

# RelBib

Bibliography of the Study of Religion

<https://relbib.de>

Dear reader,

This is a self-archived version of the following review:

---

Author: Freiburger, Oliver

Title: "Bronkhorst, Johannes: Buddhism in the shadow of Brahmanism"

Published in: The journal of Asian studies: JAS.  
Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press

Volume: 71 (1)

Year: 2012

Pages: 281 - 283

ISSN: 0021-9118

Persistent Identifier: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911811002798>

---

The article is used with permission of [Cambridge University Press](#).

Thank you for supporting Green Open Access.

Your RelBib team

EBERHARD KARLS  
UNIVERSITÄT  
TÜBINGEN



UNIVERSITÄTSBIBLIOTHEK

## SOUTH ASIA

*Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism.* By JOHANNES BRONKHORST. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011. viii, 293 pp. \$169.00 (cloth).  
doi:10.1017/S0021911811002798

This book, written by one of today's most prolific scholars of classical India, is a follow-up on his recent book, *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Early Culture of India* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), in which he, among other things, laid out the bold thesis that the concepts of rebirth and karmic retribution had been developed in non-Brāhmanical circles in north-east India before they were

incorporated into Brāhmanical thinking. After summarizing this thesis in the introductory first chapter, the present book turns to later periods to “study some of the ways in which Brahmanism did influence Buddhism” (p. 25).

The second chapter, entitled “Brahmanism,” analyzes the ways in which Brahmins increasingly regained a powerful status in society after the Maurya period. Instead of trying to revive Vedic society, this “new Brahmanism” sought patronage by offering a variety of (ritual) services to rulers, combined with a comprehensive vision of society that legitimated the rule of the latter. The chapter discusses various strategies in this endeavor. First, Johannes Bronkhorst convincingly shows that the spread of Sanskrit and the spread of Brahmins are inseparable and that respect for the status of Brahmins in society is not to be confused with conversion to Brahmanism as a religion. Rather, he describes the “new Brahmanism” as a socio-political ideology that is oriented towards rulers and that provides, at the same time, a special status for Brahmins. Brahmins “colonized the past” by creating, for example, a work of statecraft (the *Arthasāstra*) claiming that it had been composed by the (Brahmin) minister of the first great emperor, Candragupta Maurya. This, Bronkhorst argues, is an obvious attempt to justify and illustrate the envisioned role of Brahmins as counselors to the king who know how to govern an empire. Third, as an example of a “Brahmanization of borrowed features” (p. 74), he suggests that hermitages (*āśramas*) and land grants for Brahmins (*agrahāras*) were conflated, or at least closely linked, in Brāhmanical literature. This linkage created, in view of potential donors, an idealized vision of Brāhmanical settlements as places of religious effort and purity—modeled on Buddhist and Jain monasteries.

The third and longest chapter, “Buddhism Confronted with Brahmanism” discusses various effects that “new Brahmanism” had, in turn, on Buddhism. It argues that Buddhists ceded political counsel and ritual protection for kings to Brahmins, as well as the responsibility for providing a vision of society. One major reason for Buddhists to adopt Sanskrit was, according to Bronkhorst, the status it had gained as a court language; in order to defend their interests in legal and philosophical debates at court, Buddhists had to be able to converse in Sanskrit. (Why this conceivable necessity should have prompted some Buddhist traditions to write down their religious texts in Sanskrit, needs further discussion.) Bronkhorst shows that, by the middle of the first millennium, the “Brāhmanical order of society and its vision of political behavior—or at any rate a slightly watered-down version of these two—had become the norm” for Buddhists, too, illustrated by descriptions of the past in Buddhist narratives (p. 161). Whether this development was indeed closely related to the Buddhist adoption of Sanskrit remains debatable, as Bronkhorst’s key witness, Aśvaghōṣa, had an apologetic agenda and wrote for a Brāhmanical audience (see pages xix-li in *Life of the Buddha by Aśvaghōṣa*, translated by Patrick Olivelle [New York: New York University Press, 2008]).

Another area discussed is relic worship. Bronkhorst argues that in areas of South Asia where Brahmins had a powerful presence, their concepts of purity made Buddhists “hide” or replace the “impure” relics—a thesis that will probably cause debate. The book ends with a discussion on how finally Buddhists too

developed a vision of political rule (with the concept of the king as *bodhisattva*) and ritual skills to protect the state (with Tantric practices), both of which, however, could not compete anymore with the established Brāhmaṇical tradition. A number of subchapters in the book had been (or will be) published elsewhere, and some of those interesting studies have rather loose connections to its main theme. The book provides numerous discussions of particular matters, and the enormous range of references – to both primary and secondary sources—makes it a treasure trove for future investigations. For the general theme, two factors seem to deserve some more attention: the diversity and tensions within Brahmanism (consider, e.g., Brāhmaṇical asceticism) and its historical developments (e.g., the process of “Hinduization”). The ways in which we classify “Brahmanism” at any point in history—as a religion, an ideology, a socio-political program, a philosophy, and so on—determine the respective relation to “Buddhism,” whose tradition is equally complex. Aśvaghōṣa is a case in point. Was he a Buddhist? A Brahmin? Or perhaps both, somehow? The designations “Brāhmaṇical” and “Buddhist” were never static, and it is our task to sort out their multiple meanings and dimensions. This book provides rich food for thought for this enterprise.

OLIVER FREIBERGER  
*The University of Texas at Austin*  
 of@austin.utexas.edu