



جامعة جنوب الوادي

كلية الآداب بقنا

قسم الفلسفة

# نصوص فلسفية بلغة إنجليزية

كلية الآداب - قسم الفلسفة -

إعداد

أ.د حماده أحمد على

أستاذ الفلسفة اليونانية - قسم الفلسفة - كلية الآداب -

جامعة جنوب الوادي



# Saentia Sacra

Saentia Sacra

The Good Religion is Innate Wisdom: and the forms and virtues of Innate Wisdom are of the same stock as Innate Wisdom itself.

Denkard

A fund of omniscience exists eternally in our heart.

Tipitaka

Saentia Sacra is none other than that sacred knowledge which lies at the heart of every revelation and is the center of that circle which encompasses and defines tradition. The first question which presents itself is, how is the attainment of such a knowledge possible? The answer of tradition is that the twin source of this knowledge is revelation and intellection or intellectual intuition which involves the illumination of the heart and the mind of man and the presence in him of knowledge of an immediate and direct nature which is tasted and experienced, the sapience which the Islamic tradition refers to as "presential knowledge" (al-cilm al-huduri) Man is able to know and this knowledge corresponds to some aspect of reality. Ultimately in fact, knowledge is knowledge of Absolute Reality and intelligence

possesses this miraculous gift of being able to know that which is and all that partakes of being.

Scientia sacra is not the fruit of human intelligence speculating upon or reasoning about the content of an inspiration or a spiritual experience which itself is not of an intellectual character. Rather, what is received through inspiration is itself of an intellectual nature; it is sacred knowledge. The human intelligence which perceives this message and receives this truth does not impose upon it the intellectual nature or content of a spiritual experience of a sapiential character.

The knowledge contained in such an experience issues from the source of this experience which is the Intellect, the source of all sapience and the bestower of all principial knowledge, the Intellect which also modifies the human recipient that the Scholastics called the potential intellect. Here the medieval distinction between the active and passive or potential intellect<sup>3</sup> can serve to elucidate the nature of this process of the illumination of the mind and to remove the error of seeing the sapiential and intellectual content of spiritual experience as being the result of the human mind meditating upon or reasoning about the content of such an experience, whereas spiritual

experience on the highest level is itself of an intellectual and sapiential nature.

From another point of view, that of the Self which resides at the center of every self, the source of the scientia sacra revealed to man is the center and root of human intelligence itself since ultimately "knowledge of the Substance is the substance of knowledge," or knowledge of the Origin and the Source is the Origin and Source of knowledge. The truth descends upon the mind like an eagle landing upon a mountain top or it gushes forth and inundates the mind like a deep well which has suddenly burst forth into a spring. In either case, the sapiential nature of what the human being receives through spiritual experience is not the result of man's mental faculty but issues from the nature of that experience itself. Man can know through intuition and revelation not because he is a thinking being who imposes the categories of his thought upon what he perceives but because knowledge is being. The nature of reality is none other than consciousness, which, needless to say, cannot be limited to only its individual human mode.

Of course not everyone is capable of intellection or of having intellectual intuition no more than everyone is capable of having faith in a particular religion. But the lack of possibility of intellection for

everyone does not invalidate the reality of such a possibility any more than does the fact that many people are not able to have faith invalidate the reality of a religion. In any case for those who have the possibility of intellectual intuition there is the means to attain a knowledge of a sacred character that lies at the heart of that objective revelation which constitutes religion and also at the center of man's being. This microcosmic revelation makes possible access to that *scientia sacra* which contains the knowledge of the Real and the means of distinguishing between the Real and the illusory.

What we have designated as *scientia sacra* is none other than metaphysics if this term is understood correctly as the ultimate science of the Real. This term possesses certain unfortunate connotations because, first of all, the prefix *meta* does imply transcendence but not immanence and also it connotes a form of knowledge or science that comes after physics whereas metaphysics is the primary and fundamental science or wisdom which comes before and contains the principles of all the sciences.<sup>4</sup> Second, the habit of considering metaphysics in the West as a branch of philosophy, even in those philosophical schools which have a metaphysical dimension, has been instrumental in reducing the significance of metaphysics to just mental activity rather than seeing

it as a sacred science concerned with the nature of Reality and wed to methods for the realization of this knowledge, a science which embraces the whole of man's being.<sup>5</sup> In Oriental languages such terms as *prajha*, *jhdna*, *macrifah*, or *hikmah* connote the ultimate science of the Real without their being reduced to a branch of another form of knowledge known as philosophy or its equivalent. And it is in this traditional sense of *jhdna* or *macrifah* that metaphysics, or the "science of the Real," can be considered as identical with *scientia sacra*.

If *scientia sacra* lies at the heart of each tradition and is not a purely human knowledge lying outside of the sacred precinct of the various traditions, then how can one speak of it without remaining bound within a single religious universe? The response to this question has led certain scholars and philosophers engaged in "comparative philosophy" in the context of East and West to speak of "meta-philosophy" and a meta-language which stands above and beyond the language of a particular tradition.<sup>6</sup> From the traditional point of view, however, the language of metaphysics is inseparable from the content and meaning it expresses and bears the imprint of the message, this language having been developed by the metaphysicians and sages of various traditions over the ages. Each tradition possesses one or



several "languages of discourse" suitable for metaphysical doctrines and there is no need whatsoever to create a meta-language or invent a new vocabulary today to deal with such matters, since the English language is heir to the Western tradition and the several perfectly suitable metaphysical languages of the West such as those of Platonism, Thomism, and the school of Palamite theology. Moreover, contemporary traditional authors have already resuscitated the symbolic and intellectual aspects of modern languages which have decayed in their symbolic and hierarchic aspects but which nevertheless

contain metaphysical possibilities because of the very nature of human language.<sup>7</sup> These authors have created a perfectly suitable language for the expression of scientia sacra drawing occasionally from such sacred languages as Sanskrit and Arabic for certain key concepts. In any case a meta-language to express a meta-philosophy in order to expound traditional metaphysics is totally unnecessary. The language needed has been already forged from existing European languages which, although reflecting the gradual degradation of thought from an intellectual point of view, have also preserved the possibility of revival precisely because of their inalienable link with the classical languages of the West and the traditional metaphysics

expressed in them, and even in the earlier phases of the life of modern European languages.

If one were to ask what is metaphysics, the primary answer would be the science of the Real or, more specifically, the knowledge by means of which man is able to distinguish between the Real and the illusory and to know things in their essence or as they are, which means ultimately to know them in divinis.<sup>8</sup> The knowledge of the Principle which is at once the absolute and infinite Reality is the heart of metaphysics while the distinction between levels of universal and cosmic existence, including both the macrocosm and the microcosm, are like its limbs. Metaphysics concerns not only the Principle in Itself and in its manifestations but also the principles of the various sciences of a cosmological order. At the heart of the traditional sciences of the cosmos, as well as traditional anthropology, psychology, and aesthetics stands the scientia sacra which contains the principles of these sciences while being primarily concerned with the knowledge of the Principle which is both sacred knowledge and knowledge of the sacred par excellence, since the Sacred as such is none other than the Principle.

The Principle is Reality in contrast to all that appears as real but which is not reality in the ultimate sense. The Principle is the

Absolute compared to which all is relative. It is Infinite while all else is finite. The Principle is One and Unique while manifestation is multiplicity. It is the Supreme Substance compared to which all else is accident. It is the Essence to which all things are juxtaposed as form. It is at once Beyond Being and Being while the order of multiplicity is comprised of existents. It alone is while all else becomes, for It alone is eternal in the ultimate sense while all that is externalized partakes of change.

It is the Origin but also the End, the alpha and the omega. It is Emptiness if the world is envisaged as fullness and Fullness if the relative is perceived in the light of its ontological poverty and essential nothingness.<sup>9</sup> These are all manners of speaking of the Ultimate Reality which can be known but not by man as such. It can only be known through the sun of the Divine Self residing at the center of the human soul. But all these ways of describing or referring to the Principle possess meaning and are efficacious as points of reference and support for that knowledge of the Real that in its realized aspect always terminates in the Ineffable and in that silence which is the "reflection" or "shadow" of the nonmanifested aspect of the Principle upon the plane of manifestation. From that unitary point of view, the Principle or the Source is seen as not only the Inward but

also the Outward<sup>10</sup>, not only the One but also the essential reality of the many which is but the reflection of the One. At the top of that mountain of unitive knowledge there resides but the One; discrimination between the Real and the unreal terminates in the awareness of the nondual nature of the Real, the awareness which is the heart of gnosis and which represents not human knowledge but God's knowledge of Himself, the consciousness which is the goal of the path of knowledge and the essence of scientia sacra.<sup>11</sup>

The Ultimate Reality is at once Absolute and Infinite since no finite reality can be absolute due to its exclusion of some domain of reality. This reality is also the Supreme Good or the Perfection which is inseparable from the Absolute. Reality, being at once Absolute, Infinite, and Supreme Goodness or Perfection, cannot but give rise to the world or multiplicity which must be realized for otherwise that Reality would exclude certain possibilities and not be infinite. The world flows from the infinitude and goodness of the Real for to speak of goodness is to speak of manifestation, effusion, or creation and to speak of infinity is to speak of all possibilities including that of the negation of the Principle in whose direction the cosmogonic process moves without ever realizing that negation completely, for that total negation would be nothingness pure and simple.

Goodness is also from another point of view the image of the Absolute in the direction of that effusion and manifestation which marks the descent from the Principle and constitutes the world. Herein lies the root of relativity but it is still on the plane of Divinity. It is relatively in divinis or what could be called, using the well-known Hindu concept, the Divine maya.<sup>12</sup> Relativity is a possibility of that Reality which is at once Absolute and Infinite; hence that reality or the Absolute gives rise to that manifestation of the good which in descending hierarchy leads to the world. The world is ultimately good, as asserted by various orthodox traditions,<sup>13</sup> because it descends from the Divine Goodness. The instrument of this descent is the reflection of the Absolute upon the plane of that Divine Relativity, the reflection which is none other than the Supreme Logos, the source of all cosmic perfections, the "place" of the archetypes, the "Word" by which all things were made.<sup>14</sup>

Since the world or manifestation or creation issues from that Reality which is at once Absolute, Infinite, and Perfection or Goodness, these Hypostases of the Real or the Divine must be also reflected in the manifested order. The quality of absoluteness is reflected in the very existence of things, that mysterious presence of each thing which distinguishes it from all other things and from nothingness. Infini-

tude is reflected in the world in diverse modes in space which is indefinite extension, in time which is potentially endless duration, in form which displays unending diversity, in number which is marked by endless multiplicity, and in matter, a substance which partakes potentially of endless forms and divisions. As for Goodness, it is reflected in the cosmos through quality itself which is indispensable to existence however eclipsed it might become in certain forms in the world of multiplicity which are removed as far as possible from the luminous and essential pole of manifestation. Space which preserves, time which changes and transforms, form which reflects quality, number which signifies indefinite quantity and matter which is characterized by limitless substantiality are the conditions of existence of not only the physical world but the worlds above reaching ultimately the Divine Empyrean and the Divine Hypostases of Absoluteness, Infinity, and Perfection themselves.

Moreover, each of the Divine Hypostases is reflected in a particular manner in the five conditions of existence. Absoluteness is reflected in space as center, in time as the present moment, in matter as the ether which is the principle of both matter and energy, in form as the sphere which is the most perfect of forms and generator of all other regular geometric forms that are potentially contained in it, and in

number as unity which is the source and principle of all numbers. Infinitude is reflected in space as extension which theoretically knows no bound, in time as duration which has logically no end, in matter as the indefiniteness of material substantiality, in form as the unlimited possibility of diversity, and in number as the limitlessness of quantity. As for Perfection, it is reflected in space as the contents or objects in space reflecting Divine Qualities and also as pure existence which as the Sufis say is the "Breath of the Compassionate" (nafas alrahman), in space and time likewise as shapes and events possessing quality, in form as beauty and in number as that qualitative aspect of number always related to geometric forms which is usually associated with the idea of Pythagorean number. Scientia sacra sees these aspects of cosmic existence as reflections upon the plane or the multiple planes of manifestation of the Supreme Hypostases of Absoluteness, Infinitude, and Goodness which characterize the Real as such. It also sees each of these conditions of existence as reflecting directly an aspect of the Divinity: matter and energy the Divine Substance, form the Logos, number the Divine Unity which is inexhaustible, space the infinite extension of Divine Manifestation, and time the rhythms of the universal cycles of existence which the Abrahamic traditions allude to in passing as far

as their official, formal theologies are concerned and which Hinduism highlights, referring to them as days and nights in the life of Brahma.

Since metaphysics as developed in the Occident has almost always been related to ontology, it is important to pause a moment and discuss the relation of Being to the Principle or Ultimate Reality. If Being is envisaged as the principle of existence or of all that exists, then It cannot be identified with the Principle as such because the Principle is not exhausted by its creating aspect. Being is the first determination of the Supreme Principle in the direction of manifestation, and ontology remains only a part of metaphysics and is incomplete as long as it envisages the Principle only as Being in the sense defined. But if Being is used to embrace and include the sense of Absoluteness and Infinity, then it can mean both the Supra-Being or Reality beyond Being and Being as its first determination, even if only the term Being is used. Such seems to be the case with esse as employed by certain of the Scholastics and also *iwujud* in some of the schools of Islamic philosophy and theosophy.<sup>15</sup>

The distinction between Being and being. Being and existence, existence and essence or quiddity and the relation between quiddity or essence and existence in existents lies at heart of medieval Islamic,



Jewish, and Christian philosophy and has been discussed in numerous works of medieval thought. From the point of view of scientia sacra what caused this profound way of envisaging reality to become unintelligible and finally rejected in the West was the loss of that intellectual intuition which destroyed the sense of the mystery of existence and reduced the subject of philosophy from the study of the act of existence (esto) to the existent (ens), thereby gradually reducing reality to pure "it" divorced from the world of the Spirit and the majesty of Being whose constant effusions uphold the world which appears to the senses as possessing a continuous "horizontal" existence divorced from the "vertical" Cause or Being per se. That Islamic philosophy did not end with that impasse which marks the study of ontology in Western philosophy is due to its insistence upon the study of Being and its act rather than existents and to the wedding of this philosophy, by SuhrawardI and those who were to follow him, to spiritual experience which made the experience of Being not only a possibility but the source for all philosophical speculation concerning the concept and reality of being.<sup>16</sup>

majesty, the beauty of Divine Proximity cannot be beheld and integral metaphysics is fully aware of the necessity, on its own level, of the theological formulations which insist upon the hiatus between God and man or the Creator and the world. The metaphysical knowledge of unity comprehends the theological one in both a figurative and literal sense, while the reverse is not true. That is why the attainment of that unitive knowledge is impregnated with the perfume of sanctity which always strengthens the very foundations of the religion with which the formal theology in question is concerned, while the study of formal theology can never result in that *scientia sacra* which simply belongs to another dimension and which relies upon another **aspect** of the functioning of the Intellect upon the human plane. Metaphysics does not only distinguish between the Real and the apparent and Being and becoming but also between grades of existence. The hierarchic nature of reality is a universal assertion of all traditions and is part and parcel of their religious practices as well as their doctrines, whether conceived in terms of various hosts and orders of angels as described in the famous Celestial Hierarchies of Dionysius, or levels of light and darkness as in certain schools of Islamic esoterism, or as various orders of gods and titans as in religions with a mythological structure such as

Hinduism. Even in Buddhism for which the Supreme Principle is seen as the Void or Emptiness rather than Fullness, the vast intermediate worlds are depicted with remarkable power and beauty in both Buddhist cosmological texts and Buddhist art. The emphasis upon the hierarchic structure of reality in traditional doctrines is so great that a famous Persian poem states that he who does not accept the hierarchy of existence is an infidel (zindiq). Here again scientia sacra which is concerned with the nature of reality is distinguished from theology as usually understood, which can remain satisfied with what concerns man directly and a simpler view of reality based on God and man without emphasis upon the hierarchy of existence, although even in theology many schools have not failed to take into consideration the existence if not always the full significance of the intermediate planes of reality.<sup>17</sup>

The relation between the various levels of reality or hierarchy of existence cannot be fully understood without taking into consideration another important notion found in one way or another in all the complete expressions of the scientia sacra, this notion being that of

necessity to which is contrasted the notion of possibility. The distinction between necessity and possibility is the cornerstone of the philosophy of Ibn Sina (Avicenna) who has been called the "philosopher of being" and father of medieval ontology.<sup>18</sup> But the significance of both of these terms is of a purely metaphysical order and cannot be limited to the philosophical realm, even if this be traditional philosophy. It is the fruit of intellection rather than ratiocination as are in fact many of the tenets of traditional philosophy which veil in a syllogistic garb intuitions of a purely metaphysical nature. The presence of the notions of necessity and possibility in both Hindu and Far Eastern doctrines point in fact to realities of a universal order not at all limited to one particular mode of exposition or school of metaphysics. Necessity is opposed to possibility conceptually but, if the meaning

of possibility is understood fully, it will be seen that in one sense it complements necessity and is opposed to necessity only in one of its meanings. The root of possibility is related to potentiality and also "puissance," all three words being derived from posse, which means "to be able to." Possibility has in fact two meanings: one, the quality or character of something that can exist or not exist; and two, the quality or character of something which has the power and capability

to perform or carry out an act. In the first sense the quiddities of things are possible, or contingent; an object can exist or not exist and there is no logical or metaphysical contradiction whether, let us say, a horse exists or not. In this sense but on a higher level, the archetypes or what Islamic metaphysics call al-acyan al-thabitah or "immutable essences"<sup>19</sup> are also possible beings, only God being necessary. Taken in this meaning of the term, possibility is opposed to necessity while things which do exist and therefore must exist have become necessary not through their own essence but through the Necessary Being which alone is necessary in Itself. That is why, to use the language of Islamic philosophy again, they are called al-wdjib bfl-ghayr, literally "that which is made necessary by other than itself," the "other" being ultimately the Necessary Being.

In the second sense of the meaning of possibility as power, it is not opposed to necessity but complements it as far as the Principle is concerned. God is Absolute Necessity and Infinite Possibility, the omnipotence of God reflected in the Divine Attribute al-Qadir in the Quran, meaning exactly possibility in this second sense. Whatever happens in this world is according to the Will of God but also in conformity with a Divine Possibility. God could not will what is not possibility in this sense for He would then negate His own Nature.

Whatever claims a blind type of religious voluntarism might make, God's omnipotence cannot contradict His Nature and when the Gospel claims, "With God all things are possible," it is referring precisely to this Infinite Possibility of God.

Each world brought into being corresponds to a Divine Possibility and gains existence through the Divine Will which operates on different levels, sometimes appearing as contradictory to the eyes of the earthly creature. But there is never anything arbitrary about what God wills; His wisdom complements His Will and His Nature remains inviolable.

As far as necessity is concerned, it can be said that although the medieval philosophers called pure Being the Necessary Being, strictly speaking only the Beyond Being or Ultimate Reality is necessity in Itself and necessary with respect to Itself. Being is necessary vis-a-vis the world so that from the point of view of the world or of multiplicity, it can be legitimately considered as the Necessary Being. But Being can also be considered as Possibility as such which must be distinguished from the possibilities which are qualities of Being. These qualities possess two aspects: they are contingent or possible in relation to the Principle or Essence, that is,

they can exist or not exist, and they are necessary in their content and so participate in the necessity of the Essence. From the consideration of these two aspects one can see that there are two kinds of possibilities: those which reflect necessity and those which reflect contingency. The first kind engenders objects which definitely exist and the second those which can possibly not exist.

God gives existence to possibilities which are so many reflections and reverberations of Being and from this breathing of existence upon the quiddities of possibilities the world and, in fact, the myriad of worlds are born. That Divine Relativity or *mdya*, as it is projected toward nothingness and away from the Source, produces privative modalities and inversions of these possibilities whose origin is positive reflection and inversion, polarization of light and casting of shadows, luminous Logos and dark Demiurge. Being as Possibility is Itself the supreme veil of the Reality which in Itself is not only Infinite but also Absolute, that Essence which is beyond all determination.

To speak of the veil is to be concerned with one of the key concepts with which *scientia sacra* is concerned, one which, however, has not been as much emphasized in Western metaphysical doctrines as it has in the East, although it is certainly mentioned by such figures as

Eckhart and Silesius who allude to the Divine Relativity and are aware of its significance for the understanding of how the roots and principles of manifestation are to be found in the Principle Itself. The veil is none other than what the Hindus call maya and the Sufis hijab. The fact that maya has now become practically an English word points to the necessity of dealing with such a concept in the exposition of traditional doctrines and the lack of an appropriate term in the English language to convey all that maya signifies. Maya is usually translated as illusion and from the nondualistic or Advaitist point of view maya is illusion, only Atman, the Supreme Self, being real. But maya is also creativity and "Divine Play" (Ilia). On the principal level she is relativity which is the source of separateness, exteriorization, and objectivization. She is that tendency toward nothingness which brings manifestation into being, the nothingness which is never reached but which is implied by the cosmogonic movement away from the Principle. Infinitude could not but include the possibility of separation, division, and externalization which characterize all that is other than the Principle.<sup>21</sup> Maya is the supreme veil and also the supreme theophany which at once veils and reveals.<sup>22</sup>



God being good cannot but radiate His goodness and this tendency toward radiation or manifestation implies that movement away from the Source which characterizes cosmic and even metacosmic levels of reality away from the Origin which alone is absolutely real. Maya is almost the same as the Islamic rahmah, the Divine Mercy, whose "breath" existentiates the world, the very substance of the world being nafas al-rahman, the Breath of the Compassionate<sup>23</sup> in the sameway that one can call maya the breath of Atman. For Hinduism, however, the creation of the world or the casting of the veil of maya upon the Absolute Self or Atman is expressed as "Divine Play," while for Islam this externalization which is none other than the activity of maya is envisaged as the love of God to be "known," the origin of the world being the revelation of God to Himself according to the famous tradition of the Prophet (hadith), "I was a hidden treasure, I desired to be known, hence I created the world in order to be known."<sup>24</sup>

Formal theology envisages God and the world or the Creator and the created in a completely distinct and "absolute" manner and is therefore unable to provide answers for certain fundamental questions intellectually, questions which can be dealt with only from the perspective of the scientia sacra and the doctrine of maya or veil

which, on the highest level, implies introduction of relativity into the principal plane without, however, reaching the level of the Absolute which remains beyond all duality and relativity. Since there is a world which is relative, the roots of this world must exist in the principal order itself and this root is none other than the Divine maya which veils and manifests the One upon all planes of reality. She is the Feminine, at once Mary and Eve. Evil issues from the exteriorizing activity of maya but Existence which remains pure and good finally prevails over evil as Eve was forgiven for her sins by the spiritual inviolability and victory of Mary. Maya acts through both radiation and reverberation or reflection, first preparing the ground or plane of manifestation and then manifesting both the radiation and reverberation which take place on this plane. To use an image of Schuon,<sup>25</sup> if we envisage a point which symbolizes the Absolute or the Supreme Substance, the radii symbolize the radiation, the circumference the reflection or reverberation of the center and the area of the whole circle. Existence itself,<sup>26</sup> or a particular level of existence in which maya repeats her act. Maya is the source of all duality even on the principal level causing the distinction between the Essence and the Qualities. It is also the source of the dualism between subject and object even on the highest level

beyond which there is but the One, in which knower and known, or subject and object are one. But maya does not remain bound to the principal level alone. She is self-projected through various levels of cosmic existence which a hadith calls the seventy thousand veils of light and darkness and which can be summarized as the three fundamental levels of angelic, animic, and physical existence. On each level there is a manifestation or reflection of the Supreme Substance and the action of maya. For example, on the physical or material plane, the reflection of Substance is the ether which is the invisible support and origin of the physical elements. The reverberation of maya is matter and its radiation energy. Moreover, the two main tendencies of maya, which are conservation and transformation, translate themselves into space and time in this world and the many worlds and cycles which transform these worlds on the cosmic level. There is, to be sure, an immense gulf which separates various worlds and an almost complete incommensurability between the animic and the material worlds and also between the angelic or spiritual world and the animic. But through all these levels maya remains maya, being at once the revealer of the Real and Its veil, in herself the intermediary and isthmus between the Infinite and the finite. Maya in its aspect of illusion is also the cause for this impossibility

of encompassing Reality in a closed system of thought so characteristic of profane philosophy. The Absolute is blinding evidence or something incomprehensible to those who do not possess the eye or intuition to grasp it conceptually. In any case, ratiocination, belonging to the realm of relativity, cannot be used to prove or perceive the Absolute which remains beyond the reach of all attempts of the relative to comprehend It. But intelligence can know the Absolute and in fact only the Absolute is completely intelligible. Below that level, the activity of maya enters into play and brings about an element of ambiguity and uncertainty. If there were to be such a thing as pure relativity, it would be completely unintelligible. But even in the relative world which still bears the imprint of the Absolute, the element of ambiguity and unintelligibility of maya enters into all mental activity which would seek to transgress beyond its legitimate function and try to enmesh the Absolute in a finite system of thought based upon ratiocination.<sup>27</sup> Human thought as mental activity cannot become absolutely conformable to the Real as a result of maya, whereas direct knowledge or intellection has such a power. The plight of innumerable schools of modern philosophy and their failure to achieve the task of encompassing the Real through the process of purely human thought is caused by the power of maya

which exercises its illusory spell most upon those who would deny her reality.

Closely related to the doctrine of maya is the question of evil and its meaning in the light of the absolute goodness of the Origin and Source, a question which lies at the heart of the problems of theodicy, especially as they have been discussed in the Abrahamic world over the ages. This problem, namely, how can a God who is both omnipotent and good create a world which contains evil, is insoluble on the level of both formal theology and rationalistic philosophy. Its answer can be found only in metaphysics or scientia sacra, the eclipse of which has caused many men to lose their faith in religion and the religious world view precisely because of their inability to gain access to .

doctrine which would solve this apparent contradiction. From the metaphysical point of view there is not just the question of the omnipotence of God, there is also the Divine Nature which the Divine Will cannot contradict. God cannot will to cease to be God. Now, this Divine Nature is not limited to Being; as already mentioned, it is the Absolute and Infinite Reality which is the Beyond

Being or SupraBeing of which Being is the first determination in the direction of manifestation or creation. The Divine Nature or Ultimate Reality is both infinite and good and therefore wills to radiate and manifest Itself. From this radiation issue the states of existence, the multiple worlds, hence separation, elongation from the Source from which results what manifests itself as evil on a particular plane of reality. To speak of Infinity is to speak of the possibility of the negation of the Source in the direction of nothingness, hence of evil which one might call the "crystallization or existentiation of nothingness." Since only God—who is both the Beyond Being and Being—is Good, as the Gospels assert, all that is other than God partakes of that element of privation which is the source of evil. The will of God as the Godhead or the Beyond Being is the realization of the possibilities inherent in Its Infinitude and hence that separation from the Source which implies evil.

But precisely because manifestation is a possibility of Infinite Reality, the existence of the world in itself is not evil nor does the element of evil appear in any of the worlds still close to the Divine Proximity.<sup>28</sup> Now, the Will of God as Being operates within the radiation and reverberation caused by maya and the very Nature of that Infinite Reality which is the Supra-Being. The Will of God on

this level opposes concrete forms of evil according to the criteria established by various revelations and always in the light of the total good and in accordance with the economy of a particular traditional mode of life. On this level the Will of God is opposed to various types of evil without being able to eradicate existence as such, which would amount to negating the Divine Nature Itself. There are in reality two levels of operation of the Divine Will or even two Divine Wills, one related to the Absolute and Infinite Reality which cannot but manifest and create, hence, separation, elongation, and privation which appear as evil; and the second related to the Will of Being which opposes the presence of evil in accordance with the divine laws and norms which constitute the ethical structures of various traditional worlds.

To relate evil to the infinity of that Reality which is also the AllPossibility, does not mean to deny the reality of evil on a particular level of reality. The existence of evil is inseparable from the relative level in which it manifests itself. One cannot simply say that evil does not exist as do even certain traditional masters of gnosis who, gazing with constancy upon the overwhelming goodness of the Divine Principle, in a sense circumvent evil and pass it by.<sup>29</sup> But

this is of course not the case of all the traditional sages, many of whom have provided the metaphysical key for the understanding of evil. From the point of view of scientia sacra, although real on the relative plane of reality, evil has no reality as a substance and in itself as a thing or object. Evil is always partial and fragmented. It must exist because of the ontological hiatus between the Principle and manifestation but it remains always limited and bound while goodness is unlimited and opens unto the Infinite. Also as far as the Will of God is concerned, God wills evil not as evil but as part of a greater good to which this segmented reality called evil contributes. That is why evil is never evil in its existential substance but through that privation of a good which plays a role in the total economy of the cosmos and contributes to a greater good. Every disequilibrium and disorder is of a partial and transient nature contributing to that total equilibrium, harmony, and order which is the cosmos.

The doctrine of maya or hijdb enables us to understand the metaphysical roots of that which appears as evil. This doctrine explains evil as privation and separation from the Good and also as an element contributing to a greater good, although within a particular ambience or plane of existence, evil remains evil as a result of either privation



or excess. If this doctrine is fully understood then it is possible to comprehend the meaning of evil as such. But even in this case it is not possible for man to understand such or such an evil, only God being. totally and completely intelligible. In any case, although the Divine Will wills everything that exists including what appears as evil, as far as man, who is both intelligent and has a free will, is concerned, God wills for him only the good. The best way of solving the question of evil and theodicy is in fact to live a life which would make possible the actualization of the scienta sacra in one's being. This realization or actualization is the best possible way of understanding the nature of the Good and the why of terrestrial human existence which, being removed from God, cannot but be marred by the fragmentation, dissipation, and privation that appears as evil and that is as real as that plane of reality upon which it manifests itself. Evil ceases to exist, however, on a higher plane, where transient and partial disorders contribute to a greater order and privation to a greater good.

Closely allied to the question of good and evil is that of free will and determinism which has also occupied philosophers and theologians in the Abrahamic world over the ages but which also is of central concern in other traditional climates such as that of India as evi-

denced by the discussion of correct action in the Bhagavad-Gita. In this question also there is no possibility of going beyond the either-or dichotomy as long as one remains on the level of formal theology or rationalistic philosophy as witnessed by centuries of debates among theologians and philosophers in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. From the metaphysical point of view, however, the whole debate appears as sterile and fragmented through the fact that both sides attribute a quality of absoluteness to that which is relative, namely the human plane. Metaphysically speaking, only the Ultimate Reality is absolute and at once pure necessity and pure freedom. Only God is completely necessary and free, being both Absoluteness and Infinity. Now, on the human plane, we are already on the level of relativity, therefore there cannot be either absolute determination or absolute free will. Something of both must manifest itself on the level of human relativity. If only one of these two conditions were to be present, the plane of relativity would no longer be relative but absolute. Man's freedom is as real as himself. He ceases to be free in the sense of independent of the Divine Will to the extent that he ceases to be separated ontologically from God. At the same time, man is determined and not free to the extent that an ontological hiatus separates him from his Source and Origin, for only God is freedom. Journeying

from the relative toward the Absolute means at once losing the freedom of living in error and gaining freedom from the tyranny of all the psycho-material determinations which imprison and stifle the soul. In God there is pure freedom and pure necessity and only in Him is man completely free and also completely determined but with a determination which, being nothing but man's own most profound nature and the root of his being, is none other than the other face of freedom, total and unconditional. Intelligence is a divine gift which pierces through the veil of *mdya* and is able to know reality as such. It is a ray of light which pierces through the veils of cosmic existence to the Origin and connects the periphery of existence, upon which fallen man lives, to the Center wherein resides the Self. The Intellect is itself divine and only human to the extent that man participates in it. It is a substance as well as a function; it is light as well as vision. The Intellect is not the mind nor is it reason which is the reflection of the Intellect upon the human plane, but it is the root and center of consciousness and what has been traditionally called the soul. In the technical sense, however, the soul must be considered as the equivalent of the *anima* or *psyche* in which case the Intellect is *spiritus* or *nous* from whose marriage with

the passive and feminine psyche is born that gold which symbolizes the perfection of the sanctified soul.

The metacosmic principle which is the Intellect is the source of both knowledge and being, of the subjective conscience which knows and the objective order which is known. It is also the source of revelation which creates a nexus between man and the cosmos and of course the metacosmic Reality. The Logos or Buddhi or caql, as the Intellect is called in various traditions, is the luminous center which is the generating agent of the world—for "it was by the Word that all things were made"—of man, and of religion. It is God's knowledge of Himself and the first in His creation. Moreover, as there is a hierarchy

of cosmic existence, so are there levels of consciousness and degrees of descent of the Intellect through various levels of existence until man is reached, in whose heart the ray of Intellect still shines, although it is usually dimmed by the passions and the series of "falls" that have separated man from what he really is. Yet, even the consciousness of fallen man and the intelligence which shines within him, although a distant reflection of the Intellect, nevertheless display something of the miracle of the Intellect which is at once supernatural and natural. Perhaps the most immediate expe-

rience of man is his subjectivity, the mystery of inwardness and a consciousness which can reflect upon itself, opening inwardly unto the Infinite which is also bliss. No less of a miracle is the power of objectivity, the power of human intelligence to know the world in an objective manner and with a categorical certitude which no amount of sophism can destroy. Finally, there is the mystery of the adequation of knowledge, of the fact that our intelligence corresponds to the nature of reality and that what man knows corresponds to aspects of the Real.<sup>31</sup> But these are all mysteries as long as man is cut off from the light of intellectual intuition or intellection. Otherwise, in the light of the Intellect itself both the subjective and objective powers of intelligence are perfectly intelligible.

As already stated, scientia sacra cannot be attained without intellect Knowledge and the Sacred tion and the correct functioning of intelligence within man. That is why those who are cut off from this inner sacrament<sup>32</sup> not only repudiate the teachings of this sacred knowledge but also offer rationalistic arguments against them based usually on incomplete or false premises, expecting the heavens to collapse as a result of this sound and fury which metaphysically signifies nothing. Intellection does

not reach the truth as a result of profane thought or reasoning but through an a priori direct intuition of the truth. Reasoning may act as an occasion for intellection but it cannot be the cause of intellection. For that very reason the fruit of intellection cannot be nullified or negated by any form of reasoning which, based on the limitations of the person who uses reasoning, often results in error pure and simple. This assertion does not mean of course that intellection is against logic or that it is irrational. On the contrary, there is no truth which can be considered illogical, logic itself being an ontological reality of the human state. But the role and function of reasoning and the use of logic in metaphysics and profane philosophy are completely different, as different as the use of mathematics in the rosette of the Chartres Cathedral or a cupola of one of the mosques of Isfahan and in a modern skyscraper.

Although the Intellect shines within the being of man, man is too far removed from his primordial nature to be able to make full use of this divine gift by himself. He needs revelation which alone can actualize the intellect in man and allow it to function properly. The day when each man was also a prophet and when the intellect functioned in man "naturally" so that he saw all things in divinis and possessed a direct knowledge of a sacred character is long past. The

traditional doctrines themselves emphasize that in the later unfolding of the cosmic cycle it is only revelation or avatdric descent that enables man to see once again with the "eye of the heart" which is the "eye of the intellect."

If there are exceptions, these are exceptions which only prove the rule and in any case "the wind bloweth where it listeth."

Revelation in its esoteric dimension makes possible, through initiation, access to higher levels of man's being as well as consciousness.

The appropriate rites, the traditional cadre, forms and symbols, and the grace issuing from revelation provide keys with which man is able

to open the doors of the inner chambers of his being and with the help of the spiritual master to journey through the cosmic labyrinth with the result of finally attaining that treasure which is none other  
Scientia Sacra •

than the pearl of gnosis. Revelation actualizes the possibilities of the intellect, removes impediments of the carnal soul which prevent the intellect from functioning, and makes possible the transmission of an initiatic knowledge which at the same time resides within the very

substance of the intellect. There is an unbridgeable hiatus between intelligence sanctified by revelation and the intelligence which, cut off from this source and also from its own root, is reduced to its reflection upon the human mind and atrophied into that truncated and fragmented faculty which is considered scientifically as intelligence.<sup>33</sup>

As far as the relation between the intellect and revelation is concerned, it is fundamental to say a few words on the rapport between intellectuality and sacred scripture which has been so forgotten in the modern world. Without reviving spiritual exegesis, it is not possible to rediscover scientia sacra in the bosom of a tradition dominated by the

presence of sacred scripture. Scripture possesses an inner dimension which is attainable only through intellection operating within a traditional framework and which alone is able to solve certain apparent contradictions and riddles in sacred texts. Once intellectual intuition becomes inoperative and the mind a frozen lake over which ideas glide but into which nothing penetrates, then the revealed text also veils its inner dimension and spiritual exegesis becomes reduced to archaeology and philology, not to speak of the extrapolation of the subjective errors of the present era back into the age of the revelation



in question. Clement and Origen become thus transformed into modern exegetes for whom the New Testament is little more than an ethical commentary upon the social conditions of first-century Palestine.

In the Oriental world, including the Judeo-Christian tradition, the spiritual science of exegesis has never died out completely. The sacred text serves as the source for the formal world of the tradition in question, including its ritual and liturgical practices and its sacred art, as well as the intellectual aspect of the tradition extending from formal theology, philosophy, and the science of symbols to *scientia sacra* itself which crowns the inner message conveyed by the sacred text and which is attained through the intelligence that is sanctified by that very sacred scripture.<sup>34</sup> In Islam, dominated by the blinding presence of the Quran, every aspect of the tradition has been related to the Holy Book and the category of exegetes<sup>35</sup> has ranged from those concerned with the Divine Law to the gnostics who have •Knowledge and the Sacred penetrated through that spiritual hermeneutics or *ta'wil*<sup>36</sup> to the pearl of wisdom residing behind the veil of the external forms of the Holy Book. Such masterpieces of Sufism as the *Mathnawi* of Jalal al-Dfn RumI are in reality commentaries upon the Quran, not to speak of the

numerous esoteric commentaries of such masters as Ibn 'Arab!,<sup>37</sup> Sadr al-Din al-Qunyawi,<sup>38</sup> cAbd al-Razzaq al-Kashani, Rashid al-Din Ahmad Mibudi, and others. Both scientia sacra and all the ancillary traditional sciences in Islam may be said to issue forth from the fountainhead of the inner wisdom contained in the Quran in the same way that Hinduism considers the traditional sciences to be the limbs of the Vedas. Spiritual hermeneutics is the means whereby the intelligence, sanctified by revelation, is able to penetrate into the heart of revelation to discover that principial truth which is the very root and substance of intelligence itself. In this process the microcosmic manifestation of the Intellect, which is the source of inner illumination and intellection, unveils the inner meaning of that macrocosmic manifestation of the Intellect which is revelation or more specifically, sacred scripture. Moreover, the same truth pertains mutatis mutandis to the interpretation of the inner meaning of that other revealed book which is the cosmos itself. Scientia sacra envisages intelligence in its rapport not only with revelation in an external sense but also with the source of inner revelation which is the center of man, namely the heart. The seat of intelligence is the heart and not the head, as affirmed by all traditional

teachings. The word heart, hrdaya in Sanskrit, Herz in German, kardia in Greek, and cor/cordis in Latin, have the root hrd or krd which, like the Egyptian Horus, imply the center of the world or a world.<sup>39</sup>

The heart is also the center of the human microcosm and therefore the “locus” of the Intellect by which all things were made. The heart is also the seat of sentiments and the will, the other elements of which the human being is constituted. Profound emotions as well as will have their origin in the heart as does intelligence which constitutes the apex of the microcosmic ternary of powers or faculties. It is also in the heart that intelligence and faith meet and where faith itself becomes saturated with the light of sapience. In the Quran both faith (Imdn) and intelligence (caql) are explicitly identified with the heart (alqalb),<sup>40</sup> while in Hinduism the Sanskrit term sraddha, which is usually translated as faith, means literally knowledge of the heart.<sup>41</sup> In Latin also the fact that credo and cor/cordis are derived from the same root Scientia Sacra •

points to the same metaphysical truth. This traditional exegesis of language reveals not only the relation of principal knowledge to the heart but also the important metaphysical principle that integral intelligence is never divorced from faith but that, on the contrary, faith is

necessary in the actualization of the possibilities of intellection within the cadre of a revelation. That intelligence which is able to attain to the knowledge of the sacred is already sanctified and rooted in the center of the human state where it is never divorced from either faith or love. In the heart, knowledge in fact always coincides with love. Only when externalized does knowledge become related to the mind and the activity of the brain, and love to that substance which is usually called the soul. This externalization of the intelligence and its projection upon the plane of the mind is, however, a necessary condition of human existence without which man would not be man, the creature who is created as a thinking being. Dialectical intelligence identified with the mind is not in itself negative; in fact, human intelligence in its fullness implies the correct functioning of both the intelligence of the heart and that of the mind, the first being intuitive and the second analytical and discursive. The two functions together make possible the reception, crystallization, formulation, and finally communication of the truth. Mental formulation of the intuition received by the intelligence in the heart becomes completely assimilated by man and actualized through the activity of the mind. This in fact is one of the main

roles of meditation in spiritual exercises, meditation being related to the activity of the mind. Through this process also the light received by the heart is communicated and transmitted, such an activity being necessary because of the very nature of the content of the intuition received by the intelligence residing in the heart, the content which, being good, has to give of itself and, like all goodness, shine forth.<sup>42</sup> The human being needs to exteriorize certain inner truths in order to be able to interiorize, to analyze in order to synthesize, synthesis needing a phase of analysis. Hence, the need of man for language which proceeds from holy silence and returns again to it, but which plays a vital role in the formulation of the truth issuing from the first silence and in preparing man for return to the second silence which is synthesis after analysis, return to unity after separation.<sup>43</sup> Symbolically, the mind can be considered as the moon which reflects the light of the sun which is the heart. The intelligence in the heart shines upon the plane of the mind which then reflects this light upon the dark night of the terrestrial existence of fallen man. Scientia sacra which issues from the total intelligence of the heart,<sup>44</sup> therefore, also includes the dialectic of the mind. In fact, some of the greatest dialecticians in both East and West have been metaphysicians who have realized the supreme station of knowledge.

What tradition opposes is not the activity of the mind but its divorce from the heart, the seat of intelligence and the location of the "eye of knowledge," which the Sufis call the eye of the heart (fayn al-qalb or chishm-i dil) and which is none other than the "third eye" of the Hindu tradition. It is this eye which transcends duality and the rational functioning of the mind based upon analysis and which perceives the unity that is at once the origin and end of the multiplicity perceived by the mind and the mind's own power to analyze and know discursively. That is why the Sufis chant:

Open the eye of thy heart so that thou wilt see the Spirit  
So that thou wilt see that which cannot be seen.<sup>45</sup>

The attempt of the rational mind to discover the Intellect through its own light is seen by tradition to be futile because the object which the rational faculty is trying to perceive is actually the subject which makes the very act of perception by the rational faculty possible. A mind which is cut off from the light of the intelligence of the heart and

which seeks to find God is unaware that the light with which it is seeking to discover God is itself a ray of the Light of God. Such a mind cannot but be like a person wandering in the desert in the

brightness of day with a lamp in his hand looking for the sun.<sup>46</sup> Blindness does not issue from reason but from reason being cut off from the intellect and then trying to play the role of the intellect in the attainment of knowledge. Such an attempt cannot but result in that desacralization of knowledge and of life that one already observes in members of that segment of humanity which has chosen to take its destiny into its own hands and live on the earth as if it were only of this earth.

Since *scientia sacra* is expressed outwardly and does not remain only on the level of the inner illumination of the heart, it is necessary to understand something of the kind of language it employs. The formal language used for the expression of *scientia sacra*, and in fact nearly *Scientia Sacra* •

the whole spectrum of traditional teachings, is that of symbolism. *Scientia sacra* can be expressed in human words as well as in landscape paintings, beating of drums, or other formal means which convey meaning.

But in all cases symbolism remains the key for the understanding of its language. Fortunately, during this century much has been written on the veritable significance of symbols, and it has been

shown, especially in works identified with the circle of traditional writers, that symbols are not man-made signs, but reflections on a lower level of the existence of a reality belonging to the higher order.<sup>47</sup> Symbols are ontological aspects of a thing, to say the least as real as the thing itself, and in fact that which bestows significance upon a thing within the universal order of existence. In the hierarchic universe of traditional metaphysics, it can be said that every level of reality and everything on every level of reality is ultimately a symbol, only the Real being Itself as such. But on a more limited scale, one can say that symbols reflect in the formal order archetypes belonging to the principal realm and that through symbols the symbolized is unified with its archetypal reality.

There are, moreover, symbols which are "natural" in the sense of being inherent in the nature of certain objects and forms through the very cosmogonic process which has brought forth these forms upon the terrestrial plane. There are other symbols which are sanctified by a particular revelation that is like a second creation. The sun is "naturally" the symbol of the Divine Intellect for anyone who still possesses the faculty of symbolic perception and in whom the "symbolist spirit" is operative. But the same sun is sanctified in a special manner in solar cults such as Mithraism and gains a special signifi-



cance in a particular traditional universe as has wine in Christianity or water in Islam. The Sufi poets may use the symbolism of wine in the first sense of symbol but it is the Christie descent which has given that special significance to wine in the Eucharist as a sanctified symbol that remains bound to the particular world which is Christian.<sup>49</sup>

Scientia sacra makes use of both types of symbolism in the exposition of its teachings but is always rooted in its formal aspect in the tradition in which it flowers and functions and by virtue of which the very attainment of this sacred knowledge is possible in an operative manner. Sufism may draw occasionally from Hindu or Neoplatonic formulations and symbols, but its formal world is that of the Quran and it is the grace issuing from the Quranic revelation which has

Knowledge and the Sacred made the attainment of gnosis in Sufism possible. It is in fact the living tradition that molds the language of discourse of metaphysics and that chooses among the symbols available to it those which best serve its purpose of communicating a doctrine of a sapiential and sacred nature. On the one hand, symbolism can be fully understood only in the light of a living spirituality without which it can become a maze of riddles; on the other hand, symbols serve as the means

whereby man is able to understand the language of scientia sacra. Finally, it must be emphasized that traditional metaphysics or scientia sacra is not only a theoretical exposition of the knowledge of reality. Its aim is to guide man, to illuminate him, and allow him to attain the sacred. Therefore, its expositions are also points of reference, keys with which to open certain doors and means of opening the mind to certain realities. In their theoretical aspect they have a provisional aspect in the sense of the Buddhist upaya, of accommodating means of teaching the truth. In a sense, scientia sacra contains both the seed and the fruit of the tree of knowledge. As theory it is planted as a seed in the heart and mind of man, a seed that if nurtured through spiritual practice and virtue becomes a plant which finally blossoms forth and bears fruit in which, once again, that seed is contained. But if the first seed is theoretical knowledge, in the sense of theoria or vision, the second seed is realized gnosis, the realization of a knowledge which being itself sacred, consumes the whole being of the knower and, as the sacred, demands of man all that he is. That is why it is not possible to attain this knowledge in any way except by being consumed by it.

The result of my life can be summarized in three words;  
I was immature, I matured and I was consumed.

## ترجمة النصوص

## الفصل الرابع

### العلم المقدس

الدين القيم حكمة فطرية: وصور وفضائل الحكمة الفطرية من نفس  
جذعها ذاته

دينكارد

مورد العلم المطلق موجود أبدي في قلوبنا

تبييتاكا

لا يزيد العلم المقدس عن كونه معرفة مقدسة تكمن في قلب كل وحي،  
وهو مركز تلك الدائرة التي تشمل التراث وتحده، والسؤال الذي يطرح  
ذاته ، كيف بالإمكان تحصيل هذه المعرفة؟ والجواب هو أن التراث هو

المصدر التوأم لهذه المعرفة ، وهما الوحي والبصيرة أو الحدس البصيري الذي ينطوي استنارة القلب وعقل الإنسان وحضور معرفة ذات طبيعة آنية مباشرة فيه، يمكن تذوقها ومباشرتها، وهي تلك الحكمية التي يشير إليها التراث الإسلامي "المعرفة الحاضرة" (الكلمة الحاضرة) (١)، وبمقدور الإنسان أن يعرفها، وتطبق علي بعض جوانب الحقيقة، وفي نهاية المطاف، المعرفة هي معرفة الحقيقة المطلقة، ويمتلك الذكاء هذه الهبة المعجزة لموجود قادر أن يعرف ما هي وكل ما يشارك في الوجود (٢).

وليس العلم المقدس ثمرة ذكاء إنساني متأمل أو مفكر في محتوى إلهام أو تجربة روحية ليست في ذاتها ذات طابع بصيري، والأحري أن ما يُتلقى في الإلهام ذات طبيعية بصيرية، وهو معرفة مقدسة. إن الذكاء الإنساني الذي يتلقى هذه الرسالة ويتلقى هذه الحقيقة لا يفترض أنها ذات طبيعة بصيرية أو محتوى تجربة روحية لطابع حكمي، والمعرفة الواردة في مثل هذه التجربة تصدر من هذه التجربة التي هي البصيرة، مصدر كل حكمية، ومانحة كل معرفة مبدئية، تلك البصيرة التي تعدل المتلقي الإنساني الذي أطلق عليه الإسكولائيون العقل بالقوة. وقد يعين التمييز في العصر الوسط بين العقل الفعال والمنفعل أو العقل بالقوة (٣)

<sup>١</sup> - حول هذا المعنى، Nasr, Islamic Science—An Illustrated Study, London, 1976, p. 14.

<sup>٢</sup> - "Toute connaissance est, par definition, celle de la Realite absolue; c'est a dire que la Realite est 1 objet necessaire, unique, essentiel de toute connaissance possible" Schuon, L Oetl du coeur ، p20.

<sup>٣</sup> ميز الفلاسفة المسلمون مثل اليهود والمسيحيون في العصر الوسيط بين العقل الفعال وهو أصل المعرفة والعقل المنفعل (الهولي) الذي يستقبل المعرفة، ويؤكد الطبيعة العقلية لما يستقبله الذهن الإنساني من العقل الإلهي

see Ibn Sina, Le Livre des directives et remarques, trans. A. M. Goichon, Paris-Beirut, 1951, pp. 324ff; al-Farabi, Epistola sull'intelletto, trans. F. Lucchetta, Padua, 1974; F. Rahman, Prophecy in Islam, Philosophy and Orthodoxy, Chicago, 1979;

في توضيح طبيعة هذا النهج من استتارة العقل ويمحو الخطأ الذي يري المحتوي الحكمي والبصيري للتجربة الروحية باعتباره لعقل إنساني يتأمل أو يفكر في محتوى مثل هذه التجربة، في حين أن التجربة الروحية بأسمي مستو لها ذات طبيعة حكمية وبصيرية.

ومن وجهة نظر أخري إن الذات العلية التي تُقيم في مركز كل ذات إنسانية، ومصدر العلم المقدس تكشف أن الإنسان هو مركز وجذر الذكاء الإنساني ذاته لأن " معرفة الجوهر هو جوهر المعرفة" أو معرفة الأصل والمصدر هو أصل ومصدر المعرفة. وبتنزل الحق علي العقل مثل نسر يحط علي قمة جبل أو يغمر العقل ويتدفق منه مثل بئر عميق انفجر علي غرة في نبع، وفي كلا الحالين فإن الطبيعة الحكمية لما يتلقاه الإنسان من التجربة الروحية ليسوا نتيجة قدرة عقلية للإنسان بل هو من طبيعة التجربة ذاتها، وبمقدور الإنسان أن يعرف بالحدس أو الوحي لا لكونه موجوداً مفكراً يفرض مقولات لفكره علي ما يدركه بل لأن المعرفة موجودة، ولا تزيد طبيعة الحقيقة عن كونها الوعي، وغني عن القول، أنه لا يمكن حده في النمط الإنساني الفردي.

---

and J. Jolivet, *L'Intellect selon Kindi*, Leiden, 1971. As for the medieval Western world in general see E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1955; also M. Shallo, *Lessons in Scholastic Philosophy*, Philadelphia, 1916, pp. 264ff; and R. P. de Angelis, *Conoscenza dell'individuale e conoscenza dell'universale nel XIII e XIV secolo*, Rome, 1922. H. A. Wolfson has also dealt with this issue in many of his writings including *The Problem of the Soul of the Spheres*, Washington, 1962; *Essays in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, ed. I. Twersky and G. H. Williams, Cambridge, Mass., 1979; *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968; *Christianity and Islam*, Cambridge, 1948; and "Extradeical and Intradeical Interpretations of Platonic Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2211 (Jan.-March 1961):3—32.

وليس كل امرئ قادر علي التبصر أو تملك الحدس البصيري بقدر ما يعجز كل امرئ من أن يمتلك الإيمان في دين بعينه، ولكن ضعف إمكان البصيرة عند الكل لا يبطل حقيقة مثل هذا الإمكان بقدر ما أن كثير من الناس عاجزين عن تملك الإيمان لا يبطل هذا حقيقة الدين، وعلي أية حال، إن الذين لديهم إمكان الحدس البصيري عندهم وسائل لتحصيل معرفة ذات طابع مقدس تكمن في قلب الوحي الموضوعي وتتطوي الدين ومركز وجود الإنسان أيضاً، ووحى الكون الأصغر هذا يقيم إمكان الوصول إلي العلم المقدس الذي يتضمن معرفة الواقع والتمييز بين الواقع والوهمي.

إن ما نصفه بالعلم المقدس لا يزيد عن كونه ميتافيزيقا إذا فهم الاصطلاح بالشكل الصحيح باعتباره علم مطلق لما هو حقيقي، ويكتنف هذا الاصطلاح دلالات غير ملائمة بعينها، أولها أن البادئة "مابعد meta" تصف التعالي وليس الجوهر، ناهيك أنها تشير إلي شكل من المعرفة أو العلم يأتي بعد الفيزيقا بينما الميتافيزيقا علم أساسي وأولي أو حكمة تأتي قبل وتتضمن مبادئ كل العلوم (٤)، ثانياً، اعتياد الغرب علي اعتبار الميتافيزيقا فرع من الفلسفة، حتي تلك المدارس ذات البعد الميتافيزيقي قد تدرعت باختزال دلالة الميتافيزيقا إلي نشاط عقلي أحري من رؤيتها علماً مقدساً يهتم بطبيعة الحقيقة وتفترن بمناهج إدراك هذه المعرفة، وهي علم يحتضن وجود الإنسان كله (٥) وتدلل اصطلاحات

٤ - عن وجهة النظر الأفلاطونية التي تري المعرفة هيوط من عالم "المثل" أو من المبدأ إلي التجلي أقرب للمنظور الحكمي من وجهة النظر الأرسطية التي تري أن الانتقال من التجلي إلي المبدأ أو الطبيعة إلي الميتافيزيقا.

٥ - للتمييز بين الميتافيزيقا والفلسفة الدنيوية انظر



مثل براجا prajha وجهدنا jhdna ومعرفة macrifah وحكمة hikmah في اللغات الشرقية علي علم مطلق للحقيقي دون اختزال لوجودها لفرع آخر لمعرفة قد تعرف بصفتها فلسفة أو يعادلها، وجهدنا أو معرفة بالمعني التراثي هي ميتافيزيقا أو "علم الواقع" وهي متماثلة مع العلم المقدس.

إذا كان العلم المقدس يكمن في قلب كل تراث، وليس معرفة إنسانية فجة تقع خارج إطار المقدس للتراث المتعددة، فكيف يمكن للمرء أن يتحدث عنه دون أن يتقيد داخل عالم ديني بعينه؟ وقد تؤدي الإجابة علي هذا السؤال في انخراط باحثين وفلاسفة بعينهم في "الفلسفة المقارنة" في سياق الشرق والغرب للحديث عن "ميتا- فلسفة" و "ميتا -لغة" التي تجاوز لغة تراث بعينه (٦). ولغة الميتافيزيقا من المنظور التراثي لا تتفصل عن المحتوي والمعني الذي تعبر عنه وتحمل طابع الرسالة، وقد طور ميتافيزيقيوا وحكماء تراث مختلفة هذه اللغة عبر العصور ، ويمتلك كل تراث "لغة خطاب" واحدة أو عدة تناسب المذاهب الميتافيزيقية ، ولا حاجة مهما كان إلي خلق ميتا لغة أو ابتكار مفردات جديدة اليوم للتعامل مع هذه المسائل، حيث إن اللغة الإنجليزية هي وريث التراث الغربي وعديد من اللغات الميتافيزيقية المناسبة تمامًا للغرب مثل الأفلاطونية والتوماوية ومدرسة اللاهوت البالامسي Palamite ، وزد علي ذلك، قد أحيي الكتاب المعاصرون بالفعل الجوانب الرمزية

see Guenon, Introduction to the Study of Hindu Doctrines ,pp. 108ff; and idem, "Oriental Metaphysics", in Needleman (ed.), (Sword of Gnosis ,pp. 40-56.

٦ – T. Izutsu, among others, in his The Concept and Reality of Existence ,Tokyo, 1971; also his Unicité de l'existence et creation perpetuelle en mystique islamique ,Paris, 1980.

والبصيرية للغات الحديثة التي تدهورت جوانبها الرمزية والهرمية مع أنها تحتوي إمكانات ميتافيزيقية بسبب طبيعة اللغة البشرية (٧)، وابتكر الكتاب لغة مناسبة تمامًا للتعبير عن العلم المقدس بصياغة ملائمة من لغة مقدسة مثل السنسكريتية والعربية لبعض المفاهيم الأساسية، وعلي أية حال إن تعبير الميتا - لغة في التعبير عن الميتا فلسفة لشرح الميتافيزيقا التراثية ليس ضروريًا تمامًا، فاللغو المطلوبة قد صيغت بالفعل من اللغات الأوروبية الموجودة التي رغم أنها تعكس التدهور التدريجي للفكر من وجهة النظر البصيرية فإنها حافظت علي إمكان الإحياء بالتحديد بسبب ارتباطها الذي لا ينفك عن اللغات الكلاسيكية للغرب والميتافيزيقيا التراثية التي عبرت عنها، حتي في المراحل الأول من حياة اللغات الأوروبية الحديثة.

٧ - إن الخدمة التي يقدمها الكتاب التراثيون للفرنسية والإنجليزية والألمانية هي اللغات الأساسية التي استخدموها في إحياء لغة الخطاب الميتافيزيقية وانعاش جودتها الرمزية، وهي عكس العملية التي يقوم بها عدد من الفلاسفة التحليليين المحدثين والوضعيين لتطهير اللغات الأوروبية من محتواها الميتافيزيقي ، واختزالها إلى لغات أحادية البعد تعكس العقول أحادية البعد التي تستخدم مثل هذه الأشكال من اللغة. يرتبط اهتمام بعض المؤلفين التراثيين بعلم أصل الكلمة وإحياء أهمية جذر المعنى للكلمات ارتباطاً وثيقاً بهذه الحاجة إلى إبراز الإمكانات الرمزية المخبأة في بنية الكلمات التي استخدمها البشر مرة أخرى. الذين عاشوا في عالم المقدس وامتلكوا "الروح الرمزية" التي تتعكس مباشرة في لغتهم. إن اللغات المقدسة والقديمة التي لا تزال موجودة شاهد على مكنز اللغة الرائع للميتافيزيقا الموجودة في بنية اللغة نفسها. وقد تدرس الميتافيزيقيا في مجتمعات بعينها حتى يومنا هذا كشرح على لغة مقدسة أو قديمة، مثال علي ذلك بعض مدارس الصوفية.

J. L. Michon, *Le Soufi marocain Ahmad ibn 'Ajiba et son mfracj. Glossaire de la mystique musulman*, Paris, 1973, especially pp. 177ff. and see also E. Zolla , *Language and Cosmogony*, Ipswich, U.K., 1976; and J. Canteins. *Phonbnes et archetypes* , Paris, 1972.

وإن جاز للمرء أن يسأل ما الميتافيزيقا، فالإجابة الأولية هي علم الواقع أو بشكل أكثر تحديداً المعرفة بالوسائل التي يستطيع الإنسان بها التمييز بين الواقع والوهم، ومعرفة الأشياء في ماهيتها أو بما هي عليه، والتي تعني في النهاية معرفتها في الإلهوية<sup>(٨)</sup> ومعرفة المبدأ المطلق والحقيقة اللامتناهية في أن هو قلب الميتافيزيقا بينما التمييز بين الوجود الكوني والكلي بما فيها الكون الأصغر والكون الأكبر يشبه أطرافه. ولا تهتم الميتافيزيقا بالمبدأ في ذاته فحسب بل بمبادئ العلوم المختلفة للنظام الكوني، بالإضافة إلى الأنثروبولوجيا التراثية وعلم النفس وعلم الجمال الذي يعتمد علي العلم المقدس الذي يحتوي مبادي هذه العلوم، بينما في المقام الأول بمعرفة المبدأ الذي يجمع المعرفة المقدسة ومعرفة المقدس بامتياز، لأن المقدس بما هو لا يزيد عن كونه مبدأ.

والمبدأ هو الحقيقة في تضادها لكل ما يبدو واقعاً، ولكنها ليست حقيقة بالمعنى المطلق، والمبدأ مطلق مقارنة بما هو نسبي، إنه لانهائي في حين كل ما عداه محدود، وواحد وفريد والتجليات متكررة، وجوهر أسمى مقارنة بكل ما هو حادث، إنه الجوهر وكل الأشياء في تراصها صورة، إنه وراء الوجود والوجود في حين أن النظام المتكرر يقارن بالموجودات، هو وحده كائن وكل الأشياء الأخرى في صيرورة، لأنه وحده الأبدي بالمعنى المطلق في حين كل الأشياء بيرانيتها تشارك في التحول، أنه الأصل والغاية أيضاً، والألفا والأوميغا، إنه الفراغ إذا صور العالم

<sup>٨</sup> - . يشكل هذا العنصر قلب كل المذاهب التراثية بينما تتعلق المنهج بوسائل الارتباط بالحقيقة. حول العلاقة بين المذهب والمنهج

M. Pallis, "The Marriage of Wisdom and Method", Studies in Comparative Religion. ١٠٤-٧٨: (١٩٧٢) ٢/٦

بالاكتمال، والاكتمال إذا أدرك النسبي في ضوء فقره الأنطولوجي والعدم الجوهري<sup>(٩)</sup> هذه هي طرائق التحدث عن الحقيقة المطلقة التي يمكن أن تُعرف بالإنسان ولكن ليس بما هو، ولا يُعرف إلا بشمس الذات الإلهية التي تسكن في مركز النفس الإنساني، وكل هذه الطرائق التي تصف المبدأ وتشير إليه لها معني ومؤثرة باعتبارها نقاط إحالة وتدعم معرفة الواقع وهي في جانب ادراكها تنتهي في ما لا يوصف، وهي في هذا الصمت الذي هو "انعكاس" أو "ظل" لجانب غير متجلي لمبدأ يعلو مستوي التجلي، ومن وجهة النظر التوحيدية لا يُنظر إلي المبدأ أو المصدر علي أنه باطن بل ظاهر أيضا<sup>(١٠)</sup>، وليس هو الواحد فحسب بل الحقيقة الجوهرية للتعدد الكائن الذي ما هو إنعكاس للواحد، في قمة هذا الجبل للمعرفة الموحدة حيث تقيم إلا الواحد، وينتهي التمييز بين الواقع وغي الواقع في الوعي بطبيعة لاثنائية للواقع، والوعي في قلب الغنوص والذي لا يمثل المعرفة الإنسانية بل معرفة الله لذاته العلية، والإدراك هو غاية طريق المعرفة وجوهر العلم المقدس<sup>(١١)</sup>.

<sup>٩</sup> - بعض الباحثين المعاصرين مثل بانيكار R. Panikkar (in his Inter-religious Dialogue, New York, 1978) قارن بين شونياتا Shunyata البوذية والبروما Pleroma من الناحية الميتافيزيقية فإن مفهوم الحقيقة المطلقة باعتباره فراغ أو ملاء يكمل كل منهما الآخر مثل رمز بين -يانج ويتجلي كل منهما في كل تراث ، حتي المسيحية حيث تؤكد علي رمزية الامتلاء الإلهي وتطوره بشكل ملحوظ في اللاهوت الفرنسيكاني، خاصة عند القديس بزنافنتورا، وتظهر الرؤية التكميلية للفراغ في تعاليم الدومينكان عند المعلم إيكهارت الذي يتحدث عن "صحراء الربوبية".

١٠ - احد أصعب الآيات التي يصعب فهمها من وجهة النظر الظاهرية حيث يذكر القرآن " هُوَ الْأَوَّلُ وَالْآخِرُ وَالظَّاهِرُ وَالْبَاطِنُ " سورة الحديد آية ٣

<sup>١١</sup> - هذا هو رأي أدفيتا فيداننا Advaita Vedanta في الهندوسية والوحدة المتعالية للموجود (وحدة الوجود) في الصوفية، ولقصر العقل المنفصل عن الاشعة المقدسة للبصيرة يُخطئ بينه ووحدة الوجود.

والحقيقة المطلقة هي مطلق ولا متناه في آن، حيث إن الحقيقة المتناهية ليست مطلق مناسب لاستبعادها بعض مجالات الحقيقة، هذه الحقيقة خير أسمى أو كمال لا ينفصل عن المطلق، والحقيقة وجود في آن مطلق ولامتناه وخيرية أسمى أو كمال، لا يمكن إلا تُحدث للعالم أو الكثرة التي يجب أن تتحقق وإلا سوف تُقصي الحقيقة إمكانات بعينها وليست لامتناهية، يتدفق العالم من لانهاية وخيرية الواقع، لأن الحديث عن الخير حديث عن التجلي والإفاضة أو الخلق، والحديث عن اللانهائي حديث عن كل الإمكانيات بما فيها سلب المبدأ الذي يحرك النهج الكوني في اتجاهه دون السلب تمامًا، لأن النفي التام سوف يكون عدم محض وسذاجة.

والخيرية من وجهة نظر أخرى هي صورة المطلق في اتجاه هذه الإفاضة والتجلي الذي يصنع الهبوط من المبدأ ويشكل العالم، هنا يكمن جذر النسبية وهو لا يزال علي مستوي الألوهية، إنها النسبية في الألوهية أو هكذا يمكن أن تُدعي، باستعمال المفهوم الهندوسي المعروف مايا الإلهية *the Divine maya* (١٢) فالنسبية إمكان لهذه الحقيقة التي هي مطلق ولا متناه في آن، ومن ثم تُحدث هذه الحقيقة أو المطلق هذا التجلي للخير الذي يؤدي في الهبوط الهرمي النازل إلي العالم، والعالم

See Nasr, *Three Muslim Sages*, Cambridge, Mass., 1964, pp. 104-8; also T. Burckhardt, *Introduction to Sufi Doctrine*, pp. 28-30.

12 – See Schuon, *Du Divin a l'humain*, pt. 2, "Ordre divin et universel".

خير مطلق كما أكدت النراثات الرشيدة orthodox المتعددة (١٣)، لأنه يهبط من الخيرية الإلهية، وأداة هذا الهبوط هو انعكاس المطلق علي مستوي هذه النسبية الإلهية، والانعكاس لا يزيد عن كونه لوجوس أسمي، وهو مصدر كل الكمالات الكونية، و"محل" النموذج الأصلي، و"الكلمة" التي صنعت بها كل الأشياء (١٤).

وبما أن العالم أو التخلي أو الخلق يصدر من هذه الحقيقة المطلقة واللا متناهية في آن، والكمال أو الخيرية أقانيم للواقع أو الإلهي يجب أن تنعكس في النظام المتجلي، وتنعكس صفة المطلقية في كل وجود الأشياء، ذلك الوجود الغامض لكل شيء الذي يميزه عن الأشياء الأخرى وعن العدم، وتنعكس اللانهائية في العالم بأنماط متنوعة في الفراغ وهو امتداد غير محدد، وفي الزمن بمدة لا نهاية لها، وفي الشكل يعرض تنوعاً غير متناه، وفي العدد يقوم بكثرة لا متناهية، وفي المادة جوهر قابل يشارك في صور وانقسامات لا نهاية لها. وكما أن الخيرية قدتنعكس علي الكون بالصفة ذاتها التي لا يستغني عنها الوجود إلا أن خسوفها قد يأتي في صور بعينها في عالم التكثر الذي يخفي بقدر الممكن عن القطب المنير والجوهري للتجلي. فالفراغ يحفظ الزمن الي يتحول ويتغير، والصورة تعكس الصفة، والعدد يدل علي الكم اللامتناهي،

١٣ - هذه وجهة نظر المانوية التي تري العالم شر وليس خير، وهذه وجهة نظر بدائية وليست ميتافيزيقية، اي انها لا تبدأ بغاية فهم طبيعة الأشياء بل بتوفير وسيلة للهروب من سجن الوجود المادي، وتمتلك البوذية منظوراً عملياً مشابهاً لكنه بخلفية ميتافيزيقية مختلفة لأنها تتبع عالم روحي مختلف.

١٤ - ينضم الإسلام والهندوسية إلي التراث اليهودي- المسيحي في توكيد أنه بالكلمة صنعت كل الأشياء فيؤكد القرآن " إِنَّمَا أَمْرُهُ إِذَا أَرَادَ شَيْئًا أَنْ يَقُولَ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ" هنا تتحدد صيغة الأمر للفعل كن لتتماثل مع الكلمة أو اللوجوس.

والمادة التي تتميز بجوهرية غير محددة لها شروط للوجود لا في العالم الفيزيقي فحسب بل العوالم عاليه التي تصل في النهاية إلي سماء الألوهية والأقانيم الإلهية للخيرية واللاتناهي والكمال ذواتهم.

وأضف إلي ذلك أن كل الأقانيم الإلهية تنعكس بطريقة بعينها في خمسة شروط للوجود، فالخيرية تنعكس في الفراغ باعتبارها مركز، وفي الزمن باعتبارها لحظة حاضرة، وفي المادة باعتبارها الأرض التي هي مبدأ المادة والطاقة، وفي الصورة باعتبارها مجالاً أكثر كمالاً للصور ومولد لجميع الأشكال الهندسية المعتادة الأخرى المحتوية فيه بالفعل، وفي العدد باعتباره وحدة هي مصدر ومبدأ لكل الأرقام. وينعكس اللانهائي في الفراغ كامتداد لا يعرف نظرياً أي قيد، وفي الزمن باعتباره مدة ليس لها نهاية منطقية، وفي المادة باعتباره عدم تحديد للجوهرية المادية، وفي الصورة باعتباره إمكان غير محدد للتنوع، وفي العدد لا محدودية في الكم. وأما الكمال ينعكس في الفراغ باعتباره محتويات أو موضوعات في الفراغ تعكس الصفات الإلهية و أيضاً وجود محض كما يقول الصوفية "نفس الرحمن"، وفي الفراغ مثل الزمن باعتباره أشكال وأحداث تمتلك صفات، وفي الصورة باعتباره جمال، وفي العدد باعتباره جانب كمي لعدد يرتبط دوماً بأشكال هندسية مرتبطة عادة بفكرة الرقم الفيثاغوري. يرى العلم المقدس هذه الجوانب من الوجود الكوني على أنها انعكاسات على المستوى أو المستويات المتعددة من مظاهر أقانيم المطلق واللامتناهي والخيرية التي تميز الواقع بما هو. كما يرى أن كل حالة من شروط الوجود هذه تعكس بشكل مباشر جانباً من جوانب الألوهية: المادة والطاقة والجوهر الإلهي وصورة اللوجوس ، وعدد الوحدة الإلهية التي لا تتضب ، والفراغ امتداد لانهائي للتجلي الإلهي، والزمن إيقاعات لدورات

الوجود الكلية التي تلمح إلي التراثات الإبراهيمية مروراً فيما يتعلق باللاهوتيات الرسمية والصورية والتي تبرزها الهندوسية ، مشيرة إليها على أنها أيام وليالي في حياة براهما.

ونظراً لأن الميتافيزيقيا باعتبارها قد طورت في الغرب فقد ارتبطت دوماً بالأنطولوجيا، ومن الجدير هنا أن نتوقف وناقش علاقة الوجود بالمبدأ أو الحقيقة المطلقة. وإذا صور الوجود على أنه مبدأ الوجود أو كل ما هو موجود ، فلا يمكن مماثلته بالمبدأ بما هو ، لأن المبدأ لا يستنفد بجانبه المخلوق، والموجود هو أول تحديد للمبدأ الأسمى في اتجاه التجلي ، وتبقى الأنطولوجيا جزءاً فحسب من الميتافيزيقيا وهي غير مكتملة طالما صور المبدأ فحسب على أنه الموجود بالمعنى المحدد، ولكن إذا استخدم الموجود لاحتضان وإدراج معنى المطلقية واللانهائية ، فيمكن أن يعني الموجود الأسمى أو الحقيقة وراء الموجود والموجود باعتباره أول تحديد له، حتى لو استخدم اصطلاح الموجود فحسب. ويبدو أن هذا هو الحال مع الكينونة esse كما استخدمها بعض الإسكولائيين وأيضاً الوجد في بعض مدارس التجلي والفلسفة الإسلامية (١٥).

<sup>١٥</sup> - يمكن للمرء أن يفسر الميتافيزيقيا التوماوية التي تبدأ وتنتهي بالكينونة علي أنها تتضمن فكرة الحقيقة بمعناها غير المشروط وغير المحدد تماماً مع أن الاصطلاح يكتمل باصطلاح الإيمان ليدل علي كلية الإيمان للمبدء الإلهي، ومن وجهة النظر هذه ، يمكن للمرء أن يؤكد أنه رغم أن نظرية المعرفة الحسية لتوما قد انتقدت في وقت سابق بسبب إنكارها لإمكانية الحدس البصيري ، فإن التوماوية تتطوي في محتواها العقائدي حقائق ذات طبيعة ميتافيزيقية حقيقية تعكس معرفة النظام الأساسي، والتي يمكن أن تكون بمثابة دعم للتأمل الميتافيزيقي. وفي الإسلام تتحدث شخصية مثل صدر الدين الشيرازي عن الوجود، بطريقة تجعله مطابقاً مع المبدء الأسمى بعيداً عن حتميته الأولي، والاسم الأسمى للإله في الإسلام، أعني، الله، يتضمن الوجود وما وراء الوجود، الإله الشخصي والحقيقة المطلقة واللامتناهية، الإله والرؤية للمعلم إيكهارت.



والتمييز بين الوجود الإلهي Being والوجود الإنساني being، والوجود الإلهي والوجود existence، والوجود والماهية essence أو اللب quiddity، والعلاقة بين اللب أو الماهية والوجود في الموجودات تكمن في قلب الفلسفة المسيحية واليهودية والإسلامية في العصر الوسيط، ونوقشت في أعمال عدة من أعمال الفكر الوسيط، ومن وجهة النظر العلم المقدس إن ما يتسبب في جعل هذا الطريق العميق المتصور للحقيقة غير مفهوم ومرفوض للغرب هو فقدان الحس البصري الذي دمر الإحساس بسر الوجود، واختزال موضوع الفلسفة من دراسة فعل الوجود esto إلي الموجود ens، وبالتالي اختزال الحقيقة تدريجياً إلي (هو وهي لغير العاقل it) منفصلاً عن عالم الروح وجلال الموجود الإلهي الذي يدعم الإفاضة المستمرة للعالم الذي يبدو للحواس بأنه يمتلك وجوداً "أفقياً" مستمراً منفصلاً عن العلة "الرأسية" أو الموجود الإلهي في حد ذاته، لم تنته الفلسفة الإسلامية عند هذا المأزق الذي يميز دراسة الأنطولوجيا في الفلسفة الغربية بسبب إصرارها على دراسة الموجود الإلهي وفعله بدلاً من الموجودات، واقتران هذه الفلسفة عند السهروردي ومن اتبعوه في التجربة الروحية التي جعلت من تجربة الموجود الإلهي ليس إمكان فحسب بل مصدرًا لكل التأملات الفلسفية المتعلقة بمفهوم وحقيقة الموجود الإنساني<sup>(١٦)</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> - See the introduction of Corbin to Sadr al-Din Shirazi, *Le Livre des penetrations metaphysicfues*, Tehran-Paris, 1964, where he contrasts the destiny of ontology in the Islamic world ending with Sabziwari and his like and in the West terminating with Heidegger, showing the chasm which distinguishes the Islamic theosophical and philosophical schools from Existenz philosophy. See also Izutsu,

إن الحقيقة المطلقة التي هي موجود أسمى ومتعال وجوهر في آن، فهي وراء كل شيء، وفي قلب النفس الإنسانية ومركزها، ويمكن تفسير العلم المقدس من منظور لغة أو أخرى، فيمكن أن نتحدث عن الإله أو الألوهة والله والطاو أو حتي نيرفانا باعتباره وراء وجودًا وراء الوجود أو صور أو سامسارا حيث التوكيد بأن نيرفانا هي سامسارا وسامسارا هي نيرفانا، ويمكن الحديث عن الذات الأسمى لآتمان مقرونا بكل تموضع بأنه مايا. ويمكن النظر إلى الحقيقة المطلقة على أنها الموضوع الأسمى والذات الأكثر جوهرية ، لأن الإله متعالٍ وجوهري ، ولكن لا يمكن تجربته على أنه جوهري إلا بعد أن يُجرب باعتباره متعالٍ، فالإله فحسب باعتباره موجودًا إلهيًا يمكنه أن يسمح للإنسان أن يختبر الإلوهة باعتباره موجودًا أسمى. إن المعرفة التوحيدية التي لا ترى العالم إبداعًا منفصلاً بل تجليًا موحدًا برموز وشعاع وجود فعلي لمصدر لا ينفي جلال التعالي على الإطلاق. ولا يمكن رؤية جمال القرب من الألوهية دون هذا الجلال، أو نعي تمامًا الميتافيزيقا المتكاملة للضرورة علي مستواها للصيغ اللاهوتية التي تصر علي الهوية بين الإله والإنسان أو الخالق والعالم، وتترك المعرفة الميتافيزيقية للوحدة المعرفة اللاهوتية بجانبها المجازي والحرفي، والعكس ليس صحيحًا، ولهذا السبب الوصول إلى تلك المعرفة الموحدة مشبع برائحة القداسة التي تقوي دومًا أسس الدين التي يهتم بها اللاهوت الرسمي المعني ، في حين أن دراسة اللاهوت الرسمي لا يمكن أن تؤدي أبدًا إلى العلم المقدس الذي ينتمي ببساطة إلى بُعد آخر، ويعتمد على جانب آخر من عمل العقل على المستوى البشري.

---

The Concept and Reality of Existence; and Nasr, "Mulla Sadra and the Doctrine of the Unity of Being," Philosophical Forum, December 1973, pp. 153-61.

ولا تميز الميتافيزيقا بين الحقيقي والظاهري والموجود الإلهي والصوررة فحسب بل درجات الوجود أيضا، والطبيعة الهرمية للحقيقة هي تأكيد كلي لكل التراثات، وهي جزء لا يتجزأ من الممارسات الدينية وكذلك معتقداتها، سواء تصورناها باصطلاحات مستضيفين متنوعين أم أوامر ملائكة كما هو موصوف في الهرميات السماوية المشهورة لديونيسيوس أو مستويات النور والظلمة في المدارس الإسلامية الباطنية، أم أوامر عدة للآلهة والتيتان الجبابرة كما هو الحال في الأديان ذات البنية الأسطورية مثل الهندوسية، وحتى في البوذية التي تنظر إلى المبدأ الأسمى باعتباره الخلاء أو الفراغ بديلاً عن الملاء فقد صُورت العوالم الوسيطة الفسيحة بقوة وجمال ملحوظين في كل من النصوص الكونية البوذية والفن البوذي. والتركيز على البنية الهرمية للحقيقة في المذاهب التراثية كبير للغاية، لدرجة أن إحدى القوائد الفارسية الشهيرة تنص على أن من لا يقبل البنية الهرمية للوجود هو كافر (زنديق). والعلم المقدس الذي يهتم بطبيعة الحقيقة هنا يتميز عن اللاهوت كما يفهم عادةً، والذي يمكن أن يظل راضياً بما يُهم الإنسان بشكل مباشر، ونظرة أبسط للحقيقة تستند على الإله والإنسان دون التوكيد على هرمية الوجود، رغم أن مدارس عديدة في اللاهوت لم تفشل في أن تأخذ بعين الاعتبار الوجود، إن لم يكن الدلالة الكاملة للمستويات الوسيطة للحقيقة فيها<sup>(١٧)</sup>.

ولا يمكن فهم العلاقة بين المستويات المتنوعة للحقيقة أو الهرمية للوجود بشكل كامل دون الأخذ بعين الاعتبار فكرة مهمة أخرى توجد بطريقة أو بأخرى في جميع التعبيرات الكاملة للعلم المقدس، وهذا الفكرة هي وجود

<sup>١٧</sup> - في الإسلام، تتميز المدرسة اللاهوتية المنتشرة مثل الأشعرية برفضها لتسلسل الوجود بما يتفق مع وجهة نظرها الذرية والطوعية.

الضرورة الذي يتناقض مع فكرة الإمكان. و التمييز بين الضرورة والإمكان هو حجر الزاوية في فلسفة ابن سينا الذي أطلق عليه "فيلسوف الوجود" وأب الأنطولوجيا في العصور الوسطى<sup>(١٨)</sup> إلا أن دلالة هذين الإصطلاحين هي نسق ميتافيزيقي بحت، ولا يمكن حصرها في المجال الفلسفي، حتى لو كانت فلسفة تراثية، إنها ثمرة بصيرة لا مباحكة عقلية لمعتقدات فلسفة تراثية تتحجب في زي حدس قياسي ذات طبيعة ميتافيزيقية بحتة، وإن وجود مفاهيم الضرورة والإمكان في كل من المذاهب الهندوسية والشرق الأقصى يشير في الواقع إلى حقائق لنسق كلي لا يقتصر على الإطلاق على نمط بعينه من العرض أو مدرسة للميتافيزيقا.

وقد تتعارض الضرورة مع الإمكان إذا فهم معني الإمكان بكامله، فسوف يُرى أنه مكملًا للضرورة من ناحية، ويعارضها في أحد معانيها فحسب، وجذر الإمكان مرتبط بالأرجحية وأيضًا "الافتقار"، وتشتق الكلمات الثلاثة من ممكن posse التي تعني " أن تكون قادرًا علي ". ولالإمكان معنيان: الأول صفة أو طابع شيء يمكن أن يوجد أو لا يوجد، والثاني صفة أو طابع شيء لديه القدرة والقوة ليؤدي الفعل أو ينفذه، والمعني الأول كيانات الأشياء الممكنة أو المشروطة، موضوع يمكن أن يوجد أو لا يوجد، ولا يوجد تناقض منطقي أو ميتافيزيقي سواء أقلنا يوجد

<sup>18</sup> – On this question see Nasr, An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines, chap. 12, "The Anatomy of Being." In Arabic "necessity" is wujub and "possibility" imkdn, which in the context of Avicennan ontology we translate as "contingency."

<sup>19</sup>. On the immutable essences see T. Burckhardt, Introduction to Sufi Doctrine, pp. 62-64.

حصان أم لا، وفي هذا المعني إلا المستوي الأعلى نموذج أولي أو ما تطلق عليه الميتافيزيقا الإسلامية الكيان الثابت أو "الجواهر الثابتة" (19) فهي موجودات ممكنة إلا أن الله موجود ضرورة، وهذا المعني للاصطلاح يتعارض فيه الإمكان مع الضرورة، في حين أن الأشياء الموجودة وجودها يصبح ضرورة لا من خلال جوهرها بل بضرورة الموجود الإلهي الذي هو وحده ضرورة بذاته، ولهذا السبب استخدمت لغة الفلسفة الإسلامية اصطلاح الواجب بغيره وهو حرفياً " ما تقوم ضرورته بغيره " و'الغير' حتماً موجود إلهي ضروري".

والمعني الثاني للإمكان باعتباره قوة لا يتعارض مع الضرورة بل مكملاً لها فيما يتعلق بالمبدء، فالله ضرورة مطلقة وإمكان لامتناهي، وتنعكس القدرة الكلية لله فيما ينسب للقدير في القرآن، ومعني الإمكان بالضبط في المعني الثاني، وكل ما يحدث في العالم وفقاً للمشيئة الله بل يتفق مع الإمكان الإلهي ، فالله لا يريد ما هو ليس إمكاناً في هذا المعني لأنه ينفي طبيعته، ومهما كانت الإدعاءات العمياء التي قد تضعها الإرادية الدينية، فالقدرة الكلية لله لا يمكن أن تتعارض مع طبيعته، وحين يقول الإنجيل " مع الله كل شيء ممكن" يشير بالتحديد إلي إمكان الله اللامحدود.

وكل عالم يظهر للوجود متوافق مع الإمكان الإلهي ، ويكتسب الوجود من الإرادة الإلهية التي تعمل علي مستويات مختلفة، وتظهر أحياناً

19 – On the immutable essences see T. Burckhardt, Introduction to Sufi Doctrine, pp. 62-64.

متناقضة لعيون المخلوق الدنيوي، ولكن لا يوجد أي شيء اعتباطاً لما يريد الله، فحكيمته تكمل إرادته، وتبقي طبيعته غير منتهكة.

بقدر ما يتعلق الأمر بالضرورة يمكن أن يُقال رغم ان فلاسفة العصر الوسيط قد أطلقوا علي الوجود الإلهي المحض الوجود الضروري، فإنه الحديث الدقيق فحسب عن ما وراء الوجود أو الحقيقة المطلقة هو ضرورة في ذاته، وضرورة باعتبار ذاته، الوجود الإلهي ضرورة مقابلة للعالم، ولذا قد يعد مشروعاً من وجهة نظر العالم أو التكثر باعتباره وجود إلهي ضروري، وقد يعتبر الوجود الإلهي إمكان بما هو ، يجب تمييزه عن الإمكانات التي لها صفات الوجود الإلهي، وتمتلك هذه الصفات مظهرين: فهي شرط أو إمكان في علاقة بالمبدء أو الجوهر، أي أنها قد توجد أو لا توجد، وهي ضرورة في محتواها، وكذلك تشارك في ضرورة الجوهر، وبالنظر إلي هذين المظهرين يمكن للمرء أن يري أن هناك نوعين من الإمكانات: تلك التي تعكس الضرورة، والتي تعكس الاحتمال، الصنف الأول يُولد الأشياء التي توجد ، والثاني تلك التي لا يمكن أن توجد.

يمنح الله الوجود الإمكانات التي هي انعكاسات عدة وصدي للوجود الإلهي، ومن نفث هذا الوجود على جواهر الإمكانات التي تولد عدد لا يحصى من العوالم. تلك النسبية الإلهية أو مايا، كما تُسقط علي العدم وتبعد عن المصدر ، تنتج طرائق وارتكاسات تخص هذه الإمكانات التي يكون مصدرها هو الانعكاس الإيجابي والارتكاس ، واستقطاب الضوء وإلقاء الظلال ، واللوجوس المنير والديمورج المظلم. إن الوجود الإلهي باعتباره إمكان في ذاته هو الحجاب الأسمى للحقيقة التي في حد ذاته

ليست لامتناهية فحسب بل مطلقة أيضاً ، هي الجوهر الذي يفوق كل تحديد (٢٠)

إن الحديث عن الحجاب يعني الاهتمام بأحد المفاهيم الأساسية التي يهتم بها العلم المقدس، وهو مفهوم لم يتأكد في المذاهب الميتافيزيقية الغربية مثل الشرق، رغم ذكره من شخصيات مثل إيكهارت وسيليسوس الذين يلمحون إلى النسبية الإلهية ، ويدركون دلالاته لفهم كيف يُعثر علي الجذور ومبادئ التجليات في المبدأ نفسه، ولا يزيد الحجاب عن ما يسميه الهندوس مايا والصوفية حجاب. والحقيقة أن مايا أصبحت الآن عمليا كلمة إنجليزية تشير إلى ضرورة التعامل مع مثل هذا المفهوم في عرض المذاهب التراثية، لعدم وجود اصطلاح مناسب في اللغة الإنجليزية لنقل كل ما تعنيه مايا.

عادة ما نترجم مايا علي أنها وهم، ومن وجهة نظر لاثنائية أو توحيدية Advaitist مايا هي وهم، وآتمان فحسب الذات الأسمى والوجود الحقيقي، ولكن مايا خلقة أيضاً و"مغازلة إلهية" (ليلة)، وهي علي المستوي المبدئي نسبية ومصدر الانفصال والتخارج والتموضع. إنها ميل نحو العدم الذي يجلب التجلي للوجود، العدم الذي لا يُبلغ بل الذي

<sup>20</sup> – "Nous pouvons discerner [dans l'absolument Reel] une tridimensionalite, elle aussi intrins^quement indifferenciee mais annonciatrice d'un deployment possible: ces dimensions sont l'Etre', la 'Conscience', la 'Felicite'. C'est en vertu du troisieme element—immuable en soi—que la Possibility divine deborde et donne bien, 'par amour', a ce mystere d'exteriorisation qu'est le Voile universel, dont la chaine est faite des mondes, et la traine, des etres." Schuon, "Le probleme de la possibility," in Du Divin a l'humain

تتضمنه الحركة الكونية بعيداً عن المبدأ، واللانهائية لا تتضمن إمكان الانفصال والتقسيم والتخارج الذي يميز ما هو دون المبدأ<sup>(٢١)</sup>، إن مايا حجاب أسمى وكشف في آن<sup>(٢٢)</sup> والإله لكونه خير لا يمكن إلا أن تشع خيريته، وهذا الميل نحو الشعاع أو التجلي يتضمن الحركة بعيداً عن المصدر الذي يميز المستويات الكونية وحتى ما بعد الكونية للحقيقة بعيداً عن المصدر الذي هو وحده الحقيقي علي الإطلاق. ومايا تشبه بالتقريب الرحمة الإسلامية والرحمة الإلهية "نفس breath" موجودات العالم، الجوهر الفعلي لوجود العالم "نفس الرحمن"<sup>(٢٣)</sup> وبالطريقة نفسها يمكن للمرء أن يطلق علي مايا نفس آتمان، فخلق العالم في الهندوسية أو خلع حجاب مايا علي الذات المطلقة أو آتمان يُعبر به عن "مغازلة الإلهية"، بينما هذا التخارج بالنسبة للإسلام لا يزيد عن كونه نشاطاً لمايا، ويُصور باعتباره حب الله ليكون "معروفاً"، وأصل العالم وحي الله لذاته وفقاً للحديث النبوي المعروف "كنت كنزاً لا أعرف، فأحببت أن أعرف فخلقت خلقاً فعرفتهم بي فعرفوني"<sup>(٢٤)</sup>.

<sup>٢١</sup> - التي تشير إليه الميتافيزيقا الإسلامية ب"ما شاء الله" وحرفياً "كل ما هو دون الله".

<sup>٢٢</sup> - "تشبه مايا قماش سحري منسوج من سدي محجوبة ولحمة كاشفة"

Schuon, "Atma-Maya," p. 89. On the metaphysical significance of maya as both veil and principle of relativization and manifestation of the Absolute see, besides this article, the chap. "Maya" in Schuon's Light on the Ancient Worlds, pp. 89-98.

<sup>٢٣</sup> - حول نفس الرحمن أنظر

On the Breath of the Compassionate see Ibn al-'Arabi, The Bezels of Wisdom, trans. R. W. J. Austin, New York, 1980, "The Wisdom of Leadership in the Word of Aaron", pp. 241ff. Also Nasr, Science and Civilization in Islam, chap. 13.

<sup>٢٤</sup> - يسمى حديث الكنز المخفي



يتصور اللاهوت الرسمي الله والعالم أو الخالق والمخلوق بطريقة متميزة و "مطلقة" تمامًا، وبالتالي فهو غير قادر على تقديم إجابات لبعض الأسئلة الأساسية فكريا، وهي أسئلة لا يمكن التعامل معها إلا من منظور العلم المقدس و عقيدة مايا أو الحجاب الذي يتضمن بأعلى مستوى له، هو إدخال النسبية في المستوى المبدئي دون الوصول إلى مستوى المطلق الذي يظل فوق كل ثنائية ونسبية. ونظرًا لوجود عالم نسبي، يجب أن توجد جذور هذا العالم في النسق المبدئي ذاته، وهذا الجذر لا يزيد عن كونه مايا الإلهية التي تحجب وتجلي الواحد على جميع مستويات الحقيقة، فهي الأنثوية ومريم وحواء في آن، ويصدر الشر من النشاط التخارجي لمايا، لكن الوجود الذي يظل نقيًا وخيرًا يسود على الشر في النهاية، لأن حواء قد عُفِر لها خطاياها بالحصانة الروحية وانتصار مريم.

تعمل مايا من خلال الإشعاع والصدى أو الانعكاس ، حيث تقوم أولاً بإعداد الأساس أو مستوى التجلي، ثم يتجلي كل من الإشعاع والصدى اللذين يحدثان على هذا المستوى، وباستخدام صورة شوان Schuon<sup>(٢٥)</sup> إذا تصورنا نقطة ترمز إلى المطلق أو الجوهر الأسمى ، فإن نصف القطر يرمز إلى الإشعاع ، ومحيط انعكاس أو ارتداد المركز ومنطقة الدائرة بأكملها، الوجود ذاته<sup>(٢٦)</sup> أو مستوى بعينه منه تكرر فيه مايا فعلها. ومايا هي مصدر كل ثنائية حتى على المستوى المبدئي فقد

<sup>٢٥</sup> - أنظر "مايا وآتمان"

<sup>٢٦</sup> - إن كان الأمر يتعلق بالميتافيزيقا الإسلامية فإنه تُسمى الصدي "الفيض الأقدس" والشعاع "الفيض المقدس" فالأول نموذج لكل الأشياء "الاعيان الثابتة" والثاني نفس الرحمن الذي يوجد ويخرجه علي مستويات متنوعة للحقيقة.

تحدث التمييز بين الجوهر والصفات، و إنها أيضاً مصدر الثنائية بين الذات والموضوع حتى على أعلى مستوى لا يوجد بعده إلا الواحد، الذي فيه العارف والمعروف، أو الذات والموضوع واحد. لكن مايا لا تظل مقيدة بالمستوى المبدئي وحده، إنها تصور نفسها بنفسها من خلال مستويات مختلفة من الوجود الكوني الذي يسميها الحديث السبعين ألف حجاب من النور والظلام، والتي يمكن تلخيصها بثلاثة مستويات أساسية وهي الوجود الملائكي والحيوي والطبيعي.

وهناك تجلي أو انعكاس للجوهر الأسمي أو عمل لمايا على كل مستوى ، فعلى سبيل المثال ، على المستوى المادي أو الطبيعي، انعكاس الجوهر هو الأثير وهو الدعم غير المرئي وأصل العناصر الطبيعية. وارتداد مايا هو مادة وطاقتها إشعاع. وأضف إلي ذلك ، إتجاهين رئيسين لمايا ، وهما الحفظ والتحول ، يترجمان أنفسهما في المكان والزمان في هذا العالم وعديد من العوالم والدورات التي تحول هذه العوالم على المستوى الكوني. وهناك يقيناً هوة هائلة تفصل بين عوالم مختلفة وعدم قابلية شبه كاملة للقياس بين العالم الحي والعالم المادي وأيضاً بين العالم الملائكي أو الروحي والحيوي. وتظل ماياهي مايا من خلال كل هذه المستويات، لكونها تكشف عن الحقيقي وتحجبه في آنٍ ، وهي في حد ذاتها الوسيط والبرزخ بين اللامتناهي والمتناهي.

إن مايا في جانبها الوهمي هي أيضاً سبب استحالة شمول الحقيقة في نظام مغلق للفكر يُميز الفلسفة الدنيوية، والمطلق هو دليل قاطع أو شيء غير مفهوم لمن لا يمتلكون العين أو الحدس لاستيعابه من الناحية التصويرية. علي أية حال ، لا يمكن استخدام المماحكة العقلية التي

تنتهي إلى عالم النسبية لإثبات أو إدراك المطلق الذي يظل بعيداً عن متناول جميع محاولات النسبية لفهمه. لكن الذكاء يمكن أن يعرف المطلق، وفي الحقيقة المطلق وحده هو المعقول تماماً، ودون هذا المستوى يدخل نشاط مايا حيز التنفيذ، ويحدث عنصراً من الغموض وعدم اليقين. وإذا كان هناك شيء مثل النسبية البحتة فسوف يكون ذلك غير معقولاً تماماً، بل حتى في العالم النسبي الذي لا يزال يحمل طابع المطلق، فإن عنصر الغموض وعدم المعقولية لمايا يدخل في كل نشاط عقلي قد يسعى إلى تجاوز وظيفته المشروعة، ويحاول اصطيد المطلق بنظام محدد للفكر يعتمد على المماحكة العقلية<sup>(٢٧)</sup>. ولا يمكن للفكر البشري كنشاط عقلي أن يصبح مطابقاً تماماً للواقع كنتيجة لمايا، في حين أن المعرفة المباشرة أو البصيرة لهما هذه القدرة. إن وعاء مدارس الفلسفة الحديثة التي لا حصر لها وفشلها في تحقيق مهمة شمول الواقع من خلال نهج الفكر الإنساني البحث ناتجة عن قوة مايا التي تمارس تعويذتها الوهمية على أولئك الذين ينكرون حقيقتها.

وترتبط مسألة الشر ومدلولها بعقيدة مايا في ضوء الخيرية المطلقة للأصل والمصدر، وتقع المسألة في قلب مشكلة التآله theodicy كما نوقشت في العالم الإبراهيمي علي مر العصور، تلك المشكلة التي تعني كيف يكون الله كلي القدرة وخير ويخلق عالم يحتوي الشر، وهي معضلة غير قابلة للحل علي المستوي اللاهوتي الرسمي والفلسفة العقلانية، ولا يمكن أن نعثر علي حل لها إلا من خلال الميتافيزيقا أو العلم المقدس،

<sup>٢٧</sup> - "تضمن الرغبة في الحقيقة الكلية في التفسير الشامل والحصري يجلب معه اختلال توازن مستمر يسبب

تدخل مايا"

الذي تسبب خسوفه في فقدان رجال كثيرين إيمانهم بالدين، بسبب عجزهم للوصول لعقيدة من شأنها أن تحل هذا التناقض الظاهري. ومن وجهة النظر المينافيزيقية ، ليس هناك مسألة قدرة الله الكلية فحسب ، بل هناك الطبيعة الإلهية التي لا يمكن أن تتعارض معها الإرادة الإلهية أيضاً، فلا تكف إرادة الله أن يكون هو الله. وهذه الطبيعة الإلهية لا تقتصر على الموجود الإلهي، كما ذكرنا سابقاً، فهو الحقيقة المطلقة واللامتناهية التي وراء الموجود الإلهي أو الموجود الأسمى الذي يكون الموجود الإلهي فيه هو أول تحديد في اتجاه التجلي أو الخلق.

إن الطبيعة الإلهية أو الحقيقة المطلقة لا متناهية وخير معاً، وبالتالي تريد أن تشع وتُجلي ذاتها، و من هذا الإشعاع تصدر حالات الوجود والعوالم المتعددة ، ومن الانفصال والتمدد من المصدر الذي ينتج عنه ما يتجلى في ذاته باعتباره شر على مستوى بعينه من الحقيقة . وإن الحديث عن اللامتناهي هو حديث عن إمكان نفي المصدر في اتجاه العدم ، ومن ثم الشر الذي قد يسميه المرء "تبلور أو وجود العدم". بما أن الله وحده - الذي هو ما وراء الوجود والوجود - هو الخير ، كما تؤكد الأناجيل، فإن كل ما هو غير الله يشارك في عنصر الحرمان الذي هو مصدر الشر. وإرادة الله باعتبارها ربوبية أو ما وراء الوجود هي إدراك للإمكانات الكامنة في اللامتناهي، وكذلك هذا الانفصال عن المصدر الذي ينطوي على الشر. ولكون التجلي إمكان للحقيقة اللامتناهية ، فإن وجود العالم في حد ذاته ليس شراً، ولا يظهر عنصر الشر في أي من العوالم التي لا تزال قريبة من القرب الإلهي (٢٨) وتعمل إرادة الله باعتباره

٢٨ - إن العقيدة القرآنية بأن إبليس كان جنًا ومخلوقًا من نار تدل على أن وجود الشر لا يُشعر به على المستوى الكوني حتى يصل النزول إلى عالم الأرواح.

موجودًا في الشعاع والصدى الذي تسببه مايا، وطبيعة تلك الحقيقة اللامتناهية وهي الموجود الأسمي. وتتعارض إرادة الله على هذا المستوى مع الأشكال الملموسة للشر وفقًا للمعايير التي حددها الوحي المتنوع، وفي ضوء الخير الكلي دومًا، ووفقًا لتدبير نمط حياة تراثي بعينه. وتعارض إرادة الله على هذا المستوى أنواعًا متباينة من الشر دون موجود قادر على ان يجتث الوجود بما هو ، والذي قد يصل إلى حد نفي الطبيعة الإلهية ذاتها، وهناك مستويان للحقيقة مستويان من عملية الإرادة الإلهية أو حتى إثنين من الإرادة الإلهية، الأول يتعلق بالحقيقة المطلقة واللامتناهية، والتي لا يمكنه إلا أن يتجلي فيها ويخلق، وبالتالي يظهر الانفصال والتمدد والحرمان على أنه شر. والثاني يتعلق بإرادة الموجود الإلهي التي تعارض وجود الشر وفقًا للشرائع والمعايير الإلهية التي تشكل البنية الأخلاقية لمختلف العوالم التراثية.

ولا يعني ربط الشر بتلك الحقيقة التي هي كل الإمكان إنكار حقيقة الشر علي مستوي بعينه للحقيقة، إن وجود الشر لا ينفصل عن المستوي النسبي الذي يتجلي فيه، ولا يمكن للمرء أن يقول ببساطة أن الشر لا يوجد كما يفعل حتي بعض أساتذة العرفان التراثيون، الذين يحملون بثبات علي الخير الغامر للمبدء الإلهي، أعني، أنهم يتحايلون علس

الشر ويمررونه (٢٩) لكن هذا بالطبع ليس هذا حال جميع الحكماء التراثيون ، الذين قدم كثير منهم المفتاح الميتافيزيقي لفهم الشر. ورغم أن الشر من وجهة نظر العلم المقدس حقيقياً على المستوى النسبي للحقيقة ، إلا أن الشر ليس له حقيقة كجوهر وفي حد ذاته كشيء أو موضوع، فالشر دوماً تشدر أو تجزئ، ويجب أن يكون موجوداً بسبب الفجوة الأنطولوجية بين المبدأ والتجلي، ولكنه يظل دوماً محدوداً ومقيداً بينما الخير غير محدود وينفتح على اللانهائي. وبقدر ما يتعلق الأمر أيضاً بمشيئة الله ، فالله لا يشاء الشر لا باعتباره شرّاً بل كجزء من خير أكبر تساهم فيه هذا الحقيقة المجزأة التي تُدعى الشر. ولهذا السبب الشر ليس شرّاً أبداً في جوهره الوجودي بل بالحرمان من الخير الذي يلعب دوراً في الاقتصاد الكلي للكون ويساهم في خير أكبر. كل اختلال واضطراب له طبيعة جزئية وعابرة تساهم في ذلك التوازن التام والانسجام والنظام الذي هو الكون (٣٠).

إن عقيدة مايا أو حجاب تمكنا من فهم الجذور الميتافيزيكية لما يبدو أنه شر، حيث تفسر هذه العقيدة الشر باعتباره حرمان أو انفصال عن

٢٩ - كما تعمل البصيرة في الإنسان فهي لا تبدأ بمعرفة العالم بل بمعرفة قبلية للخير الإلهي الذي تتركه قبل أن تُقبل على فهم الشر، ولهذا السبب انقاد بعض الميتافيزيقيين نحو البصيرة ليفهموا مباشرة الخير في ذاته وليس لديهم رغبة لفهم الشر، ويمررونه كما لو كان لا يوجد، هناك بالطبع أيضاً الجانب التجريبي الذي يجب مراعاته. وقد يقال إن القديس الذي دمر الشر ليس في العالم بأسره ولكن حول نفسه يتنفس بالفعل في فضاء الجنة، وبالتالي يكون غافلاً عن شرور الوجود الأرضي التي لا توجد على هذا النحو بالنسبة له. يمكن العثور على هذا الموقف بين بعض الصوفييين العظام الذين يؤكدون أن الشر ببساطة لا وجود له دون عناء تقديم الدليل الميتافيزيقي على ما يعنيه المرء بمثل هذا البيان، وينطحنوا في وجهة نظر يمكن للمرء أن يقول فيها أن الشر غير موجود .

٣٠ - تعني كلمة الكون Cosmos حرفياً في اليونانية "النظام"، ونقيض الكون العدم أو الخلاء.

الخير أو أنه عنصر يساهم في خير أكبر، رغم أن الشر في محيط بعينه أو مستوي الوجود يظل شرًا نتيجة الحرمان أو الإفراط. وإذا فُهمت هذه العقيدة بكاملها، فبالمقدور فهم معنى الشر بما هو، لكن حتى في هذه الحالة ليس من المستحيل علي الإنسان أن يفهم مثل هذا الشر أو ذلك ، فوجود الله كلي ومعقول تمامًا، على أية حال ، رغم أن الإرادة الإلهية تشاء كل شيء موجود حتى ما يبدو شريرًا، بقدر ما يتعلق الأمر بالإنسان وهو ذكي وله إرادة حرة ، فإن الله يشاء الخير للإنسان فحسب، وأفضل طريقة لحل مسألة الشر والتأله هي أن نعيش حياة تجعل من الممكن تحقيق العلم المقدس في وجود المرء. وهذا الإدراك أو التطبيق هو أفضل طريقة ممكنة لفهم طبيعة الخير، وكيف أن الوجود البشري الأرضي الذي يستبعد عن الله ، لا يمكن إلا أن يشوبه التفتت والتشتت والحرمان الذي يبدو شرًا. وهذه حقيقة مستوي الحقيقة التي تتجلى فيه. وكيف الشر عن الوجود علي المستوي الأعلى ، حيث تساهم الاضطرابات العابرة والجزئية في نظام أكبر وحرمان لتحقيق خير أكبر.

وترتبط مسألة الخير والشر ارتباطًا وثيقًا بمسألة الإرادة الحرة والحتمية التي شغلت أيضًا الفلاسفة واللاهوتيين في العالم الإبراهيمي على مر العصور، وذات أهمية مركزية في المناخات التراثية الأخرى مثل الهند كما يتضح من مناقشة الفعل القويم في بهاجاداجيتا Bhagavad-Gita. ولا يوجد في هذه المسألة إمكان لتجاوز الثنائية طالما بقي المرء على مستوى اللاهوت الرسمي أو الفلسفة العقلانية كما شهدت قرون من النقاشات بين اللاهوتيين والفلاسفة في اليهودية والمسيحية والإسلام. ويبدو الجدل بأكمله من وجهة النظر الميتافيزيقية عقيمًا ومتشذرًا، حيث إن كلا الجانبين ينسب صفة المطلقة إلى ما هو نسبي، أعني، إلي

المستوى البشري. والحقيقة المطلقة من الناحية الميتافيزيقية ضرورة مطلقة وحرية محضة في آن. والله وحده هو ضرورة وحر تمامًا، لكونه مطلقاً ولا متناهيًا، ونحن بالفعل على مستوى النسبية على المستوى البشري ، وبالتالي لا يمكن أن يكون هناك حتمية أو إرادة حرة مطلقة. وشيء من الاثنين يجب أن يُجلي ذاته على مستوى النسبية البشرية، إن كان هناك شرط واحد فحسب من هذين الشرطين موجودًا، فلن يكون مستوى النسبية نسبيًا بل مطلق، فحرية الإنسان حقيقية مثله. وهو لم يعد حرًا بمعنى الاستقلال عن الإرادة الإلهية ، لدرجة أنه لم يعد منفصلاً أنطولوجيا عن الله. وفي الوقت نفسه يكون الإنسان مجبورًا وليس حرًا، لدرجة أن فجوة أنطولوجية تفصله عن مصدره وأصله ، لأن الله وحده هو الحرية. إن السفر من النسبي إلى المطلق يعني فقدان حرية العيش في الخطأ والتحرر من طغيان العوامل النفسية - المادية التي تسجن النفس وتخنقها. ففي الله حرية محضة وضرورة مطلقة ، وفيه وحده يكون الإنسان حرًا تمامًا، كما أنه مجبورًا تمامًا، ولكن مع الجبرية التي يكون فيها الموجود عمدًا بل طبيعة الإنسان العميقة وجذر وجوده لا يزيدا عن كونهما وجهًا آخر كلي وغير مشروط للحرية.

إن الذكاء هبة إلهية تخترق حجاب مايا، وقادر على معرفة الحقيقة بما هي، إنه شعاع النور الذي يخترق من خلال حجاب الوجود الكوني إلى الأصل، ويربط محيط الوجود الذي يعيش عليه الإنسان الساقط بالمركز حيث يقيم الذات الإلهية. والبصيرة في ذاتها إلهية وإنسانية بالحد الذي يشارك فيها الإنسان. وهو جوهر ناهيك عن أنه وظيفة؛ إنه نور وكذلك رؤية، والبصيرة ليست ذهنًا ولا عقلاً هو انعكاس للبصيرة على المستوى البشري، إنه جذر الوعي ومركزه، وما يُطلق عليه تراثيًا النفس. ولكن



يجب اعتبار النفس بالمعنى التقني معادلاً لكلمة anima أو psyche، وفي هذه الحالة تكون البصيرة روحاً أو نوساً nous بزواجه بالنفس الأنتوية والمنفعلة يولد الذهب الذي يرمز إلى النفس المقدسة.

ومبدأ ما وراء الكون metacosmic الذي هو البصيرة هو مصدر كل من المعرفة والوجود للضمير الذاتي الذي يعرف والنظام الموضوعي المعروف، وهو أيضاً مصدر الوحي الذي يخلق صلة بين الإنسان والكون وبالطبع بحقيقة ما وراء الكون. إن اللوجوس أو بودوها Buddhi أو العقل، كما يُطلق على البصيرة في عديد من التراثات هو المركز المضيء والعامل المولد للعالم - لأنه "بالكلمة صنع كل الأشياء" - والإنسان والدين. إنه معرفة الله لذاته والأول في خليقته. وأضف إلي ذلك ، نظراً لوجود تسلسل هرمي للوجود الكوني ، فهناك أيضاً مستويات من الوعي ودرجات من هبوط البصيرة عبر مستويات مختلفة من الوجود حتى يصل إلى الإنسان، الذي لا يزال شعاع البصيرة يضيء في قلبه، مع أنه عادةً ما يكون باهتاً بواسطة المشاعر وسلسلة "السقوط" التي فصلت الإنسان عن حقيقته.

ومع ذلك ، حتى وعي الإنسان الساقط والذكاء الذي يشع بداخله رغم انعكاسه البعيد للبصيرة ، يظهر شيئاً من معجزة البصيرة التي هي في الوقت نفسه طبيعية ومتجاوزة للطبيعة في آن. ربما تكون التجربة الأكثر إلحاحاً للإنسان هي ذاتيته ، وسر الجوهر والوعي الذي يمكن أن ينعكس على نفسه ، وينفتح باطنياً على اللامتناهي الذي هو أيضاً نعيم. ولاتقل معجزة قوة الموضوعية عن قوة الذكاء البشري لمعرفة العالم بطريقة موضوعية ويقين قاطع لا يمكن لأي قدر من المغالطة أن يدمره. وأخيراً

، هناك سر لكفاية المعرفة، وهو توافق ذكاءنا مع طبيعة الحقيقة وأن ما يعرفه الإنسان يتوافق مع جوانب الحقيقة (٣١) لكن هذه كلها أسرار طالما أن الإنسان منفصلاً عن الحدس البصري والبصيرة. وخلاف ذلك، في ضوء البصيرة ذاتها تكون كل من القوى الذاتية والموضوعية للذكاء مفهومة تمامًا.

وكما ذكرنا آنفاً، لا يمكننا الوصول إلي العلم المقدس دون البصيرة والتوظيف القويم للذكاء داخل الإنسان، ولهذا السبب من انفصلوا عن الأسرارية الباطنة (٣٢) لا ينبذوا فحسب تعاليم هذه المعرفة المقدسة فحسب بل يقدمون حججاً عقلانية ضدها تستند عادة علي مقدمات غير كاملة أو خاطئة، متوقعين أن السماوات سوف تخفق نتيجة هذا الصوت، وهذا البغض لا يدلل ميتافيزيقياً علي شيء، ولا تصل البصيرة للحق نتيجة فكر دنيوي أو تفكير بل بحدس مباشر قبلي للحق، قد يكون فعل التفكير داعياً للبصيرة ولكنه ليس سبباً لها، ولهذا السبب عينه لا يُبطل العقل ثمرة البصيرة أو ينفىها بأي صورة للتفكير تعتمد علي تقييد المرء الذي يستعمل التفكير، الذي ينتج عنه في الغالب نتائج خاطئة فجة وساذجة، ولا يعني هذا التوكيد بالطبع أن البصيرة ضد المنطق أو أنها غير عقلانية، علي النقيض، لا يوجد حق لا يعتبر منطقياً، فالمنطق ذاته

٣١ - إن مبدأ التوافق لا ينفي تأكيدنا السابق الذي قد يمنع احتواء الحقيقة وفهمها في نظام مشتق من المماحكة العقلية، لأننا نتحدث هنا عن التبصر والذكاء وليس المماحكة العقلية والفكر ذي الطابع الإنساني البحث.

٣٢ - لم يكن التراث الإسلامي فحسب هو الذي تعتبر روحانيته الحكمية أن الذكاء أعظم هبة للإنسان (وفقاً للمقولة المشهورة المنسوبة لعلي بن أبي طالب: لم يهب الله لعباده أثن من الذكاء) بل حتي المسيحية التي هي طريقاً للحب يعتبر الهاشكيون Hesychasts أن جوهر صلاة يسوع ذاته هو تحقيق وهبوط الذكاء في قلب الإنسان.

حقيقة وجودية لحال الإنسان. إلا أن دور ووظيفة التفكير واستعمال المنطق في الميتافيزيقا والفلسفة الدنيوية مختلف تمامًا، كما يختلف استعمال الرياضيات في نجمية كاتدرائية شارتر أو قبة أحد مساجد أصفهان أو في ناطحة سحاب حديثة.

ومع أن البصيرة تشع داخل كيان الإنسان إلا أن الإنسان قد بُعد عن طبيعته الأولانية التي تمكنه من الاستفادة من الهبة الربانية بنفسه، إنه يحتاج إلي الوحي الذي يحقق وحده البصيرة في الإنسان، ويسمح لها أن تُوظف علي نحو مناسب، فالיום الذي كان فيه كل إنسان نبيًا، وعملت البصيرة "علي نحو طبيعي" رأي كل الأشياء في الألوهية وامتلك معرفة مباشرة لطابع مقدس من زمن بعيد. وتؤكد المذاهب التراثية أنه بالكشف اللاحق للدورة الكونية وجد أن الوحي فحسب أو الهبوط الأفاتاري avatdric هو ما يمكن الإنسان من أن يري ب "عين القلب" ما هو ب "عين البصيرة". وإن كان هناك استثناءات، فهذه الاستثناءات تثبت القاعدة ، وعل أية حالة "تهب الريح كما تحب the wind bloweth where it listeth"، والوحي في بعده الباطني يُمكن من الوصول إلي مستويات أسمى لوجود الإنسان بالتلقين وكذلك الوعي، وتقدم الشعائر المناسبة والحلقة التراثية والصور والرموز والنعمة المنبثقة من الوحي مفاتيح بها يستطيع الإنسان أن يفتح أبواب الغرف الداخلية لوجوده، وبمساعدة المعلم الروحي ليسافر عبر المناهة الكونية، ومحصلة الرحلة هي أن يصل إلي الكنز الذي هو لؤلؤة العرفان. إن الوحي يحقق إمكانات البصيرة، ويزيل حوائل النفس الشهوانية التي تمنع البصيرة من العمل، وتجعل بالإمكان الانتقال للمعرفة الفطرية التي تقيم في الوقت نفسه في الجوهر الفعلي للبصيرة، وهناك فجوة لا يمكن تجاوزها بين

الذكاء المتقدس بالوحي والذكاء الذي ينقطع عن المصدر وعن جذره أيضاً قد تُختزل لانعكاسه عليّ الذهن البشري وتضمّر في القدرة المنتشرة والمبتورة التي تعتبر ذكاء من الناحية العلمية (٣٣)

وإن كان الحديث يتعلق بالبصيرة والوحي فمن الضرورة أن نقول بضع كلمات عن العلاقة بين البصيرية والكتاب المقدس الذي غفل عنه العالم الحديث. وليس بالمقدور اكتشاف العلم المقدس دون إحياء التأويل الروحي في حضان تراث هيمن عليه الكتاب المقدس، حيث يمتلك الكتاب المقدس بعداً باطنياً لا يتحقق إلا بالبصيرة التي تعمل في إطار تراثي، وهي وحدها قادرة أن تحل تناقضات وألغاز بعينها ظاهرة في النصوص المقدسة، وحين يُعطل الحدس البصيري ويصبح العقل بحيرة متجمدة عليه أفكار لكن لا يتسرب إليه شيء، عندئذٍ يتحجب النص الموحى به ويُختزل في الحفريات وفقة اللغة، ناهيك عن استقراء الأغاليط الذاتية للزمن الراهن التي يردونها إليّ زمن الوحي المعني. وهكذا تحول كليمنت وأوريجين إليّ مفسرين حديثين، ولا تزيد شروحهم عن كونها شروحات أخلاقية للظروف الإجتماعية لفلسطين في القرن الأول.

ولم يختف علم التفسير الروحي تماماً في العالم الشرقي بما فيه التراث اليهودي المسيحي، ويعمل النص المقدس باعتباره مصدراً للعالم الرسمي للتراث الذي نحن بصدده، بما في ذلك طقوسه وممارساته الشعيرية liturgical وفنه المقدس، فضلاً عن الجانب البصيري للتراث الممتد من اللاهوت الرسمي والفلسفة وعلم الرموز إليّ العلم المقدس ذاته الذي يتوج بالرسالة الباطنية التي ينقلها النص المقدس وتتحصل بالذكاء الذي يقده

33 – See Schuon, In the Tracks of Buddhism, p. 83.

الكتاب المقدس للغاية<sup>(٣٤)</sup> وفي الإسلام الذي هيمن عليه حضور القرآن ارتبط التراث بكل جانب فيه بالكتاب الكريم، وتعددت صنوف المفسرين<sup>(٣٥)</sup> بداية ممن عنوا بالشرعية الإلهية حتي العرفانيين الذين توغلو بالهرمينوطيقا الروحية أو التأويل<sup>(٣٦)</sup> إلي لؤلؤة الحكمة التي تكمن خلف

<sup>34</sup> - "A point de vue doctrinal, ce qui importerait le plus, ce serait de retrouver la science spirituelle de l'exégèse, c'est-à-dire de l'interprétation métaphysique et mystique des Écritures; les principes de cette science, dont le maniement presuppose de toute évidence une haute intelligence intuitive et non une simple acuité mentale, ont été exposés par Origène et d'autres, et mis en pratique par les Pères et par les plus grands saints. En d'autres termes, ce qui manque en Occident, c'est une intellectualité fondée, non sur l'érudition et le scepticisme philosophique, mais sur l'intuition intellectuelle actualisée par le Saint-Esprit sur la base d'une exégèse tenant compte de tous les plans et de tous les niveaux de l'entendement; cette exégèse implique aussi la science du symbolisme, et celle-ci s'étend à tous les domaines de l'expression formelle, notamment l'art sacré, qui, lui englobe la liturgie, au sens le plus large, aussi bien que l'art proprement dit. L'Orient traditionnel ne s'étant jamais éloigné de cette manière d'envisager des choses, la compréhension de ses métaphysiques, ses exégèses, ses symbolismes, et ses arts seraient pour l'Occident, d'un intérêt vital." Schuon, "Que peut donner l'Orient à l'Occident?" France-Asie, no. 103 (Dec. 1954):151.

<sup>٣٥</sup> - هناك أعمال عديدة باللغات الإسلامية عن "تصنيف" الشراح، ويسمون عادة طبقات المفسرين، حيث تميز بين الشرح الظاهري (تفسير) والتفسير الباطني (تأويل).

<sup>٣٦</sup> - يعني التأويل في الباطنية الإسلامية الوصول إلي المعني الباطني للنص المقدس، والذي لا ينبغي الخلط بينه وبين معني الاندراي الذي يستخدم فيه النص المقدس كتفسير فردي، ويحتوي دلالة ميتافيزيقية عميقة في أصلها الفعلي، وتعني حرفيًا "العودة إلي البدء" متضمنًا الوصول إلي المعني الباطن من المعني الظاهر، والعودة إلي الأصل أو البدء للحقيقة يتضمن الإرتجال، وحول مسألة التأويل

حجاب الصور الظاهرة للكتاب الكريم، مثل رائعة الصوفية في مثوي لجلال الدين الرومي، ناهيك عن شروح عديد من الباطنيين مثل ابن عربي! (٣٧) و صدر الدين القنوي (٣٨) و عبد الرزاق الكاشاني ورشيد الدين أحمد المييدي وآخرين. وسوا أكان العلم المقدس أم العلوم التراثية المساعدة يمكن أن يقال إنها تتبع من منبع الحكمة الباطن في القرآن فإن الهندوسية بالطريقة نفسها تعتبر العلوم التراثية أطرافاً للفيءا. والهيرمونيطيقا الروحية هي الوسيلة التي يمكن بها أن يتقدس بالوحي ، ويستطيع أن يخترق قلب الوحي ليكتشف الحقيقة المبدئية التي هي جذر وجوهر الذكاء ذاته، ويتجلي في هذا النهج الكون الأكبر للبصيرة، التي هي مصدر الاستتارة الباطنية والتبصر، ولا يتحجب المعني الباطني للكون الأصغر المتجلي للبصيرة التي هي الوحي أو بالتحديد الكتاب المقدس، وزد علي ذلك، تتعلق الحقيقة نفسها مع مراعاة اختلاف ما يقتضية تفسير المعني الباطني للكتاب الموحى الآخر وهو الكون نفسه.

لا يتصور العلم المقدس الذكاء في علاقته بالوحي بالمعني الظاهر فحسب بل بمصدر الوحي الباطن في مركز الإنسان، أعني القلب، ومقر الذكاء هو القلب وليس الرأس كما أكدت التعاليم التراثية، وترادف

---

see Corbin, En Islam iranien, vol. 3, pp. 222ff. and pp. 256ff., where it is discussed with reference to the Quran; and Nasr, Ideals and Realities of Islam, chap. 2.

<sup>٣٧</sup> - المعروف بتأويل القرآن (الشرح الروحي والهيرمونيطيقي للقرآن) المنسوب لابن عربي، كان لأحد تلاميذ مدرسته وهو عبد الرزاق الكاشاني، بينما كتب ابن عربي نفسه شروحاً ضخمة اكتشفها يحيي، ولم تطبع حتي الآن.

<sup>٣٨</sup> - الشرح الرئيس للقنوي علي سورة الفاتحة، التي يُفتح بها القرآن، ويقوم بتحريره وترجمته شيتيك W. Chittick، وسوف يظهر قريباً.

كلمة القلب في السنسكريتية هردايا hridaya وفي اللغة الألمانية هيرز Herz وكارديا kardia في اليونانية وكوى وكورديس cor/cordis في اللاتينية، ولها الجذر hrd أو krd مثل حورس المصري الذي يشير إلي مركز العالم أو العالم<sup>(٣٩)</sup>. والقلب مركز الكون الأصغر للإنسان، ولذلك هو "موضع locus" البصيرة التي تقام بها كل الأشياء. والقلب هو مقام المشاعر والإرادة والعناصر الأخرى التي تُكون الإنسان. والانفعالات العميقة مثل الإرادة لها أصلها في القلب، كما هو الحال مع الذكاء الذي يشكل قمة ثالثة من قوي أو قدرات الكون الأصغر، وفي القلب يلتقي الذكاء والإيمان، حيث يتشعب الإيمان ذاته بنور الحكمة، ويتمثل في القرآن الإيمان والعقل مع القلب<sup>(٤٠)</sup>، بينما اصطلاح سرادها sraddha في السنسكريتية قد يترجم عادة إلي الإيمان، ويعني حرفياً معرفة القلب<sup>(٤١)</sup> وتتفق كلمة القلب credo أو cor/cordis من الجذر نفسه وتشير إلي الحقيقة الميتافيزيقية ذاتها، ولا يكشف هذا التفسير التراثي للغة عن علاقة المعرفة المبدئية بالقلب فحسب يكشف عن المبدأ الميتافيزيقي المهم القائل أن الذكاء المتكامل لا ينفصل عن الإيمان بل علي النقيض الإيمان ضروري في تحقيق إمكانات البصيرة داخل قلب الوحي. وهذا

<sup>39</sup> - See R. Guenon, "The Heart and the Cave," in Studies in Comparative Religion 4 (Spring 1971):69 72.

<sup>٤٠</sup> - غالبًا ما يحدد الإيمان بالمعرفة، وعندما يشير الله إلي المؤمنين، لا يترجم الشراح التراثيون هذا الاسم "بما له إيمان" كما يتوقع المرء من المعني الحرفي، بل "بل من له معرفة تنير المخلوق وتحوله"

<sup>41</sup> - See H. Kohler, Sraddha—In der Vedischen und Altbuddistischen Literatur, Wiesbaden, 1973.

This issue has been dealt with in detail by W. C. Smith in his Faith and Belief.

يلفت سميث الانتباه إلي أن قبل الأزمنة الحديثة لم يكن للاعتقاد كُراي مقولة دينية، وكان الإيمان مرتبطاً بالمعرفة لا الاعتقاد بالمعني المؤقت المستخدم اليوم، ولا يعني هذا أن المعني التراثي لاصطلاح الاعتقاد ليس علي قيد الحياة ولا يمكن إحياءه تمامًا.

الذكاء القادر علي الوصول إلي معرفة المقدس هو بالفعل مقدس ومتجذر في مركز حال الإنسان، حيث لا ينفص عن الإيمان والحب، وتتوافق المعرفة في القلب دومًا مع الحب، وحين تكون المعرفة خارجية ترتبط بالعقل أو نشاط الدماغ فحسب والحب لهذا الجوهر يسمى عادة نفس.

إن إخراج الذكاء واسقاطه علي مستوي العقل شرط ضروري للوجود الإنساني الذي دونه لا يكون الإنسان إنسانًا ذلك المخلوق الذي خُلق ليكون موجودًا مفكرًا، والذكاء الديالكتيكي المتوافق مع العقل ليس سلبياً في ذاته، فالذكاء الإنساني في اكتماله ينطوي التوظيف القويم لكل من ذكاء القلب والعقل، فالأول حدسي والثاني تحليلي استطرادي، وتتيح هاتانوظيفتان معًا استقبال الحقيقة وبلورتها وصياغتها وفي النهاية اتصاله. وإن الصياغة العقلية للحدس التي يستقبلها الذكاء في القلب تستوعب من قبل الإنسان وتتحقق بنشاط العقل. هذا هو أحد الأدوار الرئيسية للتأمل في الممارسات الروحية، حيث يرتبط التأمل بنشاط العقل. من خلال هذه العملية أيضًا يصل الضوء الذي يستقبله القلب وينقله، وهذا النشاط ضروري بسبب طبيعة محتوى الحدس الذي يتلقاها الذكاء الموجود في القلب، ولكون المحتوى حسنًا فإن يعطيه لذاته مثل كل خير يشع من حوله<sup>(٤٢)</sup> ويحتاج الإنسان إلى إضفاء الطابع الخارجي على بعض الحقائق الباطنية حتى يتمكن من الاستيعاب والتحليل من أجل التوليف والتركييب الذي يحتاج إلى مرحلة من التحليل. ومن هنا تأتي حاجة الإنسان للغة تنبثق من الصمت المقدس وتعود إليه

<sup>٤٢</sup> - في الحلقات التربوية الإسلامية التراثية تُعتبر القدرة على تدريس الميتافيزيقيا علامة على استيعاب المعلم الكامل للموضوع بطريقة تصل عقله إلى مستوى العقل بالملكة intellectus habitus، وصارت المعرفة المطروحة عنده بالملكة، أي هضمها واستوعبها تمامًا.



مرة أخرى، ولكنها تلعب دورًا حيويًا في صياغة الحقيقة التي تصدر من الصمت الأول ، وتهيب الإنسان للعودة إلى الصمت الثاني الذي هو التوليف بعد التحليل ، والعودة للوحدة بعد الانفصال (٤٣).

ويمكن اعتبار العقل من الناحية الرمزية مثل القمر الذي يعكس نور الشمس وهو القلب، ويشع الذكاء في القلب علي مستوي العقل ثم يعكس هذا النور علي ظلام ليل الوجود الأرضي للإنسان الساقط. إن العلم المقدس الذي ينبع من الذكاء الكلي للقلب (٤٤) لذلك ينطوي ديالكتيك العقل، والحقيقة كان بعض الديالكتيين العظام في الشرق والغرب من الميتافيزيقين الذين أدركوا الحال الأسمى للمعرفة، وما يعارضه التراث ليس نشاط العقل بل انفصاله عن القلب، ومقام الذكاء وموقع "عين المعرفة" الذي يسميها الصوفي عين القلب ، وهي في التراث الهندوسي العين الثالثة، التي تتجاوز الثنائية والعمل العقلاني للعقل الذي يستند علي التحليل، والتي تدرك الوحدة التي هي الأصل والنهاية للكثرة التي يدركها العقل وقوة العقل علي التحليل والمعرفة والخطاب، ولهذا يردد المتصوفة : "أفتح عين قلبك سوف تري الروح، وسوف تري ما لا تراه" (٤٥).

٤٣ - ما تسميه الميتافيزيقا الإسلامية "الجمع بعد الفُرقة"

٤٤ - بعض المذاهب الميتافيزيقية تشرح في أعمالها الفلسفة الإسلامية والنيو صوفية، وتضعها تحت مقولة الأوراد القلبية، وتعني حرفيًا "ما دخل القلب"، وأهم الكتب في هذا الصدد لاعظم الميتافيزيقين الإسلاميين وهو صدر الدين الشيرازي

See Nasr, The Transcendent Theosophy of Sadr al-Din Shirazi, London, 1978, p. 49.

٤٥ - جشم دل بازكن كجنان بني..... أنجه نادیده است آن بني

إن محاولة الذهن العقلاني لاكتشاف البصيرة بنوره يراها التراث عقيمة لأن الموضوع الذي تحاول القدرة العقلانية إدراكه هو بالفعل ذات تجعل فعل الإدراك بالقدرة العقلية ممكناً، و الذهن منفصل عن نور ذكاء القلب، ويسعي إلي إيجاد الله، وهو لا يعي أنه النور الذي به هو يسعي لاكتشاف الله، الذي هو شعاع نور الله، ومثل هذا الذهن كشخص يتجول في الصحراء في وضح النهار حاملاً مصباح في يده يبحث عن الشمس (٤٦) لا يصدر العمي عن العقل بل من العقل المنفصل عن البصيرة، ويحاول أن يلعب دور البصيرة في الوصول للمعرفة، ومثل هذه المحاولة لا تؤدي إلي علمنة المعرفة ، و حياة نلاحظها بين شرائح الإنسانية اختارت مصيرها بيديها وتعيش علي الأرض كما لو كانت من هذه الأرض فحسب.

وقد يُعبر عن العلم المقدس بشكل ظاهري ولا يظل علي مستوي الاستتارة الباطنية للقلب، ومن الضرورة فهم شيء عن نوع اللغة التي يستعملها، فاللغة الصورية التي تُستعمل للتعبير عن العلم المقدس وتقترب من النطاق الكامل للتعاليم التراثية هي لغة رمزية، وبالإمكان التعبير عن العلم المقدس بكلمات إنسانية كما في لوحات المناظر الطبيعية أو قرع الطبول أو غيرها من الوسائل الشكلية الأخرى التي تنقل المعنى، ولكن تظل الرمزية في كل الحالات مفتاحاً لفهم لغتها، ولحسن الطالع قد كُتبت كثيراً خلال هذا القرن عن الدلالة الحقيقية للرمزية ، خاصة في الأعمال التي تنتسب لحقبة الكتاب التراثيين، فليست الرموز علامات من صنع الإنسان ، ولكنها انعكاسات علي المستوي الأدنى للوجود للحقيقة التي

تتبع نظاماً أعلى<sup>(٤٧)</sup>، والرموز جوانب أنطولوجية لشيء ما، وهي واقعية علي أقل تقدير مثل الشيء نفسه، وهذا في الحقيقة ما تضيفه الدلالة علي الشيء في نظام كلي للوجود، ويمكن أن يُقال في العالم البنيوي الهرمي للميتافيزيقا التراثية أن كل مستوي للحقيقة وكل شيء علي كل مستوي للحقيقة هو حتماً رمز، إلا الوجود الواقعي ذاته بما هو، ولكن يمكن أن نقول بشكل أكثر تحديداً أن الرموز تعكس في النظام الشكلي نماذج تتبع عالم المبدئية من خلال رموز توحد الترميز مع حقيقتها الرمزية<sup>(٤٨)</sup>.

وأضف إلي ذلك، هناك رموزاً "طبيعية"، أعني، أنها متجذرة في طبيعة أشياء وأشكال بعينها في عملية نشأة الكون أدت إلي ظهور هذه الصور علي المستوي الأرضي، وهناك رموز أخرى مقدسة بوحى بعينه يشبه الخلق الثاني. فالشمس رمز "طبيعي" للبصيرة الإلهية لأي امرئ لا يزال يمتلك ملكة الإدراك الرمزي، الذي تعمل فيه "الروح الرمزية". إلا أن

47 – On the meaning and science of symbols see L. Benoist, Signes, symboles et mythes, Paris, 1977; H. Sedlmayr, Verlust der Mitte, Salzburg, 1976; R. A. Schwaller de Lubicz, Symbol and the Symbolic, trans. R. and D. Lawlor, Brookline, Mass., 1978; G. Dumézil, Mythe et epos, 2 vols., Paris 1968-71 (dealing mostly with myths but of course also symbolism); H. Zimmer, Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization, ed. J. Campbell, New York, 1963; M. Eliade, Images and Symbols, trans. Ph. Mairet, New York, 1961; R. Alleau, La Science des symboles, Paris, 1976; and J. C. Cooper, An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols, London, 1978.

٤٨- كانما يرمزله عند الإنسان الأولاني وهو الرمز الذي لا يزال حياً في الحقيقة غير المتشذرة في الحالة الفردوسية. لقد نجا شيء من وجهة النظر الأولانية هذه بين بعض ما يسمى بالشعوب البدائية التي لا تزال "الروح الرمزية" فيها على قيد الحياة، والتي تحدد في إدراكها للأشياء الشيء الذي يرمز إليه والرمز، هذا عكس عبادة الأصنام التي يحتزل فيها الرمز إلى الشيء المادي الذي من المفترض أن يرمز إليه، بينما في المنظور الذي يعيننا، فإن الكائن الذي يرمز إلى حقيقة نموذجية "ترتفع" إلى مستوى تلك الحقيقة ويصبح صورة شفافة تعكس هذه الحقيقة وتجليها.

الشمس نفسها تُقدس بطريقة خاصة عند الطوائف الشمسية مثل الميثرائية ( \* ) وتكتسب دلالة خاصة في عالم تراثي بعينه مثل النبيذ في المسيحية أو الماء في الإسلام، وقد يستخدم الشعراء الصوفيون رمزية النبيذ بالمعنى الأول للرمز ، لكن نزول المسيح أعطى دلالة خاصة للنبيذ في القران المقدس كرمز مقدس يظل مرتبطاً بعالم يخص المسيحية (٤٩).

ويستعمل العلم المقدس نمطي الرمزية في عرضه لتعاليمه، مع أنهما متجذرا في الجانب الشكلي في التراث الذي يزهر فيه وتؤديا وظيفتهما التي بفضلها يمكن تحقيق هذه المعرفة المقدسة بفاعلية، وقد يتشرب الصوفية من حين لآخر صيغاً هندوسية أو أفلاطونية محدثة إلا أن عالمهم الصوري هو القرآن والنعمة النابعة من الوحي القرآني، التي جعلت الوصول إلي العرفان الصوفي ممكناً، والحقيقة إن التراث الحي

\* - تُعرف أيضاً بالأسرار الميثرائية، هي ديانة رومانية باطنية ترتكز على الإله ميثرا، تأثر هذا الدين بعبادة الإله الزراداشتي ميثرا، لكن الميثراس الإغريقي رُبط بتصور مميز جديد، ويُناقش مستوى الاستمرارية بين الممارسة الفارسية والجريكورومانية (المترجم)

٤٩ - "الرمزية الطبيعية التي تمثل للمبدأ الرباني بالشمس على سبيل المثال تُستقى من التناظر 'الأفقى'، ورمزية الوحي هي ما يُضفى على ذلك التشاكل فاعلية روحية، وقد كانت الحضارات الشمسية القديمة تستقى من التناظر 'الرأسي' قبل أن تتخثر وتجمد، وكذلك العرفان الذي يختزل الظاهرة إلى فكرة أو مثال. ويمكن هنا أن نسهب عن رمزية الخبز والنبيذ أو رمزية الجسد والدم، وتكريسها عند السيد المسيح، وكذلك رمزية الصليب التي تعبر ببعديها عن أسرارية 'الخبز الجسد' و'الدم النبيذ' والتي كان لها دائما معنى ميثافيزيقي ولكنها اكتسبت صفاتها شبه التقديسية بالكلمة التي تجسدت في الشكل المسيحي على الخصوص، بما يعني أن الأفاتارا لا بد أن 'يعيش' شكلاً مخصوصاً حتى يُضفى عليه الفاعلية، وكذلك الحال مع الصيغ المقدسة والأسماء الحسنى التي تنتزل في الوحي حتى 'تتحقق' في الواقع، في الواقع Schuon, Stations of Wisdom, p.

يصوغ لغة خطاب الميتافيزيقا، ويختار من بين الرموز المتاحة ما يخدم علي أكمل وجه غايته، التي تتجسد في إيصال مذهب لطبيعة مقدسة وحكمية. ولا يمكن فهم الرمزية من جانب إلا في ضوء الروحانية الحية التي دونها تصوير متاهة من الألغاز، وتعمل الرموز من جانب آخر كوسائل يستطيع بها الإنسان فهم لغة العلم المقدس.

وأخيراً، يجب التأكيد علي أن الميتافيزيقا التراثية أو العلم المقدس ليس مجرد عرضاً نظرياً لمعرفة الحقيقة، إن هدفه إرشاد الإنسان لينيره ويسمح له ببلوغ المقدس، ولذلك تعد شروحاتها نقاط مرجعية ومفاتيح بها تُفتح أبواب بعينها، ووسائل لفتح الذهن لحقائق بعينها. وجانبها النظري مشروط بمعنى يبييا upaya البوذي لاستيعاب وسائل تعلم الحقيقة، ويحتوي العلم المقدس بمعن ما البذرة والثمرة لشجرة المعرفة، وهو باعتباره نظرية تُزرع كبذرة في قلب الإنسان وعقله، إذا تغذت البذرة بالممارسة الروحية والفضيلة صارت نبتة تتفتح وتؤتي ثمارها ببذرة مرة أخرى، ولكن إذا كانت البذرة الأولى معرفة نظرية بمعنى النظر theoria أو الرؤية فإن البذرة الثانية قد تدرك العرفان، أي إدراك معرفة وجودها ذاته مقدس، يُفني وجود العارف كله، وباعتباره مقدساً فهو مطلب للإنسان بكل ما هو، ولهذا السبب من غير الممكن بلوغ هذه المعرفة بأي طريق سوي بالفناء فيها.

### تُوجز محصلة حياتي في ثلاث كلمات

كنت غير ناضج، ونضجت، وفنيت. الرومي (°)

° - خام بدم يخته شدم سوختم

° - حاصل عموم من سخن بيش نيت

## Pontifical and Promethean

Look within yourself a moment and ask who art thou? From where doest thou comest, from which place. What art thou?

Rumi

Was ist der Menschen Leben, ein Bild der Gottheit.  
What is the life of man, an image of the Godhead.

Holderlin

the concept of man as the pontiff, pontifex, or bridge between Heaven and earth, which is the traditional view of the anthropos, lies at the antipode of the modern conception of man<sup>1</sup> which envisages him as the Promethean earthly creature who has rebelled against Heaven and tried to misappropriate the role of the Divinity for himself. Pontifical man, who, in the sense used here, is none other than traditional man, lives in a world which has both an Origin and a Center. He lives in full awareness of the Origin which contains his

own perfection and whose primordial purity and wholeness he seeks

to emulate, recapture, and transmit. He also lives on a circle of whose Center he is always aware and which he seeks to reach in his life, thought, and actions. Pontifical man is the reflection of the Center on the periphery and the echo of the Origin in later cycles of time and generations of history. He is the vicegerent of God (khalifatallah) on earth, to use the Islamic term,<sup>2</sup> responsible to God for his actions, and the custodian and protector of the earth of which he is given dominion on the condition that he remain faithful to himself as the central terrestrial figure created in the "form of God," a theomorphic being living in this world but created for eternity. Pontifical man<sup>3</sup> is aware of his role as intermediary between Heaven and earth and his entelechy as lying beyond the terrestrial domain over which he is allowed to rule provided he remains aware of the transient nature of his own journey on earth. Such a man lives in awareness of a spiritual reality which transcends him and which yet is none other than his own inner nature and against which he cannot rebel, save by paying the price of separation from all that he is and all that he should wish to be. For such a man, life is impregnated

with meaning and the universe peopled with creatures whom he can address as thou. He is aware that precisely because he is human there is both grandeur and danger connected with all that he does and thinks. His actions have an effect upon his own being beyond the limited spatio-temporal conditions in which such actions take place. He knows that somehow the bark which is to take him to the shore beyond after that fleeting journey which comprises his earthly life is constructed by what he does and how he lives while he is in the human state. To be sure, the image of man as depicted in various traditions has not been identical. Some have emphasized the human state more than others and they have envisaged eschatological realities differently. But there is no doubt that all traditions are based on the central and dominant images of the Origin and the Center and see the final end of man in the state or reality which is other than this terrestrial life with which forgetful or fallen man identifies himself once he is cut off from revelation or religion that constantly hearken man back to the Origin and the Center. Promethean man, on the contrary, is a creature of this world. He feels at home on earth, earth not considered as the virgin nature which is itself an echo of paradise, but as the artificial world created by Promethean man himself in order to make it possible for him to forget God and his own inner reality. Such a man envisages life as a big marketplace in which he is free to roam around and choose objects at will. Having lost the sense of the sacred, he is drowned in



transience and impermanence and becomes a slave of his own lower nature, surrender to which he considers to be freedom. He follows passively the downward flow of the cycle of human history in which he takes pride by claiming that in doing so he has created his own destiny. But still being man, he has a nostalgia for the Sacred and the Eternal and thus turns to a thousand and one ways to satisfy this need, ways ranging from psychological novels to drug-induced mysticism.

He also becomes stifled by the prison of his own creation, wary of the destruction he has wrought upon the natural environment and the vilification of the urban setting in which he is forced to live. He seeks for solutions everywhere, even in teachings by which pontifical man, or traditional man, has lived over the ages. But these sources are not able to help him for he approaches even these truths as Promethean man. This recently born creature, who has succeeded in wreaking havoc upon the earth and practically upsetting the ecological balance of the natural order itself in only some five centuries,<sup>4</sup> is little aware that to overcome the impasse into which modern man has thrown himself as a result of attempting to forget what it really means to be man he must rediscover himself. He must come to understand the nature of man as that pontifical and central creature on this earth who stands as witness to an origin from which he descends and a

center to which he ultimately returns. The traditional doctrine of man and not the measurement of skulls and footprints is the key for the understanding of that anthropos who, despite the rebellion of Promethean man against Heaven from the period of the Renaissance and its aftermath, is still the inner man of every man, the reality which no human being can deny wherever and whenever he lives, the imprint of a theomorphic nature which no historical change and transformation can erase completely from the face of that creature called man. In recent decades many attempts have been made to trace the stages of the "disfiguration of the image of man in the West"<sup>5</sup> beginning with the first stages of the Promethean revolt in the Renaissance, some of whose causes are to be seen already in the late Middle Ages, and terminating with the inhuman condition into which modern man is being forced through a supposedly humanistic civilization. The tracing of this disfiguration could not in fact be anything other than the tracing of one facet of that process of the desacralization of knowledge and of life already outlined in the first part of this book. The decomposition and disfiguration, in the history of the West, of the image of man as being himself *imago Dei*, came into the open with that worldly humanism which characterizes the Renaissance and which is most directly reflected in its worldly art.<sup>6</sup> But there are certain elements of earlier origin which also contributed to this sudden

fall, usually interpreted as the age of the discovery of man at the moment when the hold of the Christian tradition upon Western man was beginning to weaken. One of the elements is the excessive separation between man as the seat of consciousness or the I and the cosmos as the "not-I" or a domain of reality from which man is alienated. This attitude was not unrelated to the excessive separation of the spirit from the flesh in official Christian theology even if this chasm was filled by the Hermetic tradition, especially its alchemical aspect, and affected even the daily life of the medieval community through the craft guilds. The "angelism" of medieval theology, although containing a profound truth, considered only one aspect of the traditional anthropos, allowing the rebellion against such a view by those who thought that in order to discover the spiritual significance of nature and the positive significance of the body, they had to deny the medieval concept of man. The Renaissance cult of the body, even if by some freak of history it had manifested itself in India, could not have been opposed to Hinduism in the same way that it was opposed to Christianity in the West. The other elements which brought about the destruction of the image of pontifical man and helped the birth of that Promethean rebel with whom modern man usually identifies himself were mostly asso-

ciated with the phenomena of the Renaissance itself and its aftermath or had their root in the late medieval period. These factors include the destruction of the unity and hierarchy of knowledge which resulted from the eclipse of the sapiential dimension of tradition in the West. From this event there resulted in turn the emptying of the sciences of nature of their esoteric content and their quantification, the rise of skepticism and agnosticism combined with a hatred of wisdom in its Christian form, and the loss of knowledge based upon certitude,<sup>7</sup> which was itself the result of reducing Being to a mental concept and a denial of its unifying and sanctifying rays. From an intellectual point of view the main stages in the process of the disfiguration of pontifical man into the Promethean can be traced to the late Middle Ages because they include the excessively rigid Aristotelianization of Western thought in the thirteenth century identified by some with Averroes. This //exteriorization,, of Christian thought was followed by the secularization of the science of the cosmos in the seventeenth century, itself a result of the "naturalization" of Christian man as a well-contented citizen of this world. This period,was in turn succeeded by the divinization of time and historical process associated in the nineteenth century with the name of Hegel and others who made of change and becoming the foundation

of reality and the criterion of the truth itself. The development of Aristotelian philosophy and theology in a Christian mold was itself of course not antitraditional. It even provided a metaphysical language of great power and dogmatic assertions of remarkable depth. But, as already mentioned, it did exteriorize the process of knowledge. Furthermore, Averroism in the Western world, and in contrast to the Islamic world itself from which Averroes (Ibn Rushd) himself hailed, depleted the cosmos of its "soul," helping the secularization of the cosmos which was also to affect deeply the destiny of Western man himself.<sup>8</sup>

The seventeenth-century scientific revolution not only mechanized the conception of the world but also of man, creating a world in which man found himself as an alien. Furthermore, the scientism which issued from this century and the apparent success of Newtonian physics led to the establishment of a whole series of so-called sciences of man which to this day emulate an already outmoded physics. The modern sciences of man were born in an atmosphere of positivism associated with a figure like Auguste Comte who simply reversed the traditional rapport between the study of Deus, homo, and natura in creating his famous three stage theory of human progress, which is based on the total misunderstanding of the nature of man and is a parody of traditional doctrines concerning human existence on

earth.<sup>9</sup> The Comptean science of man and his society can be only characterized as ignorance, or avidya, characteristic of the Dark Age, parading as science. Despite the refutation of the mechanistic physics upon which most sciences of man are based today and strong criticism of the type of anthropology which sees in man no more than a mammal walking upright, most of those disciplines usually identified as the social sciences and even humanities still suffer from an inferiority complex vis-a-vis the natural sciences and mathematics which forces them to adopt a world view alien to the very nature of man. As for the Hegelian turning of permanence into change and dialectical process, it not only deprived man of the image of immutability which constitutes a basic feature of the traditional concept of man but it also played a major role in the humanization of the Divinity which was to lead to the final phase of the secularization of the life of modern man. Hegel "equated" man's finite consciousness with the Divine Infinite Consciousness. From his position there was but one step to Feurbach's assertion that man's awareness of Infinite Con-

Man, Pontifical and Promethean • 165

sciousness is nothing more than the consciousness of the Infinite within human consciousness itself. Instead of man being seen as the image of God, the relation was now reversed and God came to be regarded as the image of man and the projection of his own con-

sciousness. Promethean man not only sought to steal fire from Heaven but even to kill the gods, little aware that man cannot destroy the image of the Divinity without destroying himself. As far as the traditional doctrine of man is concerned, it is based in one way or another on the concept of primordial man as the source of perfection, the total and complete reflection of the Divinity and the archetypal reality containing the possibilities of cosmic existence itself. Man is the model of the universe because he is himself the reflection of those possibilities in the principal domain which manifest themselves as the world. Man is more than merely man so that this way of envisaging his rapport with respect to the cosmos is far from being anthropomorphic in the usual sense of this term. The world is not seen as the reflection of man qua man but of man as being himself the total and plenary reflection of all those Divine Qualities whose reflections, in scattered and segmented fashion, comprise the manifested order. In traditions with a strongly mythical character this inward relationship between man and the cosmos is depicted in the myth of the sacrifice of the primordial man. For example, in the Iranian religions the sacrifice of the primordial man is associated with the creation of the world and its various orders and realms, different parts of the "body" of the primordial man being associated with different orders

of creatures such as animals, plants, and minerals. Sometimes, however, a more particular relationship is emphasized as in those Zoroastrian sources where Gayomart, who is the first man, is associated with the generation of the minerals, for as the Greater BundahiSn says, "When Gayomart was assailed with sickness, he fell on his left side. From his head lead came forth, from his blood zinc, from his marrow silver, from his feet iron, from his bones brass, from his fat crystal, from his arms steel, and from his soul as it departed, gold."<sup>11</sup> In Hinduism there is the famous passage in the Rg-Veda (X,90) according to which, from the sacrifice of Purusa or primordial man, the world and the human race consisting of the four castes are brought into being, the brahmins from his mouth, the rdjanyas or ksatriyas from his arms, the vaisyas from his belly, and the sudras from his feet, his

166 • Knowledge and the Sacred

sacrifice, or yajrias, being the model of all sacrifice.<sup>12</sup> Primordial man is the archetype of creation as he is its purpose and entelechy. That is why according to a hadith, God addresses the Prophet of Islam, whose inner reality is the primordial man par excellence in the Islamic tradition, in these terms, "If thou wert not, I would not have created the world."<sup>13</sup> This perspective envisages the human reality in its divine and cosmic dimensions in exact opposition to philosophical anthropomorphism. Man does not see God and the world in his



image but realizes that he is himself in his inner reality that image which reflects the Divine Qualities and by which cosmic reality is created, the possibilities being contained in the Logos "by which all things were made."

The metaphysical doctrine of man in the fullness of his being, in what he is, but not necessarily what he appears to be, is expounded in various languages in the different traditions with diverse degrees of emphasis which are far from being negligible. Some traditions are based more upon the divinized human receptacle while others reject this perspective in favor of the Divinity in Itself. Some depict man in his state of fall from his primordial perfection and address their message to this fallen creature, whereas others, while being fully aware that the humanity they are addressing is not the society of perfect men living in paradise, address that primordial nature which still survives in man despite the layers of "forgetfulness"<sup>14</sup> and imperfection which separate man from himself.

That primordial and plenary nature of man which Islam calls the "Universal or Perfect Man" (al-insan al-kamil)<sup>15</sup> and to which the sapiential doctrines of Graeco-Alexandrian antiquity also allude in nearly the same terms, except for the Abrahamic and specifically Islamic aspects of the doctrines absent from the Neoplatonic and Hermetic sources, reveals human reality to possess three fundamen-

tal aspects. The Universal Man, whose reality is realized only by the prophets and great seers since only they are human in the full sense of the word, is first of all the archetypal reality of the universe; second, the instrument or means whereby revelation descends into the world; and third, the perfect model for the spiritual life and the ultimate dispenser of esoteric knowledge. By virtue of the reality of the Universal Man, terrestrial man is able to gain access to revelation and tradition, hence to the sacred. Finally, through this reality which is none other than man's own reality actualized, man is able to follow Man, Pontifical and Promethean . 167 that path of perfection which will finally allow him to gain knowledge of the sacred and to become fully himself. The saying of the Delphic oracle, "Know thyself," or that of the Prophet of Islam, "He who knoweth himself knoweth his lord," is true not because man as an earthly creature is the measure of all things but because man is himself the reflection of that archetypal reality which is the measure of all things. That is why in traditional sciences of man the knowledge of the cosmos and the metacosmic reality are usually not expounded in terms of the reality of terrestrial man. Rather, the knowledge of man is expounded through and in reference to the macrocosm and metacosm, since they reflect in a blinding fashion and in an objective

mode what man is if only he were to become what he really is. The traditional doctrine of Primordial or Universal Man with all its variations—Adam Kadmon, Jen, Purusa, al-insan al-kdmil, and the like—embraces at once the metaphysical, cosmogonic, revelatory, and initiatic functions of that reality which constitutes the totality of the human state and which places before man both the grandeur of what he can be and the pettiness and wretchedness of what he is in most cases, in comparison with the ideal which he carries always within himself. Terrestrial man is nothing more than the externalization, coagulation, and often inversion and perversion of this idea and ideal of the Universal Man cast in the direction of the periphery. He is a being caught in the field of the centrifugal forces which characterize terrestrial existence as such, but is also constantly attracted by the Center where the inner man is always present. It is also by virtue of carrying this reality within himself and bearing the characteristics of a theomorphic being, because he is such a being in his essential reality, that man remains an axial creature in this world. Even his denial of the sacred has a cosmic significance, his purely empirical and earthly science going to the extent of imposing the danger of destroying the harmony of the terrestrial environment itself.<sup>17</sup> Man cannot live as a purely earthly creature totally at home in this world without destroying the natural environment precisely be-

cause he is not such a creature. The pontifical function of man remains inseparable from his reality, from what he is. That is why traditional teachings envisage the happiness of man in his remaining aware and living according to his pontifical nature as the bridge between Heaven and earth. His religious laws and rites have a cosmic function<sup>18</sup> and he is made aware that it is impossible for him to evade

168 • Knowledge and the Sacred

his responsibility as a creature who lives on the earth but is not only earthly, as a being strung between Heaven and earth, of both a spiritual and material mold, created to reflect the light of the Divine Empyrean within the world and to preserve harmony in the world through the dispensation of that light and the practice of that form of life which is in accordance with his inner reality as revealed by tradition.<sup>19</sup> Man's responsibility to society, the cosmos, and God issues ultimately from himself, not his self as ego but the inner man who is the mirror and reflection of the Supreme Self, the Ultimate Reality which can be envisaged as either pure Subject or pure Object since It transcends in Itself all dualities, being neither subject nor object.

The situation of man as bridge between Heaven and earth is reflected in all of his being and his faculties. Man is himself a supernaturally natural being. When he walks on the earth, on the one hand he

appears as a creature of the earth; on the other, it is as if he were a celestial being who has descended upon the earthly realm.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, his memory, speech, and imagination partake at once of several orders of reality. Most of all his intelligence is a supernaturally natural faculty, a sacrament partaking of all that the term supernatural signifies in Christianity, yet functioning quasi-naturally within him with the help of revelation and its unifying grace. That is why, while even in this world, man is able to move to the other shore of existence, to take his stance in the world of the sacred and to see nature herself as impregnated with grace. He is able to remove that sharp boundary which has been drawn between the natural and the supernatural in most schools of official Christian theology but which is not emphasized in the same manner in other traditions and is also overcome in the sapiential aspects of the Christian tradition itself. Metaphysically speaking then, man has his archetype in that primordial, perfect, and universal being or man who is the mirror of the Divine Qualities and Names and the prototype of creation. But each human being also possesses his own archetype and has a reality in divinis as a possibility unto himself, one which is unique since that person reflects the archetype of the human species as such in the same way that every point on the circumference of a circle reflects the center and is yet distinct from other points. The reality of man as a

species as well as of each human being has its root in the principal domain. Therefore man as such, as well as each human being, comes.

into the world through an "elaboration" and process which separates him from the Divine and departs from the world through paths, which in joy or sorrow depending on his life on earth, finally lead him back to the Divine.

This "elaboration" concerning the genesis of man is expounded in one form or another in all sapiential teachings but not in exoteric religious formulations whose point of view is the immediate concern of man for his salvation, so that they leave aside certain doctrines or only allude to them in passing, while esoterism, being concerned with the truth as such, takes such questions into consideration as we see in the case of exoteric Judaism on the one hand and the Kabbala on the other. In the Christian West, especially in modern times when the esoteric and sapiential teachings had become much less accessible than before, the religious point of view seemed to assert only the doctrine of creation ex nihilo without further explanation of what ex nihilo might mean metaphysically as Ibn cArabl, for example, had done for the term al-cadam which is the Quranic term used for creation "from nothing."<sup>21</sup>

As a result, many nineteenth-century thinkers felt that they had to

choose between either the creationist view or the Darwinian theory of evolution and naturally chose the latter as appearing more "plausible" in a world which had forfeited the view of permanence and immutability to that of constant change, process, and becoming and where the higher states of existence had lost their reality for those affected by the leveling process of modern thought. Even today, certain scientists who realize the logical and even biological absurdity of the theory of evolution and some of its implications and presuppositions believe that the only other alternative is the ex nihilo doctrine, unaware that the traditional metaphysical doctrine interprets the ex nihilo statement as implying an elaboration of man's being in divinis and through stages of being preceding his appearance on earth. This doctrine of man, based on his descent through various levels of existence above the corporeal, in fact presents a view of the appearance of man which is neither illogical nor at all in disagreement with any scientific facts—and of course not necessarily hypotheses and extrapolations—provided one accepts the hierarchy of existence, or the multiple levels of reality which surround the corporeal state. As we shall see in our later discussion of the theory of evolution, the whole modern evolutionary theory is a desperate attempt to substitute a set of horizontal, material causes in a unidimensional world to

explain effects whose causes belong to other levels of reality, to the vertical dimensions of existence.

The genesis of man, according to all traditions, occurred in many stages: first, in the Divinity Itself so that there is an uncreated "aspect" to man. That is why man can experience annihilation in God and subsistence in Him (the *al-fand5* and *al-baqa3* of Sufism) and achieve supreme union. Then man is born in the Logos which is in fact the prototype of man and another face of that same reality which the Muslims call the Universal Man and which each tradition identifies with its founder. Next, man is created on the cosmic level and what the Bible refers to as the celestial paradise, where he is dressed with a luminous body in conformity with the paradisaal state. He then descends to the level of the terrestrial paradise and is given yet another body of an ethereal and incorruptible nature. Finally, he is born into the physical world with a body which perishes but which has its principle in the subtle and luminous bodies belonging to the earlier stages of the elaboration of man and his genesis before his appearance on earth.<sup>22</sup>

Likewise, the Quran speaks of man's pre-eternal (*azali*) covenant with God when he answered God's call, "Am I not your Lord?" with the affirmative, "Yea,"<sup>23</sup> the "Am I not your Lord?" (*alastu birabbikum*) symbolizing the relation between God and man before creation and



so becoming a constantly repeated refrain for all those sages in Islam who have hearkened man to his eternal reality in divinis by reminding him of the asrar-i alast or the mysteries of this preeternal covenant. This reminding or unveiling, moreover, has always involved the doctrine of the elaboration of man through various states of being. When Hafiz, in his famous poem. Last night [dush] I saw that the angels beat at the door of the Tavern The clay of Adam, they shaped and with the mold of love they cast24 speaks of dush or "dark night" preceding the morning light, he is alluding symbolically to that unmanifested state where the primordial substance of man was being molded in the Divine Presence preceding the day of manifestation and his descent on earth; but even this.

substance molded by the angels was itself an elaboration and descent of man from his uncreated reality in divinis. It is remarkable that, while traditional teachings are aware that other creatures preceded man on earth, they believe that man pre-cedes them in the principal order and that his appearance on earth is the result of a descent not an ascent. Man precipitates on earth from the subtle state appearing out of the cloud or on a chariot as described

in various traditional accounts, this "cloud" symbolizing the intermediary condition between the subtle and the physical. He appears on earth already as a central and total being, reflecting the Absolute not only in his spiritual and mental faculties but even in his body. If Promethean man finally lost sight completely of the higher levels of existence and was forced to take recourse in some kind of mysterious temporal process called evolution which would bring him out of the primordial soup of molecules envisaged by modern science, pontifical man has always seen himself as the descent of a reality which has been elaborated through many worlds to arrive on earth in a completed form as the central and theomorphic being that he is. From his point of view as a being conscious of not only earthly, horizontal causes but also Heaven and the vertical dimension of existence and chains of causes, the monkey is not what man had once been and is no longer, but what he could never be precisely because of what he always is and has been. Pontifical man has always been man, and the traditional perspective which is his views the presence of the monkey as a cosmic sign, a creature whose significance is to display what the central human state excludes by its very centrality. To study the state of the monkey metaphysically and not just biologically is to grasp what man is not and could have never been. Traditional sciences of man have spoken at length about the inner

structure and faculties of man as well as the significance of his body and its powers. One discovers in such sources the repeated assertion that man has access to multiple levels of existence and consciousness within himself and a hierarchy of faculties and even "substances" which in any case cannot be reduced to the two entities of body and soul or mind and body, reflecting the dualism so prevalent in postCartesian Western thought. This dualism neglects the essential unity of the human microcosm precisely because duality implies opposition and, in contrast to trinity, is not a reflection of Unity. On the first level of understanding the human microcosm, therefore, one must take

172 • Knowledge and the Sacred

into consideration the tripartite nature of the human being consisting of spirit, soul, and body—the classical pneuma, psyche, and hyle or spiritus, anima, and corpus of Western traditions both Graeco-Alexandrian and Christian—at least as far as Christian Hermeticism is concerned. The soul is the principle of the body, but in the "normal" human being is itself subservient to the spirit and reaches its salvation and beatitude through its wedding to the spirit of which so many alchemical texts speak.<sup>25</sup>

This tripartite division, however, is a simplification of a more complex situation. Actually man contains within himself many levels of existence and layers. Such traditions as Tantrism and certain schools

of Sufism as well as Western Hermeticism speak not of body as opposed to soul and spirit but of several bodies of man of which the physical body is only the most outward and externalized envelope. Man possesses subtle as well as spiritual bodies in conformity with the different worlds through which he journeys. There is, moreover, an inversion between various levels of existence so that man's soul (used here in the general sense of all that is immaterial in his being), molded in this world by his actions, becomes externalized in the intermediate world as his "body." It is in reference to this principle that the Imams of Shi'ism, referring to the posthumous states of man and especially the "perfect man" represented by the Imams, have declared, "Arwahuna ajsaduna wa ajsaduna arwahund" (Our spirits are our bodies and our bodies are our spirits).<sup>26</sup> The sojourn of man through the levels of existence and forms, which the popular interpretation of Indian religions identifies with a return to the same level of reality and the esoteric dimension of the Abrahamic traditions with multiple levels of reality,<sup>27</sup> corresponds to his journey within himself and through all the layers of his own being. Man possesses an incorruptible ethereal body as well as a radiant spiritual body corresponding to the other "earths" of the higher states of being. In the same way that to speak of body and soul corresponds to the perspective of heaven or several heavens and

earth, to envisage the several bodies of man corresponds to seeing the higher levels of reality as each possessing its own heaven and earth. After all, through the grace of the Amidha Buddha man is born in the "Pure Land" and not "pure heaven," but here the symbolism of land includes the paradisaical and heavenly.<sup>28</sup> It is the celestial earth to which also Islamic esoterism refers often, and which played such an important role in Zoroastrianism, where the earth itself was conceived as having been originally an angel.<sup>29</sup> The various "bodies" of the inner man have been envisaged in very different terms in different traditions but everywhere they are related to the realization of sacred knowledge and the attainment of virtue. The beauty of man's physical body is God-given and not for him to determine. But the type of "body" attained either in the posthumous state or through initiatic practices and ways of realization depends upon how man spends that precious gift which is human life, for once this life comes to an end the door, which is open toward the Infinite, closes. Only man can pass through the door while enjoying possibilities of the human state. It makes literally all the difference in the world whether man does pass through that door while he has the possibility or not.<sup>30</sup> In any case, as far as the positive and not negative and infernal

possibilities are concerned, the various bodies of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas mentioned in northern schools of Buddhism and so central to Buddhist eschatology and techniques of meditation, the Hindu chakras as centers of the subtle bodies and energies, the okhema symphyes ("psychic vehicle") of Proclus or the lata3if or subtle bodies of Sufism, all refer to the immense reality unto which the human micro-cosm opens if only man were to cease to live on the surface of his being. Certain schools also speak of the man of light and the whole anatomy and physiology of the inner man, which is not the subject of study of modern biology but which, nevertheless, affects the human body, the physical body itself reflecting the Absolute on its own level and possessing a positive nature of great import for the understanding of the total nature of man.<sup>31</sup>

The human body is not the seat of concupiscence but only its instrument. Although asceticism is a necessary element of every authentic spiritual path, for there is something in the soul that must die before it can reach perfection, the body itself is the temple of God. It is the sacred precinct in which the Divine Presence or the Divine Light<sup>32</sup> manifests itself as asserted not only in the Oriental religions but also in Hesychasm within Orthodox Christianity where the keeping of the mind within the body and the Divine Name within the center of the body, which is the heart, plays a crucial role. This

perspective is also to be found in Christian Hermeticism but has not been greatly emphasized in Western Christian theology.<sup>33</sup>

174 • Knowledge and the Sacred

The human body consists of three basic elements: the head, the body, and the heart. The heart, which is the invisible center of both the subtle and the physical body, is the seat of intelligence and the point which relates the terrestrial human state to the higher states of being. In the heart, knowledge and being meet and are one. The head and the body are like projections of the heart: the head, whose activity is associated with the mind, is the projection of the intelligence of the heart and the body the projection of being. This separation already marks the segmentation and externalization of man. But the compartmentalization is not complete. There is an element of being in the mind and of intelligence in the body which become forgotten to the extent that man becomes engrossed in the illusion of the Promethean mode of existence and forgets his theomorphic nature. That is why modern man, who is Promethean man to the extent that such a perversion of his own reality is possible, is the type of man most forgetful of the tranquility and peace of mind which reflects being and of the intelligence of the body. That is also why those contemporary men, in quest of the sacred and the rediscovery of pontifical man, seek, on the one hand, techniques of meditation

which would allow the agitated mind to simply be and to overcome that excessive cerebral activity which characterizes modern man and, on the other hand, to rediscover the wisdom and intelligence of the body through yoga, Oriental forms of medicine, natural foods, and the like. Both attempts are in reality the quest for the heart which in the spiritual person, aware of his vocation as man, "penetrates" into both the head and the body, integrating them into the center, bestowing a contemplative perfume to mental activity and an intellectual and spiritual presence to the body which is reflected in its gestures and motions.<sup>34</sup>

In the prophet, the avatar, and the great saint both the face and the body directly manifest and display the presence of the heart through an inwardness which attracts toward the center and a radiance and emanation of grace which inebriates and unifies. For those not blessed by the vision of such beings, the sacred art of those traditions based on the iconography of the human form of the founder or outstanding spiritual figures of the tradition is at least a substitute and reminder of what a work of art man himself is. To behold a Japanese or Tibetan Buddha image, with eyes drawn inward toward the heart and the body radiating the presence of the Spirit which Man, Pontifical and Promethean • 175 resides in the heart, is to grasp in a concrete fashion what the principal



and ideal relation of the heart is to both the head and the body which preserve their own intelligible symbolism and even their own wisdom, whether a particular "mind" cut off from its own roots is aware of it or not.

The central and "absolute" nature of the human body is also to be seen in man's vertical position which directly reflects his role as the axis connecting heaven and earth. The clear distinction of his head protruding toward heaven reflects his quest for transcendence. The chest reflects glory and nobility, of a more rigorous nature in the male and generous in the female, and the sexual parts hierogenesis, divine activity whose terrestrial result is the procreation of another man or woman who miraculously enough is again not merely a biological being although outwardly brought into the world through biological means.<sup>35</sup> From the perspective of scientia sacra the human body itself is proof that man has sprung from a celestial origin and that he was born for a goal beyond the confines of his animality. The definition of man as a central being is reflected not only in his mind, speech, and other internal faculties but also in his body which stands at the center of the circle of terrestrial existence and possesses a beauty and significance which is of a purely spiritual nature. The very body of man and woman reveals the destiny of the human being as a creature born for immortality, as a being whose perfection resides in ascending the

vertical dimension of existence, having already reached the center of the horizontal dimension. Having reached the point of intersection of the cross,<sup>36</sup> it is for man to ascend its vertical axis which is the only way for him to transcend himself and to remain fully human, for to be human is to go beyond oneself. As Saint Augustine has said, to remain human, man must become superhuman. Man also possesses numerous internal faculties, a memory much more prestigious than those who are the product of modern education can envisage<sup>37</sup> and one which plays a very positive role in both intellectual and artistic activity of traditional man. He possesses an imagination which, far from being mere fantasy, has the power to create forms corresponding to cosmic realities and to play a central role in religious and even intellectual life, far more than can be conceived by the modern world whose impoverished view of reality excludes the whole domain of what might be called the imaginal, to distinguish it from the imaginary.<sup>38</sup> Man also possesses that miraculous gift of speech through which he is able to exteriorize the knowledge of both the heart and the mind. His speech is the direct reflection and consequence of his theomorphic nature and the Logos which shines at the center of his being. It is through his speech that he is able to formulate the Word of God and it is also through his speech in

176 • Knowledge and the Sacred

the form of prayer and finally the quintessential prayer of the heart which is inner speech and silent invocation that he himself becomes prayer. Man realizes his full pontifical nature in that theophanic prayer of Universal Man in which the whole creation, both Heaven and earth, participate.

From the point of view of his powers and faculty man can be said to possess essentially three powers or poles which determine his life, these being intelligence, sentiment, and will. As a theomorphic being he possesses or can possess that absolute and unconditioned intelligence which can know the truth as such; sentiments which are capable of going beyond the limited conditions of man and of reaching out for the ultimate through love, suffering, sacrifice, and also fear;<sup>39</sup> and a will which is free to choose and which reflects the Divine Freedom.

Because of man's separation from his original perfection and all the ambivalence that the human condition involves as a result of what Christianity calls the fall, none of these powers function necessarily and automatically according to man's theomorphic nature. The fall of man upon the earth, like the descent of a symbol from a higher plane of reality, means both reflection and inversion which in the case of man leads to perversion. Intelligence can become reduced to mental play; sentiments can deteriorate to little more than gravitation around

that illusory coagulation which we usually call ourselves but which is only the ego in its negative sense as comprising the knots of the soul; and the will can be debased to nothing other than the urge to do that which removes man from the source of his own being, from his own real self. But these powers, when governed by tradition and imbued with the power of the light and grace which emanates from revelation, begin to reveal, like man's body, dimensions of his theomorphic nature. The body, however, remains more innocent and true to the form in which God created it, whereas the perversion of man and his deviation from his Divine Prototype is manifested directly in this intermediate realm with which man identifies himself, namely, the realm of the will and the sentiments and even the mental reflection of Man, Pontifical and Promethean • 177

the intelligence, if not the intelligence itself. In the normal situation which is that of pontifical man, the goal of all three human powers or faculties, that is, intelligence, the sentiments, and will, is God. Moreover, in the sapiential perspective both the sentiments and the will are related to intelligence and impregnated by it, for how can one love without knowing what one loves and how can one will something without some knowledge at least of what one wills? The understanding of the reality of man as anthropos can be achieved more fully by also casting an eye upon the segmentations

and divisions of various kinds which characterize mankind as such. The original anthropos was, according to traditional teachings, an androgynic figure although some traditions speak of both a male and a female being whose union is then seen as the perfection identified with the androgynic state.<sup>40</sup> In either case, the wholeness and perfection inherent in the human state and the bliss which is associated with sexual union belong in reality to the androgynic state before the sexes were separated. But the dualities which characterize the created order and which manifest themselves on all levels of existence below the principal, such as yin-yang, purusa-prakrti, activity and passivity, form and matter, could not but appear upon the plane of that androgynic reality and give birth to the male and the female which do not, however, correspond to pure yin and pure yang. Since they are creatures they must contain both principles within themselves with one of the elements of the duality predominating in each case. The male and the female in their complementarity recreate the unity of the androgynic being and in fact sexual union is an earthly reflection of that paradisaical ecstasy which belonged to the androgynic anthropos. But that androgynic reality is also reflected in both man and woman in themselves, hence both the sense of complementarity and rivalry which characterizes the relation between the sexes. In any case the distinction between the male and female is not only biological. It is

not even only psychological or spiritual. It has its roots in the Divine Nature Itself, man reflecting more the Absoluteness of the Divine and the woman Its Infinitude. If the face of God towards the world is envisaged in masculine terms, His inner Infinitude is symbolized by the feminine as are His Mercy and Wisdom.<sup>41</sup> Human sexuality, far from being a terrestrial accident, reflects principles which are ultimately of a metacosmic significance. It is not without reason that sexuality is the only means open for human beings, not endowed

178 • Knowledge and the Sacred

with the gift of spiritual vision, to experience "the Infinite" through the senses, albeit for a few fleeting moments, and that sexuality leaves such a profound mark upon the soul of men and women and affects them in a manner far more enduring than other physical acts. To understand the nature of the male-female distinction in the human race and to appreciate the positive qualities which each sex displays is to gain greater insight into the nature of that androgynic being whose reality both the male and female carry at the center of their being.<sup>42</sup> Man is not only divided according to sex but also temperament of which both sexes partake. The four temperaments of traditional Galenic medicine which have their counterparts in other schools of traditional medicine concern not only the physical body but also the psychic substance and in fact all the faculties which comprise what

we call the soul. They affect not only the sentiments but also the will and even the modes of operation of intelligence which in themselves remain above the temperamental modifications. The same could be said of the three gunas of Hindu cosmology, those fundamental tendencies in the primary substance of the universe, or prakrti, which concern not only the physical realm but also human types.<sup>43</sup> One can say that human beings are differentiated through the dual principles of yin-yang; the three gunas, which are sattva, the ascending, raja, the expansive, and tamas, the descending tendencies; and the temperaments which have a close correlation with the four natures, elements, and humors as expounded in various cosmological schemes.<sup>44</sup> Human types can also be divided astrologically, here astrology being understood in its cosmological and symbolic rather than its predictive sense.<sup>45</sup> Astrological classifications, which are in fact related to traditional medical and physical typologies, concern the cosmic correspondences of the various aspects of the human soul and unveil the refraction of the archetype of man in the cosmic mirror in such a way as to bring out the diversity of this refraction with reference to the qualities associated with the zodiacal signs and the planets. Traditional astrology, in a sense, concerns man on the angelic level of his being but also unveils, if understood in its symbolic significance, a typology of man which reveals yet another facet of the

differentiation of the human species. The correspondence between various parts of the body as well as man's mental powers to astrological signs and the intricate rapport created between the motion of the heavens, various "aspects" and relations between planets and human activity are also a means of portraying the inward link that binds man as the microcosm to the cosmos. Mankind is also divided into castes and races, both of which must be understood in their essential reality and without the pejorative connotations which have become associated with them in the modern world. The division of humanity into castes does not necessarily mean immutable social stratification for there have been strictly traditional societies, such as the Islamic, where caste has not existed as a social institution in the same way it was found in ancient Persia or in India. The traditional science of man sees the concept of caste as a key for the understanding of human types. There are those who are contemplative by nature and drawn to the quest of knowledge, who have a sacerdotal nature and in normal times usually fulfill the priestly and intellectual functions in their society. There are those who are warriors and leaders of men, who possess the courage to fight for the truth and to protect the world in which they live, who are ready to sacrifice themselves in battle as the person with a sacerdotal



nature sacrifices himself in prayer to the Divinity. Members of this second caste have a knightly function and in normal times would be the political leaders and warriors. Then there are those given to trade, to making an honest living and working hard to sustain and support themselves and those around them. They have a mercantile nature and in traditional societies comprise those who carry out the business and economic functions of normal society. Finally, there are those whose virtue is to follow and to be led, to work according to the dictates of those who lead them. These castes which Hinduism identifies as the brahman, ksatriya, vaisya, and sudra are not necessarily identified with birth in all societies.<sup>46</sup> In any case, as far as the study of human types is concerned, they are to be found everywhere in all times and climes wherever men and women live and die. They represent fundamental human types complementing the tripartite Neoplatonic division of human beings into the pneumatics, psychics, and "hylics" (the hylikoi of the Neoplatonists). To understand the deeper significance of caste is to gain an insight into a profound aspect of human nature in whatever environment man might function and live.<sup>47</sup> Finally, it is obvious that human beings are divided into racial and ethnic types. There are four races, the yellow, the red, the black, and the white, which like the four castes act as the pillars of the human

180 • Knowledge and the Sacred

collectivity, four symbolizing stability and being associated with the earth itself with its four cardinal directions and the four elements of which the physical world is composed. Each race is an aspect of that androgynic reality and possesses its own positive features. In fact, no one race can exhaust the reality of the human state, including human beauty which each race, both its male and female members, reflect in a different fashion. The very plenitude of the Divine Principle and richness of the reality of the Universal Man, who is the theater for the theophany of all the Divine Names and Qualities, requires this multiplicity of races and ethnic groups which in their unbelievable variety manifest the different aspects of their prototype and which together give some idea of the grandeur and beauty of that first creation of God which was the human reality as such, that primordial reflection of the face of the Beloved in the mirror of nothingness. The division of mankind into male and female, the various temperamental types, astrological divisions of human beings, different natures according to caste, various racial types, and many other factors along with the interpenetration of these modes of perceiving the human state, reveal something of the immense complexity of that creature called man. But as analysis leads in turn to synthesis, this bewildering array of types all return to that primordial reality of the

anthropos which each human being reflects in himself or herself. To be human is to be human wherever and whenever one may live. There is therefore a profound unity of traditional mankind which only the traditional science of man can comprehend without reducing this unity to a uniformity and a gross quantitative equality that characterizes so much of the modern concern for man and the study of the human state.

Through all these differences of types, tradition detects the presence of that pontifical man born to know the Absolute and to live according to the will of Heaven. But tradition is also fully aware of the ambivalence of the human state, of the fact that men do not live on the level of what they are in principle, but below themselves, and of the imperfection of all that participates in what is characteristically human. This trait includes even those direct manifestations of the Absolute in the relative which comprise religion with revelation at its heart. Man is such a being that he can become prophet and spokesman for the Word of God, not to speak of the possibility of the divinized man which certain traditions like Islam, based on the Absolute itself, reject. But even in these cases there is a human margin and within each religion there exists an element of pure, unqualified Truth and a margin which already belongs to the region where the

Man, Pontifical and Promethean • 181

Truth penetrates into the human substance.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, revelation is always given in the language of the people to whom God addresses Himself. As the Quran says, "And We never sent a messenger save with the language of his folk that he might make [the message] clear for them."<sup>49</sup> Hence the multiplicity of religions in a world with multiple "humanities." The human state therefore gives a certain particularity to various revelations of the Truth while the heart of these revelations remains above all form. In fact, man himself is able to penetrate into that formless Essence through his intelligence sanctified by that revelation and even come to know that the formless Truth is modified by the form of the recipient according to the Divine Wisdom and Will, God having Himself created that recipient which receives His revelation in different climes and settings.<sup>50</sup> How strange it appears that agnostic humanism, which remains content with the vessel without realizing the origin of the divine elixir that the human vessel contains, should be only a half-way house to that which is inhuman! Pontifical man has lived on the earth for millennia and continues to survive here and there despite the onslaught of modernism. But the life of Promethean man has been indeed short-lived. The kind of humanism associated with the Promethean revolt of the Renaissance has led in only a few centuries to the veritably inhuman which threatens not only the human quality

of life but the very existence of man on earth. The reason for such a phenomenon, which seems so unexpected from the perspective of Promethean man, is quite obvious from the traditional point of view. It lies in the fact that to speak of the human is to speak, at the same time, of the Divine. Although scholars occasionally discuss what they call Chinese or Islamic humanism, there has in fact never been a humanism in any traditional civilization similar to the one associated with the European Renaissance and what followed upon its wake. Traditional civilizations have spoken of man and of course created cultures and disciplines called the humanities of the highest order but the man they have spoken of has never ceased to be that pontifical man who stands on the axis joining Heaven and earth and who bears the imprint of the Divine upon his very being. It is this basic nature of man which makes a secular and agnostic.

humanism impossible. It is not metaphysically possible to kill the gods and seek to efface the imprint of the Divinity upon man without destroying man himself; the bitter experience of the modern world stands as overwhelming evidence to this truth. The face which God has turned toward the cosmos and man (the wajhallah of the Quran)<sup>51</sup> is none other than the face of man toward the Divinity and in fact the human face itself. One cannot "efface" the "face of God" without

"effacing" man himself and reducing him to a faceless entity lost in an anthill. The cry of Nietzsche that "God is dead" could not but mean that "man is dead" as the history of the twentieth century has succeeded in demonstrating in so many ways. But in reality the response to Nietzsche was not the death of man as such but of the Promethean man who had thought he could live on a circle without a center. The other man, the pontifical man, although forgotten in the modern world, continues to live even within those human beings who pride themselves in having outgrown the models and modes of thought of their ancestors; he continues to live and will never die. That man who remains man and continues to survive here and there even during this period of eclipse of spirituality and the desacralization of life is the being who remains aware of his destiny which is transcendence and the function of his intelligence which is knowledge of the Absolute. He is fully aware of the preciousness of human life, which alone permits a creature living in this world to journey beyond the cosmos, and is always conscious of the great responsibility which such an opportunity entails. He knows that the grandeur of man does not lie in his cunning cleverness or titanic creations but resides most of all in the incredible power to empty himself of himself, to cease to exist in the initiatic sense, to participate in that state of spiritual poverty and emptiness which permits him to experience

Ultimate Reality. As the Persian poet Saadi says, Man reaches a stage where he sees nothing but God; See how exalted is the station of manhood.<sup>52</sup> Pontifical man stands at the perigee of an arc half of which represents the trajectory through which he has descended from the Source and his own archetype in divinity and the other half the arc of ascent which he must follow to return to that Source. The whole constitution of man reveals this role of the traveler who becomes what he "is" and Man, Pontifical and Promethean •

is what he becomes. Man is fully man only when he realizes who he is and in doing so fulfills not only his own destiny and reaches his entelechy but also illuminates the world about him. Journeying from the earth to his celestial abode, which he has left inwardly, man becomes the channel of grace for the earth, and the bridge which joins it to Heaven. Realization of the truth by pontifical man is not only the goal and end of the human state but also the means whereby Heaven and earth are reunited in marriage, and the Unity, which is the Source of the cosmos and the harmony which pervades it, is reestablished. To be fully man is to rediscover that primordial Unity from which all the heavens and earths originate and yet from which nothing ever really departs.

## NOTES

1. By man is meant not the male alone but the human state whose archetypal reality is the androgyne reflected in both the male and female. Man in English signifies at once the male and the human being as such like the Greek anthropos, the German mensch or the Arabic insan. There is no need to torture the natural structure of the English language to satisfy current movements which consider the use of the term "man" as a sexist bias, forgetting the second meaning of the term as anthropos.

2. On the Islamic conception of man and the meaning of this term see G. Eaton, King of the Castle, chap. 5; G. Durand, Science de l'homme et tradition, Paris, 1979, esp. chap. 3, entitled "Homo proximi orientis: science de l'homme et Islam spirituel"; and Nasr, "Who is Man? The Perennial Answer of Islam," in Needleman (ed.), The Sword of Gnosis, pp. 203-17.

See also "Man as Microcosm," in T. Izutsu, A Comparative Study of the Key Philosophical Concepts in Sufism and Taoism—Ibn 'Arabi and Lao-Tzu, Chuang-Tzu, Pt. 1, Tokyo, 1966, pp. 208ff., where the whole doctrine of the universal man (or khalifah) as expounded in Ibn 'Arabi's Fusus al-hikam is elaborated with great clarity. In pts. 2 and 3 of this work the Taoist concept of man is likewise elucidated and finally compared in a masterly fashion with the Islamic.

3. Needless to say, the title of pontiff given to the Catholic pope symbolizes directly the central function of this office as the "bridge" between God and His church as well as between the church and the community of the faithful, but this more particular usage of the term does not invalidate the universal significance of the "pontifical" function of man as such.

4. Certain modern observers of the environmental crisis, who want at the same time to defend the misdeeds of modern man, seek to extrapolate the devastation of the



planet to earlier periods of human history in order to decrease the burden of responsibility of modern man by including even goats to explain why the ecological balance is being destroyed. While one cannot deny the deforestation of certain areas or erosion of the soil during the Middle Ages or even earlier, there is no doubt that there is no comparison between the intensity, rapidity, or extent of destruction of the natural environment during the past few centuries and what occurred during the previous long periods of history when traditional man lived on the surface of the earth.

5. This is the title of a well-known essay of G. Durand. See his *On the Disfiguration of the Image of Man in the West*, Ipswich, U.K., 1976.

