16

Buddhist Original Philosophy to Pursue Worldwide Peace

Shinkan Murakami

It is true that the Early Buddhism is not a mere philosophy, but a kind of unique system of religious training and discipline to pursue inner tranquil peace (*nirvā□a, nibbāna*). But in order to understand these systems deeply and give expression to them anew, we have to recourse to philosophical terminology and think over these religious systems philosophically, i.e., logically, ontologically, epistemologically, and so on.

In the first place, I want to point to the fact that Buddhism (or Buddha's teaching) has been based on the perceptual reality and accepted on one's own experiential realizations, but not on mere reasoning.

1. Buddha's Fundamental Stance

According to the early Buddhist Canon, Buddha was often asked questions by Brahmins and others about metaphysical questions to which He never gave any definite answer: yes or no (*avyākata,* unanswered, unexplained, 無記). There are several kinds of list of these questions. The most popular one consists of ten questions: whether the world is eternal（*sassato loko*), or not eternal (*asassato*), whether the world has an end (*antavā*), or no end (*anantavā*), whether the soul is the body (*ta□ jīva□ ta□ sarīra□*), or different from the body (*aññ a□ jīva□ aññ a□ sarīra□*), whether the thus Come One (a liberated person) exists after death (*hoti tathāgato param mara□ā*), or does not exist after death□*na hoti* …), or exists and does not exist after death□*hoti ca na hoti*…), or neither exists nor does not exist after death (*n'eva hoti na na hoti*…). This indifferent stance of the Buddha shall be influential to the coming formation of the systems.

2. Buddhist Systems are confined within the scope of our perceptual experience.

In this way Buddhism avoids answering such metaphysical questions as are beyond our perception; consequently its systems seem to be confined in the

scope of our perception. The topics of discourse are liable to be limited within the scope of our (my, your) experience. These systems consist of our physical and mental elements, which are perceptible and conscious of, and which start from everyone's organs of sense. These elements are analyzed in two categorical systems.

(1) The first system is based on our five organs of sense and the mind. In Buddhism these six are called organs of sense (*indriya*) or sphere of perception (cognition, *āyatana*), which are the basis of our being: perception and the perceived, or experience and the experienced. Six organs of sense and their objects constitute 12 spheres of cognition (*āyatana*). They consist of the six organs of sense (=inner spheres of cognition: *ajjhatta āyatana*), i.e. eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body (*kāya*, tactile and somatic sense organ) and the mind (*manas*) together with the six objects (*visaya*, or six outer spheres of cognition: *bāhira āyatana*), i.e., colour (the visible, *rūpa*), sound, odour, taste, the tangible and bodily sensible (*po□□habba, spra□□avya*), and the thinkable and imaginable (*dhammā, dharmā□,* those which are understood, thought, imagined, etc.). This is called everything (*sabba□*) and 12 spheres of cognition (*āyatana*). Everything means all of our (my, your, etc.) experiential world.

(1') 18 elements of cognition (*dhātu*) are mentioned which consist of six organs of sense, six objects and six cognitions (consciousness, *viññā□a, vijñāna*) that are the function of the six organs. These are also everything.

(2) The next system speaks of our being (or existence) without mentioning an individual. It enumerates the perceptible (*rūpa*), feeling (*vedanā*), conception (*saññā, sañjñā*, imagination), mental and physical living energies (*sa□khārā, sa□skārā□*), and cognition (*viññā□a, vijñāna*: perception, consciousness). These are called the five groups (aggregates: *khandhā, skandhā□*), which seems to hint at our individual being. Or our being is looked on as name (*nāma,* mental element) and the perceptible (*rūpa*). These are often akin to or the same as the five groups.

Each of these elements (=constituents of our being) is impermanent (*anicca, anitya*), painful (*dukkha, du□kha*), and not the self (*anattan, anātman*). On expounding the organs of sense, the Pāli text runs as follows (S.IV. p.1[12-16]):

> What is impermanent is painful, what is painful is not the self; anything that is not the self is to be looked upon actually with due intellect in this way that

> 'this is not mine, I am not this, this is not my self (*n' eta□ mama, n' eso 'ham asmi, na me so attā, ti evam eta□ yathā-bhūta□ samma-ppañ□āya da□□habba□*).'

In this context, we can understand that the meaning of what is impermanent (*anicca*) seems to be most important; and what is impermanent shall be akin to what is painful and what is not the self.

What is impermanent (*anicca*) must be momentary or transitory, though in the Early Buddhist Canon, the so-called momentary destruction of constituents (elements) of our being is hardly seen. Our thought (*citta*), or mind (*manas*), or consciousness (*viñ□ā□a*, cognition) rises and vanishes night and day, just as a monkey grasps one branch, releases it, and holds another (in two texts of *Nidāna-samyutta,* S. II. pp.94-97).

The above-mentioned constituent elements of our being are called properties or qualities (*dhammā, dharmā□*) which are impermanent, etc., as shown above. Then these *dharmā□* (*dhammā*) are enumerated and classified. Our constituent elements are called the conditioned *dharmā□* (elements, or properties) that are impermanent, while inner tranquil peace (*nirvā□a*) is the unconditioned *dharma* which is not impermanent.

3. Momentary existences are directly grasped by perception.

The theories of momentary destruction (*k□a□a-bha□ga*) and discussions about it are traced in the treatises of the *Abhidharma* and *Abhidhamma*-texts.

Vasubandhu (4-5th century) summarized, in his *Abhidharma-kośa-bhā□ya* (AKBh.), the philosophical system of the Sarvāsti-vādin School which asserted the theory of momentary destruction. According to the Sarvāsti-vādin School, each of the conditioned *dharmā□* (mainly constituents of our beings) is in possession of four marks: arising, abiding, changing and extinction (impermanence) in one moment (*k□a□a*). But he asserts as a new theory of momentary destruction that the existences (*bhāvā□*) are momentary, i.e., at the moment when they arise they vanish without any cause (AKBh.p.194). He pursued the true existences (*bhāvā□, santa□*) that are conditioned elements (*dharmā□*), such as the perceptible (*rūpa,* colour, etc.), the mind (*citta*), and mental functions (*caitasikā□*). These are all momentary and perceptible, i.e. directly grasped by perception. His theory was inherited and developed by his followers as shall be seen next.

Dignāga (ca 480-540) was an influential philosopher in Indian history. He invented a new system of epistemology, i.e., philosophy of the means of cognition in his *Pramā□a-Samuccaya* (PS.). According to him, the means of cognition are only two, i.e., perception and inference; and perception is free from conceptual construction (*pratyak□a□ kalpanâpo□ha□,* PS.1.3c). He excludes any verbal conception and expression from direct perception. Direct perception is grasped by organs of sense (including the mind). What is existent truly is grasped by perception only, but not by conceptual construction, i.e., verbal cognition and inference. His theory of perception seems to be influential to the next coming theories of momentary destruction.

Dharmakīrti (early 7th century) says: "What is existent (*sat*) is only momentary (*k□anikam*). If it is not momentary, because that is contradictory to useful activity (*artha-kriyā*), it fails to be real fact (*vastutva□*) which has the characteristic of useful activity" (HB.I, p.37$^{6-7}$).

Jñānaśrīmitra (ca 980-1030□says: "What is existent is momentary just like a rain cloud (*yat sat tat k□a□ika□ yathā jala-dhara□*). Yet these existences are existent (*santas tu bhāvā ime*). [Therefore these existences are momentary]. Here existentness is potentiality to useful activity (*sattā śaktir artha-karma□i. Jñānaśrīmitra- nibandhāvalī* p.1)." "While the momentary destruction is not proved yet its understanding is ascertained by perception (*pratyak□e□a graha-sthiti□*). It's momentary destruction is ascertained because of being understood through perception (*pratyak□e□a grahād asya k□a□a-bha□ga-vyavashtiti□. Jñānaśrīmitra-n.* p.155$^{14-15}$)."

In this way, these momentary existences are truly existent and stand for the conditioned elements (*sa□sk□tā dharmā□*), i.e., the perceptible (*rūpa*), the mind (*citta*), and mental functions (*caitta, caitasika*), all of which are simply called *dharmā□* (constituent elements, functions, or properties of our being, i.e., our existence). And these constituent elements (*dharmā□*) are momentary and vanish without cause. These are all directly grasped by perception. And these are also void of self-identity (*svabhāva-śūnya*) of verbal expression (*Prajnāpāramitā-h□daya*).

4. What does *nirvā□a* (*nibbāna,* inner tranquil peace) or *parinirvā□a* (*parinibbāna,* perfect inner tranquil peace) mean?

The above-mentioned Buddhist view of one's own physical and mental constituent elements (*dharma*s) is very fundamental, and which I want to call a basic trend of Buddhist original philosophy. But Buddhism is not a mere philosophy. Any Buddhist seeks or is eager to seek one's own enlightenment, or in other words, eager or wishful to be enlightened, i.e., to become Buddha (*buddha*, *abhisambuddha*), and to get to *nirvā□a* (*nibbāna,* inner tranquil peace). Being enlightened or getting to nirvā□a implies not only to destroy ignorance and to know reality of one's own being, but also to destroy one's own mental defilements and afflictions (*āsava, kilesa*), such as desire, ignorance, greed, hatred (anger), delusion, etc. According to the Pāli Canon, the Blessed one (Buddha) Himself tells us as His own experience of enlightenment as follows:

> When the concentrated mind was without blemish pure, malleable, workable and not vacillating, I directed the mind to the knowledge of the destruction of defilements (*so eva□ samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyodāte ana□ga□e vigatūpakkilese mudubhūte kammaniye □hite āneñjappatte āsavāna□ khaya-ñā□āya citta□ abhininnāmesi□*): Then I thoroughly knew as it really is, this is suffering (*so ida□ dukkhan ti yathā-bhūta□ abbhaññāsi□*). Thoroughly knew…, this is the arising of suffering (*aya□ dukkha-samudayo ti y.-b. Ab.*). Thoroughly knew…, this is the cessation of sufferings (*aya□ dukkha-nirodho ti y.-b. Ab.*). Thoroughly knew..., this is the path to the cessation of suffering (*aya□ dukkha-nirodha-gāminī pa□ipadā ti y.-b. ab.*). Knew as it really is, these are defilements (*ime āsavā ti y.-b. Ab.*). Knew…, this is the arising of defilements (*aya□ āsava-samudayo ti y.-b. ab.*). Knew…, this is the cessation of defilements (*aya□ āsava-nirodho ti y.-b. ab.*). Knew…, this is the path to the cessation of defilements (*aya□ āsava-nirodha-gāminī pa□ipadā ti y.-b. ab.*). When I knew and realized this, my mind is released from defilements of desire also (*tassa me eva□ jānato eva□ passato kāmāsavā pi citta□ vimuccittha*), released from defilements of living also (*bhavāsavā pi c.v.*), released from defilements of ignorance also (*avijjāsavā pi c. v.*). Knowledge arose that I am released (*vimuttasmi□ vimuttam iti ñā□a□ ahosi*), birth is ended, the holy life is lived to the end, what should be done is done (*khī□ā jāti, vusita□ brahma-cariya□ kata□ kara□īya□*), there is nothing more to be (*nāpara□ itthattāyā'ti abbhaññāsi□*). This is, o Brahmin, the third knowledge I realized in the third

watch of the night (*aya□ kho me, brāhma□a, rattiyā pacchime yāme tatiyā vijjā adhigatā*). Ignorance was dispelled and Enlightening knowledge arose (*avijjā vihatā vijjā uppannā*), darkness was dispelled, and illumination appeared (*tamo vihato āloko uppanno*), just as the one who is living diligent and endeavouring himself without negligence (*yathā ta□ appamattassa ātāpino pahit'attassa viharato*).（M.I.p.23[11-28], A.IV.pp. 178[25]-79[11]）

This enlightenment is the last of the six super knowledges (*abhiññā*).

After the first sermon, He delivered a discourse (*Anatta-lakkha) a-suttanta*∝, JA.I.p.82[11]) that the perceptible (*rūpa*), feeling (*vedanā*), etc. are impermanent, painful, and not the self, and He added as follows:

> When, o bhikkhus, any learned noble disciple sees [the perceptible, etc.] as such, becomes weary of the perceptible (*rūpasmim pi nibbindati*), etc. becoming weary of all that divests himself of desire (*nibbinda□ virajjati*); by absence of desire he is released (*virāgā vimuccati*); when he is released, knowledge arises that he is released (*vimuttasmi□ vimuttam iti ñā□a□ hoti*); and he realises that birth is ended… (*khī□ā jāti, … ti pajānātī ti*). (Vin.I.14[25-32], S.III.68[21-26])

Similarly after subduing three Kassapa-brothers together with their disciples, who had been worshipping fire, He discoursed the sermon that everything is burning (*sabba□ āditt*a□):

> "The eye, o bhikkhus, is burning, the visible are burning; the cognition based on the eye is burning; the contact of the eye [with the visible] is burning (*cakkhu āditta□, rūpā ādittā, cakkhu-viññā□a□ āditta□, cakkhu-samphasso āditto*); the perceived by the contact of the eye [with the visible], be it pleasant, be it painful, be it neither pleasant nor painful, that also is burning (*yam ida□ cakkhu-samphassa-paccayā uppajjati vedayita□ sukha□ vā dukkha□ vā adukkha-m-asukha□ vā tam pi āditta□*). With what fire is it burning (*kena āditta□*)? I declare that it is burning with the fire of lust, … of hatred (anger), … of ignorance; it is burning with birth, decay, death, grief, lamentation, suffering, dejection, and despair (*rāg'agginā dos' agginā moh'agginā āditta□, jātiyā jarāya mara□ena sokehi paridevehi dukkhehi domanassehi upāyāsehi āditta*n *ti vadāmi*). The ear is burning, ... The nose, … The tongue, ... The body …, the tangible and bodily sensible elements are

> burning, ... The mind is burning, the thinkable and imaginable are burning, … When, o bhikkhus, a learned disciple sees [the perceptible, etc.] as such, becomes weary of the eye, the visible, the contact of the eye [with visible things], the perceived by the contact of the eye [with visible things], be it pleasant, be it painful, be it neither pleasant nor painful, …, he divests himself of desire; by absence of desire he is released; when he is released, he becomes aware that he is released; and he realises that birth is ended…" When this exposition was propounded, those thousand bhikkhus' minds were released from the defilements (*āsavehi cittāni vimucci□su*). (Vin.I. pp.34[17]-35[12], S.IV.pp.19[25]-20[23]).

In this way, the enlightenment (release, deliverance, liberation) is achieved after having known and become weary of the constituents of one's own being (5 aggregates, 12 spheres of cognition, and 18 elements of cognition) as shown above.

The inner tranquil peace (*nirvā□a, nibbāna*) is another name of the enlightenment. The realms of inner tranquil peace (*nirvā□a-dhātu, nibbāna-dhātu*) are two, i.e., the realm of inner tranquil peace possessed of remainder of bio-functions (*saupādi-sesā nibbāna-dhātu*) and the realm of inner tranquil peace without remainder of bio-functions (*anupādi-sesā nibbāna-dh.*).

In the case of the former (*saupādi-sesā nibbāna-dhātu*), it runs as in the following:

> This bhikkhu is a worthy one, whose defilement is exhausted, [holy life] is lived to the end, who has done what should be done, put down his burden, arrived at the right goal, exhausted fetter of life, and who by means of right enlightening knowledge has been released (*bhikkhu araha□ hoti khī□āsavo vusitavā kata-kara□īyo ohita-bhāro anuppatta-sad-attho parikkhī□a-bhava-sa□yojano sammad-aññā vimutto*). His five organs of sense remain as ever, these are not destroyed, and he perceives the pleasant and unpleasant (*tassa ti□□hant'eva pañc'indriyāni yesa□ avighātattā manāpāmanāpa□ paccanubhoti, sukhadukkha□ pa□isa□vedeti*). His desire is exhausted, hatred is exhausted, and delusion is exhausted (*tassa yo rāgakkhayo, dosakkhayo, moha-kkhayo*).

In the case of the latter (*ανυπādι–σεσā νιββāνα–δηātυ*), it runs as follows:

> This bhikkhu is a worthy one,… has been released… here now is all the perceived are not rejoiced and shall become cool (*tassa idh'eva… sabba-vedayitāni anabhinanditāni sīti-bhavissanti*).（*It*.44, p.38[5-21]）

Without remainder of bio-functions, i.e., with no sense-functions and no living functions, no one can live.

The inner tranquil peace without remainder of bio-functions means nothing but death of the enlightened one. This death of the enlightened is called as perfect inner tranquil peace (perfect enlightenment, *parinirvā□a, parinibbāna*), as for instance Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta (D.16 大般涅槃経). But in some context, the perfect inner tranquil peace (perfect enlightenment) is that of living enlightened one (Buddha, or bhikkhu). It runs thus:

> The blessed One said, 'By the path made by himself, o, Sabhiya (*pajjena katena attanā, Sabhiyā ti bhagavā*), he who has gone to perfect inner tranquil peace, crossed over doubt (*parinibbāna-gato viti□□a-ka□kho*), having abandoned both non-existence and existence (*vibhavañ ca bhavañ ca vippahāya*), has lived his life, whose next existence is destroyed, he is a bhikkhu (*vusitavā khī□a-puna-bbhavo sa bhikkhu*).'（Sn.514).

> The blessed One, who has gone to perfect inner tranquil peace, teaches the doctrine for the sake of the perfect inner tranquil peace (*parinibbuto so bhagavā parinibbānāya dhamma□ deseti*)." (D.III.55[1-2])

The inner tranquil peace (*nibbāna*) is called immortal (*amata, am□ta,* nectar), good fortune (*ma□gala*), pleasant and comfortable (*sukha*), etc. After His enlightenment the Buddha (Gotama) addressed the five bhikkhus who had attended on Him before, "Listen to me, o bhikkhus. The immortal has been won. I will teach you. I will preach the doctrine (*dhamma□ desemi*) …" (Vin.I.p.9[14-], M.I.172[1-])

At the moment of Buddha's parinibbāna (demise), when Sakka, the king of the gods, uttered a verse:

> Ah! impermanent are the living energies (*anicā vata sa□khārā* 諸行無常) that consist of arising and vanishing elements (*uppāda-vaya-dhammino* 是生滅法). Having come into existence they pass away (*uppajjitvā nirujjhanti*

> 生滅滅已). Pleasant is their complete cessation (*tesa□ vūpasamo sukho* 寂滅為楽). (D. II. pp. 157, S. 1. p. 158, cf.T.1.204c)

And this complete cessation (*vūpasamo*) seems to suggest the Blessed One's (Buddha's) perfect inner tranquil peace (*parinibbā□a,* demise, death).

> "And experience of inner tranquil peace — this is the utmost good fortune (*nibbāna-sacchi-kiriyā ca, eta□ ma□galam uttama□*)." (*Sn*.267cd)

According to the Pāli tradition the 'inner tranquil peace (*nibbāna*)' referred to the happiness of married life uttered by a young girl (*JA*.I.pp.60[30]-61[12], cf. *BvA*.pp.280[36]-281[1-7], *DhA*.I.85[10-14]). A similar story is seen in the Sarv*ā*sti-v*ā*din School's tradition too (SBV.I. p.78[13-], T.24.114b[16-]).

But here is a problem. Traditionally one who attained enlightenment or inner tranquil peace after having destroyed all kinds of desire cannot enjoy married life. It runs as follows:

> If a householder attains to become arahat (a worthy one whose defilements are exhausted, and who gets to enlightenment), his destinies are only two with no others; i.e., either he leaves home [to enter the Buddhist Order] or enters perfect inner tranquil peace (=dies), for he cannot live beyond this day (*yo gihī arahatta□ patto, dve vāssa gatiyo bhavanti anañña, tasmi□ yeva divase pabbajati vā parinibbāyati vā. Na so divaso sakkā atikkametu□*). (*Mil.* p.264[29]-265[1])

I cannot comment on this here. If this is true, it must be dangerous for an ordinary lay person to get to enlightenment and attain to inner tranquil peace. But even so, I think, enlightenment and perfect inner tranquil peace shall be an ideal goal for most Buddhists.

5. The role of the self (*attan, ātman*) in the practical life of Buddhist monks and lay persons.

As above-mentioned, Buddhist Canon repeats that all the constituent elements of our own being (*dhammā, dharmā□*) are impermanent, painful, and not the self (*anattā*). And anything that is not the self is to be looked upon as…'this is not mine (*n' eta□ mama*), I am not this (*n' eso 'ham asmi*), and this is not my self (*na*

me so attā).' Here I feel difficulties. Of course I can easily understand that I am not any of these elements and that none of these elements is my self, because any of these elements is only a part of my organs of sense, etc. But it is difficult to understand that any of these elements is not mine, because we cannot say that my eye is not mine, my ear is not mine, or so on. In order to clear these difficulties, impermanence or momentariness shall be helpful. Our existence as well as our organs of sense, perceived objects, and physical and mental elements (and functions) are impermanent and even momentary, i.e., every moment of our existence together with our organs of sense, perceived objects and others become different. Then, for instance, we can say that my eye which has just before seen the visible (scene) is changed and not mine now, or the visible (scene) which has just before been seen is gone and not any more. If my existence is impermanent and even momentary, there must be no eternal self. Then we could easily say that Buddhism denies the eternal self and eternal soul. This must be true.

But here we have a great difficulty. The impermanent and momentary self must be admitted, because without any consciousness of my self we cannot understand that 'this is not my self.' We have to be conscious of my self every moment when we hear or read 'this is not my self.' The above-mentioned phrases of not-mine and not-self cause us every time to be conscious of mine and my self. In this way my self and mine must exist even if momentarily. We cannot neglect my self and mine if we are to understand and interpret this Canonical phrase.

> Buddha (*samaṇa* Gotama) often spoke of the self (*attan*) negatively, i.e., not-self (*anattan*), and not my self *(na me attā)*, in His dialogues with His opponent visitors as well as in His sermons to His disciples. But on a few occasions, He gave hearers significant messages to go in search of themselves (*attāna gaveseyyāthā,* Vin.I. p.23), and live relying on themselves (*atta-dīpā viharatha atta-saraṇā*), seeking no other refuge than themselves and the Doctrine (Law, *dhamma*). (D.II.p.100, S.V. pp. 58, 77)

The 12th chapter of the Pāli *Dhammapada* is named 'chapter of the self' (*atta-vagga,* vv.157-166), which corresponds to the Sanskrit *Udāna-varga* (Udv. 23rd Ch. *Ātma-varga,* vv.1-26), and the Buddhist Hybrid Dhammapada (BHSDh.vv.306-326). Moreover, the *Dhammapada* (Dh.) has exceptionally many examples of *attan* in a positive context in the other chapters too.

The self is semantically subject in some verses (nominative case: *attā*, accusative case: attāna□): The self is compared to the lord (*nātha*) of self (Dh.160a, 380a), and one's own refuge (*sara□a*, Dh.380b). And it is dear (*piya*), as it is said:

> 'If one holds oneself dear (*Attānañ ce piya□ jaññā*), one should guard oneself well.'

But also it means 'oneself' (himself, his own self) that is in reality not one's own (his own): It runs:

> 'For he himself is not his own' (*Attā hi attano n'atthi,* Dh.62c).

But the self is to be subdued. It runs:

> 'For one's own self is, as is said, difficult to subdue' (*attā hi kira duddamo,* Dh.159c).

It is the object of such verbs as: guard (*rakkheya* Dh.157), establish (*nivesaye* Dh.158b, *niveseyya* Dh. 282e), make (*kayirā* Dh.159a; *karoti* Dh.162c), know (*jaññā* Dh.157a), subdue (tame: *damayanti* Dh.80d, *dametha* Dh.159c, *damayam* Dh.305c; -*danta* Dh.159c, 160c, Dh.323c; - dama Dh.159), cleanse (*pariyodapeyya* Dh.88c), conquer (*jine, jeyyam* Dh.103bc; *jita* Dh.104), apply (*yuñjam,yojaya□* Dh.104ab), guard (*gopetha* Dh. 315c), draw (*uddharatha* Dh.327c), censure (*codaya* Dh. 379a), scrutinize (*pa□imāse* Dh.379b), and control (*saññamaya* Dh.380c). Some of these verbs take as an object the mind (*citta*).

In this way, Pāli *attan* (*attā*, *attāna□*, *attanā*, *attano*) is in many cases almost the same as English reflexive pronouns: oneself, myself, yourself, etc. In a case one's own self is just as its English equivalent (Dh.159d). The Genitive *attano* means often one's own (good Dh.166a,c; fault Dh.252b,e; lord Dh.380a; refuge Dh.380b).

Here I have a question whether the above-mentioned self (*attan, ātman*) is impermanent and even momentary or not. The Early Buddhist Canon is silent. The Abhidharma-texts or Abhidhamma-texts never include the self (*ātman, attan*) in the list of *dharma*s (*dharmā□*, *dhammā*, constituents of our own being). Vasubandhu criticized 'the self' (*ātman*) and 'the person' (*pudgala,* another name for ātman) which other schools asserted, then he advocated and ascertained the doctrine that there is no eternal self (*nirātmatā, nairātmya*), i.e., without the self

our existence and experience can be explained with five aggregates of our physical and mental elements (AKBh.pp.461-478). He said:

> Because [the mind is] based on I-consciousness, the mind is metaphorically called as the self" (*aha□kāra- sanniśrayatvāc cittam ātmā ity upacaryate,* AKBh.p.27[6]).

He quotes two lines of the Canonical stanzas:

> With self well subdued, a wise person attains to the heaven. (*ātmanā hi sudāntena, svarga□ prāpnoti pa□□ita□*, Udv. 23.17cd, cf.Dh.160c, AKBh.p.27[7]).

> To subdue the mind is good. A tamed (subdued) mind is conducive to happiness. (*cittasya damana□ sādhu citta□ dānta□ sukhâvaham,* Udv.31.1cd, cf. Dh.35cd, AKBh.p.27[9]).

If Vasubandhu's such interpretation is true, the self must be impermanent and momentary, just the same as the mind and other mental elements or functions. Then what follows? Here we find the Buddhist unique view of the practical life. Momentary constituents of our being are always vanishing but most of them are renewed and succeeded continually and constitute a stream of life (*santāna, santati*). This theory seems like a film (movie) which is a series of moving images, and which lets us have an illusion that motion is occurring.

These constituents (*dhammā, dharmā□*) exist when their causes and conditions exist. They do not exist, when their causes and conditions do not exist. And they are originated dependently (*pa□icca-samuppanna, prat×tya-samutpanna*), i.e., according to the Law of dependent origination (*pa□icca-samuppāda, prat×tya-samutpāda*).

The above-mentioned Canonical phrase of 'not mine' and 'not my self' cannot and must not in reality dispel our (my) consciousness of mine, and my self, not only in ordinary life, but also in practical holy life.

At first, if I have no notion of mine and my self, I cannot understand this Canonical phrase.

Next I must be conscious of and very careful not to forget mine and my self every day and even every moment. On condition that every constituent of my being is impermanent and even momentary, I must not forget my promises, vows, and moral precepts, always being conscious of mine and my self (myself).

In ordinary life, Buddhists must follow ordinary moral precepts (5 and 10 precepts). Originally Buddhist monks (*bhikkhu*s) must follow monks' Order's precepts (about 250 precepts) and nuns (*bhikkhuni*s) must follow nuns' Order's precepts (about 350 precepts) respectively, although very few follow Order's precepts in Japan. To follow the precept not to take (steal) what belongs to others, I must be conscious that this is mine, and that is not mine, etc.

> What is the most famous teaching of Buddhas? It runs thus:
>
> The non-commitment of all evil (*sabba-pāpassa akara ⟩a ∝*),
>
> The perfecting of goodness (*kusalassa upasmpadā*),
>
> The purifying of one's mind (*sacitta-pariyodapanam*),
>
> This is the teaching of the Buddhas (the enlightened). (*eta ∝ buddhāna sāsana ∝*. (Dh.183)

The first half is a universal ethical norm, and not solely particular to Buddhism. But the purifying of one's mind is very characteristic of Buddhism. According to the commentary, 'the purifying of one's mind (*sacitta-pariyodapanam*)' is purification of one's own mind from the five coverings (hindrances, *pañcahi nχτραα⟩ει attano cittassa vodāpana ∝*. DhA. III. p.237[17-8]). The five coverings mean mental defilements (*kilesa*), which consist of desire for sensual enjoyment (*kāma-cchanda*), malevolence (*vyāpāda,* hatred, fury), sloth and torpor (*thχna-middha,* low-spiritedness and sleepiness), excitement and remorse (*uddhacca-kukkucca*, frivolity and regret), and doubt (*vicikicchā*).

Among them, malevolence (hatred) is always deemed as evil in Buddhist texts. This explanation indicates simply how to purify one's mind, and this is a characteristic of Buddhism that aims at tranquil peace of mind that should be free from hatred (malevolence), mental excitement, etc.

This is, I think, the most important characteristics of Buddhism, that is not in common with the other theistic religions, i.e., Christian, Jewish, and Islamic

religions, all of which extol hatred or anger towards their or their God's enemies in their Canons, and never deny entirely their hatred toward inimical people.

6. **Concluding Remarks.**

The Buddha's legendary biographical texts and His past stories (*Jātakas, Avadānas,* etc.) tell us of His compassion and mercy, but never hint at His anger even towards evil. Buddhist Canon leads us to be calm and peaceful, and not to get angry, excited, and hostile. Images (sculptures, pictures, etc.) of Buddhas (*Tathāgata*s) and Bodhisattvas also seem to let us be calm and peaceful, dispelling anger, fear, and hatred.

On the other hand, God and gods of most other religions seem to make people feel awe and fear of being scolded and punished. For God and gods are not always free from anger, jealousy, and hatred. We can easily find 'God's (or the Lord's) anger or wrath'or the phrase: 'God (or the Lord) is angry with ...' in the *Old Testament* (Nahum, Zephaniah, Zechariah, Malachi) as well as in the *New Testament* (Revelation). The *Koran* (*Qur'ān*) warns Muslims to fear Allah's anger and punishment.

Indian Vedic and Hindu gods, Greek, Roman gods, and Japanese gods are very awful and numinous, liable to get angry, excited, or jealous. There is a god of wrath (*manyu*) in Vedic religion (*rig-veda* 10.84). But later some Indian philosophers tried to demonstrate that the highest god (*x♣vara*) is free from anger and evil qualities or devoid of any quality (*gu h*). And Indian religious philosophies have been engaged in inquiring into how to get liberation from recurring transmigrations.

The Buddhist trend of inner tranquil peace without hatred has been dominant in the history of Buddhism in many countries and regions over the past two millenniums. This trend of Buddhism contrasts with other religions such as monotheistic Christian, Jewish, and Islamic religions, as well as polytheistic Greco-Roman religions, Hinduism (Vedic religion), Shinto, etc., all of which are characterized by faith in one God or many gods.

This Buddhist trend: inner tranquil peace without hatred and the precept of non-killing (non-violence) should be a modest but hopeful possibility to lead to non-violence and finally worldwide peace.

At the time of Buddha, war was not avoidable. Buddha is said to have prevented twice war between Kosala-king Viḍūḍabha and Sakya-people who were Buddha's relatives but in vain. Sakya-people, who kept Buddha's precept of non-killing, were fighting but without killing their enemies, but all were killed. Many texts tell us this tragedy (DhA.I.pp.337-361, *Jātaka□□hakathā* IV.pp.144-153, etc.).

The tradition of non-violence (non-killing) had risen before Buddhism, and has also been prevailed in Hinduism and Jainism in India widely.

In the first half of the last century, Mahatma Gandhi's (1869-1948) non-violent resistance and independence movement succeeded to acquire independence from the British Empire; though he himself was assassinated by a Hindu radical (Nathuram Godse).

Although Gandhi's idea of non-violence has been influential worldwide, wars do not cease in the world, and the hard-fought and incessant 'war on terror' is raging these ten years. The 'war on terror' cannot stop terror as of yet; on the contrary terrors and disasters are increasing more and more. So, all of us feel far less safe and convenient to travel abroad owing to the 'war on terror.'

Owing to Buddha's precept of non-killing, no Buddhists can approve of these wars. In the present day, any kind of war would become a catastrophic danger to the survival of human beings on the earth. We are now at the very verge of a total annihilation due to nuclear weapons, which would destroy human lives and the natural environment all together. We must take into further consideration any possibility to avoid violence and war, because we wish the survival of human beings now and in the future. We need to endeavour more to prevent violence and war in the world. I hope that the tradition of non-killing and non-violence is going to prevail worldwide. For this purpose, Buddhism's inner tranquil peace is to be accepted, sought and pursued widely and deeply.

* My thanks are due to Dr. Andrews Dale Kenneth, an associate professor of Tohoku Gakuin University, who kindly corrected my English.