, who have gone through the vicissitudes of life, could enter in to the life of a mendicant.

Buddhism and Brahmanism also differ on account of their interaction with the lay society. Buddhism originated in an urban environment and did not give much attention to the caste based discrimination and exploitation. It was guided and supported by highly urbanized intellectuals. Buddhism did not have any specific qualification for the laity and admitted anyone to the Order including rural folks, sudras, chandalas, and people with insufficient means and the less educated found it hard to secure pass to the heart of Buddhism. “Pali literature sees the nagarakas (city-dweller) as urbane and polite. Interestingly, most of the sermons recorded in the Nikayas were delivered in large cities such as Savatthi, Rajagaha and Kosambi, it registers an unmistakable disdain for gama (village) and things rural. The word gama forms part of a large number of disdainful compound words and expressions such as gamakuta (sycophant); gamadhamma (vile conduct); gamavasina dhamma.
(vile conduct); gamadaraka\textsuperscript{157} (street urchins). Buddhism could not become a sufficiently secular movement. The laity continued to practice the current practices and ceremonies, prescribed largely by the Brahmanical clergy. This non-interfering attitude of Buddhism, however, made the spread of the religion quite malleable, but its hold on the society was loosening. Thus the relation between the sangha and the upasaka world confined the Buddhistic traditions to the viharas.\textsuperscript{158}

“The sangha remained to lay devotee a sort of adult education class for religious instruction with voluntary attendance.”\textsuperscript{159} Buddhism failed to base itself in the practical aspects of popular life. Hence the Buddha was confirmed as the ninth avatara of Lord Vishnu, but his teachings were ignored.\textsuperscript{160} Buddhism assimilated much of Brahmanism, as it recruited its monks in a Hindu environment.\textsuperscript{161}

The Puranas played a substantial role in the assimilation of Buddhism in Brahmanism, “by emphasizing and assimilating some of the principles and doctrines of Buddha such as ahimsa, by accepting Buddha himself as an avatara of Vishnu, by adopting vegetarianism as a high form of austerity, by making use of monasteries and asceticism as stated in such smritis as those of Manu and Yajnavalkya.\textsuperscript{162} Pargiter also thinks that it was largely through the Pauranika literature that Brahmanism secured its revival and the downfall of Buddhism.”\textsuperscript{163}

As urbanization began to decline, monasteries were also deserted and most of the monks settled in few mahaviharas, and their contact with the lay devotee deteriorated. When monasteries became independent owing to their ownership of granaries, corn fields and servants, they stopped going on begging rounds and the contact with laity reduced even more. This flaw in Indian Buddhism seems to prove decisive in its decline.\textsuperscript{164}

The layman in Buddhism, never constitute a separate group. For them it was enough to take refuge in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Sangha. In fact, their bond to the Order was loose.\textsuperscript{165} Thus, the Buddhist laity soon assimilated and became identifiable with Brahmanism when the poorly recruited monasteries fell to the Muslim invasion.

In reviewing the disappearance of Buddhism from India we must remember that it was absorbed and not expelled. The result of the mixture is justly called Brahmanism.

\textsuperscript{57}
Later in the 12th-13th centuries any considerable references to Buddhism have not been found. From Abul Fazal in 16th century we get to know that in Akbar’s Ibadatkhana scholars from all religions were invited for the religious discussions but we do not find even the mention of Buddhism which indicates towards the insignificant condition in which Buddhism might have fallen.

Thus the alienation of lay followers might have been the strongest of the reasons for the decline of Buddhism from the whole of India except the fringes where it was kept revitalized from the neighbouring Buddhist countries from time to time, where Buddhism was in a finely flourishing condition.

The alienation might have restricted the spread and growth of the religion. Later even the Buddhist monks left going on alms round due to their permanent stationing in the viharas which were self-sustained. The teachings of the Buddha were no more preached to the society and remained confined to the sanghas, that too, in a corrupt form and as suited to the monks.

Regional Decline of Buddhism

The reasons for decline as we have seen above were not uniform at all the places, neither do all of them hold true for explaining the decline of Buddhism in one region. So, here is the explanation as to which reason became instrumental in the decline in particular region.

North India

The north western region had been a centre of the Kushana empire. It was also the scene of conflict between the Kushanas and the pre-Buddhists of Kashmir, between Shaivites and Buddhists and also between the Huna King Mihirkula and his enemy Tukhura ruler of Himatala. It is said that Mihirkula might have destroyed much of the Buddhist monuments in the Taxila and Gandhara region.

Fa-hein also found Buddhism in great fervour all around the N.W. Frontier. In Udyana there were around 500 monasteries attached to the Hinayana. While Hieun-Tsang says that there had been 1400 monasteries and around 18000 priests in Udyana, but now only a few of them remained and have no great understanding of Mahayana that they follow. They were more into magical exorcism. I-Tsing told about a monk Tao-Lin in Udyana. Huei Chao (726-729) also observes that the king of that place
also respected \textit{Tri-ratnas}.\textsuperscript{171} Ou-kong (1225) also says that Buddhists were flourishing in Udyana even during the Turkish rule.\textsuperscript{172}

Fa-hien said that the sacred alms bowl of the Buddha was preserved in Gandhara.\textsuperscript{173} There lived around 700 monks in the monastery there. He further said that Gandhara had been destroyed two generations ago by the Epthalite Hunas, but it had revived since.\textsuperscript{174} According to Hieun-Tsang, Gandhara appeared to him solitary.\textsuperscript{175} Though Buddhism was not the leading religion in Kashmir in 7th century yet it had not become trivial, nor had it lost the royal patronage of successive rulers and the nobles.\textsuperscript{176} He, however, found hundred monasteries with 5000 monks. According to him the people loved learning and were well instructed.\textsuperscript{177}

In Kalhanaa we find an almost continuous evidence of donations to the Buddhists by rulers and nobles of Kashmir. It is also proved by the remarks of Huei-Chao, (730 CE).	extsuperscript{178} "The King, his wives and the princess down to the nobles and their wives all build cloister according to their means." They make is individually and do not found an establishment together. And as a consequence of this Ou-Kong found 300 monasteries in 759 CE instead of 100 in 7th Century.\textsuperscript{179} Kalhanaa also mentions a number (long list of) of gifts to Buddhists and construction of viharas by the Kings of different religions.\textsuperscript{180} From circumstances it is apparent that the period was marked by considerable cultural activity among the Buddhists.

According to Kalhana, Khsemagupta burnt down the Jayendra vihara for sheltering the rebel, Damara Sangrama. However, it seems to be an act of political importance rather than religious persecution.\textsuperscript{181} During the region of Nandigupta (772-73 CE) Didda built Vaishnava temples as well as Buddhist viharas.\textsuperscript{182} Kalasha (1063-89 CE) built a number of mathas and agraharas, Harsha (1089-1101), known as the Nero of Kashmir, is ascribed to be an iconoclast. But his atrocities were not directed particularly against Buddhism. However he left two statues of Buddha unbroken on the request of shramana Kulasri and the singer Kanaka.\textsuperscript{183} King Harsha, according to Tibetan tradition, is ascribed with a Sanskrit poem entitled \textit{Asta-Maha Chaitya-Vandana-Stotra}.\textsuperscript{184} During the reign of Jayasinha (1123-40 CE), a vihara was erected along with a Shiva temple. Sulla vihara was completed and Suryamati matha was reconstructed.\textsuperscript{185} The \textit{Arigon Sarda} inscription at Kashmir records the construction of a brick vihara to replace an older one which had been in the region of King Simha (identified as Jayasimha by Sten Konow). This vihara is dedicated to Lokanatha (who
is identical with Avalokileshvara) invoked in line 2 of the inscription. Thus, Buddhism might have revived and flourished along with Shaivism in the middle of 12th Century CE.  

According to Taranatha and Bu-Ston, a scholar, Shantiprabha lived in the reign of Jayapida and had Punyakirtti, Danashila and Acharyasura as his disciples. Shivaswamin, the disciple of Chandramitra, belonged to the reign of Avantivarman (855-84 CE), wrote Kappinabhyudaya. This kavya was greatly influenced by the Buddhist teachings. Though it had a Buddhist legend as the theme, the poem emphasized upon the Brahmanical ideal of Grihastha. This may be suggestive of cultural ascendancy of brahmanical ideals which was to be accelerated in the course of time. In the reign of Avantivarman again, Bhatta Kallal and other Siddhas made their mark and Tantrik Buddhism gained ground.  

In I-Tsing, Ki-ye, Nanjio’s Catalogue, Cordier’s Catalogue, the names of Buddhist authors have found frequent mention.  

In Kashmir the intellectual activity went on persistently. A galaxy of luminaries was shining up and continued till the 11th CE. These include Ravigupta (725 CE), Dharmakaradatta, Dharmottaracharya (847c. CE), Danashila (9th C), Jinamitra (890 CE), Sarvajnadeva and Shamkarananda (C. 1050 CE). Besides these Jnana Shribhadra (983 CE), Ratnavajra (983 CE) and Arcata (9th CE) also have spent a part of their lives in Kashmir.  

Some Buddhist monuments are also found during the reign of Lalitaditya. These comprise a large Stupa with double platform, a monastery temple, seated Buddha figures and two crowned Buddhas or bodhisattvas in monastic robes. Bronze statues of Padmapani, with the two Shaktis, bearing an inscription of reign of Queen Didda (983-1003 CE) were also found.  

Thus it can be said that Buddhism might have survived in Kashmir up to the 12th Century and may have disappeared after a local Muslim ruler Shah Mir ascended the political power in 1339 CE. The process of decline might have been very protracted. It survived only in Ladakh. Abul Fazal, when visited Kashmir with the emperor Akbar in the 16th Century, he met some old people who practiced Buddhism but could not find Buddhist scholars. He could not ascertain as to when Buddhism died out in the region but simply remarked that it was long ago.
Buddhism began to assimilate Tantrik influence and fell a victim to allied evil of Shaiva Tantricism. And in the course of time, Shaivism absorbed a number of Buddhist followers into its fold. Besides the Chinese accounts inform us about the large number of Indian monks, who came to China towards the beginning of the 6th CE (i.e. during the rule of Mihirkula in Kashmir). Buddhists were treated favourably by all the rulers in Kashmir and those who were detrimental to Buddhist, such as Kshemagupta and Sriharsha were equally intolerant to all the sects. Their successors constructed both the monasteries and temples.

In 1339, a local Muslim dynasty came to the throne of Kashmir. In the beginning they were tolerant to the Buddhists but later in around 1400 CE they started persecuting the Buddhist, images, monasteries and temples. Religious processions and ceremonies were banned and in about 1500 CE Buddhism disappeared from Kashmir but left an indelible mark on Brahmanism and a little on Muslims. Dhyanabhadra, in his autobiography, mentions the survival of Buddhists in Jalandhar in 14th CE.

Therefore, it can be concluded that Buddhism survived in Northern India up to 14th century. It declined here due to the effect of Tantricism, Muslim persecution and assimilative tendencies of Brahmanism.

Western India

Hieun-Tsang found 100s of monasteries in Sindh with around 10,000 monks, where the people studied without aiming to excel. To I-tsing the Sammitiya school was most flourishing in this area and Lata. Huei-Chao’s account (circa 729 CE) records that Arabs invaded the country in 727 CE, and destroyed it. But it was not solely responsible for the disappearance of Buddhist from this area (Sindh). The Chachnama refers to the development of magical powers by monks which is an indication of prevalence of Tantrik Buddhism at an early date.

We found mention of Buddhists in the account of Al-Beruni and also Gardizi (1050 CE). An inscription found written on the pedestal of two Buddha images from Behar. It has been identified to belong to the 3rd regional year of a King Surapala. Thus it is probable that Buddhists survived in Sindh even in the 9th and 10th Century and the Buddhist monks might have attracted and shifted to Bengal seeing the greater prosperity of Buddhists there under the Palas.
During the invasion of Md. Qasim in Shiwistan, he was guided by a shamana against the native ruler. This shamana was the governor of Nirun. (identity is difficult to determine)

Archeological records by Fr. Heras and later by D. R. Bhandarkar have shown the prosperity of Buddhists in India. Besides, the celebrated stupa of Mirpur Khas, a large number of smaller Stupas and 2 monasteries have been discovered. From Sudharanjo-Dhado and Jarak also Buddhist remains have been found. Buddhist images from Sammitiya dominated area led to the doubt as to whether this orthodox school of the lesser Vehicle had been over taken by the image worship. Islam in Sind also had borrowed from Buddhism. The doctrine of Fana is said to be an Islamised version of ideal of Nirvana.

Cahu-Ju-Kua (1225 CE) mentioned that the people of Nan-ni-hua used to anoint their bodies with turmeric to make their bodies glow like that of the Buddha's. This indicates the survival of Buddhists in Sindh even in the 13th CE. He mentions 4000 Buddhist stupas in Gujarat, where 20000 dancing girls sing twice daily. But he is here evidently meaning the Hindu idols and the Devdasis of the temples.

The Sammitiya in the period of decadence might have lent themselves to an easier assimilation with the Hindus. With their stress on reality and on the importance of personality, they came quite near to the Hindu doctrine of metempsychosis, and the gulf was bridged over in a later period.

Hieun-Tsang found more than 100 monasteries with the 6000 priests in Valabhi in 640-41 CE. However, the temples of heretics numbered in several hundreds. Kings, though they were not Buddhists, patronized Buddhism. Epigraphic evidences show that from the rule of Dhruvasena (519-549), the Maitraka king, to the succession of Siladitya VII (c.770 CE) all the rulers patronized Buddhism and granted them gifts. These include accommodation, library etc. Sylvain Levi has observed, "the wordings of the grants are identical with those of the grants in favour of Maheshvara. The Buddhist cult is Hinduized and approaches Shaivism in which it is to be absorbed." According to Hieun-Tsang Buddhism was on a decline in Kaccha, Ujjain and Maheshvarapur in Gujarat it was almost extinct. In Itsing’s time Valabhi also was the seat of a University of good repute. According to Hieun-Tsang the monks of Bharukaccha neglected study, Monks at Chola country were dirty and attached to heretical teachings.
Central and Eastern India

According to Hieun-Tsang Malwa was known for great learning of the people.\textsuperscript{223} Buddhism was tolerated in Central India. At one instance mentioned in the Charkhari plate\textsuperscript{224} of Parmardideva (1178 CE) “a gift of a village, in Bundelkhand, was made to the brahmins but with an exception of the 5 halas of land which previously had been granted to Buddha in the same locality.” Thus, it is clear that Buddhism was still prevalent and respected in this region, by the non-Buddhist rulers.

At a place, Sirpur, in Central India, a shrine of around 8\textsuperscript{th} CE have been found, where the images of Rama and Buddha are found side by side sitting in meditation.\textsuperscript{225} At Gopalpura\textsuperscript{226} near Jubbulpura some inscribed Buddhist images have been found. Out of these, four represent Avalokiteshvara Bodhisattva and the 5\textsuperscript{th} represents Tara. These figures belong to 11\textsuperscript{th} or 12\textsuperscript{th} Century CE. This indicates that Mahayana was still popular in this region. R.D. Banerjee, in his memoirs on the Hathayas of Tripuri, speaks of bodhisattva image with an inscription of 3 lines belonging to 10\textsuperscript{th}- 11\textsuperscript{th} century CE. He further mentioned a 12\textsuperscript{th} century image of Buddha as incarnation of Vishnu featured with that of dwarf in the Keshava-Narayana temple at Amarkantaka.\textsuperscript{227} The process of assimilation of Buddhism into Hinduism is evident here.

A 12\textsuperscript{th} Century plate of Gobindachandra of Banaras mentions his queen Kumaradevi to be a sort of Tara in the service of the Buddha, however, her husband was a Brahmanical Hindu. Gobindachandra Gahadwala’s Set-Mahet (modern Sravasti) grant proves the survival of Buddhists in Kannauj in 12\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{228} The different inscriptions from Gaya, like a slab in the Surya temple with Buddhist invocation, belonging to 14\textsuperscript{th} Century CE had been found.\textsuperscript{229}

Fa-hein found Buddhism quite flourishing in Mathura and in a much better condition more eastward.\textsuperscript{230} In Ujjain and Maheshvarapur, the non-Buddhists outnumbered the Buddhists.\textsuperscript{231} Sudraka, in his Mricchakatika holds that Buddhist monks were despised and considered inauspicious.\textsuperscript{232}

A seal of a Huna ruler Tormana, found from Kaushambi indicates towards the destruction of Buddhist establishments in Koshambi by the Hunas.\textsuperscript{233}
Hieun-Tsang noted equal number of Buddhists and heretics in Kannauj. He found around 100 monasteries with the 10,000 bhikkhus and around 200 Deva temples with some thousands of believers.\textsuperscript{234} In Sravasti, the heretics outnumbered the Buddhists, and the monasteries were mostly in ruin. In Kapilavastu and Kushinagara monasteries were deserted.\textsuperscript{235} However, in Varanasi\textsuperscript{236} there were about 30 monasteries with the 3000 bhikkhus, but here also Buddhists were outnumbered by a 100 Deva temples with the 10,000 worshippers. Vaishali\textsuperscript{237} also had several hundred monasteries but were in dilapidated condition. Only in Magadha\textsuperscript{238}, especially Nalanda, Hieun-Tsang recounts the flourishing state of Buddhism.

I-tsing learned Sanskrit and Shabdavidya (the science of words/grammar) in Tamralipti.\textsuperscript{239} Hieun-Tsang (638-39) found, in Bengal, about 70 monasteries and around 8000 monks, while the Deva temples were around 300.

In Kajangala\textsuperscript{240} (Kankjol) near Rajmahal he found 6 or 7 monasteries with ever 300 monks. In Sumatra,\textsuperscript{241} 30 monasteries with 2000 bhikkhus of Lesser Vehicle. In Karvasuvarma,\textsuperscript{242} 10 monasteries with around 2000 bhikkhus of Sammitiya School. In Pundravardhan,\textsuperscript{243} 23 monasteries and 3000 monks of both Hinayana and Mahayana. In Tamralipti,\textsuperscript{244} 10 monasteries with 1000 monks where Fa-hein found around 22 monasteries. And later only 5 or 6 monasteries are seen by I-Tsing, making the decline evident.\textsuperscript{245}

The Chandra rulers during the Pala period of Bhangala or East Bengal were also Buddhists. Besides, there were some individual rulers also, who were Buddhists like Kantideva (850-950 CE) and the Kamboja Pala King Rajyapala (908-40 CE) of the Irda Plate and Ranavankamalla (early 13th century CE) of Pattikera.\textsuperscript{246}

Even in the hey-day of Buddhists under the Palas, it was flourishing. Beyond the boundary of the convents and cloisters Buddhist bore the aspects of hot-house artificial growth at least among the laity, whose conversion was always partial and superficial.\textsuperscript{247} Pandudasa, the founder of the Pandubhumi vihara, patronized Buddhism in late 10th century.\textsuperscript{248}

During the 10th-11th century we have the evidence of invocation of Buddha and Vasudeva at the same time on the occasion of the setting up of a Dharma image by one Manamrasharman in the village of Vajrayogini in Dacca district.\textsuperscript{249}
Two lines of a half defaced inscription are founded in script of about 12th century CE on the pedestal of an icon of Manjushri now preserved in the Dacca Museum. The inscription speaks of a Maharaja who was blessed, by the Goddess Chandi. Presumably the Sakya prince was responsible for the erection of the image of Manjushri.250

There was a tendency of assimilation of Buddhism with Brahmanism. It can be traced through iconographical testimony of Buddhism and Brahmanism. The process of fusion was accelerated during the Pala period. The Chakra of Vishnu is utilized by the Buddhist as a representation of their Dharma-Chakra pravartan.251 Certain poses and hand postures are indicating towards similarity in iconography, like the Dhramachakra and bhusparsha-mudra which are typical mudras of the two Dhyani Buddhas viz. Vairochana and Akshobhya. These are identified with the Hindu iconography in the two armed Nara in Deogarh with a little distinction.252

The Buddhist to a very great extent imitated the Hindus in practice such as the display of ornaments in various parts of bodies of their images contrary to the Buddhist teachings. Buddhist and Jain deities were also endowed with ornaments.253 Goddess Saraswati was incorporated into the Buddhist pantheon as the female counterpart of Manjushri (the Buddhist god of learning).254 Medieval representations of Jambhala, the Buddhist counterpart of Kubera is also one example of assimilation.255 Marshall says that some of the Maya figures on balustrades and gateways of Sanchi are identical with the Laxmi, standing or seated on the lotus which the Buddhists evidently appropriated, along with so many other formulae and motifs.256 The sculptures of Buddha and Surya are also present on the either side not as attendants but as cult objects of worship as they were standing on different pedestals and having halos round their heads. Thus this unique sculpture demonstrates not only the combination of Hindu deities of Shiva, Vishnu and Surya, but also that of Buddha with them.257

The Buddhist tantras open in the form of a dialogue between the goddess Niratma and the Lord Vajrasattva, and the Lord reveals the secret of nirvana from the suffering of the world in response to a question by the benevolent goddess. The Hindu tantra also begins with the similar question by Parvati (The mother of the world) to
her lord, Shiva. The Buddhist god of Mahasukha corresponds with the Hindu goal of Moksha.258

La Vallee Poussin considers Buddhist Tantricism, “as practically Buddhist Brahmanism or Shavism in Buddhist garb.”259 The Buddhist triad composed of Manjushri, Avalokiteshvara and Vajrapani were equated to the Brahamanical tried of Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva.260

La Vallee Poussin has observed that with the prevalence of the tantras among the Buddhists, “their pantheon, characteristic mythology, their transcendental philosophy, their principles of life and of salvation, everything is thrown into a topsy-turveydom.”261

It is indicated by Bagchi that the symbols with which the Buddhists used to explain their “abstruse mystic systems differed for a long time from that of the Hindus, but during the 11th century, even this formal distinction was blurred,” and the symbols became essentially similar to those of Shaktism.262 Foucher says that the similarity in Hindu and Buddhist tantra is because “both had adopted themes from a familiar source of ancient myths, beliefs and folk-lore.”263

The rule of the Senas has been characterized by historians as an era of orthodoxy. According to Taranath and Sumpa, under the four Sena rulers, Mahayana spread to other countries from Bengal and Bihar, and the number of followers increased considerably.264 The Sena period witnessed the compilation of Dharma-Shastras or ritualistic literature designed to enforce rules of ceremonial purity in order to protect Hindu society which had been gravely threatened by the disruptive influence of Buddhists.265 Lakshamansena, in his Tarpanadighi plate,266 granted land to Hindu temples on the very border of a pre-existing Buddhist monastery simply to harass the latter. But it seems gratuitous as the Buddhist grammarian lived on the patronage of Lakshamansena. The Court poet, Jayadeva, also sincerely accepted Buddha as the incarnation of Keshava and glorified him.

But the masses have been swayed by anti-Buddhist prejudices as it became decadent. The height of hatred is reached in the Chaitanya Bhagavata (Adi 6) of Brindabana Das where Nityananda is described as kicking the Buddhists on the
Tabaqat-i-Nasiri mentions that the brahmins with shaved heads were put to death to a man by the Muslim invaders and none survived to explain the large pieces of literature found there. These were mistaken as fortresses but the wealth accumulated in these monasteries might have made them special objects of attention and similar fate might be shared by other monasteries too. Taranatha asserts with conviction that the “creed was almost extinguished in Magadha.”

The process of disappearance of Buddhism was slowest and most protracted in Orissa. Here, Buddhism kept on being followed till the 16th–17th century. Hieun-Tsang found Buddhism flourishing in the areas of Udra, South Kosala, Konyodh and Kalinga. The monks at these places were of high intellect. However, in Konyodh and Kalinga, there were around hundred Deva temples and Jains were also numerous.

The Neulpur Copper Plate (in Cuttack) of Subhakar, who according to Sylvain Levi was ruling in 795 CE, brings to light the dynasty which profess Buddhism, and thus shows the popularity of Buddhism in the region in the early 9th century. The inscription also mentioned that Subhakar was the son of Shivakar and Shivakar was son of Kshemankara. Subhakar even sent an embassy to the Chinese king Te-tsong. It is also said that Orissa, at that time, was as famous a centre of Buddhist learning as Nalanda. There is evidence of one more Buddhist dynasty in Orissa during 10th-11th century, known from the Bonai copper plate. Here a Buddhist king named Udayavaraha was making grants in favour of brahmins. References of keeping Buddhist images in Brahmanical shrines were also found from here. From another inscription of 10th-11th century i.e. Rampur Jharial inscription, which was inscribed on the Mahadev temple near Titlagarh, evidence of erection of a temple by Acarya Gaganshiva (the name suggests his connection with Matra-Mayura sect of Shaivism who were patronized by the Kalachuri rulers). The temple as mentioned, have the images of Somesvara Shiva, Swamin (Kartikeya) and Laxmi, and an image of Siddheshvara (Buddha). Thus again, showing trends towards assimilation.

Various Buddhist images have been found preserved in the Beams collection in Cuttaek. However, in subsequent archeological survey, a large number of Mahayana images have been found scattered in Udaigiri, Nalatigiri, Jaipur and
Ratnagiri. Another bronze image with an inscription of 10th-11th century had also been found from Chauduar. Further, the images belonging to the Mahayana tantricism were also discovered from Baripada, Badsai, Hariharpur, Ranibandh and Khiching in the Mayurbhanj district, and from Ayodhya and Dhupshila in the bordering Nilgiri state. Pag Sam Jon Zang also makes references to Orissa as being the stronghold of Tantrik Buddhism.

The immunity from Muslim attack which Orissa enjoyed till 1568 CE made this region a shelter to accommodate the Buddhist refugees from different parts of the country. Taranath also mentioned the movement of Buddhist scholars to Orissa when monasteries of Vikramshila and Odantpuri were destroyed by the Muslims. Sakyasribhadra of Kashmir is said to have taken refuge in the Jaggadala monastery (Orissa), when Odantpuri was burned down by the Muslims in 1202 CE.

From the autobiography of Balarama (Orissan poet), a ruler, Prataprudra (1529 CE) is known, who, in the beginning of his reign favoured Buddhism, however, later he started persecuting them. Thus, it is evident that Buddhism was strong enough to invite the royal persecution in 16th century. On the other hand his successor Mukundadeva professed and patronized Buddhism, who was ruling in the late 16th century.

N. N. Basu refers to the Mahabharata of Sarala Das, and mentioned that the poet salutes the Buddha avatara, who resides at Nilancala (Puri). Almost all the medieval poets of Orissa including Acyutadasa revere Jagannath as Buddha incarnation. The three figures at Jagannath were mentioned as depicting the later Buddhist tantric ideology. Jagannath is equated with Upaya which unites with Subhadra, which is equated with Prajna, and produce Balarama, who is equated with Bodhicitta. They represent the phenomenal world.

The Imperial Gazetteer of India also states that in some modern representations of the avatara theory of Vaishnavism, Buddha is quite frequently replaced by Jagannath. The archeological excavations 10th-11th century also reveals the gradual assimilation of Buddha into Hindu pantheon and the development of later Mahayana and Vajrayana.
It is also predicted by some poets like Balaramadas, Jagannathdas, Ananta Das, Chaitanya and Yashowant Das, that the Buddhists would disguise themselves as Vaishnavas in the Kaliyuga.285

And the prediction, to some extent, proved to be true as most of the followers of Buddhism got assimilated with Brahmanism in the wake of Bhakti movement and also because of the loose association of the laity with the sangha. And Buddhism finally declined in the area due to the Muslim invasion of 1568, killing the last Buddhist ruler of the place, Mukundadeva.

**South India**

In the middle of 7th Century, Hieun-Tsang found Buddhism on decline in Andhra, Dhanyakataka, Chola country and in Malkuta. On the other hand, it flourished in the areas of South Kosala, Dravida, Konkanapura and Maharashtra. Mr. Frazer has suggested that the principal scene of the last struggle of Buddhism for its existence lay in the Dravidian country. The Dravidians whose national deity was Shiva, stood badly in need, for reasons unspecified, of a theistic worship, which might unite them eventually into a nation. But both Jainism and Buddhism miserably failed to satisfy the demand for a deity so imperiously made.286

Most of the Dravidians used to follow the Great Vehicle; however, it is not specifically mentioned as they owed their affiliation to Mahayana and its later subsects. On the other hand, Hinayana was not much followed, and only traces of it are found in southern parts of the country.287

One more challenge to Buddhism in South India was from the rising movements of Shaivism and Jainism. In Andhra with its capital at Vengi, the number of Buddhists and non-Buddhists was almost equal. I-tsing also mentioned the name of a Buddhist monk. Wu-Hing, who passed from Negapattam, on his way to Ceylon. Thus it might have been a famous seat of Buddhism.288 The number of Deva temples and their followers went on increasing and the monasteries were deserted in the area of Dhanyakataka. Similar was the situation in the Chola country. Here also the Buddhist monasteries were in ruins, only a few had some monks but they were far outnumbered by the Deva temples, besides, the Nirgranthas were also numerous. In
Dravida land (Kanchipuram), there were lesser Digambara Jainas than that of Buddhists. Further south in Malakuta (Travancore-Cochin), there were remains of old monasteries, and the number of monks in them was on a decline and quite less than the Jains and others.289

In the Mattavilasa-prahasana of the Pallava king Mahendraverman I (600-630 CE), the Buddhist monks and the followers of Shaivism were despised as lacking in self control and as indulged in sense pleasures.290

The Chinese monk, Huci-Chao, visited the kingdom of the king of south i.e. Vikramaditya II of Chalukya dynasty in Maharashtra and found many cloisters and monks of both Hinyana and Mahayana. In the neighbouring mountains too, he found the ruined monasteries which were built so finely that it seemed that they might have been constructed by the Yakshas (demigods). But to his disappointment there were no monks and the monasteries had fallen to pieces.291

Besides literary sources, archaeological sources also prove that Buddhism was a living religion in South India even in 16th Century.

Epigraphic evidence also indicate towards the survival of Buddhism in the area of Kalavati in Vijayanagara kingdom during the reign of Acyutendra in 1533 CE. And the literary evidence for the existence of Buddhism in South India in 16th century is found from the biography of Chaitanya Mahaprabhu.292

Buddhagupta, Taranath’s teacher, a Tibetan pilgrim found traces of Buddhism throughout the eastern border of India in 17th Century. These include Bengal, Orissa in south India at places like Trilinga (Trikalinga), Vyaynagara, Karnataka etc.294

In a pillar inscription dated 1183 CE of Kota chief, Mahamandaleshwar Keta II found at Amravati, it is mentioned that Keta II had granted three villages and 110 sheep to light two perpetual lamps before the Lord Buddha. The inscription further states that two concubines of Keta II made a gift of 55 sheep, each for one perpetual lamp to the Buddha at Dhanyakataka (modern Amravati). These gifts of perpetual lamps indicate towards Hindu mode of worship and thus assimilation.295

In the region of Kerala, only 7 images of Buddha have been found and other than Srimulavasam, no other famous Buddhist centre is evident. However, literary
sources like *Manimekhlai, Mahatmya, Musikavansha* indicate towards the existence of Buddhism.\(^{296}\)

Buddhism was a popular religion in Kerala before the rise of Shankara in 8\(^{th}\) century. It is said that he drew his inspiration from Buddhist philosophy and adopted Buddhist thoughts and practices which seemed best to him. Thus it can be said that Buddhism in Kerala did not die out, but was assimilated into the revived popular Brahmanism.\(^{297}\)

According to A. Banerjee, Buddhism in Kerala entered a period of obscurity after the 12\(^{th}\) Century CE.\(^{298}\)

A few scholars of South India in around 7\(^{th}\) century CE did a lot of damage to the reputation of Buddhists and Jainas by despising them of falsehood. These include Appar (7\(^{th}\) century CE), Jnana Sambandar and Manikvassagar. Tirumilisai (6\(^{th}\)-7\(^{th}\) century, Vaishnava Alvar saint) and Tondardipodi (8\(^{th}\) century CE), called the Buddhists as the “followers of the devil faith.”\(^{299}\) A 13\(^{th}\) century treatise on Tamil Shaivism, *Arunandi*, refers to the four schools of Buddhism out of fourteen rival philosophies, which indicate towards the survival of Buddhism in South India in 13\(^{th}\) century CE.\(^{300}\)

In the commentary on Jain work *Achara-Sara*, Buddhists were despised as meat-eaters.\(^{301}\) The Arab geographer Rashiduddin, in his book *Jam’u-t-Tawarikhi* (1310 CE) mentioned various cities of Malabar like Faknur, Manjarur, Hili, Sadarsha, Jangli, Kulam etc., where all the people were *shamanas* (Buddhists).\(^{302}\)

A Pallava inscription of 7\(^{th}\) century CE in *Varaha Perumal* temple, contains a Puranic verse on the ten incarnations of Vishnu with Buddha as one of them.\(^{303}\) Another inscription of 10\(^{th}\) century CE record grants of Nandi Kampishvara (Shiva) and to Gunamalai (Vishnu) near Vellore, by a minister of Hastimalla with the epithet *Puttagal*, meaning the feet of the Buddha depicting that the donor was a Buddhist. Thus, it is evident that Buddhism was popular in South in 10\(^{th}\) century CE.\(^{304}\) In an inscription of 1125 CE Channarayapatna No. 149, and inscription of 1136 CE, Belur 17, an ancient Guru Pushpasiddhanta was praised for making Buddha to fall in disrepute.\(^{305}\) Another inscription (Nagar 35) of 1077 credited a Jain Guru Vadisimha
with the feat that at his entrance into the hall of debate, “even the Buddha becomes unenlightened.” In a Hoyasala inscription of 1220 CE, the Buddha is called as the 9th incarnation of Vishnu and king Narsimha is praised as Buddha in the force of his own Yoga, showing again, the traits of assimilation.

Thus the most important cause of decline of Buddhism in South India can be summed up as the reformatory and revivalist trends of Brahmanism, the rise of Bhakti movement and also the assimilation of Buddhism into Brahmanism.
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