

Avijja & Monistic Emanationism in original Buddhist doctrine

By Ken Wheeler copyright

What is avijja (agnosis) specifically? To refer to said term as merely 'ignorance' is a misnomer. This very short exposition of the lost and metaphysical meaning of avijja is meant to expose the philosophical and secret ontological significance that the term avijja refers to in the cosmological model of original Buddhism, Platonism, and encompassing both (these Monistic systems), that of Emanationism, the only true model of totality.

Avijja is literally meant Emanationism, the extrinsic attribute of the Absolute which is the indefinite dyad (aoristos dyas) for all creation, if the Absolute were devoid of an attribute, creation would be impossible, for even the most simplex of things have at least one attribute, the illumination of light and fluidity of water, for example (both attributes of a simplex principle). From the perspective of the Absolute, the very 'stuff' of will (citta/Brahman), there is no attribute, it is will utterly and only; as such the nature of the Absolute and its 'act' must be wholly indistinguishable, otherwise the presupposition of two subjects, the Absolute and X, would be posited and the very premise of Monism (Monism in meaning = 1 only) and of Emanationism would be utterly negated.

Avijja is a compound term composed of the privative A (not, opposite to, other than, lack of) and VIJJA (Light, Soul, Atman, Brahman). The very nature of the Absolute (vijja), which is objectively directed (a) away from its very Subject (vijja/Brahman), which is also that very same nature of the Atman ("Atman is [of the nature of] Brahman"-Up, and Buddhism: 'Brahmabhutena attano').

The confusion over avijja lies in the fact that it is both subjectively and objectively directed simultaneously. Avijja itself being the "light from itself (directed)" is meant that avijja has the Subjective (Self and Absolute) as its object, namely the concealment or privation (a) of the Subject (Atman) from itself. Avijja is objectification by its very definition, i.e. Emanationism. The object of avijja is the Absolute (the light, or vijja, from itself, a), meaning that the Subject, the Absolute, is self-objectifying, i.e. the very nature of will (citta, chit, Brahman) itself, being 'to will', not to itself, but to other. Avijja is itself objectification (by the Subject to other), but the very lack of (a) wisdom (vijja) in the will of a being is as pertains its nature, the Subject to which avijja is the very object of.

Brahman is Atman, and Atman is of the nature of Brahman and in no doubt the very premise of both the Upanishads and of original Buddhism, the only differentiation between the two is Atman is devoid of the objectively directed attribute of Brahman, such that the Atman is self-reflexive and self-assimilative, i.e. completely dis-objectified = self-actualization,... the actualization (Atman) of what was before merely potential due to the objectively (avijja) directed nature of the Absolute. Atman is the actualization (by wisdom, self-assimilation) of Brahman which is sheer potential and unmediated (avijja).

Just as one cannot differentiate light from its attribute (to illumine), neither can the nature of the Absolute be thought different or a separate entity from its attributive or extrinsic principle, that of self-objectification, that will wills (citta cetasa). Agnosis is Emanationism itself, the objectively directed "light" from itself to other. Avijja is not a thing itself, but a privation, the uncaused cause for all becoming (bhava).

Unlike Creationism which posits a sentient all-aware Superbeing (God) as the principle (1st cause) behind the complexity we see in nature, Emanationism differs to the logic necessity of merely the extrinsic side of the nature of the Absolute as such that it is, by its very attribute, the "unmoved Mover" behind all things composite, phenomenal and noetic. Complexity in nature and the cosmos at large is in dispute by none, neither by Creationist, Nihilist, or Monist (Emanationist), only the nexus for said complexity is disputed. As pertains the Absolute, its nature and activity are inseparably one thing only, this is the long lost 'secret' behind avijja.

There is no first cause behind the phenomenal cosmos nor for the spiritual, the noetic will(s) which encircle and underlies the visible world. With attribute as 'cause', all things are manifest as the artifice (maya) of the visible world we covet in ignorance (avijja). First cause necessitates an irreconcilable duality, which cannot be enjoined in Emanationism, that A: something other than the Absolute is cause for all things become, or that B: the Absolute is complex being (God) that chose and created the cosmos. The reconciliation of the ignorant proposition of a "first cause for all things become" is merely that of the attributive and extrinsic nature of the Absolute itself, avijja, or the will to other, the 'lighting outwards of the nature of light itself', or as is meant here, the Absolute, which is of the nature of will (citta).

"Bhavanirodha nibbanam" (subjugation of becoming is meant Nirvana) is absolutely identical in meaning to "Yoga chita vritti nirodha" (Yoga [samadhi/assimilation] is the subjugation of the will's [citta] turnings/ manifestations/ perturbations); as such becoming (bhava) and vritti (perturbations) are meant the inchoate nature of the will to objectively direct itself in perpetuity is the beginningless and the primordial principle of the Absolute to other. Overcoming the attributive privation of the Subject to have itself as an object (an impossibility) must be surmounted for liberation to occur such that the Subject has itself as object indirectly thru the via negativa methodology wherein the will 'knows' itself as 'none of this' and becoming is halted and Self-objectification ceases (nirodha).

Avijja and anatta (Skt. Anatman) are interchangeable terms, the principle of the Absolute to objectification (a-vijja) is meant anatta, for what is other than the Atman, the Light/Vijja than all the 22 named phenomena which are not (a/an) the Soul (vijja/atman)? The finer distinction however between anatta and avijja is that anatta is the purely phenomenal manifestation of the ontological attribute of the Absolute, avijja.

How can what does not exist in anyway be the cause for all things and namely for suffering itself? Surely as a man lost in a barren dessert suffers thirst by the non-existence of waters in said barren lands; so too does the Samsarin (person lost in samsara) suffer at the 'hands' of his will which is objectively (avijja) directed to the world of phenomena and sense pleasures, all of which are anatman and which is meant by the very term avijja, for avijja is the privation of illumination/revelation/ditthi in the being as relates to his very nature and true Self, of which the Atman is vijja. That his will (the very Self) is objectively (anatta) directed, instead of Subjectively assimilated (vijja, Atman), "therein does he suffer" -Gotama. Liberation via wisdom (vijjavimutta, i.e. pannavimutta) is the

actualization of the light of the will upon itself (vijja) instead of, as primordially and without beginning from the Absolute, objectively (avijja) directed.

Avidya (avijja Pali) has befuddled (and continues to do so) Vedantists now for thousands of years as witnessed to in lively debates we still have record of. Namely it was impossible for them to come to odds with the nature of avidya, such that “how can what is mere privation (lack of gnosis, avidya) be the cause for all things? Was Avidya real or unreal? Was it both or neither? What is the locus of avijja? Is it the Absolute, or the Atman, or the mere (phenomenal) self, or neither, or both?” None of these questions are tenable, for avijja is not a thing in itself, but the principle of the Absolute, the primordial principle antecedent to being, or the empirical principle of avijja as manifest in the composite being. What would the locus of a shadow, the privation of light, be? Certainly we can point to X shadow, but that cannot be the locus of avijja, for something precedes the shadow, so would it be that which casts the shadow? No, for that shape which casts the shadow is preceded by the light which is blocked by that shape. The shadow belongs neither to the form nor the light, but is the objective construct of both. Avijja is subjectively directed and objectively manifest.

Since avijja is merely the extrinsic and Subjective attribute of the will (willing to other [object] = avijja), there is no locus for avijja, for if one were to say: “avijja is the attributive principle of the Absolute, therefore avijja’s locus is the Absolute/Brahman”, this is a nonsensical statement since the locus for illumination (avijja) as pertains light, is also unanswerable since neither the object of illumination, nor the light itself is the locus of illumination. Avijja is act, nature and necessity of the Absolute, all three, for its as impossible to separate illumination from light as to separate willing from will, or avijja from vijja, for avijja implies vijja, just as anatta implies the attan! Would so the fool speak of avijja or anatta without attempting to (in negative dialectics) point to the vijja, the attan (Atman. Skt.)?

Avijja has no meaning outside the conjunct of will and matter, the empirical consciousness (vinnana). The very nature of the Light (vijja) is its outwardly principle to illumine (avijja), principle nor privation have a locus. The Absolute, or Brahman is most certainly vijja, simplex in every way, so to proclaim that the locus of avijja is “in the Absolute” would be both untrue but also illogical. Light (vijja) and illumination (avijja) are inseparably one thing only; this is the indefinite dyad (aoristos dyas) of the ancient Greek Platonists. Specifically ancient Pali is revealing, for the very word for consciousness, vinnana, is literally meant agnosis (avijja): vi (opposite to, contrary of, other than) + ñana (gnosis, vijja, Knowledge, Light, Atman, Brahman), i.e. Vi+nana (vinnana). For the “unknowing” (vinnana), the consciousness of being is the resultant manifestation directly attributive to the Absolute and its very extrinsic nature.

As pertains Buddhism specifically, avijja is the first position in the chain of contingent manifestation (paticcasamuppada), however one need ask: “agnosis (avijja) OF what and BY what”? Ignorance itself is not a thing, but an attribution of something, be it in one of two modalities, primordial agnosis (avijja), or empirical agnosis. Samyutta 2.4 specifically (as well as countless other passages) equate avijja with agnosis (anana): [Katama ca, bhikkhave, avijja? yam kho, bhikkhave, dukkhe aññanam”].

Two entirely different levels of agnosis are at play in the model of being, one being the primordial agnosis which is beginningless, and the agnosis which is willed by a being from second to second, as pertains his will (citta), be it by wisdom or lack thereof; ignorance is manifest which either perpetuates becoming (bhava) and actions (karma), or wisdom in its place which subjugates (nirodha) them; specifically [SN 5.127] speaks of the empirical side of agnosis in the being who so wills them at the discretion of his (level of) ignorance. “As above, so below” this is true of the Absolute that primordial agnosis is the higher principle behind empirical agnosis as manifest in being. The self-privative avijja of the nature of the Absolute that it is subjectively directed inwards, and the empirical ‘shadow’ of the being who marvels in the logos of Emanation as cast by the Absolute, but is unknowing (avijja) as to the Subjective “light” of which he is by nature which is also identical to the Absolute itself, being will (citta).

Entirely in line with Platonism, Buddhism proclaims: [AN 5.113] “Followers, the beginning of ignorance can never be discerned (beginningless) such that it cannot be said “Here is the First where ignorance is not, here is the contingency which generated it.” Such that it should be discerned, followers, “ignorance is a condition” (Purima, bhikkhave, koti na pañña’yati avijja’ya– ‘ito pubbe avijja’ na’hosi, atha paccha’ samabhavi’ti. Evañcetam, bhikkhave, vuccati, atha ca pana pañña’yati– ‘idappaccaya’ avijja’ti.).

In Buddhist sutta, avijja is forerunner, as it should be, being first in paticcasamuppada: [AN 2.12] “Above karma, becoming, and views, ‘agnosis encircles (all of them)’ as the (source for) samsara.” (“Ka’mayogena samyutta’, bhavayogena cu’bhayam; ditthiyogena samyutta’, avijja’ya purakkhata”). Also: [SN-Att. 1.236] Nanajotim (the light of gnosis) = atman; meaning that the wisdom (vijja) made manifest in the disciple is the very premise for liberation as such that agnosis (avijja) has been cut off = end of Self-objectification (avijja, also = atta-an, i.e. anatta).

In fact, in Buddhist doctrine the only noun “freed” of avijja is the citta, which logically presupposes the fact that as pertains our earlier question: “agnosis (avijja) OF what and BY what”? , must be meant avijja of the will’s nature (atman) by the will (citta): [AN 1.196] “With mind (citta) emancipated from ignorance (avijja)...this designates the Soul is having become-Brahman.”, [AN 1.195] “Citta is freed of the sensuous taint, citta is freed of the taint of becoming (bhavaasavaapi), citta is freed of the taint of nescience/ignorance (avijja), Liberation! Gnosis is this, therein (utter) liberation.” [MN 1.279] “When his steadfast mind was perfectly purified, perfectly illumined, stainless, utterly perfect, pliable, sturdy, fixed, and everlastingly determinate then he directs his mind towards the gnosis of the destruction of defilements. Knowing thus and seeing thus his mind is emancipated from sensual desires, his mind is emancipated from becoming, his mind is emancipated from ignorance.” “This said: ‘the liberated mind/will (citta) which does not cling’ means Nibbana”[MN2-Att. 4.68]. “Steadfast-in-the-Soul (thitattoti) means one is supremely-fixed within the mind/will (citta)”[Silakkhandhavagga-Att. 1.168]. “The purification of one’s own mind/will, this means the light (joti) within one’s mind/will (citta) is the very Soul (attano)” [DN2-Att. 2.479].

The all too common and pathetic "HINDU" insult as employed by Buddhists

by Ken Wheeler copyright

I have encountered statements such as these literally hundreds of times, such as this reply I came across just yesterday: "Of course I'm an atheist! Buddhism does not depend on idiotic Hindu superstitions." Confirming yet again among so many other reasons why it has been said "were you to leave dung upon your doorstep would you expect aught but flies to appear before you?" Buddhism today is in name only, it attracts extremely miserable and depressed Atheists, and, in the West and Europe, Christian & Jewish malcontents/rejects. As one Indian philosopher and metaphysician had said: "Buddhism (modern) is an extremely sick religion inhabited by atheists, agnostics, and at best pantheists. They congregate together at 'dharma-centers', which are little more than outpatient mental wards for depressed materialists, and engage in idle chatter about attainment of oblivion and the denial of all things spiritual."

It would be intelligent for some to read works such as: "The Rise and Decline of Buddhism in India" (Hazra), and other titles as to the manner in which Buddhism became a magnet for materialists and moralists/Humanists in medieval India. In Gotama's time, the principle Upanishads were already nearly as old as present-day is to the New Testament. An extreme proliferation of Sramanic schools of thought upon the core meaning of the Vedas and Upanishads (of which were Vedanta, or the [anta] core/end/ultimate meaning of the Vedas themselves, i.e. the Upanishads) were sprouting all around as centered upon those who thought they held the truest grasp of the core principles behind and within Vedic metaphysics, of which Buddhism was but one 'successful' branch of Sramanism thereof.

It is rather ironic that Sramanic schools sprang up to establish a more condensed teaching upon the Upanishads, which themselves were wholly meant to be a core derivation of the 'ultimate' meaning of the Vedas! It is unfortunate that while the Indian Metaphysicians were keenly enabled in teaching the methodology of liberation, but were extremely verbose and symbolically obtuse in condensing the metaphysics of their system, unlike the Neoplatonists for example who were, at times, too pithy (namely that Plotinus, for example is far too hard for most to read without winning a headache). Even India's great founder of Advaita Vedanta, Sri Sancaracharya (Samkara) often had wrote to complain and whine that the Vedas were an impenetrably dense vault that only one Wiseman in million might penetrate the meaning thereof.

What is never written about is that in modern so-called 'Buddhism', there exists a solid and pungent fear of Buddhism being merely a school of thought upon the essential principles of Vedantic Monistic metaphysics. This fear is subliminal and latent in a palpable cowardice that Buddhism would lose its worth if it were partially or wholly linked to the "HINDU" Upanishads or the Vedas worse still. Such as, the 'renowned' Theravada materialist Nyanatiloka has said: "Thus with this doctrine of Selflessness, or anatta, stands or falls the ENTIRE structure of Buddhism".

This fear of loss of the "uniqueness" of Buddhism lead its followers to slaughter and condemn its founders teachings long ago, not to mention that any and all with any common sense migrated from this perverse pseudo form of Buddhism into that of either Advaita Vedanta which is commonly said was the "destroyer of (early centuries C.E. and onwards) Buddhism", or towards any one of another forms of Sramanic Vedantic asceticism and/or beliefs.

It takes a very "special" (speshul ? lol) person to espouses a religion sans a soul. For there is no such 'religion', only a Moralism or an Atheistic Humanism. The denial of the soul, or the immaterial and uncompounded metaphysical Subject cannot be enjoined to most all mankind, for it goes against his subliminal knowledge and nature. It was thought centuries ago that the "new age of reason and (false) enlightenment" via scientific thought would crush religion and spiritual philosophy; however just the opposite is the case, for modern physicists are speculating and waxing metaphysical now more than ever. Ironically the most intelligent minds of history that served as the foundation for modern science, Plato, Aristotle, Newton, etc. were self-admittedly studiers of science only as a means to a better and reasonable grasp of the works of all things spiritual and Divine. Or, "those who know more about the designed (phenomena, i.e. physical sciences) have better insight into that (not God, as in the case of Creationism) which designs". The more I encounter 'buddhists' (and I have talked with, debated and lectured amongst thousands of them), the more I am certainly convinced that, as was intelligently said by an Indian fellow: "people in the West who call themselves Buddhists are religious rejects who are just intelligent enough not to call themselves outright nihilistic Atheists." For a true Atheist is not one who merely denies the Creationist God (which is true and accurate), but is, as is technically called a "metaphysical Atheist", being one who denies ontological and immaterial Subjects such as the Soul, the Absolute and all that which lies behind and underneath the "curtain of phenomena".

Most experts in the study of earliest Buddhism (such as Dr. A.K. Coomarswamy, the founder of the Pali Text Society Mrs. Davids, Dr. Radhakrishnan, G. Grimm, G. Pande and many others) have complained harshly about the Nominalist reading of Buddhist doctrine. Such as, is commonly found in Theravada: amata, which is immortality becomes nominalized by the Theravadins and mistranslated as "deathless". Or attan, which is Pali for Atman, becomes nominalized as "yourself", Brahman, or the Absolute, becomes merely "best". The castration of metaphysics from earliest Buddhist suttas has been the case since the 5th century C.E. when Theravada rose to power and was the surviving remnant of the materialistic and Atomistic sect of Sarvastivada, which literally translates as "This is all there is-ISM: Sarva, or sabba (all, as meaning only all phenomena [SN 4.15 sabba sutta]) asti (there is) vada (ISM)"; i.e. Atomism! Let me not digress too far into the illogical standard in which Theravada loves to translate anatta as "no-SOUL(atta)", but positive appellations of atta in the Nikayas become merely "yourself", such as "attadipa" (Atman as light), atta hi paramo piya (Atman is most beloved), or attasarana (Atman as refuge). Such an illogical and inconsistent double standard for the term attan is nothing if not laughable. For, anatta is no denial of the Atman, but a denial of Atman in or related to any of 22 nouns which are deemed as Selfless (Atman-less). For all those things which are anatta are also "na me so atta" (not my Atman), as = anicca,

dukkha, anatta". I no more deny the Atman by saying ABCDEF are not-X (an-ATTA), than I would or have denied Elephants by saying "Alaska, Russia, Sweden, etc. lack, or are devoid of roaming Elephants"; "whenever we deny something unreal, it is in reference to (finding) the Real".

The "HINDU" fallacy must die in the mind of any who cherish what is both intelligent, wise, and logical, and importantly so, doctrinally provable. The concept of this "HINDU" error is rooted in a fear that Buddhism did not spring up in a vacuum, and was an entirely new methodology which was adversarial or against the principles of Vedantic liberation ontology and its metaphysics. Nothing is known except in the modality of the knower, that a more precise and accepted means of relating the 'hidden' meaning of the poetic and HIGHLY symbolic Vedas, does not imply a new religion or an "anti-Vedic" strain of thought in the teachings as found in earliest Buddhist texts. The Nikayas do not belong to any sect of modern-day Buddhism, nor any long dead sect as well; the importance of this shouldn't be forgotten.

Lets gather how "original" Buddhism is or wasn't from a small section of the pervasively consistent Nikayas: [DN 1.249] "I teach the way to the union with Brahman, I know the way to the supreme union with Brahman, and the path and means leading to Brahman, whereby the world of Brahman may be gained." [DN 1.248] "all the peoples say that Gotama is the supreme teacher of the way leading to the Union with Brahman!" [It 57] "Become-Brahman is the meaning of Tathagata." [SN 3.83] "Without taints, it meant 'Become-Brahman'." [SN 5.5] "The noble path is the designation for Brahmayana (path to Brahman)." [MN 1.341] "The Soul is having become Brahman." [SN 4.117] "Found the ancient path leading to Brahman." "I have seen" says Buddha, "the ancient path, the old road that was taken by the former all-awake Brahmins, that is the path i follow, lost long ago. Just like an overcovered path lost long ago is that which i have discovered" [SN 2.106] "I have not made a new path monks, i have only rediscovered what was lost long ago" Itivuttaka "Gotama is a TEVIJJAN (Knower/expert in the VEDAS)"-MN, Udana "Gotama is a VEDASOTTIM (Sage/expert in the Vedas)"- Digha1. Gotama was oft called himself a VEDAGU.....or "(someone) that has gone to the Vedas" "Gotama is a teacher of MONISM (advayavada)" The answer is, not original at all, in any respect.

The word "Hinduism" comes from the word sindhu, the Indo-Arya word for "the sea," and came to apply to the peoples in the region east of the Indus River. The word "Hinduism" has no connection to any specific religion at all but a peoples and area. "From the point of view of religion, the Vedic literature divides itself into two parts, viz. the Rigveda on the one hand and the rest of the Vedic literature on the other; the two distinct phases of essentially the same religion may be called Vedic religion and Brahmanism. This division and the above two names hardly need any justification. It is now recognized beyond doubt that, although Brahmanism is nothing but an isolated development of the religion contained in the Rigveda, yet the two religions are entirely different in spirit. While one represents a comparatively exalted form of a purer faith based on nature-worship, the other tends to become artificial, mechanical and hieratic, and makes rites and ceremonies its chief concern." ---[P.S. Deshmukh, Religion in Vedic Literature, 198] "Hinduism has never prepared a body of canonical scriptures or a common prayer book; it has never held a general council or convocation; never defined the relation between laity and clergy; never regulated the canonization of saints or their worship; never established a single center of religious life; never prescribed a of training for its priests"--- [Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics 6:712].

The "HINDU" profanity as used, as I myself have heard countless hundreds of times over the years, needs to die. These so-called 'buddhists' use the term HINDU in the same manner the Nazi SS officers used the term JEW; not in referring to a peoples or (incorrectly in the case of the term HINDU) a religion, but something foul, unsavory, lowly, profane, miserable, disgusting.

These same 'buddhists' fear their precious faith would sink into the grounds of ancient Vedanta like water into the dirt, if they were to come close to even partially admitting Buddhism is absolutely no more anti-Vedic than Jesus was a Jew hater. One might equally and heretically proclaim that Martin Luther was against the Bible, or Christianity in that he but only spoke coarsely against the Catholic Church's position, which he demonstrated via the Bible, was a commentarial religion too often adversarial to the principles in the Bible itself, such as confessions, relic-worshipping, fetishisms, and, in Luther's time, literally buying Heaven-insurance by donating coin to the Church.

It is a well established fact by experts in the religious history of India, that of Gotama's time, circa 500 B.C.E., the meaning of the already old-and-dusty principle Upanishads (much less the Vedas) was long lost and overcovered, as is the case in his admission: ." "I have seen" says Buddha, "the ancient path, the old road that was taken by the former all-awake Brahmins, that is the path i follow, lost long ago. Just like an overcovered path lost long ago is that which i have discovered" (SN 2.106). The only denial Gotama ever made in the suttas, was that one was never BRAHMABANDHU (born a Brahmin), but rather was one by wisdom, as Brahmin was not a birthright, but a spiritual marker of ones status for sake of wisdom.

"I don't know where my soul is"

There are four errors in this statement, and one axis of truth upon which all four rotate round

by Ken Wheeler copyright

"Where is my soul" is the most common question in reply by the ignorant and profane when discussing metaphysics, Buddhism, or other forms of Monism; being the abbreviated version of "I don't know where my soul is". Within this simple sentence can be found four grand errors of egregious presumption and one axis of truth upon which these four satellites of error go round.

Taking the first error "I", or the empirical person so-and-so (Bob, Sue etc.) this compounded and material self of which there are

“two selves” within us, the Person (spirit, Purusha) and persona (psychophysical, temporal); “two within us” (**Plato Republic 604b, Phaedo 79, Timaeus 89d**), or Philo’s “Soul of the soul”, or the Buddha’s “atta hi attano nathi” (Self is Lord of the self [persona]). This “I” of which cannot be, in metaphysics, the Knower of knowing, but rather the conscious (vinnana) living being whose conceptions and ideations are “dead when he dies”, that “I” is not the Person but the “self of which the Self is Lord”. This “I”, the objective and compounded self cannot ever come to know the Knower, which is the posterior and uncompounded Subject. The objective and temporal “I” cannot know the Subject which precedes it any more so than a puppet can know That which pulls its strings. This “I” has ‘within’ (superficially so) it no means possible by which to have Knowledge (gnosis) of the soul, since its very principle, this compounded “I” lacks the Witness and Knower by which it can or could be known. There is no “I” whereby which it could be said of anyone that it, “I”, could Know (gnosis as opposed to the empirical knowledge of the mere material “I”, which is persona) the soul.

Taking now the second error “where”, or asking of how the soul is IN TIME, the magnitude and measure of which ‘where’ is but a delineation of things compounded and ‘taking up space’ (where is this soul? It is no-where). The quest for the uncompounded in spacio-temporal existence, and the objective cosmos of becoming, flux and reflux, could not be more illogical. Anything (quite literally ‘thing’ in the true sense of objectivity) which partakes of a topos (place), a locus in space and time which is syn. with magnitude and materiality cannot be the point of any metaphysical search, in this case the soul. Would we go hunting for fish in the desert? “Where” is syn. with space-time materiality of which something might be said to have “its place”, or a “where”, whereby which it (objectivity) might be found. The soul cannot have any such correlation whereby we might ask or inquire how it is “where”; for the soul is no-where, not in space, nor in time either.

Further along this line we come to “my soul”, of stated implication this uncompounded principle of ones noetic being as illogically meant a possession or slave (“my”) to either another subject, or worse still implication an objective possession. This inverse and topsy-turvy statement is the upside-down illogical attempt to gather insight pertaining the soul thru conception that same is property and possession by something else, of which the common fool implies himself, or as meant the existential and bodily self. This cryptic materialistic line of reasoning is indicative of the perversity of understanding relevant to the fool in his “fools quest”- Plato.

Lastly stands as final error “is”, to wit the fool in his questioning seeks knowledge of the Subject as an object of anatomies to which the Greeks, Buddhists, and Vedantists declared to be a quest among compounded and conceptive antinomies “is it, is it not, is it both, it is neither”, to which the Buddha was apposite to answer such fallacious lines of questioning which involved the “pairs” of dualities, the antinomies of existential reasoning as employed by materialists in linear and objective thought on or about the soul. The Soul is tat tvam asi, as = Brahman, the Absolute, is not “is, is not..etc.”, but That, the uncompounded Absolute as opposite to all antinomies. **[SN 2.17]** Gotama Buddha: “This world is carried on by a duality (dvayanissito). Etc.”

The tie which binds these four errors together, and which is true in the statement “I don’t know where my soul is”, is “don’t know”. **[AN 5.113]** “Followers, the beginning of ignorance can never be discerned (beginningless) such that it cannot be said “Here is the First where ignorance is not, here is the contingency which generated it. Such that it should be discerned, followers, ‘ignorance is a condition’. “This avijja (agnosis, avidya, nescience, ignorance) or ‘uncaused principle’ for the “descent of Being”, is the ‘black-hole’ (again: privation) around which these four satellites of errors spin round. Avijja being in Greek ‘tolma’; as meaning Emanationism, or the extrinsic side of the Absolute, or the attribute (avijja) to the Principle (atman/Brahman/Hen) between which no distinction can be drawn in that both attribute and Principle are one (point and line are in the mathematical theology of Platonism both together = 1) thing only (will-willing, light-illumination, between which what the Absolute ‘is’ [principle] and what it ‘does’ [attribute] can have no distinction lest the premise of Monism itself be obliterated). In the case of our ‘black-hole’ analogy this privation was the source and creator of these ‘satellites’ by which the fool objectively struggles with in objective conceptualization of the immaterial soul not only in space and time, but also as possession to another and as regards his (mere) self which the Upanishads are apposite in stating “for the mortal, there is no soul”.