

Original Buddhism & its Origins

By Dr. A.K. Coomaraswamy

BUDDHISM INTRODUCTION

The more superficially one studies Buddhism, the more it seems to differ from the Brahmanism in which it originated; the more profound our study, the more difficult it becomes to distinguish Buddhism from Brahmanism, or to say in what respects, if any, Buddhism is really unorthodox. The outstanding distinction lies in the fact that Buddhist doctrine is propounded by an apparently historical founder, understood to have lived and taught in the sixth century B.C. Beyond this there are only broad distinctions of emphasis. It is taken almost for granted that one must have abandoned the world if the Way is to be followed and the doctrine understood. The teaching is addressed either to Brahmins who are forthwith converted, or to the congregation of monastic Wanderers (pravrajaka) who have already entered on the Path; others of whom are already perfected Arhats, and become in their turn the teachers of other disciples. There is an ethical teaching for laymen also, with injunctions and prohibitions as to what one should or should not do, (Vinaya, 1.235 and passim; D.I.52. 68f; S.III.208; A.I.62 (Gradual Sayings, p. 57, where Woodward's Footnote 2 is completely mistaken). The Buddha teaches that there is an ought to be done (kiraya) and an ought not to be done (akiriya); these two words never refer to "the doctrine of Karma (retribution) and its opposite". Cf. HJAS.IV.1939, p.119. That the Goal (as in Brahmanical doctrine) is one of liberation from good and evil both (see notes 105, 106 (Buddhism)) is quite another matter; the doing of good and avoidance of evil are indispensable to Wayfaring. The view that there is no ought to be done (ukiriya), however argued, is heretical: responsibility cannot be evaded either (1) by the argument of a fatal determination by the causal efficacy of past acts or (2) by making God (issaro) responsible or (3) by a denial of causality and postulation of chance; ignorance is the rooted all evil, and it is upon what we do now that our welfare depends (A.I.173f.). Man is helpless only to the extent that he sees Self in what is not Self, to the extent that he frees himself from the notion "This is V, his actions will be good and not evil; while for so long as he identifies himself with soul and body (savinnana kaya) his actions will be "self" (ish.) but nothing that can be described as a "social reform" or as a protest against the caste system. The repeated distinction of the "true Brahman" from the mere Brahman by birth is one that had already been drawn again and again in the Brahmanical books.

If we can speak of the Buddha as a reformer at all it is only in the strictly etymological sense of the word: it is not to establish anew order but to restore an older form that the Buddha descended from heaven (Confucius Analects "A gentleman does not invent, but transmits"/ Philo, Spec. IV.49 "No pronouncement of a prophet is ever his own"). Although his teaching is "all just so and infallible" (D.III.135 tath'vua hogi no annathn; A.II.23; D.III.133; Sn.357 yatha vadi tatha kdn. (Cf. RV.IV.33.6 satyam ucur nara eva' hi cakruh); hence Sn.430, Inv. 122, tathavadin. In this sense tathagato can be applied to Buddha, Dhamma and Sangha, Sn.236 8 S.III.116f cannot say hoti, no hoti, hoti ca no hoti, neva hoti na no hoti.), this is because he has fully penetrated the Eternal Law (akalika dhamma; The Dhamma taught by the Buddha, beautiful from first to last, is both of present application (sarnditthiko) and timeless (akaliko), passim. It follows that the same applies to the Buddha himself, who identifies himself with the Dhamma. Cf. Epistle to Diognetus V.2.) and personally verified all things in heaven or earth (D.I.150 sayam adhinna sacchikatva; D.III.135 sabbam . . . abhisambuddham; Dh.353 .sabbavidu'ham asmi.) he describes as a vile heresy the view that he is teaching a "philosophy of his own", thought out by himself (Epistle to Diognetus V.3. (Apostolic Fathers, 359) M.I.68f., the Buddha "roars the Lion's roar" and having recounted his supernatural powers, continues: "Now if anyone says of me, Gotama the Pilgrim, knower and seer as aforesaid, that my eminent Noble gnosis and insight have no superhuman quality, and that I teach a Law that has been beaten out by reasoning (takka pariyahatam) experimentally thought out and self expressed (sayam patibha nave), if he will not recant, not repent (catam pajahati= metanonn) and abandon this view, he falls into hell". [D.I.16,22 Buddha's Knowledge is a priori (pajanati), not inductive. D.I.45,79 to come to know truly]. "These profound truths (ye dhamma gramblurd) which the Buddha teaches are inaccessible to reasoning (atakkavacara), lie has verified them by his own super knowledge" (D.I.22) ; cf. KU.II.9 "it is not by reasoning that that idea can be reached" (nnisa tarkma matir dpaneya). Mil.217E explains that it is an "ancient Way that had been lost that the Buddha opens up again". The reference is to the brahmachariya, "walking with God" (= then sunopa ein, Phazdms 248C; Philo Wigr. 131,126) of RVX109.5, AV., Brahmanas, Upanishads and Pali texts, passim. The "Lion's roar" is originally Brhaspati's, RVX67.9, i.e. Agni's. Also RV.I.65.5 "awakened at the dawn, he restores by his operations consciousness to men". And M.I.421 asamayavimokham~ Eternal Deliverance. Saint Thomas 1.26.1. The will is free in so far as it obeys Reason, i.e. what one thinks is a blind and fettered will. Also Arichonnedian Ethics IX.8.7. RV.X.130.7 purvesam pantham anudrsya.S.H.106 purinnam vaggam purannnjasann . . . anagacchim. Stobaei Hermetica IIB . . . the road to truth which our ancestors traveled". See also Parinenides "Road of the Daimon"; Philo "the roads of heaven are happy"; Phaedrus 247. Plato Rep. Bk.VII.) No true philosopher ever came to destroy, but only to fulfill the Law. "I have seen", the Buddha says, "the ancient Way, the Old Road that was taken by the formerly All Awakened, and that is the path I follow"; and since he elsewhere praises the Brahmins of old who remembered the Ancient Way that leads to Brahma (S.IV.117; In Itivuttaka 28,29 those who follow this (ancient) Way taught by the Buddhas are called Mahatmas. But, Sn. 284 315 says "now, that the Brahmins have long neglected their ancient Law, the Buddha preaches it again".); there can be no doubt that the Buddha is alluding to "the ancient narrow path that stretches far away, whereby the contemplatives, knowers of Brahma, ascend, set free" (vimuktah), mentioned in verses that were already old when Yajnavalkya cites them in the earliest Upanishad (BU.IV. f.8, RVIV.18.1. As Mrs. Rhys Davids has also pointed out, the Buddha is a critic of Brahmanism only in external matters; the "internal system of spiritual values" he "takes for granted" ("Relations between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism", IHQ., X,1934, p. 282). In view of the current impression that the Buddha came to destroy, not to fulfill an older Law, we have emphasized throughout the uninterrupted

continuity of Brahmanical and Buddhist doctrine (e.g. in note 159 (Buddhism)); Buddhist doctrine is original (yoniso manasikaro) indeed, but certainly not novel.)

On the other hand it is expressly stated that the Brahmins of today although there are exceptions have fallen from the graces that pertained to their pure and selfless ancestors (Sn. 284f. (cf. RVX71.9); D.III.81, 82 and 94f.; exceptions, 5.11.13; Sn.1082.). It is from this point of view, and in connection with the fact that Buddha is born in an age when the royal caste is more than the priestly caste in honor, that we can best understand the reason of the promulgation of the Upanishads and Buddhism at one and the same time. These two closely related and concordant bodies of doctrine, both of "forest" origin, are not opposed to one another, but to a common enemy. The intention is clearly to restore the truths of an ancient doctrine. Not that the continuity of transmission in the lineages of the forest hermitages had ever been interrupted, but that the Brahmins at court and in the world, preoccupied with the outward forms of the ritual (See SB.IX.5.2.12,13 for the condemnation of professional sacrifices.) and perhaps too much concerned for their emoluments, had now become rather "Brahmins by birth" (brahma bandhu) than Brahmins in the sense of the Upanishads and Buddhism, "knowers of Brahma" (brahmavit; So asserted Sn. 284E, that Brahmins nowadays do not follow puranan brahmanan brakmana dhamma.) "There can be little doubt that the profound doctrine of the Self had hitherto been taught only in pupillary succession (guru parampara) to qualified disciples; there is plenty of evidence for this on the one hand in the Upanishads themselves (E.g. MUXI.29 "This deepest mystery..."; BUA7.3.12; BG.IV.3, XV7II.67. Yet the Upanishads were actually "published"; and just as the Buddha "holds nothing back", so we are told that "nothing whatever was omitted in what was told to Satyakama, a man who cannot prove his ancestry, but is called a Brahmin because of his truth speaking (CU.W.4.9). There is no more secrecy, and now whoever is a Comprehensor can properly be called a Brahmin [SB.XII.6.1.41])the word itself implies "sitting close to" a teacher) and on the other hand in the fact that the Buddha often speaks of "holding nothing back". The net result of these conditions would be that those to whom the Buddha so often refers as the "uninstructed multitude" must have entertained those mistaken "soul theories" and beliefs in the reincarnation of a "personality" against which the Buddha fulminates untiringly (S.II.58 Buddha's knowledge of origin and end of jaramaranau is identical with that of former and future samanas and brahmins and this is anvaya nanam, the sequence of gnosis). It may well be, too, that kings themselves, opposing their arrogant power to sacerdotal control, had ceased to choose their Brahmin ministers wisely. (Cf. SB.IV.1.4.5.) For that situation Indra himself, king of the Gods, "blinded by his own might" and misled by the Asuras, provides the archetype in divinis. (BD.VII.54.) On the other hand, for the "awakening" of a royalty in the Buddha's case we have likewise in Indra the paradigm; for being admonished by the spiritual adviser to whom his allegiance is due, Indra "awakens himself " (buddhva catmanam BD.VII. 57) and praises himself, the awakened Self. (From the waking and sleeping dream of this world the word 'Buddha' is literally 'the Wake', and he is, in fact, like Agni 'awakened at dawn' (RV.I.65.5 usarbudh). Refer BG.II.69 on 'sleep and waking' with S.I.107 and J.I.61.) in lauds in which we find the words, which the Buddha might have used, "Never at any time am I subject to Death" (mrtuyu = mara; RVX48.5. The Buddha is marabhibhu, Sir. 571, etc., as Indra is the conqueror of Vritra Namuci; Cf. my "Some Sources of Buddhist Iconography", in B.C. Law Volume 1, pp. 471 8, on the Mara dharsana.) It will not be overlooked, too, that the Vedic Indra is more than once referred to as Arhat. And if it seems strange that the true doctrine should have been taught, in the Buddha's case, by a member of the royal caste, it is only the same situation that we sometimes meet with in the Upanishads themselves (BUN1.2.8; CUX.3 11; Kaus.Up.IV.9 (where the situation is called 'abnormal', pratiloma). Was not Krishna also of royal blood, and yet a spiritual teacher? What all this amounts to is this, that when the salt of the "established church" has lost its savour, it is rather from without than from within that its life will be renewed.

The scriptures in which the traditions of the Buddha's life and teachings are preserved fall into two classes, those of the Narrow Way (Hinayana) and those of the Broad Way (Mahayana). It is with the former, and on the whole older texts that we shall be chiefly concerned. The books pertaining to the "Narrow Way" are composed in Pali, a literary dialect closely related to Sanskrit. The Pali literature ranges in date from about the third century B.C. to the sixth century A.D. The Canon consists of what are called the "Three Baskets", respectively of monastic regimen (Vinaya), Discourse (Sutra) and Abstract Doctrine (Abhidhamma). We shall be chiefly concerned with the five classes of the "Discourse" literature in which are preserved what are taken to be the Buddha's actual words. Of the extra canonical literature the most important of the early books are the Milindapanha and the Visuddhimagga. The great jataka books, largely composed of ancient mythological materials recast in a popular form and retold as stories of the former births, is relatively late, but very instructive both for the Buddhist point of view and as a detailed picture of life in ancient India. All these books are provided with elaborate commentaries in what now would be called the "scholastic" manner. We shall take this literature as it stands; for we have no faith in the emendation of texts by modern scholars whose critical methods are mainly based on their dislike of monastic institutions and their own view of what the Buddha ought to have said. It is in fact surprising that such a body of doctrine as the Buddhist, with its profoundly otherworldly and even anti social emphasis, and in the Buddha's own words "hard to be understood by you who are of different views, another tolerance, other tastes, other allegiance and other training" (D.III.40, cf. S.I.136, D.I.12, M.I.167.), can have become even as "popular" as it is in the modern Western environment We should have supposed that modern minds would have found in Brahmanism, with its acceptance of life as a whole, a more congenial philosophy. We can only suppose that Buddhism has been so much admired mainly for what it is not. A well known modern writer on the subject has remarked that "Buddhism in its purity ignored the existence of a God; it denied the existence of a soul; it was not so much a religion as a code of ethics" (Winifred Stephens, Legends of Indian Buddhism, 1911, p. 7. Similarly M.V Bhattacharya maintains that the Buddha taught that "there is no Self, or Atman" (Cultural Heritage of India, p. 259). Even in 1925 a Buddhist scholar could write "The soul . . . is described in the Upanishads as a small creature in shape like a man . . . Buddhism repudiated all such theories" (PTS Dictionary, s.v. attan). It would be as reasonable to say that Christianity is materialistic because it speaks of an "inner man". Few scholars would write in this manner today, but ridiculous as such statements may appear, (and it is as much an ignorance of Christian doctrine as it is of Brahmanism that is involved), they still survive in all popular accounts of "Buddhism". Th. Scherbatsky Buddhist Logic 1. 1932, p. 2. Buddhism "denied a God, it denied the Soul, it denied Eternity"! Scherbatsky's The Doctrine of the Buddha (BSOS, VI. 867L) provides a good critique of Keith's demand to "lay aside our natural desire to find reason prevailing in a barbarous age", in his

Buddhist philosophy, p. 29. It is of course, true that the Buddha denied the existence of a "soul" or "self" in the narrow sense of the word (one might say, in accordance with the command, *denegat seipsum* (deny himself), Mark, VIII.341) but this is not what our writers mean to say, or are understood by their readers to say; what three mean to say is that the Buddha denied the immortal, unborn and Supreme Self of the Upanishads. And that is palpably false. For he frequently speaks of this Self or Spirit, and nowhere more clearly than in the repeated formula *na me so atta*, "That is not my Self", excluding body and the components of empirical consciousness, a statement to which the words of Sankara are peculiarly apposite, "Whenever we deny something unreal, it is with reference to something real" (*neti-neti* Brahma Sutra III.2.22); as remarked by Mrs. Rhys Davids, "so, 'this one', is used in the Suttas for utmost emphasis in questions of personal identity" (Minor Anthologies, I, p. 7, note 2). *Na me so atta* is no more a denial of the Self than Socrates' *to . . . soma . . . ouk estin ho anthropos*=the body is not the man (A noochus 365), is a denial of the Man"! But Dh A IV. f72 "*me sammalamito atta*"! is positive. It was not for the Buddha, but for the natthika, to deny this Self! And so to "ignoring God" (it is often pretended that Buddhism is "atheistic"), one might as well argue that Meister Eckhart "ignored God" in saying "*niht, daz ist gobe gelich, wande beide niht sind*" (God is not like God, for it is impossible for the two to be the same). We can understand the appeal of this on the one hand to the rationalist and on the other to the sentimentalist. Unfortunately for these, all three statements are untrue, at least in the sense in which they are meant. It is with another Buddhism than this that we are in sympathy and are able to agree; and that is the Buddhism of the texts as they stand.

Of the texts of the Broad Way, composed in Sanskrit, few if any antedate the beginning of the Christian era. Amongst the most important of them are the Mahavastu, the Lalita Vistara, the Divyavadana and the Saddharma Pundarika. The two main forms of Buddhism to which we have referred are often spoken of, rather loosely, as respectively Southern and Northern. It is the Southern school that now survives in Ceylon, Burma and Siam. The two schools originally flourished together in Burma, Siam, Cambodia, Java and Bali, side by side with a Hinduism with which they often combined. Buddhism of the Northern school passed over into Tibet, China and Japan, through the work of Indian teachers and native disciples who made translations from Sanskrit. In those days it was not considered that the mere knowledge of languages sufficed to make a man a "translator" in any serious sense of the word; no one would have undertaken to translate a text who had not studied it for long years at the feet of a traditional and authoritative exponent of its teachings, and much less would any one have thought himself qualified to translate a book in the teachings of which he did not believe. Few indeed are the translations of Indian books into European languages that can yet come up to the standards set for themselves by the Tibetan and Chinese Buddhists (See Marco Pallis, Peaks and Lamas, 1939, pp. 79 81; ed. 1974, pp. 72 4.). It may be observed that while Brahmanism was at one time widely diffused in the "Greater India" of South East Asia, it never crossed the northern frontiers of India proper; Brahmanism was not, like Buddhism, what might be called a missionary faith. Indian culture reached and profoundly influenced the Far East through Buddhism, which sometimes fused with and sometimes existed side by side with Taoism, Confucianism and Shinto. The greatest influence was exerted by the contemplative forms of Buddhism; what had been Dhyana in India became Cha'n in China and Zen in Japan (See the various books of D.T. Suzuki.) We cannot, unfortunately, describe these forms of Buddhism here, but must affirm that although they often differ greatly in emphasis and detail from the Narrow Way they represent anything but a degeneration of Buddhism; the Buddhisms of Tibet and the Far East are calculated to evoke our deepest sympathies, equally by their profundity of their doctrines and the poignant beauty of the literature and art in which these teachings are communicated. We have only to add that Buddhism had died out in India proper by the end of the twelfth century.

Sankaracarya, the leading exponent of the Vedanta as a system, has often been called a *Pracchannabuddha*, "concealed Buddhist". The term Vedanta ("End of the Vedas" in the sense that the New Testament might be called the "conclusion and fulfillment" of the Old) occurs, however, already in the Upanishads; and the fact is that Vedanta and Buddhism have so much in common from the beginning that any exposition of either must sound like an exposition of the other. That is why a fusion of Hinduism and Buddhism takes place in the Indian Middle Ages and why Buddhism ceased to exist as a separate doctrine in India proper. If Buddhism rather than Hinduism could migrate to and survive elsewhere, this is mainly because while Hinduism fulfils itself in both the active and contemplative lives, Buddhism is chiefly concerned with the life of contemplation and can for that reason be the more easily taught as a Way of escape from the formal bonds of any social order.

THE MYTH

In asking, what is Buddhism, we must begin, as before, with the Myth. This has now become the Founder's life of some eighty years, into which period the whole epic of the victory over death has now been condensed. But if we subtract from the pseudo historical narrative all its mythical and miraculous features, the residual nucleus of historically plausible fact will be very small indeed: and all that we can say is that while there may have lived an individual teacher who gave the ancient wisdom its peculiarly "Buddhist" coloring, his personality is completely overshadowed, as he must have wished it should be (Dh. 74 *mam'eua kata. . . iti balassa sankappo*, "I did it, an infantile idea", cf. note 6 (Buddhism), by the eternal substance (*akalika dharma*) with which he identified himself. In other words, "the Buddha is only anthropomorphic, not a man" (Kern, Manual of Indian Buddhism, p. 65. Cf. A.II.38,39 where the Buddha says that he has destroyed all the causes by which he might become a God or a man, etc., and being uncontaminated by the world, cf. Sn.558 (*abhinneyam . . . tasma buddho'smi* = Therefore I am Buddha)). It is true that a majority of modern scholars, euhemerist by temperament and training, suppose that this was not Man, but a man, subsequently deified; we take the contrary view, implied by the texts, that the Buddha is a solar deity descended from heaven to save both men and Gods from all the ill that is denoted by the word "mortality", the view that his birth and awakening are coeval with time (Saddharma Pundarika, XV.1, in reply to the bewilderment of his audience, who cannot understand the Buddha's claim to have been the teacher of countless Bodhisattas in bygone aeons. In just the same way Atjuna is bewildered by Krishna's eternal birth (BG.IV.4), and the Jews could not

understand the saying of Christ, "before Abraham was, I am", i.e. "whose birth of Mary ghostly was more pleasing to him than his birth of Mary in the flesh"! Cf. Sim.IX.12.1 "The Son of God is older than all his creation" Shephard of Hernias. In Sim.V.6.5, 'The Holy Spirit' is identified with Christ, as prana equated to Agni.)

Before proceeding to the narrative we must explain how a distinction is made between the epithets Bodhisattva and Buddha. The Bodhisattva is an "awakening being", or one of "wakeful nature"; the Buddha is "awake" or "The Wake". The Bodhisattva is, dogmatically, an originally mortal being, qualifying by the making become of transcendental virtues and insights for the "total awakening" of a Buddha. Gautama Siddhartha, the "historical Buddha", is thus himself a Bodhisattva until the moment of his "all awakening". It is, furthermore assumed that a Buddha is born in every successive aeon, and that Gautama Siddhartha was the seventh in such a series of prophetic incarnations, and that he will be followed by Maitreya, now a Bodhisattva in heaven. There are other Bodhisattvas, notably Avalokitesvara, who are virtually Buddhas, but are vowed never actually to enter into their Buddhahood until the last blade of grass has been first redeemed.

Previous to his last birth on earth, the Bodhisattva is a resident in heaven; and there being urged by the Gods to release the universe from its sorrows, he considers and decides upon the time and place of his birth and the family and mother of whom he will be born. A Buddha must be born of either a priestly or the royal caste, whichever is predominant at the time; and the royal caste being predominant then, he chooses to be born of Maha Maya, the queen of king Suddhodana of the Sakya clan, at his capital city of Kapilavastu in the Middle Country; and that is to say, whatever else it may mean, in the "Middle Country" of the Ganges Valley. The Annunciation takes the form of "Maha Maya's dream", in which she sees a glorious white elephant descending from the skies to enter her womb. The king's interpreters of dreams explain that she has conceived a son who may be either a Universal Emperor or a Buddha. Both of these possibilities are actually realized in the spiritual sense, for while it is true that the Buddha's kingdom was not of this world, it is both as Teacher and as Lord of the universe that he "turns the wheel".

The child is visible in the mother's womb (Dom M. Brut, o.s.b., ed. The Hymns of the Breunary and Missal N.Y. 1936: Ventris obtuso recubans cubiti, Senses Regem thalamo manentem "Still resting in the concealed abode of the womb, Thou (SC John) didst perceive thy King reposing in His chamber". In its Christian context the motive is probably of Egyptian origin. Cf. H. Schaefer, Von Aegyptien Kunst, 1930, Abb. 71, The New Sun visible in the womb of the Sky-goddess. See also j.1.51; M. Windisch, Buddha's Geburt 116f.). "When the time comes, Maha-Maya sets out to visit her parents at Devahra; on her way she pauses at the Lumbini Park, and feeling that her time has come, she stretches out her hand to support herself by the branch of a tree, which bends down of its own accord. Standing thus, she gives painless birth to the child. The child is born from her side. It is not explicit, but can be presumed that the birth was "Virgin"; in any case it is interesting that the story was already known to Hieronymus who mentions it in a discussion of Virginity and in connection with the miraculous births of Plato and Christ. (Libri adv. fionianum, 1.42.) "The child is received by the Guardian Deities of the Four Quarters. He steps down onto the ground, takes seven strides, and proclaims himself the "Foremost in the World". The whole universe is transfigured and rejoices in light. On the same day are born the "seven connatural ones", amongst whom are the Bodhisattva's future wife, his horse, and the disciple Ananda. These things take place, not uniquely, but "normally", that is to say that such is the course of events whenever a Buddha is born. Maha Maya's dormition takes place a week after the child is born, and her sister Prajapati, and co wife of Suddhodana, takes her place. The child is taken back to Kapilavastu, and shown to the father; he is recognized and worshipped by the Brahman soothsayers, who announce that he will be Emperor or Buddha, at the age of thirty five. The child is presented in the temple, where the tutelary deity of the Sakyas bows down to him. Suddhodana, desiring that his son maybe an Emperor and not a Buddha, and learning that he will abandon the world only after he has seen an old man, a sick man, a corpse and a monk, brings him up in luxurious seclusion, ignorant of the very existence of suffering and death. The first miracle takes place on a day when the king, in accordance with custom, is taking part in the First Ploughing of the year; the child is laid in the shadow of a tree, which does not move although the shadows of other trees move naturally with the sun; in other words, the sun remains overhead. The child at school learns with supernatural facility. At the age of sixteen, by victory in an archery contest, in which his arrow pierces seven trees, he obtains his cousin Yashodhara as wife; she becomes the mother of a boy, Rahula.

In the meantime, on four successive days, while driving through the city to the pleasure park, the Bodhisattva has seen the four signs; for although all such signs have been banned from the city by royal edict, the Gods assume the forms of the old man, sick man, corpse and monk, and the Prince is made acquainted with age, illness, death and the serenity of a man who has risen above these vicissitudes of existence. He goes to his father and announces his intention of leaving the world and becoming a monk, in order to find out the way of escape from subjection to this mortality. The father cannot dissuade him, but keeps the palace gates closed. That night the Bodhisattva takes silent leave of his wife and child and calling for his horse, departs by the palace gate, miraculously opened for him by the Gods; he is accompanied only by his charioteer (manor).

Now Mara, Death, the Evil, offers him the empire of the whole world if he will return; failing in this temptation, he follows the Bodhisattva, to find another opportunity. Reaching the deep forests, the Bodhisattva cuts off his royal turban and long hair, unbecoming a pilgrim, and these are elevated by the God and enshrined in heaven. They provide him with a pilgrim's garment. He sends his charioteer back to the city with his horse; the latter dies of a broken heart.

The Bodhisattva now studies with Brahman teachers and practices extreme mortifications. He finds five disciples, all of whom leave him when he abandons these ineffectual fastings. In the meantime Sujata, the daughter of a farmer, who has been making offerings to the spirit of a banyan tree, now brings her gift of milk-rice, unto which the Gods have infused ambrosia; she finds the Bodhisattva seated beneath the tree, and gives him the rice in a golden bowl, and a golden ewer of water. She receives his blessings. He then goes down to the river to bathe, after which he eats the food, which is to last him for seven weeks. He casts the bowl into the river, and from the significant fact it floats upstream learns that he will succeed that very day. He returns to the Tree of the Awakening. At the same time Indra (the Dragon slayer, with Agni, of our former lecture, and the type of the sacrificer in divinis) assumes the shape of a grass cutter and offers to the Bodhisattva the eight bundles of grass that are used in sacrificial ritual. The Bodhisattva circumambulates the tree, and finally standing facing East finds that the circles of the world about him stand fast. He

spreads the strew, and there rises up a throne or altar at the foot of the tree; he takes his seat thereon, determined never to rise again until he has attained the knowledge of the causation and cure of the evil of mortality. It is there at the navel of the earth, and at the foot of the Tree of Life, that all former Buddhas have awakened. (D.II.85 Buddha preaching to Brethren. Majjhima Nissaya put aṭṭhabhe mukho nisidi.)"

Now Mara appears again and lays claim to the throne. The Bodhisattva touches the Earth, calling her to witness to the virtues by right of which he takes it; and she appears and gives witness. Mara, assisted by his demon army, now assaults the Bodhisattva with fire and darkness, and with showers of burning sand and ashes; but all his weapons fall harmlessly at the Bodhisattva's feet. At the first sight of Mara the Gods have fled, leaving the Bodhisattva all alone, but for the powers of the soul, his retainers; now Mara gives up the contest and the Gods return.

It is now nightfall. In the course of the night the Bodhisattva passes through all the stages of realization until at dawn, having perfectly grasped the cycle of "Causal Origination" (prattiyasamutpada) he becomes wholly awakened, and is a Buddha. The whole universe is transfigured and rejoices. The Buddha breaks into his famous song of victory: Seeking the builder of the house I have run my course in the vortex Of countless births, never escaping the hobble (of death); III is repeated birth after birth! Householder, art seen! Never again shalt thou build me a house All of thy rigging is broken, The peak of the roof is shattered (This is a technicality. See my "Symbolism of the Dome" (Part 3) in IHQ.XIV, 1938 and "Svayumatpā; Janua Coeli" in almosis 11, 1939 (1941). Shams i Tabriz XXXIV.3 "Or is it Thou who makest a ruin of every house I build?"): "Its aggregations passed away, Mind has reached the destruction of cravings.

The Buddha remains for seven weeks within the circle of the Tree of the Awakening, enjoying the gladness of release. Of the events of these weeks two are significant, first the temptation by the daughters of Mara, who attempt to win by their charms what their father could not gain by his power: and secondly the hesitation to teach; the Buddha hesitates to put in motion the Wheel of the Law, thinking that it will not be understood and that this will be the occasion of needless anguish to himself; the Gods exclaim at this, "The world is lost", and led by Brahma persuade the Buddha that some are ripe for understanding. The Buddha, accordingly, sets out for Benares and there in the "First Preaching" sets the Wheel of the Law in motion, and in the second preaches that there is no individual constant underlying the forms of our consciousness. In other words, in the doctrine of the unselfishness (anātman) of all physical and mental operations he dismisses the popular Cogito ergo sum as a crude delusion and the root of all evil. By these sermons he converts the five disciples who had formerly deserted him; and there are now five Arhats, that is to say five "despised" (nirōdha) beings in the world.

From Benares the Buddha went on to Uruvela, near the modern Bodhgaya, and finds on the way a party of thirty young men picnicking, with their wives. One of them had no wife, and had brought a woman with him, who had just stolen their belongings and run away. All the young men ask the Buddha whether he has seen such a woman. The Buddha replies, "What now, young men, do you think? Which were the better for you, to go tracking the woman, or to go tracking the Self?" (atmanan gavis; Vin.I.23 (Mahavagga 1.14). Cf. Vis.393 rajanāṃ gavesitum udāhu attanāṃ J.C.U.VIII.7.1 ya atma . . . sūratavyah. Visuddhi Magga 393 mumbling. Buddha makes King Maha Kappina mumble. Queen Anoga says "Perhaps Lord, you have seen the king?" He said "Which is better, to seek the king or to seek the Self?" (Kimpāna vo rajanāṃ gavesidumvaram udāhu attanāṃ ti). Queen answers attanānti; accordingly he dhammaṃ deseti Cf. Also Mahavagga 1.23.). They reply that it were better to seek the Self, and are converted. Here for the first time we meet with the Buddha's doctrine of a real Self. At Uruvela he reaches the hermitage of a community of Brahmanical Fire worshippers, and wishes to spend the night in their fire temple. They warn him that it is the haunt of a fierce Dragon that may hurt him. The Buddha thinks not, and retires for the night, seating himself cross legged and vigilant. The Dragon is infuriated. The Buddha will not destroy it, but will overcome it; assuming his own fiery form, and becoming a "human Dragon", he fights fire with fire, and in the morning appears with the tamed Dragon in his alms bowl. (Vin 1.25 (Mahavagga 1.15). Cf. the similar story of Moggallāna's conflict with the Dragon Rāstrapāla, Vis. 399f) Upon another day the fire worshippers are unable to split their wood, or light or extinguish their fires until the Buddha permits it. In the end the Brahmins abandon their burnt offerings (agnihotra) and become disciples of the Buddha. In this connection we must cite the instance of another Brahman fire worshipper, to whom in the course of their dialogue the Buddha says, "I pile no wood for fires or altars; I kindle a flame within me, My heart the hearth, the flame the dompted self." (S.I.169. See also my "Atmayajña: Self Sacrifice" in HJAS.VI.1942; rpt. in Coomaraswamy 2: Selected Papers, 1977.)

We perceive that the Buddha is here simply carrying on the teaching of the Brahmanical Aranyakas which, as remarked by Keith, "the internal Agnihotra is minutely described as a substitute for the formal sacrifice" (Cf. Keith, Satikhyana Aranyaka, 1908, p. xi. One must assume that it is in ignorance of the Brahmanical literature that Mrs. Rhys Davids finds something novel in the Buddha's Internal Agnihotra (Gotama the Alan, p. 97). Cf. My Atmayajña . . . (1977), p. 129; and Good enough E.R. An Introduction to the Hilojudeus, 1940, p.112, on old and new sacrifices. In just the same way I.B. Horner (Early Buddhist Theory of Alan Perfected, Ch. II, esp. p. 53) can discuss the history of word arahat at great length without mentioning that in RVA.63.4 we are told that the Gods (who, in their plurality, had never been thought of as originally immortal) "by their worth (arhāna) attained their immortality"! And in the same way the PTS Pali Dictionary knows of arahant "before Buddhism" only as an "honorific title of high officials". Buddhist exegesis by scholars who do not know their Vedas is never quite reliable.)

Time will not permit us to relate in detail the later events of the Buddha's life. He gradually builds up a large following of monastic wanderers like himself; somewhat against his will women were also allowed to be ordained as nuns; and by the end of his life there had developed an organized body of monks and nuns, many of whom lived in monasteries or nunneries, which had been donated to the community by pious laymen. The Buddha's life was spent in the care of the monastic community, and in preaching, either to assemblies of monks or to audiences of Brahmins, in disputations with whom he is invariably successful; he also performs many miracles. At last he announces his imminent death. When Ananda protests, he reminds him that while there will be those who are still addicted to mundane ways of thinking and will weep and roll in anguish, crying out "Too soon will the Eye in the World pass away", there will be others, calm and self possessed, who will reflect that all component things are impermanent, and that whatever has been

born contains within itself the inherent necessity of dissolution: "Those will honor my memory truly. who live in accordance with the Way I have taught". When a believer comes to visit him, before he dies, the Buddha says, "What goodwill it do you to see this unclean body? He who sees the Law sees me, he who sees me, sees the Law (dharma; S 111. 120.)." In announcing his forthcoming decease, the Buddha leaves this message, "Be such as have the Self (atman) as your lamp, Self as only refuge, the Law as lamp and only refuge" (D.II.101 *atta dipa viharatha atta samna . . . dhatuma(dipa dhamma sarnnk. CE Sn. 501 yeatta dipa vicaranti lokeakemcanasabbadhi) pamutta; Dh.146, 232 andhakarena onaddha pad pam an gavess atha . . . so karohi dipam attano (dipa =light). The admonition "Make the Self your refuge" (kareyya saranattano, S.III.143) enjoins what the Buddha himself has done, who says "I have made the Self my refuge" (katam me saranamattano, D.II.120):for, indeed, "ache teaches, so lie does" (yathavadi, tathahan, A.II.23,111.135, Sri. 357); which tatha is often made the basis of the epithet "Tathagata". The Buddhist "lamp" texts correspond to Svec. Up.II.15 "When the bridled man by means of his own Self suchness, as if by the light of a lamp (atma-tavena . . . dipopannana), perceives the Brahma suchness, unborn, steadfast, clean of all other suchness, then knowing God he is liberated from all] ills". The Spirit (atman) is our light when all other lights have gone out (BU.IV.3.6).*

He explains that what this means in practice is a life of incessant recollectedness (*smṛti*). The Buddhist emphasis on mindfulness can hardly be exaggerated; nothing is to be done absentmindedly; or with respect to which one could say "I did not mean to do it"; an inadvertent sin is worse than a deliberate sin (On *sati* (*smṛti*) as "watching one's step", "discretion", cf. I. Cor.10.31, Cf D.I.70. SBB.III.233, etc. Thus an inadvertent sin is worse than a deliberate sin (Mil.84, cf. 158). But like the Brahmanical *smṛti* (*smara* also has the meaning "love"), the Buddhist *sari* means more than this mere heedfulness, the *padasannam* of J.IV.252. Recollection is practiced with a view to omniscience or super gnosis (*ablanina*, *pajanana*, *prometheia*, *Pronoia*=forethought, foresight, etc.) The fullest account is given in Vis.407f. In Mil.77 9, this is a matter either of intuitive, spontaneous and unaided super gnosis, or occasioned (*katumika*=*karma*); in the latter case we are merely reminded by external signs of what we already know potentially. Comparing this with Pras.Up.W.5; CU.VII.13, 411.26.1 and MI1.VT7 ("The Self knows everything"), and taking account of the epithet *jatavedas* = Pali *jatissaro*, it appears that the Indian doctrine of Memory coincides with the Platonic doctrine in Meno 81 (*mathesis*=*anamnesis*, i.e. learning= recollection). "That means, that one must not simply "behave", instinctively; or as Plato expresses it, "Do nothing but in accordance with the leading of the immanent Principle, nothing against the common Law that rules the whole body, never yielding to the pulls of the affections, whether for good or evil; and this is what 'Self mastery' means (Laws 644, 645.) At the same time it must not be overlooked that behind this ethical application of mindfulness to conduct there lies a metaphysical doctrine; for Buddhism, like the Upanishads, regards all recognition not as an acquisition of new facts but as the recovery of a latent and ultimately unlimited omniscience; as in the Platonic doctrine, where all teaching and experience are to be thought of simply as reminders of what was already known but had been forgotten. (Plato Meno. 81,82; Republic 431A,B,604B; Laws 959B; Phaedo 83B, etc. See also my "Recollection, Indian and Platonic", JAGS. Supplement No.3,1944 and Coomaramamy, 2.: Selected Papers, Prin. Univ. Press, 1977, pp. 49 65.)

Plato, again, continually reminds us that there are two in us, and that of these two souls or selves the immortal is our "real Self". This distinction of an immortal spirit from the mortal soul, which we have already recognized in Brahmanism. is in fact the fundamental doctrine of the *Philosophia Perennis* wherever we find it. The spirit returns to God who gave it, when the dust returns to the dust. *Ganlhi seauton* (= Know thyself); *Si ignoras te, egredere* (If you are ignorant of yourself, begone). "Whither I go, ye cannot follow tire now . . . If any man would follow me, let him deny himself (John XIII.36; MarkVIII.34. Those who (to follow him have "forsaken all", and this naturally includes "themselves'.)" We must not delude ourselves by supposing that the words *denegat seipsum* (let him deny himself) are to be taken ethically (which would be to substitute means for ends); what they mean is understood by St. Bernard when he says that one ought *deficere a se tota, a semetipsa liques cere* (= one must totally abandon oneself, like a candle that burns itself up.) and by Meister Eckhart when he says that "The kingdom of God is for none but the thoroughly dead". The word of God extends to the sundering of soul from spirit" (Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews (N.T.), IV. 12.); "and it might well have been said by the Wake that "No man can be my disciple but and if he hate his own soul (Luke XIV.26, "Who hateth not father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters", cf MU.VI.28 "If to wife and family he be attached, for such a man, no, never at all", and Sn 60 "Alone I fare, forsaking wife and child, mother and father". Cf. note 118 in 'Hinduism' section.)" (*kai on miso ten heautau prsuchen*= he who does not hate his own soul). "The soul must put itself to death"="Lest the Last judgment come and find me unannihilate, and I be seized and given into the hand., of my own selfhood (Meister Eckhart and William Blake. Cf. Behmen, *Sex Puncta Theosophica*, VII.10 "Thus we see how a life perishes . . . namely, when it will be its own lord . . . If it will not give itself up to death, then it cannot obtain any other world". Cf. Matth.Xf.25; Plaaedo, 67, 68. No creature can attain a higher grade of nature without ceasing to exist" (St. Thomas Aquinas, Surn.Theod.1.63.3). Cf. Schiller, "In error only there is life arid knowledge must be death"; and what has been said above on Nirvana as a being finished. What lies beyond such deaths cannot be defined in terms of our kind of living. Dance The Divine Comedy, Paradise XIV.25. Whoso laments, that we must doff this garb of frail mortality, thenceforth to live Immortally above; he hath not seen The sweet refreshing of that heavenly shower.)".

THE DOCTRINE

In the Buddha's question cited above, "Were it not better if ye sought the Self" the contrast of the plural verb with its singular object is precise. It is One that the many are to find. Let Its consider some of the many other Buddhist contexts in which our selves, respectively composite and mortal and single and immortal, are contrasted. The question is asked, just as it had been in the Brahmanical books, "By which self (*kena atmana*)" does one attain the Brahma world?" The answer is given in another passage, where the usual formula descriptive of the Arhats attainment concludes "with the Self that is Brahma become" (*brahma bleiciena atmand*);

just as in the Upanishad "It is as Brahma that he returns to Brahma", From that world there is no returning (punaravartana) by any necessity of rebirth. Other passages distinguish the Great Self (mahatman) from the little self (alpatman) or Fair Self (kalyanatman) from foul (papatman); the former is the latter's judge.

Atman (pali: Attan): (root an, to breathe, cf. atmos, autme is primarily Spiritus, the luminous is and pneumatic principle, and as such often equated with the Gale (Vayu, Vata, root va, to blow) of the Spirit which "bloweth as it listeth" (yalha vacara carati, RVX168.1 as in John ILS). Being the ultimate in all things, atman acquires the secondary sense of "Self", regardless of our level of reference, which may be either somatic (soma; nectar of immortality), psychic or spiritual. So that over against our real Self, the Spirit in ourselves and all living things there is the "self", of which we speak when we say "I" or "you", meaning this or that man, so-and so. In other words there are two in us, Outer and Inner Man, psychophysical personality and very Person. It is therefore according to the context that we must translate. Because the word atman, used reflexively, can only be rendered by "self" we have adhered to the sense of "self" throughout, distinguishing Self from self by the capital, as is commonly done. But it must be clearly understood that the distinction is really of "spirit" (pneuma) from "soul" (psyche) in the Pauline sense. It is true that the ultimate Self, "this self's immortal Self" (MU.III.2, VI.2), is identical with Philo's "soul of the soul" (psyche, psyches), and with Plato's "immortal soul" as distinguished from the "mortal soul" and that some translators render atman by "soul"; but although there are contexts in which "soul" means "spirit" (cf William of Thierry, Epistle to the Brethren, of Mont Dim, Ch. XV, on this very problem of the distinction of anima from animus; see also Philo, Heres 55) it becomes dangerously misleading, in view of our current notions of "psychology" to speak of the ultimate and universal Self as a "soul". It would be, for example, a very great mistake to suppose that when a "philosopher" such as Jung speaks of "man in search of a soul" this has anything whatever to do with the Indian search for the Self, or for that matter with the injunction, Gnothi seauton, know thy Self. The empiricist's "self" is for the metaphysician, just like all the rest of our environment, "not my Self". Of the two "selves" referred to, the first is born of woman, the second of the divine womb, the sacrificial fire (SB.I.8.3.6; and whoever has not thus been "born again" is effectively possessed of but the one and mortal self that is born of the flesh and must end with it (JB.I.17, cf. John III 6, Gal. VI 8, I Cor. 15.50, etc.). Hence in the Upanishads and Buddhism the fundamental questions "Who art thou?", and "By which self?" is immortality attainable, the answer being, only by that Self that is immortal; the Indian texts never fall into the error of supposing that a soul that has had a beginning in time can also be immortal; nor indeed, can we see that the Christian Gospels anywhere, never put forward such an impossible doctrine as this.

The Self is the Lord of the self, and its goal. "In the saying "For one who has attained, there is not dearer than Self"" we recognize the doctrine of the Upanishads that the "Self alone is truly dear" the Hermetic "Love the Self" and the Christian doctrine that "A man, out of charity, ought to love himself more than he loves any other person i.e. that Self for whose sake he must deny himself. In the Brahmanical doctrine, our immortal, impassible, beatific inner Self and Person, one and the same in all beings, is the immanent Brahma, God within you." He does not come from anywhere nor become anyone." "That" is; but nothing else that is true can be said of it: "Thou canst not know the maker to know what is known, who is your Self in all things". Just as God himself does not know what he is, because he is not any what. The Buddhist doctrine proceeds in the same way, by elimination. Our own constitution and that of the world is repeatedly analyzed, and as each one of the five physical and mental factors of the transient personality with which the "untaught many folk" identify "themselves" is listed, the pronouncement follows, "This is not my Self" (na me so atma). "You will observe that amongst these childish mentalities who identify themselves with their accidents, the Buddha would have included Descartes, with his Cogito ergo sum.

There is, in fact, no more an individual than there is a world soul. What we call our "consciousness" is nothing but a process; its content changes from day to day and is just as much causally determined as is the content of the body." Our personality is constantly being destroyed and renewed; there is neither self nor anything of the nature of self in the world; and all this applies to all beings, or rather becomings, whether of men or Gods, now and hereafter. Just as it is expressed by Plutarch, "Nobody remains one person, nor is one person . . . Our senses, through ignorance of reality, falsely tell us that what appears to be, actually is". The old Brahmanical (and Platonic) symbol of the chariot is made use of; the chariot, with all its appurtenances, corresponds to what we call our self; there was no chariot before its parts were put together, and will be none when they fall to pieces; there is no "chariot" apart from its parts; "chariot" is nothing but a name, given for convenience to a certain continuum of perceptions, but must not be taken to be an entity (sattva); and in the same way with ourselves who are, just like the chariot, "confections". The Comprehensor has seen things "as they have become" (yatha bhutam), causally arising and disappearing, and has distinguished himself from all of them; it is not for him, but only for an ignoramus to ask such questions as "Am I?" "What was I once?", "Whence did I come?", "Whither am I going?" "If the Arhat is expressly permitted still to say "I", this is only for convenience; he has long since outgrown all belief in a personality of his own. But none of all this means, nor is it anywhere said that "There is no Self". On the contrary, there are passages in which when the five constituents of our evanescent and unreal "existence" have been listed, we find, not the usual formula of negation, "That is not my Self", but the positive injunction, "Take refuge in the Self"; just the Buddha also says that he himself has done.

The empirical personality of this man, So and so, being merely a process, it is not "my" consciousness or personality that can survive death and be born again." It is improper to ask "Whose consciousness is this?"; we should ask only, "How did this consciousness arise". The old answer is given, "The body is not 'mine', but an effect of past works". There is no "essence" that passes over from one habitation to another; as one flame is lit from another, so life is transmitted, but not a life, not "my" life" Beings are the heirs of acts;" but it cannot be said exactly that "I" now reap the rewards of what "I" did in a former habitation. There is causal continuity, but no one consciousness (vinnana), no essence (sattva) that now experiences the fruits of good and evil actions, and that also recurs and reincarnates (sandhavati samsarati) without otherness (ananyam)", to experience in the future the consequences of what is now taking place. Consciousness, indeed is never the same from one day to another.' How, then, could "it" survive and pass over from one life to another? Thus the Vedanta and Buddhism are in complete agreement that while there is transmigration, there are no individual transmigrants. All that we see is the operation of causes, and so much the worse for us if we see in this fatally determined nexus our "Self". We can find the same thing in Christianity, where it is asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that

he was born blind?" to which the remarkable answer is made that "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God might be made manifest in him". In other words, the blindness has "arisen" by the operation of those mediate causes of which God is the First Cause and without which the world would have been deprived of the perfection of causality."

The Buddha's purpose is to save us from our selves and their mortality. He would go on to say that our subjection to such fatal accidents as blindness is a part and parcel of our identification of "consciousness" with "Self". We altogether misunderstand the value and importance of "consciousness"; "that is not my Self"; and the Parable of the Raft applies as much to consciousness as to ethical procedure; like the raft, consciousness is a valuable tool, a means of operation, but like the raft not to be held onto when tire work has been done." If this alarms us, as Arishta was frightened because he thought that the peace of Nirvana implied a destruction of something real in himself," we must not overlook that what we are asked to substitute for our consciousness of things pleasant and unpleasant or rather, subjection to feelings of pleasure and pain is not a simple unconsciousness but a super-consciousness, none the less real and beatific because it cannot be analyzed in the terms of conscious thought. At the same time we ought, perhaps, to point out that this superconsciousness, or what in Christian theology is called the "divine manner of knowing, not by means of any objects external to the knower", is by no means to be equated with the sub-consciousness of modern psychology, with respect to which it has been very truly said that while "nineteenth century materialism closed the mind of man to what is above him, twentieth century, psychology open it to what is below him".

Our conscious "life" is a process, subject to corruption and death. It is this life that must be "arrested" (nirodha) if we are to live immortally. It will be useless to deal with symptoms; it is the cause or occasion (hetu, nidana) that must be sought if we are to find the "medicine" that the Buddha sought and found. It is the understanding of things "as become" (Yatha bhutam), and the realization that "personality" (attabhava) is one of these things, that liberates man from himself. The gist of the Buddhist gospel is resumed in the often and triumphant repeated words, Of all things that spring from a cause, The cause has been told by him "Thus come" And their suppression, too, The Great Pilgrim has declared.

In this chain of causes, to understand which is to have come Awake, it is emphasized that nothing whatever happens by chance but only in a regular sequence "That being present, this becomes; that not being present, this does not become". To have verified this is to have found the Way. For in "all things that spring from a cause" are included "old age, sickness, and death"; and when we know the cause, we can apply the cure. The applicated is stated in the cycle of "causal origination" mastered on the night of the Great Awakening. All the ills that flesh is heir to are inseparable from and essential to the process of existence and unavoidable by any individual; individuality is "consciousness"; consciousness is not a being, but a passion, not an activity but only a sequence of reactions in which "we", who have no power to be either as or when we will, are fatally involved; individuality is motivated by and perpetuated by wanting; and the cause of all wanting is "ignorance" (avidya), for we "ignore" that the objects of our desire can never be possessed in any real sense of the word, ignore that even when we have got what we want, we still "want" to keep it and are still "in want". The ignorance meant is of things as they really are (yatha bhutam), and tire consequent attribution of substantiality to what is merely phenomenal; the seeing of Self in what is not Self."

In making ignorance the root of all evil, Buddhism concurs with all traditional doctrine. But we must guard ourselves from supposing that an ignorance of any particular thing is meant, and especially against a confusion of the traditional "ignorance" with what we mean by "illiteracy"; so far from this, our empirical knowledge of facts is an essential part of the yet), ignorance that makes desire possible. And no less must another misunderstanding be avoided; we must not suppose that the traditional wisdom is opposed to the knowledge of useful facts; what it demands is that we should recognize in what are called "facts" and "laws of science", not absolute truths but statements of statistical probability. The pursuit of scientific knowledge does not necessarily imply an "ignorance"; it is only when the motive is a curiosity, only when we pursue knowledge for its own sake, or art for arts sake, that we are behaving "ignorantly". In Brahmanical terms, "ignorance" is of who we are; in Buddhist language, of what we are not; and these are only two ways of saying the same thing, what we really are being definable only in terms of what we are not.

It is only by making stepping stones of our dead selves, until we realize at last that there is literally nothing with which we can identify our Self, that we can become what we are. And hence the Buddhist emphasis on what in Christian terms is called "self naughting", an expression based on Christ's denegat seipsum, "Behold the Arhat's beatitude! No wanting can be found in them; excised the thought 'I am'; unmoving, un-originated, uncontaminated, very Persons, God become (brahma bhuta), great heroes, natural sons of the Wake; unshaken in whatever plight, released from further becoming (punar bhava), on ground of dompted self they stand, they in the world have won their battle; they roar the 'Lion's roar'; incomparable are the Wake" (buddah)". There is no question here of a post mortem deliverance, but of "Persons" triumphant here and now; nor will it be overlooked that the epithet "Buddha" is used in the plural, and applied to all who have reached their goal.

Of such it is often said that they are "despirated" (nimata). The word Nirvana, "despiration", which plays so large a part in our conception of Buddhism, where it is one of the most important of the many terms that are the referents to "man's last end", demands some further explanation. The verb nirva is, literally, to "blow out", not transitively, but as a fire ceases to draw, i.e. "draw breath". The older texts employ the nearly synonymous verb udva, to "blow out" or "go out"; "when the Fire blows out (udvayati) it is into the Gale that it expires"; "deprived of fuel, the fire of life is "pacified", i.e. quenched, when the mind has been curbed, one attains to the "peace of Nirvana", despiration in God". In the same way Buddhism stresses the going out of the fire or light of life for want of fuel it is by ceasing to feed our fires that the peace is reached, of which it is well said in another tradition that "it passeth understanding"; our present life is a continuity of coming to be and passing away and immediate rebirth, like aflame that goes on burning and is not the same nor yet another flame; and in the same way with rebirth after death, it is like the lighting of one flame from another; nothing concrete passes over, there is continuity, but not sameness." But "the contemplatives go out like this lamp" which, once out, 'cannot pass on its flame'." Nirvana is a kind of death, but like every death a rebirth to something other than what had been. Pari nirvana merely adds the value "complete" to the notion of a despiration.

We say "a kind of death" because the word nirvana can be used of still living things. The Bodhisattva is "despirated" when he

becomes the Buddha. Even more significant, we find that each of the stages completed in the training of a royal steed is called a Parinirvana. The Buddha uses the word chiefly in connection with the "quenching" of the fires of passion, fault and delusion (raga, do sa and moha). But there is a distinction involved here; the despiration is a present (samdrstikam) experience in two ways, ethical in as much as it implies the eradication of passion and fault, and eternal, i.e. metaphysical, in that it is a liberation from delusion, or ignorance (avijja); from both points of view it involves an unselfishness, but on the one hand in practice, on the other in theory... Thus while the denotation is that of the Greek aposbennumi (be still, go out, be quenched, of wind, fire or passion), the connotation is that of Greek teleo and teleutao (to be perfected, to die). All these meanings can be resumed in the one English word "finish"; the finished product is no longer in the making, no longer becoming what it ought to be; in the same way the finished being, the perfected man has done with all becoming; the final dissolution of the body cannot affect him, however affecting it may be to others, themselves imperfect, unfinished. Nirvana is a final end, and like Brahma, a matter about which no further questions can be asked by those who are still on fire.

In other words, the Way involves on the one hand a practical and on the other a contemplative discipline. The contemplative corresponds to the athlete, who does not contest for the prize unless he is already "in training". When the Indians speak of the Comprehensor (evamvit) of a given doctrine, they do not mean by this merely one who grasps the logical significance of a given proposition; they mean one who has "verified" it in his own person, and is what he knows; for so long as we know only of our immortal Self, we are still in the realm of ignorance; we only really know it when we become it; we cannot really know it without being it. There are ways of life dispositive to such a realization, and other ways that must prevent it. Let us, therefore, pause to consider the nature of the "mere morality", or as it is now called, "Ethics", apart from which the contemplative life would be impossible. What we should call a "practical holiness" is called alike in the old Indian books and in Buddhism a present and timeless "Walking with God" (brahmacharya). But there is also a clear distinction of the Doctrine (dharma) from its practical Meaning (artha), and it is with the latter that we are for the moment concerned.

In agreement with the old Indian theory of the relation of the Regnum to the Sacerdotium, we find a Buddhist king who requests the Bodhisattva to give him instruction both in Ethics (artha) and in Doctrine (dharma)," and this context will enable us to grasp the distinction very clearly. We find that Ethics is a matter of liberality (dana) and of commandments (Sila). More in detail, the king is to provide for all his subjects needs, and to make honorable provision for both men and animals when superannuated and no longer able to do what they did in their prime. On the other hand, the whole of what is here called the Doctrine is stated in the form of the "chariot simile", of which more later.

The terms "commandments" demands a further analysis. These rules of what is sometimes styled "mere morality="mere" because although indispensable, if we are to reach man's last end, morality is not in itself an end, but only a means are not quite rigidly fixed; in general, the reference is to the "five" or "ten virtuous habits". As five, these are (1) not to kill, (2) not to steal, (3) not to follow the lusts of the flesh, (4) to refrain from lying, and (5) to refrain from the use of intoxicants. These are essential preliminaries for any spiritual development, and are expected of all laymen. The set of ten includes the first four of the five, and (5) to avoid slander, (6) to refrain from abusive speech, (7) to avoid frivolous converse, (8) not to covet, (9) not to bear malice, and (10) to entertain no false views. The last has particular reference to the avoidance of heresies such as the belief in "soul", the view that causal determination cancels moral responsibility, the view that there is "no other world", the view that the Buddha has taught a novel doctrine, the view that he teaches an annihilation or cutting off of anything but sorrow. The foregoing five or ten rules are to be distinguished from the five or ten "bases of training" of the monastic title; the first five of these are the same as the five already listed, to which are added (6) not to eat at irregular hours, (7) not to attend musical and theatrical performances, (8) to refrain from the use of unguents and ornaments, (9) not to sleep on luxurious beds, and (10) not to accept gold or silver. Before we return to the Doctrine we must carefully guard ourselves from thinking that the Buddha attaches an absolute value to moral conduct. We must not, for example, suppose that because the means are partly ethical, Nirvana is therefore an ethical state. So far from this, the Indian point of view is an amoral state, in which no question of "altruism" can present itself, liberation being as much from the notion of "others" as it is from the notion of "self"; and not in any sense a psychological state, but a liberation from all that is implied by the "psyche" in the word "psychology". "I call him a Brahmana indeed", the Buddha says, "who has passed beyond attachment both to good and evil; one who is clean, to whom no dust attaches, a pathetic" (Dh. 412; cf. So. 363, Mil.383 and next Note. "Apathetic", i.e. "not pathological"; as are those who are subject to their own passions or sympathise with those of others. Note karuna 'pity' does not imply sympathy or compassion.) In the well known Parable of the Raft (of ethical procedure) by means of which one crosses the river of life, he asks very pointedly "what does a man do with the boat when he has reached the other side of the river? Does he carry it about on his back, or does he leave it on the shore? Perfection is something more than an infantile innocence; there must be knowledge of what are folly and wisdom, good and evil, and of how to be rid of both these values, and of how to be "right without being righteous", "moral amorally" (salavat no ra silamayah, 14.11.27; Eckhart "... she would not merely practice virtues, but virtue as a whole would be her life...", Evans trans. Vol. I, p. 374). For the Arhat, having "done all that was to be done" (krta karaayam), there is nothing more that should be done (BG.III.17 kanam na vidyate), and therefore no possibility of merit or demerit; injunctions and prohibitions have no longer any meaning where there is no longer anything that ought or ought not to be done. For there indeed, as Meister Eckhart says of the Kingdom of God, "neither vice nor virtue ever entered it"; just as in the Upanishad, where neither vice nor virtue can pass over the Bridge of Immortality." The Arhat is "no longer under the Law"; he is "not under the Law", but a "Mover at will" and a "Doer of what he will"; if we find that he acts unselfishly in our ethical sense of the word, that is our interpretation, for which he is not responsible. Only the Patipassian and Monophysite can offer any objection to the points of view.

It must also be clearly realized that it will be convenient at this point to ask, "Who is the Wake?" For the answer to this question will tell us as much as can be told of those who have followed in his footsteps to the end, and can be spoken of as "World enders" (lokantagu). Who is the Great Person, the Kinsman of the Sun, the Eye in the World," the descendant of Angirasa, the God of Gods, who says of himself that he is neither a God, nor a Genius nor a man, but a Buddha, one in whom all the conditions that determine

particular modes of existence have been destroyed," What are these Arhats, who like the Vedic immortals, have won to being what they are by their "dignity"?

The question can be approached from many different angles. In the first place, the Buddha's names and epithets are suggestive; in the Vedas, for example, the first and most of Angirases are Agni and Indra," to whom also the designation of "Arhat" is oftenest applied. Agni is, like the Buddha, "awakened at dawn" (usarbbudh): Indra is urged to be "of waking mind" (bodhin mamas), and when overcome by pride in his own strength he actually "awakens" himself when reproached by his spiritual alter ego." That the Buddha is called "Great Person" and "Most Man" (mahapurisha nrtama) by no means tells us that he is "a man", since these are epithets of the highest Gods in the oldest Brahmanical books. Maya is not a woman's name, but Natura naturans, our "Mother Nature-Original Nature/Buddha-Nature" (Maya (the "means" of all creation, divine or human, or "art" by which anything is made), is "magic" in the sense of Behmen Sex Puncta Mystica, V.If ("The Mother of eternity; the original state of Nature; the formative power in the eternal wisdom, the power of imagination, a mother in all three worlds; of use to the children of God's kingdom, and to the sorcerers for the devil's kingdom; for the understanding can make of it what it pleases"). Maya for Sankaracarya the greatest exponent of mayavada is "the Unrevealed, the Power (sakti) of the Lord, the beginningless Unknowable (avidya), inferable by the wise in relation to what can be made (kana=(actibaha), ["Man therefore knows not, or his appetites Their first affections" Dante, Purgatory XVIII.521 that by which all this moving world is brought to birth . . . and by whom are both Bondage and Liberation effected". Vivekadadarnani 108, 569.

In such contexts as this the gerundive avidya, synonymous with "Power", cannot be simply "Ignorance" but is much rather "mystery" or "opinion" as opposed to vidya, "what can be known": avidya is a Potentiality that can only be known by its effects, by all that is mayamaya. Maya is the Nature of God. Maya, in other words, is the Theotokos and mother of all living. Other parallels: Metis, the mother of Athena; Sophia; Kausalya the mother of Pama; as Maiawas the mother of Hermes, Hesiod, Theag 938). Of whom else could the Buddha have been born? That the mothers of Bodhisatvas die young is really because as Heracleitus says (Fr.X), "Nature loves to hide". Maya "vanishes" just as Urvasi, mother of Ayus (Agni) by Pururavas, vanished, and as Saranyu vanished from Vivasvan; May's vvmurti Pajapati taking her place (BC.I.18; 11. 19, 20) as Saranyu's savama took hers. The eternal Avatara has, indeed, always "two mothers", eternal and temporal, sacerdotal and royal. See also my "Nirmanakaya", JRAS, 1938. Maya, being the "art" by which all things or any thing is made (nirmita, "measured out"), and "art" having been originally a mysterious and magical knowledge, acquires its other and pejorative sense (e.g. MU. IV.2) in the same way that art, artifice, craft, cunning and sleight, are not only virtues essential to the maker by art (artifex), but can also imply artfulness, artificiality (falsity), craftiness, guile and trickery; it is the bad sense, for example that "Consciousness is a glamour" (maya vi ya vinnauam, Vis. 479, 5.111.142), while on the other hand Wycliff could still render our "wise as serpents" (Matth.X.16, cf. RV.VL52.15, ahimayah) by "sly as serpents". CE Betty Heimann, Maya in Indian and Western Philosophy, pp. 49f); Or if we consider the miraculous life, we shall find that almost every detail, from the free choice of the time and place of birth to the lateral birth itself and the taking of the Seven Strides, and from the Going Forth to the Great Awakening on the strewn altar at the foot of the World tree at the Navel of the Earth, and from the defeat of the Dragons to the miraculous kindling of the sacrificial firewood," can be exactly paralleled and in saying "exactly" we mean just that in the Vedic mythology of Agni and Indra, priest and king indivinis. For example, and the single instance must suffice, if the Vedic Dragon fights with fire and smoke, and also with women for weapons, so does Mara, Death, whom the Buddhist texts still refer to as "Holdfast"; if the Vedic Dragonslayer is deserted by the Gods and must rely upon his own resources, so is the Bodhisattva left alone, and can only call upon his own powers to assist him. In saying this we do not mean to deny that the Buddha's defeat of Mara is an allegory of self conquest, but only to point out that this is a very old story, one that has always and everywhere been told; and that in its Buddhist setting the story is not a new one, but derived immediately from the Vedic tradition, where the same story is told, and where it has the same significance."

That the perfected possess the power of motion and manifestation at will is familiar in Christian teaching, where they "shall pass in and out and find pasture " and such powers are naturally proper to those who, being "joined unto the Lord, are one Spirit" The like is repeatedly enunciated in the Brahmanical scriptures, and often in nearly the same words. In an often recurring context the Buddha describes the four stages of contemplation (dhyana) of paths of power (rddhipada) that are the equivalent of the "Noble Path" and are means to Omniscience, Full Awakening and Nirvana. When all these stations of contemplation (dhyana) have been so mastered that the practitioner can pass from one to another at will, and similarly commands the composure or synthesis (samadhi) to which they lead, then in this state of unification (eko'vadhi fihava) the liberated Arhat is at once omniscient and omnipotent; the Buddha, describing his own attainment, can remember his "former habitations" (purva-nivasa), or as we should be apt to say, "past births", in every detail; and describing his powers (rddhi), he says that "I, brethren, can realize (pratyanabhu) whatever countless powers I will; being many, I become one, and having been many become also one; seen or unseen, I can pass through a wall or a mountain as if it were air; I can sink into the earth or emerge from it as though it were water; I can walk on the water as if it were solid earth; I can move through the air like a bird; I can touch with my hands the sun and moon; I have power with respect to my body even so far as unto the Brahma world". The same powers are exercised by other adepts to the extent that they have perfected themselves in the same disciplines and are masters of composure (samadhi); it is only when contemplation (dhyana) fails that the power of motion at will is lost. The Buddha employs the old Brahmanical formula; when he says that he has taught his disciples to extract from this material body another body of intellectual substance (mavamaya kaya) . as one might draw an arrow from its sheath, a sword froth its scabbard, or a snake from its slough; it is with this intellectual body that one enjoys omniscience and is a mover at will as far as the Brahmaloaka.

Before we ask ourselves what all this means, let us remark that supernatural no more implies unnatural than super essential implies unessential; and that it would be unscientific to say that such attainments are impossible, unless one has made experiment in accordance with the prescribed and perfectly intelligible disciplines. To call these things "miraculous" is not to say "impossible", but only "wonderful"; and as we said before, following Plato, "Philosophy begins in wonder". Furthermore, it must be clearly understood that the Buddha, like other orthodox teachers, attaches no great importance to these powers and very strongly deprecates a cultivation

of powers for their own sake and in any case forbids their public exhibition by monks who possess them. "I do, indeed", he says, "possess these three powers (rddhi) of motion at will, mind reading, and teaching; but there can be no comparison of the first two of these marvels (pratiharya) with the much farther reaching and far more productive marvel of my, teaching". It will profit us more to ask what such marvels, or those of Christ imply, than to ask whether they "really" took place on some given occasion; just as in the exegesis of other hero tales it will be much more useful to ask what "seven league boots" and "tat n caps" mean, than to point out that they cannot be bought in department stores.

In the first place, we observe that in the Brahmanical contexts, omniscience, particularly of births, is predicated of Agni (Jatavedas), the "Eye in the World", and of the "all seeing" Sun, the "Eye of the Gods", and for the very good reason that these consubstantial principles are the catalytic powers apart from which no birth could be; and further, that the power of motion at will, or what is the same thing, motion without locomotion, is predicated in the Brahmanical books of the Spirit or Universal Self (atman) on the one hand; and of liberated beings, knowers of the Self and assimilated to the Self, on the other. Once we have understood that the Spirit, universal solar Self and Person, is a timeless omnipresence, it will be recognized that the Spirit, by hypothesis, is naturally possessed of all the powers that have been described; the Spirit is the "knower of all births" in saecula saeculorum precisely because it is "where everywhere and every when are focused" and is present undivided as well in all past as in all future becomings; and by the same token, we find it spoken of also as "Providence (prajia) or as "Compendious Providence" (Prajnana ghana) for the very good reason that its knowledge of "events" is not derived from the events themselves, but the events derived from its knowledge of itself. In all the Brahmanical books the powers that have been described are the Lord's: if the Comprehensor can change his form and move at will, it is "even as Brahma can change his forth and move at will; it is the Spirit, ultimately solar Self (atman) that itself not moving yet out runs others. All these things are powers of the Spirit and of those who are "in the spirit"; and if by far the greatest of all these miracles is that of the teaching, that is simply to say with St. Ambrose that "All that is trite, by whomsoever it has been said, is from the Holy Ghost". If the "signs and wonders" are lightly dismissed, it is not because they are unreal, but because it is an evil and adulterous generation that asketh for a sign.

The Buddha describes himself as unknowable (ananuvedya) even here and now; neither Gods nor men can see him; those who see him in any form or think of him in words do not see him at all. "I am neither priest nor prince nor husbandman nor anyone at all; I wander in the world a learned Nobody, uncontaminated by human qualities (alipyamana manavebhyah); useless to ask my family name (gotra)". He leaves no trace by which he can be tracked. Even here and now the Buddha cannot be taken hold of, and it cannot be said of this Supernal Person (parama purusa) after the dissolution of the body and psychic complex that he becomes or does not become, nor can both these things be affirmed or denied of him; all that can be said is that "he is"; to ask what or where he is would be futile. 141 "He who sees the Law (dharma) sees me" and that is why in the early iconography he is represented, not in humors form, but by such symbols as that of the "Wheel of the Law", of which he is the immanent mover. And that is all just as it was in the Brahmanical books, where it is Brahma that has no personal or family name" and cannot be tracked, the Spirit (atman) that never became anyone, Who knows where he is?" the interior Self that is uncontaminated, "the supreme Self of which nothing true can be said (neti-neti) and that cannot be grasped except by the thought "It is". It is assuredly with reference to that ineffable principle that the Buddha says that "There is an unborn, un-become, unmade, incomposite, and were it not for that unborn, un-become, unmade, incomposite, no way could be shown of escape from birth, becoming, making, composition"; and we do not see what that "unborn" can be but "That" inanimate (anatmya) Spirit (atman) were it not for whose invisible being (sat) there could be no life anywhere. "The Buddha flatly denies that he ever taught the cessation or annihilation of an essence; all that he teaches is the putting of a stop to sorrow.

In a famous passage of the Milinda Questions the old symbol of the chariot is used by Nagasena to break down the King's belief in the reality of his own "personality". We need hardly say that throughout the Brahmanical and Buddhist literature (as also in Plato and Philo)"the "chariot" stands for the psycho physical vehicle, as which or in which according to our knowledge of "who we are" we live and move."="The steeds are the senses, the reins their controls, the mind the coachman, and the Spirit or real Self (atman) the charioteer (rathi; The charioteer is either Agni (RVX51.6; AVJII.21.3), or the Breath (pram= Brahma, Attract, Sun), the Breath to which "no name can be given" (AA.II.3.8), or the Spiritual Self (Atman, KU.III.3; J_V.252) or Dhamma (S.I.33). The skilled charioteer (susarathi) guides his horses where he will (RV.VL75.6), just as we might now speak of the skilled driver of a motorcar or airplane as roaming where he likes.), i.e. passenger and owner, who alone knows the vehicle's destination; if the horses are allowed to run away with the mind, the vehicle will go astray; but if they are curbed and guided by the mind in accordance with its knowledge of the Self, the latter will reach home. In our Buddhist text it is strongly emphasized that all that composes the chariot and team, or body-and soul, is devoid of any essential substance; "chariot" and "self" are only the conventional names of constructed (constituted) aggregates, and do not import existences independent of or distinguishable from the factors of which they are composed; and just as one confection is called a "chariot" for convenience, so ought the human personality to be called a "self" only for convenience. And just as the repeated expression "That is not my Self" has so often been misinterpreted to mean "There is no Self" so the destructive analysis of the vehicular personality has been held to mean that there is no Person' It is complained that "the charioteer is left out". Actually, however, nothing is said for or against the imperceptible presence in the composite vehicle of an eternal substance distinct from it and one and the same in all such vehicles. Nagasena, who refuses to be regarded as a "somebody" and maintains that "Nagasena" is nothing but a name for the inconstant aggregate of the psycho physical phenomenon, could surely have said, "I live, yet not 'I', but the Law in me". And if we take into consideration other Pali texts we shall find that a charioteer is taken for granted, and who and what he is, namely one that "has never become anyone". The Eternal Law (dharma) is, in fact, the charioteer; 155 and while "the king's chariots age, and just so the body ages, the Eternal Law of existences does not age 11.156 The Buddha identifies himself that Self that he calls his refuge's' with this Law's" and calls himself the best of charioteers", one who tames men, as though they were horses. And finally we find a detailed analysis of the "chariot" concluding with the statement that the rider is the Self (atman), in almost the very words of the Upanishads." The statement of a Buddhist commentator, that the Buddha is the Spiritual Self (atman) is

assuredly correct. "" That "Great Person" (mahapurusa) is the charioteer in all beings (M.II.206 7: What Buddha teaches is brahmanam "the way to fellowship with Brahman" [sahavyataya maggo (sahaya=saha+aya); A.5.90 kalyana sahaya, Manusruti VI.49 atnucnaiva sahayena], and can teach because he can say brahmanam caham..., brahma lokam prajanami, as being one who was "born there and had always lived there". Cf. BGXVIII.54 brahma bhuta prasannatma.).

We believe that enough has now been said to show beyond any possible doubt that the "Buddha" and "Great Person", "Arhat", "Brahma become" and "God of Gods" of the Pali texts is himself the Spirit (atman) and Inner Man of all beings, and that he is "That One" who makes himself manifold in whom all beings again "become one"; that the Buddha is Brahma, Prajapati, the Light of Lights, Fire or Sun, or by whatever other name the older books refer to the First Principle; and to show that in so far as the Buddha's "life" and deeds are described, it is the doings of Brahma as Agni and Indra that are retold. Agni and Indra are the Priest and King in divinit, and it is with these two possibilities that the Buddha is born, and these two possibilities that are realized, for although his kingdom is in one sense not of this world, it is equally certain that he as Cakravartin is both priest and king in the same sense that Christ is "both priest and king". We are forced by the logic of the scriptures"" themselves to say that Agnendru, Buddha, Krishna, Moses and Christ are names of one and the same "descent" whose birth is eternal; to recognize that all scripture without exception requires of us in positive terms to know our Self and by the same token to know what is not our Self but mistakenly called a "self"; and that the Way to become what we are demands an excision from our consciousness of being, every false identification of our being with what we are not, but think we are when we say "I think" or "I do". To have "come clean" (suddha, katharos) is to have distinguished our Self from all its psycho physical, bodily and mental accidents; to have identified our Self with any of these is the worst possible sort of pathetic fallacy and the whole cause of "our" sufferings and mortality, from which no one who still is anyone can be liberated. It is related that a Confucian scholar be sought the twenty-eighth Buddhist patriarch, Bodhidharma, "to pacify his soul". The Patriarch retorted, "Produce it, and I will pacify it". The Confucian replied "That is my trouble, that I cannot find it". Bodhidharma replied, "Your wish is granted". The Confucian understood, and departed in peace.

It is altogether contrary to Buddhist, as it is to Vedantic doctrine to think of "ourselves" as wanderers in the fatally determined storm of the world's flow (samsara). "Our immortal Self is anything but a "surviving personality". "" It is not this man so and so that goes home and is lost to view, but the prodigal Self that recollects itself; and that having been many is now again one, and inscrutable, Dens absconditus. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven", and therefore "If any man would follow me, let him deny himself ". "The kingdom of God is for none but the thoroughly dead". "" The realization of Nirvana is the "Flight of the Alone to the Alone". "Tis the Void that passeth to the Void".