

Rahul Sankrityayan and the Buddhism of Nepal¹

Alaka Atreya Chudal

Introductory Remarks

Mahāpaṇḍit Rahul Sankrityayan (1893–1963) is a well-known figure in the field of Buddhist studies and Hindi literature, and is perhaps best known for his adventurous journeys to Tibet in search of lost original Buddhist texts. Born a *sanātani* Brahman², he lived variously the life of a sadhu, an Arya Samajist, a Buddhist monk, a lay Buddhist, a secularist, a wanderer, a progressive writer and a scholar who eventually embraced Marxist socialism. He was also a political activist, and was arrested and even jailed several times for such activities as delivering anti-British speeches (1922 and 1923–25), participation in the *kisān* ('peasant') satyagraha campaign in Bihar (1939), and involvement in the banned Communist Party of India (1940–42).³ Sankrityayan was such a frequent traveller that he came to be known as *ghumakkar-rāj* ('king of wanderers'). His wanderlust never died, and given his frequent journeys and other pursuits in life, it is amazing that he found time to write such a large number of books (often at the same time).

Nepal was Sankrityayan's second home. Though it was a different country with a different polity, he never thought of Nepal as a *videś* ('foreign country'). One clear reason for this was that he understood that the country was an important place on the Indian subcontinent where his works were being read. These propagated his ideas there with the same force as they did in India. During his creative period, India was in conflict with the British over the question of sovereignty, while the Nepalese for their part were struggling against the Ranas. Every work was censored by the Rana government, so that there was no question of the legal import of Sankrityayan's popular political works in Hindi. His Tibet travelogue, too, faced censorship. Therefore, he had to tone down the passages relating

1 This article is based on my PhD thesis 'A Freethinking Cultural Nationalist: Rahul Sankrityayan's Narrated Self in the Context of His Age' submitted to the University of Vienna in 2014.

2 A Brahman who attempts to observe Hinduism in an orthodox manner.

3 The years in brackets here indicate the period of Sankrityayan's imprisonment.

to Nepal in it in order to ensure that his other, non-political works were legally accessible to Nepalese readers. Nepal would also be the transit station that led on to Tibet in search of lost Indian heritage later in life. It was a land too, significantly, where few distinctions were made between Buddhism and Hinduism - where, for instance, Vishnu was worshipped as a form of Lokeshvara. This article is about Sankrityayan's relationship with Nepal and Nepalese. His connections with Nepalese were from different walks of life - scholars, merchants, politicians, writers, and others. However, this article will limit its focus to Sankrityayan's relation with the Nepalese Buddhists and his relationship with *rājgurū* Hemraj Sharma which developed in the course of his search for Buddhist manuscripts.

I will explore Sankrityayan's initial endeavours relating to Buddhism and his relationship with Nepal from different perspectives: firstly, the extent to which this relationship was built up around Buddhism will be examined, particularly as regards his Tibet trips and his relations with members of the Theravada movement in Nepal; secondly, to characterize the relationship between India and Nepal, and more specifically between Sankrityayan and Nepal, I shall coin the term "one cultural soul" and shall attempt to justify it as the reason why Sankrityayan looked upon Nepal as a familiar foreign land. The years during which Sankrityayan visited Nepal overlapped with the Theravada movement taking place there at the time; I will thus explore his connection with prominent figures active in it. Given the cultural similarity between India and Nepal, the Nepalese readily welcomed Sankrityayan into their cultural community, so that Sankrityayan never really felt as if he were in a foreign land.

My article has drawn its main strength from the familiarity I have gained with his works and with his relationship with individual Nepalese. The majority of primary sources include Sankrityayan's autobiography, biographies, letters, articles, and speeches. The interviews I conducted between 2007 and 2009 during my fieldwork⁴ are also considered as primary sources.

4 In Kathmandu, I visited the families of Hemraj Sharma, Dharmaratna Yami, Dharmaman Sahu, Mandas Tuladhar, Citta Harsha Bajracharya, and Janaklāl Śarmā and interviewed them. I also visited places in Kathmandu mentioned in *Merī jīvan yātrā*, such as libraries (Hemraj Sharma's collection, now part of the National Library, in Lalitpur, and Keshar Library in Keshar Mahal.), Buddhist viharas, and Dharmaman Sahu's and Dharmaratna Yami's houses, where Sankrityayan had stayed. I met and interviewed people who had met, talked to, or just seen Sankrityayan in their youth.

Sankrityayan's Initial Endeavours Relating to Buddhism

Sri Lanka, a Theravada Buddhist country, was where Sankrityayan first seriously studied Buddhism and was initiated as a Buddhist monk. Much earlier Anagarika Dharmapala (whose worldly name was Don David Hewawitarana), a Sri Lankan, had set out on a pilgrimage to sacred Buddhist sites in northern India that took him, quite naturally, to Bodh Gaya. There he felt the power of the Bodhi tree, supposedly an offshoot of the one under which Prince Shakyamuni had gained enlightenment, so enlightenment that everything else that he had experienced up till then paled in comparison. After the destruction of the north Indian Buddhist monasteries by Muslim invaders, the disappearance of Buddhism in India, and the occupation of the Maha Bodhi temple by a Hindu Saiva mahant,⁵ Bodh Gaya became a holy place exclusively for Hindus.

On his return to Colombo from Bodh Gaya, Dharmapala founded the Maha Bodhi Society. Its main objectives were getting the Maha Bodhi temple restored to Buddhist control, reviving Buddhism in India, promoting Buddhism in Ceylon and in the rest of the world, establishing educational institutions, printing literature related to Buddhism, and training *dhammadūtas* - monks and lay workers - to propagate the Buddhist religion and culture.⁶ That same year Dharmapala moved the society's headquarters to Calcutta in order to further the campaign to return the temple from Hindu to Buddhist control (Levine & Gellner 2008: 5-7).

In 1922 Sankrityayan, having recently entered politics, prepared a proposal to restore the Maha Bodhi temple⁷ to Buddhist control for debate by the regional Congress committee of Chapra. After a heated discussion, the committee agreed to forward the proposal to the annual national meeting of the Congress Party scheduled to be held in Gaya later that year. Anagarika Dharmapala sent Bhikshu Shri Nivasa and Bhikshu Dharmapala, joined by a number of Burmese bhikkhus, to the congress. A large meeting was organized in the tent of the Arya Samaj, and Sankrityayan and many other Buddhists and Hindus spoke on the topic. Sankrityayan

5 The temple was abandoned by Buddhists after the eradication of Buddhism under the Muslim invaders sometime in the 14th century. In 1590 a Hindu Saiva mahant, Gosain Ghamandi Giri, stumbled upon it and decided that he would make the secluded and peaceful place his permanent abode. See Ahir 2010: 15-16 for detailed information.

6 Sankrityayan visited Europe as a *dhammadūta* of the Maha Bodhi Society in 1932-33.

7 For details on the Maha Bodhi temple see Ahir 2010: 12-21.

also translated many speeches by foreign Buddhist guests from English, Sanskrit, and Pali into Hindi. But the larger issues being thrashed out between the status-quoists and the party of change overshadowed the proposal regarding the Maha Bodhi temple. Nonetheless, the whole affair brought Sankrityayan closer to Buddhism and the Buddhist community (MJY-1: 269–270). He remained regularly involved in politics after the Gaya congress, taking time out for a break in the form of a one-and-a-half-month trip to Kathmandu (during those days the capital was known as Nepal) in March–April 1923 to participate in the Śivarātri festival.

After his unsuccessful bid during the district board elections in 1929 Sankrityayan retired from Congress politics, feeling it had nothing new to attract him. He went to Sarnath and there met Bhikkhu Sri Nivasa, whom he knew from the Gaya congress and who had represented Anagarika Dharmapala in it. Bhikkhu Sri Nivasa⁸ was impressed by Sankrityayan's interest in Buddhism and suggested that he go to Sri Lanka, since the Vidyālaṅkāra Pariveṇa was looking for a Sanskrit teacher (MJY-1: 311). He went so far as to write a personal recommendation for him to Bhikkhu Naravil Dharma Ratna in the Maha Bodhi Society headquarters in Calcutta. Bhikkhu Naravil, who had been a student of Vidyālaṅkāra Pariveṇa and was now working for the re-establishment of Buddhism in India, sent off a telegram, and money to cover Sankrityayan's travel costs arrived within two or three days (MJY-2: 15). Sankrityayan reached Vidyālaṅkāra Pariveṇa on 16 May 1927.

Sankrityayan's close affiliation to Buddhism starts from his years in Sri Lanka, where he learnt Pali and studied the Tripitaka, earning himself the title of *tripīṭakācārya* ('master of the Tripitaka') before leaving Sri Lanka for Tibet in 1928 to collect lost Buddhist texts in Sanskrit. He was convinced that such a trip was obligatory if he was to gain a full knowledge of Buddhism, and in particular of the history of Indian Buddhism. He did not want to become a monk right off, for that would have meant scratching

8 Bhikkhu Sri Nivasa (1894–1968) was born in Sri Lanka and went to India at the request of Anagarika Dharmapala, who later appointed him secretary of the Maha Bodhi Society Sarnath branch. After residing for about 15 years in Sarnath, Sri Nivasa built a *viśrāmasālā* ('rest-house') in Nautanva (on the Nepal-India border) for pilgrims visiting Lumbini in Nepal, the place of the Buddha's birth. Called the Lumbini *viśrāmasālā*, it would later, in July 1944, provide shelter for five Buddhist monks exiled by the Rana government. (The *viśrāmasālā* was sold in 1956.) Sri Nivasa visited Nepal many times and helped to promote Theravada Buddhism there (Śākya 2000).

his travel plans. Entering Tibet was no easy thing for Indians at that time. After going over maps, he realized that he could only enter Tibet via Nepal, and penetrating Nepal up to Kathmandu was only possible for Indians during the *Śivarātri* festival. He left Sri Lanka on 1 December 1928 with the aim of utilizing the three months before *Śivarātri* by making pilgrimages in India to a number of historical places associated with the Buddha.

Sankrityayan's Visit to Nepal as a Buddhist

As early as 1920, when Sankrityayan was still in the Arya Samaj and not yet involved in politics or practising Buddhism, his thoughts turned to Nepal and Tibet. In that year, as planned, he did indeed enter the Terai, Nepal's plains, on the other side of the Nepal-India border and there visited Lumbini (the birthplace of the Buddha) and Kapilavastu (the capital of King Shuddhodana). He ventured further north, but became afraid of being caught by the police, and so cut short the journey. His disguise as a sadhu had helped him to gain accommodation, food, and transportation. Back on the border, in the neighbouring towns of Raxaul (India) and Birgunj (Nepal), he tried to obtain permission to visit Nepal (Kathmandu) but without success, and thus had to wait for a later *Śivarātri* festival to obtain one.

Again disguised as a sadhu, Sankrityayan visited Kathmandu Valley in February 1923 during the festival. On that occasion, visas were easily granted to Indian sadhus and pilgrims to visit the Paśupatināth temple. Sadhus were provided with accommodation and food by the government according to their status. Food, tobacco, and firewood were obtained free of cost from the Mahārājā (the Rana prime minister) (TMSV: 56).

The visits to Nepal in 1920 and 1923 do not really reveal any clear aims other than the journey itself. Later, however, it would be his interest in Buddhism and Buddhist studies that drew Sankrityayan back. He wrote of his first Kathmandu visit in 1923 that it was meant as "a rest from the pressure of political work" and in fulfilment of a long cherished desire (JMK: 136).

Whatever else Sankrityayan gained from his 1923 visit, it did pave the way for his excellent working relationship with Hemraj Sharma. He stayed in a *math* in the Thapathali quarter of Kathmandu, and it was there, in the evening of 15 February, that he first met the *rājgurū* ('chief royal priest') and an advisor to to Nepal's governing family, the Ranas as well

as a scholar, bibliophile, and a collector of manuscripts Pandit Hemraj Sharma (1935–2010 V.S.) of the Ranas. He was immediately impressed with Sharma's scholarship but had no idea how much wealth he had and how much power he wielded in Nepalese politics (MJY-1: 272). On the very day of Śivarātri, Mahārājā Chandra Shamsher visited the Thapathali *maṭh* and was curious to learn what Sankrityayan had to say about the political situation in India. The latter proved rather incommunicative, wishing to hide his identity as a political activist (MJY-1: 273). One of the religious fraternities of the Thapathali math had known Sankrityayan as an Arya Samajist speaker (having seen him at the Gaya Congress when he translated the speeches of Buddhist monks in the Arya Samaj tent) and as a student of many languages. This information, passed on, made access to rations easy: instead of having to stand in a queue, Sankrityayan now found his rations being directly delivered to his room, and in larger than normal quantities (MJY-1: 272).

The police in Nepal were preparing to send pilgrims back after the festival, but Sankrityayan wanted to stay in Kathmandu for several more days, so he went to a village, Shikhar Narayan, in the south of the Valley near the Dakṣiṅkāli temple and remained for two weeks. Then he turned his attention to searching for Buddhist texts, and towards this end visited some Buddhists in Patan. There he found out about the existence of some valuable Buddhist texts in the library of Hemraj Sharma, to whose house he directed himself. When he arrived, Sharma was busy with colleagues preparing for an upcoming debate on animal sacrifice with the famous Indian Swami, Sacchidanda. Sharma, being a śākta, believed in animal sacrifice. After Sankrityayan had given him some ideas about how to present the argument in favour of animal sacrifice, he was impressed and asked him to speak against the swami. Sankrityayan refused to participate because he was still a supporter of the Arya Samaj, and was in fact still a supporter of the swami's position (JMK: 137).⁹

Hemraj Sharma later forgot about having met Sankrityayan at his home and Thapathali, but Sankrityayan never did, having been very much impressed with his scholarship and personality. During the stopover when returning from Tibet in 1934, he went on to develop a very good

9 This scholarly debate was organized in Singha Darbar (the palace of Chandra Shamsher Rana) for twelve hours over two days. Many of the members were in favour of animal sacrifice, but the debate ended with neither side convincing the other. (Sama 2026 V.S.).

personal relationship with the man. Sankrityayan would meet *rājgurū* Sharma every time he visited Kathmandu thereafter.

During his studies in Sri Lanka, Sankrityayan determined to visit Tibet in the future to witness the practice of Buddhism in the most extreme form history had endowed it with. He realized that, as he had been jailed twice and involved in the non-cooperation movement, the English government would be unlikely to let him cross the Indian border. Furthermore, he knew that some Indians had misused the hospitality of Tibetans to the point where Tibetans tended to be suspicious of them. Thus the only realistic way left to go to Tibet was via Nepal, as a Nepalese. But permission to enter Tibet via Nepal would not be easy to obtain from the Nepalese government either, because Sankrityayan was a foreigner, while his activities in the non-cooperation movement could again raise the suspicions of the Ranas. Moreover, entering the Kathmandu Valley (which was then still called Nepal) was not always possible for Indian citizens. With this in mind, Sankrityayan successfully planned a trip to the Kathmandu Valley for Śivarātri in 1929, determined to travel on from there to Tibet (JMK: 137).

Sankrityayan entered the Kathmandu Valley as a Hindu pilgrim sadhu on 6 March 1929. He learned from other Buddhist scholars in Patan that indeed the easiest way to get into Tibet was with the help of the Dukpa Lama.¹⁰ The very next day after the high point of the festival Sankrityayan went underground in Bauddha, hoping that the Dukpa Lama would help him to gain access to Tibet. Afraid of being identified by anyone as an Indian, he did not go out frequently. He started studying Tibetan with the help of Henderson's Tibetan Manual and asked the Dukpa Lama to take him to Tibet as a member of his travelling party, saying he wished to go there because "[n]ot all books on Buddhism are available in Sri Lanka, and so I want to go to Tibet to study them. I want to propagate Buddhism in India."¹¹ The Dukpa Lama agreed. There he remained for two months disguised as a Tibetan, before hazarding the onward journey to Tibet under the alias Khunnū Chevañ.

Newar Buddhists in Patan, hearing Sankrityayan talk of himself as a Buddhist, were surprised that a Brahmin should have abandoned his caste

10 The highest lama of the Dukpa sect (ḍukpā sampradāya) MJY-2: 31–32.

11 MJY-2: 32.

(Sankrityayan 1990 V.S.: 60).¹² As a consequence, many people started visiting him in Baudhdha, wishing to meet the Brahmin from Banaras. This naturally caused him some nervousness. He did not see any possibility of going to Tibet with the Dukpa Lama anytime soon, since the latter had no immediate plans to do so. Sankrityayan began looking around for other ways and eventually stumbled upon the Nepalese Buddhist merchant Dharmaman Sahu (1861–1937). His aim of visiting Tibet was widely known among the Buddhist community there. Within it Dharmaman Sahu was the person who most helped him to achieve that aim. Besides being the richest and best-known Nepalese Newar merchant in Lhasa, with a *koṭhī* ('business house') of his own, he was a devout Buddhist and committed to helping Buddhist monks. When Dharmaman learned about Sankrityayan, he invited him to his house at Ason, Kathmandu, and introduced him to fellow merchant, Dasaratan Sahu, whom he requested to do what he could for his guest.

Sankrityayan stayed at Dharmaman Sahu's house for two days and moved into the newly renovated Kindol Vihara.¹³ The full renovation of Kindol Vihara was undertaken by friends of Dharmaditya Dharmacarya.¹⁴ Sankrityayan did not feel safe there because the vihara was always crowded, and he asked Dasaratan Sahu, one of the members of the vihara renovating group, to lodge him in a more secluded place. He was afraid that he might be identified because of his involvement in the Indian freedom movement and knew that if he were he would instantly become a *persona non grata*. Dasaratan Sahu took him to an uninhabited house out of public view. In Sankrityayan's (MJY-2: 34) words: "Dasaratan Sahu was a great devotee [of Buddhism], and he also understood my problems well. He did not let anyone come to this house."

Born in the Ason quarter of Kathmandu, Dasaratan Tuladhar (1891–1977) grew up to become a tradesman who did business in Lhasa and taught Buddhism on the side as a layman. Once Sankrityayan finally realized that there was not any possibility of entering Tibet with a Tibetan lama,

12 Though the Buddha is revered by Hindus in Nepal, they generally do not renounce Hinduism for Buddhism.

13 Sankrityayan TMSV: 76

14 These included Siddhi Ratna Tamrakar (Gvara Sahu), Buddha Ratna Sahu, Siddhiharsa (Babukaji Guruju), Bekharatna, Kulbahadur Manandhar, Lokratna Tuladhar (Upasak), Dasaratan Sahu (later Bhikṣu Dharmalok) and Lakshminani Tuladhar (later Anagarika Dharmacari) (Śākya 1994: 150).

he asked Dasaratan Sahu to take him to Yolmo (Helambu). Sahu agreed, and they both undertook the trek in Nepalese dress. Sankrityayan was now happy to be out of reach of the Nepalese government. Dasaratan Sahu took him to a friend's house, and from there Sankrityayan went to Tibet in Tibetan clothing. They met again by chance in Kalimpong when Sankrityayan was going to Tibet for the second time in March 1934, but by this time the latter had become Bhikkhu Dharmalok, a Buddhist monk, and they proceeded together towards Tibet. Dasaratan Sahu's son, too, would become an important bhikkhu, Anirudha, after he was sent to Sri Lanka to study Buddhism at the urging of Sankrityayan (Lewis & Tuladhar 2007: xlv).

In Lhasa, Sankrityayan resided at Dharmaman Sahu's *kothi*. Dharmaman Sahu wrote a letter to his sons in Lhasa asking them to accommodate Sankrityayan there. Sankrityayan stayed in Dharmaman's own house in Ason during his visits in 1929, 1934, and 1936 - hospitality acknowledged in the following words: "sāhū-jī arranged my stay in his five-storey house. The house of Sahu Dharmaman was always open for guests. Every time I visited the house, there was always a lama or other sojourners" (YKP: 11).

The close relations with Dharmaman and his three sons, Triratnaman¹⁵, Gyanaman, and Purnaman, shielded Sankrityayan from suspicion that he might be a spy of the English in Tibet rather than a Buddhist scholar (JMK: 187). His last meeting with Dharmaman Sahu was in 1936, before he left the Ason house after staying there for two months for his third journey to Tibet with Gyanaman. Dharmaman was 74 at that time and was suffering from asthma.

Dharmaman Sahu and his sons had several branch offices, in India, Nepal, and Tibet. Sankrityayan wrote: "The Nepalese were the Marvāḍīs (a well-known and highly successful trading caste) of Lhasa. Every *kothi* ('business house') has millions in wealth" (MJY-2: 59). He tells of what happened when he visited Ladakh in 1933 after coming back from his journey to Europe: "I was running out of money, but a branch of the Nepalese merchant Dharmaman had already been established there. Mahila Sahu ['the second son' of Dharmaman, Gyanaman] was there; therefore, there was no problem in getting money" (MJY-2: 127).

The Nepalese *kothi* provided accommodation also during Sankrityayan's

15 Triratnaman Tuladhar was the treasurer of the Nepal Buddhopasak Sangh ('Nepal Association of Buddhist Laymen') (see upcoming Section).

second and third visits to Tibet. The business houses of Dharmaman Sahu in Gyantse and Lhasa were home to him, and Sahu's family provided most of the help he received during his visits to Tibet (YKP: 11). Sankrityayan expresses his gratitude to the Newar and his sons in many places in his Tibet travelogue.

Sankrityayan was not the first person to enter Tibet disguised as a Nepalese (and later as a Tibetan with the name Khunnū Chevañ). A Japanese Buddhist monk, Ekai Kawaguchi, had easily crossed the border in the 1890s, since he resembled a Nepalese (Subedi 1999: 6).¹⁶ Later, when Sankrityayan visited Tibet via India as an Indian with a permit, he took an Indian friend of his named Rajnath disguised as a Nepalese citizen. "Short in stature, Rajnath wore a Nepalese topi and pyjamas, and that appearance served instead of a visa" (MJY-2: 151). Sankrityayan wrote: "Rajnath was going on ahead with the other Nepalese. No one had asked him anything, but as I passed through, the policeman ran after and shouted at me to show my pass. Doing so, I asked, 'Why do you ask only me?' He replied, 'We do not ask Nepalese for passes'. I smiled within – Rajnath had become a perfect Nepalese" (MJY-2: 152).

Although Nepalese law was very strict, then, it was possible for people to get around it. Many non-Nepalese, such as Kawaguchi,¹⁷ Sankrityayan, and Rajnath, entered Tibet pretending to be Nepalese. Since Nepal is a land of many ethnic castes and cultures, its people display many different facial features, whether Mongolian, Dravidian, or Aryan. Śivarātri was a particularly suitable occasion to enter Kathmandu incognito, not only for foreigners but also for exiled Nepalese. One exiled Buddhist monk, for instance, Prem Bahadur Shrestha, later known as Mahāprajñā, visited the Kathmandu Valley during Śivarātri in 1930 (Śākya 1993: 25).¹⁸

16 Sankrityayan had read Kawaguchi's and Alexandra David-Neel's accounts of their visits to Tibet and garnered useful information from them (TMSV: 2-3).

17 Ekai Kawaguchi had left Japan in 1897 in order "... to go in search of the authentic texts to Nepal and Tibet where they were taken by those fleeing the Muslim invasion in India, and preserved carefully" (Subedi 1999:15). "Kawaguchi read that manuscripts were safely preserved in Tibet. He also learned that Brian Hodgson, the British official in Nepal, had also collected Sanskrit texts in Nepal" (ibid.: 17). Sankrityayan had the same purpose in mind as these predecessors when he travelled to Nepal and Tibet. He would later (1935) meet Kawaguchi in Tokyo (MJY-2: 204).

18 Some years later, however, when Shrestha visited Bhojpur, he was arrested while lecturing (on 14 January 1937) and was imprisoned for four months (three months in Bhojpur and one month in Dhankuta) and again exiled back to India (Śākya 1993: 35).

As a devoted Buddhist scholar, Sankrityayan naturally was able to enjoy good relations with many Nepalese Buddhists. The Theravada movement was on the rise in Nepal during the period in which he was most active, and it will first of all be fruitful to explore the extent to which Sankrityayan cultivated relations with this movement and its supporters.

Sankrityayan and the Theravada Movement in Nepal

Sarah Levine and David N. Gellner (2008) carried out a study dealing with the Theravada movement in 20th-century Nepal, resulting in their book *Rebuilding Buddhism*. They do not record any active involvement on Sankrityayan's part in this movement, but it is worth discussing the significance of it for him and of him for it during the period of his visits to Tibet and Nepal, which took place at the time when the Theravada movement was at its peak in Nepal. It is surprising to discover that Sankrityayan was not actively involved in the movement, and this study has concluded that although he was not so, he must certainly have supported it morally. The following pages will attempt to define more precisely Sankrityayan's links to it.

During the 20th century the Ranas determined to seal off Nepal, to block the infiltration of foreign influence into the country, but this did not come about as they had wished. Their desire to obtain Western luxuries required the development of trading networks with India. Furthermore, education stood in the way. The acknowledged need for well-trained bureaucrats in the government and Sanskrit-literate priests served to keep the door of the country somewhat open. A number of Newar merchants set up permanent establishments in Calcutta, which paved the way for contact with the Maha Bodhi Society. Students who went to study in India developed good relations with the freedom fighters and leaders there, thus heightening their own political awareness.

Jagatman Vaidya (1902–1963) was the son of an Ayurvedic *vaidya* ('traditional physician'), Vrishaman Vaidya, an employee at the palace of Juddha Shamsher Rana. He was sent to India for further studies on a scholarship from the Nepalese government. Sometime after reaching Calcutta in 1921, he met Anagarika Dharmapala and fell under his spell, seeing the reflection of the Buddha in him (Śākya 1994: 144–145). Dharmapala in turn saw in Vaidya a promising advocate of Theravada Buddhism in Nepal (Levine & Gellner 2008: 27). He suggested changing

his name to Dharmaditya Dharmacharya (Śākya 1994: 146). In the summer break of 1923 the student returned to Nepal with some books published by the Maha Bodhi Society, along with issues of the Society's journal, *The Maha-Bodhi*. He shared them with his friends in Kathmandu and told them of his desire to establish what he planned to call the Nepal Buddhopasak Sangha ('Association of Nepalese Lay Buddhists') to propagate Theravada Buddhism in Nepal. At a meeting in the house of Dharma Narayan Tuladhar¹⁹, his efforts eventually bore fruit.²⁰ Members of the Sangha translated Buddhist texts from English and Pali into *nepāl bhāṣā* (Newari) and made carbon copies of their results, which served as the basis for their later publication in Dharmapala's journal *Buddha-dharma* in Calcutta. *Buddha-dharma* was the first periodical ever brought out in *nepāl bhāṣā* (Levine & Gellner 2008: 28).

Though it was difficult during the Rana regime to do such things, three weeks after the male association was established, Dharmaditya Dharmacharya established the Nepal Buddhopasika Sangh ('Association of Nepalese Female Lay Buddhists') in Patan under Hiramaya Upasika and Dhanamaya Upasika (Śākya 1994: 149).

Dharmaditya Dharmacharya also proposed, in 1923, that a renovation of Kindol Mahavihara in Swayambhu be undertaken. He discussed this with Dharmaman Sahu and wrote a request to the same effect to the Rana prime minister, Chandra Shamsher. Later, in the journal *Bauddha Bhārat*, he notes that "one śiṣya ['disciple', namely Dharmaman Sahu] donated 1,500 Nepalese rupees and Prime Minister Chandra Shamsher Janga Bahadur Rana donated 1,500 Nepalese rupees."²¹

When Sankrityayan was hiding in Kathmandu in 1929, he met Dharmaman Sahu at the same house in Ason where the Nepal Buddhopasak Sangha had been established six years before. His desire to visit Tibet to

19 He was also known as Dhamma Sahu, Dharmaman Sahu, or Dharma Sahu. Sankrityayan wrote a short biographical sketch of him under the title "Dharmā saḥū" in JMK.

20 The executive committee of the Sangha was as follows:

- a) The main propagator and manager: Dharmaditya Dharmacharya
- b) Administrator: Khadga Raj Tuladhar
- c) Treasurer: Triratna Man Tuladhar (son of Dharmaman Tuladhar)
- d) Business co-coordinator: Chittadhar Tuladhar 'Hridaya'
- e) Assistant for other works: Kuldip Upasak
- f) Member: Buddhi Ratna

21 Cited in Śākya (1994: 150)

study Buddhist texts and, upon returning, promote Buddhism met with a promise to help him on the part of Dharmaman Sahu. Sankrityayan was grateful to him for his help, since his political activities back home threatened to undermine his plans:

With great insistence he put me up in his house from 1 April to 2 April. The poor man was very simple. He was not even afraid that, no matter how pure my plans and motives were, the Nepalese government, were it to find out about them, could create trouble for him.

Sankrityayan (TMSV: 69)

On 1 December 1934, during Sankrityayan's visit to Kathmandu on his way back to India from his second visit to Tibet, Dharmaman Sahu introduced him to General Mohan Shamsheer, having been instructed to do the same with every Buddhist monk or guest who visited his house. They had a short talk and Sankrityayan later wrote that Mohan Shamsheer was surprised to learn that Buddhists were atheists (MJY-2: 187).²²

The Ranas had prohibited the public use of non-Nepali languages and banned the printing of religious texts and literary works in them, and in Newari in particular. However, a strong feeling of ethnic identity persisted among most Newars, and this was channelled into cultural activity, which led, as soon as the Rana regime was over, to the establishment of

22 In Nepal, Newars practise both the Newar variant of Vajrayana Buddhism and Theravada Buddhism. Many Buddhist groups in Nepal are also influenced by Hinduism. Buddhists have long felt the strong influence of Hinduism owing to their close contacts with the Hindu castes and because they themselves were integrated into the caste system. Many of them eventually adopted Hinduism. What is called Newar Buddhism is the form of Mahayana-Vajrayana Buddhism (mainly) practiced in the Newar ethnic community of the Kathmandu Valley. The intertwinedness of Hinduism and Buddhism in Nepal resulted in the Buddha being declared the ninth avatar of Vishnu. As the king was regarded as an incarnate form of Vishnu, the Nepalese monarchy had the strong support of Hindus, while the status attributed to the Buddha at least served to keep Buddhists loyal to it. Nepal's rulers, in short, treated Buddhists and Hindus, who shared many festivals and much iconography, largely on equal terms.

Bhattachan (2005) rejects the Hindu appropriation of the Buddha as the ninth avatar of Vishnu. His article accuses Hindus of annexing Buddhism to Hinduism, mindless of the fact that Nepalese Buddhists hold many views diametrically opposed to their own. For example, he criticizes the Hindu worship of a supremely powerful deity while subordinating others, and their worship of certain animals while at the same time slaughtering others. For details on Newar Buddhism, see Gellner 1992.

organizations such as *Cwasa Pasa* ('Friends of the pen')²³ and the *Nepāl-bhāṣā Pariṣad* ('Newari language council').²⁴

The Rana government of Nepal eventually made good on its threat, arresting a number of Newars who wrote in Newari, Cittadhar "Hridaya" (born Tuladhar) (1906–1982) being among the most prominent.²⁵ Fatte Bahadur Singh had compiled and published *Nepāli vihāra*, a collection of classical and modern poems in Newari in 1940 and was imprisoned for doing so. Cittadhar Hridaya was imprisoned alongside him because he had published a poem (whose title translates as "Mother") in that collection (Lewis & Tuladhar 2007: xix). Whilst in prison, Cittadhar Hridaya wrote his best-known work, *Sugata Saurabha*, a poetic retelling of the life of the Buddha. Sankrityayan's books on the Buddha and Buddhism were consulted as reference sources for it, Sankrityayan having made friends with the Tuladhar family while in Kathmandu. In the words of Hridaya (Lewis & Tuladhar 2007: xlv):

Sometime later, everyone had some religious books brought into the jail for them after we made a plea that we needed them for prayer. My sister first brought the *Dhammapada* for me, and this inspired me to start my own poem, a wish I could not suppress ... Later on, the *Buddhacarriya* by Mr. Rahul [Sanskrityayan] (sic) also came in as a prayer book. When this book came in, it helped me a lot. Or else I would have ... been dependent on what I had studied in my

23 *Cwasa Pasa* was established on Vaiśākh Purṇimā, V.S. 2007 in Calcutta (Śākya 1994: 156). See also Whelpton 2011: 182.

24 The Nepāl Bhāṣā Pariṣad was established on 3 March 1951 (Śākya 1994:156).

25 Sankrityayan describes the imprisonment of Chittadhar Hridaya and Dharmaratna Yami in his book *Dharma Ratna 'Yami'* (1963).

childhood from the *Lalitvistara*²⁶ by Shri Nishtānanda.²⁷

Hridaya (Lewis & Tuladhar 2007: xlv)

One of the main exponents of Theravada Buddhism in Nepal, Amritananda Mahanayaka Thera (Lal Kaji Shakya), was also particularly influenced by the books of Sankrityayan (Ahir 1993: 190-195). Amritananda, along with four other monks, was expelled from Nepal in 1924 for having converted to Buddhism. The Rana prime minister at the time, Chandra Shamsher, had invoked the previously mentioned law according to which no conversion from one religion to another was permissible. The overthrow of the Rana regime in 1950–51 was understandably most welcomed by Nepalese Buddhists, and also because the previously self-exiled and now newly reinstated King Tribhuvan took a keen interest in Buddhism and the affairs of his Buddhist subjects. In November 1956, Nepal hosted the Fourth General Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists (WFB) organized by the Dharmodaya Sabha ('Council for the advancement of the Dharma', also known as the Buddhist Society of Nepal) under the presidency of Amritananda.²⁸ The conference, in which Sankrityayan also participated, received generous financial assistance from the government of Nepal. One of the participants, Bhadanta Ānand Kauśalyāyan, later

26 Bhikkhu Mahapragya (Prem Bahadur Shrestha) had translated Sankrityayan's *Buddha caryā* into Newari under the title *Lalitavistara* and published an edition of 80 copies in 1997 V.S. (Śākya 1993: 38). This, as we have seen, has nothing to do with the classical Sanskrit work of the same name upon which Nishtananda's Newari translation, published in 1914, is based. See Lewis & Tuladhar 2007: xliii.

This latter translation was apparently well known. The Newar merchant Dalchini Manandhar had years earlier told Prem Bahadur Shrestha that "bhajans are being sung only of Ram, Kriṣṇa, Hari, and Hara (i.e. Shiva) in our country; no one sings bhajans for the Buddha. You can compose bhajans and [other] songs, so please compose a couple of bhajans." Manandhar gave him the *Lalitvistara* written by Pandit Niṣṭhānanda Bajrācārya. After reading it, Prem Bahadur Shrestha composed a collection of bhajans. He had worked in the palace of Kathmandu as a member of the entertainment group (acting in dramas, singing, playing musical instruments, etc.) for some time until 1982 V.S. (Śākya 1993: 2–5).

27 A separate study of the writings mentioned would be worthwhile to see exactly where the influence of Sankrityayan's work lay.

28 The Dharmodaya Sabha had been founded in Sarnath by Amritananda and his fellow monks on 30 November 1944 while in exile. Sankrityayan's friend Ānand Kauśalyāyan was the first vice-president, and Amritananda the first secretary. The Dharmodaya Sabha's first order of business was to appeal to Buddhists in India and in other countries to protest against the government of Nepal regarding the expulsion of the monks.

wrote that “the two personalities, Ambedkar and Sankrityayan, were the cynosure in the conference” (Kauśalyāyan 1992: 4).

Thus it is clear that Sankrityayan had close relations with many members of the Theravada movement in Nepal. He himself, though, was neither active in it nor did he ever write anything relating to it directly or on its behalf. Two causes may be supposed for this. The first reason Sankrityayan did not accept Anagarika Dharmapala’s request to engage in promoting Theravada Buddhism may have been because his own priorities lay in researching Buddhist texts and pursuing other scholarly activities. Secondly, he wanted to keep on good terms with the government of Nepal lest they stood in his way to visiting Tibet. He had already refused to propagate Buddhism as a religion in India and other parts of the world, and he had all the more reason not to do so in Nepal, where the Theravada movement was illegal. The main persons behind the Theravada movement (Dharmaman Sahu, Bhikkhu Amritananda, Cittadhar Hridaya and Bhikkhu Dharmalok) were all Sankrityayan’s good friends, and had he written in support of the movement, it would only have created problems for them. Furthermore, his own Buddhist writings would have stood no chance of being sanctioned in Nepal, his political works having already been banned by the Rana government. Still, even though he kept to the background, he followed events closely and offered encouragement where he could, for he realized that Nepal had played a key role in the history of Buddhism:

Nepal: At a very early time Buddhism was introduced into Nepal. When after the Mohamadan conquest of India, Buddhism disappeared from there; it still prevailed in that country. Most of the Buddhist canonical works on philosophy and written in Sanskrit were found there, though the whole of the last century was a period of slothfulness and inactivities on the part of the Buddhism there, that state has now changed and the young Buddhist Nepalese are awakening.

(Sankrityayan 1984: 134)

One Cultural Soul: Sankrityayan’s relationship with Nepalese

The central idea underlying Sankrityayan’s (and, in his eyes, India’s) relationship with Nepal is what I term the “one cultural soul”²⁹ shared by

29 The expression “cultural soul” was used during the *ekātmatāyajiña* (translated by van der Veer as “sacrifice for unity”), a large-scale ritual procession in 1983 organized by

both parties. Sankrityayan repeatedly presents himself as being areligious. Even as he regarded Buddhism in terms of the wider Indian culture, so too his relationship with Nepal, while outwardly tied to religion, had, according to him, a wider cultural foundation. Though he never professed a conventional faith in any religion, his relationship with Nepal was based in part on the conventional trappings of religion: the ritual, the beliefs, and the cultural accessories. He had visited Nepal as a sadhu during Śivrātri and participated in Nepal's grandest religious festival; however, this was not the main aim of his visit. Whether he assumed the robes of a sadhu or of a Buddhist monk, or else enrolled as a Brahmin in the study of Buddhism, mattered less to him than the fact that he was thereby granted membership in a brotherhood. Nepal and India share many cultural roots that go back far in time, and these still serve to make both peoples feel at home in the other's country.

As noted by van der Veer (1994: 84), religions and the particular ways of practising them each give rise to particular ways of imagining the world. He argues that ritual takes pride of place when it comes to communicating most compellingly such imaginative ideas of religious community. Hindu and Buddhist religious customs, both of which Sankrityayan had at one time or another followed, both created a sense of fellowship. His pilgrimage as a sadhu during Śivarātri, the hospitality he received at the house of a Nepalese Buddhist family, his visits to Tibet in the robes of a Buddhist monk, and his time spent searching for, studying, and editing Buddhist texts there are examples of activities that bonded the areligious Sankrityayan with Buddhist believers beyond India's borders.

Sankrityayan's relationship with Nepal's royal priest tells the same story in Hindu terms. He was a Brahmin Sanskrit scholar looked upon as one of the most senior religious authorities in Nepal, and exercised temporal power through his association with the ministerial court. Sankrityayan visited his house as a guest and received gifts, as if from

the Vishwa Hindu Parishad ('World Hindu council'), to play up the cultural similarities shared by Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, and India. For details, see van der Veer 1984: 124-126. The sentence from the statement issued on that occasion, as quoted by him (Ibid.:126), reads: "It proved that Nepal, Bhutan and Burma may be politically separate from Bharat [India] but the cultural soul of all these countries is one within." From this I have developed the expression to read "one cultural soul" so as to better convey the underlying idea.

a fellow “twice-born one.” Sharma, an orthodox Hindu, would not have cultivated such close relations with Sankrityayan had he thought of him as an areligious person, that is, as someone other than a Hindu Brahmin or a Buddhist. The normal way he treated others has been described as follows:

[...] his (i.e. Sharma’s) house was in Dhoka Tole – called Bharati Bhavan, the “House of Learning” – in the heart of Kathmandu [...]

In the first quarter of the century, not only Nepal but also Hem Raj’s house was closed to foreigners. Lévi wrote in 1925 that twice a week he had an academic meeting with Hem Raj at the Government Library, but he would have not been allowed to enter the Raj Guru’s house since people would have been scandalized to see a *mleccha* (‘barbarian’) profane the residence of such a sacred person.

(Grazilli 2001: 118–120)

But the door of Bharati Bhavan was always open for Sankrityayan, because in the eyes of the Nepalese he was either an Indian Hindu or Buddhist and born into a Brahmin family.

After Sankrityayan had met many European scholars, his interest in collecting manuscripts and working on them increased. He became aware that European scholars were also working on them,³⁰ and that they were keen, in particular, on finding manuscripts of Dharmakirti’s *Pramāṇavārttika*.³¹ During his second visit to Tibet, then, he tried to locate a copy of it. He had heard that Hemraj Sharma had an old copy of it in Kathmandu, and so he returned via Kathmandu to meet him³² to see if he could borrow it.³³ This time

30 “There were many educated middle class population in Germany who liked Buddha. Many great scholars of Sanskrit and Pali were also born in Germany. They edited and translated thousands of books.” MJY-2: 113.

31 Sankrityayan says that his interest in the *Pramāṇavārttika* was sparked after his first visit to Tibet, presumably first and foremost during his conversations with European scholars MJY-2:186.

32 Not only Sankrityayan but also many other scholars, including Sylvain Lévi, Giuseppe Tucci, Jayachandra Vidyānkara, and Kashi Prasad Jayasawal, received help from him when doing research on manuscripts (Nepāl 2057 V.S.: 2).

33 Sankrityayan received this information from Jayacandra Vidyānkara. Vidyānkara

he let himself be introduced to Sharma as an Indian intellectual.

Although they had met before under in other circumstances, this time he presented himself to Sharma as an Indian scholar. Sankrityayan learned there that the Italian scholar Giuseppe Tucci had already taken the manuscript of the *Pramāṇavārttika*. Still, although the original was not available, he was able to obtain a photographic copy of it, of which ten pages were missing, presumably from the bound volume that was produced from the photos.

Nepal (2057 V.S.: 233) has mentioned that Sharma had borrowed the *Pramāṇavārttika* from a *gubhāju*³⁴ of the Ghantaghar quarter but never returned it. The reason he could not was because Tucci never returned it to him. He was later criticized in Nepal for having made gifts of the country's treasures to foreigners.

For his third journey to Tibet, in 1936, aimed specifically at finding a complete Sanskrit manuscript of the *Pramāṇavārttika*, which he succeeded in doing and published his commentary on it.³⁵ Sankrityayan again chose to travel via Nepal. During this stay his friendship with Rājguru Sharma remained very close, with the latter providing him the use of his own car, horses, and porters. By travelling in such style, Sankrityayan was able to receive special courtesies at the customs offices along the way (YKP: 21).

The correspondence between Sharma and Sankrityayan shows Sharma's own great interest in collecting books and manuscripts. It also shows that Sankrityayan sent copies of his printed books to Sharma, or else handwritten drafts of works in progress. The letters tell us, for instance, that Chitta Harsha Bajracharya³⁶ copied Sankrityayan's Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary (compiled in 1930, unpublished) for Sharma.

Hemraj Sharma noted salient parts of Sankrityayan's visit to Nepal

had visited Nepal at the beginning of 1932 and met Hemraj Sharma (Nepāl 2057 V.S.: 219).

One may note here that *Tibbat mē savā varṣ* was published by Sharada Mandir, headed by Jayacandra Vidyalkara. Later Sharma requested Sankrityayan to soften his statements about the Ranās in the book.

34 A Newar Buddhist chief priest

35 Sankrityayan 1943

36 I was able to meet Chitta Harsha Bajracharya's son Purna Harsha Bajracharya (82) in Kathmandu in 2008. He said that his father had been a teacher of children who had difficulty in getting admission to Darbar High School and that Sankrityayan had visited their house in the Ghantaghar quarter.

in 1953 in his diary.³⁷ At one gathering, for example, where Sankrityayan argued strongly for the non-existence of God, Sharma spoke against this, but the entry bears no sign of hostility. Indeed, both often expressed in writing their appreciation for the other (Nepal 2057 V.S.: 238). It may be noted that Sankrityayan and Hemraj Sharma shared their family name, Paṇḍe, although neither used it publicly.

Similarly, Sahu Dharmaman would not have let Sankrityayan come to or stay at his house in Kathmandu and Lhasa, or have helped him journey to Tibet, if he did not have what seemed to be genuine Buddhist credentials. The fact that Dharmaman and others were already secretly active in the Theravada movement only meant that they even more open-heartedly welcomed Sankrityayan, someone who was devoted to the same cause in India as they were in Nepal. Both Sharma and Dharmaman, then, viewed Sankrityayan as belonging to their community.

Concluding Remarks

This article has sought to explore Sankrityayan's relation with Nepalese Buddhists and what journeys to Nepal meant for him. Although he was ordained as a monk in Sri Lanka, his objective in life was not mainly to propagate and practise Buddhism as the religion leading to nirvana.

Sankrityayan felt Nepal to be his second home, a view grounded in the notions of "one cultural soul". He developed intimate ties with Nepal and the Nepalese through his devotion to Buddhism and Buddhist studies. In the context of this study's examination of Sankrityayan's relationship with Nepal, his speech at the Fourth World Buddhist Conference held in Kathmandu in December 1956 is worth quoting. In front of a large gathering on the parade grounds of Tundikhel, where all the guests and King Mahendra Shah were assembled, he gave a spontaneous response in Hindi to the welcoming speech:

37 Not all the diaries of Sharma are available. Those that are have been edited and published by Jñānmaṇi Nepāl (2057 V.S.). Prakash A. Raj, the grandson of Sharma, kindly provided me copies of the original diaries along with a diary of his own written when he was nine years old, in which he tells of Sankrityayan's visit to his home. This entry latter shows that by that time Sankrityayan was a household name in Nepal. Similarly, I have come across another diary entry - made by Rocak Ghimire on 13 March 1958, during Sankrityayan's visit to Nepal with his family.

I do not think that we have arrived in a foreign land.³⁸ Nepal and India have one culture. ... The guests who have come here from faraway countries are our common guests. We need to act in concert so that they will truly become acquainted with the *janmbhūmi* ('birthplace', i.e. Nepal) and *karmbhūmi* ('field of action', i.e. India) of the Buddha.

(in Miśrā 1993: 2)

This statement is clearly emblematic of Sankrityayan's vision of India-Nepal relations and why he regarded both countries as historically bound one to the other. In his opinion, their common culture (their one cultural soul) had united both countries. The common link between India and Nepal through Buddhism goes deeper, in that they witnessed the birth of the religion, but their links go far beyond even Buddhism.

This was a state of affairs that Sankrityayan believed transcended, too, the politics of the day. The Rana government may have expelled Buddhist monks newly converted to Theravada, but Sankrityayan, who was himself a relatively new convert to Buddhism, was able to enter and sojourn in Nepal with apparent ease. One obvious reason for this, this study has shown, was his seemingly chameleon-like identity, his ability to shift from political activist, to Buddhist, to Brahmin, to communist, to scholar, to sadhu, to Arya Samajist - something that could easily have thrown anyone with suspicions off their guard. On his early visits to Nepal, Sankrityayan travelled without official permission, incognito. Later he re-emerged as a scholar of Buddhism of such obvious talent as to impress other serious scholars working in the field, especially the Rājguru Hemraj Sharma, and this made entry into Nepal easier. But just when Sankrityayan was beginning to enjoy this new-found freedom, a number of his books were banned in Nepal. His books on the Buddha and Buddhism, to be sure, were still available there, but readers no longer had ready access to his political writings. By very reason of their illegal status, his communist-inspired literature enjoyed great popularity in Nepal, which became an important print-market for all his works.

The Nepalese Newar monk Mahanam visited Darjeeling on 6 April

38 "[...] He felt at home here. The love he received from friends and acquaintances remained valuable throughout his life."

1963 to attend Sankrityayan's 70th birthday and also participated in his funeral. On 14 April 1963, at the age of 70, Sankrityayan breathed his last at his Darjeeling house. Political struggle, writing, and *ghumakkaṛī* wandering had been synonyms for him of life's meaning, but it was such relentless activity that at the same time steadily undermined the physical foundations of his life. On the day of the obsequies, 15 April, a question arose as to which ritual to follow. Sankrityayan's youngest brother Shyamlal wished to follow the Hindu ritual, whereas Bhikkhu Mahanam favoured the Buddhist one, reasoning that Sankrityayan had never renounced Buddhism after taking vows. The dispute was finally resolved with the decision to perform both. The news of Sankrityayan's death spread very fast in and outside India. The Nepali national daily *Gorkhapatra*³⁹ published the news on its front page.

References

1. Rahul Sankrityayan's Works

In Hindi

- JMK 1957. *Jinkā māi kṛtajñī*. Allahabad : Kitab Mahal.
 TMSV 1990 (V.S.). *Tibbat mē savā varṣ*. New Delhi: Sharada Mandir.
 YKP 1995. *Yātrā ke panne*. New Delhi: Bharatiya Prakashan Sansthan,
 MJY-1, MJY-2,
 MJY-3, MJY-4
 MJY-5 & JY-6 *Rāhul vānmaya: Jīvan yātrā*, vols. 1-4, ed. Kamala Sankrityayan. Delhi: Radhakrishna Prakashan, 1998.
 1946(V.S.) *Merī Jīvan Yātrā*, Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
 1963 *Dharmaratna 'Yami'*. Kathmandu: Shankar Bahadur K.C.
 2007 *Ēśiyā ke durgam bhūkhaṇḍō mē*. Delhi: Bharatiya Prakashan Sansthan.

In English

- 1970 "Buddhist Dialectics." *Buddhism: The Marxist Approach*. Delhi: People's Publishing House.

³⁹ *Gorkhapatra*, 15 April 1963.

1984 *Selected Essays of Rahul Sankrityayan*. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.

In Sanskrit

1943 Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārttikam (Svārthānumānaparicchedaḥ)*, edited and completed by Rahul Sankrityayan. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.

Hindi, Nepali, Sanskrit and Newari Books and Articles

Ātreya, V. R. 2066(a) (V.S.). 'Rāhul, Rācī, Devkoṭā ra pāgal kavitā.' *Nepālī*, no. 200: pp. 566-574.

_____. 2066(b) (V.S.). *Ek Devkoṭā anek āyām*. Kathmandu: Himalaya Book Stall.

Bajrācārya, M. 'Sen'. 1989 (1109 Nepāl Saṃvat). *Lok mye munāmi Māndās Tulādharyā jīvanī*. Kathmandu: Nepalese Folklore Society.

Bhaṭṭācārya, A. 2005. *Mahāpaṇḍit Rāhul Saṅkrītyāyan ke vyaktivāntaraṅ kī prakriyā*. Calcutta: Anand Prakashan.

Bhaṭṭācārya, R. 1993 (Jan-Mar). 'Rāhul kī vaicārik yātrā: Buddha se Mārks tak.' *Samkālīn srjan*, no. 15.

Bhikṣu S. 2022 (V.S.). *Nepāl Rāhul*. Kathmandu: Nepal Bharat Sanskritik Kendra.

Brahmānand, ed. 1971. *Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan: vyaktiva evaṅ kṛtīva*. Delhi: Hariyana Prakashan.

Chudal, A.A. 2068 (V.S.). 'Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan ra Bāisvī sadī.' *Racanā* 51 (117): pp. 34 - 40.

Ghimire, Rocak. 1994 (Jan-Feb). 'Mahāpaṇḍit Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan ko Nepāl sambandha.' *Madhuparka* 26 (9): pp. 29-33.

_____. 2056 (V.S.) *Samjhanāmā phakriekā thūgāharū*. Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan.

Kauśalyāyan, B. Ā. 1992 (30 August). 'Dambadiu paṇḍitumā: Vidyālaṅkāra mē darśan ke mahācārya.' *Sāptāhik Hindustān*, p. 4.

Mācve, P. 2005. *Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Mīsrā, K. C. 1993. 'Nepāl aur Nepālī ke sacce mitra: Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan.' *Sāhitya lok* (Kathmandu: Hindi Department, Tribhuvan University) 11 (1): pp. 1-4.

Mule, G. 1993. *Svayaṃbhū mahāpaṇḍit*. New Delhi: Rajkamal Prakashan.

_____. 1998 *Mahāpaṇḍit Rāhul Sāṅkrītyāyan: jīvnī aur kṛtīva*. Delhi: National Book Trust.

Nepāl, J. 2057 (V.S.). *Paṅ Hemrāj Śarmā: unkā kṛtī ra samikṣā*. Dang: Mahendra Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.

- Pokhrel, M. P. and S. Dhakāl (eds.).2060 (V.S.). *Janaklāl Śarmākā saṃsmaṇ.* Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan.
- Sama, B.2026 (V.S.). 'Paśubali' *Rūprekhā* 10 (4): pp. 13–15.
- _____. 2054 (V.S.). *Mero kavitaḱo ārādhanā.* Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan.
- Śākya, R. S.1998/99 (Dec./Jan.). 'Rāhulko Tibbat yātrā.' *The Himalayan Voice*, pp. 52–55. Kathmandu: The Himalayan House.
- _____. 1993. *Bauddha ṛṣi Mahāprajñā.* Kathmandu: Nepal Press.
- _____. 1994. *Bauddha jagat kā smādaraṇiya vyaktitvavarū: dosro bhāg.* Kathmandu: Mandas Memorial Publication.
- _____. 2000. *Bauddha jagat kā smaraṇiya vyaktitvavarū: tesro bhāg.* Bhaktapur: Vajirayani Lumanti Prakashan.
- _____. 1992. *Bhikkhutrāy: Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyan, Ānand Kauśalyāyan ra Jagadīś Kaśyap.* Bhaktapur: Dharmodaya Sabha.
- _____. 2046 (V.S.) 'Rāhulayā vyaktitva.' *Ananda bhūmi* (Kathmandu: Ananda Kuti Vihar) 17 (2): pp.17–21.
- Sankrityayan, K. 1971. 'Rāhul sāhitya.' In *Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyan: vyaktitva evaṃ kṛtitva.* Edited by Dā. Brahmānand, 57–67. Delhi: Hariyana Prakashan.
- _____. 1995 *Mahāmānav mahāpaṇḱit: saṃsmaṇ.* New Delhi: Radhakrishna Prakashan.
- _____. 2025 'Mahāpaṇḱit Rāhulle mahākavi Devkoṭāsāga bhet garnuhūdā' *Bhānu* 5 (12), pp. 431–436.
- Sankrityayan, K. & Ravel Cand Ā. (eds.). 1982. *Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyan ke śreṣṭh nibandh.* Delhi: Nagari Printers.
- Śarmā, B.2059 (V.S.). 'Rāhulsāga rumallidā.' *Juḱi* 22 (2): pp. 20–21.
- Śarmā, J. 2052 (V.S.). *Mahākavi Devkoṭā: ek vyaktitva duī racanā.* Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan.
- Tulādhar, R. 2064 (V.S.). 'Sugat saurabh mahākāvya ra bauddha darśan.' *Śāradā* 1 (11): pp. 74–78.
- Vaidya, N. G. 2002. 'Mahāpaṇḱit Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyan kī śatvārṣikī par 'sraddhā suman.' In *Rāhul Vimarṣ.* Edited by Dr. Rājendra Rāy, 37–39. Patna: Nepali Vidya Bhavan.
- Yami, D. 1993. 'Nepāl ko Rāhul-jī kī den.' In *Sāhitya lok* (Kathmandu: Hindi Department, Tribhuvan University) 11 (1): p. ka.

English Books, Articles, Dissertations and Commemoration Volumes

- Ahir, D. C. 1993. *Himalayan Buddhism Past and Present.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

- _____. 2010. *Buddhism in India: Rediscovery, Revival and Development*. Delhi: Buddhist world Press.
- Aiyar, R.P. and L.S. Bhandare. 1945. *The Congress Caravan: The History of the Indian National Congress and of India's Struggle for Swaraj 1885-1945*. Bombay: National Youth Publication.
- Amin, S. 2003. *Event, Metaphor, Memory: Chauri Chaura, 1922-1992*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Bechert, H. and J. Hartmann. 1998. 'Observations on the Reform of Buddhism in Nepal.' *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 8: 1-30.
- Bhattachan, K. B. 2005. 'Nepalese Buddhists' view of Hinduism.' *Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology* 9: 47-62.
- Chattopadhyaya, D. 1975. 'Introduction.' *Papers of Th. Stcherbatsky*. Soviet Indology Series (Calcutta: Indian Studies Past & Present) 2: i- xxiv.
- Chowdhory, H. B. ed. 1994. *Mahapandit Rahula Sankrityayana Birth Centenary Volume*. Calcutta: Buddha Dharmankur Sabha.
- Chudal, A. A. 2014. 'A Freethinking Cultural Nationalist: Rahul Sankrityayan's Narrated Self in the Context of His Age' PhD thesis, University of Vienna.
- De Sales, A. 2010. 'The Biography of a Magar Communist'. In *Varieties of Activist Experience: Civil Society in South Asia*, edited by David N. Gellner, pp. 18-45. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Diwakar, R.R. 2001. *Bihar through the Ages*. Bombay: Orient Longmans.
- Gaenzle, M. 2002. 'Nepali Kings and Kāśī: In the Changing Significance of Sacred Centre.' *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 7 (1):1-33.
- _____. 2006. 'Nepali Places: Appropriations of Space in Banaras.' In *Visualizing Space in Banaras: Images, Maps, and the Practice of Representation*. Edited by Martin Gaenzle and Jörg Gengnagel, pp. 303-323. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Garzilli, E. 2001. 'A Sanskrit Letter Written by Sylvain Lévi in 1923 to Hemrāja Śarmā along with some Hitherto Unknown Biographical Notes (Cultural Nationalism and Internationalism in the First Half of the 20th Century: Famous Indologists Write to the Raj Guru of Nepal – No. 1).' *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 7: pp. 115-149.
- Gellner, D. N. 1992. *Monk, Householder, and Trantik Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerke, B. 1995. 'Rahulji's Quest for Tibet.' (Paper presented at the international seminar on the life and works of Rahul Sankrityayan at the University of St. Petersburg, Russia, October/November 1995).

- Grant, P. 2009. *Buddhism and Ethnic Conflict in Sri Lanka*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jayasawal, K.P.1984. 'Lost Sanskrit Works Recovered from Tibet.' In *Selected essays of Rahul Sankrityayan* (By Rahul Sankrityayan), pp. ix–xix. New Delhi: People's Publ. House.
- Levine, S. and D. N. Gellner. 2008. *Rebuilding Buddhism: The Theravada Movement in Twentieth-Century Nepal*. Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Lewis, T. T. and S. M. Tuladhar.2007. *Sugata saurabha : An Epic Poem from Nepal on the Life of the Buddha by Chitadhar Hrdaya*. Harward University: The department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies.
- Machwe, P. 1978. *Rahul Sankrityayan*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Pathak.S.K.1994.'RahulSankrityayan:ATibetanLexicographer.' *Mahapandit Rahula Sankrityayana Birth Centenary Volume*. Edited by Hemendu Bikash Chowdhory, pp. 27–30. Calcutta: Buddha Dharmankur Sabha.
- Raj, P. A. 1994. *Portraits & Photographs from Nepal*. Kathmandu: Nabeen Publications.
- _____. 1996. *Brahmins of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Nabeen Publications.
- _____. 2003 *Profile of a Nepalese Writer: Life and Work of Prakash A. Raj*. Kathmandu: Nabeen Publication.
- Sharma, R.S. 2009. *Rethinking India's Past*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Subedi, A. 1999. *Ekai Kawaguchi: The trespassing Insider*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.
- Tewari, R. C. 1983. 'Socio-Cultural Aspects of Theravaada Buddhism in Nepal.' *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 6 (2): 67–93.
- Van der Veer, P. 1994. *Religious Nationalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Whelpton, J. 2011. *A History of Nepal*. Delhi: Cambridge University Press.