

"THE UNIVERSAL ANDALUSIAN," "THE ZEALOUS ANDALUSIAN," AND THE "ANDALUSIAN ELEGY"

Richard A. Cardwell
University of Nottingham

"Don Francisco, who in life was a consummate teacher," wrote Juan Ramón in the early 1920s, "was above all the embodiment of his own philosophy. As a consequence, his infectious example was in his person more than in his written work. . . . What attracted me about Don Francisco's philosophy," he went on, "was the human result" (*LPr*, p. 923).¹ For the Universal Andalusian, Juan Ramón Jiménez, his countryman, Francisco Giner de los Ríos (1839–1915), founder of the liberal *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* (1876), mentor directly or indirectly of such great writers as Unamuno, Antonio Machado, and Ortega, and follower of the idealistic post-Kantian Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781–1832), represented the very incarnation of the pattern for man set out in Sanz del Río's adaptation of Krause's *Ideal de la humanidad para la vida* (1860). Such was Jiménez' admiration for Giner that he became a devoted disciple. So great was the impact of Giner's ideas that Jiménez' expression took on the coloring of Krausist rhetoric. "This young man," wrote Juan Ramón of himself, "must conserve in his natural destiny as a legacy of Francisco Giner three eternal cultural goals: intelligence, sensitivity, and conscience (1915)" (*LPr*, p. 925). Obligation, destiny, cultural goals, intelligence, sensitivity, conscience are all central terms in the Krausist lexicon. But they are also used frequently by Jiménez, especially after 1913. In these two notes on the man whom he called "The Zealous Andalusian," and in other essays, we perceive the profound influence the older man exercised over Juan Ramón's thinking. We note the stress on education, on living example, the sense of determinative forces and an emphasis on spiritual qualities. What was the nature of Giner's legacy?

I have argued elsewhere² that even before meeting Don Francisco in 1902, Juan Ramón's attitudes were shaped, in part, by Krausism. On renewed contact with their coteries that influence was to become permanent. It is hardly surprising that Giner's philosophy should have proven attractive. For one thing, Krausist pantheism identified the fundamental categories of finite beauty with the infinite beauty of God. The pursuit of beauty is the search for God. Indeed, Krausism fuses Beauty, Goodness and Truth "... to constitute the fundamental accord in life's harmony and essence."³ The pursuit of beauty, therefore, is no mere escapist aestheticism, for it combines both an ethical and a metaphysical dynamic. In addition, Krausism was essentially a creative philosophy and an élitist one, two qualities likely to attract a Modernist aesthete like Juan Ramón.

Although Sanz del Río's *Ideal* is a philosophical work, it is not speculative in nature. Krause's view that any theory which overlooked the new dimension of the Kantian ethical imperative could have little claim to serious consideration lends Sanz del Río's message a peculiar cast. The *Ideal* stresses action; it formulates a messianic message for the redemption of mankind as individuals not through intercession but through man himself. As such it has a strong ethical emphasis. The *Ideal* set down guidelines whereby man might be brought to act in a particular way. In place of the prescriptive element of Catholicism, it allowed the individual to reflect on his destiny, to live fully, seizing each unrepeatable moment in order to realize the potential for perfectibility. By special training one would come to an insight into the latent and future possibilities offered, so that by acting in harmony with the intimations for future conduct one would fulfill the divine ends for which the individual was created. Giner set out this view in *La universidad española*:

The philosopher's function is not to create ideal movements that in each society develop according to historical conditions, but rather to reflect upon these movements and elaborate them in a more or less complex system of formulae in which he will discover the profundities of the spirit of his time, something that not everyone manages to see clearly, for such insight can be gained only by means of a laborious professional preparation. (II, p. 6)⁴

This raises three issues: man might interfere with but cannot stop his ultimate progress towards his destiny and redemption, for the

Krausists believed it to be a historical process; with proper preparation man can perceive the "espíritu del tiempo" and act in harmony with it; to bring about his ultimate perfectibility and the divine design he must be spiritually prepared. An addendum to this belief in a perfect and proximate world in which each man will realize his full potential, inevitable as the historical process is, would be that there exists a minority of initiates whose mission and whose spiritual preparation would consist in directing those less gifted along the proper path. Their task is to persuade their fellows of the inevitability of the new order, of the necessity for them to contribute to and, if possible, hasten its happy fulfillment. Those who can "see clearly" have a duty and vocation to promote the "ideal of humanity." Indeed, for many Krausists it was a sacred mission, an evangelization:

Elevated to this spiritual and intellectual priesthood . . . , it will be our first duty to teach truth, to propagate it and *to live exclusively for it*. . . . You should honor your teaching with *the testimony of your conduct* and defend it like the religion of your state. . . .⁵

From this and the many pronouncements in the works of Giner it is clear that the Krausist pedagogues had a profound belief and an absolute confidence in the power of education. But their teaching was made most effective by their living example, hence the strong ethical cast to their outlook. Their simple lifestyle, their sober dress, their optimistic idealism, their belief in inevitable progress and perfectability, their pride in the certain success of the Good News set them apart. Giner wrote that the number of men who live by such spirit is still very limited. However, the seeds for growth are present:

As a general rule every awakening is generated by a minority; perhaps at the present time . . . this ideal life is the monopoly of a small aristocracy in the midst of an immense crude demogogy. (XVII, p. 150)

Jiménez' adoption of the tag "la inmensa minoría" and his persistent use of the term *aristocracia* with reference to Giner and spiritual renewal might properly be linked with the above statement.⁶ This, then, is the background to the acknowledged legacy of Giner de los Ríos, one which was to color the tone of his differentiation of "committed poets" and what he felt to be the "genuine" poet in 1936:

"The human and divine obligation of the poet is to fulfill, as a free man though his conscience and as a willing slave to his vocation, his disclosed destiny" (*EEE*, p. 178).

In 1903 Jiménez spoke in terms that recall the messianism alluded to above when he praised "a generation of young people who want to work . . . and who are moving forward" (*LPr*, p. 250). Four years later we find another rallying cry: "Uplift life! Pleasant daily work" (*LPr*, p. 253). Idealism and élitism; example and action. While in these and other statements there dominates an emphasis on Art and Beauty, both aspects are combined, as in Krausism, with an undeniable ethical cast. The editorial "Glosarios" and the pages of *Helios* (1903–1904), with the constant references to art (and especially poetry) and its power to bring about a spiritual and moral regeneration, as well as the autobiographical note published in *Renacimiento* in 1907, underline the progressive idealism of the poet's aspirations. His reading of Shelley from 1904 onwards, which probably confirmed from another perspective the direction of his Krausist inspired aesthetics, gave fresh impetus to his idealism.⁷ His adaptation, in "Habla el poeta. (Nota autobiográfica)," of Thomas à Kempis' quietism does not mark a process of withdrawal as some biographers have suggested. It indicates, rather, a resolve to listen to the dictates of the inner spirit, a rejection of the interests of the mass and material preoccupations. In his gloss on à Kempis' words there lies an affirmation of faith which needs no justification other than the experiencing subject, the "I." It implies a moral imperative, an *a priori* principle that recalls Krausist thinking. In a letter to Louise Grimm⁸ from Moguer, which can be dated 1909, he wrote:

There is a life that is spiritual that lives within real life; the fact is that the life of feelings and ideas is the only life. (Ms. Cartas. Caja 13. 67. AHN)

Perhaps the clearest statement of belief is to be found in a manuscript note written circa 1922. It is a comment which may explain much of the enthusiasm for the work and personality of Rabindranath Tagore and help us understand the *genuine* similarities between his writings and those of Jiménez that reach beyond the coincidental verbal echoes established by Palau de Nemes in *Vida y obra de Juan Ramón Jiménez: La poesía desnuda* (Madrid, 1974). It seems clear that Tagore, like Emerson or Rodó, incarnated for Jiménez:

the Ginerian "life" and "man," "*el hombre completo . . . who saw with his own eyes Goodness, Truth and Beauty in their natural center.*" (Ms. Caja 8. 32/50. AHN)

The growing strength of Juan Ramón's belief in the power of poetry to promote a spiritual revival in himself and in his fellows, especially after 1902, cannot be understood without reference to the contacts, intellectual and personal, that he made during this period.

II

My study of the early period has traced the initial contacts with the Buena Nueva of Krausism. Thus, when Juan Ramón entered the care of Dr. Luis Simarro in May 1901 and renewed contact with him in 1902, he was already an eager convert. Through Simarro he was introduced to the intellectuals in the Institución Libre de Enseñanza. His association with these men—Giner, Cossio, Rubio,⁹ Achúcarro—, his attendance at their classes, the year spent in Simarro's house, his training in English and German under the Krausist Angel del Pino Sardá, all had their effect. But one name, among all these, stands out: Francisco Giner de los Ríos. It was a contact which was to prove seminal.

I was not educated in the Institución Libre nor was I a pupil of Francisco Giner as has been written. I met him when I was 21 years old (1902). And I learned from him then, *watching him teach children, part of what is best about my poetry*; I witnessed in the school garden, the dining hall, classes the *beautiful poetic spectacle of his intimate pedagogy*. . . . *The personal, not the imaginative realization of my poetry*: in love, religion, education. *A good employment for poets because they will find in its undertaking a principle of inspiration and a useful goal.* (c. 1916; AO, p. 85) [Italics mine].

We might notice, in passing, the emphasis throughout this essay on personal action and intervention, on education and example in all spheres of human activity, on moral improvement, the equation of

such action with *poesía* and the elevation of this process to the status of an axiom. Jiménez relegates an art of the imagination to give precedence to a 'poetry' of conduct. Inspiration, the process of artistic vibration and insight, becomes a sort of categorical imperative (*principio*), and the creative process itself (*desempeño*), be it the act of composition or the act of living, confers validity upon that process and gives it meaning (*utilidad fin*). Such a statement is certainly Krausist in tone.

Contact with Giner and the *institucionistas* was resumed in the last days of 1912. At that point Jiménez renewed his friendship with Achúcarro and, through him, began to frequent the newly-formed Residencia de Estudiantes. This intellectual center, to all intents and purposes an extension of the Institución, was soon to become Juan Ramón's home. Neither Achúcarro nor Giner had been forgotten in the interval between 1905 and 1912. The unpublished collection *Poemas agrestes* (1910-1911) was dedicated in its entirety to the latter and the first section to his doctor friend. The relationship between Giner and Juan Ramón was evidently a close one and there existed an intimate bond of kinship. In September 1915, some seven months after the death of Giner, Juan Ramón confided his deep affection to Guerrero Ruiz:

He tells me he was a friend of Don Francisco's since the age of nineteen,¹⁰ because the master sought him out. . . . The poet dined every Friday in don Francisco's house, and during difficult times, Giner . . . went to him, and vice versa. He was not a *saint*, as is often said; rather a man of passion and struggle, but with admirable spirit he kept himself in check. . . . His work was his life, an exemplary life, marvelous and pure. Giner was pure flame. (VV, pp. 40-41)

Once again the stress on conduct, on understanding, on sobriety and self-discipline, on greatness of spirit. This comment, like the obituary essay published in *España*, the essays in *Presente* and *Espanoles de tres mundos* and the numerous notes now collected under the title *Un andaluz de fuego* stress Giner's example and his power to galvanize latent spiritual strengths in others. The tone of continued admiration in Guerrero's memoirs and in an essay as late as 1946 (*TG*, p.225) suggest that the older man's example was more than a passing interlude. Yet despite this evidence of protracted respect and affection, the enormous bulk of Jiménez criticism has only the most

cursory comment on the impact Giner and the *krausistas* had on Juan Ramón's ideology and work.

III

In what follows I should like to take the story of Jiménez' Krausist affiliations a stage forward to consider the period 1905–1920. I propose to examine in some detail the one work which received the seal of approval from Giner himself: *Platero y yo* (*Elegía andaluza*). It is also the work by which Jiménez is universally known. But it has rarely been considered within the context of Jiménez' Krausist orientated *ética estética*.¹¹ Indeed, many critics treat *Platero* as if it were a thing apart, quite unrelated to the main corpus of his poetry. I hope to show that it represents a major statement of the poet's idealism, that it was written under the spell of Giner's example, and that, like that example, *Platero* was intended as 'una pedagogía íntima.'

We can be fairly certain that *Platero y yo* was begun on Jiménez' return to Moguer in 1905 (*CI*, p. 160). The bulk of the book was completed by 1907 as the date of "A Platero en el cielo de Moguer" suggests. It was subsequently revised between 1912 and 1914. The first, abbreviated, edition for children appeared in December 1914 under the La Lectura, Biblioteca de Juventud, imprint. It reappeared in 1916 in augmented form with a new concluding essay. It was written, then, during periods of close contact with the Institución.

One of Giner's major themes was education, but in the widest sense. "The Institución does not pretend to limit itself to instruction, but to endeavor to form men useful to the service of Humanity and their country" (VII, p. 41), argued Giner, echoing the general theme of Krause's *Ideal*. One of the other central features of Giner's scheme was the development of an artistic sense (XII, p. 57) which was to go hand in hand with the formation of a religious sense, free of dogma and truly ecumenical (VII, p. 68). *Platero* would clearly qualify under both headings. But to any educational reforms Giner would add a rider:

Let it be remembered that in not only the education of children but in that of men of all ages, the action of moving from outside to

inside is the only one that can stimulate the personal individual reform of others. (VII, p. 151)

Do these statements not echo the idealistic temper of Juan Ramón's early essays? In spite of Modernist phrasing, the central assertion of noble, living example is evident in his writings of the turn of the century. In "Rejas de oro" of 1900 he hinted at the power of "great souls" to promote idealism in others. But by 1902 the coloring is entirely Krausist:

One must conjure up poetry as an action, a spiritual force that by desiring to be more, developing within itself, creates with its own essence a new life. ("Apuntes," *Madrid Cómico*, XI, no. 24, 14 June 1902)

Poesía is clearly more than verse; it is a life-style, a spiritual impulse toward man's redemption and it is a means to self-fulfillment. By 1913 the sermonizing tone is marked. The *advertencia* to *Platero* is addressed to "Adults who may read this book for children." The book is intended, wrote Jiménez, for those readers for whom poets write. We must take it that he means those who are susceptible to some form of spiritual or aesthetic influence of example remembering that in Krausist teaching the two are inseparable.

But poets also write to create in others the simulacrum of the spiritual experience of the artist.¹² While *Platero* evokes something of the magic of childhood it is quite unlike the *Entes y sombras de mi infancia*. The world of *Platero* is certainly one of escape as Jiménez admits. It is one which he would not easily give up. He also describes this world as "a spiritual island fallen from heaven . . . an island of grace, freshness and good fortune" (*LPr*, p. 547). The terms used here, which reformulate the phraseology of Giner, may suggest that the *isla* is no ordinary paradise but the world of the *Ideal* where God's purpose for man is realized on earth. *Platero* not only gives the reader a vision of that world but it teaches him how that world might be realized since Jiménez' creation encapsulates Giner's "Pedagogía íntima." Jiménez' regard for children, which grew in strength in advancing age,¹³ took material form here and, in 1932, in *Poesía en prosa y verso (1902-1932)*, escogida para los niños por Zenobia Camprubi Aymar (Madrid: Signo, 1932). The norms for the selection are expressed in Ginerian terms: first, descriptions of feeling; second, luminous spirituality; third, free idealism. . . . "Nature," Juan Ramón

goes on to say, "does not know how to hide anything from the child: the child will take from Nature whatever is suitable, whatever it 'learns.' Poetry is the same. . . ." That is, both art, in the form of its highest expression poetry, and nature, have the power to stimulate in the child and the man the three aspects detailed: the aesthetically imaginative, the spiritual and the idealistic. The child responds to them in an intuitive way with an evident aesthetic emphasis. The effect of a work of art is thus an important one both as a record of "life" and of beauty. Let us examine this "spiritual island fallen from heaven." From the outset Jiménez shared with Giner a dislike of the activities in which the majority of their fellow Spaniards took pleasure. In the essay in *Renacimiento* Juan Ramón voiced his antipathy clearly enough:

. . . I love outward order and inner unrest. I don't smoke, I don't drink wine, I hate cafés and the bullring, religion and militarism, the accordion and the death penalty.

In a manuscript note written about the same time he copied this passage and added a significant sentence. "I live only *by* and *for* Beauty" (Caja 16, 95/24 AHN. See also *LPr*, pp. 942–943). The extension of the prepositional phrase to include *para* where *por* might have served or vice versa can only be fully understood in the context we have been examining. Beauty (which includes Goodness and Truth) is not only a goal *for* which man might strive but is also the means *whereby* he might achieve it. Jiménez seems to suggest something of the double meaning of the central principle of *Urbild*¹⁴ in Krause's messianic message. In a letter to Louise Grimm in early 1912 he wrote of the forthcoming Palm Sunday: "This time approaching is for me the most annoying of the year; all fiestas bother me, but some—Holy Week, Christmas—more than others" (Ms. Cartas. Caja 13, 67. AHN).

In "Los toros" (LXX) he laments the behavior of the young striving to ape the approved models of the Spanish *macho*: "It grieves me to see youths walking clumsily down the streets wearing wide-brimmed hats, blouses, smoking cigars, and smelling of the stables and brandy."¹⁵ He is consistent in his critical attitude to the customs, institutions and the life-style of his countrymen. "Ever since I was a small boy, Platero," he wrote in "La fábula" (CXXV), "I had a horror of fables, the Church, the Civil Guard, bulls, and the accordion" (p. 709). But he expanded this gloss of the *Renacimiento*

article to condemn the false and, ultimately, sterile view of life presented in fables which he associated with stuffed animals and false oratory. In addition, the fable's indifferent and varied moral tone seemed to lack any connections with real life. Jiménez, faced with sermonizing, prefers the style of the "pedagogía íntima" of Giner. In the face of his fellows *en masse* he turns Platero's head towards the countryside, to the "large healthy body of Nature, which, when it is *respected*, gives to *deserving* individuals the calm spectacle of its shiny eternal beauty" (p. 640; my emphasis). "Like me, he wants nothing from the Carnivals," he wrote, attributing to his *tierno burro* obvious human characteristics, "We're no good for these things. . ." ("no servimos. . .") (p. 711). Platero, "tender and pampered" and girl-like on the outside (associated with sentiment and sensitivity) is also "hard and dry within" (associated with integrity, sobriety and self-discipline). It may be that Jiménez, ever the aesthete, instinctively shunned crowds and fiestas. But his commentary seems to bear the burden of a homily. First, the use of the *nosotros* implies that the mute donkey has become an *alter ego* whereby he might catechize. Second, the "we" (rather than a single "I") suggests a select and meritorious group, which, in its capacity for observation and commentary, becomes what Giner called a *minoría pensante*, implying a superiority of mind and spirit. This, after all, is what "no servimos" really implies. The choice of words and techniques is a careful one in that there is also implied the unexpressed opposite: that the *alter ego* and the poet *do* serve, and in a more positive and distinct way. They serve as exemplars of a more valid and worthwhile outlook on life and the act of living. In this comment, as in comparable comments by Giner, we discover the implied need to live an exemplary life, one which involves a certain puritanism, which manifests a high idealism, even pride in being different and apart, even as a *loco*. As a minority group they represented all that was hostile to vain and idle pleasures, hypocrisy, cynicism, lax morals, base attitudes and human degradation in Spanish society. Jiménez offers an alternative model. He wrote in *Renacimiento* at the time he was composing *Platero*, "I believe there are two elements corrosive to the spirit: sensuality and impatience. . . ." Giner had already exhorted his disciples to stay away from ". . . extraordinary fiestas that . . . disturb the rhythm and beat of life, fatigue and deprave with the gross accumulation of every kind of prodigality . . ." (VII, p. 147).

Jiménez stands aloof and observes. He shuns, in his commentary, the *apólogo* he censured in "La fábula" and, yet, there remains a

distinct moralizing tone in *Platero*. It is not stultifying nor rhetorical; it is implied by personal example, oblique statement, and an appeal to the reader's "sensibilidad." As Juan Ramón explained in "El sentimentalismo hondo," written soon after the publication of *Platero* as a part of the projected *Un andaluz de fuego. Elegía a la muerte de un hombre* in terms which anticipate much of the tone of the lectures of the 1940s:

In the *most cultured*, refined and noble races, *sentiment shines forth as the highest quality of being*. A truly cultured man cultivates his feelings by means of flowers, children, his mother. . . . Today's important men tend to generalize their feelings, to make them too inclusive. (*LPr*, p. 921) [*italics mine*].

It is a view of life which he held in common with the *institucionistas*. In "La miga" (VI) Jiménez contrasts the traditional form of schooling, against which Giner directed his attacks, and their own view of the necessary preparation for life. The tone is playful and, at times, ironic; but the relative values of the contrasted views are clear. Village schooling is associated with poor calligraphy, cloth flowers, the deficient education of the "cura de Palos," Catholic observance, the yellowish-purple of dead fish (dead Christ?), corporal punishment and dunce's caps. "No, Platero, no," he went on, "Come with me. I will teach you about the flowers and the stars" (p. 554). The child needs to be taught of the beauties of the earth (*flores*) and the idealism of the spirit (*estrellas*). The choice of the verb "enseñar" is used deliberately to underline the fact that teaching is not only instruction but "showing" which allows the child to "ver claro." Giner's profile of the ideal teacher is remarkably similar to the image of the poet-*yo* of *Platero*.

Teaching, like the priesthood . . . demands first of all well balanced men, idealistic in temperament, loving towards the large things of life, noble and simple tastes, good habits, healthy in mind and body, and working by their thought, word and even in their manners to serve the sacred cause whose continuation is entrusted to them. (XII, p. 86; cf. *AO*, pp.84-85)

Giner's sobriety of conduct and dress (copied by Jiménez) represented a notion of proper manners. "Voice, experience, gesture, attitude, way of walking and standing . . . fall under the jurisdiction of

manners,” noted Giner in “Spencer y las buenas maneras,” who went on to argue for an intimate link between actions, example and spiritual strength. For Giner, too, as for Juan Ramón, life and art were intimately linked: “the ideal of manners . . . is always intimately linked with *beauty and art*” (VII, p. 170). This aspect was arguably the most attractive one for Juan Ramón. The linking of behavior (ethics) with beauty (aesthetics) was not only to give birth to the principle which was to become a keystone of Jiménez’ mature outlook—*la ética estética*—but it was to provide a sure ground on which he was able to place his faith after the collapse of his religious convictions. “I live in a spiritual asceticism.” “I live for the sake of poetry, art, and not only in poetry but in everything I endeavor to adjust my life to a norm of moral perfection” (1913, VV, pp. 32. Cf. Giner, VII, p. 175 and *TG*, pp. 10-11).

How, then, is man to live? Poet and donkey retire to Fuentepiña, just as Juan Ramón and his mentor headed for the Guadarrama on Sundays between 1902 and 1905.¹⁶ Nature and its beauty offered both men a spiritual haven. The depiction of ugliness and spiritual disharmony is less a question of artistic maturity and “a wider view of the social scene,” as Predmore suggests,¹⁷ than one of a Ginerian view of existence. Neither is *Platero y yo* a *costumbrista* work as Díez-Canedo argues in *Juan Ramón Jiménez en su obra* (Mexico, 1944). One scene, in particular, negates in every way one of the most popular subjects for the *cuadro de costumbres*: the gypsy. By the turn of the century the major tenets of conservative *casticismo* and *buenas ideas* in literature of the writings of Fernán Caballero, Alarcón and Pereda had given way to an accent on the so-called “typical” and the picturesque. If the mid-century was a mirror to the reaction in literature against the subversive doctrines of the Romantics, the *cuadro* of the 1890s mirrored the self-deception and complacency of a nation which the Generation of 1898 was to criticize. “Los húngaros” (XXXIII) gives the lie to the literary myth of the indigent but happy gypsy basking in the sun eating a watermelon. The essay begins with the verb *mirar* so frequently employed in *Platero*. It marks an exhortation to witness, an implicit catechism between two members of the *minoría pensante* who have seen clearly (Giner’s “ver claro”). “Look at them, Platero, stretched out full length” (p. 588). A mood of ambiguity moving between censure and compassion, which recalls a similar tone in “Rejas de oro” of 1900, is apparent in the pejorative effect of “largor” and “como . . . los perros.” This effect is underlined by the long vowel sounds. The initial picture gives way to an undeniable appreciation of the beauty of the human female form,

the copper-colored naked young woman. But that beauty, and by implication the vitality of the spirit which animates it, has been neglected with obvious deleterious results. The girl is "a statue of dirt," her former naked slenderness gone to fat. Even the grasses uprooted by her blackened hands are ugly "hierbazos." The child already shows signs of inner spiritual decay in her outward actions as she scratches obscene graffiti on a wall. The little boy is even now a simulacrum of the noisy, slovenly adult. The flea-infested father, whom Juan Ramón pairs with the monkey, takes on all the ignoble and immoral characteristics of the latter as depicted in the tradition of allegory and bestiary. The *costumbrista* scene of the merry gypsy strumming a guitar becomes the pathetic reality of a sad, lice-ridden figure reduced to the level of the animal. The traditional songs which are a necessary component of the contemporary *cuadros* of Rueda or Reyes are here the unrhythmic beating, "with indolent force," of the tambourine and the "tuneless monotony," with which the girl swears unashamedly under the coercion of her brother's kicks. The total disharmony is completed by the description of the undernourished monkey who cannot keep time and aimlessly swings a bell. The disharmony of the music is the outward sign of inner disharmony of a group of people who have failed to discover the *armonía* of their lives and destiny. They have no future for they have no present. They stand for the unyielding material upon which the Krausists felt impelled to work in their mission to bring about the ultimate perfection of mankind.

To this end Juan Ramón strips bare the reality that lay beneath the comfortable prejudices and self-deceit of the *cuadros* of the turn of the century. The ironic, "Behold, Platero, the Amaros, an ideal family," presents not the model which Giner could have admired but a caricature. "Los húngaros" is a pastiche of national ideals and *machismo* ("a man like an oak"). The much-esteemed fecund and submissive woman ("lies down like a vine") and the Catholic Church's Pauline directive to be fertile are similarly attacked. The account of the insecure economy of the group, implied in the concluding paragraph, reliant not on productive labor but on precarious and dubious enterprises, is a further indication of the direction of Jiménez' commentary. As he noted in *La alameda verde* (1906-12), "They grieve a great deal about their poverty, and they haven't touched their spiritual treasures!" (*LPr*, p. 485). It is a damning statement on national attitudes and on Spain's socio-economic organization.

Giner had coupled the role of the teacher with that of the priesthood, and he arrogated to the *minoría pensante* the spiritual

instruction of his fellows. It is no surprise therefore to find Juan Ramón disdainful of a clergy that fell short of Giner's pedagogical ideals. The antipathy for the clergy which Juan Ramón felt during his schooldays in the Colegio de San Luis Gonzaga appears in *Platero*. Don José, the village priest, is no vicar of Christ. The opening is ironic in that it implies for the most part the opposite of what is said. "Already, Platero, the annointed man is speaking with a honeyed accent." The description which follows and the undermining of the veracity of the opening statement in the second sentence conveys the true version. But the comic tone soon changes to present a man who is both restless, irascible and a hypocrite. This man of God is seen "throwing curses and stones." "I have never heard a man swear more," continues Jiménez, "nor give more offense to heaven with his oaths" (p. 576). He lives in disharmony with his neighbors and with nature. He is unmoved by the beauties of God's creation. Indeed, he perceives no hint of a divine plan. "All of this grace, softness, freshness, purity, vitality seems to him to be an example of disorder, hardness, coldness, violence, ruin." Jiménez contrasts life-enhancing attitudes and those of spiritual dessication. Don José maintains a "furious hostility" against his environment and his fellow men. Only when he goes to prayer is harmony restored, suggests Juan Ramón with wicked irony. "The silence of Don José is heard in the silence of the countryside." This curious inversion of expression where a negative is expressed in positive terms reinforces the value Jiménez himself places on the peacefulness of the countryside. Don José's attitude to the children who steal his apples may be understandable, but this irascible man, the keeper of souls, spares no kind glance for his fellows. The *pueblo* grows "dark" at his approach for he sees nothing and his presence is synonymous with darkness, the absence of life and light. On his donkey he appears like a picture of the dead Christ. This is no compliment, for Juan Ramón implies that he incarnates a religion which is without life, lacking a sense of harmony between man and nature. This is not the Godhead who manifests himself in every atom of the living world.¹⁸ And the priest is a hypocrite. The contrast of "speaking with honeyed accent" in public with the "curse words" of private anger is real enough. But he also allows his servant, Baltasar "to drag his hernia, which looks like a circus balloon, along the roads into town" without supplying the necessary charity for medical aid. He only pays him, as Jiménez reveals in a devastating aside, "to pray with the poor for the dead relatives of the rich. . . ." A soulless man who practices an inequitable, hypocritical and dead ministry, Don

José represents a lack of education in the Ginerian sense of the word. Given the control of the Church over national education little progress can be expected. The priest lacks ideals, without which, wrote Giner, "man's life, everyone's life . . . whatever his profession, priest . . . salesman, politician, is insipid, insubstantial, inert; it is vegetation, not human life . . ." (XVII, pp. 148-49).

But there are men who match up to the Ginerian ideal, who have developed a superior personality and a truly human lifestyle (VII, p. 273). We can infer that the ordinary people of Moguer going about their daily tasks are obvious examples from the tone of Juan Ramón's commentary as he stands on his lofty tower in "La azotea" (XXI). The delight in simple tasks and children's games prefigures the substance of his "Política poética" of 1936 and the theme of *el trabajo gustoso*. But a more obvious example is Darbón, Platero's doctor. Jiménez' description is not a joke, nor the veterinary a buffoon, as Predmore suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 123), for the poet's affection and admiration is obvious in the association of the man with the potency and the fruits of nature. He might sound like an old piano, be inarticulate and clumsy but his whole demeanor makes up "a friendly concert," Giner's harmony. Unlike the gypsies, Darbón is in harmony with the world and his inner self. Physically large and toothless, he nevertheless has a warm and expansive spirit. "He becomes tender like a child with Platero. If he sees a flower or a little bird, he quickly laughs . . . , a long loud laugh . . . that always ends up in tears" (p. 600). His feeling combines the candor and innocence of the child with the controlled delicacy and unrest of the serene spirit of a man bereaved. "Later, serene now, he looks for a long time at the old cemetery: 'My daughter, my poor little daughter.' " Darbón combines the necessary qualities of the "sentimiento" and "inquietud" of which Jiménez spoke in his autobiographical note for *Renacimiento*. With *delicadeza* it makes a combination which goes to form Giner's complete man: "to join strength with delicacy; energy with gentleness; profound feeling with imperturbable serenity" (IX, p. 142). Juan Ramón was to echo this statement more exactly in 1953 when he wrote "I consider delicacy of feeling a strength" (*CI*, p. 243).

The themes of man living in harmony with his environment and of man fulfilling himself in his work are insistent ones in *Platero*. In "Madrigal" (CXXXI) the poet observes a butterfly in his garden. The first draft of this essay allows a greater understanding of the contrasts Juan Ramón implies than the more spare, revised version.¹⁹ He juxtaposes the outlook of the *minoría pensante* and that of the mass.

“There are, Platero, *intimate* consummate beauties that other *more showy and meddlesome* ones in vain attempt to hide.” He then goes on to describe the apparent disinterested joy of the butterfly in flight: “Platero, look how easily it flies! How joyful it must be for it to fly like that, to fly for the sake of flying.”

There follows an interesting reflection which reveals much of Jiménez’ attitude to his art and to the accounts of his own experiences in *Platero*.

It must be similar to my feelings as a poet, the delight of verse, *singing for the sake of singing when, like the butterfly—like the rhythm in wings and waves—one has in his breast the rhythm of song*. In its flight everything flows inward, from the butterfly to its soul, *from me to my soul*. One could believe that nothing mattered more to it, *or to me* in the world. . . . Platero, *look with your eyes, they’re for seeing just as mine are*. How delightful to see it flying like that, *natural*, pure and with every movement counting!

Jiménez underlines the importance of the process of “seeing clearly” which recalls Giner’s “*ver claro*” and the spiritual preparation needed to be able “to distinguish between names and things and to seek the latter . . . in the intimacy of the conscience” (II, p. 172). Second, the evocation of the flight of the butterfly/poet’s imagination (*psiquis*) is reminiscent of a view he was to express nearly twenty years later when he defined a lyrical work ethic:

one in which we work in our life and for our life, with a conscious sense of duty, each one at his vocation “whatever pleases him,” and, let it be clear, with the rhythm appropriate and necessary to this liking. . . . In the notion of “whatever pleases each one” lies the flame that feeds poetic quality and which should always accompany work, giving it utility and delight. To work with pleasure constitutes physical and moral harmony. (1936; *TG*, pp. 20–21)²⁰

It is this fusion of the impulse towards self-realization and the realization of the ideal itself which lies at the heart of Krause’s choice of the ambiguous term *Urbild*. The *idea* (archetypal principle) becomes the *ideal* (union of man and God):

when this idea concerning humanity is clear to the spirit and moves it inwardly to convert the idea into deed, directions and practical levels of work are then determined; that is, an ideal is formed in compliance with the question: how should the relationship, tendencies, and direction that mankind embodies be ordered so that they correspond to his nature and to the fulfillment of his destiny? (*Ideal*, p. 29)

It is to this process, with the added emphasis on the aesthetic aspect of Krausist idealism, that Jiménez gives attention in "Paseo" (LVII) and to a lesser extent in "El loco" (VII), "¡Ángelus!" (X), "La cuadra" (especially the *borrador* version) (XIV), "Paisaje grana" (XIX) and "La primavera" (XXV).

In "Paseo" the inseparable couple ambles along on a summer's day, heavy with the scent of flowers. The poet senses intimations of eternity in the blue sky above, the silent heat of the countryside and the windless sail on the river below. The intimation is momentary but it confers upon the simple smells and sounds of the *campo* and Platero's bray a pristine significance which provokes an apostrophe to a form of life which Giner described as "the thirst for simplicity, repose, ample and serene horizons, communion with rural life that consumes all minds glutted with complications and refinements" (IX, p. 116). "What a simple daily pleasure! From the well I fill my glass and drink a snowy liquid," wrote Juan Ramón, suggesting that he had drunk the ideal life to the full. In a manuscript note written about 1930 under the title "Ideal devida y muerte" he observed,

A house sufficient to itself: orderly, simple beauty . . . (surrounding tranquility). To take joy everywhere in everything. Everything for one's steady and perfect *obra*. Create oneself in writing. To die confident of eternity in our work. (Ms. Caja 20, 140/141 AHN)

Platero in "El moridero" (XI) is promised an afterlife as beautiful as his living present, and Juan Ramón goes on to describe that life in terms of a *trabajo gustoso*.

The boys will play and the girls will sew by your side in little chairs. You'll learn the verses that solitude offers me. You'll hear the girls sing when they wash in the orange grove and the

sound of the draw-well will be a fresh pleasure to your everlasting peace. (p. 560)

Platero, as much as his master, achieves the fullness of his being as “La corona de perejil” suggests. The choice of the crown of rock-parsley, which was to stand as a symbol of the power of poetry to overcome the greatest obstacles and to become an illustrative motif in all his late works, is not coincidental. “Then, thought I, Platero’s chief reward would come *from the effort itself*; the same applies to my poetry” [*Italics mine*].

Several chapters express the negative side of Jiménez’ evocation of harmony, most noticeably in the wounding of Beauty and life and in the descriptions of exploitation and pollution. The castrated colt (XV) who loses his “shiny magical beauty,” is an obvious example. The sense of disharmony, of disunity and of separation from the Ginerian ideal world is clear in the concluding paragraph.

Juan Ramón was to symbolize his own momentary separation from the beauty of life in the image of the dog on a leash (LXXXVI). The callous shooting of the mangy dog (XXVII), the death of the white mare (CVIII), where momentary compassion is likened to a butterfly in the center of a whirlwind, the pollution of “El río” (XCV), the exploitation of the *burra* to gratify the superstitious beliefs in magic cures (CXIX) all belong to the same group.

In “El niño y el agua,” (XLII) Juan Ramón attempts to convey the inner nature of the spiritual condition we have described. He chooses the image of the fountain flowing in the midst of “sun-scorched, sterile dryness of a great dusty corral” (p. 601). The yard, significantly, is called “San Francisco,” recalling both *Il Poverello* and Don Francisco and their attitudes to life. “The heart fills,” writes Jiménez, “with a name that the eyes repeat in the Prussian-blue sky with letters of light: Oasis.” Whether this is a real notice or a visionary one, the symbolism is clear. The child holding the water in his hand stands, as Jiménez explains, for a state of soul, *his* soul. The fountain, ever-renewing source, in the center of a barren yard, is a veritable spiritual oasis, a center of life and idealism amid a sterile reality. In this essay, as in “La fuente vieja” (CIII), we learn something of the nature of Jiménez’ philosophy and its relationship with that of Giner. One might suppose from the transmutation of the evening sky into falling rose petals in “¡Angelus!” (X), and the statement “this life of ours loses its daily strength and another strength from within, higher, more constant and pure causes everything, as if it were a graceful fountain, to spring to

the stars" (p. 559), that Jiménez' philosophy was Platonic in nature. Yet his words echo Giner's action that moves from without to within. It may be that his idealism is rooted in reality in the Krausist adaptation of the Aristotelian ideal.²¹ There is no sense of a fixed and absolute Idea. Rather, it is a view which combines constancy and flux. The child holds the water, symbol of the life-giving value of art and artistic activity, "and the water places in his hand a tremulous palace of *freshness and grace*" (my emphasis). As the boy fulfills himself in his *trabajo gustoso*, so the artist through art realizes himself and the divine design. "Works of art, like Prometheus, bring a bolt of infinite beauty to the world; they are a vivid and progressive revelation of divinity among men. That which is beauty in its limit and genre is similar to God and reflects in itself with individual character the construction of the world in unity, opposition, and harmony" (*Ideal*, p. 55). We find the same adaptation of the Hegelian dialectical dynamic in Jiménez' elaboration of the process of the realization and confirmation of life through art. The rich spiritual state is not absolute and immutable for it combines both fixity and change. "The palace, always the same yet renewed each moment, at times vacillates." But even amid movement the "surprised first form" remains. The innocent child, like the sensitive *hombre completo*, can intuit a pattern amid constant change. This is the very essence of Krausist-Ginerian thought. They rejected Platonic idealism, believing that given man's innate capacity to fulfill his divine potential in this life there could be no case for supposing that reality was illusory and that beyond it lay a fixed and absolute Idea. In "La iglesia española" Giner rejected both Christian mysticism and formal worship as a means to Godhead and advocated an activity that would develop the moral perfection of the individual at the same time that he might realize his destiny ("fin") and God Himself. As Giner observed, "the fulfillment of his ends hangs above all on his own activity" (I, p. 25). Jiménez would say "That which vividly fulfills its end is perfect" (*LPr*, p. 944). But the sought-for goal has an existence independent of its realization by man. "Far from being a product of human activity, it is a law to which this activity should accommodate itself, and whose unique basis is found in our nature" (I, p. 30).

In "La fuente vieja" the well again symbolizes "the feeling of true life" (p. 682). Why? Because even though it belongs to a recognizable, temporal reality it also stands as a changeless principle. The changing light of dawn, noon or nighttime affects the color of the whitewashed wall but it remains "always white by being white." That is, the poet is

sensitive to the changing nuances of color but his mind knows that, beneath the apparent change, the central principle or essence is immutable. The flow of water and the contrast with the constancy of its renewal, as in "El niño y el agua," symbolize that harmonious balance of synthesis between the recognition of the eternal principle or model (*idea*) and the constant striving for the realization of its perfection (*ideal*). The fountain forms for Juan Ramón a paradigm of the oneness of man's *destino* even though time marks off birth, marriage and death as discrete moments. For although the still surface represents the motionlessness of death, the "dark, soft, murmuring greenness" of the ever-renewing depths symbolize the ineluctable process towards the divine goal, "the water of my eternity flowing from my soul." In terms of his art he is creating not only "life" or 'beauty,' "my inner life, the external beauty, my Work" (*LPr*, p. 968), but his own eternity: "Think in your work that what you are doing every moment leads to immortality" (*EEE*, p. 233).

The individual death of man or artist makes no difference. In tune with the Idealist temper of Krausism and of the contemporary Generation of 1898 thought,²² Jiménez suggests that life and art are bound not by history and its discrete events, but by a type of *Geist*, what Unamuno was to call *intrahistoria*. Given that the fountain contains the essence of art itself then all the great works of art in the world—the Parthenon, the Pyramids, the great cathedrals—and all the paintings of all countries through the ages must share in that principle. Thus in the fountain the poet can see them "ideally." "Everytime that a fountain, a tomb, a portico *made me pass a sleepless night* with the *insistent permanence of its beauty*, their images alternated in my dozings with the image of the old fountain" (p. 682. [My emphasis.] See *LPr*, pp. 948/50). In the one is all; and the same, he goes on, is true of life. Again Giner had already argued for a duality in life, "because the universal and permanent I is as true and substantive in me as the relative and changeable individual I. . . . It is duality in unity, I being singular and general, all and part, subject and essence" (VIII, p. 39). We might compare Jiménez' statement made soon after 1914:

These my longings for what is universal, may it not be that my many I's of my daily dyings become different I's—beings, things—throughout the world are passionately urging me to constitute a total I? (*LPr*, p. 974)

For Jiménez death is not a temporal accident but a part of the eternal yet changing process. In the description of Giner's death, "El pobre señor ha muerto," the dead man is described as:

a frozen river that had run only within is now the clear highway for the endless journey . . . his image will return to us faithful and enduring. Yes, it could be said that he was not going to die; that, without anyone realizing it, he had passed through death and that like a soul he was forever with us. (*LPr*, p. 933)

Another short essay for the projected biography of Giner, "El Escorial," restates the theme of eternity / change in terms of an aphoristic "present is eternity" (*LPr*, p. 919). For Juan Ramón the eternity of a work of art is the outward sign of the eternity of a man in the fullness of his being and vice versa as these extracts, the many aphorisms of the Residencia period and the draft prologue of *Canción* (1935) suggest (Ms. Caja 12, 64/288, AHN).

This view may help the reader to understand the obscure syntax and meaning of the concluding "A Platero, en su tierra" written in 1916. Juan Ramón contrasts two moments in time: the past (Platero y yo) and the present (yo vengo solo). Time has affected both past and present (sobre nosotros tres) but what remains is the insight into eternity of those years gone by. Momentarily he trusts in a continuity of experience only to hope that the *ellos* (Platero y yo) of the past will not have to experience what the present Jiménez has suffered. And so Juan Ramón embraces the Ginerian *ideal de la humanidad* to transcend the vicissitudes of life to achieve a *presente* which is *eternidad*:

I shall order my acts so that the present shall be all and seem to them a memory; so that the serene future shall bequeath them to the past. (*LPr*, p. 724)

The past can be re-created in art for a specific end. In realizing one's fullness in art, the beauty (divinity) of the moment (*recuerdo*) becomes eternal, a continued present beyond change. The belief in an *a priori* principle which the poet intuits and which, once seen, must be cultivated by the act of living well is the subject of a manuscript note of 1912 entitled "Ideas varias."

A little silver thread guides me through the nameless darkness of my life. With my soul's eyes fixed on it, words—the conta-

gions—of men mean nothing to me. On some days the little thread takes on a divine light, an eternal precision; on others . . . it is lost, raveled, almost broken. But I have faith in it. I follow like a prophet its destiny. (Ms. Caja 20, 142/13 AHN, and see *LPr*, pp. 945/35)

The last phrase is pure Giner.

Space does not permit us to explore the various essays and lectures which Jiménez wrote in the New World after 1940. Were we able to do so, we would find many of the ideas we have discussed further elaborated and refined by the mature poet. With remarkable consistency over three decades he maintained his fidelity to Giner.²³

Jiménez, as an apostle and pupil of Giner, conceived *Platero y yo* as his own contribution to an ideal which his mentor had outlined only months before Juan Ramón's birth. In the inaugural speech of the Institución for the session 1880–1881 Giner exhorted the young “to diffuse this universal sense, instructive and intimate, that tends not to teach except insofar as education can form men.” In the year of the centenary of Jiménez' birth which also marks the centenary of Giner's program to galvanize “in everyone the country's energies for the common task of redeeming it and returning it to its destiny” it is especially appropriate that we should understand the real message of Jiménez' most enduring work.

NOTES

1. *LPr*: *Libros de prosa* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1969). The following abbreviations have been used for Jiménez' works: *AO*: *El andarín de su órbita* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1974); *CI*: *La corriente infinita* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1961); *VV*: J. Guerrara Ruiz, *Juan Ramón de viva voz* (Madrid, Insula, 1961); *EEE*: *Estética y ética estética* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1967); AHN=Archivo Histórico Nacional (Madrid).

2. See Juan R. Jiménez: *The Modernist Apprenticeship (1895–1900)* (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1977), esp. pp. 26–51 and pp. 227–245.

3. Karl Christian Krause, “Estética,” *Boletín-Revista de la Universidad de Madrid*, II, 17, (1870), 1133 and compare Jiménez' “El centro verdadero, . . . en trinidad suprema e indivisible . . .; el bien, la verdad y la belleza,” *LPr*, p. 774 (c. 1916).

4. All references are to Francisco Giner de los Ríos, *Obras completas* (Madrid: La Lectura; Espasa-Calpe, 1916–36), denoting volume and page number only. Jiménez

owned volumes V–XII which are preserved in the library of the Casa-Museo, Moguer. All volumes have been cut but bear no marginalia or signatures. A manuscript note among the Jiménez papers in the Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid (AHN), seems to indicate that Juan Ramón owned more than one copy of many volumes: "Biblioteca de Zenobia y Juan Ramón, Librería para vender y cambiar . . . Obras repetidas de Don Francisco Giner (Tomos, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9)," Ms. Caja 11, 59/56. It seems that some of these volumes were lost in the plundering of Jiménez' Madrid flat in 1939.

5. "Discurso pronunciado en la Universidad Central por el doctor don Julián Sanz del Río . . . en la solemne inauguración del año académico de 1857 a 1858, apud *Ideal de la humanidad para la vida*," 2a. ed. (Madrid: Imprenta de F. Martínez García, 1871), pp. 344-45. [My italics.]

6. See for example *LPr*, pp. 928–29; *TG* p. 225 and "Mis asuntos son todos de minoría y los resuelvo siempre entre la mejor minoría" (c. 1916), *LPr*, p. 963.

7. For a study of the influence of Shelley see H. T. Young, *The Line in the Margin. Juan Ramón Jiménez and his Readings in Blake, Shelley and Yeats* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980).

8. For an examination of this correspondence see H. T. Young, "Luisa y Juan Ramón," *Revista de Letras*, 23–24 (1974), pp. 469–86.

9. See Ms. Caja 17, 101/5, AHN (c. 1919). "Elejía a la muerte de un hombre. Elejía a la . . . Trinidad: D. Francisco, el padre. Cossio, el hijo. Rubio, el espíritu santo."

10. Juan Ramón is incorrect; he was 21 in 1902.

11. In the prologue to the Librairie des Editions Espagnoles edition of *Platero y yo* published in France (Paris: Librairie des Editions Espagnoles, 1953), pp. viii-ix, Jiménez recalled a visit to the dying Giner at the end of 1914 and how Giner praised the work and indicated his regard for the book in that he had chosen it as a Christmas present for his family and friends. I shall quote from the edition of *Platero* in *LPr*, pp. 543–724. In the Cátedra edition of the text (Madrid 1978), M. P. Predmore suggests that *Platero* "es un bello ejemplo de la 'pedagogía lírica' de don Francisco Giner" (p. 43) and subsequently lists "el krausismo español" (without definition) along with St. Thomas à Kempis, the Bible and the Spanish mystics as seminal in the conception of the work (p. 68). Regrettably, the study of the text from this new viewpoint is little more than cursory.

12. Again the idea is an early one in Jiménez's work. In 1899 he suggested that literary criticism was the art of divining that experience, "debe estudiarse con amplitud un espíritu, y este estudio debe ser un paseo al través de un alma artística," *LPr*, p. 212. In "Apuntes" of 1902 he wrote, "Creo que hay que olvidarse de la vida y hacer la poesía de ella con el recuerdo de lo inevitablemente vivido."

13. "No quería dejar su habitación. Empezamos llevándole a las pequeñas escuelas del campo. Ahí con los niños, se transformaba," Gabriel Álvarez de Uribarri, "El último año de Juan Ramón (Apuntes para una biografía. Impresiones de su enfermera, la señora Guzmán)," *Índice*, 13, No. 115 (1958), 9. See also "Los niños fueron maravillosa terapéutica," *Odiel* (Huelva, 8 July, 1958).

14. For a full discussion see Juan López-Morillas, *El krausismo español* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956), Ch. IV.
15. *LPr*, p. 639. All references are to this edition by page number only.
16. See *LPr*, pp. 911 and 920. For an account of Giner's attitude to nature see José Pijoán y Soteras, *Mi don Francisco Giner (1906-10)* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1932).
17. Michael P. Predmore, *La obra en prosa de Juan Ramón Jiménez* (Madrid: Gredos, 1966), p. 102.
18. cf. Jiménez' "Cristo." "El verdadero cristiano no es el que cree en Cristo, sino el que cree y sigue su doctrina; no el que adora a Cristo, sino el que sigue sus ideas. Es decir, que el verdadero cristiano puede ser anterior a Cristo," *EEE*, p. 44 (c. 1914).
19. See Richardo Gullón, "Platero, revivido." *Papeles de Son Armadans*, No. 46 (1960), 9-60; (1960), No. 47, 167-56; No. 48 (1960), 246-92. I have italicised the phrases deleted from the final version.
20. The idea of *el trabajo gustoso* is an early one. See, for example, the manuscript of a *Diario íntimo* and the entry for October 30, 1903, *mañana*:

The poet sees an aged gardener tending roses in the morning sunshine. "... el viejo jardinero anda entre sus flores. Su barba blanca es dulce entre las rosas de otoño que van a deshojarse. ... ¡Y qué ternura tiene el pobre viejo para las pobres rosas!" Caja 16, 95/3-12, AHN. This prefigures the "Jardinero sevillano" by 33 years.

21. See López-Morillas, and *El krausismo español* and *Krausismo: Estética y literatura* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, 1973), pp. 12-17.
22. For a fuller discussion of this aspect see my "Juan Ramón Jiménez: ¿Noventa y ochista?," *Actas del Simposio Internacional de Estudios Hispánicos* (Budapest: Akademiai Kiadó, 1976), pp. 155-70.
23. Since completion of this article in 1980, three further studies appeared which lend support to the arguments rehearsed here and confirm, from another perspective, the profound impact of Krausist thought on Jiménez' life and work: Gilbert Azam, *L'Oeuvre de J.R Jiménez* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1980); Francisco Javier Blasco Pascual, *La Poética de Juan Ramón Jiménez, contexto y sistema* (Salamanca: Studia Philologica Salmanticensia, 1981) and V. García de la Concha's study of *Platero* and Krausist ideology (1981) to appear in *Actas del Congreso Internacional Conmemorativo del Centenario de Juan Ramón Jiménez*.