

---

## UNIT 3    BEING AND ANALOGY

---

### Contents

- 3.0   Objectives
- 3.1   Introduction
- 3.2   Analogy of Being from Western Perspectives
- 3.3   Analogy of Being from Indian Perspectives
- 3.4   Let Us Sum Up
- 3.5   Further Readings and References

---

### 3.0    OBJECTIVES

---

Being is that which is in some way or something. Humans encounter Being in the horizon of history which is also the horizon of Being. This historical horizon of Being includes, in a special way, the metaphysical horizons of the West and India. In this Unit we study the relation between Being and analogy:

- From Western perspectives
- From Indian perspectives
- From a comparative perspective

---

### 3.1    INTRODUCTION

---

Being is that which is in some way or something. That which is in some way or something, comes to us in many ways, in and through each and every being that we encounter in the horizon of history which is also the horizon of Being. Insofar as it comes to us we understand it. As we understand it we are able to consider it as it is, inasmuch as it is, i.e., being as being. But the moment we make an effort to grasp it, to understand it fully, it escapes us in some way, goes away from us without leaving us completely. The finite being is the ‘junction’ of this ‘coming’ and ‘going’. It is the ‘meeting point’ of the ‘arrival’ and ‘departure’ of Being. Being does not meet each being in the same way, but distinctly in the horizon of the same Being, which is originally, one. Each being is both identical with and distinct from both Being and beings. It is identical with being (one) insofar as each being is in being belonging to Being; it is also distinct from being (many) since it is not the absolute fullness of Being. Hence every being is an identity-in-distinction or one-in-many. But each being is not a one-in-many in the same way, but differently, in its own way, in an analogous way. Each being is analogous because being itself is originally analogous; for Being, that which is in some way, is in its own way. In other words, Being is analogous in itself. It is ‘realized’ diversely, yet proportionately, in all beings whatever.

---

### 3.2    ANALOGY OF BEING FROM WESTERN PERSPECTIVES

---

There is a steady dynamism in human knowledge which assumes the form of a dialectical process. This dynamism proceeds beyond everything laid down in

concepts, unfolding the conditioned and limited nature of knowledge. In the awareness of the limit as limit, the human intellect goes beyond the limit, pushing our thematic knowledge of being ever further and deeper. However, our knowledge can never be fully conceptualized. This dialectics of our knowledge about Being is a manifestation of the *analogy of Being*. The term ‘analogy’ has its origin in the Greek mathematical vocabulary. There it meant sameness of ratio or proportion between the respective terms of different pairs. “Two is to four as three is to six” exhibits the same proportion or ratio in each pair, that of half. Outside arithmetic the sameness does not have to be equality, for instance: “As a point is to a line so a surface is to a solid”, or “As sharp is to the sense of touch, so is shrill to the sense of hearing”. The sameness of proportion in such cases is not equality but merely similarity. It is a likeness in the respective ways in which the terms are related to each other in pairs, and the likeness is found in a feature that differentiates the instances. Conversely, the various instances while different in themselves exhibit in that very difference itself sufficient similarity to require expression in one and the same notion. The one identical notion is partly the same and partly different. The sameness and the difference are in the one notion.

Before we analyze the concept of analogy further we shall consider the meaning of the terms ‘univocal’, ‘equivocal’ and ‘analogous’. *Univocal term* is one which is said of many in a way which is always the same. It designates a number of things in an identical sense. It is predicated of diverse things according to exactly the same concept. For example, the term ‘metal’ can be used to designate gold, silver, copper, tin, etc. An *Equivocal term* is one which stands for concepts with totally different meanings, and thus also for totally different things. It stands for diverse things with diverse meanings. It is predicated of diverse things according to an entirely different concept,

- e.g., Bark    - bark of a dog.  
                  - bark of a tree.
- Pen            - an instrument for writing.  
                  - an enclosure for animals.
- Coach        - a vehicle.  
                  - an athletic director.
- Page         - a leaf of a book.  
                  - an attendant at court.

An *Analogous term* is one which is said of many in a way which is somewhat same and somewhat different. It is one and the same name predicated of many according to concepts which are not entirely different, but agree in some common point. In analogous predication the external term remains the same, but the concept of which the term is a symbol neither remains exactly the same, as is the case in univocal predication, nor becomes entirely different, as happens in equivocal predication, but *varies*, i.e., while changing it retains something. The reason why it does not remain exactly the same is that such a concept does not completely abstract from the differences of its inferiors. As a result, these differences have to be taken into consideration when the concept is predicated of different subjects. Thus the unity of such a concept is not absolute but only relative. For example, when my eyes perceive a material object, I can say: “I see”; and when my intellect

understands a problem, I can also say: “I see”. The act of sense perception in the first instance is completely different from that of intellectual perception. Nevertheless, there is a certain relative unity because as the eye is related to sense perception, so the intellect is related to intellectual perception. Consequently, one and the same term may be used to express both actions. But when one predicates this term of the eye and of the intellect, the concept signified by the term “to see” has to be adjusted accordingly as required by the subject (the eye or the intellect). In this way, one concept can be predicated of things which are completely different insofar as they are relatively the same. It is the condition of the possibility of both univocal and equivocal terms. Univocal and equivocal terms presuppose analogous terms; for without the ultimate, all-encompassing unity, all beings and all relations between beings would disappear. This ultimate unity is no longer univocal but analogous. In other words, univocal and equivocal terms presuppose a plurality of different contents which are separated from each other. At the same time they presuppose an ordered unity of different beings. Such a unity can only be analogous.

An analogous term implies two analogues: *primary analogue* and *secondary analogue*.

*Primary analogue* is the object which first deserves the term or of which it is first predicated. *Secondary analogue* is the object which possesses in a lesser degree the perfection indicated by the term or to which the term is later applied. In other words, the primary analogue means the analogue to which such a term belongs principally, and secondary analogues are analogues of which such a term is predicated in dependence upon the primary analogue. For example, if one predicates “healthy” of human, fresh air, and medicine, human is the primary analogue, and fresh air and medicine are the secondary analogues.

Analogy is broadly distinguished into *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*. *Intrinsic analogy* is one in which the term is verified according to its definition in both the primary and secondary analogues. It can be further distinguished into two: *intrinsic analogy of participation* and *intrinsic analogy of proportionality*. *Intrinsic analogy of participation* is the analogy in which the analogues not only verify the *definition* of the perfection, but also stand to one another in a relation of participation of that perfection, e.g., finite intelligence and infinite intelligence. Here finite intelligence intrinsically participates in the perfection of the infinite intelligence of God. *Intrinsic analogy of proportionality* is the analogy in which the analogues verify the definition of the perfection with a certain similitude of proportions, e.g., the proportions of their intelligence to their respective essences. Perhaps this fact can be made clear by illustration. Intelligence is certainly an analogous concept: God is intelligent; angel is intelligent; human is intelligent. In all these, intelligence is an intrinsic reality; yet it differs widely in each case. Intelligence as predicated of God differs widely from intelligence as predicated of angel or human. The concept as applied to all these beings manifests a proportion between two notes in the concept of this perfection; and the proportion must vary in accordance with the nature of each individual or class of individuals, and still retain the same fundamental definition, so that intelligence in all these may be said to be somewhat same and somewhat different. The following may serve as a formulation of this proportion: *Intelligence is to the nature of God as it is to the nature of an angel as it is to the nature of human*. Certainly there is proportional similarity in these concepts, although this proportion does not

postulate identity of concept. In God, the proportion is of identity. With the angel, on the contrary, because of the real distinction between its essence and being, the proportion is quite different; and human, whose essence is a composite of spiritual form with matter, must have the grade of intelligence demanded by such a nature. *Extrinsic analogy* is the one in which the term is predicated only according to its definition of the primary analogue, while it is predicated of the secondary analogues in a connected sense which may fall short or go beyond that of the definition. It can also be further distinguished into two: *attribution and proportionality*. *Extrinsic analogy of attribution* is analogy in which the nature signified by the concept is intrinsically realized only in the primary analogue, but attributed to the others only insofar as they have a relationship to the primary analogue. The traditional example is the concept of health. We say: Philip is healthy; fresh air is healthy; medicine is healthy. In its proper and accepted meaning health means that the various parts of a living body function properly in relation to the whole. Hence the perfection of health is intrinsically realized in the primary analogue, Philip. When health is predicated of fresh air and medicine, it is attributed to them merely because in fresh air and medicine there is something by which they are related to the health of a living body as contributing factors of health. Hence in calling them healthy one merely wants to affirm this relationship. For this reason fresh air, medicine, etc. are said to be healthy by relation, attribution, or extrinsic predication. The analogy of attribution is thus also called analogy of relation or proportion. *Extrinsic analogy of proportionality (metaphorical analogy)* is analogy in which the nature signified by the term is realized formally and intrinsically in one of the analogues; and in the other or others extrinsically and virtually, i.e., only with respect to a secondary characteristic, such as the activity, proper to this nature. Take for example, the term “lion”. The nature signified by the term is realized formally and intrinsically only in the animal called “lion”. A human cannot be called lion in the formal sense; for a lion is essentially irrational, whereas human is essentially rational. However, it is proper to the nature of a lion to act courageously in the face of danger. Hence we may consider this secondary aspect of the nature of a lion and predicate the term “lion” of a human who is courageous. In doing so we convey the idea that in the face of danger this human acts in the same way as a lion is supposed to act. Hence we say that ‘he is a lion’ because of his resemblance to a lion in the order of activity.

**Being is neither Univocal nor Equivocal but Analogous:** At first Being is *not a univocal concept*. For a univocal concept abstracts from the differences of its inferiors, whereas Being actually includes these differences. For instance, a substance is a being in the sense of something whose being is a being in itself. An accident is a being in the sense of something whose being is a being in another. Again God’s being is different from that of any creature because unlike any creature He is His own being. Hence it is clear that the diversity of relationship to Being prevents the univocal predication of Being. Secondly, Being is *not equivocal*. For, if equivocity occurs when there is no foundation in reality why should diverse things be called by the same name? But we predicate the name ‘Being’ of diverse things because each of them is something which has a reference to Being. Hence there is a foundation in reality for the predication of the term, so that Being is not equivocal. Consequently, it follows by exclusion that the notion of *Being is analogous*. Since we have thus distinguished two modes of analogy, *intrinsic and extrinsic*, we must now investigate which mode of analogy applies

to the notion of Being. For obvious reasons we can immediately exclude *extrinsic analogy of proportionality or metaphorical analogy*. For otherwise, many beings would be beings only according to a secondary aspect; with regard to their primary aspect these beings would be non-beings, which is impossible. Being is thus analogous according to the *intrinsic analogy of participation and proportionality*. *Intrinsic analogy of participation* rests on a relation of participation by which the finite beings participate in the Infinite Being. *Intrinsic analogy of proportionality* rests on a similitude of proportions in which each being is a proportion of the act of existing to its essence. Is Being also analogous by *extrinsic analogy of attribution*? As we have seen above, a term is analogous by analogy of attribution if the perfection signified by it is found intrinsically in the primary analogue, and is attributed to others only because of a consideration of their causal relationship to the primary analogue. Now the perfection of Being is realized intrinsically in each of the analogues. Hence, it is clear that formally speaking?Being cannot be analogous by extrinsic analogy of attribution.

---

### 3.3 ANALOGY OF BEING FROM INDIAN PERSPECTIVES

---

The Indian philosophical tradition approves that the question of Being assigned to a specific philosophical discipline such as ontology (General Metaphysics), is a symptomatically Western phenomenon. Yet Being (*sat*) is thematic in the Vedic and Upanishadic texts, and it remains a recurrent topic in later traditions. In one of the passages of the Chandogya Upanishad, Uddalaka Aruni teaches his son Svetaketu: “In the beginning, my dear, this world was just Being (*sat*), one only, without a second. To be sure, some people say: ‘In the beginning this world was just non-being (*asat*), one only, without a second; from that non-being Being was produced.’ But verily, my dear, whence could this be?...How, from non-being could Being be produced? On the contrary, my dear, in the beginning this world was just Being, one only, without a second” (*Ch. Up.*, VI. 2, 1-2).

The text itself indicates that it is preceded by earlier discussions about Being and non-being. The theory of the origination of Being from non-being, to which the text explicitly refers, is found not only in the Upanishads, but also in the Brahmanas, and even in the Rgveda itself. Norman Brown has proposed a concrete cosmological interpretation of the Rgvedic uses of *sat* and *asat* as we find them in the famous hymn X.129, or in X.72, according to which *sat* would be realm of humans and gods and of the cosmic order (*rta*), and *asat*, the chaotic underworld of the demons. Discussions of *sat* and *asat* in the Brahmana texts are usually in the line of ritualistic and mythical identifications and personifications. There are very few philosophically significant occurrences like the equation what is (*asti*) with what is ‘immortal’ in the *Satapatha Brahmana*. Being in this sense is a familiar characteristic of Brahman, and they (Being and Brahman) may even be used as synonyms.

There is no systematically developed terminology of Being in the Upanishads, and the applicability of *sat* to *Brahman* in its primeval unity often remains ambiguous. It is obvious that in these discussions the question of unity takes precedence over the question of Being. The *Brhadaranyaka Upanishad* associates *sat* with that aspect of Brahman, which is ‘formed,’ ‘mortal,’ and ‘stationary,’ and then it is contrasted with the other aspect of Brahman, which remains beyond



(*tyat*). The *Taittiriya Upanishad* referring to the same terminology of *sat* and *tyat*, presents *sat* and its separation from *tyat* as a result of Brahman's self-procreation, putting *sat* on the side of the 'defined,' 'based,' 'conscious,' 'real.' Being in these passages appears as a step into diversity. Brahman is Being insofar as it coincides with the world, with what there is. But there remains the aspect of transcendence, and *sat* alone falls short of the primeval unity of Brahman, as Being is both transcendent and immanent, identity and difference. Entities *are*, but Being alone *is*. Being transcends.

The Advaita Vedanta reflects upon the Upanishads and systematically develops these and similar questions. Sankara's references to Brahman as *sat* or *sanmatra* (pure being) remain somewhat casual; the triad, 'being,' 'consciousness,' 'bliss,' is not found in his authentic writings. Later *advaitins* too seem to be more interested in refuting false conceptions of Being than in establishing their own view of the absolute in terms of Being. However, Mandanamisra devotes special care to re-examining the notion of Being and its applicability to Brahman. 'Pure Beingness' or *sanmatra* is interpreted as the one and all-pervasive content of the immediate, non-relational, pre-predicative perception (*nirvikalpapratyaksa*). The supreme unity of all reality is thus presented as the implicit unconditioned condition of all conditions, namely, percepts, concepts, particulars, categories, imagination, and thought. However, Buddhists generally reject, avoid, or even ridicule any such theorizing in terms of Being, with its connotations of self-nature, permanence, and self-sufficiency.

**Being as *Tad Ekam*:** Here, in this Unit, the original *Rig Vedic* notion *Tad Ekam* (That One = Being = *Tad Ekam*) is preferred to all other terms as it corresponds well with the notion of Being as 'that which is in some way or something.' The hymn where the notion appears is the *Nasadiya-sukta* (Rgveda X. 129), which has been praised as containing 'the flower of Indian thought.' This hymn is the quintessence of Indian metaphysics. All things are traced to one principle. Opposites like being and non-being, life and death, night and day, are shown to be the self-unfolding of 'That One.' *Tad Ekam* is the ground of the universe. Because it is devoid of differences and definiteness, it is referred to as 'That One' which is in some way. It is neither a particular being nor non-being (nothing) but 'something' which is beyond them while being their core and ground, the Unconditioned Condition of all conditions. *Tad Ekam* had within it the latent power out of which the universe, including the gods, emerged. The point to be noted here is the conception of the ultimate Being as dynamic or self-unfolding, and as requiring no outside Power to guide and shape it. It is a hymn of Being. It is an invocation to the Being that transcends all the other beings of knowledge. It provides an experiential insight into the making of that Being. It does not deal with the beginning of the cosmos or with its evolution. It expresses a luminous awareness that Being is beyond being (existent = *sat* = *ens*) and non-being (non-existent = *asat* = *non-ens*). Being is beyond being and non-being while being in them as their only Ground.

The following is a brief summary of the seven stanzas of the hymn: Stanza one: In the hymn, *Tadanim* ("Then") refers to the time when time was not. In fact, words such as 'before' and 'after' are not suitable to describe it, as they themselves belong to time-sequence. The Being of beings is neither in space nor in time. It is beyond both, and above all categories of understanding and description. It is the unconditioned condition of all existence. Stanza two: In that state when there

was neither space nor time, neither before nor after, neither beginning nor end, neither mortal nor immortal, neither night nor day, there was only the Absolute One, Being itself, self-contained and self-sustained. Stanza three: In the unknown, unknowable, primal state, it was sheer darkness encompassed and concealed by greater darkness. It was a state of absence of all knowledge. Like an absolute expanse of water (ocean), the One (Being) was featureless and distinctionless. The all-embracing and all-transcending *Abbu* was concealed by its indescribable, unaccountable nature, *tuccya*. Its transcendence and self-concealment are accomplished by its own *chit-tapas*. Stanza four: The *manas*, whose basic quality is *karma*, is the faculty by which the One (Being) becomes many (beings); it is the principle by which the immortal *prana* descends into the phenomenal world, by which *sat* becomes *asat*. Stanza five: It is the interaction between the infinite life-power (*anit-svadha*) and consciousness-force (*chit-tapas*) that creates the world of manifestation. With this infinite activity of eternal consciousness came into existence spatial extension. It was the beginning of change in that which was otherwise changeless and immutable. It is a self-initiated, self-caused and self-propelled process. Stanza six: The origin, purpose, and end of the world are totally unknown and unknowable. No one really knows the beginning of the process. When did this diversification originate? The gods cannot explain it as they came into manifestation only after the world was created. Stanza seven: There must be something, supreme and beyond, out of which creation proceeds. Perhaps, there is a witness to all this seated in the seventh heaven, who knows the beginning and the reason of this world-movement. Only he who is beyond space, time, and causation may know it, or he too does not quite know it. Indeed, there can be no such being above or below other than the Supreme One who truly knows of this all. 'That One' neither preaches agnosticism nor promotes atheism. It speaks of creation as an unfolding and a fulfilment.

From the analysis of the Hymn we can gather the following meanings. 1) *Tad Ekam* as Mystery: *Tad Ekam* is the mystery of a primal non-differentiation of being and non-being. The origin of the world was enveloped in this primal mystery of *Tad Ekam*, which by its inherent power gave rise to the desire of a creation from which the universe sprang forth through a series of mysterious gradual processes. 2) *Tad Ekam* as the Unconditioned Ground: It is the primal positive absolute being from which the whole existence follows. This primal unconditioned ground (condition) of all beings (conditions) cannot be characterized by anyone as either existent or non-existent. It is the most transcendent which transcends space, time, death, and immortality, and beyond which there cannot be anything. It is the first cause, which breathed by its own power. 3) *Tad Ekam* as the Purely Spiritual Embryo: *Tad Ekam* is the purely spiritual embryo, the world-seed. The void is the envelope of the world embryo which leads to the birth of the world begotten of That One, which is the pure *manas* in which develops heat, desire, and creative impulse. 4) *Tad Ekam* as Consciousness: The 'heart,' mentioned in the hymn as the place of search, reminds one of the abode of mind, namely, of consciousness, and Brahman. In the world of human experience, consciousness is the only power that embraces the manifold without losing its identity and unity. A multiplicity of thoughts, objects, and contents of consciousness do not disrupt but rather reinforce the unity (That One) of consciousness. Consciousness, as one in many and as the overwhelming plurality of the world of our experience, reverts to a unity in the recesses of our consciousness. Being over and above consciousness is a contradiction in terms;

for by the very fact we define 'Being' as 'that which transcends consciousness,' we are including it in our consciousness of Being. Hence, *Tad Ekam* is not the object of consciousness, or even the subject, but pure consciousness which has no support. *Tad Ekam* is this non-support. Thus the understanding of *Tad Ekam* does not allow for this reflection, i.e., for a second understanding of the understanding. If one really understands *Tad Ekam*, one does not understand that one understands it. If one understands that one understands, then one does not understand *Tad Ekam*, but only one's own understanding of it. *Tad Ekam* has no consciousness, but is consciousness. 5) *Tad Ekam* as a Unique Neutral Principle: It is a unique neutral principle, which accounts for the origin of the world and the multiplicity of things. The use of the neuter shows that That One is above sexual difference. 6) *Tad Ekam* as Indefinable: *Tad Ekam* is an indefinable principle with manifested and unmanifested aspects. The entirely undefined principle found itself in darkness till it manifested itself through the power of tapas. 7) *Tad Ekam* as Sat and Asat: Being is That One which has manifested itself, and Non-being is That One which has not manifested itself. Hence, sat and asat, Being and Non-being, are two aspects: the manifested and the unmanifested aspects of the One Ultimate, *Tad Ekam*. 8) *Tad Ekam* as the All-inclusive a priori Condition: *Tad Ekam* is not seen against any horizon as it is the infinite horizon which includes every other horizon. It includes within it both being and non-being. It is the necessary a priori condition of every being and existence. It is the all-encompassing Being, of the positive and the negative, of evil and good, which underlies, penetrates, transforms, and unifies everything that is. 9) *Tad Ekam* as the Eternal Word: The word (*Vac*) is *Tad Ekam* itself; it is the self of *Tad Ekam*. It is the revelation of *Tad Ekam*. It was before all creation, pre-existing before anything came into being. 10) *Tad Ekam* as Brahman: The Vedas have described the One as neither being nor non-being, and the Gita repeats the same idea by affirming *Tad Ekam* as neither transcendent nor immanent but both at the same time in a unique manner. The Ultimate is the source of all, yet is itself not contained or limited by anything. That One transcends all immanence and is immanent in all transcendence. It is the ultimate cause of the world. It is tat styled as *ekam*, the One and the only One without a second. It is the transcendent, the *paratpara* which is unqualified and without the support of laws. It is Brahman himself who exists by his own power, a mystery beyond explanation or utterance.

The term 'analogy' has its origin in the Greek mathematical vocabulary. There it meant sameness of ratio or proportion between the respective terms of different pairs. "Two is to four as three is to six" exhibits the same proportion or ratio in each pair, that of half. Outside arithmetic the sameness does not have to be equality, for instance: "As a point is to a line so a surface is to a solid," or "As sharp is to the sense of touch, so is shrill to the sense of hearing." The sameness of proportion in such cases is not equality but merely similarity. It is a likeness in the respective ways in which the terms are related to each other in pairs, and the likeness is found in a feature that differentiates the instances. Conversely, the various instances while different in themselves exhibit in that very difference itself sufficient similarity to require expression in one and the same notion. The one identical notion is partly the same and partly different. The sameness and the difference are in the one notion. Hence, *analogous term* is one which is said of many, in a way which is somewhat same and somewhat different. It is one and the same name predicated of many according to concepts which are not entirely



different, but agree in some common point. In analogous predication the external term remains the same, but the concept of which the term is a symbol neither remains exactly the same, as is the case of univocal predication, nor becomes entirely different, as happens in equivocal predication, but *varies*, i.e., while changing it retains something. The reason why it does not remain exactly the same is that such a concept does not completely abstract from the differences of its inferiors. As a result, these differences have to be taken into consideration when the concept is predicated of different subjects. Thus the unity of such a concept is not absolute but only relative. For example, when my eyes perceive a material object, I can say: “I see”; and when my intellect understands a problem, I can also say: “I see”. The act of sense perception in the first instance is completely different from that of intellectual perception. Nevertheless, there is a certain relative unity, because as the eye is related to sense perception so the intellect is related to intellectual perception. Consequently, one and the same term may be used to express both actions. But when one predicates this term of the eye and of the intellect, the concept signified by the term “to see” has to be adjusted according as required by the subject (the eye or the intellect). In this way, one concept can be predicated of things which are completely different insofar as they are relatively the same.

**Meaning of *Maya*:** *Tad Ekam* however did express itself in manifoldness. Assuming name and form (*namarupa*) it became this entire universe. The key word used for explaining the manifested aspect of *Tad Ekam* (*Brahman*) is *maya* which has multiple meanings. Basically it is the manifestative (creative) and manifested power (creation) of *Brahman*. *Maya* reveals and conceals *Brahman*. As *maya* reveals, it is a projection of *Brahman* (*vikshepa*). What is thus projected is not *Brahman* but only a *namarupa* (name and form) of *Brahman*, which inevitably conceals *Brahman* in itself. Hence *maya* is the *avarana* (veil) of *Brahman*, the *avarana-vikshepa*, the concealing-revealing dynamism of *Tad Ekam*. What is revealed is only a means to understand what is not yet revealed. The plurality is understood as the expression of *Tad Ekam* revealing and concealing the same in all its manifestations. Since *maya* is *avarana* and *vikshepa*, concealing and revealing, it is *sat* and *asat*, real and non-real. Insofar as *maya* manifests *Brahman* it is said to be real; but insofar as *maya* conceals *Brahman*, pointing to that which is really real, it is said to be unreal. Therefore *maya* is defined as *sat-asat-anirvachaniya*, an indefinable being and non-being. So according to the *maya* theory, both *Brahman* and the universe are real but not in the same way, but each in its own way.

***Maya* as Analogy:** Aquinas developed the notion of analogy of participation under the influence of the Aristotelian and Neo-Platonic Greek thought. It was Plotinus (270 A.D) who maintained that the Absolute Good reflects in all creation in successive levels of participation. Thus the reflection of the Absolute is seen in every being in some way, proportionate to its essence. In the Indian thought *Brahman* is seen as life, mind, consciousness, and bliss respectively. *Brahman* is there in the innermost chamber of one’s own existence. *Brahman*, remaining in the centre, yet manifesting itself in all layers and levels of existence, is the real *maya* which is the appearance of *Brahman* in non-*Brahman* forms (*namarupa*). *Maya* assumes a variety of meaning. It points to that internal dynamism in *Brahman*, which makes revelation possible. Thus *Brahman* that is manifested is not *Brahman* but indication to *Brahman*; *maya* is real only insofar as it points to *Brahman*. *Maya* confuses human intelligence with its semblance of reality and

leads human to a thorough misunderstanding which tempts one to accept the phenomenal as ultimately real. Hence *maya* is also known as the root cause of all ignorance. *Maya*, however, has its own non-permanent reality which is characterised by being and non-being (*sat-asat*). The *maya* power of *Brahman* by which one becomes many, though one alone is really real, and the *maya* character of the universe by which many appear to be real, though they are ultimately unreal, make the understanding of being possible at two different levels. At both levels being is realized. But they differ greatly in the proportion in which they are realized. Both *Brahman* and *maya* are beings; *Brahman* is pure being (*sat*) and hence really real (*satyasya satya*) and *maya* is being with non-being (*sat-asat*). *Brahman* is the source. *Maya* is being by the unfolding of *Brahman* (*vivarta*), a notion similar to being (*Tad Ekam*) by analogy of participation.

**Check Your Progress**

**Note:** use the space provided for your Answers.

1) Explain briefly: analogy from Western perspectives

2) Explain briefly: analogy from Indian perspectives

3.4 LET US SUM UP

In the classical Western Philosophy, metaphysics is understood as the core and ground of human knowledge which underlies, penetrates, transforms, and unifies all other disciplines of knowledge. It originates from the ‘experience of something’ or Being. That is to say, metaphysics does not restrict itself to any particular being or part of that being, but rather treats of what is *common to all beings*, namely Being which is the ground of beings since all beings are in Being. Being is not a particular thing though it embraces everything in itself. That which is not particular is still *something or in some way*. Hence, *Being is that which is in some way or something*. The original *Rig Vedic* notion of *Tad Ekam* (That One = Being = *Tad Ekam*) corresponds well with the notion of Being as ‘that which is in some way or something.’ Besides, the multidimensional meaning of *Tad Ekam* as mystery, the unconditioned ground, the purely spiritual embryo, consciousness, unique neutral principle, indefinable, *Sat* and *Asat*, the all-inclusive *a priori*

condition, the eternal Word, and Brahman, is in conformity with the classical Western notion of Being which is analogous. We predicate *Tad Ekam* of diverse beings as each of them is something which has a reference to *Tad Ekam*. Hence there is a foundation in reality for the predication of the term, so that *Tad Ekam* is not equivocal. Consequently, it follows by exclusion that the notion of *Tad Ekam* is analogous.

---

### 3.5 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

---

Agrawala, Vasudeva S. *Sparks from the Vedic Fire: A New Approach to Symbolism*. Varanasi: 1962.

Coreth, Emerich. *Metaphysics*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Dasgupta, Surendranath. *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol.1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1997.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. "On Being and What There Is: Indian Perspectives on the Question of Being." In *The Question of Being*. New Delhi: India Book Centre, 1995.

Hiriyanna, M. *The Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. Bombay: Blackie and Son, 1973. Mahadevan, T.M.P. *Invitation to Indian Philosophy*. New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann Publishers, 1979.

Koren, Henry J. *An Introduction to the Science of Metaphysics*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1963.

Mookenthottam, Antony. *Towards a Theology in the Indian Context*. Bangalore: ATC, 1980.

Owens, Joseph. *An Elementary Christian Metaphysics*. Houston, Texas: Center for Thomistic Studies, 1985.

Panikkar, Raimundo. *The Vedic Experience*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1979.

Panthanmackel, George. "Being (Indian)." In: *ACPI Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. I. Edited by Johnson Puthenpurackal and George Panthanmackel. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2010.

Panthanmackel, George. "Being as *Tad Ekam*: Western Scholastic and Indian Approaches to Metaphysics." In *Western Encounter with Indian Philosophy*. Edited by Augustine Thottakara. Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 2002.

Panthanmackel, George. *Coming and Going: An Introduction to Metaphysics from Western Perspectives*. Bangalore: ATC, 1999.

Peters, John A. *Metaphysics*. Louvain: Duquesne University Press, 1963.

Radhakrishnan, S. *Indian Philosophy*. Vol. I. London: 1962.

V. Francis Vineeth. *Foundations of World Vision*. Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 1985.

V. Madhusudan Reddy. *The Vedic Epiphany*. Vol. I. Hyderabad: Institute of Human Study, 1991.