

Poetic Reason: Identity in the Midst of Mysticism and Philosophy

ETHEL JUNCO, Instituto de Humanidades, Universidad Panamericana, Aguascalientes, Mexico

JUNCO, E.: Poetic Reason: Identity in the Midst of Mysticism and Philosophy
FILOZOFIA, 79, 2024, No 8, pp. 907 – 920

The irrationalist and vitalist options in the philosophy of the early twentieth century find in María Zambrano a liminal proposal. The author proposes a double movement: archaizing in order to renew the model of a philosophy saturated with formulas and without experiential content. To do so, she reads Plato, the father of Greek rationalism, through her acute hermeneutics to demonstrate that the birth of philosophy is methodologically congruent with mystical experience. Both philosophy and mysticism are models of liberation of the soul in search of truth, understood as transcendent reality. Both start from the multiplicity of being to coincide in the unity of the permanent. Both are also sources of knowledge for the common man who can approach the divine by means of his decision and will. Thus, in her main texts we find the arguments to recover the lost spirituality and to move into the experience of the sacred through the articulation of poetic reason.

Keywords: María Zambrano – poetic reason – philosophy – mysticism – language

Introduction: Mysticism and Poetic Reason

In order to discuss the dominant philosophical postulates, Zambrano defines her contribution to European culture by tackling problems approached by different thinkers such as E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, J. Ortega y Gasset, T. Adorno, M. Horkheimer, W. Benjamin, E. Stein, H. Arendt, S. Weil, H. Hesse, T. Mann, R. Musil, among others, who question the limits of modern rationality (Gómez Blesa 2022, 72). Philosophy and the arts can no longer be understood in the same way after them (De Ros – Omlor 2017).

In the midst of a geographical and ideological exile, Zambrano proposes a new humanism in response to the results of contemporary culture (Trueba 2012, 85). After the decomposition of the transcendental subject and the instrumentalization of scientific reason, she urges to take into account the notion of life, accepted as reality in shadows, in order to make it accessible and put an end to the harmful “hermeticism of deep life” (Zambrano 1989, 313). Just like her Spanish predecessors, Miguel de Unamuno, Antonio Machado, and Ortega y Gasset, she denounces the limits of systems in her own terms and proposes a transcendence with her unique voice (Nimmo 1994, 5).

Thus, mysticism, the experience of the divine, and poetic reason, the method of thought proposed by the philosopher, coincide due to their liminal nature (Maillard 1992, 12). Both are knowledge that explore the confines of immediate reality and rational consciousness and seek an experiential result:

...something that is reason, but wider, something that also slides through the interiors, like a drop of oil that soothes and softens, a drop of happiness. Poetic reason... that’s what I’m looking for. And it is not like the other reason, it has, it must have many forms, it shall be the same in different genres (Zambrano 1996, 18 – 19).

When philosophy establishes links with mysticism, the problem of the object of knowledge – which idealism had resolved in terms of consciousness – comes into play, and Zambrano seeks to expand it. The author refers to the “entrails,” to the center of the “heart,” or to the simultaneously dark and transparent depths of the “soul” to open a mediating path of non-rationality and explore all that can also be known (Revilla 2003, 97; Trueba 2013, 20). The exploration of the liminal confronts binary patterns and values uncertainty and the transitory as an epistemological possibility (Caballero 2020, 27). From that ground, she proposes a new *póiesis* that vivifies secularized philosophy.

From a methodological perspective, she takes up the Greek philosophy of the origins – as in *El hombre y lo divino* (Zambrano 2020, 101 – 152) – and the Orphic-Pythagorean traditions, by using two key notions: “soul” and “immortality” – more precisely “pre-existence” – which situate human nature in a stage prior to logical identification. In this way, the soul is seen as a divine spark, and the body, as a space of oppression, darkness, and limit, which in turn continuously suffers the tension of fleeing. For Zambrano, fleeing – which the Pythagorean and later the Platonist considered detachment and liberation towards the natural place – is balanced by the Augustinian movement of descent into the unfathomable interior. In this view, unity has won, and it is no longer a

matter of evasion but of reuniting the person as a whole. Thus, there is a premise that goes beyond the methods of search: the certainty of the expected unity.

I. Towards a New Way of Conceiving Philosophy

In *Los bienaventurados*, Zambrano states: “There is no proper philosophy if there is not something within it that both sustains and abandons the architecture of reason” (Zambrano 2022, 103).

We will be guided by Zambrano’s premise: philosophy must detach itself from reason, specifically from a model of logos expressed in a given language that has been taken as a Western heritage. However, this detachment necessarily means using some other form of language, for practicing philosophy always supposes a logos. Thus, far from the logos of reason and the logos of language, a process of asceticism begins on what is known in order to renew an idea of knowledge that philosophy has abandoned.

A new birth demands a new definition. Thinking cannot only refer to rational activity but to a complete deciphering of what is felt. In this sense, the history of thought is shown as a movement of what is thought and what is felt, but not in interweaving but in opposition. Separating thinking and feeling – something that is clearer in Enlightenment and Romanticism – jeopardizes the result of philosophy and exposes its conclusions leaving aside the person as a whole: his interiority, his desires, his passions, and silences. This set of sensations must be brought to consciousness, meaning it must be accepted as a potential source of self-knowledge.

This perspective confronts the Cartesian idea of truth, for which the identity between reason and being is considered unquestionable because, for Descartes, the objectification of knowledge is not achieved with the contingent data of history and personal life. In contrast, Zambrano recalls that man’s being is more than rational and cannot be subjected to measure. His reality is also flowing, and change affects experience, and while it determines an unavoidable knowledge for life, it also becomes hardly accessible to discursive reason (Lizaola 2008, 55). Thus, the Spanish thinker proposes the relativization of reason and its rebirth from crisis.

On the other hand, Zambrano points out the deviation of the philosophical path: “If thought was born of admiration alone, as venerable texts tell us, what it is not easily explained is how it took shape in the form of systematic philosophy so quickly” (Zambrano 2016, 17). Thus, she recalls that, in the origins, philosophy and mysticism were very close, insofar as the real sought by science exists because of its sacred nature, as the first mystical-religious

communities that began the philosophical schools affirmed. However, as she explains, this position was later discarded. The systematization of the history of thought separates in order to understand, and Zambrano states that if philosophy can approach the truth of God, it will do so in terms of theology. Nonetheless, she does not aim for a medieval reharmonization of the orders, because she is aware that it would be a post-secularization imposture. Rather, the author proposes to disarm philosophy as we understand it and take it to the intuitive stage of origins, when there was no language between man and the world, and the gods were not detached from the cosmic and psychic energies. As utopian as this idea may be for us – but necessary as a methodological condition – it is possible to imagine a world without division, where the perception of mystery does not demand a unique and definitive answer.

To propose this both new and old image of the world, Zambrano imagines some liminal notions, banished from philosophy for being considered incomplete or preconceptual, which are developed through all her works. Here are the most important ones:

- The images of silence, emptiness, solitude, isolation, as they point to suspension.
- The images of the viscera, entrails, the heart, insofar as they reveal the foundation of feeling, silenced, denied, and devalued.
- In connection with the postponed interiority, the images of darkness, chiaroscuro, shadow, fog, dream, as intermediate spaces that expand into the unknown without accepting borders.
- The paths of the forest, as courses of new thought, for the recovery or access to the real, not understood as objective data, but as personal substance.
- In consonance with the new and intimate knowledge, silence and babbling, the acceptance of intermittency, as a restart of the language that is stripped of acquired certainties.
- Finally, the auroral light, dawn, the departure of the night, never the full light of noon, as the beginning of the new knowledge.

For Zambrano, philosophy exposes uncertainties, rather than conclusions: “The first astonishment will be converted into persistent interrogation; the inquisition of the intellect has begun its own martyrdom and also that of life” (Zambrano 2016, 19). There is no language for truth before silence exposes the void. *Alétheia* cannot manifest itself in a language that has lost, through its

instrumentality, naiveté and frankness; manifestation, then, must be awaited as one awaits the light of dawn, that light that faintly announces itself amongst the shadows, like the clearings in the forest: “it is the immediate lesson of the clearings in the forest: one must not go looking for them, nor seek anything from them. Nothing determined, prefigured, known” (Zambrano 2011b, 121).

Her proposal, not logocentric, is located on the frontier of different sorts of knowledge, and it is sustained in images that seek spiritual realization. Zambrano’s methodological archaisms also place her on the borders of thought.

II. The Foundation: Plato

The consideration of mysticism as a philosophical form, which is the aim of Zambrano’s thought, is clearly expressed in the chapter “Mysticism and Poetry” of *Philosophy and Poetry*. Based on Plato’s works, she proposes a revealing hermeneutic and explains why the Platonic way of doing philosophy is mystical. The ascensional path from the cave to the light traces a dialectic of knowledge with ascetic demands that lead to a transcendent object, whose complete image can only be reached by the soul after the death of man. This philosophical path, tinged with the style of Christian mysticism and especially of St. John of the Cross (Nimmo 1994, 55; Gómez Blesa 2022, 79 – 82), is followed by Zambrano to reintegrate to philosophical thought its true sacred object and allow it to fulfill its mission of salvation: “being a clear mysticism, it carries with it the presence of its object, which shows itself poetically” (Zambrano 1986, 193).

When examining the problem of poetry as “heresy before the Greek idea of truth” (Zambrano 2016, 45) in the chapter cited above, she tackles “the religion of the soul” in Orphism and the Dionysian cults. Plato’s theory is based on the Orphic image of the body as a tomb or prison: the passions dominate the prison, insofar as they are the forces that inhabit the soul but are opposed to its original purity.

The prison is not a passive representation, but according to the description offered in Book X of *The Republic*, it is active like the sea, which seduces, alters and changes:

The force of the flesh upon the soul has not been conceived by Plato in the manner of the wall in front of its prisoner, but in the manner of the slow and irresistible disfiguring force of the sea waves....The soul dissolves and alters upon contact with the flesh (Zambrano 2016, 47).

Although the soul is imprisoned in a strange environment, it sympathizes with it and must make a supreme effort to regain its nature and save itself (Zambrano 2016, 48). That is accomplished by an outstanding energy: the love of truth, which directs the soul towards all that is divine and imperishable. The notion of life as a fall or shipwreck is evoked in the rituals of the Orphic religious community. Plato takes it to ground it rationally; that is, the philosopher cements hope, and he even turns it into an “active certainty” since he makes it dependent on human effort (Zambrano 2016, 49).

The Spanish philosopher points out: “The nature of man is reason. This identification of human nature and reason is one of the decisive battles that Plato wins for as many centuries as separate us from him” (Zambrano 2016, 49). Nature is the way of being of a thing that is by itself, but that man must conquer because he does not get to own it.

Thus, man must separate himself from the medium in which he is contained, the foreign body in which he has fallen. The first step is to free himself from passions, i.e. catharsis. The second one is to move on to dialectics, the moment in which reason – which has already been freed – ascends to the idea of good, the divine, to produce an affine encounter between soul and divinity: “Catharsis and dialectics are nothing but means to become” (Zambrano 2016, 54). Dialectic, a movement of separation from the material world, leads to contemplation; the path begins when the prisoner breaks the chains inside the cave and seeks the vision of the sun: the first steps are painful, but the light helps him to ascend towards the truth (Zambrano 2016, 51). It is precisely the completion of the purification, that is, the contemplation of the good, what distinguishes the philosopher from the rest of the prisoners; although he no longer has anything in common with them, he retains “pity for their miserable condition” (Zambrano 2016, 51). That is why he returns to look for them and is rejected by the men who remain in darkness. The risk is death: “It is not risky to think that the death of Socrates, his teacher, was present in these lines” (Zambrano 2016, 52).

The rationalized hope of philosophy requires purification by knowledge that separates the soul from its chains to reintegrate it into its true nature. Contemplation leads the soul to become the object contemplated. The author repeatedly cites Platonic works – *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Timaeus*, *The Republic* – to affirm that this philosophy “realizes... the encounter of the soul with itself” (Zambrano 2016, 50). Through the figure of the freed prisoner, Plato offers something that most people do not see, hope given by philosophy. Thus, any man could choose the truth, ending with his condition of prisoner. Philosophy

offers salvation: “hope no longer depended on the gods, nor on destiny, the choice for the blessed life was made by oneself” (Zambrano 2016, 55). Once the philosopher has detached himself from madness and the delusion of the body, the soul is ready to recover its nature:

[Plato] brought the certainty of thought – being, unity, idea – to what was beating like a groan, like an inalienable yearning in the Orphic and Dionysian cults. For the first time, one clearly thought about what was so obscurely felt” (Zambrano 2016, 55).

In accordance with the mystic’s path, anyone’s decision on whether to be converted by philosophy is founded on something beyond this world and will not be complete until after death: “That which the soul is closely related to lies on the other bank of the river of life” (Zambrano 2016, 53). The exit from the cavern augurs a process of salvation, but it demands an asceticism that determines the way of living and dying. This is the knowledge to be acquired; as can be seen, it is a notion that transcends the limits of scientific knowledge, which does not seek to know being or the laws that govern things. Conversion by knowledge seeks to rescue the soul and return it to its original mode: “Knowledge is not an occupation of the mind but an exercise that transforms the whole soul, that affects life in its totality” (Zambrano 2016, 54). Plato’s foundation of philosophical asceticism decides the future of Christianity; it constitutes “the strongest and deepest bond that was stretched between Christian religion and Greek thought” (Zambrano 2016, 54). On this argumentative basis, Zambrano states: “What Plato actually does is theology and mysticism; theology insofar as he thinks or tries to think with reason about the divine. Mysticism, insofar as it offers us the way to become it” (Zambrano 2016, 54).

In a second moment, Zambrano deals with the motif of love, attuned with the philosophical motor and mystical union. Accordingly, the soul must leave the multiplicity of the flesh out of love for its own nature, out of necessity to save the source of the passions of passions themselves. But, in the follies of the flesh – those sung by the poets – Plato finds the presence of beauty. And beauty is more than appearances, although it manifests itself in them. The philosopher, of course, does not disdain these appearances; on the contrary, he wants to save them from destruction and find a reality for them to remain. That reality is not poetry: the poetic word fixes the melancholy of the passions (Zambrano 2016, 57), but it does not manage to eternalize them because it only

captures their flow, not their unity. Plato warns that logos does not descend to the flesh, to the question of love:

Love is a thing of the flesh; it is the flesh that desires and agonizes in love, the one that through love wants to affirm itself before death. Flesh itself lives in dispersion, but through love it redeems itself, for it seeks unity (Zambrano 2016, 58).

Love is the path of redemption and unity in two ways: through beauty, as Plato explains in *Phaedrus*, and through creation, as he expresses in *Symposium*. Philosophy saves the dispersion of the flesh in the unity of love, and though it is born out of the flesh, it has to detach from it in order to save it from appearances (Quance 2001, 113). The ascending scale through beauty parallels the dialectical ascent. Beauty manifests itself, it is sensibly visible, as a “true appearance” (Zambrano 2016, 60), and although true being is hidden, the divine, the good, the one, are not visible. Nevertheless, being is glimpsed through the manifestation of beauty, “by the tearing of the veil that covers it” (Zambrano 2016, 61). Sensible beauty is the only starting point for ascent, and it is unavoidable, even if it must be abandoned to follow the ladder of love outlined in *Symposium*. Thus, the paradox is resolved: the love of sensible beauty unites the dispersed in the path of knowledge. Love mediates; it is a beggar seeking wealth, born in the darkness, and tending to light, moved by desire to reach contemplation: “Love serves knowledge, it reaches the same end by a different path” (Zambrano 2016, 62).

The mystic rites celebrated the ascent of the purified soul as a passage between worlds. The state of transition was expressed in the form of delirium, i.e. non-rationalizable language, and was more freely expressed in raptures, chants, dances, alliances with the natural, orgies. The origin of tragedy will account for this complex process. In reference to the divine delirium, it exercises the same violence as philosophy because, due to its tension, man is left in “ecstasy,” raptured as the mystics will explain later (Zambrano 2016, 63). The impetus of love is irrational because it tends to the divine and ascends above the dispersion of matter. Plato saves that plural love by the “idea” of love, giving it definitive unity (Zambrano 2016, 63). The Platonic idea of love is mystical because it confirms the movement of asceticism from multiplicity to divine unity in search of its fusion. The idea of carnal love that we inherited culturally depends on the mystical notion of Platonic love: “Thanks to Platonism, love has had an intellectual and social category” (Zambrano 2016, 64). This doctrine lies at the core of Christian poetry in the figure of the Virgin

Mary, the possibility of the divine woman, idealized, who saves in herself the multiplicity of the feminine.

However, to give way to another cultural form, the motif of love also becomes eminently present by its absence. In *A Spiritual Canticle of the Soul*, St. John of the Cross sings of the absence of the Beloved, his non-visibility. Nature is transformed by his traces, those forms of Platonic beauty that pass and make announcements. What such beauty leaves behind serves as the foundation of all mysticism: the love that is born of the flesh must be detached from life. Love, in the mystical sense, needs death for its fulfillment, as does knowledge, in the Platonic sense. Diotima synthesizes the Orphic perspective: “matter is redeemed from its servitude” (Zambrano 2008, 233).

The extraordinary value that Zambrano finds in the realization of mystical poetry – whose great model is St. John of the Cross – is that it keeps alive the religion of love, of transformed beauty, coming from the deepest heart of Greece, and that it brings together something that has been recognized as conflictive: the relation between philosophy and Christianity. To exemplify, she quotes a stanza of *A Spiritual Canticle*, which she considers to be the most remarkable sample of Platonic survival in the core of Christianity: “O crystal fountain flowing / if in your silver stream I might discern / them there, suddenly glowing / those eyes that make me burn / deep in my heart inscribed – for which I yearn!¹ (Zambrano 2016, 65 – 66).

III. The Magisterium of St. John of the Cross

The mystic “does not want to know but to be” (Zambrano 1986, 188 – 189); thus, the possibility of God is expressed in human nothingness. In *Claros del Bosque*, published in 1977, Zambrano takes up and extols the figure of St. John of the Cross, on whose work she had reflected upon in Cuba, around 1940 (2011b). The revision of her own ideas is a methodology of deepening applied to all her axial themes. Following the example of St. John of the Cross, Zambrano studies the procedure of mysticism and considers it as a way to recover philosophical knowledge.

In the cited work, Zambrano observes a philosophical and vital autophagy in the Spanish poet, centered on the notion of silence. Clearly, the human condition prevents us from creating only from the word, from *fiat*, but it does have the capacity to reiterate or recreate what has been created. The human is the second word, the mirror creation. In this regard, she argues: “engenderer of

¹ I use Rhina P. Spailletat’s translation of the poem. See *St. John of the Cross* (2003).

musicality and abysses of silence, the word that is not a concept because it is the word that makes conceiving possible, the source of conceiving that is beyond what is properly called thinking" (Zambrano 2011a, 213).

Therein lies not insufficiency, but the whole meaning of human activity. Where there would seem to be a limit, the method begins. Truth belongs to the realm of the non-expressible, a plane that is further away and less configured than language understood in terms of a human instrument. Truth belongs to a hermetic dimension and is therefore ineffable, although the whole dynamic of knowledge not only disbelieves in this hermeticism but is defined by violating it: "A silence has always had to precede and even originate the philosophical attitude" (Zambrano 2022, 116).

Used as we are to the fact that philosophy has an answer for everything, silence may seem a failure; but, in mysticism, silence is a state of wisdom awaiting manifestation. Zambrano claims and vindicates the mode of silence for the new *póiesis* of truth as revelation (García 2019, 223). The perception of intellectual or emotional states whose manifestation exceeds the possibilities of expression has moved philosophers, artists, and mystics to silence. The unspoken and unpronounced is equivalent to the excess of contained reality. Silence is, in this case, not omission but exaltation. Rigorously speaking, the act of contemplation that predisposes the unitive phase rejects common language but accepts the intuitive mode of poetry (Moreno 1995, 175).

There are two exceptional forms of knowledge that value silence: poetry and mysticism. In both, the imperfection of functional language is eminent: babbling replaces definition, opposites show the coherence of the thing alluded to, allusion is the closest thing that can be said; the resistance of language denotes the triumph of the evoked reality. There is no fixation, delimitation, or suspended form; once the limit of perception is crossed, capture is impossible and only knowledge can advance in mirror form, in approximation to the original ineffable. Silence lies between manifestation and expression. But – and this is a land of paradoxes – even silence requires words; not past words, because language is used and worn out, but virgin words with baptismal capacity over things. Therein lies the poetic language that is, as it is proved in all Zambrano's trajectory, the only possible one for the experience of truth; the originality of the ecstatic experience can only be expressed by analogies. If silence is the precondition of expectant negativity, that is, the night of the soul, its dawn will come through the birth of the poetic word (Maillard 1992, 13). The method of poetic reason proposes to defeat *logoi* in order to clear the path to *Logos*:

It is very difficult, almost impossible, to talk about poetic reason. It is as if it made one die and be born at the same time; to be and not to be, silence and word... the feeling of life, where it is and where it is not, or where it is not yet. In this "submerged logos," in that which cries out to be within reason (Zambrano 2011c, 130).

With the impulse of love, the mystic exceeds himself, goes out and empties himself; the image of love moves him towards the absolute object of communion. To access union and break the immanence of the self, he must make himself available, reduce himself to nothingness: "the emptiness, which can be called 'nothingness,' the nothingness, the divine-human nothingness, so suspicious for the worshippers of substance" (Zambrano 2011c, 162). Nothingness is a positive notion in the mystical experience because, after the emptying of the actual subject, there remains room for a transcendent presence: "The instants of emptiness in consciousness are those that allow consciousness to resurface sharpened" (Zambrano 2022, 113). This idea does not refer to nihilistic nothingness, but to a return to emptiness as the initial chaos, an open possibility. The author clearly distinguishes the conception of nihilism – product of a nineteenth-century reason that has pretended to say everything (Gómez Blesa 2022, 74) – from the conception of Greek nothingness that also engenders mythology and cosmology.

The abandonment of the self in a unitive disposition is shared by Western mystics as well as by Eastern mysticism (Lizaola 2008, 204). Emptiness and silence prepare man in his passage for the unveiling of truth: "St. John shows us that one can have ceased to live without having fallen into death; that there is a realm beyond this immediate life, another life in this world in which the innermost reality of things is relished" (Zambrano 1986, 192). Zambrano presents the relationship with the idea of non-being that, as the unmanifested, is not yet pronounceable: "the concept of 'non-being' in Zambrano is of immense richness, and perhaps that is why it appears from the beginning linked to the realm of poetry" (Trueba 2009, 389). Like the mystics, she promotes waiting in the inwardness that lies at the spatiotemporal limits of one's own constitution. The raw material in which to delve for the expansion of the limits to occur – after renouncing the idea of objectivity and universality of knowledge – is the internment in the cavities-entrances of one's own being. Each one possesses a wealth of feelings, memories, evoked and fragmentary sensations that do not operate at the primary level of knowledge and that remain unclassified as facts underlying consciousness. All this ensemble

appears, eventually, and becomes known, manifests itself, and even imposes itself, in an irrefutable manner. The descent into the hiddenness of nature itself is set in motion by the certainty that God is the foundation of existence; every subsequent notion of freedom, happiness, history, political life, depends on such a principle. The author considers that the underlying raw material does not reveal itself unless conditions for its perception are given. The conditions coincide with those of mystical experience: a state of annihilation, silence and stillness that suspends the force of the individual self, favors contemplation, and leads to unity in the divine Self.

IV. Conclusion

The process in which the philosopher breaks the structures of merely rational knowledge and expands towards the sources of a knowledge not yet manifested is fulfilled with the method of poetic reason. Zambrano expresses that this expansion assumes the recognition of the sacred properties of reality and of man in it. Her philosophy, like mysticism, transcends discursive knowledge and aspires to an ascent to the center of mystery.

This is alluded, detailed, and confirmed throughout her work via coherent steps:

- A de-substantiation of positive knowledge.
- A clear rhetoric language which expresses the tension of the symbolic image that seeks to capture what eludes to be said.
- A methodological perspective that founds metaphysics in the sacred transcendence of being.
- The assertion that there is unity within the divine, without devaluing the immanent singular that forms human reality.
- The communication between both planes through poetry.

Despite the originality of María Zambrano, and in an era in which disruption is welcome, she is a marginalized intellectual, because her effort to shake the mode of knowledge is not taken seriously. All her work constitutes a sustained call to rethink philosophy, but however much she is studied and disseminated with admiration, the academic culture has not taken up her ideas and remains faithful to the established discourses.

Zambrano's theoretical difficulty is high because it favors the intertwining of the religious, the existential and the moral. The certainty of the acting divine – as in the ancient numerals of the universe – is a limitation to the thought of being, which has purified its chaotic manifestations – stupor

before the mystery – in the notion of being-substance. The tremendous mystery cannot be thought; substance can. The numen of the divine only manifests itself in symbols; substance is conceptualized.

Zambrano's lack of consensus among the apologists of rational philosophy is due to her methodological premise: to extend the limits of the disciplines to the point of making them as diffuse as the very realities they purport to represent. As a religious thinker, she demands from philosophy the integration of the unattainable and ineffable. A recovered, reborn philosophy would be one that brings together the contradictions of the sacred. Thus, knowledge could bring light cautiously, without dazzling, reorienting history.

Bibliography

- CABALLERO, B. (2020): Umbrales y dinteles: el papel de lo liminal en el pensamiento de María Zambrano. *Antígona, Revista de la fundación María Zambrano*, 7, 20 – 29.
- DE ROS, X. – OMLOR, D. (eds.) (2017): *The Cultural Legacy of María Zambrano*. Cambridge: Editorial Legenda.
- GARCÍA, G. S. (2019): La razón poética en Zambrano: algunas claves interpretativas para desentrañar su sentido. *Universitas Philosophica*, 36 (72), 215 – 233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.uph36-73.rpmz>
- GÓMEZ BLESA, M. (2022): El pensamiento vivo de María Zambrano. *Verbeia. Journal of English and Spanish Studies*, 6 (6), 69 – 84.
- JOHN OF THE CROSS (November 2003): A Spiritual Canticle of the Soul and the Bridegroom Christ. Trans. by R. P. Esparillat. [Online.] *First Things*. Available at: <https://www.firstthings.com/article/2003/11/a-spiritual-canticle-of-the-soul-and-the-bridegroom-christ>
- LIZAOOLA, J. (2008): *Lo sagrado en el pensamiento de María Zambrano*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- MAILLARD, CH. (1992): *La creación por la metáfora: Introducción a la razón poética*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- MORENO, J. (1995): Roce adivinatorio, mirada remota. Lógica musical del sentir en María Zambrano. *Isegoría. Revista de Filosofía Moral y Política*, 11, 162 – 176. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3989/isegoria.1995.i11.260>
- NIMMO, C. E. (1994): *La razón poética in the works of María Zambrano*. M.A. Theses. Durham University. Available at: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5869/>
- QUANCE, R. (2001): *Hacia una mujer nueva. Una mujer moderna: Concha Méndez en su mundo (1898 – 1986)*. Ed. by J. Valender. Madrid: Publicaciones de la Residencia de Estudiantes, 101 – 114.
- TRUEBA, V. (2009): De la metafísica a la lógica (sobre María Zambrano y Chantall Maillard). *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*, 85, 385 – 406.
- REVILLA, C. (2003): *Acerca del lenguaje de la razón poética. Signos filosóficos*, 9, 81 – 98.
- TRUEBA, V. (2013): Figuras femeninas de la razón poética (el pensamiento de María Zambrano desde una perspectiva de género). *Sociocriticism*, 28 (1 – 2), 16 – 51.

- ZAMBRANO, M. (1986): *Senderos*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (1989): *Para una historia de la piedad*. Málaga: Torre de las Palomas.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (1996): *Horizonte del liberalismo*. Madrid: Morata.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2008): *Hacia un saber sobre el alma*, Madrid: Alianza.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2011a): *Escritos sobre Ortega*. Madrid: Trotta.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2011b): *Claros del bosque*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2011c): *Notas de un método*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2012): *La tumba de Antígona y otros textos sobre el personaje trágico*. Ed. by V. Trueba. Madrid: Cátedra.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2016): *Filosofía y poesía*. Mexico City: FCE.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2020): *El hombre y lo divino*. Madrid: Alianza.
- ZAMBRANO, M. (2022): *Los bienaventurados*. Madrid: Alianza.

Ethel Junco
Instituto de Humanidades
Universidad Panamericana
Desarrollo Especial Universidad Bonaterra
20295 Aguascalientes
Mexico
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3369-0576>
e-mail: ejunco@up.edu.mx