Panikkar's foundational works of the 1940s and 1950s can be described as a confrontation between two worlds, the post-Medieval world of Catholic Christianity and the post-Enlightenment world of Modernity. While these worlds appear to be in opposition, Panikkar searches for places of dialogue between them. Effectively, this is a matter of confronting classicist Christian consciousness with empiricist science and philosophy; and challenging objectivist science and philosophy with hermeneutical realism. Panikkar's distinctive Catholic voice, through conversation with modern science, philosophy, history and culture, is a rationale for the efficacy of Christian faith in

---

1The notion of 'world' employed here is that of environment (Welt) or the "interpreted world" of human living rather than 'habitat' (Unwelt) or the "surrounding world" which humans share with every living thing. See Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 402.

In similar vein, José Ortega y Gasset, whose influence on Panikkar is not inconsiderable, states that "this articulation of final convictions is what molds our chaotic surroundings into the unity of a world or a universe." *Man and Crisis*, trans. Mildred Adams (New York & London: Norton & Co., 1958), 24.


The term objectivist is used as a description of the modern presumptions of science and philosophy. Panikkar, in the manner of Ortega y Gasset, seeks to replace the objective-scientific method with an approach that admits both objectivity and subjectivity as integral components of a hermeneutical realism. See Ortega y Gasset, *Man and Crisis*, 28f.
the twentieth century. Equally, he recognizes that modernity challenges Christianity to forego its dogmatic stance if it is to play a significant role in the contemporary conversation.³

The philosophical context of Panikkar's modern conversation is the German idealist debate in which Cartesian rationalism is pitted against Jacobian subjectivism.⁴ Panikkar enters the debate through the door of what is arguably modernity's greatest gift to humanity, the birth of modern science. While rejecting the universalist pretensions and nominalistic assumptions of modern science, he is equally concerned to defend the distinctive contribution and inalienable rights of science within its own sphere of competence. Likewise, he accepts the modern philosophical advances which have led to a new appreciation of the possibilities of the human mind. However, he refuses to allow either science or philosophy to become substitutes for human faith in reality.

---

³For an insightful approach to "hermeneutical conversation" and its role in "effective-historical consciousness," see Gadamer, Truth and Method, 330-351. Particularly pertinent to Panikkar's conversation between Christianity and Modernity are the concepts of "openness to experience," "fusion of horizons," and the "dialectic question-answer structure."

⁴Panikkar attempts to provide a via media which accepts the advances of the modern mind--the "anthropocentric turn" of Kantian philosophy--but is equally insistent on the necessity for some kind of human "trust" in reality if one is to live, learn or know anything worthwhile. This approach is evident in Panikkar's doctoral dissertation in science, Ontonomía de la ciencia. Sobre el sentido de la ciencia y sus relaciones con la filosofía (University of Madrid, 1958; Madrid: Gredos, 1961; Madrid: Rialp, 1963); hereafter, Ontonomía; all English translations of this text are mine.
In these matters, Panikkar's thought resembles the position of his fellow Spaniard, José Ortega y Gasset, who stresses that human living is a hermeneutical enterprise involving self-interpretation. They both recognize that the post-enlightenment experiment has effected a change in the way that human beings interact with the world, a change which is both objective and subjective. Consequently, neither rationalism nor subjectivism is judged to be an adequate philosophical basis for coping with the new reality. In their place, Panikkar proposes a modified philosophical realism which consists in a new appropriation of the classical texts from the perspective of a dynamic, evolutionary worldview.

---

5Ortega y Gasset, who does not share Panikkar's Catholic belief, insists on the importance of faith: "The most skeptical of us live amid certain fundamental convictions, live in a world, in an interpretation. . . . The very skeptic himself is convinced that everything is doubtful." Man and Crisis, 25.

6For Panikkar, there has been a "mutation of consciousness"; for Ortega, the changes are in "the vital life structure." Both authors are suggesting that this 'change' is not simply a 'subjective' matter (the field of human psychology) but a truly 'objective' reality (the field of history) influencing a new mode of human being in the world. See Man and Crisis, 28f.

7See Panikkar's doctoral dissertation in philosophy, El concepto de naturaleza. Análisis histórico y metafísico de un concepto (University of Madrid, 1946; Madrid: CSIC, [1951] 1972); hereafter Naturaleza; all English translations of this text are mine. This work can be summarized as the reinterpretation of aristotelian-thomistic concepts of 'nature' and 'being' from the perspective of 'functional' versus 'substantive' thinking. Elsewhere, Panikkar vindicates (reinterpreted) scholastic realism as the strategy for overcoming the modern crisis:

Una concepción realística de la Filosofía, muy próxima a la Escolástica en sus principios, se declara capaz de dar cuenta del desarrollo de la Ciencia y de ofrecerle una nueva bas para superar la crisis moderna. Ontonomía, 342.

In this respect, Panikkar's 'Catholic' voice can be seen in conversation with Ortega y Gasset who views the aristotelian-thomistic intellectualization of Christian faith in totally 'tragic' terms. Moreover, Ortega believed that Christianity was on the path to its ultimate demise and eventual extinction. See his Man and Crisis and The Revolt of the Masses, trans. anonymous (New York & London: Norton & Co., 1932).
The socio-political context of war-torn Europe including Spain's fascist dictatorship under Franco is an oblique rather than an overt presence in these writings. Panikkar relays the historical situation in terms of people's experience of negativity and alienation--described in terms of sickness, disease, anxiety and restlessness--extending to every dimension of human life.\(^8\) Not content to describe the modern malaise, he takes on the monumental task of unravelling the origins and development of western thought in order to understand its present crisis and future possibilities.\(^9\) His fundamental impulse is the validation of a transformed christian culture as the basis for the future of a renewed world. The distinctiveness of Panikkar's contribution is his interdisciplinary approach which brings scientific, philosophical and theological modes of discourse into dialogue.

As indicated in Chapter One, our concern is to highlight those themes, principles and methods which emerge in this initial phase of Panikkar's writings and which prove foundational for his later work in religious pluralism. We review these writings under the three general headings of cosmology, anthropology and theology which Panikkar recognizes as distinct though interrelated fields of

\(^8\)"El mal es universal. La inquietude, ..., el desasosiego humano, se extiende a todos los ámbitos de la vida." "Síntesis. Visión de síntesis del universo," Arbor (Madrid), no. 1 (1944): 5-40; republished as "Visión de síntesis del universo" (hereafter "Visión") in Humanismo y cruz (hereafter Humanismo), anthology of Panikkar's theological writings 1944-1955 (Madrid: Rialp, 1963), 9-60; citation, 10f.; all references are to Humanismo; English translations of the text are mine.

\(^9\)Here, Panikkar's instinct is equivalent to Ortega's: they both want to affirm the 'presence' of pre-enlightenment history in post-enlightenment humanity. There is no stepping over our own shadows. However, whereas Panikkar seeks to affirm a reformed Christian culture, Ortega wants to affirm the Christian past as a way of moving towards a post-Christian culture. Compare Naturaleza with Man and Crisis and The Revolt of the Masses.
research. The significance of this procedure is that it underscores the cosmic, human and divine dimensions of reality that become, in his later work, the foundational principles of his "cosmotheandric vision."

A COSMOLOGICAL TESTAMENT

Under this heading of "A Cosmological Testament"--a phrase which Panikkar uses in his major scientific work--, we present the major findings of his scientific and philosophical studies insofar as these illustrate his interdisciplinary hermeneutics. His principle of ontonomy establishes a philosophical model in which science and philosophy are able to dialogue on equal terms. His studies on entropy, matter and time are presented as specific illustrations of this dialogical method: he accepts modern scientific insights on their own terms, but then moves to establish the boundaries where scientific discourse ends and where philosophical discourse begins. He then introduces into the discussion a transcendental or theological mode of discourse which is considered necessary for a total hermeneusis. Our brief resumé of Panikkar's philosophical treatise on nature brings to the fore his aristotelian foundations which, in his interpretation, prove fruitful for dialoguing with modern science. Finally, we consider theological ramifications of Panikkar's cosmological studies which purport to establish a "theological vision of science."

The Ontonomic Principle
Panikkar's earliest works in the physical and chemical sciences were eventually integrated into a larger work for his doctoral dissertation in science.\textsuperscript{10} The synthesizing hinge of this study is his concept of \textit{ontonomy} which enables him to focus on the relationship between science and philosophy in terms of interdependence as distinct from unilateral \textit{heteronomy} or non-relational \textit{autonomy}.\textsuperscript{11} Neither medieval science's suffocating dependence on philosophy nor the rebellious emancipation of science after the Enlightenment is considered an adequate model for situating the authentic role of science in an wholistic approach to reality.

Through an historical analysis of the place of science in human culture, Panikkar shows how different thought-patterns produce quite distinct worldviews: \textit{substantive thought}, with its static approach to reality and its perception of activity as accidental, inevitably results in the philosophical heteronomy over science; whereas \textit{functional thought}, with its dynamic conception of reality and its central focus on movement, usurps philosophy and enthrones its successor, the physico-mathematical sciences. Physics replaces metaphysics as the key to reality.\textsuperscript{12} Panikkar's argument is that neither a

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Ontonomia}. Many of the chapters in Panikkar's dissertation are redacted versions of articles previously published in selected journals 1944-1950. References to original publications will be given where available.
\item\textsuperscript{11}See "Le concept d'ontonomie," \textit{Acts of the Eleventh International Congress of Philosophy Brussels 20-26 August 1953}, vol. 3 (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1953), 182ff. Here, Panikkar develops a 'third way' of interrelationship (\textit{ontonomy}) which is distinguished from the heuristic models of \textit{heteronomy} and \textit{autonomy}.
\item\textsuperscript{12}See Panikkar's commentaries on "Pensar substantivo y pensar functional" and "Física y metafísica" in \textit{Ontonomia}, 101-107 & 133-154.
\end{itemize}
paternalistic philosophy nor an absolutized science is adequate; physics and metaphysics need to form an "harmonious symbiosis".\(^{13}\)

According to Panikkar, the problem is deeper than may at first appear. He states that if we are to "cross the Rubicon between philosophy and science,\(^{14}\) there is a need to overcome the compartmentalization of knowledge, the assumption that reality is totally accessible to human thought, and the methodological reduction of all reality to dialectical laws.

Panikkar’s dialectics of western science legitimate the empirical sciences’ contribution to the understanding of reality while insisting that such understanding is intrinsically partial.\(^{15}\) The positive insight of science is in the order of the spatio-temporal measurement of the dynamic character of created beings. This is precisely the value of functional thinking which follows Newton and Einstein in recognizing that movement and change are intrinsic to material reality. The true being of created things is not only in their ex-sistence but equally in their in-sistence, their extension in time and space: in the created order, the being of things includes their be-coming.\(^{16}\)

\(^{13}\)See also "La colaboración común" where Panikkar allows philosophy to have a "constitutional reign" over science, but not a "dictatorial imperialism." Ontonomía, 28-32.

\(^{14}\)"Fué el puente provisional y estratégico para cruzar el Rubicón entre Filosofía y Ciencia"; see also Panikkar’s commentary on "La evolución del concepto de ciencia"; and note his insistence throughout this study that "la íntima estructura de las cosas es opaca a nuestra razón humana." Ontonomía, 127, 33-71, 137.

\(^{15}\)See "El sentido cósmico de la ciencia"--especially "Visión cósmica"--in Ontonomía, 133-163, esp. 154ff.

\(^{16}\)Sólo sea quizá pertinente añadir que el verdadero ser de las cosas creadas no es sólo su mero ex-sistir--extra nihilo--sino también su complejo in-sistir--in tempore et in spatio--. El ser creado no es de una sola vez, ni propiamente es, sino que será. En este llegar a ser hay un camino espacio-temporal." Ontonomía, 149.
Panikkar's own appreciation of western scientific thought will be clarified with reference to his studies on entropy, matter and time. This will further highlight his understanding of the ontonomy of science. However, in order to fully appreciate his "cosmological testament," it is necessary to follow his critique of scientific autonomy and its hidden claim to monopoly.\footnote{Panikkar calls this the "theologico-scientific inversion" whereby science, now freed from its theological and philosophical mentors, attempts also to take over their universalizing thrust, so as to independently supply the "cosmic vision" without reference to other approaches to reality. \textit{Ontonomía}, 154-163.}

In his Introduction to \textit{Ontonomía de la Ciencia}, Panikkar suggests that the entire work is the exposition of a single thought, the idea that "reality is one and multiple at the same time--although," he is careful to add, "not in the same way."\footnote{Panikkar says that the entire work intends to be "la exposición de un pensamiento, . . . es el siguiente: La realidad es una y múltiple a la vez--aunque no en el mismo sentido." \textit{Ontonomía}, 7.} In fact, he moves beyond the realms of both science and philosophy to speak of the Christian Trinity as the fundamental paradigm and ultimate mystery for understanding every ontological reality, whether divine or non-divine.\footnote{"En el mismo seno del uno y único Ser, existe una Trinidad. . . . La creación es ontológicamente una y es variada al mismo tiempo." \textit{Ontonomía}, 7.} In this view, creation and the material universe need to be understood with reference to some spiritual reality. Without an awareness of this transcendent dimension, he believes that we inevitably fall into the trap of "radical dualism" (the denial of unity) or "cosmological monism" (the denial of multiplicity).\footnote{No debe acentuarse tanto la diferencia entre materia y espíritu, por ejemplo, de manera que se caiga en un dualismo radical, ni debe tampoco considerarse sólo la unidad de tal modo que no se supere un monismo cosmológico. . . . El mismo universo material es uno y múltiple a la vez." \textit{Ontonomía}, 7.}
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Panikkar perceives that philosophy stresses the unitary character of reality, whereas science emphasizes its multiplicity. Nonetheless, he warns, neither emphasis is absolute. From this it follows that there is no single method by which reality can be legitimately approached or understood. Panikkar gives many historical examples in which the absolutization or universalization of a single method has brought disastrous results to humanity. In the context of this discussion, he establishes one of his enduring principles which states that "the object should condition the method," and since reality is multiple as well as one there is need for a "diversity of methods" according to the distinct (although inseparable) dimensions of reality.

Scientific methodology suffers from two intrinsic limitations. The first is epistemological: science is based upon measurement and observation with the aim of establishing "pure objectivity" which it believes is possible on account of its "total disinterestedness." However, Panikkar reminds us that science inevitably relies on human measurement, fallible observation, hidden interest or

---

21"La materia como el último eslabón en la escala de los seres es casi más múltiple que una. . . . La Ciencia y la Filosofía, al hablarnos sobre la realidad física, representan esta tensión, este peligro, y esta aventura. . . . Ciencia y Filosofía se complementan--y se necesitan--mutuamente." Ontonomía, 8.

22Panikkar gives many examples of such violations including the negative impact of Cartesian rationalism, Spinoza's geometrical ethics, Leibniz's functional thought, Kant's Newtonian paradigms. One of the more serious problems is that Philosophy, in an attempt to combat the influence of Science, has assimilated the "scientific method". See "Las críticas de los científicos" in Ontonomía, 25-28.

23"El objeto debe condicionar el método. . . . La diversidad del método conducía a dos distintos estratos de la misma realidad." Ontonomía, 21, 31.

24See "La temática del interés," where Panikkar also states that science's supposed 'disinterestedness' is in reality a matter of 'disconnectedness'. Ontonomía, 43-45.
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some other form of imperfect, human mediation. He surmises that the subject and object invariably condition each other in the experiment as in life itself. He further suggests that the human being and the world form a unity and inform each other.

The second limitation—metaphysical—concerns the nature of thought and reality: science not only observes and measures, it also compartmentalizes. Its concern or interest, despite its best intentions, is to separate, divide and measure pieces of reality without relationship to the whole reality. The reduction is double, in terms of both subject and object, or thought and reality. On the side of the subject, the human mind is more than a cognitional, logical, analytical instrument; measurability is only one aspect of intelligibility; knowledge of causes only one way of explaining reality. On the side of the object, there is

25Panikkar marks the paradox of science's "interest" as "disinterest" in the fundamental reality of things:

En virtud de todo el planteamiento cultural de la época, el interés ha ido cambiando paulatinamente. El hombre renuncia a conocer las esencias de las cosas, el misterio del ser. *Ontonomía*, 43.

26After Heisenberg, Panikkar argues, human knowledge of physical reality must be recognized as always inexact and never rigorous. Furthermore:

No sólo la Ciencia es dependiente del observador en sus estructuras microcósmicas, sino que todo el conocimiento de las ciencias físicas dependen intrínseca y melamente del hombre que las construye. . . . El mundo y el hombre forman una unidad. *Ontonomía*, 152f.

27See "la cuestión metodológica," *Ontonomía*, 46-50. For other discussion on the limitation of reason see "La filosofía moderna" in *Naturaleza*, 6-8. The theme is common throughout Panikkar's early works and is fundamental to his study on *F. H. Jacobi y la filosofía del sentimiento* (Buenos Aires: Sapientia, 1948); hereafter, *Jacobi*, English translations of this text are mine.

28Panikkar refers to the domination of "la influencia metodológica" which results in "la preocupación exclusiva por un tipo de problemas polariza la actividad intelectual en una determinada dirección." But, he insists, "la mente humana no es sólo una metafísica potencia cognoscitiva, sino que es también una facultad
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the whole gamut of relations and connections, including those with the non-observable, spiritual world. These connections cannot be known according to subject-object duality; they require participation, wisdom and even love.\textsuperscript{29}

Panikkar does not contest the legitimacy and benefits of the scientific method as its insight into the intrinsic dynamism of the material universe and its power to aid the emancipation of humanity clearly demonstrate. What he critiques is the \textit{universalization} of science as the \textit{only} method. In his view, any single method is inevitably partial, certainly incomplete and, in fact, quite destructive when divorced from other forms of knowledge and different approaches to reality.

Consequently, it is not science itself, but its universalist pretensions that are held to be so dangerous. By way of example, Panikkar introduces Fantappie's "unitary theory of the physical and biological sciences."\textsuperscript{30} According to Panikkar's hermeneutics, the unitary theory attempts to reduce all matter--

\textsuperscript{29}This type of "affective knowledge" will be treated more fully in the section on "Sentiment" below. Here it is sufficient to cite the limitations which Panikkar attributes to science as an epistemological method which measures--and recognizes--reality according to "grades of certainty". For Panikkar, "lo más cierto para nuestra razón no es lo más inteligible" since this depends entirely on "al nivel de nuestra capacidad racional" which is "la evidencia matemática, ampliada a algunas otras esferas posibles con el nombre de claridad y distinción." Evidently, the truth of reality is not reducible to that which the mind judges to be scientifically certain and mathematically clear. "El problema de la confianza" in \textit{Ontonomía}, 41-43.

\textsuperscript{30}See Panikkar's critique of Fantappie's attribution of formal unity to science from a purely infrascientific viewpoint in "La ciencia biomatemática," \textit{Ontonomía}, 169-175; redaction of an earlier article by the same title, \textit{Arbor} (Madrid), no. 3 (1944): 349ff.; references to \textit{Ontonomía}. 
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including that of the biological world--to measurable data. Biology becomes biomathematics, forgetting that it should also be biopoiesis. Panikkar is not opposed to a "unitary theory of science" if it is understood as the systematization of the sciences according to their mutual relations (internal order) and with reference to cosmic and human life (science's global mission). However, the empirical sciences should not overstep their own limits which they do, in Panikkar's view, once they consciously divorce themselves from philosophy. His ironic perception is that such a process actually demonstrates the impossibility of an ultimate separation of science and philosophy, revealing instead science's idealist and nominalist philosophical assumptions.

However, rather than negate the modern scientific enterprise, Panikkar attempts to place it in its true, ontonomic light. The return to a classical conception of science (such as a medieval cosmological system) is obviously inadequate; yet science equally demonstrates the insufficiency of its cartesian-ontological frameworks.

---

31 Panikkar's chapter is aptly entitled "Biomathemática y biopoiesis," Ontonomía, 169-193.

32 Ontonomía, 169. Panikkar quotes here from his own work, "Visión":

Las relaciones de las ciencias entre sí, su mutual concatenación, es decir, el establecimiento del orden interno; y el fin de la Ciencia en general, su sentido global, su misión, es decir, el establecimiento del sistema en el orden cósmico, su lugar en la vida humana.

33 Panikkar's argument is that modern empirical science has improperly, and often unconsciously, appropriated diverse philosophical traditions (especially idealism and nominalism). The result has been a blurring of the true relationship between subject and object:

El clima filosófico que ha invuelto la Ciencia casi desde su nacimiento en la Edad Moderna, es el idealismo, en una forma u otra. Por otra parte, el presupuesto científico fundamental es el de un realismo, casi diría feroz, atemperado por un nominalismo metodológico. Ontonomía, 100.
kantian foundations. Panikkar believes that a classical-realist philosophy offers the best hope for overcoming his perceived crisis of modern science.34

Ultimately, Panikkar seeks to integrate the insights of modern science and functional thinking with those of the western philosophical tradition. For example, he accepts evolution as a scientific fact, but seeks to explore its meaning in context of the higher principle of the cosmic and hierarchical dynamism of the universe.35 In fact, all “cosmological problems” must be approached from the perspective of various disciplines in “diversity and collaboration”; merely dialectical procedures are considered inadequate.36 Clearly, Panikkar’s multidimensional and interdisciplinary approach to reality relies on the concept of ontonomy--the foundational principle of the interdependence of diverse ‘methods’ of research--as its key hermeneutic principle. With this principle in place, we are now better situated to follow and appreciate Panikkar’s discussion of three significant fields of scientific enquiry.

34Panikkar makes these comments with specific relation to the modern scientific understanding of time:

La Ciencia se ve forzada a repudiar los sistemas filosóficos de Descartes y Kant. . . . Por otra parte, una concepción realista de la Filosofía, muy próxima a la Escolástica en sus principios, se declara capaz de dar cuenta del desarrollo de la Ciencia y de ofrecerle una nueva base para superar la crisis moderna. . . . Se dice de los conceptos (escolásticos), y no del sistema cosmológico medieval. Ontonomía, 341f.

35nLa evolución no se considera como una cuestión que debatir, sino como un hecho que explicar. Todo se encuentra inscrito en un dinamismo cósmico, desde los cielos emíreos hasta el último átomo. . . . Este dinamismo es de tal manera jerárquico . . . ."  Ontonomía, 183.

36nLa pura dialéctica olvidándose de la realidad. . . . Los ejemplos de los problemas cosmológicos . . . nos ofrecerán ejemplo suficiente para darnos cuenta de esta diversidad y colaboración." Ontonomía, 136, 128.
Entropy, Matter, Time

Panikkar's studies on entropy, matter and time begin with comprehensive examinations and assessments of the scientific data which it is not within our scope or competence to analyze. However, we do summarize his scientific conclusions which become his points of departure for establishing dialogue with philosophical issues and even theological concerns. We show Panikkar's double concern: to validate the rights of science within its own sphere of competence; and to demonstrate the limits of science once it transgresses its legitimate boundaries. His dialogical method--or what we call his hermeneutics of interdisciplinary conversation--searches for a meeting point in which modern scientific evidence and the voice of tradition may both speak their own truth. In the light of this approach, Panikkar's study of the law of entropy leads to an examination of its philosophical repercussions. The entropic law establishes that natural processes are irreversible and operate in a determinate direction.

37In Ontonomía the major concern is the dialogue between philosophy and science. However, theological considerations are also evident, as it were, in the 'background'. For example (p. 182): "una cuestión filosófico-científica que aunque pueda parecer que tenga repercusiones en formulaciones teológicas no toca al dogma cristiano directamente."

38For Panikkar, such hermeneutics of interdisciplinary conversation is reliant on the category of faith:

La fe procura una seguridad subjetivo-objetiva al mismo tiempo . . . ; es un convencimiento que no se basa ni en la sola evidencia, ni tampoco en una mera y sola autoridad . . . ; sino en un peculiar e irreductible abrazo entre estas dos formas." Ontonomía, 42.

39"La entropía y el fin del mundo," Ontonomía, 196-242; amplified version of an article with the same title in Revista de Filosofía (Madrid), vol. IV, no. 13 (1945): 285ff.; hereafter, "Entropía"; references to Ontonomía.

40"La ley de la entropía establece que los procesos físicos reales son irreversibles, es decir, que no pueden hacerse funcionar en dirección inversa y que,
On this scientific basis it is possible to predict and even calculate physical processes according to energy transference and dissipation; it further explains how natural systems tend towards their own demise.\(^{41}\) Not only do these scientific findings appear to contradict certain philosophical conceptions of the universe--such as the eternal return and circular movement--but they seem to imply the "thermal death" of the universe.\(^{42}\)

Panikkar argues that such cosmological extrapolations are invalid: *scientifically*, the law of entropy does not explain all the natural processes of the universe;\(^{43}\) *philosophically*, there are other dimensions to reality which transcend the proper domain of science.\(^{44}\) The law of entropy does provide valid scientific insight into the contingency and finitude of natural processes. But it

---

\(^{41}\)"Los procesos físicos siguen realmente una determinada dirección, que la ley de la entropía permite predecir y, en muchos casos, calcular. . . . La ley de la entropía afirma que la energía se degrada." These axioms effectively summarize the first two principles of thermodynamics. "Entropía," 239, 236, 208.

\(^{42}\)En consecuencia, el eterno retorno, el movimiento circular, son hipótesis míticas que la misma Física actual contradice, puesto que ha descubierto una dirección única--hacia un fin, por tanto--en todos los procesos de la naturaleza. . . . El mundo físico parece ser una realidad caduca y condenada a muerte." "Entropía," 197, 240.

\(^{43}\)For example, the entropic law does not explain the phenomena of creation (things coming-to-be from nothing) or destruction (not just dissipation but annihilation). As well, "la experiencia muestra que en el mundo desaparecen formas-*cualidades*--y aparecen otras." "Entropía," 213, 240, 216.

\(^{44}\)La invalidez de cualquier razonamiento científico para llegar a una conclusión de orden filosófico, precisamente porque la Ciencia no considera multitud de facetas, que la Filosofía, siendo una afirmación acerca de la realidad total, no puede dejar de tener en cuenta. . . . La Fisicomatemática y la Cosmología actúan en distinto plano." "Entropía," 226f.
needs to be understood as the material correlation of other cosmological principles which transcend it.\textsuperscript{45}

In fact, according to Panikkar, neither science nor philosophy can demonstrate a necessary end to the world.\textsuperscript{46} To the contrary, a planetary vision requires another solution which does not admit to the "ontological degeneration of the universe."\textsuperscript{47} Even the necessary collaboration of science with philosophy proves to be inadequate for this task. Only a transcendental appreciation of material and temporal reality, revealed through the Cosmic Law of Creation and the \textit{Mysterium Crucis}, provides an integral perspective for situating the law of entropy as a (paradoxical) sign of the positive movement of the universe towards its proper (divine) end.\textsuperscript{48}

In other words, since the universe is not bounded by material and natural processes (the fields of science and philosophy), a transcendental or \textit{theological} voice is also required in any discussion of its final cessation or destiny. Panikkar

\small
\textsuperscript{45}"La ley de la entropía nos sugiere la contingencia y la finitud de los procesos naturales . . . (sino) ésta no surge de la misma esencia de los procesos naturales, sino que es fruto de la experimentación y pudiera ser . . . parte de una ley más general que la incluyera. . . . La ley de la entropía sólo puede ser el correlato material de aquella ley cósmica." "Entropía," 239f.

\textsuperscript{46}"La ley de la entropía no sirva, por sí sola, para demostrar que el mundo tendrá un fin . . . (y) no puede una Filosofía esencialista predecir un final del universo." "Entropía," 229, 231.

\textsuperscript{47}"Una visión plenaria del mundo, en efecto, no puede admitir una degradación ontológica del universo, sino todo lo contrario." "Entropía," 240.

\textsuperscript{48}(La) ley cósmica . . . viene expresada por el \textit{Mysterium Crucis} como última constitución del ser creado e increado. El sentido de degradación de la energía sólo nos puede sugerir algo de aquella Ley Cósmica de la Creación. . . . La ley de la entropía . . . bien sugiere el camino hacia el auténtico universo." "Entropía," 240f.
takes a similar view of the ontonomic relationship of science, philosophy and theology in his investigation of modern scientific studies of matter and time.

*Matter* may appear to be totally passive, inert and entirely dependent on external laws which, in principle at least, are scientifically determinable. However, modern physics since Heisenberg has established that there is an incommunicable dimension to matter which is irreducible to any general law.\(^49\) This scientific principle of the *ultimate indeterminacy* of physical phenomena represents modern science's "revenge of truth."\(^50\) Moreover, it opens the way for a fruitful dialogue with philosophy:

Scientific indeterminacy traces an echo of the direct relation of matter to an intrinsic--ineffable--law which comes from its own nature, received from God. It is evident that the ultimate behaviour of created being does not depend on external factors--those that are measurable--but on an intrinsic factor which arises from the nature of that being.\(^51\)

---

\(^49\)See "La indeterminabilidad de la materia," *Ontonomía*, 243-308; redaction of an earlier article entitled "El indeterminismo científico," *Anales de Física y Química* (Madrid), 41:396 (1945): 573ff.; hereafter, "Materia"; references to *Ontonomía*. Introducing the topic (p. 246), Panikkar states:

La Física actual . . . parece haberse tropezado con este algo irreductible, porque la individualidad es precisamente este núcleo incomunicable que no se deja reducir a un universal ni expresar adecuadamente por una ley general.

\(^50\)"Materia," 245.

\(^51\)Panikkar traces the development of physics from Descartes and Newton, through Kant and Laplace, to positivism:

La Física, que creía poder funcionar con una autosuficiencia perfecta, descubre, en la última constitución del ser material, el correlato cuantitativo de la tan vilipendiada contingencia de la Filosofía. La determinación científica nos trae un eco de la ligazón directa de la materia a una ley intrínseca--inefable--que proviene de su misma naturaleza, recibida del Creador. Es evidente que el último comportamiento del ser creado no depende de factores externos--los únicos mensurables--; sino de un factor intrínseco que surge de la naturaleza de aquel ser. "Materia," 297.
Whereas science has established this radical indeterminacy of physical matter and elemental processes, the metaphysical significance is a philosophical question. Determinism—whether in its physical or philosophical varieties—"implies that reality is inexhaustibly measurable . . . by the human mind."\(^52\) Indeterminacy, however, implies that there is something enigmatic, opaque, spontaneous and unintelligible in reality itself. This is the radical individuality or the intimate identity of what things are in them-selves.\(^53\)

Nonetheless, Panikkar submits that he is not making a kind of metaphysical declaration of material anarchy.\(^54\) Individuality does not imply absence of relationship; to the contrary, it manifests intimate relationality in being itself.\(^55\) For example, an atom exists as pure function of a molecule, yet distinct from it; or, the material element of a spiritual entity is-itself inasmuch as it is-in, is-with, moving-towards and proceeding-from its higher spiritual nature. According to

\(^{52}\)Panikkar critiques both idealism and realism on the score of their deterministic positions: "La determinación implica que la realidad es exhaustivamente mensurable . . . --en sentido físico y filosófico--por nuestra mens humana." "Materia," 299.

\(^{53}\)Todo ser es, en última instancia, indeterminable en la medida que es indeterminado y que es indeterminado en cuanto es un ser individual. . . . Aquella partícula no sigue ninguna ley externa a ella misma, sino que obedece a su última estructura individual, particular, y sigue la espontaneidad radical con que Dios ha creado las cosas todas." "Materia," 298, 293.

\(^{54}\)Panikkar’s thomistic sense of cosmic—and cosmological—harmony is an ever-recurrent theme: "En la naturaleza reina una compleja armonía, fruto de la subordinación jerárquica de los diversos órdenes del ser. El verdadero orden no destruye o suprime la estructura inferior, sino que se asienta en las posibilidades que esta última deja abiertas (Ontonomía)." "Materia," 285.

\(^{55}\)Panikkar draws from the work of Niels Bohr—particularly the Principles of Correspondence and Complementarity—to show that modern physics (which is concerned with quantifiable causality) requires the complementarity of classical physics (which recognizes the mutual and immeasurable relationship of cause and effect). "Materia," 278, 290f.
Panikkar, this relationality of beings rules out both dualism and monism as acceptable procedures.\textsuperscript{56}

The theological implications are not difficult to recognize: the indeterminacy of matter is related to freedom, hope, the world of the spirit and the christian doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh.\textsuperscript{57} Equally, it defies any notion of a God who has broken off all meaningful relationships with the material (and human) world.\textsuperscript{58} Panikkar’s imaginative interpretation of the indeterminacy of matter is really along the lines of a modern scientific verification of philosophical realism and theological sacramentality.\textsuperscript{59} His approach to the study of time is a further demonstration of this multidisciplinary procedure.

He notes from the outset that the concept of \textit{time} is a paradoxical phenomenon which requires the ontonomic collaboration of philosophy with science.\textsuperscript{60} Classical philosophy approached the problem of time by treating it

\textsuperscript{56}“Materia,” 300-302.


\textsuperscript{58}“Ni el Dios de Aristóteles, ni el Hacedor de Descartes, ni la cosmovisión de uno ni del otro pueden ya, por más tiempo, sostener filosóficamente el edificio de la Ciencia. . . . Un Dios . . . que ha renunciado a su Presencia en favor de causas \textit{segundas} y de \textit{leyes naturales o sociologicas}, una \textit{naturaleza} de las cosas que actúa por sí misma una \textit{substancia} que no necesita quien le haga sub-sistir, son otros tantos casos de una debilidad cosmo-metafísica de nuestra especulación filosófica actual.” “Materia,” 304.

\textsuperscript{59}This is not meant to imply the notion of proof as such: “no puede aducirse ninguna prueba racional \textit{a priori} de que las cosas deban ser así, pero una vez descubierta su existencia.” “Materia,” 297.

\textsuperscript{60}See Panikkar, “La unidad fisicomatemática de tiempo,” \textit{Ontonomía}, 309-352; this is a modified version of two earlier articles: "La unidad física del tiempo," \textit{Acts of the International Congress of Philosophy Barcelona September 1948}, vol. 2
independently of space, whereas modern physics recognizes the intimate connection between the temporal and spacial dimensions of reality. Scientific investigation has attempted to establish the "atom of time" as the minimum observable interval underlying physical processes. But the very ingenuity and current failure of these attempts reveals the philosophical weakness of the cartesian-kantian concepts on which the edifice of modern science has been built: the assumption that real time is only that which is measurable; and the idealistic conception of space and time as a priori thought-forms.

To the contrary, Panikkar suggests that real space and time are intrinsic and constitutive dimensions of physical bodies. As such, they are fundamentally contingent realities and, unlike mathematical concepts, are simply not infinitely divisible. The notion of the individuality and irreducibility of material bodies is


“Para la preocupación filosófica de un Plotino, Agustín, Tomás de Aquina, etc., el problema del tiempo es independiente del problema del espacio. . . . La ciencia física, en cambio . . . plantea esta cuestión temporal en íntima conexión con la espacial.” "Tiempo," 342.

El átomo de tiempo nos ofrece sincillamente el módulo temporal cuantitativo del último proceso elemental del universo físico”; or “La unidad físicomatemática de tiempo--única que podría existir--sería, pues, el intervalo cuantitativo mínimo subyacente a los procesos del mundo físico." "Tiempo," 351, 325.

By "current failure" is intended the inability of physicists to ascertain the measurement of the atom of time with any degree of mathematical certainty: "La situación de la Física actual no permite aún aceptar con seguridad físicomatemática la existencia de una longitud elemental, ni tampoco, en consecuencia, la de un tiempo mínimo natural o absoluto." "Tiempo," 340.

See Panikkar’s comments on "La evolución historica" and his critique of Kant. "Tiempo," 341ff., 315.

El espacio y el tiempo forman parte de la constitución física de los cuerpos. . . . No tiene sentido un cuerpo material infinitamente pequeño. . . . Un cuerpo no puede separarse de un conjunto de accidentes inscritos en un espacio y un tiempo,
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also applicable to the nature of time: there remains an opaque, non-observable, immeasurable element which modern physics itself has come to recognize.66

Physico-mathematical time represents the ingenuity of functional thought: it measures the quantum of time which appears as a limited unity representing a certain minimum of (measurable) time with respect to the real movement of bodies.67 However, Panikkar reiterates that the physical processes of the universe transcend spatio-temporal coordinates: the elemental movements of the physical world are really multiple; and each bodily movement has its own proper and individual dimension which is indivisible and beyond the sum total of all its elemental movements.68 This paradoxical function of space and time--expressing both multiplicity and unity in the material universe--is finally a philosophical problem.69

---

66For example: "La Ciencia se ve forzada a repudiar los sistemas filosóficos de Descartes y Kant, que le sirvieron de base. . . . La Fisica se descubre la insuficiencia do todos estos conceptos de espacio y tiempo . . . (references to Newton, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz and Kant), en cualesquiera de estos casos era algo absoluto, indefinido, continuo, divisible, indefinamente, etc." "Tiempo," 341, 343.


68"Procesos físicos . . . 'trascienden los cuadros del espacio y del tiempo' (Niels Bohr) . . . . Hasta qué punto los movimientos del mundo físico son múltiplos reales de este movimiento elemental, es un problema que transcende la competencia de la Fisicomatemática . . . . Cada movimiento es propio y peculiar del ser que se mueve . . . ." "Tiempo," 344f., 350f.

69"Espacio y tiempo son, además, la condición de inteligibilidad y la primera expresión de la multiplicidad del universo. La pura unidad excluye el espacio y el tiempo. . . . El universo material es uno y es múltiple a la vez, es un mundo múltiple, porque el espacio y tiempo lo multiplican y lo unifican a la vez." "Tiempo," 316.
Panikkar proposes the notion of the "elemental rhythm in nature" which includes the physico-mathematical and philosophical senses of time: it recognizes a certain quantifiable natural unity in the multiple physical processes of the world; and it affirms an immeasurable natural rhythm which is, in essence, an expression of the cosmological unity--and multiplicity--of the universe.\(^\text{70}\)

Furthermore, he states:

> The real time of material things . . . is nothing other than the specific form of how beings, in their existence, are integrated into the harmonious concordance of all created things, . . . Time is not anything other than the rhythm with which bodies move towards God. Having arrived at their goal, they culminate in their return--in such a way that, at times, matter demonstrates a stronger urge than the human being--,

> and then there will be the fulness (of time) and "time will be no more."\(^\text{71}\)

Evidently, Panikkar's notion of cosmological time as the rhythm of the universe reflects his consistent pattern of moving beyond science and philosophy to introduce a transcendental or theological voice into the conversation. While he appears to take this transcendental component as a `given', he is concerned to show that, without it, neither science nor philosophy

\(^{70}\)"Si existe una unidad natural de tiempo, ésta será el límite en la individuación temporal y coincidirá con el ritmo elemental en la naturaleza. . . . Los procesos naturales se desarrollan a un determinado ritmo que, por ser necesariamente finito, podría poseer una unidad fija y precisa. . . . Este ritmo natural no es la unidad natural cuantitativa que postula la Fisicomatemática." "Tiempo," 349f.

\(^{71}\)"El átomo de tiempo nos ofrece sencillamente el módulo temporal cuantitativo del último proceso elemental del universo físico. En último término, nos ofrece una nueva, aunque lejana, contribución al conocimiento del tiempo real de las cosas materiales, que no es otra cosa que la forma específica de cómo estas, en su existir, se integran en el concierto armónico de todos los seres creados en su imitación y regreso a Aquel en quien la Existencia coincide con su misma Esencia. El tiempo no es otra cosa que el ritmo con que los cuerpos caminan hacia Dios. Llegados a la meta, culminado el regreso--en el que a veces demuestra tener más afán la materia que el ser humano--, entonces será la plenitud y no habrá ya más tiempo." "Tiempo," 351f.
is capable of carrying the burden of a total hermeneusis. Another feature of this pattern--evident in the notion of the rhythm of the universe--is his attempt to formulate an integrating principle which is capable of uniting ancient-medieval concepts with modern-scientific findings. He follows a similar interdisciplinary and cross-temporal pattern in his studies of nature and the cosmos.

Nature and the Cosmos

Panikkar appreciates that the impact of modern science has been most radical in its challenge to the traditional understanding of nature. Whereas the western world has traditionally understood nature in a static mode, as pure substance, the scientific vision of the world recognizes its dynamic, ever-changing reality: movement is not a merely external accident of physical bodies; everything is reduced to movement, including the very substance of matter.

Again, he insists, the problem is not with the insights of modern science, which have advanced the human understanding of the physical world in revolutionary proportions, but with the reductionist interpretation of nature according to (solely) physico-mathematical quantification. With regard to

---

72 Como ejemplo de la revolución primero y la sedimentación luego que el pensar funcional ha traído consigo, veamos la traslación de sentido que la Ciencia moderna ha ocasionado al concepto mismo de la naturaleza de los cuerpos. Es un proceso que va de la naturaleza como substancia a la naturaleza como movimiento. "El expolio de la substancia en la naturaleza do los cuerpos," Ontonomía, 107; see also Naturaleza under the heading of "La naturaleza en la fisicomatemática," 157ff.

73 La física clásica considera al movimiento como algo meramente externo al cuerpo que se mueve, siempre en virtud de un impulso recibido. La física actual, en cambio, se han visto forzada a sugerir no sólo que el movimiento es inherente a los cuerpos, sino que les es constitutivo. Ha reducido todo a un movimiento, incluso la misma sustancialidad de la materia. Naturaleza, 164.

74 Para la ciencia la naturaleza será el conjunto de estructuras fundamentales de una regularidad captable matemáticamente. . . . Para la ciencia, sin tener en
nature, too, the ecstatic findings of modern science require more sober reflection on the philosophical level. Panikkar reiterates that the scientific vision of reality is valid, but partial: its specific methodology provides us with one aspect of the true and total nature of material things. For its part, philosophy must incorporate the important and valid insights of modern science, but without reducing nature to either a parmenidean hypostasis or an unsustainable heraclitism.

Without entering into Panikkar's lengthy and involved discussion of the concept of nature throughout the history of the west, it is sufficient to note that his fundamental metaphysics is an attempt to reinstate the aristotelian notion of the dynamism of being as the philosophical foundation for a modern understanding of the dynamic constitution of nature. His characterization of nature as the "principle of movement and becoming," the "carrier of ontic dynamism," and the "active nucleus of being" attempts to provide a space for

cuenta su conexión posterior con la Filosofía, la naturaleza es la ley matemática de la realidad. . . . La naturaleza será el esqueleto cuantitativo de la realidad y, en consecuencia, in cuanto reducido a cantidad, totalmente inteligible. Es el inicio del cientismo." Naturaleza, 158f.

“La naturaleza científica es, pues, un aspecto de la verdadera y total naturaleza de las cosas materiales.” Here, Panikkar follows a division of the sciences according to three classes: empirical, physicomathematical and cosmological. Naturaleza, 160f.

“La explicación científica de la realidad, o bien sustantiviza los mismos resultados meramente cuantitativos de la investigación actural y se convierte en un heraclitismo insostenible; o bien hipostasando estos mismos resultados en un concepto estático y parmenidiano de sustancia. . . . Existe una tercera posibilidad, que es la integración de los resultados de la Ciencia, en un visión realista, pero dinámica y activista del ser, sin caer en la disolución heraclitiana.” Naturaleza, 162.


dialogue between traditional philosophy and modern science.\textsuperscript{79} For example, the scientific appreciation of movement as an internal constituent of created beings is affirmed but, in reference to the fuller vision of the metaphysics of nature, this immanent movement is also recognized as a movement-towards that being’s potency for perfectibility.\textsuperscript{80}

This marrying of traditional philosophy with modern science seeks a new equilibrium which neither relegates material reality to the accidental manifestation of abstract concepts nor overthrows the proper reign of the spirit.\textsuperscript{81} Matter and Spirit belong together no less than Being and Becoming, God and World, Nature and Grace. But neither must such realities be confounded, which is to speak of the need for \textit{ontonomic collaboration} or "synthesis among the speculative disciplines which cultivate the human being on earth."\textsuperscript{82}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{79}"La naturaleza es principio de movimiento. Es el principio del devenir, el núcleo activo del ser, el portador del dinamismo óntico . . . ." \textit{Naturaleza}, "El concepto fundamental," 232.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{80}"El movimiento de los seres físicos no es sino una manifestación muy externa y material, pero manifestación al fin y al cabo del profundo dinamismo del ser. . . . El movimiento inmanante supone, en consecuencia, un perfeccionamiento del ser que se mueve, una potencialidad en la sustancia. . . . La característica esencial del ser vivo: la asimilación." \textit{Naturaleza}, 165f.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{81}For example: "Si la visión escolástica considera al mundo material desde arriba, desde el ser humano con una proyección psicológica inevitable sobre la materia. . . . La visión científica ilumina el mundo desde abajo prescindiendo de cualquier contaminación antropomórfica. . . . La segunda visión, en cambio, nos orientará sobre sus diferencias con el espiritu. . . . Este desequilibrio es la típica característica de nuestra cultura." \textit{Naturaleza}, 168, 170.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{82}"Ontonomía . . . significa . . . la síntesis de las disciplinas especulativas que cultiva el hombre sobre la tierra." "Tiempo," 348.
In both the Introduction and the Epilogue to *Ontonomía de la Ciencia*, Panikkar refers to this work as a "cosmological testament". Although his central preoccupation has been the harmonization of science with philosophy, we have also noted his desire to bring a transcendental or theological voice into the conversation. Consequently, we are not surprised to find him admitting that he is also interested in establishing a "theological vision of science" wherein the world is not autonomous or disconnected from God.

As with his work on *Nature*, Panikkar's eye is ever on the question of the concrete manifestation of the supernatural in and through the natural. This reflects on the question of God and the cosmos: neither a purely immanent, pantheistic God nor an utterly transcendent, absolute Being reflect the true nature of God. Overturning the accepted understanding of an independent science which studies an autonomous world, he begins to see that the study of the cosmos is *in some way* the study of God. It is possible, then, to speak of

---

83 *Ontonomía*, 9, 359.

84 "Más que un intento de armonizar la Ciencia con la Filosofía lo que nos ha espoleado a lo largo de estas páginas, reflejo de una preocupación de muchos años por estos problemas cosmológicos, es más bien una visión teológica de la Ciencia, esto es, no una Mata-Física, sino un Teo-Física. La expresión debe comprenderse. No se trata de una Física de Dios, sino del Dios de la Física, esto es, del Dios creador del mundo, o, con otras palabras, del mundo, no como un ser autónomo, esto is, independiente y desconectado de Dios, sino constitutiva y ontonómicamente religado a El." *Ontonomía*, 355.

85 "Pero no a un Dios antropomórfico ni a un Dios puramente inmanente, ni terriblemente trascendente, sino al Dios verdadero, que es Dios también de la Ciencia . . . ." *Ontonomía*, 356.
"Science as Theology,"86 and to interpret a strict and rigorous scientific vision of the material world as a description, revelation and knowledge of God.87

Consequently, Panikkar’s "cosmological testament" is interested not only in a philosophical but also a "theological revendication of matter."88 For this purpose he sets up a dialogue between science and theology, each with its own voice and role to play in an ontonomic universe:

It is not enough to say that nature reflects and imitates God. . . . It is equally certain that the reverse is also true: God imitates and reflects nature. . . . Theology says to Science: What you describe in the universe is but a pale reflection of what occurs in God and who God is. But Science responds to Theology: What you encounter in the cosmos, what it is and what happens in it is also a refraction--and defraction--of what God is and what occurs in Him; then one of the ways of knowing God is to know about his terrestrial work.89

Panikkar’s hope is that such a dialogue would lead to the overthrow of our fossilized idea of God as "The Other".90 Equally, in deepening our knowledge of the universe, the world emerges in its own right and as the foundation for a truly

86 Ontonomía, "La Ciencia como Teología," 356.

87 Panikkar states: "Existe la visión, no ya poética o mística del universo creado, sino la visión estricta y rigurosamente física y fisicomatemática del mundo material como un descubrimiento de Dios, como un conocimiento de lo Absoluto, como un contacto con el Ser." Ontonomía, 357f.

88 "Es evidente que esta réivindication teológica de la materia . . . tenía que ser honestamente científica." Ontonomía, 358.

89 "No basta decir que la naturaleza refleja e imita a Dios. . . . Es igualmente cierto que la inversa también es verdad: Dios imita y refleja la naturaleza. . . . La Teología le dice a la Ciencia: Lo que tú descubres en el universo es un pálido reflejo de lo que ocurre en Dios y de lo que Dios es. Mas la Ciencia le responde a la Teología: Lo que yo encuentro en el cosmos, lo que éste es y lo que le sucede es también una refracción--y defracción--de lo que Dios es y en El sucede; pues uno de los medios para saber de Dios es saber acerca de su obra terrenal." Ontonomía, 358.

90 "Nuestra idea de Dios se ha fosilizado de tal manera que le hemos caracterizado como El Otro, cuando El, en rigor, es más bien El Uno." Ontonomía, 357.
"secular theology".⁹¹ As we shall see, these themes are prominent in Panikkar's theological works of this period as they are further developed in his subsequent writings.

* * * * *

Our presentation of Panikkar's cosmological writings has exhibited a number of features which we can now summarize. The principle of ontonomy establishes that modern scientific research has its legitimate rights which need to be respected. However, neither its insights nor its methods are to be absolutized. Rather, they must be brought into interrelationship and dialogue with the western philosophical and theological traditions. The ontonomic principle is particularly concerned to challenge the universalist pretensions of any single discipline or method.

The law of entropy is a case in point. From a purely scientific perspective, the entropic law would seem to predict the "thermal death" of the universe. However, once it is realized that there is more to the universe than material and natural processes, the way is left open for discussion of--and dialogue with--other non-material principles and non-natural processes which are operative in the cosmos. In fact, physico-mathematical studies of matter, space and time point to an indeterminate, unpredictable and immeasurable dimension of reality. Panikkar understands this as a transcendental or spiritual component which is beyond the competence of either science or philosophy to adjudicate.

⁹¹"Lo secular--y la Ciencia es un conspicuo exponente--pertenece también a la Teología, a una Teología secular--no laica--, que nuestra época desea." Ontonomía, 359.
The concept of nature is more readily open to the complementary insights of science and philosophy. Modern science reveals the dynamism and multiplicity of the created order; traditional philosophy tends to emphasize the stability and unity of being. Panikkar finds that a reinterpreted aristotelian-realist philosophy—with its notion of the dynamism of nature—is able to bridge the gap and so provide a philosophical foundation in which to situate the ecstatic findings of science. However, if neither multiplicity nor unity is ultimate (or if both are ultimate at the same time), there is need for a third discipline which has as its object the absolute mystery of being or, what we have come to call in the western tradition, God.

Panikkar's dialogue between science and theology is evidently an intra-western conversation in which theology is able to provide a voice which speaks of transcendence and where science's deepened knowledge of the universe is able to tell us something more of God. In this way, Panikkar's interdisciplinary hermeneutics seek to break down the barriers that so often divide the academic disciplines while simultaneously respecting the insights and methods which rightfully belong to all fields of academic enquiry. Panikkar's "cosmological testament" leaves many questions unanswered concerning the place of the human being in this new multidisciplinary and cross-temporal vision of the cosmos. This issue is now addressed with reference to Panikkar's early anthropological writings.

TOWARDS AN INTEGRAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Panikkar's foundational anthropology emerges in the form of a dialogue between modern humanism and classical christian consciousness. Our
presentation proceeds in three stages. First, we establish the principles on which he bases his understanding of the modern human predicament. Modernity is seen as shattering the perceived "mythic unity" which accompanied traditional human self-understanding. He points to the need for an integral anthropology which incorporates both classical and modern notions of the human being, but is somehow able to transcend them.

Second, we follow his attempt to reinstate sentiment as the integrating faculty of knowledge capable of overcoming the dualistic epistemologies of both rationalism and irrationalism. This discussion is based primarily on Panikkar's critique of Jacobi's philosophy of sentiment.

Third, we introduce the notion of theandric confidence which, in Panikkar's interpretation, is the integrating sentiment that advances human self-understanding beyond the impasses of traditional mythic awareness and modern fragmented consciousness. We explore his application of the theandric principle with reference to humanism and patriotism. Throughout these anthropological studies, we note the manner in which Panikkar brings philosophy into relationship with cosmological and theological discourse.

Panikkar characterizes modernity according to "three momentous events": loss of God at the end of the Middle Ages; loss of self in the Enlightenment; and loss of cosmic rhythm with the advent of technology. Consequently, the

92"El hombre occidental, en un proceso que la historia del pensamiento marca distintamente, perdió a Dios al finalizar la Edad Media, se perdió a sí mismo en el siglo de las luces y en el idealista, y se ha perdido, se ha extraviado en medio del mundo en la época contemporánea, en la época de la técnica." "Visión," 9f.
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modern experience is perceived in terms of the radical reversal of the experience of relationality--among the human, divine and cosmic dimensions of reality--that characterized classical consciousness. Panikkar describes this modern experience of dislocation and fragmentation in terms of the absence of harmony.93 Moreover, he suggests that the experience of dis-ease and anxiety extends to all the conscious and unconscious dimensions of human life.94 In this situation, post-enlightenment philosophy's "rational explanation of reality" is critiqued as fundamentally inadequate on account of its misassumption that the whole of reality is explicable to the mind. Panikkar calls this the "apparent grandeur and the real tragedy of modern philosophy."95

He also submits that one of the causes of modern dislocation is the specialized and fragmentary nature of science. In spite of the valid and valuable insights which are provided by science, it acts as a kind of mid-wife in the splintering and atomization of the human being.96 Even religion, the traditional mode through which humanity acquired cosmic harmony, has been converted-

The Enlightenment's "turn to the subject" is, from Panikkar's perspective, a "turn to the ego" which represents the "loss of the self." This will be further discussed below with reference to his appeal to "transcendent humanism".

93"El mal presente estriba en la falta de unidad, en la dislocación de los problemas ye en caencia di armonía." "Visión," 12.

94In fact, "el dolar es, in cierta manera, una defensa del organismo." As well, "el mal es universal. La inquietude, o, . . . el desasosiego humano, se extiende a todos los ámbitos de la vida, y quien no lo nota es un inconsciente." "Visión," 10f.

95"Visión," 11. Elsewhere, Panikkar equates this with "formalistic thinking" defined as: "Todo la real es racional y todo lo racional es real. . . . Lo demás es un potencia, fenómeno, apariencia." *Ontonomia*, 134.

96"El científico vive con su problema especializado, y procura vivir de él--que es aún más grave--sin relacionarlo muy a muendo con la totalidad, ni de su vida ni de la Ciencia. . . . El hombre actual vive descuartizado." "Visión," 12.
Panikkar's analysis of modernity focusses on this experience of fragmentation or "anthropological disunity." He argues that only a "radical solution" or a "new innocence" is capable of redressing the balance. Consequently, he speaks of the need for a visionary synthesis which unifies rather than fragments human life and experience.  

On the basis of this understanding of the modern human predicament, Panikkar institutes his cross-temporal dialogue between modern humanism and classical christian consciousness. He contrasts and critiques these two distinctive approaches to human reality. Traditional or classical human self-understanding is depicted in terms of a *microcosm* in which all the elements of the universe--matter, spirit and divinity--are reflected in one another. Modernity represents the breaking apart of this symbolic form of awareness.

---

97"La Religión, en la conciencia y en la práctica de la mayoría, se ha desconectado de la vida, se ha convertido en un compartimiento estanco, o, a lo más, en una *virtud* especial y especializada." "Visión," 12.

This sense of the privatization of religion is equivalent to Johannes Baptist Metz’s central critique of post-Enlightenment, bourgeois religion. See Metz’s *Faith in History and Society*, trans. David Smith (New York: Seabury Press, 1980).

98"El mal de la época actual nos parece poder ser caracterizado por la falta de *síntesis* . . . ; una síntesis que unifique--sin uniformarla--toda la vida humana, que abarque al hombre en su totalidad." "Visión," 13.

99"La Edad Media consideraba al hombre como microcosmos, un mundo en pequeño. . . . En el cosmos humano están representadas todas las escalas de los seres, en él se da la unión entre todo lo existente; es el punto de cita de todo el universo, es la intersección de todo lo real. En el hombre se da cuerpo, alma, espíritu y divinidad . . . . El mundo es un *mesocosmos*." Panikkar describes the divine, human and cosmic dimensions of reality in terms of both *intra* (microcosmic) and *inter* (mesocosmic) relationship. "Visión," 38f.
Even the term "human microcosm" is now understood as an expression of human individualism.¹⁰⁰

Nonetheless, Panikkar recognizes that modern consciousness is unable to return to a situation which it perceives as exaggerating the mythic unity of life. Furthermore, modern human awareness is dissatisfied with the manner in which traditional human understanding placed the material in servitude to the spiritual. By contrast, Panikkar critiques humanism for the way it exaggerates the material and the finite. In so doing, it "splits reality" and ignores both the spiritual dimension and the final destiny of humanity (and the cosmos).¹⁰¹

In searching for an appropriate response to this modern human predicament, Panikkar wants to avoid the pitfalls of both humanist and classical approaches. He often stresses that no purely `theoretical' solution is adequate.¹⁰² Equally unacceptable is a merely `natural' understanding of the human being which limits human reality to the elements of a natural `system'.¹⁰³ Evidently,

---

¹⁰⁰ Panikkar attributes the `individualized' interpretation of microcosm to nominalism. Now "cada hombre es un mundo. Por no haber unidad en la concepción del microcosmos que es el hombre, cada cual se construye un mundo a su manera." "Visión," 38.

¹⁰¹ "Visión," 54-56. In this context, Panikkar speaks of the need for an appreciation of both the "final" and "intermediate" ends of human life. This is evidently based on his reinterpretation of Aristotle which integrates teleology and action in the concept of nature. See the discussion of "Nature and the Cosmos" above.

¹⁰² Panikkar’s critique of post-Enlightenment disconnected reason is perhaps the central and critical motif of his early works. In this, too, he reflects the many schools of thought that have turned their attention from pure theory to the theory-praxis dialectic. For a survey of the account of the Frankfurt School, including such writers as Walter Benjamin, Theodore Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, and their influence on "political theology," see Metz's Faith in History and Society.

¹⁰³ "Visión," 40.
Panikkar’s search for an integral anthropology will need to include the reality of
the supernatural, but to do so in a way that does not diminish the reality of the
natural.104

In this respect, one of his major concerns is to overcome the cleavage that
mainstream Christian thought posits between nature and grace.105 He seems to
suggest that the Augustinian preoccupation with sin, while appropriate at a
certain level, can lead to this nature-supernature dualism. He prefers to stress
that the destiny of the human being and all creation is, in orthodox Christian
belief, inseparable from the final victory of God.106 From the other side of the
dialogue comes the modern emphasis on the temporal and historical

---

104 His formulations often come close to Karl Rahner’s Christocentric,
transcendental anthropology. For example: “En los hombres en gracia se da esta
última por participación y en Jesucristo—verdadero hombre—por propia naturaleza.”
“Visión,” 38. For Rahner, see Foundations of Christian Faith, trans. William Dych
(New York: Crossroad, 1982).

105 This is the fundamental impulse behind his exploration of the concept of
nature in the history of Western and Christian thought:

Preocupado por el problema teológica de la sobrenaturaleza como substrato
metafísico de una antropología integral que explicase al hombre personal y
concreto, al cristiano real e histórico, tuve que abordar introductioriamente el
problema metafísico de la naturaleza. Naturaleza, xiii.

Other comments make clear Panikkar’s perception that the cleavage between nature
and supernature has had serious, negative repercussions for Christian self-
understanding. See, for example, Ontonomía, 134. For a similar perspective in
modern Catholic theology, see Karl Rahner, “Concerning the Relationship between

106 Dar cabida a las preocupaciones angustiosas del hombre de la calle y
procurar elevarlas hasta la auténtica inquietud que late bajo toda apariencia de
vulgaridad cotidiana, es otra misión de la síntesis humana. Dios se encuentra
presente en todas sus criaturas y no solamente en las más elevadas en el orden de
los seres. Dios es trascendente al mundo y por eso su relación con El no es
solamente a través del último anillo del admirable orden cósmico, sino
directamente con cada ser, y personalmente con cada hombre.” “Visión,” 56f.
dimensions of life. By integrating these mutual insights with respect to the ultimate significance of both grace and nature, Panikkar attempts to breakthrough the limited perspectives of both traditional and modern forms of awareness.

In this context, he recognizes that any integral anthropology must cultivate a knowledge of history as a constitutive human dimension (humanism), and that this knowledge should culminate in a theology of history (Christianity). In this integrated human vision, history becomes salvation history, and anthropology culminates in a Christian understanding of the historical and temporal human being who is oriented towards transcendence.

In order to emphasize that the anthropological synthesis must be new, Panikkar provides a metaphor from chemistry in which all the elements are transformed into a new compound. On the one hand, all the elements are necessary, including all the specialized insights of the human sciences. On the other hand, these elements need to be changed into something new and vital. With reference to the nature-grace dualism, as to other aspects of the fragmentation of human life, Panikkar stresses that the synthesis or resolution transcends natural powers. In order to overcome the schizophrenia of atomized life and culture, it is necessary to rely on the supernatural realm of grace.

---

107“La cultura es esencialmente temporal . . . . El hombre, con su destino sobrenatural inclusive, es una unidad. Y la cultura debe estar al servicio del hombre total . . . . La elaboración de los postulados de una cultura que sea cristiana, fundada en una auténtica antropología. . . . El cultivo de la Historia . . . como conocimiento de una dimensión constitutiva del hombre, debe culminar en teología--en una teología de la Historia.” “Visión,” 55f.

108“Visión,” 57.

109“Visión,” 57-60. Here Panikkar states unequivocally: “El problema del mundo es un problema de hombres--de santos--, de gracia. Su solución y su mismo
Consequently, "living faith is the ultimate solution" since, without it, authentic human problems and objectives will not be fully recognised, let alone transformed.¹¹⁰

In part, the issue is an epistemological one. How does one define the role of faith in post-enlightenment human understanding? Panikkar recognizes that, to be authentic, modern faith in God cannot be other-worldly. To the contrary, it will be expressed as a confidence in things.¹¹¹ The challenge is to develop a non-dualistic epistemology in which supernatural faith is expressed in--rather than opposed to--modern human experience. Panikkar's philosophy of sentiment is designed to meet this challenge.

**Sentiment**

Panikkar understands the human spirit according to the trilogy of *sentiment, intellect* and *will*.¹¹² Drawing from the classics, he correlates

This is reminiscent of Bernard Lonergan's statement that evil is only a problem if God exists and, since God exists, its solution is absolutely in the supernatural order of grace. See *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1958, 1978), 694-696.

¹¹⁰ "La fe viva da la solución última. La primera misión consiste en el planteamiento de los auténticos problemas del hombre moderno." "Visión," 58f.

¹¹¹ "La fe in Dios tiene que mostrarse en nuestra confianza en las cosas. Y la paradoja es que a Dios se le sirve amándole." "Visión," 42.

¹¹² In Spanish: "El sentimiento, el intellecto o la voluntad." "Visión," 42. Elsewhere, Panikkar states:

El espiritu humano es una trinidad compuesta do conocer, querer y sentir; de intelegencia, voluntad y sentimiento, en íntima concatenación y unidad; aunque acaso no sea una división homogénea y no éste el sentimiento en plan de igualidad con otras dos potencias. *Jacobi*, 5.

The most difficult concept to translate into English is *el sentimiento*. In English,
sentiment with artistic intuition and Beauty; intellect with rationality and Truth; and the will with religious idealism and Goodness.\textsuperscript{113} In terms of human knowing, sentiment is perceived as the unifying power.\textsuperscript{114}

Panikkar's most systematic treatment of the role of sentiment in human knowledge is presented through the application of a hermeneutic of suspicion and retrieval to \textit{F. H. Jacobi's philosophy of sentiment}.\textsuperscript{115} Panikkar affirms Jacobi's retrieval of the central role of sentiment in human understanding, but rejects what is considered to be an over-subjective and finally irrational philosophy. Our presentation does not assess Panikkar's analysis of Jacobi, but utilizes this analysis to clarify Panikkar's own philosophy of sentiment and its place within his integral anthropology.

\textsuperscript{113}See his treatment of these categories in "Visión," 42-54.

\textsuperscript{114}Panikkar speaks of the "radical unity" of the human being who can, nonetheless, be studied according to distinct "operative aspects" and "human manifestations." The importance of the role of sentiment in human knowledge is precisely that it enables the intellectual and volitional dimensions of the human spirit to be understood in a non-dualistic way. "Visión," 40-42.

\textsuperscript{115}With respect to Jacobi's philosophy, Panikkar presents his aim as follows: "se trata de comprender su (Jacobi) actitud filosófica fundamental y integrarla, una vez mostrada su insuficiencia, en una visión plenaria de la realidad dentro de la línea realista y teista de la Filosofía." \textit{Jacobi}, 5.
According to Panikkar, Jacobi's emphasis on the *immediacy of experience* as distinct from analytical knowledge accounts for his influence on modern-day existentialist philosophies.¹¹⁶ This epistemological focus on immediate experience resembles Newman's distinction between "notional" and "real assent." However, for Newman, `inference' and `intuition'--or `rationality' and `faith'--are understood as complementary categories, whereas in Jacobi's philosophy they are fundamentally opposed.¹¹⁷

Panikkar attributes Jacobi's position to an "instinct of compensation." It is seen as an understandable reaction to cartesian rationalism, which absolutizes the intellect, and kantian agnosticism, which absolutizes the will.¹¹⁸ In apparent agreement, Panikkar cites Jacobi's radical critique of mainstream western philosophy:

```
Philosophy since Aristotle has not stopped wanting to subordinate immediate to mediated knowledge, the faculty of primitive perception which is fundamental for all true knowing to the faculty of reflection, the original to the copy, the essence to the word, reason to understanding.¹¹⁹
```

However, Panikkar takes his distance from Jacobi's "epistemological revolution" which emphasizes a "mortal leap of faith"--God exists and the world is an

---

¹¹⁶ "El `sentimiento del espirítu' (Geistesgefühl) de Jacobi . . . representar una captación más inmediata y auténtica de lo real que el conocimiento laborioso y analítico." Also, note Panikkar's treatment of the influence of Jacobi on modern philosophy (including Heidegger, Fichte, Jaspers and Bergson). *Jacobi*, 53, 4, 20.

¹¹⁷ *Jacobi*, 4.

¹¹⁸ *Jacobi*, 12.

¹¹⁹ Después de Aristóteles los filósofos no han cesado de querer subordinar el conocimiento inmediato en general al mediato, la facultad de percepción primitiva que es el fundamento de todo saber, a la facultad de reflexión, el original a la copia, la esencia a la palabra, la razón al entendimiento." *Jacobi*, 14f.
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ordered cosmos—as opposed to the voice of `reason'—God doesn't exist and reality is chaotic.\textsuperscript{120} In Panikkar's judgment, Jacobi only succeeds in reinstating the affective dimension of knowledge through negating the intellect. Panikkar himself wants to retrieve affectivity without denying the rightful place of intelligibility. In rhetorical parlance, he wants to affirm the role of both the heart and the head in the human discernment of truth.

Consequently, Panikkar seeks to expose the fundamental weaknesses of Jacobi’s epistemology. He poses the question of what occurs in a situation of conflicting sentiments: either one has to appeal to reason as the final arbitrator (negating Jacobi); or one settles for pure relativism and arbitrariness (effectively negating truth).\textsuperscript{121} Panikkar’s hermeneutic of suspicion reveals a paradoxical similarity in the respective epistemologies of Jacobi and Descartes. While admitting that they represent two extremes, he considers that they are both `anthropocentric' in the reductionist sense of placing ultimate confidence in the human being. Whereas Descartes absolutizes human thought, Jacobi absolutizes human intuition.\textsuperscript{122}

Moreover, according to Jacobi’s own definition, faith is a `mortal' leap, a merely `natural' act. In contrast, Panikkar stresses that philosophy's final object is "ultimate reality," and that any integral philosophical method requires contact with the `immortal'. For Panikkar, this indicates the need for some kind of

\textsuperscript{120} Jacobi’s "anti-philosophical" attitude and his "salto mortale" are discussed by Panikkar in \textit{Jacobi}, 17-22.

\textsuperscript{121} See \textit{Jacobi}, "La filosofía contra Jacobi," 25f.

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Jacobi}, 31f.
`supernatural' experience.\textsuperscript{123} Quite evidently, he does not consider that Jacobi's philosophy of religion is consistent with an epistemology of (supernatural) faith.\textsuperscript{124}

In the light of this critique, Panikkar says that Jacobi is correct in highlighting the significance of non-analytical, participative forms of knowledge such as `empathy' and `love'.\textsuperscript{125} Likewise, he is effective in pointing to the positive limits of reason.\textsuperscript{126} However, he does not succeed in negating cartesian dualism because he merely inverts the equation. Mind and reason are now replaced by intuition and affectivity. Consequently, Panikkar considers that Jacobi is insufficiently radical. Although correctly negating reason's universalist pretensions, his interpretation of the intellect as "pure reason" is a mistake.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{123}`Este objeto propio (la `última' realidad) de la Filosofía, condicionará su método," or "la estructura de la Realidad debe condicionar nuestro método de aproximación a ella." For a more complete statement of Panikkar's understanding of the role of philosophy, see Jacobi, "Definición de la Filosofía," 34ff.; citations, 35.

\textsuperscript{124}Our purpose here is not to discuss the validity of Panikkar's critique of Jacobi per se. It may well be that Jacobi's notions of faith and revelation are capable of being understood in the context of a theological, transcendental, christian anthropology. Perhaps the hidden opponent of Panikkar's critique is Ortega y Gasset who seems to insist on the need for a "natural faith" in the sense of Panikkar's critique of Jacobi. For Ortega, see such essays as "Truth as Man in Harmony with Himself" in \textit{Man and Crisis}, 102-118.

\textsuperscript{125}Jacobi, 57f.

\textsuperscript{126}See Jacobi, "El límite positivo a la razón," 58-60.

\textsuperscript{127}`El intelecto no es sólo razón. Y ahí está el error--y el acierto--fundamental del sentimentalismo." Panikkar states that Jacobi's intention of overcoming reason was correct, but that his method was defective: "La vida, el sentido común, el axioma cosmológico en última instancia... son los que limitan las pretensiones universalistas de la razón... La pretensión es justa, mas el método es además de incongruente, defectuoso." Jacobi, 52, 59.
willing, but their true source of unity. Accordingly, sentiment is seen as having a much more integral role to play in human knowledge than either Descartes or Jacobi allows.

In his definition of sentiments as "the elements of the affective life of the human being," Panikkar stresses that they should not be interpreted as a `third' or separable faculty of knowledge. Since the "human being is one," it is inadmissible to split human knowledge in this way. The intellect possesses intuition as well as reason; the will is appetite and love as well as decision; sentiment is the `crystallization' of affectivity, knowledge and sensibility. With reference to the role of sentiment in human knowing, Panikkar provides a more extensive description:

Sentiment is an irreducible anthropological element . . . forming an indestructible anthropological unity which, in the human being, is anterior to thought and will . . . . Sentiment is not ultimate or infallible . . . (but) represents a superior perfection which is more similar to God than the autonomous and disconnected activity of our intelligence . . . and of our will.

---

128° "La última razón del sentimiento estará entonces en la unificación intelecto-voluntad." Jacobi, 50.

129° Panikkar says that the tendency to perceive `sentiments' as an inferior form of knowledge is evident in the rationalism of modern philosophy--"obscure and confused knowledge"--and in the voluntarism of scholasticism--"predominantly appetites". According to this interpretation, 'intellect' and 'will' are associated with the spiritual sphere, whereas `sensibility' represents animality. Panikkar reads Jacobi's reinstatement of sentiment to the spiritual level as still being caught in the nature/supernature dualism of rationalism and voluntarism. This, of course, is unacceptable to Panikkar. Jacobi, 38ff., 53.

130° "La existencia de elementos metafísicos no justifica un atomismo in psicología." Jacobi, 40. Probably Panikkar's most often-used statement throughout Humanismo and Jacobi is: "el hombre es una unidad."

131° Jacobi, 40.

132° This is taken from another work of Panikkar entitled Patriotismo y cristianidad (Madrid: Rialp, 1961); hereafter, Patriotismo; major ideas presented as "La evolución
Sentiment, then, is neither an inferior kind of knowledge nor an imperfection as such, but the synthesizing faculty effecting the harmonious integration of all our spiritual acts. \(^{133}\) Panikkar recognizes that amid the fragmentation, incompletion and imperfection of human life, the *manifestation* of sentiment reflects our human inadequacies. Nonetheless, he insists that this "existential imperfection" of sentiment does not destroy its more noble *mission* of fusing love and knowledge, and relating the human transcendentally with God. \(^{134}\)

Consequently, while rejecting Jacobi's particular philosophy of sentiment, Panikkar perceives in his attempt to integrate the affective life into anthropology and epistemology a mystical and religious aspiration akin to such thinkers as Augustine, Anselm, Bernard, Pascal, Newman and Blondel. \(^{135}\) According to this too neglected tradition, human life without faith in the supernatural is...

---

\(^{133}\) *Jacobi*, 41f. Here, Panikkar refers to the proper thomistic understanding of 'sentiment' as related to human unity rather than being a mere passion or emotion.

\(^{134}\) "La última razón del sentimiento es una perfección; mas su manifestación humana es una insuficiencia, un reflejo débil e inadecuado del acto humano más perfecto." *Jacobi*, 50f., 60; citation, 50.

\(^{135}\) *Jacobi*, 61.
unintelligible. But a supernatural faith does not bypass reason; it is suprarational (surpassing the limits of reason) without being irrational (opposed to reason). While sentiments may appear to be the complicating factor of human existence, they are the transcendental link between earth and heaven. Sentiments are embedded in the soul. They orient humans to supernatural faith and divine life.

Panikkar warns that any anthropology which ignores sentiment falls into rationalism. Equally, any philosophy of sentiment that ignores the supernatural basis of faith falls into irrationalism. An integral anthropology ignores neither

136 Existe de hecho una situación humana real, que aunque inaccesible a la mera inteligencia del hombre, influye positivamente en nuestro ser individual y en la cultura de nuestras latitudes: El hecho de lo sobrenatural. Si no se cuenta con él, hay circunstancias humanas totalmente ininteligibles. “Jacobi, 60f.

Note, too, Panikkar’s use of the Principles of Non-Contradiction and Identity which, effectively, represent two different approaches to reality: the first emphasizes analytical thought and discursive reasoning; the second a participative form of knowing which stresses the unity of the human being and the vital, affective aspects of all human knowledge. These principles become increasingly significant throughout Panikkar’s future writings.

137 Panikkar, evidently, perceives Jacobi’s concept of "natural faith" as 'irrational' rather than 'suprarational'—even though Panikkar admits that "Jacobi pretende superar el reino de la razón, no destruirlo." Again, our intention is not to defend Panikkar’s reading of Jacobi, but to use the critique as a mode of understanding Panikkar’s own anthropology. In particular, Panikkar is opposed to the notions of "natural faith" and "pure (human) nature" because of their presumption that grace and supernature are extrinsic to the human being. He believes this to be a false theological hermeneutic of the real human situation. Jacobi, 58-60.

In this regard, Panikkar’s anthropology is closely aligned to Henri de Lubac, Karl Rahner and the school of "la nouvelle théologie". See, especially, Rahner’s essays "Concerning the Relationship between Nature and Grace" and "Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace," Theological Investigations I, 297-346; and Rahner’s extensive references to De Lubac’s Surnaturel (Paris 1946). According to Panikkar, Jacobi’s concept of faith remains at the level of a ‘mortal’ or ‘natural’ act without recognizing the ‘graced’ dimension which is intrinsic to the act of faith.
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sentiment nor reason, but situates them both according to the theandric (divine-human) structure of the human being whose life, goal and destiny is the divine mystery. Panikkar's notions of "confidence" and "christian theandrism" present themselves as important expressions--or "sentiments"--for understanding his overall programme for an integral anthropology that is compatible with both the christian tradition and post-enlightenment consciousness.

**Theandric Confidence**

If sentiment is the unifying power of Panikkar's philosophical anthropology, confidence is its primary and graced manifestation. It is a confidence that is "fully human" because it is self-transcending. Consequently, it is not auto-centered but is, precisely, confidence in reality, an act of self-transcending faith, a human trust in the 'other'. Further, such an 'act' is not based on auto-knowledge or self-reflection. It is a primordial human orientation which 'knows', prior to external and rational reflection, that one's true identity is 'beyond' oneself. 

---

138 See Panikkar, "La Confidencia: Análisis de un Sentimiento," Revista Española de Filosofía (Madrid), CSIC (1963): 43-62; hereafter, "Confidencia"; translation mine. According to Panikkar (note 1, p. 43), this study was written in 1946--that is, prior to Jacobi. This notion of some basic 'faith' or 'trust' in reality that is 'beyond' reason is similar to that exhibited in the works of Jacobi or, for that matter, Ortega y Gasset.

139 The 'other' may be a different mentality, race, christian confession, religion or culture. Panikkar perceives this understanding of the 'other' as one of the most important challenges of modern time especially given "la situación espiritual de nuestra época," no doubt an oblique reference to fascist Spain and the immediate aftermath of World War II. Ultimately, the 'other' is the discovery of God as 'non-other', although this knowledge or discovery is not necessarily thematized. "Confidencia," 45, 61ff.

140 The similarities with Karl Rahner's concept of "implicit knowledge" in the self-transcending human being are compelling. Among Rahner's formulations and applications of his "transcendental anthropology", see his Foundations of Christian Faith. The notion of "implicit" or "tacit knowledge" is
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This transcendental anthropology is metaphysically grounded in the relational unity of the created world and the constitutive "communion of all beings." Evidently, Panikkar's understanding of the human person is inherently social, relational and even cosmic in its dimensions. On this basis, faith in God can be expressed as confidence in the earth and in all beings--and, as we shall see later, in all religions.

Panikkar does not base his anthropological foundations in metaphysical 'proofs' but in his own faith-experience through which he interprets both the christian tradition and modern culture. Moreover, he asserts that any philosophy, albeit unwittingly, is based in some form of 'belief' in the transcendence of truth. Consequently, his notion of confidence--in reality, advocated by other philosophers in the period following World War II. See, for example, Michael Polanyi & Harry Prosch, *Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

141"El mundo creado es una unidad y porque la relación entre los distintos seres que forman este universo no es una relación entre unidades monádicas sino entre seres constitutivamente conexos entre sí. Esta comunión adquiere un carácter especial intenso cuando se trata del ser personal cuya misma esencia consiste en una relación." "Confidencia," 58f.

142This represents a contrasting note to the transcendental anthropologies of such theologians as Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan. While Rahner and Lonergan exhibit important social dimensions in their respective epistemologies, their starting point is the transcendentality of the individual subject. For Rahner, see *Foundations of Christian Faith*; for Lonergan, see *Method in Theology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1972).

143This would seem to be one of the 'lessons' of Jacobi which Panikkar heeds, or at least fully supports, regarding the mission of philosophy: "Es realmente la Filosofía, *investigación* de la Verdad? O no es más bien establecimiento (parcial), comprensión (truncada), demostración (inacabada)--a posterior--de la Verdad?" Panikkar is certainly more 'thomistic' in his refusal to make any absolute separation between metaphysical and theological investigation or between reason and faith: "La Verdad no es Dios--Cristo? Y no es la Religión--el Cristianismo--la que nos dá la Verdad?" *Jacobi*, 27f.
transcendence, the earth, the `other', all beings–is fundamental in both anthropological and epistemological terms.

We have already alluded to the fact that Panikkar's notion of confidence is closely related to another foundational theme which is drawn from the history of christian theology. We are speaking here of confidence as a theandric act.\footnote{The phrase "theandric act" or "theandric operation" has had a controversial history in Christianity. It is attributed, historically, to Pseudo-Dionysius (c.500) and is associated with the monothelitic heresy insofar as it had been interpreted as denying the human nature and human will of Christ (condemned by Constantinople III in 680-681). However, the term can be understood in a fully orthodox sense which recognizes the divine and human energies in Christ operating together to produce a single effect. Pope St.Martin I, for example, allowed its use as designating "the wondrous union in Christ of the two distinct operations." Other orthodox users of the phrase include St.Maximus Confessor and St.John Damascene. See A. Michel, "Theandrique (Operation)," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique (Paris) 15:1 (1946): 206-216; C. J. Moell, "Theandric Acts of Christ," New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York), vol. 14 (1967): 4. Panikkar's retrieval of the concept follows the more mystical and orthodox interpretation.}

We have referred to theandrism as an expression of that wondrous unity of the human and the divine in the graced human person. Panikkar takes the expression further by speaking of "christian theandrism" as the sentiment which expresses multiple levels of harmony. These include the internal unity of the human being (beyond head-heart dualism), human relatedness to creation (beyond self-other dualism) and human participation in the ultimate--divine--reality (beyond immanent-transcendent dualism).\footnote{See, for example, Humanismo, "El teandrismo cristiano," 233-251. Panikkar does not use the actual phrase "theandric confidence." Our choice of this phrase is made in the belief that his notions of "confidence" and "theandrism" are, if not identical, at least complementary.}

In Panikkar's view, theandric truth cannot be confined or limited to the rational level. Rather, it is known only through praxis, love, testimony, witness
and participation in the mystery of life.\textsuperscript{146} The implications of Panikkar's understanding of theandric confidence are recognizable in his approaches to humanism and patriotism.

Taking a broad historical or even cosmic view, Panikkar situates \textit{modern humanism}\textsuperscript{147} as the second stage in the evolution of human consciousness between \textit{theologism} and \textit{theandrism}. Alternatively, \textit{humanism} is the \textit{autonomous} phase superseding \textit{theological heteronomy} and preceding \textit{theandric ontonomy}.\textsuperscript{148}

According to Panikkar, humanism does not reject the supernatural as such,\textsuperscript{149} but it does represent a reductive anthropocentrism insofar as it limits transcendence to the level of human immanence. Human values are absolutized and human perfection--without intrinsic reference to the divine--is seen as the final end.\textsuperscript{150} A Christian acceptance of humanism results in a \textit{deistic} rather than

\textsuperscript{146}See, for example, "El intelecto y su praxis," originally published in \textit{Arbor} (Madrid), no. 87 (1953); future references to reprint in \textit{Humanismo}, 61-76; see especially 69ff. Panikkar wants to overcome the temptation of the intellect setting itself apart from the integral human person; he finds the approach not only of St. Bernard, but also of Thomas Aquinas, much more in line with his understanding of 'integral' or 'theandric' truth.

\textsuperscript{147}See "El cristianismo no es un humanismo," \textit{Arbor} (Madrid), no. 62 (1951): 165-186; "Cristiandad y cruz," \textit{Arbor} (Madrid), no. 82 (1952): 336-367; reprinted in \textit{Humanismo} respectively as "La superación del humanismo" and "Cristiandad y cruz," 178-253 & 291-334; references to \textit{Humanismo}.

\textsuperscript{148}Panikkar distinguishes 'classical', 'renaissance' and 'modern' humanism as three successive attempts to liberate the human being according to the evolution of human consciousness. According to him, none of these humanisms has yet achieved the true liberation which only an 'ontonomic' or 'theandric' perspective can achieve. "La superación del humanismo," 216-251.

\textsuperscript{149}This is the position of Jacques Maritain which Panikkar does not accept. See "La superación del humanismo," 191f.

\textsuperscript{150}According to Panikkar, the real danger is humanistic rationalism which makes the human mind the measure of all things--"\textit{homo mensura}"--betraying its
a *theistic* conception of God, and an extrinsic-dualistic conception of grace.\(^{151}\)

From the perspective of Christian anthropology, humanism exhibits an exaggerated confidence in human reason. The power of symbol is lost and, with it, that more profound sense of the mystery of grace and sin.\(^{152}\) The challenge, however, is not to destroy humanism or to renounce human values, but to perfect and transform them according to the insights of Christian revelation.\(^{153}\)

Panikkar considers "theocentric humanism" as a term which overcomes the reductionism associated with "anthropocentric humanism."\(^{154}\) However, he idealist, philosophical presumptions. "La superación del humanismo," 197, 194.

Panikkar reveals some reliance on Martin Heidegger through references to "Brief über den Humanismus," *Platon's Lehre von der Wahrheit* (Bern: A.Franke, 1947); and, specifically, the citation of Heidegger's famous aphorism, "Der Mensch ist der Hirt des Seins." Panikkar is also in dialogue with such existential humanists as Sartre, Hegel, Fueuerbach, Comte and Marx. Ibid. 190f.

Panikkar proposes that although humanism does not necessarily deny grace, the supernatural, redemption or the divine, it nonetheless reduces these to extrinsic and non-essential categories. As well, he states that while the concept of "Christian humanism" is theoretically possible in a non-reductionist sense, its notion of "human nature" would have to be so abstract that it would satisfy neither the "Christian" nor the "humanist". "La superación del humanismo," 203-210, 226-233.

Panikkar argues that, since grace is intrinsic to the definition of the human being, humanism is ultimately incapable of understanding the true depths of morality, religion or philosophy. Consequently, he aligns himself with de Lubac's aphorism: "L'humanisme exclusif est un humanisme inhumain." "La superación del humanismo," 208, 234, 212.

Panikkar argues that humanism transcends and destroys itself. Again, citing de Lubac with approval: "L'humanisme n'est pas spontanément chrétien. L'humanisme chrétien doit être un humanisme converti." "La superación del humanismo," 212f.

Panikkar further comments: "El humanismo ... ni de expresar, ni de ofrecer una base para la intelección de este conjunto de verdades cristianas fundamentales. ... No es necesario renunciar a ningún valor humano, mas es necesario superarlos. ... El cristianismo es un transhumanismo, un teandrismo y no un infrahumanismo." Ibid. 215, 249.

"La superación del humanismo," 199ff. The closeness of Panikkar's
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believes that the notion of humanism is so tainted that he opts for "christianness" and "theandrism".\textsuperscript{155} Theandrism is essentially nothing else than the sanctification of ordinary human existence according to its supernatural destiny. This implies the dynamic transformation of human nature according to the grace of Christ.\textsuperscript{156}

This christian-theandric vision focuses on the "Law of the Cross" which requires the "immolation of culture" and points to the "radical relativity" of all human values.\textsuperscript{157} While the theandric approach is committed to building the world according to christian values, it has its eyes set on the "eruption of a new order" when all things will pass away and there will be "a new heaven and a new earth".\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{155}La superación del humanismo," 233-251. Panikkar oscillates between the terms "theandrism" and "cristianisme". The latter term could be translated as "christianism" or "christianness".

\textsuperscript{156}La superación del humanismo," 236f. Panikkar is particularly impressed with the patristic notion of a "divine humanity". See his "El sentido cristiano de la vida. II," Arbor (Madrid), no. 11 (1945): 261-282; republished as "Su aspecto paradigmático en los primeros cristianos" (hereafter “Los primeros cristianos”) in Humanismo, 121-152; esp. 152.

\textsuperscript{157}Cristianidad y cruz," 313ff. "La inmolación de la cultura" is necessary to proclaim this world’s abiding insufficiency. However, for Panikkar, this does not imply a negative understanding of the world. To the contrary (p. 319), "el cristianismo ha venido a proclamar la insuficiencia de este mundo no porque sea malo, sino porque no es, aún, divino . . . ."

The phrase--"radical relativity"--will re-emerge as an important concept for Panikkar's approach to religious pluralism, especially when he discovers its prominence in the Buddhist tradition. Here (p. 316), it refers to the non-absolute, contingent dimension of all human values--including `culture' and `civilization'.

\textsuperscript{158}This is the primary theme of "La Eucaristía y la Resurrección de la Carne" (hereafter "Eucaristía"), Text of Panikkar’s speech at the International Eucharistic
Whereas humanism is predominantly masculine in its rational approach to life, christian-theandrom is preeminently feminine, embodying that mystical sense of the human being who is still open to the surprise of grace, and for whom the virtues of obedience, sacrifice and trust in the `other'--and ultimately in God--have not been lost or severely retarded.\footnote{159}

Writing in the period after World War II, Panikkar is very aware of the crisis of patriotism particularly as it affected the christian and western nations.\footnote{160} He identifies patriotism as a sentiment which, prior to the reflexive acts of intelligence and will, relates the human being to a determined community and, through the collective consciousness of that community, to the earth.\footnote{161} Its

Congress, Barcelona (May 1952); republished in Humanismo, 335-352; scriptural quotations, 339.

In "Cristiandad y Cruz" (pp. 306ff.), Panikkar makes it clear that his preoccupation is not with an individualistic spirituality of the Cross, but with its cosmic effects which are already modifying the social structures of this world.

\footnote{159}See "La superación del humanismo," 238f. Panikkar reinforces this attitude when he states (p. 240): "Lo misterioso, lo numinos, la revelación, la libre iniciativa de Dios, la supramundanidad y supranaturalidad y, sobre todo, la gratuidad que hace que la actitud religiosa del hombre sea siempre una actitud expectante; nada de esto cabe en el humanismo."

\footnote{160}See Patriotismo, "La idea de Patria en el mundo actual," 18-22. Significantly, Panikkar's French translation is: "La crise de l'idée de Patria"; see also his "Le sens théologique du patriotisme," La Table Ronde, no. 183 (April 1963): 56-59 (emphasis added).

\footnote{161}See Patriotismo, "El patriotismo como sentimiento," 28-39. By way of definition, Panikkar states (p. 30f.):

El patriotismo es algo primario e irreductible en el hombre, que nos afecta por entero, tanto a nuestra inteligencia, como a nuestra voluntad, gustos e inclinaciones; es el conocimiento intrínseco y vivo de una religación, o si se quiere, una inclinación primaria de nuestro ser, es decir, un sentimiento.

For Panikkar's discussion of patriotism as relating to a particular community, place, history, geography and psychology, see Patriotismo, "El objeto del
transcendental (and feminine) dimensions are immediately recognizable in that one does not `have' or `choose' one's nation or country, but one `receives'--or is `called' into relation with—the community, the homeland, the neighbor and, ultimately, God.162

Modern historical consciousness correctly interprets space and time as intrinsic, fundamental and non-arbitrary elements of the human being.163 Panikkar stresses, nonetheless, that the historical dimension is not absolute. Certainly it reflects the incarnational aspect of our earthly-human lives. Equally, it needs to be complemented by an eschatological consciousness which is aware of the constitutive relations of the human being with the whole human community, the entire earth, and the cosmic mystery of the universe.164 Beyond all nature-supernature and earth-heaven dualisms, the true christian "patria" must include both the particularity of our earthly existence and the realization of patriotism: La Patria," 51-70.


163Patriotismo, 53.

164The recurrent theme of this entire study is precisely the attempted integration of the historical-incarnational and eschatological-transcendental dimensions of patriotism. Panikkar calls this his "deducción ontónómica de los principio cristianos" which, he adds, "no permite nunca conclusiones únicas y monolíticas." Patriotismo, 107.
our divine destiny.\textsuperscript{165} By uniting the telluric and spiritual sentiments of the human being, patriotism is recognizably a theandric act.\textsuperscript{166}

The history of the christian west, in Panikkar's analysis, reveals both the grandeur and the tragedy of patriotism. Christian consciousness is perceived as having oscillated between two extremes: an eschatological unconcern for the things and places of this world (the messianic consciousness of the first christians); and the modern absolutization of the nation-state (an artificially separate, even militarily imposed, autonomous nationalism).\textsuperscript{167} The current

\textsuperscript{165}\textit{Patriotismo}, 126, 51.

Panikkar constantly returns to the theme of the unity of the human being which is stronger than all the simple, naive and ultimately inhuman divisions between the instinctive and the spiritual, the particular and the universal, etc. He admits that tensions exist between the building of terrestrial structures and the recognition of the world's contingency. However, he insists that tensions are not polarities. Ibid., 115, 118f., 127.

\textsuperscript{166}Patriotism is here described as "una tarea teándrica de redención de la tierra." \textit{Patriotismo}, 49.

\textsuperscript{167}Panikkar's hermeneutic of the western tradition recognizes five different modes of patriotic consciousness. These are elaborated in \textit{Patriotismo}, 71-105, under the heading of "La tradición occidental":

1) the \textit{messianic} patriotism of the first christians (the true--only--"patria" is heaven);

2) the \textit{incarnational} patriotism of the constantinian era which transferred the "patria" to society and the Roman state (constituting the seed for the subsequent evolution of patriotism);

3) \textit{missionary} christianity's quasi-messianic, quasi-incarnational patriotism (the identification of "patria" with the Church of medieval Europe, now transcending socio-cultural identity with the one state);

4) \textit{secular} christianity's belief in national consciousness as an essential christian virtue (misapplying the thomistic understanding of "patria" which signified the reign of God on earth expressed in civil structures);

5) the \textit{modern} formation of nationalities which further absolutizes the religious value of the nation-state now totally identified as "patria" (symbolized in the concept
identification of the nation with "patria" is said to be no longer sustainable either theoretically or practically.¹⁶⁸

Nothing symbolizes the crisis of history so powerfully as this notion of "patria" reduced to a political ideology devoid of any real sensitivity to regional particularity (mystery of incarnation), global responsibility (mystery of transcendence) or the divine destiny of the cosmos (mystery of redemption).¹⁶⁹

As a result of this tragic history, we find ourselves in the "no man's land" of the dehumanizing modern state characterized by nationalistic fanaticism and an ever-increasing number of psychologically and geographically displaced persons.

Panikkar sees the need to replace monolithic, super-power structures with authentic, `catholic' or universal structures that are adapted geographically to each region of the earth and which work towards an "harmonious plurality".¹⁷⁰

Theandric confidence cannot be placed in artificially-constructed nation-states, but only in the earth, in each other, and in God. Theandric patriotism, by

of the divine and absolute origin of nations).

¹⁶⁸ See Patriotismo, "Los signos de nuestro tiempo," 107-114.

¹⁶⁹ Panikkar calls the "mystery of incarnation" the centripetal force; the "mystery of transcendence" the centrifugal force; and the "mystery of redemption" as the synthesizing factor for a truly christian understanding of patriotism. See Patriotismo, "La síntesis cristiana," 143-151.


Note, especially: "Pero es inexorable preparar la creación de unas estructuras auténticamente católicas, es decir, ecuménicas, universales, que surjan de la realidad de la caridad cristiana y de la existencia de una familia humana." In this context, Panikkar also introduces his notion of "harmonious plurality" which will become increasingly significant for his studies on religious pluralism. Ibid., 122f., 128.
recognizing the authentic place of the affective and divine inclinations of the human being, transcends the irrational and destructive expressions of patriotism so common to the world of modern times.\textsuperscript{171}

* * * * *

As we have indicated, Panikkar’s foundational anthropology is an attempt to integrate the insights of classical Christian self-understanding and post-enlightenment self-awareness. Our three-step description and interpretation has revealed the following features. Modernity is perceived as fragmenting human experience and compartmentalizing human self-understanding. This anthropological disunity has replaced the mythical unity of classical consciousness. However, there can be no retreat to a former state of innocence. Rather, there needs to be a new synthesis which neither accepts the nature-grace dualism of traditional Christian teaching nor the rationalist presumptions that characterize enlightenment philosophy.

More positively expressed, the new synthesis affirms equally both the modern emphasis on the historical, material and temporal dimensions of life and the classical ‘knowledge’ of the importance of grace and transcendence. The integration of these two approaches is likened to a chemical reaction in which

\textsuperscript{171}In line with Panikkar’s notion of sentiment, patriotism is neither fully rational (in the cartesian sense) or irrational (in the Jacobian sense) but includes a non-rational--or what he calls here a \textit{telluric}--dimension. The notion of the nation-state produces irrational patriotism because it denies the non-rational dimension: this can be understood in Jungian terms as the expression of \textit{repressed consciousness}. Panikkar also suggests that true patriotism possesses a \textit{feminine} dimension--concrete, sentimental and particular--and a \textit{masculine} side--general, intellectual and universal--which would coincide with his distinction between the ‘historical’ and ‘eschatological’ aspects of patriotism. \textit{Patriotismo}, 129.
the positive insights of tradition and modernity are transformed into a new compound. This raises the fundamental epistemological problem of the role of faith in post-enlightenment understanding.

Panikkar rejects the enlightenment separation of faith and knowledge, or intuition and reason. He argues that faith is a constitutive form of human knowing. His argument proceeds as a hermeneutic of suspicion and retrieval of Jacobi’s notion of sentiment. In Panikkar’s view, Jacobi simply inverts the cartesian dualism of mind and spirit: faith and intuition replace thinking and reason. Panikkar’s own philosophy of sentiment seeks to establish faith as a suprarational rather than an irrational form of knowledge. Accordingly, supernatural and suprarational faith is perceived to be the sentiment or integrative faculty of knowledge that works in unison with the intellect and the will. Although sentiment is not infallible, neither is it arbitrary. Without sentiment, philosophy degenerates into rationalism. And without supernatural faith, the philosophy of sentiment degenerates into irrationalism.

The epistemological roles of sentiment and supernatural faith are expressed as a theandric confidence in reality that incorporates divine, human, cosmic, social and personal levels of self-awareness. By thematizing these transcendental relationships, Panikkar’s foundational anthropology seeks to overcome the exaggerated (mythic) monism of classical self-awareness and the extreme (rationalist) dualism of modern self-understanding. Although humanism rightly emphasizes the rational and immanent dimensions of the human person, it needs the suprarational and transcendental corrective of theandric awareness.
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This is evident with respect to the modern crisis of patriotism which emanates, in Panikkar's view, from an exaggerated sense of the sacred particularity of the historical and geographical homeland (and frequently without relationship to the regional particularity of the earth). Transcendental relationships with the 'other' are ignored so that borderlines take on an absolute and definitive status. Theandric patriotism does not imply a return to a non-historical and non-incarnational identification of the "patria" with life in heaven. However, it fundamentally opposes the ideology--and idolatry--of the modern super-power state.

Perhaps the distinguishing feature of Panikkar's foundational anthropology is his transcendental understanding of the human being as equi-primordially "personal" and "social."\textsuperscript{172} We have also seen that there are cosmic and divine aspects to the human \textit{qua} human so that, in many ways, Panikkar's anthropology is equally a cosmological and theological reading of the human person.\textsuperscript{173} We now turn our attention to his more specific theological writings which attempt to articulate classical christian approaches to God in a way that is accessible to modern human experience.

**THE DIVINE PRESENCE**

Panikkar's Christian foundations form the basis of his theological reflections. However, because those foundations are brought into dialogue with post-enlightenment consciousness, traditional christian hermeneutics are both

\begin{footnotes}
\item[172]Visión," 42.
\item[173]For example: "El hombre, colocado entre Dios y el mundo, y participando de ambos." "Visión," 42.
\end{footnotes}
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challenged and extended. We first of all explore Panikkar's christocentric and ecclesiocentric vision of the universe which challenges dualistic interpretations of Christ and the Church. Instead, he expounds a cosmic and theandric reading of these foundational dogmas of Christian faith.

Second, we present Panikkar's imaginative reinterpretation of the trinitarian symbol. This is not so much a hermeneutic of the trinitarian dogma *in se* as it is a trinitarian reading of nature, human existence and the entire cosmos.

Third, our attention turns to Panikkar's dialogue between the ineffable God of Christian teaching and the disappearance of God in modern cultural experience. Playing on the paradox of the divine presence and the divine absence, Panikkar proposes a theological reading of God's hiddenness from post-enlightenment consciousness.

**The Cosmic Vision: Christ and the Church**

The modern challenge is perceived in terms of learning to read the universe theologically, that is, according to the insights of Christian revelation. According to Panikkar, modern rationalist culture is incapable of forming an authentic cosmic vision:

> In the real world faith, grace, sin, repentance, salvation, humility, hope, obedience, the angel and the devil, etc. play a definitive role. A merely natural and rational culture cannot perceive these factors adequately, let alone direct and shape them interiorly; it lacks the definitive, uncreated, supernatural love which continually and without interruption surrounds and penetrates the world.174

174 *En el mundo real la fe, la gracia, el pecado, el arrepentimiento, la salvación, la humildad, la esperanza, la obediencia, el ángel y el diabola, etc., juegen un papel definitivo. Una cultura meramente natural y racional ni siquiera puede percibir adecuadamente estos factores, menos aún dirigirlos y conformarlos interiormente; le falta el amor definitivo increado, sobrenatural, que continuamente, sin interrupción, escudriña y penetra el mundo." *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus,*
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This cosmic vision denounces notions of pure nature, mere human or profane world—which all have to be 'conquered' in the name of Christ and the Church—since the action of Christ and the reality of grace have already changed the very structures of reality. Consequently, there is no "natural culture" or "natural religion" apart from Christ; nor are there "natural rights" bestowed on us by some abstract concept of nature. Every culture possesses a religious and theological impulse; and "every concrete human life possesses a yearning for God which penetrates the ultimate and even the smallest structures of the world." Since the grace of Christ is truly universal and social in its

originally published in Neues Abendland (Munich) 10:5 (1955): 259-266; republished under this title in Humanismo, 163-177; references to Humanismo; this citation, 173.


This is traditional catholic teaching; its modern theological formulation stresses that grace is 'intrinsic' to the human being and 'universal' in its effects. See, especially, Karl Rahner's interpretation of potentia oboedientialis which tries to safeguard the gratuity of grace without reducing it to an extrinsic concept. "Concerning the Relationship between Nature and Grace," Theological Investigations, vol. 1, 297-317.


Panikkar's emphasis on "history" versus "natural religion" can also be situated in the 'romantic' versus 'rationalist' debates concerning the 'nature' of religion. However, Panikkar's starting point is not 'pure' history but history in the context of (christian) revelation. In this sense, Panikkar accepts neither the 'romantic' nor the 'rationalist' notions of history or religion.

Toda vida concreta humana posee una nostalgia de Dios, que penetra hasta las últimas y más pequeñas estructuras del mundo." "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," 170.

© Gerard Hall. Raimon Panikkar’s Hermeneutics of Religious Pluralism. Ch. 2 “Christianity and Modernity in Dialogue: Panikkar’s Interdisciplinary Foundations”
manifestations, so-called non-Christian cultures and religions possess graced dimensions.

This is not to say that every people, race and culture is at the same level of graced existence, nor that they manifest christian life and redemption to the same degree. Panikkar’s major purpose here is to reject exclusivist interpretations of the christian teaching. His inclusivist christian hermeneutics emphasize that every authentic human value is essentially and ontologically christian.

In effect, this inclusivist hermeneutic of the christian mystery is a further expression of Panikkar’s theandric principle. In theological terms, a theandric vision of the cosmos requires that classical christian dichotomies between nature and grace, the profane and the sacred, humanity and christianity, or the world and the church, be overturned, transcended and transformed into an integral christian vision. Panikkar says that dualism was not part of primitive christian consciousness or life.

---

178 See his distinctions between "pre-Christian," "para-Christian" and "Christian cultures." "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," 175-177. These categories are purely heuristic.

179 Podemos decir que fuera de Cristo ontológicamente y, por tanto, personal y sociológicamente no se aguenta ningún valor auténticamente humano." "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," 177.

180 El Occidente ha perdido un poco la visión del bosque por causa de la misma frondosidad de sus propios arboles." See "El sentido cristiano de la vida. III," Revista Española de Pedagogía (Madrid) 5:19 (1948); republished as "La acción misionera" in Humanismo, 153-162; citation, 161.

"Si tomamos seriamente el pensamiento cristocéntrico, tenemos que superar un modo de pensar frecuentemente amanerado, racionalista." See, also, Panikkar's discussion of the "opinión dualística" and Augustine's Two Cities. "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," 166-169; citation, 165

181 Panikkar’s investigation of the Patristics leads him to argue that "este mundo
Historically, the dualistic conception of reality developed in the constantinian era when the "Church's fullness" was interpreted as "external space" or geographical expansion rather than "internal plenitude" or spiritual depth. Accordingly, the implications of dualism are recognizable both on the theological plane, via an extrinsic conception of grace, and in the political realm where ecclesial self-understanding has been narrowly "militant." Panikkar suggests that authentic ecclesial "catholicity" is not spacial but ontological: the Church is "ontologically the end of Creation which gives ultimate meaning to History."
While accepting that *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* signifies the absolute necessity of the Church for salvation—"the Church alone sustains the ultimate foundations of human existence"—, Panikkar says that this refers to the *mystical* rather than the *juridical* body of Christ. This mystical or theandric reinterpretation of classical christian dogmas claims to avoid the sterility of *microdoxy* which, in his understanding, is blind to the presence of the christian spirit in all genuine human structures and values.

By bringing christianity into dialogue with modern thought-patterns, Panikkar suggests a number of lessons that may finally produce a more integral vision of the cosmos. First of all, there are the lessons that christianity is taught

---


---

Panikkar wants to discover "aspectos olvidados de la Realidad" in the spirit of St Paul or Thomas Aquinas who were concerned with "la totalidad armónica". *Humanismo*, "Realismo y microdoxy," 118.
by modern historical consciousness. In brief, christians learn that they are not apart, beyond or above the earth. They are not spectators or judges, but temporal and historical beings, actors on the human stage with real roles to play in confronting the burning issues of our times. The Church also learns that she is a human-historical agent and a living, growing organism embodied in the real world of time and history.

In line with his dialogical approach, Panikkar stresses that the historical perspective is important but partial. Consequently, christianity challenges modernity to recognize that, while Christ and the Church belong to history, they are not trapped by history. As cosmic, theandric, sacramental realities, they incarnate God’s most intimate action in the world while simultaneously transcending all earthly structures. A purely historical worldview, with its merely linear view of time, will be unable to perceive--or, better still, participate in--this "marriage of time with eternity." Ultimately, christianity challenges

---

188 El cristiano no es un simple espectador, ni menos todavía un juez, de lo que pasa en este mundo, sino actor real y responsable de lo que en él acontece. Pero lo más grave de la conciencia cristiana moderna es que en la mente teológica de muchos . . . no aparecen ni siquiera como problemas las candentes y angustiosas cuestiones que se le presentan al hombre de nuestra época." Humanismo, "Realismo y microdoxia," 118f.

189 La cultura--y más aún la Iglesia, que es un organismo vivo--crece y se desarrolla." Humanismo, "Realismo y microdoxia," 117.

190 Christ, for example, as Logos and Pantocrator is present in creation as its principal mover and final destiny, its Alpha and Omega. Humanismo, 30, 93, 207, 298f., 306, 346f. Such a perspective requires the `ultraviolet' ray of divine faith: "solamente el caliginoso rayo de la fe nos descubre, cual luz ultravioleta, la estructura íntima y real de las cosas y de las situaciones del mundo creado." Ibid., 114.

191 Ninguna otra vida sobre la tierra tiene la tensión y vitalidad que la auténtica vida del cristianismo . . . . La vida cristiana sobre la tierra representa el casamiento del tiempo con la eternidad; los momentos son temporales y tienen al mismo tiempo trascendencia eterna y una efectividad causal con respecto a la otra vida.
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modernity to integrate its insights into a total, cosmic and transcendental vision. Alternately, modernity challenges christianity to recognize its historical and temporal dimensions. In Panikkar’s dialogue, these are complementary rather than contradictory voices. Together they form a harmony.

Finally, Panikkar's christocentric universe claims to avoid the one-sided spiritualized and individualized eschatology of traditional christian piety.192 First, he states, the dogma of the resurrection signifies not just the indestructibility of our `souls', but also the fulfillment and completion of our true selves--including our `bodies'.193 Second, the mystery of redemption signifies not only our individual incorporation into Christ, but our `communion' and collaboration with the `resurrection' of the entire world.194

The eucharist is the theandric symbol par excellence because it links creation (and our earthly lives) with the Creator (our divine destiny) in the immanent-transcendent mystery of Christ.195 As well, the Eucharist is both an historical continuation of the mystery of the Incarnation and a divine manifestation (in

---

192 Panikkar pursues this line of argument in "Eucaristía," 335-352.

193 "La inmortalidad . . . no es la indestructibilidad de un principio quintaesenciado de nuestro ser--el alma--+, sino la perennidad de nuestro yo completo, de nuestro ser verdadero con nuestro auténtico cuerpo." "Eucaristía," 341.

194 "Por la comunión, el hombre no sólo realiza su incorporación a Cristo, sino que colabora ónticamente a la resurrección del mundo." Panikkar interprets the redemptive mystery--and also the Eucharist--as more integrally connected with the mystery of the Resurrection than the one-sided emphasis on the mystery of the Cross. "Eucaristía," 352, 343ff.

195 In fact, Panikkar cites the scholastic axiom that "la Eucaristía . . . es necesaria para salvarse." However, in contradistinction to "la confusión de Rosmini," he adds that "ciertamente, no es necesaria la Comunión sacramental." "Eucaristía," 343.
space and time) of the mystery of the Resurrection.\textsuperscript{196} Interpreted from a cosmic perspective, Christ, the Church and the Eucharist are symbols of human hope and divine life that are already at work in the universe wherever truth, goodness and love are to be found.

A cosmo-theological reading of the world, such as Panikkar proposes, leaves no room for pessimism or intolerance.\textsuperscript{197} To the contrary, we live in a christic universe already on the way to its completion, fulfillment, perfection, redemption or resurrection in Christ. As interpreted by Panikkar, this christic confidence is always in the context of human responsibility for--and collaboration with--the entire creation.\textsuperscript{198} Faith in Christ the Pantocrator, whether explicit or implicit, is the foundation for cosmo-theandric confidence in reality.

Panikkar’s christic and ecclesial foundations for a theology of the universe are complemented by a theological reading of the trinitarian mystery. The Trinity becomes his most powerful symbol of the ultimate and pluralistic nature of reality.

\textsuperscript{196}“La Eucaristía . . . es también no ya una continuación (del misterio de la Encarnación), sino una manifestación, dentro de las mismas categorías espacio-temporales de nuestra historia humana, del misterio de la Resurrección.” "Eucaristía," 347.

\textsuperscript{197}As indicated, Panikkar is particularly severe in his criticism of what he calls ‘microdoxia’ (essentially intolerant bigotry resulting from intellectual fear). This is not be confused with ‘ortodoxia’ which "iluminar con su . . . e impregnar con su espíritu cristiano todas las manifestaciones de la vida humana." Humanismo, "Realismo y microdoxia," 117.

\textsuperscript{198}Dios no deja sus obras imperfectas. El no ha dejado la creación por terminar ni la ha abandonado a seguir indefinadamente cabalgando sobre sus propias estructuras, sin que lo ha llamado todo a Sí para que el universo entero penetre un día con Cristo en Dios.” "Eucaristía," 352.
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The Trinitarian Symbol

In Panikkar’s theological reading of the cosmos, the triune structure of Ultimate Reality--God--is reflected in the triune structure of all dimensions of the real. He advocates that this essentially trinitarian insight into the unity and multiplicity of reality has been lost in western metaphysics. His argument is that western thought has been so preoccupied with its mission of safeguarding the unity of reality and the transcendence of God that it has sacrificed awareness of the multiplicity of reality and the immanence of God.

In this view, the west has been so careful to avoid pantheism that it has preferred to risk atheism. Panikkar attaches much of the blame for this inadequate thinking on the empty and abstract concept of *being* that has so plagued western metaphysics to the point that a formal and abstract unity is imposed on *the being*, God. In his later writings, Panikkar will express this as the false correlation of the *being of God* with the *God of being*. In fact, he will reject the Western identity of *God* and *Being* altogether. In this foundational phase of his writings, while accepting that "God is essentially Being", he rejects the identification of God with "the concept of being emptied of content and

---

199 Panikkar’s analysis of the concept of *l’autonomie* reveals a double aspect: "l’un est plutôt negatif, une réaction contre l’hétéronomie. L’autre est un essai de construction d’un concept d’être qui ne requérait pas d’Etre suprême extérieur. Le premier aspect incline vers le panthéisme, le second vers l’athéisme." "Le concept d’ontonomie," 183.

200 El concepto de ser, dicen los filósofos, aunque sea el máximo en extensión, es el mínimo en comprensión, es el más pobre en contenido y de él no se puede sacar nada . . . . La lógica nos ofrecía la unidad formal y vacía del *ser*. El ser de la lógica . . . no es un producto de síntesis, sino de análisis . . . . La dificultad se resuelve, el círculo se cierra; el análisis nos da la unidad en el *ser*, la síntesis nos lleva a la unidad en *Dios.* "Visión," 16-18.

201 We discuss Panikkar’s more radical position in the forthcoming chapters.
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dispossessed of reality."202 As an extension of his dynamic understanding of nature, he argues that no static concept can be an adequate expression of the dynamic reality of God either in se or ad extra.

Moreover, in line with his theandric vision, he challenges the dualistic separation of the immanent and economic Trinity that has dominated classical christian thinking. Part of his effort is directed towards overturning this polarized understanding of the Trinity. He prefers to speak of the total harmonious relationship of the divine, human and cosmic dimensions of reality.203

On the basis of his theandric hermeneutic of the christian tradition, Panikkar presents the Trinity as the true symbol of all--and every--reality.204 His method relies on a participative form of knowledge or awareness since humans qua humans already participate in the ultimate trinitarian reality. Otherwise

202 "Dios es precisamente el ser. Dios es el que es. Dios es esencialmente el ser, es el ser que es: ens a se, ipsum esse--pero no el concepto de ser vacío de contenido y desposeído de realidad." "Visión, 18. Elsewhere, Panikkar identifies nature as "el principio activo de la actividad de un ser." Naturaleza, "La unidad del ser," 231f.

203 The notion of interrelationship among the three poles of reality--"Dios, el hombre y el mundo son las tres máximas realidades existentes"--and a hierarchical sense of cosmic order--"la concepción cristiana supo mantener la auténtica jerarquía"--pervade these writings in the early period; these quotations, "La superación del humanismo," 223.

This is not to say, of course, that the harmony has been achieved: "nunca quizá como hoy, el mundo en su totalidad, la vida humana en su complejidad, Dios en su infinitud y trascendencia, se nos presentan como problemas." "Visión," 9.
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expressed: one must first believe in order to understand. Specifically, he defines his approach not as a *via ascensionis ad Deum*—beginning with the world and seeking to prove the trinitarian existence of God—, but as a *via descensionis*—moving with the actualized knowledge of Christian faith, through the experience of earthly reality, and towards a "theo-teleological vision of the world".

This means that his focus is not on divine transcendence but on divine immanence as it is manifested in human reality and earthly life. The world is read theologically and teleologically, that is, as originating from, participating in, and returning to its divine origin, sustenance and goal. Evidently, Panikkar’s concern is not in elaborating a theology of the Trinity, but in the development of a trinitarian theology of the universe. We have already seen his

---

This is, of course, the classical understanding of theology which Panikkar seeks to bring into dialogue with the modern world. This is also why he steers away from rationalism which denies, or at least sets aside, the faith-dimension of our lives. Even in his philosophical work, Panikkar comments:

> A veces una excesiva preocupación polémica impide el desarrollo pleno de una visión del mundo, puesto que sólo se utilizan los pocos presupuestos que el adversario concede. Pero también la belleza, lo completo, la perfección posee su fuerza de atracción y de convencimiento. Y muchas veces se trata más de convencer que de demostrar. *Naturaleza*, 237.

---

No se está, pues, *in via ascensionis ad Deum*, en la cual sólo pueden suponerse muy pocas cosas, sino *in via descensionis*, en la que pueden mostrarse las enormes riquezas y profundas conexiones que se encuentran en las cosas . . . de exponer y desarrollar toda la potencialidad de la visión teo-teleológica del mundo." *Naturaleza*, 237. See also his comments on knowledge (via philosophy and theology)—*conocer*—and realization or actualization (via religion and Christian life)—*realizarlo*. "*Visión*,” 26.

---

En términos metafísicos la podríamos llamar retorno, reunificación, y en términos teológicos, recapitulación, redención; es algo dinámico a llevar a cabo, un deber, una meta." "*Visión*,” 18. Elsewhere he refers to "el concierto armónico de todos los seres creados en su imitación y regreso a Aquel en quien la Existencia coincide con su misma Esencia." *Ontonomía*, 351. See discussion on "Time" above.

---
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interest in a "theological vision of science" that moves away from abstract notions of the "essence" of God, the "nature" of the world, or the "properties" of humanness. He prefers to move towards a dynamic and relational understanding of an interconnected universe.208

In other words, Panikkar's trinitarian understanding of reality is interpreted from the perspective of existential and functional thought rather than essentialist and substantive categories. In this way, he seeks to make the classical doctrine of the Trinity accessible to modern consciousness.

Once the Trinity becomes the foundational paradigm or symbol for reading all reality, Panikkar shows new and exciting interpretative possibilities. By way of example, we follow his trinitarian hermeneutics of nature and human existence. Beginning with the first, Panikkar claims that there are three primary manifestations of nature. These are order, love and goal.209

He maintains that the order of nature is revealed less in terms of substances than relations. Since it is God who establishes the hierarchical order of the universe, this already implies an intimate relationship among all created realities. Moreover, it implies an intimate relationship with--and "natural orientation" towards--the Creator. In this relational sense, the ordo naturae cannot be considered "purely natural."210

---

208See our discussion of Panikkar's "Cosmological Testament" above.

209Panikkar's approach is `existentialist' (focussing on the dynamic movement within nature) rather than `essentialist' (dealing with the formal structure of nature from a philosophical perspective). Consequently, he states, "el estudio, no ya de sus elementos constitutivos, sino de sus manifestaciones primarias." Naturaleza, "Sus manifestaciones primarias," 233-283; quotation, 233f.

210Naturaleza, "Orden," 238-248. Panikkar deals with the order of nature under four sub-headings: "Ordo Naturae," "La ordenación natural a Dios," "Perfección" and
This aristotelian-thomistic emphasis on cosmic order is complemented by the platonic-augustinian stress on love as the primary potency and most intrinsic character of so-called "natural being". Following the mystical tradition of St Bernard, St John of the Cross, Pascal and Dionysius, Panikkar maintains that "love is our most intimate natural law...which moves the world." His dialectic of intentionality distinguishes between caritas (authentic love) and cupiditas (ego-centred self-gratification). It is the former which moves the cosmic process and is manifested in nature's orientation towards God who is this Love. Furthermore, love itself is trinitarian and so cannot be separated from the dimensions of freedom and intelligence.

The third manifestation of nature is teleological. This is interpreted as the essential dynamism of created reality that is intentionally and intrinsically oriented towards its proper, divine goal. Panikkar quickly distances his "Participación."


212 In Naturaleza (p. 261) Panikkar recognizes that the intellectual synthesis of Aristotle enabled Aquinas to propose la profunda visión cósmica by identifying the Supreme Good with God. Alternately, he states that it was the genius of Plato's psychological analysis of love as la ley universal del cosmos (p. 256) which Augustine transforms into specific christian reflection (pp. 260f.). The platonic-augustinian tradition, although evident in the more mystical exponents of Christianity (such as Bernard, John of the Cross and Pascal, p. 254), is largely lost in later scholasticism (including, here, a misreading of Aquinas, pp. 264ff.). In proposing that "el amor es nuestra ley natural más íntima" and (citing Dionysius) "lo que movía al mundo es el amor" (pp. 269f.), Panikkar attempts to reinstate the fully cosmic caritas--versus a merely psychological and adulterated cupiditas--to the christian tradition (pp. 264-269).

213 While intellect and will are the two essential moments of spiritual nature, love is the unifying power--in much the same way as 'sentiment' is the unifying power of Panikkar's anthropology. See Naturaleza, "Voluntad, inteligencia y amor," 252-254.

214 See Naturaleza, "Fin," 272-283; especially his discussion of "La
teleological interpretation from "purely natural" explanations of evolutionary determinism. He stresses that nature is not only regulated by cosmological laws; it is also regulated according to the divinely constituted order of the world and of Providence.\textsuperscript{215}

Panikkar's trinitarian hermeneutics of human existence exhibit a tri-
personal structure consisting of the interrelation of the "I", the "thou", and the equally personal "it".\textsuperscript{216} The presence of this "third reality", recognizable in the awakening consciousness of a child, is what enables distinction (without dualism) and relation (without monism) between the "I" and the "thou". "It" or "is" enables the revelation of "identity in diversity" which, he insists, is not simply a "psychological law" but is truly a "metaphysical reality" symbolized in the "three persons" of (every) language.\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{215}Y es asímismo esta finalidad intrínseca de la misma naturaleza la que sirve luego de base para explicar no sólo la regularidad de las leyes naturales en la cosmología en especial, sino también el orden del mundo y la Providencia." \textit{Naturaleza}, 283.

Panikkar's discussion of the "Law of Entropy" is a good example of where scientific laws are operative within their own sphere, but are more primordially dependent on the higher principles of the universe. See discussion above.

\textsuperscript{216}See "Confidencia" under the heading of "La estructura tripersonal de la existencia humana," 60f.

\textsuperscript{217}El despertar de la conciencia en el niño no toma al principio la forma de un `yo', ni menos la de un `tú', sino la forma igualmente personal de un `él' . . . una tercera realidad frente a su interlocutor. . . . Este proceso psicogenético representa algo más que una simple evolución psicológica; representa un realidad metafísica . . . La relación \textit{yo-tu} sólo es posible dentro del ámbito de un él." "Confidencia," 60.
This leads Panikkar to challenge the psychological interpretation of the evangelical precept of "loving one's neighbor as oneself." He advocates that the psychological interpretation is reduced to a kind of 'pretence' where one 'imagines' the neighbor to be oneself (whereas, in reality, one 'knows' that he or she is an 'other'). Panikkar's alternative proposal accepts the precept as a metaphysical revelation of the tri-personal relatedness of all human beings. This interpretation refuses to accept the ultimate 'otherness' of the neighbor since, at this relational level, the human 'other' is seen to be a real and constitutive dimension of oneself.218

Panikkar proceeds to apply his relational hermeneutics of the human person to his understanding of God. He says that God is not an other, or even the Other, but the ultimate reality, the third and primary factor, the "is" in which everyone and everything "exists."219 Trinitarian hermeneutics emphasize relationality as the fundament of human, earthly and divine existence.

---

Here Panikkar also gives the example of the mystic's relation with God--"la identidad en la diversidad"--which must be trinitarian in order to avoid the pitfalls of pantheism, monism and dualism.

218"Yo no debo amar al prójimo como a mí mismo porque así está mandado, interpretando entonces el "como" al estilo de "als ob", de un "como si"; esto es, yo no debo amar al prójimo recurriendo a la ficción piadosa "como si" fuese a mí mismo, sino que debo amarlo como a mí-mismo porque en verdad él es mi mismo. Esto equivale a decir que el precepto evangélico nos revela la realidad: Ama al prójimo como lo que realmente es, una parte de ti mismo . . . . " "Confidencia," 61.

This has important implications for the concept of the divine which is associated less with the "Thou" than with the "Is". For another perspective on Panikkar's understanding of the relational dimension of the human being, see his "Sur l'anthropologie du prochain," L'homme et son prochain: Acts of the Eighth Congress of the Society of Philosophy of the French Language. Paris: PUF, 1956: 228-231. Here, Panikkar distinguishes between the individual and the person; he also stresses the innate 'dialogical' structure of the human being.

219Dios no es el 'Otro' sino el `Uno' y cabalmente tan plenamente `uno' que es el `Tri-uno', la plenitud del Uno y de la Unidad. Dios no ha creado el mundo fuera
Evidently the Trinity emerges as Panikkar's most powerful symbol of reality in all its dimensions (multiplicity) and in its totality (the whole). Consequently, the Trinity is seen as the symbolic reflection of the cosmos (matter, space and time), the symbolic manifestation of human existence (intelligence, will and sentiment) and the symbolic revelation of the divine reality (Father, Son and Spirit). Panikkar's trinitarian hermeneutics seeks to recover the forgotten aspects of the whole reality and to reintegrate them into a worldview that is equally accessible to traditional and modern forms of consciousness.

He seems to suggest that monistic and dualistic worldviews spring from the absence of attention to the third factor, whether this be cosmic time, human sentiment or divine Spirit. Certainly, he believes that only a "trinitarian consciousness" is capable of remaining open to the mystical or hidden dimensions of reality. Above all, as the foundational symbol and mysterious goal of the universe, the Trinity is a constant reminder that reality is not totally accessible to the human mind. Without the mystery (pneuma) and the silence (mythos), all our knowledge (logos) will leave us spiritual orphans in a fragmented world.

Panikkar's theological writings do not all begin with the dogmas of Christian faith which are then brought into dialogue with modern experience. He also offers a series of theological reflections which take the modern experience of de El, no la creación le es extraña." "Confidencia," 61.

Panikkar is often critical of the over-dependence of Christian thought on Greek philosophical categories, especially in regard to "la enorme tensión entre Dios y las criaturas" which is "el punto endeble de la filosofia griega"; in contrast, the Christian revelation stresses that "todos las cosas de este mundo sólo son . . . porque participan del Ser de quien dependen totalmente en su ser y en su actuar (citing Aquinas)." Naturaleza, 102, 106.
alienation and emptiness as their starting point. In turn, he brings that experience into conversation with forgotten dimensions of Christian belief. We now turn to a brief discussion of these writings.

The Hidden God

In the introduction to the chapter, we referred to Panikkar’s depiction of post-enlightenment experience as one of negativity, sickness, disease, anxiety and restlessness which have extended to all dimensions of human life. This experience of dislocation is explicitly linked to the "disappearance of God" from the public arena resulting in a "profound shock" to human consciousness. No longer marked by the "messianic consciousness" of Christian antiquity, nor the "ingenuity of Christian faith" in the Middle Ages, the modern experiment leaves the human being in a state of profound disorientation. God is no longer to be found meddling in human affairs; nor is the human being any longer tolerant of divine manifestations.

The crisis of Christian belief is not only personal; equally, it embraces the social, political and historical dimensions of human life. In all, the crisis amounts to a new cultural experience of the void. Panikkar states explicitly that the "eclipse of God" has become the cultural and historical issue of modern times.

---

220 No tiene tampoco aquella conciencia de Iglesia y aquel espíritu escatológica de la primitiva cristianidad. . . . Ha perdido también la fe ingenua--y recía--de la Edad Media." "De Deo abscondito," Arbor (Madrid), no. 25 (1948), 1-26; republished in Humanismo, 254-290; references to Humanismo; quotation, 264.

221 El mundo moderno . . . no se tolera la manifestación de lo divino. Si Dios existe, su sitio está en el fondo de las conciencias, escondido del ritmo de la vida ordinaria, que prefiere manejarle sin El . . . . El pueblo cristiano . . . no se admiten teofanías." "De Deo abscondito," 266f.

222 Este eclipse de Dios es, pues, un hecho cultural de nuestro tiempo." "De Deo
Bringing this experience into dialogue with the Christian tradition, he begins in rhetorical fashion by asking if we should attribute the situation to "human fault" or "divine error." As his reflections indicate, we need to seek a resolution to the modern dilemma with reference to both divine and human factors.

First, Panikkar states that we cannot approach the problem on a purely intellectual level. Reason must be enlightened by Christian faith and the mystery of the Cross. He suggests that it is only through the eyes of the Cross that we can recognize the real chaos and disorder of the world without, at the same time, converting evil into an absolute.

Second, he relates the problematic to the classical understanding of the ineffable mystery of God which, he insists, is "pure Catholic doctrine." He notes that Jesus himself, the prophets before him, and Christian commentators throughout the centuries have all taught that there is an ineffable, transcendent and hidden dimension within God. This enables a positive theological account

---

223 "Frente a él cabe una doble postura: achar la culpa al hombre o atribuir el error a Dios." "De Deo abscondito," 269.

224 "De Deo abscondito," 254-290; esp. 257.

225 Panikkar compares this approach with rationalism: "desde un punto de vista racional el mal es grave . . . ; se racionaliza el mal, y con ello se le convierte en absoluto." "De Deo abscondito," 256.


227 The apophatic dimension of God appears in the Scriptures (e.g. Is.14:15; 1 Tim.6:16), is taught by the Fathers, developed by St Thomas in his "negative theology", is an important teaching of the Christian mystics (e.g. John of the Cross and Meister Eckhart), and is a recurrent theme in the modern theology of Hans von Balthasar, to cite just a few of Panikkar’s sources. See his writings—and appropriate footnotes—in "De Deo abscondito" (“Dios es un Ser Escondido” and “La Discreción
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of the disappearance of God from post-enlightenment consciousness in terms of a *new* manifestation of the profound, vital and absolute transcendence of God.

Third, while admitting that the experience of the void is more deep and more profound in modern culture, it is nonetheless related to the theology of the Incarnation and the Cross as well as to the doctrines of Creation and Original Sin.\(^2^{28}\)

In the light of these theological reflections, Panikkar says that the modern experience of anguish and dislocation can be interpreted as a challenge to human illusions, a *new purification* of the mind and soul and, indeed, as a *new experience* of the hidden God of invisible light.\(^2^{29}\) Consequently, while things may *seem* to hold their own meaning without reference to Christian faith or theistic awareness in modern consciousness, this is partially explicable with reference to divine revelation and the "darkness of God."\(^2^{30}\) However, this positive

\(^{2^{28}}\)De *Deo abscondito*," 274, 276, 269. For example, Panikkar specifically relates the "eclipse of God" to the act of creation in a manner that is similar to Origen's doctrine of the "cosmic fall": "Es el hombre, mejor dicho, es la opaca masa del pecado del hombre la que se interpone entre Dios y la criatura, originando el eclipse de Dios en el mundo creado." Ibid., 269.

\(^{2^{29}}\)Panikkar refers to the need for an "evangelical metanoia" defined as "una nueva purificación de la mente, para que ésta, eliminando la penumbra culpable del eclipse, penetre a través del rayo de tiniebla (this phrase attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite) en la Luz invisible de la Divinidad." "De *Deo abscondito*," 289.

Panikkar’s sense of "human culpability" should not be directly equated with personal sinfulness unrelated to the more primordial mystery of iniquity, to what theologians today call "social sin" as culturally-reinforced prejudice.

\(^{2^{30}}\)La incongruencia de nuestra época estriba en que las cosas parecen tener sentido desligadas totalmente de Dios. La penumbra debida al eclipse culpable de Dios--distinta de su propia descreción--nos impide ver los verdaderos fundamentos
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hermeneutic of the modern experience of darkness requires a complementary ‘human' perspective.

Through the consistent application of his foundational philosophical principles, Panikkar perceives that part of the ‘blame’ for God's disappearance must be attributed to rationalism and humanism. He perceives rationalism as the reign of disincarnated reason which inevitably destroys the authenticity of christian faith. Alternately, humanism represents an inadequate anthropology: human transcendence is retarded so that the fundamental truth of reality is perceived in the "half-light". These doctrines of modern culture are held responsible for the naive optimism and ill-based individualism that are enshrined in liberal philosophies of progress. In more radical expressions, they explicitly deny the reality of the christian faith along with its doctrines of grace and revelation.

Panikkar is convinced that modern ideologies, while providing valuable insight into the historical and temporal reality of the world, are intrinsically myopic. For example, while applauding the modern emphasis on personal freedom, he critiques the prevailing humanistic ethos which thinks that freedom can be achieved solely through reliance on human reason and technology. In

---

231"No es que Dios se haya eclipsado, sino que el hombre se ha empequeñecido y contentado con ser menos que hombre. . . . La penumbra . . . nos impide ver los verdaderos fundamentos de las cosas." "De Deo abscondito," 288f.

232See Panikkar's treatment of the "solución progresista" in "De Deo abscondito," 286.
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turn, he suggests that reason and technology are of significant, but relative, value.\textsuperscript{233}

However, Panikkar does not restrict his critique to rationalist and humanist modes of thought. He is equally dismissive of the "transcendental solution" which, in his interpretation, limits final truth and salvation to purely individualist and eschatological categories. In so doing, it is inevitably blind to the dynamic reality of God’s (hidden) presence in the profane and secular world.\textsuperscript{234} Evidently, these are all expressions of at least partial human responsibility for the demise of God in modern culture.

Moving back to a more extended reflection of the meaning of this modern "eclipse of God," Panikkar centres those reflections on the hidden and dynamic mystery of the \textit{Cross}. Rejecting the "suffering God" theology of some modern schools of thought, he does not present the Cross as the immolation or crucifixion of God. To the contrary, the Cross is seen as providing the world with that "divine current" which is necessary for its proper destiny.\textsuperscript{235} Therefore, the Cross represents \textit{both} the profound structure of human history \textit{and} the final immolation of all things in God.\textsuperscript{236}

\textsuperscript{233}For example: "La técnica no está ahí para sustituir al espíritu, sino par ayudarlo. . . . La técnica estará al servicio del hombre." "Cristiandad y cruz," 317, 329.

\textsuperscript{234}The phrase--"Dios es también un asunto profano"--is attributed to Ortega y Gasset. Panikkar’s discussion of three possible solutions--the "transcendent", the "immanent" and the "progressive"--leads him to a fourth "realist solution" which attempts to integrate the insights of each position. "De Deo abscondito," 285ff.

\textsuperscript{235}For example: "Lo terrenal tiene tanta importancia porque está impregnado de eternidad"; and "La cruz la que mantiene abierta esta diferencia de potencial para que corriente divina circule por entre los hombres." "Los primeros cristianos" and "Cristiandad y cruz," 136 & 316.

\textsuperscript{236}Although Panikkar’s expression may appear awkward, he is not denying that,
Panikkar’s christocentric, cosmic and existential vision of the universe incorporates creation, incarnation and the final fulfillment of the world as three interrelated and integral poles of one dynamic historical-transcendental movement. History and culture are not incidental within this movement, but neither are they final. Whereas traditional christian awareness emphasized transcendence, and modern consciousness emphasizes history, a theandric vision holds both dimensions together in creative tension.\(^{237}\)

Within this view, the "hidden mystery" of God is always reflected in the personal, social, cultural and political dimensions of earthly life "under the Cross" of incompleteness and impermanence.\(^{238}\) Consequently, far from denigrating the value of the modern experience of negativity, the mystery of the Cross raises that experience to the level of a "revelatory moment" in the history of divine self-disclosure.\(^{239}\) The Cross also shows the true significance of human

---

\(^{237}\) Panikkar’s integral vision of transcendence and history is most fully symbolized in the mystery of Christ who is described as both an ontic and an historical fact. "Realismo y Microdoxia," *Humanismo*, 115. The importance of history is recognizable when he says: "la presencia de Cristo . . . no es un fenómeno subjetivo o sentimental, sino hecho real y auténtico." "La acción misionera," *Humanismo*, 155.

\(^{238}\) See our discussion of Panikkar’s "Cosmological Testament" in the first part of this chapter. The precise socio-cultural implications of facing the void are not strongly addressed by Panikkar in this period of his writing, but become a significant theme of later works as a result of his introduction to the Buddhist and Secularist traditions. See his *Técnica y tiempo* (Buenos Aires: Columba, 1967) and *El silencio del Dios* (Madrid: Guadiana, 1970) which will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

\(^{239}\) Panikkar comments: "Esta es la tarea que se le presenta al hombre moderno: ..."
freedom by relating the value of human acts to the cosmic destiny of the universe. This finally positive reading of modern negativity suggests that the disappearance of God from contemporary consciousness is a potentially transformative moment in the historical unfolding of the cosmos.

* * * * *

Panikkar's foundational theology follows the same dialogical method he exhibits in his scientific and anthropological writings. Classical christian understandings are filtered through the eyes of post-Enlightenment perceptions of reality, and modern cultural understanding is interpreted under the broader horizon of classical christian teachings. The fruits of his theological dialogue can be summarized in the following manner. Christ is the center of the universe and the Church is necessary for salvation. However, these central doctrines of the Christian faith are not the exclusive property of any one historical tradition. Panikkar's inclusivist hermeneutics stress a cosmo-theological reading of christian revelation which rejects all dualistic interpretations of nature and grace, history and transcendence, time and eternity. This also means that the divine presence is falsely interpreted when it is set within an overly spiritualized and individualized eschatology. The post-enlightenment insight into temporality and

---

240 “La libertad human es una fuerza cósmica que rige el destino y la vuelta del universo hacia Dios . . . . La historia del mundo no está regida por unas rígidas leyes fatales.” “Cristiandad y cruz,” 325 & 323.

---
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Panikkar's trinitarian hermeneutics challenge exaggerated western metaphysical assumptions regarding the unicity of being and the transcendence of God. Reality is also manifested in diversity and multiplicity; and the divine presence is truly immanent within the world. Existentialist thought is much more alive to the dynamic character within the created universe. The Trinity emerges in Panikkar's thought as his most powerful symbol of "unity-in-diversity" which is not confined to the mystery of the Godhead--One God revealed as Threefold- -, but permeates every dimension of reality. Accordingly, the trinitarian symbol is applied to the world of nature (order-love-goal), to the structure of interpersonal existence (I-thou-it) as well as to the `whole' (cosmic-human-divine) reality. Evidently, Panikkar's trinitarian universe is understood in relational terms, reflecting the inner dynamism of the ultimate (trinitarian) reality. The approach shows how modern consciousness is able to retrieve and throw new light onto classical christian doctrines.

There remains the more fundamental question of whether or not modern thought is capable of dialoguing with a God who has seemingly disappeared from the historical stage. Panikkar recognizes that the disappearance of God from modern consciousness is an historical and cultural reality. He also suggests that it represents a "profound shock" or a new cultural experience of "the void." Addressing the issue theologically, he draws on the classical understanding of God's transcendence and hiddenness. This enables an interpretation of the modern "eclipse of God" in terms of a new and more profound experience of the hiddenness and darkness of God. Nonetheless, there is need to acknowledge
human responsibility for the modern state of affairs. In particular, rationalism and humanism retard an understanding of the full truth of reality. While also rejecting the over-spiritualized "transcendental solution," Panikkar provides a cosmo-theandric reading of the mystery of the Cross in which the historical particularity of modern culture is intimately related to the final destiny of the universe. Consequently, through the experience of the void, modernity is invited to a new revelatory experience that encourages human freedom and responsibility in the history of divine self-disclosure.

**Summary of Chapter Two**

Panikkar’s foundational writings are evidently an interdisciplinary attempt to bring classical christian teachings into dialogue with post-enlightenment thought and consciousness. By way of brief review and analysis, we now indicate some of the major features of those writings with particular emphasis on the principles, themes and methods which have significant influence on his later approaches to interreligious and cross-cultural dialogue.

First of all, we recognize the hermeneutical character of these writings whereby a plurality of sources is brought to the conversation-table in the belief that a forward-projected horizon of meaning will mediate dialogue and understanding. In this, Panikkar assumes an overarching interconnectedness within the historical development and forward movement of western culture. Consequently, classical christian consciousness and modern forms of awareness, although seemingly opposed in their metaphysical assumptions of reality, display deeper levels of common understanding that emerge in the cross-temporal and multidisciplinary conversation. Panikkar searches for a
higher synthesis that is faithful to the central insights of both classical christianity and modern existentialist thought.

Second, there is an attempt to thematize the underlying unity within the multiplicity of sources via the philosophical category of ontonomy. The ontonomic principle establishes the legitimate authority of all fields of enquiry, according to their own established methods, within their respective areas of competence. Consequently, the principle challenges the presumed universality of any particular academic discipline or methodological procedure. Equally, it insists on the existence of a fundamental interrelationship among diverse disciplines and methods.

Evidently, the principle of ontonomy underlies Panikkar's attempt to deal with scientific, philosophical and theological issues in a way that respects both their individual competencies and their mutual relationships. By way of example, he provides us with foundations for both a philosophical and a theological vision of science.

Third, Panikkar ventures into the field of epistemology. One of Panikkar's more conspicuous procedural enemies is dualism. Traditional christian hermeneutics and post-modern philosophies are equally accused of this methodological sin. In the former instance, it is displayed in the dichotomies of nature and grace, history and transcendence. In the case of modern thought, dualism is expressed in the cartesian--and jacobian--division between mind and spirit, reason and intuition.

Much of Panikkar's anthropological thesis is directed towards finding a solution to these dualistic epistemologies. He does so via his philosophy of sentiment and his notion of theandric confidence which reinstate supernatural
and suprarational faith as the integrating faculty of knowledge. This becomes the basis of his critique of rationalism and humanism. However, it is does not deny modern insight into the temporality and historicity of human existence. Faith and transcendence are understood in historical, cultural and social terms that do not override the ultimate significance of time, history and the cosmos. Individualistic and over-spiritualized notions of faith and transcendence are considered as equally reductionist--and dualistic--as modern epistemologies that deny or severely retard their significance.

Fourth, we are presented with a telo-theological view of the universe. Central christian dogmas of Christ and the Trinity, Creation and the Eschaton, the Church and the Eucharist, the Cross and Resurrection, Original Sin and the Incarnation, are all interpreted according to the dynamic thrust of the cosmos and the transcendent goal of human history. Panikkar’s telo-theological vision is advanced with reference to the modern shift of consciousness from a static to an evolutionary worldview. A significant feature of his work is the dynamic reinterpretation of classical philosophical sources and the gathering together of modern scientific evidence that indicate the dynamic thrust and transcendence of reality.

Although Panikkar does not yet explicitly use the term "cosmotheandric" to describe this reality, it is already implied in his "theandric" and "cosmic" view of the universe in which the divine, human and cosmic dimensions of reality are interpreted in their fundamental interrelationality. Consequently, we are confident in asserting that these initial cosmological, anthropological and theological studies provide the foundations for the "cosmotheandric principle" as it emerges in his later writings.

© Gerard Hall. Raimon Panikkar’s Hermeneutics of Religious Pluralism. Ch. 2 “Christianity and Modernity in Dialogue: Panikkar’s Interdisciplinary Foundations”
Finally, given this dynamic and transcendent view of reality, Panikkar recognizes that human experience of the divine is also evolving. In modern western culture, this is interpreted as a new revelation of God's hiddenness which is a significant, if until now largely ignored, dimension of divine transcendence according to traditional teaching. Certainly, this new experience of the divine may also be largely unrecognized as the result of the profound shock of God's disappearance from post-Enlightenment consciousness. However, in the full awareness that history and cultures do not stand still, Panikkar perceives that human consciousness will be increasingly and inevitably related to an emerging global awareness of cultural and religious interconnectedness.

Accordingly, Panikkar perceives that the 'christian' west is called upon to dialogue with eastern cultures and religions. His own life takes this 'turn' to the east so that his future academic work consists in converting his interdisciplinary foundations into cross-cultural and interreligious hermeneutics. His move towards this extended East-West conversation, beginning in earnest during the late 1950s and early 1960s, provides the subject-matter for our discussion in the following chapter.