

DR. B. M. BARUA
BIRTH CENTENARY
COMMEMORATION VOLUME
1989



BAUDDHA DHARMANKUR SABHA
(BENGAL BUDDHIST ASSOCIATION)
1 BUDDHIST TEMPLE STREET
CALCUTTA 700 012
INDIA

place in the post Mauryan Indian art history. Primarily Buddhist in theme, the rich material obtained at both these sites, furnishes an eloquent testimony to the happy blending of ethics and aesthetics. The broad-based Buddhist philosophy was popularised through various manifestations of art. At Bhārhut and Sānchi life of different grades of society has been portrayed with a good deal of success. The common people have been given considerable coverage in that art. This attests to the position enjoyed by them in the society of the Śuṅga period. The art-remains at Sānchi are more profuse and variegated than at Bhārhut. Right from the time of the Maurya emperor Aśoka to the early Medieval epoch, Sānchi continued as a religious and art centre. This is borne out by the remains preserved in and around Sānchi, including monuments, sculptures and inscriptions. Sānchi can be called an epic of architecture and sculpture, wherein other fine arts have harmoniously been merged to form an integrated whole. The remains of *stūpas*, temples, monasteries, sculptures and of the minor antiquities contain much useful material for the study of various facets of culture of central India extending over a period of about a thousand years.

Ancient Indian artists (*rūpa-dakṣas*) and artisans (*śilpis*) may have undergone a course of training in ethics, aesthetics, iconography and mythology. Vidisha, the capital of Daśārṇa deśa, was one of the great centres of art, similar to Takṣaśilā, Mathurā, Bhārhut, Kauśāmbī, Bodhgayā and Tāmralipti (Tamluk), in north-western and northern India. The inscription of the ivory workers carved on a *torāṇa* at Sānchi attests to the artistic achievement (*rūpa-karma*) of the Vidisha-artists.

The Śuṅga art at Bhārhut, Sānchi, Bodhgayā and Mathurā provided a background for the later classical art, which blossomed in its full form during the Gupta age. The examples from Ahicchatra, Mathurā and Sārnāth can be cited in this regard. During the time of the Pratihāras, the Chandellas, the Kalachuris, the Paramaras, the Pālas and the Senas, art developed in various forms in the northern, eastern and central India.

The Gandhāra art of the north-west flourished at several centres, such as Vāhlīka (Bactria), Takṣaśilā, Puruṣapura (Peshawar) and Puṣkalāvati (Chārsaddā). In Western India, architecture and art developed at various centres. Mention may be made of Karle, Bhājā, Kanheri, Nāsik, Nane-ghat and others. That region has preserved some rare forms of the 'rock-art'. The Vengi region, with its well-known centres of Amarāvati, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and several others, contributed considerably to Indian art. The combination of the two main aspects of art, ethics and aesthetics, is clearly discernible in the Vengi area. The blossoming of art continued during the reigns of the Chālukyas the Pallavas, the Rāstrakūtas, the Gaṅgas the Cholas and the Hoysalas.

Indian philosophy, including Jainism and Buddhism, has accorded the highest place to human values. This philosophy was not an abstract speculation but was closely related to humanity. Various Indian literary and art-manifestations have given practical forms to this philosophy, which emphasized on the values of life. Indian art, as a whole, strives for social morality, as against selfish enjoyment. The Indian ideal of a harmonious combination of *bhoga* and *apavarga*, has successfully been achieved in ancient art of the country.

SOME THOUGHTS ON ĀTMAN-BRAHMAN IN EARLY BUDDHISM

KAMALESWAR BHATTACHARYA

The publications that have appeared over the past ten years or so seem to show that interest in this problem has not lapsed. Various attempts have been made, either to prove or to disprove that the Buddha denied the *ātman*. It does not seem that the conclusions reached in 1973¹ have been seriously shaken. Some kind of confusion seems to persist, though—a confusion due to the fact that the professional Buddhist scholars do not realize the specificity of the Upaniṣadic *ātman*, which, I believe, the Buddha admitted. There is, indeed, a great deal of difference between the Upaniṣadic conception of *ātman* and the conceptions of *ātman* as found in other Brahmanical systems, e. g., Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, with whose *ātman* the *pudgala* of the Pudgalavādins has much in common.² The Upaniṣadic *ātman* is not a soul, but the Being itself, beyond the subject-object split, and thus the ground of all our authentic knowledge—a conception clearly recognized in a Mahāyāna text, the *Suvikrāntavikrāmaparipṛcchā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, as well.³

In a way, it may be said, the Upaniṣads deny the *ātman* as much as the Buddha does—if by *ātman* is understood the psychophysical individual or any of the elements (however privileged it may be, especially consciousness, *viññāna*; Pali *viññāṇa*⁴) of which this individual is composed. But, if the equation *ātman* = *brahman*, in the Upaniṣads, means—as it really does—that the individual in its inmost essence is *not an individual* but the Being itself—an identity which it realizes in Liberation, through the negation of its individuality⁵—then the Buddha admits the *ātman* as much as the Upaniṣads do. In fact, the *ātman-brahman* of the Upaniṣads is *anātmya*, *nirātman*, *nirātmaka*.⁶ And two Mahāyāna texts, the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* and the commentary on the *Ratnagotravibhāga-Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*, similarly consider *nairātmya* to be a synonym for *mahātman/paramātman*.⁷ Vasubandhu clearly defines *nairātmya*, in his *Viṃśatikā-vṛtti*: *yo bālair dharmāṇāṃ svabhāvo grāhyagrāhakādīḥ parikalpitas tena kalpitena ātmanā teṣāṃ nairātmyam, na tv anabhilāpyenātmanā yo buddhāṇāṃ viśayaḥ*, "It is by virtue of that nature of things, consisting in subject and object, etc., which the ignorant imagine, that the things are devoid of *ātman*, not by virtue of that ineffable *ātman* which is the domain of the Buddhas."⁸

A kind of *nairātmya* doctrine is also to be found in the Brahmanical tradition. Hari-vṛṣabha (whoever he may be, Bhartṛhari or some other author), in his *Vṛtti* on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* I, 5, mentions, among the "conceptions of access (to *brahman*)" [*prāptivikalpāḥ*], *sarvātmanā nairātmyam* "complete negation of *ātman*". Vṛṣabha explains, using Buddhist terminology: *nairātmyam iti : naiḥsvabhāvyam, brahmasvabhāvasya nirūpayitum vakum cāśakyatvāt, brahma ity api tattvam ity api rūpavigamāt, grāhyagrāhakaavigamād vā iti*, "*nairātmya* : the meaning is ; absence of own-nature, since it is impossible to determine the own-nature of *brahman*

and to speak of it. There is, indeed, in it, cessation of the nature 'brahman' as well as of the nature 'truth' (*tattva*); or, there is in it cessation of subject and object."⁹

In the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* we read :

*amṛtāc cāmṛtaṃ prāptaḥ śūtibhūto nirātmavān |
brahmabhūtaḥ sa nirdvaṃdvaḥ sukhī śānto nirāmayaḥ ||*¹⁰

This verse also recalls the utterance often met with in the Pali Canon : *so anattantapo aparantapo diṭṭhe va dhamme nicchāto nibbuto sūtibhūto sukhapaṭisaṃvedī brahmabhūtena attanā viharati*.¹¹

Nirvāṇa is, indeed, often designated as *brahman* in the Pali Canon, and it is—as a verse of the *Parivāra* says—but a “designation without *ātman*” (*paññatti anattā*).¹²

Nor is the insistence on *anātman* (Pali *anatta*) unique in Buddhism. Aspiring to the *ātman*, striving to know it, is it not making of it an object, thus depriving it of its all-encompassing character, and, consequently, making of it something which it is not? As an Upaniṣad states, “It is not known to those who know it; it is known to those who do not know it.”¹³ In classical Vedānta, the psychophysical complex is called *anātman*, as in Buddhism. And, in a remarkable text, Śaṅkara states, at the end of a discussion on the *ātman*’s “not being an object” (*aviśayatva*) : “Thus one must not exert oneself to know [the *ātman*], but solely to make cease the notion of *ātman* in what is non-*ātman*.”¹⁴

All his life, the Buddha,—who wanted not so much to be a philosopher as to be a saviour,—taught this doctrine of *anattā*, in order, precisely, to make cease the notion of *ātman* (Pali *atta*) in what is *anātman*—one of the four “errors” (*viparyāsa*; Pali *vipallāsa*). The *ātman* cannot be an object of knowledge, as we have just seen. It is realized in the immediate intuition, “It is” (*asti*), as an Upaniṣad states,¹⁵—i. e., beyond the subject-object split inherent in our ordinary way of knowing,—when the false identification of *ātman* with the psychophysical complex has been dispelled, when all individuality has been denied, is extinct, when there is no conceit “I am” (*asmimāna*), a conceit which has no other origin than this false identification¹⁶—technically named *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* in Pali.

This is Nirvāṇa/Nibbāna—the “unborn, unproduced, uncreated, unformed” (*ajātataṃ abhūtaṃ akataṃ asaṃkhatataṃ*), the “issue” (*nissaraṇa*) of the “born, produced, created, formed” (*jātaṃ bhūtaṃ kataṃ saṃkhatataṃ*). It has no origin; therefore, it neither decays nor dies. It is eternal (*nicca*, *dhuva*, *sassata*), in the sense that it is beyond time. It is not another world located beyond the “born, produced, created, formed”: it is in us, *is* ourselves, and we have to discover it in our inmost being, by transcending our phenomenal existence. As one of the texts says, it is not by a spatial movement (*gamana*) that one attains to the “end of the world” (*lokassa anto*), or the “end of sorrow” (*dukkhassa anto*): it is in this cubit-long body, endowed with consciousness, that are to be found the world, the origin of the world, the cessation of the world, and the way that leads to the cessation of the world; and he who thus knows, in himself, the end of the world, aspires neither to this world nor to the other.¹⁷

The Upaniṣads had initiated the negative way of speaking of the Absolute. The Buddha, too, speaks negatively of Nibbāna.¹⁸ But he also describes it as imperceptible, infinite, universal consciousness (*viññāṇa*), in which the phenomenal world with all its

categories, as well as our individuality, ceases to exist. It is attained only when our empirical consciousness,—which is the foundation of our empirical existence,—comes to an end :

*viññāṇaṃ anidassanaṃ anantaṃ sabbatopabhaṃ |
ettha āpo ca paṭhavi tejo vāyo na gādhati ||
ettha dīghañ ca rassañ ca añuṃ thūlaṃ subhāsubhaṃ |
etiha nāmañ ca rūpañ ca asesam uparujjhati |
viññāṇassa nirodhena ettha' etaṃ uparujjhati ||*¹⁹

Our empirical consciousness binds us; but it is also that through which we attain our liberation—as the formulation of the Four Noble Truths cited before seems to indicate. It is through consciousness that we must transcend consciousness, in order to become Consciousness.

In another passage we read that the “vehicle that leads to the *brahman*” (*brahmayāna*), i. e. to Nirvāṇa, has its origin in ourselves (*attani sambhūtaṃ*) :

*etad attani sambhūtaṃ brahmayānaṃ anuttaraṃ |
niyyanti dhīrā lokamhā aññadatthu jayaṃ jayaṃ ||*²⁰

These views clearly recall Upaniṣadic ideas. When the Buddha said that the psychophysical complex, composed of the *khandhas*, is not *ātman*—*n'etaṃ mama, n' eso 'ham asmi, na m' eso attā*. “This is not mine, I am not this, this is not my *ātman*”—, he certainly was not denying *ātman* as such. The logic of these statements was explained in ancient times by Uddyotakara, the author of the *Nyāyavārtika* (although he unduly saw in them an affirmation of the *ātman* as conceived in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school, i. e. as an individual ego, “object of the notion ‘I’ ” [*ahamkāraviśaya*, *ahampratyaśayaviśaya*], which is distinct from the psychophysical complex) : This is a particular negation (*viśeṣapratīṣedha*), not a universal negation (*sāmānya-pratīṣedha*); and a particular negation invariably implies a corresponding affirmation; when I say, e. g., that I do not see with the left eye, I certainly do not mean to say that I do not see at all, but that I see with the right eye!²¹

As Karl Jaspers has beautifully observed, by denying the psychophysical complex as *ātman*,—because it is impermanent (*anicca*) and hence painful (*dukkha*),—the Buddha was only judging what is not *ātman* in terms of the standard of the true *ātman*.²²

One cannot attribute to the Buddha—as the most prestigious Buddhistologist of our time does—the statement, without qualification, *n' atthi nicco dhuvo sassato avipariṇāmadhammo*.²³ The text in question—*Samyutta-Ni kāya*, III, p. 144—condemns, not the belief in a timeless Absolute that is “permanent”, “stable”, “eternal”, “immutable”, but merely the conception of a psychophysical individuality possessing all these qualities!

It should be emphasized once more—in order to avoid misunderstanding—that the *ātman* that is being spoken of is not a soul, but the Being itself. It is in this sense that it is identified, in the Pali Canon, with the *brahman* or the *dhamma* (Sanskrit *dharma*)—as it is in the Upaniṣads.²⁴

Wilhelm Geiger—to whom we owe the most detailed study of the question—arrived at a substitution theory. According to him, the term *dhamma* was, for the Buddha, but “the venerable receptacle that he filled with new content” (*das ehrwürdige Gefäß, das er mit neuem Inhalt füllte*). The Buddha’s intention was—thought Geiger—to replace the idea of *brahman* with that of *dhamma*, i. e., to replace the idea of eternity with that of change, the idea of *ātman*

with that of non-*ātman* (*anattā*). So the term *brahman*, in Geiger's view, "receives a particular shading, is seen in a new light" (*erhält...eine besondere Färbung, eine neue Beleuchtung*).²⁵

So far as I can see, this kind of interpretation finds no support in the Canon, nor in the traditional commentaries.

The Buddha, steering between the two extreme standpoints, eternalism (*sassatavāda*) on the one hand and nihilism (*ucchedavāda*) on the other, did condemn eternalism. But, as several canonical texts show, this "eternity" is nothing but *time extended*, either in this world or in a higher world.²⁶ As pointed out above, the Buddha did admit an Absolute that is eternal, in the sense that it is *timeless*. It is enough, for being convinced of this, to have a glance at the *Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, p. 364, giving the various epithets of Nibbāna : *accutaṃ padaṃ, acalaṭṭhānaṃ, amataṃ, dhuvanaṃ, niccaṃ, sassataṃ*. Buddhaghosa, in the *Visuddhimagga*, clearly explains : *appabhavattā ajaraṃmaraṇaṃ ; pabhavaajaraṃmaraṇānaṃ abhāvato niccaṃ*.²⁷ He also refers to the epithets of Nibbāna : *sassata*, etc.²⁸ So too, in the Upaniṣads, the *brahman* is eternal because it is timeless. They, too, reject the idea of a temporal eternity.

Thus it seems that Buddhism is both "eternalist" and "non-eternalist", just as the Upaniṣads are,—depending on how "eternity" is conceived of. Similar is the case with *anattā*, as we have already seen above : the Buddha admits and denies *ātman* as much as the Upaniṣads do—depending on how *ātman* is conceived of.

A study of the term *brahman*, as interpreted in the Pali commentaries, has proved illuminating in this respect. Here we have, among others, a clear indication of how the traditional commentators, in their eagerness to isolate Buddhism from the Brahmanical tradition, sought to obscure the original meaning of an important term ; but, through the various attempts of these commentators, can be discerned—so it seems to me—this original meaning.²⁹

The traditional view about *brahman* is summarized, in identical terms, in Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Majjhima-Nikāya*, the *Papañcasūdanī*,³⁰ as well as in Buddhaddatta's commentary on the *Buddhavaṃsa*, the *Madhuraṭṭhaviṇṇasini*.³¹ It is also given, in the same words, in the twelfth-century Pali grammar by Aggavaṃsa, the *Saddanīti*.³² Following the traditional etymology, current in the Brahmanical tradition,³³ the Pali commentators derive the word from the root *brūh*—(Sanskrit *brh*)—"to grow, increase". *Brahman*—masculine according to these authorities—means, we are told, someone "who has been caused to grow" (*brūhita*) by such and such specific qualities" (*tehi tehi guṇavisesehi*), or "someone who grows (*brūhati*) through such and such qualities" (*tehi tehi guṇehi*).³⁴ Different occurrences of the word in the Pali Canon are enumerated and its meanings in different contexts are defined. *Brahmā*, it is said, is used in the following meanings : "Great Brahmā" (*Mahābrahmā*), "Tathāgata" "brahmin" (*brāhmaṇa*, "the parents" (*mātāpitāro*), "the highest" (*seṭṭha*). In such instances as *sahasso Brahmā, dvisahasso Brahmā*,³⁵ *Brahmā* means "Great Brahmā". In such instances as *brahmā ti, bhikkhave, tathāgatass, etaṃ adbhivacanaṃ*,³⁶ *brahmā* means "Tathāgata". In such instances as *Suttanipāta* 1133, *brahmā* means "brahmin".³⁷ When it is said : *brahmā ti mātāpitāro pubbācariyā ti vuccare*,³⁸ the word means "the parents". Finally, when it is said :

brahmacakkaṃ pavatteti,³⁹ *brahmā* means "the highest".⁴⁰ The *Saddanīti* in this connection has the following verse which gives in a nutshell all the meanings of *brahman* :

*Mahābrahmani vippe ca atho mātāpitūsu ca /
tathāgate ca seṭṭhe ca brahmasaddo pavattati //*⁴¹

How uncertain this tradition was is seen, however, immediately after. The *Saddanīti*⁴² records another interpretation, which is, in fact, the same as the one given by Dhammapāla in his commentary *Paramatthamañjūsā* (*Mahāṭikā*) on Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga*.⁴³ According to this second, and later,⁴⁴ interpretation, there are three kinds of brahmās (*tividhā brahmāno*) : *sammutibrahmāno* "brahmās by convention", *upapattibrahmāno* "brahmās by birth", and *visuddhibrahmāno* "brahmās by purity", to which is added a fourth, "the supreme Brahmā" (*uttamabrahmā*),⁴⁵ namely the "Perfectly Enlightened One" (*sammāsambuddha*). The three kinds of "gods", *sammutidevā, upapattidevā* and *visuddhidevā*, are mentioned elsewhere in Pali literature. Here the word *brahma* in the utterance *brahmacakkaṃ pavatteti* is considered to be a substantivized adjective,⁴⁶ referring to the "Noble Doctrine" (*brahman ti ariyadhammo vuccati*). And we are told that the "Noble Ones" (*ariyā*) who have sprung forth from this,—as personal manifestations as it were of this impersonal principle,⁴⁷—are without discrimination called "brahmās by purity", for they are "brahmās in the true sense" (*paramatthabrahmatāya*). In particular, however, we are told, by virtue of such utterances as *brahmā ti, bhikkhave, tathāgatass' etaṃ adbhivacanaṃ*,⁴⁸ the "Perfectly Enlightened One" is called "the supreme Brahmā", because, by virtue of his qualities which are "the highest", he has attained the highest degree of excellence in the world including the gods.⁴⁹

In another connection, too, the *Saddanīti* interprets *brahma* as a substantivized adjective. While discussing the verbal root *bhū-*, Aggavaṃsa takes up the question of *brahmabhūta* and similar expressions occurring in the Canon, and, following the interpretations given in the *Aṭṭhakathās* and *Ṭīkāś*, proposes to explain their meanings by referring to the two verbal roots *bhū-* belonging to two different groups and used, respectively, in the sense of "being" (*sattā*) [etc.⁵⁰], and in that of "attaining" (*patti* = Sanskrit *prāpti*).⁵¹ *Brahmabhūta* is thus explained : "brahmā, in the sense of 'the highest'"; or *brahma* (substantivized adjective) means "The Way" (*magga*), and one is *brahmabhūta* because one has attained it.⁵² There is a textual problem here, of which I shall speak later.

Here again, it is clear that the tradition is not sure.

There is no doubt that by *brahma* (whatever it may be), used as first member of compounds, Nirvāṇa is often meant. The utterance *so anattantapo...* has already been quoted above. The *Samyutta-Nikāya* in one passage says of the Arahants : *loke anupaliṭṭā te brahma-bhūtā anāsavā*.⁵³ A Sanskrit text, Bhikṣu Vīryaśrīdatta's commentary on the *Arthavinīścaya-sūtra*, clearly says : *nirvāṇaṃ brahmocyate, paramapradhānatvāt, kuta etat ? 'ity api sa bhagavān śāntaḥ śrībhūto brahmabhūta' iti Sūtrāt*.⁵⁴ The term *parama*, used in this passage, recalls *seṭṭha* of the Pali commentaries, and both Vīryaśrīdatta and the authors of these commentaries had perhaps the same thing in mind. Buddhaghosa, for instance, in his various commentaries, glosses *brahmabhūtena attanā* by *seṭṭhabhūtena attanā*. In numerous other instances, too, he uses the term *seṭṭha* to gloss *brahma*⁵⁵; and the term *seṭṭha*, as well as *parama* in the commentary on the *Arthavinīścaya-sūtra*, has led scholars to think that these commentators had in mind the

neuter *brahman*, which they interpreted in the sense of “the highest” in order to indicate that it designates the Absolute—as it does in the Upaniṣadic tradition⁵⁵ (whatever may be, in the eyes of these scholars, the difference between the Upaniṣadic conception of the Absolute and the Buddhist conception of it). But, according to the Pali commentators, as we have seen, *seṭṭha* “the highest” is one of the “meanings” of *brahman* (masculine), which neither in the Upaniṣads nor in Buddhism can designate the Absolute. It might be thought that, in the first interpretation noted earlier, “the highest” (*seṭṭha*) is but a conventional meaning of the word *brahman*, having nothing to do with the Brahman gods (Buddhism knows several of them). It is often so indeed, in the commentaries. But the commentators—as we are going to see—also refer to the Brahms by the term *seṭṭha*. The Brahms, it is true, hold an important place in the Pali Canon. But, as shown elsewhere, this was merely a concession to the beliefs prevalent in the time when Buddhism originated.⁵⁶ Sometimes the Buddha and the Arahants are called Brahms. For the Brahmanical ritual practices Buddhism substituted ethical-meditational practices, the famous *Brahmavihāras*, as the means to attain to the world of the Brahms (*Brahmaloka*) and to live in communion with them (*Brahmasahavyatā*, which is the same as the *Brahmasāyujya* of the ritualists, as the *Abhidharmadīpa* shows beyond all doubt⁵⁷), to be equal to the Brahms (*Brahmasama*), to attain to the status of the Brahms (*Brahmapatta*): those practices, we are told, are typical of the Brahms.⁵⁸ However, the *Brahmaloka* is no longer “the highest” in the real sense as it used to be with the ritualists, nor have the Brahms a claim to unconditionedness any more.⁵⁹ The *Brahmavihāras*, like all other meditational practices, are considered to be impermanent because they are conditioned.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, Buddhaghosa uses the term *seṭṭha* in relation to the Brahms and the *Brahmavihāras*. Evidently, he cannot mean by “the highest”, in this context, what the Brahms themselves mean when they claim to be so—the highest Reality.⁶¹ What he means is purely ethical. He says, indeed, in the *Visuddhimagga*, while explaining the expression *Brahmavihāra*:

*Seṭṭhaṭṭhena tāva niddosabhāvena c' ettha Brahmavihārā veditabbā. Sattesu sammāpaṭipattibhāvena hi seṭṭhā ete vihārā. Yathā ca Brahmāno niddosacittā viharanti evaṃ etehi sampayuttā yogino Brahmāsāma hutvā viharanti seṭṭhaṭṭhena niddosabhāvena ca Brahmavihārā iti vuccanti.*⁶²

“It should be understood that the *Brahmavihāras* are so called in the sense of ‘the highest’ and because of their faultless nature. For these practices, in being the right mode of conduct toward beings, are the highest. And, as the Brahms live with faultless thoughts, so do the yogins, who, being associated with these practices, become equal to the Brahms. Thus these practices are called *Brahmavihāras* in the sense of the ‘highest’ and because of their faultless nature.”⁶³

To the idea of “the highest” (*seṭṭha*) Buddhaghosa adds here that of “faultlessness” (*niddosabhāva*). This occurs elsewhere, too. Thus Buddhaghosa explains the expression *Brahmapatta* in *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* (II, p. 184): *Brahmapattā ti niddosaṭṭhena Brahmabhāva-sādhakaṃ Brahmavihāraṃ....*⁶⁴ In the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, he explains *seṭṭha* “the highest” itself by “faultlessness”, when he interprets the expression *brahmayāna*.⁶⁵

As we saw earlier, according to the conventions established by the commentators, one of the meanings of *brahmā*, in the Canon, is “the parents” (*mātāpitara*). This, of course, throws

no light on the utterance cited to illustrate this “meaning”: *brahmā ti mātāpitara....* In actual practice, however, the commentators say that the word *brahmā* is used, here too, in the sense of “the highest” (*seṭṭha*),⁶⁶ and they compare the attitudes of the parents toward their children in different periods of their (the children’s) lives to the four *Brahmavihāras* which characterize the Brahms! Thus Buddhaghosa writes in the *Manorathapūraṇī*, while commenting upon *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, I, p. 132: *brahmā ti mātāpitara ti seṭṭhādhivacanaṃ. Yathā Mahābrahmuno catasso bhāvanā avijahitā honti: mettā karuṇā muditā upekkhā ti, evaṃ eva mātāpitunnaṃ puttesu catasso bhāvanā avijahitā honti....*⁶⁷ Dhammapāla, Buddhaghosa’s continuator, writes similarly when he comments on *Itivuttaka*, p. 110.⁶⁸

All this seems irreproachable. But how can Nirvāṇa be called *brahmā*, even in this specific sense of “the highest”? As we shall presently see, the commentators themselves do not seem to be quite at ease on this point. However, the instance cited earlier is not the only one where *brahma*, in relation to the highest Truth, is interpreted in this sense. There are many passages in the Canon where the Buddha is called *brahmabhūta*, and the expression is often used along with *dharmabhūta*.⁶⁹ Undoubtedly *brahma* and *dhamma* are considered to be synonyms. Thus in the *Aggañña-sutta* of the *Dīgha-Nikāya* we read: *tathāgatassa h' etaṃ adbhivacanaṃ: dhammakāyo iti pi brahmakāyo iti pi, dharmabhūto iti pi brahmabhūto iti pi*, “The Tathāgata is so called: *dhammakāya* ‘One whose body is the *dhamma*’, or *brahmakāya* ‘One whose body is *brahma*’; *dharmabhūta* ‘One who is (or: has become) the *dhamma*’, or *brahmabhūta* ‘One who is (or: has become) *brahma*’.”⁷⁰ —Here also, Buddhaghosa has nothing else to say than: *dhammo hi seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmā ti vuccati*,⁷¹ “The *dhamma* is called *brahmā* in the sense of ‘the highest’.” But, whatever the meaning of the term *dhamma* in this and similar contexts,—the Doctrine, or the “ninefold supramundane *dhamma*” (*navavidhalokuttaradhamma*), or the “true nature” (*aviparītasabhāva*), as the commentators say,⁷²—in no way, it seems, is it possible to equate *dhamma* with *brahmā* (/ *Brahmā*).

The early commentators themselves, it would seem, are not always at ease when they resort to this equation. Thus, while commenting upon *Theragāthā* 689,—a verse attributed to Udāyi Thera, which occurs also in the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* (III, p. 346), and where by *brahma* Nirvāṇa is clearly meant, since one of the manuscripts of the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* adds to *brahmapathe* the gloss *amatapathe*,⁷³—Dhammapāla first states that by *brahmapatha* the four *Brahmavihāras* are meant; but he then gives an alternative explanation according to which the first member of the compound is *brahma*, an adjective (= Sanskrit *brāhma*), meaning “the highest” (*seṭṭha*).⁷⁴ In various other contexts, too, *brahma* is interpreted as an adjective. As we saw earlier, in the enumeration of the different “meanings” of *brahmā* the sentence *brahmacakkaṃ pavatteti*—which often occurs in place of *dhammacakkaṃ pavatteti*, being one more illustration of the equivalence *brahma* = *dhamma*—is cited to illustrate the meaning “the highest” (*seṭṭha*). But, in actual practice, we find the first member of the compound *brahmacakka* interpreted as the adjective *brahma* “the highest”: *ettha brahman ti seṭṭhaṃ uttamaṃ viṣiṭṭhaṃ*; ⁷⁵ *brahman ti seṭṭhaṃ viṣiṭṭhaṃ*; ⁷⁶ *ettha brahman ti seṭṭhaṃ uttamaṃ, visuddhassa dhammacakkass' etaṃ adbhivacanaṃ*.⁷⁷ In *brahmacariya* (= Sanskrit *brahmacarya*),—an expression that in the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* designates the discipline that leads to the *brahman*, and which, according to the Buddhist tradition, designates the discipline—the “Noble Eightfold Path”

(*ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*)—that leads to Nirvāṇa, called *brahma*,⁷⁸—*brahma* is sometimes interpreted in the same manner.⁷⁹ In the Canon itself, *brahma* (as a simple word) is occasionally found used as an adjective, and the commentators gloss it by *seṭṭha* “the highest”: thus in *Suttanipāta* 151 and 285, in connection with the *Brahmavihāras*:⁸⁰ in the *Samyutta-Nikāya*, in connection with *yāna*.⁸¹ On the other hand, there are in the old commentaries instances of interpretation where *brahma* can be understood as a substantivized adjective. Thus, in one passage of the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, Buddhaghosa explains *brahmacāri* (*n*) as follows: *seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmaṃ ariyamaggaṃ carantīti brahmacāri*.⁸² It may be thought that, for Buddhaghosa, *brahma* here is a substantivized adjective, meaning “the highest” (*seṭṭha*) and designating the “Noble Path” (*ariyamagga*)—an interpretation that we found recorded in the *Saddanīti*.⁸³ This way of understanding may be questioned, in view of what Dhammapāla says in the *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*.⁸⁴ He first interprets *brahmacārin* as *brahmaṃ seṭṭhaṃ caratīti brahmacāri*—an interpretation where, again, *brahma* can be understood as a substantivized adjective. But, immediately after, he gives an alternative explanation which brings us back to *brahmā* “the highest”: *brahmā vā seṭṭho ācāro etassa atthīti brahmacāri*. According to this interpretation, therefore, *brahmā*, in this context, means “the highest conduct” (*seṭṭho ācāro*); and, if this interpretation is to be taken seriously, in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* passage, too, we have to understand *brahmaṃ*, not as the Accusative singular of *brahma*, substantivized adjective, but as the Accusative singular of *brahma*(*n*) (masculine) designating the “Noble Path”. In Dhammapāla’s first interpretation, of course, we have to understand *brahmaṃ* similarly: and the word is explained there as meaning “the highest” (*seṭṭha*). The same would be the case with *brahmaṃ* in other interpretations of *brahmacāri* (*n*) and *sabrahmacāri* (*n*),⁸⁵ as well as in the interpretation given by Dhammapāla of *brahmabhūta* in the *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*:⁸⁶ (*brahmabhūtaṃ*) *brahmaṃ vā seṭṭhaṃ arahattaphalaṃ pattaṃ*,—an interpretation according to which this expression means “one who has attained the highest Fruit consisting in Arahantship”.⁸⁷ However, in the *Nettipakkaraṇa-Aṭṭhakathā* we find the following interpretation of *sabrahmacārin*: *brahmaṃ vuccati seṭṭhaṭṭhena sakalaṃ satthusūsaṇaṃ, samaṃ saha vā brahmaṃ carati paṭipajjati sabrahmacāri*.⁸⁸ “The entire teaching of the Buddha is called *brahma*, in the sense of ‘the highest’...” Here there can be no question of *brahmā*. And Buddhaghosa does use *brahma* as a substantivized adjective designating Omniscience (*sabbaññutañña*) “in the sense of ‘the highest’”, when he explains the expression *brahmajāla* in the *Brahmajāla-sutta*: *yasmā ca ettha seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmaṃ sabbaññutaññaṃ vibhattaṃ tasmā Brahmajālan ti pi naṃ dhārehi*.⁸⁹ Beautifully, Mahānāma, in the *Saddhammapakkāsini* (*Paṭisambhidāmagga-Aṭṭhakathā*), explains *brahmacariya* as that conduct which leads to Nirvāṇa, called *brahma* “in the sense of ‘the highest’” (*uttamaṭṭhena*): *uttamaṭṭhena nibbānaṃ brahmaṃ nāma. Sikkhāyāṃ nibbānatthāya pavattanato brahmatthāya cariyā ti brahmacariyan ti vuccati*.⁹⁰ And again: *ariyamaggo nibbānena saṃsandanato brahmatthāya cariyā ti brahmacariyan ti vuccati*.⁹¹

Although theoretically possible, it does not seem that *brahmaṃ*, in the Pali commentaries just cited and in the passage of the *Paramatthamañjūsā* and the *Saddanīti* quoted earlier, is the Nominative-Accusative singular of the neuter noun *brahma* (*n*), rather than—as I believe—the Nominative-Accusative singular of *brahma*, substantivized adjective, which is also neuter. Unfortunately, the *Tikās* on the *Aṭṭhakathās* shed no light on the question. Thus, e. g., the

Dighanīkāyaṭṭhakathā-tīkā does not explain the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* passage on *brahmajāla*, but gives another interpretation, which is of no use for our purpose: *seṭṭhaṭṭhena ca brahmabhūtaṇaṃ maggaphalanibbānaṇaṃ vibhattatū brahmajālaṃ*.⁹² On the other hand, the study of the *Tikās* available in continental Europe⁹³ has given rise to an unforeseen textual problem. In *Saddanīti*, p. 555,⁹⁴ H. Smith duly identified the *Aṭṭhakathā* passages quoted. It is now possible to identify the *Tikā* passages as well. Thus Ānanda Vanaratana—to whom Tradition ascribes the composition of the earliest *Tikā*⁹⁵—writes in his *Abhidhammavūlaṭṭhikā: Atthasālinī-Līnatthapadavaṇṇanā*, which is a commentary on Buddhaghosa’s *Atthasālinī*, itself a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* of the *Abhidhamma-Piṭaka*: *cakkubhūto ti paññācakkhumayattā sattesu ca taduppādanato lokassa cakkhubhūto. ñāṇabhūto ti etassa evam eva attho daṭṭhabbo. dhammā bodhipakkhiyā. brahmā maggo. tehi uppannatā lokassa ca taduppādanato*.⁹⁶ The *Tikākāra* Dhammapāla,⁹⁷ in his turn, writes, while commenting upon Buddhaghosa’s *Papañcasūdanī* and *Sāratthappakāsini*: *dassanapariṇāyakaṭṭhenā ‘ti: yathā cakkhu sattānaṃ dassanattaṃ pariṇeti, evaṃ lokassa yathāva dassanasāadhanato dassankiccapariṇāyakaṭṭhena cakkhubhūto. paññācakkhumayattā vā sayambhuññāṇena paññācakkhuṃ bhūto patto ti vā cakkhubhūto. ñāṇabhūto ti etassa ca evam eva attho daṭṭhabbo. dhammā vā bodhipakkhiyā. tehi uppannatā lokassa ca taduppādanato anaññasādhāraṇaṃ vā dhammaṃ patto ti dhammabhūto. brahmā vuccati maggo. tena uppannatā lokassa ca taduppādanatta tañ ca sayambhuññāṇena patto ti brahmabhūto*.⁹⁸ If we now refer to *Saddanīti*, p. 555. 6-8: *yathā cakkhu sattānaṃ...cakkhubhūto*; 555. 9-11: *paññācakkhumayattā vā sayambhuññāṇena vā paññācakkhuṃ bhūto patto ti cakkhubhūto*; and 555. 14ff.: *bodhipakkhiyadhammehi vā uppannatā lokassa ca taduppādanato anaññasādhāraṇaṃ vā dhammaṃ bhūto patto ti dhammabhūto...attha vā brahmaṃ vuccati maggo*.⁹⁹ *tena uppannatā lokassa ca taduppādanattā tañ ca sayambhuññāṇena bhūto patto ti brahmabhūto*, it appears clearly that Aggavaṃsa’s source was Dhammapāla. However, instead of his *brahmaṃ*, both Ānanda and Dhammapāla have *brahmā*! Śāriputta,—who, perhaps, wrote his *Tikās* after the *Saddanīti* had been composed,¹⁰⁰—has the same *brahmā* in a virtually identical passage of his *Sāratthamañjūsā* on Buddhaghosa’s *Mano-rathapūraṇi*.¹⁰¹ Here is a problem of some importance; but all that can be said in the present state of our knowledge is that Aggavaṃsa took the liberty of changing *brahmā* into *brahmaṃ*, while Śāriputta followed Ānanda and Dhammapāla.

Another point is worth noticing. Bringing the interpretation of *brahman* (masculine) in the sense of “the highest” to its ultimate consequence, the authors of the *Tikās* sometimes use the word as a full-fledged adjective. Thus Dhammapāla explains *brahmavihāra* as follows: *Brahmānaṃ brahmāno vā viharā brahmaviharā*.¹⁰²

The interpretation of *brahma* as the masculine *brahmā*/*Brahmā*, in those compounds which refer to the highest Truth, is very odd indeed, as we have seen. I have the impression that it was to remove this oddness and to give the word a neutral character that *brahma* was later interpreted, first as an adjective and then as a substantivized adjective designating various concepts: the Noble Doctrine, the Noble Path, Nirvāṇa...The neuter *brahman* of the Upaniṣads was in the background, as it were; but the Pali commentators refused to recognize it in those canonical passages where it could easily be recognized. In the Pali commentaries I can see no clear instance of the use of the neuter word *brahma* (*n*) in the context with which

we are concerned here. Buddhaghosa does use it, but in the sense of "Vedic text" and in that of "brahminhood", in his fanciful etymologies.¹⁰⁸

To return to the Canon. We may today discard Rhys Davids' view, still largely followed in some way or other: "The neuter Brahman is...entirely unknown in the Nikāyas."¹⁰⁴ The concept of *brahman* in the Pali Canon appears to me to be the same as that with which the Upaniṣads have made us familiar, in the light of what has been stated above. The cases where the Absolute is clearly meant ought to be carefully distinguished from others where *Brahmā* is referred to, e. g., the case of the *Brahmavihāras* and that of the utterance *Brahmā ti mātāpitāro*...¹⁰⁵ As to the fact that the Buddha is sometimes called *brahmā* in the Canon, we should not see here—as Geiger did¹⁰⁶—a confusion between the neuter *brahman* and the masculine *Brahman*—a confusion which is sometimes noticed in the early Upaniṣads themselves.¹⁰⁷ As elsewhere shown,¹⁰⁸ in these cases—which, again, ought to be carefully distinguished from those where the Buddha and the Arahants are compared to *Brahmā*, as a concession to the belief prevalent in the time—*brahmā* means *brāhmaṇa*, as in the Brahmanical tradition. And the Buddha and the Arahants are often called *brāhmaṇa* in the Buddhist tradition; whether we should understand by this term *brahmavid* "knower of the *brahman*", i. e., "one who has become the *brahman*" (*brahmabhūta*), as in the Upaniṣadic tradition, also echoed by a Buddhist text in Sanskrit: *brahmavid brāhmaṇo brahmā brahmanirvāṇam āptavān*,¹⁰⁹ or "one who has expelled evil" (*bāhūtapāpa*), following the fanciful but pregnant etymology of the Buddhists,¹¹⁰ is a different matter.

The specific expressions employed in the Pali Canon seem to suggest, however, a stage of development later than the earliest Upaniṣads, although the ideas expressed can be traced there.¹¹¹ Thus the expression *brahmabhūta* is found, e. g., in the *Bhagavadgītā*, which also uses the expression *brahmanirvāṇa*. But the idea is as old as the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* (IV, 4, 6): *brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti*. Attaining the *brahman*, i. e. Liberation, is, indeed, nothing short of being it. The expression *brahmapatta*, in the sense of "one who has attained the *brahman* (and not "the status of *Brahmā*", as is the case sometime ¹¹²), occurs once in the *Majjhima-Nikāya*, and its Sanskrit equivalent, *brahmaprāpta*, is found in the *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad*. The expression *brahmapatha*,¹¹³ in the sense of the "way that leads to the *brahman* (and not "to *Brahmā*", as in a passage of the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad*, as well as in a passage of the *Saṃyutta-Nikāya*), is found in the *Maitri-Upaniṣad*, and the *Bhagavadgītā* uses the equivalent expression *brahmanāḥ pathi*, glossed by Śaṅkara as *brahmaprāptimārge*, which, in its turn, recalls the Pali expression *maggo brahmapattiyā*.¹¹⁴ It is also significant that the simile of the extinction of fire, with which is explained the concept of Nirvāṇa in the Buddhist texts, makes its appearance in such texts as the *Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad* and the *Maitreyī-and Maitri-Upaniṣad*.¹¹⁵

The existence of similarities between two traditions does not imply total identity. But the difference between the teachings of the Pali Canon and those of the Upaniṣad has too often been exaggerated.¹¹⁶ The Buddha's Absolute appears to be the same as that of the Upaniṣads,

NOTES

1. *L'Ātman-Brahman dans le Bouddhisme ancien*, Paris, 1973 (Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, Vol. XC).
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 59 ff., 65-66. —The specificity of the Upaniṣadic *ātman* was already pointed out by Śaṅkara, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* I, 1, 4 (*The Brahmasūtra Śaṅkara Bhāṣya with the Commentaries Bhāmati, Kalpataru and Parimala*, edited by Ananatakṛṣṇa Śāstrī, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, second edition, 1938, pp. 134-135).
3. *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., p. 33, n. 4. See also "The *Ātman* in two Prajñāpāramitā-Sūtras", in *Our Heritage*, 1979 (Special Number: 150th Anniversary Volume; Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. CXIX), pp. 39-45.
4. See *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., p. 13.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 3ff.
8. *Viṃśatikā-vṛtti* (S Lévi's edition, Paris, 1925), p. 6; cf. *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., p. 66.
9. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Commentaries Vṛtti and Paddhati of Vṛṣabhadeva*, Kāṇḍa I, edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer, Poona, 1966 (Deccan College Monograph Series 32), p. 23. Cf. *Indologica Taurinensia* VII (1979), pp. 109-110.
10. *Mahābhārata* (Critical Edition, Poona) XII, 192, 122.
11. *Dīgha-Nikāya*, III, pp. 232-233; *Majjhima*, I, pp. 341, 411-412; II, p. 159; *Aṅguttara*, II, p. 206; *Puggalapaññatti*, p. 56. Cf. *Aṅguttara*, I, p. 197. —Unless otherwise specified, all references to the Pali texts are in the Pali Text Society's editions.
12. *Vinaya-Piṭaka* (ed. H. Oldenberg, London, 1979-1883), V, p. 86. —Note that *anattā* here (not explained in Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī*) is explained in the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* as an adjective (*bahuvrīhi* compound): *anattā ti attavirahitā, alavaṇabhojananti ādisu viya. Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (on Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā*), Burmese edition, 1960, p. 545.
In the formula *sabbe dhammā anattā*—where by *dhammā* are usually understood the conditioned things (*saṃkhata-dhammā*)—*anattā* is sometimes interpreted both as an adjective and as a substantive (thus *Nettipakaraṇa-Atthakathā*. Sinhalese edition: Simon Hewavitarne Bequest IX, Colombo, 1921, p. 38; cf. Yaśomitra, *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, ed. Swami Dwarikadas Shastri, Part IV, Varanasi, 1973: *Bauddha Bharati Series-9*, p. 1204).
See also *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., pp. 160 ff.
13. *yasyāmatam tasya matam matam yasya na veda saḥ / avijñātam vijñātam vijñātam avijñātam || Kena-Upaniṣad* II, 3.
14. *tasmā jñāne yatno na kartavyaḥ, kiṃ tv anātmany ātmabuddhinivṛtāv eva*: Śaṅkara, *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* XVIII, 50. See also *Journal Asiatique*, 1986, p. 295.
15. *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* VI, 12-13. Cf. *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., p. 68.
16. *L'Ātman-Brahman*..., p. 73.

17. *imasmiñ ñeva vyāmamatte kaḷevare saññimhi samanake lokañ ca paññāpemi lokasamudayañ ca lokanirodhañ ca lokanirodhagāminiñ ca paṭipadaṃ*. —*nāsiṃsati lokam imaṃ parañ ca*. *Samyutta-Nikāya*, I, pp. 61-62 ; *Anguttara*, II, pp. 47-49. See *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 11, n. 1 (p. 12).
18. *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 101.
19. *Dīgha-Nikāya*, I, p. 223. Cf. *Majjhima*, I, pp. 329-330. —*L' Ātman-Brahman...*, pp. 53-55. See also K. R. Norman, "An Epithet of Nibbāna", in *Śramaṇa Vidyā : Studies in Buddhism, Prof. Jagannath Upadhyaya Commemoration Volume*, I, edited by N. H. Samtani, Sarnath, Varanasi : Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1987, pp. 23 ff. —In view of what will be stated later in this paper, it is well to remember that Buddhaghosa, —who admits that the first *viññāṇa* of the passage cited is a "name for Nibbāna" (*nibbānassa nāmaṃ*, —declines to recognize in it "consciousness": he fancifully explains the word as meaning "that which ought to be known" (*viññātabban ti viññāṇaṃ ; viññāṇan ti vijānitabbaṃ*).
20. *Samyutta-Nikāya*, V, p. 6 (See *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 91, n. 4).
21. *Nyāyavārttika* III, 1, 1, p. 702 in *Nyāyadarśanam*, I, edited by Tārānātha Nyāya-Tarkatīrtha and Amarendramohan Tarkatīrtha, Calcutta, 1936 (Calcutta Sanskrit Series XVIII) ; cf. I, 1, 4, p. 127. —*L' Ātman-Brahman...*, pp. 64-66.
22. *Die grossen Philosophen*, I (München, 1957), p. 139. Cf. *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 74.
23. E. Lamotte, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra)*, IV (Louvain, 1976), p. 1995.
24. *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 62, n. 2 ; Chapter II.
25. M. & W. Geiger, *Pāli Dhamma* (München, 1920 : Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften : philosophischphilologische und historische Klasse, XXXI. Band, 1. Abhandlung), p. 7 ; W. Geiger, *Dhamma and Brahman* (München-Neubiberg, 1921 : Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Buddhismus II), p. 4.
26. *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 14, n. 7.
27. *Visuddhimagga* XVI, 71 (in the edition by Warren and Kosambi : Harvard Oriental Series 41, Cambridge, Mass., 1950).
28. *Ibid.*, VII, 75 (cf. Aggavamsa, *Saddanīti*, ed. H. Smith, Lund, 1928-1966, I, p. 70).
29. Here is reproduced, with slight changes and additions, and after correction of the numerous misprints (no proofs were shown to the author), the basic part of the study that appeared, under the title "Brahman in the Pali Canon and in the Pali Commentaries", in *Studies in Orientology : Essays in Memory of Prof. A. L. Basham*, edited by S. K. Maity, Upendra Thakur and A. K. Narain, Agra : Y. K. Publishers, 1988, pp. 95-112.
30. Vol. I, pp. 34-35.
31. P. 11.
32. H. Smith's edition (see above, n. 28), II, p. 459.
33. See J. Gonda, *Notes on Brahman*, Utrecht, 1950.
34. *brūhito tehi tehi guṇavisesehi brahmā : Papañcasūdanī*, loc. cit. ; *Madhurathavilāsini*, loc. cit. *brūha vaḍḍhane. uparūpari brūhatīti brahmā...brahmā ti tehi tehi guṇavisesehi*

- brūhito ti brahmā : Saddanīti*, loc. cit. (cf. III, p. 861 : *tehi tehi guṇehi brūhati vaḍḍhatīti brahmā*).
35. *Majjhima-Nikāya*, III, p. 101.
 36. Untraced. See, however, n. 66 ; p. 14 below. —Vasubandhu, in the *Abhidharmakoś-abhāṣya*, quotes the *Sūtra : eṣa hi bhagavān brahmā ity api śāntaḥ śītibhūta ity api* (see also *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, quoted by L. de La Vallée Poussin in his translation of the *Abhidharmakośa*, VI, p. 245, n. 2). According to Yaśomitra, this sentence was uttered by Jīvaka. *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Ācārya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, edited by Swami Dwarikadas Shastri, Part III, Varanasi, 1972 (Bauddha Bharati Series-7), p. 982 : VI, 54. If this is true, then the reference is to Brahman, to whom the Buddha is compared because he practises the Brahmanvihāras (p. 8 below) : *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, pp. 369-370 ; *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, pp. 150-151. This, however, does not seem to be the case. See also n. 77 below.
 37. Cf. *L' Ātman-Brahman...*, pp. 149-150.
 38. *Anguttara-Nikāya*, I, p. 132 ; II, p. 70 ; *Itivuttaka*, p. 110 ; *Jātaka* (ed. Fausbøll, London, 1877-1896 ; reprint : 1962-1964), V, p. 331, v. 182.
 39. *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, pp. 69ff. ; *Samyutta*, II, p. 27 ; *Anguttara*, II, pp. 9, 24 (= *Itivuttaka*, p. 123) ; III, pp. 9, 417 ; V, p. 33 ; *Paṭisaṃbhidāmagga*, II, p. 174.
 40. *brahmā ti Mahābrahmā ti vuccati, tathāgato pi, brāhmaṇo pi, mātāpitāro pi, seṭṭham pi. "sahasso Brahmā, dvisahasso Brahmā" ti ādisu hi Mahābrahmā Brahmā ti vuccati. "brahmā ti, bhikkhave, tathāgataṃ etaṃ adhivaccanaṃ" ti ettha tathāgato. "tamonudo..." (Suttanipāta 1133) ti ettha brāhmaṇo. "brahmā ti mātāpitāro pubbācariyā ti vuccare ti ettha mātāpitāro. "brahmacakkaṃ pavatteti" ti ettha seṭṭham : Papañcasūdanī, loc. cit. ; Saddanīti, p. 459 ; cf. Madhurathavilāsini, loc. cit.*
 41. *Saddanīti*, p. 459.
 42. PP. 459-460.
 43. Siamese edition (2468-2470=1924-1926), Vol. II, pp. 128-129. H. Smith did not identify this passage (see also *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, s. v. *upapattibrahma* [n]). Dhammapāla gives this interpretation while commenting upon the expression *Brahmutama* "the highest among the Brahmās", applied to the Buddha in *Visuddhimagga* IX, 91 (in the edition referred to above ; cf. *Atthasālinī*, § 423). The passage begins as follows : *Brahmuttamenā 'ti ettha sammutibrahmāno upapattibrahmāno visuddhibrahmāno ti tividhā brahmāno*. The remainder is identical with the passage of the *Saddanīti*, apart from some insignificant variants.
 44. On the identification of Dhammapāla, author of the *Tikās*, as distinct from the Dhammapāla who wrote the *Aṭṭhakathās*, see K. R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden, 1983 : A History of Indian Literature, edited by J. Gonda, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), p. 149.
 45. *Brahmuttama* in *Visuddhimagga* IX, 91 (n. 43 above).
 46. See pp. 12-13 below.
 47. One may think of the relationship between the neuter *brahman* and the masculine *brahman* in the Brahmanical tradition.
 48. See p. 6, and n. 36 above.

49. "brahmacakkam pavatteti" ti ādivacanato brahman ti ariyadhammo vuccati. tato nibbattā avisesena sabbe pi ariyā visuddhibrahmāno nāma, paramatthabrahmatāya. visesato pana "brahmā ti kho (particle omitted in the Paramatthamañjūsā), bhikkhave, tathāgataṃ etam adhivacanā" ti (the Paramatthamañjūsā adds ādi) vacanato sammāsambuddho uttama-brahmā nāma, sadevake loke brahmabhūtehi guṇehi ukkaṃsapāramippattito : Saddanīti, pp. 459-460. (On brahmabhūta in brahmabhūtehi guṇehi see n. 79 below.)
50. See, e. g., *Kṣīratarāṅgiṇī* (ed. B. Liebich, Breslau, 1930), p. 2.
51. "bhū sattāyaṃ ; bhū pattīyaṃ" ti dvigaṇikānaṃ dvinnaṃ dhātūnaṃ vasena aṭṭhakathā-ṭikānayanissitaṃ atthaṃ pakāsayissāma āgamikānaṃ kosallathāya : Saddanīti, II, p. 555. —In connection with bhū—"to attain", reference is made (cf., e. g., *Kṣīratarāṅgiṇī*, p. 190) to the term used in Grammar : *īthaṃbhūta* (Pāṇini I, 4, 90 ; II, 3, 21 ; VI, 2, 149). *īthaṃbhūta* is thus explained : *imaṃ pakāraṃ bhūto patto* (Saddanīti, II, p. 555 ; cf. III, p. 719, § 598 ; p. 805. 27 : *imaṃ pakāraṃ bhūto patto āpanno ti itthambhūto*)—an interpretation that goes back to the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. Thus *Kāśikāvṛtti* on Pāṇini II, 3, 21 : *kañcit prakāraṃ prāpta itthambhūtaḥ*, and on Pāṇini VI, 2, 149 : *imaṃ prakāraṃ āpanna itthambhūtaḥ*. —In the exegetical literature, both Sanskrit and Pali, this meaning of bhū—is often resorted to for explaining "bhūta. The Saddanīti (p. 555) cites Dhammapāla's explanation of *manussabhūta* in the *Petavatthu-Aṭṭhakathā* (p. 71). See also, e. g., *Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā*, III, p. 9 (on *Theragāthā* 689) ; *ibid.*, II, p. 205 (explanation of *dhammabhūta* in *Theragāthā* 491) ; and the explanation of *brahmabhūta* in the *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, quoted below, p. 11.
52. *seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmabhūto, aha vā brahmaṃ vuccati maggo...tañ ca sayambhuññāṇena bhūto patto ti brahmabhūto* : Saddanīti, p. 555. (*seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmabhūto* : cf. *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 76 ; *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p. 389. Buddhaghosa gives two different interpretations of *brahmabhūta* and similar expressions : *seṭṭhasabhāvo*, etc. ["bhū sattāyaṃ"], or *Brahmā viya bhūto* [jāto nibbatto], i. e. "become like Brahmā" etc. Cf. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, III, p. 865 [*dhammabhūto*=*dhammasabhāvo*] ; *Manorathapūraṇī*, V, p. 72. See also Upasena, *Saddhammappajjotikā* [Niddesa-Aṭṭhakathā], II, p. 295 ; Mahānāma, *Saddhammappakāsinī* [Paṭisaṃbhidāmagga-Aṭṭhakathā], III, p. 646, and cf. *Saddanīti*, p. 555. 6 ff)
53. *Samyutta-Nikāya*, III, p. 83.
54. *The Arthaviniscaya-sūtra and its Commentary* (Nibandhana), edited by N. H. Samtani, Patna : K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1971 (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XIII), p. 81. (The form *brahmībhūta*, which is met with in the Brahmanical tradition as well—see, e. g., Śaṅkara, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* I, 3, 15—, clearly expresses the idea of "becoming". Late grammarians—Rāmacandra, *Prakriyākaumudī* ; Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, *Siddhāntakaumudī*—cite *brahmībhavati* in connection with Pāṇini V, 4, 50 and VII, 4, 32. Refer, however, to Nāgeśa's observations in his various writings : e. g., *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara* [ed. Sītārāma Śāstrī, Varanasi, 1960 : Sarasvatībhavana—Granthamāla 87], Vol. II, pp. 1544-1545 ; *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* [Chowkhamba edition, 1903 ; no other edition is available to me], p. 355 ; *Uddyota* on Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* on Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini V, 4, 50 ; *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghu-*

- mañjūsā* [Benares, 1925 : Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 44], p. 1567. See also below, n. 114.)
55. M. & W. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 77, n. 3 ; W. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 8 ; N. H. Samtani, Note 4 on p. 81 of his edition of the *Arthaviniscaya-sūtra and its Commentary* (see preceding note).
56. *L'Atman-Brahman...*, p. 150.
57. *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, edited by Padmanabh S. Jaini, Patna : K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series IV), second edition, 1977, p. 428. See also "Notes bouddhiques", *Indologica Taurinensia* VII (1979), pp. 108-109.
58. See *L'Atman-Brahman...*, pp. 150-151.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 55 (n. 2 to p. 54).
60. *Ibid.*, p. 81 (n. 5 to p. 80).
61. *Digha-Nikāya*, I, p. 18 ; *Majjhima*, I, p. 326.
62. *Visuddhimagga* IX, 106 (in the edition, cited, by Warren and Kosambi). Cf. *Attha-sālinī*, § 428.
63. While commenting on this passage in the *Paramatthamañjūsā*, Dhammapāla (see n. 44 above) first explains *Brahmā* in the sense of *upapattibrahmā* "Brahmā by birth" (see p. 6 above) : *Brahmāno ti upapattibrahmāno. te hi idha jhānabhāvanāya vinivaraṇacittā hutvā Brahmaloce uppunnā tattha yāvatāyukaṃ vinivaraṇacittā va honti. tasmā niddosacittā viharantīti vadanti*. But he then gives an alternative interpretation according to which the word refers to the "great beings" (*mahāsattā*)—the Bodhisattvas, whose qualities have been "caused to grow" (*brūhita* : cf. p. 6 above) through the fulfilment of the Perfections, "giving" (*dāna*), etc., which make a Buddha and which are the source of all Buddha-qualities : *Brahmāno ti vā sakalabuddhagūṇahetubhūtaṇaṃ dānapāramitādināṃ buddhakaradhammānaṃ paripūraṇavasena brūhitagūṇā mahāsattā bodhisattā...Paramatthamañjūsā*, II, p. 147). —*brūhitagūṇattā Brahmā* : Dhammapāla, *Samyuttanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭṭhikā*, Burmese edition, 1961, Vol. I, p. 242.]
64. *Manorathapūraṇī*, III, p. 169.
65. *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p. 121 (cf. p. 11 and n. 81 below). —Cf. *Paramatthajotikā*, I (Commentary on the *Khuddakapāṭha*), pp. 250-251 ; Dhammapāla's comment on *Theragāthā* 649 (quoted below, n. 80). —*brāhmaṇo ti seṭṭho niddoso* : *Manorathapūraṇī*, III, p. 4.
66. There is a divergence between the *Manorathapūraṇī* and the *Paramatthajotikā* (Commentary on the *Suttanipāta*) concerning the interpretation of the term *brahmā*, when applied to the Buddha. According to the conventions mentioned earlier (p. 6 above), "Tathāgata" (or the "Perfectly Enlightened One", *sammāsambuddha*) is one of "meanings" of *brahmā*, and Buddhaghosa says so when he comments on a passage of the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* where the Buddha is called *brahmā* : *brahmā vuccati sammāsambuddho* (*Manorathapūraṇī*, II, p. 322). The *Paramatthajotikā* (II, 2, p. 592), however, says in its comment upon *Suttanipāta* 1065, where also this term is applied to the Buddha, that it is a designation of "the highest" : *brahmā ti seṭṭhādhivacanāṃ etam* (cf. Upasena, *Saddhammappajjotikā*, III, p. 29). See *L'Atman-Brahman...*, p. 149 and n. 3.

- Dhammapāla, too, in his comment on *Theragāthā* 182, where by *brahmā* the Buddha is meant, interprets the term in the sense of "the highest".
67. *Manorathapūraṇī*, II, p. 204.
 68. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, pp. 157-158. — *brahmā ti puttānaṃ Brahmasamā uttamā seṭṭhā* : *Jātaka* Commentary, V, p. 332.
 69. See *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, p. 111 ; III, pp. 195, 224 ; *Saṃyutta*, IV, p. 94 ; *Āṅguttara*, V, pp. 226, 256 ; *Itivuttaka*, p. 57 ; *Suttanipāta* 561, 563 (= *Theragāthā* 831, 833) ; *Paṭisaṃbhidāmagga*, II, p. 194.
 70. *Dīgha-Nikāya*, III, p. 84. — See *L'Atman-Brahman...* pp. 82-83.
 71. *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, III, p. 865. (In place of *Brahma-bhūtattā eva Brahma-bhūto*, read *Dhamma-bhūtattā eva Brahma-bhūto*. See Sinhalese edition, Vol. II [Colombo, 1925 : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest XIX], p. 627.)
 72. See *L'Atman-Brahman...*, p. 93 and n. 6. — To the references given there add *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 76 ; *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p. 389 (cf. Upasena, *Saddhammappajjotikā*, II, p. 295 ; Mahānāma, *saddhammappakāsinī*, III, p. 646 ; Aggavaṃsa, *Saddanūti*, II, p. 555) : *aviparītasabhāvaṭṭhena pariyattidhammappavattanato vā hadayena cintetvā vācāya nicchāritadhammamayo ti dhammabhūto*. (The *Sāratthappakāsinī* gives the reading *aviparītabhāvaṭṭhena* ; see, however, Siamese edition, III, p. 41, and Sinhalese edition, III, [Colombo, 1930 : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest XXXI], p. 23 : *aviparītasabhāvaṭṭhena*.) Also, in connection with *navavidhalokuttaradhamma*, *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, p. 204.
 73. See *L'Atman-Brahman...*, pp. 90-91.
 74. *brahmapathe ti catubbidhe pi brahmanivārapathe, brahme vā seṭṭhe phalasamāpattipathe* : *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā*, III, p. 9 (corrected reading ; see Sinhalese edition, II [Colombo, 1925 : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest XVIII], p. 9).
 75. *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 27.
 76. *Manorathapūraṇī*, V, p. 12.
 77. *Sāratthappakāsinī*, II, p. 46. — Cf. *Samṃohavinodanī* (*Vibhaṅga-Aṭṭhakathā*), p. 399 ; Mahānāma, *Saddhammappakāsinī*, III, p. 626 ; Kassapa, *Mohavicchedanī* (*Abhidhamma-mātikathavaṇṇanā*), p. 196. — In the Sanskrit texts, too, we meet with the compound *brāhmacakra* as well as the analytical expression *brāhmaṇa cakram* : *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo, 1930-1936), pp. 385-386 ; *Arthaviniścaya-sūtra* (see n. 54 above), pp. 50, 51 ; cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* VI, 54 (*brāhman*). The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* derive *brāhma* from *brahman* (masculine) : *tasyedaṃ cakram iti brāhman* (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*). The "wheel", we are told, is qualified as *brāhma* because it was for the first time set in motion by the Buddha, called *brahmā* (on the *Sūtra* cited in this connection see n. 36 above). According to Vasubandhu, the Buddha is called *brahmā* because of his "supreme brahminhood" (*anuttarabrāhmaṇyayogād bhagavān brahmā* : *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, loc. cit.). The term, therefore, is interpreted in the sense of *brāhmaṇa* (see p. 14 below). The commentary on the *Arthaviniścaya-sūtra* does not explain the meaning.
 78. See *L'Atman-Brahman...*, p. 90 and n. 7. — The commentary on the *Arthaviniścaya-*

- sūtra* (p. 81) explains *brahmacarya* as *nirvāṇaprāpako 'nāsravo mārgaḥ*, and then, in support of this explanation, says : *nirvāṇaṃ brahmocyate...* (passage quoted above, p. 7). On the distinction made in the *Mahāgovinda-sutta* of the *Dīgha-Nikāya* (*L'Atman-Brahman...*, p. 80 and n. 5) between *brahmacariya* = *Brahmavihāra* and *brahmacariya* = *ariyamagga*, see Buddhaghosa, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, I, pp. 178-179 (with the necessary corrections) ; *Papañcasūdanī*, II, pp. 42-43 ; Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, I, pp. 108-109 ; Aggavaṃsa, *Saddanūti*, II, p. 424 ; Sāriputta, *Sāratthadīpanī* (*Samantapāsādikā-Ṭīkā*), Siamese edition, Vol. I (2511 = 1967), pp. 518-519.
79. *brahmacariyan ti brahmaṇ seṭṭhaṃ uttamaṃ cariyaṃ* : Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 168 (corrected reading ; see Siamese edition, p. 209, and Sinhalese edition [Colombo, 1920 : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest VI], p. 111). — Cf. *Paramatthajotikā*, I (Commentary on the *Khuddakapāṭha*), p. 151 : *brahmaṇ cariyaṃ brahmānaṃ vā cariyaṃ brahmacariyaṃ, seṭṭhacariyan ti vuttaṃ hoti*. — *Nettipakaraṇa-Aṭṭhakathā* (see n. 12 above), p. 36 (cf. *Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā* : *Līnatthavaṇṇanā*, I, p. 310) : *brahmaṇ seṭṭhaṃ uttamaṃ brahmūnaṃ vā seṭṭhānaṃ ariyānaṃ cariyaṃ...brahmacariyaṃ*. — In the following, °*bhūta* in *brahmabhūta* seems to be a grammatical device to adjectivize *brahman* (masculine) [see also n. 49 above ; on the later use of *brahman* as adjective see p. 13 below] : *brahmacariyan ti seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmabhūtaṃ cariyaṃ, brahmabhūtaṇaṃ vā buddhādīnaṃ cariyaṃ ti vuttaṃ hoti* : *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, I, p. 179 ; *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 204 ; *Manorathapūraṇī*, II, p. 290. (*brahmabhūtehi seṭṭhehi caritabbato tesam cariyabhāvato brahmacariyaṃ... seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmabhūtaṇaṃ buddhapaccekebuddha-buddhasāvakanāṃ cariyaṃ brahmacariyan ti vuccati* : *Samantapāsādikā*, I, pp. 127-128 ; cf. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, p. 86 ; Upasena, *Saddhammappajjotikā*, III, p. 24.)
 80. *Suttanipāta* 151, with *Paramatthajotikā*, I (Commentary on the *Khuddakapāṭha*), pp. 250-251, and *Suttanipāta* 285, with *Paramatthajotikā*, II, 1, p. 315. — In *Theragāthā* 649, Dhammapāla reads *brahmaṇ vihāraṃ* (in place of *brahmavihāraṃ*) *bhāvemi*, and comments : *brahmaṇ seṭṭhaṃ niddosaṃ* (so read) *mettādivihāraṃ bhāvemi vaḍḍhemiti attho*. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, p. 274 (on the explanation of *seṭṭha* by *niddosa* see p. 9 above). The Sanskrit texts, too, sometimes use the adjectives *brāhma* and *brāhmya* in this connection : see Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, s. v. *brahma-vihāra* ; also *Arthaviniścaya-sūtra*, p. 19 (*brāhmavihārāḥ*), where the commentator glosses *brāhma* by *brhat*, in accordance with the etymology noted earlier, an etymology by virtue of which *brhat* is often associated with *brahman* in the Brahmanical tradition (Gonda, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 ff.). The later Pali commentators often interpret *brahmavihāra* as "the highest *vihāra*" or "*vihāra* of the highest". Thus Sumaṅgala in his *Ṭīkā* on Anuruddha's *Abhidhammatthasaṃgaha* : *uttamavihārābhāvato uttamānaṃ vā vihārābhāvato brahmavihāro* (*Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*, Siamese edition, p. 260). — *brahmasaddo c' ettha uttamavācako*. *Uttamo viharo brahma-vihāro*. *Brahmasamānaṃ uttamānaṃ puggalānaṃ vihāro brahmavihāro* : Silācāra, *Abhidhammatthasaṃgahadīpanī* (Burmese edition, 1928), p. 317. See also p. and n. 102 below, and cf. the interpretations of *brahmacariya* quote in the preceding note.

81. *Samyutta-Nikāya*, V, pp. 4-6, with *Sāratthappakāsinī*, III, pp. 120-121, 122 (see p. 9 above). — *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 91 and n. 4.
82. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, III, p. 737.
83. P. 7 above.
84. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, I, p. 176.
85. *brahmaṃ seṭṭhaṃ paṭipadaṃ paṭipajjanti brahmacārī* : *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 188. *brahmaṃ seṭṭhaṃ ācāraṃ caranti brahmacārī* : *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 72 ; *Papañcasūdanī*, II, p. 206 ; *Manorathapūraṇī*, II, p. 326 ; *Puggalapañña itti-Aṭṭhakathā* p. 236. — *imaṃ brahmaṃ samānaṃ caranti, tasmā sabrahmacārīti vuccanti* : *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 81. *sabrahmacārīsū 'ti samānaṃ ekuddesatādiṃ brahmaṃ carantesu sahadhammikesu* : *Manorathapūraṇī*, II, p. 139. *samānaṃ brahmaṃ silādīdhammaṃ caranti sabrahmacārino* : Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Theragāthā-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, p. 166 (on *Theragāthā* 387). See also *Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 97 (see Siamese edition, p. 123). *saha brahmaṃ uttamaṃ paṭipadaṃ caranti sabrahmacārino* : *Mahānāma, Saddhammapakāsinī*, III, p. 544. It goes without saying that in Dhammapāla's *Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā* : *seṭṭhaṭṭhena brahmasaṃkhātāṃ bhagavato sāsanaṃ ariyamaggaṃ ca samānaṃ caranti paṭipajjanti sabrahmacārāyo* (printed *sabrahmacāriyo*), *brahma*°, in the compound *brahmasaṃkhātā*, may stand as well for *brahman* (masculine) as for *brahma*. Dhammapāla, *paramatthadīpanī* : *Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā*, p. 268 (see Sinhalese edition [referred to above, n. 79], p. 180 and n. 1 ; Siamese edition, p. 338).
86. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, pp. 36-37. See also Sinhalese edition (Colombo, 1928 : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest XXIII), p. 170.
87. Likewise, the *Ṭikākāra* Dhammapāla (see n. 44 above) writes : *brahmaṃ vā seṭṭhaṃ sammāsambodhiṃ patto ti brahmabhūto*. *Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā*, Burmese edition, 1961, Vol. III, p. 184. — On the interpretation of *bhūta* in the sense of *patta* see n. 51 above.
88. *Nettipakaraṇa-Aṭṭhakathā* (Sinhalese edition ; see n. 12 above), p. 45.
89. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 129.
90. *Saddhammapakāsinī*, III, p. 580.
91. *Idid.*, p. 582. — On the “merging” of the *ariyamagga* and *Nibbāna*, see *Dīgha-Nikāya*, II, p. 223.
92. *Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā* : *Līnatthavaṇṇanā*, I, p. 243.
93. I wish to express my deep sense of obligation to Professors Albrecht Wezler and Heinz Bechert for the facilities offered me in consulting the rich collections at Hamburg and at Göttingen, respectively.
94. See p. 7 above.
95. See K. R. Norman, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
96. Sinhalese edition : Vidyodaya Ṭikā Publication II, Colombo, 1938, p. 12. — Ānanda Comments here on the canonical passage quoted in the *Atthasālinī*, p. 5 : *so k' āvuso, bhagavā jānaṃ jānāti passaṃ passati cakkhubbūto ñāṇabhūto dhammabhūto brahmabhūto...* *Mahānāma*, commenting on Ānanda's text, says that by interpreting the word *brahmā* in the sense of “The Way” (*magga*) the author excludes the meanings “Great Brahman”

- (*Mahābrahmā*), “the highest”, etc., and that “The Way” is called *brahmā* because it “causes to grow” (*brūheti* : cf. p. 6 above), i. e. “produces” (*uppādeti*), the result (*phalaṃ brūheti uppādeti brahmā*) : *Madhusārattadīpanī*, Burmese edition, Vol. I, 1928, p. 53.
97. See n. 44 above.
98. *Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā*, Burmese edition, 1961, Vol. II, p. 62 ; cf. *Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā*, Burmese edition, 1961, Vol. II, pp. 306-307. — The latter text adds, after *pariṇeti, sādheti*, after *yāthāvadassanasādhanaṭo, pi*, and after *dhammaṃ patto, adhigato* ; and, instead of *taduppādanattā* at the end, it has, as earlier, *taduppādanato*. So also Sāriputta (see n. 101 below). Further, instead of *brahmā vuccati maggo*, it has *brahmā vuccati seṭṭhaṭṭhena maggañāṇaṃ* (cf. p. 231 : *brahmabhūta ti Brahmabhāvaṃ patā, brahmato vā ariyamaggañāṇato bhūta ariyāya jatiyā jātā*).
99. H. Smith's punctuation is modified here.
100. See, e. g., W. Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language*, authorised English translation by B. Ghosh, University of Calcutta, second edition, 1956, I, § § 31 & 50.
101. *Sāratthamañjusā* (*Ānguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā*), Burmese edition, 1961, Vol. III, p. 354.
102. *Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā* (Burmese edition), I, p. 44 ; *Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā* (Burmese edition), I, p. 40. Similarly Sāriputta, *Sāratthamañjusā* (*Ānguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā*) [Burmese edition], I, p. 38 ; cf. *Sāratthadīpanī* (*Samantapāsādikā* [Vinayaṭṭhakathā] ṭīkā, Burmese edition, 1960, Vol. I, p. 203. — Commenting on Sumaṅgala's comment on the *Abhidhammatthasaṃgaha* (see n. 80 above), Ariyavaṃsa states :... *tasmā sattesu sammāpaṭipattibhāvena brahmā uttamo vihāro, brahmānaṃ vā uttamānaṃ yogīnaṃ vihāro brahmavihāro ti atthaṃ dassento* “uttamavihārabhāvato” *tīdīmāha* (*Mañisāramañjusā*, Burmese edition, Vol. II, 1964, p. 485).
103. *Brāhmaṇa*, in the sense of “brahmin by birth”, is thus explained : *brahmaṃ aṇaṭi brāhmaṇo, mante sajjhāyati attho. idameva hi jātibrahmaṇānaṃ niruttivacanaṃ*. These brahmins are so called because they “recite Vedic texts”. As a designation of the “Noble Ones”, however, adds Buddhaghosa, the word is explained differently : *ariyā pana bāhitapāpattā brāhmaṇā ti vuccanti*. These “Noble Ones” are called *brāhmaṇa* because they have “expelled evil”. *Samantapāsādikā*, I, p. 111 ; *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, I, p. 244 (= *Papañcasūdanī*, I, p. 109). Cf. Dhammapāla, *Paramatthadīpanī* : *Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā*, pp. 58, 377-378 ; Aggavaṃsa, *Saddanīti*, II, p. 357. (On *bāhitapāpa* see *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 86 and n. 3 ; see also J. Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada* [London, 1962], p. 178.) In *Itivuttaka-Aṭṭhakathā*, II, p. 141. Dhammapāla combines the two interpretations to account for the fact that the Buddha calls himself *brāhmaṇa*. The Buddha—says Dhammapāla—is called *brāhmaṇa* “in the true sense” (*paramatthato, paramatthena*),—he possesses “the supreme brahminhood” (*anuttaraṃ brāhmaṇabhāvaṃ* : cf. *Abhidhammakosābhāṣya*, quoted above, n. 77),—because he, on the one hand, has “expelled evil” (*bāhitapāpattā*), and, on the other, “expounds the *brahma* (n)” (*brahmassa ca aṇanato = kathanato*)—“the supreme *brahma* (n), named the Noble Path” (*anuttarassa ariyamaggasaṃkhātassa brahmassa*). Here Dhammapāla uses the neuter word *brahma* (n) in the sense of the “Noble Path”—as

"Buddhist antithesis to the authority of the Veda" (for similar ideas see *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 87 [n. 3 to p. 86]; see also "The Criterion of Orthodoxy in India and the Case of Jainism and Buddhism", in *Jagannath Upadhyaya Commemoration Volume* [see n. 19 above], pp. 101 ff.; Buddhaghosa compares the three Pitakas to the three Vedas: *Manorathapūraṇī*, I, p. 95).

In *Papañcasūdanī*, III, p. 443 (cf. *Paramatthajotikā*, II, 2, p. 472, on *Suttanipāta* 655), Buddhaghosa explains the variant reading *brahmāna* in the sense of "(deed) that brings brahminhood": *brahmānan ti pi pāṭho. ayaṃ pan' ettha vacanatto : brahmaṃ āneti brahmānaṃ, brāhmaṇabhāvaṃ āvahatīti vuttaṃ hoti.*

It may be noted in this connection that Moggallāna's *Abhidhānappadīpikā* (812 in W. Subhūti's edition, Colombo, 1865) records the meanings of the masculine *brahman* we saw earlier, namely "Brahmā" (Pitāmaha), "Buddha" (Jina), "the highest", "brahmin", "the parents", and, for the neuter *brahma* (n) [Nominative singular: *brahmaṃ*], the meanings of "Veda" and "religious austerity":

*pitāmahe jīne seṭṭhe brāhmaṇe ca pitusv api /
brahmā vutto tathā brahmaṃ vede tapasī vuccate //*

(It does not seem that, in the sense of "religious austerity", *brahmaṃ* is actually attested in Pali literature; but Moggallāna's source here may well have been, as elsewhere, the *Amarakośa*. Thus *Amarakośa* III, 3, 114 [in the Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press edition with the commentary *Vyākhyānsudhā* by Bhānuji Dikṣita, Bombay, 1944]: *vedās tattvaṃ tapo brahma brahmā vipraḥ Prajāpatiḥ.*)

104. T. W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, London, 1899 (reprint: 1956) [Sacred Books of the Buddhists II] p. 298.
105. See pp. 8-9 above.
106. M. & W. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
107. *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, p. 151 and n. 2.
108. *Ibid.*, pp. 149-151.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 88 and n. 7; p. 150 and n. 1. See also Gonda, *op. cit.*, p. 52 and p. 83, n. 13.
110. See n. 103 above.
111. For details concerning the following, see *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, Chapter II. Also: "On the Brahman in Buddhist Literature", in *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* (Tirupati) XVIII (1975), pp. 1 ff. (P. 5, read: ...for attaining the *brahman* is, in fact, becoming it: *brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti*.²⁴ The highest goal is said to be the 'attainment of *brahman*' [*brahmapatti*]²⁵.)
112. See pp. 8-9 above.
113. See p. 10 above.
114. It should be clearly borne in mind that these expressions are not to be taken literally. There is no one who becomes the *brahman* (*brahmabhūta*; or whose self becomes the *brahman*: *brahmabhūtena attanā viharati*), no one who attains the *brahman* (*brahmapatta*), no way that leads to the *brahman* (*brahmapatha*)....But these expressions are employed in view of the state of ignorance in which we are,—a state where we take ourselves for this and that individual.

"Attaining the *brahman*" or "becoming the *brahman*" (the two expressions mean the same thing, as we have seen) is being what we really are, the Being itself; and this happens when the false idea of individuality is extinct and, in consequence, all passions are calmed,—when there is no *ātman*, if by this term is understood the empirical individuality (cf. the verse of the *Śāntiparvan*, and the passage of the Pali Canon, quoted p. 2 above).

115. *L'Ātman-Brahman...*, pp. 101-103.
116. See also "*Diṭṭhaṃ, Sutaṃ, Mutaṃ, Viññātaṃ*", in *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula* (London, 1980), pp. 10 ff.