

Just as, in relation to the Babylonian liturgies, there must also have existed a "wisdom literature . . . not written to be repeated in temples,"¹⁸ and as it must be assumed that there existed the concept of a "single God . . . [whose] various aspects were not yet considered separate deities in the Sumero-Accadian pantheon,"¹⁹ so in the case of the Vedic liturgies, where the occurrence of the concepts of a "One, that is equally spirated, despirated" (*āmit avātam*, x.129.2), and of Agni as "being and non-being in one" (*sadāsat*, x.5.7) cannot be called surprising. We see then in the Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, *Bhāgavad Gītā*, and even in Buddhism, nothing but an ultimate recension and publication of what had always been taught, whether to initiates or in those circles the existence of which is implied by the *brāhmōdaya* form of many hymns, and by such Brāhmins as that one who in RV x.71.11 is referred to as expounding the lore of the genesis (*vādāti jāta-vidyām*), and whom we may assume to have been, like Agni himself, a "comprehensor of the generations of all things (*visvā veda janimā*, vi.15.13; cf. iv.27.1)."

¹⁸ Stephen Herbert Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar* (Oxford, 1914), p. 11.

¹⁹ Henri Frankfort, *Iraq Excavations of the Oriental Institute, 1932/1933* (Chicago, 1934), I, 47.

[*Addendum*: Meiser Eckhart, Evans ed., II, 153, "Were there an hundred Persons in the Godhead, the man who sees distinctions apart from time and number would apprehend no more than one."]



Vedic Exemplarism

God is the cause of all things by His knowledge.

St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* (Suppl.) III.88.3.

The doctrine of Exemplarism is bound up with that of forms or ideas, and has to do with the intelligible relation that subsists as between the forms, ideas, similitudes, or eternal reasons of things (*nāma*, "name" or "nomenclon" = *forma*) and the things themselves in their accidental and contingent aspects (*rūpa*, "phenomenon" = *figura*). This is as much as to say that Exemplarism, in the last analysis, is the traditional doctrine of the relation, cognitive and causal, between the one and the many: the nature of which relation is implied in Vedic Sanskrit by the expressions *visvām eṣam* (RV III.54.8), "the many that are one, the one that is manifold" (= Plotinus, "integral multiplicity"), *visvām satyam* (RV II.24.12), "the manifold truth," and *visvām . . . garbham* (RV x.121.7), "the germ of all," and more fully enunciated in ŚB x.5.2.16, "As to this they say, 'Is He then one or many?' One should answer, 'One and many.' For inasmuch as He is That, He is one; and inasmuch as He is multiply distributed (*bahudhā vyaviśīth*) in his children, He is many,"¹ i.e., as the

[This essay was first published in the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, I (1936). —ED.]

¹ "He," in the original, "Death" (*mṛtyu*); "That," i.e., "the Person in the Sun." In order not to complicate the present exposition by a discussion *de divinis nominibus*, the pronoun has generally been substituted for the name of deity actually employed in the passages cited. I have discussed the use of essential names in my "Vedic Monotheism" [in the present volume—ED.]. The general principle is as follows: deity is everywhere of one and the same form (RV VIII.11.8, *puratā hi sadṛṣṇ asi*; I.94.7, *yo visvataḥ supṛatīkaḥ sadṛṣṇ asi*), i.e., is perfectly simple but has many names, the application of which inheres not in Him, but in the percipient; "Even as He seems, so is He named" (*yādrḡ eva dadṛṣe tādrḡ ucyaṭe*, RV v.44.6); ["He Himself is all the gods," BU II.5.19;] "As He is approached, so He becomes (*yathōpāsate tad eva bhavati*, ŚB x.5.2.20), for example, "Indra art Thou to the mortal worshipper" (RV v.3.1), "Thou art Varuna at birth, becomest Mitra when kindled" (RV III.5.4 and v.3.1).

"Person in the mirror (*ādarśe puruṣaḥ*), Who is born in his children in a likeness" (*prairūpaḥ . . . prajyāmāyāyata*, Kauṣ. Up. IV.11).²

The doctrine in these respects cannot be better demonstrated than by means of a diagram consisting of two concentric circles, with their common center and two or more radii, or by the corresponding Vedic symbol of a wheel (*cakṛa*) with its felly, hub, and spokes. Such a diagram or symbol represents the universe in cross section, the circles any two levels of reference or "worlds" (*loka*), or more specifically, the individual and intellectual, or human and angelic (*adhvātma* and *adhidivāta*) levels of reference. The whole world, or universe (*viśvam*), thus represented corresponds to the ensemble of all possibilities of manifestation, whether informal, formal, or sensible; a world (*loka* = *locus*) is a given ensemble of possibilities, a given modality. The infinite ocean of all possibility, whether of manifestation or nonmanifestation, is represented by the blank surface of the paper which at the same time interpenetrates and transcends the indefinite extension of the finite universe represented by the diagram; this unlimited surface is unaffected by the extension or abstraction of the diagram, which has no position. Each radius, spoke, or ray represents the whole being of an individual consciousness, its intersection with any circumference the operation of this consciousness at that level of reference; each such point of intersection forming the center of a minor "world," which must be thought of as a smaller circle struck about its own center, on the inner surface of the sphere of which the diagram is a cross section, in a plane, that is, at right angles to the radius or ray that connects the unique center with the point in question.

The unique center is, like the whole diagram, without position in its ambient, "position" having a meaning only upon or within the circumference; and just as this ambient is unaffected by the presumption of a center with or without its dependent radii, so the properties of the unique center once assumed are unaffected by the extension or subtraction of radii. And as the indefinitely numerous points which constitute the surface of

² [*Anurūpaḥ*, conformable by name; *prairūpa*, corresponding form, JUB 1.27 cf. RV VI.47.18; *ādarśe prairūpaḥ*, "I worship the Being in the mirror . . . I also worship His reflection," Kauṣ. Up. IV.11; *tvam eṣa prairūpase*, "Thou alone art counter born (reborn, born in a likeness)," Prasna Up. II.7. "All mirrors in the universe, I venerate, display Thy image with its radiant sheen," Jāmī, *Lawāṅh*, 26; *aprairūpaḥ* is foul, deformed, evil, improper, BU 1.3.4; *na . . . prairūpam*, "unseemly," "not in good form." A 1.148.

Monier-Williams gives *prairimā*, masc. creator, fem. likeness; cf. Augustine, *De spiritu et littera* 37, "This likeness begins now to be formed again in us"; and *Paradiso* xxvi.106, xxix.142 ff., for "mirror."]

indefinitely numerous concentric spheres represent the points of view of individual knowing subjects, so the unique point from which all radii proceed and to which all converge represents an omniscient, supra-individual consciousness, metaphysically the First Principle, theologically God in his intelligible aspect, that of the Supernal Sun, or Light; while what we have called the ambient, at once immanent and transcendent, represents the Godhead or Divine Darkness. Strictly speaking, the diagram should have been drawn not in black on white, but in gold against a black ground, and it is thus in fact that the Vedic *jyotiratha*, "the chariot of light" (= Biblical "chariot of fire"), and its wheels are conceived.

In such a diagram, it is obvious that for every point on the outer circumference there is a corresponding and analogous point on the inner circumference, with only this difference, that on the inner circumference the "points" are more closely packed. If the circumference of the inner circle be reduced, the same condition holds good. In such reduction, there can be no moment at which the "points" of which the circumference (or spherical surface represented by it) is composed can be thought of as annihilated; we can only continue to think of them as more and more densely packed, and finally coinciding in a unity without composition. In other words, all of the radii, all individual principles, and in their total extension, are represented at their common center *in principio*, in an innumerable principle (*tattva*), which is at the same time an altogether simple substance (*dharma*) and possessed of a multifarious nature (*svabhāva*); a single point, and yet for each radius its own and private starting point. In just this sense, "The notions of all created things (*kāvya* = *kaṅkarmāni*) inhere in Him, who is as it were the hub within the wheel (*cakṛe nābhir iva śrīṅā*, RV VIII.41.6).³ "In Him are all beings,

³ Similarly, RV X.82.6, "Inherent in the nave(!) of the Unborn, in which insist the several worlds as one" (*ajasya nābhau adhi cakṛam arpiṣam yasmin viśvāni bhuvanāni tathāh*); or *aja* may be rendered by "Goat," the reference being to the Sun as *Viśvakarma*, the "All-maker," in either case.

As to the rendering of *kāvya* by "notions of all created things": Vedic *kaṅk* is "poet" in the sense of the original Greek *ποιητής*; that is, Philo's sense, and as the word is applied to God in the New Testament. It is as "creator" that the term *kaṅk* is used of the Sun, Agni, and others in the *Rg Veda*; while *kāvya*, cited above from VIII.41.6, is not as in the later rhetoric merely a "poem," but "whatever is made by a *kaṅk*," whether by way of generation or art. If the word *kāvya* in the sense of "poem" also implies a diction, expression, and utterance, this corresponds to the Scholastic equation of *rationes* with *λόγοι* (St. Bonaventura, *83 Quaestiones*, q.46, n. 2).

If the Vedic *kāvyaḥ* are in a certain sense the authors of the *sūktas*, it is rather as finders or inventors (in the etymological sense of *in-venio*, dis-cover) than as

and the eye that oversees; intellect (*manas*), spiration (*prāṇāh*), and nounenon (*nāma*) coincident (*samāhītam*, 'being in *samādhi*'); in him when he comes forth all his children enjoy (*nandanti*) (the fulfilment of their ends or purposes, by which their will to life is determined);⁴ sent by him, and born of him, it is in him that all this universe is established," AV XIX.53.6-9; and in the same way as the Person, or Man, He is called the "resort of all phenomena" (*rūpāny eva yasyāyatanaṃ . . . puruṣam*, BU III.9.16).

This inheritance in the central consciousness is accordingly the means of a "unified density of cognition" (*ekībhūta prajñāna-ghana*, Maṇḍ. Up. 5), a "cognitive pleroma" (*ḥṛtsnaḥ prajñāna-ghana*, BU IV.5.13); "He knows the whole speculatively" (*viśvam sa veda varuṇo yathā dhīyā*,⁵ RV X.II.1), and *ab intra*, "being provident, even before birth, of all the generations of the Angels" (*garbhe nu sann anveṣaṃ avedam aham de-*

composers; theirs is the "prophetic" faculty; and the *sūktas* themselves are of quickening efficacy; all of which is far removed from conceptions of authorship and "literature" nowadays current. It is as *ḥavi* that the Sun "wears the forms of all things in their kind" (*viśva rūpāni praśi mānate*, RV V.81.2), that is, "trees his comrades from the curse" (*amūñcat nir avadyāt*, RV III.31.8), from the bonds of Varuṇa (*varuṇyāt*, RV X.92.14), i.e., from the fetter of Death (*bandhanāt mṛtyor*, RV VII.59.12); and because, by the mere act of shining, the Supernal Sun thus releases all things from darkness to light, from potentiality to act, he is called, as Pūṣan, the "Son of liberation" (*vimūco napāt*, RV I.42.1 and *passim*).

⁴ AV XIX.53.7, *ḥalena sarvā nandanti āgatena . . . sakhyā*, Kāla ("Time," the "Year") replacing Sakhi (the "Comrade," sc. Varuṇa, cf. God as the "Friend" in Sūfi parlance). This variant is omitted in Bloomfield's *Concordance*.

⁵ Sayana's paraphrase is admirable: *dhīyā* is *ātmānurūpānyā prajñayā*, "by his foresight (providence) in his own likeness." *Dhī* = *dhīyāna* = *contemplatio*. The *dhī* or *dhīyāna* of Varuṇa corresponds to the *ādarsa-jñāna* or "mirror-knowledge" of the *jñāna-dharmakāya*, which in Mahāyāna Buddhism is also a "knowledge of sameness" (*samata-jñāna*), e.g., in the *Abhisamayalankāra* (Obermiller, in *Acta Orientalia*, IX), and a simultaneous act; cf. *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* II.115. "Just as waves arise in the sea simultaneously (*yugapattikāle*), as things are seen simultaneously in a mirror or in dream, so is the mind in its own pasture" (*cittam svagocare* [= *svay-onau* in MU VI.34, where *cittam svayonau upasāmyate*]). I do not agree with Suzuki that this verse is out of place in its context; the idea is that just as when a breeze springs up, the dawn wind of creation for example, the whole surface of the waters is covered by ripples, which arise all together and not one by one or after another here and there, so in the world-picture the mind sees all things at one and the same time (*yugapattikāle*); while *svagocare*, "in its own pasture," does not mean "in its own sense-fields," but the contrary of this, being equivalent to *svastha-cittah*, *svastha-buddhīh*, *anāyasa-cittah*, and such expressions employed in connection with *dhīyāna*.

vānām janimāni viśvā, RV IV.27.1);⁶ in other words, His knowledge of things is not derived from them objectively and *post factum*, but from their prior likeness in the mirror of His own intellect. Just as the physical sun enjoys a bird's-eye view of this whole earth in its orbit, so the Supernal Sun "surveys the whole" (*viśvam . . . abhicāṣte*, RV I.164.44), being the eye or *Aussichtspunkt* (*adhyakṣa*) of Varuṇa or of the Angels collectively (*vām caḥsur . . . sūryāś . . . abhi yo viśvā bhuvanāni caṣṭe*, RV VII.61.1; cf. I.115.1, X.37.1, X.129.7; VS XIII.45, etc.), just as, in the Avesta, the Sun (*hvarē* = *svar* = *sarya*) is Ahura Mazda's eye, and in Buddhism, the Buddha is still the "eye in the world" (*caḥḥum loke*). What this eye sees in the eternal mirror is the "world-picture"; "The Primal Spirit (*paramātman*) sees the world-picture (*jagac-citra*, lit. the 'picture of what moves') painted by itself upon a canvas that is nothing but itself, and takes a great delight therein" (Śaṅkarācārya, *Svātmanirūpāna* 95); "sees all things at once in their diversity and in coincidence" (*abhi vi paśyati* and *abhi sampāśyati*, RV III.62.9, X.187.4; cf. VS XXXII.8, *sam ca vi ca eti*; and BG VI.29-30).

Taken in and by itself, this First Spirant, without composition (*advaita*), and at rest (*śayāna*), is the "living conjoint principle" of St. Thomas (*Sum. Theol.* I.27.2c), the unity of the "cohabitant parents" (*sakṣitā ubhā . . . mātara*, RV I.140.3, *parikṣitā pitarā*, III.7.1, etc.) who are innumerable named, but typically "Intellect" (*manas*) and "Word" (*vāc*),⁷ whose conjunction effects what Eckhart calls "the act of fecundation latent in eternity." But this unintelligible unity of the Father (-Mother)⁸ belongs entirely to the darkness of the "common nest" or

⁶ It is as *viśvā veda janimāni* that Agni is called Jātvēdas, "comprehensor of the genesis of things," RV *passim*, and as such that he is identified with Varuṇa, *ab intra* (II.5.4), being indeed the "comprehensor of Varuṇa" (IV.1.4); and this "lore of genesis" (*jātvavidyā*) which the Brāhman knows in X.71.11 is the same thing as the "hidden names of the Angels" (*devānām guhyā nāmāni*, V.5.10), as will be evident when we turn to the further discussion of *nāma*. This divine providence or wisdom is also spoken of as "counsel" (*ḥvatu*, often, like *māyā* and *śaci*, met with in pl. and then equivalent to "powers"), e.g., V.12.1, "Thou art a Comprehensor by thy counsel, Jātvēdas (*tava ḥvatu jātvēdas cikṣivān*)."

⁷ *Manas* and Vāc as conjoint pair occur in the *Rg Veda*, *Brāhmanas*, and *Upaniśads*, *passim*. Vāc is *verbum*, and as in Italian, feminine (*la parola*). Cf. Eckhart, "The Father wantons with the Word"; "From the Father's embrace of his own nature (= *svabhāva*, *prakṛti*, Vāc, Sāvitrī, Sūrya, etc.) comes the eternal playing (= *nitya līlā*) of the Son."

⁸ AV VIII.9.10, "Who knoweth the *mīthunatva* of Virāj?"; cf. JUB I.54, "They (dual) becoming Virāj (s.) engendered (yonder Sun) (*tau virād bhūvā prajānyatām*)" [cf. *pururū . . . abhavaḥ*, RV I.146.5; *pururūpa iyaḥ*, V.47.18; and AV II.1.3].

“matrix” wherein all things come to be of one and the same ilk (*yatra viśvam bhavaty ekaṇidam*, Nārāyaṇa Up. 3, cf. RV iv.10.1 *khīla*, and VS xxxi.8; *sarve asmin devā ekaṇto bhavanti*, AV xiii.4.20).

Thus, while the divine intellect and the ideas or forms or eternal reasons apparent to it are one simply *secundum rem*, the latter are at the same time manifold *secundum rationem intelligendi sive dicendi* (St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.* d.35, a. unic., q.3, concl.). As Plotinus expresses it (iv.4.1) “The Highest, as a self-contained unity, has no outgoing effect. . . . But the unity of the power is such as to allow of its being multiple to another principle, to which it is all things.”

What is represented in our diagram already presumes the diremption (*dveḍhā*, BU 1.4.3) of those that had been closely embraced (*sampariśvaktāu*, *ibid.*), that is, of knower and known, subject and object, essence and nature, Heaven and Earth, as indicated by the remotion of the circumference from the center. This diremption and divine procession (*krāma* = *devīva*, *Taittirīya Pratiśākhya* xxi.16)⁹ is coincident with the birth of the Son (Indrāgni), of Light (*ijyotis*), of the Sun, “Savitṛ the creator, who wears the visible forms of all things” (*viśvā rūpāni prāti muñcate kaviḥ . . . savitā*, RV v.81.2); “by the separation of the prior, the latter came forth” (*prathamāḥ . . . kṛtatrād eśam uparā udāyan*, RV x.27.23). In other words, the act of being implied by the words “I am that I am,” “I am Brahman,”¹⁰ although entirely one of self-intention, becomes from an external point of view the act of creation, which is at the same time a

⁹ “Having no outgoing effect,” Skr. *avisvaminva*.

¹⁰ Conversely, “There is no procession of one in *samādhi*” (*krāmo nāsti samādhe*, *Laṅkāvatāra Śāstra* ii.117). *Samādhi* corresponds to *rapus* or *excessus* in Christian yoga, but metaphysically a concentration must be distinguished from a religious ecstasy in the etymological sense of the latter word, viz. that of a going *outside* oneself.

¹¹ “It knew, indeed, itself, that ‘I am Brahman,’ thereby it became the All” (BU 1.4.10). This does not, of course, represent an empirical consideration of one’s own mentality as object, but is the pure act of being, where to be and to know are the same thing; it in no way contradicts Erigena’s magnificent words, “God does not know *what* He himself is, for He is not any what; and this ignorance surpasses all knowledge.”

BU 1.4.10, “It became the All” (*sa idam sarvaṃ bhavati*), corresponds to RV viii.58.2, “One only Fire is kindled manifold, one only Sun is present to one and all, one only Dawn illuminates this All; that which is only One becomes this All (*eḥam vā idam vi babhūva sarvaṃ*),” and is echoed also in connection with the Buddha, S ii.212, “I being One become many, and being many become One (*eko pi bahudhā homi, bahudhā pi hūsvā eko homi*).” Cf. also MU vi.26 and KU v.12, “Who maketh His single form to be manifold” (*eḥam rūpam bahudhā yah kṛvoti*).

generation (*prajānana*) and an intellectual (*mānasa*) creation *per artem* (*taṣṭā*) and *ex voluntate* (*yathā vasiṃ, kṛmya*); for the Son “in whom were created all things” (Col. 1:16) is also their form and exemplar, the whole occasion of their existence,¹² and it is, accordingly, that species and beauty are appropriated to the Son, whom as being the Word, i.e., as concept, Augustine calls the “art” of God.¹³

The Son or Sun is thus the “single form that is the form of very different things” (Eckhart, resuming in these words the whole doctrine)¹⁴ all of which are in his likeness, as he is in theirs—but with this very important distinction necessitated by the innumerability of the unique center, that while the likeness in the thing depends upon the archetype, the latter in no way depends upon the thing, but is logically antecedent: “The model of all that is, preexistent, He knows all generations (*satahsataḥ pratimānam purobhur viśvā veda janimā*), He smites the Dragon; shining (or ‘sounding’) forth (*pra . . . arcan*) from Heaven our Leader, cattle-fain, as Comrade frees his comrades from the curse” (*amañcal nir avadyāt*, RV iii.31.8; *pratiñi-varpasah*, iii.60.1; *eḥam rūpam bahudhā yah kṛvoti*, KU v.12).¹⁵ The terms “exemplar” and “image,” which imply in strictness “model” and “copy,” can, however, be used equivocally, and for this reason a distinction is made between the archetype as *imago imaginans* and the

¹² “Exemplar means *raison d'être*” (*exemplar rationem producentis dicit*, St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.31, p.1, a.1, q.1 ad 3): “Idea is the likeness of a thing, by which it is known and produced” (*ibid.*, d.35, a. unic., q.1, fund.2): “Exemplar implies idea, word, art, and reason (*idea, verbum, ars, et ratio*); idea, with respect to the act of foresight; word, with respect to the act of statement; art, with respect to the act of making; and reason, with respect to the act of completing, because it adds the intention of the end in view. And because all these are one and the same in God, one is often said in place of another” (*Breviloquium*, p.1, c.8). From these definitions the reader will be enabled to judge of the propriety of the employment of the terms in translation.

¹³ See *Serm. Theol.* 1.39.7; the artist, accordingly, whether human or divine, works “by a word conceived in his intellect” (*per verbum in intellectu conceptum, ibid.*, 1.45.6c). Cf. St. Bonaventura, “Agens per intellectum productum per formas, quae non sunt aliquid rei, sed idea in mente sicut artifex productum arcam” (*II Sent.*, d.1, p.1, a.1, q.1 ad 3, 4): “et quia multa sunt cognita, et unum cognoscens, ideo ideae sunt plures, et ars tantum una” (*ibid.*, 1.35, a. unic., q.3 ad 2).

¹⁴ Cf. St. Bonaventura, “Quia vero (exemplar in Deo) infinium et immensum, ideo extra omne genus. Et hinc est, quod existens unum potest esse similitudo expressiva [= *spjyamāna*] multorum” (*Breviloquium*, p.1, c.8).

¹⁵ Here the divine providence is directly connected with the act of creation (quest of the dragon, and release of individual potentialities from the darkness, duress, and deformity or evil of the antenatal tomb, to light and operation). “Cattle” in the *Rg Veda* are unrealized potentialities of every kind, of which the preceding principles desire to take effective possession.

imitation as *imago imaginata* (St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.31, p.11, a.1, q.1, concl.). A corresponding ambiguity is met with in Sanskrit, where the distinction must be made according to the context. As *imago imaginans*, the deity is called "primordial omniform" (*agriyam viśvarūpam*, RV 1.13.10, "the likeness of all things" (*viśvasya prātmānam*, RV 11.12.9; cf. 11.31.8, cited above), "the omniform likeness of a thousand" (*sahasra-sya prātmānam viśvarūpam*, VS XIII.41), "the counterpart of Earth" (*prātmānam pṛthivyāb*, RV 1.52.13), "for every figure He hath been the form (*rūpam rūpam prātirūpo babhūva*), that is his likeness that we should regard (*tad asya rūpam prāticaṣṇānya*), it is by His magic powers (*māyābhiḥ*) that He proceeds in a plurality of aspects" (*pururūpa iyate*, RV VI.47.18). If it be asked, "What was the model, what the starting point?" (*ḥā . . . prātmā nidānam kim*, RV x.130.3), the answer is, the sacrificial victim; for this image and this likeness by which the Father proceeds is the sacrifice—"yielding himself up to the Angels, he expressed a likeness of himself, to wit, the sacrifice, hence one says, 'Prajāpati is the sacrifice'" (*ātmanah prātmānam asṛjata, yad yajñām, tasmād āhuḥ prajāpatir yajñāb*, ŚB XI.1.8.3), cf. "Manu is the sacrifice, the standard (*pramītiḥ*), our Sirē," RV x.100.5; where the relation of the one and the many is again involved, for the Father remains impassible, although in a consubstantial likeness (that of the "Year," *ibid.* XI.1.6.13) sacrificially divisible. But while in these passages there can be no doubt of the priority of the pattern (*prātmāna, prātmā, prātirūpa*), *prātirūpa* in *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* cited below is no less surely *imago imaginata*; and although He is the model of all things, no one of them can be called His like, "There is no likeness (*prātmānam*) of him amongst those born or to be born" (RV IV.18.4.12; cf. BU IV.1.6).¹⁶

The exemplary image, form, or idea is then a likeness in the prior sense of imitable prototype; in fact, "It is inasmuch as God knows His essence as being imitable by this or that creature, that He knows it as the particular reason and idea of that creature" (*Sum. Theol.* 1.15.2c).¹⁷ An assimilation such as this need not imply a likeness of nature or mode; indeed, *minima assimilatio sufficit ad rationem exemplaris* (St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.36, a.3, q.2 fund.). For example, if "He shines upon this world in the aspect of Person" (*puruṣa-rūpeṇa*, AĀ 11.2.1), if man is "made in the image and

¹⁶ "No likeness," i.e., no *similitudo univocacionis sive participationis* (St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.35, a. unic., q.1, concl.); *non est similitudo per unius naturae participationem* (*ibid.*, d.34, a. unic., q.4 ad 1).

¹⁷ "Idea non nominat tantum essentiam, sed essentiam imitabilem," St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.36, q.2, a.2 ad 1.

likeness of God," it does not follow that God as He is in Himself is just like or of the same kind as a man, but only that the form or idea of man is present to his consciousness and being, and, be it noted, there on equal terms with an amoeba. And it is in the same way that the human artist embodies the single form entertained in his intellect in other natures such as those of stone or pigment; the *imago imaginans* here as before being the formal cause of the becoming of the *imago imaginata*; as is implied in the dictum *ars imitatur naturam in sua operatione*, where *natura* is "Natura Naturans, Creatrix, Deus."

In Kauṣ. Up. IV.2, "The macrocosm in the Sun, the likeness in the mirror" (*āditye mahat . . . ādarśe prātirūpah*), *prātirūpa* is evidently *imago imaginata*. It is, in fact, as a reflection or projection and, as we shall see, expressively (*śrīyamāna*) that the eternal reasons or ideas (*nāmāni*) are represented in their contingent aspects (*rūpani*); a formulation that implies the traditional doctrine of the correspondence of macrocosm and microcosm, as enunciated, for example, in AB VIII.2, "Yonder world is in the likeness of (*anurūpa*) this world, this world in the likeness of that," a condition that is clearly exhibited in our diagram by the correspondence of circle with circle, point for point. In what manner the ideas are causal with respect to all their contingent aspects will be apparent when we recall that the central consciousness is always thought of as a Light or Sound, of which the contingent forms on any circumference are projections, reflections, expressions, or echoes thrown, as it were, upon the wall of Plato's cave, or upon the screen of a theater, with only this difference, that the pattern or lantern slide which corresponds to the "form" or "idea" of the picture actually seen is not merely close to the source of light, but intrinsic to the light itself, so that we meet on the one hand with such expressions as "formal light" (Ulrich of Strassburg) and "image-bearing light" (Eckhart), and on the other such as VS v.35, "Thou art the omniform light" (*iyoir asi viśvarūpam*).¹⁸ "He lent their light to other lights" (*adadhāi jyotiṣu jyotir antah*, RV x.54.6), "Ye, Agniśomau,

¹⁸ In Scholastic philosophy, the nature of the divine exemplarism is constantly illustrated by means of the likeness of light, e.g., "which although it is numerically one, nevertheless expresses many and different kinds of color" (St. Bonaventura, *I Sent.*, d.35, a. unic., q.2 ad 2); "Exemplary cause, just as physical light is one in kind, which is nonetheless that of the beauty that is in all colors, which the more light they have the more beautiful they are, and of which the diversity is occasioned by the diversity of the surfaces that receive the light" (Ulrich of Strassburg); see Coomaraswamy, "The Mediaeval Theory of Beauty" [in Vol. I of this edition—ed.]; cf. Dante, *Paradiso* XXXIII.82-90, "One simple Light, that in its depths encloses, as in a single volume, all that is scattered on the pages of the universe."

