

CHAPTER I: A Pantheistic View of Reality

The metaphysics of Antonio Machado is based on a pantheistic conception of reality. This pantheistic view not only appears in his prose writing, but also serves as the basis for many ideas expressed in his poetry. The lack of a comprehensive study of this aspect of his work has caused some confusion and misunderstanding in the interpretation of his religious and philosophical thought. Before I begin a study of his work, however, I will try to answer some fundamental questions. What is pantheism, and when has it appeared? What are the arguments that support a pantheistic view of reality, and what are those which oppose it? What is the relation of pantheism to traditional theism, and how is it viewed from the point of view of science and modern metaphysics. Giving an answer to these basic questions will permit us to have a clearer understanding of the metaphysical thought of the Spanish poet and philosopher.

1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF PANTHEISM

THE PERENNIAL PHILOSOPHY

Pantheism, one of the earliest and most permanent theological doctrines in the history of religious thought, affirms the unity of God and the universe. Aldous Huxley declares that this concept constitutes the essence of what has been called the *Philosophia Perennis*—an "immemorial and universal" part of all religions. As Huxley describes it pantheism—the "perennial philosophy"—is "the metaphysics that recognizes a divine Reality substantial to the world of things and lives and minds; the psychology that finds in the soul something similar to, or even identical with, the divine Reality; the ethic that places man's final end in the knowledge of the immanent and transcendent Ground of all being... Rudiments of the Perennial Philosophy may be found among the traditionary lore of primitive peoples in every region of the world, and in its fully developed forms it has a place in every one of the higher religions."¹

In *The History of Pantheism*, C. E. Plumptre also emphasizes the universal nature of this metaphysical doctrine: "Belief in the doctrines of pantheism has been widespread

¹ Aldous Huxley, *The Perennial Philosophy* (New York: Harper, 1970), p. vii.

since ancient times. In the same way, in the religious books of the Hindus, the Vedas, as well as the philosophical, the Vedanta; in the crude speculations of the first Greek philosophers, as well as the more advanced speculations of the Alexandrines and Arabs; in the theosophy of Neo-Platonism, and the mysticism of German transcendentalism; in the theory of a Bruno as well as in the logic of a Spinoza; in the optimism of a Leibnitz, as well as in the pessimism of a Schopenhauer; pantheism is the key to all these philosophies, the same doctrine of which they are, although in different ways, the exponents"; and still more: "One must also remember that many passages from the New Testament, as well as many of the most spiritual Psalms of David, are full of pantheistic ideas, and pantheistic interpretations of God and Nature."² As proof of the historical importance of pantheism, Plumptre cites the following passage from Goethe: "To discuss God apart from Nature... is both difficult and risky; it is as though we were to separate the soul from the body. We know the soul only through the body, and we know God only through Nature. Thus the mistake, in my opinion, of characterizing as absurd those who have seen a philosophical link between God and the world. Because everything that exists belongs necessarily to the essence of God, and God is the only Being whose existence includes all things. The Sacred Scriptures do not contradict this view, although each may interpret these dogmas in different ways, according to their own point of view. All of antiquity thought with a unanimity that, for me, has great importance. For me, the judgment of so many fortifies the reality of the doctrine of emanation."³

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF PANTHEISM

It is not possible to find a single definition of pantheism that includes all of its manifestations throughout history. However, there are certain concepts that stand out in the majority of its exponents. What follows are some of the more typical elements.

Contrary to the dualistic metaphysics of conventional theism, pantheism believes in an immanent God. The entire universe is in God and, therefore, the divine essence is present in all things. God and His creatures do not differ in their essence; both are divine. All creatures subsist in God, and God is manifested in His creatures.

According to pantheistic thinking, divine being has several dimensions, or several levels. First, non-manifested being—sometimes called "non-being"—is the purest form of reality of which nothing can be said except that it is; non-manifested being represents an infinite potential which exists only in eternity, beyond space and time, and can never be described in intellectual terms. Then, in another dimension of divine reality, is manifested being, or pure being which has been actualized; it exists in time and therefore has a beginning and an end. Manifested being is also divided into two levels which correspond to spirit and to matter. Spirit exists in time, like all manifested being, but has no form in space. Matter exists in time and in space and is the only type of being which can be known by the senses. All these dimensions of being—non-manifested being,

² C. E. Plumptre, *History of Pantheism* (London: W. W. Gibbings, 1878), Vol. II, p. 262 and Vol. I, p. 26.

³ Quoted by Plumptre, Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 261.

and manifested being, in its spiritual and its material aspects—are parts, or aspects of the only Absolute Being, which is the foundation of all that is. There has been some confusion with regard to the name that has been given to these fundamental dimensions of being, but non-manifested being has been referred to as Godhead, Father, *Urgrund*, Brahman, Tao, while manifested being has been called God, *Grund*, Brahma, The Ten Thousand Things, Nature, Christ, etc. About the Godhead and its difference from God, Meister Eckhart has written: "All that is in the Godhead is one; about this we can say nothing. It is beyond all names and all nature. The essence of all creatures is an eternal life within the Godhead. God works, but not the Godhead. In this are they distinguished: in working, and non-working. The end of all things is in the hidden darkness, or the eternal Godhead; unknown and beyond understanding."⁴

One of the difficulties that human beings have, then, is the inability to comprehend the true nature of absolute being within their finite understanding. Man imagines that his senses show him what is real, but they can never penetrate the mystery of divine being. For that reason, the evidence of the senses is only relative, and any concept of reality based on the senses is in fact an illusion. In his book on pantheism and Christianity, John Hunt mentions this point when he discusses the pantheistic view of Hinduism: "We imagine the existence of matter. This is the great illusion of life. Matter is called *maya*, or deception. It seems to exist, but its existence has reality only as a manifestation of Brahma. Creation emanates from Him. When He thinks, He becomes subject and object—that which is thought and that which thinks. Just like a man who sees himself in a mirror, Brahma contemplates himself in creation. That which for us is the physical world is for Him only the image, or the reflection of His being."⁵ It is not that matter or any form of manifested being is unreal—its essence is part of the divine reality—but its form does not reveal, or rather it hides, the ultimate reality.

The fact that it is impossible to comprehend absolute being within the limits of human understanding does not mean that man is completely ignorant; although his reason, which depends on the senses, is limited, his intuition, or non-rational awareness sometimes offers him a glimpse of the divine reality. God cannot be described or defined in rational terms, but He can be felt, or experienced directly through intuitive awareness. Just like the emotions which we all experience, the existence of God can also be felt in moments of non-rational consciousness.

One of the consequences of pantheistic thought, then, is the apparent paradox of diversity within unity. The Godhead is one, but it is also multiple; pure non-manifested being *is* in a state of absolute oneness, but in its manifested state, it assumes an infinite number of forms. The pantheist cannot conceive of unity without multiplicity. The manifested universe, with its infinite variety of different forms, is the necessary development of the only divine substance.

Another consequence of the oneness of God is the affirmation that the essence of all beings is immortal, like God is immortal. But all pantheists do not agree with regard

⁴ Meister Eckhart, quoted by John Hunt, *Pantheism and Christianity* (Port Washington, N. Y. and London: Kennikat Press, 1970), p. 179.

⁵ John Hunt, *Op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

to whether this immortality is personal, or impersonal. Does the soul retain its identity when it once again becomes one with God? For some, all individuality is lost when the soul is absorbed by the immensity of non-manifested divinity. For others, the reunion of the soul with God is the achievement of its true individual identity.⁶

PANTHEISM AND THEISM

Now that we have seen some of the salient characteristics of pantheism, we can compare it with traditional theism to see how each of these points of view is justified and why each one rejects the other. First, let us see the reasons why a typical theist cannot accept the idea of unity between God and the world.

The doctrine of pantheism contradicts the traditional dogma of the separation of God and the world which, according to most orthodox thinkers, is supported by the Sacred Scriptures. Besides, if all is one this means that God created evil, that evil is part of God, which is unthinkable for those who see in God the *summum bonum*. Equally unacceptable for the conventional religious thinker is the egotism of the pantheist who seems to equate himself with God by thinking that his imperfect being is part of the divine reality. Theists believe in a personal God who is more or less anthropomorphic, while the pantheist concept of God loses its personal quality when He is defined as absolute being. Pantheists believe that truth is revealed progressively through the evolution of being, and this contradicts the dogma of a definitive Revelation which is the basis of an infallible Church. Finally, pantheism teaches that union with God is a natural thing, while from the traditional religious point of view union can only be the result of divine grace.

In spite of the fact that the Church—both Catholic and Protestant—has condemned pantheism and has even burned at the stake some of its exponents like Giordano Bruno and Lucilio Vanini, John Hunt has observed that the Church has been somewhat equivocal in its attitude toward this doctrine: "The infallible Church—the Anglican vicar writes with some irony—has never determined exactly what Pantheism is. It has applied this term to certain doctrines and to certain philosophies, with the same indefinite criteria that we find among the Protestants. It has prohibited the works of Erigena, and has permitted those of the Areopagite to pass without any censure whatever. It has not condemned the speculations of Descartes and Malebranche, the legitimate result of which was the doctrine of Spinoza. It declares itself against pantheism, but it has neither eliminated nor explained the pantheistic element of the fathers of the Church whose work it considers orthodox, nor those of the Scholastics, who were the great exponents of its medieval glory. [...] We have seen that the great masters of the gospel,

⁶ As an example of the idea that we achieve our true identity through the union with God, we can cite these words of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: "What I experience while I am face to face with, and in the depths of this world which your flesh has assimilated, this world which has become your flesh, my God, is not the absorption of the monist who wishes to be dissolved in the unity of all things... Like the monist I sink into the One which includes all things; but the One is so perfect that, when it receives me and I lose myself in it, I find the ultimate perfection of my own individuality": *Hymn of the Universe* (New York, Harper, 1965), p. 26.

from St. Paul to the Alexandrine fathers, including even St. John..., can be considered more or less pantheistic."⁷ Part of the problem results from the fact that the church has not always defined pantheism in the same way. There are also some modifications of pantheism which have confused other critics. What one might call "pure pantheism" insists on the absolute identification of God and the world. It is this version of pantheism that has been most strongly condemned because it destroys individuality, and it means that God can never be more than the manifested universe. Nevertheless, many pantheists do not believe in an absolute identification; they believe in the unity of God and the world, but they also believe that God is more than the world. We will examine this point more completely when we discuss concept of "panentheism." But now we must examine some of the arguments that are used to justify a pantheistic view of reality.

There will always be certain problems which logic cannot solve, but the pantheist feels that a monistic explanation is more logical than the dualistic concept of traditional theology. That which *is*, is absolutely. True Being must be infinite, and there cannot be more than one infinity. This was the error of Descartes, who postulated the existence of an infinite God along with an infinite universe. As Spinoza realized, these two infinities can only be one. God, in order to be God, must be infinite, and there can be no substance outside of Him: all substance must be part of His absolute being.

Which brings us to the problem of Creation. Some pantheists use the term "creation," but usually they refer only to the moment when being is transformed from one dimension to another. In this sense, creation is synonymous with "emanation" or "manifestation." If God is infinite, nothing can be added to or removed from His absolute being. The dualists maintain that God created the world *ex nihilo*, but the axiom of the pantheists is: "from nothing, nothing." Nothing, they say, can come from nothing; and non-existence can never be converted into existence. Therefore, if God created the world, it must be from His own substance.

The existence of evil has always been a problem, as much for the traditional theist as for the pantheist; but in a certain sense, that is, in an absolute sense, there is no evil for the pantheist. Evil seems to exist, because we see things from a limited point of view. But if pain and suffering and death are seen from the perspective of divine continuity, it would be evident from this larger perspective that all these things are "for good." The conventional religious thinker has to accept this idea as a matter of faith, but we will see that the concept of pantheism which includes the theory of reincarnation and the law of karma offers a logical explanation for everything that occurs in the manifested universe.

Thus, it is true that the God of the pantheists can not be contained within the limits of human understanding; but this does not have to result in an impersonal God. God can not be defined in narrow anthropomorphic terms, nor in these terms is He a person. Nevertheless, God *is* a person in the sense that He is the essence of each human being; in the depths of His infinite consciousness there exists an idea of Himself as a person, and it is to this part of God which human beings can relate in a manner which is completely personal.

⁷ John Hunt, Op. cit., p. 333 and p. 337.

The concept of the unity of God and the world is found in the *Cabbala* of the Jews and, in spite of its rejection by orthodox theologians, several passages in the New Testament also refer to this same idea. A complete study of the Scriptures would not be appropriate for this study, but as examples I would like to mention at least a few passages from the letters of Paul, as well as the Gospel of John.

We have seen that the exponents of traditional theism have adopted a dualistic perspective based on the complete separation of God and the universe. Nevertheless, in his letter to the Ephesians Paul offers a different view when he declares that there is "one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all" (IV, 6).⁸ Just like the majority of those who believe in the doctrine of pantheism, Paul conceives of the divine substance on two different levels: as non-manifested being God is "above all," and in His manifested state He is also "through all and in all." In another well-known passage, Paul inverts this perspective when he says of God: "In him we live and move and have our being" (Acts XVII, 28). Not only has Paul said that God is "in all and through all," but we also have our being "in God."

In the Gospel of John, Christ also refers to the unity of all creatures in God. He first affirms: "I and the father are one" (John X, 30). Then he prays that, some day, all men will recognize that they are one with him and with God:

"I do not pray for these [the disciples] only, but also for those who believe in me through their word, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, [...] I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one..." (John XVII, 20-26).

It could be said that the union with God has not been consummated because men are not conscious of their participation in the divine being. But Christ also assures his disciples that some day the veil will be removed, and then they will know that all is one: "In that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you" (John XIV, 20).

In his first letter to the Corinthians, Paul asks: "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" (I Corinthians III, 16). Then, he reiterates what he has said on other occasions: "yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and through whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist" (VIII, 6). When Paul speaks of the "Father," he refers to the Godhead which is not yet manifested; but when he mentions the "one Lord, Jesus Christ," he is speaking of the universe which has already been manifested. Jesus, the man, is the human being in whom the Christ Spirit has manifested in its purest form. But this same Spirit is present in all human beings, and in all things.

In his letter to the Colossians, Paul repeats this same idea even more clearly:

He [Christ] is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible... all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together (Colossians I, 15-17).

⁸ Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible

And in a later passage he reiterates: "...but Christ is all, and in all" (Colossians III, 11). Based on what Paul states in these passages, the "invisible God" is the Godhead which has not yet been manifested. Christ—or the Christ Spirit—is the "image of the invisible God," the entire manifested universe through whom "all things were created." This aspect of creation has been divided into two parts, or two dimensions: spiritual being, which is invisible because it is "in heaven," and material being, which is visible because it is "on earth."

When Paul says that Christ was "the first-born of all creation," that he is "before all things," and that "all things hold together" in him, he is echoing the initial words of the Gospel of John. Following the terminology that we have used in the present discussion, the term "God" used in this well-known passage is equivalent to the "Godhead," or the non-manifested aspect of God, while the "Word" corresponds to the "Christ," the manifested aspect of divinity:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through Him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men... [...] And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son of the Father (John I, 1-14).

John does not talk about creation *ex nihilo*, nor the dualistic separation of God and the world, because all things were made in the Christ—in the "Word"—and He was with God in the beginning, that is, the moment of the first manifestation. In the Christ was "life" and this life was the "light (the spirit, or the soul) of men." Christ was the "only Son of the Father"—Paul calls Him "the first-born of all creation"—and therefore all things were made through His divine substance.

In his letter to the Corinthians, Paul also refers to the concept of multiplicity in unity, when he speaks of the different members of a single body:

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all were made to drink of one Spirit (I Corinthians XII, 12-13).

The body is not a single member and the Christ is not a single man. Just as the members are part of one body, all men are part of the same Spirit. Like many pantheists, Paul does not believe that the unity of all things means that the universe is equal to God. He has said that all things are "in God," but he also insists that God is "above all." This means that no part of being, not even the totality of manifested being, can ever exhaust the infinite potential for being that remains within the invisible Godhead.

Finally, just as John repeats the words of Christ saying that some day men will realize their oneness with God (John XVII, 20-26), Paul also refers to a time in the future when all creatures will be conscious of their unity with the Spirit which is God:

And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all (I Corinthians XV, 28).⁹

⁹ This passage is taken from the King James Version of the Bible.

Thus, these passages from the New Testament state clearly that the world is in God and that God is in the world, but this unity will not be "consummated," until all beings know, as God knows, that all is One.

Now, before concluding our brief exposition of the history of pantheism, we must also take a look at some ideas that have appeared during the Twentieth Century, which give new impetus to a belief in the unity of God and the universe. We will first see this idea from the viewpoint of modern science.

PANTHEISM AND MODERN SCIENCE

Approximately one hundred years ago, the co-founder of the Theosophical movement, H. P. Blavatsky, predicted in her book, *The Secret Doctrine*, that during the Twentieth Century science would recognize the validity of many concepts taken from Oriental mysticism which she had discussed. (Among other things, Blavatsky expressed the idea that divine energy is the foundation of all that is.) Many scholars laughed at her, calling her a charlatan. In spite of this criticism, however, it is now clear that much of what Blavatsky had to say has been vindicated by the discoveries of modern physics. Although most people are not aware of it, some important ideas of Theosophy have been verified; and they are, precisely, those which are most closely related to the theme of our present study.¹⁰ Let us now see how this surprising development has occurred.

Before the beginning of the 20th Century, the vast majority of Western thinkers took for granted the idea that matter is solid, and it was shocking when it was discovered that matter, far from being solid and impenetrable, was full of empty space and was composed of subatomic particles which moved around each other with incredible speed and energy. Although the materialists were disturbed, they were still consoled by the idea that, if objects were not solid, this was at least true of atomic particles. So for several decades now physicists have tried to discover which particle is the foundation of matter. However, they still have not found it. On the contrary; although some are still

¹⁰ In his book *The Tao of Physics*, physicist Fritjof Capra has studied "the parallels between modern physics and Eastern mysticism," and he concludes that "a consistent view of the world is beginning to emerge from modern physics which is harmonious with ancient Eastern wisdom" (Boston, Shambala, 1991), p. 12. The biologist Lyall Watson has also observed that modern physics and mysticism are pointing toward the same description of reality: "When both physicists and mystics are asked for their description of how the world works, they give the same answers" (*Gifts of Unknown Things* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976), p. 37. In his book, *Passages About Earth* (New York: Harper, 1973), William Irwin Thompson writes about the physicist C. F. von Weizsäcker who, together with other German scientists, has studied the relation between Western science and oriental wisdom (p. 84). Thompson also quotes what Werner Heisenberg told him in an interview, when asked if others should follow the example of von Weizäcker. The well-known author of the *Principle of Indeterminacy* answered that the orient possessed knowledge that "was very necessary" for Western thought (p. 90). A similar opinion, with regard to the relation between modern physics and Eastern mysticism can be found in *The Dancing Wu Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics* of Gary Zukav (New York: William Morrow and Co.: 1979), pp. 25-26; and it is also found in the book of Bob Toben, *Space-Time and Beyond* (New York: Dutton, 1975), p. 11. Both these books were written in collaboration with well-known physicists, a fact that emphasizes the growing number of scientists who are beginning to share these ideas.

searching, the so-called "new physics" that have resulted from the work of Einstein, Bohr, Heisenberg and others, have shown that these particles are not solid objects, but rather bundles of energy. Gary Zukav (whose book *The Dancing Wu Li Masters: An Overview of the New Physics* received the American Book Award for Science Paperbacks in 1980) has written the following description of material existence:

The search for the ultimate stuff of the universe ends with the discovery that there *isn't any*. If there is any ultimate stuff of the universe, it is pure energy, but subatomic particles are not "made" of energy, they *are* energy. This is what Einstein theorized in 1905... What we have been calling matter (particles) constantly is being created, annihilated and created again... The world of particle physics is a world of sparkling energy forever dancing with itself in the form of its particles as they twinkle in and out of existence, collide, transmute and disappear again. [...] How can this happen? The answer is partly given by Einstein's special theory of relativity. *The new particles are created from the kinetic energy (energy of motion) of the projectile particle* in addition to the mass of the projectile particle and the mass of the target particle. The faster the projectile particle is traveling, the more kinetic energy is available to create new particles at the point of impact.¹¹

It has also been established that these particles are not isolated bundles of energy, but rather they comprise a vast web of integrated energy where no part is more fundamental than the other, and where anything that affects one part also produces a change in the whole. As physicist Fritjof Capra explains,

Quantum theory has thus demolished the classical concept of solid objects and of strictly deterministic laws of nature. At the subatomic level, the solid material objects of classical physics dissolve into wave-like patterns of probabilities and these patterns, ultimately, do not represent probabilities of things, but rather probabilities of interconnections... Quantum theory thus reveals a basic oneness of the universe. It shows that we cannot decompose the world into independently existing smallest units. As we penetrate into matter, nature does not show us any isolated basic building blocks, but rather appears as a complicated web of relations between the various parts of the whole.¹²

Because the energy that forms the universe is organized according to intelligent patterns which depend in part, or perhaps completely, on the consciousness of the observer, some scientists have come to believe that this universal energy is equivalent to consciousness and that consciousness is the real basis of the material universe.¹³ In his book, *Space-Time and Beyond*, which was written in collaboration with two well-known physicists: Jack Sarfatti and Fred Alan Wolf, Bob Toben has made the following affirmation: "Consciousness is the totality beyond space-time—what may in essence be the real 'I.' We have come to know that consciousness and energy are one; that all of space-time is constructed by consciousness..."¹⁴ Fritjof Capra reaffirms this point of view and then relates this concept, taken from modern physics, to some basic ideas taken from Oriental

¹¹ Gary Zukav, Op. cit., pp. 212-213 and p. 215.

¹² Fritjof Capra, Op. cit., p. 68.

¹³ The discovery that mass is equivalent to energy ($E=mc^2$) has given the physicist the vision of a living universe which exists in a dance of perpetual movement. "According to the quantum theory—Capra

mysticism: "This view, again, is in perfect harmony with the views of the Eastern mystical tradition which have always regarded consciousness as an integral part of the universe. In the Eastern view, human beings, like all other life forms, are parts of an inseparable organic whole. Their intelligence, therefore, implies that the whole, too, is intelligent."¹⁵ In fact, if one accepts the idea that everything is interconnected as part of one basic whole, human intelligence proves that the whole is also intelligent.

Another idea taken from modern science which supports the concept of an intelligent universe is the theory of the "collective unconscious" taken from Jungian psychology. Many psychologists have used this theory as the basis for a vision of the world that is basically pantheistic. In his autobiography Jung has declared: "like every other being, I am a splinter of the infinite deity";¹⁶ and although the theory of the collective unconscious usually refers only to human consciousness, it is clear that Jung himself included the entire world in his unified vision; as he puts it, "Nothing could persuade me that 'in the image of God' applied only to man. In fact it seemed to me that the high mountains, the rivers, lakes, trees, flowers and animals far better exemplified the essence of God than men..."; and in another passage: "Man and the proper animals... were bits of God that had become independent... They expressed not only the beauty, but also the thoughts of God's world."¹⁷

So we have found that modern physics and Jungian psychology both offer a vision of the world which agrees perfectly with the doctrine of pantheism which we have examined in this book. Science cannot tell us that the universal web of conscious energy, or the collective unconscious is God, but both of these concepts strengthen and support the pantheistic doctrine which says that the world is part of the divine consciousness.

PANTHEISM AND MODERN METAPHYSICS

These scientific discoveries have also influenced some philosophers in the 20th Century. In his book, *The New Consciousness of Science and Religion*, Harold K. Schilling says that the "process metaphysics" of thinkers like Alfred North Whitehead denies the legitimacy of the dualistic view of matter and spirit and prefers, instead, an integral concept which Schilling calls "the principle of multidimensional unity." Process thought tells us that traditional theism has produced an unnecessary separation between God and the world by insisting on the transcendence of God, while denying His immanence. Now that modern physics has discarded the dualistic perspective of Newtonian physics, this new metaphysical view reconciles religious thinking with scientific theories by recognizing that *God is both transcendent and immanent*. From the

writes—matter is thus never quiescent, but always in a state of motion. Macroscopically, the material objects around us may seem passive and inert, but when we magnify such a 'dead' piece of stone or metal, we see that it is full of activity. The closer we look at it, the more alive it appears" *The Tao of Physics*, Op. cit., pp. 193-194,

¹⁴ Bob Toben, *Space-Time and Beyond*, Op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁵ Fritjof Capra, Op. cit., p. 300.

¹⁶ C. G. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (New York: Vintage, 1965), p. 4.

¹⁷ C. G. Jung, Op. cit., p. 45 and p. 67.

perspective of this new metaphysical outlook, life is seen as a dynamic process which produces active manifestations—processes, events, relationships—of one integral reality. For this reason, Schilling adds, it rejects the separation of God and the world and in that way resolves the old conflict between pantheism and theism. In perfect agreement with the New Testament ideas of Paul and John that were cited earlier, Schilling concludes: "This makes way for the biblical idea that God is in the world, while at the same time it is in Him, an idea that represents panentheism, rather than conventional theism (although apparently not all process thinkers explicitly espouse panentheism)."¹⁸

The writing of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin is a good example of what Schilling has been talking about. In his book, *The Phenomenon of Man*, the Jesuit paleontologist offers more or less the same description of the world that we have seen in modern physics and in process metaphysics. He declares that the consciousness of human beings proves that, what he calls "pre-consciousness," has always existed "within" matter, and that consciousness and matter are two forms of the same primordial substance. He conceives of life as the evolutionary process of a great cosmic organism the purpose of which is to produce more consciousness. The result of this vital process has been the creation of the *noosphere*, a new mental dimension in which all the individual centers of consciousness are connected. But the process of evolution will not culminate in the creation of individual consciousnesses, because it is moving toward a new state of consciousness, which Teilhard calls "Omega," in which the personal centers will be reaffirmed in the Center of divine consciousness. Teilhard rejects the pantheism which is based on an identification of God with the universe, because it results in the annihilation of the individual. Nevertheless, he accepts what he calls "an absolutely legitimate pantheism" which permits the preservation of personal individuality. He explains this point of view in the "Postscript" which was added to a later edition of his book:

To put an end once and for all to the fears of 'pantheism,' constantly raised by certain upholders of traditional spirituality as regards evolution, how can we fail to see that, in the case of a *converging universe* such as I have delineated, far from being born from the fusion and confusion of the elemental centres it assembles, the universal centre of unification... must be conceived as pre-existing and transcendent. A very real 'pantheism' if you like (in the etymological meaning of the word) but an absolutely legitimate pantheism—for if, in the last resort, the reflective centres of the world are effectively 'one with God,' this state is obtained not by identification (God becoming all) but by the differentiating and communicating action of love (God all *in everyone*). And that is essentially orthodox and Christian.¹⁹

For Teilhard, then, the concept of the unity of all things in God constitutes an "absolutely legitimate pantheism" which, at the same time, is "essentially orthodox and Christian."

With this I hope to have answered all the questions about pantheism that were raised at the beginning of this chapter. However, we still have the question: what is *panentheism*, and how does it differ from pantheism? In the next section I try to answer this question through a brief study of the philosophy where this term originated.

¹⁸ Harold K. Schilling, *The New Consciousness in Science and Religion* (Philadelphia, Pilgrim Press, 1973), p. 246.

¹⁹ Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper, 1975), p. 309.

2. KRAUSIST PANENTHEISM

The German philosopher, Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, was born in 1781 and died in 1832. He studied in Jena with Fichte and with Schelling and, together with them and with Hegel, he belonged to the group of philosophers who followed and later modified the ideas of Kant. The philosophy of Krause never became well-known in Germany, but Julián Sanz del Río brought it to Spain where it was adopted by a group of Spanish thinkers, among whom were various professors of the Free Institution of Learning (*Institución Libre de Enseñanza*).

PANTHEISM AND PANENTHEISM

Like that of the majority of German philosophers who followed Kant in the 19th century, the metaphysics of Krause was closely related to pantheism; however, it differed in some essential aspects. Juan López Morillas refers to this in his book on Spanish Krausism: "It is not too much to remember, with regard to this point, that Krause turned his back on his teacher, Schelling, precisely because the latter was a pantheist, and then coined the new term *panentheism*, or the doctrine of all in God."²⁰ Thus, if Krause reacted in this way towards pantheism, it was primarily because, after Spinoza, it had taken on certain characteristics which made him reject the metaphysics of his teachers.

We have already seen that pantheism affirms the unity of God and the universe. It bears repeating that this unity does not necessarily mean an absolute identification: the majority of pantheists have always seen that God was more than the world, and that the totality of manifested being never exhausts the infinite potential for being that is in the Godhead. Spinoza's logical approach, however, led him to believe in an absolute identification of God with the universe. (As we noted earlier, it is this form of pantheism, which I have called "pure pantheism," against which the Church has directed its strongest condemnation.) Among those pantheistic concepts which Krause could not accept were: 1) the concept of an impersonal God that was limited to His own manifestations; 2) the lack of individuality and free will of all finite beings; and 3) the concept of an impersonal immortality that results from the fusion of finite beings with the Whole.

As a metaphysical theory, panentheism is not really new, since it only readopts certain ideas that a majority of pantheists had accepted before the philosophy of Spinoza. Panentheism does not identify God with the universe; it affirms that God contains the world in Himself while, at the same time, surpassing it. The world is in God and is part of God, but is not the totality of being. This results in the idea, as process metaphysics also recognized, that God is both immanent and transcendent. In this way panentheism avoids the disadvantages of pure pantheism, and is able to adopt a doctrine that should be more acceptable to traditional theism.

Let us now take a look at some aspects of this philosophy taken from *Das Urbild der Menschheit* (published first in 1811 and again in 1851), which is the only book by Krause that was translated into Spanish. The author of this translation entitled,

²⁰ Juan López Morillas, *El krausismo español* (Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956), p. 38.

The Ideal for the Life of Humanity, was Julián Sanz del Río, who produced two versions: one in 1860 and another in 1871.²¹ Because the author of this translation modifies the original text,²² I have also used an English translation by Scottish Professor, W. Hastie which is somewhat closer to the original German.²³ Since Krause's book is not well-known, and since it contains some ideas which are important for our topic, I will quote in some detail from both translations.

THE WORLD IN GOD

For Sanz del Río the central idea of pantheism is "the idea of God, as God and Supreme Being over the world, the foundation of life in whom all finite life has its source and will have its ultimate fullness" (Sanz del Río, p. 34). Everything that exists and lives, exists and lives in God, the primordial oneness, "outside of which nothing is nor has reality, and in which all finite beings have their essence and their foundation" (Sanz del Río, p. 243). God is the cause and the result, the origin and the end of everything that exists in this world, and in the entire universe.

Although the world exists as part of God, Krausist pantheism recognizes the absolute subordination of Spirit, of Nature and of Humanity under the Supreme Being. In perfect agreement with the words of Paul—"one God and Father of us all, who is above all, through all and in all"—Krause affirms the unity, but not the equality, of all finite beings and the Divinity: "they will recognize God as the Father, although not in the sense that the sons are equal to the father, but rather in the absolute sense that God is the Supreme Being" (Sanz del Río, p. 277).

What follows is a more detailed description of the relation of human beings with God taken from the English translation of Krause's book:

Each creature is an independent part of the whole, imperishable in its being; since each, in its own way, carries the divine image in itself. All exist and live in, with and through God. Only God *is*, and nothing is outside Him. But everything that God has created eternally, He created in Himself, imperishable, in His own image. The world does not exist outside of God because He is all that is... That which God created in eternal succession, without time and beyond time, as a being that survives eternally, manifests and reveals in forms that are always new, that which God originally put in its essence; and God, as the Being prior to and above all time, and above all creatures, works continuously in the life of all things, the same life that subsists eternally in, with and through Him as the one universal life (Hastie, pp. 5-6).

²¹ For this discussion I have used the translation 1871: C. Ch. F. Krause, *Ideal de la humanidad para la vida*, con Introducción y Comentarios por Julián Sanz del Río (Madrid: Martínez García, 1871).

²² In a notice by the supporters of Sanz del Río—Fernando de Castro, Manuel Ruíz de Quevedo, Nicolás Ramírez de Losada, Federico de Castro, Nicolás Salmerón, Francisco Giner, Tomás Tapia—it is stated: "Although Sanz Del Río modestly attributes his *Ideal* to Krause, giving the understanding that it is a mere translation..., there are some essential differences between his book and the original. That of Sanz del Río, although inspired by the beautiful work of Krause, is a completely free exposition of its meaning, which is adapted to the spirit of our people and the most pressing cultural necessities"; Op. cit., pp. vii-viii.

²³ K. C. F. Krause, *The Ideal of Humanity and Universal Federation*, Trad. W. Hastie (Edinburgh: Clark, 1900).

God is infinite, while each creature is finite and limited. But that which is finite is not inferior, and limitation is not imperfection. One of the most positive aspects of the theory of "the world in God" is the idea that the individual is never lost within the whole, which is what occurs with the pantheism of Spinoza. On the contrary; its limited, finite nature gives each creature the capacity to maintain its own individuality: "All beings participate in the being of God; they imitate God's perfection within their own limits; and it is precisely to experience this participation in their own way that they exist within a definite, limited form. All this in no way diminishes that which is divine in them; because in this way they acquire individuality, beauty and strength" (Hastie, p. 6).

INDIVIDUAL FREE WILL

According to the pantheism of Spinoza, individuals do not possess free will, but exist in a sort of "divine determinism" in which all action is already part of God's eternal being. But the idea of "the world in God" preserves the concept of individual freedom: "Only this idea lets us comprehend God in the fullness of His life without destroying the freedom of finite beings and of men" (Sanz del Río, p. 270); and once more: "It is the will of God that He be glorified in free beings who, guided by His supreme wisdom and power, will form their life from within, freely independent, and whose existence will consist in a struggle against the limits of the world, until they emerge from this struggle transfigured and worthy of the love of God" (Hastie, pp. 176-177).

Krause points out that God's gift of freedom has consequences; the free will of finite beings allows them to preserve their individual essence, but it also permits them to act in a way that distances them from God: "To the extent that the manifestations of sentient and human life develop more freely and individually, and to the extent that natural life (the world of the senses) and the desire to possess and dominate preoccupies man and divides his spirit; to this extent humanity distances itself from the fundamental unity where all life has its origin" (Sanz del Río p. 242). According to this panentheistic view, original sin is a direct result from the fact that human beings have free will. If man were not free, he would only be able to follow the will of God. Being free, he is able to follow his own desires, and this allows him to ignore his divine origin: "Only as a distant glimpse of forgotten ideas and religious sentiments is the memory of that first union with God recalled..." (Sanz del Río, p. 242). However, man's egocentric nature in no way contradicts the unity of God and the world; the fact that men live "partially apart of God—a distance that does not separate them from God—has the effect of making them aspire to once again experience the fullness of God's presence" (Sanz del Río, p. 277).

And what does Krause have to say to those who fear their identity will be absorbed when they finally achieve the goal of uniting with God? Does oneness with God mean that all individuality is lost? The fact that pantheism is not based on the complete identification of God with the world, the fact that the divine potential extends far beyond the limits of the existing universe, allows Krause to give a positive answer to these questions:

The reunion of those free beings, who strive to unite with God, is a continuation and complement of creation, God receiving in His divine harmony all finite beings who become worthy of Him. But this temporal reunion with God does not mean that these beings are somehow subsumed in God, or identified with God, but rather that these *finite beings* remain, in this reunion and in subsequent reunions, always in the relation of the creature with the Creator, of the finite with the infinite, of the part with the whole. Because it is a law of life, affecting the whole and each individual life (plant, animal, and man) that each finite being founded in and contained within the totality of its species, may live first simply within its own capacity and, afterwards and in the fullness of time, may enter into relation with the coordinated group of superior beings and with the whole (Sanz del Río, pp. 270-271).

TIME AND ETERNITY

The division of being into two categories—finite and infinite—also implies the existence of two temporal distinctions, that is to say, time and eternity; it implies that all finite beings exist in time, and that all temporal existence is founded in the eternity of divine being. On this point Krause has written: "The temporal life of spirit, nature and humanity is here and everywhere part of eternal time. That eternity is one (a real present); which includes the present of all times, without the necessity of a beginning in time (Sanz del Río, p. 278).²⁴

In this we have an explanation of what Krause means when he says that "each creature is imperishable." Although each exists in time like all finite existence, it is founded in eternity; each creature has an immortal essence "because the first divine operation, the creation of its beings, lasts eternally; the second operation in which every creature, according to it limits becomes similar to God and is elevated by God according to its merits, also lasts eternally, and both divine operations form together the living and continual relation of God and the world" (Sanz del Río, pp. 275-276).

REINCARNATION

Like many pantheistic doctrines, that of Krause also includes the theory of metempsychosis or reincarnation, which means that human beings live more than one life on the earth. According to Krause, the history of each person includes a series of lives, or reincarnations: "No being or finite life is annihilated in God, but rather is reproduced in successive rebirths and complements" (Sanz del Río, p. 275). The reason for this series of different lives is "the supreme necessity" that each creature has to perfect itself, so that it can be reunited with the divine perfection. Obviously, one lifetime is not enough for this process to be completed; to perfect itself each soul must assume many different forms during a long cycle of temporal rebirths. As Krause explains it in another passage: "In order for beings to unite their peculiarities and their multiple characteristics of life and form, and for them thus to receive the entire divine image, to each one according to its merit, God has given the continual and imperishable capacity of form and life in time; in this way each creature develops, in agreement with the divine harmony of the world, from form to form, until it has realized the totality of its being within its limits, when the cycle of its temporal existence is closed and, at the same time, it begins another new cycle" (Hastie, p. 8).

Krause concludes by saying that even when man has arrived at the end of the cycle of lives on earth, life will still continue within the divine eternity: "Many, certainly innumerable men, families and peoples have completed their times on earth; all will continue even further the life they have prepared by their own merits (an eternal law here, and in all places)" (Sanz del Río, pp. 286-287).

THE LIMITS OF FINITE EXISTENCE

Before continuing to discuss another aspect of panentheism, two more important consequences of the finite nature of human existence should be mentioned. The first is that man will never be able to obtain direct knowledge of divinity, because this knowledge will only be revealed through the limits of his senses. What oriental philosophy calls "the veil of maya," Krause has called "the life of fantasy." However, although true being is revealed only through the veil of "fantasy," man *is* able to touch it indirectly, or intuitively, in the following manner: "Nature is imprinted on each sense, and its forms, as they appear, are vividly presented in the world of fantasy. Here spirit senses and comprehends Nature, imbuing it with the particular images of its interior fantasy, which then easily creates an exterior image that is brought complete and fully to the Ideas, in order to produce an understanding of the true Nature of things" (Hastie, p. 63). All things appear to us as *maya*, or illusion, but then spirit—our intuitive consciousness—produces an inner image from which our intellect is able to grasp the essence of the real thing.

The second consequence of our finite nature is that we can never reach a complete understanding of our own divinity. Just as the finite can never embrace the infinite, man can never "find" God; and each concept that man forms with his limited understanding is destined to fail in the attempt to form a complete image of the divine reality. With regard to the vain effort to "possess" God, Krause has stated: "the ultimate fruit, the absolute possession of the object, in the ordinary sense of the word, will never be achieved, since man is finite, and God—*the ultimate object*—is infinite." But just as man is able to have an intuitive, or non-rational knowledge of the true Nature of things, he may also reach a limited knowledge of the Supreme Being. This will only happen, however, if man recognizes the limits of human understanding:

To the extent that humanity knows God, in this way will it also know all particular things, and itself, and all internal and external relationships; because in the mysterious depths of all things is God, that is, the true, ultimate reality; and connecting all these things there is always an infinite interconnectedness, a world of relationships. But where man refuses to recognize the thread that stretches between himself and the object, and where he refuses or does not know how to maintain this type of relationship, but presumes to know, feel and have direct possession of the object, there he falls into blindness, into absolutism, and presumption, and he turns his back on God as he forgets the infinite disparity between himself and God (Sanz del Río, p. 273).

Krause does not employ the terms "intuition" and "reason" like we use them today. (When he speaks of reason, he is referring to something like the biblical "Word" which constitutes one of the two levels of divine manifestation.) But similar to the ideas of modern philosophy—those of Bergson for example—what Krause tries to say is that man

always fails in his attempt to understand God when he uses the absolute concepts of rational thought. On the other hand, when he employs his intuition, or non-rational understanding which is dynamic like life itself, he feels the divine Presence in the "mysterious depths" of the thing itself. That is because the precise concepts of reason are incapable of encompassing God's infinite potential, while feeling or intuition can allow us to actually *experience* the sense of His presence.

MULTIPLICITY WITHIN UNITY

It is also clear that Krause accepts the principle of "multiplicity within unity." Similar to the way that Paul speaks of a single body with many members (I Corinthians XXI, 12-14), Krause describes a living organism when he refers to the relation of the parts to the whole: "The Organic Realm of the entire terrestrial nature is shown as a great body which exhibits its glory in the richness of all the plants and all the animals, as well as its free members" (Hastie, p. 26). And in another place he repeats Paul's terminology: "The essence and destination of humanity and of the individual are of one origin; they are only distinguished as body and members of a single Life" (Hastie, p. 37).

UNIVERSAL FEDERATION

The destiny of all manifested life, according to Krause, will be "the reunion of the unity with its interior variety," because the panentheistic doctrine, like Saint Paul, affirms that at the end of time—obviously the "end of time" does not mean the end of life—God will once again be "all in all." One of the ideas that Krause insists on throughout the entire book, is that life, and especially humanity, is constantly evolving toward a sort of "universal federation" in which all beings will be united once again as "children of God," first on earth, and then with God in the sphere of a higher dimension. When he discusses the evolution of humanity, he refers to three fundamental Ages: the Age of Childhood which is already past; the Age of Youth, in which humanity has now entered; and the Divine Age, which will be the last period of life on earth.

Like many others today, Krause feels that humanity has entered into a New Age, and that this will bring with it a new consciousness of the relation of the individual to the Divinity. Krause is not one who expects an early end of the world; he feels that the final unity will require a long period of preparation: "Not suddenly, nor without preparation, can this highest form of unity be established on earth" (Hastie, p. 142). This will not happen in the immediate future, but the new human consciousness is preparing the way: "The time of the fruit is still distant; but the time of the blossom has already arrived" (Sanz del Río, p. 40).

The beginning of a new age, however, does not mean that only in the present has there been an effort to strive for a final state of unity. Krause says that anyone who studies history can see there "the seeds of silent preparations" made in the effort to produce the desired union: "In the mysteries of primitive peoples—India, China, Egypt, Greece—in the doctrine and the society of Pythagoras and of the Essenes, in the science and life of Socrates and Plato, in the teachings of Jesus, who founded the most sublime

religion on earth, in the societies of the Templars and the Masons of the Middle Ages, the philosophical historian will recognize the signs of an effort to establish a unified organization of humanity" (Sanz del Río, p. 41; Hastie, p. 148).²⁵

Finally, when all of the preparations for the "final alliance" have been made, men from all different ages—past, present and future—will be part of the divine family, because the destiny of each individual is the same as that of humanity as a whole: "In the fullness of time, all nations will form a single brotherhood and will be like one man on earth, in harmony with himself, and conscious of the reciprocal relationship with God and with all the higher entities of humanity in the universe. Then a truly divine age will begin on earth, and will remain constant in the fullness of life with renewed beauty, until all of humanity has reached a state of worth and dignity, when its time on earth is completed and when it is finally perfected and is received into the totality of the highest level of being" (Hastie, p. 145).

In conclusion, Krause reiterates: "Then the third age of humanity will flourish; it will have passed from here to there, through many different times, and we, the children of today, will have left this natural life; but we will be reborn in heart and spirit in that future humanity, which will receive us all in the fullness of life, under God and through God and in God" (Sanz del Río, p. 298).

There are several other important aspects of Krause's philosophy which merit further study—for example, his ideas about education, sociology and aesthetics—but this concludes our study of panentheism which is its religious foundation. Because, no matter what ultimate value these ideas may have, there is no doubt that this is a truly religious philosophy; or as Elias Díaz puts it: "The philosophy of Krause is explicitly a philosophy not only open to religion, but essentially founded on it."²⁶ After this long historical digression, we can proceed to our study of pantheism in the work of Antonio Machado in the hope that we can now have a clearer understanding of his religious and philosophical thought.

3. PANTHEISM IN THE WORK OF MACHADO: PROSE

After he refers to a "pantheistic conception of reality" Juan de Mairena insists: "the metaphysics of my teacher [Abel Martín] was founded on that conception."²⁷ Machado's apocryphal philosopher explained this situation in the following manner: "Let us imagine—my teacher would say to us—a theology without Aristotle that conceived of God as a great consciousness of which ours was part..." (OPP, p. 530). We know that Machado began to form his religious and philosophical thought during the years that

²⁵ This passage was taken mainly from Sanz del Río's translation, but the reference to Jesus and the Masons was taken from the translation by Hastie, where an almost identical passage appears. In the translation of Hastie, Krause refers several times to the Masons—he himself was a Mason—but these references do not appear in the book of Sanz del Río.

²⁶ Elias Díaz, *La filosofía social del krausismo español* (Madrid: Cuadernos para el diálogo, 1973), p. 57.

²⁷ Antonio Machado, *Obras: Poesía y Prosa*, 2^a Edición (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1973), p. 531.

he studied with the Krausist teachers—Giner de los Ríos, Cossío, Salmerón—at the Free Institution of Learning.

So how does Machado use the term "pantheism"? When he wrote the phrase, "pantheistic conception of reality," was he referring to the pure pantheism of Spinoza, or the pantheism of his Krausist instructors? In what follows it will be evident that, although he uses the terms "pantheism" or "pantheistic," the metaphysics of Machado is based on the *panentheistic* conception of reality brought to Spain by Sanz del Río. We will also see that it agrees with the ideas that we have already mentioned in our discussion of modern science and process metaphysics.

THE UNIVERSE AS CONSCIOUS ENERGY

The most appropriate point at which to begin our study of Machado's pantheism is the work he has entitled the *Apocryphal Songbook (Cancionero apócrifo)*. When he describes the philosophy of the apocryphal poet, Abel Martín, he declares that his point of departure is the philosophy of Leibniz who conceives the substance of the universe as "something which is constantly active." Then, Machado anticipates the theories of the New Physics in a way that also agrees with oriental philosophy by affirming that the basic substance of the universe is conscious energy:

Abel Martín thinks of substance as energy, a force which can create movement and is always its cause, but also exists without it... The activity of this force, or pure substance, is called consciousness (OPP, p. 315).

For Martín/Machado this substance is always immobile because it is infinite: that which is infinite already is, by definition, everywhere and therefore cannot move. But although it does not move, he assures us that it never ceases to be active:

This conscious activity, through which pure substance is revealed, is not immutable or rigid just because it is immobile; on the contrary, it is always in a constant state of change (OPP, p. 315).

And in an earlier passage:

Being which is everything as it *is itself*, changes as it becomes conscious activity, and it remains immobile because there is no energy which is not itself, or that is outside it and could move it (OPP, p. 330).

This conscious substance which is "absolute and changeable, quiet and active" exists as an integrated totality: "The universe conceived as substance, an active conscious force, would be a single active monad something like the universal soul of Giordano Bruno" (OPP, pp. 316-317). However, although it has its point of departure in Leibniz, the metaphysics of Abel Martín follows a different path in that it conceives of substance as a single universal monad. In this way Martín contradicts the theory of Leibniz according to which all monads are disconnected entities which have no "windows through which something could enter or leave." Contrary to the German philosopher, for whom monads are solitary and impenetrable, Martín views substance as something which is completely unified and interrelated. As Machado explains,

Abel Martín does not follow Leibniz in his idea of monads as a plurality of substances. The concept of plurality is inadequate to describe substance. "When Leibniz—Abel Martín says—conceives of a multiplicity of monads and affirms that each is a mirror of the universe, or a more or less faithful representation of the entire universe, he is not thinking of the monads as substances which are consciously active forces, but instead he places himself outside these forces and sees them as passive entities which form, by representation like a mirror—which has nothing to do with consciousness—an image of the universe." The monad of Abel Martín, because Abel Martín also speaks of monads, would not be a mirror nor a representation of the universe, but rather the universe itself as conscious activity: *the great eye that sees everything as it sees itself* (OPP, p. 316).

Leibniz, whose philosophy is essentially dualistic, denies the immanence of God. He speaks of an infinity of different monads, while the great, all-seeing eye of Abel Martín consists of only one universal monad.

GOD IS ABSOLUTE BEING

For Machado "the universe as conscious activity" is equivalent to the concept of divinity, because "in the theology of Abel Martín God is conceived as absolute being" (OPP, p. 336). And as a possible source of Machado's image of the divine, all-seeing eye, we find in Krause's writing the following passage: "All the life in the universe constitutes a whole: and the eye of God sees all living things as an indivisible experience which is eternal and constant" (Hastie, p. 63).

Before we continue, however, it will be necessary to explain something about those who, like Antonio Sánchez Barbudo, have insisted that in Machado's metaphysics "there is no true God."²⁸ However, the fact that he does not accept the concept of God offered by orthodox theology does not mean that Machado is either an atheist or an agnostic. Those who have said this have forgotten, or have misunderstood his pantheistic view of reality. Because to affirm that Machado does not believe in God would be to say that he does not believe in absolute being which is out of the question, since this would remove the entire basis of his metaphysical thought.

It has also been said that the God of Machado is "pure nothingness": God is not the creator of the world but of Nothingness; therefore, God must also be *nothing*.²⁹ But those who have said this have overlooked two important aspects of Machado's pantheistic metaphysics. Like other pantheists, Machado feels that "for theological and metaphysical reasons" it would be impossible to create the world out of nothingness. Therefore, as Juan de Mairena has put it: "God could not be the creator of the world since the world is already an aspect of the divinity" (OPP, p. 558); in an earlier passage Abel Martín has also declared: "The world being real and reality unique and divine, to speak of the creation of the world would be equivalent to saying that God has created Himself" (OPP, p. 350). Then finally, the fact that God has created Nothingness does not signify His non-existence.³⁰ God created nothingness when He gave human beings the ability to think

²⁸ Antonio Sánchez Barbudo, *El pensamiento de Machado* (Madrid: Guadarrama, 1974), p. 13.

²⁹ Constantino Lascaris, "El Machado que se era nada," *La torre*, XII, 445-46 (1964), p. 205.

³⁰ Aurora de Albornoz has also emphasized that "The frequent association of God and nothingness

—"¡*Fiat umbra!* Human thought appeared"—and rational concepts can never comprehend God's absolute being. In Machado's metaphysics, the concept of "nothingness," or "non-being" does not have a negative meaning; it merely means that when God gave us the ability to think, He allowed us to form at least a partial (or finite) conception of His true (infinite) being.³¹ Abel Martín explains this in the following way: "God gave man the great zero, nothingness or integral zero, that is, zero integrated by all the negations of what is. Thus, the human mind possessed a concept of totality, the sum of all that *is not*, which serves, logically, as the boundary of all that *is*" (OPP, p. 336). Or as Juan de Mairena expresses it more succinctly: "God took Nothingness out of the world, so that we would be able to take the world out of nothingness."³²

THE REJECTION OF PURE PANTHEISM

So far we have spoken of characteristics which pantheism and panentheism have in common, and now we can also show how the metaphysics of Machado differs from the pure pantheism of Spinoza. When he affirms that the world is divine—"The world being real, and reality unique and divine"—it is obvious that Machado refers to the immanence of God. But he does not agree that God and the world are identical; this is shown by the statement of Abel Martín that "the world is only an aspect of the divinity" (OPP, p. 350). Like Krause and the panentheists, Machado believes that God is more than the world and that the world can never exhaust His infinite potential for being. But he also shows his belief that God is both immanent and transcendent, when he speaks of God in the heart of man: "God revealed, uncovered in the heart of man—says Abel Martín—is an otherness, an immanent otherness" (OPP, pp. 502-503). God in the heart of man is immanent, but His "otherness" shows that He also transcends the world of man: "From this point of view, God is the *transcendent otherness* which we all can see" (OPP, p. 502).

As we will see in what follows, Machado sometimes questions the belief in a permanent identity of the individual, and in this he seems to alternate between the ideas of pure pantheism and panentheism. But another concept that he shares with his Krausist teachers, is their belief in free will; instead of the "divine determinism" of Spinoza's pantheism, Machado conceives of being as a free and independent self-consciousness which exists in any one of the infinite points of the universe: "Martín conceives being as active consciousness, quiet and changeable, essentially heterogeneous, always subject, and never the passive object of outside forces" (OPP, p. 330).

has caused some critics to think of the identification of God-Nothingness, or God-Death. Nevertheless, God and Nothingness are not interchangeable terms, and neither are God and Death"; "Notas preliminares" in *Antonio Machado: Antología de su prosa*, Tomo III (Madrid: Edicusa, 1971), p. 30.

³¹Jorge Enjuto agrees with this point when he declares: "But this infinite being is unattainable for man, who knows only the finite. For this reason, God created nothingness so that human beings would have an awareness of His magnificent divinity"; "Apuntes sobre la metafísica de Antonio Machado," *La torre*, XII, 45-46 (1964), p. 217,

³²From "Mairena, posthumous," cited by Aurora de Albornoz in *Antonio Machado: Antología de su prosa*, Tomo III, Op. cit., p. 123.

This introduces another fundamental concept of Machado's philosophical thought: "the essential heterogeneity of being." For those who identify God with the world, there is a single homogeneous being that results in the lack of freedom and individuality of all finite creatures. In Machado's metaphysics, being which is "essentially heterogeneous" is not only the cause of free will; it also allows him to discuss the concept of multiplicity within unity, which Machado defines as "pure heterogeneous unity" (OPP, p. 332).

It is also clear that the heterogeneity of being is directly related to the "immanent otherness" of God. The topic of love will be examined more completely in a later section, but here it should be pointed out that love plays an important part in Machado's metaphysics. The lover wishes to be one with his beloved; but he will never succeed precisely because "in love he discovers the essential heterogeneity of the one substance" (OPP, p. 320). The soul sometimes remembers a state of unity when intuition, or non-rational awareness, evokes the "first love" of its divine origin. But when the soul tries to recover this lost unity, "It feels love as its own impurity, that is, as its *immanent other*, and it discovers the essential heterogeneity of substance" (OPP, p. 329). For that reason, in the prose, as well as in the poetry of Machado, the idea of the beloved always brings with it the memory of a "divine *otherness*." And this is one of the most important revelations of Machado's metaphysics: in his effort to unite with the beloved, man also reveals his desire to reunite with the divine source of all being.

THE WORLD OF APPEARANCES

Like all philosophers who follow Kant, Machado is conscious of the fact that human thought can never completely capture "the thing in itself." What the Hindus call "the veil of maya" and Krause refers to as "the world of fantasy," Machado describes as "the forms of objectivity, or the appearance of objectivity" which results from the vain effort to possess, as a real object, the pure heterogeneous substance. Abel Martín, therefore, "considers all objectivity only an appearance, a mirage, an illusory projection of the subject outside itself" (OPP, p. 329).

This does not mean that Machado denies the concept of an ultimate reality; when referring to the world revealed by the senses, he has commented: "Although it belongs to the subject, that doesn't mean it is without a definite and indestructible reality; in the final analysis, it is only its objectivity that is illusory" (OPP, p. 321). The world of the senses is only an illusion, but in order for the illusion to appear it must have a cause that is real. That Machado accepts the existence of a transcendent reality is confirmed by the following statement: "In the end I am a believer in the existence of a spiritual reality that is the opposite of the world of the senses."³³ Machado has no doubt about the existence of this spiritual reality. The difficulty is with human thought and its finite concepts which cannot penetrate "the heart of the absolute."

³³ These words are quoted from an autobiographical document published by Francisco Vega Díaz: "A propósito de unos documentos autobiográficos inéditos de Antonio Machado," *Papeles de Son Armadans*, LIV (1969), p. 70.

TWO MODES OF CONSCIOUSNESS

So the existence of a sphere of transcendent reality has been established, but what does it matter if this fundamental reality is inaccessible to man? How can we find a link between the finite and the infinite if, as Abel Martín has put it: "between *non-being* and *being* there is no possible connection"? In order to find an answer these questions we must reexamine human consciousness, because it is there that Machado sees the cause, and, at the same time, the only solution to this problem. The reason for the illusory appearance of physical reality is the *logical thought* of all human beings; the solution is what Machado calls *poetic thought* "which is already divine thought" (OPP, p. 336). In this way Machado divides consciousness into two essential levels: one which corresponds to man's finite being, and another which corresponds to divine being, which is infinite. However, since man is both human and divine, he is able to use both forms of thought. But first, let us see what Machado says about the rational mode of consciousness.

Pure being exists in a perpetual state of change and total heterogeneity, but logical thought converts being into something which is static, homogeneous, and unreal. Of this type of thought, Machado has declared: "To think is now to disqualify, to homogenize. Thinking of matter converts it into atoms; perpetual change, into particles which are fixed in space. Being has remained behind..." This gives us also another explanation of the relation between human thought and nothingness, because, as Machado puts it, "he who thinks of being as it *is not*, thinks in fact of pure nothingness... Logical thought only results, in fact, in the emptiness of non-being" (OPP, p. 333).

On the other hand, poetic thought is intuitive or non-rational thought, a mode of consciousness which is open and vital, and which permits man to perceive the relation between the finite and the absolute. The logical mode of thinking produces a concept of life as it *is not*, but "art, and especially poetry—Abel Martín declares—can only be seen as an activity which is the opposite of rational thought... This type of [poetic] thinking results in realities, not shadows; in intuitions, not concepts " (OPP, p. 334).³⁴ The effort

³⁴ Machado has described the difference between these two modes of thinking in the following poem in "Proverbs and Songs," from *Campos de Castilla* (CXXXVI, xxxv):

There are two modes of consciousness: one is light, and the other patience. One flashes a tiny beam over the deep sea. The other is penitent with a pole or a net, waiting for a bite like a fisherman. Tell me, which is better:	visionary consciousness that probes the deep aquarium where living fish flee, and cannot be caught, or that cursed task of tossing dead fish of the sea onto a sandy shore? (OPP, pp. 219-220).
--	--

In Machado's poetry, the sea represents the "unknown" origin and source of life. The light flashed over the sea represents man's intuition, and the fisherman who catches dead fish represents his rational consciousness. Logical thought destroys living creatures by taking them out of the vital flow of pure being. Reason produces concepts which man can understand but, as Machado learned from Bergson's lectures in Paris, these concepts have no "life." Poetic thought, or "visionary consciousness" does not produce fixed concepts for analysis, but it is the only mode of thinking that can witness being in its existential vitality.

to reintegrate objects into the reality of absolute being is a conscious process which Abel Martín has divided into three fundamental stages:

Consciousness in man begins as spontaneous life; in this first stage there can be nothing which is a product of culture; it is blind activity, but not mechanical; it is lifelike, or animal-like, if you wish. In the second stage it becomes conscious of itself as a murky stream and tries to purify itself. It feels that it has lost its innocence and sees its richness as something which is unfamiliar. This is an erotic moment of profound distress when the immanent *other* begins to be recognized as something transcendent, as an object of knowledge and love... Only after this erotic desire has created the forms of objectivity can man achieve a real visionary consciousness by reintegrating the pure heterogeneous unity of these forms, or *inverted forms of being*, and see himself, live himself, and *be himself* in full and vital intimacy (OPP, p. 332).³⁵

As Ortega y Gasset has already stated in *The Theme of Our Time*, awareness begins with the spontaneous activity of pure consciousness, or non-reflective consciousness which is not yet self-consciousness. This first stage is equivalent to the paradisiacal state when consciousness is not yet aware of itself and therefore has not felt the division of its being and is not aware of the distinction between good and evil. In the second stage man has arrived at a state of self-consciousness and has already felt the loss of the primordial unity. It is then that love produces the disquieting discovery that there, in the intimacy of its own being, is a *transcendent otherness* which the finite self can never fully recapture. Then, in the third stage poetic thought, or intuition has produced a state of integral consciousness, or infinite awareness in which man experiences the reunion of his immanent self with the transcendent self. Each of these stages is necessary, because man cannot know being, if he has not first become aware of non-being: "But *nobody*—says Martín—*can be what he is, if before that he cannot think of himself as he is not*" (OPP, p. 332). In this way Machado resolves the problem of the individual and his attempt to recover the awareness of his relation with absolute being which is God.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNISM

Machado never mentions, like Krause or St. Paul, what will happen at the end of humanity's time on earth. But he does express his faith in a future time when there will be a state of unity among all human beings. In the speech that he planned to give upon his acceptance into the Spanish Academy, he declares: "The future, Gentlemen, well may be a return—there is nothing new under the sun—to objectivity, on the one hand, and to brotherhood on the other. A new sense of faith... has already begun" (OPP, p. 949).

And this new faith in the brotherhood of the future will be a "communist faith" Machado declares in an article entitled, "About Communist poetry that may come out of Russia" (OPP, p. 954). This does not mean that the poet is in favor of Marxism—"I am not a Marxist; I have never been one, and it's very possible I will never be one" (OPP, p. 761)—but he does believe in the "Christian communism" that is prevalent in the Russian people. Machado believes that Spain will some day be a "deeply Christian" country, but among the contemporary nations, only in Russia is there a brotherly spirit that includes all of humanity: "Only on Russian lips this word: *brother*, expresses a feeling of compassion and love with a human sympathy that greatly exceeds the limits of the

family, the tribe, and the nation, all this with a heartfelt vibration of infinite scope" (OPP, p. 735). What Machado sees in the Russian people can be summed up using the following essential points: 1) Russian thought reveals "a lack of logical coherence... It is thought which is ascetic, mystical, solitary; not logical, but intuitive"; and 2) it also shows a tendency "toward universal feelings: the desire for immortality, charity toward the poor, brotherly love, the desire for moral perfection and for supreme justice, in short, Christianity" (OPP, p. 903).

What Machado refers to as "Christian Communism" is the sociological equivalent of Krause's pantheism. And while Krause's goal was a "federation of humanity," Machado speaks of "the problem of Communist poetry" which will result in a "feeling of communion among men." In order to help with the creation of this Communist consciousness which has nothing to do with Marxism, Machado offers as an easily recognizable basis, his own pantheistic metaphysics: "in order to resolve [this problem] it will be necessary to find a metaphysical foundation on which this poetry can rest, a philosophical belief since a religious faith would be difficult in our times. It will be necessary to accept: first, that there is a plurality of spirits, other unique souls like our own; second, that these spirits are not just separate monads which are incommunicable, self-sufficient multiple solidarities which sing and listen only to themselves; third, that there is a spiritual reality that transcends these individual souls in which they may coexist" (OPP, p. 952). The existence of this transcendent, spiritual reality in which souls coexist is what makes communism, that is universal brotherhood, a possibility.³⁶ This is the promise that was given to us by Christ: "Where there is one man, Christ tells us, there is all of humanity" (OPP, p. 902).

José Luis Abellán obviously agrees with Machado's comments, when he tells us that "the true Communism has a Christian origin and essence; or perhaps better, Communism is the authentic and correct interpretation of Christianity."³⁷ However, when Abellán speaks of the state of life in contemporary Russia, he concludes: "Today, we cannot share the hope of Machado which seems to have been definitely disappointed."³⁸ But Machado had already anticipated this pessimistic attitude with respect to the Russian people. He saw clearly the disadvantages of "economic determinism"; but he also saw in Marxism a "definite universal potential" (OPP, p. 736), since it represents a step toward

³⁶ Machado also expressed these ideas in a letter to Unamuno written in Baeza in 1918 which is worth mentioning, since it demonstrates that the poet had this same attitude over a longer period of time. After declaring that the spirit of Cain, or violence, has spread everywhere he affirms: "Only the Russians—blessed people!—seem to me to be capable of overcoming it with a sentiment which is more noble and universal. Tolstoyism will save Europe, if it is ever to be saved." Then, he continues speaking of Christ and brotherhood, and of God as a common father in whom we can all be united: "Let us all come to Christ... Brotherhood is... loving your neighbor for love of a common father. My brother is not my creation, nor any part of myself...; he is my equal, but other than me; the similarity does not reside in us, but in the father who engendered us... With the immense love that you feel for yourself—Jesus said—love your brother, who is your equal, but is not you; you will recognize in him a brother; but that which you have in common is the blood of God Himself, your father... Brotherly love will take us out of our solitude, and carry us to God" (OPP, p. 1,025).

³⁷ José Luis Abellán, "Antonio Machado, filósofo cristiano" *La torre*, XII, 45-46 (1964), p. 234.

³⁸ José Luis Abellán, *Op. cit.*, p. 239.

the desired goal: the union of all men on earth. And to those who have lost faith in the Russian people after seeing the defects of Russia's Marxist government, Machado says that perhaps it is not too late: "There are profound reasons that we should not expect too much of Marxism, and that we should wait for the art and poetry of the Russia of tomorrow, which will be that of yesterday, and of always. Let us not judge too quickly. It is possible that Marxism is not an element as heterogeneous with the Russian spirit as we thought... And what is probable, almost certain, is that Russia will not be so unfaithful to itself as to renounce its historical mission, which is essentially Christian" (OPP, p. 953).³⁹

* * * * *

Recapitulating, then, from pantheism we have moved to panentheism; from panentheism, to Communism; and from Communism to Christianity. These four essential points—pantheism, panentheism, Communism and Christianity—constitute the basis of the religious and philosophical thought of Antonio Machado. In this way Machado fulfills the obligation to offer his own metaphysics: "All poets—Machado has written—must have their own metaphysics... and a poet has the obligation to explain it clearly, in another form, and in unmistakable terms" (OPP, p. 349). And now it remains to be seen how this metaphysics finds its expression in his poetic work.

4. PANTHEISM IN THE WORK OF MACHADO: POETRY

Pablo de A. Cobos has said that "there is not a single poem, not in Machado nor in Mairena, that cannot be inscribed within a pantheistic, or panentheistic outline."⁴⁰ Probably because of the early influence of Krausism, a pantheistic conception of reality is evident in Machado's poetry from the beginning. This aspect of Machado's metaphysical thought was not completely developed until he finished his formal study of philosophy at the University of Madrid after the death of his wife; however, among his first poems we can already see the elements of a pantheistic view of God and the world. What follows are some examples taken from different parts of his poetic work.

SOLITUDE AND SOLITUDE, GALLERIES AND OTHER POEMS

For Abel Martín the world is "an aspect of the divinity," but many years prior to the creation of the apocryphal philosopher and poet, in the poem "Twilight," from the first edition of *Solitude*, Machado describes an intuitive vision when his soul witnessed the moment in which the universe emanated from the divine consciousness:

³⁹ This recalls the curious fact that the American psychic Edgar Cayce also prophesied that Russia would have a crucial role in the future of Christianity. When someone asked him about the future of religion, he answered: "Changes are coming, this is certain—an evolution, or revolution of the ideas of religious thought. The basis of this change for the world will come, someday, from Russia; not from Communism, no! Rather from the basis of the same, like Christ taught—His type of Communism!"; from Lytle Robinson, *Edgar Cayce's Story of the Origin and Destiny of Man* (New York: Berkley, 1973), p. 163.

⁴⁰ Pablo de A. Cobos, *El pensamiento de Antonio Machado en Juan de Mairena* (Madrid: Ínsula, 1971), p. 236.

My heart felt a red nostalgia,
 vermilion dreams, which streamed into my soul
 from the great unconscious,
 like a chaotic and murky region
 where clouds of igneous stars float,
 unformed, in a milky sky... (OPP, p. 38).

When the poet speaks of the "great unconscious" he must be referring to non-manifested being—what Paul calls "the invisible God,"—from which smoldering stars stream forth in the first moment when the universe emanates from All That Is. Once again, there is no mention of a creation *ex nihilo*, since everything already existed in the mind of God.

As this description of a pantheistic cosmogenesis in the poem "Twilight" shows, Machado has already recognized that the individual is part of the divine totality of being. In poem XVIII this same concept is poeticized as a drop of water that is part of the ocean when the poet speaks of immersing himself in the whole, like a "drop of the sea, in the immense sea" (OPP, p. 77). According to pantheism, each individual is a microcosm which has within itself the essence of the macrocosm which is God. In his poem, "The great fullness, or integral consciousness," Machado expresses this idea with the words "All of the ocean in each drop" (OPP, p. 337); but in poem XIII which was written many years before the aforementioned poem, the following lines had already appeared: "What is this drop in the wind / which shouts to the sea: I am the sea?" (OPP, p. 74).

Using this same idea, Machado also describes a note of cosmic music to represent the relation of the individual to the whole. Still speaking of poem XIII, the "afternoon," which constitutes the life of the poet, is also a "note of the immense lyre" (OPP, p. 73). And in poem LXXXVIII from *Solitude, galleries and other poems*, the poet hears the "forgotten music" played by the hand of God—the "creator of stars"—and once again sees his life as "a single note of the immense lyre" (OPP, p. 129). In using this imagery, Machado is clearly referring to the "music of the spheres" from the Pythagorean tradition which conceives of the universe as a melody of divine harmony.

In other poems from this same period the image of *two sisters* is used to express a metaphysical view of reality which is essentially pantheistic. In poem XXXVIII, "April flowered / outside my window..." (OPP, pp. 89-91), the poet gazes through a balcony filled with flowers, and the atmosphere of springtime stimulates a vision of the paradisiacal garden. In it he sees two sisters whose mysterious laboring seems to symbolize the manifestation of the universe. The older sister spins "white linen" wrapped around a circular spindle—a symbol of totality—representing the spiritual dimension which is manifested for the first time. The younger sister looks at the poet as though she identifies with him, as her needle moves through the folds of black and white clothing, representing the physical realm of existence. It has been stated that the clothing which is made by these two sisters represents the life of the poet;⁴¹ and in fact the black tunic

⁴¹ Javier Herrero has said that the two sisters "weave the soul of the poet (in this case, it is black and white; a black tunic and a white veil);... although the poet is immersed in time, he still lives among the perfume and flowers of Paradise"; "El sistema poético de la obra temprana de Antonio Machado", *Cuadernos hispanoamericanos*, 304-307 (octubre-diciembre 1975; enero 1976), p. 582. Another analysis of this poem is found in the book of Carlos Bousoño, *Teoría de la expresión poética* (Madrid: Gredos, 1966), pp. 155-160.

seems to represent the lower, inferior part of the self which is coarse and dark, while the white veil corresponds to the upper, superior dimension which is subtle and luminous.⁴² When the poet looks through his window during another month of April, however, the elder sister is crying, saddened by the absence of the younger sister whose death represents the short duration of individual existence. Then, when the poet looks for a third time, the older sister has also disappeared; only the white thread which an "invisible hand"—the will of the unmanifested Deity—coils around a solitary spindle. With this Machado expresses an idea found in a poem from *Campos de Castilla* (CXXXVI, xxxix): "I love Jesus, who told us: / Heaven and Earth will pass. / When Heaven and Earth are gone / my word will remain..." (OPP, p. 219). What remains after the disappearance of the two sisters is the Word which, according to the Gospel of John, was there in the beginning, through which all things were made. In the concluding lines of poem XXXVIII, the poet looks at himself in "the clear / moon of the mirror / which dreams in the distance," and he recognizes that his own soul is also an image, or a reflection of the Word, the latent divine energy from which the dream of all human existence is created.

In the previous poem and in all of Machado's poetry, a frequent topic is the ephemeral nature of the world that is known by the senses. This is the central theme of another poem from the first edition of *Solitude*, which is entitled "The sad sea":

The grey waves of a sea of steel pound
 against the coarse roughened docks
 of the old port. A strong north wind
 ripples the sea. The sad sea projects
 a bitter illusion with its waves of grey.

 The red brigantine is a bloody
 ghost on the sea, which the sea rocks...

 The red brigantine is a ghost
 which the wind agitates and windswept sea rocks,
 an angry windswept sea with waves of grey (OPP, p. 38).

Although the red color gives an appearance of reality, the brigantine—the vessel in which we sail through our life—is only an illusion which is tossed on the vast surface of the sea—absolute being—whose steel surface the physical senses are powerless to penetrate.

However, it is not only on the surface where we see a reflection of reality; when we peer into the depths of our self, we also perceive "a hazy / labyrinth of mirrors"

⁴² In his poem "A gallant inventory" (OPP, pp. 92-92) Machado uses the symbol of the two sisters to represent two different aspects of the soul. In this case, there is no black and white clothing, but rather one sister who is blonde and another who is a brunette, representing the two parts of the self. The dark-haired sister represents the lower self: the pleasures of the flesh, the mortality of the body, the lack of truth and substance that is found under a "low, darkened sky." Then, the blond haired sister is the "morning star / in the blue distance" who represents the divine purity to which the soul aspires when it finally is free from the temptations of the lower self. Plato expresses the same concept with different symbols when he speaks of the soul that is pulled upward by a white horse, while a black horse carries the soul downward. In this case it is the two horses which represent the different aspects of the self.

(XVII, OPP, p. 85). Then, in these lines from poem LXXXVII, entitled "Renaissance," from *Solitude, galleries and other poems*, Machado reiterates:

In our souls everything
is guided by a mysterious hand.
Incomprehensible, mute,
we know nothing of our souls (OPP, p. 129.)

This is also what the poet wishes to express in poem XVIII when he borrows these words from Ecclesiastes, "Vanity of vanities, / everything is black vanity." The finite light of human consciousness "illuminates nothing." Only the voice of the soul—the divine spirit—speaking from his heart in a moment of solitude is not an illusion:

...he heard another voice, the soul in solitude, exclaim:
only you, light glowing in my heart, are real (XVIII, OPP, p. 77).

FIELDS OF CASTILE

In the poem "Galleries," which was never published in his books of poetry, Machado describes another vision which recalls the divine origin of his soul:

I have viewed my soul in dreams
like a long and narrow
dimly lit corridor
with an illuminated foundation...
Perhaps my soul has
the cheerful light of the countryside,
and its aromas come
from there, the glowing foundation... (OPP, pp. 32-33).

Demonstrating that this early manifestation of pantheism has been present in the poet's thought, even before the creation of his "apocryphal" writers, the following poem appears in *Fields of Castile*:

Soul light, divine light,
beacon, torch, star, sun...
A man feels his way forward,
with a lantern at his back (CXXXVI, li, OPP, p. 223).

This poem shows clearly that Machado believes in the divinity of the soul—"We all have a bit of God in our heart," he once declared⁴³—because our soul is part of the "divine light" which shines in the heart of all human beings. Man progresses through the "dimly

⁴³ From P. Pla y Beltrán, "Mi entrevista con Antonio Machado," *Cuadernos americanos*, LXXIII, 1 (1954), p. 237. This same concept is found in oriental philosophy in the following passage from the Upanishads: "The light that shines beyond this world is indeed the same one that glows in men" (*Chandogya Upanishad*, III, 13, 7) quoted by Eduardo A. Azcuy, *Arquetipos y símbolos celestes* (Buenos Aires: Fernando García Cambeiro, 1976), p. 76.

lit corridor" of an illusory life, but he still carries in his consciousness a memory of the "glowing foundation" of his divine origin.

In spite of his hope for the soul's continued existence after death, Machado sometimes questions the continuation of his identity as an individual soul:

To die. To fall like a drop
of the sea into the immense sea?
Or to be what I have never been:
one without a shadow or a dream,
a loner who is moving on
without a road or a mirror? (CXXXVI, xlv, OPP, p. 222).

What is death: to submerge oneself in the divine totality and cease to exist as an individual? Or to do what one has never done in this life: to awake from the dream of life and lose one's imperfections, to continue progressing as a true individual without a predetermined path? In this poem Machado does not answer these questions, but when he writes about life after death he will show his faith in the permanent identity of the self.

In another short poem from *Fields of Castile* the concept of pantheism is expressed when two young men discuss the road they should take to arrive at a fiesta. When they begin to argue, a passing cart driver recites the following lines:

Pilgrim, to go to Rome,
the important thing is to keep moving;
when traveling to Rome,
any road will get you there (CXXXVI, iii, OPP, p. 224).

"All roads lead to Rome," says the old refrain, and Machado uses this popular saying to express the idea that *all is One*. The road doesn't matter; the important thing is to make progress. Because the world is *in God*, God is everywhere, and all paths lead to the Center of divine consciousness.

In this part of his poetic work, Machado again describes the illusory aspect of physical existence. God exists as absolute being, but the divine reality is always veiled by the limits of our finite awareness. Here he uses Calderón's idea that "Life is a dream" to demonstrate that it is impossible to comprehend God in this life:

Last night I dreamed that I was seeing
God, and I was speaking to Him;
and I dreamed that God was listening...
Then I dreamed that I was dreaming (CXXXV, xxi, OPP, p. 216).

As Krause insisted, man can never "possess" God because the divine essence always transcends the narrow limits of man's finite understanding. In spite of this, however, Machado never loses sight of the "divine light" that shines within his own soul and that, at times, is revealed to his intuitive mind:

Last night when I was sleeping
I dreamed—blessed illusion!—
it was God that I felt
deep within my heart (LIX, OPP, p. 111).

NEW SONGS AND APOCRYPHAL SONGBOOK

In his later poems, Machado refers to the pantheistic conception of reality with even more frequency. Shortly before he expounds his metaphysics in the *Apocryphal Songbook*, he anticipates the monistic concept of the "*great eye which sees everything as it sees itself*." In "Rainbow at night," a poem he dedicated to his friend, the poet Ramón del Valle Inclán, he wrote the following lines:

And you, Lord, seer of souls,
through whom we all see... (OPP, p. 264).

And like Krause when he conceived of the eternal Now that is experienced by God as absolute being—"Eternity is one (a real present); which includes the same present in all times without the necessity of a beginning"—Machado has also written the following one-line poem:

Today is always still (CLIX, viii, OPP, p. 271).

Then, in the concluding lines of the third part of "Songs for Guiomar" (CLXXXIII, iii), he also describe a vision of universal harmony in which all of time constitutes a single, eternal moment:

In this April light everything becomes transparent;
everything in yesterday's today, the Still
that time in its hours of ripeness
recalls and sings—
all is fused into a single melody,
one chorus of evenings and of dawns...

In this latter part of his poetic work, Machado uses the concept of *nothingness* to represent the ephemeral nature of the world which man knows through his senses. The poetic version of this concept is found in the sonnet entitled: "To the Great Zero":

When *Being that is itself* made nothingness
and took a well-deserved moment of rest,
day finally had its night, and man
had company in the absence of his beloved.

Fiat umbra! And human thought was born.
The universal egg appeared in his hand,
empty and cold, without color or form,
filled only with a vague mist.

Take the integral zero, a hollow sphere,
which you must perceive if you wish to see it.
Today it limits the back of your beast,
and with the miracle of non-being fulfilled,
poet, dedicate a borderline song
to death, to silence and to forgetting (OPP, pp. 335-336).

In complete agreement with the doctrine of pantheism, Machado's God did not create the world; but by giving man the ability to think, He created the miracle of "nothingness": a

misty world, "empty and cold, without color or form," that is conceived within the limits of a finite mind. As long as he uses the concepts of logical thought, man remains at the margin, or the "borderline" of reality, in that zone of existence where only death, silence and forgetting are real.

Contrary to the opinion of some of Machado's critics, "To the Great Zero" is not the culmination of his metaphysical thought; it represents only one aspect—the human dimension—of his metaphysics. As we observed in the philosophy of the *Apocryphal Songbook*, even the limits of human thought have a positive aspect, and this idea is expressed once again in the poem "Siesta":

While the fish of fire follows its curved path,
near the cypress under the supreme azure,
the blind Cupid soars in white stone,
while the ivory song of the green cicada
echoes and dreams in the elm tree,
let us honor the Lord
—the dark imprint of his beneficent hand—
who created silence in the midst of clamor.
To the God of distance and of absence,
an anchor in the sea, the full sea...
He frees us from the world—omnipresence—
and opens up a path that we can follow.
With the cup of shadow filled to the brim,
and with this heart that is never full,
let us honor the Lord, maker of Nothingness,
who sculpted into faith our rational mind.

As it is stated in "To the Great Zero," nothingness is the product of human thought. But when he says that we should honor "the God of distance and of absence," Machado emphasizes the positive aspect of the only divine creation, and this is in complete agreement with Krausist pantheism. For the pantheist who identifies God with the world it is not possible to avoid the loss of freedom which occurs when individual identity is incorporated into the Whole. But the concept of a God who is both immanent and transcendent saves us from the problem of divine "omnipresence" and offers us the chance to travel freely through life—"and opens up a path that we can follow." If the heart of man "that is never full" were filled with the divine presence, life would be static, and man would not be able to make progress in the task of perfecting his soul. The distance which separates God from His finite creatures gives them the possibility of acting contrary to the divine will; but this is necessary if man is going to make his free contribution to the creative impulse which forms the universe. Not being able to "find" God in this life is the price that must be paid if man is to maintain his freedom, and his integrity as an individual being.

And this brings us to the poem which represents the true culmination of Machado's pantheistic metaphysics: "To the Great Fullness or Integral Consciousness." Like "To the Great Zero," this poem is found in the *Apocryphal Songbook*; it is the final item of the first section containing the philosophy and the poetry of Abel Martín. It begins with the image of Auguste Rodin's famous statue, The Thinker:

In his statue the supreme Zero
 —cold marble,
 an austere frown,
 with one hand on his cheek—
 at the great bend in the river,
 may he always meditate on the shore,
 and may the glory be eternal.
 And may the divine logic
 that perceives
 without a single false image
 —there are no mirrors; only a fountain—
 declare: be
 all that is, and may all that sees
 see itself. Motionless and active
 —the sea and fish and living hook,
 all the sea in every drop,
 all the fish in every egg,
 all newborn—
 offering a song of oneness.
 Everything changes but still remains,
 everything thinks,
 like a coin
 in a dream that passes
 from hand to hand.
 Full of love, the rose and the thistle,
 the poppy and the tassel
 all come from the same seed.
 Harmony:
 everything sings in the light.
 The forms of zero are erased;
 once again we see,
 bubbling up from the source,
 the living waters of being (OPP, pp. 336-337).

Pablo de A. Cobos is correct when he says that this poem "represents the consummation of *The Ideal of Humanity*... A final synthesis of the poetic metaphysics of Martín, Mairena and Machado, all three inspired by the post-Kantian philosophy of Krause and Julián Sanz del Río."⁴⁴ In this important poem Machado makes no reference to the final moment of a Divine Age, like Krause. But the ideas follow the same circular path as that of Krause and other pantheistic philosophers, a circle which begins, and ends, with the absolute being which is God.

As we noted earlier, the poem begins with a reference to Rodin's famous statue, the "supreme Zero," which represents the divine gift of thought to mankind. The thinker meditates on the "shore," that is, on the border, or the edge of pure being, near a "quiet bend in the river" of time, which flows out of the primordial fountain of being. Then, from human logic we change to "divine logic," which in Machado's writing is equivalent to non-rational or "poetic" thought. For this mode of consciousness, there are no forms

⁴⁴ Pablo de A. Cobos, *Humor y pensamiento de Antonio Machado en sus apócrifos* (Madrid: Ínsula, 1972), p. 59.

of thought which limit pure being—"without a single false image"—nor the illusory appearances which hide the source of reality—"there are no mirrors; only a fountain." Seen from the perspective of what Machado has called "integral consciousness," all is one since the essence of the whole is contained in all the parts—"all the sea in every drop, / all the fish in every egg." The world exists in a constant state of change, but nothing is lost—"Everything changes but still remains"—because the essence of each finite being is always part of the ultimate reality, or absolute being. All things have their origin in the same divine "seed," and the foundation of every finite being is "Love." The integral consciousness forms a great symphony of universal harmony in which all things are reunited in "the living waters of being."

* * * * *

This concludes our study of pantheism and its importance for the religious and philosophical thought of Antonio Machado. Many of these ideas will reappear in the chapters which follow because, as we noted at the beginning of this chapter, everything that the poet writes is composed on the basis of a pantheistic, or panentheistic metaphysics.

Now the person who has read this intellectual explanation of his thought might think that Machado only knows God in the context of the arid concepts of pure reason. In the chapter which follows, I will show that, for Machado, the pantheistic God is also a personal God, whose presence can be intimately experienced, in spite of the obstacles created by the limits of rational thought. We will see that Machado's metaphysics is founded on the living experience of the divine Reality.