Annales du Musée Guimet, tome LIX[e], 1954.

45 *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch. 34, pp. 310*c*22-311*a*2: According to some, when the Bodhisattva reaches the foot of the Bodhi tree, he sits at that spot and obtains supreme and perfect enlightenment. At that moment, the Bodhisattva penetrates the True Nature of dharmas, and from then on there is no more earth (*pṛthivī*) which might support him. Why? The earth is illusion for beings and exists as a fruition (*vipāka*) resulting from former actions: that is why it is not able to support the Bodhisattva. When the Bodhisattva is on the point of realizing Saṃbodhi, he has as his body (*kāya*) the knowledge of the True Nature (*dharmatājñāna*), and from then on the place where he sits changes into Vajra.

According to others, the Earth (*pṛthivī*) rests in the Circle of Gold (*kāñcanamaya maṇḍala*); this Circle of Gold rests on the Vajra; from the upper end of the Vajra emerges a terrace (*prāsāda*) like a lotus flower (*padmapuṣpa*); just above, it supports the spot where the Bodhisattva is sitting and prevents him from sinking in. That is why the area of enlightenment (*bodhimaṇḍa*) where the Bodhisattva sits is called Vajra.

Finally, according to others, as soon as the Bodhisattva has realized Saṃbodhi, every place where the Bodhisattva takes up the four bodily attitudes (*īryapatha*) changes into diamond.

The second explanation is based on cosmological conceptions which have varied in the course of time: compare D II 107, and *Kośavyākhyā*, p. 15 with *Kośa* III 138-41 and *Kośabhāṣya*, pp. 157-8. Also see Hsüan-chuang, *Hsi yü chi*, T 2087, ch. 8, p. 915*b*15-18.

Carved representations of the outer Vajrāsana in A.K. Coomaraswamy, *La Sculpture de Bodhgayā*, Ars Asiatica XVIII, Paris, Editions d'Art et d'Histoire, 1935, pl. XLIV and XLV.

46 E. Waldschmidt, *MPS*, pp. 469-70; Idem, *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*, Göttingen, 1944-8, p. 224, n. 37.

47 *MPS*, p. 398.

48 The grandiose cosmic system which multiplies to infinity the great chiliocosms is not unknown to the early Scriptures (cf. A I 227), but is only fully exploited in the Mahāyānasūtras.

49 Many are the Sūtras identifying the *paṭiccasamuppāda* with the *dhamma*, *dhammatā* and *tathatā*: cf. W. Rāhula, 'Wrong Notions of Dhammatā (Dharmatā)', in L. Cousins (et al.), *Buddhist studies in honour of I. B. Horner*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1974, pp. 187-8.

50 *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch. 23, p. 235*a*4-7. Cf. the definitions of the 'True Nature of all dharmas' in the *Pañcaviṃśati*, T 223, ch. 2, p. 231*b*13-14; ch. 3, p. 234*c*12; ch. 4, p. 244*a*1-2; ch. 6, p. 257*b*13-14; ch. 23, p. 392*a*19-24; ch. 27, p. 416*c*8-11.

51 *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch. 34, p. 313*a*11-13. This definition starts with a reproduction of the famous kārikā by Nāgārjuna:

anirodham anutpādam anucchedam aśāśvatam/
anekārtham anānārtham anāgamam anirgamam//

52 These ideas are developed in *Traité* II 1060.

DEVAS AND ADHIDEVAS IN BUDDHISM

In a paper published in the Waldschmidt Festschrift[1] I have examined the text of what is said to be one of the only two suttas in the Pali canon in which the Buddha is specifically asked about the existence of the devas.[2] In that examination of the *Saṅgārava-sutta* (= M II 209-13)[3] I have shown (I hope convincingly) that the existing editions and translations of the sutta are not satisfactory, with the result that the answer which the Buddha gave to his questioner has been misunderstood.

In the present paper I wish to examine the second of the two suttas, the *Kaṇṇakatthala-sutta* (= M II 125-33), since I believe that this too has been misunderstood. In this sutta Pasenadi, the king of Kosala, comes to the Buddha and asks him a series of questions. He asks first about omniscience, and then about the four castes. The Buddha answers his questions. Pasenadi then asks: *kim pana, bhante, atthi devā*. 'But, sir, do devas exist?' Instead of replying immediately, the Buddha repeats the question: *kim pana tvaṃ, mahārāja, evaṃ vadesi 'kim pana, bhante, atthi devā'*. 'But why, great king, do you ask this question?'

It seems that Pasenadi takes this counter-question as meaning, 'Why do you ask? The question is unnecessary,' for he then continues with his questioning. Buddhaghosa, when commenting upon this passage, places this interpretation upon the Buddha's reply and states: *kiṃ, mahārāja, kin tvaṃ 'santi devā Cātummahārājikā, santi devā Tāvatiṃsā . . . pe . . . santi devā Paranimmitavasavattino, santi devā tatuttariṃ' evaṃ devānaṃ atthibhāvaṃ na jānāsi yena evaṃ vadesi* (Ps III 359,22 foll.). 'Are you unaware of the existence of such devas as the Cātummahārājika devas and the Tāvatiṃsa devas, that you ask this question?'

Pasenadi then continues: *yadi vā te, bhante, devā āgantāro itthattaṃ, yadi vā anāgantāro itthattaṃ*. 'Will those devas return to this earthly state, or will they not?' That is to say: 'Will those devas come back to existence as men, or are they non-returners?' It seems to me that Pasenadi's question reveals some knowledge of the Buddha's teaching, or at least something very similar to it. We find, for example, the Buddha saying: *ime vā pana bhonto*

sattā kāya-sucaritena samannāgatā vacī-sucaritena samannāgatā mano-sucaritena samannāgatā . . . te kāyassa bhedā parammaraṇā sugatiṃ saggaṃ lokaṃ upapannā (It 99–100). 'Beings who do well in deed, word, and thought are after death reborn in the heavenly world [i.e. as devas]'. The Buddha also taught that those who entered upon the stream went through the course of being once-returners (*sakad-āgāmino*), non-returners (*anāgāmino*), and arahants. I suggest that Pasenadi's use of the word *anāgantāro* (an agent noun in *-tṛ* being used as a periphrastic future) is a definite reflection of the technical term *anāgāmin*, a non-returner who will be reborn only once more (in the Brahma-loka) before entering nibbāna. Pasenadi is therefore saying, in effect, 'Some beings are reborn as devas, because of the good kamma they have performed in a previous existence. Are such devas, who have taken the first step on the way upwards, irreversibly on their way to nibbāna?'

The Buddha's answer to this question is unambiguous: *ye te, mahārāja, devā savyāpajjhā te devā āgantāro itthattaṃ; ye te devā avyāpajjhā, te devā anāgantāro itthattaṃ*. 'Those devas who are malevolent will return to this earthly state; those who are not will not return'. That is to say: 'The devas, like other beings, are subject to the working of kamma. If they do bad deeds in their lives as devas, they will descend to a lower gati and be reborn as men. If they do not do bad deeds, they will not be reborn as men'.

Pasenadi's son Viḍūḍabha then asks: *ye te, bhante, devā savyāpajjhā āgantāro itthattaṃ, te devā ye te devā avyāpajjhā anāgantāro itthattaṃ te deve tamhā ṭhānā cāvessanti vā pabbājessanti vā*. 'Can those devas who are malevolent, and will return to this earthly state, drive away or banish from heaven those devas who have not been malevolent and will not return?' That is to say: 'Can the bad devas who will be reborn as men[4] do anything to impede the progress of the good devas?' Just as Viḍūḍabha has asked on behalf of Pasenadi, so Ānanda replies on behalf of the Buddha. He asks Viḍūḍabha: *yāvatā rañño Pasenadissa Kosalassa vijitaṃ, yattha ca rājā Pasenadi Kosalo issariyādhipaccaṃ kāreti, pahoti tattha rājā Pasenadi Kosalo samaṇaṃ vā brāhmaṇaṃ vā puññavantaṃ vā apuññavantaṃ vā . . . tamhā ṭhānā cāvetuṃ vā pabbājetuṃ vā*. 'Can the king banish from his kingdom, as far as his rule extends, anyone

he wishes, good or bad?' Viḍūḍabha replies that the king is so able.

Ānanda then asks if the king can do this outside his kingdom, and Viḍūḍabha states that he cannot. Ānanda then asks: *pahoti rājā Pasenadi Kosalo deve Tāvatiṃse tamhā ṭhānā cāvetuṃ vā pabbājetuṃ vā*. 'Can the king banish the Tāvatiṃsa devas from their heaven?' Viḍūḍabha replies: *dassanāya pi, bho, rājā Pasenadi Kosalo deve Tāvatiṃse na ppahoti, kuto pana tamhā ṭhānā cāvetuṃ vā pabbājetuṃ vā*. 'The king cannot even see the Tāvatiṃsa devas, much less banish them from their heaven'. Ānanda says: *evam eva kho, senāpati, ye te devā savyāpajjhā āgantāro itthattaṃ, te devā ye te devā avyāpajjhā anāgantāro itthattaṃ te deve dassanāya pi na ppahonti, kuto pana tamhā ṭhānā cāvessanti vā pabbājessanti vā*. 'The malevolent gods who will return to this earthly state cannot even see the gods who are not malevolent, much less banish them from their heaven'.

Pasenadi is delighted with this reply, although Marasinghe in his analysis of the *Kaṇṇakatthala-sutta*[5] thinks that the Buddha and Ānanda are at cross-purposes with Pasenadi and Viḍūḍabha, and he consequently makes no attempt to explain the reasons for Viḍūḍabha's strange question and Ānanda's equally strange reply.

Pasenadi then asks: *kim pana, bhante, atthi Brahmā*. 'Does Brahmā exist?' As before, the Buddha merely repeats the question, whereupon Pasenadi continues with the same query which he had about the devas: *yadi vā so, bhante, Brahmā āgantā itthattaṃ, yadi vā anāgantā itthattaṃ*. 'Will Brahmā return to this earthly state or not?' Again I would suggest that such a question was based upon some knowledge of the Buddha's teaching, or something very like it: 'Can someone who has reached the last stage before nibbāna by being reborn in the Brahma-loka as Brahmā himself, still be reborn as a man?' The Buddha gives the same answer as before: 'If Brahmā is not malevolent (*avyāpajjho*), he will not be reborn as a man'. We may assume that he is probably making a distinction between one who is on his way to arahantship, and one who, although not a follower of the Buddha, is nevertheless reborn in the Brahma-loka because of great merit acquired in previous births.[6]

The discussion is then interrupted, when a servant enters to say

that the king's carriage is ready for his departure. Just as Pasenadi is leaving he thanks the Buddha for having answered his questions. He says: *sabbaññutaṃ mayaṃ, bhante, Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā; sabbaññutaṃ Bhagavā vyākāsi . . . cātuvaṇṇiṃ suddhiṃ mayaṃ, bhante, Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā; cātuvaṇṇiṃ suddhiṃ Bhagavā vyākāsi.* 'We asked the Buddha about omniscience, and the Buddha answered us about omniscience . . . we asked about the purity of the four castes, and the Buddha answered us about the purity of the four castes'. The syntax of his speech then seems to change, and he says: *adhideve mayaṃ, bhante, Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā; adhideve Bhagavā vyākāsi. adhibrahmānaṃ mayaṃ, bhante, Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā; adhibrahmānaṃ Bhagavā vyākāsi.* 'We asked the Buddha in respect of devas, and he answered us in respect of devas. We asked the Buddha in respect of Brahmā, and he answered us in respect of Brahmā'. The syntax then reverts to the earlier pattern: *yaṃ yad eva ca pana mayaṃ, bhante, Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā, taṃ tad eva Bhagavā vyākāsi.* 'Whatever we asked the Buddha, that he answered us'.

I say, 'The syntax of his speech then seems to change'. This is to adopt the explanation of the words *adhideve* and *adhibrahmānaṃ* given in CPD.[7] Although PED lists them (with this reference) s.v. *adhideva* with the meaning 'a superior or supreme god, above the gods', and s.v. *adhibrahmā* with the meaning 'a superior Brahmā, higher than Brahmā', CPD explains both *adhideve* and *adhibrahmānaṃ* as indeclinables made up of two elements: the preposition *adhi* followed by an accusative plural or locative singular *deve*, and an accusative singular *brahmānaṃ* (although s.v. *adhi* CPD states that both are accusative). One hesitates to differ from Helmer Smith and Dines Andersen, who were probably the finest Pali scholars that Europe has produced, and yet one would be very surprised to find a construction like *adhi deve apucchimhā* in any Pali context. To find it after two occurrences of the usual construction of the root *pucch-* with two accusatives, one of the person asked and one of the question asked, and before another occurrence of the same construction, seems to me to be so unlikely that we can disregard it as a possibility. The natural way of taking *adhideve Bhagavantaṃ apucchimhā* in this context is to translate it as: 'We asked the Buddha about adhidevas'.

It may be that the editors of CPD did not accept this obvious translation because they did not believe that the word *adhideva* was likely to occur in a canonical text with the meaning 'superior deva'. Where the word occurs again in the canon at Sn 1148, they suggest the same interpretation of *adhi* + *deve*, although the canonical cty on the final vagga of Sn (i.e. the *Culla-niddesa*) takes *adhideva* in the sense of 'superior deva'.[8] The aṭṭhakathā explains: *adhideve abhiññāyā ti adhidevakare dhamme ñatvā* (Pj II 607,8 = Nidd-a II 94,31), and strangely enough CPD translates *adhidevakara* as 'leading to the position of a super-god'. It is possible that this seeming inconsistency may be the result of a conscious attempt to see a difference between the commentarial and non-commentarial meanings.

It is possible that Smith and Andersen were thinking of the Skt adverbial phrases *adhidevam* (quoted without reference by Monier-Williams),[9] and *adhidevatam* (quoted from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,[10] where it occurs in the context *ity adhidevatam*, which Eggeling translates[11] as 'thus as regards the deities').[12] Both of these phrases, however, are examples of *adhi* + an accusative singular, and if the Pali words were really archaisms of this type then we should have expected *adhidevaṃ* as well as *adhibrahmānaṃ*.

Possibly the editors of CPD had in mind a type of tmesis like that found in the Vedas.[13] A few examples of the separation of the prefix from the verb *are* found in Pali,[14] and also in Ardha-Māgadhī;[15] there is even one example quoted from BHS.[16] Clearly it would be possible to take *adhi deve apucchimhā* as standing for *deve adhi-apucchimhā*, although the verb *adhi-pucch-* does not seem to occur elsewhere in Pali, nor *adhi-pṛcch-* in Skt. To adopt the same explanation for Sn 1148, however, where we find *adhideve abhiññāya*, creates difficulties, since *deve adhi-abhi-ñāya* would seem to be unlikely.

Since, however, the word *adhideva* is old in Skt, occurring first in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VII.30),[17] and since I have shown in my examination of the *Saṅgārava-sutta* that it not only occurs in a Pali canonical text, but actually in the same text that we are now discussing and moreover in the nominative plural form *adhidevā*, where any idea of *deve* being governed by *adhi* can be ruled out, I hope that it will be agreed that the editors

of Vol. I of CPD were being unnecessarily cautious in adopting the interpretation they did.

If, then, it is accepted that Pasenadi was indeed thanking the Buddha for having answered about adhidevas, then we can without difficulty reconstruct the original question which Pasenadi asked. He must have said: *atthi adhidevā*. 'Do adhidevas exist?' The corruption which led to the text developing into the form which we have today was therefore identical with that which I have shown occurred in the *Saṅgārava-sutta*, i.e. the loss of *adhi-* after the word *atthi*. The same applies to the question: *atthi adhibrahmā*. 'Does an adhibrahmā exist?'

If it is accepted that these two emendations to the text are correct, then we have to try to understand what the words *adhideva* and *adhibrahmā* mean, and why Pasenadi asked questions about them. We can get some help about their meanings from the grammatical texts. We find in the *Saddanīti: atireko devo atidevo, evaṃ adhidevo* (Sadd 752,28), and in the *Payogasiddhi: adhiko devo atidevo, evaṃ adhidevo*. 'A deva who is superior is an atideva; similarly adhideva'. We have information about *atideva* in an earlier text, for in his cty on Dhs Buddhaghosa, when explaining the meaning of the prefix *abhi-* in the word *abhidhamma*, states that it has the same meaning as the prefix *ati-*. He says: *yo āyu-vaṇṇa-issariya-yasa-sampatti-ādīhi atirekataro c'eva visesavantataro ca devo atidevo ti vuccati; tathārūpo Brahmā pi ati-Brahmā ti vuccati* (As 2,24-27). 'The deva who is specially distinguished and surpasses others in age, beauty, dominion, pomp, and other attainments is called atideva "the peerless deva"; similarly Brahmā is called ati-Brahmā "the peerless Brahmā."'[18] Or as Taylor translates it: 'The king who exceeds and is distinguished from his fellows in long life, beauty, and dominion, is called the "pre-eminent" king, and a superior Brahmā is called an ati-Brahmā'.[19]

The word *atideva* is used in the Pali canon. In the *Theragāthā* we find it used of the Buddha himself (Th 489). In the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* it is used of an arahant who is spoken of as *atidevapatto* (S I 141,18*). This is glossed as: *atidevabhāvaṃ patto* (Spk I 207,11), and translated as 'a man who past the gods hath won his way'.[20] In the *Culla-niddesa* it is also used of the Buddha: *Bhagavā sammuti-devānaṃ ca upapatti-devānaṃ ca visuddhi-devānaṃ ca*

devo ca atideva ca devātidevo ca (Nidd II 173,16-18). 'The Buddha is the deva and the atideva and the atideva of devas of the devas by convention and the devas by rebirth and the devas by purity'.

Outside the canon the word *atideva* is used in Mil of a king, in the list of titles which will be his as a result of his outstanding *dāna: so rājā . . . rājūnaṃ atirājā bhaveyya, devānaṃ atidevo bhaveyya* (Mil 277,9). 'That king would be the pre-eminent king of kings, the pre-eminent deva of devas'. The list continues: *Brahmānaṃ ati-Brahmā bhaveyya.* 'He would be the pre-eminent Brahmā of Brahmās'. The gloss about the arahant quoted above from Spk I 207 continues: *Brahmānaṃ ati-Brahmabhāvaṃ patto.* 'Arrived at the status of ati-Brahmā of Brahmās'. Similarly in Vism Buddhaghosa uses the word *ati-Brahmā* of the Buddha: [Bhagavā] . . . *devadevo Sakkānaṃ ati-Sakko Brahmānaṃ ati-Brahmā* (Vism 2,7-8). 'The deva of devas, the ati-Sakka of Sakkas, the ati-Brahmā of Brahmās'.[21] In a stock phrase describing the Tathāgata found several times in the cties, we again see the word *ati-Brahmā:* [*Tathāgato*]. . . *atulo appameyyo anuttaro rājarājā devadevo Sakkānaṃ ati-Sakko Brahmānaṃ ati-Brahmā* (Ps I 51,15 = Mp I 111,4 = Ud-a 132,3). 'The Tathāgata is unweighable, immeasurable, incomparable, king of kings, deva of devas, ati-Sakka of Sakkas, ati-Brahmā of Brahmās'.

If *atideva* can be used of the Buddha, or a Tathāgata, or an arahant, or a generous king, as in these quotations, and if *adhideva* means the same as *atideva*, then we may not be far wrong in thinking that *adhideva* may also be used of the Buddha. We find some support for this view when we consider that the Buddha's knowledge and insight are referred to as *adhideva-ñāṇa-dassana* (A IV 304,23). Although CPD translates this as: 'A knowledge comprehending even all that concerns the gods (adopting the same interpretation of *adhideva* as mentioned above), and Hare translates: 'Knowledge and vision of the higher devas',[22] it makes better sense to take it as 'the knowledge and insight of an adhideva', i.e. a Buddha. Similarly, if *adhi-Brahmā* is the equivalent of *ati-Brahmā*, then we are probably justified in thinking that *adhi-Brahmā* can also be used of the Buddha.

What light does this throw on the *Kaṇṇakatthala-sutta*? I said

above that Pasenadi's questions about the possibility that devas and Brahmā might be reborn as men seemed to be based upon some sort of knowledge of the Buddha's teaching, or something very similar to it. Now that we can see that his questions were actually about adhidevas and adhi-Brahmā we can be even more certain that they were based upon some partially misunderstood Buddhist teaching. If he had heard something of the descriptions of the Buddha as *atideva* and *ati-Brahmā*, which are quoted above, or heard the Buddha's reply to Saṅgārava that he knew that adhidevas existed, then it is not unreasonable that he should ask the Buddha about this. I say 'partially-misunderstood', because there is no hint in his questions that he understood that the terms applied to the Buddha.

Moreover, this enables us to suggest a solution to one problem in the discussion. It seems very likely to me that the Buddha repeated Pasenadi's question, which (as we have reconstructed it) was 'Do adhidevas exist?', simply because he was not certain what Pasenadi was getting at. After all, he was (probably unconsciously, but in effect) saying, 'Do you and other Buddhas exist?' As soon as Pasenadi took the Buddha's counter-question as a signal to continue, and went on to ask about heavenly adhidevas, then it was clear that he was not asking about Buddhas but about superior devas of the heavenly type.

Once we see that Pasenadi's original question was about the existence or otherwise of adhidevas, not devas, then the form which the subsequent questions took becomes more intelligible. The Buddha, for the reason just given, repeats Pasenadi's question. Pasenadi takes this to mean: 'Why do you ask? Of course they exist'. He then asks: 'Are they, because of their pre-eminent deva nature, assured of rebirth as devas or better, or is there a chance that they will be reborn as men?' The Buddha replies that if they have performed bad deeds they will fall from their position as adhidevas.

Pasenadi's son then asks about the superior nature of the adhidevas in a different way. 'Does their superior nature mean that they have power over other devas? If they are malevolent and desire to hurt other devas, can they expel them from the deva-world?' Ānanda answers the question by making use of the different meanings of the word *deva*, which is reminiscent of the

way in which the Buddha answered Saṅgārava's question in the *Saṅgārava-sutta*. Since the devas by convention (*sammuti-devā*) are defined as: *rājāno ca rājakumārā ca deviyo ca,*[23] 'kings and princes and queens', then it follows that Pasenadi himself is a deva, and since he is king of Kosala with subordinate kings beneath him he is by implication (although this is not actually stated) a pre-eminent king (*adhideva*). Does he have power as a deva, in his own kingdom, to expel both the good and the bad? Yes. Does he have power outside his kingdom? No. Does he, as a deva by convention (*sammuti*) have power over the Tāvatiṃsa devas by rebirth (*upapatti*)? No, certainly not. He cannot even see them. Ānanda states that, in exactly the same way, adhidevas who are malevolent have no power over other devas; they cannot even see them.

If our reconstruction of the text is correct, Pasenadi then goes on to ask about the existence of adhi-Brahmā. Once more the Buddha hesitates, presumably wondering whether the question refers to himself. Again Pasenadi makes it clear that he is referring to a heavenly Brahmā, and he asks whether the superior nature of an adhi-Brahmā will safeguard him from rebirth as a man. As before, the Buddha replies that it will depend upon his kamma. The announcement that the king's carriage is ready is made before Pasenadi can ask about the power which an adhi-Brahmā has over other Brahmās.

My reconstruction of the dialogue in the *Saṅgārava-sutta* was aided by the existence of the v.l. *adhidevā* for *atthi devā* in the text of the sutta, which gave a hint as to the way in which the passage was to be emended. There were also glosses in the cty which were consistent with such a reading,[24] and helped to confirm the correctness of my suggestion.

In the case of the *Kaṇṇakatthala-sutta*, however, no manuscript tradition of either the sutta or the cty retains any trace of the original forms of the questions *atthi adhidevā* and *atthi adhi-Brahmā*. The absence of any hint from the cty strongly suggests that the corruption of the text had taken place before Buddhaghosa's time, and in fact long enough before his time for there to be no trace of the correct reading in the Sinhalese aṭṭhakathās upon which Buddhaghosa based his cty. We are, however, able to reconstruct the text of the sutta because of the existence of

the words *adhideve* and *adhi-Brahmānaṃ* in Pasenadi's speech of thanks to the Buddha.

From the questions and answers in the *Saṅgārava-sutta*, I concluded that the Buddha conceded that there were on the earth princes who were by convention called devas (*sammuti-devā*), but there were others, Buddhas like himself, who were superior (*adhidevā*) to these.[25] From the questions and answers in the *Kaṇṇakatthala-sutta*, I conclude that the Buddha conceded that there were adhidevas of the rebirth type (*upapatti-devā*), but he refuted (or rather Ānanda speaking on his behalf refuted) that their pre-eminent nature was of any importance.

In these two suttas, therefore, the Buddha conceded the existence of devas and adhidevas of the convention and rebirth types, but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that when the Buddha spoke of adhidevas he was referring to pre-eminent devas of the purity type (*visuddhi-devā*), i.e. Buddhas like himself.

CAMBRIDGE K. R. NORMAN

Notes

1 K.R. Norman, 'The Buddha's view of devas', *Beiträge zur Indienforschung: Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin, 1977, pp.329–36.
2 See M.M.J. Marasinghe, *Gods in early Buddhism*, Vidyalankara, 1974, p.124.
3 Abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts follow the system laid down in CPD. References are to PTS editions unless otherwise stated.
4 Marasinghe, *op.cit.*, p. 135, seems to assume that this happens after the malevolent devas have been reborn as men. This can hardly be correct, as Richard Gombrich points out in his review of Marasinghe's book (*Journal of Asian Studies*, 36/1, November 1976, pp. 175–76).
5 Marasinghe, *op.cit.*, p. 126.
6 An *anāgāmin* is born in the Brahma-loka, but one born in the Brahma-loka is not necessarily an *anāgāmin*. See *DPPN* II 336, s.v. *Brahma-loka*.
7 See *CPD* Vol. I, s.vv. *adhi-deve* and *adhi-Brahmānaṃ*.
8 *Bhagavā sammutideve adhidevā ti abhiññāya, upapattideve adhidevā ti abhiññāya, visuddhideve adhidevā ti abhiññaya . . . adhideve abhiññāya. Bhagavā attano ca paresaṃ ca adhidevakare dhamme vedi . . . katame attano adhidevakarā dhammā? sammāpaṭipadā . . . ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo. ime vuccanti attano adhidevakarā dhammā. katame paresaṃ adhidevakarā dhammā? sammāpaṭipadā . . . maggo. ime vuccanti paresaṃ adhidevakarā dhammā* (Nidd II [Ne] 238,27–239,12).
9 Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899, s.v. *adhidevam*.
10 Śat. Br. 6,5,3,3 etc.
11 J. Eggeling, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* III (= SBE XLI), Oxford, 1894, p. 239.
12 Sāyana glosses: *devatā adhikṛtya*.
13 A.A. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, Strassburg, 1910, p. 415.
14 See R. Morris, *The Buddhavaṃsa and the Cariyā-piṭaka*, London PTS, 1882, p. xvi and *CPD* Vol. I, s.v. *ajjha*.
15 See A.N. Upadhye, 'Syntactic position of a preposition in Ardhamāgadhī', *IHQ* 9, 1933, pp. 987–88.
16 *na tāvad ut te lekhā laṅghayitavyā*, 'you must not cross over the line' (for *ul-laṅghayitavyā*), Av-ś I 223,11 (quoted *BHSG* §23.16).
17 See O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, s.v. *adhideva*.
18 Pe Maung Tin and Mrs Rhys Davids, *The Expositor*, Vol. I, London PTS, 1920, p. 4.
19 Arnold C. Taylor, 'Buddhist Abhidhamma', *JRAS* 1894, pp.560–61.
20 Mrs Rhys Davids, *Kindred Sayings*, Vol. I, London PTS, 1917, p. 178.
21 Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, London PTS, 1923, p. 2.
22 E.M. Hare, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. IV, London PTS, 1935, p. 202.
23 Nidd II 173,3–5.
24 Norman, *op.cit.*, pp. 332–34.
25 *ibid.*, p. 336.