

ARNOLD KUNST

Stanisław Schayer

(8. V. 1899 — 1. XII. 1941)

I

Three years after the death of Stanisław Schayer in Otwock on the first of December 1941, it was remarked in connexion with his rôle in the organization and promotion of Oriental studies in Warsaw, that with the establishment of the Oriental Institute at the Warsaw University, which was largely the result of his efforts, Indology in Poland was fixed as a branch of studies on a basis equal to other humane studies. The opinion was expressed that when the Warsaw University is rebuilt after destruction, the restitution of Oriental research will be equally obvious as the restitution of other branches of research, and that the foundation of such position of equality was one of Schayer's greatest merits.

Unfortunately, Schayer shared the fate of those many, who witnessed only the destruction of their work wrought by the war, but were deprived of participating in the subsequent reconstruction work undertaken in those branches of life, which they had initiated in the first place.

In the light of Schayer's personal experience, the bitterness of this truth is perhaps particularly dramatic.

To begin his biography from the period near to its end, and close to myself who intensely participated in this phase of his life, Schayer arrived with his wife, Mrs. Elżbieta Schayer, in London towards the end of August 1939. In his letters preceding the journey, Schayer had mentioned that as long as health still permitted (by that time asthma joined the somewhat subsiding TB), and the war situation was not clear, he wanted to make the trip to England to meet some of the outstanding Indian scholars, amongst whom were Sir Ralph L. Turner (then Professor Turner), Director of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; the late F. W. Thomas, the noted Sanskrit authority; E. H. Johnston, the then Bodley Professor of Sanskrit in Oxford; E. J. Thomas, and William Stedé, the well-known Buddhologists; Mrs. Rhys Davids, and others. A short stay was also planned in Scotland and a meeting with Sir Arthur B. Keith of the University of Edinburgh was envisaged.

Yet his arrival in London can be for all practical purposes considered the

actual closure of his scholarly life and career. He saw none of those, who indirectly were the cause and purpose of his journey, and after that, to my knowledge, no opportunity for any work was given to Schayer in the wake of the quick development of events around the world and him.

Impervious to any suggestion to stay on in England, worn out and prepared to face the worst — his habitually clear thinking bore no illusions — he packed up and went after three days of an unhappy sojourn in London.

After a roundabout journey through Scandinavia, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, he and his wife reached Warsaw on the 7th of September 1939, the date when the general exodus from the capital was sounded.

Soon thereafter, the Institute of Oriental Studies of the University of Warsaw at Królewska Street in Warsaw was bombed out and burnt down with much of its valuable library acquired largely as the result of Schayer's efforts and organizational ability. Schayer's health was giving way, asthma appearing to give more trouble than the chronic TB. By a fortunate concurrence of events, he suffered no great material hardships during a part of the war and was reasonably well looked after in the Otwock sanatorium. He died there on the first of December 1941 at the age of 42.

II

He was born in 1899 in Sędziszów (voivodship of Kielce), the son of Antoni, a railway official, and Maria née Ostrołęcka. Soon after the birth of his son, Antoni Schayer was transferred to Warsaw where in 1905 he met his death.

In 1916, Stanisław Schayer concluded his secondary schooling in the Emilian Konopczyński Gymnasium. Soon thereafter (1916—17) he entered the recently (1915) reopened University of Warsaw, where he studied classical languages under the guidance of Professor Ryszard Ganszyniec. He participated actively in student organizations and contributed to the University magazine "Pro Arte et Studio".

His study in the Warsaw University was, however, of short duration. He soon moved to Germany, where he embarked at the Heidelberg University for the first time on systematic studies of Indian philology. There he was pupil of the two well-known scholars, Bruno Liebich and Max Wallaser. He did not neglect his philosophical training, which he was undergoing under Hans Driesch, the then notable German biologist, philosopher and psychologist.

Schayer often mentioned Driesch as a teacher, to whom he owed much. It is possible that in his article on *Somatism in Indian Psychology*¹ it

¹ "Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres", Cracow 1936.

was the inspiration of Driesch, the pioneer of anti-mechanism in psychology and of dynamic vitalism, that caused Schayer to go into the analysis of the systems of Indian psychology.

After a while Schayer moved from Heidelberg to Freiburg in Breisgau in Baden. There he studied philosophy with Heinrich Rickert, the main, and after Wilhelm Windelband's death, the leading member of the Southwest German school of Neo-kantianists. His theory of culture values, and studies on epistemology experienced a new turn with the rising of Husserl's principle of phenomenology. Whether or not Schayer was attending Husserl's lectures in Freiburg, I could not establish for certain.

In Freiburg, at the age of 22, Schayer obtained his doctor's degree for the thesis on the *Vorbereiten zur Geschichte der Mahāyānistischen Erlösungslehre*², probably under the guidance of E. Leumann.

Soon thereafter he moved to Munich where he continued his study under Lucian Schermann.

Schayer's sojourn in Munich fell in the most critical time, which Germany was undergoing in the post-Versailles period, both intellectually and economically. It was the peak of inflation and severe food shortages. Hardships suffered by Schayer at that time are likely to have prepared the background for his TB, which set in so forcefully a few years later. These were also the days of the revolutionary fight in Germany which in Munich began in November 1918.

Having decided not to pursue his career in Germany, Schayer returned to Poland and was habilitated in 1924 by Professor Andrzej Gawroński at the University of Lwów (Jan Kazimierz University); two years later the habilitation was transferred to the Warsaw University. As the position of a "docent" was unpaid, he taught German, elementary philosophy and classics in a secondary school of a little provincial town (Przasnysz). He eagerly accepted, a little later, teaching offers from three schools in Warsaw, which gave him the opportunity of being closer to the University and the literary and scholarly events. When he married in 1925, he already was paid for commissioned lectures at the University of Warsaw. He became extraordinary professor of Indian philology at the end of 1930; the chair of full professor was granted him in 1938. For all practical purposes he held it for one year only.

In 1928 he was overtaken by tuberculosis which was never to leave him. Yet in all the years of ailment I never remember him to have missed a lecture or to delay what was to be accomplished at a given deadline. He was well looked after and was master of his time, which he scrupulously divided between work and recuperation. The disease seemed at times to lend him added

² "Zeitschrift für Buddhismus", Munich 1921.

energy and speed. He was never bashful about it, nor did he ever burden anybody by talking about it. He was conscious of his health, but never fussy or frightened: he looked after it in so far as it was necessary to live a normal and active life.

III

Schayer's scholarly activity may be described as clearly falling under two categories which completely supplement each other.

The first is his organizational work in the field of Indian studies. When he emerged in Poland in 1924 after completing his thesis in Germany, there was no organized study in Indian philology in Warsaw. Lwów was at that time leading in studies in Sanskrit under the guidance of Andrzej Gawroński, the actual founder of systematic scholarship in this field in Poland. After Gawroński's death in 1927, Lwów, with an already established Oriental Institute at its University, was conducting regular studies under Stefan Stasiak, professor of Indian philology, and with Eugeniusz Słuszkiewicz, now professor of Indian philology in the Warsaw University, attached to the chair of comparative linguistics occupied by Jerzy Kuryłowicz. Indian studies were also conducted in Cracow by Helena Willman-Grabowska, and Sanskrit was taught by Rozadowski. With the exception of comparative linguistic studies, where Sanskrit was studied in an ancillary manner, no Sanskrit courses and, even less so, courses of Indian culture, literature or philosophy were held anywhere at the University of Warsaw.

Schayer's ambition was to establish in the capital of Poland an institute, which not only would open opportunities for young people for regular study of Indian culture and languages, but would also provide for an outpost enabling students to study other Oriental cultures. Lwów had an Institute headed by Z. Smogorzewski and W. Kotwicz, Cracow conducted Oriental studies under the leadership of T. Kowalski. There were other prominent or promising scholars in the two Universities or even in Warsaw, who were either teaching under the camouflage of another chair — Schayer himself was first appointed in 1929 associate professor for philosophy — or were attached as assistants to professors who had no more suitable placements for them.

On the 6th of November 1932 the Oriental Institute at the University of Warsaw eventually came to life, the result of Schayer's, and others' assisting him, unremitting efforts.

First a humble room on the premises of the University, then in its own location in Królewska Street, it offered hospitality to scholars of high calibre like A. Zajaczkowski, J. Jaworski, W. Jabłoński, R. Ranošek, S. Przeworski and others. Schayer's seminar for

Indology soon housed a library, small but well selected, reputed to be better than some in the leading European Universities.

In order to realize the importance of Schayer's achievements it should be remembered that the knowledge of the East was in Poland saturated with many prejudices. Some of them worked directly against the development of genuine research; others could easily lead it astray. Thus, a number of people believed that Poland faced many more important matters than studies on India or other Asian countries. Right or wrong, this conviction seemed to draw some justification from the economic and political situation of the country. This view was shared, for instance, by some departments of the Ministry of Education. As a result, the needs of Oriental studies did not find too much understanding in the official circles. Propaganda for colonial expansion, sponsored by some political groups, was obviously more detrimental than favourable to the development of this branch of studies.

On the other hand, there was in the Polish public as in some other countries of Europe and America, a kind of an uncritical enthusiasm for everything Eastern, a wide-spread admiration for the "Oriental wisdom" ("ex Oriente lux") and similar phenomena. India was the first and foremost victim of this enthusiasm. Philosophy and religion of Hinduism and Buddhism were at first imported to Europe mostly by English, French and German theosophists and presented to the public in their own interpretation. Owing to this, more serious interests did not reach beyond a small circle of scholars. Instead, a conception of cheap and primitive philosophical and religious ideas was introduced to the Polish public as the quintessence of the "Oriental wisdom". It is obvious that this view took particularly firm roots in countries where the scope of Oriental studies was limited. The work of a small group of scholars could not effectively counteract the unscholarly approach.

With the platform firmly established and the prestige to Indian studies duly accorded in the faculty, Schayer felt more secure in disseminating his views on both the knowledge and the substance of Indian culture, religions and philosophy, for the benefit of the Polish lay-public at large. Quack-Orientalists from Germany were still fresh in his mind. He had found Herman Kayserling's performance, his School of Wisdom and the *Tagebuch eines Philosophen* particularly disgusting. He saw in Keyserling's "Academy" of Psychoanalysis and Yoga, arranged in the early twenties in Darmstadt, an act of a shallow and pompous farce, all tending to mislead the public in the correct understanding of Indian philosophy, and to warp the essential tenets of this philosophy. He had equally resented the anthroposophical activities of Rudolf Steiner and his "Free High School for Spiritual Science" established after Steiner's exclusion from the theosophic association. . . . did not have its roots merely in the superior-

Schayer's resentment did not have its roots merely in the indignity of an expert in a subject misrepresented by amateurs. His was an indignity of an expert in a subject misrepresented by amateurs. His was an indignity of an expert in a subject misrepresented by amateurs.

tion of an honest and clear thinker at the intellectual dishonesty and cheap and pompous idealism under the disguise of pseudo-science, humanitarianism and search for "Weltanschauung".

It may be said that Schayer developed an allergy to any atmosphere that reverberated these moods. He had found, as has been mentioned before, though to a lesser degree and in not so well an organized manner, similar dispositions in Poland. To remedy these, he embarked on a series of activities, one of which was the publication of popular books, which would familiarize the Polish public with the principles of Indian philosophy and religions, and with Indian literature and culture. In this period fall his major popular publications on Brahmanism, Buddha and Buddhism, on the philosophical methods of the Indians, and Indian and Iranian religions. In the period preceding these major, popularly written religiological and philosophical works, he published some of his translations from Sanskrit, amongst them Kālidāsa's *Śakuntalā*, Tagore's poems from Bengali, and some essays on the Indian theatre, literature, the Upanishads, etc.³

Another step towards informed popularization of knowledge of Indian culture was the founding of the "Society of Friends of India" ("Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Indii") which held its periodical meetings with the objective of exchanging information and views on ancient and modern art, literature, political and current events in India.

Yet another organizational activity of Schayer, this time intended to attract attention from abroad to Polish achievements in Oriental scholarship, was marked by the foundation of a periodical "Biuletyn" with the English subtitle "The Polish Bulletin of Oriental Studies". It was an organ of the Institute and the Oriental Section of the "Warsaw Society of Learning" ("Warszawskie Towarzystwo Naukowe"). This periodical contributed to the partial settlement of the then prevalent argument in Poland as to whether the Polish orientalist should preferably publish the results of his findings in the Oriental field in Polish or in a foreign language. In the Bulletin⁴ Polish scholars were encouraged to write in English and French. At that time preference was given to Polish in the "Rocznik Orientalistyczny". Publications of the "Polish Academy of Science" (Oriental Committee) were favouring monographs in foreign languages. The non-Polish preference served also the purpose of allowing foreign scholars to print in Polish periodicals.

A close contact between Polish and particularly French, British and Belgian scholars in the field of Indian research was one of Schayer's successful achievements. During the holding of the chair by Schayer pro-

³ See bibliographical list.

⁴ Two numbers only saw the daylight. The second number appeared on the eve of the second world war.

minent scholars such as V. Lesný, Paul Tuxen, Jean Przyluski⁵ visited Warsaw and delivered lectures. Graduates or well-nigh established scholars like L. Skurzak and C. Regamey went for further education to France and England, while lecturers of modern languages or scholars from abroad, like Maryla Falk, came to work in Warsaw.

Nobody was ever more conscious than Schayer of the difficulties faced as a rule by a student entering the University: difficulties in the pursuance of his studies and difficulties of financial nature. A student embarking on Oriental studies faced perhaps double difficulty: he had practically no textbooks in Polish⁶ and to the current financial difficulties were added poor prospects for the future. The solution to the first category of difficulty Schayer envisaged in the publication of textbooks familiarizing the student with, at least, the elements of the problem. In 1930, he published his history of Indian Literature, and later the textbook on religions mentioned before. He had further plans, but life was shorter than designs. He was indefatigable in his efforts to meet the other type of students' difficulty: funds. Scholarships for study in Warsaw and abroad were very difficult to obtain and *a fortiori* more difficult for such impractical subjects like Indian philology. Yet Schayer usually succeeded in obtaining them for those whom he considered deserving. Vis-à-vis others, according to his own words, he practised eugenics and with supreme competence attempted to dissuade from Oriental studies persons whose intentions he did not consider steady or solid.

IV

Schayer's contribution to research in religions and philosophies of India is, in the light of his short life, particularly significant. Until the twentieth century, Poland could not claim any independent achievements or, in fact, any tradition established in the field of study of Indian culture. Outbursts of interest by the 19th century scholars such as J. Lelewel (contributions to Indian history, astrology and astronomy), Dunin L. Borkowski (translations from Bhartṛhari) and W. S. Majewski (the first Sanskrit grammar to appear in Poland in Devanāgarī print), were only glimpses into some of the fragments of systematic studies and discoveries in Indian culture, occupying Europe at that time. In the early decades of the twentieth century, organized studies of Indian philology existed practically all over Europe, and the period of publishing synthetic, documentarily well-substantiated studies, embracing broad fields of Indian religions, history, philosophies, logic, and literature were in full bloom.

⁵ Przyluski obtained an honorary doctor's degree in Warsaw.

⁶ Gawroński's Sanskrit Grammar was not published before 1932.

Due to obvious circumstances, actual studies on India did not begin in Poland till 1919, when Gawroński established his Institute at Lwów. Soon thereafter, a small but select group of Polish scholars established itself in the country.

As has been said, Schayer began his study of India in Germany. His professors were scholars of high standing, but of interest not always and entirely corresponding to his desires. From scholars like Bruno Liebach and Ernst Leumann he could acquire a thorough knowledge of language and literature. His work with Max Walleiser of Heidelberg, the expert in Buddhism and particularly in the Mādhyamika school, may not have been very fruitful, as it fell in the earliest stage of Schayer's university studies, when he was not yet sufficiently equipped to be affected by Walleiser's theories. Whatever the case, Schayer's philosophical and religious predilection led him to divide his time of university study into two major subjects which he followed scrupulously to the end: Indian philology and Western philosophy. The latter was to help him in the formulation of Indian philosophical principles which, he believed, were to a high degree translatable into Western conceptions without losing their intrinsic originality. However controversial this interpretation may be, Schayer gave in his work ample evidence that Western methods and terminology are supple enough to be used as an instrument for finding solutions to problems of Indian philosophies and logical systems. His thesis on the *Vorbereiten zur Geschichte der Mahāyānistischen Erlösungslehre* already reveals this method of analysis⁷.

While mainly engaged in philosophic and soteriological problems of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, and more particularly in the Mādhyamika exegesis of Buddha's doctrines, he contributed largely in the period till the early thirties to the knowledge of Hinduism by articles on the structure of the magic conception according to the Atharva-Veda and the Brāhmanas⁸, on the meaning of the word "Upaniṣads"⁹, Indian Philosophy as the Problem of the Present Times¹⁰, the Transience of Existence (*anityata*)¹¹, on Indian logic and the methods of the Nyāya-analysis.

It may be said that in this period, roughly till 1930, his work is passively under the influence of his German teachers, whose many doctrines he could never wholly accept, but whose methods of research he followed, possibly

⁷ The thesis was translated into English by R. T. Knight in 1923 and published by Probsthain as *Mahāyāna Doctrine of Salvation*.

⁸ See bibliographical list Nr. 10.

⁹ See bibliographical list Nr. 15.

¹⁰ See bibliographical list Nr. 17.

¹¹ See bibliographical list Nr. 26.

by force of habit. The methods acquired were no doubt thorough, and even, if often founded on anthropological or metaphysical misconceptions, could serve as a sound instrument to be used in further research.

Open opposition to German interpretation of Indian and Buddhist philosophy and religion, voiced sporadically and in general terms by Schayer before, through small articles or statements, had not become part of Schayer's approach to his study of India and Indian philosophy before approximately 1930.

This opposition which reflects Schayer's interest and development of his work can be broadly described to fall into three main categories. i. e. the general approach to Indian culture, the conception of Buddhism, and the interpretation of logic.

The first category, which will also branch out into other fields of interest, is marked by Schayer's rebellion against the "indo-germanisch" or the indo-european approach to Indian culture, applied by German Indology. Beginning with the romantic writers Friedrich Schlegel and Wilhelm Schlegel, the Vedic Arians represented to the Germans their indo-germanic ancestors, while the Arian culture was but a predecessor to German culture, unblemished by any later influence. The whole civilization of ancient India was thus viewed as the creation of Indo-Arians. This was later reflected in the big encyclopaedic publication founded by G. Buehler under the general title *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, and perpetuated in one form or another in the various analyses of India's culture and her philosophies including the Vedas, Upanishads and Buddhism.

Schayer's sensitivity to the thus arisen inaccuracies and the sterility of results attainable on the basis of these theories, turned his mind towards the further West, and particularly France, where to the forefront came the name of Jean Przyluski and his theories, initiated by an at first seemingly insignificant article *De quelques noms anaryens en indo-aryen*¹². This and other contributions of Przyluski tended to establish the now obvious truth that the Arian element was one, the youngest, amongst other elements contributing to what is known as Indian culture. Przyluski's interest was mainly directed towards the separation of the australo-asiatic element from the material known to the scholar heretofore. The existence of the australo-asiatic factor in the languages of India was already recorded by others and particularly by Sylvain Lévi. On the other hand, the revival of Dravidian studies in India corroborated the correctness of the newly entered path of research. It would be outside the scope of this note to go into

¹² "Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique", Paris 1921.

the scientific details of this branch of research and its accuracy, soon shaken by later discoveries and by the establishment of influences of the uralo-altaian group of languages. The general acceptance of the not-solely-arian theory was a revelation to Schayer, and it would seem that not only his mind was relieved by the new discovery, but so was also his conception of ethical approach to scholarship. He had rebelled before against the romantic approach perpetuated by German scholarship, but he lacked the scientific proof to combat it. French indology succurred him, in that it provided the necessary evidence which had been wanting or vaguely scattered in conjectures. When he delivered his speech at the bestowal of the honorary doctor's degree to Jean Przyłuski in Warsaw, he said amongst other things: "As early as in the R̥gveda we encounter non-arian elements of most divers origin. Thus the myth is exploded of the "pure" Arian culture of India, which, in the eyes of German romantics and their followers, was to justify the purpose and value of study of Indian culture".

Schayer's general interpretation of the value of indological studies became thus defined as being directed towards the discovery of the complex stages of development of Indian culture within the framework of the history of events inside Asia. As such it militated against the German conception of such studies purporting to enquire into the allegedly predominant indo-european element in Indian culture, its origin and formation.

This so defined objective of Schayer's research found its particular reflection in his interpretation of Buddhism, its historical background, doctrines, and specific religious and philosophical aspects.

An excerpt from Otto Strauss' review of Schayer's *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapada*¹³, in the "Orientalistische Literaturzeitung"¹⁴ is characteristic enough to show the reaction of an eminent historian of Indian philosophy to Schayer's views. O. Strauss says¹⁵: "Next Schayer turns quite sharply against the interpretation by a generation of scholars whom we recognize as our teachers. This interpretation, according to Schayer, has, under the influence of protestantism, drawn particular attention to the reconstruction of the authentic doctrine of the original Buddhist] community, and has considered as a digression everything younger than this original community. Schayer believes that the ascertainment of the original doctrine, though he will not deny its importance, is neither the only nor the most im-

¹³ See bibliographical list Nos. 20 and 21. Incidentally the *Cinq Chapitres de la Prasannapada* by J. W. de Jong, Buddhica IX, Paris 1949, makes copious use of Schayer's work on the Prasannapadā.

¹⁴ Schayer, *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapada*. Besprochen von Otto Strauss. OLZ, 36, Jahrgang 8/9, Leipsic 1933, pp. 571—572.

¹⁵ The translation from German is mine.

portant problem'. It is obvious that it is not the only problem, since, thanks to the translation from Chinese of the *Abhidharmakośa* by de la Vallée Poussin (1872—1931) we have now gained knowledge of the scholastic Hināyāna, that was denied to the preceding generation of scholars... Those [like Schayer], systematically disposed, trained in the subtleties of modern philosophy and well versed in Buddhist scholastics, will always hold the exegesis of more recent systems to be of greatest importance; they will also give preference to this task, because here the results are within easy reach and are based on unequivocal evidence".

This diplomatically phrased passage, which simultaneously bows to the ancestors and lights a candle to scholarship, salvages the importance of the Hināyāna orthodoxy and flatteringly snubs Schayer and those like him for search of easy results: it eschews however any reference to the principle, which was at the bottom of Schayer's contention: the refutation of the trend to study India as an indo-germanic myth instead of India in the setting of Asia's true historical and anthropological background.

For Schayer, Buddhism was an historical phenomenon, an act of evolution, the origin of which is not to be sought in the appearance of an individual teacher, nor is the end of it to be sought in Gautama Buddha's death. The Hināyāna tradition upheld by the Theravādins was neither closer nor more orthodox or purer than the Mahāyāna, both being various phases of development of one religio-philosophical movement. The thesis of Glasenapp, that not before Aśoka did Buddhism develop into a universal religion¹⁶, the theory of T. Stcherbatsky that Buddhism was not a religion before its Mahāyāna phase, as well as other similar theories, including those of B. K. Sarkar, were vigorously denied by Schayer. Along with S  nart, de la Vall  e Poussin and Przyluski, Schayer maintained that Buddhism was in the first place a religion, and that its philosophy was only a superstructure imposed on the emotional and irrational, i.e. religious, experience.

This conception was closely accompanied by the belief in the principle that, no matter at what stage of its history and in how many diversifications through numerous sects and schools Buddhism developed, it always remained a homogeneous religious movement and was to be viewed as such. In his *Das mahayanistische Absolutum nach der Lehre der Madhyamikas* which is conceived as a reply to Stcherbatsky's review of Schayer's *Ausgew  hlte Kapitel aus der Prasannapad  *¹⁷, Schayer, referring to Stcher-

¹⁶ H. von Glasenapp, *Der Buddhismus in Indien und im fernen Osten*, Berlin 1936.

¹⁷ Stcherbatsky, *Die drei Richtungen in der Philosophie des Buddhismus*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. X, Lw  w 1934, pp. 1—37.

batsky's Kant-pervaded exegesis of the Mādhyamika conception of the absolute, repeats what he had said once in the *Ausgewählte Kapitel*. He had objected there, as he did later, to the danger of isolated treatments of certain elements in a philosophical system without having first established the position of these elements in the system itself.

It is indeed impossible to venture in this note into the details of interpretation given by Schayer in his elaborate analysis of various concepts included in the Mahāyāna philosophical speculations. But the foregoing may serve as sufficient evidence to support the view, that his main effort was to understand Buddhism as a homogeneous religion and philosophy, where diversified theses and theories were not to demonstrate the haphazardness of individual interpretations, but prove that through the variety of concepts leading to the formation of schools and sects, evidence was given of the deep and living interest of the devout in the essential principle of the Buddhist system. In this vein Schayer's further elaboration of the concept of Nāgārjuna's *śūnyatā* to be conceived not as a nihilist approach but as a positive conception of the absolute, gained its recognition amongst scholars as coinciding with the general interpretation of the Mādhyamika philosophers. Schayer's disappointment with Stcherbatsky's disavowal of his own theory of the absolute as originally presented in his *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa* gave him occasion for a very clear presentation of views on the subject¹⁸, where in most cases he refutes Stcherbatsky's Kantian approach.

To my knowledge, Schayer never expressly quoted in his work Husserl, with whose theory of phenomenology he was familiar. Whether or not his otherwise philosophically well substantiated refutation of the Kantian approach is based on Husserlian approach is not easy to judge; nor is it obvious to attribute to Schayer the use of the Husserlian method in his analysis of the Mahāyāna absolute; he may have found himself compelled by the nature of the substance to apply this method no matter whether he was familiar with Husserl or not. The Mahāyāna absolute contains the element of consciousness, and in the concept of the *sarva-sattva-citta* of Avatamsa is implied the immanent consciousness of all living beings similar to the concept adopted by Husserl.

Being engaged ever more deeply in the research on Buddhism, in the latter years of his work Schayer learnt Tibetan and the elements of Chinese to widen the scope of his knowledge. Thus was a field opened to him which he hoped to exploit, but which he did in a limited way only, as the interruption of his scholarly career by war and its conclusion by death left little opportunity.

¹⁸ *op. cit.*

The preoccupation with the ontological and the metaphysical in Buddhism¹⁹ also somewhat reduced Schayer's interest in his later years in the study of Indian or, more particularly, Buddhist logic. During his visit in London he mentioned to me that he had had enough of this subject and "would rather leave it to his successors". His contribution to Indian logic, though scarce in volume²⁰ is of quite particular interest, as he has for the first time attempted to formulate formalistically the *nyāya* and the Buddhist types of syllogism.

His contention that the Indian *anumana* cannot be either identified with the Aristotelian syllogism, or analysed by Aristotelian methods, was based on the premise that the Indian logic operates as a rule with assertions and assertion variables, whereas Aristotle deals with names and name variables. Such interpretation, he maintained, can already be attributed to Indian texts which, as for instance the *Kathavatthu* and the Commentary of Buddhaghosa, knew the principles of the assertion variables. The examples given by Shwe Zan Aung in his *Points of Controversy*, in which name variables are used, point to the application of the *modus tollendo tollens*, which, however, contrary to Aung's analysis, operate with relations of assertions not names. Whereas the *modus tollendo tollens* may be said to be universally applied by the Buddhist in defeating his opponent, the Mādhyamika, as opposed to the Theravādin or even the *naiyāyika*, modifies this method by its application to negative dialectics, which is eventually reduced to the *prasaṅga-vākya*, i.e. the theory of, so to say, *reductio ad absurdum* of the opponent's statement. (*Reductio ad absurdum* is not an absolutely precise rendering of *prasaṅga-vākya*). In his series of small articles entitled *Studies of Indian Logic* Schayer endeavoured to prove his points and went into details, the analysis of which is far beyond the scope of this note.

The repercussion of his theories cannot be claimed to be vigorous or enthusiastic, nor can the opposite be stated. Indian logic has so far not become the subject of study for logicians in general. It is even a fact, and indeed a regrettable one, that with very few exceptions even Sanskrit scholars give so little of their time to this important subject. The greater therefore is Schayer's merit in not only encouraging the study of Buddhist logic but giving it a slant, which may make it a fascinating subject for further inquiry.

To conclude this sketch, in which an attempt has been made to show Schayer as a man of high scholarship measured by his achievements, and a scho-

¹⁹ See also his *Contribution to the Problem of Time in Indian Philosophy*, Polish Academy of Science, Cracow 1938, the greater part of which is devoted to the conception of time in Buddhism. Part III of the publication forms the translation and analysis of *The Three Times* of Śāntarakṣita with Kamalaśīla's Commentary.

²⁰ See bibliographical list, numbers 22, 24 and 25.

lar of promises unfulfilled because of the tragic severance of his young life, it should be added that his interest in modern India, her struggles for independence and her contributions to the world culture were not alien to him. The establishment of the "Society of Friends of India", translations from Tagore, reviews of modern works (Gawroński's translation of Tagore's *Sadhana*, Romain Rolland's monograph on Mahātma Gandhi) bear testimony to this interest. Yet Schayer himself never managed to formulate in a larger work his own views on the Indian problem. The views expressed in his minor articles show a keen interest in India's politics and social structure, but are not quantitatively sufficient or philosophically elaborate enough to lend themselves to a synthetic evaluation. But again, a man's work is to be gauged not only by what he accomplished but by what he was mentally equipped to accomplish. His energy, his intellectual prowess and versatility were a potential of rare calibre and had his life not been hewn down at 42, his output surely would have amounted to an outstanding one. In fact, this output may have been richer than we know it; but there is a handicap to our knowledge: the circumstances surrounding his death barred any access to his legacy, which subsequently, due to war and its aftermath, drifted out of existence.

To complete the note, it is my pleasant duty to express my sincerest thanks to Stanisław Schayer's widow, Mrs. Elżbieta Schayer, who, by providing me with various data relating to Schayer's life, made it possible for me to attempt to be in the presentation of facts much more accurate than I could have been otherwise. For any misrepresentation or inaccuracies found in this note, I am wholly responsible.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL LIST

The list does not claim to be complete or perfectly accurate. In some cases titles were excerpted from references, while the work itself was not accessible to me. This reservation applies more particularly to minor articles; in the case of major works the data is generally complete. Reviews are as a rule not quoted. Titles of works in Polish are accompanied by a provisional translation in English. The latter is presented between square brackets. The order is chronological.

1. *Vorbereiten zur Geschichte der mahāyānistischen Erlösungslehre*, "Zeitschrift für Buddhismus" 5, Munich 1921¹, pp. 235 ff. and 334 ff.

¹ Translated into English by R. T. Knight: *Mahayana Doctrine of Salvation*, London 1923.

2. *Die Erlösungslehre der Yogacāras nach dem Sūtrālaṅkāra des Asaṅga*, "Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik", vol I, Leipsic 1923, pp. 99—123.
3. *Kabir. Pieśni Kabira*. Z oryginału bengalskiego tłumaczył oraz wstępem i objaśnieniami opatrzył... [Układ Rabindranatha Tagore], Warsaw 1923.
[Kabir. Songs of Kabir. Translation from Bengali, Introduction and Notes.]
4. *Kalidasa. Śakuntala czyli Pierścień Fatalny*. Dramat heroiczny w 7 aktach. Przetłumaczył z oryginału indyjskiego, wstępem i objaśnieniami opatrzył... Wielka Biblioteka, Nr 93, Warsaw (1924).
[Kālidāsa. Śakuntalā or the Fatal Ring. A Heroic Drama in 7 Acts. Translation from Sanskrit, Notes and Introduction.]
5. *Na marginesie Upaniszad*, "Wiadomości Literackie", Nr. 16, Warsaw 1924.
[The Upaniṣads: Marginal Notes.]
6. *Wśród szowinistów i mistyków. Impresje niemieckie*. "Wiadomości Literackie", Nr. 1, Warsaw 1924.
[Among Chauvinists and Mystics. Impressions from Germany.]
7. *Tagore i filozofia staroindyjska*, "Wiadomości Literackie", Nr. 35, Warsaw 1924.
[Tagore and the Ancient Indian Philosophy.]
8. *Gandhi i Indie. Na marginesie pracy Romain Rollanda. Filozofia europejska a hinduizm*, "Wiadomości Literackie", Nr. 51, Warsaw 1924.
[Gandhi and India. Notes on Romain Rolland's Book. European Philosophy and Hinduism.]
9. *Klasyczny teatr indyjski*. "Scena Polska", Warsaw 1924.
[The Classical Theatre of India.]
10. *Die Struktur der magischen Weltanschauung nach dem Atharva Veda und den Brahmaṇa Texten*. "Zeitschrift für Buddhismus" 15, Munich 1925².
11. *Buddaizm w literaturze niemieckiej*. "Fantazy" Nr. 2, Warsaw 1925.
[Buddhism in German Literature.]
12. *Die Weltanschauung der Brahmaṇa-Texte*. "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 2, Lwów 1925, pp. 26—32.
13. *Indie starożytne w świetle źródeł*, Teksty źródłowe do nauki historii w szkole średniej, Fasc. 4, Cracow 1926.
[Ancient India in the light of Historical Sources.]
14. *Filozofia Porównawcza*, "Przegląd Filozoficzny", Year 29, Warsaw 1927, pp. 235 ff.
[Comparative Philosophy.]
15. *Über die Bedeutung des Wortes Upaniṣad*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 3, Lwów 1927, pp. 57—67.
16. *Słowo o teozofii*, "Wiadomości Literackie" Nr. 159, Warsaw 1928 (?)
[A Word about Theosophy.]

² A summary of the article appeared in Polish in 1924.

17. *Indische Philosophie als Problem der Gegenwart*, 15. Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft, Heidelberg 1928.
18. *Feuer und Brennstoff. Ein Kapitel aus dem Madhyamika-Śāstra des Nāgārjuna mit der Vṛtti des Candrakīrti*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 7, Lwów 1929, pp. 26—52.
19. *Literatura indyjska*, Wielka Literatura Powszechna, Trzaska, Evert i Michalski, vol. I., Warsaw 1930, pp. 115—226.
[Indian Literature.]
20. *Das zehnte Kapitel der Prasannapada*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 7, Lwów 1930.
21. *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapada (V, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI). Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej Nr. 14, Cracow 1931.
22. *Z badań nad logiką buddyjską*, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Sprawozdanie z czynności i posiedzeń, Cracow 1932—33. First year: vol. 37, Nr. 6, pp. 32—33; second year: vol. 38, Nr. 2, pp. 19—22.
[Enquiries into Buddhist Logic.]
23. *Ariowie. Braminizm. Budda i Buddyzm*, "Świat i Życie", vol. I., Warsaw 1933, pp. 316, 792, 825.
[Arians. Brahmanism. Buddha and Buddhism.]
24. *Studien zur indischen Logik*. "Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres", Classe de Philologie, Cracow 1932: Nos 4—6, pp. 98—102; 1933: Nos 1—6, pp. 90—96.
25. *Über die Methode der Nyāya-Forschung*, Festschrift für M. Winternitz, Leipsic 1933.
26. *Anityatā. Zagadnienie nietrwałości bytu*, "Przegląd Filozoficzny", Years 36, 37, 41, Warsaw 1933—38.
[Anityatā. Transience of Existence.]
27. *Kamalaśīlas Kritik des Puṅgalavāda*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 8, Lwów 1934, pp. 68—93.
28. *Staroruski wariant wedyjskiego mitu o kosmicznym prameżu*, "Collectanea Orientalia" Nr. 5, Vilna 1934, pp. 32—34 (from the Congress of Polish Orientalists: Warsaw — Vilna 1931—32).
[The Old-Russian Variant of the Vedic Myth of the Supreme Man.]
29. *Zagadnienie elementów niearyjskich w buddyzmie indyjskim*, "Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres" Fasc. 1—3, Cracow 1934 (—35), pp. 55—65.
[Pre-Arian Elements in Indian Buddhism.]
30. *O filozofowaniu Hindusów*, "Przegląd Współczesny", Nr. 161, Warsaw 1935, pp. 289—311.
[On philosophical speculations of the Indians.]

31. *A Note on the Old Russian Variant of the Purushasūkta*, "Archiv Orientalní", vol. 7, Fasc. 3, Prague 1935, pp. 320—323.
32. *Das mahāyānistische Absolutum nach der Lehre der Madhyamikas*, "Orientalistische Literaturzeitung" XXXVIII, Leipsic 1935, pp. 401—405.
33. *Precanonical Buddhism*, "Archiv Orientalní", vol. 7, Fasc. 1—2, Prague 1935, pp. 121—132.
34. *Notes and Queries on Buddhism*, "Rocznik Orientalistyczny", vol. 11, Lwów 1936, pp. 206—213.
35. *The Historical Background of Indian Tolerance*. "Prabuddha Bharata", vol. 41, Calcutta 1936.
36. *O somatyzmie psychologii indyjskiej*, "Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres", Nos 7—10, Cracow 1936, pp. 159—168.
[Somatism in Indian Psychology.]
37. *Nauka Zoroastra*, "Wiedza i Życie", Fasc. 7., Warsaw 1937, pp. 440—451.
[Zoroaster's Teachings.]
38. *New Contributions to the Problem of Pre-kināyanistic Buddhism*, "Polish Bulletin of Oriental Studies", vol. 1, Warsaw 1937, pp. 8—17.
39. *Contributions to the Problem of Time in Indian Philosophy*, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej, Nr. 31, Cracow 1938.
40. *Przedmowa: Braminizm. Buddyzm. Religie Irańskie*. Biblioteka Wiedzy, vol. 39, Religie Wschodu, Warsaw 1938, [Trzaska, Evert i Michalski]
[Introduction: Brahmanism, Buddhism, Iranian Religions.]