

"Whose Image Is This?" in Eckhart's Sermones

Author(s): Donald F. Duclow

Source: *Mystics Quarterly*, March 1989, Vol. 15, No. 1 (March 1989), pp. 29-40

Published by: Penn State University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20716906>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/20716906?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Mystics Quarterly*

JSTOR

“Whose Image Is This?” in Eckhart’s Sermones*

The theme of image is central to Meister Eckhart’s thought in both the Latin and German works. The terms *‘imago,’* *‘bild’* and their cognates provide a focus that unites many of the Dominican’s concerns: God’s unity and trinity, creation and eternal being, and mystical union. Synthetic power is built into these terms because images do not stand alone, but are images “of” something. Therefore, ‘image’ necessarily refers to ‘exemplar’; and in Eckhart’s German, *‘bild’* does double duty by meaning image and exemplar.¹ Further, the terms have biblical roots in Genesis’s account of humanity’s creation in God’s “image and likeness,”² and the exegetical and theological traditions apply this language to both the divine Son and the human soul. For the Son is the image of God within and toward which the soul is created (*ad imaginem*).³ As Augustine insisted, humanity reflects God’s image within the “interior man” or mind, and hence the analysis of memory, knowledge and love yields psychological analogies between the soul and Trinity.⁴ In the broad wake of Augustine, salvation history and the spiritual life found expression in terms of image: the fall obscured God’s image in man, whose original likeness must be restored in Christ. This restoration is the goal of Christian history and of individual spiritual striving. As a Dominican master and preacher, Eckhart inevitably confronted these traditional themes. Perhaps just as inevitably, they were not quite the same when he finished with them. For with his typical originality, Eckhart dramatically emphasized the relational dynamics of imaging, and created a mystical theology of image that is uniquely his own.

Here I shall examine this theology in one of its most concise statements, Eckhart’s Latin *Sermon* 49. I shall then compare his and Thomas Aquinas’s treatments of image. This comparison will suggest major differences between the two Dominican masters, and thus highlight the distinctive features of Eckhart’s theology of image.

Latin *Sermon* 49 concerns Matthew 22:20, “Whose are this image and inscription?”⁵ The Gospel story is familiar. The Pharisees and Herodians set out to trap Jesus, and ask whether tribute should be paid to Caesar. Jesus demands to see the coin used to pay taxes, and in turn asks whose image and

name it bears. When they answer “Caesar’s,” he says, “Give back to Caesar what belongs to Caesar—and to God what belongs to God.”

Medieval exegetes often discuss this incident, which occurs in all the synoptic Gospels. Before turning to Eckhart’s sermon, a glance at three commentaries may clarify standard interpretations of the text. The *Glossa ordinaria* is the schoolmen’s exegetical handbook, which Eckhart frequently cites. Thomas Aquinas’s *Catena aurea* and *Commentary on Matthew* are major works by Eckhart’s authoritative Dominican predecessor. All three commentaries carefully describe the historical context for the Gospel story. The Herodians’ loyalty to Rome and the Pharisees’ to Judaic law place Jesus in a political and religious bind. Does he fear Caesar more than God? He notes his questioners’ hypocrisy and deceit, and uses the coin to confound both parties. Here the *Glossa* alludes briefly to the *imago Dei* theme: “Just as Caesar demands what is impressed with his image, so also God [demands] the soul stamped with the light of his face.”⁶ Thomas’s *Catena* cites Hilary to make the same point,⁷ and in his *Commentary* Thomas defines the text’s “mystical” meaning: “We have a soul that is in the image of God, and therefore we should return it to God; with regard to those things that we have from the world, we should keep peace with the world.”⁸ For the *Glossa* and Thomas, the Gospel text yields a spiritual meaning by contrasting the images of Caesar and God, yet this meaning emerges only within a historical and literal analysis of the text.

Eckhart, however, approaches the Gospel verse quite differently. The historical context disappears, as he isolates Jesus’s question—“Whose image is this?”—and immediately finds its answer in Paul, “the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.”⁹ Our preacher discusses the theology of the image, not first-century politics and taxation. His concern is the image that belongs to God, because as he remarks elsewhere, this constitutes the proper meaning of image whereas the “world” belongs to Caesar.¹⁰ Like many of Eckhart’s Latin sermons, *Sermon 49* is schematic and suggests notes for preaching rather than a complete, polished draft. Eckhart even writes a note to himself, “Carefully treat each text, as well as you know” (235;423,n.508). The sermon has three sections. The first focuses on the soul’s “highest part” as the locus for the human *imago Dei* and its return to God. The second is a brief treatise outlining eight points concerning image. And the third defines image’s place in Trinitarian life and creation.

For Eckhart the term ‘image’ describes the divine Son, the human soul and the unity between them. His analysis of the Son is clearest in the sermon’s third section, where he defines ‘image’ as “a simple formal emanation that transmits the whole pure naked essence.”¹¹ Formal causality is an intrinsic mode of acting, which at this point neither receives anything from

without nor moves outwards in efficient or final causality. Eckhart fuses Aristotelian and Neoplatonic categories, with the latter clearly predominating. Image is a “formal *emanation*” that expresses and flows out from its source (236;424,n.509); it marks the first stage of the Good’s self-diffusion. Eckhart describes this stage in one of his most distinctive metaphors. It is “as if you were to imagine something swelling up from itself and in itself and then boiling without any ‘boiling over’ yet understood” (236;426, n.511). This boiling (*bullitio*) marks the Son’s emergence within the divine essence, as the Dominican notes in the more conventional metaphor of birth. He writes,

The image has the character of a birth, an offspring, and a son inasmuch as it comes forth in the same nature and is equal and similar in everything to what produced it. Hence, the Son, the Image, is in the Father and the Father is in Him; he is one in the Father.¹²

In this respect the Son is the perfect and primary image of the Father,¹³ sharing the same nature equally and in full mutuality. Yet the Son also “breathes forth love, the Holy Spirit” (237;427,n.512), and thus completes the trinitarian procession. Eckhart then connects the Trinity and creation by returning to his ‘boiling’ metaphor. He says, “It is necessary for something first to ‘boil’ itself totally and then finally to ‘boil over’ so that it can be completely perfected in itself while overflowing [with a fruitfulness] that is more than perfection.”¹⁴ With the Spirit’s emergence, the Trinity ‘boils’ totally within itself and thence ‘boils over’ into creation. Creation thus becomes an exuberant extension of the Trinity’s life. In this movement, efficient and final causality come into play. But more significantly the Son’s function shifts from image to exemplar. As “the first born of every creature,” he is “set before every creature as the exemplar to whom they are to be patterned, just as a painter sets a picture before an apprentice for him to copy” (235;422,n.506). In the Son image and exemplar thus coincide. He is at once “the image of the invisible God” and the pattern for all created being. Or more precisely, because the Son images and reveals the Father, he becomes the exemplar for creation’s subsequent images and likenesses.

Alois Haas notes that for Eckhart, “The basic model of all image relations is the Son’s flowing out from the Father.”¹⁵ To emphasize this point, I shall speak of the Son as *exemplary image* in two respects: first, because of his centrality to Eckhart’s theological scheme; and second, because of his privileged place in the Dominican’s analyses of image. We have seen the Son’s theological centrality in *Sermon* 49, and may now note how the Son colors Eckhart’s interpretation of image.

While imaging presumes unity and difference, for Eckhart the accent

consistently falls on unity. The sermon's second section concerns the nature of image. For the exemplar to be recognized, its image must be similar to it in nature, in species, and "as far as possible, even in individual reality" (236;424,n.509). Eckhart refers to Augustine's *De Trinitate* on the equality appropriate to "the perfection of the image" (236;424,n.509). Augustine's text discusses the relation between Father and Son, specifically their co-eternity,¹⁶ so that he too focuses on the Son as exemplary image. Eckhart goes on to exclude "everything that is alien or other" from the notion of image: that an image is stone, colored, etc. does not pertain to it *qua* image. The Dominican clearly denies image a sensible reality, and instead allies it with the intelligible "species" by which knowledge occurs.¹⁷ Image, as we shall see, is intellectual in nature. The conclusion of this section deserves to be quoted in full:

The image and its exemplar are not separately numbered as two substances, but the one is in the other. "I am in the Father, and the Father is in me" (Jn. 14:11). Furthermore, the just person depends on Justice formally, not like something from outside oneself, different and alien. This is the sixth property of the image. Seventh, it is consequently necessary that the image be found only in intellectual nature where the same reality returns to itself in a "perfect return," and where the one that gives birth is one and the same with the child or offspring, finding oneself in the other and the other in oneself. Eighth, note that for the image truly to represent what it images it is necessary that it lack nothing that is in what it images and that there is nothing related to it or in it that pertains to anything else. Therefore it can lack nothing that is in God, and can possess nothing that is in anything created. (236;425,n.510)

Here Eckhart refers simultaneously to the divine Son and the human soul as image. The two examples for numerical unity specify this double reference. The first leads to the Trinity, as Eckhart cites John concerning the full mutuality between Father and Son; while the second focuses on one of the Dominican's favorite themes, the just person's relation to divine justice. The just, insofar as (*inquantum*) they are just, dwell immediately within God.¹⁸ The *inquantum* principle excludes all other features of the just—e.g., that they are created, bodily, etc.—and considers only their direct participation in God's just being. From this perspective the just person and God are not separate substances, but "the one is in the other." The relation between the just and God thus reflects that between the Son and the Father, since both involve an intimate mutuality of image and exemplar. Eckhart's seventh point places imaging within the intellect. His phrase, "perfect return," derives from the discussion of self-knowledge in the Neoplatonic *Book of Causes*. In understanding itself, intellect "returns to its own essence in a perfect return."¹⁹ The *Book of Causes* describes this knowledge in dynamic

terms: it proceeds from intellect's act of knowing, and returns to intellect as the object of knowledge. Eckhart immediately links this intellectual movement to birth, where begetter and child are "one and the same" and dwell within each other. Indeed, only intellectual birth works in this way, since parents and offspring are generally more sharply differentiated than Eckhart's description allows. But he has in mind a particular birth, the Son's within the Trinity, whose dynamics are well expressed in the "perfect return" between intellectual image and exemplar. This focus also clarifies the Dominican's eighth point, the isomorphism where the image contains everything of its model and excludes all else. For the divine Son fulfills this requirement as exemplary image of the Father. And for Eckhart we too are called to participate in this image and to "lack nothing that is in God."

The sermon's first section discusses this participation. On Augustine's authority, Eckhart describes the soul's purification and illumination. The divine image, he tells us, will be found "where the soul is truly light, not extinguished by bodily contagion" (234;421,n.505). The soul's higher part or *vertax* must be cleared of "the figure of this world," or as Eckhart says elsewhere, we must leave behind the "alien images" that we form of the created world.²⁰ For only in this detachment does the soul itself become a shining image, "joined to the angelic light" and illumined by the Son's revelation of the invisible God. Eckhart often locates this revelation in the intellect as the soul's highest part. Here he cites Augustine's claim that "likeness (*similitudo*) is found in every creature, but image (*imago*) only in intellectual beings" (235;422,n.506). While Eckhart applies this claim directly to the divine Son, it clearly extends to the human *imago Dei* as well. For the Dominican's first Genesis commentary similarly associates intellect and image when discussing humanity's creation. Other creatures are like something in God, namely the ideas that delineate their species' boundaries; but as intellect man is like God himself.²¹ Because according to Aristotle the intellect in knowing "becomes all things," it cannot be limited to this or that, to one species or another; rather, it transcends all finite being, and space and time as well.²² This transcendence marks the intellect's similarity to God, and leads Eckhart to conclude that for this reason man is created "'to the image of God,' not to something in God."²³ Intellect thus becomes the locus for humanity's imaging of God, and hence for our capacity to receive divine light. In another sermon Eckhart refers to the *Confessions* where Augustine turns inward and sees the divine light above his mind, and comments, "God as God is, understands, and is found only in intellectual nature, where the image of God is capable of God (*capax Dei*)."²⁴

In *Sermon* 49 Eckhart describes the imaging process. He asks "how we are

conformed” to the image of the invisible God (235;422,n.507), and in reply again turns to Paul: “As with unveiled face we gaze upon God’s glory, we are being transformed into the very image from glory to glory as though by the Lord’s spirit” (2 Cor. 3:18). Eckhart glosses this verse in several ways, each marking out a mystical ascent. He first focuses literally on the term ‘trans-formation’ as going beyond form. We are being transformed “first, because the earlier form is vanishing; and second, because the image transcends and is higher than any form” (235;423,n.508). Here he alludes to his familiar theme of detachment, as another sermon makes clear: “All the just are transformed, not only formed, into the same image of justice because they deny themselves and go forth from their forms, by which they are what is proper to them.”²⁵ They thus become the image of divine justice itself. Letting go the particular forms by which they are this or that, the just ascend to the Son who, as exemplary image, transcends all finite form. When Paul describes this ascent “from glory to glory,” Eckhart sees a movement “from the natural light into the supernatural and from the light of grace finally into the light of glory” (235;423,n.508). This interpretation echoes Thomas’s distinction between the lights of grace and glory; by the former the mind participates in the divine nature, while the latter “establishes the intellect in a certain deiformity (*deiformitas*).”²⁶ This Thomistic theme suggests once again the intellect’s conforming to God. Eckhart then presents another gloss concerning “illuminations sent down under bodily form” to the soul, which “wishes to pass from this ‘glory’ to the ‘glory’ that rests in itself until finally it can ascend in that glory to the one that ‘dwells in light inaccessible.’”²⁷ Retracing the Son’s expansive movement into creation, the soul ascends from symbolic, bodily illuminations, into its own intellectual light as image, and thence to the divine “light inaccessible.” To conclude the section, Eckhart returns briefly to the Gospel text, “Whose image *and inscription* are this?” and cites the Apocalypse concerning God’s name written upon the triumphant.²⁸ At this point the preacher breaks off his commentary with the note, “Carefully treat each text, as well as you know.” Yet the inscription, it would seem, confirms the transformed soul’s passage into the divine light above form or image. This passage suggests a movement altogether beyond image, since this light is not itself an image but rather the “inaccessible” source of all images and likenesses.

Sermon 49 illustrates Eckhart’s Latin preaching and outlines his theology of image. As a preacher, he moves abruptly from the historical letter to speculative and mystical themes. In contrast to the *Glossa ordinaria* and Thomas, Eckhart leaves Caesar’s image behind in the rush to explicate the divine image and the soul’s conformity to it. He effects this transition by

turning to a different biblical text, Colossians 1:15, “the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.” Other texts from Paul and John sustain the sermon’s major themes and lend them both authority and lyrical urgency, as when Eckhart follows Paul “from glory to glory.” The symbolic richness evident in the German works emerges in Eckhart’s spare, scholastic Latin when he develops traditional light imagery and his own boiling metaphor. Yet this remains an unusual sermon, one that is hard to imagine being preached. Even for an academic sermon, it contains some formidable theologizing and is laden with technical distinctions. Perhaps only a preacher convinced of intellectual insight’s pivotal role in salvation could present so high-flying and speculative a sermon.

Eckhart’s theology of image includes many familiar, traditional elements. He cites standard biblical texts and uses themes common among his predecessors. Like Augustine and Thomas, he views the Son as perfect image, and links imaging with form and intellect. But authority has a nose of wax, and Eckhart reshapes these received teachings. The clearest change lies in his use of image language to telescope the relation between the divine Son and the human soul. For Augustine and Thomas, image simultaneously distinguishes and connects God and the soul. In *De Trinitate* Augustine develops elaborate psychological analogies, which he then dismantles in Book XV where difference comes to predominate over likeness.²⁹ Similarly, Thomas consistently distinguishes between the Son and soul as perfect and imperfect images respectively. Eckhart also recognizes a duality in the soul’s imaging when he notes that “in grace a person has at the same time a conformity and a distinction in relation to God, just as [in the case of being] an ‘image’ and ‘to the image.’”³⁰ Indeed, this traditional distinction underlies *Sermon* 49’s discussion of the soul’s transformation “from glory to glory.” For if the Son and soul were simply one identical image, the transformation would not be required, but an established fact. Yet Eckhart suggests far stronger, more immediate ties between the human and divine images than Augustine and Thomas allow, so that the distinction itself finally disappears.

To illustrate this point, let us consider an analogy that Thomas derives from Augustine:

Since the perfect likeness to God cannot be except in an identical nature, the Image of God exists in His firstborn Son as the image of the king is in his son, who is of the same nature as himself; whereas it exists in man as in an alien nature, as the image of the king is on the silver coin.³¹

With its coin and image, this analogy suggests the Gospel story of tribute. Moreover, the analogy confirms that God’s image occurs in man, as Thomas here replies to the objection that only the divine Son is “the image

of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.” As we have seen, this Pauline text is Eckhart’s initial answer to Jesus’s question, “Whose image is this?” Eckhart agrees with Thomas concerning the Son’s generation equally and in the same nature as the Father. The two Dominicans differ sharply, however, concerning the relation between the Son and the human soul. We can see this difference in their analogies of coinage and sonship. Thomas develops a proportional analogy where the soul is to the Son as the coin is to the king’s son. The same exemplar becomes manifest in both images, yet with a clear distinction in kind: one is born “of the same nature,” while the other is minted “in an alien nature.” But in *Sermon 49* Eckhart explains coinage *in terms of* sonship, which then becomes the focus for his analysis of both the divine and human images. This analogical shift dramatically alters the relation between the soul and God. For the soul immediately receives the divine image and finally *becomes* the Son, at least in its highest part, *verex* or intellect. Eckhart’s repeated claims regarding the Word’s birth in the soul also indicate that sonship, not coinage in an “alien nature,” expresses his theology of image in both the Trinity and humanity. Indeed, since Eckhart insists on creatures’ nothingness,³² there simply are no independent natures to receive imperfect images. He therefore connects the soul and Son within a single process of imaging and birth. For imaging is an ecstatic movement from the Father’s unity, to the Son and Spirit, and thence into creation. In “boiling over,” the Trinity sustains creation as a field of sheer likenesses and images. Within this field, intellect confers privileged status on humanity as God’s image because it establishes a direct bond with the Son, the intellectual image of the Father. As the intellect is assimilated to the Son, he is born in the soul. Image and birth are thus reciprocal descriptions of the convergence between the soul and God. In this convergence intellect and knowledge are transformed in ways that again differ from Thomas’s account. Aquinas maintains a consistent duality between the human knower and the known; even in the light of glory, the blessed do not know God precisely as he knows himself.³³ But for Eckhart the intellect achieves what Kelley calls “principial knowledge”—that is, within the Son, the intellect comes to know as God himself knows.³⁴

The soul’s final ascent takes it beyond even this knowledge, since in several texts Eckhart describes a mystical breakthrough that leads beyond the intellectual union of the soul and Son. This breakthrough carries us into the Godhead, where “the highest angel and the fly and the soul are equal.”³⁵ Here all distinctions give way, even those between the Trinitarian persons and between God and creatures. The Godhead theme sets limits to Eckhart’s theology of image by grounding it in an imageless source, and by calling us into this source. A German sermon clarifies the re-

lation between images and the Godhead. Commenting on the Transfiguration, Eckhart says, "The soul must be transfigured and impressed and moulded again in that image which is God's Son."³⁶ The phrase 'impressed and moulded' recalls the coin metaphor, as we are to be minted anew in the Son's likeness. The preacher then cites the familiar contrast between the Son as God's image and the soul as "formed after the image," but he now traces them both back to the Godhead:

The Son is an image of God above all images, he is an image of His concealed Godhead. And from there, where the Son is an image of God, from the imprint of the Son's image, the soul receives her image. The soul draws from where the Son draws. But the soul is not suspended even there, where the Son issues forth from the Father: she is above all images.³⁷

By correlating image and sonship, Eckhart had drawn the human soul directly into the Trinitarian life where it achieves identity with the Son. But by grounding both the Son and soul in the Godhead, he carried this dialectic into the unity of the divine nature. For while the soul bears the Son's image, she does not rest within his birth where he "issues forth from the Father." With its distinct persons, the Trinity does not satisfy the soul's desire for unity. She finally dwells "above all images"—that is, in the Godhead itself.³⁸ As the soul and Son enter this ground, the distinction between image and exemplar disappears, along with all otherness and difference. There is only the Godhead where all is simply one. Here Eckhart seems radically iconoclastic, as he breaks through not only creaturely images, but also the Son and soul themselves as images.

Yet iconoclastic breakthrough is not Eckhart's last word. Recent commentators have stressed the reciprocity between his two major mystical themes, the Son's birth in the soul and the breakthrough to Godhead.³⁹ Each requires the other, since birth occurs in the ground opened up by breakthrough. Eckhart's theology of image reflects this reciprocity. For if the return to the Godhead marks the end of images, it also marks their beginning by carrying them into the wellspring of all imaging. We have seen Eckhart define image as a "formal emanation" that boils up and expresses "the whole pure naked essence" (236;425,n.511). The Godhead is that essence. From it images flow in the birth of the Son and soul, and in the likenesses of creation. The preacher thus sets in motion a cycle of imaging and iconoclasm: images proceed from the concealed Godhead and return to it; they disappear into it and boil up within it. In typically Eckhartian fashion, this cycle leaves us with no place to rest. Rather, it describes an itinerary of mystical practice that keeps us going and coming, to and from the Godhead. In one direction, we are to let go of created images; to be "transformed" into the Son as he is born within us; and to break through to

the Godhead “above all images.” In the other direction, we are to become living images of the concealed Godhead and Son, and to manifest them in practices of detachment, justice and charity. We must be fruitful in action as the divine nature is in its boiling exuberance and creativity; such action too marks us as God’s image.⁴⁰ By following this circling itinerary, we may heed Eckhart’s counsel: “In the way I have spoken of image, so should you live.”⁴¹

Donald F. Duclow
Gwynedd-Mercy College

Notes

* This article was first presented in a session on Meister Eckhart at the 21st International Congress on Medieval Studies, at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, in May, 1986. The session was sponsored by *Mystics Quarterly* and organized by Frank Tobin. I thank Mark Führer and Frank Tobin for their suggestions concerning the article’s revision.

1. Alois M. Haas, “Meister Eckharts mystische Bildlehre,” in *Der Begriff der Repräsentatio im Mittelalter*, ed. A. Zimmerman (Berlin/New York, 1971), 113–38.

2. Gn. 1:26. See Eckhart, *Comm. Gen.*, in *Die lateinischen Werke* (Stuttgart/Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1936–), vol. 1: 270–76, n. 115–20; hereafter abbreviated “LW” with volume, page and paragraph references. The companion edition of Eckhart’s vernacular writings, *Die deutschen Werke*, will be cited as “DW” with volume and page references.

3. For a useful historical survey, see the entries on “Image et ressemblance” in the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 7 (1969), cols. 1410–71.

4. Concerning Augustine, see “Image et ressemblance,” cols. 1418–22; and *inter alia*, Augustine, quaestio 51, *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher (*Corpus Christianorum* 44A; Turnholt: Brepols, 1975), 78–82.

5. *Sermo* 49 has been translated by Bernard McGinn in *Meister Eckhart: Teacher and Preacher* (New York, 1986), 234–37; the Latin text is LW 4:421–28, n. 505–12. References to this sermon will generally be given in parentheses immediately following quotations by translation page, LW 4 page, and paragraph number.

6. *Glossa ordinaria*, PL 114:156C.

7. Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea*, ed. A. Guarienti (Turin: Marietti, 1953), Vol. 1, 322.

8. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentum in Matthaeum*, in *Opera omnia* (Parma, 1861), Vol. 10, 202.

9. Col. 1:15. Eckhart, *Sermo* 49:235; 421, n. 505. For Thomas’s gloss on Col. 1:15, see his *Comm. in Epist. ad Col.* in the *Commentaria in omnes S. Pauli Epistolas*, ed. A. Pado-vani, (Turin, 1911), Vol. 2, 470–71.

10. Eckhart, *Comm. Gen.*, LW 1:438,n.301; *Par. Gen.*, LW 1:666, n. 194: "Imago enim proprie est quod in anima a deo est concreatum, non superinductum ab extra ... 'caesari,' id est mundo"; *Comm. Jn.*, LW 3:503,n.575; and *Sermo* 44, LW 4:370,n.442. Yet in these passages, too, the moral and anagogical predominate over the literal and political, as Eckhart correlates Caesar with world, flesh and devil.
11. *Sermo* 49:236;424,n.511. See Eckhart, *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:480–81,n.143; and Vladimir Lossky, *Théologie négative et connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart* (Paris, 1973), 348–49.
12. *Sermo* 49:237;427,n.512; citing Jn. 10:38 and 30. See also Eckhart's vernacular sermon, *Predigt* 16b, DW 1:265.
13. See Eckhart, *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:350,n.29, where he cites Thomas Aquinas, *S.T. I* q.35 a.2 ad 3.
14. *Sermo* 49: 237;428,n.512. See Eckhart, *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:21–22,n.16; and *Sermo* 25, LW 4: 236,n.258.
15. Haas, "Eckharts mystische Bildlehre," 119.
16. Augustine, *De Trinitate* 6,10,11.
17. See also Eckhart, *Comm. Jn.*, LW 3:162,n.194: "species sive imago."
18. See Eckhart, *Comm. Jn.*, LW 3:13–19,n.14–22; *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:386–99, n.59–70; *Predigt* 6, DW 1:99–115; *Predigt* 39, DW 2:251–66; Frank Tobin, *Meister Eckhart: Thought and Language* (Philadelphia; 1986), 90–94; and D. F. Duclow, "Meister Eckhart on the *Book of Wisdom*: Commentary and Sermons," *Traditio*, forthcoming.
19. *Liber de causis*, ed. A. Pattin (Louvain, 1966), prop. 14, 79; see also prop. 12, 74–75; and Eckhart, *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:326–27,n.5.
20. See, for example, *Predigt* 2, DW 1:25; and *Predigt* 5b, DW 1:92–93.
21. Eckhart, *Comm. Gen.*, LW 1:270–71,n.115.
22. *Ibid.*, citing Aristotle, *De anima* 430a 14, and 431b 21–23; See also Eckhart, *Sermo* 26, LW 4:245,n.269; *Parisian Question* 2, LW 5:49–54,n.1–10; *Predigt* 69, LW 3:169–80; and John Caputo, "The Nothingness of the Intellect in Meister Eckhart's 'Parisian Questions,'" *The Thomist* 39 (1975), 85–115.
23. Eckhart, *Comm. Gen.*, LW 1:271,n.115.
24. Eckhart, *Sermo* 14, LW 4:144,n.152. See also *Sermo* 11, LW 4:108–09,n.115; *Sermo* 29, LW 4:270,n.304–05; and Augustine, *De Trinitate* 14,8,11.
25. Eckhart, *Sermo* 31, LW 4:285,n.326, also glossing 2 Cor. 3:18. See *Sermo* 25, LW 4:242,n.266; *Predigt* 16b, DW 1:273–74; and Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15,8,14.
26. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T. I* 2^{ae}q.110 a.3; and I q.12 a.6. While Eckhart cites Thomas's distinction, he understands "grace" differently. For Thomas grace is the divine life itself in which human nature is called to share; for Eckhart it is often an intermediary or means to divine union. See Tobin, *Meister Eckhart*, 105–12.
27. Eckhart, *Sermo* 49:235;423,n.508; citing 1 Tim. 6:16.

28. *Ibid.*, citing Rev. 3:12.
29. See Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15,7,11–12; 15,13–16,22–26; and 15,22–23,42–43.
30. Eckhart, *Sermo* 25, LW 4:234–35,n.257; translated in *Eckhart: Teacher and Preacher*, 218.
31. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* I q.93 a.1 ad 2; translated by Anton Pegis in *Basic Writings of Thomas Aquinas* (New York, 1945), 886. See also *S.T.* I q.35 a.2 ad 3; and Augustine, *Sermo* 9,8,9, PL 38:82, where Augustine comments, “You are God’s coin, and better for this reason, because by intellect and a certain life you know whose image you bear, and to whose image you are made; for a coin does not know that it is an image of the emperor.”
32. See Eckhart, *Comm. Jn.*, LW 3:256,n.308; *Comm. Wis.*, LW 2:354,n.4, and 423–24,n.91; and *Predigt* 4, DW 1:69–70.
33. Thomas Aquinas, *S.T.* I q.12 a.6; and similarly regarding angelic knowledge of God, *S.T.* I q.56 a.3.
34. “Principal knowledge” is the main theme of C. F. Kelley’s *Meister Eckhart on Divine Knowledge* (New Haven, 1977); see especially 38, 125–26, 173, and 250,n.4. See also Eckhart, *Predigt* 1, DW 1:15–19; and *Predigt* 70, DW 3:197–98.
35. Eckhart, *Predigt* 52, DW 2:492–94, and 504–05; translated by E. Colledge in *Meister Eckhart: The Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises and Defense* (New York, 1981), 200 and 203. See the important commentary on this sermon by John Caputo, “Fundamental Themes in Meister Eckhart’s Mysticism,” *The Thomist* 42 (1978), 197–225.
36. Eckhart, *Predigt* 72, DW 3:244; translated by M. O’C. Walshe, *Meister Eckhart: Sermons and Treatises* (London, 1981), Vol. 2, 326.
37. *Ibid.* 244–45; trans. Walshe, 326.
38. Eckhart, *Predigt* 71, DW 3:230–31; translated by Frank Tobin in *Eckhart: Teacher and Preacher*, 325.
39. Caputo, “Fundamental Themes,” 222–24; Tobin, *Meister Eckhart*, 144; Bernard McGinn, “The God Beyond God: Theology and Mysticism in the Thought of Meister Eckhart,” *Journal of Religion* 61 (1981), 1–19; and D. F. Duclow, “Hermeneutics and Meister Eckhart,” *Philosophy Today* 28 (1984), 36–43.
40. See especially Eckhart, *Predigt* 86, DW 3:481–92. In *Breakthrough: Meister Eckhart’s Creation Spirituality in New Translation*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1980), Matthew Fox emphasizes the active, social dimension of Eckhart’s teaching (417–545).
41. Eckhart, *Predigt* 16b, DW 1:271; trans. *Eckhart: Teacher and Preacher*, 277.