

## FOREWORD

When we brought out *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies* in 1967, we announced that at some time in the future there would be a second volume, to be called *Further Buddhist Studies*. The idea was that it should garner and preserve for a while those of my shorter literary efforts which seemed to have a lasting value, and the fruition of this project had therefore to wait until the author's *oeuvre* appeared to be reasonably complete. This time has now come. A look at the Bibliography will show that production came to an end in 1968—some time before my 65th birthday. The five years since then have been devoted to teaching students at sundry universities, combating the infirmities of old age and preparing a definite edition, in three volumes, of my translations of *Prajñāpāramitā* texts. *Kaṭam karanīyam*. The task is both completed and accomplished. What I have had to say has been said. Nothing new occurs to me any longer, and there will be no more.

The *Bibliography* is more than a manifestation of personal pride—like a banner unfurled before battle. It acts as a sort of guide to the various publications which are quoted by the way they are arranged in the Bibliography: Capital letters for books, numbers for articles, small letters for reviews, numbers preceded by O for pre-Buddhist publications.

(I–III): The *articles*, both long and short, *on Buddhism* in the more narrow sense of the word, are self-explanatory and little need be said about them.

As for III.4, fifteen years after I wrote this article I was confronted with the problem of the relation between Jung and Buddhism in the Bay Area of San Francisco where the young seemed to regard the writings of Hermann Hesse as antidotes to the ills which beset American society. In lecture after lecture I had to explain that this kind of thing had nothing whatever to do with any recognizable form of Buddhism, that the formulations of the doctrine are quite at variance with those

of the Buddhists,<sup>1</sup> and that the type of person whom Buddhists intend to produce is not at all the same which the Jungians have in mind, whether one takes the average product of a Jungian analysis, or such rather unpleasant fictional characters as Emil Sinclair, Demian, "Siddhartha" or the Steppenwolf; compared with the stifling atmosphere in which they live, Buddhism seems to take place in the clear air of the Himalayas.

III.1 is included not because of what is said about the somewhat unrewarding topic of the "bodies of the Buddha", but because there I enunciate what I regard as a very important methodological principle which should, I think, guide the evaluation of literary sources in any truly realistic history of Buddhist thought.

(II): Under the section heading "*The Philosophical Background*" we reprint three items which have no immediately obvious connection with Buddhism. A few words about my personal intellectual development may explain how they fit into the scheme of things.

In 1932 I had printed, though not published, a fairly large work on *Der Satz vom Widerspruch* which, modelling myself a bit on Arthur Schopenhauer, I was inclined to regard as my *Hauptwerk*. In fact it contains all my later ideas without exception. At that time, however, it was totally still-born, the Nazis ceremoniously burned it in Hamburg, no more than perhaps forty copies have survived and public indifference towards it has been total, unrelieved by any kind of interest anywhere at any time. When in 1933 I removed myself to England I regarded this book as my greatest, and in fact only, asset, and started to decant it into the English language—achieving, however, only the three articles which appear on pages 56–112.<sup>2</sup> What I had not reckoned with was that the traditional style of philosophizing, to which I had become accustomed in Germany, had gone out of fashion in England, and that my arrival there coincided with the victory of the

<sup>1</sup> This must become perfectly clear to anyone who reads the melodramatic accounts of "the Self" in volume XX of Jung's *Collected Works* (2nd ed., 1970).

<sup>2</sup> In addition there were, in 1935–6, two books, nos. 05 and 06. Orthodox marxists, like J. D. Bernal, a lapsed Catholic, criticized these as too mystical and anti-scientific—quite rightly as things have turned out.

comparatively rational logical positivism of my friend Alfred Jules Ayer, soon to be followed by the linguistic futilities which Ernest Gellner has so brilliantly described in his *Words and Things* (1959, Pelican 1968).

At the same time I endeavoured to neutralize the Marxist virus in my system—first by a number of political and semi-political books, culminating in *Spain To-day* in 1936, and then by composing a book on *The Psychology of Mass Propaganda* which argued for the futility of all political action on the ground that mass activities must necessarily be permeated and vitiated by self-deception, as well as by greed and hatred. This book was, on ideological grounds, never brought out by the publisher who had commissioned it, and it will probably be found among my posthumous papers.

The upshot of all these convulsions and heartaches was a revival of an earlier interest in Buddhism, which goes back to my adolescence and had come to some prominence in my Heidelberg days in 1923 and 1924. Still continuing to think with pen in hand I composed a vast treatise on *Contradiction and Reality*, of which a *Summary* was printed at the outbreak of the war at the expense of a friend. The war itself drove me into Dr. Aubrey Westlake's wood in Godshill in Hampshire where, as later in a caravan in Ewelme, Oxon., I attempted to realize in meditation the teachings which I had speculatively developed in that *Summary*. Thereafter I decided to adopt an indirect approach and thus between 1946 and 1968 remained content to edit and expound the ancient Sanskrit texts of the *philosophia perennis*.<sup>1</sup>

The component of my views which sticks most of all in the gullets of my academic contemporaries is the acceptance of *magic*. This was stated as clearly in 1934 (s. pp. 81-2) as in 1964 (s. pp. 9-14), and it induced the then president of the Aristotelean Society, who was also the first female professor of logic<sup>2</sup> in modern history, to absentee herself from the meeting of November 19th where she should have chaired my paper. And yet all who have studied the history of ideas must

<sup>1</sup> About this term see S 212-215.

<sup>2</sup> Bertrand Russell pointed out to me at the time that this compound shows the importance of word order in English. What would happen if "female" became the penultimate word?—And she loved him so much!

be aware that a fusion between philosophy and magic is a normal stage in the history of many philosophical systems. In Indian Buddhism it took place from at least the third century A.D. onwards,<sup>1</sup> and in the Greco-Roman world it was carried out by Stoics, Gnostics (s. pp. 15–32) and Neoplatonists, to mention only a few. The later stages of Neoplatonism, as represented by Jamblichus, Proclus and Damascius, correspond closely to my own point of view. Modern philosophers usually deal with these people by summarily ejecting them from the premises, on the ground that they fall outside some narrow definition of ‘philosophy’, or they somewhat quaintly complain about aspects of Neoplatonism” which makes it totally unacceptable to an empiricist”.<sup>2</sup> Classicists are taught to disparage them; e.g. Jamblichus “corrupted Plotinus’ teaching by introducing theosophical phantasies from alien sources; and his tendency is to substitute magic for mysticism”.<sup>3</sup> Historians of philosophy have treated them very shabbily, by providing no editions or translations, or anything that might be considered to be an even tolerably adequate treatment, until 1972 when R. T. Wallis, a British exile in Oklahoma, published his *Neo-Platonism*.

It may be more than a mere coincidence that both Jamblichus and I are fated to live in an effete and excessively urbanized civilization, at a time when the joint activities of the internal and external proletariat combine to put a stop to the few remaining educated people, and when the massive overweight of the political superstructure crushes the bones of everyone and everybody. On the other hand, some of the responsibility for my views may lie with some congenital disposition. When we both lived in London, Prof. Eichhorn, a Sinologue now in Tuebingen, assured me that, to his great surprise, my views were exactly those of a Chinese of the Han period (200 B.C.–A.D. 200). No compliment could have been more welcome! For, as Roy Fuller so aptly put it, “Anyone

<sup>1</sup> See S 82–84.

<sup>2</sup> *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*, ed. J. O. Urmson, 1960, p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd ed., 1970, p. 538b. Oh these aliens! Who has not heard of Heinrich Heine’s, “Ausländer, Juden sinds zumeist”, and so on.

happy in this age and place Is daft or corrupt. Better to abdicate," etc. etc.

Even in modern times a resurgence of magic is attested by the portent of Carl Gustav Jung, and other rather more powerful<sup>1</sup> tokens. It is quite an important component in the "counter-culture" which I encountered during my last stay in Berkeley. After being accused of "obscurantism" for so many years I was really gratified to be treated for once as a kind of culture hero. Students habitually handed me their horoscopes for my appraisal, and little girls, locally known as "co-eds", reverently held the hand of the master so as to ascertain more clearly the configuration of his heart line.<sup>2</sup> *Tempora mutantur sed non mutamur in illis.*

Leaving aside these unseemly jokes, I wish to point out that it was not an Indian, but Glycon, a Greek, who said:<sup>3</sup>

πάντα γέλωσ καὶ παντα κόνις καὶ πάντα τὸ μηδέν.  
πάντα γὰρ ἐξ ἀλόγων ἐστὶ τὰ γινόμενα

Oriental philosophy cannot possibly be understood if one assumes that the minds of Orientals are qualitatively different from those of Westerners, and that it contains some "mysterious" elements which can never have a living meaning to men brought up in the West. I regard Buddhist philosophy, as preached in the *Prajñāpāramitā* and argued by Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti as the most likely, or at least as the least unlikely, of all philosophical attitudes. I arrived at it by the logical development of elements which form part of "Western" tradition for thousands of years, and I had reached the basic tenets (as shown in 02) long before I had made a study of the Sanskrit sources. When I was a student, it was well nigh

<sup>1</sup> In my 1939 typescript of *The Psychology of Mass Propaganda* a special chapter on Magical Beliefs gives examples drawn from the "blood and soil" of a Germany tortured by Hitler and his Nazis, from the mummy-worshipping atheists of Stalin's Russia, etc. A fine survey of recent trends in L. Pauwels and J. Bergier, *Le matin des magiciens*, 1960 ("The Dawn of Magic", 1964, 1967).

<sup>2</sup> The usual reaction, incidentally, was, "I am glad that I am not married to you!" This shows that the little girls knew what they were about.

<sup>3</sup> *Anth. Pal.* 10, 124.

impossible to get any real information about the Mahayana, the Gnostics and the later Neoplatonists. There must have been hundreds and hundreds of us who wanted to know more—how otherwise could one account for the immense upsurge in the scholarly study of these three systems of thought over the last fifty years? It is in order to illustrate points such as these that I offer up to kindred spirits the sixty pages devoted here to the “Philosophical Background”.

(IV): Out of 143 *reviews* we have chosen to reprint 31. These either contain useful scholarly information, chiefly about my own chosen field of Mahayana literature, or they treat of problems, tendencies, misconceptions and significant personalities who are still with us in the seventies. Some of the reviews may seem unduly polemical. But, if we may pursue the topic of magic a bit further, those who know about these things are aware that a conjunction of Mars and Moon in Aries in the ninth house inclines the native to religious invective and controversy. May this reference to my natal chart (March 18, 1904, 3 p.m. London, Lewisham) act as a balm to the victims' bruised feelings!

The articles have generally been printed as they stood. Occasionally I have used the opportunity to introduce some *Retractationes* or to add references to later publications in which the topic on hand has been treated more fully. For one of my reviews (i.e. zcv) I must apologize outright, because I wrote about something I knew nothing about. In the article II.1, on “Objective Validity”, I had to improve the English style in this, my very first effort in English. Some of it (esp. pp. 61–2) is rather heavy going, has an indefinable Teutonic flavour and seems to resist further anglicizing. As in the case of *Thirty Years* the usage of diacritical marks, italics, capitals, etc., is that of the articles as they appeared at the time, and therefore varies from place to place.

We thank the following for allowing us to reprint material which appears here: *Akten des 24.Or.Kongress München* 63; *The Aristotelean Society* 03; *The Aryan Path*, zad; *Asia Major*, zaf, zbm; Anthony Blond Ltd., 84; *Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies*, zbx, zcz; *The Hibbert Journal*, zo, zba, zbp, zbz; *Indo-Iranian Journal*, zau, zbf, zdc, zdd, zdo, zdr, zdx; *Journal of the American Oriental Society*,

zdi; *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, zdm; *Marxist Quarterly* o8; *The Middle Way* 23, 24, 25, 29, 42, i, zm, zn, zr, zaw, zbu, zbq, zcq, zdu; *Oriental Art* 7, e, zaa, zaz, zbv, zbw, zci, zck, zcx, zdk; *Philosophy* o4; *Philosophy East and West* 22; *Self-Knowledge* 20; Supplements to *Numen* 89; University of Washington Press 91.

In this Foreword I have, at the prompting of some friends, let my hair down quite a bit, and much, probably too much, of it is about my own dear self. This should not allow me to forget that during the last twenty-five years I have been helped by many people. Two of these should perhaps be singled out. The one is my wife Muriel who has stood by me during all this time. The other is George Hill, my Oxford publisher, who was the first to make my reputation and who has shown that a publisher can also be a friend.

Foxwell, Marston Road  
Sherborne, Dorset