

Revisiting 19.3.188 Self and No-Self

We exist for a fragment of time only and therefore relatively. But is there something behind time itself which is absolute, a principle of Foreverness? The Buddhists firmly deny it; the Advaitins just as firmly proclaim it, while philosophy accepts and reconciles both schools. 19.3.188

Buddhist central teaching is that reality is *anatma* which is an-atma, which means no self... notice I wrote small s “self.” Reality is *Sunya* which means void of all form, determination, content, ego.

Advaita central teaching is that reality is capital S Self... which means *Atma* or Brahman which means beyond all form, determination, content, ego.

What Buddhism means by *no-self*, *anatma*, is the falsity of the local limited ego-self... appearance is unreal.

What Advaita means by *Self* is the Reality of the ultimate Self: non-local, non-ego-self.

One says not self—means not ego self. The other says Self—means Overself.

What one says by negating the unreal, the other says by affirming the real.

Perhaps this also fills out the meaning of Ennead 5.1.1.

5.1.1

What can it be that has brought the souls to *forget* God, and, though members of the Divine and entirely of that world, to *ignore* at once themselves and It?

... A double discipline must be applied if human beings in this pass are to be reclaimed, and brought back to their origins, lifted once more towards the Supreme and One and First.

There is the method, which we amply exhibit elsewhere, declaring the dishonour of the objects which the Soul holds here in honour; the second teaches or recalls to the Soul its true race and worth; this latter is the leading truth, and, clearly brought out, is the evidence of the other.