

The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object

A Discussion of the Nature of Transcendental Consciousness

by Franklin Merrell-Wolff

Part 13 of 25

PART II

The Aphorisms on Consciousness-Without-an-Object

CHAPTER 4

Commentaries on the Aphorisms on Consciousness-Without-an-Object

(continued)

38. Endless resistance is the Universe of experience; the agony of crucifixion.

Frustration is of the very essence of objective existence. That the consciousness of embodied man is not wholly frustrated is due to the fact that actual ordinary consciousness is not *wholly* objective. Glimmerings from the Roots do arise from time to time, and they cast transient sheaths of joyousness over the objective field. But generally the source of these glimmerings is not known for what it is, and so the objective field is credited with value which of itself, taken in abstraction, it does not possess. The purely objective is a binder or restricter which denies or inhibits the aspiration of the soul. The creative drive from within can find room within the objective only by the rending of constricting form. Hence it is that the fresh manifestation of Spirit is always at the price of crucifixion. The birth of the Christ within man is ever at the price of rending apart the old man of the world.

39. Ceaseless creativeness is *Nirvana*; the Bliss beyond all human conceiving.

Creativeness, taken in isolation from the created effect, is unalloyed Bliss. A *Nirvanic* State which is taken in complete isolation is pure Bliss, quite beyond the conception of ordinary consciousness. But this is a partial consciousness, standing as the counterpart of isolated objective consciousness. It is not the final or synthetic State, and thus is not the final Goal of the mystic Path. But it is a possible abiding place, and it is possible for the mystic to arrive in, and be enclosed by, the *Nirvanic* State in a sense analogous to the ordinary binding within objective consciousness. There is a sense in which we may speak of a bondage to Bliss as well as a bondage to pain. It is, unquestionably, a far more desirable kind of bondage than that in the dark field of the object, but the bound *Nirvani* is not yet a full Master. To be sure, he has conquered one kind of bondage, and thus realized some of the powers of mastery, but an even greater problem of self-mastery remains unresolved.

The attainment of *Nirvana* implies the successful meeting of all the dark trials of the Path. The struggle with the personal egoism has resulted in a successful issue; the clinging to objects has been dissolved; the battle with temptations and threatening shadows along the Path has been successfully fought; and resolution has been maintained firmly; but there still remains the task of rising superior to Glory. The little appreciated fact is that the Goal of aspiration may become a possessor of the Self, and something like spiritual egoism may replace the old personal egoism.

It is easy for many to understand that dark tendencies in the soul should be overcome, for with many the light of conscience at least glows in the consciousness. These may, and generally do, find it difficult to overcome the dark tendencies. Quite commonly, we find ourselves doing that which we would not do and leaving undone that which we unquestionably feel we should do. The undesirability of such tendencies we recognize, but find difficulty in knowing how to deal with them. The better part of our innate moral sense certainly supports the discipline of the Way which leads to *Nirvana*. Yet beyond this there lies an unsuspected and, inherently, more difficult problem.

We may think of *Nirvana* as the State in which all of highest excellence or value is realized, and in a form that is not alloyed with any dross. It is, indeed, the Divine Presence of the Christian mystic. It is quite natural to conceive of this as the Ultimate, beyond which there is nothing more. But there is a defect. For here is a State which I enjoy and to which I tend to cling, and thus it involves a kind of selfishness, though it is a spiritual kind of selfishness. Thus I am possessed, even though possessed by That to which I give highest value and honor.

After all, Bliss is a valued modification of consciousness. But where there is valuation there is still duality—a difference between that which is valued and that which is depreciated. The highest State transcends even the possibility of valuation, and its complementary depreciation. The Highest Perfection finds no distinction whatsoever. This is the State in which there is no Self of any sort, whether personal or spiritual, and where there is no embodiment of Supreme Values or God. It is the Vast Solitude, the Teeming Desert.

To turn one's back upon the best of everything is intrinsically more difficult than to turn away from those things and qualities which one's moral judgment and best feeling condemn readily enough. But it is not enough to arrive at the Place beyond evil; it is also necessary to transcend the Good. This is a dark saying, hard to understand, yet it is so. But he who has found *Nirvana* is safe.

40. But for Consciousness-without-an-object there is neither creativeness nor resistance.

One might say that IT is both creativeness and resistance, but in the last analysis this is a distortion of the Reality. To be sure, IT supports both possibilities, but as directly realized IT is a Consciousness so utterly different from anything that can be conceived by the relative consciousness that only negations can be predicated of IT. As it were, the creating and the creation are simply annulled. From that standpoint it is equally true to say that the universe is and yet it is not and never has been, nor ever shall be. And equally, it would have to be said that there is not, never has been, nor ever would be, any

creativity. It is quite useless to try to conceive this, since there is no substitute for the Direct Realization.

41. Ever-becoming and ever-ceasing-to-be is endless action.

That ever-becoming and ever-ceasing-to-be is action is self-evident. But the aphorism implies more than this. It defines the nature of action. Action is not merely a moving from here to there; it is a dying of a “here” together with a birth of a “there”. To act is to destroy and beget. To act is to lose that which has been, though it replaces the old with something new.

42. When ever-becoming cancels the ever-ceasing-to-be then Rest is realized.

This seems self-evident, as Rest is clearly the other of all action, whether in the positive or negative sense. But one might draw the erroneous conclusion that Rest and action exist exclusively in discrete portions of time. Actually, Rest and action may be realized at the same time. At a sufficiently profound level of realization, ceaseless action leaves the eternal Rest inviolate. The disjunction of these two complementaries is valid only for partial consciousness.

43. Ceaseless action is the Universe.

The Universe or Cosmos is the active phase or mode of THAT of which neither action nor Rest may be predicated, when conceived as a totality.

44. Unending Rest is *Nirvana*.

Since *Nirvana*, as here understood, is ever the complementary other of the Universe, it is that which the Universe is not. Hence, with respect to action, *Nirvana* has the value of Rest.

It should be clearly understood that with respect to the present aphorisms the conception of *Nirvana* is not necessarily identical with the definitions of the Oriental usage of the term, though there is at least a considerable degree of agreement in the meanings. The term is here used to represent meanings born out of a direct Realization which may not be *wholly* identical with any other that has been formulated.

45. But Consciousness-without-an-object is neither action nor Rest.

Both action and Rest are rooted in THAT, but of THAT as a whole neither action nor Rest can be predicated. THAT is all embracing but unconditioned. Thus, since in any positive predication it is a conditioning because it defines, and gives, to that extent, a delineation of nature or character, thereby implying an Other which is different, it follows that no such predication can be valid. On the other hand, negative predication is valid if it is clearly understood that it is a restriction which is denied, and not a Power.

46. When consciousness is attached to objects it is restricted through the forms imposed by the world-containing Space, by Time, and by Law.

Space, Time, and Law condition the contents of consciousness but not the consciousness itself. And when any center of consciousness is attached to, and thus identified with, contents or objects, it seems to be likewise conditioned. Thus to the extent man is so attached, he is not free but is determined. The doctrine of determinism, therefore, does express a part-truth, namely, a truth that has pragmatic but not transcendental validity. So he who feels himself wholly conditioned is highly attached. But the concrete consciousness may be in a state that is anything from slightly to highly detached, and thus have a corresponding experience of freedom, which we may view as determination through the Subject, rather than conditioning through the Object or environment. Mankind as a whole knows little genuine freedom, but lives conditioned in part by the objective environment and in part by psychical factors, which are none the less objective because they are subtle. But authentic freedom is possible.

47. When consciousness is disengaged from objects, Liberation from the forms of the world-containing Space, of Time, and of Law is attained.

Disengagement or detachment from objects does not necessarily imply the non-cognition of objects. But it does imply the break of involvement in the sense of a false identification with objects. It is possible to act upon and with objects and yet remain so detached that the individual is unbound. Thus, action is not incompatible with Liberation. One who attains and maintains this state of consciousness can achieve an authentically willed action.

48. Attachment to objects is consciousness bound within the Universe.

The meaning here with respect to consciousness is to be understood in the sense of an individual center of consciousness, not consciousness in the abstract or universal sense. Further, it is not stated that attachment to objects produces the Universe, but simply that consciousness—in the sense of individual center of consciousness—is bound within the Universe. Thus, this aphorism does not lead to the implication that the Universe, as such, is necessarily an illusion devoid of all reality value, but rather affirms that attachment produces a phase of bondage with respect to individual consciousness. Undoubtedly this does result in a state of delusion, but this may be no more than a mode of the individual consciousness, with respect to which the judgment that the Universe, as such, is unreal would be an unjustified extrapolation.

49. Liberation from such attachment is the State of unlimited Nirvanic Freedom.

That the *Nirvanic* State of Consciousness is one of Liberation or Freedom has long been the traditional teaching. The aphorism accentuates the fact that this Freedom depends upon detachment from the object, but does not imply that such detachment is the

whole meaning of the *Nirvanic* Freedom. It does imply that, while realization of the *Nirvanic* State is dependent upon detachment from the object, it is not dependent upon non-cognition of the Object. For simple cognition of the Object does not necessitate attachment to it. Thus realization of *Nirvana* is, in principle, compatible with continued cognition of the World, provided there is non-attachment to it.

The *Nirvanic* State of Consciousness when realized in its purity does imply non-cognition as well as detachment from the Universe of Objects. Possibly this is the more frequent form of the realization, and there exists the view that this is the only possible form of the realization. But this is an error. If this were the truth, then *Nirvana* could only be a realization in a full trance of objective consciousness, or after physical death. But a more integral realization is possible, such that the *Nirvanic* State may be known together with the cognition of, and even action in, the world, provided there is detachment. Confirmation of this may be found in several of the northern Buddhistic Sutras and in the writings of Sri Aurobindo.

Detachment is a negative condition of the realization, but positively more is required in order that the realization may reach into the relative consciousness. A new power of cognition must also be actuated, else the realization is incomplete. This new power is born spontaneously, though there may be a time-lag in the adjustment of the relative consciousness. However, the aphoristic statement is not concerned with psychological detail of this sort, no matter how great it may be in its human importance. Actually, the aphorisms are a sort of spiritual mathematic dealing with essential relationship, rather than with the more humanistic factors.

50. But Consciousness-without-an-object is neither bondage nor Liberation [Freedom].

First of all this is true for the general reason that pure Consciousness is not conditioned or determined by either or both members of any pair of opposites. But without the pure Consciousness there could be neither bondage nor Liberation. Only because of the experience of bondage is it possible to realize Liberation; likewise, without knowledge of Freedom there could be no cognition of a state of bondage. Movement, development, or process appear to our relative consciousness as either determined by law or a manifestation of free spontaneity, but these are only alternatives of the relative consciousness and not ontological forms. To any given center of consciousness, Being may appear either as absolutely conditioned or as a freely playing spontaneity, but the fact that it so appears to such a center tells us something about the individual psychology of the latter, and does not reveal to us the nature of the Ultimate as it is in itself.

51. Consciousness-without-an-object may be symbolized by a SPACE which is unaffected by the presence or absence of objects; for which there is neither Time nor Timelessness; neither a world-containing Space nor a Spatial Void; neither tension nor Equilibrium; neither resistance nor Creativeness; neither agony nor Bliss; neither action nor Rest; neither restriction nor Freedom.

This, together with the following aphorisms, introduces an alternative symbol for Consciousness-without-an-object, namely, the symbol of SPACE. No form, either conceptual or aesthetic, can possibly be an adequate representation of the all-containing Ultimate Reality, since such a form is a comprehended or contained entity. But a form may serve as a pointer to a meaning beyond itself and thus fulfill an office in the human consciousness in the sense of orienting the latter beyond itself. The effective symbol must possess the dual character: (a) of being in some measure comprehensible by the human consciousness; and, (b) of reaching beyond the possibility of human comprehension. In the literature dealing with Realization many symbols may be found which have served this office. But in time, symbols tend to lose their power as the evolving human consciousness approaches a comprehensive understanding of them. Then new and more profound symbols must be found to replace the old. Consciousness-without-an-object is such a symbol for the more subjective orientation of human consciousness, while SPACE is a corresponding symbol for the more objective orientation. The notion of “Void” or “Emptiness” has been used, but has the weakness of suggesting to many minds complete annihilation, hence the more positive symbols of Consciousness-without-an-object and SPACE are used here.

“Space” is a symbol that has been used before, and one of the best explanations of it is to be found in *The Secret Doctrine*. Thus:

The “Parent,” Space, is the eternal, ever-present Cause of all—the incomprehensible DEITY, whose “Invisible Robes” are the mystic Root of all Matter, and of the Universe. Space is the *one eternal thing* that we can most easily imagine, immovable in its abstraction and uninfluenced by either the presence or absence in it of an objective Universe. It is without dimension, in every sense, and self-existent. Spirit is the first differentiation from “THAT,” the Causeless Cause of both Spirit and Matter. As taught in the Esoteric Catechism, it is neither “limitless void,” nor “conditioned fullness,” but both. It was and ever will be.⁸

“Space”, as used for the symbol, is not to be identified with any of our perceptual or conceptual spaces which are conceived as having specific properties, such as three-dimensional, “curved”, and so forth. The notion must be understood in the most abstract sense possible, as the root or base of every specifically conceivable space. Nor is it to be conceived as either “fullness” or as “voidness” but rather as embracing both conceptions. It thus is a better symbol than either “voidness” or “plenum”.

But while the interpretation of THAT as either voidness or plenum is not ultimately valid, yet relative to the needs of different types of human consciousness the symbol is most effective when taken in one or the other of these two aspects. When the approach is predominantly negative with respect to relative consciousness, naturally the symbol is conceived under the form of the Voidness, as in the case of Shunya Buddhism. But in this work the accentuation is positive, and thus “SPACE” or “Consciousness-without-an-object” is conceived provisionally as substantive, with the acknowledgment that this orientation is not ultimately valid.

⁸ *The Secret Doctrine*, 3rd Ed., p. 67.

As the distinction between these two aspects or emphases is of considerable importance, some discussion of them may be valuable. Technically, the distinction has been given the form of Substantialism versus Non-Substantialism. Thus, quoting from Hamilton: "Philosophers, as they affirm or deny the authority of consciousness in guaranteeing a substratum or substance to the manifestations of the Ego and Non-Ego, are divided into Realists or Substantialists and into Nihilists or Non-Substantialists."⁹ It is easy to see that under the class of Non-Substantialism also belong the philosophies classed as Positivism, Phenomenalism, Agnosticism, and Aestheticism.¹⁰ As examples of the substantialistic philosophical orientation, particular attention may be drawn to the philosophies of Spinoza and Sri Aurobindo Ghose;¹¹ while as examples of non-substantialistic philosophies we may cite those of Auguste Comte and the Taoists, and most of the Buddhists, particularly Zen Buddhism.

One fact which stands out is that the contrasting views, while quite understandably exemplified in various speculative philosophies, are also to be found among philosophies based upon realization. This may strike one with the force of considerable surprise. For, if realization is an authentic insight into Truth, should it not lead to fundamental agreement when manifested as philosophic symbols? Offhand, one may quite reasonably expect such to be the case, yet a fairly wide acquaintance with the literature reveals divergencies sufficiently wide as to appear like contradictions. Since this can be a stumbling block for the seeker, it is probably well to give the question some consideration.

One reaction to this apparent contradiction, on the part of the seeker who has attained some degree of realization, is to view those formulations which are most consonant with his own insight as revealing an authentic Enlightenment, while the incompatible statements are regarded as in essential error and thus not the expression from the matrix of a genuine Enlightenment. As a result, we may have the development of a considerable degree of separative intolerance at a relatively high level. While all this may be quite understandable as a subjective phenomenon and may serve certain psychological needs, nonetheless, objectively considered, it is less than an integral view. Or, even if the seeker does not take so extreme a position, he may view his own expression and those of similar form as necessarily the more comprehensive, while viewing opposed expressions as inferior insights. In general, such attitudes are simply not sound, for even a considerable degree of Enlightenment is compatible with a failure to transcend one's own individual psychology. Indeed, the Transcendental Consciousness as it is on its own level is inevitably stepped down and modified by the psychological temperament of the *sadhaka*,¹² and, if the individual has not become cognizant of the relativity of his own psychology, he can very easily fall into the error of projecting his own attitude as an objective universal. Actually, opposed interpretations may be just as valid, and even more valid, and in any case, an Enlightenment which is sufficiently profound will find a relative or partial truth in all authentic formulations.

⁹ Quoted from *Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Vol. II, p. 614.

¹⁰ For an able discussion of Aestheticism as the predominant form of Oriental philosophy, see F. S. C. Northrop's *The Meeting of East and West*.

¹¹ See *The Life Divine* by Sri Aurobindo, Chapter IX, "The Pure Existent," p. 68.

¹² The meaning of *sadhaka* is the seeker or one who is practicing yoga.

The philosophic expressions, whether Substantialistic or Non-Substantialistic, are, in any case, but partial statements, expressions of one or another facet, and are valid as long as taken in a provisional sense. One may know this and acknowledge it and then proceed with the development which accords the better with his own Vision. Then there need not be any fundamental conflict with counter, yet essentially complementary, views. Of necessity any formulation must be partial and incomplete, however wide its integration.

52. As the GREAT SPACE is not to be identified with the Universe, so neither is It to be identified with any Self.

The SPACE of the symbol is here called the GREAT SPACE to emphasize the fact that it is to be understood as space in the ultimate or generic sense, in contradistinction to the special spaces of perception and conception. Further, IT is neither an objective nor a subjective space and hence may not be designated as either the Self or the Universe.

53. The GREAT SPACE is not God, but the comprehender of all Gods, as well as of all lesser creatures.

The GREAT SPACE transcends and embraces all entities, even the greatest. There is a sense in which we may validly speak of the Divine Person, but, underlying, overlying, and enveloping even This, is THAT, symbolized by the GREAT SPACE.

54. The GREAT SPACE, or Consciousness-without-an-object, is the Sole Reality upon which all objects and all selves depend and derive their existence.

The essential additional affirmation of this aphorism is that the GREAT SPACE is the *sole* Reality. What this means seems evident enough until one stops to think about it, and then at once difficulties appear in both the notions “sole” and “reality”. First of all, “sole” suggests the meaning of “one”, which is clearly abstracted from a matrix which also embraces the notions of “many” and “plurality”. In this sense, a sole reality would exclude the possibility of multiplicity, and we would still find ourselves within the dualistic field. Actually THAT must be conceived as both not many and not one, when speaking in the strictly metaphysical sense, but unless we would abandon the effort to build a thinkable and psychologically positive symbol, we must go further than purely negative definition. Actually, the symbol is a psychological value which serves the orientation of individual consciousness and thus is something less than metaphysical truth. Therefore, the accentuation of soleness or oneness is to be conceived as a correlative to the states of consciousness which lie in bondage to the sense of manyness. It is thus not an ultimate conception. However, soleness may be conceived in a sense having a higher, as well as in a sense having a lower, relative validity. So we should think of the soleness as having a unity more like that possessed by the mathematical continuum than that of the bare number “one”. For the continuum is a notion of a unity of a totality composed of infinite multiplicity but not involving relationships between discrete entities. This appears to me the best positive conception as yet possible for suggesting the Reality underlying the negative definition of “not one and not many”.

With respect to the notion of “reality”, we have even greater difficulties, for whether used in the philosophic or the pragmatic senses it has had, historically, several meanings. Most commonly, at least in Western thought, this notion has been employed in relation to supposed objective existences, and this is obviously not the sense that could apply to the GREAT SPACE, which is neither objective nor subjective. We must, therefore, undertake some effort to derive the meaning which is valid for the aphorism.

Ordinarily, we think of “reality” as in contrast to the notion of “illusion”, but this hardly leads to a clear understanding, since each notion becomes negatively defined by the other, and we are little, if at all, advanced to a true conception of what we *feel* in relation to these notions.¹³ Pragmatically, we generally have little difficulty in differentiating between many illusions and relative realities, such as a mirage lake and a real lake, but this is not enough to define for us what we mean when these terms are extended to a metaphysical usage. For clearly, as a bare, visual, sense-impression, the mirage lake is as authentic as a real lake. We might say that as aesthetic modification of consciousness the one is as real as the other, but the distinction of reality versus illusion arises when some judgment is added to the pure aesthetic modification. But a judgment does not give reality; it gives either truth or error. If the judgment produces an error, then we are obsessed by an illusion; otherwise there is no illusion.

It would appear that this identification of illusion and error leads to the conclusion that the other of illusion is not reality but truth, and this opens a door for analysis that is much more fruitful. In support of this view, attention is called to the following quotation from Immanuel Kant:

Still less can appearance [*phenomenon*] and *illusion* be taken as identical. For truth or illusion is not to be found in the objects of intuition, but in the judgments upon them, so far as they are thought. It is therefore quite right to say that the senses never err, not because they always judge rightly, but because they do not judge at all.¹⁴

If the other of truth is illusion, then it at once becomes evident that the other of reality is appearance, the latter notion not implying illusion unless an erroneous judgment has been made concerning it, and in that case, the illusion has been produced by the mistaken judgment and is not a property of the appearance as such. We can now derive a meaning for “reality” which is valid with respect to the usage of the aphorism. “Reality” becomes identical with “Noumenon”, and its other, “appearance”, with “phenomenon”. With this the distinction becomes epistemologically defined and acquires a certain clarity of meaning.

In the history of Western thought the most important development of the contrasting conceptions of “noumenon” and “phenomenon” has been in the Greek philosophies and the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. The meanings given in these two usages, while fundamentally related, are not identical; a result growing out of the critical thinking of later times. With Plato, in particular, the noumenon designates the intelligible,

¹³ For an illuminating discussion of illusionism, see *The Life Divine* by Sri Aurobindo, Chapters V and VI, Book II.

¹⁴ *The Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 293, Max Muller translation.

or the things of thought, but which are not objects for sensibility. The latter are phenomena and are of an inferior and even undivine order. With Kant, the noumenon is generally equivalent to the thing-in-itself as it is in abstraction from the intuition of the senses, while the phenomenon remains, as it was with the Greeks, the sensibly given object. But unlike the Greeks, Kant did not view the noumenon as an existence given through the pure reason. Pure thought might find it a necessary or useful conception but did not, by itself, give it existence. What Kant has to say here is quite valuable as pointing to a conception which is of fundamental importance in the present work, and accordingly, the following quotation is worthy of special attention.

In the *Critique* he says:

. . . if I admit things which are objects of the understanding only, and nevertheless can be given as objects of an intuition, though not of sensuous intuition . . . such things would be called *Noumena*.

Unless therefore we are to move in a constant circle, we must admit that the very word phenomenon indicates a relation to something the immediate representation of which is no doubt sensuous, but which nevertheless, even without this qualification of our sensibility (on which the form of our intuition is founded) must be something by itself, that is an object independent of our sensibility.

Hence arises the concept of a noumenon, which however is not positive, nor a definite knowledge of anything, but which implies only the thinking of something, without taking any account of the form of sensuous intuition. But, in order that a noumenon may signify a *real* object that can be distinguished from all phenomena, *it is not enough that I should free my thought of all conditions of sensuous intuition, but I must besides have some reason for admitting another kind of intuition besides the sensuous, in which such an object can be given; otherwise my thought would be empty, however free it may be from contradictions.*¹⁵

Kant's significant addition to the Greek conception is the statement that if the noumenon is to be realized as real, and thus more than a formal conception, there must be an intuition of it other than sensuous intuition. This is clearly the intellectual intuition of Schelling and other subsequent philosophers. In the present system such a function is affirmed but has been called "introception", for reasons discussed later.¹⁶

At last we are in a position to define "Reality" as the noumenon which is immediately cognized by Introception, or Knowledge through Identity, while "phenomenon" means the sensuous appearance. A third form of cognition would be conceptual representation which occupies a position intermediate between the phenomenon and the noumenon. But we must take a further step, since the Subject or Self, neglected by the Greeks and treated as a constant by Kant, becomes for us a component that is constant and primary only in relation to the object, but in relation to

¹⁵ *Critique of Pure Reason*, 217 and 219, Max Muller translation. Italics mine.

¹⁶ See the discussion of "Introception" in the third part of this work.

Pure Consciousness is derivative. We might view this Subject as a sort of transcendental phenomenon, namely, transcendental with respect to the object but standing in something like a phenomenal relationship to Pure Consciousness.

55. The GREAT SPACE comprehends both the Path of the Universe and the Path of *Nirvana*.

Essentially this aphorism is a reassertion of previous formulations in terms of Consciousness-without-an-object. The two Ways of the Subjective and the Objective are embraced in the one Way of the universal and transcendental comprehender. A consciousness which is sufficiently awakened would find *Nirvana* and the Universe to be coexistences capable of simultaneous realization.

56. BESIDE THE GREAT SPACE THERE IS NONE OTHER.

[This completes Chapter 4 dealing with the Commentaries on the Aphorisms one at a time and also completes Part II of the work *Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*.]