GEORGE GRIMM

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BUDDHA

THE RELIGION OF REASON AND MEDITATION

AKADEMIE-VERLAG · BERLIN

GEORGE GRIMM

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BUDDHA
THE RELIGION OF REASON AND MEDITATION

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BUDDHA

THE RELIGION OF REASON AND MEDITATION

BY
GEORGE GRIMM

EDITED BY
M. KELLER-GRIMM AND MAX HOPPE
2ND REVISED EDITION
2ND TO 4TH THOUSAND

"Among beings there are some whose eyes are not quite covered with dust: they will perceive the truth".

AKADEMIE-VERLAG · BERLIN
1958

Original title:
Die Lehre des Buddho, die Religion der Vernunft
und der Meditation
Translated by Bhikkhu Sīlācāra

Published by the Akademie-Verlag GmbH., Berlin W 8, Mohrenstraße 39
License No. 202. 100/437/58
Printed and bound by Druckhaus „Maxim Gorki", Altenburg
Order and Publisher's Number: 5309
Printed in Germany

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The present main work appeared in German language in fourteen impressions during the author's lifetime. The fourteenth impression was translated into English by Bhikkhu Sīlācāra* in 1926. As appendix were added "The Doctrine of the Buddha as the Flower of Indian Thought," "The Metaphysics of the Buddha" and "Right Cognition." In the meantime also the fifteenth and sixteenth thousand have appeared in the German impression. The author finds the connecting bridge to true Indian spirit as is once more expressed in a most excellent manner in the appendix in the chapter "The Doctrine of the Buddha as the Flower of Indian Thought." This most comprehensive spirit already during the lifetime of Dr. George Grimm enabled a community of faithful followers to gather round him. After his decease on 26th August 1945 at Utting am Ammersee—he was born on 25th February 1868 at Rollhofen near Lauf an der Pegnitz in Middle Franconia – this community grew to considerable numbers; but his friends and admirers extend far beyond this narrower circle (cf. biographical notes at the end of the book). For this reason a second English edition has become necessary, which is herewith presented.

Besides his other literary activities, George Grimm had long been preparing a further new edition of his chief work, *The Doctrine of the Buddha, the Religion of Reason*. The unfavourable times after 1933 prevented the fulfilment of this plan during his lifetime. A new and detailed introduction to this enlarged work that was enriched by much profound knowledge existed in two versions. The later version was selected which, from the author's mature mind in the last years of his life, selects the most appropriate words for the spirit of the teaching. Such spirit is always guided by the words of the Buddha and speaks from the work. The following chapters were almost entirely rewritten: "Sankhārā," "Concentration," and "Contemplative Visions, the Steep Ascent to Nibbāna;" additional chapters were: "Taking the Refuge with the Three Jewels," and "The Reach in the Doctrine of the Buddha of Atakkāvacara, the Idea of Not-Within-The-Realm-Of-Logical-Thought." In accordance with one of George Grimm's

* Bhikkhu Sīlācāra, known as Buddhist author and translator of the Pāli-Canon, died eighty years old on 27th January 1951.

last wishes, the title of the work was lengthened to *The Doctrine of the Buddha, the Religion of Reason and Meditation.*

Here it is appropriate to refer to a few passages from the most recent publications of well known authors, from which the *fundamental idea* of the teaching also clearly emerges, since the words of the Buddha, taken as they are given, simply *call for* this interpretation. Only a few pregnant passages are reproduced here, for these references are naturally by no means exhaustive, and indeed cannot possibly be within these narrow limits. Above all, the remarks of the Indianist, *Erich Frauwallner,* in his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (History of Indian Philosophy), Vol. I, (Otto Müller Verlag Salzburg, 1953) are worthy of note: "... The statement has already been made that Buddhism denies the existence of a soul, and that therefore salvation, extinction (Sanskrit: *nirvānam*, Pāli: *nibbānam*), is an ending in nothing. And such a statement has provoked lively discussions and a whole field of literature ... In my view, things would never have seemed so difficult if, from the very beginning, it had been considered on the basis of the old canonical texts. If one had not at first become acquainted with the fantastically embellished legends of a later period, one would hardly have thought, as previously happened, of doubting the historicity of the person of the Buddha, and of seeing a myth of nature in the accounts of his life. In the same way, the question how primitive Buddhism viewed the problem of the soul and of the true nature of salvation would from the very beginning have appeared in a different light, if one had not first become acquainted with late Mahāyāna texts, for the understanding of which there lacked at that time every assumption, and which were bound almost of necessity to lead to misinterpretations. But after these had been arrived at, it was difficult to alter prejudices once formed." Thus Frauwallner also describes it as "a crude and untenable anachronism" when doctrines of later dogmatics, in particular the Dharma doctrine, are already ascribed to the Buddha, above all by Russian scholars.

Frauwallner cleverly brings us nearer to the ancient Indian spirit from which the teaching originated when he states: "And how is it with regard to the question of salvation? Attempts were made in the first place to read the answer to this question from the word with which Buddhism describes salvation, namely from the word extinction (*nirvānam, P. nibbānam*). This word signifies the extinction of a flame, and salvation is expressly compared to such an extinction. It was then said that just as a flame disappears with extinction and no longer exists, so too is the released one brought to nought with redemption. But this train of thought rests on absolutely false assumptions, and makes the serious mistake of introducing strange and unfamiliar notions into the Indian world of thought. As we have seen already in the section on epic philosophy in the discussion between Bhṛgu and Bharadvāja, the kindling and extinction of a flame do not mean for the Indian of antiquity an arising and passing away, but the fire already existing becomes visible and again invisible thereby, and this is the reason why that description is used for the fate of the soul after death.

In this respect, the statement of the text is perfectly plain and unambiguous, where it says: 'The soul (jīvah) that has entered the body perishes not when the body perishes, but it is like a fire after the firewood is burnt away. Just as the fire is no longer perceivable when no more firewood is added to it, but is, on account of its entering the ether, without fixed abode and therefore difficult to grasp, so does the soul, when it has quitted the body, find itself in a state resembling the ether, but is not perceived because of its fineness; of this there can be no doubt.' Thus with extinction the fire does not pass away, but merely becomes inconceivable. And the same conception underlies the Buddha's comparison of salvation with the extinction of a fire. Just as the path of the extinguished fire cannot be known, as he says, for example, in a passage, so is it not possible to indicate the path of the completely redeemed who have penetrated beyond the fetters and flood of desires, and have attained eternal and unchangeable bliss. This one passage here can suffice ... Moreover, there are other statements and modes of expression which clearly show that extinction was not understood to be annihilation. One speaks of a sphere of extinction (*nirvāṇadhātuh*) into which the redeemed one enters, of a city of extinction *nirvāṇapuram*). And it is just as unambiguous when the Buddha speaks in the following way of that abode of extinction: 'There is, monks, an unborn, an unoriginated, an unmade, an unformed. If there were not, monks, this unborn, unoriginated, unmade, and unformed, there would be no way out for the born, the originated, the made, and the formed'. Thus the attempt to read from the expression of extinction (*nirvāṇam*) the concept of annihilation ultimately rests on a misunderstanding" (see 225—227)*.

A few statements still merit our special attention. Thus: "The ordinary man can easily be led astray into regarding his earthly personality as his true self (*ātmā*, *P. attā*). This leads him to attach a particular value to this self and to everything connected therewith. In this way craving and thirst awake. He clings to it, he grasps it (*upādānam*), as Buddhism says, and thus creates conditions which fetter him to this existence, and lead him from rebirth to rebirth to a new becoming (*bhavaḥ*). If, on the other hand, he recognizes that all this is not his true self, and in reality does not touch him, then craving is extinguished, he turns away from everything earthly, the fetters binding him to existence are broken, and he attains salvation.

These conceptions are ultimately connected with views with which we are already familiar from the philosophy of the Upanishads. There knowledge of the Ātmā, of the Self, and hence of the true I or self, is regarded as decisive for obtaining salvation. For the man who recognizes this true self, will turn away from everything else, and thus become detached from everything earthly. Thus as Yajñavalkya strikingly states in his last discourse with his spouse Maitreyi, it is only the I, the ego, the Ātmā, which endows all things with value, and there-

* Cf. George Grimm „Die Botschaft des Buddha, der Schlüssel zur Unsterblichkeit (The Message of the Buddha, the Key to Immortality)", Baum-Verlag, Pfullingen, Württemberg (Germany).

fore for it only right aspiration has to be considered. What is different from it is sorrowful (*tato 'nyad ārtam*). In both cases, we come across the same ideas, only in Buddhism they are differently expressed and, so to speak negatively formulated. Here it does not say that we should know the true self, but that we must not regard as the self (*ātmā, P. attā*) that which is not the self. For otherwise craving clings to this false self, and thus brings about an entanglement in the cycle of beings. And salvation takes place not through our becoming conscious of the true self, but through our recognizing as not-self (*anatmā, P. anattā*) all that is falsely regarded as the self, and so detaching desire therefrom." (See 192—193).

"Further, ancient Buddhist tradition reports that the Buddha addressed, shortly after the Sermon of Benares, a second discourse to his first five followers which is also preserved and is called the discourse of the characteristics of the not-self. In it he first of all broadly explains that the five groups of grasping* are not to be considered as the self. He then puts to his disciples the question: 'What think you, monks, is corporeality changeable or unchangeable?' 'Changeable, Lord' is the reply. 'But that which is changeable, is it suffering or joy?' 'Suffering, Lord.' 'Now that which is variable, full of sorrow, and subject to change, can we say, if we consider it: this is mine, this am I, this is my Self?' 'This we cannot say, Lord.' The same questions are put and then answered in reference to the other four groups. And then the Buddha adds: 'Therefore, monks, whatever there has been, will be, and is of corporeality, sensation, consciousness, forms, and knowledge, no matter whether in us or in the world outside, whether coarse or fine, low or high, far or near; all this corporeality, sensation, consciousness, these forms, and this knowledge are not mine, are not-I, are not my Self; so must every one really see it who possesses right Knowledge. Therefore, monks, the man who sees it is a noble hearer with experience who turns away from corporeality, sensation, consciousness, forms, and Knowledge. By thus turning from them, he becomes free from craving. Through the cessation of craving he obtains salvation. In the redeemed one there originates the knowledge of his redemption: 'Rebirth is abolished, the holy course of life is complete, duty is fulfilled, and there is no more return into this world,' thus he knows.' Here, then, is the thought of the false ego-conception, from which we must be freed in order to do away with craving, and thus to detach ourselves from entanglement in the cycle of births, clearly expressed and broadly explained. And above all, it is Yājñavalkya's statement, namely that everything different from the Ātmā, the true self, is sorrowful, which is here the basis. Only it appears differently expressed in keeping with the whole arrangement of the teaching, indeed in the form that all that is sorrowful cannot be the self or I." (See 194—195).

Frauwallner points out that the argument of the discourse on the characteristics of the not-self which the Buddha delivered at Benares to his first five

* within which Personality is exhausted without remainder, as we shall see later on.

followers, recurs in numerous passages of the Canon. "But with this argument the Buddha has achieved what he wants. The false belief that sees the self in the earthly personality is thus rejected. At the same time, however, every statement concerning the existence or non-existence of the self is avoided.

Mistaken attempts have certainly been made to read from the above mentioned argument a denial of the self on the part of the Buddha. But this, of course, goes too far; for the unbiased judge all that is said is that the five groups are not the self or I; and this too is the only purpose that is served by that argument. Every attempt to discover more in it, would go beyond this purpose and miss the point. Indeed, from the statement that everything perishable and sorrowful cannot be the self, one might sooner draw the deduction that the self is therefore imperishable and free from suffering, and that any one arguing in this way presupposes the existence of such a soul. Moreover, in connexion with the above argument, the texts of the Buddhist Canon never say that a self does not exist, but at most that it is not conceivable. Again, attempts have been made to interpret this by saying that the Buddha chose this method of expression in order not to alarm the weaker of his disciples through a denial of the self and through the resultant annihilation with salvation. But such trains of thought are quite alien to the Buddha's proclamation. He does not go in search of followers, least of all in such crooked ways. Finally, the Buddha himself guards against such an interpretation of his words. In one of the discourses in which he has shown again in the usual way that the five groups are not the I or self, he then breaks out in the following words: 'And I, O monks, who speak thus, and teach thus, am accused wrongly, vainly, falsely, and inappropriately by some ascetics and Brahmins: 'A denier is the ascetic Gautama, he teaches the destruction, annihilation, and perishing of the being that now exists (*sataḥ sattvasya*).' These ascetics wrongly, vainly, falsely, and inappropriately accuse me of being what I am not, O monks, and of saying what I do not say: 'A denier is the ascetic Gautama, he teaches the destruction, annihilation, and perishing of the being, that now exists.' Only one thing, monks, do I teach, now as before, namely suffering and the abolition of suffering.'

To sum up, we can say, therefore, that the Buddha declines to answer the question concerning the existence of a self, because he regards it as one of those questions that lead to fruitless discussions and explanations, and divert us from the real goal of salvation. But a denial of the soul is not expressed; rather is it described merely as inconceivable, wherever an express statement occurs." (See 224—225.)*

Gustav Mensching writes about the problem of the self (attā) in his *Buddhistische Geisteswelt* (The spiritual World of Buddhism)** which embraces the whole

* *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (History of Indian Philosophy), Vol. I, by Erich Frauwallner. Otto Müller Verlag, Salzburg, 1953.

** *Buddhistische Geisteswelt.* Vom historischen Buddha zum Lamaismus. Texte ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Gustav Mensching (The Spiritual World of Buddhism. From the historical Buddha to Lamaism. Texts selected and introduced by Gustav Mensching). Holle Verlag, Darmstadt-Baden-Baden-Genf, 1955.

province of Buddhism: "Research in the West is not wholly in agreement on what was meant in the original teaching of the Buddha. Is each and every self denied, or does the Buddha wish to deprive of the real self only the world of phenomena, and hence that which has concrete existence, and thus all knowledge and denominability? I for my part regard the latter view as being very much to the point, and believe that the texts also support this conception. By illusion of personality is clearly understood the complex of the five groups of clinging which is comprised in the individual. Apart from these factors that constitute personality, there is no personality. But the man who is unredeemed erroneously identifies with the self certain of these factors of existence. The famous sermon of the not-self says in effect that the Buddha makes it clear that none of the finite and fleeting elements of existence is 'my self.' Thus there is stated perfectly clearly the existence of an ultimate absolute behind the fleeting factors. The refusal of a statement concerning the existence or non-existence of a self proper means that the categories of 'being' and 'not-being,' which spring from, and refer only to, the finite world, do not apply to the absolute. A distinction is drawn between three kinds of the (finite) self as possible (but erroneous) views, namely the material self, the spiritual self, and the self consisting only of consciousness. Man must be delivered from all three forms of the so-called self. Even consciousness is, as we see, a group of existence-factors, and consequently is not maintained in the cycle of rebirths; it arises and passes away in accordance with the law of dependent origination. The pernicious character of finite individual existence is in particular characterized by the assumption of ten fetters, the first five of which lead to a lower rebirth, and the sixth to the tenth, in so far as the first five are broken, lead to a higher existence which, of course, is also in need of salvation." (See 51—52).

In a note to these remarks Mensching states: "M. v. Glasenapp defends the other point of view, e. g., in *Vedānta und Buddhismus* (Vedānta and Buddhism) (Mainzer Akademieschrift 1950) and in many other passages. The author has already dealt, critically and in detail in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (1953, 331 seq.), with the interpretation of the anattā-doctrine by H. v. Glasenapp, and has taken up the viewpoint that the denial of the 'self' can refer only to the empirical personality within the phenomenal world. At the time I wrote: 'If, therefore, it is said of all dharma and dharma-complexes that they are *anattā*, then, in my opinion, this can only mean that they really are not or have not that which in the empirical world is described as I or self.' I am glad to find precisely the same point of view defended in a work by Erich Frauwallner, Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, Vol. I, 1953, (History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, 1953) which has in the meantime appeared." Mensching then returns to Frauwallner's previously mentioned remarks on *anattā*. In reference to Samyutta-Nikāya II, 86, where mention is made of the extinction of an oil-lamp whose fuel was used up, he gives in detail Frauwallner's statements concerning the concept of extinction in the ancient Indian's world of religious ideas. He then goes on to say: "Now the Buddha says exactly the same thing, e. g. Udāna

VIII, 10: just as the path of the extinct fire cannot be known, so too is it impossible to indicate the path of the wholly redeemed ... The point here is to show that the Buddha unquestionably assumed an ultimate self about which he did not speak for reasons previously mentioned. But, as I already wrote in my above-mentioned review of H. v. Glasenapp's work on 'Vedānta und Buddhismus' (Vedānta and Buddhism), even the formula of 'entering' into nirvāna, to be met frequently, is wholly without meaning, if within the individual there is nothing that enters. It is also difficult to see how a being, when recollecting his previous births (pubbenivāsānussatināna), can conceive all these dharma-combinations as his births. It is well known that in the Questions of the Greek King Menandros (Indian: Milinda), who reigned in Northern India in the first century B. C., the question is also discussed in the Milindapanha whether the person reborn, who, of course, is not the same individual as the deceased, therefore escapes the fruits of his deeds. The question is answered in the negative with the argument that the existence of the new individual is conditioned by that of the deceased, just as the fire, carelessly kindled by me in my own house and spreading to my neighbour's house, is, of course, not the same fire that I kindled, but is yet conditioned by the one kindled by me, so that I am also responsible for it. But this causal connexion, as we shall see, refers only to phenomenal reality, and, as already stated, one cannot see how I can consider and recall as *my* forms of existence phenomenal causality and its results in the form of successive individual existences, without the assumption of a self in the background."

We must therefore always clearly bear in mind that the Buddha taught in ancient India which was imbued with a profoundly metaphysical spirit. "Here religions, outwardly most different, join hands *in the incessant demand to despise as perishable everything earthly, and to keep one's eyes firmly on the imperishable*, whether this be called Brahman, Nirvāna, or anything else."* And although there were materialists, in such a bright light there could also be no lack of corners with the greatest darkness, but they were the outsiders, characterized as deniers, as gainsayers. We meet this genuinely Indian spirit in the *Mahāvagga* I, 14, a work of the *Vināya-Pitaka*, where we are told how thirty Brahmin youths ask the Buddha whether he has seen a woman who ran away from them after she had robbed one of them. The Buddha solemnly replies by asking them: "What is better, young men, to look for the woman or to look for your own self?" The ancient Indian spirit renders the youths equally susceptible to the Master's question; they abandon everything and accept him as their teacher. We found already indicated how the Buddha answered this question from practical experience and in his own quite special way. In the present work this answer in all its fulness and extent becomes for the attentive reader a guide that promises him victory.

* *Die Fragen des Königs Menandros* (The Questions of King Menandros). First rendered into German from the Pali by Otto Schrader. Verlag Paul Raatz, Berlin SW., 1905.

For the Buddha the questions arise from what is given, and an answer is always coupled with realization. It points always in the direction where freedom alone becomes possible, in the direction that lies in a detachment from the personality and its world. George Grimm points out that the Buddha's simple ideas, which could be understood even by a cowherd and appear again and again as the foundation of the teaching, can be presented in a syllogism which he calls the "Great Syllogism", as the reader will discover in the introduction. This train of thought, as known to us in the quotations, is as follows: "What is known as perishable, and for that very reason as sorrowful for me, has therefore to be considered really wisely: 'This belongs to me not, this I am not, this is not my Self.' Now, with all that is ever seen, thought, known, and investigated in the mind (so it says in the 35th Sutta of the Majjhima-Nikāya), I observe an arising and passing away, and accordingly recognize it as transient and the bringer of suffering. And this applies to everything knowable in reality: 'This belongs to me not, this I am not, this is not my Self'."* This very embodiment in a syllogism certainly seems to many to be doubtful and questionable, since to them it appears to demand "illegitimately" a scientific acknowledgment of the correctness of the Buddha's teaching. Those who think thus can set their minds at rest, for it is a syllogism whose major premiss shines only for *religious* minds, who alone clearly feel the inconstant, inadequate, and insecure element in our unfortunate situation, and who in addition surmise that at bottom they are free from all that. It concerns only rare religious minds who want to *know* where others merely believe. Whether they then see through *everything* knowable in and around themselves, and discover that everything is feeble and unstable, and, on account of its sorrow-bearing nature, is not the self or I, depends on their power of knowledge, in so far as it can give them, with the present fruit of their deeds, the possibility of knowing with sufficient keenness, in order to grasp completely the *sublime truth of suffering*. The syllogism makes it specially clear that the contemplator starts from that which is given, which is always his personality and the world that is known thereby. In so far as it is seen through as "not the self," it is given up; and this is always seen in practical life. This syllogism certainly has an *assumption*, namely a religious person who aspires to knowledge. He is so deeply affected by the transitoriness of everything earthly, that his heart would break and he would be in despair, if this severe shock did not bring him the great positive principle of his life, namely the experience with the holy. And this experience, which is renewed and deepened again and again in meditations, always determines more and more his thoughts, and thus his words and actions.

The presentation of the ancient doctrine was simple; it gave a clear prescription for deliverance and detachment. This may also be what Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan tries to express when he writes: "Historical Buddhism means the

* *Die Botschaft des Buddha, der Schlüssel zur Unsterblichkeit.* By George Grimm. Baum-Verlag, Pfullingen/Württ. (Germany) 1953.

spread of the Upanishad doctrines among the peoples. It thus helped to create a heritage which is living to the present day" (Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, p. 471). Of course, only an exeedingly great man, indeed the greatest, could express knowledge in a form so universally intelligible, knowledge that is recognized only by sages in their heart of hearts (*paccatam veditabbo viññāhi*) (*Sam. Nik.* L V).

It is evident that a teaching, which sages in their heart of hearts acknowledge, is particularly shaky when it is subjected to the interpretation of scribes and scholars who lack that which the teaching first brings to life, namely the inner experience. Thus from the great idea of detachment comes the small one of denial. A diffuse and lengthy erudition does less and less justice to the profound thoughts of the teaching. This applies to the commentary literature since the time of Buddhaghosa (fifth century A. D.) rather than to the *Abhidhamma*. Through valuable ideas in the sphere of the analysis of consciousness, the *Abhidhamma* often had a very stimulating effect, although in the schools of Mahāyāna fruitful ideas came to light just because the spirit of meditation stimulated them there. Although the really religious minds are led again and again on to the right path by their own genuine efforts at liberation, the degeneration and decline of the teaching through scribes and scholars is nevertheless a great misfortune for the many who want to hear. The scholars have the say, and their words befog that which originally was clearly said.*

An example of this degeneration and decline in its formal expression is found stated by Herbert Günther in *Das Seelenproblem im älteren Buddhismus* (Rascher Verlag, Zürich). "In all cases where in Pāli *anattan* is used as predicate, and this is the majority of all authoritative passages, the translation is, as one might expect, 'is not the I,' 'is not the Self;' but there also occur other renderings, such as 'is without self,' and 'unsubstantial.' The last two translations are for

*) A. P. Buddhadatta, the wellknown Singhalese Pāli scholar and head of the Aggārāma at Ambalangoda in Ceylon (appointed as the Agga-Mahāpandita at the Council of Rangoon) wrote on 4 th March 1947 concerning the English edition of George Grimm's main work in a letter to his daughter:

"I read that book carefully and found, as you have stated in your letter itself 'that he was the recoverer of the old genuine doctrine of the Buddha, which has been submerged'. When we read our Pali texts and the commentaries, we get the idea that Buddhism is a kind of Nihilism. But it refuses to accept nihilism or eternalism. Thus I was puzzled for a long time to understand the true meaning of Buddhism though I was born a Buddhist. Many people do not go so far in these matters. At last I understood that Buddha's teaching was not so difficult to understand by the masses as they are now represented in the Canonical books; but was easily understood by the common people at that time. Those people who came to the Buddha were not all great thinkers; many of them had only a general knowledge of things. But they were able to realize the truth, as it was preached by the Buddha. This was through the way pointed out by Dr. Grimm. They could easily understand when the Buddha preached that 'your body, mind, etc. are not you or yours; the eye, ear, tongue, etc. are not yours; therefore cling not to them, give them up; when you have no clinging whatever, then you would be free from all suffering', and so on. When one truly goes by this path he will be freed and will realize the Truth."

the Pali Canon groundless, and cannot in any circumstances be upheld." (p. 14—15). He then demonstrates this by a careful philological interpretation of the textual passages in question. In another passage he states that the interpretation *attavirahata* "without ātman" cannot apply to older Buddhism, but comes from a late period when *attan* (Sanskrit: *ātman*) = *svabhāva* means "substantiality," and hence *anattan* = *nihsvabhāva* = unsubstantial. Karl Seidenstücker, the Indianist, in his essay on Early Buddhism* refers to the "peculiar interpretation of the anattā doctrine in the sense of denying the real essence outside that which in man is transient and mortal. This tendency occurs the more plainly, the more recent the writings, until in the *Abhidhamma*, and especially in exegetic literature and in commentaries (approximately a thousand years after the Buddha), it is presented to us, so to speak, in pure culture." This mental tendency is detrimental to all real meditation, and from it absolutely no bridge can be made to the unbounded, that is to say to an awakening of kindness to all that lives and breathes, of sympathy for all tortured creatures, of mutual joy, and of sublime equanimity. Edward Conze says**: "The meditation on Dharmas dissolves other people, as well as oneself, into a conglomeration of impersonal and instantaneous dharmas. It reduces our manhood into five heaps, or pieces, plus a label. If there is nothing in the world except bundles of Dharmas—as cold and as impersonal as atoms—instantaneously perishing all the time, there is nothing which friendliness and compassion could work on. One cannot wish well to a Dharma which is gone by the time one has come to wish it well, nor can one pity a Dharma—say a 'mind-object'—or a 'sight-organ,' or a 'sound-consciousness.' In those Buddhist circles where the method of Dharmas was practised to a greater extent than the Unlimited, it led to a certain dryness of mind, to aloofness, and to lack of human warmth. . ." Here we must add that it so happened because in respect of the dharmas (Pāli: dhammā), the meaning of the words had been lost which, with a contemplation of the objects of reflectiveness in the ancient suttas, constantly calls them to mind: "And independently he dwells without support, and clings to nothing in the world (*anissito ca viharati, na ca kiñci loke upādiyati*). It was not imagined that: "This belongs to me not, this I am not, this is not my Self," as proclaimed again and again by the Buddha, applied also to the dharmas.

Conze comes to speak of the prophecies which presage the disappearance of the true teaching, in spite of the outward existence of Buddhism; the oldest of these give five hundred years for the duration of the teaching. Then in another passage we read: ". . . In the beginning of the Order, we hear of many who became Arhats, some of them with astonishing ease. Fewer and fewer cases are recorded in later writings. In the end, as shown by the *prophecies* quoted above, the conviction spread that the time for Arhats was over. The cream had been taken off the milk. The scholars ousted the saints, and erudition took the

* *Yāna*, Journal for Early Buddhism and religious culture. Pt. 1. X. year Jan./Feb. 1957.
** Buddhism: Its Essence and Development, p. 129.

place of attainment. One of the Scriptures of the Sarvastivadins relates the terrible and sad story of the death of the last Arhat by the hands of one of the scholars. The story well illustrates the mood of the times." (Loc. cit., p. 115—116.)

Radhakrishnan reflects on the doctrine* which directs his attention to the sutta of the burden and of the bearer of the burden (Sam. Nik. XXII, 22): "Nirvāna is not a lapse into a void, but only a negation of the flux and a positive return of the self to itself. The logical conclusion from this would be that something is, though it is not the empirical self. This is also in agreement with Buddha's statement that the self is neither the same as nor entirely different from the skandhas. It is not a mere composite of mind and body, nor is it the eternal substance, exempt from the vicissitudes of change. The discussion of the burden and its bearer makes out that the skandhas which are the burden and the pudgala which is the bearer are distinct entities. If they were identical, there is no need to distinguish between them. 'O, ye mendicants, I am going to point out to you the burden as well as the carrier of the burden: the five states are the burden and the pudgala is the carrier of the burden; he who holds that there is no soul is a man with false notions.' To be born is to take up the burden; to lay it down is to attain bliss or nirvāna."

Already in the Canon, therefore, we find the discourse of the burden and of the bearer of the burden. Heinrich Gomperz writes of the Vaibhāshikas (literally opponents): "Possibly it is the same school that was described also as that of the I-eachers (Pāli: Puggala-vādins, 'personalists,' De La Vallée-Poussin *Buddhisme*, p. 163), because it assumed an imperishable I or self, without, however expressing itself concerning the relation of the self to the five parts that constitute man. Badly informed as we are of their teaching, they may have remained close enough to the original viewpoint of the Buddha."**

What we know of them is summarised as follows by De La Vallée-Poussin in his work *Nirvāna*: "When the Buddha refuses to endorse the identity of, or the difference between, the principles of life and of the body, he does so (according to the explanation of the Pudgala-vādins) because the pudgala, the life-principle or life-essence (*sattva, tathāgata*), is in reality neither identical with, nor different from, the elements (*skandhas*). In comparison with the elements, the pudgala is beyond description (*avācya*); the pudgala is not perceived independently of the elements, and hence it is not different from the elements. It does not have the nature of the elements, for in that case it would be subject to birth and death; hence it is not identical with the elements. In just the same way, it is also impossible to say that it is perishable or imperishable. The pudgala is a thing-in-itself (*dravya*); it is defined as the doer of deeds, and as the one who reaps the fruits. Related to it are rebirth and nirvāna, the state of captivity and the

* S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, pp. 386—387.

** Heinrich Gomperz, *Die indische Theosophie vom geschichtlichen Standpunkt gemeinverständlich dargestellt.* Verlag Eugen Diederichs, 1925.

state of freedom". We also find the interpretation of their teaching defined as follows: "The pudgala is something absolutely incomprehensible; thus it is no dharma since it does not have merely a momentary existence; but, on the other hand, it is also not an immaterial *mental* substance existing through itself, like the individual atman of the Brahmins."

According to the testimony of the wellknown Chinese pilgrim, Hiuen Tsiang, who travelled through India from 619 to 645 A. D., the viharos of the Pudgalavādins were in their heyday at that time. They enjoyed the special favour of the zealous follower of Asoka, the great Indian Emperor Harsha (606—647). Their main centres, which were in western India, were, on account of that position, the earliest destroyed by Moslem attacks and vandalism.

We have no objective description of their exposition of the Buddha's teaching. They had remained independent thinkers, and the dogmatists had found them to be troublesome opponents. And yet the justification of their attitude is seen through existing statements; even in the 22nd dialogue of the *Majj. Nik.* it says: "Already in this visible phenomenon I declare the Tathāgata to be inaccessible and ungraspable." De La Vallée-Poussin also recognizes that for them the problem of nirvāna is simple and logical. In his work *Nirvāna* we read: "Their numerical and pedagogical importance was not properly appreciated by Indianists who are fond of describing them as 'heretics.' Their prestige was noteworthy."

Edward Conze tries to understand their obvious request: "They spoke of an indefinable principle called the *pudgala,* the person, who is neither different nor not different from the five Skandhas. It persists through the several lives of a being until he reaches Nirvana. It has a sort of middle position between our true and our empirical self. On the one hand, it accounts for our sense of personal identity (like the "empirical self"), and on the other, it lasts into Nirvana (like the "true self"). Among all controversial issues, this one was considered as the most critical of all. Throughout the centuries the orthodox never wearied of piling argument upon argument to defeat this admission of a *Self* by the Pudgalavadins. But the more tenaceously and persistently one tries to keep something out of one's mind, or out of a system of thought, the more surely it will come in. The orthodox, in the end, were forced to admit the notion of a permanent ego, not openly, but in various disguises, hidden in particularly obscure and abstruse concepts, like the *Subconscious life-continuum* (bhavanga) of the Theravadins, the *continued existence of a very subtle Consciousness* of the Sautrantikas, the *Root-Consciousness of* Mahasanghikas, etc. The *Store-Consciousness* of the Yogacarins is conceived in the same spirit. As soon as the advice to disregard the individual self had hardened into the proposition that *'there is no self,'* such concessions to common-sense became quite inevitable."(Buddhism: its Essence and Development, pp. 169—170).

All these discussions spring from a request, lying deep within us, which cannot be ignored with impunity. *Conze* sees it behind the genuine Buddhist disciple's striving for detachment, and expresses it in the following words: "It is assumed

first of all that there is an ultimate reality, and secondly that there is a point in ourselves at which we touch that ultimate reality" (Loc. cit. p. 110.). Mrs. *Rhys Davids*, the well known Pāli scholar and translator, has of all English Buddhists given to this problem the consideration it merits. But *in addition to this*, the present work takes the Pāli Canon simply as it is given; and it will be clear to the attentive reader how auspicious it is to be introduced to the doctrine of the greatest of gods and men by a *congenial* mind.

Karl Eugen Neumann, who through his translations became a very special pioneer of Buddhism in German-speaking countries, read the book in its first edition. It first appeared in 1915, the year in which Neumann died. He wrote to the author: "The work is undoubtedly by far the most important exposition of Buddhism that has appeared since Oldenberg's book. Nevertheless, it is incomparably deeper and more comprehensive, and is in every respect a profound and exhaustive study. From a first cursory perusal, two explanations in particular have struck me as being quite outstanding, namely *anattā* as Not-I, and *āsavo* as influences."

Friedrich Zimmermann (1851—1917) became a grateful reader of the *Lehre des Buddha*, as is seen from his letters to the author. Under the name of Subhadra Bhikshu, he became known as the author of *Buddhistischer Katechismus zur Einführung in die Lehre des Buddha Gótama* which first appeared in 1888, and then ran to fourteen impressions, and was translated into seventeen languages. The following statements are of interest: "I was particularly satisfied with your treatment of the difficult theme of personality and *anattā*. So much preposterous nonsense about this teaching has been brought to light in Buddhist periodicals, that I began to doubt whether any of our German 'Buddhists' really understood the subject. It seemed as though everyone wanted to show off his profundity of thought, in order to plunge the reader into confusion and misunderstanding, and to bring into discredit the principal teaching of the Master. For at bottom, all these pensive pronouncements say in effect that the Buddha taught the absurdity that there is nothing, absolutely nothing, in and behind the personality; on the contrary, that the subject of knowing does not exist at all, and that in modern language the Buddha simply stated: 'Brothers, I proclaim to you that I am not; I am nothing but an illusion.' Here it was not even explained who then really had this illusion, so that it was again left hanging in the air without any support.

I have often reproached myself that my dislike of all polemical writing and my positive nervousness of it deterred me from taking action against this nonsense and from putting an end to it by a precise presentation of the truth. Now I am highly delighted that you have done this, and indeed so thoroughly and comprehensively that the unreflecting followers of nihilism will not be able to advance against it."

The Indianist, *Dr. Karl Seidenstücker*, best known for his *Pali-Buddhismus in Übersetzungen*, stated: ". . . Apart from questions of quite minor importanc, I must say that I have not yet found anywhere so profound and striking a presen-

tation of the Buddha's teaching. Above all, I am pleased with the assertion and emphasis of the transcendental subject; this was first and foremost the one thing that was necessary..." Later Seidenstücker became a close collaborator of George Grimm.

The reader will easily be able to convince himself that the Buddha brought the mind of ancient India to the highest perfection. He also has sought for the Ātman, as all great minds have sought it. "Know thyself!" ran the inscription on the temple of the Pythia. And Herakleitos, in the search for his I, had come so far that he was able to assert that the boundaries of the soul could not be found, even if all roads were run through. Further, like all India, the Buddha also had sought for the Attā in the *indirect* way, by taking away from the Attā everything that is not the Attā. But he followed this way so radically and with so much success, that everything cognizable, especially also the mental, especially also *thinking*, revealed itself to him as *Anattā* and thereby as something that had to be overcome by us. And *for this reason* he says: You teach the Attā, but I teach what the Attā is *not*. You know the Attā, but I only know what the Attā is *not*. Therefore you are always talking about the Attā, but I only speak of Anattā. In short, you have the Attā-method, the *attā-vāda*, whereas I have the Anattā-method, the *anattā-vāda*. And this I have because only thus is the Attā, that is, myself, able to become free from suffering and happy. "But, monks, cleave ye to any I-doctrine (attā-vāda), whereby no sorrow more can come to him who cleaves, neither lamentation nor suffering, neither grief nor despair? Know ye of any such I-doctrine?"—"Indeed, we do not, Lord."—"Well said, monks. Neither do I know of any such I-doctrine."*

And so the Buddha has *not* become unfaithful to Indian thought; on the contrary, his teaching is the *efflorescence* thereof. He is 'the true Brahman' who has wholly realized the ideal of the Upanishads. And for this very reason, India will once more welcome him as her greatest son, as soon as she has again recognized this."

* These sentences and the notes appertaining thereto are taken from the Appendix of this work "The Flower of Indian Thought." "From this explanation it will probably become clear without further ado that our modern form of saying "the I is *transcendent*" is not the mode of expression used by the *Attā-vāda*, for whom the I is not absolutely transcendent, inasmuch as it is ultimately found in pure cognition; but it is really the language of the *Anattā-vāda*, since the statement "the I is transcendent" means: "the I is beyond all cognition, it absolutely cannot be found out." How stupid, how incredibly stupid it is to accuse him who teaches the transcendence of the I, of adhering to the *Attā-vāda*, will certainly become clear to the greatest simpleton, when he learns that the Buddha even verbally teaches about the I, what is involved in the conception of transcendency: "I am not anywhere whatsoever, to any one whatsoever, in anything whatsoever." "But since the I and anything belonging to the I is not to be found (anupalabhamāne) . . ." "Even in this present life is the Accomplished One not to be found out (ananuvejja)." Because no kind of cognition penetrates to the I, nothing whatsoever, absolutely nothing, can be told about it; the rest is—silence! And it is only this *silence* about the I, no more, that the Buddha teaches. 'This is the *true* ātman teaching, the *true* attā-vāda' (Cf. Sam. Nik., XLV, 4).

Meanwhile, on the occasion of great declarations, the Buddha has in fact been extolled by Indians in authority as India's greatest son. Of course, we shall not be able to set much store by public demonstrations at which the spirit of the teaching is easily falsified, since no teaching, like the original one of the Buddha, appeals so intimately to the individual, and can become alive solely as a result *of you and me*.. Naturally, this applies far less to the later forms of Buddhism which have become popular. It was very fortunate for their religious element that scholastic subtleties never gained importance in wider circles. But the transforming power of the teaching was still great for a long time, and it certainly is still, where it is able to appeal again and again to the individual man's conscience.

What the currents of thought that had received their impulse from the Buddha were able to achieve, had become clear in India, in the very country of their origin, although there they lost the name of their founder. Buddhism had already fulfilled a great mission, when the last remains of the forms that were signalized by this name vanished from India almost without a trace at the beginning of the thirteenth century, not at least because, having become withered and impotent internally, they were no longer able to hold their own among Indians with their powerful, decidedly metaphysical abilities. The teaching had entered deep into Hinduism and had there remained alive. Even in its later development, its spirit had had an extremely stimulating effect; its benevolent attitude, with a foundation of incomparable excellence, had gained a profound and wide influence, and had contributed quite specially to the spreading of a gentleness which extends even to the animal world. The dividing barriers of caste were initially overcome by it from within, since in his moral worth or worthlessness the individual alone had the final say. Although the Brahminic reaction since Kumārila (first half of the eighth century A. D.), and possibly also in its opposition to Buddhism, led to a further development of the caste system and to its final rigidity, the strong spirit of gentleness, tolerance, and conciliatory disposition was preserved, in so far as in Hinduism the religious aspiration of the individual with its development of kindness positively retained its significance. And this spirit is again acknowledged by Radhakrishnan, India's philosophical Vice-chancellor, when he says: "Buddhism succeeded so well because it was a religion of love, giving voice to all the inarticulate forces which were working against the established order and the ceremonial religion, addressing itself to the poor, the lowly, and the disinherited" (Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, p. 475). And another notable Indian exclaims: "It is indeed remarkable that, in this country of the most varied sects and confessions of faith, when we gained our independence, we resolved to take our refuge in the wheel of the doctrine set in motion for the first time by Gotama the Buddha on the sacred soil of Sarnath near Kāshi (Benares)."

This, gentle reader, is the spirit which the book wishes to convey to you. But it calls upon you to read with attention, and indeed with devotion. Only then will you become conscious of this spirit, which in addition enables you to attain

something even higher, whereby the entire world and with it all sufferings are overcome. It will give to each that which he is able to derive from it in accordance with his talents and abilities. It offers itself as the companion for silent hours; and what has been read summons us to meditation. We must thoroughly chew the nourishment received, so that it may be well digested; and this gives us a simile for proper reading. But with proper reading the impulse for our meditation will grow from the book, for without such meditation we cannot obtain any living knowledge. With such use it will become the friend and counsellor, and it may be that it will be the *one* book that replaces all libraries. But soon (it is already on the way) the reader will come to know the truth of the words: "Every doctrine of which you can say that it leads to freedom from passion and not to passion; to independence and not to obligation; to a reduction and not to an increase of worldly gain; to frugality and not to covetousness; to satisfaction and not to dissatisfaction; to solitude and not to sociability; to performance and not to indolence; to pleasure in good and not to pleasure in evil; of such a doctrine you can say positively that this is *the* rule, this is *the* teaching, this is the Master's message."*

For the valuable assistance in the translation of the revised and the new chapters the editors owe greatest thanks to Mr. E. F. J. Payne, translator of the works of Arthur Schopenhauer into English.

Utting, 3rd December 1957. *Max Hoppe*

* Quoted from *Buddhism* by Edward Conze.

INTRODUCTION

I

Who was the Buddha?

The Buddha was born about the middle of the sixth century B. C. in the Indian city of Kapilavatthu as Prince Siddhattha, son of King Suddhodana from the family of the Gotamides, and was therefore an Indian. What this means will be clear from what follows.*

From time immemorial, India formed her own world. She is shut off in the north-west by the Indo-Persian mountain frontier, in the north-east by the Himālayas having the highest mountains in the world, in the south-west by the Arabian Sea, and in the south-east by the Indian Ocean. Although her being thus cut off was not so great as to make commercial relations very difficult with neighbouring nations, such as had existed from the remotest times, it was nevertheless enough to protect her, at any rate during the time of her development, from invasion by foreign armies, and from the inundation and drying up of her culture through foreign influences. When later the storms of the Greek, Scythian, and Mohammedan invasions broke over India, the Indian world of thought was already consolidated, had become scholastically finished, and therefore could no longer be influenced. On the contrary, as regards a subjugated India, the foreign conquerors became just as intellectually dependent as did the Roman Empire with regard to conquered Greece. The culture of India is, therefore, thoroughly original. Its development was favoured by the climate of the country which freed men from the ordinary cares of life, and thus gave them leisure to devote themselves to the great problems raised by existence. The northern part of India is subtropical, but the greater part is tropical; and Indian poetry of all kinds, such as the epic, the lyric, and the drama, reflects the charm and magic of the tropical world.

The dominant race in India belongs to the Indo-European group of nations which settled in seven principal branches as Indians and Iranians in Central and Southern Asia, as Greeks, and Italians in the South, and as Slavs, Teutons, and Celts in the northern countries of Europe. It was quite obvious, and had been

* The historical foundations for the following remarks are for the most part based on Paul Deussen's Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, Vol. I.

known from very early times, that the languages of Greece and Rome were more closely, and all the cultural languages of Europe more distantly, related to one another; and yet no one was able to give a satisfactory account of this relationship. But after Sanskrit, the language of the ancient Indians, had become known towards the end of the last century, it was a discovery, not to be missed, that Indians and Persians in Asia, Greeks and Romans, Celts, Teutons, and Slavs in Europe were the descendants of an original and homogeneous race. On the other hand, it is no longer possible to discover the original abode of this mother-race. The partition of this original race into seven main branches, and the migration of the latter into their present domiciles occurred in prehistoric times.

The Indo-Europeans who had settled in India, at all times called themselves Aryans, and still so called themselves even in the Buddha's time. The Buddha himself says in the Dīgha-Nikāya XVI, 1, 28: "As far as Aryans dwell, and as far as commerce extends that is fostered by merchants, this defended city of Pātaliputta will shine as the first."

The original meaning of the word "arya" is "devout," "pious;" and so "the Aryans" are "those belonging to the pious," in which sense the word arya was also originally understood as the name of a people. This alone indicates the original nature of the culture that was created by the Aryan Indians.

"Pious" is a *religious* concept, and means having a religious view of life and the world. But a view of the world is religious, when a man feels in his conscience obliged also to pay heed to the securing of his great future after death, and considers himself "bound" (*religatur*) to this obligation, no matter whether he believes in a personal god or not. This is the proper meaning of the concept religion, however surprising *this* definition may appear to modern man who in this sense is quite areligious. On account of this obligation of his conscience, a religious man in particular sees himself compelled no longer to arrange his conduct exclusively for the unrestrained satisfaction of the desire for sensual pleasure, but to ponder over the consequences that could result for the coming life from such a brutal egoism. Thus a religious view of life inevitably leads to the ennoblement of man's conduct of life, and, if such a view inspires a whole people, it improves their conduct too. If this restraint that binds one's conscience is lacking, then at best we may get civilization, a refinement of the love of pleasure, for the satisfaction of which men do not shrink even from the most brutal measures.

From the very beginning, the Aryan Indians have been religiously minded in this sense, and have remained so even to the present time; indeed, it can be said that they were and are generally the most religious people on earth. They therefore succeeded in producing a noble and sublime *culture* which saved them in particular from a "civilization of factory chimneys," according to Nietzsche "the most pitiable of all civilizations."*

* What a sin there is against the generations to come in the unlimited exploitation of the treasures of the earth which is carried on for the purpose of an ever greater satisfaction of the craving for enjoyment!

The religious character of Arya-Indian culture is also specially clear from the following words of Deussen: "In India there is no real historiography as in Greece and Rome, and historians of the ordinary category (like those who could not forgive a Plato for not being a Demosthenes) charitably shrug their shoulders that so highly gifted a people has not succeeded in producing a permanent organism of State, not to speak of a public oratory, indeed has not even managed to write down its history. They should rather try to understand that the Indians were too superior, after the manner of the Egyptians, to take a delight in lists of kings, that is, to count shadows as Plato would say; they should endeavour to see that the Aryan genius disdained to take temporal things and their order and arrangement too seriously, since it sought the eternal with all the energy of its powers, and expressed this in a very rich literature that was poetical, religious and philosophical."

How the religious frame of mind controlled from the earliest times the life of the Aryan Indian is shown in abundance by the Hymns of the *Rig-veda** which originated in the third millennium B. C., and are attributed to wise seers or rishis who "investigated with insight in their thinking." (123). Thus they were *philosophers* and not theologians; and accordingly their world-view was philosophical. But every philosophical view of the world is based on two elements, namely a looking out into the external world, and a looking into one's own self, into the depths of one's own personality. Here looking inwards is the essential thing; the man who still identifies himself wholly with his personality arrives at quite a different view of the world from that of the man who recognizes his personality more and more as a mere "attribute" that is not essential to him. Now the rishis had already arrived at the latter knowledge. With it they knew themselves in their very core to be untouched by the decay of their body, and hence to be immortal, so that for them there arose the problem of the nature and safeguard of their future after death. Naturally, the knowledge that was directed outwards on to a phenomenal world presenting itself to the five external senses revealed to them also the rule of natural forces that shape this entire world. According to the general opinion (Deussen also held this point of view), they in their naivety are then said to have personified as "gods" those forces of nature. Thus, like every polytheism, the Vedic Pantheon is said to have originated. But this is an exceedingly superficial explanation; the Aryan Indian of the Rig-Veda did not personify the forces of nature, but, starting from the knowledge that his own substance lies behind his body, he personified the mysterious principle from which every original force of nature springs, and its substance that is not directly accessible to knowledge. These he characterized as gods, because, like his own substance, he clearly recognized that these too were untouched by the change in their phenomenal forms, and were therefore

* The Veda, "the (sacred) knowledge," is the oldest monument preserved of Indian and Indo-European literature. It is more than six times as extensive as the Bible. Originally, in accordance with ancient Indian usage, its texts were passed on by word of mouth, and only later were they recorded in writing.

eternal. Now, since he was face to face with many forces of nature, and consequently with many substances, there were for him just as many gods. Consequently, in their totality, they represent the foundation of the world which was later called Brahman. Two thousand years later, the Buddha declared the sun and moon to be gods in this sense, and he spoke also of "tree deities" "who live in the trees" (Majjh. Nik., 45). Everything that produces life is for the Indian divine, a god.

From his own inner being the ancient Aryan deduced the true kernel of all the forces of nature. How correct this is, is seen from the fact that only in ourselves can we descend into the ground of the world in which we too are rooted; for everything manifesting itself to our external senses always reveals to us only its outer shell. Moreover, this is confirmed by Kant's words: "The mere concept of the I or self, which is unalterable and cannot be further described at all, expresses substantiality. Substance is the first subject of all inherent accidents. But this I or self is an absolute subject to which all accidents and predicates can belong, and which cannot possibly be a predicate of another thing. Moreover, the concept we have generally of all substances *has been borrowed by us from this I or self*. This is the original concept of substance." (570)

When we read the Rig-Veda, it is at once obvious to us that its polytheism is of the kind we have just described. But who could not admire such a polytheism?

Yet this is not all. The ancient Aryan Indian had already in the second half of the Rig-Veda period advanced to the idea of unity, as is expressed by the Rishi Dirghatamas in the lapidary words: "Diverse names the poets give to that which is only one" (106). This "epoch-making" knowledge is stated in more detail in the well known hymn of creation: "At that time there was neither non-existence nor existence.—No atmosphere, no skies above.—In whose care was the world, who encompassed it?—Where was the deep abyss, where the waters of the ocean?—At that time there was neither death nor immortality.—No night or day was manifest.—In the primordial state no wind did blow.—There was the One beside which there was no Other.—Yet who has succeeded in the search?—Who has perceived whence comes creation?—From it the gods in this world have sprung.—Who therefore states whence they have come?"

At this stage the answer was that there was put on the throne a single supreme God who was called Prajāpati, i. e., "Lord of Creation." However, he too was still a person, but differed from the personal God of the West in that he did not place a world outside himself; on the contrary, he transforms himself wholly or partially (that is, without detriment to his continued personal existence) into nature and her phenomena, "he over whom nothing higher exists and who has entered into all beings, Prajāpati, favouring himself with children." (191)

With this view of the world were determined man's goal and the morality contributing to its realization. What else could this goal have been but the attainment of the "community, the world-community, the complete community with the gods," and thus the arrival at "the true eternal home," at the "fields of

pasture which can no longer be taken away, and where the weak are no longer under tribute to the strong?" (288). Accordingly, the morality of the Rig-Veda teaches the "Divine Path," the path to the gods. But at first this path was the prayer to the gods for acceptance into their community:

Where one walks for jubilation,
Where the third and highest heaven vaults,
Where regions are filled with light,
There let me immortal be.

Where bliss and rapture are found,
Where joy upon joy dwells,
Where craving's yearning is allayed,
There let me immortal be.

But the gods receive into their community only those who are kindly disposed, and who at their death leave behind what is imperfect. Therefore, here on earth, one must show oneself to be a good man, that is to say, one must be *kind*:

"To give to the poor curtails not one's wealth;
Who gives not, has no one to feel pity for him.
The man who is well stocked with food, and when one in need
Approaches him to beg for alms, he hardens his heart
To one who always paid him honour,
Finds none who will feel pity for him.
He findeth joy who also to the poor communicates." (93)

This shows that, even in those times thousands of years ago, the Aryan Indians had become aware of kindness, the great and fundamental law of morality.

*

In the Neo-Vedic period, which lasted from about 1000 to 500 B. C. and ends with the Upanishads, the place of the Rishis of the Rig-Veda was taken by the great men of the Brahman caste, with the formation of the caste system. They regarded themselves as the successors of the Rishis (12), and, like all beings (as is seen in their dread of death), were also agitated by the horror of the transitory nature of their own corporeality. And because they themselves were the source of that horror, they cultivated *inward contemplation*, and so had come to the view that their substance, their true I or self, the Ātman, lay behind their corporeality, consequently was not touched by the death of the body, and thus was immortal. They therefore tried to determine the future that awaited them after death, again by inward contemplation, since through this they endeavoured to ascertain the possible states of their substantial I or self beyond the perishable and transient body. For this purpose, they withdrew from the affairs of the world into a solitary place, and sought to put off from themselves what should be laid aside, namely the external world, their

grossly material body and with it the life of the senses, the whole of their faculty of conception until there was left only pure thinking without any objective perception. But in spite of all this (and here was to be found something new and portentous), they saw themselves wholly untouched in their existence even after this extreme detachment from all that which is commonly regarded as man's substance. On the contrary, the consciousness of the positive and actual nature of their self stood out the more brilliantly, the farther the process of detachment was continued. Indeed, this consciousness first dawned on them in all its glory at the highest point where they had left behind them everything knowable, although at this summit their I or self, apart from that awareness of its actual and positive nature, had become incapable of being grasped and defined. "Not knowing inwards, not knowing outwards, not knowing in both directions, neither perceiving nor not perceiving, also not consisting of knowledge through and through, invisible, ungraspable, grounded only in the certainty of its own I or self, beyond the entire extension of the world, full of bliss and without a second. This is the fourth quarter*, this is the self, this we should know.**"

With this the summit of brahmanic wisdom was reached; man's highest possible state appeared to be realized, and the final goal attained. Our I or self, rid of all transient and sorrowful attributes, is eternal, complete in itself, and full of bliss. The supreme God, superior to all the gods, even to Prajāpati hitherto the highest god, was discovered in our inner nature, beyond our empirical self, as our real and true self. But as this I or self is also "without personality," as Meister Eckhart would say, expressions such as God and Deity which involved a personal element were no longer suitable for this divine self, and so a special description had to be found for the super-personal, truly divine, truly holy fourth quarter. This was just *the Brahman, "the Holy One."****

That the Brahman is identical with the fourth quarter of our self is clearly expressed particularly in the following passage of the *Paramahaṃsa Upanishad*: "That path of the Paramahaṃsas (of the highest migratory swans) is difficult to find in the world, and not many enter upon it. What is the highest Paramahaṃsa? It is he who no longer asks about cold and heat, pleasure and sorrow

* The state of wakefulness, "knowing outwards," is the first quarter, the state of sleep, "knowing inwards", the second quarter. The state of deep sleep, "knowing neither inwards nor outwards," is the third quarter.

** Māndūkya-Up., 7.

*** The original meaning of Brahman is prayer (See the author's *Wissenschaft des Buddhismus*, p. 300 seq.). With the ancient Indians the prayer as a rule consisted in invoking the gods. *This* prayer was naturally beyond question for the great Brahmins (Brahmana means one who prays). Their prayer was a submersion into their own depths, a devotional submersion undertaken in a solemn and sacred disposition of the soul. Thus it is really self-evident that these deeply religious men called "the holy," "the Brahman" the most sacred thing that was discovered through *their* prayer. — How wide the meaning is which was included in the concept "Brahman" is indeed clear from the fact that Brahman means also the venerable speech, venerable conduct, and venerable status (of the Brahmins).

honour and dishonour. Pride and selfishness he leaves behind, and since his own body is regarded by him as carrion, he turns away forever from this decayed body, and constantly directs his knowledge to that other thing, takes up his position in it, and knows that it is serene and unchangeable: I myself am that which has no second and which consists entirely of well-being. This is the true yogin, is the one who knows; his consciousness is filled with that of which the sole flavour is perfect well-being. *This Brahman am I*, thus does he know and has attained the goal, has attained the goal."

The detachment from grossly material corporeality and thus the ascent to the highest spirituality naturally occurred very gradually from stage to stage. In this way, the "one who prays" passed on his return into the Brahman, into his "home," through all the forms of "superhuman" existence, such as are first to be presumed in boundless reality; consequently, he *experienced* in himself and in his own body all the kingdoms of gods and heavens. Thus and *only* thus can we convince ourselves here on earth of the actual and positive nature of these higher spheres of existence: "Ask not what is divine; for if you are not so; you know it not even if you hear it, my Christian" (Angelus Silesius).—"Only those believe in the divine who are it themselves" (Hölderlin).—"My friend, if paradise is not first within you, then assuredly believe me that you will never enter it" (Angelus Silesius).—"Let man be noble, charitable and good.—For this alone distinguishes him from all the beings we know.—Hail to the *unknown higher beings* whom we *divine*!—Let man be like them, and may his *example* teach us to believe in them" (Goethe).

With this the first correct light is cast on the doctrine of *metempsychosis* in the cycle of rebirths to which the Aryan Indian has adhered with self-assured conviction from time immemorial—it was already taught in the Rig-Veda. If man's substance is not touched by death, then for the person who does not already in his present existence find his way back into the Holy, the Brahman, there is left absolutely no other possibility except rebirth to a new existence which is more suitable to him, and in which he can strive farther towards his home.

The very core of the doctrine of metempsychosis is expounded with particular clearness in the Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad 4, 4, 2—6, where it says after the description of the soul's departure from its previous body: "Then the self has particular consciousness, and goes to the body which is related to that consciousness. It is followed by knowledge, work and past experience.—Just as a leech supported on a straw goes to the end of it, takes hold of another support and contracts itself, so does the self throw this body aside—make it senseless—take hold of another support, and contract itself.—Just as a goldsmith takes apart a little quantity of gold and fashions another—a newer and better—form, so does the self throw this body away, or make it senseless, and make another—a newer and better—form, suited to the Manes, or the celestial minstrels, or the gods, or Virāj, or Hiranyagarbha, or other beings.— .... As it does and acts, so it becomes; by doing good it becomes good, and by doing evil it becomes

evil—it becomes virtuous through good acts and vicious through evil acts. Others, however, say, 'The self is identified with desire alone. What it desires, it resolves; what it resolves, it works out; and what it works out, it attains.'"*

From this view of the world the later Aryan Indian derived the following moral principles that were obligatory to all his fellow-countrymen: 1. charity, 2. uprightness, 3. not to injure any living being, 4. truthfulness, 5. self-control. To impress these principles deeply on his mind, he even betokened the rolling of the thunder as follows: "Da! da! da!", that is to say, Damyata! Datta! Dayathvam!—"Restrain yourselves! Give alms! Have compassion!"

This morality was so universally observed that many an Indian prince was able to adopt something of the testimony which King Ashvapati Kaikeya drew up for his subjects: "In my kingdom there is no thief, no miser, no drunkard, no one who would not make sacrifices, no one not versed in the Veda, no rake, no harlot." (Deussen, l. c. p. 328 th seq.) Such morality is brought to maturity by the belief in rebirth, if, as in India, it is associated with an awareness that the nature of the future existence is determined by actions in the present.

Of even greater severity were the demands on those who wanted to escape from the entire cycle of rebirths and hence from the world, and to become submerged in the Holy, the Brahman. Besides acquiring a knowledge of the Veda as the primary object, it was their duty to practise self-castigation (asceticism) and renunciation (nyāsa) as its assumption and sequel. Self-castigation consisted in acquiring all the virtues, and thus in gradually mortifying the life of instinct and impulse; it further consisted in the voluntary acceptance of privations, such as doing penance and fasting, in order to weaken still further the craving for earthly pleasures. *Renunciation* was the radical means; and it was carried out through detachment from wife and family and from all external possessions. Even in the times of the oldest Upanishads, this ascetic life developed into a special vocation that was similar to the status of the head of the family (dharmaskandha). The ascetics traversed the country as wandering mendicants or lived as forest hermits. The highest renunciation was practised by the sannyāsin; he too wandered through the land as the "highest migratory swan" (Paramahaṃsa). His garment consisted of rags or of a mere loin-cloth; or the "space of the world" was his garment. His food was extremely poor, and at the highest stage the clay vessel for receiving it was "his belly or his hand." His occupation was silence and meditation which caused him to regard his body as carrion. His goal was the Brahman.

Such was the nature of the country and the people in India when Siddhattha Gotama, the king's son and the future Buddha, was born there. According to the Indian view, the country and the people generally had to be of such a nature, if there was to be room for a Buddha, and this we can read even from the Buddha's own words: "The Perfect One is an Aryan; therefore his four truths are called Aryan Truths" (Sam. Nik. L. VI, 28).

* From Swami Madhavananda's translation.

II

What is a Buddha?

Calderon, the great Spanish writer, profoundly characterizes the world of life: "All life is but a dream, and every man, I see, dreams all his deeds and nature.—The king dreams he is king, and, deeply sunk in such a dream, commands and rules and governs, and all to him are subject.—And yet his fortune to dust is turned by death which, also as a dream, forever threatens him.—Of their wealth the rich dream, and yet they have no peace.—The poor on earth dream of their bondage and distress.—He dreams who starts to rise, who is afraid and runs, who loves and is afire with hate.—Thus in this wide world *what all are, that they dream*, although not one discerns this.—Indeed, all life is but a dream, and even dreams are just a dream."

Even in the Veda and the Upanishads there is still much dreaming. As with the Christian mystics, everything is seen and presented in semi-darkness, and moreover is woven into an extremely complicated and symbolizing sacrificial cult. Thus we must pursue a laborious path to their comprehension. And this is not all. Even the wisdom of the Veda is not yet perfect wisdom, in spite of its immeasurable greatness that inspires the deepest reverence. For even the Brahman of the Upanishads is not yet man's final goal (purusha-artha) which almost all Indian systems have sought from time immemorial, but only the penultimate stage thereto. The unconditional identification of our own primary ground, of our own I or self (Ātman), with the world-Ātman is a mere speculation, wholly after the manner of the Christian mystics, of whom Seuse says: "Behold, the divine essence is a spiritual substance which mortal eye cannot see. A man sees God, however, in his deeds, just as a man perceives a good master in his works. For Paul says that creatures are a mirror (speculum) in which God is reflected." This *speculation*, which is obtained from mere excursions into the realm of the transcendent, has been revealed as such by the Buddha when he says that the world in itself belongs to the four incomprehensible things, and that to concern ourselves with them entails trouble and distraction (Cf. Die Wissenschaft des Buddhismus, p. 322 seq.). A far greater error in the Veda is its sacrificial cult which in its animal sacrifices is in a high degree positively immoral.

According to the Buddha, only a Buddha is *perfectly* "awakened" from the dream of life. This is not merely the sense, but the literal meaning of the word Buddha. This follows from the 54th dialogue of the Majjhima Nikāya, where one who has "awakened" from the dream is described as *paṭibuddha*, and in particular from the Samyutta Nikāya VI 4, 9, where *suttappabuddha* ("awakened from the dream of sleep") is used instead of the word Buddha.

But *to what* has a Buddha awakened? To the supreme reality, to reality as it is in truth, to that reality which Schopenhauer divined when he said: "When we wake up from a dream that vividly affects us, it is not so much its disappearance (which convinces us of its emptiness) as the discovery of a second reality

which lays concealed under that (of the dream) so deeply stirring us, and which now emerges. We really all have a lasting divination or presentiment that also under this reality in which we live and are there lies hidden a second and different reality. It is the thing-in-itself, the ὕπαρ (reality proper) to this ὄναρ (the present life's dream)."

But a Buddha has not merely awakened to the supreme reality; he also presents his highest knowledge that is superior to that of "all gods and men" most clearly and free from all mythological disguise and mythical clothing. Here, however, it is given in so cogent a form that it presents itself as positively self-evident to the person who is able to follow him. For this reason a Buddha does not demand any belief, but promises knowledge: "Knowing thus and seeing thus, O monks, will you perhaps say: 'To the Master we show reverence, out of reverence for the Master we speak thus'?"—"Certainly not, Lord."—"Then do you say only that which you have thought over for yourselves, which you yourselves have discerned and understood?"—"Certainly, Lord."—"Well invested are you with this Marvel (this is the doctrine of the Buddha), with this clearly visible thing that is at all times accessible and says: 'Come and see!' Men of judgment and discretion can fix it in their own interior." (Majjh. Nik., 38 th Discourse). Where should we find a second founder of a religion who would have said anything like this?

Now when is a truth in itself evident and clearly visible? In other words, what knowledge gives us evident and obvious truth? Very few know this. If we are really clever, we imagine that truth is equivalent to immediate intuitive perception. But intuitive perception is simply the source of truth.*

Truth is knowledge, and all knowlege is a judgment, and every judgment is the work of the power of judgment, and hence an activity of the faculty of reason. But every activity of this faculty consists in the drawing of conclusions with major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. If, for example, I state the truth: "I am mortal," this rests on the drawing of a conclusion, on the syllogism: "All men are mortal (major premise)—I am a man (minor premise)—Therefore I am mortal" (conclusion). This holds good even of such self-evident truths as "The earth exists." Here the underlying syllogism is: "What I perceive exists—I perceive the earth—consequently it exists." If with such sentences man is not aware that he draws conclusions, this only shows how much it is a matter of course for every living being, even the animal, to draw conclusions.

If, however, all knowledge is a judgment, and every judgment rests on the drawing of a conclusion, then it must also be possible to demonstrate all Knowl-

* Intuition or immediate perception is a perception of the five *external* senses, a *sensuous* perception, or an intuitively direct perception by means of the sixth sense, the sense of *intuitive* thought. This latter perception is limited to the intuitive perception of space, of knowledge itself as such, and finally of the state that is wholly devoid of object.

This immediate perception (sensuous or intellectually and intuitively immediate) is still wholly without words or concepts. For this very reason, it cannot as such be communicated by words, but only by shifting it to another kind of perception, possibly by way of the work of art.

edge. For by a proof we understand simply the production of the syllogism on which a stated truth depends, so that a thing is true only in so far as it can be demonstrated.* For this very reason, Kant also says that, if we cannot be clear about the correctness of a sentence, we have but to bring it into the form of a logical syllogism (logos means faculty of reason).**

Therefore we must not set up intuitive perception in opposition to the syllogism, but the two must be combined into a unity. The syllogism itself must be *experienced* in its two premises, in its major and minor premises; in other words, intuitive perception must form the granite foundation from which the premises are drawn. *Such* a syllogism is the product of perfectly correct thinking, and for this very reason affords us infallible certainty and perfect knowledge. At bottom, this is meant when we speak of the sure and unerring certainty of the knowledge of intuitive perception, as we shall do subsequently in this work.

Now the Buddha has obtained his truths precisely through this method of logical inference, and he also teaches them in this form. In the 12th dialogue of the Majjhima Nikāya he himself specially emphasizes this logical character of his teaching: A former monk, a certain Sunakkhatta, had in Vesālī spread the report: "The ascetic Gotama teaches a doctrine which is gained by logical thinking, built up on critical investigation, discovered by himself; and the object of proclaiming his doctrine is simply that, whoever thinks logically, will arrive at a complete destruction of suffering." To this the Buddha replied, when he had been acquainted of it by his disciple Sāriputta: "Angry, o Sāriputta, is Sunakkhatta, in anger has he spoken these words; the foolish man imagines he will censure me, and precisely in this way he praises the Perfected One. Indeed, Sāriputta, it is *praise* of the Perfected One when a man says: 'And the object

* Great is the danger of error, when the concept or judgment cannot be traced back directly to the underlying intuitive knowledge and thus to reality, but only by means of several, or even of a long chain of syllogisms. This is in contrast to those concepts and judgments which in their premises have their *immediate* ground in intuitive perception. And it is this very danger which we have in mind, when we speak of the inferior value of *merely demonstrated* truths.

** The animal too has intuition, intuitive perception, but very little reflection. Action based on mere intuition is equivalent to impulsive conduct. Far superior to this is conduct that is guided by reflection, by a deliberation that tests and compares. When our times here again undertake their "transvaluation of values" by attaching more weight to intuition than to reflection, this too is only a further sign of decadence. Here evolution has led from the one extreme of exclusively admitting the reasoning faculty's activity to an almost total ruling out of intuition, as had been carried out by rationalism, to the other extreme of deifying "pure intuition" as the exclusive source of knowledge. In this way, our entire age moves positively in extremes, and precisely in those that lead to decadence. Reflection "is the second potential of knowledge, and the exercise of it calls for effort and exertion" (Schopenhauer, World as Will and Representation, Vol. II, chap. 8), alone a sufficient reason for scrapping it as not modern.

As everywhere, so also here truth lies in the centre; intuition and reflection belong inseparably to each other, since only reflection, based absolutely on intuitive perception and never going beyond this, brings us knowledge and consequently truth.

of expounding his doctrine is simply that, *whoever thinks logically*, will arrive at a complete destruction of suffering!'" The teaching of the Buddha is *therefore a religion of reason*; moreover, in the Canon it is characterized directly by the epithet *vibhajjavāda*, a word which is translated in Childers' Pāli Dictionary as "religion of logic or reason."

This scientific character of the Buddha's teaching was generally recognized and acknowledged within his community even centuries after his death. This has found a thoroughly characteristic expression in the account of the Singhalese Church Chronicles of the first dialogue between Mahinda, the converter of Ceylon, and King Devanampiya Tissa about 250 B. C. The Thera (the most senior) arranges for a formal examination of the King in logic, in order to find out "whether the king possesses a clear understanding." In the vicinity is a mango-tree, and the Thera asks: "What, great king, is the name of this tree?"—"It is called mango, Lord."—"Is there or is there not, great king, yet another mango-tree besides this mango-tree?"—"There are many other mango-trees, Lord."—"Are there yet other trees, great king, besides this mango-tree and those mango-trees?"—"There are, Lord, but they are no mango-trees."—"Is there yet another tree besides the other mango-trees and non-mango-trees?"—"Yes, Lord, this mango-tree here."—"Well done, great king, you are sagacious."—The Thera sets a similar test which the king likewise passes with brilliance: "Besides your relations and those not related to you, is there still any person, great king?"—"Myself, Lord!"—"Well done, great king, a man is neither related nor not related to himself." — "Then the Thera saw", so the narrative runs, "that the king was sagacious, and would be able to understand the teaching, and he preached to him the parable of the elephant's foot."

As in every science, so too in the science of the Buddha, logic is the great instrument for a knowledge of the truth. His precepts and propositions are determined by syllogisms, and indeed by those with none but self-evident and obviously correct premises, as can be ascertained by any one who takes the trouble. For this very reason, their inner evidence is revealed to every one who studies them as thoroughly as does, say, a student of medicine his medical text-books before his examination. Of course, a man must be "intelligent", as intelligent as king Devanampiya Tissa, and must have also the will and energy for such study. Whoever lacks these, lacks the religious sense, that is to say, he does not feel the need to secure his great future after death. He is, therefore no "Aryan," such as is assumed by the Buddha with his teaching.

But the following is the most unique and astonishing thing which the Buddha shares with no one else in the world. Unlike any one else, he has not only laid bare the great practical problem of how we can make ourselves perfectly free from sorrow and absolutely full of bliss, but he has referred this essential problem directly to the primary problem of our deepest nature. What is wholly unique is that he has referred it to a single syllogism of such simplicity that, with good will, even an intelligent shepherd can in the end see and experience it in all its overwhelming certainty. This syllogism is as follows:

"That which I see arise and pass away within me, and thus bring me suffering with the appearance of this transitoriness, cannot be I myself. Now, whatever is knowable, I see arise and pass away within me, and, — with the appearance of this transitoriness, — bring me suffering. Therefore nothing knowable is my I or Self."

This means that neither my body nor even my mind is my substantial I or Self; on the contrary, body and mind are only inessential "attributes" of me, of which I can again rid myself, in order then, as a "Perfect One, deep, immeasurable, and unfathomable as the great ocean," to plunge into absolute reality, into Nibbāna, in which everything knowable is extinguished, "in imperishable bliss;" "full of peace is this state, exalted and sublime is this state."

This syllogism is the starting-point for an understanding of the Buddha's teaching, and it finds its crowning touch in the possibilities that are brought about through *meditation*. In the direction of the aim which it indicates, the supreme goal at the same time limns itself, which in a meditative contemplation becomes an ever greater certainty.

Thus here importance is attached only to a logic whose premises are rooted entirely in intuitive reality. The Buddha's whole method of consideration goes back to this. From the very first, this stipulates a very *mindful*, indeed an extremely *slow*, thinking, a *meditative** thinking which becomes contemplation. To begin with, there is a faint dawning, a slight, merely felt *presentiment* of the truth. In its gradual progress, this presentiment becomes a *belief in the truth* interspersed with doubts, and finally a complete *logical comprehension*, until at the culminating point it merges into a *palpably intuitive penetration* of its object. Just as the rising sun in all its glow scatters all twilight, so does this penetration dispel forever all doubts. The truth is then directly *experienced* by us precisely by our *thoroughly* penetrating its object with the spiritual eye, just as I *experience* in all its mighty form and structure the mountain mass of Mont Blanc when I directly look at it. And *thus*, in *this* way, with *such* clearness, must a man *experience* all the elements of his personality as not the I or Self (*anattā*), as essentially foreign to himself. This he must do in order to become an actual "seer of Nibbāna," and thus at the same time one who experiences immediately in his own body the absolute bliss of complete *desirelessness* which ensues as a result of *this* "vision." He will then also be one who actually makes Nibbāna *known*.

The premises of the Buddha's judgments and conclusions are found again at any moment and without any trouble in intuitive perceptive reality, a characteristic that represents, neither more nor less, the formal part of the cognitive activity of *all* men of genius. A classical, formal proof of this is given by the

* Meditation (*meditari* = to think, reflect, ruminate, ponder, contemplate) thoughtfulness, contemplation, deliberation. In the doctrine of the Buddha meditation becomes the means of the profoundest knowledge. It produces contemplation, a discerning contemplation.

circumstance that the Buddha's statements are, one and all, interspersed with *parables* drawn from reality. Indeed, these occur in full measure and at times in a striking manner, such as will not be found anywhere else. Yet parables are quite pre-eminently suitable for verifying abstract ideas as the reflected image of intuitive reality, and for this very reason every really inspired mind also feels the need—the more so, the more highly gifted he is—to make his abstract ideas clear through similes and parables. Therefore, Sāriputta, the greatest of the Buddha's disciples, says: "Through parables the meaning of a discourse also becomes clear to many an intelligent man" (Majj. Nik., 43rd Discourse). But the Buddha himself was thoroughly impressed with the discernment that only that abstract knowledge is of value which can always and easily be shown to be based on intuitive reality. He was so penetrated with this idea, that he enjoined, even on those who had barely entered his Order, to make clear to themselves and to others, through parables and thus by going back to the reality of intuitive perception, the knowledge that his teaching had to convey to them. "His speech is weighty and pregnant, *embellished occasionally with similes and parables*, clear and definite, and appropriate to its subject." This is a stock sentence in the enumeration of the basic duties of the Order. A judgment or proposition, which cannot be illustrated by a simile from reality, has in fact no real value.

Therefore the Buddha's teaching is based on *intuitive* thinking, which for this reason he demands. He also expressly states this character of his teaching in the standing sentence: "This doctrine is profound, hard to see, difficult to perceive, calm, sublime, *not in the sphere of the merely abstract thought* (atakkāvacara), subtle, to be grasped only by sages." He had every reason also to stress in particular the characteristic of his teaching that it is not accessible to the merely abstract thought. For precisely in his day in India, dialectic, the art of disputation, flourished in the highest degree among the "Samanas and Brahmins". Even in Greece, in the palmy days of the Sophists, it could not have been more in vogue. On the basis of merely abstract concepts and in the guise of logic, it was infallibly demonstrated that "everything is" and also that "nothing is." Likewise it was shown that "all is unity" and also that "all is plurality" (Cf. Franke, Dīgha Nik., p. 19, Note 3). Here, of course, the false element did not consist in the fact that men worked *with the laws of logic*,* but in their casting about ready-made concepts (takkā) according to the laws of logic after the manner of algebraical equations. This they did without making sure from time

* Logic comes from λογίζεσθαι, to count, reckon, calculate; to take into account, consider, reason, infer. This in turn comes from *logos*, word and reason or reflection, which are inseparable. But according to this, *logical thinking* means thinking in conformity with the laws of reason. It indicates that procedure of the faculty of reason, of the logos, which that faculty observes when left to itself and undisturbed, and hence in the solitary thinking of a rational being who is not led astray by anything, whether it be with the material of merely abstract representations, or *with that of representations of intuitive perception* (Cf. Schopenhauer's Handschriftlicher Nachlaß, p. 3 seqq.).

to time of the reality of these concepts and of their *true* content by descending to the reality of intuitive perception, and thus without thinking meditatively. "All that is merely imaginable or conceivable, and consequently also what is false, impossible, absurd, and senseless, enters into abstract concepts" (Schopenhauer, World as Will and Representation, Vol. II, chap. 6). For this very reason they must establish their legitimacy in the individual case first from intuitive reality; in other words, thinking must always remain *intuitive*, and can never lose, even for a moment, the connexion with sensuous *experience*, if all the judgments obtained with it are not to be "without foundation" (Dīgha Nik., I, 1, 29; Franke, p. 22, note 1). Just this and *only* this is what the Buddha means when he says that his teaching is attakkāvacara, which therefore means that "my doctrine does not lie in the realm of the *merely abstract concept* (takkā), but is rooted rather in intuitive perception" (Majj. Nik., 48th Discourse). It therefore rests on that thinking which operates not merely with abstract concepts (takkā), as empty husks into which anyone puts what he wants, but with representations of *intuitive perception*. For the comprehension of his teaching, therefore, the mere dialectical method is not enough, but beyond it *direct observation* is necessary, which is just *intuitive* thinking.

In the light of this method of the Master, and guided by his own words, there is revealed to us in the present work an understanding of the cycle of rebirths in all its depths and heights; and here *this* understanding at the same time entails a following of the path. A unique mountain path is opened up to our view! He who has awakened will gradually advance upon it, after he has accustomed his spiritual eye to the brilliant light of the religious ideal which, as the *mysterium tremendum*, radiates in his face from the doctrine of the Buddha. But just as we already feel relief, joy, and comfort when we reach even only the first slopes of the mighty mountain mass from the low ground of the mountain valley, so does the Buddha's teaching become easy to understand to everyone of intelligence, if at the same time he is of good will, at any rate to the extent of teaching him to comprehend the cycle of his rebirths with the possibility of *controlling* it. With this he experiences in his meditations the firm foundation of all genuine religiosity, and in this the inner peace and hence *genuine* happiness, of which our age no longer possesses even a trace, bursting as it does with intellectual arrogance and with all its sciences and technical achievements.

III

The Method of Handing down the "Marvel"

The doctrine of the Buddha is the doctrine of the universally prevalent law of transitoriness. It would not be true, if this law had not been realized in the doctrine itself, whose external fate was somewhat as follows:

After the Buddha had proclaimed his teaching to all the people in Central India throughout half a century, travelling on foot from place to place and sometimes accompanied by a number of monks; and when the monks, in the Vedic

manner, had thoroughly committed to memory his individual discourses and utterances, these, together with the expositions of his great disciples, were passed on from mouth to mouth after the Master's death in 483 B. C. This was done with scrupulous accuracy, since men were conscious of their immense importance. In addition, the sacred texts (suttas) were arranged at various councils into groups (nikāyas), and collected into Pitakas (baskets), in fact into the Suttapitaka, the Basket of the Discourses, and the Vinayapitaka, the Basket of the Rules of the Order. To these two „baskets" the Abhidhammapitaka, the Basket of Scholastic Philosophy, was later added as a further independent development. Thus the Tipitaka (the Three Baskets), as the sum-total of the Buddhist sacred writings, was established for all time. The Tipitaka was first recorded in writing a few decades before our era under King Vattagamini in Ceylon, whither it had been brought by Mahinda, son of the great Buddhist Emperor Asoka (264—227 B.C.).

Therefore only this Tipitaka is concerned for the determination of the Buddha's original doctrine. It seems necessary to state this expressly, since, very soon after his death, a new source for *the explanation* of his doctrine began to flow, namely a literature of commentaries of considerable magnitude. The greatest part of this was brought together into a compilation under the name of *Aṭṭhakathā*, "explanation of the sense". The commentaries were naturally written by monks, Theras (Elders); at the same time, they are said to have represented the point of view of the first three councils (roughly 483, 383, and 245 B.C.). It is said that the Aṭṭhakathā, together with the Tipitaka, was brought to Ceylon in 245 B.C. by the monk Mahinda, son of King Asoka, and there translated into Singhalese. Nothing exists either of the original Aṭṭhakathā written in Pāli, or of the Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā which had been translated into Old Singhalese by Mahinda. On the other hand, the latter was discovered in the fifth century A.D. by the monk Buddhaghosa who had moved from India to Ceylon. According to his statements, he translated back into Pāli its essential parts with the addition of his own interpretations. This Aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa is still preserved, and is called the Theravāda interpretation by the monks of to-day in Ceylon, Burma, and Siam.

Perpetuated thus by Buddhaghosa, this literature of commentaries clung to the Three Baskets like a mighty creeper; indeed, it is often regarded in the viharas of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam as a heresy to want to form an opinion of one's own concerning the contents of the Three Baskets, however cogently substantiated such an opinion may be. This, then, is precisely the method of the Catholic Church which for two thousand years has likewise forbidden any individual interpretation of the Bible. For this reason Deussen rightly says in his *Erinnerungen an Indien* that the Buddhism of today is a magnifying mirror of the faults of Catholicism.

Here the tragic feature is that this Theravāda-interpretation of Buddhaghosa and of later commentators no longer does justice to the kernel of the Buddha's teaching. This school explains the fact of rebirth as follows: Man's essential nature consists in bodily and mental forces which, when acting together, style

themselves as "I". Like everything else, these forces calling themselves "I" naturally disappear in death. But in continuation of them, there then sprang up in a different germinating material, made ready by the parents in the act of copulation, new forces which are equivalent to those that have perished, and which again form a human being, and in him, thus describing himself, once more say "I". It is exactly the same as if a new candle were kindled from an old one burnt down almost to extinction. This is said to be rebirth as taught by the Buddha. In point of fact this theory, which has no basis in the words of the Buddha himself, is naturally nothing but a special form of the belief in annihilation which the Buddha rejects in a solemn manner. For precisely because the forces springing up in a different germinating material are *new*, they are no longer the old; the forces that had formed the previous human being have perished definitely and forever. If I perish with the disappearance of the forces themselves that formed my essential nature, how then am I concerned with the *new* forces that are said to spring up in a new germinating material after my death, even if such new forces are equivalent to those that have disappeared? What clear-thinking mind still speaks here of rebirth,—in the sense in which the Buddha describes it in the parable of the *one* wanderer? "Just as when a man went from his place to another place, and from this again to another, and from this place returned to his own place, the thought then occurred to him: 'I have gone from my place to that place, I have stood there, sat there, spoken there, and been silent there; from that place, however, I have gone to this place, and then I have stood there, sat there, spoken there, and been silent there; then I have returned again from this place to my own place'; in the same way do my disciples call to mind many different forms of previous existences" (Majj. Nik. 77th discourse). The interpretation that is not to be read from the words of the Buddha himself is obtained only by the explanation that the discourses of the Buddha must not be taken literally just as they are given. This certainly resulted in the direct opposite to what we previously came to know as the Aryan Indian genius with its powerful Ātman doctrine, which revealed itself through the centuries. Thus it cannot be a matter for surprise that *this* Buddhism not only evoked so much contempt from Shankara, the great Vedic commentator (born 788 A.D.), that he called the Buddha (whom he obviously knew only in the form of the Buddhism of the commentaries) an old prattler, but also that the doctrine of the Buddha disappeared entirely from India between 800 and 1000 A.D. (Deussen, l. c. I, 3, p. 180). In fact, *this* Buddhism is no religion for the Indian Arya.*)**)

*) The opposition in which many commentaries stand not only to the teaching of the Buddha himself, but also to the Aryan Indian genius generally, really forces one to the assumption that these commentators were not pure Aryans at all, but Dravidians (the original inhabitants of India) who lived in South India in large numbers in the time of the Buddha, and still do today. The Singhalese also consist of Aryan and Dravidian elements.

**) The Buddhist *laity* in the countries in which Buddhism continued to exist have, of course, not bothered at all about the theoretical reversal of the Buddha's idea by Buddhist *scholars* (the misfortune was just that the monks had for the most part become mere schol-

The Maha-Aṭṭhakathā is undoubtedly mainly responsible for the fact that the Order of the Buddha was at an early date split into sects. This applies in particular to the schism into Theravādins, as the advocates of the Buddhism of the commentaries, and into Mahasanghikas, as the opponents,—a schism which had already occurred at the second Council of Vesāli in the year 383 B.C. In the first century A. D. we have the origin of Mahāyāna, of the "Great Vehicle", as it was called by its followers themselves. By contrast, they contemptuously described as Hināyāna, the "Small (defective) Vehicle", the older modes of thought which were based ultimately on the Pāli Canon. The Buddha teaches that the man, who works for his own salvation *as well as* for the salvation of others, "is the greatest, the best, the most venerable, and the most sublime" (Ang. Nik. IV, 95). Here he emphasizes that only the man "who is himself not drawn into the swamp can pull out another who is submerged" (Majj. Nik., 8th discourse). But in addition, the Mahāyāna set up a Bodhisattva-ideal which will attain its own supreme salvation only after the salvation of every other being. Moreover, we have a mythology which has been taken over from Brahmanism, and a decided cult of divine and demonic beings.

At the beginning of our era "the community of Buddhists flourished throughout the length and breadth of India, and its apostles took the faith of the Buddha beyond India to nations whose names were not yet known in that country" (Oldenberg, 445). The teaching had certainly become the religion of the people, and the Master's prophecy to his disciple Ānanda had quite definitely become true as to "the distinguishing feature of the doctrine, as is natural to those who are awakened": "Not long, Ānanda, will the holy life be preserved. Five hundred years will the doctrine of truth last" (Cullavagga X, 1, 6). Nevertheless, the "Marvel", even as the mere religion of the people, has left its mark on the whole of non-Islamic Asia, and thus on more than half the human race, even where it no longer exists as a definite corporate body, as in India. All Asiatic religions are indebted to it for the noblest moral element that is effective even to-day, which culminates in kindness to all that lives and breathes, the doctrine of the perfectly Awakened One (Cf. William Hunter, A Brief History of the Indian People).

Buddhism first came to Europe in its later forms in the last century; but in the present century editions of the Tipitaka also appeared in the original text. These were followed by a series of translations and expositions, which at first stimulated considerable interest. But as some of the European Indianists became involved in the net of the above-mentioned Buddhism of the commentaries, and fashioned their translations as well as their expositions of the teaching in this negative sense, circles who were religiously interested very soon turned

ars), so that this perversion of his idea by its competent wardens has been without practical consequence. And this was very fortunate for historical Buddhism. This is what Sir *Edwin Arnold*, auther of the famous didactic poem The Light of Asia, has in mind when he says in his preface that it is his "firm conviction that a third of mankind would never have been brought to believe in blank abstractions, or in Nothingness as the issue and crown of Being".

away again in disappointment. Not even for the European Aryan can *such* a religion be considered.

In view of all this, the author of the present work has scarcely drawn upon the literature of the commentaries. He has built up his work exclusively on the Sutta-pitaka, on the Basket of the Discourses of the Buddha and his great disciples. As far as possible, he has followed the example of the monk Pūrana who, when asked to take part in the Council that met soon after the Buddha's death, politely declined, and said that he preferred to stick to what he himself had heard from the Master's lips. The correctness of the standpoint of sticking to the words of the Buddha himself results, moreover, from what the Master says of his doctrine, namely that it carries within itself its own confirmation, and needs no other authority.

With the method of handing down the Basket of the Discourses, many different trimmings of later monks may of course have crept into it, which were not in the sense of the Buddha. To separate and isolate these, the author applied a criterion for the genuineness of the passages quoted which may be made clear through the following simile.

Men have been digging in the ruins of an ancient city. According to tradition there stood in the middle a great temple, the ground-plan of which is still recognisable. The investigators now apply themselves to the identification of the huge blocks of stone lying around, as forming part of the temple. Concerning almost every single stone a learned contention is spun out as to whether or not it belongs to the temple, so that no end to the disputing seems in sight. An architect for a long time listens in silence. Then he comes to a bold resolve: he will build up the temple again with the original stones. So he has workmen come; points out stone after stone; has each fitted into its proper place, until at last the whole temple without a gap anywhere, is reconstructed in all its splendour and in a pleasing harmony of all its parts, wherein every block exactly fits in with every other. Is not the whole contention as to the genuineness of each separate stone thereby decided in the simplest and surest manner?

Perhaps the reader will recognise even as immediately in the passages quoted in "The Doctrine of the Buddha" under his hands, the original blocks of the words of the Master, and in the whole system, the *dhamma anitiha*. Assuredly he has recognised it if in the reading of the book he has also experienced in himself the truth of those other words, that the teaching of the Buddha is like the paw of the lion: "What it strikes, be it lofty or low, that it strikes soundly."

It may then be for him a matter of indifference whether many others besides himself have the same experience, in particular whether Schopenhauer's words will ever be fulfilled: "Therefore we may hope that one day even Europe will be purified of all Jewish mythology. Perhaps the century has come in which the people of the Japhetic group of languages coming from Asia (Indo-Europeans) will again receive the *sacred religions of their native country*; for, after going astray for a long time, they have again become ripe for these" (Parerga Vol. II. § 115, at the end).

George Grimm

THEME AND BASIS
OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE BUDDHA

Schopenhauer has pointed out to us the great truth that the nature of all that exists consists in willing. Every creature, from the first moment of its existence to its last breath, wills, and all its powers, mental as well as physical, are exclusively for the service of this will; yea, they are nothing but will itself made visible. If man no longer wills, if he has become entirely without will, each of himself feels that he has become impossible as a human being; we feel that because of the annihilation of his will, and thereby of his real nature, he must vanish from the world. And if mankind were not to will anything, if every being were to be entirely without will, then the whole world within a very short time would simply disappear, because every kind of existence is based solely upon will.

Because all existence is will, everything that is in harmony with this will is happiness, and everything hindering it is suffering,—suffering meaning impeded will. Thus happiness and suffering, in the last analysis, only reveal the extent to which the will of the individual is able to maintain and effectuate itself.

Obvious as all this is to everybody who has once grasped it, there is equally as little doubt that every act of will at every moment is impeded on all hands. Even where will seems to get fulfilled, its consequences at length turn round against itself, and at last in inevitable death, it suffers complete shipwreck.

Thus is it to-day, thus has it been through all the past, and thus will it continue to be as long as there are men, or even living creatures at all. For everybody feels—and the reasoning man perceives it—that those circumstances which are in opposition to a real and permanent gratification of our will are dictated by the law of nature, representing an iron necessity, connected as inseparably with every act of will as heat is connected with fire. For where life is—and where will is, there is life, will being nothing else but the will to live—there, even when every possibility of development is taken into account, at last must be death, and therewith, an inevitable, ever repeated ultimate collapse of life and thus of will.

Clear as all this is, there can hardly be a man who at least once in his life has not put to himself the timid question, if there is really no way out of this terrible self-dissension of our nature which always wants what must be impossible according to the very nature of this will; whether there is not at least a possibility of escaping *death*. Is this not strange? Is not the simple putting of this question

more inexplicable than the problem of death itself? For if suffering, if above all, death, is conditioned by the very law of nature, how should it be possible to evade them? How can man in face of the unequivocal language of nature, demonstrating to him on every corpse the inevitableness of death, entertain the thought that it might be possible to conquer death?

And still this question is not only the question of every single human being, but has been the great question of mankind from its first beginnings, and will remain so as long as there are men. It is the chief, properly speaking, the only theme, as well as the strong point, of all religions, and is the source of every philosophy. Free mankind from evil, first of all from death, and religion and philosophy will not only be counted superfluous, but truly have become superfluous. Not even a god does man need, if rid of suffering and become immortal; from which it is clear that the concept of god is ultimately nothing but an expedient for solving the problem of suffering and death. On the other hand, men are content with the most absurd dogmatical forms of belief, if only they make claim to vanquish suffering and death.

"If our life," says Schopenhauer, "were endless and free from pain, perhaps it would never enter any one's head to ask why the world is here, and constructed just as it is. Accordingly we find that the interest awakened by philosophical or religious systems has its strongest point in the dogma of some kind of existence after death; and though the latter systems make the existence of their gods the chief point and seem to defend this with utmost zeal, this is ultimately only because they have bound their doctrine of immortality to it and think both inseparable; really they only care for this. For if it could be secured otherwise, their lively zeal for their gods would very soon cool down; and it would give place to almost complete indifference, if, on the other hand, the utter impossibility of immortality could be proved to them." In entire agreement with this, it is just that doctrine, materialism, which, holding to the ocular evidence of nature itself, teaches the annihilation of man by death, that, as Schopenhauer goes on to say, has never been able to obtain a permanent influence over mankind. This proves that the solution of the problem given by materialism goes against the inner nature of man, and therefore cannot possibly be true. For viewed simply from the standpoint of materialism, man is merely a part of nature, her mere product and nothing more. But if this is so, then his nature must be in harmony with it; and thus in his feelings, it would be impossible for him to be in conflict with her dictates.

Accordingly the situation is such, that in the innermost depths of human nature the conviction is firmly established that in spite of all seeming impossibility, there must be a way and a bridge leading beyond suffering and death.

But has mankind succeeded in finding out such a way? Here, without more ado, this much is clear, that an answer is only to be expected from the religions. For philosophy that alone might come into question here, certainly in its greatest representatives has looked astonishingly deep into the mystery of death; but of the philosophers, none even claims to have discovered a practicable way

that leads beyond death. But all religions are built upon faith, so much so that according to our current notions, this trait is the direct and formal nature of every religion. A system abhorring faith can *eo ipso* on no account be taken as a religion. But not every man is able to believe. "There is," as Schopenhauer says, "a boiling point on the scale of culture, where all faith vanishes, and man longs for better insight."

As soon as he has come thus far, he is irrecoverably lost for faith, and therewith for religion. "For faith,"—again according to Schopenhauer—"is like love; it cannot be enforced; it will only thrive on the soil of ignorance." But apart from that, mere faith is always a precarious matter, particularly if, as in our case, the various religions and creeds teach different things about the way in which man may vanquish death, and if, at the same time each one claims the direction shown by itself to be the right one, and that faith is to be given only to itself, not to the others. Upon which shall we rely? There is no other way than to examine the different religions with regard to their compatibility with reason. To reason indeed, they all themselves appeal, in their eager efforts to snatch away one another's adherents. But precisely in this do they all sign their own death-warrant. For with this they, in the last resort, allow the reason of man to judge as to what is true and what is not true. But on the other hand, they themselves with their doctrines always come into the most violent contradiction with the demands of this same reason; a fact which has found its classical expression in the saying "Credo quia absurdum est."

This is becoming evident precisely in our time, when the conviction of the inadequacy of religions slowly begins to become a phenomenon of the multitude, and just in the direction here in question, the "shall-believe" is more and more opposed by the "want-to-know." But who is able to satisfy this craving, since all our philosophy too, here fails completely? Indeed, we seem to have come to the standpoint of many, that here all knowledge is impossible and mere faith having become untenable, complete resignation remains the only possible thing. Yet here, just in time, in consequence of those secret conjunctions in the course of the world's events, thanks to which help or compensation comes for every state that has grown untenable, salvation arises, as so often before, out of the East: *ex oriente lux!*

Let us once more call the situation to mind: "The age of science no longer wants to believe, but to know." More than that, it is no longer satisfied with that feebler kind of knowledge, namely, the purely abstract, gained by mere concepts or even consisting in mere concepts, as is particularly made evident by the rejection of every philosophy founded upon pure concepts, such as was in vogue during earlier days. Our age demands immediate insight; it also wants to base metaphysical concepts upon self-experience, accessible to everybody. For self-experience alone gives real certainty. Fully to understand this we must recall the incomparable elucidation of the relation between direct knowledge and abstract knowledge given by Schopenhauer, that diamond of his philosophy, which relation may be briefly explained thus:

Abstract knowledge receives its entire content only from direct, sense-perceived knowledge; it borrows its materials entirely from the latter. Therefore it is not able to give really new knowledge, but only serves to condense our direct knowledge, once gained, into settled concepts, and thus to fix it and transmit it to others. Accordingly truth, that is, the adequate apprehension of something existing in the intellect of man, may ultimately be gained only through our own immediate perception. As Schopenhauer says: "Perception is not only the source of all knowledge, it is itself very knowledge. As out of the immediately radiated splendour of the sun we enter into the borrowed and reflected light of the moon, so do we pass from the sense-perceived, immediate representation bearing its own evidence and warrant in itself, to the abstract and discursive notions of reason which receive all their content only from this direct sense-perceived knowledge, and in relation to the same. As long as we remain simply percipient, everything is clear, fixed and certain. There are neither questions, nor doubts, nor errors. One neither wants, nor is able, to go further; peace is found in immediate perception; contentment in the present. But with abstract knowledge, with reason, in the theoretical there arises doubt and error, and in the practical, sorrow and regret."

Thus, only direct sense-perceived knowledge gives complete satisfaction. Whoever possesses *it*, has no more need of faith, every form of faith melting before it like liquid wax; for him who possesses it, all merely abstract knowledge also, with all its sources of error, has become superfluous: he who has become certain of the existence of a thing through himself perceiving it, as little needs to believe in this existence, as to have it proved to him.

Only this highest degree of truth can permanently satisfy man with regard to the primal problem as to whether it is possible to overcome suffering and, above all, death. This highest degree of truth our age demands, also in this connection.

And now, hearken! Thousands of years ago, there lived in India a man, who, as no other has done, succeeded in crystallizing out this great, primary problem of mankind in all its purity, free from all accessories of any kind, more especially, purified from other obscure, refuse by-products of the longing for metaphysical knowledge. He claimed for himself to have solved the problem in such a manner, that every one by his own direct perception, by his own immediate insight might convince himself of the correctness of the solution, and even at any time, if only he wishes to do so, may test it upon himself. Thus he does not, as do our religions, merely draw a bill of exchange payable after death in an uncertain future. And it happens that the doctrine of this man whom many call the greatest of the Aryans and therefore the greatest of men, precisely at this moment is making its way among mankind looking longingly for a teaching that on one hand may present to it the kernel of all religions and all metaphysics, pure and unmixed, and on the other guarantees its solution in accordance with the methods of exact science, by self-experimentation. This is the doctrine of Gotama the Buddha, the Awakened One, the culminating point of Indian

wisdom. Is it any wonder that all those who cannot pass with indifference over the great question of suffering culminating in death, or as children of an era that craves for knowledge, are no longer able to believe, but want to know, begin more and more to swarm round this doctrine which begins for them to take possession of the throne of religions that satisfy them no longer? Give me the name of another mortal who has set forth with equal clearness the great problem of mankind, how to escape suffering and death, and made it the exclusive theme of his doctrine and his life, as the Buddha has done!

The solution of this problem of suffering, from the very beginning was the great task he set himself. For its sake he who had the claim to the crown of his father, an Indian petty king, renounced this crown as well as riches, wife and child and "just entering on his princedom, in first manhood, in the bloom of youth, dark-haired, against the wish of his parents weeping and lamenting, with shorn hair and beard, clad in garb of yellow, he left home behind and retired from the household life to the homeless life," to find out if it were not possible to put an end to this whole chain of suffering. Though the story about the motives of his flight from the world in its details is nothing but a legend, still this legend is so beautiful and is so much in line with the spirit of his doctrine, marking out and defining its contents from the beginning so distinctly and faithfully, that it may be rendered here.

Already when Prince Siddhattha—this was the Buddha's original name—was born, the Brahmins living as priests and astrologers at the court of his father, King Suddhodana, predicted the future destiny of the child. They prophesied: "If Prince Siddhattha mounts the throne, he will become a king of kings, a ruler of the world; but if he renounces the throne and chooses the life of an ascetic, then he will become an overcomer of the world, a perfect Buddha." And the ascetic Kaladevala came from the wilderness of the Himālaya and threw himself down before the child, speaking thus: "Truly, this child will some day become a most perfect Buddha and show men the way to liberation." And he wept, for he knew that at his advanced age, he could not live to see that day. But the king, by every means at his disposal sought to hinder the fulfilment of this prediction, as he wished Prince Siddhattha to become a monarch dominating the world. As the Brahmins had told him that the sight of human suffering and of earthly transitoriness would cause the prince to flee from the world, he kept away from his son everything that might have given him knowledge of human misery and death. He furnished him with every kind of pleasure and all royal splendour, to chain him to worldly life as closely as possible. As he grew up a youth, his father had three palaces built for him, suited to the three seasons of the Indian climate, the hot, the cold, and the rainy. They were all furnished with magnificent splendour. Wide gardens and groves extended all around, with clear ponds girdled with lotus flowers, cool grottoes, murmuring cascades, and garden beds full of beautiful flowers. Within these gardens and groves the prince spent his youth, but he was not allowed to leave them; and to every poor, sick or old man, entrance to them was strictly prohibited. The sons of the

country's most noble families were his companions. In his sixteenth year his father had him married to the Princess Yasodhara, and besides that, he provided him with a whole harem of beautiful girls skilled in all manner of dances and songs, and in all kinds of musical instruments in use among Indian princes. Then one day, in driving through the park, he suddenly noticed an infirm old man, his back bent down under the burden of many years, who with the aid of a staff crawled painfully along. Full of astonishment Siddhattha asked his driver Channa, what this curious creature might be, and Channa replied that it was an old man. "Was he born in this state?" the prince went on asking. "No, my Lord, once he was young and in full bloom like you." "Are there more of such old men?" the prince inquired, growing more and more astonished. "Very many, my Lord." "And how could he fall into this miserable state?" "Such is nature's course, that all men must become old and feeble, if they do not die young." "And I too, Channa?" "Yes, my Lord, you too." This accident put the young prince in such a pensive mood, that he gave the order to turn home, as he had lost all delight in his beautiful surroundings. Some time afterwards in driving out again, he caught sight of a leper, and when Channa answered his questions about this apparition, he was so deeply impressed in mind that from then on, he shunned all pleasures and began to think about human misery. After a longer time had elapsed, the prince encountered a third apparition. He saw a decayed corpse lying at the wayside. Greatly perturbed he turned home at once and cried out: "Woe to men! Of what use to me is all royal splendour, all this pomp and all these pleasures, if they are not able to save me from old age, from sickness and death? How unhappy is mankind! Are there no means to put an end to suffering and death ever renewing themselves with every new birth?" Henceforth, this question incessantly occupied him. Riding out at a later time, he found an answer. An ascetic appeared to him, wearing a garb of yellow as do the Buddhist brethren, his awe-inspiring features clearly reflecting the deep peace of his mind.

This apparition indicated to him the way in which he had to seek the solution of his great problem. His resolution to quit the world like that reverend ascetic and to go out into the wilderness, slowly ripened. And then, all at once he put this resolution into effect, in the unshakeable conviction that it would be given him to discover the end of every form of suffering.

To this problem, for him the greatest, the six following years of most horrible self-mortifications were devoted, as the custom of India of that day held this to be the way leading soonest to the perception of truth. And he said to himself: "Whatever feelings painful, burning and bitter, ascetics and brahmins ever have undergone in the past, undergo in the present, or shall undergo in the future: this is the utmost; further they cannot go."[1]) To this one goal was devoted that time of quiet inward contemplation, in which he next immersed himself when he had convinced himself of the uselessness of all painful asceticism, and which at last brought him the solution of his great problem. In triumph he first communicated it to the five monks who had surrounded him during the time of

his self-martyrdom, but who had left him when he had recognized this way as erroneous. "An Exalted One, O monks, is the Accomplished One; a Supremely Awakened One is He! Give ear, O monks, the deathless has been attained. I will instruct you, I will impart to you the doctrine. Following my instructions, ye shall know and realize that utmost noble goal of the holy life for yourselves even in this present lifetime."[2]) And in fact, like the Master, they also soon attained to "the incomparable security, the birthless, the free from growth and decay and disease, the deathless, the sorrowless, the stainless."[3] They attained the end of suffering.

This gospel of the ending of suffering henceforth constituted the only theme of the Buddha, the Awakened One, as thenceforward he called himself. To its propagation the following forty-five years of his life were devoted. Every day, yea, every hour he could say of himself: "As before so also now, I preach only Suffering and the Cessation of Suffering."[4] "As the great ocean, ye disciples, is penetrated by only one taste, the taste of salt, even so, disciples, this Doctrine and this Order are penetrated by only one taste, the taste of salvation."[5] This, the sole content of his teaching, he made externally knowable by condensing it into the Four Most Excellent Truths of Suffering, within which everything good is contained: "Just as all living creatures that go upon feet find passage-way in the footsteps of the elephant, the footprint of the elephant being by them held in the highest esteem by reason of its great size, even so, all things whatsoever that are good and salutary are contained and comprehended in the Four Most Excellent Truths, namely in these: the Most Excellent Truth of Suffering, the Most Excellent Truth of the Arising of Suffering, the Most Excellent Truth of the Ceasing of Suffering and the Most Excellent Truth of the Path that leads to the Ceasing of Suffering."[6]

Certainly his knowledge was not restricted to these four excellent truths; his mind had penetrated the abysses of existence in other directions also, more deeply than any other mortal; but with deliberate intention he communicated nothing of it to mankind, but exclusively limited himself to the four excellent truths: "Once upon a time, the Venerable One was staying at Kosambi in a Sinsapa-forest. And the Venerable One took up a few *sinsapa* leaves in his hand and said to his disciples: "What do you think, my disciples, which is more, these few *sinsapa* leaves I hold in my hand, or the other leaves in the *sinsapa* wood above?"—"The few leaves, Lord, that the Venerable One holds in his hands, are small in number; much more are the leaves in the *sinsapa* forest above."—"Even so, disciples, what I have perceived and have not communicated to you is much more than what I have communicated to you. And why, O disciples, have I not revealed this to you? Because, O disciples, it would not be of advantage to you, because it does not promote the higher life in all its purity, because it does not lead to disgust with the world, to annihilation of all lust, to the ceasing of the transitory, to peace, to the higher knowledge, to awakening, to Nibbāna. Therefore I have not communicated it to you. And what, disciples, have I communicated to you? What Suffering is, disciples, I have communicated to

you; what the Arising of Suffering is, disciples, I have communicated to you; what the Ceasing of Suffering is, disciples, I have communicated to you; and what is the Path that leads to the Ceasing of Suffering, disciples, I have communicated to you."[7]

The Buddha even goes so far as to reject every setting up of problems that go beyond this exclusively practical purpose, all theoretical questions and all speculative enquiries, particularly those about the essence of the world or of ourselves, as a mere overflow of our tendency towards polymathy terminating only in "a blind alley of views, a cave, a gorge of views" and thus only involving the inexperienced mortal still deeper in suffering.[8] Accordingly, the Buddha especially does not teach any system of philosophy; not only no kind of metaphysics, but also no ontology nor dianoiology. Concerning the world in itself, its origin, its duration, its laws, he is indifferent, since any such predictions and statements are ultimately without any practical purpose for mankind. All this has interest for him only in so far as it is of practical value for the annihilation of suffering. Therefore in his teaching those philosophers who, corrupted by the thirst for knowledge for its own sake, wish to have every enigma of existence solved, will lose their labour, since, if the saying holds good of any one, it holds good of the Buddha: "Non meum est docere doctores." It is not my task to teach scholars. Apart from this, the enigma of the world belongs to those enigmas "with which to dabble only leads to perplexity;"[9] while those dabbling with it resemble men born blind, who have been led to touch an elephant. The first of them touches the head, the other the trunk, the third one the foot, the fourth one the tail, and now each of them cries out: "The elephant looks like this; no, he looks like that," until the combat of opinions turns into a combat of fists.[10] Such investigators entirely mistake the situation wherein they find themselves. This is like that of explorers who have ventured into a lonely desert and on every side are beset by wild animals. Instead of thinking about defending themselves against these animals and saving their lives, they enter upon zoological studies of them, which end in themselves being devoured by the beasts, together with the results of their studies. The Buddha himself sums up their standpoint as follows.

"It is as if, Mālunkyāputta, a man had been wounded by an arrow thickly smeared with poison, and his friends and companions, his relatives and kinsfolk, were to procure for him a physician or surgeon; and the sick man were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the man who wounded me belonged to the warrior caste, or to the Brahmin caste, or to the agricultural caste, or to the menial caste!' "Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt the name of the man who wounded me and to what clan he belongs.'

"Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the man who wounded me was tall, or short, or of middle height.'

"Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the bow which wounded me was a *cāpa*, or a *kodanda*.'

"Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the bow-string which wounded me was made from smaller-wort, or bamboo, or sinew, or *maruva*, or from milkweed.'

"Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the shaft which wounded me was feathered from the wings of a vulture, or of a heron, or of a falcon, or of a peacock.'

"Or again he were to say, 'I will not have this arrow taken out until I have learnt whether the shaft which wounded me was wound round with the sinews of an ox, or of a buffalo, or of a monkey.' That man would die, Mālunkyāputta, without ever having learnt this.

"In exactly the same way, Mālunkyāputta, any one who should say, 'I will not lead the religious life under the Blessed One until the Blessed One shall elucidate to me, either that the world is eternal, or that the world is not eternal . . . or that the saint exists or does not exist after death,'—that person would die, Mālunkyāputta, before the Accomplished One had ever elucidated this to him.

"The religious life, Mālunkyāputta, does not depend on the dogma that the world is eternal, nor does the religious life depend on the dogma that the world is not eternal. Whether the dogma obtains, that the world is eternal, or that the world is not eternal, there still remain birth, old age, death, sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief and despair, for the extinction of which in the present life I am prescribing."[11]

Thus again it is nothing but a sign of the surpassing wisdom of the Buddha, that of the ocean of wisdom wherein he had plunged, he only has communicated just as much as is necessary to save us from our desperate situation; anything more would only distract our mind from the great goal of concentrating all our forces upon this salvation.

But of course the four excellent truths do not exhaust all truths, as the Buddha acknowledges. Naturally he admits all verities the human mind has ever found and may still find. Some of them he even incorporates into his teaching, e. g. the doctrine of reincarnation, simply because they are true! "That of which the wise declare that it does not exist in the world, that I also declare not to exist; and what the wise declare to exist in the world, that I also declare to exist."[12] But just because these verities were known to mankind apart from him, and might well have been discovered without a "Perfectly Awakened One," he does not acknowledge them as distinguishing points in his doctrine. What he has given to mankind is something entirely unique, something it might never obtain through any other man with the exception of another Perfectly Awakened One; it is "that doctrine that is peculiar to the Awakened Ones."[13] Certainly mankind itself, in its greatest representatives, has gained deep insight into suffering, into its origin, annihilation, and the way leading to this annihilation. Since the fact of suffering dominates the whole cosmos as well as the life of every single being, it would be quite incomprehensible, if this were not the case. But these were only single glimpses of light, only partial insights that

could lead to no decisive results. This holds good of the modern philosophy of Schopenhauer, who, like no other European, has shown the essence of all life to consist in suffering, but who has not been able to find the way and the bridge leading out of suffering. Not less does it hold good of the ancient Upanishads, which in their greatness are only surpassed by the Buddha's doctrine. But they too fall below it inasmuch as they do not make the fact of suffering their only content, do not see suffering always and everywhere, and therefore do not know a clearly visible way to its complete annihilation.

The Buddha thus brings immediately before our consciousness as does no other, the principal and cardinal problem of our life, how to escape suffering and, above all, the suffering of death. But he does more: he promises us its solution in the highest possible form of certitude, that is, by the awakening of our own direct cognition. His doctrine is, first, free from every wrapping of a mythological or allegorical character, such as is peculiar to religions. "As if there were somewhere near a village or a town a big *sal* tree, and in the changing season, there fell leaves and twigs down from it, there fell branches and bark and greenwood, so that later on it was free from leaves and twigs, free from branches and bark, consisting of kernel wood only,—even so here the exposition of Lord Gotama is free from leaves and twigs, free from branches and bark, consisting of pure kernel wood."[14])

Then, next, the Buddha rejects every kind of theorising: "The Accomplished One is free from every theory, for he has *seen*," he says of himself.[15] Not even with logical conclusions which in one way or another forsake immediate perception does the Buddha concern himself. The sole criterion of truth for him is, and always remains, one's own immediate, intuitive apprehension of truth. It is only the self-evident consequence of this standpoint, that he does not claim any belief in his own purely descriptive exposition of the things he says he knows by his direct perception; and that he even admonishes his disciples to accept nothing, even from himself, simply on good faith, but to accept only as fact what they themselves have beheld. "Now, ye monks, thus knowing, thus perceiving, will ye speak thus: 'We hold the Teacher in reverence and what we say is only said out of reverence for the Teacher?'"—"Nay, verily, Lord."—"Then, monks, what you say is only what you yourselves have recognised, what you yourselves have comprehended, what you yourselves have understood, is it not so?"—"It is even so, Lord."—"Well said, monks! Given are ye, my monks, to this Teaching, the clearly visible, the timeless, the all-inviting, which is to be understood by every reasonable man."[16] And further on: "Do not believe, O Bhaddiya, in hearsay, nor in traditions, nor in rumours, nor in the word handed down, nor in purely logical conclusions, nor in external semblance, nor because of agreement of anything with the views you cherish and approve of, nor because of your own thinking of anything that it is true. Neither shall you think: 'The ascetic, the Buddha himself, is my teacher,' but if you, Bhaddiya, yourself, gain the insight: Such things are evil, such things lead to misfortune and suffering: then you may reject them."[17] Especially does he often warn against

holding any transmitted dogmas of belief; because "one may remember well or may remember badly."[18] In the same manner he compares believers to "a row of blind men chained together, of whom not one of the first, or of the middle, or of the last, sees anything."[19] Particular warning he also gives against trusting to the speculations of any speculating philosopher, "for such an one may philosophize well or philosophize badly."[20] Only our own immediate insight is of value; and the Buddha's doctrine itself also has value only in so far as it makes this our own insight possible. "And the Teacher expounds the Teaching, more and more deeply, more and more highly, in all its divisions obscure and clear. According as the Teacher proceeds to expound the Teaching to the monk, more and more deeply, more and more highly, in all its divisions obscure and clear, so, penetrating ever further into the Teaching, he arrives at certitude as respects point after point in the Teaching. Wheresoever, disciples, for such reasons, upon such grounds, through such tokens, faith is fixed on the Accomplished One, has struck root, is settled fast, such, disciples, is called *reasonable* faith, faith *grounded in sight*, firm, not to be shaken by any ascetic or recluse or god or devil or by any one whatsoever in all the world. In this wise, disciples, is the Teaching tried in respect of the Accomplished One. In this wise also is the Accomplished One well tried in respect of the Teaching."[21] "Not directly at the beginning, ye disciples, may certainty be attained; but gradually striving, gradually struggling, striding on pace by pace, certainty is attained. But how, gradually striving, gradually struggling, striding on pace by pace, is certainty attained? There, ye monks, a man full of trust comes near. Having come near, he associates. Associating, he listens. With open ears he hears the Teaching. Having heard the Teaching, he retains it. Having retained the sentences, he contemplates their content. Contemplating their content, the sentences give him insight. As the sentences give insight to him, he approves them. Approving them, he weighs them. Having weighed them, he works, and because he works earnestly, he in his own person realizes the supreme truth, and, wisely penetrating, beholds it face to face."[22]

According to this, the Buddha only asks one thing from his disciples, namely, the treading of the way shown by himself, upon which one may oneself win the intuitive apprehension of truth. This minimum of trust, to try, at least once, the way shown by him to the discovery of truth, even he cannot omit, but as *anima candida*, as a man who obviously has no selfish purpose in view, he may certainly demand it. But this minimum of trust, entirely indispensable in the world, once given to him, and the way shown by him and described by him with the accuracy of an ordnance map, once entered upon, all the rest follows of itself. Very soon the foretold glimpses of light and undivined results will appear, one after the other, like the stations a traveller on a road reaches one after the other; thus the faith first given will change into unshakeable certainty as to the correctness of that part of the way not yet accomplished. "Whoever, ye monks, is a worldly master who deals with worldly things, even such a one is not treated like a merchant or a dealer, by people saying of him: 'Thus we want

it, then we will try; if we cannot get it thus, we do not want to try.' How much more, O disciples, the Accomplished One, who is entirely free from worldly matters! To the trusting follower, to the follower training himself in the Master's Order with earnest zeal, the confidence dawns: Master is the Accomplished One, his disciple am I; the Accomplished One knows, I do not know. To the trusting disciple, to the disciple who trains himself in the Master's Order with earnest zeal, the Master's Order imparts itself, refreshing and precious; in him the confidence dawns: Let skin and tendons and bones shrivel up within my body, let flesh and blood dry up: whatever may be accomplished by manly virtue, manly strength and manly valour, not till it is accomplished, shall my strength lessen." [23] Thus then, the Buddha does not want more faith than must be given to a *guide*, but certainly not less than a guide must claim: "This, oh Brahmin, I can do in regard to this: A guide is the Accomplished One." [24]

According to the standpoint thus taken up by him, all purely abstract notions are wanting in his Discourses, and only such occur as may be immediately drawn from perception and are therefore without more ado, evident in themselves, just as in a guide-book difficult technical terms of physics, geology and other branches of science are out of place.

If the Buddha thus wishes to bring about the individual's own direct perception of truth, the question arises as to what may be the nature of this perception that can lead to such extraordinary results as he promises. Its peculiarity cannot lie in the object, since the Buddha also has to do only with the world about us. Therefore it cannot be anything else but a peculiar mode of looking at things that he wishes to teach us. And indeed its secret consists in an extraordinary deepening of the normal manner of looking at things. Here the Buddha is in perfect harmony with Schopenhauer. Like this philosopher he first proceeds from the fact that there are various degrees of this cognition through the medium of the senses, from the dull gaze with which the beast looks at the world, to the look of the genius, penetrating into all depths. It is precisely the realization of this mode of viewing things, called by Schopenhauer the *genius-like* one, in the form of pure contemplation, which is the goal the Buddha sets before every one. He not only gives in detail the several steps leading upwards to it, but he also teaches the ever greater perfecting of this pure contemplation itself, right up to the culminating point where "it draws aside the veil of the world." [25]

As regards the antecedent conditions under which this pure contemplation comes about, the Buddha also agrees with Schopenhauer. Just as for Schopenhauer it sets in through the cognizing part of consciousness becoming entirely separated from the willing part, just as according to him it is conditioned by such a deep silence of will, on one hand, and such an energy of the perceptive function, on the other, that even individuality vanishes from the consciousness and man is left alone as the pure subject of cognition; even so also, according to the Buddha, by eliminating all and every motion of will, such a complete tranquillity of the mind—*samatha*—must be produced, that "thoughts about Me and Mine no more arise", and on the other hand the utmost energy in per-

ception must be produced, if the "eye of knowledge" is to open; in particular, the "hindrances" of mental sloth and of dubiety must be abandoned. And as, according to Schopenhauer, in order to obtain thoughts of genius one must be so completely alienated from the world that the commonest events seem to be quite new and unknown, so also, according to the Buddha, the "penetrating insight" presupposes "loosening" and is in itself conditioned by "alienation," "far from lusts, far from unwholesome states of mind." Indeed, we find the adequate expression for the "pure subject of cognition," in the words wherein the disciples often characterize their Master, calling him, "the One who has become eye, who has become knowledge."

But in two points the Buddha here deviates from Schopenhauer, or rather, surpasses him: First, in regard to the object of contemplation. For he teaches, laying, for the rest, great stress upon the contemplation of the world alone accessible to us as the normal and sufficing one, that in the highest stage of "alienation," of "loosening," when in complete equanimity everything has been abandoned and thereby the sight can be directed exclusively inwards, in inner enlightenment a higher form of perception will appear like a chicken from an egg, reaching far beyond the limits of birth and death and thus make possible for us complete clearness concerning our situation. Schopenhauer has certainly pointed to this region, styled by him "illuminism," as to something really existing, and given it its place, but he did not enter it, well knowing that he could not, because he did not know the necessary antecedent conditions. But according to the Buddha, contrary to Schopenhauer's view,—who on this point, since all experience was here wanting to him, was unable to give a competent judgment—also this higher kind of perception may very well be conferred on others, and he imparts this knowledge to us in the clearest possible manner. To be sure, also according to him, it is accessible only to a few, *but it is not at all necessary for the annihilation of suffering.* As for the rest—and with this we come to an essential difference between the Buddha and Schopenhauer, connected, as we shall see later on, with the different answer given by the Buddha to the fundamental question of Schopenhauer's system—man may very well develop in himself the faculty for the apprehension of the world peculiar to the genius. He even may come thus far, that he is able to bring it about every time he wants to, "just as he wishes, in its fulness and width" contrary to the view of Schopenhauer, according to whom the cognition of the genius is not perhaps difficult, but does not at all lie within our power, and is only a state of mind exceptionally occurring in a "festival hour," a "lucid interval" of the genius, who must himself be born as such. To make accessible this genius-like mode of looking at things is precisely, as said above, the direct aim of the doctrine of the Buddha.

To teach this art, he only needs to have a "reasonable man" before him, "not a hypocrite or a dissembler, but a straightforward man."[26] Him he offers to lead by a quite definite mode of training, up the mountain of pure cognition, from which, as Schopenhauer promises, in the individual not only the general,

the Ideas, may be seen, but something quite different, something unparalleled, namely, the ocean of suffering heaving deep below his feet, while he himself is throned upon an inaccessible height, whither not even the smallest drop of this ocean sprays up, and where therefore purest happiness reigns. "It is, as if near a village or a town there were a high rock, and two friends were approaching it. Having reached it, one of them remains standing at the base of the rock, while the other one climbs to the top of the rock. And the friend below, at the foot of the rock, cries up to the friend who has climbed up to the top of the rock: 'What now, friend, are you seeing from the rock?' But that other replies: 'I see, dearest one, from the rock a serene garden, a magnificent wood, a landscape all in bloom, a bright pool of water.' But the other says: 'This is impossible, dearest one, this cannot be, that from the top of that rock you can see a serene garden, a magnificent wood, a landscape all in bloom, a bright pool of water.' Then the friend comes down from the summit, and takes his friend by the arm and leads him up the rock, and, having given him a little time to rest, asks him: 'What now, friend, are you seeing from the top of the rock?' And the other one says: 'Now, friend, I see from the rock a serene garden, a magnificent wood, a landscape all in bloom, a bright pool of water.' But the other one says: 'Just now, dearest one, we heard you speaking thus: 'It is impossible, it cannot be, that from the top of that rock you can see a serene garden, a magnificent forest, a landscape all in bloom, a bright pool of water.' And now again, we have heard you speaking thus: 'I see there from the top of the rock a serene garden, a magnificent wood, a landscape all in bloom, a bright pool of water.'

And thereupon the first one replies: 'So long, dearest one, as this high rock was obstructing me, of course I could not see what was to be seen.'"[27]

Certainly, also according to Schopenhauer, when we have become the pure subject of cognition, we reach a state free from pain, the greatest and purest happiness of life. But this happiness is perishable. For it consists only in a temporary quieting of the ceaseless torment of willing, in a passing silence of will, in the fetters of which we remain chained, after as before, since ultimately, we ourselves are will. But according to the Buddha, following the way of pure contemplation, we are able to attain *permanent*, total annihilation of willing, and therewith may see the fetters wherewith willing had bound us, lying forever broken at our feet.

That these two, Schopenhauer and the Buddha, did not see quite the same from the mountain of knowledge, is explained, first by the fact that Schopenhauer, so to say, had only climbed the first slopes of the mountain, while the Buddha *from the summit* "looked down into this world of pain."[28] Schopenhauer, the man of will, convinced as he was of the impossibility of influencing his will, was incapable of making any attempt to develop within himself the genius' mode of contemplation, but had to wait in patience till a lucky hour of itself should bring a cognition more or less free from willing, the depth and duration of which he was unable in any way to determine. The Buddha, on the other hand, who by the extreme purity of his entire mode of life, in advance

had cleansed his cognition from all the perturbations of willing, had thus acquired the power of transporting himself, at will and for as long as he liked, into the deepest contemplation, to remain in a state of pure cognition, wherein the whole truth of the world then revealed itself to him.

A further reason why, to both of these great men the same view did not offer itself from the mountain of cognition, is this, that each of them had fixed his gaze upon quite a different field of sight. Schopenhauer wanted to explain "the primary phenomena in the individual and in the whole as the world," and therefore he only saw the "Ideas" the *form* of these primary phenomena, and as their *content* the immeasurable ocean of will, so immense that it swallowed up the philosopher himself, and he thought himself to consist of it, thus, without any hope of escaping it, unless this ocean should some time or other dry up of its own accord. The Buddha, renouncing every explanation of all other phenomena, wanted nothing but simply to find the end of suffering. Therefore, at last, behind the ocean of will he found another realm, the realm of freedom from suffering, the narrow entrance to this realm at the same time disclosing itself to him.

Precisely this exclusive limitation of all his striving to this one point, how to escape suffering, led him at last to his goal. And so he made this point the foundation of his unique way of salvation, which may be briefly characterized as a direct envisagement growing more and more deep, an ever purer contemplation of suffering, regarded according to its compassing bounds its causes and its relation to ourselves. This contemplation constitutes the goal of all insight, and the source of all wisdom. All virtue, ultimately, serves only it, by creating in a pure heart wherein the storms of willing are laid to rest, the indispensably necessary antecedent condition for it. He only who by the practice of ceaseless mindfulness of such sort that he performs everything he thinks, says and does with full consciousness, little by little has trained his mind so that it is able to dwell incessantly and exclusively in the contemplation of suffering,—only he, "wisely penetrating" will struggle through to that point where, at first far away, like the holy grail, but in time becoming more and more distinct, rises "the island, the only one" where there is no more suffering, and especially, no more death. Such a one alone is at all competent to pass an authoritative judgment upon the truth or untruth of the Buddha's teaching. Else he resembles the friend who refuses to climb the rock from which the most enchanting view offers itself, but who nevertheless denies that this view may be seen from above. He resembles the man born blind, for whom things visible do not exist because he does not see them: "As if, O Brahmin, there were a man born blind, not seeing things black or white or blue or yellow or red or green, nor seeing what is equal and what unequal, nor stars nor sun nor moon. And as if he thus should speak: 'There is neither black nor white; there is none who might see black or white; there is neither blue nor yellow; there is no one who might see blue or yellow; there is neither red nor green; there is no one who might see red or green; there is neither equal nor unequal; there is no one who might see equal or

unequal; there are no stars, there is no one who might see the stars; there is neither sun nor moon, there is no one who might see sun or moon. I myself do not know anything about them, I do not see them, *therefore* they do not exist.' Just so, O Brahmin, is the Brahmin Pokkharasāti, the Opamañña from Subhagavana, blind and without eyesight. That he should perceive the utmost reality, the highest truth, is impossible."[29]

From this, to be sure, there results a certain exclusiveness in the doctrine of the Buddha; it presumes men who not only have become clearly conscious of suffering as the primary problem of their existence, but who have come so far as to expect salvation, if such a thing is to be hoped for, no longer from without, but only through their own strength. For such, as is said in the Samyutta Nikāya, to seek to win peace through others, as priests or sacrificers, is the same as if a stone were thrown into deep water, and now people, praying and imploring and folding their hands, came and knelt down all round saying: 'Rise, O dear stone! Come to the surface, O dear stone! Spring up on to the shore, O dear stone!' But the stone remains at the bottom.[30] Of such men at any time there never have been too many. Most men find it convenient to take no notice at all of suffering in any form, to say nothing of occupying themselves minutely with it. For them, there is of course no help, therefore they are not taken into account by the Buddha. He calls them "uninstructed men, unperceiving the Noble Doctrine, unacquainted with the Noble Doctrine."[31] They are those, who, according to Schopenhauer, represent the factory wares of nature, to whom one may also belong even if one is a scholar; they are the great mass to which, as says Thilo, commonly belongs one more person than each individual thinks! "With them Lord Gotama has nothing in common."[32] But with those also he has nothing in common who, though they do not blindly pass over the fact of suffering, do not wish to be enlightened about the fact that liberation from suffering cannot be realized through any kind of grace, especially not by the help of some personal god, but exclusively by our own strength and by personal action.

Thus the doctrine of the Buddha, having for its organ the most exact of all methods, that of natural science, in experimentally realizing truth, requires true men, "no hypocrites, nor dissemblers, unassuming, resolute, stout-hearted, possessing insight, clear-headed, steadfast, of collected and unified mind, wise and intelligent,"[33] who alone are capable of applying the experimental method. With them, "the noble ones, knowing the doctrine of the noble ones, inclined towards the doctrine of the noble ones,"[34] he has communication, as with the true aristocrats of mankind, "to whom this world is too mean,"[35] who therefore wish to grow out of it. To them as prize he offers a solution of the great problem of the world's suffering, which, being based upon one's own immediate perception, provides unshakeable certainty: "Whoso has not properly understood the four excellent truths", says the Samyutta Nikâya, "he goes from one teacher to another and looks searchingly into his face thinking: 'Does this one really know something, see something?' It is as if a feather or a flock of cotton, light,

at the mercy of the wind, blown about a plain, were carried now here, now there, now by this wind, now by that, by reason of its very lightness. But whoso has truly understood the four excellent truths, he no longer goes from one teacher to another and searchingly looks into his face to see if this one may really know something, see something. It is as if a brazen column, or a post of a gate, stood there, deeply founded, well dug into the ground, without tottering or shaking. If now from this or that quarter, wind and weather come mightily storming on, it cannot tremble, shake and totter, and why not? Because of the depth of the foundation, because the column is well dug in."[36]

And this system, warranting to the noblest of men such a goal by the application of the surest, and thereby most modern method, is said to be no longer suited to our times! *For such a contention we must seek the reasons*, for such must exist. And here in the end we find, when such statements are not based on pure unreason, always the same reason given, either directly, or with some variations, namely, that it does not suit the modern criticizers of the Buddha's doctrine of salvation,—he himself calls them men "who only learn the doctrine so as to be able to give discourses and express opinions about it"[37] instead of practically testing its truth,—that according to him, salvation from suffering is identical with salvation from the world itself, and that the Buddha asks of his disciples that they try this method of salvation in earnest. This is said to be no longer up to date. Now it may be admitted that precisely in our time, notwithstanding its high civilization, or perhaps just because of it,* mankind is devoted in quite a terrifying degree to a materialistic conception of the world, even where theoretically this is held in abhorrence, and just on this account, all consciousness of the unsuitability of their continued stay in this world, and thereby of the necessity of salvation, is wanting in men. Of course, we will not deny either that the utmost our modern thinkers are able to fulfil in this direction consists generally in writing books full of learning about salvation, and about those who have lived and taught *practical* salvation; or, sitting at a well-spread table, to expatiate movingly upon the grandeur of renunciation of the world. But this does not exclude the fact that there are also in our time some few who do not feel at all satisfied with this world, and therefore try to grow out of it; for whom, therefore, the gospel of salvation through one's own strength during this *present lifetime* and, in such wise that its occurrence is *directly perceived, experienced within oneself*, is the most tremendous event that can happen in the world. For such the doctrine of the Buddha is modern, quite as modern as any branch of natural science whose methods it shares. To those few, the doctrine of the Buddha, who himself for this very reason called it "the timeless," will be for all time modern, in the same way that the definitive solution of a problem remains valid for all time. You may lose the interest in the problem,—whether that, in our case, is an advantage, each may judge for himself; you may even

* Civilization alone, without culture, that means, without improvement of the heart, is nothing but refinement of every form of pleasure-seeking, and therefore ultimately producing an enhancement of egoism, and thereby of the struggle of everybody against everybody.

try to find a still simpler solution than the one here given. But so long as you have not succeeded in doing this,—and try to name another who has solved the problem of salvation, attainable for every reasonable man, with the same immediate security giving directly perceived certainty as the Buddha has done—so long is it simply folly to try to discredit the solution given because it was already reached two thousand years ago.* So long also is it folly—let each consider within himself, if this expression is too strong!—to belittle the solution of this problem given by the Buddha as unmodern, merely because it can be fully realized, as we shall see later, only by going away into homelessness (Pabbajjâ), that means, by becoming a monk. Who wants the goal, must also want the only known means thereto. Further on we shall speak more in detail about this going into homelessness, and especially about the collision of duties possibly occurring thereby. Here, where we only have to touch upon the suitability of the step to our age, we should only like to point out what, after all, is only self-evident, that whoever desires in this present life to obtain *entire* deliverance from the world, in this very life must wholly forsake it, must leave it entirely behind him. Here also the old saying holds good: "You can't wash a hide without making it wet." The Buddha would not have been the great genius he was, if he had not recognized that to reach this perfect salvation in this present lifetime only a very very few are fit and ready. Therefore it is again nothing but foolishness to fear that our enlightened world might become overrun by actually living Buddhist monks. For this reason the Buddha does not expect any one to take this way, if on any grounds he does not think himself fit to do so. On the contrary, to all those who are already alive to the consciousness of their eternal destiny lying beyond the world, but who prefer to make their way towards this goal within the world, he points out the nearest way for them, so that they need not return after death into this our world, but may realise the great goal in one of the highest worlds of light. Yea, because he knows the path leading out of the world, he also knows the paths leading within the world to a fortunate rebirth, and shows these with indisputable certainty. His doctrine, therefore, is modern in this sense also, that it assures to each man who does not belong to the great multitude in the sense given above, that is, to the man of the world who is concerned about his future after death, the measure of freedom from suffering and of well-being procurable for him. "If this doctrine should be attainable only for Lord Gotama and the monks and nuns, but not for his male and female adherents, *living the household life*, clad in white, *abstaining in chastity*, and not for the male and female adherents, *living the household life, and satisfying their desires*, then this holy life would be incomplete just because of this. But because this doctrine may be attained by the Lord Gotama and the monks and nuns, as well as by the male and female adherents,

* From the outset is probable that the solution of the problem of salvation, if at all possible to the human mind, has been attained in ancient India, where as in no other country, this problem had drawn men into its circle, in an unexampled manner, as far as the speculative, as well as the practical side of the problem is concerned.

living the household life, clad in white, *abstaining in chastity*, and by the male and female adherents *satisfying their desires*, therefore this holy life is perfect, just because of this."[38]

After all, for the expert, even to-day, it still holds good what the Brahmin Moggallâna, a contemporary of the Buddha, exalts in his teaching: "Just as among the odours of roots the black rose-garlic is thought the most excellent of its kind; and among the odours of kernel wood the red sandal wood is thought the most excellent of its kind; and among the odours of flowers the white jasmine is thought the most excellent of its kind; even so also, is the doctrine of Lord Gotama the best in our times to-day."[39]*

* The question put so often as to whether the spreading of Buddhist ideas among ourselves is desirable, considering the peculiar character of our civilization which lays the chief stress upon the living out of our personality as it is euphemistically called—for in truth this is nothing but a living out of our desires—is, firstly, wrongly put, and, secondly, without purpose. Rightly put, it ought to run: Is the solution of the enigma of man given by the Buddha, correct, or is it not? If it is correct, then all the other solutions dissenting in theory *or practice* from the Buddha, are wrong, without further words. The opponents of Buddhism, therefore, in so far as they are playing an honest game, will have to refute his teachings; which ought not to be difficult if they are erroneous since they are not founded on any revelation, but only on perception. On the other hand, the question is purposeless. Every one who takes the trouble to make himself acquainted with the doctrine of the Buddha has himself personally to come to terms with it. What attitude others may adopt cannot concern him in any way, since he alone will reap the fruits of his doing. For this reason the Buddhist naturally concedes the same right to every other system. Buddhism is the religion of unlimited tolerance.

I.

THE MOST EXCELLENT TRUTH OF SUFFERING

The Criterion of Suffering

Suffering is impeded volition. This sentence, coined by Schopenhauer, is so clear and so true that it needs no further proof. Everything running contrary to my volition and to my wishes is suffering, and everything occurring in harmony with my wishes, but finding resistance, is, as far as this goes, also suffering. Therefore the Buddha also proceeds from this self-evident definition of suffering, when, in the first of the four excellent truths, defining suffering as follows: "Birth is Suffering, old age is Suffering, disease is Suffering, death is Suffering, to be united to the disliked is Suffering, to be separated from the liked is Suffering, not to get what one desires is Suffering. This, friends, is what is called Suffering."[40] So far every man will be in perfect accordance with the Buddha. But herein lies the peculiarity of his doctrine, that according to him there is nothing at all but suffering in the world. For immediately after the words as given above, the Buddha proceeds: "In short, the five groups of grasping are Suffering." Later on, we shall return to these five groups of grasping. At present it will suffice to define them briefly as representing all objects of will at all possible; thus the words say: All activities of will are suffering, or, since we already know the nature of everything existing to consist in volition: Everything is full of suffering, just because of its nature. "Suffering only arises where something arises, Suffering only vanishes where something vanishes."[41] Against this part of the first of the four excellent truths the average man revolts; this he thinks he ought to reject as a perversion, sprung from world-sundered and world-estranged brooding, a perversion recognizable as such, through its taking only a fleeting glance at life. For what an immense quantity of pleasure, of lust, of the purer joys of family life, in nature and in art, life offers! How dare one overlook all this? How can one shut one's eyes against it? No, not everything in life is suffering; it is not even true, that suffering predominates therein; but in spite of suffering, existent without doubt, the world is beautiful and worthy of being enjoyed.

If nevertheless the Buddha should be right, then without further argument it is clear that the average man must have made a terrible mistake in his judgment of the content of life according to its actual value. This, of course, is not impossible. For the question of life's value cannot be answered off-hand simply from

clear and pure perception, in which everything is fixed and certain. But this answer represents a *judgment*, that is, a bringing together of the materials offered by perception, into a relationship of concepts by means of the activity of reason. Now the part that error plays in the action of reason is often immense, especially if the subsuming of countless isolated accidents of manifold kind, reaching into the past and the future, under one or under a few fixed concepts, is involved. Free from error such can only be when done with the utmost care, looking out over the past and the future and this is given only to very few. The great mass of mankind when using their reason in this manner, falls into the greatest errors, so that such an error "may dominate centuries, throw its iron yoke upon whole nations, stifle the noblest feelings of mankind; and cause even him whom it is not able to deceive, to be put in fetters by his own servants, its dupes." Such an error, then, is "the enemy, against whom the wisest minds of all times have waged unequal combat. Only what *they* have won from him, has become the property of mankind."

May it not be that here also, in this question as to the value of life, such a fundamental error of the multitude, even of mankind taken as a whole, might come into operation, an error that only an enlightened mind like a Buddha might be able to remove? Only the utmost carefulness and thoughtfulness, the primary antecedent condition of a correct judgment, can, on our part, lead to a correct answer.

In applying it, there has first to be exposed a fundamental error which is generally made when judging as to the value or worthlessness of life, making it in advance, impossible to understand the doctrine of the Buddha. It is this: that a thing which man desires with such unexampled ardour as he does life, must at all events be desirable. But this is a gigantic paralogism. Imagine a man condemned to lifelong imprisonment with the prospect before him of an endless chain of misery. Will he not, facing sudden death, nevertheless cry out: I want to live, to live? Or go to the death-bed of a man who has been sick for years and is at last tormented by the most torturing pain. Will not he too, for all that, only too often exclaim in his pains: I want to live, to live! Will not they both want to live even when you tell them that death means for them redemption from severe and incurable suffering, that further life for them means nothing but further suffering? Will they not answer again and again: I want to live, to live at any price, even at this price, that my whole life be nothing but suffering? From this it is evidently clear, that man in general will take upon him a life full of suffering, even a life consisting of nothing but suffering, if only he can, and is allowed to live. But from this it follows as evidently, that this boundless clinging to life cannot be founded upon an understanding that life is not identical with suffering but is something fundamentally different and really worth striving for; the reason for this clinging to life, as we shall see later on, being something entirely different. Therefore it is not legitimate to take this human impulsion towards life into account in deciding the question as to whether in life suffering preponderates, or whether perhaps indeed, life and suffering in the last analysis

are identical concepts. On the contrary, the question really is if at the bar of purified cognition this impulsion will not prove to be entirely mistaken. With this, the principal weapon with which the average man comes forth against this part of the doctrine of the Buddha, in advance falls to the ground. For it is just this clinging to life as such, which is the chief argument by which he is guided in examining the question as to whether life is really worth living. The argument: "Certainly life is worth living, else I should not crave for it thus irresistibly," will either lead him to the negation of the doctrine of the Buddha without any more ado; or if he nevertheless occupies himself with the arguments adduced by the Buddha, it forms, for all that, the basis of his reasoning, generally remaining hidden from the reasoner himself, but in advance influencing his investigation in a decisive manner, and determining its results from the beginning. Thus he shows a lack of heedfulness, whereby he blocks up his own way to the understanding of the first of the four excellent truths. Whoso wishes to understand this, before all else must be able entirely to put aside his unparalleled attachment to life in his examination of the question as to how far suffering dominates in life. Even if he thinks this attachment to be something unassailable, he must not allow it to influence him in any way. In other words, he must be able to face the question in an entirely objective manner, like one looking down upon life from some high watch-tower, as if removed from it, and therefore in no way influenced either by desire or dislike. Only then will he be able quietly to compare the pros and cons, and thus only gain the balance needed for judging as to the *justification* of this his craving for life itself. A lustful man is not the proper authority for judging as to a woman's beauty or ugliness; and a man possessed by the desire for life is not the right person to decide as to the worth or worthlessness of life. But how very few of those who self-complacently criticize the "pessimism" of the Buddha, fulfil this fundamental antecedent condition of an objective judgment!

Not less important in judging life is another circumstance reckoned with by only very few: Happiness is satisfaction of the will, suffering is obstruction of the will. Now everything occurring in the world is not a single accident consisting by itself, but, just as it is itself the effect of a cause, on its own side, it will become again the cause of new effects. Accordingly, with every event there is bound up a countless number of motions of will, partly pleasant, partly unpleasant. The question therefore arises: In what way can judgment be given as to whether an event may be called a happy or an unhappy one? To answer this question, we shall do best to come down to immediate experience. Somebody has won the first prize in a lottery. This, beyond doubt is a satisfaction of the will in a very high degree, and, in addition, an immense piece of good fortune. Now this man who until then, has led a life free from sorrow, in consequence of this event goes wrong, turns an idler and a spendthrift, squanders all his gains and, at last, despised by all, finds himself in deepest misery, ruined and without the energy to work himself out of his misery. What now will be his judgment, and that of others, in regard to the prize he lately won? Unquestionably,

that this seeming good fortune in reality was the greatest misfortune of his life. Or take another case: A certain person thinks good eating and drinking the chief "good" in his existence. Therein he takes pride and comfort, and does not hesitate at times to set forth this happiness of his life in the right light before others. But by and by, in consequence of this life, there supervenes a grave malady. Will he now, writhing in torments, still think the time of good eating, recognizing it as the cause of his present suffering, a happy one, and remember it with pleasure, thinking, "still it was nice"? Or will he not rather curse it as the source of his present suffering? Or, suppose a man tormented by thirst, sees a cool drink. Full of greed he drinks of it, and feels a momentary pleasant sensation running through his body. Afterwards he feels pains and thus sees that he has drunk poison. Will he still have the courage to call this cool drink a good? Or will he not rather, recognizing this "good" as the cause of his keen pains, now look back upon it as a misfortune, and therewith register it under the heading of suffering? From this it is evidentially clear that a momentary sensation agreeing with our will, does not give us the right to enter it in our book of life as a good. Even innumerable pleasant motions of will, released by some event, lose afterwards all their value, yes, may even become accurst, if one single moment in the long chain is miserable, and this single decisive moment happens to be the last one in the chain of effects produced by the so-called happy event. This single last moment alone gives to the whole chain of perhaps yearslong impulses of will, its definitive character. When it is full of misery, it sucks up the happiness of years, as a sponge the water surrounding it. It may even erase it utterly from the account of life as if it had never been there. But equally well it may erase the misery of years like a corrosive acid. A person may have been the unhappiest of men during his whole life. But if now, in this moment, he becomes really happy, if he really feels himself quite well, if his feeling of happiness is not darkened by any prospect of the future, then the whole past full of suffering will be utterly forgotten. He will feel as if liberated from a heavy oppressive nightmare that now has vanished in the abyss of the past, and therefore counts no more.

Certainly it cannot be otherwise. It is always only the present that is real; hence it is always only the satisfaction of will and thereby happiness, or, on the other hand, the obstruction of will and thereby unhappiness which I feel *now* that is real. Happiness or unhappiness belonging to the past, are, like everything gone by, nothing but a shadow without reality. Especially is bygone happiness, brought into relation to my present woe, apt only to intensify the latter, according to the law that a fall is accompanied by more painful results, the greater the height from which it takes place.

Accordingly only the last moment of life counts in the evaluating of a life as a happy or an unhappy one, and ultimately, the last moment of consciousness before death. For only *this* present will then be real. If I, in *this* moment, feel well and thereby happy, a whole life full of greatest misery will count nothing against this; and if I feel unhappy, this feeling is not modified by even the hap-

piest past, but rather increased to unbearableness by the frightful contrast with the latter.

In regard to this, above everything else entire clearness must be reached through deep reflection, before one is competent to pass judgment as to how far life is to be put on record as happiness or as suffering. From this fundamental fact therefore the Buddha too sets out in developing the first of his four excellent truths, the truth of Suffering. It forms the clue to their understanding.

According to the arguments just advanced, the following chain of thought forms the foundation of all the expositions of the Buddha on suffering. I may be made as happy as possible by a satisfaction of my will: but in that moment where, by the taking away of the object conferring this satisfaction of will, it has changed into suffering,—into suffering that will be the greater, the greater the luck has been that granted the possession of the object—only the fact of suffering will be real, and thereby will furnish exclusively the standard for evaluating the object as one happy or painful for me. The object was such that at last there has remained to me only one thing: suffering. If I am honest, therefore, I can only post it up in the book of my life with this as final result, i. e. as a negative entry. As there depends very much, strictly speaking almost everything, on this cognition, we will come down once more to immediate experience. A person may find the complete and exclusive satisfaction of his will in possessing or cherishing some object, in his wife or his children, or in the realization of some idea grown dear to him. And now this object upon which his interests are entirely concentrated, is snatched away from him, further occupation with it becomes impossible to him; thereupon life itself will become worthless to him, and he will break out into the lamentation: Life has no more value for me.

After this, however, according to the Buddha, the decision of the question, as to how far life must be looked upon as suffering, depends upon this other, as to whether there are objects of the will which cannot be taken away from man, and thereby satisfactions of the will which do not become suffering. Only such with inner justification might be registered as well-being, as happiness; every other satisfaction purified cognition cannot honestly register otherwise than under the heading of suffering. But an object of will that cannot be taken away, necessarily presupposes that it is not perishable. For in the moment when it perishes, when it dissolves, it is irrecoverably lost for will, even if will clings to it ever so much. The question, therefore, amounts to this: Are there imperishable objects of will? Or, to put it otherwise: The real, ultimate criterion of suffering is *transitoriness:* "Whatever is transitory, is painful."[42]

Indeed this dictum forms the basis of granite upon which the whole doctrine of the Buddha about suffering is built: "That there are three kinds of sensations, I have taught: Pleasure, pain, and that which is neither pleasure nor pain .... And again I have taught: Whatever is felt, belongs to suffering. Thus alone in regard to the impermanence of things I have said that whatever is felt belongs to suffering, having regard to the fact that things are subject to annihilation,

to destruction; that pleasure in them ceases, that they are subject to cessation, to changeableness."[43]

As we see, these words not only give transitoriness as the infallible criterion for what may be looked upon as suffering, but they also contain the statement that everything follows this law of transitoriness: all things are impermanent, are subject to annihilation, to destruction.

Really to recognize this, and to its whole extent, is the point on which everything depends. Certainly, the mediate objects of our willing, the objects of the external world, everybody without further ado will concede to be transitory without exception, because here the continual change, the incessant dissolution is evident. But the matter becomes quite different, when the *immediate* manifestation of our willing in that which we call our personality, comes into question. This personality is said to be the only thing in the world which lies outside the realm of transitoriness, either entirely and to its whole extent, so that man, neck and crop, as it were, would be immortal, or partially so, if at least its kernel should be permanent and thus imperishable. This kernel some think to find in the soul: others, as Schopenhauer and his disciples, in will manifesting itself in the personality.

That even the powerful genius of Schopenhauer thought himself forced to recognize in the personality, if only in its last substratum and with manifold reservations, the only insurmountable barrier to the law of transitoriness comprising everything else, shows clearly how deeply rooted in man is the illusion that personality includes the imperishable, the eternal. Even thus from of old, within that part of the personality that was thought to be removed from the realm of transitoriness, there was found the island in the ocean of worldly misery, to which one only needed to flee, perhaps as pure spirit, to escape from suffering. And precisely for this reason, mankind never has been able to penetrate to the first of the four excellent truths that everything, everything without exception in the world, is suffering.

Here within the personality lies the great obstacle to the acknowledgment of the first of the four excellent truths. Everything else, as said above, is obviously perishable and therefore, according to our exposition above, painful. To eliminate this obstacle had to be the main task of the Buddha in the direction here in question; and this, in fact, it was. For he always limited himself to this; but he takes every imaginable trouble to make clear that everything connected with personality, and therewith personality itself, is without exception subject to the iron law of transitoriness, and thereby, of dissolution and decay, therefore painful throughout its whole extent. This he does by dissolving personality into its parts: corporeal form, sensation, perception, mentations and consciousness, and by showing the characteristic of transitoriness present in each of them.

It is clear, however, that here we are only able to follow the Buddha further, if we have first convinced ourselves that the dissolution of personality into the five components just enumerated, as given by him, is really correct and exhaustive, that is to say, if the essence of personality shall have become quite clear to us. Therefore we shall first have to deal with this question.

Personality

"Personality, personality, is said, Venerable One; but what is personality, does the Blessed One say?" Thus the adherent Visākha asked the sage nun Dhammadinnā, his former wife. "The five groups of grasping are personality: that is the grasping-group of the corporeal form, the grasping-group of sensation, the grasping-group of perception, the grasping-group of the activities of the mind, the grasping-group of cognition. These five groups of grasping, friend Visākha, constitute the personality, so the Blessed One has said."[44] After this, according to the Buddha, personality consists of five groups: the body, the sensations, the perceptions, the activities of the mind, and the cognition. But these groups are not simply groups, but more closely defined as groups *of grasping*. Therefore to understand the definition given by the Buddha, insight must be gained into two things. First, that personality is really exhausted by these five groups, that it is summed up in them; secondly, why the Buddha calls them just groups *of grasping*.

The answer to this last question is the fundamental antecedent condition for understanding the essence of personality. Therefore it properly ought to be given first. For in order to comprehend something as the sum of a number of definite groups, before all, the general character of these groups must be known, consisting in our case precisely in this, that they are groups of *grasping* which constitute the personality. But as far as we have got at present, a thorough treatment of this question is for systematical reasons not yet possible. Therefore we cannot do otherwise than anticipate the result of our later expositions and assume it until then as established. This result is, briefly, as follows. According to the Buddha, our essence is not exhausted by our personality; we only grasp it, we only cling to it, though so tightly that we imagine ourselves to consist in it, "as if a man with hands besmeared with resin caught hold of a twig."[45] Therefore it is nothing but an expression of this fact, when the Buddha calls the five groups forming our personality, groups of grasping, Upādānakkhandhā.*

We must always bear in mind this character of the five groups, when under the guidance of the Buddha we now try to comprehend them as the sole and complete components of our personality, and this in accordance with the principle of the Buddha *intuitively*, in such a manner that we look through their machinery in form of the personality precisely as through the composition and the working together of the parts of an ingeniously constructed machine we have fully understood.

* The word we translate here by personality is Sakkāya. It is composed from sat-kāya: kāya meaning ,as the definition given at the beginning of this chapter indicates, the summary of the five groups: corporeal form, sensation, perception, mentations, cognition; *sat* meaning "*being*". By Sakkāya therefore the summary of the five groups is defined as the real being—that is, of ourselves,—expressing thus that we entirely consist in these five groups.

Just this same content our conception of personality possesses. For it is thought of as a being existing for itself, that exhausts itself in the marks—just these five groups—wherein it appears. Sakkāya and personality are thus indeed equivalent terms.

The basis of the personality is formed by the material body. It originates in the moment of generation by father and mother from the several chemical materials the Buddha sums up under the four chief-elements, the earthy, watery, fiery and airy one. These materials constitute the female egg as well as the male spermatic cell, and, further, they furnish the matter for building up the body, which is drawn from the blood of the mother, and worked up into the form of the new body. This upbuilding being finished, the body is born and further sustained in similar fashion, in that, by taking nourishment to replace the particles incessantly streaming away, new substitutes are brought in from the four chief-elements: "This my formed body is composed of the four elements, generated by father and mother, built up from rice, porridge and sour gruel."[46]

This body, constituted thus, shows itself endowed with organs of sense equally consisting of the four chief-elements. By this, that is, by the "body endowed with the six organs of sense," we have what is generally, and also by the Buddha himself, designated as the body or, more exactly, as the corporeal form, *rūpa:* "Just as the enclosed space which we call a house comes to be through the conjunction of timbers and bindweed and grass and mud, in the selfsame way, through the conjunction of bones and sinew and flesh and skin, there comes to be this enclosed space which we call a body."[47]

The corporeal form thus consists exclusively of the four chief-elements. The materials from which it is built up, are throughout identical with the inorganic substances of the external world, they are directly taken from it, and afterwards they return to union with it. Only when incorporated into the body they are brought into the form peculiar to this, just as the materials from which a house is built up have also been worked into a form belonging to this kind of structure.

Evident as this fact is, and unconditioned as it is generally conceded to be from the purely rational point of view*, nevertheless it is known with perfectly clear consciousness only by very few; which is a clear proof how very shallow the "normal" perception is. But this fact *must* be penetrated by longer reflection in its full significance, if we wish fully to understand the essence of personality! The basis of this personality, the body together with the organs of sense, is nothing but a mere collection and transformation of matter from external nature; nay, in the main, it consists simply of worked-up dung.

One would imagine that, with this state of things really penetrated, even now it ought to be a matter for some astonishment that men should cling to a structure with such a basis, namely, to this same personality, as to the highest they know. But just from this it will probably also become clear why the Buddha lays such stress upon the penetration of this basis of our personality as of a mere conjunction of the substances comprised in the four chief-elements:

"What now, brethren, is the earthy element? The earthy element may be either internal or external; whereof the internal division is as follows. Whatsoever is found in the subject proper to the person, of a hard or solid nature,

* "Think, o Man, that you are dust and shall return to dust," the Catholic church also calls to her adherents before every corpse.

such as the hair of the head or of the body, nails, teeth, skin, flesh, sinews, bones, marrow, kidneys, heart, liver, pleura, spleen, lungs, intestines, mesentery, stomach, excrement and whatever else of hard or solid nature exists in the subject proper to the person,—this is called the internal earthy element. Whatsoever exists of the earthy element, whether belonging to the subject or foreign to the subject, all is designated as the earthy element. And what is the watery element? The watery element may be either internal or external; whereof the internal division is as follows: Whatsoever is found in the subject proper to the person, of a fluid or watery nature, such as bile, phlegm, pus, blood, perspiration, fat, tears, sperm, spittle, nasal mucus, oil of the joints, urine and whatever else of a fluid or watery nature exists in the subject proper to the person—this is called the internal watery element. Whatsoever exists of the watery element, whether belonging to the subject or foreign to the subject, all is designated as the watery element. And what is the fiery element? The fiery element may be either internal or external; whereof the internal division is as follows: Whatsoever is found in the subject proper to the person, of the nature of heat or fire, such as that wherethrough warmth is present, whereby digestion takes place, whereby the physical frame becomes heated, whereby what is eaten and drunken, tasted and swallowed undergoes complete transformation, and whatever else of a hot or fiery nature exists in the subject proper to the person—this is called the internal fiery element. Whatsoever exists of the fiery element, whether belonging to the subject or foreign to the subject—all is designated as the fiery element. And what is the airy element? The airy element may be either internal or external; whereof the internal division is as follows. Whatsoever is found in the subject proper to the person, of the nature of air or wind, such as the up-coming airs and the down-going airs, the wind seated in stomach and intestines, the airs that traverse the limbs, the incoming and outgoing breaths—this and whatever else of an airy or windy nature exists in the subject proper to the person is called the internal airy element. Whatsoever exists of the airy element, whether belonging to the subject or foreign to the subject—all is designated as the airy element."[48] Thus the Buddha entirely equilibrates the materials building up our body with those of the external world; he even identifies them with the latter.

* *
*

But, as already stated, the body compounded in such a way with the six organs of sense is only the *basis* of personality, not yet this personality itself. For this to come about, the four other groups, sensation, perception, activities of the mind, and cognition, must be developed. This happens through the six sense-organs coming into an activity peculiar to them, such activity consisting in each sense-organ intercepting and gathering a definite quality of the external world; thus the eye gathers forms,* the ear sounds, the nose odours, the tongue

* Only *colours* are the eye's object: "One perceives, one perceives, O brother. And what does one perceive? One perceives blue and one perceives yellow and one perceives white"

juices, the body the tangible and palpable,* whilst the sense of thought, as the reservoir, has as its object the objects of the remaining five senses: "Different domains and different spheres of action, O brother, suit the five different senses, and one sense does not share in the domain and sphere of action of another. They are sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. Do not these senses, brother, have a central point (patisarana), and does not something share in their domain and sphere of action?"—"The five senses have *thinking* as a central point (mana), and thinking shares in their domain and sphere of action."[49]

But the sense of thought is not merely the central point for the five outer senses; it is in addition the special and exclusive organ of perception for boundless *space*. These facts, as established by the Buddha, are discussed in more detail with reference to the relevant passage in Appendix 2 II of this work.

*

Such is the nature of the *apparatus* of the senses. But in order that this apparatus may work, and hence that external bodies may put the tools or instruments of the senses into the activity that is peculiar to them, the organs of sense must first of all be *capable of functioning*, or, as the Buddha puts it, the organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling must be "intact." Then the objects corresponding to the several organs of sense must come within their reach, and at last the action of seeing, or of hearing, and so on, must be stirred and incited through the influence of the outer object, or, as the Buddha puts it, there must be a corresponding interlocking of the organs of sense and of the forms, sounds, odours, savours, objects of touch and ideas coming within their reach. If all this is the case, then by the interlocking of the organ and of the object of sense, *consciousness arises:*

"If, friends, the organ of vision exists intact, but external forms do not come within its range and hence the proper interlocking is lacking, then the corresponding parcel of consciousness does not arise. And if the organ of vision is not defective and outward forms do come within its reach, but the appropriate interlocking fails to take place, then again the corresponding parcel of consciousness does not arise.** If, however, the organ of vision is uninjured and outward

(43rd dialogue, Majjhima Nikāya). That *only* colours of light are the object of the visual sense is already evident from the fact that colourless objects, like the atmosphere, are invisible. However, it becomes exceedingly clear, if we hold a rod or a thermometer in a pail of water; the rod appears to be broken or shortened, just because we do not see the rod itself, but only the light reflected from it which is refracted in the water. Therefore the "forms" (rupā), as the Buddha generally describes the objects of the visual sense, are primarily only forms of light.

* in the form of *resistances* (pressure) and differences of temperature.

** If, for example, I am absent-mindedly looking out of my window upon the street, then, though various forms may come within reach of my sight, nevertheless there is no "corresponding interlocking" of eye and form, and therefore no consciousness of these things arises within me.

forms come within its reach and the proper interlocking takes place, then the corresponding parcel of consciousness arises.

As with the organ of vision, so with the organ of hearing, the organ of smell, the organ of taste, the organ of touch, the organ of thought.* If each is whole and intact, but the corresponding external object does not come within its range and hence the appropriate interlocking is lacking, then the corresponding parcel of consciousness does not arise. And if the internal organ is whole and intact and the corresponding external object does come within its range, but the proper interlocking fails to take place, then again the corresponding parcel of consciousness does not arise. If, however, the internal organ is whole and intact, and the corresponding external object comes within its range, and the appropriate interlocking takes place, then the corresponding parcel of consciousness arises." [50]

In another passage [51] the Buddha describes this process as follows: "Through the eye and forms consciousness arises: 'visual consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Through the ear and sounds consciousness arises: 'auditory consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Through the nose and smells consciousness arises: 'olfactory consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Through the tongue and flavours consciousness arises: 'gustatory consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Through the body and objects of taction consciousness arises: 'tactile consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Through the organ of thought and ideas consciousness arises: 'mental consciousness' accordingly is the term applied. Just as with fire, O monks, when by means of one or another conditioning cause a fire burns up, exactly according to that is the name applied. Thus, if a fire burns up by means of logs, then 'log-fire' is the name applied. If a fire burns up by means of faggots, then 'faggot-fire' is the name applied. If a fire burns up by means of grass, then 'grass-fire' is the name applied. If a fire burns up by means of chaff, then 'chaff-fire' is the name applied. And if a fire burns up by means of cow-dung then 'cow-dung-fire' is the name applied. If a fire burns up by means of rubbish, then 'rubbish-fire' is the name applied. In the selfsame way, O monks, when, on account of any conditioning cause whatsoever, any consciousness whatsoever springs up, exactly in accordance therewith is the name applied."

If this exposition is closely thought over, it yields a surprising result. Consciousness is nothing substantial whatever. It is nothing but the effect of a fixed conditioning cause, namely, of the interlocking of one of the activities of the

* Also to the organ of thinking an object must correspond. As said above, these objects of the organ of thinking are the objects of the other five senses, that is, all possible appearances of the world, either directly as concrete and immediate perceptions, or indirectly as formations of the imaginative faculty raised by means of association of ideas out of our memory, or as abstract notions formed earlier and again become objects of the activity of the organ of thinking. In harmony with this, the Buddha calls the objects of the sense of thought, *dhammā*, that means realities in the most extensive sense. Accordingly, we shall continue to translate Dhammā, as meaning the objects of the organ of thought, by "realities" — but alternately, for sake of greater clearness, by "ideas."

six senses and its objects. It is only present, if and for as long as this cause exists, and vanishes again into nothing as soon as this cause disappears. It flames up in the moment when an organ of sense is excited through an external object corresponding to it, as fire flames up if a match is rubbed on its rubbing-surface. Again it disappears, if the organs of sense are put out of action, just as the fire is extinguished, if the wood through which it had flamed up is withdrawn from it. If I do not see, that means, if I do not put my eye, directing it towards an object, into action, then there does not burn—we may directly say, 'burn'—any visual-consciousness within me, if I do not hear, no auditory-consciousness, and if all activities of the senses, thinking included, have ceased, then there no consciousness at all is burning: it is *extinguished.* "From whatever reason, ye monks, consciousness arises, just through this one, and through this one only is it effected." "Apart from a conditioning cause there is no coming to pass of consciousness,"[52] in short, consciousness is something causally conditioned.

* *
*

If through the starting of an activity of sense the corresponding consciousness, as visual consciousness, auditory consciousness, and so forth, flames up, then only am I *touched* through the external object. "In dependence upon the eye and forms there arises visual consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact. In dependence upon the ear and sounds there arises auditory consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact. In dependence upon the nose and smells there arises olfactory consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact. In dependence upon the tongue and flavours there arises gustatory consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact. In dependence upon the body and objects of contaction there arises tactile consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact. In dependence upon the organ of thought and ideas there arises mental consciousness; the conjunction of these three constitutes contact."[53]

Before this contact, and hence before consciousness is kindled in which I am first *touched* by the object appearing in it, this external object stimulating the sense-activity, and indeed even my own body certainly do not exist for me. Only in consequence of the kindling of consciousness am I *touched* by the external object to the extent that I am affected in the first instance by a *sensation.* "And what sensations do we have? We have pleasant sensations; we have unpleasant sensations; and we have sensations neither pleasant nor unpleasant."[54] More than this we do not experience through sensation alone. Therefore, at this stage, we do not yet know even the object that evokes the sensation. Such object arises first through *perception* which is directly attached to sensation. With the lowest sense (that of touch), we can clearly observe the temporal relation between sensation and perception. If in the dark in a light sleep I knock against an object with my arm, then, in consequence of the interplay between the organ of touch and its object, consciousness is kindled in which contact

first of all occurs between me and the object. If the sleep is so deep that no interplay takes place between the organ of touch and the external object, and consequently no consciousness is evoked, then I too am not *touched* by it. If, however, I am touched, then there first arises in me a mere sensation; the *perception* of the object that brought about the sensation occurs only gradually through constant touching.

But the result of this perceptual activity by means of our organs of perception is at first still very poor.

Each of our outer senses conveys to us only quite definite properties of things. Thus, as previously mentioned, we see with the eye only colours.

The ear introduces into our consciousness only sounds, the nose only odours, and our organ of taste only tastes, whilst the sense of touch conveys to us the degree of hardness and firmness of objects, and thus gives us an infallible lead to a knowledge of an object's size, shape, hardness, and temperature. Therefore they are always only the separate building-stones from which our intellect must first construct the things out of which those building-stones originate, before it can arrive at a total perception of the thing. If, for example, I suddenly see at a distance in open country a spot of colour rise above the ground, then, to begin with, it is simply nothing more than such a spot of colour that presents itself to me. In order to know what it really represents, the syllogistic activity of the intellect must come into play. As the outline of the spot of colour coincides with a human figure, the conclusion is obvious that it is such a figure. But then it may be that the form is merely a flat picture, perhaps a target that has been raised. If from the different shadows of colour, and in particular from the degrees of brightness and darkness in the boundary lines of the coloured figure, I have established that it is a three-dimensional figure, I then draw the further conclusion that I have before me a living person. But as the form does not move, I at once become uncertain again concerning my conclusion, since it occurs to me that it might be perhaps a three-dimensional scarecrow merely dressed up to look like a man. But now my second sense is affected, the sense of hearing, since from the direction of the form I hear a human voice. In the activity of my intellect I at once associate this voice with the form, and am now certain that it is a human being. And yet I have deceived myself, for I now see next to it another figure rise from the ground, and with a shout run away from it. I now know that the voice did not come from the original figure, and my supposed certainty about its nature again disappears, with the result that I cannot reach any definite perception at all. Then the figure likewise begins to run, and only now am I certain that it is in fact a human being. And yet an illusion might still be possible. What if the form were a self-moving ingeniously contrived automaton? I obtain actual certainty only when I come so near to the form that I can recognize the face and speak to it. Only then can I make sure that the figure has all the characteristics emerging from my general representation "human being" which exists in me, and so can draw the infallible conclusion that I have before me a human being. *Only now do I actually perceive*

it intuitively as a human being, in that the complete picture thus constructed by me in agreement with objective reality is put or "extended" by me (again in agreement with that objective reality) into the place from which my outer senses have supplied me with the separate characteristics. But it is the same with the perception of *all* objects, even of those that are directly in front of me, only that here the separate impressions of my outer senses are picked up by my central cognitive faculty with such certainty and lightning rapidity, and collected into a unity in synthetic thinking, that I am not aware of anything of this entire operation of the intellect except the result.

In this way, the Buddha has analysed the entire process of perception, and thus, like all the more profound truths, has also anticipated the intellectual nature (so called by the moderns) of empirical intuitive perception. Thus he says:

"Through contact is sensation conditioned; what we feel we perceive (as forms of light, sounds, and so on); what we perceive we think together (namely the different characteristics of the object); what we think together we extend (out into space); what we thus extend approaches man conditioned in precisely this way as that which is called perception of the extended world (papañca) in the forms entering consciousness through the eye, in the sounds entering consciousness through the ear, in the odours entering consciousness through the nose, in the juices entering consciousness through the tongue, in the objects of touch entering consciousness through the body, in the things of the past, present, and future entering consciousness through the organ of thought."*

This intellectual nature of intuitive perception, which the Buddha already taught, becomes even more obvious from what follows. With the occurrence of the immediate perception of an object the sources of error are to be found not in our outer senses in so far as these are normal, but in the synthetic activity of our intellect. The errors made by our intellect in this province produce what is called deceptive appearance. Such deceptive appearance occurs, for example, when we are sitting in one of two railway trains standing next to each other, and now suddenly see our own train set in motion, whereas in reality this train is standing still and the other is moving off. Here it is not our eye, but our intellect that deceives us. Our eye acquaints us only with the fact that a change in the position of the two trains relative to each other is beginning to take place; it does not tell us from which of the two trains this change comes. The latter is rather an inference of our intellect. Thus as we are expecting the departure of our train, we conclude quite unconsciously that "our train may depart at any moment;—we now see a change occur in the position of our train relative to the other;—and hence it is our train that has produced this change of position." This notion, which thus occurs to us, is then regarded by us as so much in keeping with reality (indeed it could be so, as we imagine), that we are under the impression that we actually see our train move. That the deceptive appearance

* Majj. Nik., 18th Discourse.

is in fact brought about by us only through such a false conclusion, is clear when it is a single carriage without an engine in which we are sitting. If we are clearly conscious of this at the given moment, then, with a change in the position of this carriage relative to a train standing on a neighbouring track, we shall quite certainly see this train actually depart. It is also the same with the deceptive appearance in consequence of which we see the sun continue to move in the heavens. Here too in reality we see only how our own position on the earth constantly shifts in relation to that of the sun. Now the notion is deeply engrained in our consciousness that the earth stands firm and motionless, and the opposite, purely abstract idea that the earth really moves is the less able to set aside or even to weaken that fundamental notion, since it is merely abstract, and is not always present in our minds even in this form. We, therefore, again infer automatically that "in the relation of my position on the earth to the sun, there constantly occurs a change of position; the cause of this cannot reside on the earth; therefore it is the sun that moves." Again the effect of this is that we then actually see the sun move. If, however, we were astronomers who know exactly the real sequence of events, and could have before us the actual facts with all their details and in the greatest clearness, and hence could wholly set aside temporarily the deceptive fundamental notion according to which the earth stands still, then, so long as we could do this, we should actually see with our eyes the sun stand still.

The part, indeed the overwhelming part, played by the syllogistic activity of our intellect in bringing about the perception of things, becomes quite clear in the following case. We place a small pellet of a few centimetres in diameter on the table, cross the middle and index fingers of the right hand, and then touch the pellet with the tips of the two fingers thus brought into that abnormal position. We shall feel quite distinctly two pellets.

Again, the reason for this is as follows. If the left side of the index finger as well as the right side of the middle finger receive in their normal position the impression of one pellet, then these impressions must result from two pellets. This experience we carry round with us in the form of a living, universal conception, and thus automatically use it as a basis even in our present case of the abnormal position of the two fingers. Here also we therefore infer that, "if the left side of the index finger as well as the right side of the middle finger have the impression of one pellet, these impressions must result from two pellets; in the present case I also have such impressions; therefore I have before me two pellets." Here again this conclusion also determines our immediate perception with such authority that we actually feel two pellets. However, even this deceptive appearance can again be removed if, when touching the pellet, we examine it as closely and clearly as possible, and thus restrain our fundamental conception which is drawn from the normal case, and under which we are inclined to subsume the concrete case.

A deceptive appearance will result, even in normal cases, from the share the intellect, as the central organ, has in bringing about intuitive empirical percep-

tions, if such intellect is not sufficiently developed, and thus is not yet able correctly to elaborate the material supplied to it by the outer senses, in other words, "to think together," and therefore to assign to it its proper place in space. This, for example, is the case with the child who cannot find with his little hands the spot from which an object is held out to him, and who therefore fails to grasp it.

* *
*

Under the Buddha's guidance, in complete agreement with daily experience, and with the observations and conclusions of our exact sciences, the origination and mechanism of personality or of the five groups of grasping are thus presented. For "every corporeal form* peculiar to what is formed thus** ranks as component of the group of corporeal form. Every sensation peculiar to what is formed thus ranks as component of the group of sensation. Every perception peculiar to what is formed thus ranks as component of the group of perception. Every mentation peculiar to what is formed thus ranks as component of the group of activities of the mind.*** Every cognition peculiar to what is formed thus ranks as component of the group of cognition. Now we understand: 'Thus is the grouping, the collecting, the placing together of these five groups of grasping.'"[55] Now, we may add, the origin of personality is understood as the origin of what man generally looks at as representing his essence.

Reviewing this whole history of the origin of personality, it becomes clear without further ado that the five groups into which the Buddha has analysed it, really exhaust it completely. We shall find nothing in it that may not be classified among one of these groups. But going further, it becomes clear that the four groups of sensation, perception, activities of the mind, and cognition, are always found together. If through the collision of an organ of sense with an object corresponding to it, consciousness flames up, then at once sensation

* This means our body, that "comes to be through the conjunction of bones and sinew and flesh and skin." See above!

** This means, the personality.

*** The fourth one of the groups (khandā) constituting the personality, is the group of the *sankhārā, sankhārākkhandha.* To understand the word *sankhāra* is of fundamental importance for the understanding of the whole doctrine of the Buddha. Therefore we will come back to its meaning later on. Here we only wish to lay down the following: *Sankhārākkhandha* contains within itself all inner emotions arising in us in consequence of the sensation and perception of a sense-perceptible object, that is, first, the said considering or *thinking,* further on, the willing originating from this thinking, in all its possible varieties, as desire, joy, enthusiasm, antipathy, wrath, anger, sadness, fear etc., in short, the whole complex of mentation and volition setting in, in dependence upon feeling and perceiving a certain object of sense. We comprehend this whole complex of mentation and willing as the totality of the motions *of the mind* roused by a concrete sensation and perception. Therefore the expression "group of activities of the mind" is entirely adequate to *sankhārākkhandha.* Strictly speaking, also the mentations are expressions of willing, namely, the immediate realisation of willing in thinking. This is also adequately expressed by the term "mind," wherein the relation to willing widely prevails.

and perception of the object as well as the functions of the mind and the cognition appear as inevitable consequences in consciousness: "Whatever there, in dependence upon eye-contact, in dependence on ear-contact, in dependence on nose-contact, in dependence on tongue-contact, in dependence on body-contact, in dependence on mind-contact arises of sensation, arises of perception, arises of activities of mind, arises of cognition," it is said in the 147th Dialogue of the Majjhima Nikāya which passage is given in more detail in the "*Milindapañha*," as follows:

"The king said: May it be possible, reverend Nāgasena, to separate these phenomena bound together in a unity, from each other, and to show their diversity, so that one might be able to say: 'This is contact, this is sensation, this is will, this is cognition, this is idea, this is discursive thinking'?" "No, O king, that is impossible."—"Give me an explanation."—"Suppose, O king, that the cook of a prince was preparing a soup or a gravy and adding some sour milk, salt, ginger, cummin, pepper and other spices. If the prince now should speak to him thus: 'Extract singly the juice of the sour milk, as well as that of the salt, of the ginger, the pepper, the cummin and the other spices you added!'—might this cook, O king, be able to separate the juices of those spices mixed thus completely, and to extract them and to say: 'This here is the sour, and that the salt, this is the bitter, this is the biting, this is the acrid and that the sweet'?" —"Certainly not, sir. That is impossible. But nevertheless all the spices together with their characteristic qualities are contained therein."—"Just so, O king, it is impossible really to separate those phenomena bound together into a unity and to show their diversity and to say: 'This is contact, this is sensation, this is perception, this is will, this is cognition, this is idea, this is discursive thinking'."

Consciousness, sensation, perception, activities of the mind and cognition thus are the respective product of the activities of the senses, always occurring joined together, and always generated anew by these with the exactness of a piece of mechanism. Indeed, if we sift the matter to the bottom, the corporeal form together with the organs of sense, that we have called the *basis* of personality, is nothing but the mechanical contrivance of the six senses, *the six-senses-machine*, having for its purpose to bring us into contact with the external world by generating consciousness and thereby sensation and perception of it. The five different organs of sense of this machine are just so many different tools for effecting the interlocking of the five different groups of components of the external world; the sixth organ, the organ of thought, being, as said above, only the focal and collective point of the remaining activities of sense, their "mainstay." Whatever namely the world may be, at all events it is composed of those "marks," those "characteristics,"[56] entering consciousness as forms, sounds, odours, flavours, objects of touch in form of perception, and furnishing furthermore the materials for the products of the sense of thought. In these elements the world is summed up: "Everything will I show you, my monks. What is everything? The eye and forms, the ear and sounds, the nose and odours, the tongue and

flavours, the body and the objects of touch, the organ of thinking and ideas. This, ye monks, is called everything."[57] The internal evidence of this sentence will afterwards become clearer to us. Here it may suffice to prove that according to the Buddha, the world is nothing but a world of forms, of sounds, of odours, of flavours, of objects of touch and of ideas, for the comprehension of which, including their working up by means of the sixth sense in the form of the activities of the mind, the machine of the six senses is designed and put together.

*

To be sure, this may not yet be entirely intelligible from the foregoing expositions. How can a formation consisting exclusively of the four chief-elements, that means, of matter—and our body, as far as we have yet learnt to know it, is nothing else—how can it bring forth, if put into activity, consciousness and thereby sensation, perception and thought, in short, the summation of all those phenomena we call spiritual ones? If a body composed of dead matter is set into motion, always none but purely mechanical movements are brought forth, but never the so-called spiritual phenomena, even if this body possesses the form of a human body, as for instance a human corpse, which is certainly a very clear proof that in the material body, as such, and alone, the sufficient cause of those spiritual phenomena cannot be contained. But on the other hand we have seen in the foregoing, that the spiritual phenomena are bound to the material body, inclusive of its organs, and conditioned by them. It follows from this that the material body, inclusive of its organs built up in the same manner from the matter of external nature, must be endowed with *special qualities* to be able to arouse consciousness and to produce their peculiar effects of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking. This may be made clear by an analogy.

If I give a piece of common iron to somebody and ask him with it to attract and keep fast other particles of iron without immediately touching them, he will rightly declare this to be an impossibility, since the qualities necessary for this are wanting to iron as such. But if he understands something of physics, he will add that he could easily fulfil the task proposed, if a piece of magnetic iron were handed to him. For some pieces of oxide of iron or loadstone possess the quality of attracting and holding fast, particles of iron. This quality is called magnetism; and a piece of iron possessing it, is called a natural magnet. This kind of iron thus possesses a quality not possessed by common iron, it develops something anlogous to life by causing motion from within; and it develops this quality because it is magnetized. But what is this magnetism? Surely something added to the iron. This is already proved by the fact that by touching or stroking with a natural loadstone, magnetism may be transferred temporarily to iron and permanently to steel, both thereby becoming artificial magnets. But, for the rest, this something is entirely unknown to us. Perhaps it is something infinitely subtle, infinitely ethereal, not perceivable as such,

first of all, not weighable; perhaps it only consists in a change of a certain kind, produced in the molecules of the iron themselves. However this may be, at all events magnetizing, that is, the procedure by which unmagnetical iron becomes magnetical, gives to the iron a mysterious capacity, otherwise totally alien to it. This capacity itself is only able to exist in dependence on iron, thus, it vanishes, if not earlier, then at latest, along with the destruction of the piece of iron itself. Precisely the same relation, as that between unmagnetical and magnetical iron, exists between inorganic and organic matter. Inorganic matter can never, in no case, support the processes of consciousness consisting in sensation, perception and thinking. To become capable of this it must become *especially qualified.* As iron must be made *magnetic,* it must be made *organic;* as iron must become *magnetized,* it must become *organized.* This precisely is done by building it up in the maternal womb into a corporeal form of a certain kind. As many a piece of oxide of iron is already magnetized by nature, so here, in the maternal womb from the very beginning, the material body, including its purely material organs of sense, are *organized,* that is, they are made capable of serving as organs of sense. Certainly we can just as little tell how this organization here is effected, and wherein it consists. We do not know if perhaps the material body is loaded with a kind of ethereal fluid, neither weighable nor perceivable as such; or if there happens only a change of the state of the molecules of matter. But here too we know at least this much, that organization is something added to inorganic matter, giving to the organs of sense formed by it a mysterious capacity entirely foreign to their essence. This is the capacity of causing consciousness to flame up as soon as they are put into activity, and of thereby engendering sensation and perception. This transmutation of inorganic matter into organic, is equivalent to that of dead matter into living matter, for the latter expression denotes just the capacity of arousing sensation. Thus vitality and the organization of a corporeal form, mean the same thing.* This vitality is completely bound up with the material body, just as magnetism is only able to exist in dependence on iron, disappears, at the latest, with the decomposition of the same. In the same manner, vitality can only exist in dependence on the material body, and must at last totally disappear upon the disintegration of such a body.

Thus the machine of the six senses now becomes quite intelligible. It consists of the body endowed with vitality, or, if you prefer to say so, loaded with vitality, or, in short, enabled to live. Only organs of sense already capable of living, and only such as still possess the faculty of life, are able to perform their functions. This, too, is the meaning of the words of the twenty-eighth Dialogue of the Majjhima Nikāya, that the organs of vision, of hearing, of smell, of taste, of touch and of thought must be intact, if the sensing-process is to set in.

But there is reason for showing in still more detail that our expositions really correspond to the doctrine of the Buddha, which alone is to be reproduced here.

* "To live and to be organic are reciprocal concepts." (Schopenhauer.)

The monk Mahākoṭṭhita wanted to know how our bodily organs of sense come into possession of their peculiar faculty of arousing consciousness, and thereby sensation and perception, as he expresses himself in questioning Sāriputta: "Five senses there are, brother: sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch. By reason of what do they continue their existence?" From Sāriputta he gets the following answer: "The five senses, O brother, exist by reason of vitality."[58]* Thereby Sāriputta expresssly declares the functions of the senses to be nothing but manifestations of vitality having their sufficient reason therein. The Buddha himself expresses the same thought by using the term *nāma-rūpa* for the six-senses-machine or the corporeal organism. For by *rūpa* he means the body consisting of inorganic matter, and by *nāma* the faculty of sensation, of perception, of thought, of contact, of attention and so on: "And what, ye monks, is *nāma-rūpa?* Sensation, perception, thinking, contact, attention—these, friends, are called *nāma.* The four chief-elements and the corporeal form that comes to be by reason of the four chief elements—this, friends, is called *rūpa.* Thus that is *nāma,* and this, *rūpa.* This, ye monks, is called *nāma-rūpa.*"[59] As the *faculties* comprised under *nāma*** form the kernel of what is called life,*** the meaning of *nāma-rūpa* again, is that of a body capable of life. † Moreover, *nāma-rūpa* may also be translated by mind-body, since *we* call the faculties comprised under *nāma* the mental ones and, by a collective term, the "mind." ††

* The sixth sense, the sense of thought, is not mentioned here, obviously because Sāriputta has explained just before that it is nothing but the centre of the other senses, their "mainstay", and therefore must exist under the same fundamental antecedent condition as the other ones.

** That the Buddha means by *nāma* only the *faculties* of sensation, of perception, of thought, of contact etc., is clearly evident from the chain of causality (Paṭiccasamuppāda) that will be treated of later on, Nāma-rūpa being adduced there as an antecedent condition of concrete contact, sensation, perception etc. In the Dialogues a word will often be found to mean a certain quality, as well as the *capacity* to develop it.

*** As a rule, only the faculty of *sensation* is given as the characteristic quality of life. This is certainly correct. For perception, thought, and attention etc., are only the necessary consequences of sensation in the higher grades of life.

† The faculty of life appears in two directions, once as the capacity of the vegetative functions of the body, and then as the capacity of the sensitive functions—sensation, perception and thinking—of the organs of the six senses, including the organ of thought as their centre, or, as we would say, of the central nervous system. *Nāma* comprises especially this second side of vitality, the capacity of sensuous functioning. But as this capacity, being the higher degree of vitality, presupposes the lower one, that is, the capacity of vegetative life, and therefore includes it as self-evident, the Buddha in defining *nāma* as above, might conveniently leave this latter and lower side of vitality unmentioned. We are doing precisely the same in defining life simply as the capacity of sensation.

†† The expression *nāma-rūpa* is taken from the Veda, where it designates what possesses name and form, that is, the single individual. "The world here then was not developed, it developed itself in names and forms, so that it was said: 'The individual called thus and thus by his name—*nāma*—possesses this or that form—*rūpa.*' This same world is developing still to-day into names and forms, so that it is said: 'The individual called so and so has this or that form.'" (Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad 1, 4, 7). "Name and form are the reality." (Ibid. 1, 6, 3.) The same reality of the individual the Buddha, of course, also means by *nāma-rūpa.*

That especially the relation of *nāma* to *rūpa* is the same as the relation of magnetism to iron, is clear from the following.

Nāma-rūpa is the six-sense-machine which alone makes possible contact between us and the objects of the outer world, and thereby, sensation and mentation. The Buddha states this elsewhere as follows: "If, Ānanda, you were asked: 'Is contact due to a particular cause?' you should say: 'It is.' And to the question: 'From what cause is contact?' you should say: 'Nāma-rūpa is the cause of contact.'"[60] Thereby he explains *nāma-rūpa* as follows:

He distinguishes between *nāmakāya* and *rūpakāya*, these terms designating the mental and the material body. Proceeding from this he explains that, if the mental body were not there, then the material body would not be attainable by us,* hence, could not exist. And if, on the other hand, the material body were not existent, then "those modes, features, characters, expressions," in which the mental body manifests itself, that is, sensation, perception and mentation, would not be possible for us, so that really only by the conjunction of these two "bodies" is the possibility of contact and thereby of sensation and mentation given: "Therefore, just this is the ground, the basis, the genesis, the cause of contact, to wit, *nāma-rūpa.*"[61]

Hence, the six-sense-machine—*nāma-rūpa*—according to the Buddha, actually consists of two co-ordinate components which only in their conjunction yield the capacity of engendering consciousness and thereby sensation, perception and cognition. These two are the material and the mental body. We see these two components related to each other in very much the same way that we relate magnetism to steel, which acquire the power of attracting and repelling other iron particles only in their union. To make this agreement outwardly recognizable we only need to say, correspondent to the expression *nāma-rūpa*, instead, "magnet" "magnet-iron," and then to define this concept, in connection with *nāmakāya* and *rūpakāya*, the mental and the material body, as the combination of the "magnetic body" and the "iron body."

To be sure, how the relation between this spiritual and this material body is more exactly constituted, we do not know, as little as up till now we have succeeded in explaining fully the relationship of magnetism to steel, its vehicle. The Buddha also does not tell us; but just as we are able to describe magnetism only from the effects through which it becomes visible, he too contents himself with defining the mental body according to "those modes, features, characters, expressions, in which it manifests itself."[62] At all events we must be careful not to take the rendering of the expression *nāmakāya* by "mental body," here chosen by us, in the sense wherein it is generally understood among ourselves, as signifying a substance indestructible and immaterial which might inhabit the material body. By "mental body" as we have already said, nothing is designated but that unknown factor which transfers the coarse material body

* Here we must especially bear in mind that, in respect of our real essence, we are behind our personality.

into that condition where it is able to produce sensations, perceptions and cognition for us. In the doctrine of the Buddha the contrast of mind and matter, as understood by Christian theologians, does not exist. Mind and matter are for him nothing completely distinct, but hold place in one and the same scale, matter being at the same time something coarsely mental, mind and soul at the same time something subtly material. In other words: The mental body is something material in exactly the same sense that the magnet in relation to coarsely material iron may be called something mental. This conception of the Buddha is in perfect harmony with our modern physiology, for which it is also certain that the so-called mental or spiritual processes must ultimately be nothing but material processes, though of the subtlest kind, such as perhaps we may imagine the oscillations of the ether to be. Positively speaking, we shall doubtless come nearest to the truth by defining the relation of the mental or spiritual body to the material one thus, that the spiritual body represents a more intimate determinant, that is to say, a quality, of the material body, in the same way that magnetism constitutes a quality of iron. There also results from this, that vitality (which, as explained before, is, according to the Buddha, fundamentally identical with the faculties comprised within the idea of the mental body) and the animal heat of the material body, mutually condition each other. For after Sāriputta has explained the senses as being conditioned through vitality, the dialogue between him and the monk Mahākoṭṭhita runs on thus: "And by reason of what, does vitality exist?"—"Vitality exists by reason of heat."—"And by reason of what does heat exist?"—"Heat exists by reason of vitality."—"Then we understand the venerable Sāriputta to say that heat exists by reason of vitality, and we also understand the venerable Sāriputta to say that vitality exists by reason of heat. But what, friend, are we to take as the meaning of such words?"—"Well, I will give you an illustration, friend, for by means of an illustration many an intelligent man comes to an understanding of the word spoken.* Just as in an oil lamp that is lit, by reason of the flame light appears, and by reason of the light the flame,—in the selfsame way, friend, vitality exists by reason of heat, and heat exists by reason of vitality."[63] Vitality thus stands to animal heat, filling and penetrating the material body, in the same relation as the light stands to the flame, and thereby, like animal heat, it is itself a quality of the material body. Here, again, we have an analogy with magnetism, this, as Schopenhauer says, being no primary force of nature, but reduceable to electricity, the latter itself standing in interchangeable relations to heat (thermo-electricity).

Lastly the perfect correctness of the analogy between the relation of the material and the mental body and that of iron and magnetism may be inferred from the further fact that, as magnetism can be transferred from a magnet to other pieces of iron, so the mental or spiritual body, by a saint in the state of highest concentration, may in a certain sense be *exteriorized.*

* For the same reason the comparison with magnetism is here carried through.

"With his mind thus concentrated, made completely pure, utterly clear, devoid of depravity, free from dirty spots, ready to act, firm, and imperturbable, he applies and directs it to the calling up of the mental body. He calls up from this body another body, having form, made of thought-stuff, having all limbs and parts, not deprived of any organ. Just, O king, as if a man were to pull out a reed from its sheath. He would know: 'This is the reed, this is the sheath. The reed is one thing, the sheath another. It is from the sheath that the reed has been drawn forth'—just so, O king, the monk calls up from this body another body, having form, made of thought-stuff, having all limbs and parts, not deprived of any organ."[64]

According to this, the similarity between mineral magnetism and what until now, following the Buddha, we have defined as vitality or spiritual body, is indeed so great that we can quite understand, why these latter days have coined the expression "*animal* magnetism" for the latter quality.

Summing up what we have been saying, the result is that the six-sense-machine—*nāma-rūpa*—consists of two components, one of which,—*rūpa*, the body built up from the materials of the outer world, is the supporter of the other component, namely, vitality, called also *nāma* or *nāmakāya*, mental body, in such a way that the latter constitutes a closer definition, that means, a *quality* of the material body, in the same manner as magnetism constitutes a quality of iron. As magnetism makes iron magnetic, vitality makes the material body organic, that is to say, it changes inorganic matter into organic matter, the latter only in the form of a corporeal organism being *capable* of arousing consciousness and thereby of bringing about contact with the outer world.*

From these expositions results also the insight that eye-consciousness, ear-consciousness etc. does not arise in the brain,—as to-day is inferred from the fact that, if a nerve leading from an organ of sense to the brain is severed, nothing more is seen or heard etc.,—but they arise immediately in the eye, the ear etc., the severing of the respective nerve only interrupting the contact

* It will be noticed that, in using this term, "corporeal" corresponds to *rūpa* and "organism" to *nāma*.—

It is in perfect harmony with these expositions, if *nāma-rūpa* is, in the Milindapañha, defined as follows:

"*The king said: 'Master Nagasena, you were talking about nāma-rūpa. What means nāma and what means rūpa?'*

'What there is of coarse matter about a creature, that is *rūpa*, and what there is subtle, spiritual, mental about it, that is *nāma*.'

'How is it, Master Nagasena, that not *nāma* alone is reborn, or *rūpa* alone?'

'Because, O king, both are inextricably connected; only as a unity may they come into existence.'

'Give me an illustration!'

'Just as, O king, a hen cannot lay the yolk and the egg-shell separately, because the yolk and the egg-shell are thus mutually dependent that they may only originate as an unity: in the same manner, O king, there would be no *rūpa*, if there were no *nāma*. For *nāma* and *rūpa* are thus mutually dependent that they may only originate together. Thus it happens from time immemorial.'"

with the source of the current, so that the nerve, so to say, is no longer charged with vitality.

*

Hereby the bodily organism, *nāma-rūpa* as the six-sense-machine and thereby the one substratum of the personality, is fully comprehended. But the personality has still another substratum, to wit, *consciousness*. For the possibility of coming into contact with the world depends, as has been made fully clear in the foregoing exposition, not only on the existence of the bodily organism, but also on this organism arousing consciousness in its sixfold sensual activity. If in consequence of the activity of the organism no consciousness should flame up, then in spite of this activity of the senses we should not be touched by the world, or to express it otherwise, we should not feel nor hear anything. Therefore personality is only the homogeneous result of the bodily organism and of the element of consciousness. This second substratum also must be inspected somewhat more narrowly.

Next, the possible objection that consciousness cannot be regarded as a separate basis of personality, because it is itself only produced by means of the corporeal organism, must be rejected. To recognize this objection as untenable, the mere hint suffices that a burning match also consists of two wholly different elements, wood and fire, though the latter is only produced by contact of the former with the rubbing-surface of the match-box. In the same manner consciousness only flames up through the interlocking of an individual organ of sense with an object of the outer world corresponding to it. With the element of fire consciousness also shares another quality, that of having to be kindled always anew.

But for the rest, the relations between the corporeal organism and consciousness are much more intimate then those between fire and match. For the relation of the two latter objects is simply conditioned, that is, it is nothing but a connection between cause and effect. But the corporeal organism and consciousness are *mutually* conditioned.

Next, we know already that consciousness is conditioned through the corporeal organism, being a product of it. But on the other hand, the existence of the corporeal organism itself is also conditioned through consciousness. For if the corporeal organism did not generate consciousness, then there would not be any sensation. But a body without sensation, though *capable* of living, would be destined to destruction, as is clear without further argument, only from its being unable to take nourishment. Even the embryo within the maternal womb could not develop to maturity, if it did not develop in its later stages some activity of the senses, in consequence of which consciousness is aroused in it. For we know that it shows life of its own from the sixth month of pregnancy, manifesting itself through its own movements. Now we know vitality to be identical with the faculty of sensation, and real life with real sensation. Thus the embryo possesses sensation even in this stage of development; and, because

we know sensation without consciousness to be impossible, it also must have consciousness. Certainly this is only the lowest kind of sensation, nothing but sensation of *touch*, that is aroused through the organ of touch being spread over the whole body, to wit, the respective parts of the nervous system. Such sensations may also be felt by a worm, and therefore consciousness resulting thereby is only such as corresponds to this lowest degree of sensation, without perception attached to it.* All the other senses are still inactive, therefore do not generate consciousness; first of all, the brain does not yet produce consciousness of thought and therefore, of course, no self-consciousness. But nevertheless, the embryo also must in time develop at least this touch-consciousness, if it is to come to maturity. So here also, consciousness is the antecedent condition for the further development and evolution of *nāma-rūpa* or of the corporeal organism. Consciousness must even descend into the impregnated ovum in the moment of conception, if this is to be enabled to develop into an embryo. Certainly at this period consciousness is still so weak, that it only arouses vegetative irritations, because it is produced by organic matter not yet differentiated, to wit, not yet differentiated to organs of sense. Therefore in the first instance it is only a kind of consciousness, and only arouses sensations or analogies of such, as are possessed by the germ of a plant in development. Only by and by, as the evolution of the embryo goes on, this plant-like consciousness is raised to animal touch-consciousness. Therewith the mutual conditionality of both factors, the corporeal organism and consciousness, is established.

"Just as, O friend, two bundles of reed are standing there, leaning against each other, in the selfsame way, O friend, consciousness arises in dependence on corporeal organism (*nāma-rūpa*) and the corporeal organism in dependence on consciousness."[65]

"Ānanda, if it be asked: 'Does the corporeal organism depend on anything?' the reply should be: 'It does.' And if it be asked: 'On what does the corporeal organism depend?' the reply should be: 'The corporeal organism depends on consciousness.'"[66]

"Ānanda, if it be asked: 'Does consciousness depend on anything?' the reply should be: 'It does.' And if it be asked: 'On what does consciousness depend?' the reply should be: 'Consciousness depends on the corporeal organism.'"[67]

"This truth, Ānanda, that on consciousness depends the corporeal organism, is to be understood in this way: Suppose, Ānanda, consciousness were not to descend into the maternal womb, pray, would the corporeal organism consolidate in the maternal womb?"

"Nay, verily, Reverend Sir."

"Suppose, Ānanda, consciousness, after having descended into the maternal womb, were then to go away again, pray, would the corporeal organism be born to life in the world?"

"Nay, verily, Reverend Sir."

* *This* kind of consciousness is therefore exhausted by concrete sensation.

"Suppose, Ānanda, consciousness were to be severed from a child, either boy or girl, pray, would the corporeal organism attain to growth, increase and development?"

"Nay, verily, Reverend Sir."

"Accordingly, Ānanda, here we have in consciousness the cause, the occasion, the origin and the dependence of the corporeal organism."

"I have said that on the corporeal organism depends consciousmess. This truth, Ānanda, that on the corporeal organism depends consciousness, is to be understood in this way: Suppose, Ānanda, that consciousness were to gain no foothold in the corporeal organism, pray, would there in the future be birth, old age and death and the coming into existence of misery's host?"

"Nay, verily, Reverend Sir."

"Accordingly, Ānanda, here we have in the corporeal organism the cause, the occasion, the origin, and the dependence of consciousness."*[68]

But what is this consciousness, *viññāṇa*, in reality? The Buddha defines it as an element (*dhātu*) "invisible, boundless, all-penetrating."[69] The objects enter this element at the same time, the interlocking of the sensual activities and of their corresponding objects having aroused it. Only by their entering the element of consciousness are the objects of the senses able to touch us, and only thereby sensation and perception of them becomes possible for us. The whole world, therefore, is for us existent only as far as it is irradiated by this element, and it vanishes again for us as soon as this element is temporarily or forever extinguished. "Everything has its stand in consciousness" and "When consciousness ceases, this here also ceases," the Buddha therefore teaches further on.**[70] Because this element thus forms the indispensable

* The corporeal organism—Nāma-rūpa—is the reason, the corporeal organism is the cause that the group of consciousness is able to appear (Majjh.-Nik. 109 th Discourse).

** It is well known that the modern empirical theory of the sensual perceptions, built upon the sensualism of Locke, suffers from a great defect. According to this theory sensations and perceptions arise only through the external object irritating the organ of sense. But here it remains entirely unintelligible how the irritating objects are felt and perceived as being *outside* of the organs of sense, the whole process occurring only *in* or *about* the organ of sense and therefore not being able to reach out of the realm of the same (the problem of the excentricity of sensation and perception). Now compare with this the doctrine of the Buddha as expounded above: Just where the defect of the modern empirical theory becomes visible, the factor discovered by the Buddha is introduced, and thereby completely remedies this defect. For through contact of the organ of sense and the immediate object of sense, for instance of the molecular current of the ether striking the surface of the eye, an invisible element called consciousness is aroused. In a moment, with the speed of thought, it spreads along the molecular stream to the object, emanating that stream comparable to an electric current running in the same manner with the speed of lightning through the whole conducting wire, be this as long as it may. Only thus sensation and perception of the external objects are made possible for us, who stand likewise as something inscrutable behind the whole process. This element, like space more subtle than the subtlest radiant matter, is boundless as is space. This boundlessness reveals itself especially by the help of space, consciousness illuminating the latter in its entire endlessness as soon as the organ of thought is directed upon it.

antecedent condition, or the medium through which we become conscious of the objects of the world—this becoming conscious consisting in contact, sensation and perception—*therefore* it is called the element of consciousness.* Also in this way the relation of consciousness to the corporeal organism is the same as that of the fire to the match. Things must, in the same manner, first enter the fire to be perceived in the darkness: "This is my body, built up of the four chief elements, sprung from father and mother, and that is my consciousness, bound to it, on that does it depend," it is said in the Dīghanikāya II, 84, just as we may say: "This is the match, built up of wood and of chemical stuffs, sprung from the chemist; and that is the fire, bound to it, on that does it depend."

Now we not only understand the five groups as representing the only and complete components of personality, but we also, as promised, see through their mechanism, just as we may see through the plan and the working together of the parts of a machine we have thoroughly understood. Personality itself is such a machine at work, but with its products included.

The machine is represented by the corporeal organism we have just on this account called the six-sense-machine. It possesses the peculiarity of being only able to exist and to work after the accession of another element wholly different from it. This heterogeneous element is consciousness, possessing on its part the peculiar quality of being generated always anew as soon as the six-sense-machine begins to work. As soon as it flames up in this manner, it produces, according to its being aroused by the respective organ of sight, of hearing, of smell, of taste, of touch or of thought, the *sensation* of seeing, of hearing, of smelling, of tasting, of touching, of thinking, and the respective *perception* of the object felt in this way. Out of this sensation and perception, later on, the activities of the mind arise.**

* Instead of being or becoming conscious, we may also say *cognitive*. "For consciousness consists in recognizing" (Schopenhauer).

** That sensation, and thereby perception and the activities of the mind, themselves conditioned by sensation, are especially conditioned by the corporeal organism, is particularly emphasised in the following passages: "Whithin a monk who thus gives heed to himself and dominates his recognizing, who persists without relaxing in wholesome striving and in working upon himself, there arises a pleasant sensation or arises an unpleasant sensation, or arises a sensation which is neither pleasant nor unpleasant. Then he recognizes the following: 'Within myself this sensation has arisen. It has arisen in dependence on a cause, not without a cause. In dependence on which cause? In dependence on this body.'" (Sam. Nik. IV, 211.)—"A monk, the mind of whom is released, knows: When the body dissolves, all sensations will be extinguished. It is, O monks, as if a shadow might originate, conditioned by a tree. Suppose that a man, provided with an axe and a basket, should go and fell that tree at the root. Having felled it at the root, suppose he should dig out the root and pull it out together with the tender fibres. Thereupon he should saw the trunk into pieces and split these and so reduce them to chips. The chips he should let become dry by wind and sun, then he should burn them and change them to ashes, and the ashes he should give to the winds or let them be carried away by the streaming floods of a river. Thus the shadow conditioned by the tree would be radically destroyed, like a palm-tree disrooted from the soil, it would be annihilated and not be able to arise again. In exactly the same (radical) manner all sensations will be extinguished when the body dissolves." (Majj. Nik., 140th Discourse)

Accordingly, the corporeal organism and consciousness are the two chief groups uniting themselves to produce the three other groups of sensation, of perception, and of the activities of the mind as their common result.*

They are, in their mutual conditionality, the real substrata of the personality and produce the "body endowed with consciousness," as it is always said in the Dialogues.

"In so far only, Ānanda, as one can be born, or grow old, or die, or dissolve, or reappear, in so far only is there any process of verbal expression, in so far only is there any process of explanation, in so far only is there any process of manifestation, in so far only is there any sphere of knowledge, in so far only do we go round the wheel of life up to our appearance amid the conditions of this world,—*in as far as this is, to wit, the corporeal organism together with consciousness.*"**[71] Now we may, without further ado, fix an essential quality pertaining to all the five groups wherein personality consists. The Buddha lays decisive stress upon this quality, he even dissolves personality into the five groups only for its sake. If we survey our whole series of deductions once more, the following total view presents itself.

* The first one of the five groups, the group of corporeal form, or of corporeality, *rūpakkhandha*, therefore is meant as being the same we already know as *nāma-rūpa*. This is beyond doubt. For on one side, *rūpakkhandha* comprises within itself the body able *to live:* "If corporeality,—that is, *rūpa*, the object of the first group—was the self, ye monks, then it could not be *exposed to malady.*" (Mahavagga I, 6.) On the other hand, as we have seen, *nāma-rūpa* is just this body able to live.—That the first group nevertheless is only designated as *rūpakkhandha*, without mentioning *nāma*, has its reason only therein that, in speaking of *rūpa*, vitality is considered to be included as self evident, as we too, when we mean a living body, simply speak of a body. *Rūpa* is only specially designated by *nāma* and thereby designated as *nāma-rūpa*, if the vitality of *rūpa* is to be rendered especially conspicuous. Such is the case in the passages of the *Paṭiccasamuppāda* cited above, wherein the proof had to be given that only a body *able to live* might be a sufficient cause for producing concrete sensation and perception. Therefore *rūpakkhandha* is, properly speaking, *nāma-rūpakkhandha*. By the way, that *nāma* must be contained in *rūpakkhandha*, follows already from *nāma* not being able to be separated from *rūpa*, but both being absolutely inseparable, so that where one of them is, the other also must be present.—If, on the other hand, also the three other *khandhā*, *vedanā*, *saññā* and *saṅkhārā* are comprised in other passages under the designation of *nāma*, the meaning is simply this: *Rūpakkhandha* or, properly speaking, *nāma-rūpakkhandha* comprises the body endowed with vitality, especially with the faculty of producing the so-called mental processes. But *vedanākkhandha*, *saññakkhandha* and *sankhārakkhandha* are the groups of those mental processes themselves, comprised under the term *nāmakkhandha*, because they are *based* upon *nāma* as the respective *faculty* or *quality* of the material body as of a living entity.

The group of consciousness, *viññāṇakkhandha*, does not belong even in this sense to the *nāmakkhandha*, as, following the expositions given above in the text, consciousness is a separate element accessory to *nāma*. Therefore it is also said in the passage given afterwards: "Nāma-rūpa *together with* consciousness."

** Here the following passage of the Dīgha Nik. XXIII may be brought to notice: ".... If there, O Kassapa, the iron-ball is combined with heat, combined with air, blazing, flaming and flaring, then it is lighter, more flexible and pliable. But if the iron-ball is no more combined with heat and air, but has cooled down and become extinguished, then it has become heavier, more stiff and rigid. Just so, warrior king, is this body, if combined

The material substratum of the personality is the corporeal organism, or the six-sense-machine as we say. This machine fitted out with the organs of the senses and besides that, with the necessary contrivances for its further maintenance and continuous supplying with fuel like any other machine, in the maternal womb—we shall see later by what—is built up out of parts of the outer world, these being at the same time assimilated by the maternal organism, or changed from dead into vital matter and thus organized, and further, kept working through an unbroken supply of food. As long as this machine is in order and goes well, it also fulfils its purpose of making possible the element of consciousness and thereby, of sensation and perception and, later on, the activities of the mind. If it is not able to work any more, then consciousness too is at an end, and thereby also sensation and perception and naturally also new activities of mind, just because they are mere products of the six-sense-machine and of consciousness. Only a new-built six-sense-machine may again bring forth these phenomena. Also sensation, perception and the activities of the mind are therefore nothing persistent, as little as the element of consciousness, but they are only the respective results of the six-sense-machine *in conjunction* with the element of consciousness and ultimately conditioned by the former. Since, as we have seen, this six-sense-machine itself, that is, the corporeal organism, is again a product of the four chief elements, the five groups constituting personality are thereby *causally conditioned:* "And thus has the Blessed One spoken: 'Whoso perceives the Arising of things through cause, the same perceives the truth. Whoso perceives the truth, the same perceives the Arising of things through cause.' In dependence upon cause, verily, have these five adherence-groups arisen."[72]

Now we also understand something further. Because our body endowed with organs of sense is the apparatus by means of which we come into connection with the world, the body, by coming into action, generating the element of consciousness and only thereby sensation and perception of the world, *the beginning as well as the end of the world is conditioned by it.* If the body is dissolved by death, the entire world vanishes for us. And if there should be, as the Buddha promises, a definitive overcoming of the world, then we may say now already that it will be possible only through this, that there exists a way to the final extinguishing of every corporeal organism—remember here that the Buddha teaches incessant rebirth—and thereby of consciousness, thereby of personality, thereby at last of the world itself:

with vitality, with warmth, with consciousness, lighter, more flexible and pliable; but if this body is no longer combined with vitality and warmth and consciousness, then it has become heavy, more stiff and rigid."

So here instead of "*Nāma-rūpa* together with consciousness" it is said: "this body combined *with vitality, with warmth,* with consciousness," from which it results again obviously that *nāma* is the same as "combined with vitality, with warmth." Besides this, the relation of vitality to the material organism is defined also in this passage in exactly the same manner as the relation of magnetism to iron, the body endowed with vitality being compared to a *heated* iron-ball.

"Once the Blessed One was staying in the Jeta grove near Sāvatthī, in the monastery of Anāthapindika. And Rohitassa, a heavenly spirit, radiant in beauty, as night fell, lit up the whole garden, and betook himself to the Blessed One. Arriving thither, he respectfully saluted the Blessed One and stood beside him. And standing beside him, Rohitassa, the heavenly spirit, spoke thus to the Blessed One:

'May it be possible, O Lord, through going, to know, to see or to reach the end of the world, where neither birth is, nor growing old nor dying, neither originating nor perishing?'

'It is impossible, O friend, thus I say, through going, to know, to see or to reach the end of the world, where neither birth is, nor growing old nor dying, neither originating nor perishing.'

'Wonderful it is, O Lord, astonishing it is, O Lord, how the Blessed One tells me thus correctly: "It is impossible, O friend, thus I say, through going, to know, to see or to reach the end of the world, where neither birth is, nor growing old nor dying, neither originating nor perishing." Once, in a former birth, O Lord, I was a hermit, called Rohitassa, the son of Bhoja, and by dominating magic I was able to walk through the air. Such, O Lord, was my speed, that I, during the time an archer, strong, well trained, skilled and expert, takes to shoot with a light arrow, without using his strength, across the shadow of a palm-tree, could make a stride as far as the Eastern Sea is away from the Western Sea. In possession of such speed, capable of making such strides, O Lord, the wish arose in me to reach, by going, the end of the world. And without eating and drinking, without chewing or tasting, without voiding excrement or urine, without being hindered by sleep or weariness, I spent and lived a hundred years. And having gone through a full hundred years, I died on the way, without having reached the end of the world. Wonderful it is, O Lord, astonishing it is, O Lord, how the Blessed One tells me thus correctly: 'It is impossible, O friend, thus I say, by going, to know, to see or to reach the end of the world, where neither birth is, nor growing old nor dying, neither originating nor perishing.'

'Certainly it is impossible, O friend, thus I say, by going, to know, to see or to reach the end of the world, where neither birth is, nor growing old nor dying, neither originating nor perishing. But neither is it possible, O friend, thus I say, to make an end of suffering without having reached the end of the world. But this I declare, O friend: *Within this body, six feet high, endowed with perception and cognition, is contained the world, the origin of the world, and the end of the world, and the path leading towards the end of the world*'."[73] Or, as we have heard above, but only now are able to understand completely: within *nāma-rūpa*, to wit, our corporeal organism, together with consciousness, everything is contained "that lies in the domain of concepts, in the domain of explanation, in the domain of manifestation, in the domain of cognition."

If thus the corporeal organism together with consciousness offers us *the possibility* of coming into contact with the world, this world *becomes real* for

us in the same measure that the six-sense-machine is set in action and thereby all the five groups appear, thus, in the measure that we develop into personality: Within and with this personality we experience what we call the world or the All. And because this living and moving and having our being in the All seems to us the highest ideal, therefore we know no higher bliss than our personality, wherein each of us sees for himself the realization of this whole process of the world.

Further, it follows from this point of view, how wise it was of the Buddha to furnish the proof of the great universal law of transitoriness and therewith of suffering, especially by means of the five groups constituting personality. For if we recognize all the five groups of personality as transient, then everything is known as transient, and full of suffering, because for us everything consists only in and through our personality.

To this proof we may therefore now return.

The World of Suffering

The whole world, its beginning as well as its continuing and its end, is for us connected with our personality. The five groups constituting personality are causally conditioned in this manner that the corporeal group represents the basis of the four other groups, sensation, perception, mentation and cognition, and even through the activity of the organs of sense, at first of all, produces them. The body itself is a product of the substances comprised within the four chief elements; it is "built up of the four chief elements," and is therefore itself conditioned by these. Our personality, and thereby our whole world, ultimately share the fate of the four chief elements, they are *transient* like these.

These are axioms which everybody who once has understood them, perceives without more ado; they have become self-evident for him. Just this self-evidence is what the Buddha wants us to comprehend. Ultimately, he only works with self-evident ideas, what is ocularly recognized, being always self-evident.

First then, it is in question for the Buddha to illustrate the transitoriness of the four chief elements, as plainly to our sight as possible:

"A time will come, when the external watery element will rise in fury, and when that happens, the external earthy element will disappear. In that day this great external earthy element will unmistakably reveal itself as transient, will show itself subject to ruin, destruction and all vicissitude.

"A time will come when the external watery element will rise in fury and sweep away village and town and city and province and kingdom. Yea, there will come a time when the waters of the great ocean will be hundreds of miles deep, many hundreds of miles deep. And a time will come when the waters in the great ocean will stand no more then seven palm-tree's height in depth, then six, then five, four, three, two and, at last, only one palm-tree's height in depth. There will come a time when the water in the great ocean will stand only seven

men's height in depth, then only six, then five, four, three, two, and finally, only one man's height in depth. And a time will be when the water in the great ocean will only come up to a man's middle, then to his loins, then to his knee, then only to his ancle. Yea, there will come a time when there will be no more water left in the great ocean than will cover one joint of the finger. In that day this great external watery element will unmistakably reveal itself as transient, will show itself subject to ruin, destruction and all vicissitude.

"A time will come when the fiery element will rage furiously and devour village and town and city and province and kingdom, and, spreading over meadows and pastures, jungle and plain and pleasure-grove, will only cease when there is naught to devour. And there will come a time when men will seek to preserve fire with a fan made out of a fowl's wing, or from scraps of hide. In that day this great external fiery element will unmistakably reveal itself as transient, will show itself subject to ruin, destruction and all vicissitude.

"A time will come when the external airy element will rage in fury and carry away village and town and city and province and kingdom, and there will also come a time when, in the last month of the hot season, not a blade of grass stirring in the water-courses, men will seek to make a little wind with a fan made from a palm-stalk. In that day this great external airy element will unmistakably reveal itself as transient, will show itself subject to ruin, destruction and all vicissitude."[74]

If thus all matter comprised under the heading of the four chief elements shows itself subject to the great law of transitoriness, the same is of course the case with all things formed by it, especially with our body. Therefore the Buddha, immediately after having described the incessant vicissitude of all material things, proceeds thus: "What, then, of this fathom-long body? Is there aught here of which may rightly be said 'I' or 'Mine' or 'Am?' Nay, verily, nothing whatsoever"—that means, also our body is "subject to ruin, destruction and all vicissitude." Accordingly then also the transitoriness of the remaining components of our personality is self-evident, being based upon the body, including its organs:

"The corporeal form, O monks, is transient, and what underlies the arising of the corporeal form, what conditions it, that too is transient. Corporeal form arisen from that which is transient, how could it be permanent?

"Sensation is transient, and what underlies the arising of sensation, what conditions it, that too is transient. Sensation arisen from that which is transient, how could it be permanent?

"Perception is transient, and what underlies the arising of perception, what conditions it, that, too, is transient. Perception arisen from that which is transient, how could it be permanent?

"The activities of the mind are transient, and what underlies the arising of the activities of the mind, what conditions them, that, too, is transient. The activities of the mind arisen from that which is transient, how could they be permanent?

"Cognition is transient and what underlies the arising of cognition, what conditions it, that, too, is transient. Cognition arisen from that which is transient, how could it be permanent?"[75]

Accordingly in regard to all the five groups of personality upon which all our volition is concentrated—the Buddha calling them therefore the five groups of *grasping*—as well as to all external objects of will, included in the five groups, the saying holds good: "Arising shows itself, passing away shows itself, during existence vicissitude shows itself."[76]

But thereby it is also established that the whole personality, thereby also the whole world made accessible to us through this, is painful. For "whatever is transient, that is painful:"

"What think ye, monks? Is body permanent or is it transient?"

"It is transient, O Lord."

"But that which is transient—is it painful or is it pleasant?"

"It is painful, Lord."

"What think, ye, monks? Is sensation, is perception, are the activities of the mind, is cognition permanent or transient?"

"They are transient, Lord."

"But what is transient—is it painful or pleasant?"

"It is painful, Lord."[77]

This painfulness in consequence of transitoriness shows itself in the body as "decay, death," in the four other groups as "pain, sorrow, grief and despair."

Thus, at last, there remains of every satisfaction of will, nothing but suffering caused by its loss. Only with this final effect, as we have shown, can it be entered up in the book of life. The latter, therefore, at last, must show nothing but negative entries. In other words: the Buddha is right in valuing everything ultimately as suffering.

To the average man this generally only becomes clear when this book is definitively closed, when death comes near. Then, with the complete breakdown of all willing, when he sees everything torn from him, his prosperity, his dearest relations, even his own body in the pangs with which he is writhing, and together with these, the whole of the rest of the world, then also for him only an ocean of misery remains, and this ocean of suffering only will then be real. Let us only stop and consider: What, to us, to-day, is yesterday with all its pleasures? Nothing but a mere shadow. But to-morrow, to-day will be just such another shadow; and the day after to-morrow, to-morrow will be the same: and at last, face to face with death, our entire life will be all a mere shadow. All its comforts are then over, definitively over, and nothing will remain but suffering, nameless suffering. Whoso wishes fully to experience this, and thus wishes to pass a competent judgment on the first of the four excellent truths of the Buddha, let him betake himself to some deathbed and carry out his contemplation *there*, and best of all, to the death-bed of some sensualist. Does not this sensualist resemble a merchant who, after having started his business with a million, has

revelled in a life of pleasure, until he has squandered all he had and finds himself face to face with nothing? Have not, as in the books of this merchant, so in the book of life of that dying sensualist all active entries vanished and only the passive ones remained?

Certainly, the will to life struggling for its right to existence and defending itself daily in innumerable brains, has still one last resource left, so as not to be obliged to modify its judgment on the value of life, namely this, that at last also to a dying man, and indeed the more he has worked during his lifetime, the happifying consciousness remains that at least *the fruits* of his labours, pains and troubles, are reaped by his relatives, and lastly by mankind as a whole, contributing thus to the general evolution. To this the Buddha, if he were still alive, would reply: You fool, you are talking of the evolution of mankind. Look a little closer at this evolution. Certainly mankind rises higher and higher, until, —why! until the whole towering edifice, the whole superior civilization you dream of, falls a victim to the law of dissolution and decay, as so often has happened during the limitless past. Thereupon the play may begin anew, and go on and on thus through endless time, only interrupted by world-catastrophes again and again occurring, in which, together with everything alive, the whole staging of life also will entirely disappear through the planets falling into the sun, until it is built up again anew. But meanwhile every single man perishes through inevitable death again and again, with the prospect that also his children and grandchildren, as well as the innumerable generations coming after them, only live to die, as he himself has to die, and that with them also the fruits of his own labour he left to them, wherein only he ultimately saw the value of his life, will crash down into the bottomless abyss of the past. In short: *There is no evolution such as you dream of.* As to life, death is just as essential as birth, old age just as essential as youth;* even so, there is no evolution of the world that is not inevitably followed by decay. Evolution and decay are nothing but the two sides of *one* process, to wit, of *becoming:* Everything appears in the first part of its *becoming* as evolution, in the second one as decay.

This impossibility of any lasting satisfaction of will, which prevails throughout the whole world, and therefore the final domination of suffering, is so evident, so obvious, that it can nowise be refuted,but only ignored. And as a matter of fact, incredible as it is, the will of man, this his foundation, is so strong, that it enables him to ignore even this fundamental truth which lights up the whole essence of the world, if he does not want to see it. By means of empty sophisms he slurs it over, or even babbles in high-sounding phrases about reaching a final state of mankind full of bliss. And this his opinion is not altered even by the consideration that this happy, final state of his, if it is to be reached at

* Compare with this the words of the Buddha in regard to Ānanda's wondering to himself that the Master no longer looked so imposing as once he did: "Thus it is, Ānanda, that upon youth follows age, upon health, sickness, upon life, death."[78]

all, ought to have been reached long ago, having regard to the endless time that has flowed into the ocean of the past.*

With such men there is nothing to be done. They are, as said above, in regard to their valuation of life, under the ban of their blind cleaving to it. They cannot keep to pure observation of the problem in an objective manner, and thus they are "incapable of seeing clear," as the Buddha says. But it is impossible for the *objective* observer, after what we have just said, to come to any other judgment in regard to life than to that given by the Buddha. Only too well he will comprehend the truth of the words:

"Impermanent are all the compounds of existence!

Painful are all the compounds of existence!"[79]

But also this insight that life must ultimately in every direction necessarily change to suffering, and therefore at last become itself suffering and nothing but suffering, might still be bearable. Also with this view before us we might still withdraw to that standpoint that just therefore, because only the present time is real, it is the highest wisdom to enjoy this present and to make this the purpose of life, indifferent to any later judgment on the whole life. We might also console ourselves about the sorrowful end with the thought that this end too will come to an end, and therefore be at last overcome. But this too, according to the Buddha, would be self-deceit, and in fact, the worst of all. For our present existence is not our whole life, it is only a tiny section of our life.

* Compare Du Prel, "The Enigma of Man:" "As a whole, it may be said, that the solution of the enigma of man proposed by materialism is very comfortless ..... To compensate us for this comfortlessness, materialism puts the accent on the life of *the species*. Nature is thus said not to care for the individual, but for the species only. By making continual progress, mankind is said to approach a state that may be thought to develop at last into the golden age. To work as a serving member to reach this state, is said to be the task of the individual. But, sad to say, this solace does not last long. For, apart from the fact that species also die out, it is quite an arbitrary proceeding to remain fixed at the biological standpoint in regarding the matter. As a naturalist, the materialistic observer must take the higher standpoint of astronomy. There will be a time when the earth, through the decline of the isothermal lines from the poles towards the equator, will at last become uninhabitable, and afterwards the earth will dissolve into a current of meteorites and fall into the sun. Therefore, even if mankind should reach a golden age, it yet would lack an heir. But what has finally to come to a definitive end, in any case is devoid of purpose. From the materialistic point of view, individual death makes bygone life just as purposeless as the bygone history of civilization becomes purposeless through the dying out of mankind. At no point of evolution can a purpose be seen, if no purpose can be seen in the final point.—Certainly, from the astronomical point of view the play always begins anew, by solar systems dissolving into cosmic nebulae, and these developing again into solar systems. But the results of these biological and cosmological processes are always lost again. Purposelessness does not become more rational by always renewing itself. Thus, every reason for enthusiasm is lacking in the history of the species, the reality of which in addition to that does not exceed that of its individuals. An artist always destroying his own works deserves no admiration, but ought to be confined in a madhouse, all the more so, indeed, the more genius is displayed in his works. Hence it is nothing but a mere phrase, if materialism tries to fill us with enthusiasm for the grandeur of nature. According to its own premises, it ought rather to depict nature as a materialized absurdity."

This itself is without beginning and without end, if we do not make an end to it: "Without beginning or end, ye monks, is this round of rebirth (*saṁsāra*). There cannot be discerned a first beginning of beings who, sunk in ignorance and bound by thirst, ceaselessly transmigrating, again and again run to a new birth."*

It is only from this standpoint that the flood of suffering, the dreadfulness and awfulness of life is to be seen in its full measure.

For the Buddha teaches the round of rebirths, within which the creatures are wandering incessantly, to consist of five fates: "Five in number, Sāriputta, are the fates that may befall after death; namely these: passage into the hell-world, the animal kingdom, the realm of shades, the world of men or the abodes of the gods. The hell-world I know, Sāriputta; and the road that leads to the hell-world, and the course of conduct that brings down to it, following which, at the break-up of the body, after death, descending upon a sorry journey downwards towards loss, a man is born in the hell-world—this also I know. The animal kingdom I know, Sāriputta; and the road, the course of conduct, following which, at the break-up of the body, after death, a man is born into the animal kingdom—this too I know. The realm of shades I know, Sāriputta; and the road, the course of conduct which, at the break-up of the body after death, bring a man to the realm of shades—this too I know. The world of men I know, Sāriputta; and the road that leads to the world of men, the course of conduct, through the following whereof, at the break-up of the body, after death, a man is born into the world of men—this too I know. The gods I know, Sāriputta; and the road that leads to the abodes of the gods, the course of conduct through the following of which, a man, at the break-up of the body, after death, journeying happily, is born into the heaven-world—this also I know... And, Sāriputta, penetrating the mind and heart of a certain person, I perceive: 'This person so acts, so conducts himself, follows such a course, that at the break-up of the body, after death, descending upon a sorry journey towards loss, he will come to the hell-world.' And after a time, with the pure, the superhuman, celestial Seeing, I behold that person descend upon that sorry journey towards loss, I see him in the hell-world in utter anguish, subject to pains bitter and grievous. Just as if there were a fiery pit, over the height of a man in depth, filled with red-hot embers, smokeless, glowing; and a man should approach, scorched by the noonday sun, half dead with the heat, exhausted, tottering, athirst, making straight for that pit of fire, and an observing man should see him and say: 'This good man so acts, so conducts himself, follows such a course, that he will certainly come into that fiery pit', and not long thereafter he should actually see the man fallen into the pit of fire in utter anguish, subject to bitter and grievous torment; in the selfsame way, Sāriputta, I behold a person so conducts himself that after death he comes to the hell-world, there to undergo the extremest pangs of sharp and piercing agonies.** But again, Sāri-

* Saṁsāra means: a course (sar) returning (sam) to its starting point.

** In the 129th Discourse of the Majjhima Nikāya, it is said: "If man, ye monks, might say, rightly: 'Utterly unwished for, utterly unwelcome, utterly unpleasant,' he might

putta, penetrating the heart and mind of a certain person, I perceive: 'This person so acts, so conducts himself, follows such a course, that after death he will come to the animal kingdom,' and in due time, with the pure, the superhuman, celestial Seeing, I behold him born into the animal kingdom', in great misery and subject to grievous and bitter sufferings. It is as if there were a cesspool over a man's height in depth filled with filth; and a man should approach, scorched by the sun, half dead with heat, worn out, reeling, parched with thirst, walking directly on towards that cesspool. And an observing man should see him and say: 'This good man, as he is now going, will surely come into that cesspool.' And in a short time he should see the man fallen into the cesspool, in great misery and subject to bitter and grievous suffering. In like manner also, Sāriputta, do I behold a man follow such a course that after death I see him born into the animal kingdom, there to undergo bitter and grievous misery and suffering.*— Again, Sāriputta, penetrating the heart and mind of a certain person, I perceive: 'This person so acts that after death he will come to the realm of shades, and later I actually see him in the spirit-world, sore afflicted and distressed. It is as if upon a piece of poor soil there were growing a tree having but few branches which, scanty of foliage, yielded but little shade, and a man devoured by the fierce noonday heat, utterly exhausted with thirst and weariness, should

rightly of the hell-world say: 'Utterly unwished for, utterly unwelcome, utterly unpleasant.' Not even by means of a simile might the greatness of the sufferings of the hell-worlds become quite clear."—As one of the monks, nevertheless, asks for a simile, the Blessed One asks, if a criminal receiving daily, morning, noon and night, three hundred strokes with a sword, would not be sad and sorrowful. The answer is: "Even if chastised with one stroke of the sword only, this man would be sad and sorrowful, how much more after three hundred strokes." Thereupon the Blessed One took up a stone of moderate size, of the size of a fist, and turning to the monks said: "What do you think, O monks, which is larger, this stone of moderate size, of the size of a fist, or Himālaya, the king of the mountains?"— "Very small, O Lord, is this stone of moderate size, of the size of a fist, that the Blessed One has there, against Himālaya, the king of the mountains; it cannot be reckoned, it cannot be counted, it cannot be compared."—"Even so, monks, what a man, chastised with three hundred strokes of a blade, experiences of sadness and sorrow, cannot be reckoned, counted or compared against the sufferings of the hell-worlds."

* Compare the 129th Discourse of Majjh. Nikāya, cited above: "If I should try, O monks, to expose to you in any way the state of those which have become animals, nevertheless, monks, it would hardly be possible to explain in words, the greatness of the sufferings of animals.

"It is as if, monks, a man should throw a drum-net with only one hole into the ocean and it would be driven by the eastern wind to the west, by the western wind to the east, by the northern wind to the south, by the southern wind to the north. And there should be an one-eyed turtle coming up to the surface of the ocean once in every hundred years. What do you think, monks, would this one-eyed turtle get its neck into that one-holed drum-net?"— "Hardly ever, Lord, but if at all, then only after a very long time had elapsed."—"Rather, monks, might this one-eyed turtle get its neck into the one-holed drum-net than a fool, once sunk into this depth, come again into the world of men. And why so? Because there is, monks, no just conduct, no straightforward conduct, no wholesome acting, no charitable acting. There, monks, they are accustomed to devour each other, and to kill the weaker ones."

come staggering along the road straight on towards this tree, and one observing him should say: 'This good man is making straight for that tree,' and a short time thereafter, he should actually see the man, either seated or lying down beneath the tree, sore afflicted and distressed. In similar wise, Sāriputta, do I see a man so comport himself that after death I behold him come to the realm of shades there to suffer much affliction and distress.—Again, Sāriputta, penetrating the heart and mind of a certain person, I perceive: 'This person so acts that after death he will reappear as a man,' and some time later I do indeed see him as a man, in the enjoyment of many pleasures. Somewhat as if upon a piece of good soil there were growing a tree, many-branched, thick of foliage, yielding abundant shade, and one drew near, oppressed by the noonday heat, thirsty and weary, and made straight for this tree; and an observer should see him and remark: 'This good man is coming straight to that tree,' and later on he should see the man sitting or reclining in the shade of the tree, experiencing much pleasurable sensation. Similarly, Sāriputta, do I behold a man so conduct himself that after death he comes again into the world of men, there to experience much pleasurable sensation.—Again, Sāriputta, penetrating the heart and mind of a certain person, I perceive: 'This person so acts that after death, journeying happily, he will come to the heaven-worlds,' and later I behold him in the heaven-world, enjoying the height of felicity. Just as if there were a palace, having a pavilion, smooth within and without, with an enclosed, finely casemented alcove, and therein a couch at either end cushioned in purple and provided with coverlets long-fleeced and white and flower inwoven, hung also with choicest antelope skins; and a man should draw near, spent with the noontide heat, reeling with exhaustion, parched with thirst, and should move straight on towards this same palace, and an observer should see him and say: 'This good man is coming straight on towards that palace'; and later should indeed behold the man arrived at the palace and, in the pavilion sitting or reclining upon the couch, enjoying the greatest felicity. In like manner also, Sāriputta, do I see a man so act that after death I behold him arrived in the heaven-world, enjoying the greatest felicity."[80]

Among these five fates ultimately only the last one, the abode in the heaven-world, could be desirable. But according to the Buddha this one is just as much subject to the great law of transitoriness as the abode in the four other ones, objectification in the animal world and in the hells also finding always its end, though possibly only after enormous stretches of time. "Up to the highest world of the gods every existence becomes annihilated"—"The Thirty-three Gods and the Yāma Gods, the Satisfied Gods, the Gods Who Delight in Fashioning, the Gods Who Have Control of Pleasures Fashioned by Others, they all, bound with the fetters of desire, return into the power of Māra which means into the power of death."[81] Unfailingly, therefore, always again descent to the lower worlds will follow.

But moreover, this pleasant prospect of staying in a heaven, or even only in the realm of mankind, is open only to very few beings, in complete accordance

with the doctrine of the Christ, according to whom, also "many are called, but few chosen":

"Just as, monks, here on the soil of this India there are only a few beautiful gardens and woods, fields and ponds, but far more mountain slopes and gorges, streams difficult to pass, wild virgin forests and heights impossible to climb; in like manner, monks, only a few creatures who have died as men are reborn as men, but far more creatures who died as men, come back to existence in a hell, among animals, or in the realm of shades."[82]

Thus every being is eternally wandering to and fro within Saṁsāra through the five realms, finding itself reborn by the incessant change of the five groups constituting its personality, now as a man, now as a spectre, now as an animal, now as a devil, now and then as a god. "In wombs we are germinating, in other worlds we are germinating, in the changing circle we are returning now and then."[83]

We must try to make directly clear to ourselves what this means. First, we must become clear about the endlessness of this our wandering through the worlds:

"Suppose, O monks, a man should cut off the grasses and herbs, twigs and leaves of this entire continent of India, should collect them and heap up one handful of them after the other, saying: 'This is my mother, this is the mother of my mother', and so on,—there would be no end of the mothers of the mother of this man. But he would reach the very last bit, the end of all the grasses and herbs of this continent of India,—and why? Without beginning or end, monks, is this round of rebirths. There cannot be discerned the first beginning of beings, who, sunk in ignorance and bound by thirst, are incessantly transmigrating, and again and again run to a new birth ..."

"As if, monks, a man should heap up this great earth by handfuls, to form a ball of earth, saying: 'This is my father, this is my father's father,' and so on—there would be no end of the fathers of the father of this man, but this great earth would be used up, would come to an end. And why? Without beginning or end, O monks, is this round of rebirths. There cannot be discerned the first beginning of beings, who, sunk in ignorance and bound by thirst, are incessantly transmigrating, and again and again run to a new birth.

"And thus, O monks, during a long time you have experienced suffering, you have experienced pain and misery and have enlarged the burying-ground, truly long enough to be disgusted with all productions, long enough to turn away from them."*[84]

* In the Samyutta Nikāya LXI, 1, it is said that in consequence of the countless bodies deposited only by one man in the course of his re-births, the heap of bones thereby made would be immense. To the height of a mountain the heap of bones would mount during only one world-cycle, following upon the ceaseless change of birth and death, if one, in thought, gathered together the bones of only one single creature; yea, a veritable mountain chain of chalk would be accumulated. Compare also the passage in Jātaka, No. 116, where it is said that there is no spot on earth that is not composed of the dust of beings who have died. Recall also Voltaire's saying: "*Le globe ne contient que des cadavres*," the globe contains nothing but corpses.

But the Buddha is not content to describe in this general manner the endlessness of the round of our rebirths. He also shows separately, of what kind our single existences have been, first, within the realm of mankind itself.

"What do you think, O monks? Which may be more, the flood of tears you have shed on this long way, running again and again to new birth and new death, united to the disliked, separated from the liked, complaining and weeping, or the water of the four great oceans? ....

"Through a long time, you have experienced the death of the mother, the death of the father, the death of the son, the death of the daughter, the death of brother and sister, through a long time you were oppressed by sickness. And while the death of the mother, the death of the father, the death of the son, the death of the daughter, the death of brother and sister, the loss of wealth, the pain of sickness was your lot, while you were united to the disliked, separated from the liked, running from birth to death, from death to birth, you have shed on this long way truly more tears than water is contained within the four great oceans.

"What do you think, monks? Which may be more, the blood that on this long way, while you were always running to new birth and death, was flowing at your decapitation, or the water of the four great oceans? ....

"Through a long time, you have shed, sentenced to death as murderers, more blood in being executed than there is water contained within the four great oceans. Through a long time, you have shed, caught as robbers, more blood in being executed than water is contained within the four great oceans. Through a long time, you have shed, detected as adulterers, more blood in being executed than there is water contained within the four great oceans."[85]

But thereby the abundance of suffering lying behind us is not yet exhausted. Much worse were those sufferings that arose for us, as we were straying through *the lower abysses* of existence:

"What do you think, O monks? Which may be more, the blood that was flowing at your decapitation, while you were again and again running to new birth and death, or the water of the four great oceans? ....

"Through a long time, you have as cows and calves truly shed more blood in being decapitated than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time, you have as buffaloes and buffalo-calves truly shed more blood in being decapitated than water is contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time, you have as sheep and lambs truly shed more blood in being decapitated than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time you have as he-goats and she-goats truly shed more blood in being decapitated than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time, you have as deers and stags truly shed more blood in being shot than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time, you have as swine and pigs truly shed more blood in being slaughtered than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"Through a long time, you have as hens and doves and geese truly shed more blood in being butchered than there is water contained within the four great oceans.

"But how is this possible? Without beginning or end, O monks, is this round of rebirths. There cannot be discerned the first beginning of beings, who sunk in ignorance and bound by thirst, are incessantly transmigrating and again and again run to a new birth.

"And thus, O monks, through a long time you have experienced suffering, pain and misery, and enlarged the burying-ground; truly long enough to be disgusted with all productions, long enough to turn away from them."[86]

It is clear that, if all this is really so—not to speak of the stay in the hells—if this is really our past fate and will be our future one, then the saying "All life is suffering" becomes true in its most horrible sense. But not a few will declare that they are unable to follow the Buddha any further on this way, even if they agree with this judgment on the value of our *present* life. For here every possibility of our own immediate insight, which, also according to the Buddha, forms the only real criterion of all truth, seems to be wanting. To such we reply that the Buddha does not at all want them to take his sayings, cited above, without criticism and upon mere faith. The declaration that we ought only to believe what we ourselves have recognized as true holds good also in this case, and to give immediate insight into the round of our rebirths is the special theme of the second of the four excellent truths, as we shall see later on. It may even happen that on the way shown by the Buddha we may gain an immediate perception of our own existences before our birth, and of the vanishing and reappearing of the other creatures, by developing the "pure, superhuman, celestial eye."

Meanwhile, precisely this truth as to the nature of our existence before and after birth is such that it may be also found without immediate insight, in a purely indirect way, since to a purely sober judgment of things it appears as the only possible one. For this very reason it is not peculiar to the Buddha, but forms part of the original faith of mankind* and as such lies at the base of all the great religions of the earth, with the sole exception of Judaism, and of the two religions originating from it, Christianity and Mohammedanism.

This indirect path to its confirmation we also will tread first, as it were, by way of introduction. It is the path of *hypothesis*. Human reason, as long as immediate insight into any occurrence is impossible, seeks to find out truth in this form, not only in daily life but also within the domain of science. For a mere hypothesis also may come near to immediate truth. This is the case, for instance, with the theory of the origination of the world put forward by Kant and Laplace, or the theory of the ether. Here the criterion of a hypothesis in regard to its

* This is proven by the fact that the doctrine of reincarnation already forms part of the religious systems of the most primitive peoples, such as the *Arunta* and other tribes of Central Australia.

being inwardly well founded, consists in its explaining the occurrence concerned as completely as possible and in its being in perfect harmony with the whole course of nature. Thus a great obstacle to the theory of Kant and Laplace being accepted as entirely correct, is that the relation of the densities of the planets and of the sun cannot very well be brought into harmony with it.

If these fundamental axioms are applied to the doctrine of the Buddha as far as the nature of our existence before and after birth is concerned, the following conclusions are reached. His doctrine embraces three statements:

1. There is an existence after death;
2. This existence is effected by rebirth, strictly speaking, *by palingenesis;*
3. It takes place within the five realms mentioned above.

The first statement has always been accepted as true by the immense majority of mankind, at every time and in every place. The agreement goes so far that it can hardly be explained otherwise than through the saying of Spinoza: "We feel by immediate consciousness that we are immortal."* Only when men try to transfer this immediate truth, founded in the depth of their essence and therefore only felt, into abstract knowledge, only when, to put it otherwise, they try to understand it in accordance with the law of sufficient reason, only then do contradictions appear. Against this truth those only fight who call themselves scientific materialists, a class of men already very well known to the Buddha:

„There, Sandaka, a teacher defends this view: 'There is no such thing as alms or sacrifice or offering. There is neither fruit nor result of good or evil deeds. There is no such thing as this world or the next. There is neither father nor mother, nor beings springing into life without them. There are in the world no recluses or Brahmins who have reached the highest point, who walk perfectly, and who having understood and realized, by themselves alone, both this world and the next, make their wisdom known to others. A human being is built up of the four elements. When he dies, the earthy in him returns and relapses to the earth, the fluid to the water, the heat to the fire, the windy to the air, and his senses pass into space. The four bearers, on the bier as a fifth, take his dead body away; till they reach the burning-ground men utter forth eulogies, but there his bones are bleached and his offerings end in ashes. It is a doctrine of fools, this talk of gifts. It is an empty lie, mere idle talk, when men say there is profit therein. Fools and wise alike, on the dissolution of the body, are cut off, annihilated, and after death they are not."[87]

But curiously, though obviousness is on its side—for with death, what we are accustomed to call man, evidently dissolves—materialism, as Schopenhauer says, and as we mentioned before, never has been able to gain a permanent influence over mankind. The reasons for this are evident. Materialism is just

* If we want to see clearly how deeply rooted in man this consciousness is, we must think of the inappeasable anxiety which seizes every man immediately before death, as to what his future will be afterwards. It seizes even those who in days of health have nothing but a superior smile for every belief in a life after death.

as much a hypothesis as any other scientific system which tries to explain the phenomenon of life. But as said above, a hypothesis cannot be correct, if it is contradictory to a fundamental fact of the course of nature. But to this course of nature surely there belongs not only man and all his activities but also the immediate consciousness of living on after death; for, as said above, it represents a common property of mankind. Accordingly it must be included in an explanation of life. Many try to explain it in this way, that from this consciousness only a longing for living on after death peculiar to man may result, but not the fact of the realization of this longing. But there is this to be said in reply, that the mere fact of such a longing being present in every man and therefore being essential to us, gives security for the realization of this longing in some way or other, in accord with the axiom, *natura nihil frustra facit*, Nature makes nothing in vain. We could not possess this longing at all if it were not to be satisfied. When a naturalist has discovered the existence of a peculiar longing in any creature, without anything more he will be so certain that this longing is capable of being satisfied that he would consider it folly to cease searching for *the object* of this longing on the ground that there could not possibly be any such object. On the contrary, he will not stop searching until he has found this object, feeling certain that Nature works on the lines of least resistence, and therefore creates no wants for which there is no satisfaction. Besides this, materialism already is wrecked on the fact of the existence of moral and therefore unselfish actions, since such are certainly to be found, and belong as much to the phenomena of life as birth and death, with which, therefore, a hypothesis claiming to explain the phenomenon of life cannot be allowed to conflict. Even the materialist will esteem and admire a man who, without hesitation, sacrifices his own person for others. But how will he reconcile this esteem and admiration with his own system, according to which it must be senseless to annihilate oneself to save the life of another person who is nothing to me; for what bond, according to the system of materialism, can bind me to another man? Am I not a fool in sacrificing my own life for another person, since in accordance with the materialistic view of the world, life must be the highest thing for me, everything without a remainder being annihilated for me with the annihilation of my own life? And where would be the equivalent for the sacrifice of life for another man, felt also by a materialist to be a noble deed, if with death everything is over? For this also belongs to the phenomenon of life, and must therefore be taken into account in giving an explanation of this phenomenon, that in us there dwells an ineradicable feeling that every action must somehow have its reward. If a materialistic answers: 'The equivalent of the action must be sought in the fact that it makes for the benefit of another creature'; then the further question must be answered: 'But how, if the man sacrificing his life, sacrifices it for a *lost* cause? For instance, what about those five hundred Switzers who sacrificed themselves for Louis XVI when the Tuileries were stormed by the people? Was not their death, regarded from a purely natural point of view, entirely worthless? Nevertheless, who will dare to say that it would have been the same thing

for these noble men, if, instead of giving their lives for their master, they had weakley betrayed him and sided with the people? But if it is not the same, when and where can the equivalent for which human feeling impatiently longs, take place, if complete annihilation follows death? And thus is it with every good and, still more, with every heroical deed which does not bear the fruits expected.*

By such reflections also does the Buddha silence the materialistic doctrine that with death, all is over. "There, Sandaka, a reasonable man is reflecting thus: 'This dear teacher sets up such a meaning, such a doctrine: [to wit, the materialistic one, as reproduced by the above words]. If it is true what he is saying, then every moral action upon the earth is purposeless. Then we both are grown exactly the same .... Therefore it is too much if this dear teacher goes naked, shaves his crown; crouches down on his heels, plucks out both hair and beard; and if I, living in a house full of children, using silk and sandal wood, ornaments and odoriferous ointments, finding pleasure in gold and silver, shall have in future just the same fate as this dear teacher.' And he perceives: 'This is not the path to truth, and turns away unsatisfied from such path.'"[88]

Indeed, the knowledge that materialism makes all true morality impossible, is decisive in making every moral man refuse it. For, as a moral man, he immediately feels the whole importance of moral action and rejects materialism merely from this immediate feeling, felt truth being nothing but truth immediately perceived, only not yet abstracted into notions. And only to men who already have gained this height of moral action does the Buddha address himself.

But if the fact of death not being our end is established for a man, then the second question for him is: Of what kind is his continued existence after death? Here two chief doctrines are opposed to each other, first, the doctrine of personal continuance, mainly represented by the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the individual in an eternal heaven or in an eternal hell; and secondly, the doctrine of palingenesis.

Which is truth? Here also for every one who has not yet himself recognized it, only the standpoint of the reasonable man remains, which, in the words of

* *Du Prel* calls that trait in man by which he feels himself responsible for his actions even beyond death, *moral instinct.* "Man is the highest fact of nature, and morality is his highest function. Instinctively we place morality higher than knowledge. In a moral man, we will hardly miss knowledge, but genius without morals we feel to be repulsive. Stupidity rouses regret or a smile, but immorality rouses indignation. Consequently, the real test of philosophical systems is their aptitude for forming the basis of a moral system. But moral instinct is illogical if human individuality exists only between the cradle and the grave. If the visible part of our career alone had validity, and we went towards our annihilation with full consciousness, then we should resemble men condemned to death, only that our way to the scaffold would be a little longer, and the time uncertain when we should reach it. The law allows the condemned criminal the satisfaction of his wishes for the last days of his life, as was already the case with the ancient Greeks. But we ought to make this claim for the satisfaction of our wishes, for the whole duration of our life, neglecting all preparations for the other world, if as materialists we look upon death as annihilation."

the Buddha himself, may be defined as follows: "There a reasonable man reflects thus: If some of those dear recluses and Brahmins teach personal continuance, I cannot see it, and if other dear recluses and Brahmins teach that there is no personal duration, neither do I perceive this. But if, without having seen or perceived it, I now should decide in favour of one of these doctrines, and say: 'This one only is true, and the other teaching is foolish', then this would not be well done. For we may easily trust to something that is hollow and empty and wrong, and we may fail to trust to something that is right and true and real. And thus who seeks for truth, if he is a reasonable man, will not draw readily the onesided conclusion: 'Only this opinion is true, and the other opinion is foolish,' but to gain insight into these statements, it is of importance to regard their content."[89] To use our own way of thinking, this means: Here also for everybody who cannot blindly believe but wants to know, to begin with, only hypotheses come into question which must be examined for their value according to the rules applying to them. Especially must they be examined to see if they do not come into contradiction with other facts established beyond contradiction. For in this case even their simple possibility must be denied, and therefore they are to be rejected from the beginning.

Now we have seen that the body obviously perishes in death, its components then returning to the common stock of inorganic substances of external nature, and that together with the annihilation of this *basis*, the remaining components of the personality also, namely sensation, perception, mentation and cognition, dissolve into nothing and become impossible. We may be influenced by dogmatic prejudices to ignore this obvious demonstration of nature, or even in spite of it, hold fast to the belief in personal continuance; but if one does not set up will instead of cognition as the source of truth,—and every belief is ultimately a function of will, and will, as we know, cannot be instructed,—but if we share the standpoint that all verities can only be based upon perception and must be rooted in it, then it is established beyond doubt that, if a man dies, not only his corporeal part but also everything mental in him, sensation, perception, mentation and cognition, thereby the whole of personality, perishes. This is so clear to every unprejudiced observer that materialism just from this fact derives its chief weapon against every belief in continuance after death. Certainly, in doing so, it commits itself the unpardonable mistake of concluding from the impossibility of one alternative that the other one, the palingenesis we will afterwards speak of, is also impossible.

In particular, the Christian doctrine of personal survival after death in an eternal heaven or an eternal hell, presupposes the belief in a personal god, and, together with this dogma, leads to monstrous contradictions: How can human insight bear the thought of a god who ought to be the sum of infinite goodness, wisdom, and power, creating beings whom he knows to be condemned in an overwhelming majority to eternal damnation in a hell, since "many are called, but few are chosen." Certainly, these beings choose their gruesome fate themselves, as their will is free. But how can a most gracious god bestow such a hor-

rible gift, when he knows beforehand, in virtue of his omniscience, how dreadfully they will misuse it! What should we think about a father who should send his child into the world or even only generate it, knowing for certain that it would later on commit "voluntarily" a crime that would be punished with life-long imprisonment, and thus remain through all its life in deepest despair! But what would such a deed be in comparison to that other one, to give existence to a being, even to the greater majority of beings, so that those beings, namely, the animals, who have no free will and are therefore without fault, live always in terror and fear* without any prospect of compensation—because, according to the Christian doctrine, animals are not immortal;—while the others, men, are to be doomed in consequence of this their free will to eternal hell, foreseen by their creator to be the consequence of this free will which he gave to them! Must not the intellect first be created, that may bear such a thought? Is it not, moreover, contrary to every law of thought that the fault of a poor finite creature, which itself must therefore be limited and finite, should be revenged by an infinite punishment? And then, as Schopenhauer quite correctly remarks: Is it conceivable that the same god who orders men to overlook and to forgive every offence, acts himself in quite a different manner, inflicting eternal punishment even after death? But the most senseless thing is that this god who wants me to believe in this dogma of eternal punishment in hell, under threat in case of my unbelief of having that dogma made good on my own person, on the other hand has endowed me with a power of insight which simply will not let me believe such a dogma because of its opposition to all reason.

It is not saying too much to assert that a hypothesis involving such consequences and contradictions cannot possibly stand the trial at the assize of intellect and must therefore be dismissed without more ado.**

Accordingly palingenesis remains as the only possible form of existence after death. For to a man for whom the fact of his living on after death is established, but who has to reject on the other hand all doctrines of personal continuation—not only the Christian one, but all others beside that teach personal continuation in the form of metempsychosis or transmigration of souls—only the possibility of continuation *involving the annihilation of personality* offers itself. This annihilation is contained in palingenesis. For palingenesis means decomposition and renewal of the entire individual, thus that the dying creature perishes entirely, together with its consciousness, but that there remains a germ from which a new individual arises together with new consciousness, "man thus

* We cannot imagine what a fear-filled life most animals are leading. Only look at some tiny little bird taking its food! It will turn its head at least *ten* times in every direction so as to spy out in time a supposed enemy, before it risks picking up *once* a grain of seed. The average man thinks this behaviour dainty and droll, but whoso looks deeper will recognize just from this, that these harmless creatures also are living in a state of constant fear and anxiety.

** The doctrine of personal continuance after death is nothing but a hypothesis naturally in this case too, if it is proclaimed as the revelation of a personal god, for this argument is itself nothing but a mere hypothesis, inevitably leading to irreconcilable contradictions.

ripening like corn, and ripening always again and again." This doctrine of continuance after death is the only one which stands in no contradiction to any other fact of the course of nature. And because it is the only one, in accepting which, continuance after death can be imagined without falling into logical contradictions, already for this reason it must be accepted as true by every one for whom the fact of continuance after death as such is established.

But this hypothesis—nothing more than a hypothesis is at first in question—is not only incontrovertible in all its parts and consequences, through its being in harmony with the whole process of nature, so much so that even Hume, though "excessively empirical," as Schopenhauer calls him, says in his sceptical treatise on immortality, that this system is the only one of its kind to which philosophy can pay heed, but it is also, according to Schopenhauer, a postulate of practical reason. This is plain from the fact that everybody comes to it of himself, that at least it becomes immediately clear to everybody who hears about it for the first time, "if the brain, confused from early youth by having become imbued with false fundamental doctrines, does not with superstitious fear, flee it from afar."

Palingenesis thus has always been the conviction of the choicest and wisest of mankind.

But how palingenesis, this renewal of existence, effects itself in the moment of death, this is the great mystery: "Every new-born creature enters its new existence full of freshness and gladness, and enjoys it as a boon: but there is no boon and there cannot be a boon. Its fresh existence is paid for by the old age and the death of a worn-out creature that has perished but contained the indestructible germ from which this new existence originated: they are *one* being. To point out the bridge between the two would certainly mean the solution of a great problem," says Schopenhauer; of a problem, we may add, that from all time has been insoluble. Nobody has effected its solution, with the sole exception of one man, and this sole exception is again—the Buddha! To his insight of genius it was possible to look even into this most secret workshop of nature, and thus to find the solution of this problem, a solution as simple as only truth can be. For truth is always simple, so simple that, as Goethe once remarked, men are always angry that it is so simple. But of this we will speak later. Here we have only to establish that palingenesis is the only possible form of continuance after death, and that this only possible form of continuance is taught by the Buddha.*

* As soon as we have reached the insight that palingenesis is the real form of our living on, then, without further ado, the insight into the beginninglessness of the round of our rebirths and thereby into the immeasurable spaces of time we have already wandered through is reached too. For if the birth that has opened my present life was not my first one, then neither was the preceding one the first one, and so on without cessation, back to the beginningless infinity of the past. If we look down upon the immense spaces of time with which the Hindu is wont to reckon, with a supercilious smile, thinking our passing present life to be our life as such, then we only show the narrowness of our mental horizon. On this we

What might cause offence in his doctrine, as far as the mode of rebirth taught by it is concerned, can therefore only be its third element. He teaches that palingenesis is not confined to the realm of human beings only,* but extends just as well to the world of animals, and to that of spectres, as to hells and heavens. To this it might be objected that, on one side, realms of spectres, heavens and hells are beyond all possible experience; and that, on the other hand, the supposition is senseless and in contradiction to every idea of evolution, that man might fall back into such depths as the realm of animals or a hell would mean.

Concerning the first objection it declares ordinary experience to be the only experience possible. To this it must be replied, following a saying of Goethe: Certainly we must give in at the boundaries of experience, but not at the boundaries of our own narrow-minded individual experience, but at the boundaries of the experience of mankind. This means: the realm of the eternally unknown begins only where even the greatest of mankind are not able to penetrate. But by these greatest ones, ultimately not the intellectually, but also *morally* eminent must be understood, those who have fought the heaviest battle, and won the greatest victory, to wit, the victory over themselves. Measured with this measure, all our so-called great men dwindle down to dwarfs. Now these morally great men assert that they know these three realms inaccessible to normal perception, even though designating them by names totally different and taken from the range of ideas wherein they were living. What gives us the right to disbelieve their assertions? Perhaps that they as morally great men were incapable of uttering a conscious falsehood? Or this, that, though separated by thousands of years and of miles, they saw the same? Or perhaps that especially the Buddha and his disciples lay stress upon complete sobriety and carefulness in regard to all inner experiences, especially in regard to those occurring upon the highest stages of holiness and conferring a vision that embraces the whole round of rebirths, as the fundamental presupposition of right insight?**

Certainly we do not say too much if we assert that the reality of an occurrence of *outer* history, if testified to by such a multitude of unimpeachable witnesses

smile again, having won the right standpoint by ascertaining that we are essentially outside of time, and time is therefore not able to harm us in any way, as will be seen in our next chapter. Therefore it is also self-evident that by entering it, we are able to see it pass in its entire endlessness, though becoming always other beings.—Besides this, modern astronomy too reckons with the same immense spaces of time.

* Here it must be noted that rebirth as a man need not necessarily take place upon *our* earth. Quite in harmony with modern astronomy, already ancient India had reached the insight that the universe consists of countless world-systems and therefore also of countless earths.

** Such inner illumination has even been represented as a diseased state. Such results are reached, if the critic's own "Pelagian common sense," as Schopenhauer calls it, is made the measure of all things. It must be a curious mental sanity which declares men to be insane who developed their mental faculties so far as to be able to triumph over all their passions, even over every kind of motion of the will in a way that seems impossible to us average mortals, and thus to acquire the highest powers of sense and mind! Is not this owing to some confusion of conceptions in regard to what is sanity and insanity?

as such holy men are, would be doubted by no reasonable person. If here nevertheless, especially by modern "enlightened" persons, such doubts are raised—but this is never done by people who have an eye for the *real* boundaries of the possible and for the criterions of reality—then this can only have its grounds in the improbability of the existence of such realms. For their existence can only be thought improbable; in no case impossible or contradictory to facts otherwise known. But are they really so improbable? On the contrary, it is improbable that the form of life existing upon our earth should be the only one that Nature, otherwise inexhaustible, has brought forth. But if the probability of the contrary presses itself upon us on the path of pure reasoning, then it is further just as probable that those forms of life we have to suspect otherwhere exhaust, with due regard to the inexhaustibility of Nature, all possibilities of a happy as well as of an unhappy existence, in as far as they may be brought into harmony with the fundamental laws of the universe, especially with the universal law of transitoriness. On a small scale we see the same thing upon our earth, where also to states of highest bliss, those of pain hardly imaginable are opposed; and to lives radiant with the most extraordinary good fortune, are opposed such as only form a chain of endless tortures, as in the animal world. Why should nature not do on a grand scale, what we see every day occurring on a small scale? Why, in short, should not extremes of existence exist, extending in the direction of happiness as well as in that of unhappiness? Of course, the extreme in the direction of untainted happiness, such as is said to be found within the heavens, we easily agree with; but in any case, this much is clear, that if there are heavens, according to the law of polarity there must also be states of the opposite extreme, designated as hells, in whatever form we choose to picture these states. Therefore, whoso does not want to miss a heaven, must also reckon with a hell.

Therewith we come to the second objection, to wit, that the supposition that man can fall back into such depths is absurd. But there is nothing at all absurd here, at the most only something may be contrary to our will. This means that against this possibility nothing at all may be adduced from the standpoint of reason and experience, but that the only thing opposed to it is our will, thirsting for well-being, and, as it always does, falsifying insight in this case also. Because human will abhors a form of existence "consisting only of suffering," such as the view of a reappearance in a hell, or in animal form insinuates, therefore man simply shuts his eyes to all such eventualities, trying to persuade himself that such things cannot be. But what can be and what cannot be, is not decided by our will, but by the laws dominating the world; and it has always been fatal to truth when, faced by it, people have attempted to adopt the standpoint: *Sic volo, sic jubeo: stat pro ratione voluntas.*

This influence of will in the investigation of truth is often to be found concealed behind even the most "scientific" theories. Especially is it concealed within the theory of "evolution" with which the possibility of a relapse of man into lower realms of existence is thought to be refuted. Because man perceives in nature a

progressive development in the forms of life, and because it thus pleases his will, he rashly infers an unlimited development of his own species, though nature teaches him by clear evidence that there is no such development: every evolution being, as hinted above, only the first half of a process, namely, of becoming, the second half of which must always bring about decay and, at last, the complete collapse of the thing that seemed at first to develop. This is a law that holds good for the greatest as well as for the smallest things. But when, by and by, man gains the insight that the unlimited development of a species is an illusion, then he at last transfers the realization of the thought of evolution to the single individual, rather than believe in the purposelessness of his striving and of his volition. He imagines a metaphysical goal to be set up for the individual beyond the realm of transitoriness, and thinks that the individual ripens more and more towards this goal until this is actually reached, either in death, or at least after a series of existences following each other, as a traveller on foot comes nearer to his goal with every step he takes, even if he does not notice it.* If the thought of evolution is formulated thus, then it comes near to truth inasmuch as man looks for the centre of gravity *within himself* and no longer in the species, in harmony with his own inner nature which is only able to regard itself as the centre of the whole world and thereby as the object of all its endeavours. But even daily experience ought to tell us that progressive evolution does not take place here either. Of course we have to bear in mind that evolution is only to be taken as a purification of character; that is to say, *moral* evolution is to be attained, since it is a question not of a physical, but of a metaphysical goal. But how little of such evolution is to be found! Do we not rather almost as a rule perceive just the opposite of it? Is life not serving in general to develop *selfishness*, the opposite of moral purification, in every direction? How very few men are there who at the end of their life are free from qualms of conscience, this sole measure of all moral progress, and thereby feel within themselves the immediate certainty that they really have made moral progress and may die in peace and full of trust without being in need to pacify their minds artificially by an imagined external forgiving of sins through a priest, or through the belief in a god forgiving sins! So here is no development either; nay, many men in the course of their life are sinking through their instincts and inclinations down to the level of beasts, or even reach such a degree of bestiality as even beasts do not descend to, for which reason the decent section of their fellow-countrymen do their utmost to keep them at a distance as much as possible, the state even enforcing their actual exclusion from human society. Is it absurd, if eternal justice, inexorably at work, in the moment of death, when alone a new settlement in a corresponding environment is possible, actually undertakes this settlement, sending the being there where it belongs according to its entire character, and where the

* This conception is not at all a production of modern times, as the Buddha had already to refute it. Majjh. Nik. 76th Discourse

dispositions peculiar to it are not regarded at all as unnatural, but as quite natural and proper, that is, sending it to the animal realm or even to a hell, to balance at the same time all the misery it has caused? Certainly not forever, for *everything* in the world, in Saṁsāra, has an end, the stay in the animal world, or in hell, also.

This hypothesis, which besides does justice to the idea of the unity of all life, inasmuch as according to it, animal as well as devil have the prospect somewhere and some time of coming up again and attaining human existence, truly seems much more in accordance with reality than that evolution-idea, according to which everything happens so nicely in agreement with our will, that one cannot help suspecting that here once more the wish is father to the thought.

Certainly, from this point of view a truly horrible prospect opens before us in the future: we are not by a "law of evolution" born onward and upward to ever purer regions, but as through times long past, so also now, and through all future time, we wander through the gruesome abysses of existence. And in view of the endless number of rebirths still in store for us the possibility, even the certainty exists, that we ourselves may sink down to the deepest of those abysses, to the animal-world and to the hell-worlds, thus into states of greatest misery, so that we might experience for ourselves the truth of the words of *Jacob Boehme:* "If all the mountains were books, and all the lakes ink, and all the trees pens, still they would not suffice to depict all the misery."

But is it the fault of the Buddha, of all the men of sanctity to whom a glimpse into these abysses has been granted, that by some incomprehensible fatality we are involved in such a world? Are they bound to be wrong, merely because we cannot believe in such a dreadful situation, like a child who cannot believe that the beautiful flowers it is gathering are growing above an abyss hidden precisely by them, and on that account finally itself must tumble into this abyss?

But if our stay in the world is of this sort, if wheresoever we may look, in the infinitudes of space and time, ultimately we only see suffering, often *only* suffering for immeasurable time, then even the most inveterate "optimist" will certainly not venture to doubt the first of the four excellent truths that all life at bottom is suffering. Rather will he be unable to do otherwise than concede the truth of these other words of the Master also: "The whole world is devoured by flames, the whole world is enshrouded in smoke, the whole world is on fire, the whole world is trembling."[90] And so, full of expectation, he will listen to the further message how he may escape this world of suffering forever. But this problem presupposes for its solution before all else the elucidation of the relation in which we stand to our everchanging personalities during the round of rebirths* and therewith to the world itself. Therefore we will now turn

* Personality is to be understood in the sense given above, as the totality of the five groups of grasping, be it in the form of a human, or of an animal, or of any other organism.

to the consideration of this relation, the more so, as it forms the bridge to immediate insight into the endless round of rebirths of which we have been treating above.

The Subject of Suffering

I am: that is the most certain axiom there is. It belongs to those axioms that are evident in themselves without any proof. Indeed, it holds good before every proof; for whatever I want to prove, that "I" want to prove, and to prove for *Myself*. This axiom is more certain than all perception, which, in general, is the most reliable criterion of truth we have. For every perception is effected through *me*, and therefore already presupposes me as the perceiving subject. I may be in doubt as to *what* I am; I may even doubt if I really "*am*", that is, I may doubt if the definition of my essence can and may be undertaken by means of the idea of being that is itself only gained through perception. I may even prove irrefutably that "I" is indeed nothing but a mere thought for which no substantial equivalent can be found. All this we may do. In fact, I may prove whatever I like: the reality of myself is not in the least affected thereby, and I will pass over all these proofs with a smile, even if I acknowledge their validity. For I cannot argue away my own existence even with the help of the deepest-going analysis; and if somebody should try to prove to me that I am really nothing, then I should answer, if I thought it worth while to answer at all: "But, my good friend, if I do not exist, why do you trouble yourself at all to prove to me that I don't? In all your arguments you always presuppose me as the person to whom you address them, in the same way that you presuppose yourself in setting them forth. For how could you undertake to prove that we do not exist, if you had not existed in advance to give this proof?" Indeed, it is really ridiculous to raise the question at all as to whether I am. Everybody feels at once, without further words, that such questions as "Am I?" or "Am I not?" do not in truth cast any doubt upon the actuality of my self, but only seek to express that perhaps I may not be what I think myself to be, that even the predicate "am" may not be applicable to my essence. But in this case an unprejudiced man will only give this answer: "Very well! Then I am not what up to now I thought myself to be. Perhaps I am something that neither you nor any other man is able to find out, but in spite of all, I am; in this case, I am something inscrutable."

All this is so clear that, as said above, it cannot be proved, but only made clear by words. It is so clear that the contrary, namely, that I am not, in any sense at all, may be "tongued" but cannot be "brained," it can be *said* in words, but it cannot be *thought*. Therefore the fact of his reality is self-evident for every man, self-evident for the unprejudiced normal man as well as for the greatest geniuses, self-evident especially for our great philosophers, for all great founders of religions and, of course, for the Buddha too.

For them it is the fundamental fact which they do not even discuss, and for the greatest of them the "Self" is the first cause of things:

"What is the first cause, what is Brahman—(here a general name for "principle")—? Whence are we?

Through what do we exist, and upon what are we founded?
Governed by whom, ye wise ones, do we move
Within the changing states of pain and pleasure?
Can time, nature, necessity, or chance,
Primordial matter, mind, or a combination
Of these be thought of as the primal cause?
Never! For the 'Self' there exists."

Thus says the Çvetāçvatara-Upanishad, expressing thereby the belief that all the principles enumerated here cannot be thought as existing for themselves alone, but only as determinants of the Self—Ātman—which, therefore, when everything is taken into account, is the first cause.

If, however, proof is required for this fundamental fact, that I am, then the Buddha provides such proof, and, in accordance with the self-evident nature of the fact to be proved, it is the most striking that could possibly be given: "You are, because you suffer,"—a statement the truth of which is experienced immediately every moment we live. But why at this point is this self-evident fact, that I am, thus urged? Simply because self-evident facts are precisely those that are only too easily overlooked, and on that account, curiously enough, ourselves also. Later on, we shall have occasion to find this amply confirmed.

Because our *I* is thus the fundamental fact with which every one is confronted, the fundamental question of all philosophy is not, as is generally assumed: "What is the world?" but "What am I?"* To deal with this fundamental question the Buddha also was led. For precisely because man is a being exposed to suffering, for him who had set before himself the goal of bringing this suffering to an end, the question arose: "What am I?" If he wished to find a successful issue to his great task, he necessarily had to get clear ideas as to this question, at least in so far as he could state this with certainty: "Is the necessity of suffering grounded in our own essence, suffering thus being merely an emanation of the same? Or is it something that reaches us only as an alien element?" Only in the latter case is there a possibility of freeing ourselves from it; whilst in the former case, every effort to escape it must be in vain from the very outset. For from my own essence, which just means, from myself, I can as little flee as the hand can throw itself away. No one can jump out of his own skin: "What thinkest thou, Aggivessana: Whoso clings to suffering, gives himself to suffering, holds by suffering with the view: 'This is mine, this am I, this is myself'—can

* This incorrect formulation of the cardinal problem is largely responsible for the sterility of Western philosophy, since, in defining the problem as a question of what *the world is*, it is assumed as self-evident that I myself belong to this world. But precisely thus the possibility of understanding myself as extra-mundane is shut off from the very outset.

such an one keep clear of suffering?"—"How might that be? That he cannot, honoured Gotama!"[91]

Thus also the Buddha, precisely through this problem of the annihilation of suffering, found himself confronted by the great question: What is the proper essence of man? Or, what amounts to the same thing: What is his true *I*? Indeed, according to him, the importance of this question is so great that he has placed the answer to it in the very heart of his doctrine, as also is evident from the answer he gave to thirty Brahmin youths who asked him as to the whereabouts of a runaway woman: "Which is of greater importance, O youths, to search for this woman or to search for your *I*?"[92]

This question as to our true essence may be approached from two sides: We may try to answer it directly or indirectly, namely, by determining what I am *not*, at all events. Which way is the better, cannot be decided beforehand. Nevertheless, without further words this much is clear, that the indirect way is certainly the safer one. What I am *not*, can be determined with certainty, at all events; but a positive answer to the question as to what I am, may easily raise doubts as to whether I actually am that wherein the answer asserts my essence to consist, as is amply proved by our divers philosophical systems. Therefore it must, from the outset, inspire us with confidence in the Buddha that he prefers the safer indirect way. For the characteristic mark of his doctrine consists in pointing out to us, step by step, so that we can safely and comfortably follow him, what in any case, we are *not*, the Buddha summing up the result each time in the great formula: "This belongs not to me; This am I not; This is not myself." To this path he was already led by the manner in which he put his problem as to whether the elements of suffering form a constituent part of the essence of a human being.

Besides, this indirect method of solving the problem is also the natural one. For the contrast between *I* and not-*I* dominates the whole world and every individual being. It is merely a matter of drawing the boundary-line between *I* and not-*I* correctly, and making the cut which divides them, in the proper place. The Buddha has drawn this dividing line between *attā* and *anattā*, between *I* and not-*I*, with great exactness. He invites all to examine if he has determined the boundary in the right manner. Let us accept his invitation.

First, of course, we must discuss the criterion according to which the Buddha distinguishes between *attā* and *anattā*. It is clear that this criterion, in correspondence with the tremendous importance of the question that by its help is to be answered, must be put beyond all doubt, so beyond all doubt that we may be able resolutely to stake our whole destiny upon the consequences resulting from it. The Buddha, of course, does not leave us in the dark as to this criterion. It may be gathered from nearly all his discourses, and is expressly formulated in the 148th Discourse of the *Majjhima Nikāya* in the following words: "'The eye is the *I*', such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of the eye. But if originating and perishing are perceived, the result would follow: My *I* is originating and perishing. Therefore it is inadmissible to

assert the eye to be the *I*. Consequently the eye is not the *I*." Accordingly the Buddha makes the following formula, the criterion for determining the boundary between *I* and not-*I:* What we perceive originating and perishing, that cannot be assumed to be my Self, cannot be my *I*. This formula must become quite clear to us, in order that we may be able, despite its extraordinary simplicity, to penetrate it in all its depth and inner obviousness. Note especially that the Buddha does not say: What originates and perishes, is not my *I*, not my Self. This sentence might be disputed; as it might not be clear at once, why not even something transient might not constitute my essence. But the Buddha says: "What I *perceive* originating and perishing, that cannot be my *I*, my Self;" and this statement will certainly not be doubted by any thinking creature. For what I *perceive* to originate and to perish must, with logical consequence, be something different from me. If a thing passes before my physical eye, then it is irrefutably certain that it cannot be identical with my eye; and if with my ear I hear a sound begin and die away, not even a fool would assert that it was his ear itself that had just died away. Just because I exist, beyond doubt exist, I cannot be that which I perceive disappear before my physical or spiritual eye, before myself as *the perceiving subject.* For if the *I* were identical with the disappearing object, along with its disappearing, I also should have ceased to exist. But there I am; I am still there after the thing is gone. Therefore it was not my *I* nor anything belonging to me which just now disappeared. On the contrary, *it is precisely its disappearance that causes me astonishment, surprise and—pain.*

For it is just through my not-myself being involved in this passing away, that pain and suffering in consequence of transitoriness alone become possible at all. For this suffering—and the Buddha does not know any other suffering, as we have amply shown—consists just in the state desired giving place to another state not desired. But this presupposes something to exist that *experiences* this passing from the state desired into the state not desired, which therefore itself does not participate in this incessant change, but on the contrary feels it as painful; and this something is nothing but my self. This something am I, with the whole reality of pain felt by me. To express it otherwise: I cannot be identical with *the cause* of my pains.* On the contrary, if I were identical with the thing I behold perish, I could not experience pain through this passing away, because whatever in its own essence is transitory—and everything I see to be transitory is transitory in consequence of its inner nature—cannot experience this transitoriness as painful, since it is *not contrary to its nature, but only the*

* This idea may also be expressed thus: In every change something perishes, and something new is formed. But the something that has perished cannot be unhappy because it does not exist any more; and the something that has newly arisen cannot be unhappy either, because it has not experienced the change but on the contrary has only just arisen out of it: to say nothing of the fact that it ought to feel *glad* about this change, just because its own existence is due to it. Therefore a third something must be present which feels the change to be painful. This third something *I* am.

outcome of its innermost essence. Just as, for example, gas that has become free does not hesitate about expanding into empty space, but on the contrary endeavours to do so with the utmost violence, since this is in accord with its nature. Therefore also the second criterion for determining the boundary between *I* and not-*I* of which the Buddha makes use, is evident in itself, to wit, *that I cannot consist in that which because of its transitoriness causes pain to me.**

Both criterions for the determining of the realm of the not-*I*, to wit, that of perceived transitoriness and that of suffering in consequence of this transitoriness, in the Discourses are always condensed into this sentence: "Is this permanent or transient?"—"It is transient, O Lord."—"But that which is transient—is that painful or is it pleasurable?"—"It is painful, O Lord."—"But that which is transient, painful, subject to all vicissitude—is it possible thus to regard it: This is mine, this am I, this is my Self?"—"That is not possible, O Lord."

Now in what has gone before we have found nothing permanent within the world, but recognized everything as transient, as subject to incessant change, especially everything constituting our personality; on which account precisely, everything, the components of our personality included, changes finally always to suffering also. Accordingly, the question as to what is not-*I*, of which I can in no case consist, is, in effect, already decided: Everything is not-*I*, *anattā*. On one side stands *I*; on the other, the whole gigantic cosmos, the duration, origination and dissolution of which I recognize in and through my personality.

* Compare with our expositions the form in which *Schopenhauer* has put the paralogism of personality given by *Kant*. As the matter is of fundamental importance, the following passage may be quoted verbatim:

"With regard to all motion, of whatever kind it may be, it can be established *a priori* that it becomes perceivable only by comparison with something at rest. From this it follows that the course of time also, together with everything within it, could not be perceived if there were not something that had no part in the same, with the motionlessness of which we contrast the motion of time. To be sure, we here judge according to the analogy of motion in space, but space and time must always serve to illustrate each other. Therefore we must also represent time under the figure of a straight line, in order to construct it intuitively *a priori*, and make it apprehensible. Next we cannot imagine, if everything within our consciousness was going on together at once in the ordinary flow of time, how this going on could nevertheless be perceived. For this to happen we must assume something to remain at rest, at which time with its contents flows past. Therefore there must be something immovable within consciousness itself. This can be nothing but the perceiving subject itself gazing unmoved and unchanging at the course of time and its changing contents. Before its gaze, life runs its course like a play. How little part itself takes in this play, even we feel, if we vividly call to mind in old age the scenes of youth and of childhood ..... Taken as a whole, the truth underlying the error of rational psychology—some truth underlies, as a rule, every error—seems to have its root in this. The truth is, that even in our empirical consciousness *an eternal resting-point may be pointed out, but only one point, and that it may only just be pointed out*, but no materials for further argumentation may be taken from it. Here I refer to my own doctrine, according to which the recognizing subject is all-perceiving but cannot be perceived: nevertheless we take it as the fixed point which time passes together with all ideas, while, its course itself certainly can only be recognized in contradistinction to something at rest." (Parerga I, p. 114.)

Indeed, if we are not in advance hindered by rigid contrary views, if we look down in equal-minded reflectiveness, in tranquil contemplation upon the elements of the cosmos in their combination as personality, we can almost lay our hands upon the truth when the Buddha says:[93]

"The eye* is the *I*', such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of the eye. But if originating and perishing are perceived the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes'.** Therefore it is inadmissible to declare the eye to be the *I*. Consequently the eye is not the *I*.—'Forms are the *I*,' such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of the forms. But if originating and perishing are perceived, the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes'. Therefore it is inadmissible to declare forms to be the *I*.—'Eye-consciousness is the *I*'—'eye-contact is the *I*'—'sensation is the *I*'—'thirst*** is the *I*,' such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of thirst. But if originating and perishing are perceived, the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes.' Therefore it is inadmissible to assert thirst to be the *I*. Consequently the eye is not the *I*, the forms are not the *I*, eye-consciousness is not the *I*, eye-contact is not the *I*, sensation is not the *I*, thirst is not the *I*.

'The ear is the *I*'—'the nose is the *I*'—'the tongue is the *I*'—'the body is the *I*'—'the organ of thought is the *I*,' such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of thinking.† But if originating and perishing are perceived, there the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes.' Therefore it is inadmissible to assert the thinking to be the *I*.—'Objects of thought are the *I*,' such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of the objects of thinking. But if originating and perishing are perceived, the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes.' Therefore it is inadmissible to assert objects of thought to be the *I*.—'Mind-consciousness is the *I*'—'mind-contact is the *I*'—'sensation is the *I*'—'thirst is the *I*,' such a statement is inadmissible. We perceive the originating and perishing of thirst. But if originating and perishing are perceived the result would be: 'My *I* originates and perishes.' Therefore it is inadmissible to assert thirst to be the *I*. Therefore thinking is not the *I*, objects of thinking are not the *I*, mind-consciousness is not the *I*, mind-contact is not the *I*, sensation is not the *I*, thirst is not the *I*".

In short: as soon as the process of the originating of my personality and thereby to me, of the whole world, is analised and therein every single component of this process as well as this process itself is examined by the criterion

* That is, seeing.

** To repeat it once more: This is impossible, because, if I myself together with the eye, were always changing and vanishing and originating, change, as such, could not be perceived, nor felt as joy and sorrow.

*** This means, thirsting-will always arises anew from sensation and from perception. Of this thirst we shall give later on a detailed description.

† Thinking, that means, in effect, the *organ* of thought.

for defining the boundary between the realm of *I* and that of not-*I*, it becomes clear that nothing of this belongs to my *I*, but that everything lies outside of the same. For I stand behind the entire process and its constituent parts; in hours of contemplative analysis I look down upon them as a cold, dispassionate spectator, as the pure subject of cognition. I observe their incessant arising and passing away, by which I myself, the observer, remain entirely untouched:

"The monk, O monks, betakes himself to the depths of the forest or to the foot of a tree, or to any solitary spot, and sits himself down with legs crossed under him; and, body held erect, earnestly practises recollectedness. He considers this body of his, encased in a skin and filled full of all manner of uncleannesses; looks it up and down from the soles of the feet to the crown of the head, and thus reflects: 'This body has a shock of hair on the upper extremity and scattered hair all over it; it has nails and teeth, skin and flesh. There are in it sinews and bones and marrow of the bones, kidneys, heart and liver, diaphragm, spleen, lungs, stomach, intestines, and mesentery; excrement, bile, phlegm, pus, blood, sweat, lymph, tears, semen, spittle, nasal mucus, oil of the joints, and urine.'

"It is as if there were a sack, tied up at both ends, filled with diverse grains—paddy, beans, pulse, sesame and rice—and a keen-sighted man were to open it and scrutinise its contents, saying: 'This is paddy, these are beans; that is pulse; this is sesame; and this is rice.' In like manner, also, does the monk consider this body, encased in its skin and filled with all manner of uncleannesses, scrutinising it up and down from the soles of the feet to the crown of the head.

"Again: the monk considers the body, however situated, however occupied, in respect of its constituent elements, reflecting: 'This body is compounded of the four elements, earth, water, fire and air.'

"Again, O monks, as if the monk should see a dead body lying at the burying-place, one or two or three days dead, bloated, bluish-black in colour, a prey to corruption, he compares it with his own body and concludes: 'This my body is even as that; shall so become, inevitably, without escape.' Again: as if the monk should see a dead body lying at the place of burial, a blood-bespattered frame-work of bones hung with mere rags of flesh, held together only by the sinews; or a blood-bespattered skeleton totally stripped of flesh, held together only by sinews; or a skeleton wholly bare of flesh and blood, held together only by the sinews; or the bones detached from the sinews, and scattered hither and thither, here a bone of the hand, there a bone of the foot, here a shin-bone, there a thigh-bone, here the pelvis, here the spine, there the skull;—as if he should see all this, he compares it with his own body and concludes: 'This my body is even as that; shall so become, inevitably, without escape.' Again: as if the monk should see a dead body lying at the place of burial, the bones white and of the colour of mussel-shells; or gathered together into a heap after the lapse of a year; or weathered away and turned to dust;—as if he should see this, the monk compares it with his own body and concludes: 'This my body is even as that; shall so become, inevitably, without escape.'

"Thus as respects his own body, he keeps watch upon the body; as respects other bodies he keeps watch upon the body; both as respects his own and other bodies, he keeps watch upon the body."[94]

And what does he find in this keeping watch upon the body? The old fact: he observes: The body arises, the body passes away; the body arises and passes away, but I remain untouched by this. What I am seeing before me, is nothing but a formation arisen out of the four chief elements, which I perceive always to renew itself out of them, and under my eyes hurry incessantly towards definite decay, until at last it entirely dissolves and returns to union with the matter of external nature; in short: he finds out: "It is a body," "subject to dissolution and decay,"—and nothing else, especially not my *I*, not my Self. For how could this be my self which I perceive passing away before mine eyes? "This consideration is constantly before his mind, even because it conduces to understanding, to clear comprehension."[95] For only now do we begin to think about ourselves, are we surprised at ourselves, perceiving that we cannot really consist in what up till now we have thought ourselves to consist.*

Thus, as with the body, so is it with the whole process of sensation and perception: "Again: the monk keeps watch upon the phenomena of the six subjective-objective spheres of sense.—And how does he keep watch upon the phenomena of the six subjective-objective spheres of sense? The monk, O monks, understands the eye and understands forms; and the connexion that comes to be because of these two,—that also he understands. He understands the ear and

* If we wish to perceive quite clearly that the body cannot be our *I*, we may think about the following: It is well known that the incessant change of matter within our body has this effect, that already after seven years at most no atom within it remains the same. In the meantime, from nourishment newly taken in, an entirely new body has been built up. Now take a captive sentenced to seven years imprisonment who as a matter of course thinks his body his *I*, or at least, an essential component of the same, and set before him, at the beginning of his term of punishment, all the food he will consume within the coming seven years, in the shape of tins of preserved food, and tell him: "Here in these tins of food is contained your self as it will be after seven years." Further, collect in a barrel all his excreta during his seven years imprisonment. At the end of this time lead him to the barrel and tell him: "Here in this barrel your bygone self is lying; only look at it!" One would imagine that the monstrosity of the view that the body and its substances have anything to do with our real self must here leap to the eye. Let none object: "My essence does not consist in the material substances, but in *the form* they have assumed," for this form is nothing existing in itself, but is only substance itself endowed with form, only the temporary state of the substance. Certainly this form conditions the diversity of beings, but even on that very account with the effect that this diversity itself is only formal; materially everything is the same, nothing but—dirt! The most admirable form cannot cover up this fact. Whoever feels shocked by this truth, let him imagine a man whose form has again dissolved, that is, a putrefying corpse, and on the other hand look closely at a crushed snail, and then answer the question if both are not *materially* exactly the same. "It is significant of the value of everything existing, that its charms reside only in its form, which is as fugitive as that—substance—is consistent; every moment it is changing and can only stay as long as it clings parasitically to substance (now to this and now to that part of it), but perishes as soon as it loses this stronghold." (Schopenhauer.)

understands sounds; and the connexion that comes to be because of these two, —that also he understands. He understands the nose and understands odours; and the connexion that comes to be because of these two,—that also he understands. He understands the tongue and understands objects of taste; and the connexion that comes to be because of these two,—that also he understands. He understands the body and understands objects of touch; and the connexion that becomes to be because of these two,—that also he understands. He understands the mind and understands ideas; and the connexion that comes to be because of these two,—that also he understands. He is aware when the connexion arises that has not yet arisen; is aware when the connexion that already has arisen is overcome; is aware when the connexion that has been overcome appears no more forever.

"But how, as respects sensation, does the monk keep watch upon sensation? The monk, O monks, in experiencing a pleasant sensation, is aware, 'I experience a pleasant sensation'; in experiencing an unpleasant sensation is aware, 'I experience an unpleasant sensation'; in experiencing a sensation neither pleasant nor unpleasant is aware, 'I experience a sensation neither pleasant nor unpleasant'.

"But how does a monk keep watch over the mind? The monk, O monks, perceives as craving, the mind bound by craving: and as uncraving, the mind free from craving. He perceives as hating, the mind bound by hatred; and as unhating, the mind free from hatred. He perceives as deluded, the mind bound by delusion; and as undeluded, the mind free from delusion.

"Thus, as respects things in himself, he keeps watch constantly upon things; as respects things without, he keeps watch upon things; he observes how the things originate, how the things vanish (with the result): 'They are *things*'" —and nothing else, especially are these not my I, not my Self. For how could that be my I, my true being, which I *see* thus fluctuating before me, vanishing and arising before me always anew? "Thus this observation never leaves him, since it conduces to comprehension, to thoughtfulness and he lives without leaning any more (on these things), and to nothing in the world is he attached." For now it has become clear to him that he himself, in his true essence can have nothing to do with the five groups of grasping, making up his personality and thus his true essence must lie beyond the machinery of his personality, so that the nun Vajirā is right in saying: "Only a heap of *productions* (sankhārā) is there brought forth and carried on in ceaseless change, no living being may here be found."[96]

Now, too, the conclusion of the Master may be fully understood:

"What thinkest thou, Aggivessana, is the body permanent or transient?"

"It is transient, honoured Gotama!"

"But that which is transient—is that painful or is it pleasurable?"

"It is painful, honoured Gotama!"

"But that which is transient, painful, subject to all vicissitude—is it possible to regard it: 'This is mine; this am I; this is my Self'?"

"This is not possible, honoured Gotama!"

"What thinkest thou, Aggivessana, sensation, perception, activities of the mind, cognition, — are these permanent or are they transient?"

"They are transient, honoured Gotama!"

"But that which is transient—is that painful or is it pleasurable?"

"It is painful, honoured Gotama!"

"But that which is transient, painful, subject to all vicissitude—is it possible to regard it: 'This is mine; this am I; this is my Self'?"

"That is not possible, honoured Gotama!"[97]

Accordingly, the matter stands really thus as the Buddha recapitulates it in the following words:

"Wherefore monks, whatsoever there is of body, whatsoever there is of sensation, whatsoever there is of perception, whatsoever there is of mentations, whatsoever there is of cognition, in the past, in the future and at the present moment, our own or a stranger's, gross or subtle, mean or exalted, remote or close at hand—all body as it has come to be, all sensation, all perception, all the activities of the mind, all cognition as it has come to be, is, in the light of the highest wisdom, to be regarded thus: 'This belongs not to me; this am I not; this is not my Self.'"

Now we may also understand why we are so helpless against the five groups constituting our personality. They all follow their own laws. Those of our body, even to-day, we do not yet know thoroughly; sensations are coming and going against our will, thoughts and moods are vexing us without our being able to drive them away. How could all this be, if they really did belong to our essence, if we were consisting in them? What really and essentially belongs to us ought to be entirely at our own unqualified disposal, and our volition could not possibly come into conflict with our faculties, because volition and the organs of its realization, would be in the same degree essential to us. A faculty belonging really, that is essentially, to us, we should absolutely dominate, because our essence would consist in putting it into action. Only what is foreign to us, we must first bring into our power. But this is exactly the case with the five groups which constitute our personality. Most men cannot dominate them at all; nobody can dominate them entirely; and very few come near to it. And those few have only reached this through incessant exercise and effort. From this point of view also it is a contradiction to assert our essence to consist in the elements of our personality and thereby, in this personality itself. This contradiction the Buddha deals with in the thirty-fifth Dialogue of the Majjhima Nikāya:

"What thinkest thou, Aggivessana, does a reigning warrior King, such as King Pasenadi of Kosala, or King Ajātasattu of Magadhā, *within their own domains* possess the power of pronouncing and causing to be carried out sentences of death, outlawry and banishment?"

"Reigning warrior kings, such as King Pasenadi and King Ajātasattu, indeed, possess such powers, honoured Gotama; and even this company of no-

tables of Vajjī and of Mallā *within their own domains* exercise powers of life and death, outlawry and banishment; how much more, duly appointed Kings, like King Pasenadi of Kosala and King Ajātasattu of Magadhā. These have such powers, honoured Gotama, and are worthy of such powers."

"What thinkest thou then, Aggivessana? Inasmuch as thou hast but now said: 'Body is my Self,' dost thou possess this power over body—'Let my body be thus, let not my body be so'?"

"That I have not, honoured Gotama!"

"Pause and consider, Aggivessana, and, having well considered, then give answer, for thy last does not tally with thy first nor thy first with thy last. Inasmuch as thou hast but now said: 'Sensation is my Self—Perception is my Self—the Activities of mind are my Self—Cognition is my Self,' hast thou this dominion over cognition—'Let my cognition be thus, let not my cognition be so'?"

"That I have not, honoured Gotama."

Further: if we consisted of the five groups, if our essence were exhausted by them, then they ought to be to us the most natural and familiar thing of the world. They would be nothing but our self, our *I*, and thereby, completely recognized and defined. But compare with this, how curiously not only the child, but also the grown-up man, during all his lifetime, regards and studies his body, wonders at it as at a riddle, a mystery, exactly as he would behave if suddenly he were to come across something entirely strange with which he had never before had anything to do. But not less does the man of a reflective mind, the man whose gaze has not become dulled by habit, himself wonder at his faculties of sense, at the sensations, moods and thoughts arising within himself; and he asks himself: "How have I come into possession of all these things? Must I really have them?" A question that would be quite impossible, if he were nothing but these processes themselves. Then he would be comprehended in these processes, more especially, in the consciousness produced by them. This consciousness would be produced with the same machine-like self-evidence as steam by the steam-engine. Consciousness and thereby man himself would be the adequate product of the conditions of their existence, would find their exhaustive and sufficient cause in them, would without remainder be comprehended in them. Whence then should come astonishment of the consciousness and of the *I* produced in it, at their own existence and at the whole process producing them?* But this astonishment exists, and not only mere astonishment of consciousness at itself, but the astonishment of somebody who wonders especially at this consciousness, indeed therefore, of one who must be standing behind it. It is the great wonder how I acquired "this body endowed with sensuality and consciousness," or, to express ourselves popularly, how I ever got into this world. It is that great wonder which forms the original basis of every

* Astonishment arises only if no sufficient explanation in accord with the law of sufficient reason is possible.

religion and every philosophy, and overcomes perhaps every man at least once in his life, in a contemplative hour.

Take notice, how this fundamental feeling of mankind expresses itself also in language, that most immediate product of direct perception: "I enter the world," "I leave the world," "Life pleases me," "I cling to life," "I take away my life," in which it is to be noted that life is nothing but the five groups in action. How could I cling to life, how especially could I take away my life, if I myself *were* life, that is, if I consisted in the five groups? Especially, to take away my own life would, in this case, be just as impossible as, (to repeat this simile once more) it is impossible for the hand to throw itself away, or for a machine to commit self-annihilation. How could it be possible to annihilate my *real* self, that is, that wherein I ultimately consist, be this what it may, since it constitutes my *essence* to be what I am? Even the mere will to be some *other* thing than I am in reality is contrary to my essence and therefore cannot arise; how much more is the will to self-annihilation contrary to my essence! *Omnis natura conservatrix sui!* I can only throw away or annihilate something wherein I do *not* consist, and which is therefore *alien* to me. This thought, wisely considered, alone must make it clear that I am something standing *behind* life, behind the five groups, something only *adhering*, only *clinging* to life and to the five groups constituting personality, as to something *alien* which I think desirable.

Let us just attempt the counterproof! If personality constitutes my essence, then of course every part of it must form a part of this my essence, and with the successive falling away of these parts I ought to become ever less. Now let me imagine that I have lost hair and teeth: have I thereby become less? A ridiculous question! Further: Suppose I lose a leg, both legs, an arm, both arms; have I thereby become less? In this case also I know myself to be quite whole and complete; I have become *poorer*, but not *less*. How could this be, if my essence consisted of my body? Certainly, the so-called vital organs of our organism cannot be taken away without our ceasing to live. But are they therefore our essence? Suppose that medical science were in a position to amputate these vital organs also, piece by piece, and by and by to replace them completely by new ones, in such a manner that another part is always removed when the last removed part has been completely replaced, until at last all the organs, the brain included, have been, so to say, changed in this manner. Should I then have become another man? Again: A ridiculous question! The whole procedure that had given me a new body in a visible manner—in reality Nature herself effects just such a change, as we have seen above—would not touch me in the least. But from this once more it becomes evident that I cannot consist in my body.

Even so is it with the functions of the senses. If I become deaf, that is to say, if I lose the sense of hearing, I again become poorer, but not less, and it is the same, if I lose the sense of smell, of taste and even of feeling. I would always become poorer and poorer, but in no wise less. I would feel always entirely and completely the same as I was before. It could even happen that I might be glad

about this poverty of sense faculty thus come over me. If, for instance, a man very sensitive to noise, who therefore would prefer to hear nothing at all, but for some reason is unable to repair to the stillness for which he longs, loses the power of hearing, he will certainly bear this loss very easily, perhaps he will even rejoice over it, since thereby a perennial source of pain to him is forever closed. It may even be that a man grows weary of all his five senses, feels them as a burden from which he would like to be freed, in the immediate consciousness that he in his real essence will not be touched thereby. Certainly, there remains the sixth sense, thinking, to which this does not seem to be applicable. For, as Schopenhauer says, every one identifies his essence with consciousness, again in harmony with the words of the Buddha: "Of the body built up from the four chief-elements also an inexperienced average man may grow weary, but what is designated as thinking or as mind or as consciousness, thereof the inexperienced average man cannot get enough, cannot break away from it. And why not? For long has the inexperienced average man clung to it, tended and cherished it (and thought): 'This belongs to me, this am I, this is my Self.'"[98] This means: Since, lacking the necessary reflectiveness, we are inclined, first of all, to regard at least the noble parts of our body as belonging to our essence, we thus ultimately cling to thinking, and therewith to consciousness resulting from it, as to our real essence. But just as, for instance, the loss of sight and of consciousness of seeing based upon it, does not fundamentally touch my self, just as little am I touched in my real essence, if I not only stop the activities of the five outer-senses, but also cease to think, and thereby take away the basis of all consciousness. This is proved to me every night anew in sleep, where I am without consciousness, but nevertheless existing. Nobody will say that he perishes in falling asleep, and originates anew in awakening; on the contrary, he will think it not bad to be in the state of a deep, sound sleep.* To put it briefly: In looking critically at all the components of my personality, I recognize clearly that none of them belongs so essentially to me that in losing it I should become not only poorer, but less. But further, I recognize just as clearly that neither can I consist in the interaction of these components as their product. For I look down upon this interaction with its incessant changes, I observe it in all its details, as one only can look down upon something alien, as one only can observe something foreign to himself. The Buddha is therefore undoubtedly right in teaching that our real essence does not consist in the components of our personality, and therefore not in this personality itself.

* We may also say: In a sleeping man, every kind of consciousness, also consciousness of thought, has ceased to exist; and yet, he exists. Therefore consciousness of thought does not belong to his essence; it is *anattā*. But what besides, in addition to this, exists in him, to wit, his corporeal organism, we have already recognized as *anattā*, as not our Self. Therefore he exists, though he is nothing of what he seems to be *for us*. Moreover, the fact that I am also still existing in deep dreamless sleep, must be strictly differentiated from the question as to whether such an existence is desirable. Only this latter point is really doubted by man, not the former fact.—The question of the value of an existence without any activity of the senses or of the mind, will be dealt with later on.

But precisely on this account do I exist, apart from this personality and uninjured by its decay. Therefore a man, even if it is convincingly shown to him a hundred times over that his essence can in no case consist in what he calls his personality, will pass on with a superior air, smiling tranquilly, over any conclusion as to his non-existence that may be drawn from that fact. As shown above, he will not even be able to understand the objection, as it is really meant, to wit, that he does not in any wise exist at all, but will answer: "Very well! If I do not consist in my personality, then I am something else." Accordingly, even at the stage we have now reached, he may consider it a debatable point as to *what* he is, but never as to *if* he is.

* *
*

"Then I am something else." But what is left, if nothing constituting man's personality forms the real essence of man?

In putting this question, the problem of the *nature* of our Self, of our essence, takes a new direction. Until now, so to say, we have gone straight ahead in our search for the right answer, investigating the components of our personality lying before us and generally assumed to constitute the essence of man, to see how far the latter assumption can be justified. We always had something tangible before us, and in our enquiry, for that very reason, stood on the solid ground of reality. But now, having thus far reflected upon ourselves that it has become clear to us that our essence is in no wise identical with our personality, we are threatened with the loss of our support in perceptible reality, we are in danger of getting on to the swampy, shaky ground of empty notions, or even into the barren domain of metaphysical speculations. Double cautiousness is therefore needed.

For if we proceed to ask what this "other thing" might be, wherein I am ultimately said to exist, we shall probably get the answer: "Well, my essence consists *in my soul.*" But this answer will most likely be given with some hesitation, because the person answering will almost certainly feel that the counter-question will immediately follow: "But what is this soul?" How much this counter-question is justified, will become clear, if we remember that the word "soul" only represents a special expression for the real essence of man, so that the sentence: "My essence consists in my soul" is nothing more than a piece of empty tautology. We therefore cannot help but try to define this soul a little more exactly. The answer will not long be wanting; theologians and commonplace philosophers have so long trumpeted it abroad in the world that every child knows by heart: "*The soul is an immaterial and therefore spiritual, therefore simple, therefore imperishable, substance.*" For how many thousands of believing men does this definition of their essence constitute the magic formula that banishes every doubt, the granite foundation upon which they have based their whole view of the world and therewith all their action, without—and herein

lies the tragedy of the affair—even once making the attempt to investigate the solidity of this foundation. At the bottom, however, this is not in the least to be wondered at. The fact that man *is*, in some sense or another, *is*, as the fundamental and original fact of all being, stands beyond question. Therefore it only seems self-evident that he then must be *something*, *is* something; and if it is not comprised within the perceptible components of his personality, it must naturally lie *behind* them as pure spirit, which is only another word for the so-called spiritual substance.

And yet the belief in this immaterial and simple substance, this "spirit" dwelling within us, is just as untenable as the belief that our essence consists in our personality. It is even much more untenable, a mere creation of the brain, the outcome of confused and careless thinking. To understand this is not difficult. With a little reflection, the baselessness of this assumption might be gathered at once from what has been said in our previous pages. But as it is just this notion of the purely spiritual or of a spiritual substance or of pure spirit, that is so often misused, and with us, so to say, constitutes a big bag into which theologians and commonplace philosophers put everything they cannot prove and explain, it will be better to submit these notions to special analysis in thoughtful reflectiveness, a course, recommended by the Buddha as a sure remedy against all errors, and thus to reduce them to their real content. Let us therefore without fear look somewhat nearer at this "spirit"!

Spiritual substance or pure spirit are mere abstract notions. To value them adequately we must remember the invaluable expositions of Schopenhauer concerning the essence of notions. According to him, notions are the product of reflection on the world as given by perception. They arise through the forming of one notion out of a number of perceived separate things. In this one notion everything individual and special about the separate, single things is omitted, and only what is common to the whole class of things thought of under the homogeneous notion is preserved. Thus, man has formed the notion "oak" to signify all the innumerable but similar single trees given him in perception, which are comprised under this notion. Notions are therefore nothing originally real, but an artificial product of reason distilled from the world given in perception. They take their substance and their content exclusively from the perceptible world, and therefore possess reality only in so far as they lead back to something given by perception. From this it follows self-evidently, first, that a notion having no perceptible substratum is an empty creation of the brain, a "mere word inside the head;" and secondly, that also a notion correctly arrived at, that is, one really derived from perception, can, and may, be only "for immanent, but never for transcendent use." This means that it may never be applied beyond the realm of experience from which alone it has been abstracted and within which therefore it alone is valid.

Let us apply this insight to the notions of spiritual substance or pure spirit. How were they formed? Or, what is the same thing: From which elements of perception did they originate?

We saw that personality is nothing but a "heap of productions" (Sankhārā). These productions are of three kinds:—the purely corporeal, that is, the activities of the several bodily organs, the circulation of the blood, inhalation and exhalation,—the Buddha always mentions inhalation and exhalation as fundamental activities conditioning all other corporeal processes,—further, the functions of the senses, upon which sensation and perception are based; and, finally, the action of reason, consisting in deliberation and consideration.* The two last-named kinds of activities, that is, the purely sensual ones,—to wit, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching, and the perceiving action of the mind—on one side, and the action of reason, to wit, abstract thinking, on the other side, together with their respective product of consciousness, we call mental processes, in contradistinction to the corporeal ones. Since now these mental or spiritual productions presuppose, of course, a substratum on which they effect themselves, but the body together with its organs of sense, the brain included, is thought not to constitute a sufficient substratum for these so-called mental or spiritual processes, a special substratum is simply postulated for these "spiritual" functions; and so we get the "spirit," the spiritual substance, which is said to be hidden as a peculiar something, and as their substratum, behind these spiritual functions. Fundamentally, that is, for him who recognizes, by the help of the Buddha's not less startlingly simple than genius-like elucidation, that all the so-called spiritual functions, the functions of the senses in the proper sense, as well as those of mind and of reason, are nothing but mere functions of the organs of sense, including the organ of thought, effecting the arising of consciousness, the assumption of a spiritual substance or of an actual "spirit" means nothing more than a hypostasis of those so-called spiritual functions themselves. It is the same tendency of the human mind towards personification, which makes a native of the South Sea Islands, who for the first time sees a steam-engine at work, suppose that within the machine an imprisoned "spirit" is working, and run away from it in terror. It is the same tendency which always causes man, if he does not understand a process in its inner connection, to substitute for the purely natural connection not yet accessible to him, an independent force supposed to exist solely for this special purpose.

Between the natural man and the scholar, there is in such a case only this difference, that the scholar postulates a purely physical force, such as the hypothetical ether, to explain the transmission of light, or the atoms, to explain chemical combinations, and in doing so often comes near to truth. The simple-minded man, on the other hand, uses a more radical method, in assuming, as often as he needs them, witches, devils, gods, or, as in our case, a separate individual soul standing behind the body, that is, a spiritual substance, or, to drop all circumlocutions, an actual "spirit." This completely effects the result he desires. All vexing problems are got rid of, once for all, completely, and at the same time in the simplest and most exhaustive manner. For us, however, our

* See below, the chapter on the Saṅkhārā.

investigations yield us only the insight that man in truth as little conceals within himself a "spirit" or any spiritual substance, as that there are such "spirits" in haunted localities. As in the latter case a physical process is hypostatized, so in our case a psychical one. What is real, what alone lies at the base of the notions of spirit and of spiritual substance, are only the so-called psychical or, more correctly, *sensual processes*. Thereby the mysterious "spirit" in man reveals itself as in reality only a simple collective term for the so-called mental or spiritual functions, as opposed to the corporeal ones. This alone is the true content of the notions of spirit and spiritual substance. Whatever else is usually thought to be within them, has no real foundation, and is therefore an empty creation of the brain.*

To understand the entire superfluity or even untenability of the postulation of a particular spiritual substance, a soul, as bearer of the mental functions, what follows is worth consideration. If a separate spiritual substance exercises the functions of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking, it cannot, in its functions, be dependent on the body, just because the functions are *its own* and not those of the body. Therefore the soul ought to be able to perform the act of cognition mentioned before with *every* organ of sense, just as it chooses; that means: if it liked, it might hear with the eye, or see with the ear; it would not even need to use any organ of sense, simply because it would be able to hear and see by force *of its own essence*. The organs of sense, on the contrary, would only make hindrances and difficulties for the functions of cognizing taking place only in the soul itself, in the same way that a keen-sighted man would only find his power of seeing interfered with, in using a pair of spectacles. But in reality it is just the reverse: the various psychical processes are exclusively bound up with the respective corporeal organs, the organ of thought included, and in such a manner conditioned by these organs that every injury to these latter adversely affects the former, and the collapse of the bodily organs in death, brings about their definitive annihilation. From all this it accordingly follows that the act of cognition is exclusively the product of these organs, not that of an entirely superfluous soul standing behind them.

This reflection is also at the basis of the answer given to king Milinda by the wise Nāgasena on the question as to whether there is a cognizing soul-being:

"What do you mean, O king, by this cognizing soul-being?"

"That soul-being in the interior of man, sir, that with the eye beholds forms, that with the ear hears sounds, that with the nose smells odours, that with the tongue tastes flavours, that with the body touches objects of touch, and that with the mind perceives ideas. Just as we, sitting in this palace, may look through any window, as we like, be it through the eastern or the western, the northern or the southern one, just so, O Lord, this soul-being looks as it likes, through this one or that of the doors of the senses."

* As remarked above, the expression "mind" also represents nothing but a collective term, designating the totality of the psychical processes in the direction of will and of thinking.

But the Thera said: "Those five doors of the senses I will explain to you, O king. Listen and pay good heed! If there was in the interior of man a soul-being perceiving through the eye, forms, just as we perceive through any window here, objects, then this soul-being ought to be able to perceive the forms just as well through the ear, through the nose, through the tongue, through the body or through the organ of thought. And it ought to be able to hear sounds, to smell odours, to taste flavours, to touch objects and to perceive ideas just as well through every single door of the senses."

"It is certainly not able to do that, sir."

"But then, O king, your last does not tally with your first nor your first with your last!—Just as we, O king, sitting in this palace, if we open the windows and put out our heads, in full daylight perceive objects more clearly, just so this soul-being within us, if the five doors of the senses were torn out, ought to be able to perceive objects better in full daylight."

"It is certainly not able to do that, sir."

"But then, O king, your last does not tally with your first nor your first with your last.—If for example this Dinna should go out and take his place (before the open door) in the vestibule, would you, O king, know this to be so?"

"Certainly I should know this, sir."

"And if this same Dinna, O king, should come in again and take his place before you, would you, O king, then also know this to be so?"

"Certainly, sir."

"And if, O king, we should place a thing having taste upon the tongue, would this soul-being existing within us know, if this thing was sour, salty, bitter, sharp, acrid or sweet?"

"Certainly it would know this, sir."

"But if this thing were within the stomach, could this soul-being then recognize its taste?"

"Certainly not, sir."

"But then, O king, your last does not tally with your first nor your first with your last."* [99]

To be sure, those who maintain the existence of a soul think they can meet these arguments with the following objection: "It is true, the functions of cognition are bound up with the organs of the senses, the organ of thought included, but the purpose of the latter is only that of tools, of which the soul merely makes use." But whoever advances such an objection, forgets the principle hinted at above, that the principles of explanation must not be multiplied without necessity.** For if once the organs of sense form the necessary presupposition

* This means: If it were a soul that tasted the thing, thus affirming its own essence, it naturally ought also to be able to taste an object placed in the stomach instead of the mouth, in the same way that the king recognizes his servant Dinna just as well if he is standing in the open vestibule, as if he is standing immediately before him.

** This principle may be better understood from the following passage of *Du Prel, History of the Development of the Universe*, p. 180: "The subjective intellect desires to pene-

of every act of cognition there is no reason why they should not form its *only* condition. Then, however, they find themselves confronted with the following alternative: Either the assumed spiritual substance or soul must itself perish in death, inasmuch as then, after being robbed of the material organs of sense used by it till now, it is no longer capable of the act of cognition, and thus precisely that is wanting, to explain which it was postulated, and which forms its essential content; a soul which, together with its sensual activity, has also lost all activity of mind and of reason, being no soul, being nothing at all. Or else, the soul is still able to carry out its cognizing functions even after death, without the corresponding corporeal organs. In this case, it remains a puzzle why it cannot effect during life, when its organs are only impaired, what it may do after death, when they are completely gone. If it is able to cognize after death without any material organ, then it ought to be able to do the same in life much more easily when the organs are only impaired, since the instrument it is accustomed to handle is at least partially at its disposition. Thus it is here, as it is with every product of phantasy; at last they break down before reality. Therefore the Buddha calls the dogma of the self being constant and immutable in the form of an individual soul "an utterly and entirely foolish idea."[100]

But if thus the untenability of the soul-hypothesis is manifest in every direction, it only remains astonishing, how nevertheless men cling so tightly to such a hypothesis as to show themselves inaccessible to every other teaching. But the reason for this is not very difficult to find. The average man identifies his essence with the five components of his personality, thinking it self-evident that these components must stand in some essential relation to his real Self, and on this very account lives under the delusion that it is his essence which manifests itself in his personality and presents itself as such: "How, Venerable One, is there belief in personality?"—"Take, friend Visākha, the uninstructed man of the world, unperceiving of the Noble Ones, unacquainted with the Noble Teaching, untrained in the Noble Teaching, unperceiving of Good Men, unacquainted with the Teaching of Good Men, untrained in the Teaching of Good Men—this man looks upon body, sensation, perception, mentation, consciousness, as himself; or he looks upon himself as possessing body, sensation, perception, mentation, consciousness; or he regards body, sensation, perception, mentation, consciousness as being in himself; or else he regards himself as being in body, sensation, perception, mentation, consciousness."[101] But reality demonstrates to him, before his eyes, that all the five groups, and together with them also

trate objective nature in a logical manner. As nature attains the object of her productions with the fewest possible means, those scientific hypotheses must also be the best which analyse phenomena conceptively according to the Law of Parsimony. The objectively smallest quantity of force in nature must be reflected in the minimum, but nevertheless sufficient amount of logic present in scientific hypotheses. Of two hypotheses one explaining as much as the other, the simpler one is the better one. Accordingly, already in Plato's day, we find it prized as the first principle of science, that the principles of explanation must not be multiplied without necessity . . . This is based upon the instinctive but firm conviction that simplicity is the mark of truth."

their product, personality, in death falls a prey to destruction. Accordingly there results for him a double conclusion: First, as a practical consequence, there arises in him an immense fear of death, as of the supposed annihilation of his essence. Only the reverse side of this fear is his boundless attachment to life, that is, to the Five Groups in action. This attachment generally maintains itself also in the face of suffering, to such an extent that men will even accept a life consisting solely of suffering, if only they may be allowed to live at all, and thus be saved from supposed annihilation for as long as possible. Here we come upon what is at once the deepest and last cause of all for this boundless attachment to life. This, as we have seen above, cannot reside in life itself being something worth desiring, but consists simply in the delusion that our essence consists in the five groups of personality, and thus is doomed to destruction together with them. Give a man the clear conviction that sickness and death cannot touch him in his real essence, and he will at once become perfectly indifferent in regard to them!

Besides this practical consequence of the fear of death, the belief in personality begets another, a theoretical one: In truth, man, as we saw above, does *not* consist in his personality, therefore death, being only the dissolution of the elements of this personality, cannot touch him. *But this he does not recognize*, being under the delusion that he consists of his personality. Thus he is blinded by a fatal error in regard to himself. But on the other hand, precisely because of this, he cannot with logical consequence carry through this error which is in direct contrast to his essence, but comes again and again into a conflict with it which reaches its culminating-point at the moment when death clearly reveals itself as the dissolution of the five components of his personality and thereby of this personality itself. For in consequence of his error, death presents itself to him as his own dissolution. But against this assumption his essence, as being in contradiction therewith, revolts. And so in despair he seeks for a way out of this conflict between his inner essence and his false apprehension of the relation in which he stands to his personality. But instead of, at least on this point, seeing correctly through this relation, he in a makeshift manner reconciles his false apprehension with himself through a fresh error whereby he deceives himself into believing in the continued existence of his personality after death, in spite of the *obvious* fact of its annihilation. This error just consists in the assumption of a soul, such an assumed bearer of the spiritual functions being not only a very easily assumed principle for the explanation of these, seeing that it is only postulated for this purpose, but also enabling man to believe, in spite of the opposing evidence of natural facts, that he himself is in no way touched by death as regards his spiritual functions, since the soul, being a simple substance, is not subject to death. To be sure, the fact that the body at last perishes, cannot be explained away even by the assumption of a soul. But because he dislikes the idea of going without his body forever, he lets this body be placed again at his disposal, sooner or later, by the act of his almighty god. In such a manner, it is certainly not difficult to master all difficulties.

But *we* who have clearly recognized from the course of our investigation that our essence cannot consist in our personality, regard its decay in quite another manner. Our real essence is as little touched by this decay as we are touched by the burning of wood that is felled in the forest and burnt before our eyes. Therefore we understand also the exhortation of the Master to let go, with tranquil mind, the five groups constituting our personality:

"What think ye, monks? Suppose that in this Jeta forest a man should come and gather together grass, twigs, leaves and branches and burn them up, or do with them whatsoever else he listed; should you think: 'This man is gathering together and burning or doing whatsoever else he lists with *us*'?"

"Nay indeed, Lord."

"And why not?"

"These things, Lord, truly are not our *I*, nor do they belong to our *I*."

"Just even so, ye monks, what is not yours, that surrender! Long will its surrender make for your happiness and well-being. And what is it that is not yours? Body, monks, is not yours; sensation is not yours; perception is not yours; the activities of the mind are not yours; consciousness is not yours. Give them up, one and all! Long will their giving up tend to your happiness and well-being!"[102]

Because we have now won the insight that the groups constituting our personality have nothing to do with our true essence, in order to banish our fear of being annihilated in death, we have no need to take refuge in such fantastic inventions as the hypothesis of a spiritual substance, a soul, by assuming which man, in contradiction to reality, deceives himself into believing in the duration of these elements of personality that are doomed to destruction. On the contrary, we may confidently trust ourselves to the further guidance of the Master on the path that really will lead us back to ourselves. For, though none of the elements constituting our personality nor a soul standing behind it can form our real essence, *Still We Are*, a fundamental fact which remains even in face of this result. And this, after all, is the main thing.

* *
*

Still we are: But is this really true? Suppose that the whole of our personality, all mental functions included, before all, thinking and consciousness resulting from it, is dissolved in death, and behind this dissolved personality no substance or soul of any kind remains. What shall I then be?

We may well be somewhat curious as to what answer the Buddha will give to this question; all the more so, that now we must gradually come to the point where the indirect path by which he has hitherto led us, namely that of pointing out to us wherein we do *not* consist, can no longer be followed. For nothing more seems to remain over wherein man might erroneously find his essence and so we ought soon to come upon the *positive* kernel of this our essence. For certainly we dare assume that the Buddha will not definitively lose himself in nothing but

negations concerning what we are *not*, but will conduct us beyond them to a positive result, proceeding from this, that the method followed by him can only have for its object the pulling away more and more of the thick, alien covering that lies spread over our real essence, until that essence itself lies openly before us, like the kernel of a fruit that is gradually freed of its wrapping of leaves and husk, one after another. Let us therefore listen and examine what the Buddha has still further to tell us!

If he were himself standing before us, he would probably reply, smiling at our expectation: "Friend, take care that you do not lose that heedfulness with which you have followed me until now, for you are on the point of losing it, or rather, you have lost it already. You think, because you are, you ought also to be *something*, and this something you now wish to know. But now, just take pains to think clearly, and to analyse well all notions in regard to their content. For all evil comes from confused thinking.

"You want to be *something*, that probably means, you do not want to be *nothing*. But what is opposed to Nothing as its exhaustive contrary? Certainly *Everything*. For the most extreme and comprehensive alternatives you can set up are: Everything or Nothing. The Something you want to be ought therefore to belong to Everything, ought to be a part or element of it. Whoever has something, has not got everything, but only part of it; and whoever *is* something, is therefore just a part of everything. But what is Everything? 'Everything is what I want to show you, monks. What is Everything? The eye and forms, the ear and sounds, the nose and odours, the tongue and flavours, the body and objects of touch, thinking and ideas, this, ye monks, is called Everything.'[103] But I have just now shown you clearly enough that you cannot consist in anything of this. But behind all this, that is, behind Everything, there is only *Nothing*. Consequently you are no Something, but you are indeed—Nothing."

So then I am indeed fully summed up in the five groups constituting my personality, behind which yawns only Nothing! I am nothing but this personality; and personality is nothing but a heap of transitory processes without any abiding kernel. Accordingly, with the dissolution of this personality in death I have completely and radically come to an end, just as a carriage has come to an end, if it is broken up and its several constituent parts burnt! Why then all these long discussions about what I am not, if at last I am nothing at all? If this is the entire renowned wisdom of the Buddha, he might have given it in a much more simple and dignified manner. Trivial as is the saying, "Much ado about nothing," here it has become truth. That later disciple of the Buddha, Nāgasena, who enlightened king Milinda as to the nature of our essence, was quite another man. He openly confessed, he explicitly declared and made clear, that we are fundamentally nothing but a mere name, the foundations of which at death scatter to every wind. Look for yourself! Here is the famous dialogue:

"How is your reverence called? Bhante, what is your name?"

"Your majesty, I am called Nāgasena; my fellow-monks, your majesty, address me as Nāgasena: but whether parents gave me the name Nāgasena, or Sūrasena,

or Vīrasena, or Sīhasena, it is, nevertheless, your majesty, but a way of counting, a term, an appellation, a convenient designation, a mere name, this Nāgasena; for there is no individual* to be found."

Then said Milinda the king:

"Listen to me, my lords, ye five hundred Yonakas, and ye numerous monks! Nāgasena here says thus: 'There is no individual here to be found.' Is it possible for me to assent to what he says?"

And Milinda the king spoke to the venerable Nāgasena as follows:—"Bhante Nāgasena, if there is no individual to be found, who is it then furnishes you monks with the monkish requisites,—robes, food, bedding, and medicine, the reliance of the sick? who is it makes use of the same? who is it keeps the precepts? who is it applies himself to meditation? who is it realizes the Path, the Fruits, and Nibbāna? who is it destroys life? who is it takes what is not given him? who is it commits immorality? who is it tells lies? who is it drinks intoxicating liquor? who is it commits the five crimes that constitute 'proximate karma?' In that case, there is no merit; there is no demerit; there is no one who does or causes to be done meritorious or demeritorious deeds; neither good nor evil deeds can have any fruit or result. Bhante Nāgasena, neither is he a murderer who kills a monk, nor can you monks, bhante Nāgasena, have any teacher, preceptor, or ordination. When you say, 'My fellow-monks, your majesty, address me as Nāgasena,' what then is this Nāgasena? Pray, bhante, is the hair of the head Nāgasena?

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is the hair of the body Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Are nails .. teeth .. skin .. flesh .. sinews .. bones .. marrow of the bones .. kidneys .. heart .. liver .. pleura .. spleen .. lungs .. intestines .. mesentery .. stomach .. faeces .. bile .. phlegm .. pus .. blood .. sweat .. fat .. tears .. lymph .. saliva .. snot .. synovial fluid .. urine .. brain of the head Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is the corporeal form Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is sensation Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is perception Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Are the activities of the mind Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is cognition Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

* Puggala = Individual (the "undivisible"), the single being as bearer of particularity or individuality. Thus puggala denotes the being which through its attachment is coupled to personality and therefore appears as a *person*, contrary to the Tathāgata, the fully detached.

"Are then, bhante, corporeal form, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, and cognition unitedly Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

"Is it then bhante, something besides corporeal form, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind and cognition which is Nāgasena?"

"Nay, verily, your majesty."

„Bhante, although I question you very closely, I fail to discover any Nāgasena. Verily, now, bhante, Nāgasena is a mere empty sound. What Nāgasena is there here? Bhante, you speak a falsehood, a lie: there is no Nāgasena."

Then the venerable Nāgasena spoke to Milinda the king as follows:—"Your majesty, you are a delicate prince, an exceedingly delicate prince; and if, your majesty, you walk in the middle of the day on hot sandy ground, and you tread on rough grit, gravel, and sand, your feet become sore, your body tired, the mind oppressed, and the body-consciousness suffers. Pray, did you come afoot, or riding?"

"Bhante, I do not go afoot: I came in a chariot."

"Your majesty, if you came in a chariot, declare to me the chariot. Pray, your majesty, is the pole the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is the axle the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Are the wheels the chariot?"

„Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is the chariot-body the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is the banner-staff the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is the yoke the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Are the reins the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is the goading-stick the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Pray, your majesty, are pole, axle, wheels, chariot-body, banner-staff, yoke, reins and goad unitedly the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Is it, then, your majesty, something else besides pole, axle, wheels, chariot-body, banner-staff, yoke, reins, and goad which is the chariot?"

"Nay, verily, bhante."

"Your majesty, although I question you very closely, I fail to discover any chariot. Verily now, your majesty, the word chariot is a mere empty sound. What chariot is there here? Your majesty, you speak a falsehood, a lie: there is no chariot. Your majesty, you are the chief-king in all the continent of India; of whom are you afraid that you speak a lie? Listen to me, my lords, ye five

hundred Yonakas, and ye numerous monks! Milinda the king here says thus: 'I came in a chariot' and being requested: 'Your majesty, if you came in a chariot, declare to me the chariot,' he fails to produce any chariot. Is it possible, pray, for me to assent to what he says?"

When he had thus spoken, the five hundred Yonakas applauded the venerable Nāgasena and spoke to Milinda the king as follows:

"Now, your majesty, answer, if you can."

Then Milinda the king spoke to the venerable Nāgasena as follows:

"Bhante Nāgasena, I speak no lie: the word 'chariot' is but a way of counting, term, appellation, convenient designation, and name for pole, axle, wheels, chariot-body, and bannerstaff."

"Thoroughly well, your majesty, do you understand a chariot. In exactly the same way, your majesty, in respect of me, Nāgasena is but a way of counting, term, appellation, convenient designation, mere name for the hair of my head, hair of my body .. brain of the head, corporeal form, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, and cognition. But in the absolute sense is no individual here to be found. And the nun Vajirā, your majesty, said as follows in the presence of the Blessed One:

'Even as the word of 'chariot' means
That members join to frame a whole;
So when the Groups appear to view,
We use the phrase, 'A living being.'"[104*]

As a matter of fact, not a few fall back precisely upon this dialogue when they wish to make out the goal of the Buddha's doctrine to be the absolute annihilation of man. Are they right? Let us again summon up the Manes of the Master. How would he speak on this question? "So then, after all, thou hast lost that heedfulness about which I particularly warned thee, hast indeed so completely lost it, foolish questioner, that now, at the end of all, thou rankest thy self with that class of men who, in philosophising, forget *themselves*. Formerly thou lookedst at them as at a curiosity, but now thou thyself hast lost all heedfulness, to such an extent that you even think it possible, that in searching for *what* Iam, I myself might have forgotten *that* I am, that I must be, in some sense or the other; and that this fundamental, primordial fact remains, even if I perceive in regard to everything in the world that it cannot be my essence, that I cannot consist in anything within the world, that I therefore am *Nothing*. But with this little word *Nothing* you cannot come to terms; it embarrasses and perturbs you. But don't let it impose upon you; keep intact your heedfulness and your mental clearness in regard to it also, and very soon you will see how groundless was your perturbation, and how rash were the conclusions you drew from this little word."

* satta = living being. "Where there are found sense organs, their objects and the corresponding consciousness, there is found the living being or the manifestation of the living being" (Sam. Nik. XXXV, 66.).

Let us comply with this invitation of the Master. What is *Nothing?* As we saw, it is the antithesis of *Everything.* And what is *Everything?* As said above, the eye and forms, the ear and sounds, the nose and odours, the tongue and flavours, the body and tangibles, the mind (the organ of thought) and ideas. To whom is this not clear without further words? Who would not admire this astoundingly simple and nevertheless so extremely acute demarcation of being? Certainly our great philosophers also teach that everything that is, exists only with reference to *possible experience*, this statement as respects its contents coinciding with the definition given by the Buddha according to which the six senses, thought included, are the sole bearers of all possible experience. But how insipid thus abstractly given, does our formulation seem, when compared with the immediate obviousness of the Buddha's definition, the demonstrativeness of which cannot be surpassed!

But if we thus have such a self-evident definition of the notion of *Everything* then the notion of *Nothing* also becomes completely luminous without further words: Because "*Nothing*" is only the antithesis of "*Everything*", therefore by *Nothing* we designate nothing more than the absence of all the elements out of which the notion of "Everything" is compounded. Hence, the answer to the question: "What is Nothing" is simply: "To see nothing more, to hear nothing more, to smell nothing more, to taste nothing more, to touch nothing more, to think nothing more: This is Nothing." Both questions: "What is Everything" and: "What is Nothing?" thereby have the same contents, the one in positive, the other in negative form. We find again the same thought in that other saying of the Buddha: "Here in consciousness everything is to be found"[105]. This means, as consciousness is the product of the respective activities of the senses: in visual consciousness, in auditory consciousness, in olfactory consciousness, in gustatory consciousness, in tactile consciousness, in mental consciousness, everything exists and is founded, and if you cease to see, to hear, to smell, and so forth, if you no longer see, hear, smell, taste, touch, think, then for you *everything* is annihilated, and only pure *Nothing* remains. But who would venture to assert that *this* Nothing was a real *Nothing*, absolute Nothing in every sense of the word, therefore no mere relative Nothing, no *nihil privativum*, but the veritable negative Nothing, the *nihil negativum?* Even this most complete Nothing that we are at all able to imagine, only expresses the annihilation of every function of sense, thinking included. Who does not feel without further saying that, as there are colours of which our eye is not susceptible, and which we therefore can only find out by way of chemistry, as for example, the ultra-violet rays; and as there are vibrations which we cannot perceive as sounds, so also there may be something lying behind all the activities of the senses, and of thinking, thus, something behind, or in, the so-called nothing? Indeed, if we again bring into play our heedfulness, if, in fact, we give close heed, we shall remember having already made the acquaintance of such a thing, as of the most evident thing in the world, namely, as *ourselves.* For we have learnt to know beyond doubt that ourselves, that is, our innermost essence,

does not consist in the six-sense-activities and in their correlates, so that we must stand behind these; hence, there, where to our apprehension yawns Nothing.

This so much feared "You are nothing," thus ultimately only means what you know long since: You consist just as little in forms, sounds, odours, flavours, tangibles, and ideas, as in seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking. You are nothing of all this, and therefore, since these are all the components of the world, of the universe, you are nothing belonging to the world. You are, in truth, beyond the world, beyond the universe; or, to express ourselves in the spirit of the Buddha: Everything is not your Self,—"the whole world is *anattā*."*[106]

Of course Nāgasena also did not intend to tell king Milinda anything else. Both meet each other for the first time, and accordingly introduce themselves to each other. Nāgasena in a spirited manner makes use of the occasion to enlighten the king as to this entire representation being, like everything else in the world, nothing but illusion, and himself in truth, not to be found. For the king of course looked at him, according to the common opinion prevalent then the same as to-day, as at a person, that is, as at a substantial essence appearing in the fixed personality before him, as this personality or else as *in* it. The fundamental error of this view Nāgasena wishes to expose to him. Therefore he shows him that the real substratum of the notion of personality is nothing but a "heap of productions"—Sankhārā—appearing as a homogeneous organism, as the "body endowed with the six senses and with consciousness", just as the real substratum of the notion of carriage is formed by the several parts of the carriage put together in a certain manner, the entire content of the notion "person" on one side and "carriage" on the other, being thus in truth exhausted. If the "heap of productions," the "body endowed with the six senses and with consciousness" dissolves in death, then what was understood by the designation of "Nāgasena" has entirely and definitively come to an end, as the carriage has come to its end, when its component parts are burnt. Especially does no immaterial or spiritual substance, known to us so well as the soul, remain, but only—Nothing. But—and this is the chief thing, which Nāgasena, in his time, might assume to be understood as self-evident by the king, and therefore did not state expressly: "*All this am I not, this does not belong to me, this is not my Self.*" Of his *real* Self Nāgasena says not a word in the dialogue. In exactly the same manner as the Buddha,—we shall soon see why—he always only explains to Milinda that what the king thinks to be his Self, is nothing but the unsubstantial ghost of Not-self, of *anattā*.

So I still exist, in spite of the expositions of Nāgasena, and though according to the Buddha himself, I am nothing, that is, *nothing belonging to this world*. For, as said above, we do not know any other Nothing, nay, we cannot even think of any other Nothing. Though already we may have a presentiment that this my real existence, is an existence of quite a different kind than that peculiar to

* "Sabbe dhamma anattā: all things are not the I."

the five groups. Accordingly, it is now evident how groundless was the embarrassment into which we let ourselves be flung, over the word *Nothing*; and that this embarrassment was only possible through want of heedfulness. On the other hand, it is evident how well -founded it was always to point out that by showing *what I* am not, the fact never can be denied *that* I am, that I must exist in some sense. Indeed, to state it for the last time: How confused a man must be who thinks it possible that a sound thinker—and this little will certainly not be denied to the Buddha even by his opponents —in a proof which ostentatiously confined itself to demonstrating to man what he is *not*, wherein he cannot consist, exhausting itself therefore in pointing out to him: "You are neither this nor that nor the other," in the end only wanted to prove: "Hence you are not at all, do not exist in any sense of the word!" For the whole argument proceeds on the self-evident assumption that he to whom it is addressed in reality must be present in some sense or another.*

But let us again bring proof of our contention by allowing the Buddha to speak for himself:

"There, ye monks, the instructed holy disciple, who has beheld the Noble Ones; is conversant with the Teaching of the Noble Ones, well trained in the Teaching of the Noble Ones; who has beheld Good Men, is conversant with the Teaching of Good Men, well trained in the Teaching of Good Men. Such an one does not regard body, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition as himself; nor himself as similar to body, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition; nor body, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition as in himself; nor himself as in body, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition."[107] Is it possible to read in these words that the whole essence of man is exhausted in these five groups? Do they not rather clearly illustrate the fact that the high disciple *exists* as a self-evident presupposition, and only lay stress upon the fact that he is something essentially different from the five groups constituting his personality?

Perhaps this is expressed even more clearly in the following passage: "The earthy element, the watery element, the fiery element, the windy element,

* This also is the literal meaning of *anattā*. The word does not mean "not a self" but "not *my* self"; therefore it presupposes the real existence of this my same self. "What is transitory, is painful, what is painful, is *anattā, what is anattā, is not mine, this am I not, this is not my self.*" (Samyutta Nikāya XXXV, 1) The expression *anattā* is therefore an abbreviation, a symbol of this great formula. If we therefore wish correctly to understand the word *anattā*, we must always replace it by this great formula.

The essence of a thing is formed by that which may not be taken away from it without destroying it. In consequence of this, *every* reality has, of course, its own peculiar essence. So the plantain- tree, though having no *kernel*, has of course an essence in the given sense. This essence consists in the phyllodium sheaths rolled one over the other. Now man is also a reality, therefore an essence of man in the given sense must also exist. It is designed as the "*I*" as the "attā" or the "self". The question can therefore never be *if* there is such an *I*, such an attā or self, but only *wherein* this *I* or attā or self or human essence really *consists*.

the element of space, the element of consciousness* I have conceived to be not the Self, and myself as not consisting in the earthy element, the watery element, the fiery element, the windy element, the element of space, the element of consciousness."[108] Is it not here expressly stated that the saint recognizes himself as standing beyond the five groups and thereby, beyond the world?

But if we want more proofs that the Buddha does not teach the nonsense of absolute Nihilism, proofs certainly not needed by any one who has recognized more or less within himself intuitively through deep contemplation that in his real essence he is not touched by the slow perishing of the five groups, and thus must be something essentially different from them, let us first turn to the following passage:

"The wandering ascetic Vacchagotta spoke thus to the Exalted One:

'How is this, dear Gotama: Is the *I* existent?'

Upon these words, the Exalted One kept silence.

'How now, dear Gotama? The *I* is not existent?'

Upon these words, the Exalted One again kept silence.

Thereupon the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta rose from his seat and went away.

Not long after the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta had departed, the reverend Ānanda spoke thus to the Exalted One:

'O Lord, why did the Exalted One not explain himself upon this question of the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta?'

'If, Ānanda, I had answered to the question of the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta: 'Is the *I* existent?' 'The *I* is existent,' then, Ānanda, I had thereby sided with those ascetics and Brahmins who teach eternalism.** If, on the other hand, Ānanda, I had answered to the question of the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta: 'The *I* is not-existent,' then, Ānanda, I had thereby sided with those ascetics and Brahmins who teach annihilation.

'And if, Ānanda, I had answered to the question of the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta: 'The *I* is existent,' would this have been a means of causing to arise in him the insight: All things are not the *I*?'***

'Nay, verily, O Lord.'

'But if, Ānanda, I had answered to the question of the wandering ascetic Vacchagotta: 'The *I* is not-existent,' then this, Ānanda, would have brought the confused wandering ascetic Vacchagotta into this still greater confusion: 'Formerly, my *I* was existent, but now it is not.'"†[109]

* The first five elements are the component parts of the bodily organism, *nāma-rūpa*, the six elements together constituting the "bodily organism together with consciousness."

** This means, the permanence of the Self *in time* as an individual soul.

*** This alone is of value, all salvation consisting in being liberated from the component parts of Not-*I*.

† Note that this passage is in the *Avyākata*-Samyutta, that means, in that part of the Canon which treats of what the Buddha has *not* revealed. He refuses also to reveal anything about the self, especially whether it is correct to say:—"the self exists" or—"the self does not exist." He confines himself to explaining what in any case does *not* constitute our self.

In this passage, the Buddha expressly refuses to side with those ascetics and Brahmins who teach annihilation. He certainly knew why. For in his time too there was no lack of those shallow thinkers who are still so closely bound up with their personality that in their brains there is simply no room left for the idea of the ultra-mundaneness of their essence. Therefore, when they hear of the ultimate goal of the doctrine of Buddha being the definitive annihilation of the personality upon the death of the saint, they are only able to explain this as meaning the absolute annihilation of man. They only know the alternative of a personal *I* consisting in the five groups, or no *I* at all, and solve it in this way: The Buddha declares the five groups to be not the *I*, hence there is no *I* at all. Thus a saint would be a man who absolutely annihilates himself,—really, a curious kind of saint. Hence, each of them, hearing the Buddha's doctrine of salvation, must feel thus: "'Then I shall be cut off! Then I shall perish! Then I shall no more be!' And he grieves and mourns and laments and beats his breast in dire dismay." To make these confused brains harmless, the Buddha opposes to them the man who really understands his doctrine, who, confronted by the doctrine of the annihilation of personality "is not overcome by senseless trembling, not overcome by thoughts like this: 'Then I shall be cut off! Then I shall perish! Then I shall no more be!'"[110] He even in words of terrible earnest protests against the insinuation that he teaches annihilation: "To discover a monk the mind of whom is thus separated from him, so that they could say: 'This is the substratum of the consciousness of the Tathāgata,' is impossible even for the gods, Indra and Brahma and Prajāpati included. And why so? Already in the visible reality is the Accomplished One not to be found out, say I. And, monks, against me, thus teaching and preaching, many ascetics and brahmins falsely, groundlessly, untruly, in defiance of fact, bring accusation thus: 'A nihilist is this ascetic Gotama. He preaches the cutting off, the destruction, the nullification of the present living being.' But for what I am not, for what I say not, for that these good ascetics and brahmins thus falsely, groundlessly, untruly, in defiance of fact impeach me. For, O monks, as before so also now, I preach only Suffering and the cessation of Suffering."[111] To these words he in another passage[112] appends the following: "In one connection, Sīha, whoso speaks the truth about me may say: 'Annihilation the ascetic Gotama teaches; for the purpose of annihilation he propagates his doctrine; and thereby he directs his disciples.' In what connection now, could a man telling the truth, thus speak about me? I teach the annihilation of craving, the annihilation of hatred, the annihilation of delusion, I teach the annihilation of manifold evil things that do not pertain to salvation." Certainly, one might add that we do not consist in craving, hatred and delusion, nor in those other manifold evil things; but this statement the Buddha, as speaking to reasonable men, may have thought superfluous.

Especially clear and beyond any misunderstanding is also the following dialogue wherein we find a summing up of all that we have hitherto been saying. In the mind of a monk called Yamaka the following wicked heresy had sprung

up: "Thus do I understand the doctrine taught by the Blessed One, that on the dissolution of the body the monk, who is liberated from the influences, is annihilated, perishes and is no more after death."

"Say not so, brother Yamaka. Do not traduce the Blessed One; for it is not well to traduce the Blessed One. The Blessed One would never say that on the dissolution of the body the saint who is liberated from the influences, is annihilated, perishes and is no more after death."

But, as nevertheless Yamaka persisted obstinately in adhering to his pestiferous delusion, the monks told the venerable Sāriputta, the greatest of the disciples of the Buddha, "the disciple resembling the master, as it is said."[113] Sāriputta undertakes the correction of Yamaka in this way:

"Is the report true, brother Yamaka, that the following wicked view has sprung up in your mind: 'Thus do I understand the doctrine taught by the Blessed One, that on the dissolution of the body the monk, who is delivered from all influences, is annihilated, perishes, and does not exist after death?'"

"Even so, brother, do I understand the doctrine."

"What think you, brother Yamaka? Is the corporeal form permanent or transitory?"

"It is transitory, brother."

"And that which is transitory—is it painful or pleasurable?"

"It is painful, brother."

"And that which is transitory, painful, and liable to change—is it possible to say of it: 'This is mine; this am I; this is my Self'?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Is sensation, perception, are the activities of the mind, is cognition, permanent or transitory?"

"It is transitory, brother."

"And that which is transitory—is it painful, or is it pleasurable?"

"It is painful, brother."

"And that which is transitory, painful, and liable to change—is it possible to say of it: 'This is mine; this am I; this is my Self'?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Accordingly, brother Yamaka, as respects all corporeal form whatsoever . . . as respects all sensation whatsoever—as respects all perception whatsoever—as respects all activities of the mind whatsoever . . . as respects all cognition whatsoever, past, future, or present, be it subjective or existing outside, gross or subtle, mean or exalted, far or near, the correct view in the light of the highest knowledge is as follows: 'This is not mine; this am I not; this is not my Self.'

"Perceiving this, brother Yamaka, the learned and noble disciple conceives an aversion for the corporeal form, conceives an aversion for sensation, conceives an aversion for perception, conceives an aversion for the activities of the mind, conceives an aversion for cognition. And in conceiving this aversion he becomes divested of the influences, and by the absence of the influences he becomes free; and when he is free, he becomes aware that he is free.

"What think you now, brother Yamaka? Do you consider the corporeal form as the Perfected One?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Do you consider sensation—perception—the activities of the mind—cognition, as the Perfected One?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"What think you, brother Yamaka? Do you consider the Perfected One as comprised in the corporeal form?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Do you consider the Perfected One as separated from the corporeal form?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Do you consider the Perfected One as comprised in sensation . . . in perception . . . in the activities of the mind . . . in cognition?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"Do you consider the Perfected One as separated from sensation . . . from perception . . . from the activities of the mind . . . from cognition?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"What think you, brother Yamaka? Are the corporeal form, sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, and cognition unitedly the Perfected One?"

"Nay, verily, brother."

"What think you, brother Yamaka? Do you consider the Perfected One to be without body, without sensation, without perception, without activities of the mind, without cognition?"

"Nay, verily, brother."*

"Considering now, brother Yamaka, that you fail to make out and establish the Perfected One *even in the present existence*, is it reasonable for you to say: 'Thus do I understand the doctrine taught by the Blessed One, that on the dissolution of the body the monk who is delivered from the influences, is annihilated, perishes, and is no more after death'?"

"Brother Sāriputta, it was because of my ignorance that I held this wicked view; but now that I have listened to the High Doctrine of the venerable Sāriputta, I have abandoned that wicked view and completely understood the High Doctrine."

"But if others were to ask you, brother Yamaka, as follows: 'Brother Yamaka, the monk, who is a saint and delivered from the influences, what becomes of him on the dissolution of the body, after death?' what would you reply, brother Yamaka, if you were asked that question?"

"Brother, if others were to ask me thus, then I would reply, as follows: 'Brethren, the corporeal form was transitory and that which was transitory was painful and that which was painful has ceased and disappeared. The sen-

* Of course the five groups, as long as we adhere to them, are qualities belonging to us, but not *essential* qualities. They have nothing to do with our real essence. Accordingly there results the following: As long as I adhere to them I am of course not without them, but if I let them go, I am thereby not touched in my essence.—Later on, we shall speak more at length about this.

sation . . . perception . . . the activities of the mind . . . cognition was transitory, and that which was transitory was painful, and that which was painful has ceased and disappeared.' Thus would I reply, brother, if I were asked that question."

"Well said! well said! brother Yamaka. Come now, brother Yamaka, I will give you an illustration that you may still better comprehend this matter.

"Suppose, brother Yamaka, there were a householder, or a son of a householder, rich, wealthy, and affluent, and thoroughly well guarded, and some man were to become unfriendly, inimical and hostile to him, and were to wish to kill him. And suppose it were to occur to this man as follows: 'This householder, or son of a householder, is rich, wealthy, and affluent, and thoroughly well guarded. It would not be easy to kill him by violence. What if now I were to ingratiate myself with him and then kill him? And suppose he were to draw near to that householder, or son of a householder, and say as follows: 'Lord, I would fain enter your service.' And suppose the householder, or son of a householder, were to admit him into his service; and the man were to be his servant, rising before him and retiring after him, willing and obliging and pleasant spoken. And suppose the householder, or son of a householder, were to treat him as a friend, were to treat him as a comrade, and repose confidence in him. And suppose then, brother, that when that man judged that the householder, or son of a householder, had acquired thorough confidence in him, he were to get him into some secluded spot and kill him with a sharp weapon.

"What think you, brother Yamaka? When that man drew near to that householder, or son of a householder, and said as follows: 'Lord, I would fain enter your service,' was he not a murderer, though not recognized as such?"

"And also when he was his servant, rising before him and retiring after him, willing and obliging and pleasant spoken, was he not a murderer, though not recognized as such?

"And also when he got him into a secluded spot and killed him with a sharp weapon, was he not a murderer, though not recognized as such?"

"Even so, brother."

"In exactly the same way, brother, the ignorant, unconverted man, who is not a follower of noble diciples, not conversant with the Noble Doctrine, not disciplined in the Noble Doctrine, not a follower of good people, not conversant with the Doctrine held by good people, not trained in the Doctrine held by good people, not disciplined in the Doctrine held by good people, considers the corporeal form as himself, or himself as of the nature of the corporeal form, or the corporeal form as comprised in himself, or himself as comprised in the corporeal form. He considers the sensation . . . perception . . . the activities of the mind . . . cognition as himself, or himself as consisting in them, or themselves as comprised in himself, or himself as comprised in them.

"He does not recognize according to reality that the corporeal form is transitory. He does not recognize according to reality that sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are transitory.

"He does not recognize according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are painful.

"He does not recognize according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are not he himself.

"He does not recognize according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation, perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are produced.

"He does not recognize according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are murderers.*

"And he seeks after the corporeal form, attaches himself to it, and makes the affirmation that it is his Self. And he seeks after sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition, attaches himself to them, and makes the affirmation that they are his Self. And these five groups of grasping, sought after and become attached, long inure to his detriment and misery.

"But the learned and noble disciple, brother, who is a follower of noble disciples, conversant with the Noble Doctrine, disciplined in the Noble Doctrine, a follower of good people, conversant with the Doctrine held by good people, disciplined in the Doctrine held by good people, does not consider the corporeal form as himself, nor himself as of the nature of the corporeal form, nor the corporeal form as comprised in himself, nor himself as comprised in the corporeal form. He does not consider sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition as himself, nor himself as consisting in them, nor themselves as comprised in himself, nor himself as comprised in them.

"He recognizes according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are transitory.

"He recognizes according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are painful.

"He recognizes according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are not he himself.

"He recognizes according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are produced.

"He recognizes according to reality, that the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition are murderers.

"And he does not seek after the corporeal form ... sensation ... perception ... the activities of the mind ... cognition, nor attach himself to them, nor make the affirmation that they are his Self. And the not seeking after, the not becoming attached to these five groups of grasping, long inures to his well-being and happiness."[114]

Thus in this dialogue, in complete harmony with our exposition, it is presupposed as self-evident that the delivered saint exists, in whatever way he may do so. But on the other hand it is also made plain wherein he cannot possibly consist, that is, in the five groups constituting personality. The definitive

* This means, in regard to the illustration given before, he takes the five groups of grasping to be his friend, whereas they are in truth his enemy, bringing death to him.

annihilation of these five groups happens in death. Hence, to the saint the process we call death is nothing but the annihilation of those things that are, because they belong to this world, transitory, painful, produced and therefore do not form his real essence, his true Self. Only what is fundamentally alien to him has "come to annihilation." This relationship is fundamentally misunderstood by the ignorant, unconverted man, who brings the components of his personality into relation to his real essence, obstinately seeking them as if they were his Self. But just thereby he loses himself completely in his personality, so completely as to be entirely absorbed into it. Hence he looks upon himself as doomed to death: the five components of personality become a murderer bringing death to him, more especially a murderer of the state alone proper to us, of freedom from these five groups, a state which, as we shall see later on, is one of inexpressible peace. This thought, by the way, finds expression in those other words: "Whoso, O brethren, does not taste of the insight into the body, truly does not taste the imperishable. He alone who tastes the insight into the body, truly tastes the imperishable."[115]

Finally, the two following sayings of the Buddha may be quoted in which he solemnly announces the existence of the realm of freedom from suffering, that alone in truth is proper to us, and must therefore be looked upon as our real home:

"*There is*, ye monks, something not born, not due to causes, not made, not produced by creative activity. If, ye monks, this something not born, not due to causes, not made, not produced by creative activity, did not exist, then a getting out of this born, this due to causes, this made, this produced by creative activity could not be found. But because, ye monks, there is something not born, not due to causes, not made, not produced by creative activity, therefore a getting out of the born, the due to causes, the made, the produced by creative activity may be found.

"*There is*, ye monks, that realm where there is neither earth nor water, neither fire nor air, neither the realm of infinite space nor the realm of infinite consciousness, nor the realm of nothingness nor the realm of neither perception nor yet non-perception, neither this world nor the other one, nor both, neither moon nor sun. This, ye monks, I call neither coming nor going nor standing nor perishing nor originating. Without support, without progress, without basis is this; even this is the end of suffering.

"Verily, difficult to behold is the Not-self; for not easy to behold is truth."[116]

Thus man exists, independent of his personality, and also after it is annihilated: This is the tremendous culmination of the doctrine of the Buddha, which may be won to on the basis of our own intuitive insight.*

Though this fundamental verity of the Doctrine of the Buddha stands out in the sharpest outlines, nevertheless from the passages in the Discourses, already

* It may be won by seeing through the realm of the Not-self: "Difficult to behold verily, is the Not-self," namely, in its quality as not our Self.

quoted, we can see that the Buddha and his disciples obviously and deliberately evade making any positive statement as to the condition of the Perfected One after death, that is, after the personality is completely cast off, and thereby, as to our own essence independent of personality. Always and without exception they talk about it only in negative expressions; the Buddha even teaching that in a true monk not even the thought of the I should arise. This circumstance for people lacking understanding has become the chief argument for imputing to the Buddha the monstrosity of teaching the absolute annihilation of man upon the death of the saint, notwithstanding his repeated insistence that what perishes in death are only the components of the not-self. For him, however, who is able to follow the train of his thoughts, this declining of all and every positive definition of the real essence of man—what *we* name thus, is only the *apparent* man—is clear without further ado. The reason of this we already know. It lies in this, that the *true* man, as at the death of the saint he goes forth, entirely pure and liberated from all the stains of personality, is beyond the world and thereby in a realm forever inaccessible to knowledge. Thereby for knowledge he is nothing; but we must again lay stress upon his being nothing only for knowledge, that is, for seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking, his nothingness being thereby reduced to his being nothing *knowable*. But where the veil of nothingness sinks down upon knowledge, there every positive definition, even that of being, comes to an end; yea, there is even no room left for the mere word "I" in its positive form. A little reflection will make this clear.

Here we must again remember the basic elucidation which Schopenhauer has furnished on the origin of notions. According to him, they are nothing originally real, but only an artificial product of reason distilled from perception. Therefore their contents are only of things given in perception, that is, of the world of the senses. Therefore they can and may only be immanently, but never transcendently, used. This is, as a rule, generally overlooked even by those who have gained this insight abstractly, as far as the fundamental notions of the *I* and of *being* are concerned. Especially in regard to the notion of being holds good what Schopenhauer blames the Germans for: "Before certain words, such as *right, liberty, goodness, being* (this insignificant infinitive of the copula), the German becomes quite dizzy. Suddenly he gets into a sort of delirium and begins to utter empty, high-sounding phrases, stringing the vaguest and therefore the hollowest notions artificially together, instead of fixing his eyes upon reality and looking at the real things and relations from which those notions have been abstracted, and which therefore constitute their only true content".

Let us therefore soberly formulate the contents of the notion "being."

To give a judgment, means, to give or to deny a predicate to a subject. This relation of the predicate to the subject is expressed by the copula "it is—it is not." In this manner, more particularly every verb may be expressed by means of its participle. Therefore the meaning of the copula is that the predicate should be thought of as connected with the subject, and nothing more. Now all predi-

cates that can ever be attached to a subject are conditioned by experience, that means, every possible predicate is mediated through one of the six senses, and belongs to the sphere of one or other of these. For the six senses and their objects are, as we have seen, everything. The most general and ultimate predicates that may be given or denied to a subject are therefore seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking. Only to these fundamental predicates, therefore, may the copula "to be" ultimately relate: I am a seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching, thinking one. It makes no difference, if this is positively expressed, or if the copula seems to be used independently, thus: "I am, you are, he is," as it must be supplemented by "a seeing, hearing ... thinking one." At least the copula must attribute the latter predicate, thinking, to the subject, as: I think, therefore I am, *i. e.* a thinking one. If I annul all these predicates, more particularly, thinking, then the copula "to be" loses every content; it becomes "a mere word within the brain," to which nothing corresponds, that means, it becomes itself nothing. Now, the holy one in death does indeed throw away, together with the six organs of sense, all seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking. Accordingly it is senseless to declare him to be, simply because all being consists only in seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking.

But it would be just as wrong to declare the delivered saint *not* to be. Certainly, he is no more in being in the proper sense of the word, he is no more a seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking one, and thereby he has vanished so far as our powers of apprehension go, which are able to move only in this sixfold direction, and has become *nothing*. But as we saw above, this being which alone is comprehensible for us is not *being in itself*, but only a certain kind of being, just as our notion of Nothing is not an absolute, but only a relative nothing, only nothing for our apprehension. But man, from want of heedfulness identifying himself wholly and completely with that form of being, which consists in the six activities of the senses, is accustomed to take the notion of non-being not in its proper and correct meaning as a mere relative non-being, consisting in the absence of all sense activity, but as non-being in the absolute sense of the word, conceiving in the same manner the notion of nothing in its widest sense, as absolute nothing. Thus he extends the notions of nothing and non-being beyond the realm from which they are abstracted and for which therefore they only are valid. Instead of using them immanently, he uses them transcendently, and thus he arrives at the grave paralogism that with the ceasing of being consisting in the six activities of the senses, pure non-being, absolute nothingness takes place. To avoid this paralogism, we may not say that the redeemed saint is not, though he has become nothing to our apprehension.

The case, briefly, is as follows: The copula "to be" is the widest conception abstracted from experience, formed by reason for the purpose of giving or denying a predicate to the subject. Its application is therefore not permitted from the moment when a subject destitute of all predicates, that is, free from all seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching and thinking, comes into question. Because

here is no predicate at all that might be attributed to this mere subjective, even the copula "to be" which is merely meant to express that along with the subject some predicate must be thought, has no longer any meaning. But by becoming divested of its predicates, this subjective something, of course, does not itself become nothing, even though it may have ceased to exist as subject, that is, as bearer of these predicates, at least, not if, as here, all these predicates, as we have already seen, do not essentially belong to it and are therefore, at bottom, something alien to it. But we cannot any longer conceive it, because what we are able to conceive was nothing but these predicates from which it is now free.* Here, then, we find ourselves confronted by a kind of existence that in *our* sense is no longer existence, we have arrived at the portals of the uncognizable, the transcendental: No eye can see it, no ear hear it, no nose smell it, no tongue taste it, no touching touch it, no brain think it any more; and because the subjective within us thus lies beyond all perception—"there is an escape into the beyond of this sensual world"[117]—therefore no conception and consequently no word, fits it. The Buddha himself expounds this train of thought in the Dīghanikāya XV as follows: First, he explains that we cannot in any way assert our true self to consist in sensations, we cannot say that it is sentient in consequence of its inner essence, as sensations themselves again are conditioned through the sensual activities of the corporeal organism which obviously is alien to our essence, and are only generated through these activities, therefore only arise within us as something alien. After this, he speaks of the only possible assumption now remaining, namely, that our self must be free from sensations, and then proceeds in this strain: "To somebody, Ānanda, who said: 'Not within myself is the sensation, free from sensation is my self' it might be answered thus: 'But, friend, where there is no longer any sensibility, can there be an 'I am'?" To this question Ānanda answers: "Certainly not, Lord." Thus the Buddha here expressly declares that the copula "to be" possesses meaning only within the realm of sensations as within the realm of possible perception, the extremest, most comprehensive predicate that by its means can be brought into connection with the subject, being only sensation. If we have rid ourselves of sensation, it can no longer be said that our self *is*.**

* The apparatus of our faculty of apprehension is only adapted to these predicates and therefore exclusively directed towards them, thus, towards the external, towards the components of the *not*-self. Therefore it is incapable of casting light upon our own essence which stands behind them: "Outwards the Self-Existent bored the holes, therefore man may look outwards but not into the inner self." (Kathaka Upanishad 4, 1.)—The same thought is expressed by Schopenhauer as follows: "The I is the dark point in consciousness, as, on the retina it is exactly the entrance point of the optic nerve that is blind, as the brain itself is quite insensitive, as the body of the sun itself is dark, and as the eye sees everything with the exception of itself. Our faculty of apprehension *is wholly directed outwards* . . . Therefore everybody knows himself only as an individual . . . *But if he were able to become conscious of what he is besides and apart of this, he would willingly let go his individuality, and smile at the tenacity of his adherence to it.*"

** As regards the details of this deduction, the following is to be noted: "Sensation does not belong to me, therefore I have to abandon it," this is correct. "Therefore I am without

But if thus even the most all-embracing conception man is at all able to form, that of being, cannot be applied to our true essence, then naturally *every* view pertaining to it is recognized as inapplicable, even as impossible: "To say of a monk (already during lifetime inwardly) detached from his mind that he has the view: 'An Accomplished One is after death', or that he has the view: 'An Accomplished One is not after death', or that he has the view: 'An Accomplished One is and is not after death', or that he has the view: 'Neither is nor is not an Accomplished One after death', all this is inapplicable. And why so? So far, Ānanda, as a term reaches, so far as the path of the term reaches, so far as an explanation reaches, so far as the way of the explanation reaches, so far as a presentation reaches, so far as the way of the presentation reaches, so far as wisdom reaches, so far as the realm of wisdom reaches, so far as a circle extends, so far as a circle encircles: just so far the circle encircles.* Thus it is not applicable to say that a monk released in such knowledge no longer cognizes, no longer sees'." For the rest, there is only—silence:

"Om, Amitaya! measure not with words
Th'Immeasurable, nor sink the plumb of thought
Into the Fathomless! Who asks doth err,
Who answers, errs. Say naught!"[119]

Or, as it is said in the Canon itself: "As the flame swept away by force of the wind vanishes and cannot be designated by any word, just so the wise

sensations," this is already wrong, as there is a touch of something positive concealed in this sentence, namely: I am, though without sensations. We are only able to say: I must *become* without sensations; or: The saint has made himself free from sensation.

* This means: So far as the domain of views extends, so far can those views exist. Here, however, that domain is left behind.—Thus, especially unbecoming would be the view that the redeemed one remained at least identical with himself, thus, the conception of *identity:* Because of the redeemed one it cannot even be said, "He is;" therefore, still less can it be said: "He is something identical with himself." Neither is there anything at all identical with itself, within the world—personality, especially, is nothing of this kind—nor yet may my true essence be defined as such. For the conception of identity also, as abstracted from experience, presupposes a sequence of changes, and thereby at least two moments of time wherein something shall be identical with itself. But in the redeemed one all change, and therewith also, time, has been done away. As long as he is alive, certainly there is present the *appearance* of something identical with itself, because in his innermost depth he remains untouched by the succession of changes. But that this is indeed only seeming, and that, even during the lifetime of the Delivered One, in the strictest sense, there can be no talk of a persisting in itself, becomes clear at his death, from which time onward, because of the ceasing of all time, the very expression "to persist" has no more meaning. Thereby it is established that even in his lifetime also he cannot have been a persisting being in the strict meaning of the word, death not having touched him but only the component parts of his not-self. Therefore also the conception of persistence or of identity is not to the point; the fact itself can always only be correctly characterized by negative expressions, such as "changeless," "deathless." Very acute, and quite in the sense of the Buddha, are Schelling's remarks on this point: "In so far as the I is eternal, it has no duration at all; for duration can only be thought of in relation to objects. We speak of the eternity of duration, of sempiternity, that is, of an existence lasting through all time, but eternity in its pure sense (*aeternitas*) is existence *outside of time. The pure and original form of eternity lies within the I.*"

delivered from the organism (*nāmakāya*) vanishes, and cannot be designated by any word.

"For him who has gone home there is no measure; that whereby he might be designated no longer exists; where all phenomena have ceased, there also all possibilities of naming are gone."* [120]

"Is there, O Brother, something different left, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind?"

"Just leave it alone, brother."

"Is there nothing left, O Brother, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind?"

"Just leave it alone, brother."

"Is there, O Brother, something different left and something different not left, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind?"

"Just leave it alone, brother."

"Or, is there, O Brother, neither something different left nor something different not left, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind?"

"Just leave it alone, brother."

"To my question 'Is there, O Brother, something different left, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind' you reply: "Just leave it alone, brother." To my question: 'Is there nothing left, O Brother, after the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind' you reply: 'Just leave it alone, brother.' To my question: 'Is there, O Brother, something different left and something different not left—or neither something different left nor something different not left, after the six realms of contact

* If we consider that what is called god—at least in so far as this god is internally experienced, — is nothing but our own innermost essence, as becomes especially clear in reading the Christian mystics, then without further ado we shall perceive the entire consonance of the following words of Schopenhauer with our foregoing exposition: "Of such a god we can have no other theology than that which Dionysius Areopagita gives in his Theologia Mystica, which consists merely in the explanation that about god all predicates may be denied, but not a single one may be affirmed, because he is beyond all being and all knowledge. Dionysius calls this 'the Beyond,'—the Buddha speaking of the 'other shore' and describes it as something entirely inaccessible to our knowledge. This theology is the only true one, only it contains nothing at all. It expressly tells and teaches nothing, and consists only in the declaration that it knows this very well, and that it cannot be otherwise."

Compare, for the rest, the following words of Angelus Silesius:

"I am a blissful thing, a non-thing tho' I be;
To everything that is, 't is an unknown mystery,"

as also the passage from Merswin's *Book of the Nine Rocks:* "Tell me, my darling, how do they talk about these men, or how are these men called who have seen into their origin?"—"I will tell you. You must know that these men have lost their names and have become nameless, forever removed from the ocean of this world,"—the Saṁsāra.

have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind' you reply: 'Just leave it alone, brother.' But how, O Brother, shall the meaning of these words be understood?"

"To say: 'After the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind, then there is something different left,'—this, O Brother, would mean to explain something inexplicable. To say: 'After the six realms of contact have been annihilated without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind, nothing is left—something different is left and something different is not left— neither something different is left nor something different is not left,' this would mean to explain something inexplicable. As far, O Brother, as the six realms of contact extend, just as far extends the expanse of the world (papañca); and as far as the expanse of the world extends, just as far do the six realms of contact extend. With the annihilation of the six realms of contact without a remainder and without leaving a trace behind, O Brother, the expanse of the world is extinguished, the expanse of the world comes to rest."[121]

"Does, O Reverend One, a Perfected One exist beyond death?"

"The Exalted One, O Mahārāja, has not revealed that a Perfected One exists beyond death."

"Thus, a Perfected One does not exist beyond death, O Reverend One?"

"Neither this, O Mahārāja, has the Exalted One revealed, that a Perfected One does not exist beyond death."

"Thus Reverend One, a Perfected One exists beyond death and at the same time does not exist beyond death—or neither exists beyond death, nor does not exist beyond death?"

The answer was always the same: "The Exalted One has not revealed this."*

"But what is the cause, Reverend One, what is the reason, why the Exalted One has not revealed this?"

"Your Majesty, let me now put a question to yourself," the nun answered, "and as it seems good to your Majesty, so do you make answer. What do you think, O Mahārāja, have you got a calculator or a mint-master or a teller, who might be able to count the sands of the Ganges, who might be able to say: 'So many grains of sand, or so many hundreds or thousands of grains of sand are there'?"

"That have I not, Reverend One."

"Or have you got a calculator, or a mint-master, or a teller who might be able to measure the water of the great Ocean, who might be able to say: So many quarts of water, or so many hundreds or thousands or hundreds of thousands of quarts of water are contained therein?"

"That have I not, Reverend One."

"And why not?"

"Because the great ocean is deep, immeasurable, unfathomable."

* He only revealed that he is not touched by death.

„Even so is it, O Mahārāja, if you wish to understand the essence of a Perfected One according to the predicates of corporeality, of sensation, of perception, of the activities of the mind, of cognition. In a Perfected One, this corporeality, this sensation, this perception, these activities of the mind, this cognition would be extinguished, their root would be annihilated, like a palm-tree it would be cut off and flung away, so that it would not be able to develop again in future time. The Perfected One, O Mahārāja, is free from this, that his essence might be counted with numerals of the corporeal world: *he is deep, immeasurable, unfathomable like the great ocean.* That a Perfected One exists beyond death, does not apply; that a Perfected One does not exist beyond death, does not apply; that a Perfected One neither exists nor does not exist beyond death, neither does this apply."[122]

In short: Nothing in the world any longer applies. A Perfected One in his purity, rid of the dross of his personality, thus beyond death, is something uncognizable, is inscrutable; but he exists, he still is, namely, something inscrutable. Certainly, in attaining this result, the firm ground that supports all our knowledge, the apprehensible, seems to tremble and give way, just because it lies beyond this. Nevertheless it indicates to us the direction in which the thing apprehended lies hidden, the thing itself remaining veiled inasmuch as it does not enter apprehension, and therefore to this appears as nothing.

And because it appears to ordinary apprehension as nothing, therefore there is no longer any room left even for the mere *thought* of the *I* in its positive form. For thoughts may only be aroused by objects of apprehension, which latter are all not the *I*. But as a matter of fact, no thought oftener arises in us than that of *I*, nay, it accompanies all our thoughts as the logical *I*: *I* see, *I* hear, and so on. Therefore it is just as essential to become clear as to the origin and content of this thought of *I* as it was essential to come to clearness about the thought of *being*.

This is only possible, if we may at least temporarily reach the height of insight gained by a Perfected One, who enjoys the view of *anattā* in its entire purity. Let us imagine him sitting in deepest seclusion in some lonely place, having dismissed the entire outer world from his mind and in the highest degree of concentration holding it directed exclusively upon the machinery of his personality, thus remaining in contemplation of the origin and dissolution of the five groups of grasping: "Such is the body, such is the origin of the body, such is the dissolution of the body; such is sensation, such is the origin of sensation, such is the dissolution of sensation; such is perception, such is the origin of perception, such is the dissolution of perception; such are the activities of the mind, such is the origin of the activities of the mind, such is the dissolution of the activities of the mind; such is cognition, such is the origin of cognition, such is the dissolution of cognition."[123] Where, in such contemplation, is room left for the *I*? From this standpoint the whole machinery of personality shows itself to be merely a whirl of processes, which to the spectator seem something so alien to his essence, that in regarding them, "temptations to think in the form of 'I'

and 'Mine'"* no longer arise, but within him, even in regard to his apprehending activity itself, the only thoughts aroused discharge themselves in the great formula: "This does not belong to me, this am I not, this is not my self."

In quite another manner does the "uninstructed man of the world" behave in regard to the machinery of his personality. He feels himself so intimately interwoven with it, or, as the Buddha says "the inclination to believe in personality adheres to him" to such an extent that he imagines himself to consist entirely in it. Therefore in observing the incessant origination and dissolving of the five groups, he imagines that he sees himself incessantly originating and dissolving; and accordingly he says: "*I* originate, *I* dissolve, *I* feel, *I* perceive," and so on.

Thus we arrive at the thought of our *I* only if we see ourselves bound up with the five groups of grasping, that is, bound up with our personality, and then lose ourselves in them, incapable of opposing ourselves to them with estranged regard:

"If, ye disciples, something is there, if we grasp something, if we are devoted to something, then this doctrine originates: 'This is my *I*, this is the world, and this my *I* will become permanent after my death, will be lasting, existing on, immutable.'—If, ye disciples, the body is there, if we grasp the body, if we are devoted to the body, then this doctrine originates: 'This—[that is, the body]—is my *I*, this is the world, and this my *I*—[therefore the body]—will after my death become permanent, lasting, existing on, immutable.'

"If sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition are there, if we grasp sensation, perception, the activities of the mind, cognition, if we are devoted to them, then this doctrine originates: 'This—[meaning sensation, perception, the activities of the mind and cognition]—is my *I*, this is the world, and this my *I* will, after my death, become permanent, lasting, existing on, immutable.'

"What do you think, ye disciples: Is the body, sensation, perception, are the activities of the mind, is cognition, permanent or transient?"—"They are transient, O Lord."—"But what is transient, is this painful or pleasurable?"—"Painful, O Lord."—"Now if we do not grasp what proves itself to be transient, painful, subject to all vicissitudes—may then this doctrine arise: 'This—[personality as the totality of the five groups]—is my *I*, this is the world, and this my *I* will become after my death permanent, lasting, existing on, immutable'?"—"Certainly not, O Lord."**

* ahankāra-mamankāra-mān 'ānusayo.

** The same idea as is also expressed in the following passage, is often misunderstood: "If, monks, there were the I, would it not also be (possible to say): 'Belonging to my I?'"—"It would, Lord."—"But since, ye monks, the I, and anything belonging to the I, is not to be found really and truly what of the theory: 'This is the world, this is the I, this I shall become in death, permanent, stable, lasting, existing on, ever the same?' Is not such an idea an utterly and entirely foolish idea?" "How should it not be an utterly and entirely foolish idea?" (Majjh. N. 22nd. Discourse.)

As results from this passage, the Buddha does not say: "The I *is* not—this he positively declines to do; but he here again says that at all events the conception of being cannot

According to this, the *I*-idea is based upon a misunderstanding of our relation to our personality, having its origin ultimately in the fact that in the subjective —it will be noticed that this word also is only a term indicating *the direction* in which our transcendent self may be sought—or in the inexplicable, or in the inscrutable, or in nothing—all merely tautologies—in a manner that will be treated later on, the psycho-physical process begins which we call personality, and therewith at the same time the illusion originates, that this process in its several activities, as seeing, hearing and so on, is essential to the subjective, and constitutes the activity of its own *essence*. This delusion makes the subjective, or our transcendent self, the subject, more accurately the "subject of inherence," and, doing so, makes it the *empirical*, and thereby the *logical*, *I*. Now we never say, as we ought to do in harmony with truth, looking down upon all processes as upon something alien: "There arise movements of breath, there arises a sensation, there arises a thought," but: "*I* breathe, *I* feel, *I* think," meaning thereby, as expounded above: "I am *essentially* a breathing being, a feeling being, a thinking being." Our true self, which really lies behind those processes, is thus at once regarded as consisting in them, they are thought to belong *essentially* to it, and we then have nothing but the conceptual *reflection* of this wrong *view* when it is itself made the subject, and thus the bearer of the predicates so erroneously attributed to it. Thus the self thought of in the *I*-idea is our transcendent self, in so far as it is made the subject, that means, the bearer of the predicates, and is regarded as consisting in them. If we come to the true view of recognizing everything as *anattā* and thereby denying every predicate to our self, then in that moment the self ceases to be the subject, ceases from its introduction by means of the *I*-idea into the world of experience. It vanishes again into nothing, in the sense sufficiently explained above.

But, of course, it nevertheless remains true that I am bound to my personality, and further, it remains true that I am using the machine of the six senses and thereby producing consciousness. In this sense, as of attributes *not essential* to us, a Perfected One also may certainly think and say: "*I* possess this body, *I* feel," and so on. But at the culmination of pure insight he has overcome the

be applied to the I, for the reason that the I cannot be *found out*. And because the I cannot be found out, and therefore does not at all exist in the world, therefore of course it can neither be "permanent, lasting, existing, ever the same." For these conceptions also designate nothing but a certain state *within* the world.—The reality of the I is further also fixed in the course of the quoted twenty-second Discourse of the Majj. Nik. with all emphasis, in the grand elaboration of the simile in which the Buddha confronts us with our entire personality which he shows to be as entirely foreign to us as the branches and grasses of a forest are.

The supra-mundaneness of the *I* is very clearly shown in the two following passages: "The empty world, the empty world, they say, Lord. But why, Lord, do they say so?"—"Because the world is empty of the I and of anything belonging to the I, therefore, Ānanda, they say, 'the empty world.'"[124] "It is impossible and cannot be that a correctly cognizing man should look upon anything as the I,—such a thing cannot happen. But it is certainly possible that an average man should look upon something as the I."[125]

form of thinking with the *I* as subject, also in this justified domain, the case presenting itself to him as follows: First, he perceives the fact of his being coupled up with the components of his personality which are essentially foreign to him, and further, he definitely perceives that the totality of the processes of personality emanate from himself. For the rest, however, he perceives that, since he is not able to penetrate with his insight to his real self, neither can he definitely determine the nature of his coupling up with his personality, since this also takes place in those inscrutable depths. In these depths, no longer accessible to apprehension, *the actuation* of the machine of the six senses also goes on. Therefore we can neither perceive how we set the heart, the lungs or other organs in motion, nor even which nerves and muscles we use in hearing, seeing, thinking: the vegetative functions as well as the sensitive ones being performed below the threshold of consciousness, the light of consciousness lit up by the sensitive functions being thrown only upon the machine already in activity. From this it follows that thinking entirely adapted to reality neither troubles about the self as such, nor about its connections with personality, because it is unable directly to apprehend anything of this. It occupies itself solely with the material processes of the personality as such, which alone may be apprehended. In short: thinking that is entirely adapted to reality does not occupy itself with *the subject* of cognition which is absolutely inaccessible to the faculty of cognition, but only with *the objects* of this cognizing faculty which alone may be cognized. But with these also, it only troubles in so far as their relation to this subject of cognition may be determined *from themselves*, which determining ultimately issues in this, that all these objects stand in no kind of *essential* relation to the *I*. On this height of insight we therefore only may think thus: "This originates, this perishes; this shall originate, this shall perish." That *I* am the one who is thinking and creating all this, never occurs to my consciousness as a self-evident thing, or at least only in the form of the *anattā*-thought, thus, only in the negative form that everything cognizable in no case has anything to do with my *essence*. We really have no *self*-consciousness, but only consciousness of what is *not* our self.*

Certainly, this perfectly objective thinking, strictly limiting itself to the *objects* of apprehension, in which therefore reflection does not go a hair's breadth beyond intuition, can only be cultivated in hours of meditative contemplation. If we wish to share our insight with others, then we must again think and speak, in taking the *I* as subject, if only in order to distinguish our own experiences from those of others. Thus did the Buddha. For the time of meditative contemplation he taught entirely objective thinking, but for the rest, the form of thinking having the *I* for its subject, as far as this imperfect form of thinking is at

* Whereas the saint has lost the *I*-thought, the child has not yet come up to it. It calls itself as it hears itself called by others, which proves that it only recognizes its personality as an object.—If a saint with his full supreme knowledge should suddenly be transferred into the world, without fellow-creatures with whom he was forced to speak, and should form a language for himself, the word "I" would not occur at all in this language.

least not directly contrary to reality. But even this last-named defect he had to accept into the bargain, since language has completely conformed itself to the fundamental error of mankind that we consist in the elements of our personality, in so much that we say for example: "I *am* a man, I *am* this one or that one."* But, once for all, he guarded his standpoint by making this general reservation: "These are only current expressions, used also by the Perfected One, *but with due reserve.*"[126]

For the rest, as may be seen from the passage just given, and as we have repeatedly noticed, he calls the true man who has freed himself from the elements of his personality, and thereby from personality itself and so, from the entire world, hence, above all, himself—*the Perfected One*, Tathāgata. Hence, it makes no difference, if at first he remains in external connection with the elements of his personality, or if he throws them entirely away in death: in both cases he is the Perfected One, only, in the first case *before*, in the other one *after*, death. In the latter case, he is the Perfected One in his complete purity, entirely free from the taints of his personality which alone had made him visible to us, as pure glass is only made visible by the spots of dirt lying upon it. His death therefore has for sole consequence that, in completely divesting himself of his body, he becomes invisible to men: "As long as his body shall exist, gods and men will behold him; but after the dissolution of the body, after the end of his life, gods and men shall behold him no more. As, ye monks, when the stalk of a bunch of mango fruits is cut off from the tree, all the mango fruits hanging on the stalk will follow it, even so also, O monks, is it with the body of the Perfected One, whose will to live is annihilated. As long as his body still exists, gods and men will behold him; but after the dissolution of his body, after the end of his life, gods and men will behold him no more."**[127]

* *
*

We shall now understand how right the Buddha was in admonishing us to seek for our self,*** his admonition being identical with the inscription of the temple

* The possibility of this delusion is based upon the inaccessibility of our true essence to apprehension: I may come to any view about myself, because all are equally wrong.

** Be it noted: The body of the Perfected One with its sensations and perceptions is compared to the bunch of mango fruits, his will to live to the stalk of this bunch, but the Perfected One himself to *the stem* of the mango tree, that is not touched by cutting off the bunch. Compare Rigveda-saṃhitā X, 136,3: "The bodies only in our stead—ye sons of earth may there behold."—

To the question: "What shall I be, when once as a saint I have passed through the last death, have laid aside the last body?" we might reply thus: "Exactly the same as you are now. But what are you now? Can you tell me, since all the components of your personality are *not* your self, *anattâ*? Only try to define yourself, bearing in mind this fact! It will be impossible to you, for even now you are something inscrutable."

*** Compare above: "What may be better, ye youths, to seek for the woman, or to seek for your *I*?"

at Delphi: "Know yourself!" For everything we took till now to be our I, proved itself in the "befitting search for the state beyond,"[128] shown to us by the Master, to be *not* the *I*. Thus at last there remained for our true *I* nothing of the world and thereby no possibility of understanding it in any way. Further meditation in this direction would therefore be stupid, hence the Master explicitly declares that no reasonable man "dwells in such contemplations."[129] Thereby we recognize the word *I* as the greatest equivoque existing, as Schopenhauer says. Everybody understands it to be something else; this one, as all the components of his personality; the other, as only the so-called spiritual elements of the same; a third, as consisting only of thinking; whereas we have recognized it to be transcendent in *every* direction.

In this manner we have, step by step, certainly come to an entire subversion of all conceptions. Before this, we regarded ourselves as belonging to the world, to the universe, consisting of its own elements. Hence, we felt at home in the world, and Nothing, as being the contrary of Everything, meant for us the total annihilation of the universe, as also of ourselves. We therefore shrunk back from it as from the abyss that would forthwith devour us. Now we have understood the world to be essentially foreign to our deepest self. We see ourselves in some inexplicable manner involved in it, so that it is to us in all its details an inscrutable riddle, saving only the suffering it makes for us, which is the only thing we cannot doubt:

"Mysterious is everything,
Only one thing not, and that our pain."

This entire inversion of the manner of the saint of looking at the world, as compared with that of the average man, is hinted at by the Master himself, when he says: "What in the world is regarded as true, ye monks, that by the saints is regarded as false, as it really is, rightly, in accordance with perfect wisdom. What in the world is regarded as false, ye monks, that by the saints is regarded as true, as it really is, rightly, in accordance with perfect wisdom."[130]

To illustrate this his inversion, we reproduce the beautiful simile wherein Du Prel in his "Enigma of Man" describes the situation of mankind, a simile which is true in a much deeper sense than its author himself suspected.

"Let us imagine the following case: On a ship sailing in the Pacific a sailor is put into hypnotic trance. It is suggested to him that he is to sleep till evening and then awaken without any recollection of his past. This suggestion having been strongly impressed upon him, the sailor is carried into a boat and landed upon a small island of the ocean, the ship sailing away at full speed.

"Upon awakening, this sailor would be entirely like a new-born babe, with this difference only that he would have come into his world as a full-grown and rational being. He would commence his existence as a man. In vain, however, would he think and meditate as to who he is and how he came into this environment so completely strange to him. Without the least memory of his past, he would thus be astonished, even terrified at himself and the place in which he had awakened, so that he might easily become a melancholiac.

"As far as his sight reaches, the ocean extends,—a sight he believes never to have beheld before. He turns inland in order to get some idea of where is on his island, but everything seems strange to him; he does not remember to have ever seen things of this kind: plants and animals, mountains, and the clouds flitting over them. At last he catches sight of creatures like himself; he hurries towards them to get some information, but they are all in the same inexplicable condition; they do not know who they are, nor whence they have come.

"A company of men in such a curious situation would be devoured with anxious pondering about themselves and their island; but all their thinking and mutual questions would never explain the inscrutable fate that had brought them there. With a mixture of keen admiration and deep astonishment they would see the sun sink down, as a spectacle never seen before, spanning the ocean with a luminous bridge of floods of gold, and boundless again would be their astonishment, when thousands of stars began to shine in the dark sky.

"By and by, of course, the wants of the body would draw them away from their meditations. Hunger and thirst, weariness and sleep appear; the inclemency of the weather compels them to look about for shelter, and thus on this island would begin the most curious Robinson Crusoe existence that can be imagined. For Robinson Crusoe brought memories of civilization with him to his island, whereas our colonists have had to think out and invent everything themselves.

"It is unnecessary to depict the situation further; and it is also immaterial, whether hypnotical emptying of the brain actually can go so far—but experiments of this kind have been made—that awakening out of trance may be fully the same as being newly born. Nevertheless I have not spoken of entirely imaginary things. The island of which I have told is called *earth*; the ocean surrounding it is called *space;* the creatures meeting each other on the island are called *men;* and the wearisome "Robinsonade" they go through is called *the history of human civilisation.*

"Indeed, if we reflect with any degree of heedfulness upon our own situation on earth, the comparison with those inhabitants of the island tallies at all points, with the exception of one: we do not awaken with a ready-formed consciousness as full-grown beings, but with undeveloped consciousness as helpless creatures. As this is the only difference, it depends only on this point that we behave quite otherwise than do these island inhabitants. These awaken as deep-thinking philosophers. For a philosopher is one who is able to wonder at his own existence and at that of the world. But during childhood we become so accustomed to the appearance of things and to our own existence that, far from perturbing us, they seem to us as self-evident things. And when our consciousness does attain to ripeness, through the blunting power of habit it is no longer capable of wonder, and so, through our whole life we go, entirely absorbed by practical occupations."

The Buddha, in teaching us to consider our situation with thoughtful heedfulness, has given back to us this capacity for wonder in fullest measure, so

that we again feel ourselves as strangers in the world, as strangers even in our own body, as strangers in regard to everything we call our personality. He has given us, indeed, very much more, for as his disciples, even now we no longer share the fate of all the other inhabitants of the island who may perhaps feel themselves strangers on their island, but do not know who they are and where they came from. For we, even now, know at least this much, that the ocean, flowing round the universe wherein we find ourselves placed, the ocean of *Nothingness*, contains "the island, the unique,"[130a] from which we were driven out into the universe. For we have recognized in this nothing that we dreaded so much at first, the dark womb wherein our real essence, our eternal home, is hidden. *Attham̐ gata*, he who went home, the deceased saint is called.* Now we understand that in fearing this "Nothing" so much, we resemble children, who, though living in a comfortless region, look, full of fear and trembling, upon the immense dark forest that stretches out before them, and cannot be brought by any inducement to enter it, while, all the time, behind it, in the midst of green meadows, bathed in smiling sunshine stands their parents' house from which they set out at first. But if it has once become clear to these children that through this dark forest lies the way that leads to their home, then its hitherto uncanny stillness changes for them into mysterious silence, and the forest becomes for them the great hope of their life. So also for us, the *nothing* that we regarded so long as the measureless black pall spread over the abyss of absolute annihilation into which every living being must one day fall, now becomes the mysterious veil that lies over our own innermost essence. We only need to go behind it to escape the sufferings of Saṁsāra forever. Then we disappear for the world by becoming, as sufficiently explained, nothing cognizable, that is, nothing for it, but not nothing for ourselves. On the contrary we leave the world, in leaving behind the only thing still belonging to it, our corpse,—everything else we long before threw at its feet—and thus we proceed "to the glory of our Self," a word not used by the Buddha,** but this, not because of its being false, but because, according to what in our previous pages we have been saying, it might give rise only too easily to misinterpretations, in consequence of its relation to personality. But as we have done our best to exclude the possibility of such misinterpretations, we may without fear make use of it. If understood, as we have learnt to take it, it tells us the same story as the Master's own words: "Liberated of what we call body, sensation, perception, mentations, consciousness, the Perfected One is deep, immeasurable, unfathomable, like the ocean." This his inscrutable essence the saint enters, to it he withdraws, in it he rests.***

* Suttanipāta, v. 1076, whereas in the Dhammapada, v. 402, the redeemed one is called "he who crosses out of his fetters."

** It is taken from the Laws of Manu (12; 91), where it is said: "Thus he enters, lighting the sacrifice to the Self, to the own glory of his Self."

*** The words of Manu given above are, as to their contents, identical with the word dealt with later on, as spoken by Sāriputta, the greatest disciple of the Master: "Bliss is the Nibbāna, bliss is the Nibbāna." Instead of the words of Manu, we might say just as well, we enter the state of bliss.

Thus the great question, as to whether, having regard to our relation to suffering, it is not impossible to escape from it, is solved: It is possible. For suffering is rooted in the structure of the world, being as a whole, as well as in all its component parts, in an eternally fluid condition, subject to the great law of transitoriness. This world is the world of our six senses which we experience *in* our personality and *as* our personality. But personality in its elements is something alien to our true essence. From this alien thing we only need to free ourselves to become at the same time free from the whole world of suffering, and thereby from the suffering of the world, that is, from suffering altogether. The possibility of this liberation the Buddha expressly asserts in the following passage: "It is not, O disciples, as if liberation from corporeality, from sensation, from perception, from mentation, from consciousness, could not be attained, for then creatures could not liberate themselves from corporeality, from sensation, from perception, from mentation, from consciousness. But because there really is, O disciples, liberation from corporeality, from sensation, from perception, from mentation, from consciousness, therefore creatures do liberate themselves from corporeality, from sensation, from perception, from mentation, from consciousness."[131]

But this insight, fundamental as it is, is not yet sufficient. For now the other great question arises: How can this liberation be realized? How can we vanquish our personality and the whole world and reach that realm, our own proper realm, "where there is neither birth nor sickness nor becoming old nor dying, nor woe, sorrow, suffering, grief and despair," and so, putting this statement to the test, by visible evidence prove ourselves to be beyond the world and all its suffering? It is clear that if the Buddha is able to answer exhaustively this question also, he has indeed bestowed upon mankind the greatest benefit that can ever be bestowed upon it.

Whether he succeeded, let what follows, show.